



2012

A “Lawyer for All Seasons”: The Lawyer as Conflict Manager

Michael T. Colatrella Jr.
Pacific McGeorge School of Law

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/facultyarticles>



Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

49 SAN DIEGO L. REV. 93 (2012).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the McGeorge School of Law Faculty Scholarship at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in McGeorge School of Law Scholarly Articles by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact mgibney@pacific.edu.

A “Lawyer for All Seasons”: The Lawyer as Conflict Manager

By

Michael T. Colatrella Jr.*

Abstract

This interdisciplinary Article explores why interpersonal conflict management principles and skills are essential to good lawyering and, thus, why law schools should teach these principles and skills to all their students. In demonstrating the immense practical value an understanding of interpersonal conflict management principles and skills have in the practice of law, this Article examines case studies involving organizations that have dramatically reduced legal costs, among other benefits, by abandoning a solely legalistic approach to conflict and embracing conflict management principles. The lessons learned from these studies and the interpersonal conflict management principles that underlie them support the idea that the legal profession’s transformation from one that emphasizes a narrower legalistic approach to one that embraces a broader conflict management approach applies to all lawyers and benefits all clients.

* Assistant Professor of Law, University of the Pacific McGeorge School of Law. For helpful comments to early drafts of this Article, I wish to thank my colleagues Professors Brian Landsberg, Omar Dajani, Maureen Watkins, and Clinical Director Dorothy Landsberg. To my good friend, Thomas Cinti, Esq., I extend special thanks for reading multiple drafts of this Article. For providing information or directing me to helpful research, I wish to thank Cathy K. Costantino, Adjunct Professor of Law at Georgetown University; Joanna Martinson Jacobs, Acting Director of the U.S. Office of Dispute Resolution; and Mary Rowe, MIT Ombudsperson and Adjunct Professor of Negotiation and Conflict Management at the MIT Sloan School of Management. For their research assistance, I wish to thank Joanna Armstrong, Andrea Marie Upton, and Anthony Yu. For additional proof reading, thanks go to Jung Hyun “Vivian” Cho and Ha “Sara” Kim. I am particularly grateful to my wife, Jean Mary Shanley Esq., for her support, advice, and editorial assistance throughout the research and writing of this Article.

Article Contents

I. Introduction.....	3
II. Conflict Management and the Lawyer’s Craft.....	7
A. Law School’s “Signature Pedagogy”: The Case-Dialogue Method	8
B. Legal Process and the Process of Conflict.....	10
1. The Two-Phase Theory of Productive Interpersonal Conflict & the Competitive Escalation Cycle.....	11
2. Negative Transformations of the Escalation Cycle: Down the Rabbit Hole	12
i. <i>Tactics Shift from Light to Heavy</i>	13
ii. <i>Issues Proliferate</i>	13
iii. <i>Stereotyping and Demonizing Ensue</i>	14
iv. <i>Good Intentions Give Way to Bad</i>	14
v. <i>The Conflict Expands to Include More People</i>	15
3. The Lawyer’s Role in Minimizing Conflict Escalation Cycles: Early Intervention and Early Settlement.....	16
C. Productive Conflict Principles: The Path to Early Settlement	18
1. Interdependence & the Law School Illusion of “I’ll See You in Court!”	19
2. The Importance of Face-Saving & the Law School Ethic of “Say Uncle”	22
3. Interest-Based Problem Solving & the Law School Illusion of “My Way or the Highway”	25
4. The Lawyer’s Role in Promoting Productive Conflict	28
III. Lessons from Organizational Conflict Management Programs.....	29
A. The Early Case Assessment Strategy.....	30
1. Toro, Inc.....	31
2. Georgia Pacific.....	34
B. The Transformation through Productive Conflict Strategy	36
1. The University of Michigan Health System	36
2. The United States Postal Service REDRESS Program.....	42
C. The Lawyer as Conflict Manager: The Cost of Conflict	46
IV. Conclusion: Creating the 21 st Century Lawyer.....	48

I. Introduction

In a keynote address made to legal educators at the American Association of Law Schools' annual meeting in 1999, Attorney General Janet Reno expressed her wish that the American lawyer "be the problem solver, the peacemaker, the sword, and the shield."¹ Her vision was for a lawyer to be seen as a true "counselor" and not only as an advocate and analyst.² In the dozen years since Attorney General Reno encouraged legal educators to expand their mission beyond casting lawyers in the role of "sword[s]" and "shield[s]" in clients' legal battles, progress has been made.³ Legal educators are increasingly offering courses, seminars, concentrations, advanced degrees, and continuing education in alternative dispute resolution methods, conflict management, and problem solving that are designed to give law students and practicing lawyers the professional knowledge and skills to address not just the legal dimensions of clients' disputes and problems, but also the business and interpersonal dimensions.⁴ Thus, more lawyers today are better prepared to prevent disputes from escalating into full-blown litigation and to resolve both litigation and transactional disputes in more creative, efficient ways.⁵ This progress represents only the beginning of a more fundamental and necessary transformation that, if successful, will redefine the professional identity of the American lawyer to include the role of conflict manager in addition to other important roles a lawyer must play.⁶

For this transformation to be complete, however, there must be a ground shift in thinking within the legal profession. It has been keenly observed that in the United States, law is our "national religion" and lawyers "constitute our priesthood."⁷ Lawyers are the primary gatekeepers of conflicts in our society, deciding or strongly influencing how conflicts are handled.⁸ Despite an increased commitment to alternative dispute resolution processes, both legal education and our national culture still over-emphasize adjudicatory processes and strategies in resolving disputes and have largely ignored the progress that has been made in recent decades in understanding effective interpersonal

¹ Janet Reno, *Lawyers as Problem-Solvers: Keynote Address to the AALS*, 49 J. LEGAL EDUC. 5, 5 (1999).

² *Id.* at 6.

³ *Id.*

⁴ Michael Moffitt, *Island, Vitamins, Salt, Germs: Four Visions of the Future of ADR in Law Schools (and a Data-Driven Snapshot of the Field Today)*, 25 OHIO ST. J. ON DISP. RESOL. 25, 31, 42 (2010) (in analyzing the Association of American Law School's Directory of Law Teachers from 1997 to 2007, the author determined that the number of full-time faculty teaching ADR related courses increased by over 20% and the number of courses being taught increased over 200% during the time period studied). A study by the American Bar Association indicates ADR courses are among the fastest growing area in law school curricula. SECTION OF LEGAL EDUC. & ADMISSION TO THE BAR, A SURVEY OF LAW SCHOOL CURRICULA 33 (2004). Additionally, at least 78% of law schools offer all three primary alternative dispute resolution relate courses: alternative dispute resolution, negotiation, and mediation. *Id.*

⁵ See Moffitt, *supra* note 4, at 7, 33; C. Michael Bryce, *ADR Education from a Litigator / Educator Perspective*, 81 ST. JOHN'S L. REV. 227, 341-46 (2007) (recounting the growth of ADR programs at American law schools and describing some of those programs).

⁶ SUSAN SWAIM DAICOFF, *LAWYER, KNOW THYSELF: A PSYCHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF PERSONALITY STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES* 173 (2004) (suggesting that the "post-Enlightenment developments in philosophy, law and legal practice" that recognized the role psychology and emotional elements have in legal disputes should be synthesized into a movement).

⁷ JEROLD S. AUERBACH, *JUSTICE WITHOUT LAW?* 9 (1983).

⁸ WILLIAM M. SULLIVAN ET AL., *EDUCATING LAWYERS* 1 (2007).

conflict management.⁹ Legal educators provide future lawyers with limited opportunities to learn other ways to manage conflicts or to appreciate the intricacies of the interpersonal conflict in which they are so often professionally embroiled.¹⁰ The narrow and primarily legalistic education many lawyers receive, as this Article will examine more closely below, might prepare them to be effective advocates in the context of courts and other legal proceedings, but offers little guidance in how to be effective advocates in the interpersonal, collaborative processes they will frequently encounter in settlement negotiations, business deals, mediations, and organizational conflicts.

In today's competitive environment all lawyers would be well-advised to develop skills not only in handling litigation, but also in assisting clients in preventing, or at least minimizing, unproductive conflicts that may lead to litigation. "Winning" lawsuits and knowing how to keep litigation costs low are only part of good lawyering because clients understand that even successful, well-managed litigation is too frequently a losing endeavor. In the future, lawyers who are able to assist clients in managing their activities more wisely to reduce the incidence of conflict, as well as deftly handling conflicts, including litigation, once they arise, will be well-positioned to become leaders in their profession as this new era continues to advance. In short, a lawyer must be a conflict manager.

The role of lawyer as a conflict manager is an important subset of a lawyer's role as a problem solver.¹¹ The broader concept of problem solving, in addition to the traditional and essential lawyering skills of advocacy and analytical ability, also includes investigative skills, creative thinking, emotional awareness, and many others.¹² Intellectual leaders in this area such as Professor Carrie Menkel-Meadow and Dean Paul Brest have written and spoken powerfully about the need for legal education to prepare students better for their future roles as professional problem solvers.¹³ There is also an increased awareness that all manner of legal skills need to be taught more pervasively in law schools.¹⁴ But less has been written specifically about the role a lawyer can play in managing conflict inside and outside of the traditional legal arena by using interpersonal conflict management principles and skills.¹⁵ Law schools should commit to creating

⁹ *Id.* at 23-24; Jean R. Sternlight & Jennifer Robbennolt, *Good Lawyers Should Be Good Psychologists: Insights for Interviewing and Counseling Clients*, 23 OHIO ST. J. ON DISP. RESOL. 437, 438 (2008).

¹⁰ SULLIVAN ET AL., *supra* note 8, at 111-12; Edward Rubin, *What's Wrong with Langdell's Method, and What to Do About it*, 60 VAND. L. REV. 609, 641 (2007).

¹¹ Carrie J. Menkel-Meadow, *When Winning Isn't Everything: The Lawyer as Problem Solver*, 28 HOFSTRA L. REV. 905, 918 (2000).

¹² *Id.* at 911-12.

¹³ See generally Carrie J. Menkel-Meadow, *Aha? Is Creativity Possible in Legal Problem Solving and Teachable in Legal Education?*, 6 HARV. NEGOT. L. REV. 97 (2001); Menkel-Meadow, *supra* note 11; PAUL BREST & LINDA HAMILTON KRIEGER, *PROBLEM SOLVING, DECISION MAKING, AND PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT: A GUIDE FOR LAWYERS AND POLICYMAKERS* (2010); Paul Brest & Linda Hamilton Krieger, *Lawyers as Problem Solvers*, 72 TEMP. L. REV. 811 (1999); Paul Brest, *The Responsibility of Law Schools: Educating Lawyers as Counselors and Problem Solvers*, 58 L. & CONTEMP. PROBS. 5 (1995); Paul Brest, *On Teaching Professional Judgment*, 69 WASH. L. REV. 527 (1994).

¹⁴ SULLIVAN ET AL., *supra* note 8, at 87-91.

¹⁵ Although not referring to lawyers as "conflict managers" specifically, there are a number of articulate voices calling for law schools to place greater emphasis on collaborative skills and psychological principles in the law school curriculum. See, e.g., John Lande & Jean R. Sternlight, *The Potential Contribution of ADR to an Integrated Curriculum: Preparing Law Students for Real World Lawyering*, 25 OHIO ST. J. ON DISP. RESOL. 247, 267-68 (2010); Jean R. Sternlight & Jennifer Robbennolt, *Good Lawyers Should be Good Psychologists: Insights for Interviewing and Counseling Clients*, 23 OHIO ST. J. ON DISP. RESOL. 437

conflict managers. This commitment includes not only teaching all students the proper use of alternative dispute resolution procedures like negotiation and mediation, but must also include teaching important interpersonal conflict management principles that are essential for students to perform well in those more collaborative processes.¹⁶

It can be fairly said that conflict *is* the business of law. But most lawyers receive no training in the fundamental principles that govern and animate interpersonal conflict.¹⁷ Interpersonal conflict management principles are distinct from dispute resolution processes, like mediation for example. Interpersonal conflict management principles include social science concepts such as face-saving, conflict styles, and conflict cycles. Despite progress made in expanding the field of alternative dispute resolution, most lawyers remain uninformed of the psychological factors that can escalate and prolong conflict, and of factors that tend to de-escalate conflict, paving the way for compromise.¹⁸ Consequently, lawyers often lack the knowledge that is essential for excellence in conflict management and, hence, excellence in lawyering.¹⁹

Regardless of how law students are educated, lawyers are conflict managers because their clients seek consultation regarding conflicts that, like a cut diamond, are multifaceted, including not only legal but also business, emotional, and interpersonal aspects.²⁰ The lawyer who assumes the role of conflict manager appreciates the whole problem even when engaged to address only one or two facets of it.²¹ The key questions that remain are whether legal educators and lawyers will acknowledge the more expansive role that lawyers can play in assisting clients, and whether they will endeavor to prepare law students to play that role well by including in the curriculum greater exposure to psychological and sociological science principles that will aid them in navigating highly conflicted situations more adeptly.

This is, of course, not to say that it is necessary for lawyers also to be psychologists or sociologists any more than it is necessary for accountants to also be

(2008); Jean R. Sternlight, *Lawyer's Representing of Clients in Mediation: Using Economics and Psychology to Structure Advocacy in a Nonadversarial Setting*, 14 OHIO ST. J. ON DISP. RESOL. 269, 302-13 (1999) (exploring psychological barriers to settlement); Leonard L. Riskin, *Mediation in the Law Schools*, 34 J. LEGAL EDUC. 259, 261-62 (1984) (explaining that lawyers must use "meditative ways" in their practice).

¹⁶ Andrea Kupfer Schneider, *Building a Pedagogy of Problem-Solving: Learning to Choose Among ADR Processes*, 5 HARV. NEGOT. L. REV. 113, 127-31 (2000) (examining the importance for lawyers' understanding of emotional and non-emotional consequences in choosing a dispute resolution process).

¹⁷ A survey of 651 law firm associates by the National Association for Law Placement (NALP) shows that 34.1% of the associates took a negotiating skill course and 21.7% took an alternative dispute resolution skill course during law school. NAT'L ASS'N FOR LAW PLACEMENT, 2010 SURVEY OF LAW SCHOOL EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES AND BENEFITS 18 (2011). However, there are overlaps in these percentages because respondents can select more than one course in their responses. Moreover, an ongoing survey by Sean Nolon, Director of Dispute Resolution Program and Associate Professor of Law at Vermont Law School, of the 200 ABA-Accredited law schools in the U.S., which 137 have responded so far, indicates only 10.9% of the schools require their students to take at least one non-litigation dispute resolution course to graduate. Sean Nolon et al., *Integrating Non-Litigation Dispute Resolution into the JD Curriculum: A Survey of U.S. ABA-Accredited Law Schools*, SURVEY MONKEY (June 23, 2011, 12:00 PM), http://www.surveymonkey.com/sr.aspx?sm=yFtyoMXI9ZFp7xaLrAFO58M1TM9BiVd_2fstDf64koaDU_3d.

¹⁸ NAT'L ASS'N FOR LAW PLACEMENT, *supra* note 17, at 18.

¹⁹ Paul Brest, *Skeptical Thoughts: Integrating Problem Solving into Legal Curriculum Faces Uphill Climb*, DISP. RESOL. MAG., Summer 2000, at 20, 21-22.

²⁰ BREST & KRIEGER, *supra* note 13, at 3.

²¹ *Id.* at 3-4.

lawyers. But as one would wish an accountant to be familiar with law and legal analysis because her work deals intimately with statutes and administrative rules, one would also wish a lawyer to be familiar with fundamental principles of managing conflict because her work involves interpersonal conflict that also has non-legal dimensions. Time, money and harmonious productivity are the premier concerns of today's legal clients.²² Their livelihood literally depends upon it. If lawyers are to thrive and help lead in this climate change, they must find ways to respond to the shifting needs of their clients. Those lawyers who have embraced the role of conflict manager in addition to the many other varied roles they must play, as this Article will demonstrate, confer a greater benefit to their clients and distinguish themselves in the process. They also elevate the legal profession.

To make the case for why lawyers should include conflict manager as part of their professional identity, this Article will rely primarily on examples and case studies from organizational conflicts. The reason for this particular focus is that organizations are a rich source for exploring the value of approaching disputes from a broader "conflict management" perspective, rather than a narrower "legalistic" perspective because of the sheer variety and number of conflicts they face year in and year out. The organizational studies that this Article will explore are also particularly valuable because they provide both quantitative and qualitative data that concretely demonstrate the benefits of a conflict management perspective. The lessons learned from these studies and the interpersonal conflict management principles that underlie them, support the idea that the legal profession's transformation from one that emphasizes a narrower legalistic approach to one that embraces a broader conflict management approach applies to all lawyers. Such an approach also will benefit all clients, whether private citizens or organizations.

This Article explores why it is a worthy endeavor to encourage lawyers to embrace their role as conflict managers and for legal educators to implement changes in the education of law students to help them perform well in that role. Section II begins by exploring the role of the lawyer as conflict manager by assessing the traditional law school curriculum in light of two important social science principles of interpersonal conflict, in an effort to highlight where traditional law school training undermines an understanding of effective conflict management. Section III examines what it means to be a conflict-competent organization and lawyer through reviews of four case studies. Section IV concludes that embracing the role of conflict manager will become increasingly imperative if lawyers are to maintain their historical status as prominent players in addressing conflict in the 21st century. While detailed discussion of potential solutions are beyond this Article's scope, this Article also concludes that it is essential for the legal profession to require education in alternative dispute resolution processes and interpersonal conflict management principles for all its students, and to initiate a discussion as to the nature and content of that education.

²² *How to Curb Your Legal Bill*, ECONOMIST (May 5, 2011), <http://www.economist.com/node/18651204>; *A Less Gilded Future*, ECONOMIST (May 5, 2011), <http://www.economist.com/node/18651114>.

II. Conflict Management and the Lawyer's Craft

Few professionals deal with conflict more consistently and directly than lawyers. Business, healthcare, and sales professionals all encounter a good number of conflicts in their day-to-day professional lives, but these conflicts are ancillary to their professions. Business people create a product or service, health care professionals deliver medical services, and sales professionals sell something. The conflict that these professionals encounter results from the simple fact that they must interact with other people to do their jobs—and where people interact significantly with others, there will be interpersonal conflict.²³ Unlike these professionals, the main business of most lawyers *is* conflict. Conflict is not ancillary to a lawyer's job—it is her job. A lawyer who is retained to represent a client in litigation or a legal transaction, whether she knows it or not, has become part of an interpersonal conflict. Even lawsuits or transactions between large organizations involving complex and highly technical issues such as patent infringement are at their heart interpersonal conflicts because they are ultimately controlled by people.²⁴ People must act on behalf of the entity, negotiate for it, litigate for it, and make decisions for it, and where there is human interaction, the principles of interpersonal conflict apply in full force regardless of whether the named client is an organization or an individual.²⁵

Whether one is a litigator or transactional lawyer, and in some instances a regulatory lawyer, the primary function of the lawyer is to aid a client in settling a dispute, solving a problem, or negotiating a business deal where needs and concerns of the parties involved are, at least to some degree, in conflict.²⁶ To prepare lawyers to be good conflict managers, law schools must teach all of their students the relevant social science principles that are fundamental to understanding the science of conflict management. Law schools not only fail to teach important conflict management principles with any regularity, but they tend to engender beliefs inconsistent with appropriate, empirically supported interpersonal conflict management strategies.²⁷

There are a number of relevant principles from other disciplines related to conflict management that law schools should introduce to students, including, but not limited to, emotional intelligence, conflict style, communication theory, mindfulness, cognitive dissonance theory, principles of perception and memory, decision making, conflict escalation cycles, and productive conflict principles.²⁸ This Article will examine the last

²³ WILLIAM WILMOT & JOYCE HOCKER, *INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT* 2 (8th ed. 2011).

²⁴ *See id.* at 4-5.

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ *See* DEAN G. PRUITT & SUNG HEE KIM, *SOCIAL CONFLICT: ESCALATION, STALEMATE, AND SETTLEMENT* 7-8 (3rd ed. 2004) (defining conflict as where parties “perceive divergence of interests”).

²⁷ Mara Merlino et al., *Science in the Law School Curriculum: A Snapshot of the Legal Education Landscape*, 58 J. LEGAL EDUC. 190, 190-91 (2008); Menkel-Meadow, *supra* note 11, at 918. Professor Carrie Menkel-Meadow sums up the problem succinctly in commenting on the traditional law school curriculum when she states that “professionals solve human and legal problems by working with others.” *Id.* She goes on to explain that “we need to, as my third grade report card said: ‘work and play well with others,’ . . . [but] an emphasis on argument, debate, issue spotting, moot courts, and trials encourage[s] . . . a culture of acrimony.” *Id.*

²⁸ There have been a number of excellent social science and psychology books relevant to the lawyers' work, many authored by world-class scientists, that are easily digestible to non-scientists and useful supplements to law texts in ADR related courses. *See* ROBERT B. CIALDINI, *INFLUENCE: SCIENCE AND PRACTICE* (5th ed. 2009); DAN ARIELY, *PREDICTABLY IRRATIONAL: THE HIDDEN FORCES THAT SHAPE OUR*

two principles in more detail — “conflict escalation cycles” and “productive conflict principles” – to illustrate the important role that social science principles play in managing “legal” disputes efficiently. These two areas of interpersonal conflict management theory are particularly appropriate to explore in detail in this Article because, not only are they essential concepts that operate to reduce acrimony and promote amicable resolutions, but they are specifically undermined in a traditional law school curriculum that over-emphasizes case-method education. Before exploring these interpersonal conflict management concepts, however, this Article will briefly describe what is meant by a “traditional” law school education.

A. Law School’s “Signature Pedagogy”: The Case-Dialogue Method

The classic “Socratic dialogue and case method” (case-dialogue), famously established by Harvard Law School Dean Christopher Columbus Langdell in 1870, remains the predominant educational approach for most U.S. law schools.²⁹ The purpose of what has been called law school’s “signature pedagogy” is to develop critical thinking and analytical competence in law students.³⁰ The general approach of the case-method—with significant variation among professors—consists of a two-step process. First, a student is selected to “state the case,” which involves, at minimum, reciting the relevant facts of a published appellate opinion, describing the procedural posture of the case, and explaining what the court ruled and why.³¹ Second, the professor proceeds to pose questions to the student—the Socratic dialogue—probing both the student’s understanding of the case and the case’s broader import in the context of the legal subject being studied.

The case-dialogue method teaches important legal competencies such as “grounding analysis in facts, the comprehensive spotting of relevant issues and concerns, the search for governing rules, principles, or standards by which to make decisions, and the weighing of policy considerations”³² A well-executed case-dialogue approach can also improve students’ ability to “think on their feet” and “express themselves.”³³ However, an over-emphasis on the “formal, procedural aspects of legal reasoning . . . mak[es] other aspects of the cases peripheral or ancillary.”³⁴

DECISIONS (2008); CAROL TAVRIS & ELLIOT ARONSON, *MISTAKES WERE MADE (BUT NOT BY ME)* (2007); PAUL EKMAN, *EMOTIONS REVEALED: RECOGNIZING FACES AND FEELINGS TO IMPROVE COMMUNICATION AND EMOTIONAL LIFE* (2003); DANIEL GILBERT, *STUMBLING ON HAPPINESS* (2005); MATT RIDLEY, *THE ORIGINS OF VIRTUE: HUMAN INSTINCTS AND THE EVOLUTION OF COOPERATION* (1996); DANIEL GOLEMAN, *EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE: WHY IT CAN MATTER MORE THAN IQ* (1995); ANTONIO DAMASIO, *DESCARTES’ ERROR: EMOTION, REASON, AND THE HUMAN BRIAN* (1994); ELLEN J. LANGER, *MINDFULNESS* (1989).

²⁹ Rubin, *supra* note 10, at 610; ROY STUCKEY & OTHERS, *BEST PRACTICES FOR LEGAL EDUCATION: A VISION AND A ROAD MAP* 207 (2007).

³⁰ STUCKEY, *supra* note 29, at 210.

³¹ *Id.* at 213-14.

³² *Id.* at 212. The case book is the primary tool of the case-dialogue method. *Id.* Casebooks are largely comprised of published federal and state appellate court opinions, which are often edited significantly to accentuate particular points of law. *Id.*

³³ *Id.* at 211.

³⁴ SULLIVAN ET AL., *supra* note 8, at 52.

Business, ethical, and interpersonal dimensions are a few of the important aspects of disputes that the case-dialogue method often neglects or renders ancillary.³⁵ What were the financial and business ramifications for the parties taking this dispute through appeal? What ethical or moral choices did the lawyers or parties make in pursuing the litigation? What were the possible interpersonal consequences of prosecuting a prolonged and contentious legal battle where former friends or relatives were parties on opposite sides? What might a settlement have looked like? While these questions are not always answerable, they are often worth exploring when the facts of the case are complete enough. Conversely, it has been observed that by being required to view legal problems primarily from a perspective that emphasizes legal arguments and procedure, students often view the people involved in the lawsuit merely as “‘individual strategists,’ whatever their social and psychological situation.”³⁶

To teach analytical skills effectively, it may be necessary to isolate the sub-skill of legal analysis for some period of time.³⁷ At least one researcher has reported that “it takes at least a whole semester for most students to sufficiently internalize the basic shift in understanding necessary to recognize the legal point of view.”³⁸ There is evidence to suggest, however, that the persistent use of case-dialogue method through the last third of law school produces diminishing educational returns, with third year law students reporting “significant reduction in the amount of time and effort spent on academics compared to earlier years.”³⁹ Employing a case-dialogue method education for most of a law student’s education, often long past its optimal utility, also leaves unexamined non-legal dimensions of conflicts that are often essential for resolving the conflict efficiently. This creates a gap between what law students learn in law school and what they need to know to be effective lawyers upon graduation.⁴⁰ This Article will now turn to the first of

³⁵ *Id.*

³⁶ *Id.* at 53; DAICOFF, *supra* note 6, at 72 (relating a study suggesting that law school education make students less “[a]ltruistic, trusting, . . . ethical in dealing with others, [and] concern for the welfare of others” than when they entered).

³⁷ K. Anders Ericsson, Ralf Th. Krampe & Clemens Tesch-Romer, *The Role of Deliberate Practice in Acquisition of Expert Performance*, PSYCHOL. REV. 100, 363 (1993).

³⁸ SULLIVAN ET AL., *supra* note 8, at 53.

³⁹ *Id.* at 77.

⁴⁰ STUCKEY, *supra* note 29, at 16. The gap between what lawyers need to know to practice law well and what law schools generally teach has been a topic of serious discussion for more than three decades. There have been four major studies done of the American legal education system in recent decades: The Campton Report (SECTION OF LEGAL EDUC. & ADMISSIONS TO THE BAR & AM. BAR ASS’N, REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TASK FORCE ON LAWYER COMPETENCY: THE ROLE OF LAW SCHOOLS (1979)); The MacCrate Report (SECTION OF LEGAL EDUC. & ADMISSIONS TO THE BAR & AM. BAR ASS’N, LEGAL EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT – AN EDUCATIONAL CONTINUUM: REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON LAW SCHOOLS AND THE PROFESSIONAL: NARROWING THE GAP (1992)); The Best Practices Report (STUCKEY, *supra* note 29), and the Carnegie Report (SULLIVAN ET AL., *supra* note 8). The required learning outcomes for law students are still being debated, and, as of this writing, it is not certain whether the required learning outcomes will explicitly include “alternative methods of dispute resolution, counseling, interviewing, [and] negotiating” as is proposed. See SECTION OF LEGAL EDUC. & ADMISSIONS TO THE BAR & AM. BAR ASS’N STANDARD REVIEW COMM., STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES STANDARD 302 (Draft for Jan. 8-9, 2010 Meeting) (highlighting two alternatives for Standard 302(b)(2)(iii)). Alternative One calls for proficiency as an entry level practitioner in “a sufficient depth and breadth of other professional skills that the law school identifies as necessary for effective, responsible and ethical participation in the legal profession.” Alternative Two calls for proficiency in “a sufficient depth and breadth of other professional skills that the law school identifies as necessary for effective, responsible, and ethical participation in the legal professional, which shall include trial and appellate advocacy, alternative

those interpersonal conflict management principles that will help to close this gap and explore its proper role in the lawyer's craft.

B. Legal Process and the Process of Conflict

A fundamental conflict management principle of which many lawyers are unaware is that the longer a conflict lasts the more intense it is likely to become and the harder it will be to resolve.⁴¹ This principle is commonly known as “competitive conflict escalation cycle.”⁴² It is a basic tenet underlying the wisdom of early intervention and early settlement in many successful conflict management programs, as will be demonstrated in the case studies below.⁴³ A lawyer's failure to appreciate this principle often results in legal disputes that last longer, sap greater energy, and cost more than they should.

Not only do law schools fail to teach competitive conflict management cycles, but their over-emphasis on litigation, advocacy, and the case-dialogue method create the erroneous impression that anything less than full-blown litigation demonstrates, at best, a lack of professional zeal, and, at worst, professional negligence. Lawyers are drilled in basic legal procedure involving pleadings, discovery motion practice, and trial practice, but they are not taught that interpersonal conflict also unfolds in predictable patterns.⁴⁴ Moreover, they are not aware that the patterns of procedural practice are actually in tension with the patterns of interpersonal conflict resolution. This tension is created because the value of the discovery process must be weighed against the value of early settlement. This is a tension that lawyers must proactively manage if they are to maximize their success. The longer discovery and other mechanisms of litigation proceed, the more intense the conflict is likely to become, requiring greater resources to litigate and making settlement more difficult to accomplish.⁴⁵ Conversely, the less discovery and litigation that is conducted, the less a lawyer knows about the circumstances of the dispute and the nature of the other participants so as to make valuing the case for settlement less accurate and more risky.⁴⁶

The lawyer's role as conflict manager is to manage this tension effectively to promote amicable and advantageous settlement sooner rather than later. There is no “one size fits all” formula or rule to determine when a dispute should settle because the decision to settle involves analyzing numerous factors that are highly situational.⁴⁷ Nevertheless, understanding this tension will help attorneys make better decisions about when and how to conduct settlement discussions, and, consequently, improve their effectiveness in managing the conflict.

methods of dispute resolution, counseling, interviewing, negotiating, factual investigation, organization and management of legal work, and drafting.”)

⁴¹ ROXANE S. LULOFS & DUDLEY D. CAHN, *CONFLICT: FROM THEORY TO ACTION* 81 (2nd ed. 2000).

⁴² *Id.* at 19.

⁴³ See Section IV of this Article.

⁴⁴ SECTION OF LEGAL EDUC. & ADMISSION TO THE BAR, *supra* note 4, at 25 (showing that civil procedure is a required course in all law schools).

⁴⁵ PRUITT & KIM, *supra* note 26, at 89-90; LULOFS & CAHN, *supra* note 41, at 81-82.

⁴⁶ See GERALD R. WILLIAMS, *LEGAL NEGOTIATION AND SETTLEMENT* 115-29 (1983); JOHN LANDE, *LAWYERING WITH PLANNED EARLY NEGOTIATION: HOW YOU CAN GET GOOD RESULTS FOR CLIENTS AND MAKE MONEY* 10-15 (2011).

⁴⁷ WILLIAMS, *supra* note 46, at 10-12 (reviewing the factors relevant to settlement).

1. The Two-Phase Theory of Productive Interpersonal Conflict & The Competitive Escalation Cycle

The best place to begin a discussion of interpersonal conflict is with the theory of how to manage it properly. The two-phase theory of interpersonal conflict management divides effective management into a “differentiation” phase and an “integration” phase.⁴⁸ In the differentiation phase, “the parties raise the conflict issues and spend sufficient time and energy clarifying positions, pursuing the reasons behind those positions, and acknowledging the severity of their differences.”⁴⁹ In the integration phase, parties “acknowledge common ground, explore possible options, and move toward some solution”⁵⁰ Successful interpersonal conflict management requires that one effectively navigate the transition between the differentiation phase, where the parties attempt to understand their differences, and the integration phase, where the parties attempt to reconcile those differences.⁵¹

The two-phase interpersonal conflict model is easy to explain but often challenging to execute. Parties can find it difficult to navigate the transition between phases successfully because the differentiation phase is riddled with psychological landmines.⁵² One of the most destructive of these landmines is competitive conflict escalation cycles. In an effort to understand the conflict, “[t]he combination of hostility and irreconcilable positions may lead to behavior that spurs uncontrolled, hostile escalation into destructive conflict.”⁵³

Several distinct conflict patterns have been identified, but the competitive conflict escalation cycle is the most applicable to legal disputes and would be most beneficial for lawyers to understand.⁵⁴ In simplest terms, a competitive escalation cycle occurs when “the behaviors of one person intensify the behaviors of another person.”⁵⁵ A competitive escalation cycle is “characterized by a heavy reliance on overt power manipulation, threats, coercion and deception,” behaviors that are often associated with legal conflicts.⁵⁶ The most important feature of this escalation cycle for lawyers to understand is that the longer the conflict endures, the more intense and complex it will become.⁵⁷ Thus, from a competitive conflict escalation cycle perspective, the immediate days or weeks following the inciting incident is the best opportunity to engage in meaningful settlement discussions because as the conflict progresses, the parties are more likely to undergo negative transformations in their attitudes and perceptions that pose formidable obstacles to settlement.⁵⁸

⁴⁸ JOSEPH P. FOLGER ET AL., WORKING THROUGH CONFLICT: STRATEGIES FOR RELATIONSHIPS, GROUPS, AND ORGANIZATIONS 16 (5th ed. 2005).

⁴⁹ *Id.*

⁵⁰ *Id.*

⁵¹ *Id.* at 22.

⁵² *Id.* at 17-20.

⁵³ *Id.* at 17.

⁵⁴ LULOFS & CAHN, *supra* note 41, at 77. For example, other conflict cycles that have been identified are “conflict avoidance cycle,” where people “avoid initiating conflict or withdraw too quickly when confronted with conflict. *Id.* at 77-78. The “de-escalatory cycle” is characterized by parties who reduce communication and interactions because perceived grievances. *Id.* at 79-80.

⁵⁵ *Id.*

⁵⁶ WILMOT & HOCKER, *supra* note 23, at 21.

⁵⁷ PRUITT & KIM, *supra* note 26, at 89-90.

⁵⁸ *See id.* at 89-91.

2. Negative Transformations of the Escalation Cycle: Down the Rabbit Hole

As interpersonal conflict is prolonged and parties alternatively engage in various forms of coercion, arguments, and threats like the ones discussed above, attorneys should be aware of five forms of negative transformation that often begin to characterize the dispute, and should be avoided at all costs.⁵⁹ The result of these transformations is a prolonged and intensified conflict that is more difficult to control, and, ultimately, more difficult and costly to settle.⁶⁰ This is why wise lawyers, when possible, attempt to resolve disputes as early as practicable.⁶¹ If early settlement is not possible or advisable, conflict savvy lawyers use productive interpersonal conflict techniques to maintain good relations with their counterparts, a subject to which this Article will turn shortly. Once the negative transformations appear, lawyers find themselves falling further and further down the rabbit hole, arriving in a whole different world that is not conducive to satisfactory dispute resolution.

Most disputes do not start with a high level of hostility and intensity, but these negative qualities build strength the longer the dispute remains unresolved.⁶² Even disputes that are characterized by anger or fear at their onset follow this same pattern of escalation because anger and fear are temporary feelings.⁶³ The damaging transformations that occur in conflict involve the parties' attitudes, perceptions, and goals.⁶⁴ Unlike feelings of anger and fear, which are transient, shifts in a person's attitude, perception and goals are enduring and resistant to change once established.⁶⁵ This is why avoiding these destructive transformations, or at least minimizing them, is so vital to effective conflict resolution. The five common transformations that often occur as a conflict escalates are as follows: (1) tactics shift from light to heavy; (2) issues proliferate; (3) stereotyping and demonizing ensue; (4) good intentions give way to bad; (5) the conflict expands to include more parties.⁶⁶

⁵⁹ *Id.*

⁶⁰ *Id.* at 97 (stating “[c]onflict spirals are often hard to stop once they get started because each side feels failing to retaliate will be seen as a sign of weakness . . .”).

⁶¹ For an excellent, in-depth examination of the process of early settlement, see generally LANDE, *supra* note 46.

⁶² See PRUITT & KIM, *supra* note 26, at 89-91.

⁶³ *Id.* at 153.

⁶⁴ *Id.*

⁶⁵ *Id.*

⁶⁶ *Id.* at 88-91.

i. Tactics Shift from Light to Heavy

Parties initially use “gentle tactics” to try to resolve disputes.⁶⁷ Gentle tactics include forms of ingratiation and persuasive arguments.⁶⁸ For example, in an employment dispute between a manager and an employee over the employee failing to receive a promotion he expected and wanted, the employee might first try to persuade the manager to give him the promotion by highlighting the excellent working relationship they have had over the years and express how much he looked forward to working with the manager in the new position. The employee may then respectfully present logical arguments supporting his position why he is most deserving of the promotion and that a great mistake has been made. If these gentle forms of persuasion fail, this “great mistake,” from the employee’s perspective, will transform into a “great injustice,” and he will look for more forceful or “heavy” ways to satisfy his goal of obtaining the promotion.⁶⁹ His arguments and manner of presenting them may become more strident. He may resort to threats, such as the threat to “go over” the manager’s head and take his “case” to a higher authority within the company if the matter cannot be resolved.⁷⁰

ii. Issues Proliferate

The longer a conflict continues, the more grievances the parties tend to uncover, making the dispute more complex and difficult to resolve.⁷¹ In other words, issues proliferate.⁷² The employee who failed to receive his coveted promotion might subsequently realize that his salary merit increase last year was sub par and that, now that he thinks about it, his manager often makes jokes that the employee finds somewhat sexist. For her part, as the conflict intensifies, the manager might remember a travel expense reimbursement report with irregularities that the employee submitted several months ago. At the time, she waived off her suspicions, but now it seems likely that the employee has been padding his expense account!

As issues multiply and the parties become more competitive, greater resources are needed to fight about them.⁷³ More issues in the conflict require more investigation and analysis. More thought and analysis can require more money and time commitments. The employee dusts off his employee manual to study the promotion policy and standards, and casually investigates his manager’s history of promotion giving, looking for trends that demonstrate bias with respect to male employees of Italian descent. The manager digs out the employee’s travel expense reports for the last year and scours them for inconsistencies and evidence of fraud and deceit. There is nothing inherently wrong

⁶⁷ *Id.* at 89. A “coercive commitment” is another common heavy tactic. *Id.* at 75. A coercive commitment is a form of punishment designed to compel the other person to give up the fight, such as promising to engage in a specific course of action (or inaction) until the coercer’s request is met. *Id.* In our employment dispute example, a coercive commitment made by the employee might be to refuse to work over-time or perform “extra” duties” until the manager grants him the promotion if the employee believes that this would hurt the manager’s interests.

⁶⁸ *Id.*

⁶⁹ *See id.*

⁷⁰ *See id.*

⁷¹ LULOFS & CAHN, *supra* note 41, at 81.

⁷² PRUITT & KIM, *supra* note 26, at 89.

⁷³ *Id.* at 90.

with parties discovering additional issues over which they have conflicts. These additional issues may be valid and legitimately need to be addressed. The point here is that as conflicts intensify, parties actively seek new issues to strengthen the cause and the issues they raise are often weak or tangential to the main conflict. Consequently, they detract from the more serious issues and drain limited resources in terms of time, energy and finances.

iii. Stereotyping and Demonizing Ensue

As the parties' conflict escalates and their relationship deteriorates, once specific and narrow grievances transform themselves into more generalized grievances about the other party's attitude or personality.⁷⁴ This form of stereotyping often encourages the parties to demonize each other.⁷⁵ The employee's perspective shifts from a disagreement over his worthiness for promotion into a battle with a bigoted manager who is prejudiced against men and Italians. The manager's perspective shifts from trying tactfully to address the understandable disappointment of a valued employee after not receiving a promotion into battling an ungrateful employee who is more than likely a crook. These negative, oversimplified shifts in attitude and perspective denote an important and unwelcome turning point in any conflict because once the negative attitudes and perspectives attach to the conflict, they are difficult to disengage.⁷⁶ There is also no clear signal that these negative shifts have occurred because they are incremental.⁷⁷ They begin imperceptibly but culminate ferociously, like a house fire that begins in between the walls of the house and grows unseen until it emerges in full force and consumes the entire home.

iv. Good Intentions Give Way to Bad

Another aspect of conflict escalation is a shift from the parties' initial goal of obtaining just compensation for the wrongdoing to a more caustic goal of injuring the other party.⁷⁸ At the beginning of most conflicts, the parties have an "individualistic orientation."⁷⁹ They simply want to satisfy their substantive needs "without regard for how well or how poorly the [o]ther [party] is doing."⁸⁰ So, in the first phase of the dispute, the employee just wants to get that promotion. As the conflict escalates and the parties become more competitive, however, parties will increasingly define "doing well" by how well the he or she is doing in comparison to how well his or her adversary is doing.⁸¹ Further increases in hostility and competition, in conjunction with the negative attitude and perspective shifts discussed above, sometimes intensify to such a degree that achieving their original goal is unsatisfying.⁸² To "do well" in the matter requires hurting

⁷⁴ *Id.* at 89-90.

⁷⁵ *Id.*

⁷⁶ *Id.* at 153-54 (stating the mechanisms that sustain negative attitudes and perspectives are "self-fulfilling prophecy, rationalizing behavior, and three kinds of selective information processing").

⁷⁷ *See id.* (stating that these transformations are "incremental").

⁷⁸ *Id.* at 90.

⁷⁹ *Id.*

⁸⁰ *Id.*

⁸¹ *Id.*

⁸² *Id.*

the other side *in addition* to satisfying substantive goals, or at least a valuable consolation prize if the original goal is unattainable.⁸³ In most circumstances, the need to “hurt” the other side’s interests is satisfied by causing them sufficient inconvenience or financial loss.⁸⁴ For example, the unpromoted employee might be satisfied by appealing the manager’s decision not to promote the employee to a vice president or the human resource department because it will cause the manager great inconvenience and embarrassment. In some cases, however, “hurting” can involve physical violence.

v. ***The Conflict Expands to Include More People***

The longer a conflict progresses, the greater number of people it sweeps into its ambit.⁸⁵ Seeking greater competitive advantage, parties amass social support to strengthen their cause.⁸⁶ Sometimes this social support is in the form of friends and colleagues with whom they can commiserate and gain emotional and psychological strength to carry on the fight.⁸⁷ In addition, parties seek to co-op others who can be useful to them in more tangible ways.⁸⁸ Our employee, for example, might lobby other managers and co-workers to his cause in an attempt to convince his manager to give him the promotion. He may, as already suggested, appeal the unwelcome employment decision to a higher authority within the organization. The employee may also seek advisors who can help guide him to the most effective path of obtaining the promotion.

Sometimes when parties in conflict feel that they can make no further progress in a conflict without professional assistance, they proceed with hiring a lawyer who may then further escalate the dispute by taking it to the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission or similar state agency. The decision to hire a lawyer is, in its own way, a distinct form of escalation.⁸⁹ Hiring a lawyer takes time, energy, and, frequently, money. It also demonstrates a serious commitment to achieving one’s stated goals. It is paramount for attorneys to appreciate, however, that when they are retained to represent a client in a conflict, they are entering into the middle of a dispute, not the beginning of one.⁹⁰ Lawsuits often are interpersonal disputes that have taken on a legal dimension, not legal disputes that have an interpersonal dimension.⁹¹ To make good strategic decisions about the handling of the dispute, lawyers should have a sense of not just the facts and legal issues relevant to the dispute, but also the interpersonal status of the dispute.

⁸³ *Id.*

⁸⁴ *See id.* at 179.

⁸⁵ *Id.* at 191.

⁸⁶ *Id.* at 174.

⁸⁷ *See id.*

⁸⁸ *Id.* at 91.

⁸⁹ *See id.*

⁹⁰ LULOFS & CAHN, *supra* note 41, at 81.

⁹¹ *See id.* (stating that part of a lawyers skill is the “continuous translation of human conflicts into legal language”).

3. The Lawyer's Role in Minimizing Conflict Escalation Cycles: Early Intervention and Early Settlement

It is not obvious to many attorneys that early settlement is a course of action that they should seriously consider. Attorneys are taught to assess the strength of disputes on a “full set” of facts instead of partial facts.⁹² Why should they risk an erroneous assessment of a legal conflict by settling the dispute, perhaps for too little or too much, before substantial discovery has been conducted? Attorneys are also specifically guided to operate under the false and limiting belief that it is appropriate for most cases to settle after all discovery is completed or, worse, on the “eve of trial.”⁹³ In his deservedly well-regarded law school text, *Pre-Trial*, Professor Mauet says that “[w]hile a case can be settled at any time, settlement possibilities are almost always explored when a case nears the pre-trial conference stage and a trial is just around the corner. Discovery will be completed at this point, and there is sufficient information to accurately assess the case.”⁹⁴ He relegated to a *footnote*, the observation that “[o]bviously, settlement should be explored earlier as well, for instance just before or just after the plaintiff’s deposition has been taken, when the costs both in terms of delay and litigation expenses can be held down.”⁹⁵

With this background training, it is not surprising that attorneys are unaware, or do not fully appreciate, that the longer a conflict persists the greater the likelihood is that it will expand, intensify and transform in ways that will make its efficient resolution more difficult or impossible.⁹⁶ Attorneys who are unaware of the principles of conflict escalation see little down side in continuing discovery, except for the additional time and associated costs involved with that discovery. They are not aware that attempting to settle a conflict even a few months later will be more difficult than attempting to settle it sooner.⁹⁷ In fact, they believe the dispute will be easier to settle because the parties will have more complete information about the matter. But as hostilities increase, possessing more information simply means that they have more to fight about.

One common behavior in the conflict escalation cycle found in interactions between lawyers in both the litigation and transaction context is “repeatedly offering the same argument in support of a position . . . , the parties get nowhere but seem to be working feverishly. . . , [and become] polariz[ed] on issues. . . .”⁹⁸ Escalation theory tells us that even when these coercive tactics are appropriate in the context of litigation or transaction, they will tend to intensify the conflict because they will inspire the other side to find ways to gain the upper hand, retaliate, and defend in kind.⁹⁹ As parties exchange blow for blow, motion for motion, brief for brief, clause for clause, or letter for letter, the conflict becomes progressively intense and complex, building a momentum that is

⁹² See generally Rubin, *supra* note 10.

⁹³ THOMAS A. MAUET, *PRETRIAL* 354 (5th ed. 2002).

⁹⁴ *Id.*

⁹⁵ *Id.* at 354 n.4.

⁹⁶ Phillip M. Armstrong, *Why We Still Litigate*, 8 PEPP. DISP. RESOL. L.J. 379, 383 (2008) (attributing lack of ADR education in law school as one reason why lawyers overuse litigation).

⁹⁷ See LULOFS & CAHN, *supra* note 41, at 81.

⁹⁸ FOLGER ET AL., *supra* note 48, at 24.

⁹⁹ *Id.* at 27.

increasingly difficult to control.¹⁰⁰ While this crescendo of conflict is more characteristic of the litigation context, it can also arise in the transactional context.

An understanding of competitive conflict escalation cycles instructs differently. The reality is that there are more costs involved in prolonged discovery than the cost of the discovery itself. The longer the discovery process, the greater the likelihood that the conflict will escalate in intensity and hostility, and that the parties will become more polarized, making settlement take longer than anticipated, cost more than estimated, and become more difficult to achieve than anyone imagined.¹⁰¹ They will commit greater resources and energy to “winning,” and in many cases, begin to demonize the other party.¹⁰² The “demonization” of the other party often causes formerly reasonable parties to shift their primary goal from “doing well” in the litigation to “hurting the other side at any cost.”¹⁰³ Thus, the attorney’s original estimate of completing discovery in two months turns into a two-year process because he did not account for the increased contentiousness and inflexibility that prolonged litigation often begets. In addition, conflict resolution is “most successful” when parties focus on the substantive issues.¹⁰⁴ The transformations discussed above, which increase in frequency and degree as the conflict proceeds, distract from the substantive issues and direct attention toward less productive paths.¹⁰⁵ This makes it more difficult to resolve the dispute.¹⁰⁶

Dispute resolution pioneer and mediator Eric Green, who successfully mediated the multimillion dollar, highly contentious antitrust lawsuit between the U.S. and Microsoft in 2001 says that one of the keys to the successful use of alternative dispute resolution practice is that “attorneys and parties have to be prepared *just enough* to make economic decisions in a minimal risk setting.”¹⁰⁷ Green goes on to say that “[s]ome of the biggest problems in the use of ADR are that cases settle too late, take too long to settle, and settle after too many dollars have been spent.”¹⁰⁸ A recent study of the cost of litigation involving major U.S. companies supports Eric Green’s assessment that organizational lawyers are often overzealous, even wasteful, in their pursuit of discovery in litigation.¹⁰⁹ In a survey of litigation costs and habits of approximately 20 Fortune 200 companies in 2008, the companies reported that in “major cases” that went to trial, they produced on average 4,980,441 documents in discovery of which only 4,772 on average were marked as exhibits at trial.¹¹⁰ This means that only 1 document for every 1,044 documents produced is used as a trial exhibit.

¹⁰⁰ *Id.*

¹⁰¹ PRUITT & KIM, *supra* note 26, at 89-91.

¹⁰² *Id.* at 90.

¹⁰³ *Id.* Closely associated with this concept is the concept of “irrational escalation of commitment,” where parties continue to fight in ways that hurt their self-interest. MAX H. BAZERMAN & MARGARET A. NEALE, *NEGOTIATING RATIONALLY* 9-15 (1992).

¹⁰⁴ LULOFS & CAHN, *supra* note 41, at 93.

¹⁰⁵ *See* PRUITT & KIM, *supra* note 26, at 89-91.

¹⁰⁶ *Id.*

¹⁰⁷ DEBORAH M. KOLB & ASSOCIATES, *WHEN TALK WORKS: PROFILES OF MEDIATORS* 281 (1997) (emphasis added).

¹⁰⁸ *Id.*

¹⁰⁹ Lawyers for Civil Justice, Civil Justice Reform Grp. & U.S. Chamber Inst. for Legal Reform, *Litigation Cost Survey of Major Companies*, presented at 2010 Conference on Civil Litigation, Duke Law School, May 10-11, 2010.

¹¹⁰ *Id.*

A judicious attorney understands the principles of conflict escalation and, like the organizational programs this Article will examine below, appreciates that there are countervailing considerations that favor settling a dispute as soon as practicable. Some disputes require an attorney to conduct complete discovery and significant motion practice and some require no formal discovery or motion practice at all, and many legal conflicts fall somewhere in between. In deciding the degree of discovery and pre-trial procedure required in any legal conflict, the attorney must factor in not only what he is likely to accomplish from those activities, but should also factor in the degree of escalation a prolonged litigation process might engender that could unduly delay resolution or make it more difficult. Good professional judgment requires that a balance be struck between obtaining enough information and strategic advantage to resolve the matter successfully, without dragging the parties down an unnecessarily adversarial path that will further polarize them and thwart an amicable resolution.

C. Productive Conflict Principles: The Path to Early Settlement

Although many attorneys would acknowledge that, in theory, early settlement is certainly best for the parties, attaining this result for clients in practice is a different question. The more challenging inquiry at the heart of this discussion is not whether early settlement is theoretically best, but rather, how does one go about achieving it? To maximize the opportunities to resolve conflicts early and minimize the risks of unnecessarily escalating conflicts, attorneys must know how to manage conflicts productively. What are the “productive conflict” techniques or principles that attorneys must understand to arrive at a fair and expedient, amicable, satisfying, and long-lasting agreement between the parties? More importantly, are they learning these techniques in law school?

If lawyers are going to be useful in their role as conflict manager on behalf of their clients, they will need to be educated in the principles of productive conflict management. Productive conflict is where the interpersonal interaction improves the quality of decisions and strengthens, or at least minimizes, harm to relationships.¹¹¹ Productive conflict is often characterized by its focus on substantive issues, open dialogue, flexibility of the parties, and consideration of other’s legitimate needs and concerns.¹¹² Productive conflict management skills are to collaborative dispute resolution processes, (like negotiation and mediation), what advocacy skills are to adjudicatory processes, (like arbitration and litigation). Conversely, destructive conflict is where the interpersonal interaction diminishes the quality of decisions and damages relationships.¹¹³ The behaviors that often characterize this form of conflict include personal verbal attacks, inflexibility, over-competitiveness, and minimizing others’ legitimate needs and concerns.¹¹⁴ Essentially, productive and destructive conflict are opposite ends of the same spectrum. As destructive conflict increases, productive conflict decreases.

¹¹¹ LULOFS & CAHN, *supra* note 41, at 16-17; MICHAEL A. ROBERTO, WHY GREAT LEADERS DON’T TAKE YES FOR AN ANSWER: MANAGING FOR CONFLICT AND CONSENSUS 117-18 (2005).

¹¹² See WILLIAM A. DONOHUE WITH ROBERT KOLT, MANAGING INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT 10 (1992).

¹¹³ *Id.*

¹¹⁴ *Id.* at 9-10.

While there are many principles and techniques to promote productive conflict and minimize destructive conflict, this Article will explore three distinct, but related, social science principles that promote productive conflict. The first is the principle of “interdependence of the parties,” the second is the principle of “saving face,” and the third is “maintaining flexibility” in the means by which a client’s goals are achieved. Traditional law school education largely ignores, and even undermines, the law student’s understanding of these principles by generally cultivating an attitude that the parties are separate, that they don’t need each other in any way, and that they don’t need to give any thought to how the other party will feel or react in response to their actions.¹¹⁵ Consequently, relationships often become strained and damaged, sometimes irreparably, resulting in an escalation of conflict and a downward spiral in the relationships that makes it difficult, or even impossible, to resolve the dispute amicably.¹¹⁶ With a background understanding of the fundamentals of interpersonal conflict management, however, lawyers will be better equipped to avoid the pitfalls that cause the parties to become polarized and to promote productive conflict resolution.

1. Interdependence & the Law School Illusion of “I’ll See You in Court!”

Law school education, to the extent that it over-emphasizes a litigation-oriented method of study, supplants a fundamental conflict management principle commonly referred to as the “interdependence of the parties.” This principle holds that participants in conflicts, including legal conflicts, are interdependent in that the underlying needs and concerns that fuel the lawsuit will almost certainly be resolved by each party consenting to give the other party something in exchange for settlement.¹¹⁷ In other words, the parties need each other to resolve the dispute. Over-emphasis on the case-dialogue method cultivates an illusion that most legal disputes are resolved through court or tribunal adjudication.¹¹⁸

The rationale for this method of instruction, as discussed above, is that the law student learns proper analytical reasoning and to “think like a lawyer” in addition to the subject matter presented in each case.¹¹⁹ The common pattern that characterizes law school case studies is where one litigant attempts to force his or her legal will upon the other by seeking relief from a court.¹²⁰ In almost all reported cases, there is a party who prevails in whole or in part.¹²¹ There is a named winner and a loser. Litigation is aptly analogized to war—“to the victor go the spoils.”¹²² It is a war with rules, and like war,

¹¹⁵ Menkel-Meadow, *supra* note 11, at 907.

¹¹⁶ *Id.*

¹¹⁷ See LULOFS & CAHN, *supra* note 41, at 5; FOLGER ET AL., *supra* note 48, at 5, 58-59; WILMOT & HOCKER, *supra* note 23, at 13-14.

¹¹⁸ Robert W. Gordon, *The Geologic Strata of the Law School Curriculum*, 60 VAND. L. REV. 339, 340-41 (2007).

¹¹⁹ *Id.*

¹²⁰ SULLIVAN ET AL., *supra* note 8, at 50-54.

¹²¹ See JAMES C. DUFF & ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS, JUDICIAL BUSINESS OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS: ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR 111 tbl.B-5 (2010) (stating that 91.7% lose on appeal and 8.3% win).

¹²² See generally FREDERICK L. WHITMER, LITIGATION IS WAR (2007) (the description for this text uses “the analogy that litigation is war to develop strategic principles. . . for the conduct of litigation for anyone

participants obtain what they want through aggressive tactics and strategies, using briefs instead of bullets.

While the case method approach to legal education unquestionably creates and sharpens legal minds, it is oriented to adversarial processes and not collaborative processes.¹²³ Rarely are law students exposed to cases where the parties settle through a collaborative process prior to a ruling by a judge or jury. It would be no exaggeration to estimate that over 95% of all legal disputes studied in law school involve adjudication by courts and tribunals.¹²⁴ Yet in reality, once law students leave the sheltered environment of law school, they will find that the percentage of disputes they handle through resolution by a tribunal is almost precisely the reverse of their law school experience. Perhaps only 5% of the disputes they will manage as an attorney will be resolved by a tribunal.¹²⁵ For litigants and lawyers involved in civil lawsuits, the question is not whether they will settle the dispute, but rather *when* they will settle and for *how much*.

Law students' pervasive under-exposure to disputes resolved through settlement in a traditional law school education creates the false impression that parties and counsel to a legal dispute are independent of each other. "Independent" in this context means that the respective parties do not need each other to satisfy their underlying desires or concerns that motivated the prosecution or defense of the lawsuit.¹²⁶ The authors of *Educating Lawyers*, the evaluation of legal education by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, rightly observed that law students "learn from both what is said and what is left unsaid."¹²⁷

Thus, law students are sent forth into the world often under the mistaken impression that the employee suing her employer for unlawful discrimination will vindicate her rights in court! The vendor allegedly denied payment unjustly will obtain relief from the court! Attorneys, of course, sometimes do obtain relief for their clients from courts and other tribunals using adversarial methods. The advocacy and analytical abilities that attorneys use to win cases are essential lawyering skills that have not only helped their clients to achieve their goals, but have also advanced important societal goals.¹²⁸ But an over-emphasis on case-dialogue method can leave law students with the mistaken belief that the parties are independent because adjudication is the rule and settlement the exception, when the reverse is true. Under such a belief, neither party nor counsel perceives that cooperation from the other party and his or her counsel is needed to satisfy their litigation goals.¹²⁹ Although going to trial is always a theoretical option in civil legal disputes, it is rarely a practical one for most litigants, including those with

involved in the commercial litigation process." The book is loosely based on Carl von Clausewitz' classic book on war.).

¹²³ See SULLIVAN ET.AL., *supra* note 8, at 50-54.

¹²⁴ See *id.*; Rubin, *supra* note 10, at 649.

¹²⁵ Marc Galanter, *The Vanishing Trial: An Examination of Trials and Related Matters in Federal and State Courts*, 1 J. EMPIRICAL LEGAL STUD. 459, 459 (2004).

¹²⁶ See LULOFS & CAHN, *supra* note 41, at 81.

¹²⁷ SULLIVAN ET.AL., *supra* note 8, at 140.

¹²⁸ Through litigation, lawyers have significantly advanced important rights of the society at large. See, e.g., *Brown v. Bd. of Educ.*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954) (ruling that segregation was unconstitutional). However, there is a movement to advance important civil rights in collaborative processes as well as adversarial processes. See, e.g., Jennifer Gerarda Brown, *Peacemaking in the Culture War Between Gay Rights and Religious Liberty*, 95 IOWA L. REV. 747, 749 (2010) (arguing that mediation "offers a way out of the polarization that often characterizes public discourse about the interplay of religious faith and homosexuals").

¹²⁹ Galanter, *supra* note 125, at 459.

sufficient financial resources to afford the long costly journey. In over 90% of the lawsuits filed, the costs, time delay, and risk of total loss by adjudication do not outweigh the attractiveness of a settlement.¹³⁰

There are important reasons why parties to a lawsuit should appreciate that they are for all intents and purposes *interdependent*. The perception that their respective legal fates are bound together and controlled by one another has a profound effect on how well or poorly they treat each other in the litigation.¹³¹ Parties and counsel who view themselves as largely *interdependent* tend to treat each more civilly and professionally.¹³² Participants in litigation who view themselves as *independent* are more likely to engage in and create destructive conflict interaction that decreases their chances of doing well in the litigation or transaction.¹³³ The characteristics of destructive conflict that most often applicable to legal disputes are personal attacks and inflexibility.¹³⁴ This form of behavior is highly injurious to effective conflict management and contributes to increased costs for the client.¹³⁵ This is not to say that an attorney might not feign greater independence from the other party than he or she believes is true as a way to increase negotiating leverage. Presenting a strong alternative to settlement, like the position that your client will likely prevail at trial, is a legitimate and often effective negotiating tactic.¹³⁶ The problem arises when the attorney, believing he has true independence from

¹³⁰ *Id.*

¹³¹ FOLGER ET AL., *supra* note 48, at 58-59.

¹³² See WILMOT & HOCKER, *supra* note 23, at 13-14.

¹³³ Some lawyers mistakenly believe that hostile behavior and personal attacks are just part of “good lawyering.” Hon. Mark D. Fox & Michael L. Fox, *It’s No Joking Matter: Our Profession Requires Greater Civility and Respect*, N.Y. ST. B.A. J., Feb. 2009, at 10; see *In re First City Bancorporation*, 282 F.3d 864 (5th Cir. 2002); FOLGER ET AL., *supra* note 48, at 58.

¹³⁴ See LULOFS & CAHN, *supra* note 41, at 81. A good example of this is the case of *In re First City Bancorporation*, 282 F.3d 864 (5th Cir. 2002). In a class action suit against a Texas bank, plaintiffs’ counsel launched numerous personal verbal attacks on other attorneys in various stages of the litigation. *Id.* at 866. In a sampling of some of the more colorful personal attacks upon other attorneys, he called them “stooge”, “puppet”, “weak pussyfooting deadhead”, and “underling who graduated from a 29th tier law school.” *Id.* With regard to the chairman of the Texas bank, plaintiffs’ counsel hurled such choice characterizations as “hayseed” and “washed up has-been.” *Id.* In his appeal of the \$25,000 sanction imposed by the lower court, the lawyer trying to justify his behavior argued to the Fifth Circuit that “the statements he made were, for the most part, correct,” and that “the court and opposing counsel caused his abusive conduct.” *Id.* at 867. Agreeing with the lower court’s finding that the lawyer’s behavior was “egregious, obnoxious, and insulting,” the Fifth Circuit affirmed the sanction. *Id.*

¹³⁵ Arguably, the independence from one another is, at least in part, one reason for the perceived general decline in professional civility in the legal profession. A 1991 study conducted by the Seventh Circuit of 1300 attorneys found that 42% of them “felt civility was an issue.” Melissa S. Hung, *A Non-Trivial Pursuit: The California Attorney Guidelines of Civility and Professionalism*, 48 SANTA CLARA L. REV. 1127, 1130 (2008). Almost 70% of attorneys surveyed in a 2006 American Bar Association study reported “lawyers have become less civil to each other over time.” Stephen N. Zack, *Statement Re: The Attorney Exclusion in the SEC’s Final Whistleblower Rule*, ABA NOW (May 26, 2011), <http://abanet.org/media/wyyouraba/2007/article09.html>. The line between zealous advocacy and hostility is not a clear one, and even the most affable attorney occasionally can lose his or her temper in the highly stressful and competitive practice of law. There are, however, a significant percentage of attorneys who engage in verbally assaultive behavior either because they think it is not inappropriate, or because they see verbal attacks as a useful intimidation tactic designed to secure the best deal for their client. Allen K. Harris, *The Professionalism Crisis – The “z” Words and Other Rambo Tactics: The Conference of Chief Justices’ Solution*, 53 S. C. L. REV. 549, 569-71 (2002).

¹³⁶ G. RICHARD SHELL, *BARGAINING FOR ADVANTAGE* 101 (2nd ed. 2006) (explaining that the more desirable one’s alternative to a negotiated agreement appears the greater that negotiator’s power).

the other party, behaves in offensive ways that undermine a relationship that he will likely need before all is said and done.

2. The Importance of Face-Saving & the Law School Ethic of “Say Uncle”

The adversarial, litigation-oriented emphasis of a traditional law school education also gives law students the flawed understanding that their objective in legal disputes is to be the winner who takes all, and to the corollary perception, that it is the lawyer’s duty to bring the other side to its knees. In addition to overlooking the practical reality that the vast majority of cases are settled, the law school education largely ignores the interpersonal conflict challenges created by adversarial processes that operate to make the loser “say uncle.” This attitude lacks appreciation for another distinct social science principle in conflict management awareness skills called “saving face.”

The concept of “saving face” refers to a person’s desire to maintain a sense of self-worth and a positive public image.¹³⁷ This public image is known as “face,” a person’s “claim to be seen as a certain kind of person.”¹³⁸ Attorneys should understand the concept of “face” because “the introduction of face issues into a conflict can escalate the severity of the conflict, making it very difficult for people to resolve the original issue.”¹³⁹ For all the reasons stated in the prior subsection about the litigation oriented nature of many law schools, attorneys often do not appreciate how aggressive tactics, such as intimidation, personal attacks, and threats, harden their opponents and prevent productive conflict.

There are two types of face: “positive face” and “negative face.”¹⁴⁰ Positive face refers to a person’s desire to be respected and to “maintain a favorable image.”¹⁴¹ Negative face refers to a person’s desire to be free from intimidation and coercion.¹⁴²

¹³⁷ FOLGER ET AL., *supra* note 48, at 145. The ethical rules of professional conduct help only minimally to mitigate this situation. Although they require a minimum amount of professionalism, they set minimal and ambiguous standards that are difficult to follow and even more difficult to police. For example, Model Rule 1.2 (d) requires that a lawyer not “counsel a client to engage, or assist a client, in conduct that the lawyer knows is criminal or fraudulent . . .”, but this language leaves ample room for negative behavior. MODEL RULES OF PROF’L CONDUCT R. 1.2(d) (1983). Similarly, Model Rule 4.4 states that “a lawyer shall not use means that have no substantial purpose other than to embarrass, delay, or burden a third person . . .” *Id.* at R. 4.4. Under this rule, attorneys may rationalize that their bad behavior had some legitimate “substantial purpose” in the litigation, which is a low threshold to meet. In fact, many attorneys see their tactics as beneficial, even essential, to winning their case and doing well in a negotiation. CAROL TAVRIS & ELLIOT ARONSON, *MISTAKES WERE MADE (BUT NOT BY ME)* 13-17 (2007) (The book reviews scientific literature relevant to cognitive distance theory in which it explores how people use self-justification behavior to excuse unethical behavior.). Unfortunately, the idea that lawyers can be both zealous advocates and be civil, even friendly, with their “adversary” is often unknown to many law students and lawyers.

¹³⁸ FOLGER ET AL., *supra* note 48, at 145.

¹³⁹ LULOFS & CAHN, *supra* note 41, at 294. While face-saving is always important, it takes on a heightened import in cross-cultural negotiations. LEIGH L. THOMPSON, *THE MIND AND HEART OF THE NEGOTIATOR* 274 (4th ed. 2009). As lawyering becomes increasingly global, it becomes even more important for attorneys to understand the concept of face-saving. For an excellent discussion of skills that attorneys need to function cross-culturally, see Harold Abramson, *Outward bound to Other Cultures: Seven Guidelines for U.S. Dispute Resolution Trainers*, 9 PEPP. DISP. RESOL. L.J. 437 (emphasizing, among other things, the importance of collaborative skills in cross-cultural negotiations).

¹⁴⁰ *Id.* at 295.

¹⁴¹ *Id.*; FOLGER ET AL., *supra* note 48, at 147.

¹⁴² *Id.* at 162; LULOFS & CAHN, *supra* note 41, at 295.

When a party threatens another party's positive or negative face, the threatened party employs defensive "face-saving" strategies to "protect or repair relational images."¹⁴³ These face-saving strategies can take several forms, but all forms of face-saving become obstacles to effective conflict resolution.¹⁴⁴

Threats and intimidation obstruct productive conflict resolution because a person will normally become intransigent and inflexible when faced with coercive tactics that cause them to lose "face." They become less willing to engage in collaboration and compromise.¹⁴⁵ Acquiescing to coercive tactics without at least a good fight triggers in most people a loss of self-esteem.¹⁴⁶ In an effort to maintain (or enhance) self worth, the normal response to coercive tactics is to hold one's ground and fight back.¹⁴⁷ If the conflict escalates, a person's resolve can become so rigid that, in the words of one researcher, "[p]eople often remain committed to a stand or solution even in light of convincing refutations, not because they still believe it is the best option but because they believe moving away from that position will harm their image."¹⁴⁸ When a person feels vulnerable and defensive, he or she is more likely to place "a higher value on consistency than accuracy," limiting that person's ability to adapt to new information.¹⁴⁹

Personal attacks like name-calling, insults, and other forms of contempt also obstruct productive conflict resolution because a person will normally focus on revenge and retaliation rather than the substantive issues.¹⁵⁰ Revenge and retaliation are common face-saving strategies in response to embarrassment and humiliation that further complicate the dispute.¹⁵¹ Revenge can even become an additional issue in the conflict.¹⁵² A person's desire for revenge can "become[] so central an issue that it swamps the importance of the tangible issues at stake and generates intense conflict that can impede the progress toward agreement and substantially increase the cost of conflict resolution."¹⁵³ Diminished time is spent trying to work through the substantive issues and the growing hostility increases the chance of impasse. In addition, this behavior sets off a never-ending cycle of the parties attacking each other, adopting similar strategies that fuel the conflict.¹⁵⁴

Face-saving issues are particularly insidious because parties often are unaware of them. Not wanting to acknowledge a loss of face, the mind keeps the loss of face hidden while it simultaneously attempts to repair any damage through various face-saving strategies.¹⁵⁵ These strategies are sometimes believed to be related to the substantive issues, but they are really about self-esteem.¹⁵⁶ For example, a spouse in divorce

¹⁴³ FOLGER ET AL., *supra* note 48, at 148.

¹⁴⁴ *See id.* at 153.

¹⁴⁵ *Id.* at 152.

¹⁴⁶ LULOFS & CAHN, *supra* note 41, at 295.

¹⁴⁷ FOLGER ET AL., *supra* note 48, at 162.

¹⁴⁸ *Id.* at 164.

¹⁴⁹ *Id.*

¹⁵⁰ LULOFS & CAHN, *supra* note 41, at 299-300; FOLGER ET AL., *supra* note 48, at 162-63.

¹⁵¹ LULOFS & CAHN, *supra* note 41, at 301.

¹⁵² *Id.*

¹⁵³ WILMOT & HOCKER, *supra* note 23, at 77.

¹⁵⁴ *Id.* at 79 (stating that "causing another person to lose the sense of dignity and worth . . ." can cause destructive conflict cycles).

¹⁵⁵ FOLGER ET AL., *supra* note 48, at 153.

¹⁵⁶ *Id.*

litigation may fight vehemently for a dining room set he never liked because he is motivated by a desire to maintain a sense of control or dignity, not a desire for furniture.

The well-trained, conflict-competent attorney ideally appreciates “face” issues in promoting productive conflict, and attempts always to protect and “give” face to the other party. First, the lawyer will refrain from overly manipulative tactics such as threats, personal attacks, and undue intimidation.¹⁵⁷ Second, the lawyer will initially seek to guide clients, as a general rule, toward collaborative processes in resolving disputes, rather than a procedural litigation route. As seen above, even well-managed traditional adjudicatory processes like litigation and arbitration that rely largely upon adversarial tactics create face issues. Finally, the conflict-competent lawyer will always attempt to minimize damage the other party’s self-esteem and public image by using techniques designed to “give” or restore face.

There are several techniques to restore “face.” One such technique is simply to treat others with respect and good will.¹⁵⁸ A second technique for “giving face” is to listen and inquire about the other’s needs and concerns and to address them to the greatest extent possible.¹⁵⁹ These techniques target the party’s need to feel that the means by which the dispute is being resolved is fair.¹⁶⁰ These are sometimes called process needs.¹⁶¹ Surprisingly, lawyers often overlook a party’s process needs, and automatically, and erroneously, assume that the other party is concerned exclusively with outcomes. The third way to restore face is by apologizing.¹⁶² “Apologies are a means of impression management used to restore or minimize damage done to one’s identity and stave off potential punishment from the person offended.”¹⁶³

A fourth technique for “giving face” is to state your “preferences” and not to make demands or threats.¹⁶⁴ The adversarial nature of litigation inspires attorneys to threaten litigation or other negative consequences as a means to force the other party to acquiesce. This form of intimidation often backfires and hardens the other party’s resolve rather than weakens it.¹⁶⁵ Thus, stating a desired outcome or course of action as a preference, rather than a demand, makes one’s desire known but does so in a way that does not appear to deprive the other party of their autonomy.¹⁶⁶ For example, a less conflict-wise attorney might say “if you don’t pay my client \$100,000 we will see you in court.” A lawyer more attuned to face issues and the problems they may cause in resolving a dispute might frame this same desire as follows: “We don’t think going to trial is in anyone’s best interest, but we are prepared to do so if it comes to that. Based on my assessment of the facts I have reviewed, my client is entitled to a minimum of \$100,000 to compensate him for his injuries that we think your client caused. Is there something you think I’m not taking into consideration?” Both lawyers are communicating the same substantive message—they want a minimum of \$100,000 to

¹⁵⁷ WILMOT & HOCKER, *supra* note 23, at 79; *see* LULOFS & CAHN, *supra* note 41, at 294-96.

¹⁵⁸ WILMOT & HOCKER, *supra* note 23, at 81.

¹⁵⁹ *Id.* at 82.

¹⁶⁰ FOLGER ET AL., *supra* note 48, at 162.

¹⁶¹ Nancy A. Welsh, *Making Deal in Court-Connected Mediation: What’s Justice Got to Do with It*, 79 Wash. U. L. Q. 787, 791 (2001).

¹⁶² LULOFS & CAHN, *supra* note 41, at 307.

¹⁶³ *Id.*

¹⁶⁴ WILMOT & HOCKER, *supra* note 23, at 82.

¹⁶⁵ LULOFS & CAHN, *supra* note 41, at 295.

¹⁶⁶ WILMOT & HOCKER, *supra* note 23, at 82.

settle the case—but the first lawyer is framing the message as a threat, while the second lawyer is framing the message as a request.¹⁶⁷ Although the message is the same in both instances, the response is likely to be different.

3. Interest-Based Problem Solving & the Law School Illusion of “My Way or the Highway.”

Traditional law school education primarily teaches students to advocate a “position,” legal or factual, or both, on behalf of a client. Positional thinking focuses on what a party wants in the dispute and seeks to use legal or factual arguments to support that position, rather than addressing the underlying reasons for why the party wants it. Lawyers who view their work solely in terms of their legal “positions” engage in more black-and-white analysis, and often are inflexible in collaborative processes, neglecting non-legal facets of the dispute such as business impacts, relationship changes, or other personal needs.¹⁶⁸ Positional advocacy thwarts amicable resolutions because, unlike the adjudicative process, there is no one to decide who is right and who is wrong.¹⁶⁹ There is no judge. Accordingly, to be effective conflict managers in collaborative processes, lawyers must often look beyond the legal arguments and to the parties’ interests or underlying needs and concerns in shepherding conflict resolutions.¹⁷⁰ This is the conflict resolution concept commonly known as “interest-based solutions.” Interest-based problem solving has received significant attention in academic literature and in law school elective ADR courses. But since it is such an essential concept to effective conflict management, but is not yet universally taught to law students, it would be remiss not to discuss it here, at least briefly.¹⁷¹

The distinction between the parties’ positions and their interests is easily overlooked.¹⁷² Understanding this distinction, on balance, improves the quality of settlements and reduces acrimony. Positions are *what* a party wants and interests are *why* the party is taking that position.¹⁷³ Examples of positional statements are “give my client one million dollars in compensation for my client’s injuries;” “rehire my client;” and “stop using my client’s patented technology in your product.” Underlying these positional statements are the parties’ concerns and needs that the positions are designed to satisfy to a lesser or greater extent.¹⁷⁴ A party’s concern and needs are commonly

¹⁶⁷ The way offers and statements are presented in negotiation is known as a “frame.” BAZERMAN & NEALE, *supra* note 103, at 31. The way the offer is framed can increase the likelihood of a favorable response from a negotiating counterpart. Russel Korobkin & Chris Guthrie, *Psychological Barriers to Litigation Settlement: An Experimental Approach*, 93 MICH. L. REV. 107, 130-35 (1994).

¹⁶⁸ Menkel-Meadow, *supra* note 11, at 907.

¹⁶⁹ THOMPSON, *supra* note 139, at 88 (“Substantiation” is the technical term for the type of positional arguments commonly used by attorneys in negotiation. Substantiation has been shown to be a relatively ineffective strategy in collaborative negotiation processes because “substantiation begets more substantiation.”).

¹⁷⁰ ROGER FISHER, WILLIAM URY & BRUCE PATTON, *GETTING TO YES 4-7* (2nd ed. 1991).

¹⁷¹ See, e.g., FISHER ET AL., *supra* note 170, at 41-55; ROBERT H. MNOOKIN, *BEYOND WINNING* 11-43 (2000); Jim Hilbert, *Collaborative Lawyering: A Process for Interest-Based Negotiation*, 38 HOFSTRA L. REV. 1083, 1087 (2010) (stating that “the vast majority of negotiation and dispute resolution law school courses advocate for the use of interest-based negotiation for doing deals and resolving conflicts”).

¹⁷² See FISHER ET AL., *supra* note 170, at 40-41.

¹⁷³ *Id.* at 44.

¹⁷⁴ *Id.* at 42.

referred to as her interests.¹⁷⁵ Thus, the interests underlying the statement, “I want you to stop using my patented technology in your product,” are, perhaps, the recognition of ownership and profits that naturally flow from it. Having the other party stop using the patented information is one solution—a rights-based solution—but not the only solution. Another potential solution, using an interest-based approach, would be to permit the other company to continue using the patents in its product for a price and with appropriate recognition of the patent holder. This satisfies one party’s need to use the technology and the other party’s need to be recognized and compensated for its labors in inventing the technology.

Like the patent infringement example above, interest-based solutions often create joint gains by finding value through trades in the negotiation.¹⁷⁶ A joint gain is defined as “an improvement from each party’s point of view.”¹⁷⁷ A simple example of a joint gain in an otherwise positional-looking dispute would be for a defendant in a personal injury suit to agree to pay the plaintiff’s settlement demand figure in exchange for allowing the defendant to pay it in monthly installments over one year instead of in one lump sum. Assuming that the plaintiff cares more about the amount of settlement than when it is paid, and the defendant cares more about cash flow than the total amount paid, this deal is improved for both parties. While interest-based solutions are not always possible, they should always be considered because they frequently are more beneficial to clients than rights-based solutions when the problem is viewed in its entirety, which includes the legal, business, financial, relationship, and emotional aspects.¹⁷⁸

This collaborative approach requires flexibility from the lawyers regarding the type of solutions that will satisfy their clients’ concerns because, to voluntarily resolve the dispute, the parties will need to find a solution that satisfies them both, at least minimally.¹⁷⁹ Conflict is productive where the parties remain flexible in their willingness to consider multiple potential solutions to “bridge the apparent incompatibility of positions.”¹⁸⁰ Conversely, inflexibility is one of the most common causes of conflict escalation.¹⁸¹

There are three principal advantages of using collaborative, interest-based processes. First, an amicable settlement is more likely, because the very nature of the process is designed to consider what the other party minimally needs to resolve the dispute and then attempts to develop multiple ways to meet those needs.¹⁸² The more potential solutions developed, especially ones designed to meet all parties’ underlying needs, the more likely those solutions will be acceptable to all parties.¹⁸³ Second, the resolution processes are more efficient because they largely avoid acrimony, ego contests, and gamesmanship that can prolong disputes, consequently lowering transactions costs.¹⁸⁴ Third, relationships are preserved, as the process avoids many of

¹⁷⁵ *Id.* at 40-41.

¹⁷⁶ DAVID A. LAX & JAMES K. SEBENIUS, *THE MANAGER AS NEGOTIATOR: BARGAINING FOR COOPERATION AND COMPETITIVE GAIN* 32 (1986).

¹⁷⁷ *Id.*

¹⁷⁸ THOMPSON, *supra* note 139, at 75-76.

¹⁷⁹ *See* LULOFS & CAHN, *supra* note 41, at 17.

¹⁸⁰ FOLGER ET AL., *supra* note 48, at 9.

¹⁸¹ *Id.* at 21.

¹⁸² FISHER ET AL., *supra* note 170, at 41-43.

¹⁸³ *Id.* at 41-43, 51.

¹⁸⁴ *Id.* at 4-6.

the common “hard” bargaining tactics in positional bargaining like threats, demands, and deceptions.¹⁸⁵

Nevertheless, the collaborative, interest-based approach is antithetical to what students actually learn in law schools, unless students have had an ADR related course.¹⁸⁶ A recent survey of 651 law firm associates reported that 34.1% took negotiating courses in law school and only 21.7% took alternative dispute resolution skills courses.¹⁸⁷ Further, in an ongoing survey by Sean Nolon, Director of Dispute Resolution Program and associate professor of law at Vermont Law School, of the 200 ABA-Accredited law schools in the U.S., of which 137 have responded so far, indicates only 10.9% of the schools require their students to take at least one non-litigation dispute resolution course to graduate.¹⁸⁸ The vast majority of law school is devoted to teaching students how to “win” legal battles through analytical and advocacy prowess. The “win-lose” attitude created by traditional law school education results in a “culture of adversarialism, with an emphasis on argument, debate, threats, hidden information, deception, lies, persuasion, declaration, and toughness.”¹⁸⁹ While many of these forms of advocacy can be effective in court, assuming they are used appropriately and ethically, they are counterproductive when overused in collaborative processes, such as negotiating business deals and litigation settlements.¹⁹⁰ “Arguments for one’s own position or against the other’s position” is one of the most destructive strategies in obtaining interest-based, or “win-win,” agreements.¹⁹¹ In fact, one of the hallmarks of destructive conflict interaction in collaborative processes is the participants’ “belief that one side must win and the other must lose.”¹⁹²

An excellent example of a lawyer win-lose “tunnel vision” and inflexibility is demonstrated by a dispute over teacher assignments in an elementary school.¹⁹³ Parents of first grade students were dismayed to find at the opening of the school year that all of the first grade African American students were assigned to the only African American teacher at the school.¹⁹⁴ In addition to the significant racial implications, the “teacher was thought by many parents to be the least qualified of the four first grade teachers.”¹⁹⁵ The community immediately polarized.¹⁹⁶ African American parents met to discuss the matter, separately from Caucasian parents who also met to decide what course of action to take.¹⁹⁷ The teacher’s association became involved to ascertain whether the teacher’s legal rights had been violated as well.¹⁹⁸ Lawyers became involved, people started to demand their “rights,” and “more than one lawyer hinted at the possibility of

¹⁸⁵ *Id.* at 6-7.

¹⁸⁶ Brest, *supra* note 13, at 534.

¹⁸⁷ NAT’L ASS’N FOR LAW PLACEMENT, *supra* note 17, at 18.

¹⁸⁸ Nolon et al., *supra* note 17.

¹⁸⁹ Menkel-Meadow, *supra* note 11, at 907.

¹⁹⁰ THOMPSON, *supra* note 139, at 88.

¹⁹¹ *Id.*

¹⁹² FOLGER ET AL., *supra* note 48, at 9.

¹⁹³ Alan M. Lerner, *Law & Lawyering in the Work Place: Building Better Lawyers by Teaching Students to Exercise Critical Judgment as Creative Problem Solver*, 32 AKRON L. REV. 107, 108-09 (1999).

¹⁹⁴ *Id.* at 109.

¹⁹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁹⁶ *Id.*

¹⁹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁹⁸ *Id.*

litigation.”¹⁹⁹ As tensions mounted, a school board member proposed an interest-based solution: No one would be reassigned, but “the schedules for the four [first grade] classes would be realigned so that they would have a number of joint activities, both academic and other; and in-service support and training would be provided to all first grade teachers engaged in this experiment in collaborative teaching.”²⁰⁰ All interested parties accepted this “elegant” solution to a conflict that “had enormous potential to degenerate into a litigation that might have destroyed a community.”²⁰¹ The board member who experienced these events first-hand, and who also happened to be a lawyer, recounts his “disappointment that none of the lawyers for any of the interested parties had proposed a solution other than that to which their clients were entitled.”²⁰² He also lamented that none of the lawyers “even suggested a process by which the interested parties could try to work out a solution that might satisfy the needs of all.”²⁰³ This example of lawyer inflexibility and rights-based thinking is illustrative of a systemic problem in legal education (and lawyering), where students receive little or no required education in interpersonal conflict management or collaborative processes.²⁰⁴

4. The Lawyer’s Role in Promoting Productive Conflict

With a proper understanding of various social science principles of interpersonal conflict, lawyers are in an ideal position to promote productive conflict in the disputes they manage for their clients. They can accomplish this in various ways. First, they can use the interpersonal conflict management skills to manage the conflict directly themselves. They can also coach clients to manage the process more productively. Moreover, by improving their effectiveness as professional conflict managers, they will also be better able to manage conflicts that arise with clients and colleagues, which are also part of every lawyer’s professional experience. Productive conflict practices “improve[] the quality of decisions, strengthen[] relationships and increase[] productivity within the organization.”²⁰⁵ In promoting productive conflict, the role of the lawyer is to look beyond the legal issues and adversarial processes, to appreciate the social science

¹⁹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰⁰ *Id.*

²⁰¹ *Id.*

²⁰² *Id.* at 109-10.

²⁰³ *Id.*

²⁰⁴ Mediator Eric Green provides another useful example of a collaborative, interest-based process in a contentious patent infringement matter, *Telecredit Inc. v. TRW*, he handled as a young attorney. KOLB, *supra* note 107, at 279. Green reports that the litigation had become “financially and personally onerous for all parties . . . [and] so acrimonious that junior lawyers and paralegals researching documents in opposing counsel’s office were no longer even allowed coffee from the firm’s coffee pots. . . .” *Id.* To break the costly and destructive cycle of conflict that had already cost the parties hundred of thousands of dollars in litigation expenses, the parties agreed to an informal “information exchange that would take place in front of high-level corporate management and a neutral advisor” *Id.* at 280. After the parties presented their respective arguments before the chief executives from each party and the neutral, the chief executives met to discuss possible settlement. *Id.* They reached a settlement within an hour. *Id.* The settlement provided for TRW to obtain a license from Telecredit to use the patent in exchange for a mutually acceptable licensing fee, “with credits to be granted based on TRW’s legal fees in the case, which exactly matched the licensing figure.” *Id.* This process later became known as a “mini-trial,” and one side estimated that it cost the parties about \$25,000, but saved them more than one million in anticipated legal fees.” *Id.*

²⁰⁵ See Section II above.

based human dynamics of the parties. It is in this light that the best solutions are uncovered, and amicable settlement is more consistently and efficiently obtained.

The interpersonal conflict management principles discussed above are only illustrative of the types of knowledge lawyers need to navigate the conflicts that they will encounter in their professional lives successfully, but which law schools largely ignore. Other social science principles of which lawyers should be acquainted is significantly greater, and beyond the scope of this Article. Moreover, even law students who take ADR courses, like Negotiation and Mediation, may not be taught many of the most important social science principles if the course is taught stressing legal processes.

A multifaceted and multidisciplinary approach to problem solving, in contrast to a highly legalistic approach, is proven to be highly beneficial for cost-conscious clients, and thus, an approach that law students should embrace and learn.²⁰⁶ Indeed, perhaps the best evidence of the costs of mismanaged conflict to an organization is actually the savings benefits reaped by proactive organizations that effectively implement quality conflict management programs. In the next section, this Article will explore several examples of such organizations as further proof that collaborative dispute resolution efforts are almost always more cost effective for clients in the long run.

III. Lessons from Organizational Conflict Management Programs

An increasing number of organizations are developing conflict management programs with a proactive strategic focus. These organizations are enjoying increased productivity and decreased costs.²⁰⁷ Although the details of these programs vary among organizations, one common denominator is that they all recognize that effective problem solving requires that lawyers view client problems broadly by considering the client's business concerns and relationships, as well as the client's legal issues.²⁰⁸ They also

²⁰⁶ SULLIVAN ET.AL., *supra* note 8, at 77 (stating that the “narrow and highly abstract range of vision” that an over-emphasis on a case-dialogue approach promotes “can have a corrosive effect on the development of the full range of understanding necessary for a competent and responsible legal professional”).

²⁰⁷ See, e.g., Phillip M. Armstrong, *Georgia-Pacific's ADR Program: A Critical Review After 10 Years*, DISP. RESOL. J., May-July 2005, at 19; Ashby Jones, *House Calls*, CORP. COUNS., Oct. 2004, at 88, 88-90 (also published online under the title *Beyond Scorched-Earth Litigation* on Sept. 20, 2004).

²⁰⁸ A 2003 landmark study of the American Arbitration Association (AAA) that focused specifically on the activities and role of legal departments within organizations and their dispute resolution practices found that organizations that viewed disputes as multidimensional business problems and not merely narrow legal problems enjoyed significant economic and non-economic benefits. AM. ARBITRATION ASS'N, DISPUTE-WISE BUSINESS MANAGEMENT: IMPROVING ECONOMIC AND NON-ECONOMIC OUTCOMES IN MANAGING BUSINESS CONFLICTS 8 (2006), available at <http://www.adr.org/si.asp?id=4124>. The study explained that they have “a willingness to take a more global view of the full spectrum of the an organization's disputes—addressing each of them in relation to the other disputes in the portfolio with an overall goal of minimizing risk, cost, time spent, and resources expended, while preserving important business relationships.” *Id.* at 4. Under this approach, “winning” is not determined by the number of court victories, but rather by “how well the organization manages . . . the total economic and non-economic impact . . . of disputes it faces across all facets of its business.” *Id.* at 3 (emphasis added). The most dispute-wise companies report having “stronger relationships with customers, suppliers, employees, and partners, describing these relationships as excellent/very good.” *Id.* at 8. The most dispute-wise organizations “experience lower legal department expenses . . . and are much less likely to describe their departments as ‘lean’ or ‘stretched to the limit.’” *Id.*

incorporate a variety of the social science principles examined in Section II above to varying degrees and in different ways. This Article will now take a closer look at four organizations with an eye toward pulling out lessons that might be relevant to lawyers and, ultimately, to the law school curriculum. The following case studies are intended to illuminate a path for more efficient ways to solve disputes, both organizational and otherwise, and to provide a context for the reassessment of the case-dialogue instruction.

These four organizations are Toro, Georgia Pacific, The University of Michigan Health System (the “Health System”) and the U.S. Postal Service’s REDRESS (“REDRESS”) mediation program. The first two of these programs (Toro and Georgia Pacific) have goals similar to that of traditional litigation, which is simply to resolve the dispute as quickly, justly, and cost effectively as possible. However, the latter two (Health System and REDRESS) have goals that are fundamentally different from simply resolving the dispute, which is to learn from the dispute so that transformations and improvements in operations and relationships can be made going forward.

A. The Early Case Assessment Strategy

In Section II (B), this Article explained how the magnetic pull of conflict escalation cycles makes a strong case for early assessment and settlement of disputes. Early case assessment programs are among the fastest growing organizational conflict management strategies because they provide significant cost savings and control over disputes. A fundamental strategy of these programs is to quickly gather sufficient information about the dispute so that the parties can pursue settlement as soon as reasonably possible, often within weeks or months of the incident. Implicit in these early case assessment programs is recognition of the importance of addressing the dispute at the beginning of the competitive conflict escalation cycle, thereby avoiding negative transformations in the parties’ attitudes and perspectives that often characterize prolonged interpersonal conflict.²⁰⁹ Litigation costs are thus avoided, which can be significant since they “are often two or three times greater than the settlements themselves.”²¹⁰ An effective method to reduce the high transactional costs of conflict is reducing the length of the conflict, and the simplest way to do this is to avoid litigation when possible.²¹¹

Settling disputes before litigation not only minimizes disputing time, thus saving money, but also affords clients maximum control over the dispute resolution process.²¹² Once a dispute enters litigation, it is constrained by court rules and subject to court supervision that limits clients’ flexibility.²¹³ Outside of litigation, clients maintain greater control over information sharing, which allows parties to interact in a less adversarial atmosphere.²¹⁴ Obviously, a degree of cooperation is required among the

The price/earning ratios for the most dispute-wise companies average 28% higher than “the mean for all publicly held companies in the survey and 68% higher the mean for companies in the least dispute-wise category.” *Id.*

²⁰⁹ See, e.g., Armstrong, *supra* note 207, at 19; Jones, *supra* note 207, at 93-95.

²¹⁰ DAVID B. LIPSKY ET AL., EMERGING SYSTEMS FOR MANAGING WORKPLACE CONFLICT 77 (2003).

²¹¹ See, e.g., Jones, *supra* note 207, at 90.

²¹² LAURENCE J. BOULLE, MICHAEL T. COLATRELLA JR. & ANTHONY P. PICCHIONI, MEDIATION: SKILLS AND TECHNIQUES 3 (2008).

²¹³ *Id.*

²¹⁴ *Id.* at 3-4

parties to accomplish early settlement, but when there is so much value to be gained, parties are motivated to cooperate.

Two organizations whose early settlement programs are worthy of review are Toro, Inc. and Georgia Pacific, as they have been quite successful and willing to share information publicly about their experiences.²¹⁵ They provide solid examples of programs that avoid the classic problem of competitive conflict escalation cycle in the traditional adversarial context. Both programs also incorporate features that help to promote productive conflict in the process of managing the disputes. The primary goal of each of these organization's programs is still primarily traditional in nature, which is to settle the dispute as quickly and cost effectively as possible.

1. Toro, Inc.

Toro, Inc. tells a remarkable success story about the effective implementation of conflict management strategies. Toro is a multinational company that sells landscaping products and services, such as lawnmowers and sprinkler systems, and also provides landscaping services for golf courses and sports fields.²¹⁶ With 4,700 employees spread across 80 countries, it earns over \$1.5 billion in annual revenue.²¹⁷ In 1991, Toro adopted an early settlement assessment program that was, in part, motivated by a loss at trial in which a jury award of \$1,000,000 to a Florida man who was badly burned when the Toro lawnmower he was operating exploded.²¹⁸ Prior to this verdict, Toro had managed litigation according to a traditional aggressive litigation model.²¹⁹ However, Toro's head of Product Integrity, Andrew Byers, became disillusioned with Toro's "scorched-earth" litigation policy.²²⁰ Under an aggressive litigation policy, he said, "[o]ur expenses were going up, our caseloads were growing, and we had lost any ability to predict the outcomes of cases."²²¹ Byers began working with Toro's legal department to shift the company's approach from an aggressive litigation strategy to an aggressive settlement strategy.²²² The company estimates that this new settlement strategy saved it over \$100,000,000 in legal costs and claimant compensation between the years 1991 and 2005.²²³

One key aspect of Toro's success is its policy of early settlement of claims. "Within days" of receiving word that a customer has been injured using Toro equipment, Toro sets up an in-person meeting with the injured customer at his or her home, even if the customer has not filed a claim.²²⁴ The purpose of the meeting is to investigate the

²¹⁵ Other prominent organizations that have instituted early settlement programs are Johnson and Johnson, DuPont and General Electric, each boasting significant benefits. Jones, *supra* note 207, at 90. Most organizations are not as transparent as Toro, Inc. about the costs savings these early settlement programs provide. Part of the reluctance to share this information may be that it is a form of the organization's intellectual property that allows the organization to operate more efficiently.

²¹⁶ *Corporate Fact Sheet*, TORO INC., www.toro.com (last visited May 27, 2011).

²¹⁷ *Id.*

²¹⁸ Jones, *supra* note 207, at 91-93; Miguel A. Olivella, Jr., *Toro's Early Intervention Program, After Six Years, Has Saved \$50M*, 17 ALTERNATIVES TO THE HIGH COST OF LITIG. 65 (1999).

²¹⁹ See, e.g., Jones, *supra* note 207, at 91.

²²⁰ *Id.* at 93.

²²¹ *Id.*

²²² *Id.*

²²³ *Id.* at 90.

²²⁴ *Id.* at 93.

injury and assess the potential for early settlement.²²⁵ Paralegals attend these meetings, and sometimes they bring along a Toro engineer to help with any technical aspects of the accident.²²⁶ The paralegals have authority in the “mid-five figures” to settle claims on the spot.²²⁷ Toro is able to settle approximately 70% of the injury-related complaints and claims at this meeting.²²⁸ Most of the 30% of claims that are not settled within weeks of the injury by the paralegals are referred to mediation.²²⁹ Toro then retains outside counsel, who understands and embraces Toro’s aggressive settlement strategy, to act as its advocate in these mediations.²³⁰ Through mediation, Toro disposes of almost all of the remaining claims.²³¹ The few remaining claims that have not been resolved through mediation are dismissed through summary proceedings.²³²

Another key characteristic of Toro’s early settlement program is the emphasis on empathy and customer satisfaction. For the initial meeting in the customer’s home, Toro sends one or two paralegals who are highly adept at building rapport and putting people at ease.²³³ Lawyers are not involved and the Toro representatives make a point of emphasizing that they are not lawyers.²³⁴ They dress casually in polo shirts and khaki pants.²³⁵ In the casual setting of the customer’s home, often over coffee, the paralegal listens to the customer’s concerns, and expresses sympathy and regret over the injury.²³⁶ They are particularly attentive to the concerns and needs of the customer and his or her family, who are typically still emotional about the injury.²³⁷ One of Toro’s paralegals, Carol Kelly, who regularly participates in these meetings, says that “[w]e understand that coming to terms with anger or grief is part of the healing process, and it also happens to be helpful in resolving cases.”²³⁸

Toro is also flexible in settling cases, adopting a willingness to settle even weak claims that the company believes have little chance of success in court.²³⁹ For example, a claim filed by retired telephone engineer and Toro customer, James Nolan, illustrates this strategy.²⁴⁰ While Nolan was hosing down the underside of a running Toro lawnmower, his index finger was “smashed” by a lug nut that shot out of the mower and ricocheted off the ground.²⁴¹ Nolan wrote an angry letter to Toro alleging that the lawnmower was improperly designed and threatening to sue.²⁴² Within a week, Toro paralegal Carol Kelly arranged a Toro engineer to accompany her to a meeting with Nolan at his home.²⁴³ At the meeting, she listened to his account of the accident, expressed sympathy for his

²²⁵ *Id.* at 93-95.

²²⁶ *Id.* at 88.

²²⁷ *Id.* at 95.

²²⁸ *Id.*

²²⁹ *Id.*

²³⁰ *Id.*

²³¹ *Id.*

²³² *Id.*

²³³ *Id.* at 93-95.

²³⁴ *Id.* at 93.

²³⁵ *Id.*

²³⁶ *Id.*

²³⁷ *Id.*

²³⁸ *Id.*

²³⁹ *Id.* at 97.

²⁴⁰ *Id.* at 88.

²⁴¹ *Id.*

²⁴² *Id.*

²⁴³ *Id.*

injury, and inspected the mower.²⁴⁴ She explained to Nolan that he had improperly used the mower by cleaning it while it was running.²⁴⁵ Even though she thought that Toro could easily defend the claim in court, she settled the claim by giving Nolan a few thousand dollars and a new mower in exchange for a full release.²⁴⁶ Nolan later said that his relationship with Toro went “from bad to wonderful” and in a note, thanked Carol Kelly.²⁴⁷ In managing the conflict in this way, Toro not only avoided potentially protracted litigation and its associated costs, but also retained a customer.

Toro has enjoyed significant financial savings in its litigation expenses since adopting its early settlement program. Toro’s average cost per claim dropped from \$115,000 in 1991 to \$35,000 in 2005.²⁴⁸ Initial critics of the program who warned that an early settlement policy would invite a flood of frivolous litigation are surprised to hear that the number of Toro’s claims has also decreased.²⁴⁹ In the five-year period before implementing the new settlement policy, Toro received 640 injury-related claims.²⁵⁰ After implementing the new policy, the number of injury-related claims in the next five-year period from 1991 to 1996 dropped to 536 claims, and dropped again in the next five-year period from 1996 to 2001 to 404 claims.²⁵¹ In total, comparing the pre-settlement policy costs to those post-settlement policy costs, Toro estimates that it has saved \$100,000,000 between 1991 and mid-2005.²⁵² This estimate, of course, does not take into account revenues it continues to earn from customers like James Nolan whom the company was able to retain through early settlement and sympathetic treatment, as opposed to the relationship alienating process of protracted litigation.²⁵³

Toro’s early settlement program is successful because it incorporates three important interpersonal conflict management principles discussed in Section II: early intervention, face-saving, and flexibility. Responding “within days” to its customer complaints and scheduling in-person meetings with complainants within weeks of the incident allow Toro to deal with the conflict at the beginning of the conflict escalation cycle when parties are more likely to be flexible and still substantively oriented. The likelihood of parties developing lasting negative perceptions and attitudes about the company is also diminished by early settlement. A customer like James Nolan, discussed above, would likely not be favorably disposed to Toro after a year of contentious litigation, even if he was satisfied with any ultimate settlement. Toro’s program also promotes face-saving because timely responses to complaints are a means of demonstrating respect for the parties and their claims, regardless of whether those claims were valid. In addition, in-person meetings allow the parties to “feel included, approved of, and respected.”²⁵⁴ The Toro settlement paralegals provide one of the most powerful forms of face-saving by sympathetically listening to customer concerns and needs. Finally, Toro’s willingness to settle even questionable claims demonstrates a flexibility

²⁴⁴ *Id.*

²⁴⁵ *Id.*

²⁴⁶ *Id.*

²⁴⁷ *Id.*

²⁴⁸ *Id.* at 90.

²⁴⁹ *Id.* at 91.

²⁵⁰ *Id.*

²⁵¹ *Id.*

²⁵² *Id.* at 90.

²⁵³ See generally LANDE, *supra* note 46.

²⁵⁴ WILMOT & HOCKER, *supra* note 23, at 82.

that has enabled it to avoid costly litigation expenses in most of its disputes. It is wise to consider the transactional cost of litigating a dispute and weighing it against other important considerations such as precedent setting and the likelihood of success.

2. Georgia Pacific

In 1995 Georgia Pacific, a leading manufacturer of paper and packaging products, launched a pilot program involving a “problem-solving” approach” to managing its civil disputes as a way to avoid the undue expense of protracted litigation.²⁵⁵ It started with a few matters, but has since grown dramatically. Between 1995 and 2004, the company estimates that its early settlement program has saved the company \$34,780,000 dollars.²⁵⁶

Prior to the implementation of the new program, Georgia Pacific’s approach was like those of Toro and many other large, well-funded organizations.²⁵⁷ The company would pursue claim resolution through a process involving outside counsel, lawsuits and discovery proceedings, often leading them right up to trial before settlement would be achieved.²⁵⁸ Speaking about the previous policy, Georgia Pacific’s vice-president and general counsel states: “In the old days, we might have spent \$100,000 [in legal fees and other costs] and taken two or three years to settle a case that probably could have been resolved for half that amount shortly after the suit was filed.”²⁵⁹ He goes on to say that “[w]e might have felt justified in defending the case, but after it was clear the other side had some legitimate claims, the economics made no sense at all.”²⁶⁰

Assessing that a claim is “legitimate” is a key feature to Georgia Pacific’s early settlement program. Both Georgia Pacific and Toro adhere to an early settlement strategy, but Georgia Pacific is more selective in qualifying cases for this approach. Georgia Pacific will not include a case in its early settlement program if the company has been named because “it has a deep pocket” or where the company believes its product has “had no role in the . . . damages alleged.”²⁶¹ It will also typically choose traditional litigation if “an overriding principle or precedent is at stake” or “where the company believes that the case will open the floodgates to frivolous claims.”²⁶² For those cases selected for the early settlement program, Georgia Pacific tries to settle them within 60-90 days and well before a party initiates formal and costly discovery.²⁶³ If direct

²⁵⁵ Armstrong, *supra* note 207, at 20.

²⁵⁶ *Id.* Georgia Pacific is with over 40,000 employees spread across 300 facilities in North American, South America and Europe. *Company Overview – About Us*, GEORGIA PACIFIC, <http://www.gp.com/aboutus/companyOverview/index.html> (last visited June 28, 2011).

²⁵⁷ Armstrong, *supra* note 207, at 20.

²⁵⁸ *Id.*

²⁵⁹ Phillip M. Armstrong, *Case Study: Georgia-Pacific’s Aggressive Use of Early Case Evaluation and ADR*, ACCA DOCKET, November/December 1998, at 42-47, available at <http://www.agc.net/docs/s06-004.pdf>.

²⁶⁰ *Id.*

²⁶¹ Armstrong, *supra* note 207, at 20.

²⁶² *Id.* at 20-21. Interestingly, the company has found that no one type of case is less suitable for early settlement or other forms of alternative dispute resolution, like mediation, than any other type of case. *Id.* For example, early in the program’s incarnation, the company presumed that personal injury actions were “poor candidates” for the program. *Id.* As this proved to be false, now “virtually all lawsuits or claims undergo an early case assessment and ADR analysis,” with only claims deemed suitable proceeding into the program. *Id.*

²⁶³ *Id.* at 20.

negotiation fails, the company relies primarily on mediation.²⁶⁴ Between 1995 and 2004, the company selected, on average, 55 cases per year with savings of \$56,000 per claim, which yielded in over \$3,000,000 in savings per year.²⁶⁵ The argument that employing anything less than full blown, aggressive litigation would “open the floodgates of frivolous litigation” was a concern expressed by Georgia Pacific’s management when it first contemplated initiating the early settlement program.²⁶⁶ Although the company has not released specific data, it has said that its experience with early settlement has been “just the opposite [and the program] did not invite a host of new lawsuits.”²⁶⁷

It is this kind of misunderstanding of the actual consequences of using early settlement and ADR that motivates Georgia Pacific to continually educate its management and lawyers about their successful program and the benefits of ADR.²⁶⁸ Their experience is that “while most law schools now offer ADR courses, its lawyers are frequently unfamiliar with process and benefits of ADR because ‘[ADR courses] are seldom part of the required curriculum.’”²⁶⁹ Also, because of turnover, new business managers need to be educated about ADR and “existing managers must be periodically reminded of why ADR works and why it is good for the company.”²⁷⁰

Finally, Georgia Pacific’s commitment to early settlement and mediation is further bolstered by its practice of using a dispute resolution clause in its contracts.²⁷¹ Its dispute resolution clause requires the contract parties to meet at least twice to attempt to negotiate the dispute “in good faith” before suit may be filed, and provides a voluntary option to mediate the dispute if the direct negotiations between the parties fails.²⁷² The first round of direct negotiations is between “managers” who will “make every effort to meet as soon as reasonably possible at a mutually agreed time and place.”²⁷³ If the managers cannot resolve the dispute “within 20 days of their first meeting,” they must refer the dispute to “Senior Executives *who do not have direct responsibility* for the administration of this agreement.”²⁷⁴ The senior executives are required to meet to discuss the dispute “within fourteen days of the end of the twenty day period.”²⁷⁵ If the matter has not been resolved within 30 days of the executives first meeting the matter goes to mediation as long as both parties agree.²⁷⁶ If the matter is not settled at mediation within 30 days of “commencing such procedure . . . either party may initiate litigation or otherwise pursue whatever remedies may be available to such party.”²⁷⁷

Georgia Pacific’s conflict management program demonstrates that an organization can be selective in the disputes it chooses to target for early settlement and still realize significant financial savings. But there are two additional points this case study raises

²⁶⁴ *See id.*

²⁶⁵ Armstrong, *supra* note 207, at 21.

²⁶⁶ *Id.*

²⁶⁷ *Id.*

²⁶⁸ *Id.* at 20.

²⁶⁹ *Id.* at 21.

²⁷⁰ *Id.* at 20.

²⁷¹ *Id.* at 21.

²⁷² *Id.*

²⁷³ *Id.*

²⁷⁴ *Id.* at 20 (emphasis added).

²⁷⁵ *Id.* at 21.

²⁷⁶ *Id.*

²⁷⁷ Georgia Pacific’s initial multi-step dispute resolution clause provided arbitration, but arbitration, while sometimes still used, is no longer required by the clause. *Id.* at 20.

that are relevant to this Article's inquiry. First, management recognized the need for an ongoing education process for managers and lawyers regarding the benefits of ADR processes, so that they would fully embrace the culture of conflict resolution that the company sought to cultivate. This is a point law schools should heed as more and more organizations rely on conflict management systems to enhance the efficiency of their organizations. Second, Georgia Pacific incorporates a dispute resolution clause in its contracts that specifically requires the parties to use collaborative processes to settle any dispute before commencing litigation. This demonstrates a wise proactive conflict management strategy that addresses the possibility of a dispute and positions it for early settlement while the parties' relationship is amicable. Once a dispute arises, parties are often reluctant to be the first to suggest settlement for fear of looking weak, and thus, losing face. Establishing a pre-dispute contractual settlement policy eliminates this obstacle to early settlement discussions. The clause is also notable because it excludes arbitration, an adversarial process, the cost of which can be considerable.²⁷⁸

B. The Transformation through Productive Conflict Strategy

The next two organizations whose early settlement programs are worthy of review are Health System and REDRESS. These programs are instructive in how organizations can achieve transformative results by implementing a program that looks deeper into the organization to examine what factors within its structure, operations and relationships are giving rise to disputes. These programs seek success through the healing of the underlying issues that are giving rise to the conflict rather than through resolving each conflict on a case-by-case basis. Like Toro and Georgia Pacific, they incorporate various social science principles with a focus on avoiding conflict escalation cycles through the early intervention in disputes and on cultivating productive conflict. By contrast, however, instead of seeking out ways to simply settle the dispute quickly and cheaply, they actively seek out ways of transforming the organization into a more highly functioning organism. This approach views the conflict in a more highly evolved manner. It is not simply a problem to be carefully and sensitively diffused and "settled." Rather, it is an opportunity for growth for one or more parties to the conflict that will lead to a more harmonious organizational environment moving forward.

1. The University of Michigan Health System

Organizational conflict, when managed appropriately, can substantively improve an organization's product and the way it delivers its service.²⁷⁹ Lawyers are frequently trained to see conflicts as wholly undesirable and attack and extinguish them.²⁸⁰ But conflicts can also be the "active ingredient of interpersonal, social, and organizational growth."²⁸¹ With the view that conflict could also strengthen an organization, the University of Michigan Health System (the "Health System") adopted a more

²⁷⁸ *Id.*

²⁷⁹ DONOHUE & KOLT, *supra* note 112, at 4.

²⁸⁰ Jonathan M. Hyman, *Four Ways of Looking at a Lawsuit: How Lawyers can use the Cognitive Frameworks of Mediation*, 34 J.L. & POL'Y 11, 42-49 (2010).

²⁸¹ BOULLE ET AL., *supra* note 212, at 141.

collaborative approach in dealing with medical negligence claims against the organization and its staff. In doing so, it has saved tens of millions of dollars, has undoubtedly saved many lives, and has sparked a revolution in the way in which the medical insurance industry handles medical negligence claims.²⁸²

In 1999, the Health System, with the assistance of its attorneys, transformed the way the organization addressed medical negligence claims. It rejected the traditional “deny and defend” strategy used by almost all other healthcare systems in dealing with medical negligence claims at the time and embraced the strategy of becoming conflict managers.²⁸³ Embracing early settlement philosophy and a customer-centered approach explained above, the Health System also strives to learn from the claims it encounters so that it can minimize recurrences of similar claims.²⁸⁴

As with most organizational change, the transformation of the Health System started by questioning basic, widely held beliefs among medical professionals and insurers that turned out to be erroneous.²⁸⁵ The erroneous assumptions in this instance were that plaintiffs in medical negligence cases were predominantly concerned about the unwanted medical outcome or “opportunists trying to squeeze every dime they can from the system.”²⁸⁶ Operating under misguided assumptions, the common strategy among healthcare systems and insurers in addressing medical negligence claims was, and still is, “deny and defend.”²⁸⁷ A deny and defend strategy “urge[s] secrecy, disputes fault, deflects responsibility, and make[s] it as slow and as expensive as possible for plaintiffs to continue the fight.”²⁸⁸ To do otherwise, in this traditional view, is to invite frivolous claims and open the proverbial “floodgates of litigation.”²⁸⁹ A no-holds barred litigation strategy, however, exacts a high price on plaintiffs and defendants alike. One recent study examining the employment of such a strategy showed that “for every dollar spent on compensation, 54 cents went to administrative expenses (including those involving lawyers, experts, and courts).”²⁹⁰ More alarmingly, a strategy of secrecy and attitude of denial of fault in medical facilities undermine patient safety. The Institute of Medicine 1999 report, “To Err Is Human,” acknowledged that “as many as 98,000 deaths occurred each year because of medical errors.”²⁹¹ Medical safety experts believe that “effective and wide-sweeping patient safety initiatives” are thwarted by an atmosphere of denial and secrecy.²⁹²

²⁸² Richard. C. Boothman et al., *A Better Approach to Medical Malpractice Claims? The University of Michigan Experience*, 2 J. HEALTH & LIFE SCI. L. 125, 137 (2009). The cost savings, organizational improvement, and ethical benefit of the “accountability and transparency” approach used by Health System have inspired other medical organizations and medical insurers to adopt a similar approach with similar success. These institutions include Kaiser Permanent, The Children’s Hospital & Clinic of Minnesota, Catholic Healthcare West and John’s Hopkins. Some have reposted equally impressive success, showing a reduction of claims payments by up to 40% within a few years of implementing a more collaborative approach to conflict management. *Id.*

²⁸³ *Id.*

²⁸⁴ *Id.* at 133.

²⁸⁵ *Id.* at 133-34.

²⁸⁶ *Id.* at 127-28.

²⁸⁷ *Id.* at 128.

²⁸⁸ *Id.*

²⁸⁹ *Id.* at 130, 159.

²⁹⁰ *Id.* at 129.

²⁹¹ *Id.* at 131.

²⁹² *Id.*

Unsatisfied with simply reacting to disputes as they arose, the Health System sought a way to reduce medical negligence claims. It chose to manage conflicts proactively.²⁹³ In doing so it first questioned what really was motivating patients to bring medical negligence claims. Through research studies, it found that patients who brought medical negligence claims were not, as often assumed, mostly opportunists or solely concerned with medical errors.²⁹⁴ These studies found that major factors that motivated many patients in bringing formal medical negligence claims were a desire to understand how their unwanted injury occurred, prevent the same injury from happening to others, and encourage their caregivers to acknowledge responsibility for the harm caused to them.²⁹⁵ In one study, 37% of respondents reported that “an explanation and apology would have made a difference” in their decisions to file a lawsuit.²⁹⁶ Another study found that in 24% of the cases examined, patients filed a lawsuit after discovering that “the physician had failed to be completely honest with them about what happened, allowed them to believe things that were not true, or intentionally misled them.”²⁹⁷ Armed with more accurate information as to what caused medical negligence lawsuits, the Health System set about designing a process for reducing medical negligence complaints by addressing their underlying cause—causes that were rooted in the patient’s emotional and psychological needs.

The Health System turned its back on the old tradition of “deny and defend” and embraced a new policy characterized by “accountability and transparency,” concepts that would make even the most hard-boiled litigator weak in the knees.²⁹⁸ Three principles formed the foundation of its new medical negligence conflict management program: (1) “compensate quickly and fairly when unreasonable medical care causes injury”; (2) “defend medically reasonable care vigorously”; and (3) “reduce patient injuries (and therefore claims) by learning from patients’ experiences.”²⁹⁹

It is worth pointing out that all healthcare institutions could profess to embrace these principles, even those who adopt a “deny and defend” strategy. As with many strategies, however, the distinction of the Health System and its unique, ground-breaking success lies in the details and honest application of its strategy. The details of how it applied these foundational principles involve two basic categories of claims: pre-injury initiatives and post-injury initiatives. Yet, the same predominant guiding principles of communication and education provide the foundation for both categories of the Health System’s claims management strategy. These principles are very different from “deny and defend.”

The pre-injury initiatives essentially seek to identify problems promptly and bring them into the light of day for discussion and correction. First, the Health System adopted a commitment to establishing “realistic expectations . . . in both patient and caregiver” about the contemplated medical treatment through “thoughtful and thorough communication.”³⁰⁰ Somewhat more unconventional was the Health System’s efforts to “[c]reate institutional appreciation for the value of early detection [and reporting] of

²⁹³ *Id.* at 135.

²⁹⁴ *Id.* at 133.

²⁹⁵ *Id.*

²⁹⁶ *Id.*

²⁹⁷ *Id.*

²⁹⁸ *Id.* at 137-39.

²⁹⁹ *Id.* at 139.

³⁰⁰ *Id.* at 135.

unexpected outcomes.”³⁰¹ To encourage staff to follow through on detection and reporting of unexpected outcomes, the Health System provided caregivers not only resources to identify such outcomes, but also support in “assisting patients and families in the event of a problem.”³⁰²

The Health System’s post-injury initiatives seek to identify the root causes of medical negligence lawsuits and institute measures to insure they are not repeated. Once again, the rule of the day is communication and education. After an unexpected and undesirable medical outcome occurs, caregivers and administrators first concentrate on patient care and communication with the family before turning their attention to remedial action.³⁰³ Specifically, they do the following:

- Patient/families are approached, acknowledged, and engaged in the acute phase.
- Patient care needs are prioritized.
- Patient/families receive answers (to the extent known).
- Expectations for follow-up are established, the patient and family understand the situation is being addressed, and the patient and family are doing their parts.
- Patients and families receive acknowledgement of, and an apology for, true mistakes. They receive a thorough explanation regardless.
- The patient’s experience is studied for improvements that are later shared with the patient and family.
- Future clinical care is monitored via metrics established and measured to evaluate efficiency and durability of improvements.³⁰⁴

The emphasis on communication, both internally among employees and externally with the patient and family, is a winning strategy. Clearly, the initiatives listed above focus on promptly initiating patient contact, attending to care needs, sharing information, and promising follow-up. Because patients genuinely appreciate this approach, and it makes them feel so much better about the situation, it naturally tends to assuage anger and increase respect for the caregivers.³⁰⁵ The case of “JW” provides a good example of this phenomenon.

JW was a 36-year old wife and mother of two who alleged that, among other claims, the Health Systems doctors and staff negligently failed to timely diagnose her breast cancer, leaving it undetected and untreated until after it had metastasized, an making treatment options more invasive and “diminishing her opportunity for cure.”³⁰⁶ Applying the Health System’s claim-handling principles articulated above, the claim was settled within a year, during which she seemed to respond well to medical treatment for her condition.³⁰⁷ Not long before settlement, all interested parties including “the physicians treating her for cancer, the patient [JW], her husband, their attorney, and risk management representatives” met to discuss the situation.³⁰⁸ The purpose of this meeting

³⁰¹ *Id.*

³⁰² *Id.*

³⁰³ *Id.*

³⁰⁴ *Id.*

³⁰⁵ *Id.* at 151-52.

³⁰⁶ *Id.* at 151-52.

³⁰⁷ *Id.* at 157.

³⁰⁸ *Id.*

was to give JW and her husband “an opportunity to tell their story, and an opportunity for the physicians to share their thoughts and apologize, if appropriate.”³⁰⁹ As part of the settlement, JW agreed to have her story videotaped for educational purposes.³¹⁰ Regarding the meeting she had with the Health System’s representatives and the physicians whom she alleged negligently failed to timely diagnose her cancer, she said:

After that night (of the meeting), I left there like I was on a mountaintop. I felt like I had finally been heard, they listened. . . . If that had been the end of the legal pursuit, that would have been fine with me, I was perfectly satisfied after that night. What that apology meant to me was that they had listened finally and I had been heard. I can’t even describe how euphoric I felt when I left that meeting³¹¹

By contrast, if the patient was treated as a potential opponent in a lawsuit, it can become a self-fulfilling prophecy. Patients feel the tension and the dismissal of their needs as adversarial interests take center stage, and thus are, in fact, more likely to become legal opponents.³¹² The Health System’s post-injury initiatives listed above are characterized by a belief that during pre-litigation, the patient’s and the Health System’s interests are the same—“to seek honest answers to questions raised by the patient’s adverse outcome.”³¹³ Believing both sides share this objective, the Health System proceeds cooperatively and with transparency.

Also at the heart of its post-injury initiatives is the establishment of an honest method for distinguishing between reasonable and unreasonable care, in an effort to formulate the best practices for the future. Inherent in this process is an emphasis on education, which helps to prevent future lawsuits. When institutions use the “deny and defend” strategy, they are focused on evaluating the provided care against the backdrop of the law. There is a problem with this approach, as it leads to a myopic understanding of “reasonable care.” Lawyers are trained to define “reasonable care” as the care that can be defended in court and not in the context of avoiding future litigation.³¹⁴ Thus, the analysis is highly influenced by legal defenses as opposed to the medical definition of best practices. By contrast, a strategy grounded in accountability and transparency is the best means by which institutions may determine truly “unreasonable” medical care from the standpoint of smooth, uneventful business operations. If institutions are highly committed to learning from past mistakes, they will devote meaningful resources to reforms. These reforms will shape institutions’ activities in a positive, claim-reducing manner.

In an effort to shift the focus to best medical practices from litigation defense, the Health System hired experienced nurses to work in its Risk Management Department to investigate incidents potentially involving unreasonable care.³¹⁵ This required a

³⁰⁹ *Id.*

³¹⁰ *Id.*

³¹¹ *Id.* at 158.

³¹² PRUITT & KIM, *supra* note 26, at 154 (explaining that “self-fulfilling prophecy” is an experimentally proven phenomenon “in which Party’s beliefs and attitudes about Other make Party behave in ways that elicit behavior from Other that reinforces these beliefs.”).

³¹³ *Id.* at 141.

³¹⁴ *Id.*

³¹⁵ *Id.* at 139.

“revamp[ing]” of the department, motivated by the notion that the Risk Management Department was in the business of not only making an accurate distinction between reasonable and unreasonable medical care, but also of improving patient safety and effectively advising clinical services.³¹⁶ To accomplish these goals, the Health System reasoned, “it was easier to teach claims handling to caregivers than to acquaint claims handlers with complex medical issues.”³¹⁷ While it is true that the Risk Management Department budget increased because experienced caregivers generally cost more than experienced insurance claims adjusters, the investment yielded significant dividends.³¹⁸

In addition to hiring nurses to help in the risk management department, the Health System further enhanced the credibility of the process by forming a committee of care providers who would provide a “check and balance” review of decisions made by the Risk Management Department.³¹⁹ Their committee consists of 32 members, representing “nearly 20 specialties.”³²⁰ In each matter it considers, the committee’s charge is to answer two questions: “(1) Was the care at issue reasonable under the circumstances? and (2) Did the care adversely impact the patient’s outcome?”³²¹ It is also of note that “the committee considers every case for potential peer review, quality improvement, and educational opportunity.”³²² In comparison to the new Michigan Health System’s approach to medical negligence, the earlier committee was composed of only six caregivers whose mission was to serve as “a resource for trial lawyers” representing the institution.³²³ Thus, in deciding the reasonableness of medical treatment, the Health System moved from a system dominated by medically untrained claims adjusters and lawyers whose mission was to defend the institution, to one that is dominated by caregivers whose mission it is to determine whether “unreasonable medical mistakes” occurred, and to learn from those mistakes when discovered.³²⁴

The quantifiable benefits of adopting a philosophy of “accountability and transparency” in managing medical malpractice claims have been nothing short of exceptional for the Health System. Since adopting the new approach and becoming a self-insured institution, it has been able to reduce its claim reserves from 70 million in 1999 to 13 million in 2007.³²⁵ The average time to process claims has also been reduced dramatically.³²⁶ From August 2001 through August 2007, the average time to process medical negligence claims “dropped from 20.3 months to about 8 months.”³²⁷ This drop in processing time, in part, accounts for the reduced cost of malpractice claims. Once again, the Health System’s new program did not open the “floodgates of litigation,” but rather significantly reduced the number of claims from 136 claims in 1999 to 61 claims in

³¹⁶ *Id.*

³¹⁷ *Id.*

³¹⁸ *Id.*

³¹⁹ *Id.*

³²⁰ *Id.* at 140.

³²¹ *Id.*

³²² *Id.*

³²³ *Id.*

³²⁴ *Id.*

³²⁵ SAM TERZICH, ACE PROGRESS REPORT: SHOULD HEALTHCARE RISK MANAGERS FOCUS ON IMPROVING PATIENT SAFETY, OR ON SUPPORTING THE CLAIM PROCESS? THEY ACTUALLY NEED TO DO BOTH 2 (2010), available at <http://www2.esis.com/NR/rdonlyres/E2D0AAAB-A851-4F23-BF23-256EA45C4D71/0/healthcareriskmanagersclaimprocess.pdf>.

³²⁶ Boothman, *supra* note 282, at 144.

³²⁷ *Id.*

2006.³²⁸ The company concluded that under the new claims management system, new claims fell by 55% over this time period.³²⁹

Like Toro's and Georgia Pacific's conflict management programs, the Health System's medical negligence conflict management program relies on early intervention as a key feature of its success. But Health System's program goes beyond early intervention, and even beyond Toro's practice of sending sympathetic listeners and problems solvers to speak with claimants. It replaced the "deny and defend" face-damaging tactics of threats, intimidation and stonewalling with accountability, and transparency, and the face-giving tactics of sharing information, listening and attending to parties' medical and emotional needs. Investing a credible internal process for determining medical error is also a form of face-giving because it demonstrates a commitment to patient care. As discussed above, when face issues are appropriately managed, parties are more willing to engage in collaboration and comprising.

Using the goodwill it creates with its patients through its accountability and transparency approach, the Health System's program attempts to collaborate meaningfully with the patient on the medical problem that concerns the patient and Health System and its staff. It attempts to use a "principled" form of negotiation, popularized by the authors of the classic negotiation book, *Getting to Yes*, where negotiators see themselves working together on a problem "side-by-side" rather than in a "personal face-to-face confrontation."³³⁰ Moreover, the Health System "mines" the conflict to improve its organization. The risk management review committee considers every unanticipated medical outcome it reviews as an opportunity for "quality improvement" and "educational opportunity."

2. The United States Postal Service REDRESS Program

The U.S. Postal Service's REDRESS mediation program is a valuable example of a conflict management program that uses early intervention and productive interpersonal conflict management techniques. The U.S. Postal Service's conflict management system is among the oldest and largest public sector conflict management systems.³³¹ The REDRESS mediation program was started in 1994 to address the growing problem of employment discrimination claims in the postal service and "to improve workplace climate."³³² REDRESS mediates, on average, over 1,000 disputes a month across 90 U.S. cities, making it the largest employment mediation program in the world.³³³ The program has recently undergone a multi-year comprehensive effectiveness study, which aids in evaluating its success.³³⁴

³²⁸ *Id.* at 143. Specifically, the claims numbered as follows from 1999 to 2006: 136 claims in 1999; 122 claims in 2000; 121 claims in 2001; 88 claims in 2002; 81 claims in 2003; 91 claims in 2004; 85 claims in 2005; and 61 claims in 2006. *Id.*

³²⁹ *Id.*

³³⁰ See FISHER ET AL., *supra* note 170, at 37-38.

³³¹ Lisa Blomgren Bingham et al., *Dispute System Design and Justice in Employment Dispute Resolution: Mediation at the Workplace*, 14 HARV. NEGOT. L. REV. 1, 24 (2009).

³³² *Id.*

³³³ *Id.*

³³⁴ A comprehensive, multi-year study tracked the REDRESS program from its inception as a pilot program in 1994 through 2006. The purpose of the study was to evaluate the "effectiveness and unique purpose of the program." *Id.* at 25. In doing so, it looked at a wide array of data that included "procedural justice

The REDRESS program has a number of key features. First, the program provides that mediation is voluntary for the complainant, but mandatory for the supervisor who acts as the United States Postal Service (USPS) representative.³³⁵ Second, it exclusively uses a “transformative” mediation model,³³⁶ which is characterized by the mediator’s particular emphasis on “assisting the parties to have a constructive interaction and to improve the relationship”³³⁷ Unlike facilitative and evaluative mediation models that are characterized by a focus on party settlement, the transformative mediation model attempts to break the “vicious circle of disempowerment, disconnection, and demonization” that prevents parties in conflict from working together effectively, thereby paving the way for the parties to work together more productively on future conflicts as well.³³⁸ The transformative mediator attempts to “improve the quality of the conflict interaction” by generating in the parties “empowerment” and “recognition.”³³⁹ Empowerment means that parties define and decide issues for themselves.³⁴⁰ Recognition means that each party acquires a better understanding of the other party’s perspective of the conflict.³⁴¹

Participant survey results reveal that REDRESS largely meets its goals of empowerment and recognition. Concerning empowerment, participants feel free to make their own decision concerning settlement without undue pressure from the mediator in over 85% of the cases.³⁴² There are two statistical findings that demonstrate REDRESS substantially achieved its goal of recognition. First, approximately 75% of all participants reported that they felt the other party listened to them during the mediation.³⁴³ The second kind of evidence demonstrating recognition is the number of apologies participants made during the mediation. Supervisors said that they “apologize[d] to the complainant about some aspect of the dispute” approximately 31% of the cases.³⁴⁴ Complainants say they apologized to supervisors approximately 24% of the time.³⁴⁵

In keeping with the transformative mediation model, the REDRESS program identified the goal of “improv[ing] workplace climate” as a strategy for reducing Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) filings.³⁴⁶ Improving workplace climate was adjudged to include “improv[ing] the way employees and supervisors handle conflict, and ultimately to empower participants to more efficiently manage their conflict for

[satisfaction with the process), distributive justice [satisfaction with the results], interactional justice [perceptions of fairness], case closure rates, complaint filing rates, and formal complaint flow-through rates.” *Id.* The study considered, among other things, the program’s effect on the EEO filings and the climate of the workplace. *Id.*

³³⁵ *Id.* The REDRESS program currently enjoys a 75% employee participation rate. *Id.* at 30-31.

³³⁶ *Id.*

³³⁷ BOULLE ET AL., *supra* note 212, at 13.

³³⁸ ROBERT A. BARUCH BUSH & JOSEPH P. FOLGER, THE PROMISE OF MEDIATION: THE TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO CONFLICT 52-53 (2004).

³³⁹ Bingham et al., *supra* note 331, at 31; BUSH & FOLGER, *supra* note 338, at 22.

³⁴⁰ BUSH & FOLGER, *supra* note 338, at 22.

³⁴¹ *Id.*

³⁴² Bingham et al., *supra* note 331, at 34. (“Complainants report that they felt pressure to accept a settlement in 15.2% of the cases, while their own representatives and other report that this happened in 10.9% or fewer of the cases.”).

³⁴³ *Id.* at 36.

³⁴⁴ *Id.* at 38 (the precise number is 30.9%).

³⁴⁵ *Id.* (the precise number is 24.1%).

³⁴⁶ *Id.*

themselves, resulting in better, more productive work environment.”³⁴⁷ Supervisors reported improved conflict management behavior after going through a three day REDRESS training or participating in a REDRESS mediation.³⁴⁸ The supervisor’s use of listening skills also was reported to have improved.³⁴⁹

Perhaps the best indicator, however, of REDRESS’ positive impact on workplace climate comes from employees’ perceptions of the workplace and supervisors’ behavior. Employees reported an improved open door atmosphere after implementation of the program.³⁵⁰ In addition, employees reported decreased incidence of “yelling, arguing, disciplining or intimidating” as a way for supervisors to handle conflict.³⁵¹ Thus, implementing an in-house mediation program demonstrably improved workplace climate, and as well be examined below, reduced EEO claims.³⁵²

The study also concluded that the REDRESS program streamlined the resolution of EEO cases.³⁵³ Although settlement is not explicitly a goal of transformative mediation, it is an implicit consequence of conflicted co-workers managing conflict more effectively. During the period studied, closure rates, which track formal settlement within 30 days of the mediation, ranged from 70% to 80%.³⁵⁴

As importantly, EEO filings dropped precipitously as a consequence of implementing the REDRESS program. EEO complaints dropped from a high of 14,000 complaints in 1997 before REDRESS to 8,500 complaints in 2003, with the decline in complaints correlating with the implementation of REDRESS in various cities.³⁵⁵ Overall, adjusting for workforce size, EEO complaints have dropped 30% from their peak in 1997 since implementing REDRESS, and are filed by 40% fewer employees.³⁵⁶ The study did not report actual costs savings realized as a result of reducing the number of EEO claims, but in the private sector the average costs in combined defense and settlement of an EEO claim is \$270,000.³⁵⁷ Even if the average cost of US Postal Service EEO claims are much less, a 30% reduction in the number of EEO claims adds up to a considerable financial costs savings.

³⁴⁷ Bingham et al., *supra* note 331, at 25.

³⁴⁸ *Id.* Before receiving training or participating in mediation, only 13% of supervisors said “they communicated openly to manage conflict at work.” *Id.* After training the percentage of supervisors who reported communicating openly to manage conflict increased to 50%. *Id.* The number of supervisors who reported managing conflict by giving direct orders dropped from 30% before the training or mediation to 19% after. *Id.*

³⁴⁹ Before REDRESS, only 10% of supervisors felt that “listening works best for managing conflict,” but after participating in a REDRESS training or mediation 38% of supervisors felt listening “worked best.” *Id.*

³⁵⁰ *Id.* Before REDRESS 31% of employees perceived “that employees, supervisors and managers could easily approach other to discuss problems.” *Id.* After REDRESS, the employees’ perception of the existence of open door atmosphere rose to 53%. *Id.*

³⁵¹ *Id.* The second most common response to the question “how does your boss deal with conflict,” before REDRESS was by “yelling, arguing, disciplining, or intimidating.” *Id.* After REDRESS, this response fell from 17% to 3%. *Id.*

³⁵² *Id.*

³⁵³ *Id.*

³⁵⁴ *Id.* Settlement rates and closure rates differ. Settlement rate refers to the cases settled at the mediation conference. *Id.* The REDRESS settlement rate in 2004 was 54%, but the closure rate increased to 72.4%. *Id.*

³⁵⁵ *Id.*

³⁵⁶ *Id.*

³⁵⁷ U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION, <http://www.eeoc.gov> (last visited May 31, 2011).

REDRESS' success in accomplishing its uncommon goal of improving workplace climate is directly attributable to the program's extensive use of productive conflict management principles that this Article has previously examined, which are embodied in the transformative mediation model. Empowering parties to define the issues and decide how to resolve them, a key feature of this model, emphasizes the interdependence of the parties. As discussed, the greater the perception that the parties have that they are interdependent—that resolution must come through consent of the other—the more cooperative they will be with one another in working through the conflict. While the principle of interdependence is relevant in all conflicts, it takes on a heightened importance in workplace conflicts because parties are more likely to continue their relationship after the conflict is resolved.

The program's use of mediation plays an important part in promoting interdependence because one of mediation's key features is party "self-determination."³⁵⁸ Self-determination is the principle that parties are the masters of their own dispute, deciding when and how to resolve it.³⁵⁹ Self-determination and empowerment are particularly prominent features in transformative mediation.³⁶⁰ Facilitative and evaluative models of mediation also empower parties, but those models are arguably less "empowering" because a mediator operating under either of these mediation models is more likely to take an active role in defining the issues and formulating a solution than a transformative mediator.³⁶¹

The REDRESS program's use of recognition is another way it enhances productive conflict. Recognition occurs when a party, at least to some degree, can see the conflict from the other party's perspective. The REDRESS program enhances recognition by creating a mediation climate where parties are encouraged to listen and, when appropriate, feel comfortable enough to apologize. Listening and apologizing, as discussed above, are two effective forms of "face-giving" that improve conflict interactions. The REDRESS data show that a vast number of participants felt as if they were listened to in the mediations and the significant number of apologies that occurred at the mediations suggests that face-giving was an integral part of the program's success.

Most meaningfully, perhaps, is that by incorporating the productive conflict principles into the mediations and training, the quality of workplace conflict interactions has been improved measurably. Improving workplace climate has lowered EEO complaints.³⁶² Since implementing the REDRESS program, EEO complaints have

³⁵⁸ CARRIE MENKEL-MEADOW, LELA PORTER LOVE & ANDREA KUPFER SCHNEIDER, *MEDIATION: PRACTICE, POLICY, AND ETHICS* 94 (2006) (explaining that "[s]elf-determination means that parties remain in control of both the process and the outcome").

³⁵⁹ *Id.*

³⁶⁰ BUSH & FOLGER, *supra* note 338, at 95.

³⁶¹ BOULLE ETAL., *supra* note 212, at 12-13.

³⁶² The Intergraded Conflict Management System (ICMS) is worth briefly describing because several large organizations, private and public, have spent considerable time, money and energy in implementing them, and they are growing in popularity. *See, e.g.,* Judith Cohen, *Why programs Are No Longer Enough: An Interview on collaborating at the U.S. TSA*, 27 *ALTERNATIVES TO THE HIGH COSTS OF LITIG.* 81 (2009) (describing the federal transportation security administration's development of an integrated conflict management system). The ICMS goal is not only address disputes as they arise in a systematic way but also to help minimize disputes, too. Jennifer F. Lynch, Q. C., *Beyond ADR: A Systems Approach to Conflict Management*, 17 *NEG. J.* 206, 212-13 (2001). A key feature of this approach is to require managers "to prevent, manage, contain and resolve all conflict at the earliest time and lowest level possible." *Id.* There

dropped significantly from their previous high. Particularly important to point out is that the drop in EEO complaints correlated with the roll-out of the REDRESS program from city to city. Thus, the program has proved effective in not only resolving conflicts, but also effective in preventing them.

C. The Lawyer as Conflict Manager: The Cost of Conflict

Organizations of all sizes, both public and private, are recognizing that the over-use of adversarial dispute resolution methods and the mismanagement of interpersonal conflict exact unacceptably high costs. The most visible of these costs are the legal expenses. Traditional adversarial dispute resolution processes require more time, energy, and money to pursue than collaborative dispute resolution processes.³⁶³ And the financial costs of legal services to pursue these more costly processes have risen significantly in recent years and continue to rise. In the five years leading up to the global economic downturn in late 2007, legal fees rose an average 7% annually, nearly twice the rate of inflation.³⁶⁴ The global economic downturn slowed, but did not stop, rising legal costs. The average attorney-billing rate in the U.S. in 2010 was \$385, which represents an average increase of 3.16% annually in the years following the global economic slump.³⁶⁵ Consequently, clients are looking for ways to reduce costs, making legal costs a very attractive area for corporate executives to take a second, and perhaps a third and fourth look. These considerations are increasingly leading organizational clients to utilize collaborative processes to resolve their disputes.

More significant than legal expenses in many instances are the indirect costs of adversarial dispute resolution processes. Adversarial dispute resolution processes by their very nature are more likely to destroy or damage the relationship among combatants.³⁶⁶ Organizational conflicts often involve important strategic business

are five key features to ICMS: all-encompassing, conflict-competent culture, multiple access points, options and choice, and support structures. *Id.* at 212-14.

³⁶³ See Section III of this Article.

³⁶⁴ Karen Sloan, *For Firms, 2010 was Full of Billing Blues*, CONN. L. TRIB., Jan. 10, 2011 (National Law Journal's Annual Survey of Hourly Billing Rates).

³⁶⁵ *Id.* The rising cost of billable hours, however, shows only part of the changing legal economic landscape. Another relevant feature is that the total costs of legal work appear to be rising at a rate in excess of the percentage increase of billable hours. A study presented at the Conference on Civil Litigation held in 2010 at Duke Law School found that for Fortune 200 companies the cost of "outside litigation" alone, which does not include damage awards, rose 73% from 2000 to 2008. Lawyers for Civil Justice, *supra* note 109 (see Average Total Litigation Costs as a Percent of U.S. Revenues 2000-2008 on page 10 of Appendix 1). Demonstrating that the increased cost of outside litigation was not the result of increased commercial activity, the survey found that the "total litigation costs as a percent of US revenue" rose from .34% in 2000 to .57% in 2008, an increase almost twofold. *Id.* Using the 2008 cost of litigation as a percent of revenue figure of .57% from the survey and average profit margins by industry, it can be roughly calculated that litigation expense by itself, excluding any damage awards, accounts for between 18.1% to 31.1% of an organizations profits. See Letter from Henry N. Butler, Exec. Dir., Northwestern Law Searle Center on Law, Regulation, and Economic Growth, to Hon. Lee H. Rosenthal, Hon. Mark R. Kravitz & Hon. John G. Koeltl, U.S. Dist. Court Judges (June 2, 2010) (on file with author); see also John B. Henry, *Fortune 500: The Total Costs of Litigation Estimated at One-Third Profits*, THE METROPOLITAN CORP. COUNS., Feb. 1, 2008 (reporting that elawForum based on litigation data it compiled over an eight year period estimates the "total costs of litigation to be 210 billion dollars, equivalent to one third of after-tax profit of the Fortune 500.").

³⁶⁶ MENKEL-MEADOW ET AL., *supra* note 358, at 32.

relationships with customers, business partners, and employees that the organization created and nurtured through considerable investment of time and other limited resources.³⁶⁷ The unnecessary loss of or injury to any of these relationships that could have been avoided through use of a collaborative dispute resolution process has a financial impact on the organization. Just because the financial impact of damaging an important business relationship is difficult to quantify in many circumstances does not make the loss any less real.³⁶⁸ This is the type of cost that is often overlooked by attorneys narrowly focused on legal issues, but felt acutely by clients. One circumstance, however, where the financial impact is reasonably quantifiable is employee turnover.³⁶⁹ On average, the cost to replace an exempted employee is the equivalent of that employee's annual compensation, including salary and benefits.³⁷⁰ Because of the considerable cost of replacing employees, organizations are increasingly turning to collaborative dispute resolution processes to minimize employee turnover.³⁷¹

To minimize both direct and indirect costs, organizations are developing in-house conflict management systems, like the ones in the case studies examined above, of varying complexity and breadth that address conflict at its early stage outside of traditional litigation.³⁷² There is no longer any credible doubt that alternative dispute resolution processes, on average, save meaningful time, money and other valuable and limited organizational resources.³⁷³ The case studies examined above all realized

³⁶⁷ AM. ARBITRATION ASS'N, *supra* note 208, at 4.

³⁶⁸ *Id.* (explaining that business "relationships with customers, suppliers, and employees . . ." are "expensive to build and sustain.").

³⁶⁹ KARL A. SLAIKEU & RALPH H. HASSON, CONTROLLING THE COSTS OF CONFLICT: HOW TO DESIGN A SYSTEM FOR YOUR ORGANIZATION 15 (1994); J. Douglas Phillips, *The Price Tag on Turnover*, PERSONNEL J., Dec. 1990, at 58-61.

³⁷⁰ SLAIKEU & HASSON, *supra* note 369, at 14-16. Of course, the cost to replace an employee can be much higher. For example to replace an engineer, the Raytheon Corporation calculated the cost at 150% of the engineer's total compensation by accounting for "lost productivity, recruiting fees, interviewing time, staffing department employees' salaries, and orientation and training costs." DANIEL DANA, CONFLICT RESOLUTION 22 (2001).

³⁷¹ Unresolved conflict has a direct impact on an organization's employee turnover rate. DANA, *supra* note 69, at 22. By some reports, "unresolved conflict is a decisive factor in at least 50% of all voluntary departures." *Id.*

³⁷² See generally LIPSKY ET AL., *supra* note 210. The line between ad hoc ADR use and a conflict management system is not a clear one, even among experts. *Id.* at 11-12. It can be said, however, that a conflict management system is one that stresses "a holistic or integrated approach to the management of a conflict . . ., [one] that transforms disputes into settlements, or more generally conflict into cooperation, within the boundaries of the organizations." David B. Lipsky, *Toward a Strategic Theory of Workplace Conflict Management*, 24 OHIO ST. J. ON DISP. RESOL. 143, 150 (2008).

³⁷³ A comprehensive study examining civil cases in which the federal government was a litigant and handled by the United States Attorney's office between 1995 and 1998 found that the use of ADR saved time and money. Lisa Blomgren Bingham et al., *Dispute Resolution and the Vanishing Trial: Comparing Federal Government Litigation and ADR Outcomes*, 24 OHIO ST. ON DISPUTE RESOL. 225 (2009). Out of the 15,288 civil matters that were part of the study, 14,777 went through traditional litigation and 511 went through non-binding ADR processes. *Id.* Cases that were sent to ADR enjoyed a 65% settlement rate, as compared to a 29% settlement rate for those that went through traditional litigation. *Id.* The study demonstrated significant savings in litigation expenses, staff time and length of litigation. *Id.* The assistant U.S. attorneys estimated that on average the government saved \$10,735 in litigation expenses alone by using ADR, which did not include staff time. *Id.* The assistant U.S. attorney estimated ADR saved 88 hours of staff time, which was defined as "the number of hours you and others (including paralegals) would have spent on this case if ADR had not been used." *Id.* Finally, U.S. attorneys estimated that ADR reduce the time of litigation by six months. *Id.* Furthermore, a 2006 study on the Center for Mediation Services

significant financial savings by moving away from traditional adversarial dispute resolution methods to more collaborative processes early in the dispute. The benefits of these systems to organizational efficiency are too great to ignore, especially in challenging economic climates where organizations are seizing every opportunity to operate more efficiently. As of 1998, about 25% of the Fortune 1000 companies have implemented conflict management systems, and many smaller and mid-size organizations have followed suit.³⁷⁴ Fortune 1000 companies that have adopted a conflict management system include General Electric, Chevron, Nestle USA, Johnson and Johnson and Alcoa.³⁷⁵ Many governmental organizations have also embraced the benefits of conflict management systems, including the Bureau of National Affairs and FEMA.³⁷⁶ Some of the most experienced researchers in this area stated “no company or other organization that adopted a workplace conflict management system, to the best of our knowledge, has yet abandoned that system in favor of more traditional methods of managing conflict.”³⁷⁷ Conflict management systems, and the collaborative processes they incorporate, are becoming increasingly common in organizational settings.

Collaborative processes and interpersonal conflict management knowledge will help attorneys to resolve individual conflicts effectively as much as they help effectively resolve organizational conflicts. Attorneys representing individuals in the areas of personal injury, family, and real estate law, for example, with knowledge of competitive conflict escalation cycles, and productive conflict techniques, would save their clients time and money by resolving conflicts sooner and with less acrimony, even in situations where preserving business relations were not of the utmost importance. As stated at the beginning of this Article, most legal conflicts, at their heart, are interpersonal conflicts whether they involve a dispute between two individuals or a dispute between two multinational companies.

IV. Conclusion: Creating the 21st Century Lawyer

Wisdom has been defined as having “total perspective—seeing an object, event, or idea in all its pertinent relationships.”³⁷⁸ This explanation of wisdom is helpful in understanding what it means to be an attorney who is a good conflict manager. As the case studies have demonstrated, there is enormous value in viewing clients’ problems from a broader conflict management perspective rather than from a narrow legal

(the Center) launched by the New York City Office of Administrative Trials and Hearings (OATH), which is “one of a very small number of municipal workplace mediation programs,” reveals an 80% reduction in monetary costs and disputing time when the city embraced the Center’s program. D. Hardison Wood & David Mark Leon, *Measuring Value in Mediation: A Case Study of Workplace Mediation in City Government*, 21 OHIO ST. J. ON DISP. RESOL. 383, 395-96. The program also “increas[ed] dispute resolution efficiency, improve[ed] employee morale, and satisf[ied] participants and other interested parties.” *Id.* at 394. FEDERAL INTERAGENCY ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION WORKING GROUP SECTIONS ET AL., REPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT ON THE USE AND RESULTS OF ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT (2007) (detailing significant savings through the use of alternative dispute resolution in the executive federal agencies).

³⁷⁴ LIPSKY ET AL., *supra* note 210, at 150.

³⁷⁵ *Id.* at 148.

³⁷⁶ *Id.*

³⁷⁷ *Id.* at 152.

³⁷⁸ Will Durant, *What is Wisdom?*, WISDOM, II, No. 8, 1957, at 25-26.

perspective. The conflict management approach, which views clients' problems as multidimensional, cuts costs, saves time and yields a better chance of preserving relationships among disputants. The attorney who adopts this approach not only analyzes the clients' rights under the law, but also considers how the manner in which the conflict is managed will affect the client's relationships with customers, employees, important business partners, family members, and friends. The attorney who is a good conflict manager also appreciates the psychological needs of the parties themselves and will attempt to resolve the conflict as soon as practicable. To accomplish this, the attorney must understand not only the proper use of the full spectrum of dispute processes, but must also possess the interpersonal conflict management skills to work within collaborative processes effectively.

Therefore, law schools have an obligation to assist its students in forming a robust professional identity that includes the role of conflict manager in addition to the other roles attorneys must play to do their job well. Law schools have come under justified criticism in recent years for not being as mindful and as comprehensive as they should be in helping students form a professional identity that "will orient them to the full dimensions of the legal profession."³⁷⁹ An understanding of conflict management processes and interpersonal conflict management principles are two of these missing dimensions. It has been accurately and elegantly observed that "[p]rofessional education teaches both a way of understanding how the world works and a distinct set of skills for working in the world."³⁸⁰ In failing to instruct all students systematically in relevant conflict management principles, processes, and skills, law schools send forth their graduates with an incomplete and even distorted view of the legal world in which they are expected to work effectively.

The time is ripe for law schools to embrace the emerging field of conflict management in their own core content of study and not only offer related subjects in electives taken by only minority of students. At minimum, law schools should require students to take an ADR Survey course *and* a Negotiation course that integrates interpersonal conflict management principles.³⁸¹ Although almost all law schools offer ADR related courses as electives, only a small percentage requires them.³⁸² Requiring an ADR Survey course will acquaint law students with the fundamental ADR process like negotiation, mediation, and arbitration, as well as what are referred to as hybrid processes, such as med-arb, mini-trial, and summary jury trials.³⁸³ Increasingly, ADR Survey course texts also include materials on designing dispute resolution systems for organizations.³⁸⁴ Requiring a Negotiation course would acquaint students with the interpersonal conflict management principles and skills essential for successfully advocating in collaborative processes. A client is little advantaged if his attorney correctly advises to use mediation to attempt to resolve a dispute, but lacks the requisite interpersonal conflict management skills to participate meaningfully in mediation. This

³⁷⁹ SULLIVAN ET AL., *supra* note 8, at 29.

³⁸⁰ *Id.* at 185.

³⁸¹ Or, better still, law schools should require all students take a Psychology of Conflict course as a condition of graduation. The challenge with such a proposal is the finding faculty qualified to teach it.

³⁸² Nolon, *supra* note 17.

³⁸³ See generally JAY FOLBERG ET AL., *RESOLVING DISPUTES: THEORY, PRACTICE, AND LAW* (2nd ed. 2010); CARRIE J. MENKEL-MEADOW ET AL., *DISPUTE RESOLUTION: BEYOND THE ADVERSARIAL MODEL* (2005).

³⁸⁴ See, e.g., LEONARD L. RISKIN ET AL., *DISPUTE RESOLUTION AND LAWYERS* 886-923 (4th ed. 2009).

education will also help students to better manage other inevitable professional conflicts with clients and colleagues that are often as critical to their success as those conflicts they manage for clients.

To put this proposal in perspective, American law schools require approximately 90 credit hours for graduation.³⁸⁵ If a law school required a three-credit ADR course and a three-credit Negotiation course, it would amount about to approximately 7% of a student's total law school education.³⁸⁶ This is a modest investment of time for topics that are fundamental to the practice of law.³⁸⁷ But it would be a substantial improvement over what almost all law schools are presently requiring, which is nothing.

This Article has explored only two interpersonal conflict management principles of which attorneys should be knowledgeable—competitive conflict escalation cycles and productive conflict. There are, of course, many other important interpersonal conflict management principles in which lawyers should be educated, and the time is ripe to begin educating law students in those principles. There are at least two compelling reasons why lawyers and law schools can no longer be ambivalent about the role that interpersonal conflict management plays in legal disputes. First, it has never been truer that the collaborative dispute resolution processes are a prominent, even dominant, feature of a lawyer's work.³⁸⁸ It is untenable to not require a minimum degree of education so that future lawyers are more capable of participating meaningfully in those processes. Lawyers can also benefit financially from being conflict managers. The growing number of organizations that are utilizing conflict management systems and collaborative processes to resolve their conflicts will need professionals to design and maintain those systems and processes, as well as those who know how to work effectively in collaborative environments. Attorneys who have the knowledge and skills to satisfy these needs will reap the financial rewards of expanding into the emerging field of conflict management and prevention.

The second reason why law schools should no longer delay in the teaching of interpersonal conflict management skills to all of their students is that the field of conflict management is growing in knowledge and recognition with each passing year.³⁸⁹

³⁸⁵ SECTION OF LEGAL EDUC. & ADMISSION TO THE BAR, *supra* note 4, at 13-14 (stating that ninety credit-hours is the median required for graduation for all ABA approved law schools).

³⁸⁶ The precise percentage is 6.6% of the total law school credits taken. There are certainly additional and, perhaps, more effective ways to integrate this education into the existing curriculum than as proposed here, but that discussion is beyond the scope of this Article. For a thoughtful discussion of ways alternative dispute resolution can be incorporated into the law school curriculum see Lande & Sternlight, *supra* note 15.

³⁸⁷ The MacCrate Report lists ten "fundamental lawyering skills": Problem solving, legal analysis and reasoning, legal research, Factual investigation, communication, counseling, *negotiation*, litigation and *ADR procedures*, organization and management of legal work, recognizing and resolving ethical dilemmas. SECTION OF LEGAL EDUC. & ADMISSIONS TO THE BAR & AM. BAR ASS'N, *supra* note 40, at 135, 138-40 (emphasis added).

³⁸⁸ Galanter, *supra* note 125, at 459 (study of federal courts show in 2002 91.2% of all civil cases were resolved without trial).

³⁸⁹ THE PEACE & JUSTICE STUDIES ASS'N & THE INT'L PEACE RESEARCH ASS'N FOUND., GLOBAL DIRECTORY OF PEACE STUDIES AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION PROGRAMS (Ian M. Harris & Amy L. Shuster eds., 7th ed. 2006). The first edition of the directory listed 36 colleges and universities offering conflict management programs in 1981. *Id.* at Preface. In 1983, the second edition of the directory listed 67 colleges and university conflict management programs. *Id.* The seventh edition, published in 2006, lists "includes over 450 entries for undergraduate and graduate education (70%) and research centers (30%). *Id.* These are based at some 390 unique institutions, 133 from outside the United States, and representing 40

Although as a multidisciplinary field it draws extensively upon other more established disciplines for its knowledge base, such as the fields of psychology, sociology, economics and neuroscience, it is also becoming a distinct field of science in its own right.³⁹⁰ Attorneys must be a part of this emerging conflict-competent culture if they are to serve their clients well in answer to the high calling of their profession. If attorneys do not step up to fill this emerging field of conflict management, there are a small but growing number of non-lawyer professionals with advanced degrees in dispute resolution and conflict management who receive significantly more education in collaborative process and interpersonal conflict management skills than lawyers presently do, and they will be more than pleased to dominate this field.³⁹¹

While lawyers must be capable advocates and analysts, they must also be capable conflict managers if they are to be competitive in a culture that will increasingly demand conflict-competence from them. Through self-education and continuing formal education, many lawyers are able to bridge the gap between what they learn in law school what they need to know to practice law well, but many do not. Even those who successfully bridged the divide between their legal education and the real world demands of practice could narrow that gap more efficiently if law schools addressed the “dimensions” of their future careers more completely.

In proposing that lawyers need to be conflict managers, it is tempting to think that the 21st century will need a new kind of lawyer—one that can be the “sword” and the “shield,” as well as the “problem-solver” and “peacemaker.” But deeper reflection will reveal that this is not a new kind of lawyer at all. The best lawyers, of any era, have always been lawyers “for all seasons.”

countries on six continents.” *Id.* The U.S. News & World Report recently named “mediator” one of the “Best Careers for a Changing Job Landscape.” Marty Nemko, *Best Careers for a Changing Job Landscape*, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT (Dec. 19, 2007), <http://money.usnews.com/money/careers/articles/2007/12/19/best-careers-for-a-changing-job-landscape>.

³⁹⁰ THE PEACE & JUSTICE STUDIES ASS’N & THE INT’L PEACE RESEARCH ASS’N FOUND., *supra* note 389. There are over 250 conflict management programs in the US. *Id.* Many of these offer advance degrees in conflict management that include a focus on business disputes. *See, e.g.*, SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION (May 31, 2011), <http://smu.edu/education/disputeresolution/> (offering a Master of Arts in Dispute Resolution); STRAUS INSTITUTE FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION (May 31, 2011), <http://law.pepperdine.edu/straus/> (Pepperdine University, offering a Master’s Degree in Dispute Resolution); UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, CENTER FOR APPROPRIATE DISPUTE RESOLUTION (May 31, 2011), <http://adr.uoregon.edu/> (offering a Master’s Program in Conflict and Dispute Resolution).

³⁹¹ *See, e.g.*, SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR DISPUTE RESOLUTION (May 31, 2011), <http://smu.edu/education/disputeresolution/> (offering a Master of Arts in Dispute Resolution); NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY, <http://www.nova.edu/> (offering a Master of Science and Ph.D. in Conflict Analysis and Resolution); GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS & SCIENCES, <http://grad.georgetown.edu/> (offering a Master of Arts in Conflict Resolution); , GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY, THE SCHOOL FOR CONFLICT ANALYSIS & RESOLUTION, <http://icar.gmu.edu/> (offering a Master of Science and Ph.D. in Conflict Analysis and Resolution).