

Mediating between the mediation models; Identifying common concerns in search of a “flexible model.”

The thesis explored here is that a flexible model of mediation is possible and desirable. A flexible model is defined in this paper as a model that incorporates both problem solving and transformative approaches in response to the expressed needs of the parties. It suggests that experienced mediators often use a flexible model, consciously or unconsciously, and remain able to honor the underlying principles of mediation: neutrality, impartiality, self-determination, voluntary participation and confidentiality (Frenkel & Stark, 2008). As stated in Model Standards of Conduct for Mediators, 2005, “mediation is a process in which an impartial third party facilitates communication and negotiation and promotes voluntary decision making by the parties to the dispute” (Class PowerPoint, February 16, 2012).

This thesis is primarily a response to Bush and Folger’s argument against a mixed model in *The Promise of Mediation* (2005). Other prominent mediators respond and argue for a mixed model. Both points of view will be examined to understand the feasibility and desirability of a flexible model. The dominant three models of Directive, Facilitative and Transformative will be discussed in relation to the four stories of the mediation process: *Satisfaction*, *Social Justice*, *Transformation*, and *Oppression*. According to Bush and Folger, an individualist ideology supports the *Satisfaction Story* orientation and the relational ideology supports the *Transformation Story* orientation (2005). They argue that the two orientations are incompatible and cannot be blended in practice. In support of the value of a flexible model, other fields will be cited where an integrative approach has yielded quality outcomes.

It is necessary to summarize the four stories of the mediation process to understand how Bush and Folger see them as interwoven with the different mediation models in practice. The

Satisfaction Story speaks of a process in which the party's human needs are addressed and suffering is reduced. Because mediation is informal (not legal), voluntary and flexible, the mediators who operate within this story choose to “reframe a contentious dispute as a mutual problem” to be resolved (Bush and Folger, 2005, p. 9). It is the dominant story in the mediation field and operates in many mediation settings such as child custody, small-claims, environmental disputes and public policy. In short, mediation practice within this story is credited with easing court case burden and reducing public and private expense in resolving conflicts.

The *Social Justice Story* thinks of mediation as a way to organize individuals in a society around common interests. It is particularly important for underserved minority groups that are often subject to exploitation. Mediation in this story can “strengthen the weak by helping establish alliances among them” (Bush and Folger, 2005, p. 12). The *Social Justice Story* plays out in many mediation settings and areas such as interpersonal, neighborhood mediation, consumer disputes, environmental disputes where weaker groups might be exploited. For example, in land development disputes, organizing grassroots efforts can shift power imbalances and can serve to strengthen disadvantaged groups.

The *Transformation Story* shares some concerns with the two stories discussed but is distinct from them; its focus is to transform the conflict and the interactions of the parties involved. It seeks to *empower* the parties with a stronger sense of “self-respect, self-reliance and self-confidence” (Bush and Folger, 2005, p. 13). The other dimension in this story is that of *recognition*; each party can grow morally and increase their empathy for the other. It is thought in this story that both empowerment and recognition will aid the parties in this dispute and make them more skillful conflict resolvers going forward. As a result, third party assistance will not be needed in the future.

The *Oppression Story* is the negative story of the four presented. In essence, it is the opposite of the *Social Justice Story* and sees mediation as having dangers for underserved individuals. It suggests that in actuality, mediation is often used to increase the power of the dominant members of society over the weaker. The informality that the *Social Justice Story* points to as an asset is seen here as a hazard; the lack of formal rules and regulations in mediation allow the mediator broad power and freedom in expressing biases. Leah Wing states her concern in her article “Mediation and Inequality Reconsidered: Bringing the Discussion to the Table.” She expresses that there is a dominant paradigm in which mediation practice is set that does not address the inequalities that non-dominant social groups experience in mediation (Wing, 2009). Fiss (1984) expresses a similar concern about mediation, and ADR in general, because it incorrectly “assumes a rough equality between the contending parties” (p. 1076).

The field of mediation encompasses many different models of mediation, with the three most prominent being: Evaluative, Facilitative, and Transformative. The underlying ideologies, goals and process of the three differ in varying degrees. These three models all share the interest of assisting parties in negotiating effectively, honoring the participation of a neutral third party, and in creating a safe space for a constructive conversation to take place. The models can be seen as existing on a continuum from more interventionist to less interventionist, with Facilitative resting in the middle (Love and Stulberg, 2007). A brief description of each follows.

Evaluative mediation is the most settlement oriented of the three. The mediator in this model feels free to direct the process and make informal or formal suggestions to the parties as to the resolution of the conflict. These mediators “are concerned with legal rights of the parties rather than the needs and interests, and evaluate based on legal concepts of fairness” (Zumeta,

2000). They often “shuttle” between the parties and are often referred by the courts. Many, although not all, Evaluative mediators are lawyers.

Facilitative mediation is less directive than the Evaluative model but shares an interest in reaching agreement, although does not push to have one. The mediator in this model facilitates the self-determined process of the parties, supports a collaborative problem solving process, moves from positions to discovering underlying interests and needs, gathers information by using open-ended questions, reframes the conversation, reflects and summarizes. The mediator assists the parties in building an agenda, looks at options and reaches agreement if desired by the parties. He/she does not offer opinions or make judgments. This type of mediator manages the process but not the outcome (Zumeta, 2000).

Transformative mediation distinguishes itself from the others and shifts its goal to transforming the conflict interaction; it supports empowerment and recognition in the parties as discussed earlier in the transformation story. It is not agreement oriented. There are ten hallmarks of practice: it is disclosed that the process is focused on empowerment and recognition, it leaves responsibility for the outcomes with the parties, it is a non-judgmental mediation style, it maintains an optimistic view of the parties competency, it believes in the value of expressing emotions, it allows for uncertainty, it is responsive to past events, it maintains a focus on the here and now, it sees conflict as part of a larger story and it acknowledges small successes in the process (Bush and Folger, 1996).

Bush and Folger (2005) discuss how the three models interface with the four stories of mediation. They say that the *Satisfaction Story* is the story engaged in by the Facilitative and Evaluative mediators; the *Transformation Story* as that which is embraced by the Transformative mediators. Bush and Folger categorize Evaluative and Facilitative as the problem solvers and

the Transformative mediators as transformers. These two categories themselves will be questioned later in this paper but for now will be used as defined by Bush and Folger in *The Promise of Mediation*. They state that the two different mediation models and their associated stories are informed by incompatible underlying ideologies.

These distinct ideologies set the trajectories for the different mediation paths. Bush and Folger (2005) state that the problem solvers orientation defines conflict in terms of problems that seek satisfactory resolutions. The conflict is centered around incompatible interests and unmet needs. The focus on addressing interests and needs leads these mediators to handle the conflict in specific ways.

Bush and Folger (1994b) describe how problem solver mediators pursue the path in practice. First, “mediators tend to search for and define problems that need to be solved or addressed” (p. 10). They then employ strategies to create mutually agreeable resolutions. They imply that these mediators tend to ignore relational issues such as those of trust between the parties, self-esteem of the parties and past histories between the parties. They “drop concerns that cannot be treated as problems” (Bush and Folger, 1994b, p. 11). In their view, these mediators discourage the expression of emotions. Using this definition of conflict, they enhance their discussion by saying that this thinking is informed by an individualist ideology dominant in the US mainstream. This ideology “views the human world as made up of radically separate individual beings, of equal worth but with different desires, whose nature it is to seek satisfaction of those individual needs and desires” (Bush and Folger, 1994b, p. 13).

The Transformative mediation model defines conflict very differently. Bush and Folger (2005) see this model as “based on the theory of conflict as an interactional crisis...and the process of mediation as one of conflict transformation... the mediator’s role as supporting the

empowerment and recognition shifts that change party interaction from destructive to constructive” (p. 237). Underlying the Transformative mediation story and practice is that of a relational ideology. They assert that there is a relational connection between the self and society. In contrast to the individualist ideology, this point of view does not simply honor the autonomy of the individual; it holds that the world contains interconnected individuals who have the capacity to develop “empowerment” and “recognition” and through this they find unity. Bush and Folger (1994b) feel that “in developing conscious awareness of other’s common humanity, instead of regarding others as things to be used for one’s own ends, the individual moves from a lower to a higher state of being” (p. 20).

In practice, according to Bush and Folger (2005), Transformative mediators focus on the conflict interaction, seek opportunities to cultivate empowerment and recognition, and avoid a direct course to agreement. They value expression of emotion and believe past histories are useful and necessary to include. They are oriented to the present moment and not future oriented as they claim problem solvers are. They encourage perspective taking between the parties. They are interested in fostering the moral growth of the parties. They don’t see settlement as a goal as they claim problem solvers do. Settlement is not necessarily a goal as they claim it to be for the problem solver mediators.

To understand better the critical conversation that arose after the 1994 publication of *The Promise of Mediation* and continues in the mediation community today, it is important here to look at Bush and Folger’s broad brushstroke “positions,” then to examine specific statements they use to support their positions and finally to evaluate these statements. The same attention will be paid to those with different “positions.” An attempt will then be made to mediate between these conflicting party views.

Bush and Folger (2005) take the following positions in *The Promise of Mediation: the Transformation Story* is superior to the *Satisfaction Story*; the practice of a transformative mediation model is better for the world than the problem solving mediation model; Facilitative and Evaluative mediators are basically the same; problem solvers are usually directive and outcome oriented; problem solvers do not value emotions whereas transformers see emotions as important to the process; and the models cannot be combined because they are informed by mutually incompatible ideologies.

They support their positions by stating them as factual and by including statements by practicing mediators and existing texts that agree with them. A look at some examples follows. In support of their claim that problem solver mediators are directive and outcome oriented they quote a problem solver as saying, “Why shouldn’t I advise the parties what to do if I know what is going to work best in their situation? The whole reason I am here is to help them find a solution to their problem” (Bush and Folger, 1994a, p. 71). A response to this would be to quote many Facilitative mediators, included by Bush and Folger in the problem solvers category, who neither philosophically see their role to be this nor practice in this manner. In discussing how emotions are handled in settlement oriented mediation, which they equate earlier with problem solvers, they quote Christopher Moore in *The Mediation Process* as saying, “for a mediator to assist parties in reaching an agreeable solution, he or she must... minimize or neutralize the effects of negative emotions” (Bush and Folger, 2005, p. 240). The two primary strategies for doing so involve “venting emotions” and “suppressing emotions” (Moore, 2003, p. 173). After checking their Moore citation, it can be seen to be an incomplete part of a much larger discussion. Bush and Folger quote Saposnek, saying that these mediators ask questions that “imply to the parties that expressions of their feelings is irrelevant and counterproductive” and

that the mediator is “interested in ideas for solutions to their problems” (Bush and Folger, 2005, p. 240). In response, while managing emotions is consistently discussed in mediation texts, minimizing emotions and their value in the mediation process is not the prescribed strategy. Managing is not the same as minimizing.

Of major significance to this paper is Bush and Folger’s discussion about the feasibility of a flexible model, that of a combined use of problem solving and transformative approaches to mediation. They say that it is impossible and that “integrating the two approaches presents enormous practical and conceptual difficulties... the core practices of each are inconsistent: it would be effectively impossible for mediators to employ both sets of practices together” (Bush and Folger, 1994a, p. 109). They close the door on the subject. But others open it and continue to seek an approach that sees mediation as an opportunity to both address the goal of reaching agreement as well as the transformation of the disputants.

Looking at the potential of a flexible model requires a critical review of Bush and Folger’s claim that it is not possible or desirable. What do other prominent mediators in the field say about a flexible model? Those who reflect on a blended model do not buy into Bush and Folger’s thinking that in conflict mediation the process is more important than the outcome. They see that the transformation can take place in the disputant’s relationship to the conflict itself and not necessarily to each other. This can happen in the course of reaching settlement. Carrie Menkel-Meadow (1995) clarifies this: “Why is individual growth process privileged over other processes... can’t relationships of people to their conflict be changed in mediation, without necessarily changing the relationship between the people?” (p. 237). She suggests that a polarized view of outcome versus process is seriously questionable and that mediators with such

views are in danger of just the kind of either/or thinking that they want their disputants to rise above in the mediation process.

Others, including David A. Hoffman (1999), question how the principle of self-determination plays out in Transformative mediation: “How could we justify imposing our own view of what mediation should accomplish (personal growth and development) on parties who came to us for something else (namely, settlement)” (p. 1)? He also expresses concern with regards to the appropriateness of the transformative approach in many cases, such as business disputes. As a self-proclaimed problem solver, he chooses to acknowledge and respect the concepts of empowerment and recognition. But he believes that “an integration of transformative and problem solving techniques is not only possible, but in many cases essential” (Hoffman, 1999, p. 2). He suggests that transformative moments happen in all mediations and should be seen as opportunities while at the same time settlement should be pursued. Hoffman embraces the richness that the two approaches can yield when combined.

Ken Cloke (2007), a prominent author, academic and practicing mediator, sees the value of searching for “the hidden unities” that connect the diverse mediation practices (p. 2). This search would lead to a “holistic, pluralistic and eclectic approach to mediation styles” (Cloke, 2007, p. 2). It is notable that the inclusiveness, the choice to seek unities in the various models, is in sharp contrast with the Bush and Folger approach that is to seek the differences. Since what is sought can determine what is found, Cloke finds that the approach that best serves the parties is the inclusive one: all the approaches combined into a single whole have more power than any of the parts on their own. Ideally, he recommends a fluency in all the mediation styles and the ability to move among them as determined by the conflict itself, as well as in the moments that are presented in the course of any mediation (Cloke, 2007).

Michael Williams (1997), a mediator in Dublin, Ireland, rejects Bush and Folger's argument that transformative and problem solving mediation orientations cannot be mixed. First he asks, do we have to choose between them? He concludes that we do not and should not. Like many, he says that in practice the two approaches often operate together. He cites mediations involving spousal separation to be cases in which both are often effectively practiced, resulting in satisfaction and transformation. Williams sees satisfaction as leading to transformation.

Finally, Frenkel and Stark (2008) join the chorus of the mediators quoted and say that they are "skeptical of the claim that transformation is inconsistent with problem solving," and later in their text say that most effective mediators are flexible and adapt their mediating approaches in response to the clients, circumstances and context (p. 85). As this paper set out to make a case for a flexible model, it is important to acknowledge that mediators selected were those responding critically to Bush and Folger's position against blending the models. It would have been equally possible to find many practitioners in favor of their point of view.

So, at the mediation table we have two parties: one that believes in the transformative mediation model and the other in the problem solving model. In asking each party "please tell me what brought you here today" their "positions" become clear. I learn that the transformative mediator insists that the mediator should not be agreement oriented and should facilitate the development of empowerment and recognition in the parties. And when practiced in its purest form, this approach is best because it transforms the conflict itself, makes the parties stronger and has the power to create a moral shift in society. The problem solver mediator states that parties come to mediation to have their conflict resolved and the job of the mediator is to facilitate their self-determined process to that end. It should be noted that Evaluative and Facilitative mediation, questionably lumped together by Bush and Folger, would differ in the

processes engaged in to reach this end. The problem solver continues, yes, it is important to address the relationship between the parties, but not instead of an agreement. Furthermore, parties are empowered through the process of reaching an agreement and might not be empowered without an agreement.

Through some open-ended questions, I learn that both practices honor certain underlying principles but they manage the process differently. The principles and values shared by both might be: belief in a cooperative process over a competitive one, value in confidentiality, exercise of impartiality, maintenance of neutrality, respect for the voluntary participation of the parties and the management of a constructive conversation in a safe space. I would reframe this as their common concerns.

I might ask each party to take the perspective of the other, and having done so, ask what they each valued in the other's approach. Going forward, what might they each envision as the best options for philosophical co-existence and practice? One option that might surface, along with mutual respect for the other, might be for a flexible model with blended values and approaches. This model would incorporate those underlying values suggested by Bernard Mayer (2004) in *Beyond Neutrality* (p. 106) as:

- Resolution is better than conflict (a possible compromise for the transformers).
- Cooperation is better than competition.
- Integrative solutions are better than distributive solutions.
- The coercive use of power is bad.
- Interests are important; positions are a problem.
- Communication among antagonists is desirable.
- Pressuring people to accept a solution is not helpful.
- Empowering disputants to solve their own problems is important.

It is notable that only the first item on the above might cause the transformers to pause.

Use and applicability of a flexible model depend on a clear understanding about which mediator qualities, experience and knowledge are required to practice it and in what context it

should be used. It should be understood from the start in this discussion that training in both problem solving and transformative models would be critical. But that alone, would not be enough. Much experience of practicing the models would be essential. Through trainings and experience, the mediator would hopefully find an authentic “self” as a practitioner. Training in Emotional Intelligence for the mediator, with its focus on self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and social skills, would also be invaluable (Johnson, Levine and Richard, 2003, p. 153-155). The skillfulness of the mediator required in any model in dealing with their own emotions and those of the parties becomes particularly pronounced in the fullness of the flexible model.

There seems to be a dearth of research regarding which models work best and in what context. Perhaps this is because the variables are unlimited and this makes research difficult to pursue. Given that there are many formal mediation models already in practice and little study on what works best and where, the question of whether yet another model, a flexible model, contributes to the mediation field should be asked. Logic tells us that most, if not all, conflicts involve relationships, emotions, and a shared interest in resolution. Dealing with the conflict ideally needs to include addressing all these aspects and a flexible model would do so. We know this is possible, because many experienced mediators, including those cited, choose to practice this way.

In other fields, hybrid approaches have yielded positive outcomes. In international relations, Joseph Nye (2009) at Harvard suggests the use of “Smart Power” which he defines as the ability to combine hard and soft power into a winning strategy. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton agrees with this approach. In her confirmation testimony, she states, “We must use what has been called “Smart Power” — the full range of tools at our disposal — diplomatic,

economic, military, political, legal and cultural-picking the right tool, or combination of tools, for each situation” (<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm>).

The best outcomes in both medicine and psychology are the result of a hybrid approach. In medical practice, a physician must integrate evidence based medicine (based on peer reviewed randomized double-blinded research trials) together with good clinical judgement. The diagnostic approach combines both the “art and science of medicine” in order to provide optimal individualized care. Similarly, a physician must select from a variety of treatment options which may include supportive care (such as counseling, rehabilitation, or physical therapy), medications, percutaneous and/or surgical intervention. The best judgement requires a doctor to first “do no harm” and perhaps start with a less invasive approach unless the clinical circumstances warrant otherwise.

Perhaps more closely aligned to conflict resolution is the field of psychology. A good example of a hybrid treatment model is multimodal therapy, an approach to psychotherapy founded by Arnold Lazarus. Set within the framework of Cognitive Behavior Therapy (CBT), this approach is based on the idea that humans are biological beings that think, feel, act, sense, imagine and interact, and that each of these “modalities” should be addressed in psychological treatment (Lazarus, 1989). Multimodal therapy embraces “technical eclecticism.” Many different theoretical perspectives are included in this treatment orientation with value placed on individualized patient treatment.

Making a case for a flexible model of mediation is not an attempt to devalue any of the salient models in use; rather, it is an effort to add to them. It seems a waste of time for people in the mediation field to bicker among these models over which is “best.” The field might be better served to focus on trainings that encourage centering practices which can lead to what spiritual

traditions call a relaxed and focused mind, so critical for the mediator. As expressed earlier, trainings in Emotional Intelligence might also bring forward a more fully developed mediator. In this sense it is less about the mediation model and more about the mediator. It should be remembered that indigenous societies have successfully relied on the wise men, healers, and tribal chiefs to resolve their conflicts. In these societies, the issue is not about the model used; instead, it is about the wisdom, respect, and trust engendered by the mediator. Quality practice is also about full disclosure on the part of the mediator with regard to the model to be used and agreement from the parties to engage in the process.

Transformational mediation is not being attacked here. I find the emphasis on empowerment and recognition to be of great value at the mediation table and in society at large. But the views expressed in *The Promise of Mediation* about its superiority and the desire to keep it exclusive of other approaches seems rigid to me. Others, more experienced than I, have similar reactions. I recall what the Buddha said: “To be attached to a certain view and to look down upon other views as inferior - this the wise call a fetter.”

In closing, I think of a cartoon I have seen with a psychiatrist and a patient. Above the patient’s head is a thought in a balloon: “I hope he treats the problem I have,” and above the psychiatrist’s head a balloon says, “I hope she has the problem I treat.” In our field, it could read, “I hope he/she mediates the kind of conflict we have” and “I hope they have the kind of conflict I mediate!” What I mean here is that there should be agreement between mediator and disputants that they can work together effectively. And a final word on mediator practice might be summed up in Carl Jung’s (1953) statement, “Learn your theories as well as you can, but put them aside when you touch the miracle of a living soul. Not theories but your own creative individuality alone must decide” (p. 73).

A flexible model, one that blends both problem solving and transformative approaches, is both possible and desirable and responds to Jung's wise advice.

A brief reflection on writing this paper:

As I responded to Bush and Folger's firm stand on not mixing the models, I noted how rigid I thought their thinking was. Later on, after rereading what I wrote, I saw that same rigidity in my own thinking. Bush and Folger want the integrity of their model kept pure because they believe it is most effective that way. It is this effectiveness that represents their most significant underlying "interest." It is not a news flash that beliefs can become rigidly held in the context of conflict, it is just that it is valuable to note my own rigidity. It is a reminder to me that I carry strong beliefs that can get "fixed" and that I can be judgmental. Going forward, more self-awareness about this will be useful as I learn to be a "neutral."

References

- Bush, R.A.B. and Folger, J.P. (1994a - 2005). *The promise of mediation: The transformative approach to conflict* (1st and 2nd editions). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bush, R.A.B. and Folger, J.P. (1994b). Ideology, Orientations to Conflict, and Mediation Discourse. In J.P. Folger, and T.S. Jones (Eds.), *New Directions in Mediation* (3-25). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bush, R.A.B. and Folger, J.P. (1996). Transformative Mediation and Third-Party Intervention: Ten Hallmarks of a Transformative Approach to Practice. *Mediation Quarterly*. 13(4), 45-60.
- Cloke, K. (2007). Let a Thousand Flowers Bloom: A Holistic, Pluralistic and Eclectic Approach to Mediation. *ACResolution*. 6(2), 26-30.
- Fiss, O. M. (1984). Against settlement. *Yale Law Journal*, 93(6), 1073-1090.
- Frenkel, D. N. and Stark, J. H. (2008). The role of the mediator: differing approaches, fundamental norms. In *The practice of mediation: A video-integrated text* (61-89). New York: Wolters Kluwer.
- Hoffman, D. A. (1999). Confessions of a Problem-Solving Mediator. *Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution News*. 23(3), 1-4.
- Johnson, M., Levine, S. and Richard, L.R. (2003). Emotionally intelligent mediation: Four key competencies. In Bowling, D. and Hoffman, D. (Eds). *Bringing Peace into the Room*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Jung, C. (1953). *Psychological Reflections*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Lazarus, A. (1989). *The Practice of Multimodal Therapy*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Love, L. and Stulberg, J. (2007). The uses of mediation. In Kupfer Schneider, A. and Honeyman, C. (Eds.). In *The Negotiator's Fieldbook* (67-74). Chicago: American Bar Association.
- Mayer, B. S. (2004). The use (and misuse) of mediation. In *Beyond Neutrality*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Menkel-Meadow, C. (1995). The Many Ways of Mediation: The Transformation of Traditions, Ideologies, Paradigms, and Practices. *Negotiation Journal*. 11(3), 217-242.
- Moore, C W. (2003). *The Mediation Process: Practical Strategies for Resolving Conflict* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nye, J. (2009). Get Smart: Combining Hard and Soft Power. *Foreign Affairs*. Retrieved from: www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/65163/joseph-s-nye-jr/get-smart?
- Williams, M. (1997). Can't I Get No Satisfaction? Thoughts on The Promise of Mediation. *Mediation Quarterly*. 15(2), 143-154.
- Wing, L. (2009). Mediation and inequality reconsidered: Bringing the discussion to the table. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 26(4), 383-404.
- Zumeta, Z. (2000). Styles of Mediation: Facilitative, Evaluative, and Transformative Mediation. Retrieved from: www.mediate.com/articles/zumeta.cfm

Kathy,

I really enjoyed your “mediation” of the conflict between the transformers and the satisfaction seekers! You have made a very good case for the adoption of a “flexible model” and support

your case with solid research on the views of some well respected scholars/practitioners in the field. Your recognition that that which best empowers the parties may very well be the reaching of an agreement was very insightful. I was also impressed by your forays into other fields to see whether hybrid approaches (e.g., multimodal therapy) have been adopted.

Your paper very cogently lays out the debate between the two styles of mediation; I will have the “positions” and “interests” of each style in the forefront of my mind when I next cover the spectrum of styles in an Intro to Mediation class. Thank you!

I have read and taken into account your optional assignment in calculating your final grade.

Grade: A

Michele