

**S
C
H
O
O
L**

**O
F**

**M
A
N
A
G
E
M
E
N
T**



WORKING PAPER SERIES

Some Observations On The Growth And Nature Of ADR In Australian Workplaces

Bernadine Vangramberg

Working Paper 9/2002

Some Observations On The Growth And Nature Of ADR In Australian Workplaces

Bernadine Van Gramberg

ABSTRACT

Formal Alternative Dispute Resolution schemes (ADR) in tribunals and courts in Australia are now well established. The use of private ADR practitioners in industrial relations, however, is still very much in its infancy. This paper presents the findings of the author's survey of Australian ADR practitioners and draws on 3 case studies of ADR conducted in the workplace. It would appear, from the evidence presented, that Australia is witnessing the 'thin edge of the wedge' of a growing movement rather than the short-lived emergence of a management 'fad'. The growth of consultants in Australia, has meant that most employers are aware of a range of consultancy services available to them. Whilst, the survey showed the uptake to date of these services has been slow, it has demonstrated that most ADR practitioners rated the uptake of their services as growing steadily. Further, it can be surmised from this growth in workplace ADR that employers are satisfied that mediation and other ADR processes have a place in the workplace for a range of disputes.

However, the case studies point to serious issues concerning process, ethics, justice and power. The first case study illustrates a dispute in which the employees believed that the ADR process used was facilitation, and the management team understood the process to be fact-finding, but the actual role played by the third party appeared to be neither. The second case detailed a facilitator's passivity during enterprise negotiations which contributed to the employees accepting a dubious outcome. Finally, in the third case, a mediator's self imposed time limits were used to put pressure on the parties to settle.

The cases raise questions regarding training and standards for workplace ADR practitioners. Cases such as these have the potential to malign the practice of ADR before it is able to gain a foothold in emerging fields such as the workplace.

INTRODUCTION

This paper presents the findings of a study into the growth and nature of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in Australian workplaces comprising two surveys and three case studies conducted between 2000 and 2001.

(i) The employer survey

The employer survey sought to determine the level of prior use of private mediation as well as gauge the level of support and demand from employers for a fee-for-service alternative to the (currently free) dispute resolution process undertaken by the AIRC. A total of 550 questionnaires sent to medium to large employers in the state of Victoria, 129 responded (23.5 percent). Of the respondents, 35.2 percent identified themselves as manufacturers, 11.7 percent as government administration and 9.4 in Health and Community Services. The remaining respondents were scattered across the industry groupings and all industries were represented. The distribution of industries in the survey was similar to that found in the 1995 Australian Workplace Industrial Relations

Survey (Morehead, Steele, Alexander, Stephen and Duffin, 1997) and thus, whilst being a small sample, it was taken to be representative of the industry distribution of Australian workplaces.

(ii) The Survey of ADR Practitioners

A national survey of ADR Practitioners was conducted to investigate whether there has been a growth of ADR services offered to Australian workplaces; the nature of the services offered (types of ADR); and the implications for the traditional industrial relations actors if private ADR services should expand in the future. The database consisted of the mailing list for the 4th National Mediation Conference, kindly provided by the organisers and supplemented through an internet search for mediation providers and, third, through discussions with ADR practitioners (sourced through the internet). The final list of 1710 names represents a wide net which may, arguably, be described as being close to a representative group of Australian ADR practitioners.

The 302 responses received represented a 17.7 per cent return rate. However, many of the respondents practiced ADR solely in jurisdictions outside the workplace and had to be removed from the survey population. Only 156 responses reflected ADR practitioners who conducted at least some part of their business in the workplace. This much smaller population, representing a 9.1 per cent return rate, is arguably a representative sample of the embryonic workplace ADR professional.

(iii) The Case Studies

In this study, the recent application of an ADR technique by a private practitioner in the workplace was the event under investigation. The selection of the case studies emerged from the employer survey. Three employers responding to the employer questionnaire volunteered to have the ADR process undertaken at their workplace be further investigated. This study reports on a fact-finding exercise conducted at a medium sized metals manufacturing plant, facilitation of the enterprise negotiations at a privatised utility and mediation of a grievance at a state-owned enterprise.

The Findings: A Growth In Private Workplace ADR

A total of 69 of the 129 respondent employers indicated they had utilised mediation in their workplace in the past. When asked the professional background of the mediators utilised, responses indicated that workplace mediators could not be considered a homogenous group. Table 1 demonstrates that external mediators tended to be from employer associations (16.8 percent); unions (12.9 percent) and legal firms (12.9 per cent). Retired industrial relations commissioners were also employed as mediators (8.9 per cent). Other (less used) sources of mediators nominated by respondents comprised academics, consultants with management backgrounds, consultants with government backgrounds and psychologists. Only one respondent nominated the use of a dedicated mediation consultant, possibly indicating that workplace mediation is not as yet a full time occupation (this is examined in a later section).

Internal mediation by the HR manager was cited as the most prevalent form of workplace ADR by employers, with 33.7 per cent indicating this was a role performed by their HR manager. Given that 69 of the 129 employer respondents had utilised mediation in the past, and of that number, only 23 (18.0 per cent) had engaged an

external third party, suggesting again, that external third parties engaged to resolve workplace disputes is as yet a relatively uncommon occurrence.

Table 1: Background of Mediators utilised by respondent employers

| Background of Mediator | Percentage of workplaces which used a mediator (n=69) |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Lawyer | 12.9 |
| Employer Association Rep | 16.8 |
| Union Representative | 12.9 |
| Ex-Commissioner | 8.9 |
| Academic | 1.0 |
| HR Manager** | 33.7 |
| Other | 13.8 |
| TOTAL* | 100.0 |

Source: Employer survey

*Respondents were able to select more than one category for their mediators.


** HR managers listed here were not external third parties, but employees of the firm

Practitioner views on whether there has been a growth in ADR

Just over half of the 38 practitioner respondents (50.3 per cent) to this question believed that ADR commenced in Australia after 1985. A smaller group of 22.6 per cent felt that ADR actually began being offered to Australian workplaces earlier than 1985. Whilst there may have been disagreement over the commencement date of workplace ADR, there was little dissention over the question of whether workplace ADR has since grown. Some 115 (74.2 per cent) of the 155 respondents to this question indicated that there has been some growth in workplace ADR since 1996. Of the remaining respondents, only 4.2 per cent felt there had been no growth in private ADR while 21.3 per cent were unsure as they had only recently commenced their practice. Despite their uncertainty, this group, arguably, must anticipate growth given they have chosen to establish businesses providing workplace ADR.

When asked to gauge the extent of the growth in workplace ADR, nearly half the respondents (49 per cent) indicated it was low but growing. A further 27 per cent measured the rate at low, but steady. Only 8 per cent of respondents felt that there was a rapid growth in ADR (Figure 1). Of course, care should be exercised here as different respondents may gauge the growth of ADR differently, depending on their individual interpretation of the gradations provided.

Figure 1: ADR practitioner responses to the level of growth of ADR




Source: ADR practitioner survey

Proportion of Workload on ADR

Despite the claimed growth in workplace ADR, most practitioners surveyed did not have a full-time workload of workplace-based ADR. Figure 2 depicts the proportion (shown as a percentage) of ADR practitioners' total workloads spent resolving workplace disputes. For the 150 respondents to this question, the majority obtain less than 20 per cent of their workload from employment-related disputes (74.8 per cent). A small, but significant group (12.9 per cent of respondents) undertook between 21-40 per cent of their workload in workplace ADR. A further 5.2 per cent claimed to undertake between 41 and 59 per cent of their total workload resolving workplace disputes and only 3.9 per cent indicated that workplace ADR accounts for over 60 per cent of their workload. It is clear that few ADR practitioners make their living, at this time, resolving only workplace disputes.

Figure 2: Proportion of practitioners' workload spent resolving workplace disputes



Source: ADR practitioner survey


Workplace ADR was not the main area of work for the ADR practitioners surveyed. When asked what other avenues of ADR were practiced, 137 respondents indicated that they obtain dispute resolution work in avenues other than the workplace including

dealing with family disputes (25.9 per cent), community disputes (22.1 per cent), equal employment opportunity disputes (12.8 per cent), landlord-tenant disputes (10.9 per cent) and small claims (10.9 per cent).

The Nature of ADR offered in Australian workplaces

The practitioner survey responses indicated that a limited range of ADR is offered in Australian workplaces (Figure 3). The mainstay of Australian workplace ADR resides in the facilitative processes (NADRAC, 1997) of mediation, conciliation and facilitation. Mediation, described in the questionnaire as ‘third party assists negotiation’ was the most utilised form of workplace ADR, attracting 82.6 per cent of responses. Facilitation (‘third party chairs discussion’) at 56.1 per cent was conducted slightly more often than conciliation, defined as ‘third party participates in the construction of solution’ (41.3 per cent). Little use appears to be made of the more interventionist processes of private arbitration (7.7 per cent) or med-arb (8.4 per cent). Interestingly, private arbitration (7.7 per cent) was utilised more often by men (11.7 per cent) than women (6.4 per cent)¹.

Figure 3: Forms of ADR offered by Australian ADR practitioners



Source: ADR practitioner survey


Who offers these forms of workplace ADR?

Clearly, from the results presented above, Australian workplace ADR centres on mediation, facilitation and conciliation. The survey of ADR practitioners showed that although there were generally no distinctive differences in the extent to which these forms of ADR were practiced by male and female ADR practitioners, the form of ADR was related to the professional background of the practitioner. Figure 4 provides a perceptual map which illustrates these relationships. Perceptual mapping is a statistical

¹ As more women (88) than men (66) responded to the questionnaire, gender based responses are provided as a percentage of gender. Note that 2 respondents failed to indicate their sex.

technique which allows for the cross tabulations between variables to be visually appraised by gauging their relative proximity to each other. The closer the variables, the stronger is the statistical relationship between them. The mapping process automatically weights the variables, so that the observable links in Figure 4 between professional groups and the form of ADR practiced takes into account that some professions responded to the questionnaire in greater numbers than others. For clarity, some professionals were grouped together. This was possible where groups demonstrated such similarities in their response to this question as to be statistically indistinguishable from each other. The merged groups included practitioners from the following backgrounds: psychologists, social workers and community workers (Psych/soc/com); academics and teachers (academic/teacher) and practitioners from employer or managerial backgrounds such as employer association staff, HR managers and ex-general managers (Employer background).

Figure 4: Practitioner background and the form of ADR conducted



Source: ADR practitioner survey

It was found that the main types of ADR were very much related to particular professions. Those practitioners from employer backgrounds were linked more closely with facilitation and conciliation. While facilitation is considered a largely ‘hands off’ role for the third party, conciliation allows the third party considerable leeway for intervention including making suggestions (Astor and Chinkin, 1991). That practitioners from employer backgrounds oscillate between the two forms of ADR indicates that their experience in workplace matters provides them with the ability not only, perhaps, to supervise negotiations between disputants, but also to make suggestions and take a more active role in the ADR process. Like the employer group, academics and teachers were also linked to conciliation and facilitation. However, it is unlikely that academics are used to any great extent as workplace ADR practitioners as it was found that academics are rarely brought in to resolve workplace disputes.

Also flexible in their ability to deliver ADR services were the lawyers. The perceptual map in figure 4 indicates that lawyers primarily practice mediation, but to some extent engage in arbitration. Their involvement in interventionist ADR processes indicates that they are, perhaps, more equipped to make suggestions, and at times make a determination on how best to settle the dispute than practitioners from other backgrounds.

Unions were linked to conducting the determinative processes of arbitration and med-arb. The interventionist style adopted by this group may in part be due to their greater exposure to, and experience in, workplace conflict than many of the other groups and, perhaps, their reluctance to move away from their traditional role in the adversarial processes. However, some care needs to be applied to the findings concerning union ADR practitioners as there were only 7 respondents in this category and so it is not possible to generalise these findings.

Psychologists, social and community workers were linked predominantly with mediation. This finding is consistent with their use of the therapeutic model of mediation, often conducted by those in the helping professions and those experienced in counselling and listening skills (Peavy, 1996).


The fact that practitioners from different backgrounds appear to specialise in one or two forms of ADR has two main implications for workplace ADR. First, mediation, facilitation and conciliation are the most common forms of ADR found in Australian workplaces. As these forms are principally offered by practitioners from employer and legal backgrounds, it could be hypothesised that the growth in private ADR is being led by these professional groups. Second, there is a common belief that certain disputes should be handled using certain forms of ADR. If this is the case, would employers hire psychologists to resolve interpersonal disputes but not to facilitate enterprise negotiations? This question will now be addressed.

Types of Disputes resolved via ADR

Given that there was a large employer consensus that facilitative processes are better suited to interpersonal or interests disputes, rather than rights disputes, it follows that their engagement of practitioners to resolve workplace disputes would also be more heavily slanted to interpersonal disputes, disciplinary matters and facilitation of negotiations. This was tested by analysing the workloads of ADR consultants. The ADR practitioner survey asked respondents to estimate the bulk of their workload in terms of the type of dispute resolved. Figure 5 details the types of disputes which ADR practitioners handle, arranged according to their professional background.

Figure 5 shows that, proportionally, lawyers were more strongly associated with resolving disciplinary matters than the other groups. Their engagement is most likely on the instigation of employers wishing to avoid the unfair dismissal jurisdiction of the AIRC. From Figure 4, it is apparent that lawyers handle these types of disputes utilising mediation and, to a lesser extent, arbitration. In other words, lawyers are likely to handle disciplinary matters either by bringing the parties together to discuss their differences or by making a recommendatory ruling over the matter.

Figure 5: Practitioner background and type of dispute handled



Source: ADR practitioner survey

The perceptual map in Figure 5 indicates that unions are likely to be associated with the facilitation of enterprise negotiations, pay and allowance disputes and discipline. Like practitioners from employer backgrounds, unions have strong workplace experience. However, because of their low numbers in this survey, a general comment on union involvement in disciplinary matters cannot be made


While ADR practitioners from employer backgrounds also dealt with disciplinary matters, Figure 5 shows that they featured more prominently in facilitating enterprise negotiations, demonstrating, perhaps, their perceived expertise in agreement making. Their involvement as facilitators of enterprise bargaining negotiations (which lead to the setting of wages and conditions in the workplace) also helps to explain their engagement as third parties dealing with pay and allowance disputes. Figure 4 demonstrated that these practitioners primarily utilise facilitation and conciliation. Facilitation is often associated with the chairing of negotiations between the workplace parties where the facilitator does not play an active role in the development of the enterprise agreement. Conciliation, however, is a more interventionist form of ADR which would more likely be utilised to urge parties to come to an agreement, for instance on pay and allowance matters in dispute (NADRAC, 1997).

Psychologists, social workers and community workers were associated with interpersonal disputes and to some extent, with disciplinary matters. Both types of disputes often require a counselling approach and this is consistent with the findings portrayed in Figure 4 showing that these professionals tend to use mediation.

Professional background and estimation of growth of their ADR business

Two diagrams help to illustrate the extent to which certain professional groups have increased their share of workplace ADR business over others. First, Figure 6 illustrates the relationship between each of the professional groups and their estimation of how rapidly their work has grown. As psychologists and lawyers dominated survey respondents, estimates of the growth of ADR workload have been expressed as percentages of responses for each professional group. Unions were omitted from these calculations for, although they indicated they were experiencing steady growth in ADR, there were only 7 respondents, too low for meaningful examination.

Figure 6: Rate of growth of ADR work according to professional background




Source: ADR practitioner survey

Clearly, the growth in ADR has been experienced as an increase in business by all professional groups. However, on closer investigation, Figure 6 shows that practitioners with employer and psychology, social and community worker backgrounds, and to some extent lawyers, indicate that their work is growing. Academics and teachers too claim their work is growing. However, as some of the ADR work of teachers involves resolving disputes between students, their growth may not technically be considered as workplace ADR.

Figure 7 demonstrates the proportion of ADR practitioners' workloads spent resolving workplace disputes. Again, responses from each professional group have been expressed as percentages of total responses for that group, and unions have been omitted. When the results from Figure 6 are compared with those in Figure 7, it is clear that while all practitioners are experiencing some growth in workplace ADR, those from employer backgrounds obtain the greatest proportion of their total workload in the workplace. According to these practitioners, 43.8 per cent spend more than 21 per cent of their total workload resolving workplace disputes. This is far greater than the 18.6 per cent of lawyers and 22.2 per cent of academics and teachers who claim to practice more than 21 per cent of their total workload in workplace ADR. This was consistent with the

findings of the employer survey (Table 1), which showed that lawyers and ADR practitioners from employer associations were the main types of ADR practitioners hired for workplace disputes.

Figure 7: Proportion of ADR practitioner's workload spent resolving workplace disputes according to professional background



Source: ADR practitioner survey

If the growth of workplace ADR is indeed occurring amongst practitioners from employer backgrounds and lawyers, as the survey results indicate, then this fact also informs the nature of workplace ADR. Practitioners from employer backgrounds tend to be involved in enterprise bargaining and disputes over pay and allowances (Figure 4). Given that this professional group is linked to the practice of facilitation and conciliation, it can be surmised from the findings, that the growth in workplace ADR is most likely to encompass facilitation of enterprise negotiations and conciliation of pay and allowance disputes. To a lesser extent, lawyers are also experiencing a growth in their workplace ADR business. They have been linked to the resolution of disciplinary matters (Figure 4) using mediation and to a lesser extent, arbitration.

THE CASE STUDIES

(i) Fact finding at Metals

This case study illustrated the use of ADR to resolve a dispute over a proposed roster in a unionised metals manufacturing plant. Unable to deal with the matter himself, the HR manager turned to a consultant who recommended fact-finding². There was considerable misunderstanding by the disputants about the nature of the ADR process used. On one hand, the managerial parties and the shop steward described the process as fact-finding and on the other, the employees believed it was mediation. The third party did not indicate clearly to the disputants the process he would use. As a result, the employees

² Fact-finding commences with a process of identifying the personnel who need to be interviewed and the documentation necessary to determine the facts of the case. The fact-finder then presents the case to management. The process may be inclusive of the fact-finder hearing the arguments and evidence presented by the disputants. Generally, no determination on the matter is made by the third party (Rome, 2000)

had an expectation that their dispute would be resolved in the presence of their supervisor, with whom they were in dispute. Instead, the process consisted of the facilitator interviewing the group of employees and taking their concerns to management for subsequent decision. During the fact-finding process the facilitator assumed a role as an advocate for management. He criticised the employees' arguments and evidence and put forward management's proposition as a more sensible alternative. By overly relying on the employees' shop steward to speak on their behalf, he did not adequately canvass views from employees for whom English was a second language. In other words, he did not conduct a process corresponding to any known ADR technique.

The case raises the issue of training and accreditation of ADR practitioners as an emerging issue in an industrial relations environment witnessing the growth of ADR. Without adequate controls, it is likely that practitioner skills and processes will vary as will the quality of dispute resolution outcomes.

(ii) Facilitation of an enterprise agreement at EnergyCo

This case depicted the engagement of a third party by the management of EnergyCo, a privatised utility, to coach the relatively inexperienced management and employee negotiating teams through the bargaining process. Upon engagement, the practitioner, a management consultant, described his role to management as facilitation³. However, the case study demonstrated that the third party took on a range of roles, which oscillated between management advocacy (where the facilitator agued for management's agenda and debriefed with the management negotiating team but not with the employee team) and facilitation (where, for example, the facilitator intervened in the negotiation process in order to prevent conflict) in bringing the negotiating teams to a final agreement. The fluidity of process undertaken by the third party demonstrated his lack of neutrality and independence from the parties. This was exacerbated by the fact that the practitioner was the former HR manager of EnergyCo. Of particular concern was the ability of the management team to promulgate misleading financial information without incurring the facilitator's question or comment (as the ex-HR manager, the facilitator was said to have a sound knowledge of the financial state of the company). Their ambit claim which indicated the possible collapse of the company formed the basis for the employee team's concession making.

Like the previous case, this case raises the issue of training and accreditation of workplace facilitators. It highlights the need for an ethical code of practice and an understanding of conflict of interest by ADR practitioners.

(iii) Grievance mediation at Infotainment

This case study examined the use of mediation⁴ to settle an interpersonal dispute between members of a work team in a non-unionised government enterprise. The issue centred upon the attempt by Infotainment management to return a grounds person back

³ Facilitation has been described as a form of supervised negotiation (Chaykin, 1994).

⁴Mediation is a process in which the parties to a dispute, with the assistance of a neutral third party (the mediator), identify the disputed issues, develop options, consider alternatives and endeavour to reach an agreement. The mediator has no advisory or determinative role in regard to the content of the dispute or the outcome of its resolution, but may advise on or determine the process of mediation whereby resolution is attempted (NADRAC, 1997).

to work following the break down of relations between him and two supervisory grade staff. The case revealed four major problems associated with the ADR process conducted by an externally engaged practitioner.

First, the practitioner, a psychologist, was arguably not independent of the disputants. She was engaged on the recommendation of the advocate for the grounds person (who was both her friend and colleague). Her association with a disputant's advocate presents a conflict of interest in her role as an independent third party, particularly as she received a briefing on the case from the advocate. The second anomaly in the conduct of ADR found in this case (and in the two previous cases), was that there is a gap between the theoretical process of ADR and the actual practice conducted. Generally, a third party hired by an employer to achieve the employer's objective is regarded as a management consultant. ADR, on the other hand, should not operate to a predetermined outcome (Astor and Chinkin, 1991). In this case, the objective of Infotainment management was to return the grounds person to the work team, rather than to negotiate other settlements. In other words, there was no opportunity to explore or brainstorm other options in the mediation session. This, arguably, represents a breach in the rules of a mediation session (Charlton and Dewdney, 1994). Further, the time constraint imposed by the mediator created an urgency to sign the agreement, arguably a level of coercion as well as denying the coordinator and operations manager interactional justice (Tyler, 1991).

Third, and related to the flawed ADR process was the apparent denial of procedural justice to the supervisory grade staff. Both complained of the lack of attention given to their issues of concern. This was largely explained by the mediator's focus on the grounds person (and thus, on management's agenda). The ADR process seemed to have been framed around satisfying the needs of the grounds person required to return him back to work. The fourth issue raised by this case is the reliance on the skills and experience of ADR practitioners in ensuring a fair dispute resolution process. The case study revealed that the disputants were prepared to afford the mediator a degree of trust and respect based on their legitimisation of her authority.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study reported on the findings of an employer survey into the demand for private mediation, a survey of ADR practitioners who offer dispute resolution services to workplaces and three case studies. It was demonstrated that there has been a slow but steady growth of ADR in Australian workplaces even though most ADR practitioners work less than 20 per cent of their total workload resolving workplace disputes. The study also demonstrated that this growth is predominantly in the areas of facilitation, mediation and conciliation.

ADR in Australia is applied almost exclusively to interest disputes such as personality conflicts, disciplinary matters and facilitating enterprise negotiations. Employers surveyed indicated that they found ADR more suitable for these types of disputes. Further, the study found that there is a correlation between the professional background of the practitioner, the form of ADR they practice and the type of dispute they resolve. Overall, it was found that practitioners from employer backgrounds are principally hired

to facilitate negotiations and conciliate disciplinary matters. Lawyers are engaged mainly for mediation (and to a lesser extent, arbitration) of disciplinary matters and psychologists, social and community workers are engaged to resolve personality disputes through mediation.

There are no formal requirements necessary to practice ADR in Australian workplaces such as training, accreditation, a code of ethics or a code of practice. This study presented the findings of three case studies which demonstrated that ADR practitioners, many of them with professional backgrounds as management consultants, demonstrated an inability to separate the roles of neutral ADR practitioner with that of a management advocate. The fluidity of the roles played by ADR practitioners in the case studies led to the conduct of unrecognisable, hybrid ADR processes which arguably denied procedural and distributive justice to the disputants and demonstrated breaches of neutrality and impartiality by the ADR practitioner. Given that the growth of workplace ADR is primarily amongst ADR practitioners with management consulting backgrounds, these findings lend weight to an argument for mandatory formal training and accreditation in order to practice ADR in the field of employment disputes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Astor, H. & Chinkin, C. 1991, 'Mediator Training and Ethics' *Australian Dispute Resolution Journal*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 205-223.
- Charlton, H. & Dewdney, M. 1995, *The Mediator's Handbook – Skills and Strategies for Practitioners*, The Law Book Company, Sydney.
- Chaykin, A. 1994, *Selecting the Right Mediator*, American Arbitration Association, New York.
- Morehead, A. Steele, M. Alexander, M. Stephen, K. and Duffin, L. 1997, *Changes at Work: The 1995 Australian Workplace Industrial Relations Survey*. Longman, Sydney.
- NADRAC, 2001, 'On-Line ADR Background Paper', Department of Finance and Administration, Canberra.
- Peavy, V. 1996, 'Counselling as a culture of healing' *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp.141-151.
- Rome, D.L. 2001, 'Resolving Business Disputes. Fact-Finding and Impasse', *Dispute Resolution Journal*, January, pp. 8-15.
- Tyler, T. 1991, 'Procedure or Result: What do Disputants want from Legal Authorities?', in K.J. Mackie, (ed), *A Handbook of Dispute Resolution ADR in Action*, Routledge Press, London.