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Abstract

Grounded in interpretive theory, this book addresses the question, “How do professional, lay, and gendered actors understand and experience litigated case processing leading up to and including mediation in legal disputes?” Litigation and mediation processes are increasingly well described and understood through a fast-growing literature to which lawyers and other social scientists have contributed. Yet, rather little in-depth empirical data are available on what happens during case processing as well as what occurs prior to and inside mediation sessions, in terms of how these processes are understood and experienced by the actors involved. The different perceptions of professional, legal, and lay actors, and of males and females, particularly require further examination. These differences are explored here through data derived from 131 interviews, questionnaires, and observations of parties, lawyers, and mediators involved in 64 mediated fatality and injury cases in medical disputes (mandatory and voluntary; pre- and intra-litigation).

Attention to the discursive representations of the various actors on issues such as understandings of plaintiffs’ litigation aims, all actors’ mediation objectives and perceptions of what occurred during mediations reveals significant differences in terms of both language and agenda. It emerges that professional and lay actors, males and females, occupy largely parallel worlds of understanding affecting how conflict and its resolution are perceived. There is some evidence that mediation experience leads lawyers to reconceptualize their roles. This move away from conventional legal thought is further revealed through the discourse of lawyer-mediators, which was frequently distinct from practicing attorneys and more akin to that of non-lawyer-mediators. Nevertheless, in juxtaposing actors’ understandings and perceptions on all sides of the same or similar cases, the data reveal inherent problems with the core workings of the legal system, as stark similarities in the discourse of plaintiffs and defendants on the one hand, and lawyers of all camps on the other reveal unlikely conceptual alignments between legal and extralegal actors involved in case processing.
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