ACADEMIA International Journal for Social Sciences
Volume 4, Issue 3, 2025 ISSN-L (Online): 3006-6638

AI and Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR): History and Innovations

Seema Gul
seemagulllb56@gmail.com
Assistant professor, Khyber Law college, University of Peshawar

Muhammad Sulaim Ajmal Khan
mhero4923@gmail.com
Student at law department, Abdul Wali khan University, Mardan

Sayyed Mobassir Shah
mobassirshah45@gmail.com
Student at law department, Abdul Wali khan University, Mardan

Aleena Javed
aleenajaved88@gmail.com
Student of Khyber Law college, University of Peshawar

Corresponding Author: * Seema Gul seemagulllb56@gmail.com

Received: 24-08-2025 **Revised:** 14-09-2025 **Accepted:** 27-09-2025 **Published:** 15-10-2025

ABSTRACT

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is transforming many professional spheres, and Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) is not an exemption. The paper will provide the definition of ADR origin and scope and then explain the fundamental ideas of AI and its history. Next, we proceed to analyze the application of AI tools to help ADR practitioners with mediation, arbitration, case management, and predict outcomes. Through the examination of the most recent literature, industry publications, and technology review, we show how AI can be employed to facilitate the process of document analysis, suggest negotiation tactics, conduct administrative work, and estimate the result of a case. We also examine ethical and practical issues like prejudice and transparency and give some suggestions regarding the establishment of AI as a responsible resolution of disputes. The paper concludes that AI can enhance the efficiency, accessibility, and strategic insights of the process of ADR, yet it should be under close supervision of the human judgment and ethical principles to make the process fair and trustworthy.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence (AI); Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR); Mediation; Arbitration; Predictive Analytics; Case Management; Online Dispute Resolution; Ethics in AI.*

INTRODUCTION

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) refers to techniques such as negotiation, mediation, arbitration and other non-court processes by which parties may resolve disputes outside the confines of court litigation. As an adaptable alternative to adversarial court trials, ADR has expanded enormously since its modern inception in the mid-restaurants 1970s. Federal initiatives and statutes that were enacted in the 1980s and 1990s promoted ADR to reduce overburdened courts and to reduce costs. Today, the appeal of ADR is the speed of the process, the reduced cost, the confidentiality, and the ability of participants to control the outcome. Common approaches to addressing ADR vary from informal negotiation and mediation (where a neutral 'mediator' assists in finding agreement) to formal arbitration (where an arbitrator imposes binding decision). Artificial Intelligence (AI), in a very broad sense, is a field of computer science in which machines are made to perform tasks that typically require human intelligence - such as learning, reasoning,

perception and understanding language. The foundations of AI are traced back to the 1950s (the seminal work of Alan Turing and the Dartmouth Conference in 1956), but it has only been the recent advances (machine learning, deep learning and in particular generative artificial intelligence (AI) models like GPT-3) that have enabled AI to process huge amounts of data and deliver human-like outputs. Today's AI can parse documents, recognize speech, analyze patterns, and even write natural language or code. As the capability of AI has increased, legal professionals have started to use these tools to assist their work. This paper deals with the intersection of the above-mentioned fields: The role of modern AI tools in improving ADR processes. We start by explaining the background of ADR and the main components of AI. We then discuss the ways in which AI is helping in various activities associated with ADR - from facilitation of mediation to management of a case in arbitration - with a focus on data analytics and predictive insight. We furthermore identify challenges (e.g ethical issues) and propose best practices for the responsible use of AI in dispute resolution. By assembling the state of the art and case examples, we hope to illustrate how AI can be used to enhance the efficiency, fairness, and coverage of ADR while maintaining human oversight and the principles of the law.

Background: ADR History and Practice

Alternative dispute resolution emerged as a formal concept in the late 20th century. Early ADR methods trace trade guild arbitrations in medieval times, but modern ADR grew from the 1970s reforms addressing court backlogs. The term “ADR” was popularized by legal scholars like Frank Sander at the 1976 Pound Conference. In the U.S., the first ADR programs appeared in the 1970s to relieve congested courts. Federal agencies later mandated ADR use: for example, Attorney General orders in 1985 and statutes in the 1990s required government agencies and courts to offer ADR. By the 2000s many courts made mediation or arbitration mandatory before trial in certain cases.

The practice of ADR has its own vocabulary. Negotiation (no third party), mediation (neutral facilitator), conciliation (informal settlement meeting), and arbitration (neutral decision-maker) are the main forms. ADR processes share common features: they involve voluntary or contractual engagement of a neutral to assist parties in settlement, often allow creative solutions, and generally impose fewer rigid procedures than courts. ADR is praised for offering faster, more confidential, and more participant-driven resolutions than litigation. Courts rarely overturn awards if parties agreed to ADR, and many legal systems now explicitly encourage or require ADR in disputes.

In recent years, ADR has further evolved through technology: the concept of Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) enables parties to resolve conflicts via Internet platforms. Systems like Rechtwijzer (Netherlands) and the British Columbia Civil Resolution Tribunal illustrate full ODR processes combining case intake, online negotiation, and decision support. While fully automated ADR (a “robot arbiter”) remains rare, technology now supports many ADR steps. As one scholar notes, an advanced ODR model ideally integrates case management, triaging, advisory and decision-support tools, communication platforms, and agreement drafting aids. The goal is an end-to-end system where human parties and neutrals can efficiently navigate a dispute online, aided by intelligent software.

AI Fundamentals and Definitions

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is a broad field encompassing software and systems that exhibit “intelligent” behavior. In practice, AI covers techniques like machine learning (systems that improve data) and deep learning (complex neural networks), as well as symbolic reasoning methods. A useful definition is that AI enables computers to perform tasks requiring human-like intelligence reasoning, learning, perception, language understanding, etc. Modern AI often “learns” from large datasets: it identifies patterns and makes

decisions or predictions much faster than humans could. For example, AI can parse thousands of legal documents to extract relevant case facts or scan a medical library to suggest potential diagnoses.

Historically, AI research dates from mid-20th century: Alan Turing's famous 1950 paper and the 1956 Dartmouth conference set the stage. However, progress was slow until recent decades. Milestones include IBM's chess computer Deep Blue beating Garry Kasparov in 1997, IBM's Watson winning "Jeopardy!" in 2011, and the 2012 deep learning revolution with modern neural networks. The latest wave is generative AI. Large language models like OpenAI's GPT series (e.g. GPT-3 released 2020) can generate human-like text, translate languages, and answer questions surprisingly well. By 2023–2024, AI systems not only analyze data but create novel outputs (essays, images, software code) from prompts. This generative capability has ignited widespread interest (and debate) in AI's role across industries.

In summary, AI today refers to a spectrum of tools: from simpler rule-based software and classic expert systems to advanced machine learning and natural language processing engines. Regardless of method, AI systems rely on algorithms and compute power to assist or augment human decision-making. Within law and dispute resolution, AI's relevance comes from its ability to handle complex data, suggest insights, automate routine tasks, and even simulate aspects of communication.

METHODOLOGY

This research is based upon a qualitative review of scholarly articles, legal analyses, industries, and case studies related to AI and ADR. We conducted a search of academic databases, legal journals and professional sites (e.g. Mediate.com, AAA.org, JAMS) for recent discussions of the applications of AI in dispute resolution. Key themes were identified and collated; historical context for ADR, definitions of AI, specific AI tools used in mediation and arbitration, examples of predictive analytics and emerging guidelines. Excerpts from sources (legal commentaries, case reports, and technology articles) were integrated with human analysis. Where possible, multi-disciplinary insights (legal, technological, ethical) were combined to form a balanced view. This literature synthesis allows us to capture current trends (as of 2024) without conducting new empirical trials. Limitations include reliance on available publications; in some emerging areas (e.g. live AI mediators), empirical data is still scant.

AI IN MEDIATION

Mediation, as a process, is fundamentally human centered in that it relies on the use of a neutral mediator to assist the parties in their communication and negotiation between them. AI's role in mediation so far has been more supportive than even replacing the human mediator. For instance, AI-driven chatbots and virtual assistants can help mediators by formulating questions, summarizing the issues of each party, or suggesting settlement options based on data. One report state that "generative AI tools can pose questions designed to determine what the underlying interests of the parties are, propose offers and predict the likelihood that such offers will be accepted." By suggesting such lines of inquiry, AI helps mediators to ensure that they have thought through all angles. A mediator might compare the suggestions of the AI to its own to avoid overlooking anything. AI can also be used as a "virtual mediator" on the Internet. Using Natural Language Processing (NLP) and sentiment analysis, AI can interpret the tone and content of communication between parties to detect contentious topics or signs of impasse. For instance, AI could detect a growing level of frustration in emails or chat messages, and warn the mediator to step in. Similarly, AI may monitor communication patterns: long response times or terse language may indicate reluctance or breakdowns. By analyzing these cues, AI tools can help the mediator know when it's time to change strategies or take breaks or frame issues in a different way. There are concrete cases which show how beneficial AI is. In one example reported, a mediator used ChatGPT to create the prompts. With parties deadlocked in a dispute

over a commercial lease, for example, the mediator asked the chatbot in private what compromise number might be reasonable. ChatGPT suggested $275,000. Although the mediator doubted the tenant would pay so much, he told the two parties - but without disclosing where he got the suggestion from - that a neutral tool offered $275K. This gave the parties an incentive to think twice, and they counter-offered $270K, which the landlord accepted. The parties finally settled for just $5K from the AI's suggestion. In this case, the concept of a chatbot's recommendation provoked progress. The AI did not resolve the case but instead acted as an impartial prompt to break an impasse. This is an example of how AI can be used to improve the mediation process without replacing the human dynamic. In a bigger scale or lower-stakes disputes, AI mediation platforms are also emerging. Some online services have AI bots to collect the views of each party and offer joint solutions to the problem as well, allowing trained mediators to step in where required. However, practitioners warn that AI's capacity to empathize and deal with strong emotions is limited. For instance, research indicates that "generative AI is ill-equipped to help parties cope with the strong emotions that often come up during mediation," and expert mediators highlight the importance of human empathy. Current consensus is that AI in mediation works best as an assistant, in the sense that it deals with data and offers suggestions, while humans take care of the interpersonal subtleties. As one mediator noted, it is not the role of chatbots to make decisions but instead "complement and augment the mediator's capabilities".

AI in Arbitration and Adjudication

Arbitration, which is more like a private trial, is also a beneficiary of AI assistance. Here, AI tools primarily focus on efficiency: they automate the analysis of documents, streamline the management of cases, and aid legal research. For example, document-heavy phases of arbitration can use AI to index and review evidence. Modern AI systems with their huge training corpora can "rapidly search, compare, and make decisions based on the large collections of data," in a way that surpasses human capabilities. summarize and mine large amounts of text, images and data". In practice, this means an arbitrator (or his assistant) could post all hearing transcripts, exhibits, and briefs, into an AI tool that identifies important facts, contradictions or arguments missed AAA's analysts note AI are able to identify discrepancies in depositions or instantly find the cited evidence in voluminous exhibits. This helps to save days or weeks of manual effort and allows arbitrators to focus on the substantive issues. AI is also helpful in drafting in arbitration. With generative models such as ChatGPT, professionals can auto-generate initial drafts of regular texts: boiler plate sections, procedural summaries, or standard clauses. An AAA overview explains that AI drafting tools can "generate first draft settlements" and "edit documents". or unchallenged arbitration awards based on prescribed terms" and automate repetitive parts of motions or briefs. Of course, any AI draft must be thoroughly reviewed by lawyers, but it jiggers the writing process. Along with that, there are specialized platforms such as Lex Machina and Fast case (using NLP) for the delivery of necessary case law or arbitrator profiles. By scanning existing decisions, these AI platforms help neutrals and lawyers identify persuasive precedents or statistical trends in outcome. Perhaps the most transformative is the use of predictive analytics: the ability to predict the outcome of a dispute using an AI. By mining historical case data - Machine learning models can be used for estimating the odds of different results. This is a very enlightening observation of the strategy. As an example, when a model indicated that Party A had 20 percent probability of victory, a mediator would be more realistic in settling disputes and less arguing. One of the professionals in ADR posits that AI can nowadays analyze past data of cases and predict possible outcomes with incredible precision in order to assist the parties in setting their expectations and pushing them towards settlement accordingly. Several sites like Lex Machina offer information on the behavior of judges, thereby offering attorneys a clue on which legal arguments would likely win in which court of law; For example, unlike arbitration award decisions, incomplete components (embarking on the cases available to the public) can be utilized to assess risk. To conclude, outcomes of a case can become more data driven because of the possibility of AI predicting the outcomes and reducing the element of uncertainty that can be found in ADR. Besides adjudication-related tasks, AI is its hand in arbitration administration. Scheduling applications and

workflow applications with AI - to streamline the calendar and resource utilization, e.g. large ADR bodies (such as JAMS) have integrated AI case management programs that notionally assign mediators, create reminders and track task due dates. These systems eliminate clerical mistakes and bottlenecks. Even in the situation where hybrid or even fully online proceedings are involved, artificial intelligence-driven chat and videoconferencing features can help with translating or summarizing languages of a conversation in real time. These are applications whose stages are at the maturity stage.

CASE MANAGEMENT AND ODR SYSTEMS

Case management is the field of great importance, and using AI, ADR can become easier to access and offered to self-represented litigants. The AI-driven ODR Systems may provide directed workflows: the systems may prompt users to present facts, documents, and evidence systematically. To take an example, a smart ODR portal may include the utilization of questionnaires and templates to make sure that the sides are submitting all the data that is needed and within the time constraints of the procedures. Such information collection was done manually through the staff or by filling complex forms in the traditional model. Portals of AI- Based case management allow the parties to begin the conflict, to always having access to the data and to know the timelines - and the progress of the case" in real time. This atmosphere of transparency is useful to get through ADR without getting lost by non-lawyers in bureaucracy. Advanced ODR models have "triage" tools applied to screen cases. There can be an AI triage system to highlight urgent issues (such as domestic violence or deadline driven claims) and provide recommendations as to the proper resolution forum. By easily spotting high risk disputes or suggesting the right path to ADR, such tools make the process easier and safer for vulnerable parties. These sorts of automated intake and triaging functions reflect that "case management" and "triaging" components are discovered in ADR research models. ODR platforms also have advisory aspects too often. For example, AI tools can provide reality-testing advice: "Your case may be worth considerably less in arbitration than you think," or calculate damages. The research literature mentions that advisory services could include judgment of calculators, legal information, or customized information on probable case valuations. Some systems even include "BATNA" (best alternative to negotiated agreement) advice, advising parties what their likely thing is going to be if they don't settle. These decision support functionalities direct to the parties towards the fair settlements. Once an agreement is reached, AI may help to draw up clear settlement documents (known as "agreement technologies"), decreasing misunderstandings later. Several ODR platforms have already demonstrated these ideas. To take an example, Australia's Civil Resolution Tribunal employs sophisticated online systems that use a combination of negotiation chatrooms and algorithmic suggestion of outcomes (based on similar previous cases). Internationally, systems such as Smart settle use game theory and machine algorithms to help parties find compromises by numerically balancing tradeoffs. A recent literature review of AI for ADR even models an "intelligent ODR" with 6 integrated components (case management, triage, advisory, communication, decision support, drafting), This is not yet available in a single platform, but framework for how AI can holistically support the ADR process.

ETHICAL ISSUES AND CHALLENGES

While there are many benefits to using AI tools, the use of these tools in ADR raises important ethical and practical concerns. One major issue is bias. AI systems learn from historical data that may include patterns of systemic bias. For instance, if arbitration awards in the past tended to favor large corporations, an AI model trained using that data might implicitly predict lower odds for individual claimants. Without careful oversight, AI could unintentionally perpetuate unfair patterns. Privacy And data security are also critical: with ADR often involves sensitive personal or business information. AI tools must manage documents and communications with high levels of confidentiality and cybersecurity safeguards. Regulators are growing concerned with such issues; for instance, the EU's proposed AI Act would categorize judicial decision to

support AI at high risk, requiring transparency and human supervision. While specific AI laws in ADR are in the beginning stages, best practice dictates the clear ethical guidelines. Transparency of AI is another issue. Mediators, arbitrators, and parties must know (at least generally) how an AI tool arrives upon its suggestions. Black-box algorithms that provide recommendations without explanation may destroy trust. As one AAA article highlights, "AI" is enhancement and not replacement for the specialized expertise" of neutrals. In practice, this means that arbitrators and mediators should take the outputs of AI as one input among many and be prepared to explain or override them. Professional guidelines may be necessary to ensure fairness - for example, the American Bar Association and AAA to recommend that ADR professionals vet AI tools for accuracy and being biased prior to being used. The human factor is also a limitation to the role of AI in ADR. A machine can never "mediate" emotions, build empathy, or deal with nuances of ethics, Critics point out that AI mediation tools run the risk of "hallucinations" (erroneous outputs) and cannot take the place of a mediator's skill in managing anger or fear. Therefore, it is currently agreed that AI should be used as an assistant. One review of AI mediation notes that most current systems "assist trained mediators rather than substituting for" them". In other words, AI can do heavy lifting (data analysis, drafting, number crunching) so humans are able to do what they do best (listen, reason, decide). Moreover, access to AI is not even. Large law firms or arbitration centers can afford advanced smaller mediators, or public-sector ADR programs may not have access to analytics tools, for example. These digits divide risks creating inequality in ADR. To get around this, open source- and nonprofit AI initiatives (such as the ones emerging in the UN or community mediation spaces) are important. Jurisdictional legal frameworks also differ from it is possible that one country prohibits certain uses of AI, while another encourages them, making cross-border disputes difficult. ADR organizations will need coordinated strategies to help ensure that technologies remain within legal and ethical boundaries.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To realize the benefits of AI while mitigating concerns, we recommend a few things:

1. **Human-in-the-Loop:** Always use AI as a support tool and never use it as a decision-maker tool. Mediators and arbitrators should monitor AI outputs, review, and put up any automated suggestions. This retains accountability and enables human values (fairness, empathy) to guide the process.

2. **Transparency and Explainability:** Use AI platforms that offer understandable reasoning. When AI makes a prediction or a suggestion of a range of settlements, neutrals should have some explanation (e.g. This recommendation is based on similar cases in the past with analogous facts"). Parties should be notified of instances in which AI is being used and consent to its role

3. **Bias Auditing:** Regularly test AI tools to check for bias. For instance, examine whether the algorithm's recommendations unduly favor repeat filers, corporations or one demographic group. If biases are found, retrain or modify models. We recommend the use of very different and representative case data in training as much as possible.

4. **Data Security:** Make sure any AI platform used in ADR is compliant with strict privacy laws. Encryption and data minimization. ADR organizations should create protocols for safeguarding sensitive information, perhaps limiting the processing of AI on de-identified or aggregated data when possible.

5. **Skill Development:** ADR professionals should have been trained on AI tools. This includes understanding capabilities and limits of AI, ways to verify the AI-generated content (e.g. fact-

check AI research) and ways to intervene when AI goes wrong. Judicial and ADR conferences can incorporate workshops in AI.

6. **Policy and Ethics Standards:** ABA, AAA and other bodies should continue to create guidelines for AI in ADR. For example, AAA's Resource Document on AI Ethics could be used to suggest best practices for neutrals. Where possible, laws or court rules should set out the rights of parties to AI to use (for example, a right for a party to impose a challenge on an award where it was made solely based on an undisclosed algorithm).

7. **Access and Equity:** To avoid creating a divide between the technology has and have nots, open-source ODR platforms or low-cost AI assistants should be created, possibly through legal aid programs or international NGOs. For instance, a public artificial intelligence (AI) chatbot to assist in writing mediation proposals may be freely available to self-represented litigants.

8. **Continuous Evaluation:** With how quickly AI is changing, AI practitioners should periodically revisit new research and tools. Pilot projects (such as the example of ChatGPT mediation) should be documented and studied. ADR institutions could set up tech committees to evaluate new AI applications (e.g. emotion detection, VR mediation rooms). By following these recommendations, ADR can responsibly integrate AI. The idea here is to improve dispute resolution - making it faster, data-informed and accessible - without losing justice and the human connection that is at the heart of mediation.

CONCLUSION

Some of the positive tools that can be used to facilitate Alternative Dispute Resolution are Artificial Intelligence, which automates some of the routines, finding information about data, and assisting in decision-making. Analyzing the communication in the mediation process and summarizing evidence in the arbitration one, AI can assist in making ADR processes more efficient and quicker. Predictive analytics provide parties with improved expectations of outcomes, and ODR platforms demonstrate that one can control a case and a negotiation with the help of intelligent software. These innovations could make the cost lower, handle large caseloads, and make justice more available, when human mediators are in short supply. However, AI is not a panacea. Bias, privacy, and over-reliance ethical risks should be addressed with caution. Human judgment still cannot be replaced in the interpretation of the context, interpretation of emotions, and application of fairness. AI, as highlighted by the AAA and other bodies, should be a tool to assist in making presumptive diagnosis or diagnosing a disease, but it should not be taken as a substitute to the ADR practitioner. Improper use and the lack of proper guardians can make AI significantly contribute to the degradation of the key values of equity and efficiency of ADR, yet with the right measures in place, it can also contribute to the expansion of the field. In conclusion, it can be said that the future of ADR will probably be in hybrid human-machine systems. Mediators and arbitrators will use AI assistants to research, write, and give insight, only to wind up leading the process. It will be essential to continue working on the collaboration of legal professionals, technologists, and ethicists to achieve the benefits of AI in dispute resolution. Striking out the right balance, we can use the power of AI to make the process of dispute resolution more informed, agile and fair, enabling parties to resolve conflicts in the digital era amicably.

REFERENCES

American Arbitration Association. (2024, February 20). *How arbitrators are harnessing artificial intelligence*. AAA News & Insights. Retrieved from https://www.adr.org/news-and-insights/how-arbitrators-are-harnessing-artificial-intelligence .

Amin, N. (2024). *A new frontier in online dispute resolution: Combining AI and mindfulness*. *Case Western Reserve Journal of Law, Technology & the Internet*, 15(2), 283–310. Available at https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/jolti/vol15/iss2/3 .

Cornell Law School, Legal Information Institute. (n.d.). *Alternative dispute resolution*. In *Wex Legal Encyclopedia*. Retrieved Month Day, Year, from https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/alternative_dispute_resolution .

Hildreth, J. (2025, March 14). *The role of AI in alternative dispute resolution: Mediation and arbitration*. Mediate.com. Retrieved from https://mediate.com/news/the-role-of-ai-in-alternative-dispute-resolution-mediation-and-arbitration .

ISO. (n.d.). *What is artificial intelligence (AI)?* ISO.org. Retrieved Month Day, Year, from https://www.iso.org/artificial-intelligence/what-is-ai .

Schreiber ADR. (2025, February 13). *Artificial intelligence in ADR: Transforming dispute resolution with cutting-edge technology*. Retrieved from https://www.schreiberadr.com/artificial-intelligence-in-adr-transforming-dispute-resolution-with-cutting-edge-technology .

Sando, M., & Salger, C. (2024). *AI mediation: Using AI to help mediate disputes*. Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School. (Discussed in Noopur Amin, *New Frontier in ODR*.)

United States Office of Personnel Management. (2011). *Alternate dispute resolution handbook*. Retrieved from https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/employee-relations/employee-rights-appeals/alternative-dispute-resolution/handbook.pdf .

Zeleznikow, J. (2021). *Using artificial intelligence to provide intelligent dispute resolution support*. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, 30(4), 789–812. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10726-021-09734-1 .