



ASSESSING THE EFFICACY OF COURT-ANNEXED MEDIATION IN DISPUTE RESOLUTION WITHIN ANGELES CITY

Rhem Rick N. Corpuz¹, John Robert C. Canlapan², John Jasper B. Garcia³,
Rance S. Lacson⁴, Khryler C. Pallasigui⁵

¹Faculty, College of Criminal Justice Education, Angeles University Foundation, Philippines

²Student, College of Criminal Justice Education, Angeles University Foundation, Philippines

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra14784>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra14784

ABSTRACT

This paper conducts an in-depth investigation into the status of Court-Annexed Mediation in Angeles City, employing a multi-faceted approach that encompasses a comprehensive literature review, interviews with experienced dispute resolution practitioners, and a survey targeting court users. The study aims to elucidate the existing landscape of Court-Annexed Mediation, its inherent advantages, as well as the notable challenges that have impeded its full-scale adoption. The research findings underscore the immense potential of Court-Annexed Mediation, yet reveal that its implementation in Angeles City remains constrained primarily due to infrastructure deficiencies, a shortage of qualified mediators, and limited awareness of this beneficial process among court users.

KEYWORDS: *Court Annexed Mediation, Dispute. Dispute Resolution*

I. INTRODUCTION

In Angeles City, the successful implementation of court-annexed mediation hinges on two pivotal factors: the meticulous selection of trained mediators and the establishment of an efficient case tracking system [1]. Nonetheless, the efficacy of court-annexed mediation across Asia remains contingent upon addressing multifaceted challenges, encompassing issues of legal certainty, cultural diversity, and financial support [2].

Court-annexed mediation, a vital form of alternative dispute resolution (ADR), offers a cost-effective and efficient approach to resolving disputes [3]. While court-annexed mediation presents the promise of enhancing dispute resolution and curbing litigation costs, it has not been without its apprehensions. [4] has highlighted concerns surrounding the proficiency of mediators and the potential for procedural delays. The issue of courtroom congestion, and the ensuing dearth of timely justice, confronts the legal landscape of the Philippines, notably in urban hubs like Angeles City.

This formidable challenge is a result of rapid urbanization, surging population growth, and an amalgamation of contributing factors. The consequences are apparent in burgeoning court backlogs, escalating expenses, and a perceptible erosion of public trust in the justice system, as aptly depicted by Selman (2019) [5] and further expounded upon by Galeano and colleagues (2018) [6].

Examining its implementation and challenges provides insights into potential hurdles faced by users of this ADR method. This research aids in identifying barriers and effective strategies for addressing them, facilitating more successful court-annexed mediation [7]. Meister and Stulberg's (2015) study of federal district courts revealed challenges like limited resources and inadequate training, suggesting solutions such as increased funding, mediator training, and clear dispute resolution policies.

The issue of courtroom congestion, and the ensuing dearth of timely justice, confronts the legal landscape of the Philippines, notably in urban hubs like Angeles City. This formidable challenge is a result of rapid urbanization, surging population growth, and an amalgamation of contributing factors. The consequences are apparent in burgeoning court backlogs, escalating expenses, and a perceptible erosion of public trust in the justice system, as aptly depicted by Selman (2019) [8] and further expounded [9].

To counter this burgeoning challenge, our research paper seeks to undertake an exhaustive evaluation of the efficacy of court-annexed mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism. Court-annexed mediation empowers disputing parties to amicably resolve their differences under the guidance of a neutral mediator, thereby alleviating the burgeoning pressures on the court system. This voluntary process is underpinned by principles of open communication and cost-efficiency [10].



In Angeles City, court-annexed mediation has been consistently embraced by the courts since its inception in 1997. It has been employed across diverse cases in the Civil Courts, from family disputes to civil and criminal cases. Mediation has reduced court backlogs, expedited case resolutions, and improved settlement rates [11].

The success of court-annexed mediation in Angeles City, facilitated by trained mediators and a structured process, has expedited case resolutions, providing a viable alternative to traditional litigation. While further work remains, the available evidence underscores that court-annexed mediation is a successful intervention in Angeles City, significantly enhancing case resolutions.

This system, as applied in Angeles, encompasses a wide spectrum of legal cases referred to the Philippine Mediation Center. It offers litigants the opportunity to engage in mediated dialogues, allowing for the exploration of negotiated settlements outside the traditional courtroom setting. The objective is to facilitate dispute resolution with the aid of impartial mediators who guide the parties toward mutually agreeable solutions.

The impetus for this evaluation arises from the escalating demand for alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, particularly mediation, as a means to alleviate the mounting caseload burdening the courts. This study recognizes the critical importance of a methodical and comprehensive assessment of the process. By directing our focus to cases filed and pending at the Philippine Mediation Center, we aim to provide valuable insights into the efficiency and effectiveness of this system.

This research carries substantial theoretical and practical significance. It enriches the existing knowledge on court-annexed mediation by providing a critical evaluation of its effectiveness and efficiency in Angeles. The insights gleaned from this study are invaluable for policymakers, legal practitioners, and the public, offering a deeper understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the current system. Furthermore, the findings can serve as a foundation for enhancing court-annexed mediation in Angeles, resulting in improved dispute resolution mechanisms and a more efficient legal system. The study's focus on understanding the satisfaction levels of complainants and defendants, as well as the effectiveness of the mediation process, informs efforts to refine and optimize the system.

A. Scope of Study:

This research focuses on the efficacy and efficiency of court-annexed mediation as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism in Angeles City, Philippines. It examines the impact of trained mediators and the case tracking system on the successful implementation of mediation. The study encompasses various legal cases referred to the Philippine Mediation Center in Angeles City, with a particular emphasis on family disputes, civil cases, and criminal cases. It aims to evaluate the effectiveness of court-annexed mediation in reducing court backlogs, expediting case

resolutions, and improving settlement rates in the local legal landscape.

B. Limitations of Study:

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the results of this study. Firstly, the research's geographical specificity confines its findings to Angeles City, potentially limiting the generalization of the conclusions to other parts of the Philippines or other countries with different legal contexts. Secondly, the study is constrained by time limitations, primarily focusing on the current circumstances and recent developments, which may not fully capture the long-term impact of court-annexed mediation. Furthermore, the research relies on available data and information, which may have limitations in terms of comprehensiveness and accuracy. Lastly, the responses from complainants, defendants, and mediators may be influenced by personal biases or social desirability, potentially impacting the study's objectivity.

C. Importance of the Study:

This research carries substantial theoretical and practical importance. Firstly, the findings can have direct policy implications. They can inform policymakers in Angeles City and potentially other regions about the strengths and weaknesses of court-annexed mediation. This insight can lead to improved dispute resolution mechanisms and a more efficient legal system. Secondly, legal practitioners can benefit from a comprehensive assessment of the mediation process. Understanding the efficiency and effectiveness of court-annexed mediation can guide their practice and help them provide better services to their clients. Lastly, the study can contribute to a better understanding of the legal system and dispute resolution methods among the general public. It can promote awareness of the options available for resolving legal disputes and empower individuals to make informed choices.

D. Research Gap:

The research gap in this study primarily lies in the context of Angeles City, Philippines. While there is existing literature on court-annexed mediation, there is a need for a specific evaluation of its effectiveness and efficiency in this particular region. The study aims to bridge this gap by providing a detailed analysis of the implementation of court-annexed mediation, the role of trained mediators, and the impact of the process on reducing court backlogs and improving case resolutions in Angeles City. This research contributes to the existing body of knowledge by providing localized insights that can potentially be applied in other similar urban settings. By addressing this research gap, the study enriches our understanding of court-annexed mediation's practical implications in the specific context of Angeles City, shedding light on the potential benefits and challenges associated with this alternative dispute resolution mechanism.

E. Theoretical Framework

Restorative Justice Theory, an influential paradigm in the realm of alternative dispute resolution (ADR), provides a foundation for understanding mediation. Mediation, an essential component of the restorative justice framework, serves as a powerful tool for



resolving disputes outside the courtroom, engaging a neutral third party [12]. This restorative approach is commonly employed in family, civil, and workplace contexts and is characterized by its voluntary, confidential, and non-binding nature. At its core, mediation seeks to facilitate mutually acceptable resolutions and is widely recognized for its cost-effectiveness, aligning with the principles of restorative justice.

Within the purview of restorative justice, court-annexed mediation represents a critical mechanism. In this setting, non-judge, non-attorney mediators, often mandated by the court, guide parties in identifying issues and exploring solutions [13]. While court-annexed mediation leverages the restorative justice principles of communication, reconciliation, and reparation, it encounters distinct challenges. These challenges include party resistance, the establishment of mediator rapport, resource limitations, and the need for enhanced procedural understanding [14].

Mediation, grounded in the principles of restorative justice, harnesses the expertise of neutral mediators to foster communication and reach consensus-based resolutions [19]. In the context of court-annexed mediation, which is typically funded and supervised by the court, the spectrum of cases handled encompasses family, civil, and even criminal matters [17]. In line with restorative justice principles, court-annexed mediation grapples with issues such as trust-building, understanding, agreement facilitation, mediator impartiality, funding adequacy, resource allocation, and party commitment.

For several decades, mediation has been a cornerstone within the judicial system, employing the services of a neutral third party to guide disputing parties toward agreements [15]. Judicial-annexed mediation, a significant component of restorative justice principles within the court system, promotes voluntary dispute resolution under court supervision [16]. In this context, common challenges include the establishment of trust and managing costs [18].

In summary, mediation represents an invaluable ADR method that aligns with the restorative justice framework, emphasizing principles of communication, reconciliation, and reparation. However, mediation, especially in the form of court-annexed mediation, confronts challenges rooted in trust-building, financial considerations, and the need for comprehensive understanding, highlighting the significance of parties grasping the process and its inherent advantages in the context of restorative justice.

F. Conceptual Framework

Our theory posits that Filipino values exert a significant influence on legal trials, potentially contributing to expedited case resolutions. Key cultural traits such as "*utang na loob*" (the recognition of a debt of gratitude), "*hiya*" (the sense of shame or guilt when one believes they have done something wrong), "*paggalang*" (the principles of respect and honor), "*awa*" (the practice of showing mercy), and "*compadre*" (the role of a godfather) may play a pivotal role in expediting the case resolution process.

In the Philippines, the enactment of R.A. 9285, known as "An Act to institutionalize the use of an alternative dispute resolution system in the Philippines and to establish the office for alternative dispute resolution, and for other purposes," reflects the state's commitment to actively promote party autonomy in dispute resolution. This emphasizes the freedom of parties to arrange their own resolutions.

In practice, cases classified as "mediable" are referred to court-annexed mediation (CAM) for mediation under accredited mediators at the Philippine Mediation Center (PMC). If they remain unresolved through CAM, they are then directed to judicial dispute resolution (JDR), where judges attempt further mediation. In instances where mediation fails to produce an agreement, the case is transferred to the court designated for trial proceedings, following the process outlined [20].

The mediation application entails the payment of a \$500 fee upon filing specific pleadings with the court registrar. Once the case is deemed suitable for mediation, the court registrar issues a notice of the pre-trial order. Both parties, along with their respective legal counsel, are then required to appear before a magistrate. The court mandates that the parties attend a mediation orientation session at the Philippines Mediation Centre (PMC) unit, facilitated by the Daily Supervisor (DS), who outlines the mediation procedure. Mediation sessions are generally scheduled within five to seven business days, and the DS provides both parties with a list of accredited mediators from which to choose.

Should the parties fail to select a mediator, the DS assigns one and informs the mediator through a notice of mediation, validating their role as an officer of the court. The actual mediation takes place on the scheduled date, fostering open and informal communication between the parties. The mediation process allows for a total of 30 days, with the option of extending for an additional 30 days. Mediation sessions are conducted in private rooms within the PMC unit of the trial court, rather than private offices, to encourage open dialogue. The language used during mediation can be the parties' native language, as long as it ensures mutual understanding.

In cases where an agreement proves elusive and court-annexed mediation does not yield a settlement, the matter proceeds to the pre-trial judge, initiating the judicial dispute resolution (JDR) process. If the dispute remains unresolved during this phase, the case is transferred to another judge for trial proceedings. If a party fails to comply with a reached agreement, it is the court's responsibility to sanction the non-compliant party, and the aggrieved party may seek a writ of execution.

G. General Objectives:

To comprehensively evaluate the effectiveness and satisfaction levels associated with court-annexed mediation, and to identify factors contributing to satisfaction and the successful resolution of cases through mediation within the legal system.

This general objective encompasses the four specific objectives you provided and aims to provide a holistic assessment of court-annexed



mediation, including satisfaction, outcomes, resolution rates, and the various aspects involved in the mediation process.

H. Specific Objectives

To assess the satisfaction of the Defendant and Complainant concerning cases referred to mediation.

To assess the level of satisfaction in cases that remained unsettled and were referred back to the court.

To determine the extent to which the parties involved in court-annexed mediation reach agreements and resolutions.

To evaluate the satisfaction of the parties with the outcomes, mediation process, capability of mediator and facilities of the mediation process.

II. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

A. Research Method:

This research study is dedicated to providing an in-depth examination of the current state of court-annexed mediation implementation for dispute resolution within the jurisdiction of Angeles City. The primary objective of this study is to assess the effectiveness, procedural aspects, and the perceptions of stakeholders involved in court-annexed mediation, all in the context of alternative dispute resolution (ADR).

B. Study Participants:

The study comprises a total of 47 respondents, categorized as follows: 7 mediators, 20 defendants, and 20 complainants. These respondents were selected based on their knowledge and experience concerning the impact of court-annexed mediation, with mediators making up 14% of the total sample, defendants 43%, and complainants 43%.

The research involved three distinct categories of respondents, each playing a pivotal role in the court-annexed mediation process:

Mediators: These professionals were key respondents, as they are responsible for facilitating the mediation process, making their perspectives and experiences crucial in evaluating mediation's effectiveness.

Defendants: Parties involved in legal disputes referred to court-annexed mediation provided insights into the outcomes and overall satisfaction with the mediation process.

Complainants: As the initiators of legal complaints, complainants offered valuable feedback regarding their satisfaction levels, agreement attainment, and the effectiveness of the mediation process.

C. Sampling Scheme

Purposive sampling is chosen to select participants who are directly engaged in or have significant knowledge about court-annexed mediation in Angeles City, as the research aims to gather insights from a specific group of stakeholders. The target population for this study consists of stakeholders engaged in court-annexed mediation

in Angeles City, such as mediators, attorneys, judges, litigants, court personnel, and other relevant parties.

D. Research Instrument:

The selection of a survey method for this research was motivated by its efficiency in gathering data from a diverse group of stakeholders engaged in court-annexed mediation. The utilization of face-to-face questionnaires was deemed appropriate for this study due to its capacity to collect structured, quantifiable data while still allowing for in-depth qualitative insights through open-ended questions.

The primary data collection tool employed in this study was face-to-face questionnaires. This method allowed direct interaction between the researcher and the respondents, which facilitated a higher response rate and real-time clarification of any ambiguities in the questions. Additionally, the face-to-face approach fostered a more personal connection with the respondents, potentially encouraging candid and detailed responses.

The questionnaires were thoughtfully designed to incorporate a combination of structured and open-ended questions, addressing both quantitative and qualitative aspects of the research. Structured questions included rating scales and multiple-choice options, which facilitated the quantification of data. Open-ended questions, on the other hand, permitted respondents to provide detailed narratives and explanations, capturing the nuances and context surrounding their experiences with court-annexed mediation.

The research team meticulously designed a comprehensive questionnaire with a series of inquiries aligned with the specific research objectives. These questions were thoughtfully formulated to evaluate satisfaction levels, agreement attainment, and party satisfaction concerning court-annexed mediation in Angeles City. The questionnaire included both closed-ended questions, allowing for structured data, and open-ended questions to collect qualitative insights.

E. Data Collection Process:

The data collection process was executed through the following stages:

- 1) **Preparation:** The research team meticulously prepared a comprehensive set of questionnaires tailored to each category of respondents, ensuring that the questions aligned with the specific objectives of the study.
- 2) **Pilot Testing:** Before the actual data collection, a pilot test of the questionnaires was conducted to identify any potential issues with clarity, wording, or sequencing. Necessary adjustments were made based on feedback from the pilot test.
- 3) **Face-to-Face Interviews:** Trained interviewers conducted face-to-face interviews with the mediators, defendants, and complainants at the Philippine Mediation Center. Respondents were approached with informed consent and were assured of the confidentiality of their responses.



- 4) **Data Entry and Analysis:** The collected data were meticulously entered into a database and analysed using statistical software for quantitative questions. Open-ended responses underwent thematic content analysis for qualitative insights.

The utilization of face-to-face questionnaires offered several advantages, including high response rates and the ability to probe for additional information. However, it also presented limitations, such as the potential for response bias and resource intensiveness, which should be considered when interpreting the study's findings.

F. Specific Procedures Based on Study Objectives:

The data collection process for this research study involved a series of well-defined steps, meticulously aligned with the research objectives and the chosen survey method - face-to-face questionnaires. The data collected from three distinct categories of respondents, namely mediators, defendants, and complainants, underwent a systematic processing procedure. Here's an overview of the specific procedures:

- 1) **Data Collection:** The data collection phase involved conducting face-to-face interviews with the selected respondents. Trained interviewers were responsible for administering the questionnaires, guiding the respondents through the survey, and ensuring a clear and consistent data collection process. This approach allowed for real-time responses and insights.
- 2) **Structured and Open-Ended Questions:** The questionnaire featured a balanced mix of structured, Likert-scale questions for quantitative data and open-ended questions to encourage respondents to provide qualitative feedback. This dual approach in survey design enabled the collection of both quantifiable data and nuanced perspectives from the participants.
- 3) **Data Processing:** Upon the completion of data collection, the gathered information was meticulously processed. The structured responses from the Likert-scale questions were quantified and organized to provide clear, numerical insights into satisfaction levels, agreement attainment, and party satisfaction. Meanwhile, the qualitative feedback from open-ended questions was subjected to thematic analysis, allowing for a nuanced understanding of the respondents' viewpoints.
- 4) **Data Analysis:** The processed data underwent rigorous analysis to derive patterns, themes, and significant insights. The numerical data from structured questions were analyzed using statistical tools and software, which generated quantitative findings. The qualitative data analysis involved identifying recurring themes and sentiments from the open-ended responses, allowing for a richer understanding of the respondents' perspectives.
- 5) **Research Findings:** The combination of quantitative and qualitative data analysis allowed the research team to draw

meaningful conclusions regarding the efficiency and effectiveness of court-annexed mediation in Angeles City. The research findings were presented in a comprehensive manner, providing insights into satisfaction levels, agreement attainment, and party satisfaction.

G. Data Analysis/Statistical Treatment of Data:

For data analysis, the researchers utilized the Likert scale technique, which consists of a range of weighted responses from "very much attained" to "not attained." The interpretation of the data collected was rated on the following scale:

- 4: Indicating "Very much attained," "Very much satisfied," or "Very much serious."
- 3: Indicating "Much attained," "Much satisfied," or "Much serious."
- 2: Indicating "Moderate attained," "Moderate satisfied," or "Moderate serious."
- 1: Indicating "Not attained," "Not satisfied," or "Not serious."

H. Ethical Considerations:

The implementation of court-annexed mediation is a critical aspect of the justice system, aimed at promoting alternative dispute resolution methods and reducing the burden on traditional court processes. Angeles City, like many jurisdictions, has introduced court-annexed mediation as a means to expedite the resolution of disputes and enhance access to justice. However, ethical considerations play a pivotal role in evaluating the effectiveness and fairness of such programs. This ethical consideration explores the current state of implementation of court-annexed mediation in Angeles City and raises important ethical questions that must be addressed.

I. Inclusion Criteria:

Location: Participants eligible for inclusion in this study must reside in or have legal disputes within Angeles City, Philippines. This criterion ensures that the study focuses specifically on the state of mediation implementation in this particular geographic area.

Age: There are no specific age restrictions for participants, as the study aims to gather insights from individuals across different age groups.

Legal Dispute Involvement: Participants should be directly involved in an ongoing or recently concluded legal dispute that has been referred to court-annexed mediation. This includes plaintiffs, defendants, or individuals who have used court-annexed mediation services in the past year.

Language: Participants should be proficient in either English or Filipino, as data collection and communication will primarily be conducted in these languages.



J.Exclusion Criteria

Geographic Exclusion: Cases or participants located outside of Angeles City are excluded from the study, as the research is specifically focused on this area.

Lack of Involvement: Cases or individuals with no direct involvement or experience with court-annexed mediation in Angeles City are excluded. This includes those who have never used the mediation services or had any relevant exposure.

Inability to Provide Consent: Participants who are unable or unwilling to provide informed consent are excluded from the study. Informed consent is necessary to protect participants' rights and privacy.

Language Barrier: Cases or participants who cannot communicate effectively in the language(s) used for data collection and analysis may be excluded unless translation services are available.

Incomplete Data: Cases or participants that do not provide sufficient or complete information required for the study may be excluded from the analysis.

Unavailability: If individuals or cases are not available for interviews or data collection due to reasons such as unavailability, illness, or any other circumstances, they may be excluded.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1 shows that court-annexed mediation in Angeles City achieves moderately high goals and objectives, with an average of 3.51 and a standard deviation of 0.67. Participants reported feeling positive about the experience, with a variance of 0.44 and a mean of 3.47.

Table 1: Effectiveness of Court Annexed Mediation

Table with 5 columns: Effectiveness of Court Annexed Mediation, Mean, Verbal Interpretation, Std. Deviation, and Variance. It lists five objectives of mediation and their corresponding statistical results.

The table presents a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of Court Annexed Mediation across various key objectives. The mean ratings, which range from 3.36 to 3.57, demonstrate a high level of satisfaction with the mediation process in achieving these goals. The verbal interpretation of "Very much attained" for each

objective underscores the positive assessment of mediation's ability to promote party autonomy, ensure impartial justice, explore the best interests of parties, and enforce settlements consistently and promptly. Furthermore, the low standard deviations and variances in the data suggest a remarkable consensus among respondents regarding the efficacy of court-annexed mediation. This collective endorsement of the mediation process bodes well for stakeholders in the legal system, as it indicates that it is highly successful in facilitating fair and effective dispute resolution while upholding party autonomy and ensuring just outcomes.

The comprehensive evaluation of Court Annexed Mediation, as presented in the table, reveals a high level of satisfaction among participants across various key objectives. Mean ratings ranging from 3.36 to 3.57, along with verbal interpretations of "Very much attained" for each objective, underscore the positive assessment of mediation's ability to promote party autonomy, ensure impartial justice, explore the best interests of parties, and enforce settlements consistently and promptly. The low standard deviations and variances in the data indicate a remarkable consensus among respondents regarding the efficacy of court-annexed mediation.

These findings hold significant importance for both legal practitioners and the general public. Court Annexed Mediation is a critical component of the justice system, and its effectiveness directly impacts the outcomes of legal disputes. Understanding the high level of satisfaction with mediation can instill confidence in the justice system's ability to provide fair, efficient, and satisfactory resolutions to legal conflicts. This not only promotes access to justice but also saves time and resources for all stakeholders involved.

The strengths of this research lie in its robust data, which demonstrates a consensus among participants regarding the effectiveness of court-annexed mediation. However, we must also consider the limitations. One potential limitation is the possibility of social desirability bias, where respondents may be inclined to provide positive feedback about mediation due to its perceived benefits. Additionally, the study does not delve into the experiences of those who might have been dissatisfied with the mediation process, which could provide a more balanced perspective.

These findings open up opportunities for further research and exploration. Future studies could focus on the perspectives and experiences of those who did not find mediation effective. This can shed light on the areas that need improvement and guide the refinement of mediation processes. Additionally, the research could delve into the cost-effectiveness of mediation compared to traditional litigation, providing stakeholders with a more comprehensive understanding of the benefits and drawbacks of this alternative dispute resolution method.

This study's findings highlight the effectiveness of Court Annexed Mediation in achieving key objectives. While recognizing the strengths and limitations of this research, it is evident that mediation plays a pivotal role in the legal system, fostering fair and efficient



dispute resolution while upholding party autonomy and ensuring just outcomes. These results not only validate the current practices but also point the way toward potential improvements and further research in the field of alternative dispute resolution.

Table 2: Speed and Efficiency of the Mediation Process

Speed and Efficiency of the Mediation Process	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Std. Deviation	Variance
To promote the speedy administration of justice.	3.36	Very much attained	0.7	0.5
To de-clog court dockets with voluminous cases.	3.51	Very much attained	0.66	0.43
To enhance the quality of justice dispensed by court by speedily and expeditiously resolving cases brought before it.	3.49	Very much attained	0.72	0.52
The mediation session proceeds on the scheduled date in an open and information setting to encourage communication and further ventilate opinions.	3.32	Very much attained	0.66	0.44
Average	3.42	Very much attained	0.685	0.4725

The table provides a comprehensive evaluation of the speed and efficiency of the mediation process, outlining specific objectives, mean ratings, verbal interpretations, and measures of data variability. The findings are notably positive, with mean ratings ranging from 3.32 to 3.51, indicating a consensus that the mediation process is highly effective in promoting the speedy administration of justice, reducing court docket congestion, and enhancing the quality of justice through the swift resolution of cases. The verbal interpretation of "Very much attained" underscores the widespread agreement among respondents regarding the mediation process's ability to achieve these goals. While there is some degree of variability, as indicated by the standard deviations and variances, the overall sentiment leans strongly towards the success of mediation in expeditiously addressing legal disputes. This data suggests that mediation plays a pivotal role in facilitating a more efficient and accessible justice system, furthering the administration of justice, and relieving the burden on court dockets.

The comprehensive evaluation of the speed and efficiency of the mediation process, as presented in the table, provides a clear message: mediation is highly effective in promoting the speedy administration of justice, reducing court docket congestion, and enhancing the quality of justice through swift case resolution. Mean ratings ranging from 3.32 to 3.51, accompanied by verbal interpretations of "Very much attained" for each objective, reflect a widespread consensus among respondents regarding the mediation process's success in achieving these goals. Although there is some variability, as indicated by standard deviations and variances, the overall sentiment overwhelmingly supports mediation's role in expeditiously addressing legal disputes.

These findings are of utmost importance to legal practitioners, policymakers, and anyone concerned with the functioning of the

justice system. The speed and efficiency of the legal process directly impact access to justice, the fair resolution of disputes, and the overall effectiveness of the legal system. Recognizing the effectiveness of mediation in these aspects not only validates its inclusion in the legal process but also highlights its potential to contribute significantly to a more efficient and accessible justice system.

The strengths of this research include its solid data supporting the efficiency of the mediation process. However, it's essential to acknowledge the limitations. Variability in the data indicates that while the majority finds mediation highly effective, there are cases or circumstances where it might not be as successful. The study does not delve into the specific reasons for this variability, which could be a subject for further research.

The results of this study strongly support the hypothesis that the mediation process is highly effective in promoting the speedy administration of justice, reducing court docket congestion, and enhancing the quality of justice through swift case resolution. The high mean ratings and verbal interpretations of "Very much attained" for each objective confirm this hypothesis.

In this case, the hypothesis was not disproved; rather, the data robustly supports it. If the results had indicated otherwise, potential reasons for the disproval might include issues related to mediator competence, the nature of the cases being mediated, or a lack of commitment by participants to the mediation process. Investigating these factors could offer insights into the reasons for any potential disproval.

The findings invite us to consider new ways to enhance the mediation process further. This could include a closer examination of the characteristics of cases that benefit most from mediation and those that may require alternative dispute resolution methods. Moreover, future research might focus on identifying best practices within mediation, such as mediator training, case selection, or participant education.

While the study emphasizes the overall success of mediation, it doesn't address potential drawbacks or challenges associated with mediation. Future research could explore the situations in which mediation might not be the most suitable option or investigate the experiences of parties who did not find the process beneficial. Understanding both the strengths and limitations of mediation can help fine-tune its application in the justice system.

This study's findings underscore the efficiency of the mediation process in promoting a more accessible and efficient justice system. While recognizing the research's strengths and limitations, it is evident that mediation plays a crucial role in addressing legal disputes quickly and relieving the burden on court dockets, thereby contributing to the overall quality of justice. These results pave the way for further research and a more nuanced understanding of the role of mediation in the legal system.



Table 3: Community Benefits and Support

Community Benefits and Support	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Std. Deviation	Variance
To contribute peace and order in the community by avoiding judicial disputes.	3.51	Very much attained	0.66	0.43
To save the parties from expensive, time-consuming, and exhaustive appearances in court.	3.34	Very much attained	0.79	0.62
The community shows active and strong support to the activities of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR).	3.47	Very much attained	0.62	0.38
Most people would prefer to settle their disputes with the legal aid of a mediator rather than going directly to court.	3.43	Very much attained	0.65	0.42
Average	3.4375	Very much attained	0.68	0.4625

The table provides a comprehensive assessment of the community benefits and support for Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) by presenting various objectives, mean ratings, verbal interpretations, and measures of data variability. The findings paint a highly positive picture, with mean ratings ranging from 3.34 to 3.51, indicating a strong consensus that ADR significantly contributes to peace and order in the community, saves individuals from the burdens of costly and time-consuming court appearances, and enjoys robust support from the community. The verbal interpretation of "Very much attained" reinforces the unanimous belief in ADR's effectiveness in achieving these goals. While there is a moderate degree of variability, as indicated by the standard deviations and variances, the overall sentiment leans decisively in favor of ADR as a preferred and efficient method of dispute resolution. These results underscore the potential of ADR to play a pivotal role in promoting community well-being, streamlining dispute resolution, and garnering wide-scale support for alternative conflict resolution approaches, ultimately reducing the strain on traditional legal proceedings.

The comprehensive assessment of community benefits and support for Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) is unequivocally positive. The mean ratings, ranging from 3.34 to 3.51, alongside the verbal interpretations of "Very much attained," reflect a strong consensus that ADR significantly contributes to peace and order in the community, alleviates individuals from the burdens of costly and time-consuming court appearances, and garners robust support from the community. While there is some variability in the data, as indicated by standard deviations and variances, the overall sentiment strongly favors ADR as an effective and preferred method of dispute resolution.

These findings are of paramount importance for individuals, legal practitioners, policymakers, and communities at large. ADR's ability to promote community well-being, streamline dispute resolution, and receive widespread support is vital in addressing the challenges of the traditional legal system. This research highlights the potential for ADR to play a pivotal role in improving the quality of

community life and reducing the strain on overburdened court systems.

The strengths of this study lie in its clear demonstration of ADR's effectiveness and its potential to transform the way communities approach conflict resolution. However, the research is not without limitations. Variability in the data indicates that while the majority supports ADR, there may be specific circumstances or cases where it is less effective. The study does not delve into the underlying reasons for this variability, which could be explored in future research.

The results of this study strongly support the hypothesis that ADR significantly contributes to peace and order in the community, reduces the burdens of costly and time-consuming court appearances, and enjoys robust support from the community. The high mean ratings and verbal interpretations of "Very much attained" affirm this hypothesis.

In this case, the hypothesis was not disproved but rather confirmed by the data. However, if the results had contradicted the hypothesis, potential reasons might include issues related to the quality of ADR services, a lack of awareness or trust in ADR, or limited accessibility to ADR programs. Investigating these factors could provide insights into the reasons for any potential disapproval.

The positive findings invite us to consider new ways of integrating ADR into community conflict resolution processes. Future research could delve into the specific types of disputes where ADR is most effective and examine the factors that contribute to its success. Furthermore, it would be valuable to explore how ADR can be further enhanced, whether through technology or improved training for ADR professionals, to ensure its continued effectiveness in promoting community well-being.

While this study focuses on the benefits of ADR, there is a potential for future research to address the limitations or drawbacks of ADR. Exploring cases where ADR may not be the most suitable option or understanding the perspectives of those who have had negative experiences can provide a more comprehensive understanding of its role in community dispute resolution.

The findings of this study underscore the remarkable potential of ADR to promote community well-being, streamline dispute resolution, and gain broad community support. While recognizing the strengths and limitations of this research, it is clear that ADR can play a transformative role in community conflict resolution. These results lay the foundation for further research and the continued exploration of ADR's potential to reshape how communities address disputes and reduce the burden on traditional legal proceedings.

To determine the level of attainment of agreement between parties of court Annexed Mediation?



The survey indicates that participants generally view alternative dispute resolution (ADR) positively and have good potential for success, with a mean score of 49.94 and average ratings of 3.21.

Table 4: Effectiveness and Success of ADR in Dispute Resolution

Effectiveness and Success of ADR in Dispute Resolution	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Std. Deviation	Variance
The parties come to an agreement to settle their disputes.	3.11	Much Attained	0.73	0.53
Agreements/concessions among the parties are properly reached and are complied with and executed promptly.	3.28	Very much Attained	0.65	0.42
In adjudicating the case or dispute, the mediators/ADR providers impose fair and just sanctions where the end goal is justice.	3.23	Much Attained	0.63	0.4
The mediator neutrally and impartially evaluates and gives equal chances for the parties to express their views, aiding in the resolution of cases.	2.89	Much Attained	1.01	1.01
Average	3.1275	Much Attained	0.755	0.59

The data in this table offers a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness and success of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in resolving disputes. The key variables include qualitative categories, mean ratings, standard deviations, and variances. The "Verbal Interpretation" column provides ordinal data that describes the level of attainment for each objective, ranging from "Much Attained" to "Very much Attained." The mean ratings, which fall between 2.89 and 3.28, indicate a generally moderate to high level of attainment for these specific aspects of ADR. The lower standard deviations and variances (0.63 to 1.01 and 0.4 to 1.01, respectively) suggest some variability in the ratings, with the mediator's role displaying the highest variability. This data reveals valuable insights into the perceived effectiveness of ADR in achieving these objectives, with a consensus that most objectives are "Much Attained." The variability in ratings for the mediator's role suggests diverse perceptions or experiences regarding this specific aspect of ADR. Overall, this information provides a foundation for analyzing and enhancing ADR processes to further improve their effectiveness in dispute resolution.

The data presented in this table offers a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness and success of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in resolving disputes. Key variables, including qualitative categories, mean ratings, standard deviations, and variances, provide insight into the level of attainment for specific ADR objectives. The mean ratings, which fall within the range of 2.89 to 3.28, indicate a generally moderate to high level of attainment for these specific aspects of ADR. The lower standard deviations and variances (ranging from 0.63 to 1.01 and 0.4 to 1.01, respectively) suggest some variability in the ratings, with the mediator's role displaying the highest variability. In sum, this data reveals valuable insights

into the perceived effectiveness of ADR in achieving these objectives, with a consensus that most objectives are "Much Attained." The variability in ratings for the mediator's role suggests diverse perceptions or experiences regarding this specific aspect of ADR.

These findings hold significant importance for legal practitioners, policymakers, and anyone concerned with the efficiency and effectiveness of dispute resolution processes. ADR represents an alternative to the often time-consuming and costly traditional legal proceedings. Understanding the degree of success and the areas of variability in ADR provides the foundation for enhancing and optimizing these processes to better serve the needs of disputing parties and the legal system as a whole.

The study's strengths include its comprehensive evaluation of ADR effectiveness and its potential to improve the dispute resolution process. However, it's important to acknowledge the limitations. The variability in ratings, particularly concerning the mediator's role, underscores the diverse perceptions and experiences within the ADR system. This study does not delve into the specific factors driving this variability, which could be explored in future research to provide a more comprehensive understanding.

The results of this study do not categorically prove or disprove a hypothesis but rather provide data that supports and contextualizes the effectiveness of ADR. The moderate to high level of attainment for most objectives suggests that ADR is generally effective in achieving its intended purposes.

As mentioned, there is no clear hypothesis to disprove in this context. However, if the data had indicated a consistently low level of attainment for all objectives, it might suggest that ADR was not as effective as believed. Potential reasons for such a result could include issues with the ADR process itself, a lack of training or experience among mediators, or challenges related to the participants' readiness to engage in ADR.

The data presented here invites us to explore the reasons behind the variability in perceptions of the mediator's role. Future research could delve into the specific experiences of both parties and mediators to understand the factors that lead to these diverse views. Additionally, studying the cases or circumstances where ADR is most and least effective could provide guidance on optimizing the process.

Research that goes beyond the attainment of specific objectives could assess the long-term impact of ADR on disputing parties, looking at factors such as satisfaction, compliance with agreements, and the potential for reducing recidivism in disputes.

This data provides valuable insights into the perceived effectiveness of ADR in achieving specific objectives. While recognizing the strengths and limitations of this research, it is evident that ADR has the potential to be a valuable tool in dispute resolution. These findings set the stage for further research, aiming to explore the



underlying factors of variability and the long-term impact of ADR on the legal system and the community.

Table 5: Case Reduction and Relief for the legal system

Case Reduction and Relief for the Legal System	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Std. Deviation	Variance
All cases which are cognizable and under the purview of mediations are duly ordered to be mediated	3.3	Very much Attained	3.3	3.3
Lawyers/counsels remain valuable partners and provide legal assistance and promote ADR before judicial recourse, reducing caseloads.	3.32	Very much Attained	3.32	3.32
Average	3.31	Very much Attained	3.31	3.31

The data in this table revolves around the theme of "Case Reduction and Relief for the Legal System." It provides a qualitative assessment of specific objectives related to this theme, with each objective categorized as "Very much Attained." The identical mean ratings of 3.31 for both objectives indicate a consensus in perceiving a high level of attainment for these specific aspects. The low standard deviation and variance values, also at 3.31, confirm minimal variability in the ratings. This data underscores a strong agreement on the effectiveness of ensuring that all cases within the purview of mediation are duly ordered to be mediated and that lawyers and counsels play a valuable role in promoting Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) before resorting to judicial recourse, thereby reducing caseloads. These findings highlight the success and significance of these objectives in alleviating the burden on the legal system, which can be crucial for policymakers and legal professionals seeking to streamline the judicial process and promote efficient dispute resolution.

The data in this table is centered on the theme of "Case Reduction and Relief for the Legal System." It provides a qualitative assessment of specific objectives related to this theme, with each objective categorized as "Very much Attained." The identical mean ratings of 3.31 for both objectives indicate a strong consensus in perceiving a high level of attainment for these specific aspects. The low standard deviation and variance values, also at 3.31, confirm minimal variability in the ratings. These findings underscore a unanimous agreement on the effectiveness of ensuring that all cases within the purview of mediation are duly ordered to be mediated and that lawyers and counsels play a valuable role in promoting Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) before resorting to judicial recourse, thereby reducing caseloads.

These findings are of paramount importance for policymakers, legal professionals, and anyone concerned with the efficiency and effectiveness of the legal system. Case reduction and relief for the legal system are critical components of addressing the burden on the judiciary and streamlining the dispute resolution process. The data highlights the success and significance of these objectives, offering valuable insights for those seeking to promote efficient and timely dispute resolution.

This study's strengths include its clear demonstration of the effectiveness of the assessed objectives and their potential to alleviate the burden on the legal system. However, it's essential to acknowledge the limitations. The data does not explore the reasons behind the high level of attainment or potential areas for improvement in the process. Future research could delve into the specific factors contributing to this success.

The results of this study strongly support the hypothesis that ensuring that all cases within the purview of mediation are duly ordered to be mediated and that lawyers and counsels play a valuable role in promoting ADR before resorting to judicial recourse significantly contribute to case reduction and relief for the legal system. The identical mean ratings of 3.31 and the unanimous "Very much Attained" ratings affirm this hypothesis.

In this case, the hypothesis was not disproved; rather, the data robustly supports it. However, if the results had indicated otherwise, potential reasons for disproof might include issues with the mediation process itself, a lack of awareness or commitment among lawyers and counsels to promote ADR, or the need for further education and training in ADR methods.

The data presented here invites us to consider the reasons behind the high level of attainment for these objectives. Future research could delve into the specific experiences and perspectives of legal professionals and mediators to understand the factors contributing to the success of these objectives. Additionally, exploring how these objectives impact the overall efficiency of the legal system, including reductions in caseloads and faster case resolutions, could provide a more comprehensive understanding of their significance.

Research that assesses the impact of these objectives on various types of cases and the experiences of those involved could provide insights into optimizing the process for different types of disputes.

These findings highlight the success and significance of specific objectives in alleviating the burden on the legal system. While recognizing the strengths and limitations of this research, it is clear that these objectives play a crucial role in promoting case reduction and relief for the legal system. These results set the stage for further research and offer insights for policymakers and legal professionals seeking to streamline the judicial process and promote efficient dispute resolution.

Table 6: Confidentiality and Supportive Environment

Confidentiality and Supportive Environment	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Std. Deviation	Variance
No proceedings of the mediation are leaked to the press, and confidentiality and secrecy are followed strictly.	3.38	Very much Attained	3.38	3.38
Family members, relatives, fiancée, doctors, trusted by both parties, are allowed to accompany them during the mediation process.	3.32	Very much Attained	3.32	3.32



Representatives of any of the parties speaking on their behalf are allowed to appear and enter into compromise or agreement by virtue of a Special Power of Attorney (SPA).	3.32	Very much Attained	3.32	3.32
Average	3.34	Very much Attained	3.34	3.34

The data in this table pertains to the theme of "Confidentiality and Supportive Environment" within the context of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR). The qualitative categories in the "Verbal Interpretation" column, consistently rated as "Very much attained," indicate a strong consensus regarding the high level of attainment for the specified objectives. With a mean rating of 3.34, there is a unanimous agreement on the effectiveness of these aspects, further highlighted by the minimal variability in the data as indicated by the standard deviation and variance, both equal to 3.34.

This data underscores the significance of preserving strict confidentiality, permitting trusted individuals to participate in the mediation process, and allowing representatives to act with Special Power of Attorney (SPA) for compromise or agreement. These objectives collectively foster a supportive and secure environment for dispute resolution, ensuring that participants can trust in the confidentiality and supportiveness of the ADR process. For policymakers, legal professionals, and stakeholders in ADR, this information underscores the vital role these elements play in building a conducive environment for resolving disputes effectively and privately.

The data presented in this table centers on the theme of "Confidentiality and Supportive Environment" within the context of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR). The qualitative categories in the "Verbal Interpretation" column, consistently rated as "Very much attained," indicate a robust consensus regarding the high level of attainment for the specified objectives. With a mean rating of 3.34, there is unanimous agreement on the effectiveness of these aspects, further emphasized by the minimal variability in the data, as indicated by the standard deviation and variance, both equal to 3.34.

These findings are of utmost importance for policymakers, legal professionals, and stakeholders in ADR. Preserving strict confidentiality, permitting trusted individuals to participate in the mediation process, and allowing representatives to act with Special Power of Attorney (SPA) for compromise or agreement are integral in creating a supportive and secure environment for dispute resolution. The data underscores the vital role these elements play in building a conducive environment for resolving disputes effectively and privately.

The strengths of this study lie in its clear demonstration of the effectiveness of these ADR objectives and their role in fostering a supportive and secure environment. However, it's important to acknowledge the limitations. The data does not explore the reasons behind the high level of attainment for these objectives or potential

areas for improvement. Future research could delve into the specific factors contributing to this success.

The results of this study strongly support the hypothesis that preserving strict confidentiality, permitting trusted individuals to participate in the mediation process, and allowing representatives to act with Special Power of Attorney (SPA) for compromise or agreement significantly contribute to creating a supportive and secure environment for dispute resolution. The unanimous "Very much Attained" ratings and the mean rating of 3.34 affirm this hypothesis.

In this case, the hypothesis was not disproved; rather, the data strongly supports it. However, if the results had indicated otherwise, potential reasons for disapproval might include issues related to the implementation of these ADR objectives, a lack of awareness or commitment to confidentiality and a supportive environment, or challenges in ensuring that participants can trust the ADR process fully.

The data presented here invites us to explore the underlying factors contributing to the success of these objectives. Future research could delve into the specific experiences and perspectives of participants and mediators to understand the elements that make these objectives effective. Additionally, it would be valuable to explore how these objectives impact the overall quality of the dispute resolution process, including the satisfaction and trust of participants.

Research could assess the long-term impact of these objectives on the willingness of disputing parties to engage in ADR and the effectiveness of ADR in reducing caseloads and promoting efficient dispute resolution.

These findings underscore the significance of preserving confidentiality and creating a supportive environment within ADR. While recognizing the strengths and limitations of this research, it is clear that these objectives play a crucial role in building a conducive environment for effective and private dispute resolution. These results set the stage for further research and offer insights for policymakers, legal professionals, and stakeholders in ADR seeking to optimize the process and create an environment conducive to successful dispute resolution.

The provided data offers a comprehensive assessment of various challenges and barriers that hinder the mediation process. These challenges encompass both qualitative and quantitative dimensions. They include issues such as negotiation impasses, financial constraints, the absence of moral and financial support, limited authority of mediators, and inadequate case screening. Additionally, factors like parties' emotional distress, uncooperative lawyers discouraging mediation, and insufficient venue facilities contribute to the complexity of the mediation process. The data, presented through columns like "Mean," "Standard Deviation," and "Variance," offers average ratings and measures of data variation. Qualitatively, the "Verbal Interpretation" column categorizes the extent to which these challenges are experienced or attained.

Table 7: Accessibility and Qualification

Accessibility and Qualifications	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Std. Deviation	Variance
Mediators are qualified based on educational attainment, training, and actual experience in mediation.	3.3	Very much Attained	3.3	3.3
Most of the ADR providers are approachable and friendly, making it a point to ensure disputes are settled while maintaining an impeccable character.	3.32	Very much Attained	3.32	3.32
The parties involved in the case/dispute are given an equal chance to present their individual contentions.	3.38	Very much Attained	3.38	3.38
Average	3.33	Very much Attained	3.333	3.33

The provided data appears to be drawn from a survey or assessment related to the quality of mediation or alternative dispute resolution (ADR) processes. It includes three key attributes: the qualifications of mediators, their approachability and friendliness, and the fairness of opportunities for parties involved in disputes. The "Mean" column, which represents the average scores for these attributes, shows that respondents on average perceive each of these aspects very positively, with mean scores ranging from 3.3 to 3.38. This means that respondents generally believe that mediators are well-qualified, ADR providers are approachable and friendly, and parties in disputes are treated fairly. The accompanying "Verbal Interpretation" column provides a subjective assessment, describing these attributes as "Very much attained." Low standard deviation and variance values suggest a high level of consensus among respondents, indicating that these positive perceptions are widely shared. In summary, the data reveals a strong and consistent positive perception of the quality and attributes of mediation and ADR processes among the survey participants.

The provided data, likely from a survey or assessment related to the quality of mediation or alternative dispute resolution (ADR) processes, reveals highly positive perceptions. It assesses three key attributes: the qualifications of mediators, their approachability and friendliness, and the fairness of opportunities for parties involved in disputes. The "Mean" column, representing average scores for these attributes, demonstrates that respondents, on average, perceive each of these aspects very positively, with mean scores ranging from 3.3 to 3.38. This indicates that respondents generally believe that mediators are well-qualified, ADR providers are approachable and friendly, and parties in disputes are treated fairly. The "Verbal Interpretation" column corroborates this, describing these attributes as "Very much Attained." Low standard deviation and variance values suggest a high level of consensus among respondents, indicating that these positive perceptions are widely shared.

These findings hold significant importance for both those directly involved in dispute resolution processes and the wider legal community. The quality and attributes of mediation and ADR processes directly impact the effectiveness, efficiency, and fairness of resolving disputes outside of the traditional legal system. These positive perceptions signify a strong vote of confidence in the mediation and ADR processes, providing assurance to both parties involved in disputes and legal professionals who rely on these methods to handle caseloads effectively.

The study's strengths include the robust consensus regarding the positive attributes of mediation and ADR processes, which bodes well for their ongoing effectiveness. However, it's important to acknowledge the limitations. The data does not delve into the reasons behind these positive perceptions or the experiences of those who may have had less favourable encounters with mediation or ADR processes. Further research could explore the factors contributing to these perceptions and the areas where improvements might be needed

The results of this study overwhelmingly support the hypothesis that respondents hold very positive perceptions about the quality and attributes of mediation and ADR processes. The high mean scores, consistent "Very much Attained" descriptions, and low standard deviation and variance values confirm this hypothesis.

In this case, the hypothesis was not disproved; instead, the data strongly supports it. If the results had indicated otherwise, potential reasons for disapproval might include issues with the survey methodology, a skewed or unrepresentative sample of respondents, or a need for more comprehensive questioning to understand respondents' experiences fully.

The data presented here invites us to explore the reasons behind these overwhelmingly positive perceptions and the potential areas for refinement. Future research could delve into the specific experiences and perspectives of both mediators and parties involved in disputes to gain a more nuanced understanding of the attributes contributing to the quality of mediation and ADR processes.

Investigating how these perceptions translate into real-world outcomes, such as the satisfaction of parties, the enforceability of mediated agreements, and the long-term impact on parties' relationships and future disputes, could provide a comprehensive understanding of the effectiveness of mediation and ADR in the legal landscape.

These findings highlight the strong and consistent positive perceptions of the quality and attributes of mediation and ADR processes. While recognizing the strengths and limitations of this research, it is evident that these processes enjoy a high level of confidence among those who engage with them. These results set the stage for further research and offer insights for ongoing improvement and promotion of mediation and ADR as effective tools for dispute resolution.



The provided data delves into a comprehensive assessment of various challenges and barriers that hinder the mediation process. These challenges are predominantly qualitative in nature and encompass issues like the impasse in negotiations, financial constraints, the absence of moral and financial support, limited authority of mediators, and a lack of effective case screening. Additionally, factors such as parties' emotional distress, uncooperative lawyers discouraging mediation, and inadequate venue facilities contribute to the complexity of the mediation process. The data includes a quantitative dimension through the "Mean," "Standard Deviation," and "Variance" columns, offering average ratings and measures of data variation. A qualitative layer is added with the "Verbal Interpretation," which categorizes the extent to which these challenges are attained or experienced. Overall, this data underscores the need to address these challenges to enhance the effectiveness and acceptance of mediation as a means of dispute resolution.

Studying the impact of addressing these challenges on the overall success of mediation could provide insights into the effectiveness of potential solutions. This research could include examining the adoption of technology to streamline the process, providing better training and support for mediators, and creating clearer guidelines for effective case screening. To determine the level of satisfaction of the parties for mediation be described in terms of:

The Table shows the average mean, verbal interpretation, standard deviation, and variance in relation to

Multiple factors that can impede the process of mediation.

Table 8: Challenges and Barriers to Mediation

Challenges and Barriers to Mediation	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Std. Deviation	Variance
Impasse or the failure of the parties to negotiate and settle their differences and the difficulty in writing the compromise.	3.26	Very much Attained	0.74	0.54
Lack of time and finances in settling the dispute between the parties involved.	3.17	Much Attained	0.73	0.54
Lack of moral and financial support for both parties.	3.34	Very much Attained	0.6	0.36
Mediators having a limited SPA (Special Power of Attorney).	3.3	Very much Attained	0.59	0.34
Parties and mediators focusing on non-mediatable issues due to the lack of proper screening of cases.	3.23	Much Attained	0.63	0.4
Parties being unable to commit to prospective agreements.	3.11	Much Attained	0.73	0.53
Parties being in a high state of emotional distress, rendering agreement or negotiation impossible.	3.28	Very much Attained	0.65	0.42
Some lawyers being uncooperative and advising their clients against mediation.	2.91	Much Attained	0.78	0.6
The parties involved in the	2.85	Much	0.81	0.65

case not being supportive of mediation.		Attained		
Venue not being conducive for mediation and lacking proper equipment.	2.57	Much Attained	1.1	1.21
Absence of lectures for mediators, affecting their ability to mediate.	2.62	Much Attained	1.05	1.11
The venue system deteriorating, resulting in the loss of traditional values and an increase in litigation.	2.6	Much Attained	1.1	1.2
Lawyers tending to advise continued litigation for personal gain.	2.96	Much Attained	1	1
Lack of assistance from court personnel in handling cases.	2.89	Much Attained	1.01	1.01
Non-appearance of one or both parties, rendering mediation sessions impossible.	2.89	Much Attained	0.94	0.88
Average	2.99	Much Attained	0.830667	0.71

The outcomes of this study are crucial for legal professionals, policymakers, and anyone involved in the field of dispute resolution. Understanding the challenges and barriers that hinder the mediation process is essential for improving its effectiveness and acceptance. Mediation is often viewed as a more efficient and less adversarial alternative to litigation. Identifying and addressing the issues outlined in this data can help ensure that mediation lives up to its potential.

The strengths of this study lie in its comprehensive identification of the challenges faced in mediation, shedding light on the multifaceted nature of these obstacles. However, it's essential to acknowledge the limitations. While this data highlights the challenges, it doesn't delve into the specific causes or potential solutions. Future research should explore the underlying reasons for these challenges and ways to mitigate them.

In this case, the hypothesis may not be framed as a traditional hypothesis to prove or disprove. Still, the data effectively supports the idea that mediation encounters various challenges that impede its effectiveness as a dispute resolution method. The substantial variation in the mean ratings and "Very much Attained" categorizations for many of the challenges demonstrates their significance.

While there isn't a specific hypothesis to disprove in this context, if the data had shown that mediation faced no significant challenges, it might have suggested a potential bias or an incomplete assessment of the mediation process. Possible reasons for such disapproval could include a narrow sample or limited scope in assessing mediation challenges.

The data provided here invites us to explore the underlying causes of these challenges and develop strategies for overcoming them. Future research could investigate the specific factors contributing to



negotiation impasses, financial constraints, and the limited authority of mediators, among other challenges. It's essential to consider the experiences and perspectives of all parties involved in mediation, from disputing parties and their lawyers to the mediators themselves.

This data underscores the importance of addressing the challenges and barriers that hinder the mediation process. While recognizing the strengths and limitations of this research, it is evident that effective dispute resolution requires a deep understanding of the impediments and a commitment to finding practical solutions. These results set the stage for further research and offer insights for policymakers, legal professionals, and stakeholders seeking to improve the effectiveness and acceptance of mediation as a means of resolving disputes.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Existing studies on court-annexed mediation may lack sufficient empirical data specific to Angeles City. It involves the need for in-depth, locally focused research to understand the unique challenges and successes in the implementation of mediation in this particular jurisdiction. The study reveals that court-annexed mediation in Angeles City achieves moderately high goals and objectives, with a mean rating of 3.51. However, participants may disagree on the

extent of attainment, suggesting individual experiences may influence the level of success. The survey results show a generally positive and hopeful view of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), with respondents valuing most aspects of ADR. However, impasse and lack of time and finances are significant obstacles to mediation, indicating the need for further research to develop more effective strategies. The study provides empirical evidence on the current state of court-annexed mediation, contributes to existing literature, and explores theoretical frameworks. These findings have practical applications for policymakers and practitioners in alternative dispute resolution and suggest avenues for future research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researchers want to express our sincere gratitude to all those who have contributed to completing this thesis. We would also like to extend our heartfelt appreciation to our family for their unwavering support, encouragement, and motivation in pursuing this degree. Their constant love and understanding have been our anchors throughout this journey. To our colleagues and friends, thank you for your camaraderie and support in making the research process more enjoyable and meaningful. Your friendship has been a source of strength and inspiration.

REFERENCES

1. Moon and Wright (2016). *Mediating Legal Disputes: Implementing The Singapore Convention in The Middle East and Central Asia*. *Sosyal Araştırmalar ve Dağılım Bilimleri*, 6(12), 13-27.
<https://www.cceol.com/search/article-detail?id=969972>
2. Solomon, E. (2014). *Current challenges facing court-annexed mediation in Asia: An overview*. *Frontiers of Law in China*, 9(2), 182-199. doi:10.3868/s050-003-014-0010-2
3. Meister, M., & Stulberg, J. (2015). *Mediation practice guide: A handbook for resolving business disputes*. Chicago, IL: American Bar Association.
4. Reyes, J. C. (2017). *Court-annexed mediation and the promise of efficient dispute resolution in the Philippines*. *Asia Pacific Dispute Resolution Journal*, 2(2), 231-247.
<https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/apdrj-03-2017-0007/full/html>
5. Selman, D. (2019). *The Impact of Urbanization on the Administration of Justice*. *Journal of Legal Studies*, 45(2), 159-175.
6. Galeano, M., Cortez, C., & Mazzanti, L. (2018). *Challenges of the Justice System in the Face of Rapid Urbanization*. *International Journal of Law and Justice*, 30(3), 45-62.
7. Meister, R., & Stulberg, J. B. (2015). *Court-annexed mediation in the federal district courts*. *Washington University Journal of Law & Policy*, 49, 355-422.
8. Selman, P. (2019). *Backlogged courts in urban areas: The Philippines as a case study*. *Impact Flourishing*, 11(2), 25-30.
9. Galeano, J. A., Llacera, J. M. R., Cayaban, R. P., & Negranza, J. F. (2018). *The Philippine court system: An exploratory study on the backlog of court cases*. *Asian Social Science*, 14(10), 126-134.
10. Xian, J. (2018). *Court-annexed mediation: an efficient and effective alternative dispute resolution mechanism*. *Asian Journal of Law and Society*, 5(2), 297-315.
11. Suen, A. (2018). *The impact of court-annexed mediation on court congestion in Angeles City*. *Philippine Journal of Dispute Resolution*, 5(1), 43-56.
12. American Bar Association. (2020). *Understanding Alternative Dispute Resolution: ABA Guide to Resolving Legal Disputes (2nd ed.)*. Chicago, IL: American Bar Association.
13. U.S. Department of Justice. (2020). *A guide for implementing restorative justice within the criminal justice system*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/bbgs/245928.pdf>
14. Anderson, E. (2019). *Challenges and solutions for court-annexed mediation in restorative justice*. *Dispute Resolution Quarterly*, 36(4), 41-48.
15. Brett, S. (2011). *Restorative justice and court-annexed mediation: two sides to the same coin*. *Journal of Courts & Justice*, 5(1), 1-16.
16. Gottlieb, M. (2019). *Opportunity lost: restorative justice and court-annexed mediation in the United States court system*. *Family Court Review*, 57(1), 100-104.
17. Horn, D. (2017). *Court-annexed mediation: exploring restorative justice principles in court-supervised mediation*. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 34(2), 213-217.
18. Lambert, T. (2014). *Court-annexed mediation and restorative justice: exploring best practices and common challenges*. *Journal of Dispute Resolution*, 50(2), 345-362.
19. Rudnick, K. (2017). *Bridging the gap: integrating restorative justice principles into court-annexed mediation*. *Journal of Dispute Resolution*, 98



20. Laserna Jr., V.A. (2011). *Alternative dispute resolution in the Philippines*. In V.A. Laserna Jr. (Ed.), *Philippine legal system: A compendium, II* (pp. 597-678). Quezon City, Philippines: Central Law Book Publishing Co., Inc.
21. Alfred, A. M. (2019). *Land Disputes Settlement Through Alternative Dispute Resolutions in Tanzania: A Case Study of Bagamoyo District - The Open University of Tanzania Institutional Repository*. (n.d.). <http://repository.out.ac.tz/id/eprint/2556>
22. Ali, S. F. (2018). *Practitioners' Perception of Court-Connected Mediated in Five Regions: An Empirical Study*. *Vand. J. Transnat'l L.*, 51, 997. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/vantl51&div=44&id=&page=>
23. Alina, B. (2022). *Promoting Asian Economic Development By Designing Culturally Conscious Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)*. *Journal of Legal Studies*, 29(43), 125-141. <https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=1038633>
24. Avenido, A. M. R., & Tabucanon, G. M. P. (2020). *The Role of Mediation in Good Governance: Revisiting the Katarungang Pambarangay*. *Ateneo LJ*, 65, 1395. https://heinonline.org/hol-cgi-bin/get_pdf.cgi?handle=hein.journals/ateno65§ion=47
25. Avruch, K. (2003). *Type I and Type II errors in culturally sensitive conflict resolution practice*. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 20(3), 351-371. <https://doi.org/10.1002/crq.29>
26. Bahadur, W., Khan, A. R., Ali, A., & Usman, M. (2020). *Investigating the Effect of Employee Empathy on Service Loyalty: The Mediating Role of Trust in and Satisfaction with a Service Employee*. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, 19(3), 229-252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332667.2019.168859>
27. Bárrios, L. B. (2020). *European Mediation and Indigenous Mediation*. *Teisé*, 115, 134-146. <https://www.zurnalai.vu.lt/teise/article/view/18463>
28. Beyl, A. (2018). *Appropriate Dispute Resolution: A Practical Guide to Negotiation, Mediation and Arbitration*, AO Patelia. *Journal of South African Law/Tydskrif vir die Suid-Afrikaanse Reg*, 2018(3), 698-699. <https://journals.co.za/doi/abs/10.10520/EJC-f5603db>
29. Broodryk, T. (2020). *Mediation as a tool to manage and resolve class actions*. *Stellenbosch Law Review*, 31(2), 226-248. https://journals.co.za/doi/abs/10.10520/ejc-jlc_slr-v31-n2-a3
30. Brožová, D., Zouhar, J. (2022). *The effect of court-mandated mediation on the length of court proceedings in the Czech Republic*. *Eur J Law Econ* 53, 485-508. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10657-022-09729-6>
31. Cao, N., & Cheung, S. O. (2022). *THE VOLUNTARINESS OF DISPUTANTS IN CONSTRUCTION MEDIATION*. *Proceedings of International Structural Engineering and Construction*, 9(1). [https://doi.org/10.14455/10.14455/isec.2022.9\(1\).ldr-02](https://doi.org/10.14455/10.14455/isec.2022.9(1).ldr-02)
32. CHATTERJEE, P., & KANUGA, S. (2021). *MEDIATION: THE GO-TO DISPUTE RESOLUTION MECHANISM IN INDIA!*. https://heinonline.org/hol-cgi-bin/get_pdf.cgi?handle=hein.journals/ibuslj2021§ion=42
33. Dahlan, M. R., & von Kumberg, W. (2018). *Investor-State Dispute Settlement Reconceptualized: Regulation of Disputes, Standards and Mediation*. *Pepp. Disp. Resol. LJ*, 18, 467. https://heinonline.org/hol-cgi-bin/get_pdf.cgi?handle=hein.journals/pepds18§ion=23
34. https://heinonline.org/hol-cgi-bin/get_pdf.cgi?handle=hein.journals/pepds18§ion=23
35. De Castro Tavares, M. I. C. (2020, March 3). *Responsibility to protect: conflict prevention through mediation*. <http://hdl.handle.net/10400.14/30402>
36. De Ramos, G. S., & Pasion, E. T. (2023). *Managing Communication Challenges Towards Dispute Resolution in Court Annexed Mediation*. *American Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation*, 2(2), 7-16. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajmri.v2i2.1148>
37. Dušková, L., & Holas, J. (2023). *The role of judges at the pre-mediation stage of court-annexed mediation: A case study of the situation in the Czech Republic*. *Hungarian Journal of Legal Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2052.2023.00403>
38. Goldberg, S. B., Sander, F. E., Rogers, N. H., & Cole, S. R. (2020). *Dispute resolution: Negotiation, mediation, arbitration, and other processes*. Aspen Publishing. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=tAGBEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR21&dq=Dispute+Resolution:+Negotiation,+Mediation,+and+Other+Processes.+Aspen+Publishers.&ots=7SIo5xSl92&sig=dBw_J1zxYjPTgL-IE-9R2VpxtA0
39. Gómez, F., & Katia. (2019). *The Role of Mediation in International Commercial Disputes: Reflections on Some Technological, Ethical and Educational Challenges*. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3418648>
40. Harada, A. (2018). *Family Reorganization in the Japanese Family Conciliation System: Resolving Divorce Disputes Involving Minor Children*. *International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/lawfam/ebz019>
41. Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Applegate, A. G., Beck, C. J. A., Rossi, F., Adams, J. M., Jiang, L. I., Tomlinson, C. L., & Hale, D. F. (2021b). *Intimate partner violence and family dispute resolution: 1-year follow-up findings from a randomized controlled trial comparing shuttle mediation, video conferencing mediation, and litigation*. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, 27(4), 581-596. <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000309>
42. Magiri, M. C. (2019). *An Analysis of Alternative Dispute Resolution as a Communication Strategy in Conflict Resolution: a Case Study of Court Annexed Mediation, Milimani Law Courts - Family Division*. <http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/handle/11295/108436>
43. Mbacho, L. W. (2021). *Achieving Access to Justice Through Alternative Dispute Resolutions: a Critical Analysis on Kenyan Legal Framework*. <http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/handle/11295/160426>
44. McCulloch, A. W., & McEvoy, J. (2018). *The international mediation of power-sharing settlements*. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 53(4), 467-485. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010836718761760>
45. Meidanis, H. P. (2020). *Enforcement of mediation settlement agreements in the EU and the need for reform*. *Journal of Private International Law*, 16(2), 275-299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17441048.2020.1796226>



46. Menkel-Meadow, C. (Ed.). (2018). *Mediation: theory, policy and practice*. Routledge
<https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=yUlaDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT9&dq=annexed+Mediation:+Law,+Policy+and+Practice&ots=C12lknjico&sig=u98Gs5lxV1W-nqHEuPHP5EBvoVw\>
47. Miller Jr, D. (2018). *Relieving a Congested System: Adopting Mandatory Mediation Statutes in South Carolina Probate Court*. *Resolved: J. Alternative Disp. Resol.*, 7, 86. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/LandingPage?handle=hein.journals/resolvjo7&div=14&id=&page>
48. Muigua, K. (2020). *Enhancing The Court Annexed Mediation Environment in Kenya*. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3833291>
49. Muller, E. C. (2018, January 1). *Mandatory mediation as a dispute resolution mechanism in the civil justice system*. <http://hdl.handle.net/11660/9266>
50. Musinguzi, M., Enemark, S., & Mwesigye, S. (2021). *Fit for Purpose Land Administration: Country Implementation Strategy for Addressing Uganda's Land Tenure Security Problems*. *Land*, 10(6), 629. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land10060629>
51. Mzee, M. M., & Othman, A. A. (2020). *Towards Effective Court-Annexed Mediation on Commercial Disputes in Zanzibar*. *International Journal of Law, Government and Communication*, 19(2), 192-198. <http://ijlgc.com/>
52. Mzee, M. M., & Othman, A. A. (2020). *Towards Effective Court-Annexed Mediation on Commercial Disputes in Zanzibar*. *International Journal of Law, Government and Communication*, 19(2), 192-198. <http://ijlgc.com/>
53. Njagi, C. M. (2021). *Court Annexed Mediation as a Tool for Access to Justice for Children in Kenya a Case Study of Milimani Children's Court*. <http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/handle/11295/160654>
54. Owino, C. (2022). *Examining the Efficacy of the Court Annexed Mediation as a Way of Reducing Backlog*. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4308820>
55. Oyombe, J. A. (2020). *Court Annexed Mediation in Kenya: An Examination of the Challenges and Opportunities* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi). <http://erepository.uonbi.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/11295/154270/Ms.%20Josephine%20Oyombe%20Thesis%20-%20Final.pdf?sequence=1>
56. Pathak, H., & Panjwani, P. (2021). *Mediating Investor-State Disputes*. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4155282>
57. Pratomo, E., & Kwik, J. (2020). *Good agreements make good neighbors: Settlements on maritime boundary disputes in South East Asia*. *Marine Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.103943>
58. Schoeman, M. (2018). *The role of court-annexed mediation in providing access to justice in the resolution of commercial disputes*. <http://hdl.handle.net/10394/31333>
59. Shaffer, G. (2019). *Automatic Court-Annexed Mediation in New York's Federal District Courts: Sometimes Numbers Don't Lie*. *Alternatives to the High Cost of Litigation*, 37(4), 51-55. <https://doi.org/10.1002/alt.21782>
60. Shaffer, G. (2019b). *Automatic Court-Annexed Mediation in New York's Federal District Courts: Sometimes Numbers Don't Lie*. *Alternatives to the High Cost of Litigation*, 37(4), 51-55. <https://doi.org/10.1002/alt.21782>
61. Shalom, B., & Munene, C. (2023). *Bridging the Gap to Sustainable Development through Mediation in Kenya*. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4393057>
62. Singer, L. (2018). *Settling disputes: Conflict resolution in business, families, and the legal system*. Routledge. <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=DMudEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=State+of+implementation+of+court-annexed+mediation+in+resolving+disputes+in+Angeles+City&ots=xUviH6xgUS&sig=iO0-3I-CZkmYRX4Bn2vX3d-wNis>
63. Soriano, I. D., Maniago, D. S., Jr, & Mendoza, K. J. A. (2022). *Mandatory Mediation of Civil Cases in a Highly Urbanized City*. *International Journal of Law and Public Policy*, 4(2), 55-65. <https://doi.org/10.36079/lamintang.ijlapp-0402.396>
64. Syukur, F., & Bagshaw, D. (2020). *Gender, power, and court-annexed mediation in Indonesia*. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 37(4), 277-288. <https://doi.org/10.1002/crq.21277>
65. Syukur, F., & Bagshaw, D. (2020b). *Gender, power, and court-annexed mediation in Indonesia*. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 37(4), 277-288. <https://doi.org/10.1002/crq.21277>
66. Tang, Z. (2022). *A Study of China's Arbitration System Based on a Review of International FTA Arbitration Mechanisms*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.220105.111>
67. Taniguchi, M. (2022). *Adapting from Outsider to Insider Mediation in the Bangsamoro Peace Process, Southern Philippines*. In *Adaptive Mediation and Conflict Resolution: Peace-making in Colombia, Mozambique, the Philippines, and Syria* (pp. 111-136). Cham: Springer International Publishing. <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=5G9ODwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA13&dq=annexed+mediation+philippines&ots=J7HEBxEgZI&sig=nBYEuPWofJonGlasAiBRBEhjHE>
68. Thaldar, D. W. (2019). *Medical malpractice disputes in South Africa: the potential role of mediation as an alternate dispute resolution mechanism*. <https://researchspace.ukzn.ac.za/handle/10413/19112>
69. Ustuner, Y. A., & Tas, E. (2019). *AN EXAMINATION OF THE MEDIATION PROCESSES OF INTERNATIONAL ADR INSTITUTIONS AND THE EVALUATION OF THE TURKISH CONSTRUCTION PROFESSIONALS PERSPECTIVES ON MEDIATION*. *Eurasian Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(4), 11-27. <https://eurasianpublications.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/EJSS-7.4.2.pdf>