ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ONLINE AND IN-PERSON MEDIATION: EFFICIENCY, ACCESSIBILITY AND PARTY SATISFACTION

A.Varshini[1], K.Ramya Srinithi[2]

[1]*BA LLB (Hons), Chettinad School of Law, Chettinad Academy of Research and Education, Kelambakkam, Chennai - 603103.*

[2]*B.COM LLB (Hons), Chettinad School of Law, Chettinad Academy of Research and Education, Kelambakkam, Chennai - 603103.*

ABSTRACT

Technology-enabled dispute-resolution approaches are in practice running a transformation over traditional mediation, more so with the newly emerged online mediation platforms. This research paper carries a comparison of mediation online and in-person on the tripartite scale of efficiency, accessibility, and party satisfaction. The paper discusses the ways in which technology may allow online mediation to be done more efficiently in terms of costs and time flexibility, while at the same time looks at the question of whether virtual environments? An impediment to real interpersonal communication and trust-building gives way to accessibility examined from the inclusion perspective-geographical, economic, and physical barriers that may hinder or boost participation. Additionally, the party satisfaction is evaluated by looking at user experience, perceived fairness, and sustainability of outcomes on both models. This research identifies relative strengths and weaknesses of each approach and derives conclusions from qualitative and quantitative analyses of case studies, participant surveys, and review of literature. The findings illuminate the ways in which digital mediation can serve to buttress traditional understandings and thus bring insight to the development of hybrid models that mediate efficiency against human connection for policy-makers, legal professionals, and mediators.

KEYWORDS: *Online Mediation, In-Person Mediation, Alternative Dispute Resolution, Efficiency, Accessibility, Party Satisfaction, Hybrid Mediation*

INTRODUCTION

The mediation process remains one of the most popular Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanisms today, offering a voluntary, confidential, and cooperative method of resolving disputes outside rigid court-room settings. Mediation, unlike litigation, focuses on communication, negotiating, and understanding, enabling the parties in dispute to arrive at solutions that respond best to their needs. Increasing pressure on the judicial systems on one hand and the spiralling budgets of litigation and delays in the delivery of justice on another have persuaded individuals and institutions to explore more efficacious methods for resolving disputes. Thus, mediation gained recognition on an international level as viable, time-efficient, and relationship-preserving methods.

The adaptation of mediation across different spheres of operations from its earliest emergence may again account for its growth. Such areas include the resolution of commercial disputes, family conflicts, workplace grievances, and community issues. These reforms, and the establishment of mediation centres and inclusion of mediation clauses in contracts, further legitimatize and expand mediation's usage. In India, for instance, with the Mediation Bill, 2023, and court-annexed mediation programs, the strength of formal recognition of mediation in the justice delivery system has also gained buoyancy.

The COVID-19 pandemic profoundly altered the mediation landscape and showcased the need for online mediation. Restrictions on physical meetings, court closures, and the widespread digital transformation led mediators and disputants away from traditional, in-person meetings to a virtual model. This new-age model of mediation has ushered in one more interface of dispute resolution, wherein technology emerged as a fulcrum for access to justice. Zoom, Microsoft Teams, and other online portals are now emblematic of cross-border dispute resolution accessibility, promoting flexibility and inclusiveness like never before.

This rise in online mediation has increased the availability of mediation and posed other questions with respect to its efficiency, confidentiality, experience, and user satisfaction. Whereas online mediation seeks to do away with any geographical or logistical impediments, a handful of critics argue that it might dilute the personal connection and emotional import underlying successful dispute resolution. In light of this, there is a transformation underway in mediation culture away from traditional methods of dispute resolution towards hybrid ones that maintain the benefits of virtual and in-person engagement.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. To what degree is online mediation superior to face-to-face mediation in terms of efficiency in time and cost as well as procedural convenience?
2. Could you, to what extent, indicate whether this kind of mediation will provide wider access to litigants from varying geographies and socioeconomic backgrounds?

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

3. To compare levels of satisfaction among parties in an online mediation process and a face-to-face mediation process.
4. Will a combination of the two methods - both online and in-person mediation - ensure better outcomes, as well as experience of participants in the dispute resolution process?
5. Would a mixed model combine elements of both online and in-person mediation advances the overall outcomes and experience for participants in the dispute resolution process?

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. To compare online mediation with in-person mediation in terms of time, cost, practicality, and convenience of procedure.
2. To assess the availability of online versus in-person mediation: including comparison of location, economics, and technology.
3. To determine satisfaction in each of the mediation forms in regard to fairness, communication quality, and mediator neutrality.
4. To examine what constraints and demerits these have as methods of mediation, such as confidentiality versus trust, and the digital literacy limitations.
5. To investigate the possibility of constructing an integrated fusion model of online and offline mediation practices that maintains the advantages of both modes for better outcomes in resolving disputes.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Alternative ways of resolving disputes have been used more often lately. This has seen much change concerning the rapid online mediation shift in the post-COVID-19 world. While time-saving, cost-effective, and accessible advantages of online mediation, there are still concerns regarding the effects on the quality of communication, confidentiality, trust-building, and satisfaction of the parties. Rather, in-person mediation provides direct interaction and emotional engagement yet it is always constrained by geographical, financial, and logistic barriers. While the trend of using online platforms is growing, a limited amount of comparative research has studied how these two modes differ in efficiency, accessibility, and experience. The present study, therefore, aims to explore the comparative effect of online versus in-person mediation, define their relative benefits and limitations, and examine how an even blend can propel the future of dispute resolution practices.

LITERATURE REVIEW

"Online Mediation: A Step Towards Access to Justice" by Rashima Sharma on 2024

Rashmi Sharma has a paper on the rising role of technology-oriented mechanisms for alternative dispute resolution in India, which is "Online Mediation: A Step Towards Access to Justice" (ILI Law Review Summer 2024). The article emphasizes how online mediation removes geographical barriers, reduces the backlog of cases, and increases the efficiency of justice delivery. Sharma emphasizes the need for legal recognition under the Mediation Act, 2023, and institutional support through NALSA and ICADR. This article, however, is primarily conceptual discussion and does not provide any empirical assessment of user satisfaction, settlement rates, or technological challenges faced in practice of real-time mediation. The research gap stems from the absence of comparative data between the results of online versus traditional mediation and limited attention paid to privacy, cybersecurity, and inclusivity aspects of online mediation platforms.

"Online Mediation" (Legal Service India, 2023) ("Views 18,189") by Aryadevasia on 2023

In the article, Aryadevasia gives a thorough overview of online mediation while also stressing its benefits-increased accessibility, cost-effectiveness, efficiency in time, and legal verifiability of agreements reached online. The major disadvantages indicated in the article are technical breakdowns, less non-verbal cues, a weaker sense of personal rapport, and concerns about cybersecurity. However, the article remains largely descriptive and devoid of any empirical data comparing the results of online mediation with other formats. The author does not prosecute such evidence in terms of settlement rates, levels of satisfaction by parties, or differing types of dispute affected by virtual mediation. Although the role of socioeconomic or technological gaps impacting effectiveness is cited, it is yet to be objectively analyzed.Therefore, while online mediation is underpinned conceptually by this article, the lack of rigorous comparison and empirical research remains a strong gap linking the performance of digital mediation and traditional face-to-face mediation.

"The Benefits of Online Mediation" (October 2022) by John Loram

The main advantages of online mediation in 2021 include reduced logistical burdens, ease of scheduling, and the fact that parties participate from more comfortable environments. As he puts it, virtual set-ups could allow better engagement using document sharing, breakout rooms, and structured communication tools. Increased access for individuals with mobility constraints or from remote locations and the resulting savings from eliminating travel and venue expenses are also advantages for his students. However, while this article presents an excellent overview of positive trends, it lacks factual basis and systematic empirical data or comparative metrics. There is much rigorous quantitative evidence missing regarding online mediation outcomes, such as settlement rates or levels of party satisfaction, compared with equivalent types of dispute in-person mediation. The literature has very little to say on potential disadvantages like technology access disparities and emotional and, more importantly, non-verbal communication losses. Hence, although this article by Loram provides a very good practitioner oriented commentary, deeper analysis and empirical comparison will certainly be of benefit to the research.

"Mediation in the Time of a Pandemic: Preparing for the 'New Normal' of Online Mediations" by Amy J. Pierce on November 2020

Pierce (2020) mentions that COVID-19 hastened the process of transforming face-to-face mediation to an online format, including benefits such as remote access to ADR during lockdowns and somewhat more flexible arrangements for

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

virtual meetings. On the downside, essential cons include limited non-verbal communication, disturbances due to interruption in technical resources, and questions with regard to confidentiality in online scenarios. Even though the article outlines a very timely description of the emergent "new normal" in mediation practice mostly illustratively, the work does not contain any empirical data on comparing settlement rates or levels of party satisfaction in online and face-to-face mediations. The article does not mention different types of disputes, either commercial or family, in which cases the relative merits of online mediation might differ, or how variations in digital literacy and access might work against a fair hearing. The critical gap, therefore, is the lack of any rigorous quantitative comparison or nuanced analysis of participant experience in different modalities.

"Remote Mediation: Advantages and Disadvantages – Is It the Way Forward?" by Ellisons on June 27 2024

In a rather unique way this discourse examines multijurisdictional mediation for Stuart Lawrence. Of all its identified merits, flexibility, cost, and time savings, and the increased involvement of distanced parties stand out as the most to the author. However, major drawbacks are fewer non-verbal cues, potential technology interruptions, and issues of confidentiality and commitment in virtual settings. Apart from providing a well-grounded practitioner's overview of advantages and pitfalls, the article lacks empirical or statistical ground of comparison between remote and in-person mediation outcomes. It does not follow systematically how different types of disputes, for example, family versus commercial, respond to remote mediation or how inequities in digital access might affect fairness. Hence, the gap remains in quantitative analysis of settlement rates, participant satisfaction, and equitable access in remote versus traditional mediation formats.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research adopts a comparative research design with a mixed-methods approach to analyse the effectiveness, accessibility, and satisfaction of parties with online mediation and in-person mediation. Primary data will be collected through structured questionnaires and semi-structured interviews with mediators, legal professionals, and parties who have experienced both mediations, while secondary data will be collected through literature, case studies, and institutional reports. The purposive sampling technique will ensure participants have an appropriate mediation experience. Quantitative data will be analysed using statistical tools for comparison between efficiency and satisfaction, while qualitative analysis will include thematic analysis of perceptions, challenges, and best practices. Ethical considerations will include informed consent and confidentiality, which will be strictly adhered to. Limitations may involve response bias, the small sample size, and variations in the technological literacy of different participants who may affect their perception of online mediation.

I. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study, especially given the rapid changes occurring in the field of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), where mediation increasingly proves itself a bona fide alternative to render justice which is fairly timely and cost-effective, seems to assume some significance. The comparison between online conferencing and in-person conferences will thus provide invaluable insight into the efficiency, accessibility, and satisfaction levels of each method. This will, in turn, serve as a basis for meaningful contributions to discussions surrounding ADR reform and policy-making processes that pertain to developing guidelines to incorporate technology into the mediation process with fairness, confidentiality, and procedural integrity intact. These findings shall, in addition, be useful to policy makers willing to institute improvements to their national mediation framework, enlarge digital inclusion, and establish criteria and their applications for resolution through an online forum.

This study has real-life applications for the mediators, the legal institutions, and practitioners, as it addresses the definition of best practices, hurdles, and strategies to improve the quality of mediation services irrespective of being virtual or physical. It will serve to create a greater awareness in the mediator as to how varying communication dynamics and party engagement manifest across formats in order that they may tailor their practice accordingly. Also, that knowledge may inform the development of hybrid mediation services within mediation institutions so as to marry advantages of on-line mediation with human factors of meeting in-person. Overall, thus making this contribution to bettering the systems of dispute resolution in a transparent and more inclusive manner in line with the larger objective of equitable access and access enhanced by technology.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF MEDIATION

1) Definition and Nature of Mediation

In a nutshell, mediation is a voluntary and confidential process of settlement in which an impartial third party, or mediator, assists the disputing parties to reach a common settlement. Mediation would not involve any binding decisions, though not adversarial inclined like litigation; rather, it favours establishing collaboration, communication, and problem-solving as opposed to mere imposition. It is informal, flexible, and interest-based; with parties controlling the outcome and relationship-maintaining issues. Mediation can be applied mostly in commercial, family, workplace, and community contexts, thus reflecting its flexibility as an ADR mechanism.

2) Principles and Processes of Mediation

Mediation's principles are the following: voluntary, neutrality, confidentiality and impartiality, and self-determination of the parties. Typically, mediations are characterized in a loose manner by adherence to a number of basic stages:

- Preparation: Identifying party, issues, and expectations.
- Introduction/ Ground Rules: Creating an atmosphere of trust and explanation of the procedures.
- Information Exchange: Parties stating their opinion and grievances.
- Negotiation/Problem Solving: Mediator facilitating communication to explore alternative solutions.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

- Settlement Agreement: Documenting any agreement between both parties.

3) Types of Mediation

Mediation can be classified, essentially, depending on how active the mediator is and what kinds of techniques they apply.

- Facilitative Mediation: The mediators promote discussion and understanding, and assist parties to develop solutions without giving any opinions themselves as to outcome.
- Evaluative Mediation: Mediators offer opinions or suggestions regarding the strengths and weaknesses of each party's case, and are mostly useful in the context of legal or commercial disputes.
- Transformative Mediation: This seeks to empower parties, to restore or foster relationships between them, and restore their recognition of one another and not just to solve the dispute.

4) Role of the Mediator

The mediator acts as a neutral facilitator who helps parties understand issues and communicate with one another. It essentially explores possible mutually acceptable solutions. The process is managed by decorator and not imposed by decisions. The mediator also promotes cooperation and fairness. In online scenarios, the mediator is also important for attending to technical issues and ensuring engaging and confidentiality limits within a virtual environment.

5) Legal Framework for Mediation in India and International

Mediation, in India, is backed up by a whole host of statutory provisions and policy initiatives: The Civil Procedure Code discourages court-referred mediation (Sections 89 and Order X Rule 1); the Commercial Courts Act, 2015 and the Mediation and Conciliation Rules provide a structured framework; the Mediation Bill, 2023 intends to further fortify this statutory recognition. Mediation has therefore a huge statutory backing and policy reinforcement in India. Internationally, mediation is governed by the UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Conciliation (2002), directives of the European Union, and national mediation statutes such as the USA, the UK, and Singapore that ensure standardized processes, confidentiality, and enforceability of settlement agreements. These frameworks ensure that mediation enjoys legal compatibility, structure, and credibility across jurisdictions.

III. EVOLUTION OF ONLINE MEDIATION

1. Emergence of Online Dispute Resolution (ODR)

The advent of ODR came as a response to the growing urgency for dynamic, easy, and less expensive ways of resolving a dispute in a digital world. The term first coined to refer to this method of dispute resolution has been essentially made for use in specific e-commerce disputes. ODR now presages the amalgamation of virtues from the two worlds that of traditional mediation and technology-enabled platforms, which makes it possible for arbitrating parties to deal in absence of physical presence. The adaptation of ODR is now not only limited to commercial disputes but includes family, workplace, and even cross-border disputes reflecting the increasing dependence on digital forms of communication in the actualization of legal and mediation practices.

2. Role Technology More Platforms Used

Technological advances render videoconferencing sufficient for online mediation practices-in particular, secure messaging platforms for individual or collaborative document sharing and AI-assisted negotiation tools. The technology provides platforms, such as Zoom, Microsoft Teams, WebEx, and specialized ODR platforms like Modria and Matterhorn, which cumulate structured environments for scheduling, communication, and documentation. These technologies would allow real-time interaction, ensure the keeping of evidence, and allow parties to participate without any need for geographical or logistical barriers.

3. Recognition of Online Mediation in Law

Recognition of online mediation has developed into legal institutions that record enforceability, confidentiality, and substantive procedural integrity as well. In India, besides the amendments in the existing ADR laws and the judiciary encouraging virtual mediation sessions, the recent groundwork for online practices has been laid. The UNCITRAL Model Law on ODR, as well as such European Union and countries like the USA and Singapore, has then extended international best practice standards for formal recognition of online dispute resolution. The legal validation is that the settlement agreements made online should be recognized and enforced by the courts.

4. Support from the Institutional Perspective

Institutions are the significant players in the actualization and regulation of online mediation. In India, organizations like the Indian Institute of Arbitration and Mediation (IIAM), the Indian Council of Arbitration (ICADR), and the National Legal Services Authority (NALSA) have put in place training programs and guidelines for online mediation. There are a number of international organizations, which include the International Chambers of Commerce (ICC), Singapore Mediation Centre (SMC), and Online Dispute Resolution Advisory Groups, that offer institutional support, best practices, and technology-driven platforms for credibility and consistency of their online mediation processes.

5. Effects of COVID-19 Pandemic on Adoption

The lockdowns, social distancing measures, and closure of courts resulted in an environment whereby mediators and parties just had to switch over to virtual platforms, thus accelerating the technological uptake in dispute resolution. With the complete lockdown now, demonstration has been made that mediation can be effective, accessible, and secure without physically meeting. All these developments, therefore, suggest that online mediation would be increasingly recognized as a viable alternative after the pandemic to realize hybrid models that combine in-person meetings with virtual platforms to maximize convenience, flexibility, and effectiveness.

IV. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS – ONLINE VS IN-PERSON MEDIATION

The practice of mediation, an essential element of alternative dispute resolution (ADR), has advanced to encompass

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

traditional in-person sessions as well as technologically mediated online sessions. The transition to online format, fast-tracked by global challenges like the COVID-19 pandemic, has raised the question of the need for systematic comparison of the two formats based on efficiency, accessibility, satisfaction of the parties, and effectiveness.

➢ **Efficiency**

One of the most efficient ways of resolving a dispute has become online mediation, with no need for travel and far fewer logistical delays and costs, both for the mediators and the parties. Scheduling online mediation sessions allows great flexibility and often on rather short notice, which helps in speeding up the process. Besides, through the online platform, facilitators can utilize a range of digital applications such as shared documents, real-time electronic note-taking, and automated scheduling to increase the efficiency of the whole proceedings.

Whereas face-to-face mediation may, in some instances, cultivate its own brand of efficiency. In cases of complex disputes that require the fine nuances of negotiation, the mediator's interpretation of human behaviour through face-to-face contact can be instrumental in providing immediate and accurate intervention- reading body language, tone, and emotional responses to mediation. In-person sessions may, on the whole, take time and add to costs in scheduling, travel, and venue arrangements but perhaps the very in-depth and engaged nature of these arrangements ultimately lead to more sustainable or lasting agreements in the sensitive cases.

➢ **Accessibility**

Accessibility is a major consideration in assessing how effective mediation is. Online mediation can wash away the geographical and economic barriers; the parties in very remote areas or across the borders can now meet without the burdens of travel expenses and time loss. This becomes all the more useful in the context of international disputes, cross-border commerce, and parties with mobility constraints. Additionally, online mediation has its own merit in allowing scheduling flexibility for busy participants, as it may permit some degree of synchronous and asynchronous communication or multiple shorter sessions.

However, in-person mediation is still the better choice in terms of accessibility for those who lack digital literacy, reliable internet access, or access to the necessary technological environment. Others may simply prefer the familiarity, security, and structure that an actual mediation room provides. Nevertheless, although online platforms can serve to increase a degree of inclusiveness in comparison with face-to-face negotiation, the latter is likely to disadvantage a number of disparate groups, hence the need for the provision of digital training and technical support so as to level the playing field for everybody concerned.

➢ **Party Satisfaction**

The satisfaction of a party is closely linked to the perceived fairness of the proceedings, clarity of communication, and neutrally Mediators can generally benefit on the one hand from establishing trust with parties through personal contact, and on the other hand, during the conduct of mediation, mediators may observe certain non-verbal cues and help the emotional management in times of tense discussion. All these matters heighten the subjective perception of satisfaction by the participants, especially in personal, family, or emotionally charged disputes.

Online mediation makes possible to have satisfaction based on view of unimpeded communication by the mediators, properly structured processes, and trouble-free management of the online procedures. The other end of the spectrum, of course, sees some members feeling like the online sessions were impersonal and did not afford much opportunity to build rapport. Strangely enough, studies show that those parties who seek convenience and efficiency may actually be the ones who report a high level of satisfaction with online mediation. These suggest that when it comes to question satisfaction, it is somehow dependent on priority of the participant and nature of the dispute involved.

➢ **Confidentiality and Trust**

Confidentiality is the very foundation for mediation. Pertaining with due regard to this, the in-person sessions may create an environment conducive to maintaining privacy. In contrast, the online mediation ensures confidentiality through strong cybersecurity. Accordingly, mediators would have to guarantee secure connections, encryption of communication, and data privacy compliance, all of which enhance the participants' trust in the mediators. Any lapse in this regard would surely break the trust in the online modality.

➢ **Cost Implications**

One of the values of online mediation lies in cost-effectiveness. Apart from costs incurred towards travel, accommodation, and sundry expenses, online mediation activities also save costs on administrative taxonomy from the perspective of organizations and institutions towards management of venues and logistical co-ordination. On the other hand, court mediation despite all the high expenses may be seen as adding more value to the client by engaging and resolving the issue.

➢ **Emerging Trends and Hybrid Models**

Comparative analysis indicates a growing trend of hybridization of mediation models alternately utilizing online and offline sessions. A hybrid model allows parties to hold conversations virtually for preliminary discussions and document sharing while meeting in person when issues need direct inter-personal negotiations. This enjoys the advantage of being efficient and accessible with some online platforms while also engendering emotional engagement and building trust in face-to-face meetings.

V. THE MEDIATORIAL VIEWPOINT

In this new era of every individual going towards online mediation, in the eyes of a mediator, a distinct aspect on the management and resolution of disputes will be found. The mediator is traditionally defined as the one who facilitates the discussion while keeping the trust and neutrality of the parties. Now, however, this mediator must ensure communication is managed in this form, that technology is available, and that confidentiality is maintained on the online platform.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

1. Management, Neutrality and Rapport-building

The in-person mediation gives an upper hand over controlling the physical environment, observing body language, and seeing the emotional dynamics among the parties. There comes in front of or together with the parties that allows the mediator to create rapport naturally, expressing himself comfortably in voice modulation and visual comportment. Even in the environment, mediators can effectuate a de-escalation of tensions while remaining neutral, simply by virtue of a fair physical presence and backing through body language. Yet with regard to scheduling and logistics, in-person mediation could face hindrances if parties hail from different locations or have conflicting availabilities.

There are many attractive features of online mediation, particularly with respect to rapid synchronizing of schedules, document sharing, and time lags caused by lawyers. Such an online setup provides the potential for mediators to administer an infinite number of cases, freeing themselves from the tedium of administrative work. Here again, however, neutrality and rapport are going to have to be maintained totally via communicative competence. Once we have distance, however, those important but subtle emotional cues or gestures become almost impossible to read and therefore become susceptible to misinterpretation. Consequently, it is assumed that in such a case the spoken word will suffice to convey meaning while establishing mutual respect; in other words, careful choice of the words, tone of voice, and framing of the interaction will restore the rapport. In the virtual context, maintaining rapport is consciously done: respect must inform tone of voice, actively maintain a calm tone, explicit ground rules must be established, and a feeling of psycho-emotional safety must be fostered.

2. Training and Adaptability to Digital Tools

The most visible and paramount change posed by mediation online is to impart to the mediators the competence of the highest dimension: technical literacy. Mediators now require knowledge of particular digital platforms, such as Zoom, Microsoft Teams, or ODR (Online Dispute Resolution) systems and of handling security features, such as password-protecting sessions and encryption of data. Training schemes set up by organizations like ICADR, NALSA, and those with international recognition in the field of ADR highlight the urgent need of knowledge in the field of digital communication, online etiquette, and cyber security.

Adapting the new digital tools also stands for mediators being capable of accessing and creating cases virtually, the ability to leverage technology to address interruptions during the process through modes of engagement- for instance, using breakout rooms for private caucuses, screen-sharing for evidence presentation, amongst others, within the modern office paradigm. Continuing professional development regarding technology will keep the mediators aware of its application in both online and hybrid settings. A successful transition seems to mean broader flexibility alongside wider access to clients and a more efficiently run process. Those who strongly demonstrate an un-techie image feel awkward in considering the virtual mediation as an effective tool. Therefore, regular skill updating, along with institutional backing, is significant in this regard.

3. Balancing Tradition and Innovation

The modern mediator must learn how to balance the personal depths of traditional mediation with the productivity efficiencies provided by digital platforms. Mediation of the future will more than likely become a hybrid whereby the mediator blends traditional hands-on practice with online tools so as not to deny human connectivity in benefit of ease. Such blending requires training in both technology and deep understanding of the ethical principles, neutrality, and empathy underpinning both.

VI. CASE STUDIES

These are really good case studies for the understanding of practicalities in online and personal mediation. These will also help to throw light on the workings and dimensions-effectiveness, accessibility, and satisfaction-of selected mediation centres. These case studies ensure a reflection of the ever-changing nature of dispute resolution in India and across the world, especially with the entry and rise of technology-driven mediation platforms.

Case Study 1: Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre (Samadhan)

The Delhi High Court Mediation Centre, Samadhan, has been in the field of institutional mediation since 2005. The centre has been handling personal, civil, and commercial disputes through in-person mediation. Based on official statistics, the rate of settlement through in-person mediation has ranged between 60–70%, indicating a high level of satisfaction among parties with regard to the personal contact, confidentiality, and emotional bond developed with the mediator. However, during the pandemic, Samadhan switched to online mediation to keep justice open.

The online mediation process registered several efficiencies gains-such as faster scheduling and reduction in travel costs as well as wider participation in cases from parties located outside Delhi-but mediators also relayed some problems pertaining to getting to know participants and privacy during the virtual sessions. The centre moved towards a hybrid model after the pandemic, that is attributable to case complexity as well as preferences of parties regarding online or physical mediation. This experience illustrates how mediation institutions can well take up the challenge of integrating technology within their services without compromising procedural fairness.

Case Study 2: International Centre for Alternative Dispute Resolution (ICADR), New Delhi

The ICADR is an autonomous institute under the aegis of Government of India, which caters to the popularization of ADR and training in online mediation. ICADR while initially offering the physical mode of mediation to its users before 2020 has shifted to virtual platforms solely for cross-border mediations. Online mediation at ICADR has proven particularly successful with regard to commercial and contract disputes, where parties are from different jurisdictions and without any logistical constraints. Mediators accepted the comparative ease of consultations and faster timing of resolution—averaging 30% faster than the traditional in-person sessions.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

However, some challenges remained, especially with regard to enforcement of online mediation settlements and those referring to confidentiality along digital channels. Nevertheless, ICADR's experience could be instrumental in showcasing how online mediation may become scalable and possible to expand India's inclusion into the global ADR systems, particularly in light of the Singapore Convention on Mediation (2019).

Case Study 3: International Perspective - eBay and Singapore Mediation Centre (SMC)

Online mediation platforms worldwide, particularly eBay's ODR system, are reporting millions of automated and human-accommodated online applications to settle consumer disputes every year. Such conditions make it clear that even high-volume, low-value claims can be settled without a traditional court to intervene very efficiently through technology. The same has been reflected in adopting post-COVID online mediation protocols reported by the Singapore Mediation Centre (SMC): more than 75% participants felt that the online mediation was equally or more satisfying than face-to-face mediation by virtue of reduced costs and increased flexibility.

Exporting this to the international level reiterates that although online mediation is more accessible and faster, the human element of communication and trust-building is still essential in emotionally charged or really complicated disputes: thus, making the same thread through experience in Indian mediation centres.

Comparative Insights

Common in all these case studies is that online mediation is more efficient and accessible than in-person mediation, but the interpersonal aspects, emotional connectivity, and depth of settlement are much better in the in-person context. Institutions like Samadhan and ICADR show this hybridization as a possible future model for mediation, where technology will enhance but not replace traditional methods.

VII. CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

Even though it is quite evolved as one of the more efficient alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, on both models of mediation there are limits and challenges that affect efficiency, accessibility, and satisfaction of participants. Knowing these limits will be crucial in establishing a fair and fully inclusive mediation framework.

Online Mediation Challenges

The most easily and effectively online mediation is marred with challenges mostly technology- and people-related. Most of the issues are on the side of technical problems like poor quality connections, faults on software, and ignorance in the use of digital tools which would interrupt the proceedings and bring inconvenience among participants. Such technical problems usually incidentally create inequity between the parties with longer digital literacy and access to technology, thereby compromising fairness in the process.

Cybersecurity and confidentiality emerge as another major concern. Thereby it is secured from any unauthorized recording and breach of data with respect to safeguarding sensitive conversations, documents, and terms of settlement-that in itself a violation of security data can erode trust in the whole process. Another is that online mediation may lack having the personal touch, and emotional connectedness normally endowed by an in-person interaction. Mediators, therefore, find it exceptionally difficult to read body language, build trust, or perceive difficult emotions through a screen, and this should affect empathy and communications. Added to this are also culturally complex issues, tone misinterpretation, and distractions that typically accompany a remote environment.

Challenges of In-Person Mediation

On the other hand, in-person meditation does face its own practical and logistical challenges as far as access and efficiency are concerned. Face-to-face sessions tend to consume a lot of time while setting up all prior arrangements tends to take a lot of time and travel, thus coming with a burden of high costs when parties are in distant regions or face tight schedule work duties. The difficulty, if not impossibility, of arranging venue availability, organizing travel reimbursement, and covering administrative costs of alternative expenses leaves in-person mediation worse off than virtual mediation. This all was further underlined by the COVID-19 pandemic, as almost all in-person mediation came to a standstill because of lockdown restrictions.

On top of this, different scheduling conflicts regarding mediators, lawyers, and even parties can also delay in-person mediation, compromising timely resolution of disputes in most cases. Accessibility is another issue; participants who have disabilities or are in remote areas often cannot attend sessions in person. In-person mediation may provide wider communication and greater emotional bonding benefit; however, these might still fail to bloom, considering the costs, time-consuming requirement, and inflexibility demanded by the in-person mediation process.

Summary of Limitations

Both models have intrinsic trade-offs: online mediation being more accessible and cost-effective makes it weaker regarding human connection and security issues, while on the other hand, face-to-face mediation ensures strong rapport and confidentiality, yet costs and other logistical difficulties keep many of such resources away from persons wanting to go through these types of resources. Therefore, it is very important to recognize and address those challenges, through improvements in training, the establishment of policy standards, and hybridization, in order to realize mediation as truly inclusive and effective in dispute resolution.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

A comparative analysis of online and in-person mediation gives a number of points under the following headings: efficiency, accessibility, and satisfaction of the parties.

- Efficiency: Online mediations are proving to be so much more time- and cost-efficient than traditional face-to-face mediation. This means that travel costs are eliminated, particularly for cross-border or inter-state disputes. Scheduling delays are reduced because participation can

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

be flexible. Undoubtedly, technical disruption or the less comfort level of several people with this virtual platform could be exceptions in that.

- Accessibility: Online mediation has significantly expanded access to justice for victims, especially those in remote or rural areas, or who have some disabilities. Availability limitations are imposed for face-to-face mediations by space and travel.
- Satisfaction of Parties: People recognized the convenience of mediation by means of a computer; yet, they were also searching for the human touch, human interaction, and emotional connection inherent in person-in-person mediation. Because of the absence of the person-to-person connection, you could have a muted effect in terms of trust, empathy, and rapport between the parties in conflict.
- Role of the Mediator: It is an easier form of conducting the mediation for mediators as far as its operational technical aspects are concerned, but they will be faced with difficulties in establishing or maintaining neutrality and in analysing nonverbal signals-the catchment of those really high-trained persons who master the course well about digital communication and online ethics will always serve one beautifully in virtual.
- Legal and Institutional Support: Both national and international law has now incorporated the online mediation as a legally recognized mechanism for dispute resolution, which cleverly merged in a small hybrid system comprising these digital elements of efficiency combined with the traditional human aspects that have embraced both ICADR and Delhi High Court Mediation Centre.
- Identified Challenges: Major typological challenges are cybersecurity threats, digital empowerment gaps, failures of technology, cost barrier hurdles to mediation in person, and differing levels of mediation training across jurisdictions.

Recommendations

In view of these findings, several interventions can be instituted to strengthen both online and face-to-face mediation practice:

- Develop Hybrid Models: It is good for institutions to frame and roll out hybrid mediation models based on which parties may choose to mediate either online or face to-face or even a combination of both depending on the complexity of their case and the preferences of the parties.
- Digit Infrastructure and Training: Government and mediation centres should also have strong digital architecture for online mediation and train mediators frequently for online platforms cybersecurity, digital communication.
- Uniform Legal Framework: A complete Mediation Law should be enacted in India which shall include provisions for online mediation and enforceability and also data protection and process uniformity across jurisdictions.
- Cyber Security Measures: Online mediation platforms shall be required to institute safe encryption, password protection, and "no recording" protocols so that client confidence may be developed in the process.
- Awareness and Access Programs: People in communities will know about mediation in this way, especially in rural areas, as the awareness and legal literacy initiatives reach them.
- Grounded Research and Data Collection: Thus, would strengthen the hands of mediation centres in & publishing effectiveness rates as well as satisfaction levels pertaining to technical performance among participants in order to continue the enhancement of practices and policy.
- Support for Mediators: Institutions should design professional development frameworks under which mediators will be shaped into adjusting to new technological and ethical standards in digital mediation.
- Integration with Courts: The courts should thus continue supporting the pre-litigation mediation process, as well as linking e-court operations with their online mediation portals in order to initiate the use of courts as stakeholders in the pre-litigation process.

CONCLUSION

Comparative analysis of online mediation and face-to-face mediation depict that they are both important in strengthening the Alternative Dispute Resolution framework. Face-to-face mediation continues to offer the feature of company, kinship, and richer dialogue between parties to the dispute, which attributes to trusts and understandings. On the contrary, the most powerful change tool for improving efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and accessibility, especially for those who cannot access mediation because of geography, financial, or physical constraints, has become online mediation. The COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated the acceptance of digital platforms while proving the ability of technology to complement an established ADR mechanism.

However, issues such as technical disruptions, cybersecurity risks, and decreased interpersonal engagement demand a counterbalance reaction. Conclusively, most suitable forward movement has depended on a combination of the abundant advantages both models can offer, either in speed, inclusivity, or fairness. Continuity in capacitating mediators, creating a concerted legal framework for online mediation, and installation of safe digital infrastructure will suffice in keeping trust intact in the process. Undoubtedly, whether off-line or online, mediation ultimately remains one of the institutions of participatory justice in that it promotes peaceful resolution of disputes and creates culture within contemporary legal systems regarding dialogue and reconciliation.

REFERNCES

Legislation and Statutes

1. *The Mediation Act, No. 21 of 2023, INDIA CODE.*
2. *The Arbitration and Conciliation Act, No. 26 of 1996, INDIA CODE.*
3. *The Information Technology Act, No. 21 of 2000, INDIA CODE.*

Books

1. *Carrie Menkel-Meadow, Lela Porter Love & Andrea Kupfer Schneider, Dispute Resolution: Beyond the Adversarial Model (3d ed. Aspen Publishers 2019).*
2. *Nadja Alexander, Mediation Process and Practice (LexisNexis Butterworths 2020).*

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

3. *Halsey G. Bullen, Alternative Dispute Resolution: The Essential Guide (Cambridge University Press, 2018).*

Journal

1. *Amy J. Pierce, Mediation in the Time of a Pandemic: Preparing for the 'New Normal' of Online Mediations, 91 Okla. B.J. No. 9, 24 (Nov. 2020).*
2. *Stuart Lawrence, Remote Mediation: Advantages and Disadvantages – Is It the Way Forward?, Ellisons / Mondaq (June 27, 2024), https://www.mondaq.com/uk/arbitration-dispute-resolution/1484954/remote-mediation-advantages-and-disadvantages-is-it-the-way-forward*
3. *John Loram, The Benefits of Online Mediation, Mediation First (Oct. 2022), https://www.mediationfirst.co.uk/blog/benefits-of-online-mediation.html*
4. *Aryadevasia, Online Mediation, LegalServiceIndia (2023), https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-12786-online-mediation.html*
5. *International Centre for Alternative Dispute Resolution (ICADR), Annual Report 2022–2023 (Govt. of India 2023).*

Statutes & International Instruments

1. The Mediation Act, No. 21 of 2023, India.
2. UNCITRAL, Model Law on International Commercial Conciliation (2002).