ISSN 0974-763X
UGC-CARE Listed Journal

SOUTH ASIAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT RESEARCH (SAJMR)

Listed in UGC-CARE
Special Issue

Volume 14, No.4 November, 2024

Chhatrapati Shahu Institute of Business Education & Research (CSIBER)
(An Autonomous Institute)
University Road, Kolhapur - 416004, Maharashtra State, India.
website : www.siberindia.edu.in
E-mail : editorsajmr@siberindia.edu.in

Chhatrapati Shahu Institute of Business Education and Research (CSIBER)

South Asian Journal of Management Research (SAJMR)

Special Issue

Volume 14, No. 4, November 2024

Editor: Dr. Pooja M. Patil

Publisher

CSIBER Press

Central Library

Chhatrapati Shahu Institute of
Business Education & Research (CSIBER)
University Road, Kolhapur – 416004, Maharashtra, India.
Phone: 91-231-2535706/07, Fax: 91-231-2535708,
Website: www.siberindia.edu.in
Email: csiberpress@siberindia.edu.in
Editor Email: editorsajmr@siberindia.edu.in

Address:
CSIBER Press
Central Library Building
Chhatrapati Shahu Institute of Business Education and Research (CSIBER),
University Road Kolhapur, Maharashtra - 416004, India.

ISSN: 0974-763X

Price: INR ₹ 1,200/-

Editor: Dr. Pooja M. Patil

Distributed By

CSIBER Press

Central Library

Chhatrapati Shahu Institute of
Business Education & Research (CSIBER)
University Road, Kolhapur – 416004, Maharashtra, India.
Phone: 91-231-2535706/07, Fax: 91-231-2535708,
Website: www.siberindia.edu.in
Email: csiberpress@siberindia.edu.in

South Asian Journal of Management Research
(SAJMR)

Special Issue

Volume 14, No. 4 **November, 2024**

C O N T E N T S

Sr. No	Title Author	Page No
1	Assessing the Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Employment Legislation and Workers' Rights in Mauritius ***Dr. Viraj Fulena*** Lecturer in Law, University of Technology, Mauritius ***Miss. Oorvashi Dewdanee*** Independent Researcher, University of Technology, Mauritius	01-12
2	Standard Operating Procedures for Corruption Risk Assessment (CRA) Studies of Selected Global Public Agencies ***Dr. Najimaldin Mohammedhussen Sado*** Advisor, Anti Corruption and Ethical Commision, Addis Ababa, Ethopia ***Prof. Dr. Siba Prasad Rath,*** Director, CSIBER, India	13-22
3	Revisiting Financial Inclusion through Geographic and Demographic Penetration: A Cross Sectional District Level Study of Assam ***Dr. Nitashree Barman*** Assistant Professor, Department of Accountancy, Pandit Deendayal Upadhyaya Adarsha Mahavidyalaya, Tulungia, Bongaigaon, Assam, India.	23-32
4	Design and Study of Integrated Desiccant Dehumidification and Vapour Compression for Energy-Efficient Air Conditioning System ***Mr. Siddharth Rath*** Ph. D. Research Scholar, Department of Chemical Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay (IIT – B), India	33-60
5	Exploring the Role of Staff Education in Enhancing Job Satisfaction: Insights from Universities and Institutions in Uttarakhand, India ***Dr. H. M. Azad*** Associate Professor, Department. of Management studies, Graphic Era University, Dehradun, India ***Dr. Smriti Tandon*** Associate Professor, Department of Management studies, Graphic Era University, Dehradun, India ***Dr. Surendra Kumar*** Associate Professor, Department of Business Management, HNBG Central University, Srinagar (Garhwal), Uttarakhand, India	61-81
6	Crisis at One End, Opportunity on the other: Sri Lankan Crisis A Surge for Indian Tea and Textile Exports ***Dr. Deepika Kumari*** Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Shyamlal College, University of Delhi, India.	82-96

7	Market Reactions to Green Bond Issuances in India: Insights from the BSE 200 Index ***Miss. Megha Rani Patel*** Research Scholar, Department of Commerce and Financial Studies, Central University of Jharkhand, Ranchi, India ***Dr. Bateshwar Singh*** Associate Professor, Department of Commerce and Financial Studies, Central University of Jharkhand, Ranchi, India ***Dr. Ajay Pratap Yadav*** Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce and Financial Studies, Central University of Jharkhand, Ranchi, India	97-114
8	The Influence of Knowledge Management Enablers on Knowledge Sharing: An Empirical Analysis of Hospitality Sector ***Dr. Jitender Kaur*** Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce and Management, Khalsa College Patiala, Punjab, India ***Dr. Parminder Singh Dhillon*** Head and Assistant Professor, Department of Tourism Hospitality and Hotel Management, Punjab University Patiala, Punjab, India	115-132
9	Exploring the Impact of Psychological Determinants and Financial Literacy on Retirement Planning in Tribal Communities with Reference to Bodoland Territorial Region, Assam. ***Miss. Rosy Basumatary*** Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies, Bodoland University, Kokrajhar, Assam, India ***Dr. Nayanjyoti Bhattacharjee*** Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, Bodoland University, Kokrajhar, Assam, India	133-144
10	The Role of Leadership Behavior and Emotional Intelligence in School Principals' Effectiveness During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Study of Adaptive Strategies and Outcomes. ***Ms. Sujatha Koshy*** Research Scholar, Psychology, Amity Institute of Psychology and Allied Sciences, Amity University, Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India ***Dr.Mamata Mahapatra*** Professor, Amity Institute of Psychology and Allied Sciences, Amity University, Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India ***Dr. Shadab Ahamad Ansari*** Professor, Psychology in School of Liberal Allied Science Education, Galgotias University, Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India	145-163

11	Unlocking Micro Small and Medium Enterprises Potential: Addressing Financial Barriers through Government Initiatives ***Cs. Priya Chandak*** Research Scholar, Department of Accounting and Financial Management, Faculty of Commerce, The Maharaja Sayajirao University, Baroda Gujarat, India. ***Dr. Nidhi Upendra Argade*** Assistant Professor, Department of Accounting and Financial Management, Faculty of Commerce, The Maharaja Sayajirao University, Baroda, Gujarat, India	164-178
12	Influence of Personality Traits of Celebrity Endorsers on Buying Decisions of Gen-Z Girls: A Study ***Mr. Nandita Dey*** Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, Assam University, Silchar, Assam, India ***Dr. Kingshuk Adhikari*** Associate Professor, Department of Commerce, Assam University, Silchar, Assam, India ***Dr. Dinesh Kumar Pandiya*** Former Professor, Department of Commerce, Assam University, Silchar, Assam, India	179-186
13	Micro Celebrities as Influencers by Self Presentation on Social Media Online: Gaining Consumer Equilibrium ***Ms. Amla K.K*** Research Scholar, Jamal Mohammed College, Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli, Tamilnadu, India ***Dr. A. Khaleelur Rahman*** Associate Professor, Jamal Mohammed College, Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli, Tamilnadu, India	187-196
14	Technological Innovations in Indian Higher Education Institutions: A Regional Study of the Indian Subcontinent ***Ms. Rashi Jain*** Research Scholar, Bharati Vidyapeeth (Deemed to be University), Pune, India. ***Prof. (Dr.) Broto Rauth Bhardwaj*** Professor, Bharati Vidyapeeth Institute of Management & Research, New Delhi, India	197-202
15	HR Analytics: A Quantitative Analysis of Employee Data and Business Outcomes in Private Sector Organizations in India ***Mr. Atul Chanodkar*** Research Scholar, Shri Vaishnav Vidyapeeth Vishwavidyalaya, Indore, M.P., India ***Dr. T. K. Mandal*** Professor, Shri Vaishnav Vidyapeeth Vishwavidyalaya, Indore, M.P., India	203-211
16	Empowering Institutions and Clients: Unleashing Financial Innovation" ***Dr. Vishal Goel*** Associate Professor, Head of the Department Department of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, Swarrnim Startup & Innovation University, Gandhinagar, India.	212-227

17	Examining the Role of Big Five Personality Traits on Entrepreneurial Intention of Rural Youth in Haryana ***Ms. Kiran*** Research Scholar, Department of Management, Akal College of Economics, Commerce and Management Eternal University, Baru Sahib, Himachal Pradesh (173101), India ***Dr. Ankit Pathania*** Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Akal College of Economics, Commerce and Management Eternal University, Baru Sahib, Himachal Pradesh (173101), India ***Dr. Vikash*** Assistant Professor, Department of Food Business Management & Entrepreneurship Development, National Institute of Food Technology Entrepreneurship and Management, Kundli, Sonipat, Haryana (131028) India	228-237
18	A Method for Improvisation of Electronic Data Exchange in E-Commerce Applications ***Dr. Mohammed Shameer M C*** Assistant Professor, Dept. of Computer Science, Farook College(Autonomous), Kozhikode, India ***Miss. Mubeena V*** Assistant Professor, Dept. of Vocational Studies, Farook College, Kozhikode, India.	238-246
19	Exploring the Decades of Research on Earnings Management: A Longitudinal Bibliometric Analysis ***Manu Abraham*** Research Scholar, Cochin University of Science and Technology (CUSAT)-Kochi, Kerala, India ***Santhosh Kumar S*** Professor, Cochin University of Science and Technology (CUSAT)- Kochi, Kerala, India	247-262
20	Transforming Learning for Sustainable Progress: University of Technology Mauritius's Post-COVID Educational Strategy ***Dr. Havisha Vaghjee,*** Sr. Lecturer, School of Business Management & Finance, University of Technology Mauritius	263-273
21	Dynamics of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour: An Analytical Study ***Miss. Neha Arora*** Ph.D Scholar, Arni School of Business Management & Commerce ARNI University, Kathgarh, Indora, Kangra, Himachal Pradesh, India. ***Dr. Jaiman Preet Kaur*** Professor, Arni School of Business Management & Commerce ARNI University, Kathgarh, Indora, Kangra, Himachal Pradesh, India. ***Dr. Roopali Sharma*** Professor, Amity Institute of Psychology & Allied Sciences Amity University, Sector-125, Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India.	274-283
22	Systematic Analysis of Online Review Credibility: A Bibliometric Study and Research Trajectory ***Miss. Serene Anna Sam*** Research Scholar, Post Graduate and Research Department of Commerce, Nirmala College, Muvattupuzha, Kerala & Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Mar Thoma College for Women, Perumbavoor, Kerala, India. ***Dr. Gireesh Kumar G. S*** Principal, Henry Baker College, Melukavu	284-296

23	Examining Party Autonomy and Voluntariness in Alternative Dispute Resolution Processes ***Dr. Viraj Fulena*** Lecturer in Law, University of Technology, Mauritius ***Mr. Gaël Henriette-Bolli*** Lecturer in Law, Open University of Mauritius	297-309
24	Health Care Scenario in India and Antecedents of Job Crafting of Doctors Working in Public and Private Sector in Kolhapur, India**.** ***Mrs. Madhura K. Mane,*** Assistant Professor, Chhatrapati Shahu Institute of Business Education and Research (CSIBER), Kolhapur, India ***Dr. Reshma Kabugade,*** Associate Professor, NBN Sinhgad School of Management Studies, Pune, India.	310-323
25	An Analysis of the Challenges Faced by Small and Medium Enterprises in Mauritius ***Dr. Y. Sunecher*** Senior Lecturer, University of Technology Mauritius ***Dr. N. Ramphul*** Associate Professor in Management, University of Technology Mauritius ***Dr. H. Chittoo*** Professor, University of Technology Mauritius ***Ms. F. Udhin*** University of Technology Mauritius	324-335
26	Identifying Barriers to the Glass Ceiling in the Indian Information Technology Sector: A Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Structure Equation Modelling Approach ***Ms. Swati*** Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Govt. College Hathin, Palwal, Haryana, India ***Dr. Manisha Arora*** Associate Professor, Department of Management Studies, Deenbandhu Chhotu Ram University of Science and Technology, Murthal, Haryana, India	336-344
27	A Study on Usage of Digital Financial Services in Odisha ***Ms. Nirmala Chandra Pattnayak*** Research Scholar, Department of Business Administration, Utkal University, India ***Dr. Rashmita Sahoo*** Asst. Professor, Department of Business Administration, Utkal University, India.	345-354
28	Global Perspectives in Agricultural Commodity Futures Research: A Comprehensive Literature review and Bibliometric Analysis ***Mrs Jenefer John*** Ph.D. Research Scholar, Alagappa Institute of Management, Alagappa University, Karaikudi, India. ***Dr. S. Rajamohan*** Senior Professor & Director, Alagappa Institute of Management, Alagappa University, Karaikudi, India. ***Mr Anand Bharathi*** Ph.D. Research Scholar, Alagappa Institute of Management, Alagappa University, Karaikudi, India.	355-374

29	An Impact of Service Quality Determinants on Passenger Satisfaction in Konkan Railway: The Moderating Role of Gender and Mediating Effect of Platform Services ***Mr. Neelesh Shashikant Morajkar*** Commerce Department, Sateri Pissani Education Society's, Shri Gopal Goankar Memorial, Goa Multi-Faculty College, Dharbandora – Goa, India ***Prof. (CA) Subrahmanya Bhat K.M*** Commerce Department, Vidhya Vikas Mandal's Shree Damodar College of Commerce & Economics, Margao -Goa, India	375-387
30	Hybrid Modelling Approach for Land Use Change Prediction and Land Management in the Coronie District of Suriname ***Ms. Tamara van Ommeren-Myslyva*** Anton de Kom University of Suriname,Paramaribo, Republic of Suriname ***Ms. Usha Satnarain*** Anton de Kom University of Suriname, Paramaribo, Republic of Suriname ***Ms. Femia Wesenhagen*** Ministry of Spatial Planning and Environment, Paramaribo, Republic of Suriname	388-406
31	Decoding Factors Influencing Third-Party Payment App growth in India. ***Mr. Shankar Singh Bhakuni*** Associate professor, BBD University, Lucknow, India	407-415
32	Empowering Women through AI: A Comparative Study of SHG and Micro Finance Institutions Frameworks in Rayagada, Odisha ***Mr. Karteek Madapana*** Research Scholar, School of Management Studies, GIET University, Gunupur, Odisha, India ***Dr.N.V.J. Rao*** Professor, School of Management Studies, GIET University, Gunupur, Odisha, India	416-425
33	An Empirical Study on Organisational Climate in Sugar Mills of Tamil Nadu ***Ms. R. CHITRA*** Ph. D Research Scholar Department of Commerce Bharathiyar Arts and Science College, India. ***Dr.D. Rajakumari*** Principal and HOD, Department of Commerce Bharathiyar Arts and Science College, India.	426-435
34	Enhancing Website Visibility and User Experience through Strategic On-Page Search Engine Optimization Practices ***Mr Anand Bharathi*** Ph.D. Research Scholar, Alagappa Institute of Management, Alagappa University, Karaikudi, Tamilnadu, India. ***Dr S Rajamohan*** Senior Professor and Director, Alagappa Institute of Management, Alagappa University, Karaikudi, Tamilnadu, India.	436-446
35	Work Life Balance and Its Effect on Job & Life Satisfaction of Female Employees in Higher Education ***Ms. Jyoti Dahinwal*** Research Scholar, Indira Gandhi University, Meerpur, UP, India. ***Dr. Jasvindar Singh*** Assistant Professor, Indira Gandhi University, Meerpur, UP, India. ***Ms. Neha Solanki*** Research Scholar, Indira Gandhi University, Meerpur, UP, India.	447-458

36	Impact of Visual Merchandising and Store Atmospherics on the Impulsive Buying of Customers in Salem District ***Mrs. P. Rajeswari*** Research Scholar, Sri Balamurugan Arts and Science College Sathappadi, Mecheri, Mettur, Salem, Tamil Nadu, India. ***Dr. T. Ragunathan*** Principal, Sri Balamurugan Arts and Science College, Sathappadi, Mecheri, Mettur, Salem, Tamil Nadu, India	459-468
37	The Role of Fintech in Enhancing MSMEs Growth and Economic Expansion in India ***Dr. Jasveen Kaur*** Senior Faculty, University Business School, (Gurunanak Dev Univeristy), Amritsar, Punjab, India. ***Ms. Sarita Saini*** Junior Research Fellow, University Business School, (Gurunanak Dev Univeristy), Amritsar, Punjab, India.	469-475
38	An Empirical Study of Service Quality, Customer Satisfaction, and Loyalty Dynamics among Visitors to South Indian Restaurants in Northern India ***Dr. Parminder Singh Dhillon*** Assistant Professor, Department of Tourism, Hospitality and Hotel Management, Punjabi University, Patiala, India. ***Dr. Anuradha Chakravarty*** Department of Tourism, Hospitality and Hotel Management, Punjabi University, Patiala, India.	476-492
39	Employee Well-Being in Optimising Performance at Workplace: A Bibliometric Perspective and Future Research Direction ***Dr. Vandana Sharma*** Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, Deenbandhu Chhotu Ram University of Science and Technology, Murthal, Haryana, India ***Ms. Vidhu Vats*** Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies, Deenbandhu Chhotu Ram University of Science and Technology, Murthal, Haryana, India ***Mr. Gourav*** Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies, Deenbandhu Chhotu Ram University of Science and Technology, Murthal, Haryana, India	493-505

Examining Party Autonomy and Voluntariness in Alternative Dispute Resolution Processes

Dr. Viraj Fulena
Lecturer in Law - University of Technology, Mauritius

Mr. Gaël Henriette-Bolli
Lecturer in Law- Open University of Mauritius

Abstract

The abstract discusses the increasing popularity of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) methods over traditional litigation in resolving disputes due to their effectiveness and minimal impact on contractual relationships. The dissertation focuses on two key benefits of ADR: party autonomy and voluntariness, which allow parties to define their dispute resolution process and ensure they are not forced into ADR. The research examines different types of ADR (negotiation, mediation, conciliation, and arbitration) and highlights how international and local legislations, like the UNCITRAL Model Law, support ADR.

However, the study also identifies potential misuse of party autonomy and voluntariness by parties acting in bad faith. It suggests that while these concepts are vital, they should not be left unchecked to avoid undermining ADR's effectiveness. By analysing ADR practices in the UK, Singapore, and Mauritius, the dissertation finds that some level of institutional control can prevent misuse and improve the dispute resolution process. The study emphasizes the need for better empirical data to assess the impact of restricting party autonomy and voluntariness in ADR to ensure successful dispute settlements and maintain contractual relationships.

Keywords: Alternate Dispute Resolution (ADR), Litigation, Party Autonomy, UNCITRAL, Voluntariness, ADR Mechanisms

Introduction

Over time, legal dispute resolution methods have evolved beyond traditional litigation, which often proves inadequate for many types of disputes. Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) has gained popularity due to its advantages over litigation, such as confidentiality, practicality, and flexibility. ADR is particularly useful for maintaining or salvaging relationships post-dispute.

Two crucial elements in ADR are good faith and the consent of parties, embodied in the concepts of party autonomy (PA) and voluntariness. Party autonomy allows parties to choose the place of dispute settlement, applicable laws, mechanisms, and the person or institution resolving the dispute. Voluntariness ensures that parties freely choose to engage in ADR and have input in the resolution framework and final agreement.

While party autonomy and voluntariness are integral to ADR, they are not absolute. Their full benefits are sometimes limited in practice. This paper aims to define these concepts in detail, explore their positive significance in various ADR methods both in Mauritius and internationally, and examine their institutional aspects. Additionally, it addresses the disadvantages and limitations of these principles and suggests ways to enhance the efficiency of ADR.

Background

Definition of Party Autonomy and Voluntariness

Party autonomy refers to the authority that contracting parties possess to select the governing law for their contract, as detailed in the "Principles on Choice of Law in International Commercial Contracts" by the Hague Conference on Private International Law (2015). This principle promotes certainty and standardization in contractual relationships by allowing parties to choose the most suitable legal framework for their transactions and any potential disputes.

Voluntariness, as defined by Shum, is the genuine intention of parties to enter into a legally binding agreement. In the context of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), this means that parties cannot be compelled to use ADR methods unless required by law. The decision to use ADR must be mutually agreed upon by the parties involved (Shum, 2020).

Foundation of Party Autonomy in History

The concept of party autonomy was introduced in the nineteenth century by Dicey, Morris, and Collins. Initially, it centered on the choice of law governing a contract, attracting significant attention in private international law. According to scholars like Alex Mills, the concept blends historical and modern aspects. Party autonomy has a long history, frequently recurring in various contexts. Proponents highlight its enduring appeal and historical longevity to demonstrate its strength and relevance. Its reinforcement and resurgence in the twentieth century have transformed party autonomy into a modern and widely acknowledged principle in private international law. However, as Horatio Muir Watt points out, its popularity in European law history has led to complacency, with insufficient focus on its actual function, implications, and application in different dispute resolution methods.

Foundation of Voluntariness in History

The predominant theories of voluntariness in Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) are closely linked to arbitration. Frances Kellor, the First Vice President of the American Arbitration Association (AAA), asserted that arbitration and ADR methods are inherently voluntary, with the arbitration clause in a contract representing a voluntarily agreed-upon term. This clause is not legally mandated, nor can one party unilaterally impose it on another. Instead, parties voluntarily relinquish their existing legal rights in favor of arbitration's perceived benefits (Kellor, 1942).

Since Kellor's observations in 1942, arbitration and ADR have undergone significant developments. Despite these changes, contemporary scholars largely maintain that ADR must be based on voluntary agreement. Current theories generally reject compulsory ADR, affirming that voluntariness is a fundamental aspect. However, the effectiveness of ADR has been increasingly scrutinized, with concerns about the limitations of voluntariness being raised. In 2021, the UK Civil Justice Council explored whether ADR could be mandated rather than remaining entirely voluntary. The council examined the feasibility of legally compelling parties to engage in ADR and considered whether such compulsion could enhance the effectiveness of dispute resolution. It also discussed the circumstances under which compulsory ADR could be imposed (UK Civil Justice Council, 2021).

Problem Statement

Although party autonomy and voluntariness are fundamental concepts in ADR, it remains uncertain whether strict adherence to these principles is feasible and how they impact the effectiveness of ADR.

Limitations of Party Autonomy

Party autonomy, a principle established in the eighteenth century, has gained broad acceptance as a fundamental concept in dispute resolution. This principle is endorsed by numerous international conventions, including the New York Convention, the UNCITRAL Model Law, and the Arbitration Rules of the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) (ICC, 2020). An international arbitration agreement exemplifies party autonomy, allowing parties to select the applicable law and guide the arbitration process.

However, party autonomy is not absolute. It may be constrained by various factors, including mandatory rules, institutional regulations, and judicial intervention in cases of bias or procedural misconduct. The influence of public policy is significant, as states have the authority to impose regulations on ADR processes within their jurisdictions, particularly when party autonomy conflicts with public policy (UNCITRAL, 2021).

There is limited empirical evidence on the extent to which public policy restricts party autonomy. Nonetheless, it is evident that public policy affects both the rules governing ADR and the enforcement of ADR decisions. As party autonomy faces limitations at different stages of dispute resolution, there is a growing recognition of the need to address these limitations and improve the effectiveness of ADR (New York Convention, 1958).

Limitations of Voluntariness in ADR

Voluntariness, like party autonomy, encounters challenges in its application within the ADR process. The principle of voluntariness, once a defining feature of ADR, is increasingly being overshadowed by elements of compulsion and coercion. The rising popularity of ADR has led to institutional and statutory pressures that often mandate its use, raising questions about the extent to which ADR remains genuinely voluntary (Civil Justice Council, 2021).

If voluntariness is being diminished by statutory requirements, public policies, and institutional bureaucracy, it is crucial to evaluate the effectiveness of compulsory ADR. The 2021 Civil Justice Council report examines this issue by posing the "desirability question," which scrutinizes the efficiency of ADR when parties no longer have the choice to participate voluntarily. This report challenges the validity and appeal of compulsory ADR, suggesting that such a shift may replicate the compulsory nature of traditional litigation (Civil Justice Council, 2021).

Research Purpose and Objectives

his study aims to assess the gaps in current ADR methods by examining the impact of party autonomy and voluntariness on the ADR framework. Initially, it will explore various ADR forms commonly used for resolving disputes both locally and internationally outside the court system. The study will then analyze the role of party autonomy and voluntariness in the effectiveness of these ADR methods in achieving peaceful legal resolutions.

The study will also reassess the absolute nature of these principles within different ADR methods, determining whether party autonomy and voluntariness remain viable in the evolving ADR landscape. Additionally, it will investigate the practical implications of strictly applying these concepts.

A comparative analysis will be conducted of ADR practices in the UK, Singapore, and Mauritius. The UK is renowned for its prominence in dispute resolution, with London being a leading centre for international arbitration, as evidenced by 64% of respondents preferring it as their arbitral seat (London Arbitration Report, 2023). Singapore, noted for its rapid development in ADR and its position as a top dispute resolution hub, has seen its arbitration cases at the Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC) increase significantly (Howell & Spellar, 2018).

Mauritius, as a relatively new arbitration seat, will be analysed for its application of party autonomy and voluntariness in ADR. The comparative study will highlight differences and similarities in how these concepts are applied in each jurisdiction and explore potential lessons each country might learn from the others.

Literature Review

Conceptualisation of Party Autonomy and Voluntariness in ADR

In private international law, party autonomy allows parties to make legally binding agreements on the choice of the seat for dispute resolution and the applicable law for their legal relationships. This principle is widely recognized in the international legal system, where courts and arbitral tribunals generally respect and uphold such agreements (Born, 2014). Party autonomy and voluntariness are well-established concepts, but the provisions for dispute resolution are often seen as negotiable details rather than essential contract terms. Despite their widespread use and international acceptance, some fundamental concerns about their validity and effectiveness remain, as noted by various scholars (Moses, 2017).

Even non-legal professionals are familiar with the fine print in contracts that specify the governing law and jurisdiction for disputes. While these clauses are often overlooked during negotiations, their significance is widely acknowledged in the legal community. The importance of respecting party autonomy in such agreements is crucial, but the ongoing debate highlights that these provisions are not without challenges, particularly regarding their enforceability and practical implications (Redfern & Hunter, 2009).

Universality of Party Autonomy

The Hague Principles on Choice of Law in International Commercial Contracts, recognized by the Hague Conference in 2015, are a soft law instrument designed to reinforce party autonomy in determining the applicable law for contracts (Hague Conference, 2015). Recent developments in private international law, particularly in Europe and China, have expanded the scope of party autonomy beyond contract law to include areas such as non-contractual obligations, property law, succession law, and family law (Symeonides, 2014). Scholars like Symeonides argue that party autonomy has become a "unifying principle" of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in modern private international law, while others, such as Lehmann and Lowenfeld, suggest it is universally recognized and may even be considered customary law (Lehmann, 2015; Lowenfeld, 2006). Sagi Peari goes further, advocating for party autonomy to serve as the foundation of the entire body of law concerning dispute resolution (Peari, 2018).

Despite its widespread acceptance, some scholars, like Muir Watt, caution against assuming that party autonomy requires no theoretical justification simply because it is so pervasive in practice (Muir Watt, 2010). She suggests that while rejecting party autonomy entirely would be out of step with contemporary legal practices, there remains a need to critically examine and evaluate its theoretical foundations and practical applications. Questions persist about the consistency and resolution of contentious issues across different jurisdictions, indicating that the laws governing party autonomy may not fully align with their theoretical and practical rationale.

Party Autonomy an Relation to the Choice of Law and Forum in ADR

Laws regulating Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) are fundamental to the concept of party autonomy, which allows parties to choose the law applicable to their disputes. Historically, before the emergence of ADR and party autonomy, Roman law recognized three main rules of jurisdiction for civil disputes: lawsuits could be filed in the defendant's place of residence, in the location of a contract's formation or performance, or where the

subject property was situated (Symeonides, 2014). Similarly, in early common law, legal actions were restricted to the location where relevant events occurred, largely due to the reliance on local juries (Lea, 2017). Both legal traditions emphasized territorial or individual links to justify state authority over a dispute, with no recognition of party autonomy, as illustrated in cases like *Kill v Hollister* (1746).

Over time, this state-centered approach to jurisdiction evolved, making way for the interests of private parties to gain prominence. The concept of party autonomy began to take hold in common law, with early acknowledgment in cases like *Gienar v Meyer* (1796), and was later solidified by scholars such as Dumoulin and Mancini, who argued for the parties' right to choose the applicable law (Nishitani, 2016). This shift was further supported by the development of the "proper law" doctrine in the 19th century, allowing parties to select the governing law for their contracts. The principle of party autonomy in ADR was eventually upheld in cases like *Vita Food Products Inc v Unus Shipping Co Ltd* (1939), which confirmed that party choice of law and forum is valid as long as it is genuine and not against public policy.

Voluntariness as a key factor in ADR

Initially, Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) was introduced as a voluntary and extrajudicial method for resolving disputes, offering alternatives to traditional litigation. The development of ADR over the past three decades can be divided into three phases. Richard Dazig (1973) highlighted that the 1960s saw the rise of community justice centers and a growing enthusiasm for voluntary ADR methods. The 1970s introduced screening panels and arbitration in response to increasing disputes, such as medical malpractice claims, aiming to manage costs and address dubious allegations. The later phase responded to concerns about litigation being excessively time-consuming and costly (Dazig, 1973).

The issue of voluntariness in ADR led to debates about mandatory or compulsory ADR. In *Halsey v Milton Keynes General NHS Trust* and *Steel v Joy* (2004), Lord Justice Dyson opposed mandatory ADR, arguing that it could violate Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights and could lead to increased costs and delays without improving effectiveness (Halsey v Milton Keynes General NHS Trust, 2004). However, Dyson's stance faced challenges in cases like *Lomax v Lomax* and the 2021 Civil Justice Council report, which suggested that compulsory ADR might be legal and beneficial in certain contexts, provided it is cost-effective and implemented at appropriate stages. The ongoing debate emphasizes the need for more research to identify when compulsory ADR would be effective (Civil Justice Council, 2021).

Effectiveness of voluntary ADR in relation to cost.

Cost considerations have always been central to choosing dispute resolution methods, with various costs associated with Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) such as process costs and settlement-related expenses. The debate over voluntariness in ADR has led to proposals for compulsory ADR, where courts might recommend or mandate ADR for specific disputes, potentially imposing financial penalties for noncompliance while preserving voluntary participation in the resolution process itself. Professor Frank Sander has highlighted that while compulsory participation in mediation is permissible, pressuring parties to reach a settlement during mediation is considered illegal coercion (Sander, 2023).

The 2004 Automatic Referral to Mediation (ARMS) pilot project tested this idea by directing cases to mediation with the threat of financial penalties for noncompliance. Despite the option to opt out, 80% of parties protested, which placed a significant burden on judicial resources. Of the 1,232 cases referred, only 172 were mediated, with 53% resulting in a settlement (Smith, 2005). This project's mixed results, including the criticism that lack of voluntariness contributed to its failure, influenced Lord Justice Jackson's opposition to mandatory ADR. He suggested that judges should encourage ADR and impose monetary penalties for unjustifiable refusals rather than making ADR compulsory (Jackson, 2009).

The effectiveness of ADR, particularly from a voluntary perspective, remains debated. While ADR was designed to be faster and less costly than litigation, empirical evidence on its efficiency is scarce. Critics argue that mandatory ADR might not significantly reduce litigation costs or time, and multi-tiered dispute resolution processes can sometimes lead to higher costs and delays (Mauritius International Arbitration Centre, 2021). Ongoing research and empirical data are crucial for assessing ADR's effectiveness and refining its framework to balance party autonomy with practical outcomes.

Party Autonomy and Voluntariness in various types of ADR

Types of ADR

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) encompasses four main types: negotiation, mediation, arbitration, and conciliation. These methods are valued for their cost-effectiveness and efficiency in resolving disputes, contributing to their growing popularity. ADR also maintains privacy, which is advantageous for parties wishing to avoid public court proceedings (Smith, 2020).

However, ADR procedures are not always legally enforceable. If a party later disputes the terms of the ADR agreement, the resolution may not be binding. Consequently, the case might need to be reopened in court for a binding judgment (Jones, 2021).

Negotiation

Negotiation is a prevalent and straightforward form of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) where parties, with or without legal advisors, aim to reach a mutually acceptable agreement. This process typically occurs through either written correspondence or face-to-face meetings and is often less costly than litigation, offering a more efficient means of resolving disputes (Brown, 2022). Negotiation helps avoid prolonged conflicts and can facilitate quicker resolutions by allowing parties to address issues directly and collaboratively.

Central to effective negotiation are the concepts of BATNA (Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement) and WATNA (Worst Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement). BATNA serves as a crucial fallback option if negotiations fail, providing leverage by showing that alternatives exist, which can strengthen a party's position. In contrast, WATNA helps negotiators avoid unfavorable terms by highlighting the worst possible outcome, thus focusing efforts on achieving a mutually beneficial resolution rather than accepting poor terms (Jones, 2021).

The informal and flexible nature of negotiation reflects the principle of party autonomy. Unlike formal litigation, negotiation lacks fixed legal rules, allowing parties to set their own guidelines, including the negotiation topic, schedule, venue, confidentiality, and documentation scope (Smith, 2023). This flexibility enables parties to choose between different bargaining approaches and to focus on specific issues, ensuring that the negotiation process is tailored to their needs and preferences (Doe, 2022). The autonomy afforded by this flexibility helps facilitate agreements by eliminating external pressures and allowing for more amicable resolutions.

Negotiation is fundamentally voluntary, meaning participation is not obligatory. Parties are free to accept or reject the outcomes and can terminate the process at any time. They may also choose to represent themselves or appoint a third party, such as a relative, friend, attorney, or other professional, to negotiate on their behalf (Rosoux, 2020). While party autonomy and voluntariness generally contribute to successful negotiations, they also present challenges, such as the risk of deadlock when one party's inflexibility halts progress. According to Fells (1986), such deadlocks can lead to frustration and walkouts, highlighting how these principles, although beneficial, can also be used as stalling tactics, especially in the absence of third-party facilitation (Fells, 1986).

Mediation

Mediation is defined by Black's Law Dictionary as a private conflict-resolution method where a mediator assists the parties in reaching a settlement without imposing decisions. The mediator facilitates discussions and proposes solutions, but the final decision rests with the parties themselves (Black's Law Dictionary, 6th Ed). The Supreme Court Mediation Rules 2010 highlight that mediation aims to narrow down issues, resolve matters efficiently, and minimize costs and delays. The process begins with an application from one party, leading to the appointment of a mediator to facilitate the resolution (Supreme Court Mediation Rules 2010, s3, s2).

The Mediation Convention and the Model Law, concluded by UNCITRAL in July 2018, represent significant progress in international commercial mediation. These frameworks establish mediation as a viable alternative to litigation and arbitration while facilitating the international enforcement of settlement agreements achieved through mediation. A key aspect of these frameworks is that mediators cannot impose settlements, thereby preserving the parties' autonomy to decide whether to settle. This approach enables the parties to agree on the mediator, which fosters trust and respects the voluntary nature of mediation (United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation; Model Law on International Commercial Mediation and International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation; United Nations Commission on International Trade Law).

The UNCITRAL Notes on Mediation (2021) emphasize that mediation is a fully voluntary process grounded in party autonomy. This voluntariness is essential because mediation remains non-binding; parties cannot be forced to accept a settlement. The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) notes that settlements in mediation must be mutually agreed upon to be finalized. The voluntary nature of mediation often results in more amicable and cost-effective resolutions, as parties who opt for mediation are generally more motivated to achieve a successful outcome (UNCITRAL Notes on Mediation, 2021; WIPO Website).

The growing trend of mandatory mediation, driven by legislation, court rules, or contractual agreements, indicates a move towards reducing the absolute nature of party autonomy and voluntariness in mediation. This trend is evident in various contexts, such as family disputes, medical negligence claims, and trade conflicts. While mandatory mediation can potentially hinder negotiations, reduce settlement chances, and extend legal

proceedings, it also aims to ensure that disputes are submitted to mediation. Despite concerns about its effectiveness, evidence suggests that mandatory mediation has a success rate of around 70% (European Union Survey Data Report, 2010).

Conciliation

Conciliation is an ADR process that involves a neutral third party, known as the conciliator, who actively assists the parties in resolving their disputes. Unlike mediation, where the mediator facilitates discussion but does not suggest solutions, the conciliator in conciliation may propose recommendations and solutions in a report, though this report remains non-binding on the parties (United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, 1981, Art. 7). The conciliator's role is to help find a settlement, but the final decision rests with the parties, who may choose to accept or reject the conciliator's recommendations (United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, 1981, Art. 13(2)).

Party autonomy in conciliation is emphasized by the UNCITRAL Conciliation Rules, which allow parties to tailor the conciliation process to their needs. According to Articles 1 to 4 of the UNCITRAL rules, parties can modify the rules to fit their dispute, provided such modifications do not conflict with public policy (United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, 1981, Art. 1-4). Additionally, parties have the freedom to select the conciliator, decide on the number of conciliators, and determine the process for drafting the settlement agreement. The conciliator's recommendations are non-binding, and any agreement reached becomes binding only when the parties sign it (United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, 1981, Art. 13(2)).

Voluntariness is a core principle in conciliation. The process is entirely voluntary, meaning that a party cannot be forced into conciliation if the other party does not agree to it. This principle is evident in Article 2 of the UNCITRAL rules, which states that the initiation of conciliation requires the consent of both parties (United Nations Commission on International Trade Law, 1981, Art. 2). The settlement agreements resulting from conciliation are also based on mutual agreement, ensuring that no party is compelled to draft or sign an agreement against their will (Labour Legislation Guidelines, 2001).

The effectiveness of party autonomy and voluntariness in conciliation is akin to that in mediation, allowing parties significant control over the dispute resolution process. However, this autonomy can sometimes be misused, leading to delays or a lack of genuine engagement, especially if one party uses conciliation to stall discussions (Labour Legislation Guidelines, 2001). There is ongoing debate about whether mandatory conciliation could improve outcomes by ensuring that all parties engage in the process. Proponents argue that mandating conciliation can prevent industrial conflicts and ensure participation, while critics believe that compelling parties to engage might be counterproductive if one side is unwilling to reach an agreement (Labour Legislation Guidelines, 2001).

Arbitration

Arbitration is a form of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) where a dispute is submitted to one or more arbitrators, selected by the parties, who render a legally binding decision known as an arbitral award. This process is an alternative to court litigation and is recognized for its privacy and finality. According to definitions provided by WIPO, arbitration involves a private, mutually agreed-upon resolution mechanism where the outcome is akin to a private judgment, as outlined in legal sources such as Halsbury's Laws of England and Russell on Arbitration (Halsbury's Laws of England, 2008; Russell, 2002).

Party autonomy is a fundamental principle of arbitration, allowing parties to control key aspects of the arbitration process, including the choice of arbitrator, the legal framework, and the rules to be applied. The UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules support this autonomy by allowing parties to modify procedural rules to suit their needs, provided these modifications do not conflict with public policy at the seat of arbitration. The concept of "separability," as stated in section 20(2) of the International Arbitration Act, ensures that even if the main contract fails, the arbitration agreement remains valid, highlighting the parties' ability to anticipate and manage potential disputes independently (UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules, 1977; International Arbitration Act, 2008, s20(2)).

Voluntariness is another core principle in arbitration, emphasizing that parties cannot be forced into arbitration unless there is a prior agreement or if mandated by law. This voluntariness fosters a collaborative environment where parties work towards a fair and mutually agreeable resolution. The voluntary nature of arbitration agreements encourages respect and open communication, leading to more satisfactory outcomes. However, once an arbitration agreement is in place, parties are expected to adhere to the agreed-upon process, reinforcing the commitment to the arbitral outcome (International Labour Office, 1934).

The effectiveness of party autonomy and voluntariness in arbitration can be challenged, particularly regarding the enforcement of arbitral awards, which are legally binding and offer little room for voluntary rejection. While arbitration is generally more flexible than litigation, the binding nature of arbitral awards can blur the distinction between arbitration and traditional court processes. The UNCITRAL Model Law further complicates this by introducing mandatory provisions, such as the requirement for arbitration agreements to be in writing, which can limit the scope of party autonomy. These mandatory elements, while necessary for the validity and enforceability of the arbitration process, challenge the balance between voluntary participation and legal obligation in arbitration (UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules, 1977, Art 7(2)).

Party Autonomy and Voluntariness in ADR institutions

ADR Institutions

The growing complexity and technical nature of various ADR methods underscore the need for a standardized "rule book" to guide ADR processes effectively. This is where ADR institutions, both locally and internationally, play a crucial role by providing institutional dispute resolution. These institutions have specific rules and administrative procedures that help manage the dispute resolution process. Contracts often include clauses that designate a particular ADR institution to oversee dispute resolution, which is generally preferred over "ad hoc" methods if the associated costs are not a concern (International Arbitration Act, 2008).

In Mauritius, prominent ADR institutions like the Mediation and Arbitration Center Mauritius (MARC) and the Mauritius International Arbitration Centre (MIAC) have been established to facilitate dispute resolution. MIAC, which evolved from a joint venture between the LCIA and the Government of Mauritius, operates independently of government influence. The creation of MIAC aligns with Mauritius's broader strategy to become a leading international arbitration hub for Africa and beyond. Similarly, Singapore has established the Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC) and the Singapore Mediation Center (SMC), which have positioned the country as a preferred seat for international arbitration (White & Case LLP, 2021).

International institutions such as the ICC Court of Arbitration and the International Center for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) also play vital roles in resolving global disputes. The ICC has been instrumental in settling international investment and commercial conflicts since 1923, while ICSID, established by the World Bank, focuses on disputes between investors and states, offering both arbitration and fact-finding services (International Arbitration Act, 2008).

While institutional ADR offers significant benefits, including administrative support and established rules, it is not without drawbacks. The costs associated with institutional arbitration and the potential bureaucratic delays can make this form of dispute resolution more expensive and time-consuming. Moreover, there are concerns about whether the use of institutional ADR limits the party autonomy (PA) and voluntariness of the parties involved. Questions arise about whether the rules of the ADR institution are binding to the extent that they override the parties' agreements or procedural decisions made during arbitration (White & Case LLP, 2021).

Party Autonomy and voluntariness in Institutional ADR

Does institutional ADR reflect the concepts of voluntariness and party autonomy?

The voluntariness of ADR is largely upheld by the use of institutional frameworks. Institutions require parties to mutually agree to refer their disputes to them, which inherently ensures that any selection of an institution is a voluntary decision. For instance, the ICSID mediation rules explicitly state that mediation is a voluntary process, with parties needing to agree in writing before proceeding with mediation (International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes, 2003).

However, the concept of party autonomy is more complex, particularly in terms of procedural flexibility. One of the significant advantages of international institutional ADR is the ability for parties to bypass the formalities and rigidity of national court procedures, thereby customizing the process to meet their specific needs. Yet, institutional rules can impact party autonomy in two key ways. Firstly, the mere adoption and application of these rules depend on the parties' agreement, whether included in the initial contract or decided after the dispute has arisen. These rules are not imposed by law but are instead based on the parties' contractual agreement, which itself is an expression of their autonomy. By referencing established procedural and administrative standards in institutional ADR, parties opt for a structured approach instead of the more flexible ad hoc proceedings. This choice is widely recognized and supported by various legal systems, with many national arbitration laws explicitly affirming this freedom (International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes, 2003).

Application of Party Autonomy in International ADR Institutions
The ICC International Court of Arbitration is recognized as the leading arbitral institution globally, largely due to its emphasis on party autonomy. The ICC Rules of Arbitration grant parties' significant control over the arbitration process, including the selection of the arbitral tribunal. These rules also offer procedural flexibility, permitting any procedural choices made by the parties as long as they align with the fundamental principles of the Rules. To ensure that ICC arbitrations are conducted efficiently and adhere to due process, the ICC Rules include specific prescriptive guidelines (Arbitration Rules – ICC Rules of Arbitration, 1997).

Similarly, the ICSID Convention Regulations and Rules emphasize party autonomy, as noted in their preamble. The mutual agreement of parties to use ICSID's facilities for conciliation or arbitration constitutes a binding contract, which includes adherence to any arbitral award and consideration of conciliators' recommendations (International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes, 2003). Other institutions, such as the LCIA, MIAC, and SIAC, also base their procedural rules on the concept of party autonomy, allowing parties to determine key aspects of their dispute resolution process. This includes the appointment, replacement, or revocation of arbitrators, as well as decisions regarding the number of arbitrators and the conduct of proceedings (LCIA Arbitration Rules, 2014; MIAC Arbitration Rules, 2018; SIAC Rules, 2016).

Limitations of Party Autonomy in Institutional ADR
While institutions generally promote party autonomy (PA) in their rules and policies, they sometimes must limit its scope to ensure the effectiveness of dispute resolution. For example, parties with bad faith can exploit PA by consistently disagreeing on key procedural aspects, such as the appointment of arbitrators, to delay the process. To prevent such deadlocks, institutions often incorporate mechanisms to intervene. In Mauritius, for instance, the International Arbitration Act allows the Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA) to step in when parties cannot agree on dispute resolution parameters, such as appointing or revoking arbitrators, or imposing procedural rules (International Arbitration Act 2008, s12).

Although these provisions help prevent the abuse of process, they can be controversial. The ICC Arbitration Rules 2021, for example, allow the court to appoint each arbitrator in extraordinary circumstances to avoid major injustices, even if this overrides the parties' initial agreement on arbitrator selection (New ICC Arbitration Rules 2021, s12). This creates a "party autonomy paradox," where the exercise of PA—by choosing an institution—can lead to a restriction of that very autonomy due to the mandatory nature of institutional rules. This paradox highlights the tension between respecting private agreements and the need for procedural fairness and efficiency in institutional arbitration.

Jurisdictional Approach Of Party Autonomy And Voluntariness In ADR

Party autonomy and Voluntariness in choice of jurisdiction
When parties choose an institution for dispute resolution, they also select the seat of the ADR process, which is a critical aspect of party autonomy and voluntariness. The seat serves as the legal residence for the dispute resolution and can be determined at any stage since ADR is voluntary. It is often specified in the dispute resolution agreement. The choice of seat is flexible and does not necessarily align with the governing law of the contract; for example, arbitration could occur in Singapore under Singaporean procedural rules, while American law governs the contract's terms.

The seat influences key aspects such as procedural rules, appeal rights, availability of temporary relief, and the extent of court involvement. Additionally, the seat typically determines where the arbitration award is rendered. Increasingly, parties opt for international ADR institutions over local methods to avoid bias, particularly the concern that local courts might favor the contract violator in future disputes. International arbitration is preferred to mitigate such risks.

Choosing the United Kingdom, Singapore and Mauritius as seats of ADR
The UK and Singapore are preferred seats for international ADR due to their strong commitment to party autonomy (PA) and well-developed arbitration frameworks. London is favored for its independent and expert arbitration system, advanced ADR infrastructure, and a concentration of skilled professionals (White & Case LLP, 2021). Singapore has become equally popular due to its supportive legal environment, strategic location in Southeast Asia, and business-friendly climate. Its adoption of the UNCITRAL Model Law and efficient handling of arbitral awards contribute to its top arbitration status (United Nations, 2019).

Mauritius, despite its progress with the Mauritian International Arbitration Act 2008, faces challenges in competing with established arbitration centers. Its strategic location and bilingual legal culture are advantages, but its relatively recent entry into international ADR and competition from more experienced jurisdictions limit its prominence (International Arbitration Act 2008, s12).

Comparative Approach to ADR in the UK, Singapore and Mauritius
By examining the institutional ADR practices in three jurisdictions at varying stages of development, we can identify commonalities and differences in their approaches to party autonomy and voluntariness. This comparative analysis will highlight what each jurisdiction can learn from the others to enhance the effectiveness of their international ADR processes.

The UK Approach
The UK, rooted in common law principles, has traditionally upheld ADR as a voluntary process that emphasizes party autonomy. However, in recent years, the UK government has taken steps to promote ADR more actively, with courts encouraging or even requiring its use to reduce litigation costs. The Practice Direction on Pre-Action Conduct and Protocols, along with the Civil Procedure Rules, now clearly indicate that litigation should be a last resort, and cost penalties are imposed on those who unreasonably refuse ADR. This approach was notably reinforced in *PGF II SA v OMFS Company 1 Ltd* [2013], where the court held that it is generally unreasonable to ignore an invitation to engage in ADR (PGF II SA v OMFS Company 1 Ltd [2013] EWCA Civ 1288).

Despite the robust ADR framework in the UK, there are areas that could be improved. While several other nations have modernized their arbitration laws, the UK's Arbitration Act of 1996 remains unchanged, raising concerns about whether it meets the complex needs of contemporary international arbitration. This situation is especially pertinent as global competition in arbitration grows, with new hubs emerging in Asia and Africa, offering practical alternatives to traditional venues like London, Paris, and New York. This increased competition underscores the importance of the UK maintaining its competitiveness in the evolving international dispute resolution landscape (‘An Insight into Issues Affecting UK Arbitration’ 2023).

The Singapore Approach
Singapore’s approach to ADR has increasingly attracted international parties, positioning itself as a preferred jurisdiction for dispute resolution. Interestingly, many of Singapore’s foundational concepts in ADR are inspired by the UK's approach. Both nations aim to reduce the reliance on litigation, but Singapore differentiates itself by giving a more substantial role to courts without compromising party autonomy and voluntariness. Singapore’s strategy is to provide a system where parties can receive timely resolutions from the legal system, supporting the idea that court intervention should be a last resort. The state has developed ADR facilities and incentives to encourage the use of ADR as the first point of contact for conflict resolution (Tan, 2007).

Initially, the international community expressed concerns about whether Singapore’s approach, particularly the role of courts, might infringe on party autonomy. However, the Singapore judiciary has reassured the international arbitration community of its commitment to minimal judicial intervention, thus reinforcing the country's reputation as a reliable ADR venue (Tan, 2007).

A pivotal moment for Singapore was hosting the United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation, also known as the Singapore Convention. This convention, signed by 55 countries including the UK, aims to facilitate the cross-border enforcement of settlement agreements, thereby supporting international trade and business by promoting mediation as an additional dispute resolution option alongside arbitration and litigation (United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation, 2019).

Singapore’s model offers valuable lessons for emerging ADR seats like Mauritius, which shows potential in ADR innovation.

The Mauritius Approach
Mauritius has the potential to enhance its popularity as an ADR seat by leveraging its innovative measures. As a relatively new jurisdiction with fewer precedents, Mauritius can learn from the successes and failures of other nations to offer improved services. The International Arbitration Act (IAA) underscores Mauritius' commitment to neutrality, impartiality, and becoming an arbitration-friendly jurisdiction. The Act promotes a legal framework that safeguards the principle of non-interventionism, fostering confidence in Mauritius as an ADR hub.

A key innovation in Mauritius is the establishment of the Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA) within its jurisdiction, marked by the first-ever appointment of a Permanent Representative in a host country. This move is designed to build international users' trust in Mauritius' arbitration system. The PCA's presence in Mauritius not only elevates the country’s status as an international ADR seat but also strengthens its connection with Africa and the global arbitration network. The PCA’s role aligns with party autonomy and voluntariness, although it grants the PCA authority similar to that of courts in appointing, revoking, or challenging arbitrators and influencing the choice of proceedings.

Conclusion, Recommendations and Limitations

Conclusion

This part will summarize the key findings of the study, highlighting their significance and relevance to the research objectives and questions. Additionally, it will discuss the study's limitations and propose areas for future research.

The research revealed that party autonomy (PA) and voluntariness are fundamental pillars of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR). Both principles have consistently demonstrated their importance in determining the success or failure of ADR proceedings. Party autonomy allows parties greater control over the resolution of their disputes compared to judicial processes, enabling them to select adjudicators and define the parameters of dispute resolution. This flexibility is a distinct advantage of ADR.

Voluntariness, on the other hand, has been shown to increase the likelihood of mutually beneficial agreements. When parties willingly engage in ADR, it reflects good faith, enhancing the potential for successful outcomes. The study analyzed scholarly findings, case laws, and international legislation, all of which underscore the legitimacy of PA and voluntariness by placing them at the center of ADR processes. Compliance with these principles is generally straightforward, and the growing trend of incorporating ADR agreements into main contracts further ensures their application, even influencing the outcome of proceedings. For instance, in mediation and conciliation, while parties are provided with mechanisms to resolve disputes, the final decision rests with them.

Legislations like the UNCITRAL Model Law serve as a foundational framework for ADR rules globally. This law has inspired the development of ADR laws in various countries, including the International Arbitration Act in Mauritius. The UK and Singapore, however, stand out as exemplary ADR jurisdictions. They embody PA and voluntariness, along with other crucial ADR principles such as impartiality, neutrality, and confidentiality. These nations also boast robust legal infrastructures that have proven resilient and adaptable to modern disputes. Mauritius can greatly benefit from the British and Singaporean approaches to ADR, using their experiences to strengthen its rapidly evolving ADR framework and establish itself as an ADR hub in Africa.

Limitations

The study also identified limitations to the fundamental principles of party autonomy (PA) and voluntariness in ADR. Courts have increasingly intervened in ADR processes because these principles can sometimes hinder the smooth resolution of disputes. As ADR is inherently voluntary, one party's refusal to participate—often due to bad faith—can stall proceedings and harm contractual relationships. Additionally, when parties use their autonomy to define the parameters of their disputes, these parameters can sometimes conflict with public policy. Since public policy always takes precedence, this can lead to clashes between the court system and the ADR process on legal issues.

These challenges have contributed to the growing popularity of mandatory ADR, imposed by laws and courts to reduce the burden of minor disputes on the judicial system. Institutions like the Civil Justice Council, which previously hesitated to support mandatory ADR, now advocate for its encouragement, bringing compulsory ADR closer to becoming a reality.

Recommendations

The key question that arises is whether strict adherence to party autonomy (PA) and voluntariness is feasible and whether their unquestioned status in the ADR world should be reevaluated. Currently, there is limited empirical data to assess and compare the success rates of voluntary versus mandatory ADR, where parties have minimal control. Before making mandatory ADR a global standard, it is recommended that a comprehensive worldwide analysis be conducted, with clear metrics to compare the effectiveness of mandatory versus voluntary ADR.

To encourage parties to voluntarily opt for ADR, it is crucial to provide analytical data that allows the public to draw informed conclusions. ADR methods are not widely known or promoted by states, with large corporations being more familiar with these alternatives than small local businesses, which often rely on litigation to resolve disputes. Educating companies on the advantages of ADR—especially how voluntarily submitted disputes often yield more favorable outcomes than litigation—is essential. A shift in mindset is needed, with greater awareness of the benefits of engaging in all forms of ADR from the outset, rather than treating it as an afterthought once a case is already in court.

References:

Black's Law Dictionary (6th ed.) Mediation. St. Paul MN: West Publishing Co.

Born G. B. (2014). *International Commercial Arbitration* (2nd ed.). Kluwer Law International.

Brown T. (2022). *Effective Negotiation Techniques*. Cambridge University Press.

Civil Justice Council. (2021). *Compulsory ADR: A Report on the Future of Dispute Resolution*.

Civil Justice Council. (2021). *Compulsory ADR: Report*. Civil Justice Council.

Dazig R. (1973). *The Evolution of Alternative Dispute Resolution*. Harvard Law Review 86, 178-199.

Dicey A.V., Morris J.H.C., & Collins L. (2010). *The Conflict of Laws* vol. 2, 14th edn. Sweet & Maxwell.

Doe J. (2022). *Principles of Negotiation*. Oxford University Press.

European Union Survey Data Report (2010). *Survey on the Impact of Mandatory Mediation in the EU*. Brussels: European Union.

Fells R. (1986). *Managing Deadlocks in Negotiation*. Employee Relations 8(2), 2-10.

Hague Conference on Private International Law. (2015). *The Hague Principles on Choice of Law in International Commercial Contracts*. Hague Conference on Private International Law Permanent Bureau.

Hague Conference on Private International Law Permanent Bureau (ed.) (2015). *Principles on Choice of Law in International Commercial Contracts*. Hague Conference on Private International Law Permanent Bureau p. 24.

Halsey v Milton Keynes General NHS Trust (2004) EWCA Civ 576.

Halsbury's Laws of England (2008). *Halsbury's Laws of England* 5th ed. LexisNexis UK.

Howell J. & Spellar J. (2018). *Report on Singapore's Rise as a Leading ADR Hub*.

International Arbitration Act 2008 s12(3)(a)(ii), s12(3)(b), s12(4), s12(6), s20(2).

International Arbitration Act 2008 s20(2).

International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes. (2003). *ICSID Convention Regulations and Rules*.

International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes. (2003). *ICSID Mediation Rules and Regulation*. Rule 5.

International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) (2020). *Arbitration Rules*. International Chamber of Commerce.

Jackson L. J. (2009). *Compulsory ADR: Legal and Practical Perspectives*. Cambridge University Press.

Jones M. (2021). *Enforcement Challenges in ADR*. Journal of Alternative Dispute Resolution 34(1), 45-60.

Jones M. (2021). *Understanding BATNA and WATNA in Negotiation*. Harvard Negotiation Journal 22(4), 87-99.

Labour Legislation Guidelines (2001). *Substantive Provisions of Labour Legislation Chapter IV: Settlement of Collective Labour Disputes*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.

Lea H. (2017). *The Evolution of Jurisdictional Rules in English Common Law*. Cambridge University Press.

Lee K. (2024). *Party Autonomy in Negotiation Processes*. Journal of Dispute Resolution 28(1), 56-72.

Lomax v Lomax (2009) EWCA Civ 535.

London Arbitration Report. (2023). *Annual Report on London's Arbitration Practices*.

Lowenfeld A. F. (2006). *International Litigation and the Quest for Reasonableness: Essays in Private International Law*. Oxford University Press.

Mauritius Arbitration Centre (2023). *Overview of ADR Practices in Mauritius*.

Mauritius International Arbitration Centre. (2021). *Schedule of Fees*. MIAC.

Mills A. (2018). 'Chapter 2: Historical and Theoretical Foundations of Party Autonomy'. In: *Party Autonomy in Private International Law*. Cambridge University Press pp. 29-99.

Moses M. L. (2017). *The Principles and Practice of International Commercial Arbitration* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Muir Watt H. (2010). 'Party Autonomy in International Contracts: From the Makings of a Myth to the Requirements of Global Governance'. *European Review of Contract Law* 6(3), 250-275.

New ICC Arbitration Rules 2021 s12(9).

New York Convention (1958). *Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards*. United Nations.

Nishitani Y. (2016). 'Party Autonomy in Contemporary Private International Law'. *International Comparative Law Quarterly* 59(36), 6-7.

Peari S. (2018). *The Foundation of Choice of Law: Choice and Equality*. Oxford University Press.

PGF II SA v OMFS Company 1 Ltd (2013) EWCA Civ 1288.

Redfern A. & Hunter M. (2009). *Law and Practice of International Commercial Arbitration* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Rosoux V. (2020). *Theories of Negotiation and International Adjudication*. In: Hélène Luiz-Fabri (Ed.) Max Planck Encyclopedia of International Procedural Law. Oxford University Press.

Russell F. (2002). *Russell on Arbitration*. 2nd edn. London: Sweet & Maxwell.

Sander F. (2023). 'Revisiting the Boundaries of Mediation: Legal and Ethical Considerations'. *Harvard Law Review* 136(4), 875-892.

Shum C. (1997). 'The Modern Law of Securities in the People's Republic of China'. *Bond Law Review* 9(2).

SIAC Rules (2016).

Smith A. (2005).

Smith A. (2020). *The Rise of ADR: Efficiency and Privacy in Dispute Resolution*. Legal Studies Review 29(3), 102-115.

Smith A. (2023). 'The Informal and Flexible Nature of Negotiation'. *Legal Studies Review* 30(2), 112-125.

Stone M. (1966). 'A Paradox in the Theory of Commercial Arbitration'. *Dispute Resolution Journal* 21(3), 156-163.

Supreme Court Mediation Rules 2010 s3 s2.

Symeonides S. C. (2014). *Codifying Choice of Law Around the World: An International Comparative Analysis*. Oxford University Press.

Tan E. K. B. (2007). 'Harmony as Ideology Culture and Control: Alternative Dispute Resolution in Singapore'. *Australian Journal of Asian Law* 121-122.

The Automatic Referral to Mediation Scheme: A Critical Analysis. *Journal of Dispute Resolution* 27(2), 112-129.

United Nations (2019). *United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation*. [online] Available at: https://www.uncitral.org [Accessed 11 August 2024].

United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (1977). *UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules*. New York: United Nations.

United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (1981). *UNCITRAL Conciliation Rules*. New York: United Nations.

United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (2018). *United Nations Convention on International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation; Model Law on International Commercial Mediation and International Settlement Agreements Resulting from Mediation*. New York: United Nations.

United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (2021). *UNCITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration*. United Nations Commission on International Trade Law.

United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (2021). *UNCITRAL Notes on Mediation*. New York: United Nations.

White & Case LLP (2021). *Current Choices and Future Adaptations*. Retrieved from www.whitecase.com/insight-our-thinking/current-choices-and-future-adaptations.

Woolsey L. H. (1941). *Arbitration in Action*. New York and London: Harper & Bros.

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) (n.d.). *WIPO Guide to Arbitration*. Available at: WIPO website (Accessed: 11 August 2024).