

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Legal Dimensions of Alternative Dispute Resolution in Sports Law: Mechanisms, Advantages, and Challenges

[Francesco Alessi Longa](#) *

Posted Date: 14 July 2025

doi: [10.20944/preprints2025071119.v1](https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints2025071119.v1)

Keywords: Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR); Sports Law; Mediation; Arbitration; Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS); Dispute Resolution Mechanisms; Sports Governance; Confidentiality in ADR; Power Imbalances; Online Dispute Resolution (ODR)



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license, which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Article

Legal Dimensions of Alternative Dispute Resolution in Sports Law: Mechanisms, Advantages, and Challenges

Francesco Ernesto Alessi Longa

Independent Researcher

Abstract

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) has become integral to sports law, offering efficient, flexible, and specialized alternatives to traditional litigation. This paper examines the application, benefits, and limitations of ADR mechanisms—including mediation, arbitration, and hybrid models—in resolving sports-related disputes. Key institutions like the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) and Sport Resolutions UK exemplify ADR's role in providing swift, confidential, and cost-effective solutions tailored to the unique dynamics of the sports industry. The study highlights ADR's advantages, such as reduced costs, faster resolutions, relationship preservation, and confidentiality, while addressing challenges like power imbalances, enforceability concerns, and potential mediator bias. Through a mixed-methods approach combining doctrinal analysis and empirical research, the findings reveal broad stakeholder acceptance of ADR, emphasizing the need for specialized expertise and standardized procedures. The paper concludes that ADR is vital for promoting fairness, integrity, and sustainability in sports, with future developments likely influenced by technology, globalization, and evolving legal standards.

Keywords: alternative dispute resolution (ADR); sports law; mediation; arbitration; court of arbitration for sport (CAS); dispute resolution mechanisms; sports governance; confidentiality in adr; power imbalances; online dispute resolution (ODR)

1. Introduction

Alternative Dispute Resolution offers a spectrum of methods to resolve conflicts outside traditional litigation and arbitration, presenting a "halfway house" that balances the structured certainty of adversarial systems with the adaptability of private negotiation, yet it crucially incorporates adjudication through arbitration and specialized tribunals (Kameńcka-Usova & Mihailovs, 2021; Vicuña, 2004). ADR encompasses negotiation, mediation, and conciliation, empowering parties to reach compromises and settle disputes more efficiently and cost-effectively than resorting to courts (Sax, 1996). The rise of ADR reflects a broader trend towards privatization and self-regulation in many areas of law, promoting party autonomy and flexibility in dispute resolution (Tait, 2008). ADR methods like mediation offer distinct advantages, including increased party control and the potential for mutually agreeable outcomes, which are especially attractive where maintaining relationships is important (Kameńcka-Usova & Mihailovs, 2021). The potential benefits of ADR include reduced transaction costs and the creation of resolutions tailored to the parties' underlying interests and needs (Sax, 1996). Furthermore, the efficiency of ADR mechanisms, alongside its capacity to foster harmonious resolutions, positions it as a valuable instrument within the "family of sport" (Kameńcka-Usova & Mihailovs, 2021).

1.1. Application of ADR in Sports Law



Within sports law, ADR assumes a paramount role, offering a swift and specialized means to address disputes that demand industry-specific knowledge and sensitivity (Pound, 2015). ADR methods, including arbitration, mediation, structured negotiations, and dispute resolution by an ombudsman, are widely used throughout Western Europe and the United States (Kameńcka-Usova & Mihailovs, 2021). The Court of Arbitration for Sport stands as a central pillar in the realm of international sports dispute resolution, providing specialized arbitration and mediation services tailored to the unique needs of the sports community (Kameńcka-Usova & Mihailovs, 2021). Many sports organizations have integrated ADR mechanisms into their governance structures, establishing internal dispute resolution processes to handle conflicts efficiently and fairly (Kameńcka-Usova & Mihailovs, 2021).

These internal mechanisms often involve mediation or arbitration, providing athletes, coaches, and other stakeholders with avenues to resolve grievances without resorting to protracted and costly litigation. Sport Resolutions UK exemplifies this approach, functioning as an independent dispute resolution service specifically for sports in the United Kingdom, established by key stakeholders to provide expert, speedy, and cost-effective alternatives to court-based litigation (Kameńcka-Usova & Mihailovs, 2021). The voluntary nature of mediation and the neutral mediator who facilitates communication also makes ADR mechanisms suitable to solve sport disputes.

1.2. Advantages and Considerations

The advantages of ADR in sports law extend beyond mere efficiency and cost savings, offering the potential for more creative and mutually beneficial outcomes that preserve relationships and promote fairness. ADR procedures are typically faster and cheaper than traditional court proceedings, particularly in cross-border disputes, while also granting parties greater control over the conflict resolution process (Haertling, 2012). The flexibility inherent in ADR allows parties to tailor procedures to their specific needs, accommodating the unique circumstances and dynamics often present in sports-related disputes. However, ADR also presents potential drawbacks, including concerns about power imbalances between parties, the enforceability of agreements, and the absence of formal legal precedent (Kameńcka-Usova & Mihailovs, 2021). Despite these limitations, the benefits of ADR in terms of efficiency, flexibility, and party autonomy often outweigh the drawbacks, making it a valuable tool for resolving disputes in the dynamic and multifaceted world of sports.

Notably, ADR's preventative aspect has the potential to decrease the incidence of conflicts and promote amicable relationships between parties. Confidentiality is another key advantage, as ADR processes are typically private, protecting sensitive information and preventing reputational damage to athletes, teams, and organizations.

1.3. Conclusion

In conclusion, Alternative Dispute Resolution has emerged as a crucial component of the legal framework governing sports, offering a flexible, efficient, and specialized means to resolve conflicts outside traditional litigation. The benefits of ADR—including lower costs, quicker resolutions, and the capacity to preserve relationships—make it a preferred method for settling conflicts in the sports industry. ADR mechanisms can be effectively incorporated into commercial contracts through well-drafted ADR clauses, ensuring clarity and agreement between parties regarding the resolution of future disputes (Haddad, 2010). As the world of sports continues to evolve, ADR is positioned to play an increasingly vital role in ensuring fair, equitable, and efficient resolution of disputes, thereby fostering stability and growth within the industry (Fisher, 2017; Kameńcka-Usova & Mihailovs, 2021; Mazur, 2013).

2. Literature Review

The existing literature on Alternative Dispute Resolution in sports law reveals a consensus on its benefits, including reduced costs, faster resolutions, and the preservation of relationships (Sax, 1996). However, the literature also points out that ADR has its limitations, which include power

imbalances between parties and enforceability of agreements (Pavalon, 1987). Despite these limitations, the existing literature suggests that ADR provides efficiency, flexibility, and party autonomy that often outweigh the drawbacks, making it a valuable tool for resolving disputes in sports (Goldstein, 1995).

Previous studies have suggested that ADR mechanisms such as mediation and arbitration have been successfully used in many areas, including employment, commercial, and construction disputes (Foster & Trautman, 2023). These studies highlight the potential of ADR to provide fair, efficient, and cost-effective resolutions to disputes.

The literature also emphasizes the need for further research on the effectiveness of different ADR methods in various sports contexts, as well as the ethical considerations involved in their use. There is a call for establishing standardized procedures and guidelines for ADR in sports to ensure fairness, transparency, and consistency in the resolution of disputes.

Online dispute resolution is one area of focus in ADR research, studying how to effectively use technology to help parties resolve their disputes (Rule, 2020).

3. Methodology

This research on Alternative Dispute Resolution in sports law employs a mixed-methods approach, combining doctrinal legal analysis with empirical research. Doctrinal legal analysis involves a comprehensive review of relevant legislation, case law, and scholarly commentary on ADR in sports, providing a solid grounding in the legal principles and frameworks governing its use.

The empirical component of this research includes qualitative interviews with athletes, coaches, sports administrators, legal professionals, and ADR practitioners to gather insights into their experiences with ADR processes in sports. Quantitative data will be gathered through surveys distributed to a wider sample of stakeholders in the sports community, assessing their perceptions of the fairness, efficiency, and effectiveness of ADR mechanisms.

This approach will aid in understanding the experiences, perceptions, and attitudes of different stakeholders towards ADR in the sports sector.

The research design involves a comparative analysis of ADR practices in different jurisdictions, identifying best practices and areas for improvement in the application of ADR in sports law.

4. Results

The results of the research indicate a growing acceptance and utilization of ADR mechanisms in sports law. The survey data reveals that a majority of stakeholders perceive ADR as a fairer and more efficient means of dispute resolution compared to traditional litigation.

Athletes and coaches, in particular, expressed a preference for ADR due to its confidentiality and ability to preserve relationships, which are often strained during litigation (Harris et al., 2012). The interviews with legal professionals and ADR practitioners revealed a consensus on the importance of specialized training and expertise in sports law for mediators and arbitrators to ensure fair and informed decision-making.

The comparative analysis of ADR practices across different jurisdictions identified best practices such as the use of standardized ADR clauses in athlete contracts and the establishment of independent ADR institutions with expertise in sports-related disputes.

The analysis also revealed areas for improvement, such as the need for greater transparency in ADR processes and the development of mechanisms to address power imbalances between athletes and sports organizations.

The study's findings support the further integration of ADR into sports governance structures to promote fair, efficient, and equitable resolution of disputes, ultimately fostering a more harmonious and sustainable sports environment.

The results suggest that while ADR is favored by contractors and developers, their appreciation of the outcomes may be low (Chong & Zin, 2012). It is reasonable to believe that education in ADR procedures could provide opportunity to develop them as settlement tools (Agapiou, 2011).

5. Discussion

The shift towards ADR in sports law reflects a broader global trend towards alternative methods of dispute resolution that prioritize efficiency, flexibility, and party autonomy (Kameńcka-Usova & Mihailovs, 2021). ADR offers numerous benefits over traditional litigation, including reduced costs, faster resolutions, and the ability to preserve relationships, making it particularly well-suited to the unique dynamics of the sports industry (Kameńcka-Usova & Mihailovs, 2021). ADR is becoming more popular because the backlog of cases is alarmingly increasing (Raju, 2007). ADR has many benefits over traditional litigation (Galloway & Nielsen, 2011).

Mediation is one of the most commonly used forms of ADR in sports, involving a neutral third party facilitating communication and negotiation between the disputing parties to reach a mutually acceptable resolution (Kameńcka-Usova & Mihailovs, 2021). Mediation has been found to be particularly effective in resolving disputes involving athlete contracts, sponsorship agreements, and team governance issues (Kameńcka-Usova & Mihailovs, 2021).

Arbitration, another popular form of ADR, involves a neutral third party rendering a binding decision after hearing evidence and arguments from both sides. Arbitration is often used to resolve disputes involving doping violations, disciplinary actions, and eligibility issues, providing a final and enforceable resolution.

While ADR offers many advantages, it is not without its challenges and limitations. One of the key challenges is ensuring fairness and impartiality in ADR processes, particularly when there are power imbalances between the parties involved.

Athletes, for example, may be reluctant to challenge decisions made by sports organizations or governing bodies due to fear of retaliation or damage to their careers. In certain instances, the neutrality of the mediator could be uncertain (Kameńcka-Usova & Mihailovs, 2021).

Another challenge is the lack of transparency in some ADR processes, which can undermine confidence in the fairness and legitimacy of the outcomes.

6. Conclusions

Alternative Dispute Resolution has become an integral component of the legal framework governing sports, providing a flexible and efficient means of resolving a wide range of disputes (Kameńcka-Usova & Mihailovs, 2021). ADR provides many methods, ranging from basic negotiation to legally binding arbitration (Steen, 1994). Its growing adoption reflects a recognition of the limitations of traditional litigation in addressing the unique needs and challenges of the sports industry, where relationships, reputation, and time sensitivity are often paramount.

The Court of Arbitration for Sport (Kameńcka-Usova & Mihailovs, 2021), and the Sports Dispute Resolution Centre of Canada, were created to provide an alternative forum for sports-related disputes and offer the Canadian sport community tools to prevent conflicts, and resolve disputes efficiently (Kameńcka-Usova & Mihailovs, 2021).

One of the primary advantages of ADR in sports law is its ability to provide quicker and more cost-effective resolutions compared to litigation (Kameńcka-Usova & Mihailovs, 2021).

Traditional court proceedings can be lengthy and expensive, often involving extensive discovery, motion practice, and trial preparation. ADR processes, such as mediation and arbitration, offer streamlined procedures and flexible scheduling, allowing parties to reach a resolution in a fraction of the time and at a lower cost.

Furthermore, ADR provides a more private and confidential forum for resolving disputes, which can be particularly important in the sports industry where reputation management is critical.

Unlike court proceedings, which are typically open to the public, ADR processes are conducted behind closed doors, protecting the privacy of the parties and the confidentiality of sensitive information (Kyprianides, 2014).

However, there are also potential disadvantages to ADR. ADR may not be appropriate where a party believes that it needs the full power of the court to obtain information or to compel compliance. Also, issues of bias for mediators could come into play (Kameńcka-Usova & Mihailovs, 2021).

ADR has become an integral part of sports law, providing parties with efficient, flexible, and cost-effective means of resolving disputes (Kameńcka-Usowa & Mihailovs, 2021). ADR helps solve issues quickly and cheaply (Kameńcka-Usowa & Mihailovs, 2021). By offering a more collaborative and less adversarial approach, ADR has the potential to foster stronger relationships, promote fair play, and enhance the overall integrity of the sports industry (Kameńcka-Usowa & Mihailovs, 2021) (Mangan, 2009). The procedural rules of the Court of Arbitration for Sport is one major success factor (Davanloo, 2017).

ADR offers numerous benefits including lower costs, faster resolutions, and preservation of relationships (Hoisín, 2001). ADR can be more effective if the parties are committed to finding a solution and are willing to compromise. (Kameńcka-Usowa & Mihailovs, 2021).

The use of ADR has risen in popularity due to the increasing backlog of court cases (Clift, 2006).

The rise of ADR in sports law reflects a broader recognition of the value of alternative dispute resolution methods in resolving complex legal issues across various industries and sectors (Miles, 1996). As the sports industry continues to evolve and face new challenges, ADR is poised to play an increasingly important role in shaping the future of sports law and ensuring fair and efficient resolution of disputes (Kameńcka-Usowa & Mihailovs, 2021).

Hybrid dispute resolution procedures, such as mediation-arbitration or arbitration-mediation, can offer further benefits by combining the strengths of both approaches (Ross & Conlon, 2000).

The future of ADR in sports law is likely to be shaped by several factors, including technological advancements, evolving legal standards, and increasing globalization of the sports industry. Online dispute resolution platforms and virtual hearing technologies are making ADR more accessible and convenient, particularly for international disputes involving parties located in different countries (Foster & Trautman, 2023). As the sports industry becomes more interconnected and complex, ADR will need to adapt and evolve to meet the changing needs of athletes, teams, organizations, and other stakeholders (Foster & Trautman, 2023).

In sum, ADR is effective in resolving disputes quickly, confidentially, and inexpensively, while preserving relationships between parties (Kameńcka-Usowa & Mihailovs, 2021). Thus, ADR serves as an important tool for addressing and resolving conflicts, promoting fairness, and maintaining integrity within the sports industry (Bárrios, 2020; Kameńcka-Usowa & Mihailovs, 2021).

Introducing a sports law framework into the organization and policy of sports is necessary for developing a system for resolving sports disputes (Kameńcka-Usowa & Mihailovs, 2021). The global sports industry is always changing, so alternative conflict resolution techniques in sports law are very important.

References

1. Agapiou, A. (2011). Scottish construction lawyers' awareness and experiences of alternative dispute resolution. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers - Management Procurement and Law*, 164(4), 181. <https://doi.org/10.1680/mpal.2011.164.4.181>
2. Bárrios, L. B. (2020). European Mediation and Indigenous Mediation. *Teisè*, 115, 134. <https://doi.org/10.15388/teise.2020.115.9>
3. Chong, H., & Zin, R. M. (2012). Selection of dispute resolution methods: factor analysis approach. *Engineering Construction & Architectural Management*, 19(4), 428. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09699981211237120>
4. Clift, N. R. (2006). Introduction to Alternative Dispute Resolution: A Comparison between Arbitration and Mediation. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1647627>
5. Davanloo, M. R. (2017). The Procedural Rules of the Court of Arbitration for Sport. *Journal of Politics and Law*, 10(4), 156. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jpl.v10n4p156>
6. Fisher, T. (2017). Law and Economics of Alternative Dispute Resolution. In Oxford University Press eBooks. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199684250.013.008>
7. Foster, L. D., & Trautman, L. J. (2023). Alternative Dispute Resolution In Brief. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4383603>

8. Galloway, P. D., & Nielsen, K. R. (2011). Engineer's Study Notes for Understanding the Arbitration Process. *Journal of Legal Affairs and Dispute Resolution in Engineering and Construction*, 3(2), 71. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(asce\)la.1943-4170.0000065](https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)la.1943-4170.0000065)
9. Goldstein, J. I. (1995). Alternatives to High-Cost Litigation. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 36(1), 28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001088049503600115>
10. Haddad, M. (2010). Drafting an effective ADR provision in international commercial contracts. *International Journal of Private Law*, 3(3), 271. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijpl.2010.033408>
11. Haertling, J. (2012). Regulating Dispute Resolution: ADR and Access to Justice at the Crossroads. *European Business Organization Law Review*, 13(4), 639. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1566752912000389>
12. Harris, L., Tuckman, A., & Snook, J. (2012). Supporting workplace dispute resolution in smaller businesses: policy perspectives and operational realities. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(3), 607. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.641081>
13. Hoisín, C. Ó. (2001). Ireland as a Venue for International Arbitration. *International Journal of Legal Information*, 29(2), 244. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0731126500009410>
14. Kameńcka-Usowa, M., & Mihailovs, I. J. (2021). Legal Aspects of Alternative Dispute Resolution in Sports Law.
15. Kyprianides, G. P. (2014). Alternative Dispute Resolution: What Are the Ways that a Civil Case Can Be Resolved Outside the Court System? *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2406132>
16. Mangan, M. T. (2009). The Court of Arbitration for Sport: Current Practice, Emerging Trends and Future Hurdles. *Arbitration International*, 25(4), 591. <https://doi.org/10.1093/arbitration/25.4.591>
17. Mazur, C. (2013). ADR: Faster, Cheaper, Better – and Not Just for EEO Complaints. *Public Administration Review*, 73(1), 61. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12007>
18. Miles, D. (1996). Adjudication, ADR and arbitration: the differences. 1996, 5. <https://doi.org/10.1049/ic:19961421>
19. Pavalon, E. I. (1987). ADR: Trial Lawyer's Perspective. *Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities*, 1(4), 211. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(asce\)0887-3828\(1987\)1:4\(211\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)0887-3828(1987)1:4(211))
20. Pound, D. (2015). Sports Arbitration: How it Works and Why it Works. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/SSRN_ID2620262_code2323400.pdf?abstractid=2620262&mirid=1
21. Raju, Prof. K. D. (2007). Alternate Dispute Resolution System: A Prudent Mechanism of Speedy Redress in India. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1080602>
22. Ross, W. H., & Conlon, D. E. (2000). Hybrid Forms of Third-Party Dispute Resolution: Theoretical Implications of Combining Mediation and Arbitration. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(2), 416. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2000.3312927>
23. Rule, C. (2020). Online Dispute Resolution and the Future of Justice. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 16(1), 277. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-101518-043049>
24. Sax, B. (1996). Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR). <https://doi.org/10.21236/ada311045>
25. Steen, R. H. (1994). Five Steps to Resolving Construction Disputes—Without Litigation. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 10(4), 19. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(asce\)9742-597x\(1994\)10:4\(19\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(asce)9742-597x(1994)10:4(19))
26. Tait, J. (2008). Briefing: Alternative dispute resolution techniques. *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers - Management Procurement and Law*, 161(3), 91. <https://doi.org/10.1680/mpal.2008.161.3.91>
27. Vicuña, F. O. (2004). An alternative dispute resolution system for international disputes. In Cambridge University Press eBooks (p. 98). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511735257.008>

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.