UNC SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT

PUBLIC MANAGEMENT BULLETIN NO. 29 | MAY 2025

# AI and Community Mediation: Views from Six Experts

John B. Stephens

## CONTENTS



The consideration of artificial intelligence in community mediation (CM) is unexplored terrain. CM programs assist local governments, the court system, and schools in North Carolina and across the United States. They provide conflict-resolution training and operate with a mix of paid staff and trained volunteers. The Mediation Network of North Carolina lists twelve member centers, each of which serves multiple counties or a single high-population county.[1] CM centers offer services for neighbor-neighbor, family, consumer-business, and landlord-tenant conflicts. Some centers assist with workplace disputes, conduct Restorative Justice Circles, and facilitate community dialogues.[2] With the rapid growth of AI platforms such as Claude, ChatGPT, Gemini, and Perplexity, an exploratory study about how CM leaders understand and assess AI is timely.

To begin assessing AI's potential uses, risks, and rewards, six CM leaders were contacted to form an expert panel and were assigned several videos and one article on AI in mediation. Surveys and a focus group yielded individual and group assessments of AI's risk, rewards, and appropriateness for CM.[3] As local government elected leaders and agency administrators

John B. Stephens is an associate professor of public administration and government at the School of Government.

1. "Meet Our Centers," Mediation Network of North Carolina, accessed April 22, 2025, https://mnnc.org/meet-our-centers/.

2. "Community Mediation Basics," National Association for Community Mediation, accessed April 22, 2025, https://www.nafcm.org/page/Frequently_Asked_.

3. The availability and capabilities of AI platforms are rapidly changing. This study's snapshot is valuable, but participants' views about CM and AI are likely to have changed since their interaction with AI

consider how AI is affecting their operations, it is useful to know how CM leaders are thinking about and using AI. Local government relationships with a variety of community-based nonprofits and civic organizations could benefit from this study of AI's pros and cons in the eyes of CM staff and volunteers.

## Background

Community mediation provides low-cost or free mediation services as an alternative to court proceedings and supports positive peacemaking in various community settings. Previous research has identified its successes, challenges, and potential,[4] and a subsequent assessment of work in the CM field focused on "the social change vision" and the needs of CM programs' communities.[5] Other studies include examining the relationship between board and stakeholder diversity and CM performance[6] and the extent of informal use of conflict-resolution skills in various settings by volunteer community mediators.[7] Unsurprisingly, there is no apparent connection between this research and AI in CM operations. Inclusive mediation, as referenced in the focus group data, is developed in a work by Harmon-Darrow et al.[8]

For this study's focus on a topic new to CM, the relevant materials are a 2019 review of U.S. and Canada CM by the National Association for Community Mediation, which lists nine "hallmarks" of CM. "The Nine Hallmarks bind CMC [community-mediation centers] and community mediators together in philosophy and practice. Each CMC is at a different stage of embedding and actualizing the Hallmarks into the culture, structure, and communication of their centers."[9] Several of the points made by study participants connect to four of the nine hallmarks:

> The use of trained community volunteers as providers of mediation services; the practice of mediation is open to all.
>
> Providing direct access to the public through self-referral and striving to reduce barriers to service including physical, linguistic, cultural, programmatic, and economic. . . .
>
> Providing an alternative to the judicial system at any stage of a conflict.

information in March 2024.

4. Timothy Hedeen, "The Evolution and Evaluation of Community Mediation: Limited Research Suggests Unlimited Progress," *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 22, no. 1 (2004): 101–34.

5. Lorig Charkoudian and Michal Bilick, "State of Knowledge: Community Mediation at a Crossroads," *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 32, no. 3 (2015): 233.

6. Beth Gazley, Won Kyung Chang, and Lisa Blomgren Bingham, "Board Diversity, Stakeholder Representation, and Collaborative Performance in Community Mediation Centers." *Public Administration Review* 70, no. 4 (2010): 610–20.

7. Jeanne Felicity Zimmer, "Daily Uses of Conflict-Resolution Skills: A Study of Experienced Volunteer Community Mediators" (PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 2019), https://hdl.handle.net/11299/211828.

8. Caroline Harmon-Darrow, Lorig Charkoudian, Tracee Ford, Michele Ennis, and Erricka Bridgeford, "Defining Inclusive Mediation: Theory, Practice, and Research." *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 37, no. 4 (2020): 305–24.

9. Felicia Washington, D. G. Mawn, and Julie Shedd, *State of Community Mediation 2019* (Carter School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University, 2019), 3, https://www.jamsadr.com/files/uploads/documents/jams-foundation/nafcm-state-of-community-mediation-report-2019.pdf.

> Initiating, facilitating and educating for collaborative community relationships to effect positive systemic change.[10]

Study participants had extensive experience in mediating, training volunteer mediators, and managing CMC programs. They were attuned to CMC roles in school and judicial systems and were committed to responsiveness to community conflict-resolution needs. Claims about AI supplementing or supplanting human communication and problem-solving may challenge how CMCs train and work with volunteer mediators.

## Study Design

The study assembled six experienced CM leaders to provide individual thoughts before and after exposure to a reading and videos about AI and to participate in a one-hour focus group. Prior experience with AI was not a criterion for selection. Given the recent awareness of publicly available AI tools, using an expert panel to explore initial thinking from a CM perspective offers a valuable contribution to the conflict-resolution field's consideration of AI promises and perils.

### Participants

Snowball sampling was employed, starting with the author's relationship with local CM leaders.[11] The outreach yielded a six-person pool: four participants from North Carolina and two participants from Maryland.

The participants averaged over twenty years of CM experience. Three were center directors, and two worked with Community Mediation Maryland, a statewide organization serving fifteen local CM programs. All participants had direct mediation experience and had played lead roles in training and mentoring. Five had program-management responsibilities. Participants are listed in the sidebar.

**Thank You**

Thanks to Laura Jeffords for assistance in recruiting community mediation colleagues to participate in the study. Thanks to all study participants:

- Raquel Dominguez (Elna B. Spaulding Conflict Resolution Center, Durham)
- Will Dudenhausen (Orange County Dispute Settlement Center, Carrboro)
- Tracee Ford (Community Mediation Maryland)
- Frances Henderson (Orange County Dispute Settlement Center, Carrboro)
- Laura Jeffords (The Mediation Center, Asheville)
- Cawanna King (Community Mediation Maryland)

10. National Association for Community Mediation, *Annual Report* (2023), 5, https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.nafcm.org/resource/resmgr/bod/nafcm_annual_report__2023_.pdf.

11. See Mark S. Handcock and Krista J. Gile, "Comment: On the Concept of Snowball Sampling," *Sociological Methodology* 41, no. 1 (2011): 367–71, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9531.2011.01243.x.

### Materials on AI and Mediation

The author selected one reading and four videos on the topic of AI's use in CM. The selection was intended to provide a variety of viewpoints, comprise materials that were easy for participants to access, and limit the participants' time commitment to about ninety minutes. Two items were publicly available: an article on Mediate.com and a portion of a July 2023 webinar of the Ontario Association for Family Mediation. The other three were a set of speculative videos, created by the UNC School of Government, showing different levels of AI involvement as an assistant or co-mediator (see appendix).

## Community Mediators' Views on AI

Participants' views of AI were assessed with two brief open-ended questionnaires, one administered before the participants studied the materials and one administered after.

This served three purposes. First, it was important to benchmark participants' experience with and understanding of AI in general. Second, these surveys collected their ideas, concerns, and hopes about AI in relation to CM. Third, they allowed the author to better prepare for leading the focus group. The surveys consisted of two items each and were open-ended. There were six responses to the first survey and five responses to the second survey.

### First Survey

Participants reported little knowledge or exposure to AI and raised concerns about AI versus human capabilities.

Most participants reported modest understanding and little or no direct experience with AI. Responses included "My knowledge is very slim" (Henderson) and "I do not know much about A.I. I have a general idea that it can manage large amounts of information" (Dominguez). One participant noted a general sense of fear about AI: "All I know is that everyone is up in arms about it. That there's a general fear that it's going to take us over" (Ford).

Another CM leader had some hopes for AI but compared it to the negative effects of social media. "There's tremendous potential for it to improve lives, but social media has that potential and frankly I believe that an algorithm learning that hate drives more views than love is a large part of how we got to such a divided place as a society" (Dudenhausen).

One participant was a notable exception to this limited exposure, having used Grammarly for proofreading and ChatGPT for drafting letters, generating names for workshops, and creating references for a continuing-legal-education training. This participant had also used AI in planning a Girl Scout backpacking trip (Jeffords). She had attended a few trainings about AI as part of her continuing legal education and had "read some articles about how AI can be biased and perpetuate inequality and bias." As a college instructor, the participant had "discussed AI use in assignments with my students, including how it can be helpful and where it might lead to plagiarism, as well as how the use of AI might help or hinder student learning" (Jeffords).

The other survey question was "What do you think about A.I. related to mediation training, practice, or program administration?" Responses overlapped concerning questions or concerns about the role of AI compared with human understanding and capability to discern cultural, language, and nonverbal nuances essential to effective assisted dispute resolution. Two

participants expressed cautious openness to AI. "I believe that AI could possibly be useful in helping humans with mediation, but I would not trust it to replace humans. Mediators have to reflect not only the things being said, but they have to ask about body language and facial expressions. Also language is constantly evolving and could mean different things to different people. I would be skeptical of AI's ability to keep up" (King). Similarly, "Mediation practice and training is based on the observation of human behavior, intuition, and the experience of the mediator. I am intrigued by the subject" (Dominguez). One participant cited the necessity of these skills in effective mediation to question the necessity of AI. "Our field is so human and related to personalities and quirks and rapport building—do we need it? I understand it is helping in therapy, so I am open to learning [if] it could help in mediation" (Henderson).

Disparities between the capabilities of AI and humans were not always seen as detrimental, however. One participant expressed a hope related to power and marginalization. "As a member of several marginalized groups, I'm accustomed to other entities being in charge. Maybe AI will be more compassionate than humans to humans" (Ford). Another reported initially feeling that "trying to replace the human part of mediation" made AI's use in CM ethically problematic. "Then, I mentioned it to my husband who is a 'computer guy' who works for IBM. He sees A.I. as a tool not as a replacement. Such as using ChatGPT to create scenarios and see what the different possible responses are. It's just a different feeling. Looking forward to learning more" (Dominguez). For one participant, the degree of safety and risk involved "depends on how [AI] is used. I don't think that AI is smart enough at this point to replace the humans, but there may be some ways that AI can support good thinking, generate ideas, or make tedious processes more efficient. I think there are likely safer uses of AI, like using Grammarly for proofing (though it's not perfect—it once tried to change 'small claims' to 'tiny claims' in a document!)" (Jeffords).

But even the participant who compared AI to social media also showed some cautious optimism by recalling how the pandemic challenged his assumptions about the role of human interaction. "I'm curious. I've often considered that the humanity of face-to-face conflict resolution is irreplaceable. And then the pandemic happened, and I mediated, facilitated, and trained via screens. It wasn't nearly as bad as I thought it would be." But while replacing in-person communication with telecommunication did not supplant that element of humanity, the participant thought that incorporating AI "seems like a big step in that direction" (Dudenhausen). Community mediators came to the study open to the possibility that AI could benefit CM but worried that necessary and fundamentally human parts of the CM process could be undermined or even compromised by a technology framed as an emulation of human ability.

## Second Survey

### *Reactions to the Materials*

After the reading and videos, participants were asked to identify a meaningful portion of the article or videos. Several cited the possibilities that AI presents for administrative tasks and for training or coaching. Referring to a video demonstrating a dialogue between a divorce mediator and ChatGPT, one participant appreciated "the way that AI has the potential to help create screening questions and help with other administrative and logistical issues related to running a mediation center, program, or business" (Ford). Another thought that the mediator's "demonstration of using AI as a 'mentor' was interesting and led me to think AI could be a training tool for new mediators" (Henderson). A third participant said that AI "could make great sense as a help for things like intake, training, coaching/mentoring, and administration" and

found the demonstration "particularly helpful in seeing the capabilities of AI to aid mediators in their roles. I hadn't considered AI as mentor to be honest. There's lots of capability there, even for very seasoned mediators" (Dudenhausen).

The participant who had the most experience with AI had several thoughts after the videos and reading. First, the participant distinguished CM from other settings where the mediator could (or should) bring information about the issues into the process. "The article talked about ChatGPT's ability to 'provide data-driven, objective information.' While data is a useful tool in many contexts, it seems like the authors are thinking in the context of evaluative mediation. In the CM framework we use, there is not room for the mediator to bring in data or 'objective information' which may be contrary to the participant's values, culture, and goals. I think it's likely that such 'objective information' generated by ChatGPT is based on dominant culture and could perpetuate bias in mediation" (Jeffords).

Second, the participant raised a concern about mediators' prior experiences and how AI could go beyond that experience. This supposed advantage of AI, the participant said, implies a failure to maintain an exclusive focus on the needs and stories of the disputants. "The article also mentioned that 'the mediator is essentially limited to his or her experience from similar disputes in previous mediations.' While, of course, mediators continue to learn as they practice, it is not the role of the mediator to draw their prior experiences into the conflict of the current participants, but instead to be present in the current session. Doing so helps the mediator avoid painting potentially inaccurate assumptions, stories, and stereotypes onto participants and keeps the focus on what participants are actually saying" (Jeffords).

Finally, the participant worried about AI's propensity to validate a mediator's approach or past actions rather than probing the mediator's judgment.

> It seems like the mediator was relying on the AI to validate herself, and also to generate suggestion-questions for participants. It is concerning that she is looking to AI to validate her approach, which I'd imagine is drawing from a soup of practices and schools of thought. Traditional mediation literature, which is largely based on the writings and research of white attorneys and academics, is based on dominant culture ideas that promote the mediator's role as smarter, more logical, and more educated than participants. I believe that the future of effective mediation lies in a movement towards a more inclusive approach where the mediator is an expert on the process of mediation, and not in what's best for participants. I understand that many people mediate this way, and it seems like AI is likely to perpetuate these practices. (Jeffords)

The AI reading and videos prompted interest in its uses for administrative and training parts of CM. Cautions included whether "objective information" put forward by an AI is appropriate in the CM context and whether the AI advice in one of the videos draws from mediation models that are not aligned with CM values and practices.

### *Looking Forward: AI and Community Mediation*

A question from the first survey was repeated: "What do you think about A.I. related to community mediation training, practice, or program administration?"

Most responses raised concerns about fairness and putting efficiency over other CM values. "Practice-wise," wrote the participant with experience using AI, "I am very concerned that the use of AI in mediation will only serve to perpetuate biased approaches which have a disparate impact on the poor, people of the global majority, people from marginalized cultures (such as Appalachian people), people with lower educational levels, and everyone who doesn't have the same background, goals, and values as the mediator" (Jeffords). Others continued to express concern that AI would be unable to support the beneficial elements of existing approaches. "I think that there is potential. However, there are subtleties and nuances related to mediation and the human mind that we often just trip upon the 'right or useful' words that support collaboration, so I don't know that we would have a formula or algorithm that we could use to capture that" (Ford). "I think AI is still very limited in practice . . . when it comes to emotions and empathy, along with the need for human interaction and empathy to help folks come to the table and work together" (Dudenhausen).

One participant saw value in using AI to handle large amounts of information. "I'm starting to see possibilities for A.I. as an assistant to a mediator to help with processing of data sets. I could've used AI this week in a divorce mediation that had complex dollar amount possibility computations" (Henderson). But the same participant wondered whether relying on AI could undercut the value of the proposed solutions arising from the mediation. "I do have some questions about if A.I. is used to generate options (you'd certainly have to have parties opt in) is the self-determination of the parties lessened? Would they have the same amount of buy-in if they chose between A.I. generated options versus options they worked to come up with?" (Henderson).

## Focus Group Findings

Themes that emerged from the focus group included AI's potential as a supplement for some activities in mediation, its usefulness as a support for administrative functions, and its inability to adequately work with emotions, body language, and culturally infused meanings as disputants do problem-solving. The greatest concerns about using AI were the reinforcement of power inequalities and the tension with CM's values of community-building and disputant self-determination.

Several comments referenced either the divorce mediator's use of AI as a coach or the article's point about AI providing objective information and other supports for reaching a resolution.

### *Potential Benefits*

Participants identified several uses that could fit well with CM practices. AI language models could help a mediator distill conversation into well-defined issues to address for a potential resolution of the conflict. Most participants thought AI could be a useful tool to generate options related to resolving disputes: One participant commented that AI would not freeze like a human mediator, and it could brainstorm very quickly. However, another participant argued that only the participants should generate ideas to resolve their dispute, reasoning that "hands on" work by disputants builds commitment to the outcome, something that having them react to an AI-generated list of options was unlikely to do.

Participants saw potential in AI's ability to convert speech, text, or numerical information into helpful visuals. An AI tool could, for example, help divorcing parents consider multiple alternatives for parenting schedules. One participant recalled a specific situation where AI might have come in handy: "I was mediating a fairly complicated divorce mediation, the kind that has a

lot of properties and values that need to go in one or the other columns and get divided up. And it occurred to me that when we were trying to, like, write on whiteboards and do post-it notes and calculators, and this kind of thing, it could have been useful to have some sort of AI assistant that would generate possibilities for how things could be divided up and sort of tag issues with each thing" (Henderson).

Participants agreed that AI could be a useful means of examining the CM process itself. As a training tool, an AI could, for example, mimic a human and enact common challenges to help trainees develop mediation skills. Or it "could vent" at trainees to help them practice their listening and summarizing skills (Ford). Some participants saw these exercises as useful primarily for volunteers new to mediation, while one saw AI possibly acting as a coach or mentor for experienced mediators (Ford). It could also educate disputants by comparing the outcomes of mediation with those of legal challenges: "I do see how it could be of great value to . . . the evaluative process where the parties are able to see what could possibly happen if they go to court. And that may encourage people to settle for something that may be more palatable for them at mediation" (King).

Two other potential benefits were mentioned, but may not have had the support of all participants. The first was its grant-writing ability. AI competence in this area could help reduce the gap between organizations that can afford human grant-writing expertise and those that cannot (CM centers are often in the latter category) (Ford). The other potential benefit was the ability to help CM centers reach all parts of the community. One participant noted that CM volunteers and staff skew female. AI could help mediators reach underrepresented community members, allowing CM programs to better meet their goal of reflecting and including the communities they serve (Ford).

From one video and the reading, participants questioned the purported value of efficiency for using AI in mediation. One expert said that while community mediation may entail up-front time for intake and ensuring voluntary participation, the disputants' working through all aspects of a conflict is more efficient compared with going to court, where some key parts of the relationship are not addressed (Ford).

Overall, the group viewed AI as a potential supplement to CM practice but not in any way a replacement for human mediation.

### *Weaknesses and Threats*

The focus group raised many shortcomings or threats of AI, some of which echoed the survey results. AI was seen as being at odds with "the inclusive model of mediation" used by many CM programs (King). Similarly, AI seems disconnected from CM's values of restoring relationships and effectively working with cultural differences around class, region, gender, and other basic components of the range of conflicts coming to CM. Since AI models are trained on "what is on the Internet," their responses might not compensate for structural bias and might risk perpetuating such bias (Dudenhausen). Participants noted that AI is not capable of grasping emotions or comprehending complex relationships among disputants. "I don't think the mediators can be replaced. . . . We [practice] transformative mediation and focus on emotions and it's . . . important [to draw on] the intuition and the experience of the mediator to conduct the mediation" (Dominguez). One participant saw potential for AI as "a translator" that could listen to an exchange and react faster than human mediators to offer a summary and reflection

on the values and feelings of the disputants (King). But there were doubts that AI could recognize power imbalances that human mediators would recognize and be alert to a history of abuse or to one disputant's dominance over another (Dudenhausen).

Two participants also noted that safeguards limiting AI's ability to discuss sensitive or violent topics—such as rape or suicide—could hamper how conflicts could be accurately recorded and addressed. One participant had to do a work-around for a conflict involving a disputant who self-identified a post-traumatic stress disorder relevant to the interaction (Ford).

When prompted to conclude their thoughts in a few words, experts offered the following responses:

- Terrified
- Optimistic
- Cautious
- Good and evil uses
- Dependence

For the participant who said *dependence*, the worry was that an AI tool could undercut human understanding and growth in high-quality mediation training and practice. In other words, "What skills do we surrender in the name of efficiency and convenience?" (Ford). Even if an AI tool were never used to fully or partially replace human interaction, it could still impede the human elements of CM by becoming a crutch for mediators.

## Discussion

A small exploratory study cannot address the range of CM leaders' and volunteers' understanding of AI or experiences with it. The six-person panel was drawn from two mid-Atlantic states, so geographic diversity was small. Seeking participants with CM and AI experience would yield different views about AI applicability and safeguards. Participants' exposure to AI was modest, and other reading or video assignments would likely sway their assessments. But these exploratory results suggest that CM values, as articulated by the National Association for Community Mediation,[12] appear to be in tension with how AI tools operate. The salience of those values might diminish in the wake of AI's incorporation into the CM process, with its increased focus on efficiency and on reducing the work of disputants in mediation. Participants' commitment as mediators to reaching the community's diverse populations raised concern about depersonalizing mediation with the incorporation of AI.

A related potential issue is the gaps that would likely arise between disputants in the understanding, acceptance, and expected use of AI in mediation. Like the dissemination of smartphones and the functionality expected by people in many parts of their lives, early "tech adopters" may expect AI inclusion in mediation. Other parties to the same dispute, not experienced in AI, could feel that they are at a disadvantage in the face of a disputant—or mediator—employing AI.

12. National Association for Community Mediation, *Annual Report*, 5.

The potential value of AI appears to lie away from in-person CM, through applications to CM training, coaching, and administrative tasks. However, CM leaders may need to reassess their view that AI is comparatively less competent in understanding and responding to the cultural and emotional components of CM practice if AI platforms capable of emulating emotional intelligence are developed, as some AI leaders claim has already been accomplished.[13]

## Conclusion

This study provides a snapshot of CM leaders' assessment of AI use in CM training, practice, and program operation. The main drawbacks they cited were its lack of emotional and cultural competence and its undercutting the disputants' commitment to the outcome of the mediation by mechanizing some parts of the interactive process. The advantages they saw in AI were helping with administrative tasks (e.g., scheduling or grant-writing); supporting CM training and coaching; assisting in identifying issues, tracking, and summarizing viewpoints; and brainstorming options for resolving disputes. The next phase of research calls for operationalizing AI application to address drawbacks and advantages in well-designed comparisons in CM practice, training, and operations.

13. See, for example, Mohit Chandra et al., "Longitudinal Study on Social and Emotional Use of AI Conversational Agent," arXiv Preprint no. 2504.14112 (arXiv, 2025); Minling Guo and Zhiming Liu, "Hysteria in Empathy: Understanding Virtual Companionship and Emotional Connection Between Humans and AI," *Theory & Psychology* 35, no. 2 (2025): 163–84; Kate Loveys et al., "Effects of Emotional Expressiveness of a Female Digital Human on Loneliness, Stress, Perceived Support, and Closeness Across Genders: Randomized Controlled Trial," *Journal of Medical Internet Research* 23, no. 11 (2021): e30624; Onome, "How AI Is Understanding Human Emotions," AutoGPT, July 11, 2024, https://autogpt.net/how-ai-is-understanding-human-emotions/#t-1746470479148.

# Appendix. AI Materials Assigned to Study Participants

## Study-Specific Materials

A series of speculative videos, designed by John Stephens and produced by the UNC-Chapel Hill School of Government, were created for this study to demonstrate possible roles of AI as a "co-mediator." The videos were produced in November 2023 and are on file with the School of Government.

**"Scenario 1: AI as Co-Mediator." 1 min., 47 sec.**

An AI model with a human voice is introduced as a co-mediator when the mediation begins.

**"Scenario 2: AI Makes Initial Contact with Disputants and Conducts the First Part of a Mediation." 2 min., 42 sec.**

An AI has made initial contact with disputants and conducted one-on-one sessions to hear each person's story and to summarize their concerns. The human mediator explains this process, reiterates the concerns that the AI has summarized, and tells the disputants that the AI and human mediator will work together for the rest of the mediation.

**"Scenario 3: AI as Lead Mediator—Conducts All Work Leading up to a Draft Agreement." 2 min., 2 sec.**

An AI has conducted all parts of the mediation, leading to a draft agreement. The human mediator explains that his role is to meet with each disputant in case either wishes to make changes to the agreement. But first, he needs to confirm that the representatives of the disputants are human rather than robots and requires a blood test.

## General Materials

Shamdani, Sara. "AI and the Future of Mediation." Hosted by Ontario Association for Family Mediation OAFM, YouTube. July 12, 2023. https://youtu.be/zBLS4eaxDbg?si=FTFuzMLdipopMo-v.

Participants were asked to view twenty minutes of this 56-minute webinar (Segment 24:40 to 44:30), in which the presenter demonstrates her use of ChatGPT as a sounding board for an actual divorce mediation.

Weisheit, Sonja, and Christoph Salger. "Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Mediation—ChatGPT as Mediator 4.0." *Mediate.com*. June 21, 2023. https://mediate.com/artificial-intelligence-ai-in-mediation-chatgpt-as-mediator-4-0/.

The article explores the potential of ChatGPT as a tool in mediation, analyzing its strengths and limitations. While ChatGPT can support mediators by offering data analysis, communication tools, and solution suggestions, it lacks emotional intelligence, empathy, and cultural sensitivity essential for conflict resolution. Ethical and legal concerns such as privacy, bias, and transparency also limit its ability to act independently. The authors conclude that ChatGPT should not replace human mediators but can enhance their work, creating a productive human-AI collaboration that improves mediation efficiency and outcomes. A real-world example underscores its practical value.

## Bibliography

Chandra, Mohit, Javier Hernandez, Gonzalo Ramos, Mahsa Ershadi, Ananya Bhattacharjee, Judith Amores, Ebele Okoli, Ann Paradiso, Shahed Warreth, and Jina Suh. "Longitudinal Study on Social and Emotional Use of AI Conversational Agent." arXiv Preprint no. 2504.14112 (arXiv, 2025).

Charkoudian, Lorig, and Michal Bilick. "State of Knowledge: Community Mediation at a Crossroads." *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 32, no. 3 (2015): 233–76.

Gazley, Beth, Won Kyung Chang, and Lisa Blomgren Bingham. "Board Diversity, Stakeholder Representation, and Collaborative Performance in Community Mediation Centers." *Public Administration Review* 70, no. 4 (2010): 610–20.

Guo, Minling, and Zhiming Liu. "Hysteria in Empathy: Understanding Virtual Companionship and Emotional Connection Between Humans and AI." *Theory & Psychology* 35, no. 2 (2025): 163–84.

Handcock Mark S., and Krista J. Gile. "Comment: On the Concept of Snowball Sampling." *Sociological Methodology* 41, no. 1 (2011): 367–71. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9531.2011.01243.x.

Harmon-Darrow, Caroline, Lorig Charkoudian, Tracee Ford, Michele Ennis, and Erricka Bridgeford. "Defining Inclusive Mediation: Theory, Practice, and Research." *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 37, no. 4 (2020): 305–24.

Hedeen, Timothy. "The Evolution and Evaluation of Community Mediation: Limited Research Suggests Unlimited Progress." *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 22, no. 1 (2004): 101–34.

Loveys, Kate, Mark Sagar, Xueyuan Zhang, Gregory Fricchione, and Elizabeth Broadbent. "Effects of Emotional Expressiveness of a Female Digital Human on Loneliness, Stress, Perceived Support, and Closeness Across Genders: Randomized Controlled Trial." *Journal of Medical Internet Research* 23, no. 11 (2021): e30624.

National Association for Community Mediation. *Annual Report*. 2023. https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.nafcm.org/resource/resmgr/bod/nafcm_annual_report__2023_.pdf.

Washington, Felicia, D. G. Mawn, Julie Shedd. *State of Community Mediation 2019*. Carter School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution, George Mason University (2019). https://www.jamsadr.com/files/uploads/documents/jams-foundation/nafcm-state-of-community-mediation-report-2019.pdf.

Zimmer, Jeanne Felicity. "Daily Uses of Conflict-Resolution Skills: A Study of Experienced Volunteer Community Mediators." PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 2019. https://hdl.handle.net/11299/211828.