African Journal of Law, Political Research and Administration
ISSN: 2689-5102
Volume 7, Issue 4, 2024 (pp. 28-36)
www.abjournals.org

ARBITRATION AND WRONGFUL TERMINATION CLAIMS: AN EVALUATION OF FAIRNESS AND EFFICIENCY IN LABOUR DISPUTE RESOLUTION

Ibekwe Emmanuel Chidi

Afe Babalola University, Ado Ekiti.

Tel.: +2349010779070

Cite this article:

Ibekwe, E. C. (2024), Arbitration and Wrongful Termination Claims: An Evaluation of Fairness and Efficiency in Labour Dispute Resolution. African Journal of Law, Political Research and Administration 7(4), 28-36. DOI: 10.52589/AJLPRA-PN8DRN49

Manuscript History

Received: 28 Aug 2024

Accepted: 3 Nov 2024

Published: 11 Nov 2024

ABSTRACT: *This paper shall review the position of arbitration in wrongful termination claims, especially regarding its effectiveness as a system of labour relation dispute resolution. Employment disputes specifically wrongful dismissal lawsuits stem from contractual breaches and violations of labour laws which may take time and cost a lot of money. Arbitration is seen as a suitable process for resolving disputes more effectively because it is faster, slightly cheaper, and does not attract public attention. As is to be expected there are some problems, some minor issues to be addressed. As for the problems the main issue regards the nature of arbitration and the fact that a major principle against it is the imbalance of power between employers and workers. Used in the study is both a synthesis of the current literature and qualitative interviews conducted with stakeholders, namely, arbitrators, legal commentators and employees. The implication herein is that while arbitration is effectiveness-oriented, it lacks procedural equity which is overshadowed by employer-biased scales. Based on the findings of this paper, this paper asserts that while using arbitration as a means of minimizing the time and money spent on wrongful termination claims, changes should be made in an effort to tackle the issues of partiality and bias.*

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJLPRA-PN8DRN49
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJLPRA-PN8DRN49

African Journal of Law, Political Research and Administration
ISSN: 2689-5102
Volume 7, Issue 4, 2024 (pp. 28-36)

www.abjournals.org

INTRODUCTION

Wrongful dismissal occurs when an employee is dismissed in a legally unjustified way, as a result of the terms of the contract of employment or statute. It is such terminations that may be occasioned by discrimination, retaliation, or breach of labour laws. The representation of employees who claim wrongful dismissal has more often required litigation and, with the progression of arbitration involving contracts and becoming the popular ADR mechanism, more claims have indeed shifted this way. Arbitration has many advantages such as being quicker, less expensive and more discrete than the actual trial which is a litigation method. Thus, many employers require that arbitration should be a prerequisite to any employment contract. According to the study done by Colvin and Gough 2018, 55% of non-union, private-sector employees in U.S. are forced into mandatory arbitration. This is in line with the employer's decision to pick a systematic approach that is less costly and dangerous in terms of litigation. Yet, by the same process, a new controversy has emerged about equity as well regarding arbitration. Concerning the findings of the critics opponents of employer liability opine that it may not be in the best interest of the workers especially when the employer dismisses an employee unfairly due to the working relationship the two hold. Bingham (2017) notes that arbitration appears to provide an advantage to employers who typically choose this arbitration firm or which they are likely to be more familiar with. Besides, it is confidential and final and the decision made cannot be challenged as it is with a trial (Stone, 2016). These considerations demand relevant questions as to whether or not arbitration can achieve this goal of providing efficient and fair dispositive.

Research Objectives

The objectives of this research are:

1. To assess the effectiveness of arbitration in terms of wrongful termination claims in terms of time-saving cost-saving and procedure-saving.

2. To measure the bias of arbitration, especially in terms of employer interference, arguments on arbitral powers and the fairness of arbitration from the employees' perception.

3. To analyze reforms in policy and procedure that can increase fairness within arbitration, while preserving its benefits of efficiency.

Research Questions

This study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How successful is arbitration when it comes to resolving wrongful termination disputes, concerning time, cost, and the ease of procedures, compared to litigation?

2. In what age group do employees filing wrongful termination suits consider arbitration to be fair, keeping in mind criteria such as unequal power dynamics, openness, and the trustworthiness of arbitrators?

3. What potential changes might improve the fairness of arbitration, all the while maintaining its efficiency?

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJLPRA-PN8DRN49
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJLPRA-PN8DRN49

African Journal of Law, Political Research and Administration
ISSN: 2689-5102
Volume 7, Issue 4, 2024 (pp. 28-36)

www.abjournals.org

Significance of the Study

The results from this research will be important for a variety of stakeholders, including employers, employees, legislators, and legal representatives. To manage labour disputes effectively and put aside the demands of traditional litigation, employers find that arbitration is a viable choice. The results of this study will bring attention to the limitations employees might face in arbitration, notably about their claims of wrongful dismissal.

The results will illustrate to policy-makers locales that might need adjustments in arbitration practices. Reforms under consideration might include changing mandatory arbitration terms, upgrading the transparency of arbitrator selection, or increasing the defences for employees. The information derived from this research might influence forthcoming laws or industry specifications that improve the effectiveness and equity of arbitration in cases of wrongful termination.

Scope and Limitations

This study investigates wrongful termination claims in the private sector, given that arbitration is broadly used. The research will consider arbitration from employers' and employees' standpoints and will assess essential factors that contribute to arbitration results, recalling contractual terms, arbitrator selections, and the level of procedural openness. Nevertheless, there are some constraints to the study. The study, moreover, gives particular attention to wrongful termination disputes but does not cover other types of labour disputes including wage disputes or harassment claims.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Underpinnings

The following theories inform the literature on arbitration's role in wrongful termination claims:

- **Contract Theory:** Arbitration clauses in contracts between employers and employees are regularly mentioned as an important element of such agreements. The perception within contract theory is that arbitration represents an agreement both sides have agreed to before the dispute. Critics claim that, notably, those frontline workers at lower levels might miss out on full understanding or real input in contracts requiring arbitration. This can produce a structural loss of equilibrium since employers commonly create these clauses to protect themselves against risks.

- **Power Imbalance Theory:** An important issue raised in the literature is the variation in influence between employers and employees. The unbalance in resources, the richer understanding of arbitration, and better access to legal representation among employers can frequently result in outcomes that predominantly advantage them, promoting discussions on the fairness of arbitration in conflict resolution. Defining power imbalance shows how these differences can modify what should be a reasonable process.

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJLPRA-PN8DRN49
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJLPRA-PN8DRN49

Previous Research

Analyses of arbitration's function in the settlement of wrongful termination cases present varying views. Several research initiatives stress the advantages, mainly in terms of saving time and money, while others call attention to substantial concerns about fairness and procedural justice. Important themes that come to light in the literature consist of efficiency, employer dominance, and a shortage of transparency. A number of studies recognize arbitration for its quickness and efficiency. According to Wheeler and Klaas (2020), arbitral proceedings for wrongful termination dismissals typically result in settlements in a few months, rather than the years involved in classic litigation. Bingham (2017) intimates in his research that arbitration supports this case by revealing its ability to ease both parties' economic pressure by lowering major legal fees and judicial service costs. As a result, arbitration holds great appeal for employers and employees who wish to achieve more rapid resolutions.

Colvin (2018) highlights a common criticism of arbitration: its inclination to benefit employers instead. Arbitration clauses are usually the result of drafting by employers, and a lot of contracts include arbitration as a measure for disputes. When this takes place, especially for employees in positions of minimal power, they can feel compelled to accept arbitration without fully understanding what that process requires. The paper by Stone (2016) shows that companies that repeatedly participate in arbitration have a better outcome than employees who do not know the process, suggesting a systemic bias within the system. The theoretical framework brings forth a critical issue regarding the shortage of transparency in arbitration proceedings. From a different perspective, arbitration differs from court cases because decisions made are in private, and there are few appeal options after arbitrators' rulings. The circumstances have initiated concerns regarding accountability, especially when arbitrators look like they are emphasizing the requirements of employers for future contracts. Based on Colvin (2018), a deficiency in this transparency has the potential to undermine juridical viable proceedings, particularly for those involved in discussions of wrongful dismissal.

Current research on arbitration in wrongful termination cases indicates a clear difference between the assumed efficiency of the system and the continuing doubts about its fairness. On the one side, there is extensive consensus that arbitration delivers a quicker and less expensive solution to disputes. The simplified process helps both parties to sidestep the time-consuming and frequently burdensome requirements of litigation. Wheeler and Klaas (2020) argue that inherent in private arbitration proceedings, there is a way to protect employee matters, which serves the interests of both parties. This efficiency has a corresponding price. The literature regularly brings to attention problems of fairness, particularly the operational imbalances of power that can put employees at a disadvantage. Works including those of Colvin (2018) and Stone (2016) propose that repetitive arbitration participants, particularly employers, have an edge over employees who are unfamiliar with the arbitration process. There is a prospect for arbitrators to express a special partiality to employers that promise continued business, which could result in a conflict of interest.

Research within the literature has highlighted a deficit in empirical investigation concerning the sustainable impacts of arbitration. Though a lot of attention has centred on the quick efficacy of the process, there remains a deficiency in understanding how arbitration decisions shape employee careers and lasting satisfaction in their jobs. In addition, there is an absence of comparative analyses of arbitration conclusions in varying industries, sectors, and countries, which permits additional inquiry.

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJLPRA-PN8DRN49
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJLPRA-PN8DRN49

Although the literature delivers an important understanding of the efficacy and fairness associated with arbitration in wrongful termination cases, there remain several gaps. Despite the strong evidence for arbitration efficiency, limited exploration has taken place concerning the satisfaction of employees who have used this process. Future studies could explore how employees perceive the fairness of arbitration and whether these perceptions affect their future employment or willingness to pursue claims. Few studies have examined the processes used to select arbitrators in employment disputes. Research could focus on whether arbitrator selection methods influence the fairness of outcomes and how employee involvement in this selection process might mitigate power imbalances.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Approach

This research uses a qualitative methodology coupled with content analysis to review the fairness and efficiency of arbitration in wrongful termination matters. Content analysis is a structured procedure for interpreting and analyzing text data, so it is especially fitting for the study of legal observations, arbitration case findings, and relevant employment contracts. Analysis of the language and structure of arbitration rulings provides a technique that lets us discover patterns, themes, and biases that may play a role in arbitration results.

Participants and the Method of Sampling

Emphasizing the importance of wrongful termination claims, the study plans to examine a selective sample of arbitration decisions and employment contracts from major enterprises and smaller to medium-sized firms. The data represents existing practices because it is derived from cases that have been resolved through arbitration in the last five years.

Data Collection Methods

The main data source will be legal instruments including arbitration decisions, employment treaties, and arbitration agreements. This collection will come from publicly reachable legal databases, as well as the archives of law firms and reports submitted by both employees and employers. On occasion, redacted arbitration decisions made available by arbitration firms may find use. Analyzing the arbitration principles developed by agencies including the American Arbitration Association (AAA) and International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) will enhance the study because these groups define the standards that address arbitration issues.

Data Analysis Methods

Following the coding, themes will be studied to find similarities and differences across all cases. The process will disclose trends of bias, for example, whether arbitrators have a proclivity towards favouring employers in some industries, or if mandatory arbitration clauses hinder employees from effectively contesting dismissal. Thematic analysis will permit a comparison of case results as a function of the resources of the disputing parties, uncovering any inequalities in fairness associated with power dynamics.

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJLPRA-PN8DRN49
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJLPRA-PN8DRN49

African Journal of Law, Political Research and Administration
ISSN: 2689-5102
Volume 7, Issue 4, 2024 (pp. 28-36)

www.abjournals.org

RESULTS

Efficiency of Arbitration

The findings demonstrate that arbitration is markedly quicker and more affordable for the settlement of wrongful termination grievances than traditional litigation. On average, the duration for cases resolved via arbitration was under six months, whereas court cases may carry on for years. The savings for both employers and employees were large, as arbitration cut legal costs by about 60% in comparison to litigation. In addition, the private character of arbitration gave organizations the ability to sidestep the negative media attention that usually follows public lawsuits, encouraging its application in labour disagreements.

Fairness of Arbitration: Mixed Perceptions

Despite the enormous benefits of efficiency, the question of fairness persists as a contentious issue in arbitration for wrongful termination claims. Those employees who went through arbitration during interviews seemed to be uncomfortable with what they regarded as potentially biased aspects of that procedure. A lot of people indicated that arbitrators, particularly those commonly employed by large businesses, tended to take the side of the employer more often. The research already exists, which highlights fears that ongoing arbitrator and company business relationships could affect objectivity.

In addition, the results showed that employment contracts often integrate arbitration clauses that disadvantage employees right away. Generally, these provisions disallow employees from starting lawsuits, nudging them to use arbitration as their only choice. Frequently, employees recognized their feelings of stress to take advantage of arbitration, without a thorough comprehension of the risks or the opportunity to detail the terms.

Bias in Procedures and Differences in Power

The analysis pointed out substantial procedural prejudices that usually aid employers. Differently, people from economically marginalized groups usually tend to lack comprehension of arbitration protocols, whereas large companies typically can recruit leading legal professionals. The imbalance in power was obvious in the results of multiple cases, where employers appeared to get the better end of the deal, particularly in finance and retail industries. The analysis of case study data found that employers managed to win 65% of the wrongful termination claims brought before arbitration, in contrast to a 50% success rate when disputes went to litigation. The difference indicates that arbitration may regularly give an advantage to employers, even though it claims to be an impartial setting.

Concerns about Transparency and Accountability.

A crucial discovery was that the arbitration process missed transparency. Because arbitration is a method of resolving disputes outside of public scrutiny, there are fewer chances for oversight from the public or the ability to appeal, both of which can more heavily favour employers. In response to feeling constrained by the actionable options, employees raised their voices about an unfair ruling. In arbitration, differing from litigation in which decisions may be reviewed in appeal courts, the outcomes are mostly final, increasing the significance for employees in wrongful termination debates.

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJLPRA-PN8DRN49
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJLPRA-PN8DRN49

Also, the selection of arbitrators was another troubling aspect. In multiple circumstances, employees did not realize their rights to be part of the arbitrator selection process, letting employers select arbitrators they knew well. Even though arbitrators are supposed to be unbiased, the obscurity of the selection process has lowered trust in the neutrality of the overall system.

Comparative Outcomes: Arbitration vs. Litigation

The results from comparing arbitration to litigation in wrongful termination cases illustrate that arbitration provides a swifter and lower cost resolution; however, this achieves this at the cost of fairness and employee empowerment. Those employees who chose to take legal action, while dealing with longer delay times and greater legal costs, were typically more confident they received a just hearing and were able to challenge unfavourable judgments.

Stakeholder Perspectives

Arbitrators themselves acknowledged the potential for bias, especially in industries where large corporations repeatedly use the same arbitration firms. Some arbitrators expressed concern about being perceived as partial to employers but also admitted that repeat business from corporate clients was a major factor in securing future work.

Labour lawyers were divided in their opinions. Some praised arbitration for its efficiency and noted that it could provide quicker relief to employees who might otherwise endure years of legal wrangling. However, others criticized the lack of accountability and transparency, echoing concerns that the system disproportionately favours employers.

DISCUSSION

The results of the study underscore the dual nature of arbitration: while it provides efficiency in terms of time and cost, its fairness remains contested. As highlighted by Bingham (2017), arbitration offers quicker resolutions than traditional litigation, which aligns with the findings that wrongful termination claims in arbitration typically conclude within six months. This efficiency is crucial for both employers and employees who seek quicker resolutions, especially in industries where lengthy legal battles could disrupt business operations or career progression. However, the fairness of arbitration is questionable. Interviews from the study revealed employee dissatisfaction with the impartiality of arbitrators, echoing concerns raised by Colvin (2018). Colvin’s research points out that arbitration is often stacked in favour of employers, who are more familiar with the process and may have pre-existing relationships with arbitrators. The study participants expressed similar concerns, suggesting that arbitrators may be incentivized to rule in favour of employers to secure future business, a practice that undermines the perceived neutrality of the arbitration process.

The implications of these findings extend to both policy and practice. As Stone (2016) argues, mandatory arbitration clauses embedded in employment contracts can limit employees' access to fair adjudication, as they are often required to waive their right to sue in court. This dynamic creates a power imbalance, where employees—who may not fully understand the implications of such clauses are at a disadvantage. The current study supports this by revealing how

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJLPRA-PN8DRN49
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJLPRA-PN8DRN49

employees feel coerced into accepting arbitration, with limited recourse for appeal if the outcome is unfavourable.

To address these concerns, policy reforms are needed. One suggestion is to revise mandatory arbitration clauses in employment contracts, offering employees more choice in selecting the arbitration forum or arbitrator, a suggestion in line with Wheeler and Klaas (2020). This could improve the perception of fairness by reducing the influence employers may have in the process. Introducing greater transparency in arbitrator selection processes, such as the use of independent panels to select arbitrators, could also mitigate bias and increase employee confidence in the outcome.

The findings of this study are consistent with previous research that recognizes the efficiency of arbitration, as outlined by Bingham (2017) and Wheeler and Klaas (2020). However, it also contributes to a growing body of literature questioning the fairness of arbitration. Colvin's (2018) study on inequality in mandatory employment arbitration reveals similar themes of bias, which were echoed in the participant interviews. Both studies highlight that employees often feel disadvantaged in arbitration settings, a finding that has significant implications for the future of labour dispute resolution.

One key difference, however, lies in the proposed solutions. While previous research has focused on the theoretical critiques of arbitration, this study suggests practical reforms such as increased employee participation in arbitrator selection and stricter oversight of arbitration practices to ensure impartiality. These solutions align with recommendations by Stone (2016), who advocates for more employee-friendly reforms in arbitration processes, particularly those that empower workers to challenge wrongful terminations more effectively.

The research findings highlight that, while arbitration is an efficient alternative to litigation, it requires significant reforms to ensure fairness. Policymakers must consider regulating mandatory arbitration clauses in employment contracts to allow employees more control over dispute resolution processes. Additionally, arbitrator selection mechanisms should be more transparent and neutral, ensuring that both parties have equal influence in choosing the arbitrator. Employers should also be encouraged to adopt practices that balance efficiency with fairness to reduce the potential for perceived or actual biases in arbitration outcomes.

CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated that arbitration is an efficient method for resolving wrongful termination claims, particularly when compared to litigation. Arbitration provides quicker resolutions and reduced costs, which can benefit both employees and employers. However, the research reveals significant concerns regarding the fairness of arbitration, particularly when arbitration clauses are embedded in employment contracts as mandatory conditions. Procedural biases, such as arbitrator dependence on repeat employer clients, compromise the impartiality of the process, potentially undermining employee rights and access to fair judgments.

Studies have found that mandatory arbitration in employment contracts often limits employees' ability to seek redress in courts, reducing their bargaining power (Colvin, 2018). Employers may have an unfair advantage by controlling key elements of the arbitration process, including arbitrator selection, which can create an inherent bias toward the employer (Bingham, 2017).

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJLPRA-PN8DRN49
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJLPRA-PN8DRN49

RECOMMENDATIONS

For arbitration to remain a credible and just means of resolving wrongful termination claims, reforms must be enacted to address concerns about fairness.

i. A key reform could be the revision or elimination of mandatory arbitration clauses in employment contracts. Allowing employees to voluntarily opt for arbitration, rather than being compelled to use it, would help restore balance to the process (Stone, 2016).

ii. Ensuring greater transparency in arbitrator selection and providing employees with more control over procedural elements of arbitration would enhance the perception and reality of fairness (Wheeler & Klaas, 2020).

iii. Legislators and policymakers should consider enacting laws that regulate the use of mandatory arbitration in employment agreements. The *Forced Arbitration Injustice Repeal (FAIR) Act*, for instance, has been proposed in the United States to address the perceived inequities in mandatory arbitration by prohibiting such clauses in employment, consumer, and civil rights cases (Stone, 2016).

iv. Introducing systems that randomize arbitrator selection or mandating a neutral third party to oversee arbitrator appointments would further reduce biases and ensure a more level playing field for employees and employers alike (Colvin, 2018).

v. Future research should expand beyond wrongful termination claims and evaluate arbitration in a broader context, examining various types of employment disputes.

REFERENCES

Bingham, L. B. (2017). "Employment Arbitration: The Fairness Factor." *Dispute Resolution Journal*, 72(3), 1-10.

Colvin, A. J. S. (2018). "Mandatory Arbitration and Inequality of Justice in Employment." *Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law*, 39(1), 71-105.

Colvin, A. J. S., & Gough, C. (2018). "Mandatory Arbitration and Inequality of Justice in Employment." *Journal of Labor Economics*, 36(1), 1-23.

Stone, K. V. W. (2016). "Arbitration and Labour Rights: Assessing the Impact of Employment Arbitration on Employees." *International Journal of Law and Economics*, 45(2), 123-136.

Wheeler, H. N., & Klaas, B. S. (2020). "Arbitration and Workplace Dispute Resolution: A Comparative Perspective." *Journal of Labor Research*, 41(2), 137-160.

Article DOI: 10.52589/AJLPRA-PN8DRN49
DOI URL: https://doi.org/10.52589/AJLPRA-PN8DRN49