

CONSTRUCTION DISPUTE RESOLUTION: ALTERNATIVE CONSTRUCTION DISPUTE RESOLUTION, MEDIATION, AND ARBITRATION



Taufik Hidayat¹
Universitas Pekalongan, Pekalongan, Indonesia
taufiknindya04@gmail.com

Sami'an²
Universitas Pekalongan, Pekalongan, Indonesia
dosen.samian@gmail.com

Abstract

Construction dispute resolution in Indonesia often faces challenges, such as lengthy processes and high litigation costs in court proceedings. Therefore, alternative dispute resolution methods, such as mediation and arbitration, have become appealing solutions. This study aims to analyze the effectiveness of resolving construction disputes through mediation and arbitration using a normative juridical method. The approach includes the analysis of legislation, legal doctrines, and relevant case studies. The results show that mediation offers advantages such as a fast process, low cost, and the preservation of good relationships between parties. However, mediation outcomes are non-binding, making their effectiveness dependent on the willingness of parties to adhere to agreements. On the other hand, arbitration provides final and binding decisions with executive power, making it more suitable for complex and high-value disputes. Nevertheless, arbitration's relatively high costs and ambiguities in arbitration clauses within contracts often hinder its implementation. This study also identifies the need for further education for construction actors regarding the benefits of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mechanisms, strengthening the role of institutions such as the Indonesian National Arbitration Board (BANI), and drafting clearer arbitration clauses in construction contracts. With regulatory enhancements and increased awareness, mediation and arbitration can become more effective and efficient alternatives for resolving construction disputes in Indonesia.

Keywords: Construction Disputes, Mediation, Arbitration, Alternative Dispute Resolution, Normative Juridical.

INTRODUCTION

The construction industry is one of the strategic sectors that plays an important role in infrastructure development and a country's economic growth (Agustina & Purnomo, 2023). The complexity of this sector is evident from the involvement of many parties, such as project owners, contractors, subcontractors, consultants, and material suppliers. In addition, construction projects often involve large investment values and long implementation periods. This condition creates the potential for disputes to arise at various stages of project implementation, from planning, construction, to completion. The causes of these disputes can vary, such as schedule discrepancies, delayed payments, design changes, and differing interpretations of the contract.

The resolution of construction disputes through litigation in court is often considered less effective. Lengthy litigation processes, rigid legal formalities, and high costs often worsen the situation, especially for parties who rely on the smooth progress of the project for the sustainability of their business (Ismanto & Hardjomuljadi, 2019). Moreover, litigation processes tend to be adversarial, which can damage cooperative relationships between the parties involved. In this context, an alternative approach is needed that is faster, more efficient, and capable of maintaining good relations between the parties.

According to Jannah & Musjtar (2019), Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) has become the primary choice in the construction industry. Mediation and arbitration are the two most frequently used ADR mechanisms. Mediation offers a collaborative approach with the assistance of a neutral mediator to reach a mutual agreement. Meanwhile, arbitration offers a more formal dispute resolution process compared to mediation, but still more flexible than litigation, with a binding decision. Both methods are known to be more time- and cost-efficient than traditional litigation.

Although ADR is becoming increasingly popular, its effectiveness in resolving construction disputes remains a subject of debate (Muskibah & Hidayah, 2021). Some parties argue that arbitration costs can approach those of litigation, especially in complex cases. On the other hand, mediation often faces challenges when one party is uncooperative or lacks full trust in the process. This shows that the success of ADR depends not only on the mechanism used but also on the attitude of the parties involved, the skills of the mediator or arbitrator, and the clarity of the contractual clauses.

In addition, in the Indonesian legal context, the implementation of ADR also faces structural and cultural challenges. According to Renyaan & Ingratubun (2022), many parties still have limited understanding of the role and benefits of ADR in dispute resolution, leading them to prefer litigation as the last resort. On the other hand, in practice, arbitration clauses are often not clearly formulated in contracts, resulting in disputes being brought back to court. This phenomenon reflects the importance of legal understanding and capacity building for the parties involved in dispute resolution.

In the global context, ADR has proven successful in reducing court workloads and expediting dispute resolution. In several developed countries, such as the United Kingdom and Singapore, ADR has become an integral part of the dispute resolution system in the construction sector. However, this success is supported by clear regulations, strong institutional support, and professionalism among the parties involved. This serves as an

important lesson for Indonesia to improve the quality of dispute resolution in the construction sector (Permatasari & Dewi, 2025).

Based on this background, this study aims to explore alternative mechanisms for resolving construction disputes, focusing on mediation and arbitration. Through this approach, it is expected that effective strategies can be identified to minimize the negative impact of construction disputes on project continuity and the cooperative relationships of the parties involved.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a normative juridical method aimed at examining the prevailing legal norms in resolving construction disputes through alternative mechanisms such as mediation and arbitration. According to Zainuddin & Karina (2023), the normative juridical method emphasizes the analysis of legislation, legal doctrines, and relevant principles within the legal framework. The approaches used include the statutory approach, the conceptual approach, and the case approach.

The statutory approach is carried out by reviewing various regulations governing the resolution of construction disputes, such as Law Number 2 of 2017 concerning Construction Services and Law Number 30 of 1999 concerning Arbitration and Alternative Dispute Resolution. This approach aims to understand the legal framework underlying the implementation of mediation and arbitration in Indonesia. The conceptual approach is used to explore the theories and basic principles of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), focusing on mediation and arbitration as methods considered more efficient and flexible compared to litigation in court. Furthermore, the case approach is conducted by analyzing several arbitration and mediation decisions that have been resolved in Indonesia. This analysis seeks to understand how legal norms are applied in practice and to evaluate the effectiveness of mediation and arbitration in resolving construction disputes.

The data used in this study are secondary data, including primary legal materials such as legislation and secondary legal materials such as literature, legal journals, and relevant academic documents. Data collection techniques were carried out through library research, examining various legal documents and relevant literature sources. The collected data were analyzed qualitatively using a descriptive-analytical approach. This analysis began with describing the content of the applicable legal norms, followed by evaluating their application in resolving construction disputes in Indonesia. The results of this study are expected to contribute to the development of more effective alternative dispute resolution mechanisms in the construction sector.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Based on an analysis of statutory regulations and case studies conducted, it was found that the resolution of construction disputes through mediation and arbitration mechanisms offers advantages over litigation. Mediation enables the parties to resolve disputes quickly at a relatively lower cost while maintaining good relationships between them. For example, in several major construction disputes in Indonesia, mediation has proven capable of producing

agreements beneficial to both parties without going through lengthy and costly court proceedings.

Arbitration, on the other hand, produces binding decisions with enforceable legal force equivalent to court judgments. This makes it the primary choice for complex construction disputes involving high-value contracts. An analysis of several arbitration decisions shows that the arbitration process in Indonesia tends to be relatively efficient, although the costs involved are generally higher than those for mediation.

However, in practice, the effectiveness of mediation and arbitration in Indonesia still faces several challenges. One of these is the limited understanding of the ADR process among parties, which causes many disputes to still be brought before the courts. Furthermore, the success of mediation is highly dependent on the cooperative attitude of the parties, while arbitration is often hindered by unclear arbitration clauses in construction contracts.

Dispute resolution through mediation and arbitration offers a more flexible solution than litigation, especially for construction projects involving multiple parties and interests. The following are key findings of this study:

Mediation as an Alternative for Construction Dispute Resolution

Mediation is a dispute resolution method that prioritizes a non-adversarial approach, where the parties involved work together to find a mutually beneficial solution (Nansi, 2022). This approach differs from litigation or court-based dispute resolution, which is often confrontational. In mediation, the main principle is to create a joint agreement based on the interests and needs of each party, rather than purely on legal claims. The process is usually facilitated by a mediator, who acts as a neutral party to help the parties communicate effectively, identify key issues, and find solutions acceptable to all.

One of the main advantages of mediation is its flexibility. Unlike litigation, which must follow strict legal rules and formal procedures, mediation allows the parties to determine the format, rules, and meeting schedules according to their needs (Nurafifah, 2022). The parties can directly express their views, needs, and interests without being constrained by formal protocols. This makes mediation more personal, relevant, and solution-oriented. In many cases, such flexibility reduces tension between disputing parties, enabling them to maintain their working relationships.

This flexibility and informal approach are particularly relevant in construction disputes, where projects often involve complex, long-term working relationships between contractors, subcontractors, consultants, and project owners. Unresolved disputes can disrupt project progress, increase costs, and damage established relationships. Mediation allows disputes to be resolved quickly and harmoniously, avoiding lengthy and costly litigation. Another advantage is the confidentiality of mediation, allowing parties to discuss openly without fear of reputational harm (Zuliana & Haryanto, 2024).

However, mediation also has fundamental limitations. One major drawback is that mediation outcomes are not legally binding. If one party chooses not to comply with the agreement reached, the dispute may resurface and need to be resolved through arbitration or litigation. This means that mediation's success largely depends on the goodwill and commitment of the parties to honor the agreement. If a party is uncooperative, mediation may be ineffective (Sugianto & Marpaung, 2022).

The mediator's competence is also a crucial factor. A skilled mediator must possess strong communication skills, deep understanding of the issues at stake, and the ability to

build trust between the parties. The mediator must also maintain neutrality throughout the process to avoid perceptions of bias. In some cases, a lack of qualified mediators can hinder effective mediation.

Given these characteristics, mediation is best suited for disputes with relatively low conflict intensity, involving parties still willing to reach a joint solution. For complex disputes or those involving severely strained relationships, mediation may require additional support such as legal counsel or technical experts to help parties understand the implications of potential decisions.

Despite its limitations, mediation remains highly effective in many situations, especially for saving time and costs and preserving relationships. In the construction industry, where delays can cause substantial losses, mediation offers an efficient solution without jeopardizing ongoing cooperation. With better mediator training and greater awareness among industry stakeholders of mediation's benefits, it has strong potential to become the preferred method for resolving construction disputes in the future.

Arbitration as an Alternative for Construction Dispute Resolution

Arbitration is a dispute resolution method that offers a more formal yet still flexible alternative to court litigation. In arbitration, disputes are resolved through decisions made by one or more arbitrators with expertise in a specific field, including construction (Fadillah & Putri, 2021). The primary advantage of arbitration is that its decisions are final and legally binding, with enforceable authority equivalent to court judgments. This legal certainty is particularly valuable in construction disputes, where timely resolution is necessary to ensure projects can continue without disruption.

The formal nature of arbitration ensures that disputes are resolved in a structured manner, with each party given the opportunity to present arguments and evidence before the arbitrator. Compared to the rigid nature of litigation, arbitration offers greater flexibility. The parties can determine various aspects of the process themselves, such as selecting arbitrators with specific expertise, setting hearing schedules, and choosing the venue for proceedings (Riza & Abduh, 2019). In construction disputes, this flexibility is highly relevant, as it allows the resolution process to align with technical needs and on-site realities.

Arbitration is also generally faster than litigation, which can take years to conclude. Depending on the complexity of the case, arbitration can be resolved in months to about a year (Ritonga et al., 2024). This is critical in construction, where delays in dispute resolution can escalate costs, halt projects, or even cause project termination. Arbitration enables disputes to be resolved more efficiently, ensuring project continuity.

However, despite its strengths, arbitration also faces challenges. One is cost—arbitration can be more expensive than mediation due to arbitrators' fees, particularly since they are often experts in civil engineering, project management, or contract law, as well as administrative fees charged by arbitration institutions.

The effectiveness of arbitration heavily depends on the competence of the arbitrator. A qualified arbitrator must have deep knowledge of construction technicalities, relevant law, and the ability to make fair, evidence-based decisions. If an arbitrator lacks the necessary qualifications or independence, arbitration can become ineffective and cause dissatisfaction. Thus, selecting the right arbitrator is critical.

Another common obstacle is the clarity of arbitration clauses in construction contracts. These clauses stipulate that disputes will be resolved through arbitration and set

the rules governing the process. In Indonesia, many arbitration clauses are ambiguously or incompletely drafted, sometimes leading to new disputes over their validity—ironically requiring court intervention before arbitration can proceed. This underscores the importance of clear, comprehensive contracts from the outset.

Institutions such as the Indonesian National Board of Arbitration (BANI) have facilitated arbitration in construction disputes. Nonetheless, improvements in institutional capacity and efficiency are still needed. Additionally, greater industry awareness of arbitration's benefits and the importance of clear arbitration clauses in contracts should be promoted.

Although arbitration has its challenges, its advantages make it a highly relevant alternative—particularly in construction disputes. With proper implementation, arbitration can resolve disputes quickly, provide legal certainty, and avoid lengthy, costly litigation (Mayangsari et al., 2020). This not only saves time and money but also supports constructive, ongoing cooperation between project stakeholders.

Case Studies on Alternative Dispute Resolution for Construction in Indonesia

Construction disputes frequently arise in development projects in Indonesia, whether due to technical errors, administrative shortcomings, or a lack of understanding among parties involved regarding the terms of the work contract. Mediation and arbitration have been recognized as effective alternative dispute resolution (ADR) methods for settling construction conflicts. These methods are not only faster than litigation but also help maintain harmonious working relationships between the disputing parties. The following study will examine two specific cases: the dispute in a market revitalization project in Gorontalo and a construction project in Pekanbaru, with emphasis on the role of mediation and arbitration as primary solutions.

1. Dispute in the Revitalization Project of Pontolo Public Market, North Gorontalo Regency

The Phase II revitalization project for Pontolo Public Market in North Gorontalo faced several disputes due to project implementation that did not align with the contract. Issues included the involvement of irresponsible individuals, substandard work quality, and document forgery impacting project fund disbursement. A lack of understanding by those responsible regarding contract provisions further worsened the situation.

According to a study by Latada et al. (2022), mediation was the first step taken to resolve the dispute in this case. A neutral mediator facilitated communication between the disputing parties to find a mutually acceptable solution. Through this method, constructive dialogue clarified each party's responsibilities and resulted in a peaceful agreement focused on the project's continuity. If mediation failed, arbitration became the next alternative. Arbitration provided a binding decision based on technical and legal facts, ensuring an independent evaluation of work quality and disputed documents could be conducted objectively.

2. Construction Service Dispute in Pekanbaru

A construction dispute in Pekanbaru also illustrates the challenges often encountered in development projects. According to a study by Priyambodo (2021), this dispute was generally triggered by delayed payments by the project owner, excessive interference in project management, and the commencement of work before contract documentation was finalized.

One solution adopted was mediation, which proved effective for resolving the conflict amicably. In the mediation process, a neutral third party assisted the parties in reaching a mutually beneficial agreement, such as rescheduling payments or revising the contract. Mediation also offered flexibility and helped preserve the working relationship between the contractor and project owner, ensuring future cooperation remained possible. If mediation failed, arbitration became the next option. Arbitration offered a more formal yet still expedited resolution process, with decisions based on the technical expertise of the arbitrators. In this case, arbitration provided legal certainty that helped resolve the dispute effectively without a lengthy court process.

Mediation and arbitration are effective dispute resolution methods, particularly in Indonesia's complex construction sector. In both the Gorontalo and Pekanbaru cases, these methods offered significant advantages over litigation, such as time and cost savings and the continuation of good working relationships. Mediation allowed for peaceful and flexible solutions, while arbitration offered legal certainty through the involvement of technical experts. Therefore, the combination of these two methods should be promoted more widely to address construction disputes, considering the sector's high complexity and the need for swift resolution.

Implementation of Alternative Dispute Resolution Regulations in Construction

In the Indonesian regulatory context, construction dispute resolution through alternative mechanisms such as mediation and arbitration is clearly stipulated in Law No. 30 of 1999 on Arbitration and Alternative Dispute Resolution. This law provides a strong legal basis for implementing ADR with the aim of creating a dispute resolution system that is faster, more efficient, and more flexible than litigation. Nevertheless, its application in practice still faces challenges requiring serious attention, particularly in terms of outreach and education for construction stakeholders. Many construction players—whether contractors, consultants, or project owners—do not fully understand the benefits of ADR or the procedures to access it.

One of the main obstacles to ADR implementation in Indonesia is the lack of technical knowledge about the mediation and arbitration processes among construction practitioners, especially in areas far from major cities (Handoko & Mulyana, 2023). This lack of information often leads parties in dispute to opt for litigation, which, while legally binding, is typically more time-consuming and costly. Therefore, enhancing education on the benefits of ADR is crucial to ensure that more stakeholders understand this method as an effective solution for resolving disputes in a time-efficient manner while preserving harmonious working relationships.

In addition to education, institutional support from bodies such as the Indonesian National Arbitration Board (BANI) also needs strengthening. As one of the main institutions handling construction disputes through arbitration, BANI plays a strategic role in ensuring the efficiency and transparency of the arbitration process. However, there remains a perception that arbitration procedures in Indonesia can be inefficient in terms of both time and cost (Harapan, 2024). To address this, BANI must continue innovating to provide more accessible services, including leveraging digital technology to simplify administrative processes and conduct arbitration hearings online. On the other hand, enhancing the capacity of arbitrators through regular training and certification is also essential to ensure high-quality arbitration decisions that are acceptable to all parties.

According to Muskibah (2018), globally, the experiences of developed countries can serve as important lessons for Indonesia. The United Kingdom and Singapore, for example, have successfully integrated ADR into their legal systems. In the UK, the Construction Industry Scheme and institutions like the Technology and Construction Court, which focus on construction disputes, support ADR as an integral part of conflict resolution. Meanwhile, Singapore has positioned institutions such as the Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC) as leading arbitration hubs globally, with high service standards and transparent procedures. The success of these countries underscores the importance of a strong legal framework, robust institutional support, and continuous education to build trust in ADR mechanisms.

To compete and adopt these best practices, Indonesia needs to undertake several strategic steps, including:

1. Strengthening Regulations

It is important to enhance existing regulations by drafting more detailed technical guidelines on mediation and arbitration procedures specifically for the construction sector. These guidelines could include dispute resolution time limits, cost arrangements, and mechanisms for enforcing arbitration awards.

2. ADR Training and Seminars

The government and construction associations such as Gapensi or the Indonesian Consultants Association (Inkindo) should actively organize training programs and seminars to introduce ADR to construction stakeholders. This would significantly improve understanding and awareness of ADR's importance.

3. Institutional Capacity Building

Strengthening institutions such as BANI through collaboration with international bodies like SIAC or the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) can help Indonesia raise its domestic arbitration standards. Additionally, leveraging digital technology—such as developing online platforms for case registration and conducting virtual arbitration hearings—will make ADR more accessible to parties in remote areas.

With stronger regulations, more capable institutions, and broader education, ADR in Indonesia holds great potential to become the primary solution for resolving construction disputes. If optimally implemented, ADR will not only improve dispute resolution efficiency but also support the success of construction projects, which are often key drivers of national economic development.

CONCLUSION

Construction dispute resolution in Indonesia through alternative mechanisms such as mediation and arbitration shows great potential as a faster, more flexible, and more efficient solution compared to litigation. Mediation offers a non-confrontational approach with relatively low costs and mutually agreed outcomes, making it suitable for disputes with a low level of conflict. Meanwhile, arbitration provides a final and binding decision, making it an appropriate choice for complex and high-value construction disputes. Nevertheless, the implementation of mediation and arbitration in Indonesia still faces various challenges, such as the parties' lack of understanding of alternative dispute resolution processes, the high cost of arbitration, and issues related to the clarity of arbitration clauses in construction contracts.

To enhance the effectiveness of these mechanisms, broader education is needed for construction stakeholders regarding the benefits of ADR, the drafting of clearer arbitration clauses, and the strengthening of institutions such as the Indonesian National Arbitration Board (BANI).

REFERENCES

- Agustina, A., & Purnomo, S. (2023). Kajian Hukum Penyelesaian Sengketa Kegagalan Bangunan Dalam Pekerjaan Konstruksi. *JURNAL RECTUM: Tinjauan Yuridis Penanganan Tindak Pidana*, 5(2), 32-43. <http://jurnal.darmaagung.ac.id/index.php/jurnalrectum/article/view/3153>
- Fadillah, F. A., & Putri, S. A. (2021). Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa Dan Arbitrase (Literature Review Etika). *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen Terapan*, 2(6), 744-756. <https://dinastirev.org/JIMT/article/view/486>
- Handoko, B., Prihadiati, R. L. A., & Mulyana, M. (2023). Kepastian Hukum Badan Arbitrase dan Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa Konstruksi Indonesia dalam Perjanjian Penanaman Modal Asing di Sektor Konstruksi. *HUMANIORUM*, 1(2), 63-72. <http://journal.elena.co.id/index.php/humaniorum/article/view/16>
- Harahap, S. H. A. R. D. (2024). Studi Kasus Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa (Penyelesaian Sengketa Ganti Rugi Akibat Wanprestasi). *Jurnal Cendikia ISNU SU*, 1(1), 1-10. <https://journal.isnusumut.org/index.php/jcisnu/article/view/20>
- Ismanto, H., & Hardjomuljadi, S. (2019). Analisis pengaruh dewan sengketa & arbitrase terhadap penyelesaian sengketa konstruksi berdasarkan FIDIC condition of contract 2017. *Konstruksia*, 10(1), 73-86. <https://jurnal.umj.ac.id/index.php/konstruksia/article/view/3874>
- Jannah, M. P. N., & Musjtar, D. N. (2019). Penyelesaian Sengketa Wanprestasi Akibat Keterlambatan Pelaksanaan Perjanjian Konstruksi Bangunan. *UIR Law Review*, 3(2), 41-49. <https://journal.uir.ac.id/index.php/uirlawreview/article/view/3489>
- Latada, H., Ashad, H., & Musa, R. (2022). Analisis Penyelesaian Sengketa Jasa Konstruksi pada Proyek Pembangunan Pasar Rakyat Pontolo Kabupaten Gorontalo. *Jurnal Flyover*, 2(1), 10-20. <http://www.pasca-umi.ac.id/index.php/flyover/article/view/867>
- Mayangsari, A., Prasetyo, A. A., & Bonauli, R. R. (2020). PEMBANGUNAN HUKUM ARBITRASE DI BIDANG KONSTRUKSI (Politik Hukum) SEBAGAI UPAYA PENYELESAIAN SENGKETA (Tinjauan atas Undang-Undang No. 30 Tahun 1999 Tentang Arbitrase dan Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa Dan Tinjauan Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2017 Tentang Jasa Konstruksi). *Fairness and Justice: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Hukum*, 18(1), 86-100. <http://jurnal.unmuhjember.ac.id/index.php/FAJ/article/view/6528>
- Muskibah, M. (2018). Arbitrase Sebagai Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa. *Jurnal Komunikasi Hukum*, 4(2), 139-149. <https://repository.unja.ac.id/17562/>

- Muskibah, M., & Hidayah, L. N. (2021). Penyelesaian Sengketa Konstruksi Melalui Arbitrase Berdasarkan Peraturan Perundang-Undangan. *Pandecta Research Law Journal*, 16(1), 14-26. <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/nju/pandecta/article/view/25671>
- Nansi, W. S. (2022). Mediasi Sebagai Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa Pertanahan Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Pemberdayaan Hukum*, 2(1), 48-55. <https://www.lppmfatimaparepare.org/index.php/JPH/article/view/86>
- Nurafifah, A., & Marpaung, D. S. H. (2022). Mediasi Sebagai Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa. *Jurnal Justitia: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum dan Humaniora*, 9(5), 2303-2317. <http://jurnal.um-tapsel.ac.id/index.php/Justitia/article/view/6565/0>
- Permatasari, P. M., & Dewi, C. I. D. L. (2025). Praktek Penyelesaian Sengketa Konstruksi Diluar Pengadilan Di Indonesia. *RIO LAW JOURNAL*, 6(1), 403-414. <http://ojs.umb-bungo.ac.id/index.php/RIO/article/view/1575>
- Priyambodo, M. A. (2021). Mekanisme Penyelesaian Sengketa Konstruksi Menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2017 Tentang Jasa Konstruksi. *Iblam Law Review*, 1(3), 173-177. <https://ejurnal.iblam.ac.id/IRL/index.php/ILR/article/view/32>
- Renyaan, W., & Ingratubun, J. A. (2022). Analisis Penyelesaian Sengketa Kontrak Kerja Konstruksi Proyek Pemerintah Melalui Non Litigasi. *Jurnal Hukum Ius Publicum*, 3(1), 82-96. <https://umelmandiri.ac.id/journal.umelmandiri.ac.id/ojs/index.php/jiu/article/view/47>
- Ritonga, H. N., Sembiring, R. B., Manurung, N., & Samzidane, M. H. (2024). Kewenangan Arbitrase Dalam Penyelesaian Sengketa Bisnis Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Cendikia ISNU SU*, 1(2), 97-105. <https://journal.isnusunumut.org/index.php/jcisnu/article/view/247>
- Riza, F., & Abduh, R. (2019). Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa Secara Arbitrase Melalui Pemanfaatan Teknologi Informasi. *De Lega Lata: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 4(1), 77-86. <https://jurnal.umsu.ac.id/index.php/delegalata/article/view/3171>
- Sari, I. (2019). Keunggulan Arbitrase Sebagai Forum Penyelesaian Sengketa Di Luar Pengadilan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum Dirgantara*, 9(2), 47-73. <https://journal.universitassuryadarma.ac.id/index.php/jihd/article/download/354/326>
- Sari, E. P. B., Kurmaliasari, A., & Maharani, R. S. (2024). Efektivitas Mediasi Dan Arbitrase Dalam Penyelesaian Sengketa Bisnis Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum dan Kebijakan Publik*, 6(3), 542-551. <https://journalpedia.com/1/index.php/jhkp/article/view/3032>
- Sugianto, F. A., & Marpaung, D. S. H. (2022). Efektivitas Peranan Mediasi Dalam Upaya Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa Kekayaan Intelektual. *Jurnal Meta-Yuridis*, 5(1), 51-59. <https://journal.upgris.ac.id/index.php/meta-yuridis/article/view/8756>
- Zainuddin, M., & Karina, A. D. (2023). Penggunaan Metode Yuridis Normatif Dalam Membuktikan Kebenaran Pada Penelitian Hukum. *Smart Law Journal*, 2(2), 114-123. <https://journal.unkaha.com/index.php/slj/article/view/26>
- Zuliana, A., & Haryanto, I. (2024). Analisa Perbandingan Antara Perundangan dan FIDIC Terkait Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa Konstruksi di Luar Pengadilan. *In National*

Conference on Law Studies (NCOLS), 6(1). 379-391.
<https://conference.upnvj.ac.id/index.php/ncols/article/view/2956>