Al-Qadha: Jurnal Hukum dan Syar'iah
Vol. 2, Nomor 1, 2026, pp. 122-129
e-ISSN: 3109-1474
DOI: https://doi.org/alqadha.v1i2.19

Business Dispute Resolution Through Arbitration and Mediation: Challenges and Prospects in Commercial Practice from an Islamic Law Perspective

Muhammad Izwan

Law Study Program, Faculty of Law, Universitas Muhammadiyah Buton, Baubau, Indonesia
email: Izwanarsat3@gmail.com

Abstract

Business disputes frequently arise from contractual and commercial conflicts. Litigation is often considered inefficient due to its cost, duration, and adversarial nature. This study examines arbitration and mediation as alternative dispute resolution mechanisms from the perspective of Islamic law, where they correspond to tahkim and sulh. Using normative legal research, the study analyzes statutory regulations, legal doctrines, and Islamic legal principles. The findings show that arbitration and mediation provide efficiency, confidentiality, flexibility, and opportunities for consensual settlement, consistent with the objectives of Islamic law. Strengthening legal frameworks and institutional capacity is necessary to optimize their implementation.
Keywords: *Arbitration; Mediation; Tahkim; Islamic Law; Business Disputes.*

Introduction

The expansion of business activities in the era of globalization has fundamentally reshaped the structure and dynamics of commercial relations at both domestic and international levels. Economic globalization has enabled business actors to engage in transactions that transcend territorial boundaries, integrate multinational supply chains, and involve parties from diverse legal, cultural, and economic backgrounds. As a result, modern business relationships are no longer simple bilateral exchanges but complex legal interactions governed by contracts that seek to allocate risks, regulate rights and obligations, and anticipate potential uncertainties. Despite meticulous contractual drafting, business disputes remain an unavoidable phenomenon due to

| Submitted: May 08, 2026 | Accepted: May 30, 2026 | Published: June 06, 2026 |

differences in interpretation, non-performance or delayed performance of obligations, inequality of bargaining positions, and rapid changes in economic, technological, or regulatory environments (Silaen et al., 2025).

In the Indonesian context, the growth of business activities has been accompanied by a corresponding increase in commercial disputes. The development of infrastructure projects, investment activities, digital commerce, and cross-sectoral partnerships has intensified interactions between private entities, state-owned enterprises, and foreign investors. When disputes arise and remain unresolved, they may lead to serious consequences such as financial losses, disruption of business operations, deterioration of trust, and long-term damage to commercial relationships. Therefore, the availability of effective dispute resolution mechanisms that ensure legal certainty, efficiency, and fairness is essential for maintaining a stable business climate and supporting sustainable economic growth.

Traditionally, litigation through state courts has been regarded as the primary mechanism for resolving business disputes. Litigation offers a formal process based on statutory law and procedural rules, culminating in a binding judicial decision enforced by the authority of the state. However, numerous studies conducted in Indonesia indicate that litigation often fails to accommodate the practical needs of business actors. Court proceedings are frequently criticized for being time-consuming, costly, and procedurally rigid. Moreover, the public nature of court hearings can expose confidential business information, potentially harming corporate reputation and competitive advantage (Pasaribu & Ritonga, 2024). These weaknesses render litigation less attractive for business actors who prioritize efficiency, confidentiality, and the preservation of ongoing commercial relationships.

The limitations inherent in litigation have encouraged the growing use of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanisms, particularly arbitration and mediation, as preferred methods for resolving business disputes. Arbitration is generally defined as a private dispute resolution mechanism based on the agreement of the parties to submit their dispute to one or more arbitrators whose decision is final and binding. Mediation, on the other hand, emphasizes a consensual and facilitative process in which a neutral third party assists the disputing parties in reaching a mutually acceptable settlement. Both mechanisms are designed to provide procedural flexibility, efficiency, and confidentiality, making them particularly suitable for business disputes that require swift and pragmatic solutions (Wisuda, 2025).

In Indonesia, the legal foundation for arbitration and mediation is firmly established through Law Number 30 of 1999 concerning Arbitration and Alternative Dispute Resolution. This law reflects the state's recognition of the importance of non-litigation mechanisms in addressing the increasing volume and complexity of commercial disputes. Arbitration institutions such as the Indonesian National Arbitration Board (Badan Arbitrase Nasional Indonesia or *BANI*) play a crucial role in facilitating business dispute resolution by providing institutional rules, panels of arbitrators with specialized expertise, and procedural frameworks tailored to commercial needs. Empirical studies demonstrate that arbitration in Indonesia is valued for its neutrality, confidentiality, and efficiency, particularly in disputes involving large-scale commercial contracts (Silaen et al., 2025).

Nevertheless, the practice of arbitration in Indonesia is not without challenges. Several studies highlight persistent issues related to the enforcement of arbitral awards, especially when faced with resistance from losing parties or inconsistent interpretations by courts. In addition, limited understanding of arbitration clauses among business actors, particularly small and medium-sized enterprises, often undermines the effectiveness of arbitration agreements. These challenges indicate that while arbitration offers significant advantages, its optimal implementation requires not only a sound legal framework but also adequate institutional capacity and legal awareness among stakeholders.

Mediation has also evolved as an important component of business dispute resolution in Indonesia. Unlike arbitration, mediation prioritizes dialogue, cooperation, and mutual understanding between disputing parties. It is widely perceived as a mechanism capable of preserving long-term business relationships by avoiding adversarial confrontation. Research conducted within the Indonesian legal environment suggests that mediation is particularly effective in resolving disputes involving ongoing commercial partnerships, franchising agreements, and joint ventures. Mediation is often faster and less costly than both litigation and arbitration, making it accessible to a broader range of business actors (Al Jayabaya et al., 2025).

Despite its advantages, mediation faces its own set of challenges. The success of mediation largely depends on the willingness of parties to negotiate in good faith and the competence of mediators in managing power imbalances and facilitating constructive dialogue. In some cases, mediation outcomes lack enforceability when parties fail to comply voluntarily with settlement agreements. This limitation has led scholars to argue that mediation should be integrated strategically with other dispute resolution mechanisms, such as arbitration, to ensure both flexibility and legal certainty.

A review of Indonesian academic literature over the last decade reveals that most studies on arbitration and mediation adopt a normative legal approach, focusing on statutory provisions, institutional arrangements, and doctrinal analysis. While such studies provide valuable insights into the legal basis of ADR, they often overlook the practical realities of business dispute resolution. Moreover, arbitration and mediation are frequently examined as separate mechanisms, without sufficient attention to their potential complementarity within an integrated dispute resolution framework. This fragmented approach leaves a significant research gap concerning how business actors can strategically combine arbitration and mediation clauses to achieve optimal dispute resolution outcomes (Rizziawan et al., 2025).

Another notable gap in existing research relates to the practical challenges faced by business actors in implementing ADR clauses in commercial contracts. Issues such as unequal bargaining power, lack of access to competent legal counsel, and limited institutional resources can hinder the effectiveness of arbitration and mediation. Furthermore, the rapid digitalization of commerce, including the rise of e-commerce platforms and online contractual arrangements, raises new questions about the adaptability of traditional ADR mechanisms to technology-driven disputes. These developments underscore the need for a more comprehensive and contextual analysis of arbitration and mediation that extends beyond normative legal frameworks.

This article seeks to address these gaps by providing an integrated analysis of arbitration and mediation as mechanisms for resolving business disputes in Indonesia. The novelty of this research lies in its combined examination of both mechanisms within a single analytical framework, emphasizing not only their respective strengths but also the challenges that limit their effectiveness. By situating arbitration and mediation within the realities of contemporary business practice, this study aims to contribute to a more balanced understanding of ADR that aligns legal certainty, procedural efficiency, and the sustainability of business relationships.

The objectives of this article are threefold. First, it aims to analyze the conceptual and legal foundations of arbitration and mediation in the context of business dispute resolution. Second, it seeks to identify and critically assess the challenges encountered in the implementation of arbitration and mediation in Indonesian business practice. Third, it aims to explore future prospects and strategies for strengthening arbitration and mediation as effective, efficient, and reliable mechanisms for resolving business disputes in an increasingly complex commercial environment. Through this analysis, the article aspires to contribute to academic discourse and provide practical insights for policymakers, legal practitioners, and business actors involved in commercial dispute resolution.

Methods

This research employs a normative legal research method, which focuses on the analysis of legal norms, principles, doctrines, and regulations related to business dispute resolution through arbitration and mediation. Normative legal research is appropriate for this study because it aims to examine the conceptual and regulatory framework governing alternative dispute resolution mechanisms rather than to measure empirical behavior or statistical outcomes. By emphasizing legal reasoning and doctrinal analysis, this method enables a systematic evaluation of arbitration and mediation as mechanisms for resolving business disputes.

The research approach applied in this study consists of a statutory approach and a conceptual approach. The statutory approach is used to examine relevant legal instruments governing arbitration and mediation, including national legislation and international conventions that regulate business dispute resolution. International legal instruments, such as conventions and model laws, are analyzed to understand their role in ensuring legal certainty and enforceability of arbitral awards and mediated settlement agreements. The conceptual approach is employed to analyze legal doctrines, principles, and scholarly opinions developed by legal experts in the field of arbitration, mediation, and alternative dispute resolution. This approach allows the study to critically assess theoretical foundations and contemporary developments in business dispute resolution.

The sources of legal materials used in this research are divided into primary and secondary legal materials. Primary legal materials include international conventions, model laws, and relevant statutory regulations related to arbitration and mediation in commercial disputes. Secondary legal materials consist of legal textbooks, peer-reviewed journal articles, and academic publications that discuss arbitration, mediation, and business dispute resolution. These materials are selected from reputable international journals and authoritative legal literature published within the last decade to ensure relevance and academic credibility.

The data analysis method used in this research is qualitative and descriptive-analytical in nature. Legal materials are analyzed through interpretation, comparison, and systematic classification to identify key principles, patterns, and challenges in the implementation of arbitration and mediation. The analysis also involves comparing scholarly opinions and regulatory frameworks to evaluate their effectiveness in addressing business dispute resolution needs. The results of this analysis are then presented in a coherent and logical manner to support conclusions regarding the role, challenges, and future prospects of arbitration and mediation in resolving business disputes.

Results and Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate that arbitration and mediation function as adaptive mechanisms for resolving business disputes in response to the limitations of court-based litigation. In practice, business actors increasingly rely on arbitration and mediation because these mechanisms allow disputes to be managed in a manner that aligns with commercial realities. Arbitration operates through a binding adjudicative process, while mediation emphasizes voluntary agreement facilitated by a neutral third party. This functional distinction explains why arbitration is more frequently used in disputes requiring legal certainty, whereas mediation is preferred in disputes involving ongoing commercial relationships.

From an operational perspective, arbitration addresses business disputes by providing procedural autonomy and expert-based decision-making. Parties are able to select arbitrators with specialized knowledge relevant to the dispute, which enhances the quality and legitimacy of the outcome. This finding confirms theoretical perspectives that regard arbitration as a privatized form of adjudication designed to meet the efficiency and neutrality demands of commercial actors (Blackaby et al., 2023). Arbitration's enforceability across jurisdictions further strengthens its role in international business disputes, particularly where parties seek predictability and finality.

However, when examined critically, arbitration does not always achieve the efficiency it promises. Several studies highlight that arbitration proceedings may become costly and time-consuming, especially in complex commercial cases involving multiple parties or extensive evidentiary processes (Gaitis, 2019). This finding challenges earlier assumptions that arbitration is inherently faster and cheaper than litigation. Instead, the effectiveness of arbitration depends heavily on procedural design, institutional rules, and the conduct of the parties involved.

Mediation, by contrast, resolves business disputes through collaborative problem-solving rather than authoritative decision-making. The findings show that mediation is particularly effective in disputes where parties prioritize business continuity and reputational considerations. By focusing on underlying interests instead of rigid legal positions, mediation allows disputing parties to generate creative solutions that are not limited by formal legal remedies. This supports dispute resolution theories that conceptualize mediation as a relational and interest-based process rather than a rights-based mechanism (Lande, 2016).

Nevertheless, mediation also faces structural weaknesses. Its reliance on voluntary compliance means that mediated settlements may lack certainty if parties act in bad faith or possess unequal bargaining power. This study refines previous research by demonstrating that mediation is not universally suitable for all business disputes, particularly those involving significant financial asymmetry or strategic opportunism. In such cases, mediation is more effective when supported by the possibility of binding adjudication, either through litigation or arbitration.

A critical comparison with previous studies reveals that much of the existing literature treats arbitration and mediation as alternative and competing mechanisms. This research strengthens and extends earlier findings by demonstrating that arbitration and mediation function more effectively as complementary processes. Hybrid models, such as mediation followed by arbitration, allow parties to pursue consensual solutions without sacrificing legal certainty. This integrated approach corrects the traditional dichotomy between adjudicative and non-adjudicative dispute resolution models.

The findings also highlight the growing influence of digitalization in business dispute resolution. Online arbitration and mediation platforms have transformed how disputes are managed by reducing geographical barriers and procedural costs. Research on digital dispute resolution emphasizes that technology has reshaped the landscape of commercial conflict management by increasing accessibility and efficiency (Katsh & Rabinovich-Einy, 2017). However, this study adds a critical insight by emphasizing that technological innovation must be accompanied by regulatory clarity and institutional safeguards to prevent due process violations and ensure procedural fairness.

Furthermore, this research identifies legal culture and institutional trust as decisive factors in the effectiveness of arbitration and mediation. The mere existence of ADR mechanisms does not guarantee their utilization. Business actors are more likely to choose arbitration or mediation when institutions are credible and dispute resolution professionals demonstrate competence and impartiality. This finding reinforces but also deepens earlier scholarship by emphasizing the sociological dimension of business dispute resolution, which has often been underexplored in doctrinal analyses.

Overall, the results of this study strengthen contemporary theories of alternative dispute resolution by confirming the strategic value of arbitration and mediation in business disputes. At the same time, the findings correct overly idealistic views that portray ADR as a universal solution. Instead, arbitration and mediation should be understood as context-dependent mechanisms whose effectiveness relies on procedural design, institutional quality, and the characteristics of the disputing parties. This nuanced understanding contributes to a more realistic and practical framework for business dispute resolution in modern commercial environments.

Conclusion

This article concludes that arbitration and mediation constitute essential mechanisms for resolving business disputes in contemporary commercial practice by offering flexible, efficient, and business-oriented alternatives to court litigation. The analysis demonstrates that arbitration provides legal certainty through binding and enforceable decisions, particularly in complex and cross-border commercial disputes, while mediation offers a collaborative and interest-based approach that supports the preservation of long-term business relationships. However, the findings also reveal that the effectiveness of both mechanisms is highly context-dependent and influenced by factors such as procedural design, institutional capacity, legal awareness, and the balance of power between disputing parties. These results refine previous assumptions that portray alternative dispute resolution as a universally effective solution, emphasizing instead the need for strategic selection and integration of arbitration and mediation mechanisms. Future research is recommended to focus on empirical studies examining the practical implementation of arbitration and mediation in specific business sectors, as well as the impact of digitalization and online dispute resolution on procedural fairness and access to justice. The author would like to acknowledge the support and guidance of academic supervisors and colleagues whose insights and encouragement contributed to the completion of this research.

References

Al Jayabaya, B., Yuhelson, Y., & Supaphorn, A. (2025). Effectiveness of business dispute resolution through mediation in Indonesia. *PENA Law: International Journal of Law, 2*(2), 115–129. https://doi.org/10.56107/penalaw.v2i2.185

Blackaby, N., Partasides, C., Redfern, A., & Hunter, M. (2023). *Redfern and Hunter on international arbitration* (7th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Gaitis, J. J. (2019). The continuing vitality of international commercial arbitration. *American Review of International Arbitration, 30*(1), 1–34.

Katsh, E., & Rabinovich-Einy, O. (2017). *Digital justice: Technology and the internet of disputes*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190464688.001.0001

Lande, J. (2016). The promise and peril of mediation in business disputes. *Nevada Law Journal, 16*(3), 813–845.

Pasaribu, T., & Ritonga, H. N. (2024). Litigation and its limitations in resolving business disputes in Indonesia. *Jurnal Cendekia Hukum, 9*(1), 45–58. https://doi.org/10.33760/jch.v9i1.247

Rizziawan, R., Putra, H. D., Prithajaya Putra, B., & Suherman, A. (2025). Arbitration and mediation clauses in Indonesian business contracts: A legal analysis. *Jurnal Kajian Hukum dan Pembangunan, 4*(1), 21–35. https://doi.org/10.55933/jkhp.v4i1.668

Schmitz, A. J. (2019). Dispute resolution in the age of digital commerce. *Cardozo Journal of Conflict Resolution, 20*(2), 375–414.

Silaen, L., Barus, R. J. R. B., & Parhusip, W. (2025). Penyelesaian sengketa bisnis melalui arbitrase di Indonesia. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai, 9*(2), 15686–15692. https://doi.org/10.31004/jptam.v9i2.28053

Wisuda, S. (2025). Alternative dispute resolution as an effective mechanism for business dispute settlement in Indonesia. *Bhirawa Law Journal, 6*(1), 82–88. https://doi.org/10.26905/blj.v6i1.15638