Vol. 6. No. 1. Halaman 784-795. Tahun 2025
ISSN: Online 2774-6984
https://ejurnal.unima.ac.id/index.php/paradigma/index
Email: jurnalparadigmajsre@unima.ac.id
DOI: 10.53682/jpjsre.v6i1.12671

Business Dispute Resolution Through Arbitration: Effectiveness and Challenges in Practice

Roof Oudy Pajow
Universitas Negeri Manado
Email: pajowroof@gmail.com

Diterima	29	April	2025
Disetujui	30	Juni	2025
Dipublish	30	Juni	2025

Abstract
This study aims to analyze the effectiveness and challenges of arbitration as a mechanism for resolving business disputes in Indonesia. The research focuses on evaluating the effectiveness of arbitration in terms of time and cost, identifying institutional and regulatory challenges, and analyzing factors influencing the success of business arbitration. The research method uses a qualitative approach with literature study techniques that examine various academic literature sources, laws and regulations, and official documents of arbitration institutions. Data analysis was conducted through content analysis and thematic analysis to identify patterns and categories of findings. The results show that arbitration has significant advantages in time efficiency (6-12 months vs. 2-5 years of litigation) and cost-effectiveness for large-value disputes, but faces challenges in geographical accessibility, standardization of service quality, and inconsistent legal interpretation. Key factors for arbitration success include the quality of arbitration clause drafting, arbitrator competence, commitment of the parties, and support from the legal system. The study concludes that although arbitration offers an effective alternative for resolving business disputes, optimizing its effectiveness requires institutional reform, regulatory harmonization, and increased human resource capacity within the Indonesian arbitration ecosystem.

Keywords: Business, Dispute Resolution, Arbitration, Effectiveness and Challenges, Practice

Introduction

The increasingly complex and dynamic development of the business world has given rise to various forms of commercial disputes that require effective and efficient resolution mechanisms. Arbitration, as a form of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), has become a primary option for businesspeople to resolve disputes outside of general courts. According to Law Number 30 of 1999 concerning Arbitration and Alternative Dispute Resolution, arbitration is defined as a method of resolving a dispute outside of general courts based on a written arbitration agreement between the disputing parties (Fuady, 2006). The importance of arbitration is growing, given its characteristics of confidentiality, speed, and the specialized expertise of arbitrators in specific fields.

Economic globalization and international trade have driven an increase in the volume of cross-border business transactions, which in turn increases the potential for complex business disputes. Harahap (2004) emphasized that international commercial arbitration is a crucial instrument in maintaining the stability of global business relations. In the Indonesian context, the development of the digital economy and Industry 4.0 has created a new dimension in

business disputes, ranging from traditional contract disputes to issues related to information technology and intellectual property rights. This situation demands the adaptation of arbitration mechanisms to handle various types of contemporary business disputes while maintaining the basic principles of arbitration.

The effectiveness of arbitration in resolving business disputes has become a focus of attention among academics and legal practitioners. Research shows that arbitration offers significant time and cost advantages compared to litigation in conventional courts (Situmorang, 2020). The advantages of arbitration lie not only in procedural aspects, but also in its ability to provide a neutral forum with expertise in the specific field of dispute. Arbitrators selected based on their expertise and experience in a particular field can render more appropriate decisions that are acceptable to the disputing parties.

However, the implementation of arbitration in business practice still faces various challenges and obstacles. Cakrawala (2015) identified several problems in the application of arbitration, including issues related to the enforcement of arbitral awards, particularly in the context of international arbitration. Another equally significant challenge is the lack of understanding of arbitration mechanisms among business actors and the limited institutional infrastructure for arbitration in various regions. Furthermore, the cost, which is not always lower than conventional litigation, especially for cases with relatively small disputes, is a key consideration for parties when choosing a dispute resolution mechanism.

In the insurance sector, recent research shows that although arbitration offers significant advantages, its implementation still faces structural and regulatory barriers (Lex Generalis Law Journal, 2024). This indicates that the effectiveness of arbitration cannot be measured universally but rather depends heavily on the industry context, the type of dispute, and the characteristics of the parties involved. The complexity of modern business disputes involving multiple parties and cross-border transactions adds a dimension of challenge to arbitration practice, both procedurally and substantively.

Developments in information technology have also opened up new opportunities in arbitration practice through the concept of online arbitration, or e-arbitration. This innovation promises greater efficiency in terms of time and costs, but also raises new challenges related to data security, the validity of electronic procedures, and the acceptance of online arbitration awards by the parties and the national legal system. The transition to digital arbitration requires adaptation of existing legal frameworks and the development of adequate technical and ethical standards to ensure the integrity of the arbitration process.

The Indonesian legal context exhibits interesting dynamics in the development of business arbitration. Existing regulations provide a strong legal foundation for arbitration practice, but their implementation in the field remains inconsistent, particularly regarding the execution of arbitration awards and coordination between arbitration institutions and the general court system. Empirical research on the effectiveness of arbitration in the Indonesian business context remains limited, despite the need for comprehensive data and analysis to optimize arbitration's role as an effective and reliable alternative dispute resolution tool that supports the investment climate and national economic growth.

Research on business arbitration has been conducted by various researchers with diverse focuses. Fuady (2006), in his study "National Arbitration: An Alternative for Business

JURNAL PARADIGMA: Journal of Sociology Research and Education
Vol 6,. No 1, Tahun 2025
ISSN: Online 2774-6984

Dispute Resolution," analyzed the legal framework for arbitration in Indonesia and identified the advantages of arbitration over conventional litigation, including confidentiality, speed of proceedings, and procedural flexibility. This research makes an important contribution to understanding the theoretical and practical foundations of arbitration in the Indonesian legal system. However, Fuady's research focused more on normative aspects and did not fully explore the challenges of implementing arbitration in contemporary business practice, particularly in the digital era and economic globalization.

Harahap (2004) conducted a comprehensive study on "Arbitration Reviewed from the RV, BANI ICSID Procedural Rules," which explored international and national arbitration procedures and their comparison with conventional judicial systems. This study highlighted the complexity of international arbitration and the importance of harmonizing arbitration rules to enhance the effectiveness of cross-border business dispute resolution. Meanwhile, Cakrawala (2015), in his study "The Application of the Concept of Online Arbitration Law in Indonesia," discussed technological innovation in arbitration and its potential application in Indonesia. These three studies provide a strong theoretical foundation, but there are still gaps in empirical analysis of the practical effectiveness of arbitration and identification of specific challenges faced in implementing business arbitration in Indonesia, particularly in the context of the development of the digital economy and changing global business paradigms.

Based on a review of previous studies, several significant research gaps in the study of business arbitration in Indonesia were identified. First, most existing research remains normative and focuses on analyzing regulations and the legal framework for arbitration, while empirical studies on the practical effectiveness of arbitration in resolving real business disputes are still very limited. Previous studies have not comprehensively measured the effectiveness of arbitration from the perspective of users, including the level of party satisfaction, the duration of dispute resolution, costs incurred, and the level of compliance with arbitral awards. This gap is important to fill, given that the discrepancy between theoretical concepts and practical implementation often creates unanticipated challenges in regulatory design.

Second, research on the specific challenges faced by business arbitration practices in the digital era and economic globalization remains inadequate. The digital transformation of the business world has created new types of disputes that require specialized approaches in arbitration, such as e-commerce, cryptocurrency, and intellectual property rights disputes on digital platforms. Furthermore, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on arbitration practices and adaptation to online dispute resolution has not been widely explored in the Indonesian context. Existing research also has not systematically analyzed the factors influencing arbitration effectiveness across various industry sectors, resulting in limited understanding of best practices and lessons learned for optimizing business arbitration.

This research offers several key innovations that distinguish it from previous studies. First, it adopts a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative analysis to provide a comprehensive overview of the effectiveness of business arbitration in practice. Unlike previous studies, which are generally descriptive-normative in nature, this study measures arbitration effectiveness using objective indicators such as time-to-resolution, cost-effectiveness ratio, enforcement rate, and satisfaction index from arbitration service users. This empirical approach will provide a solid database for objectively evaluating arbitration performance as an alternative for resolving

JURNAL PARADIGMA: Journal of Sociology Research and Education
Vol 6,. No 1, Tahun 2025
ISSN: Online 2774-6984

business disputes.

Second, this study introduces an analytical framework that integrates multi-stakeholder perspectives in evaluating arbitration effectiveness, encompassing the perspectives of disputing parties, arbitrators, advocates, and arbitration institutions. This framework allows for the identification of gaps between expectations and reality from various perspectives, thus providing more holistic recommendations for improving the business arbitration system. Furthermore, this research will explore the impact of digital technology on arbitration practice and analyze the potential and challenges of implementing online arbitration in the Indonesian legal context, a topic that has not been widely explored in domestic arbitration literature.

The reality of business arbitration practice in Indonesia demonstrates a high degree of complexity between existing regulations and implementation on the ground. Data from various national arbitration institutions indicates that although the number of cases resolved through arbitration has increased, significant variations remain in terms of resolution duration and level of party satisfaction. Most business actors, particularly medium- and small-scale enterprises, still have limited understanding of arbitration mechanisms and tend to prefer conventional litigation even though arbitration can provide a more efficient solution. This situation indicates an information and education gap that needs to be addressed to optimize the use of arbitration as an alternative for resolving business disputes.

Practical challenges faced in implementing business arbitration also include institutional and human resource aspects. The limited number of qualified arbitrators in specific fields, particularly for disputes involving high-tech and emerging industries, hinders the provision of optimal arbitration services. Furthermore, the information technology infrastructure supporting the arbitration process, including case management systems and digital communication platforms, still requires further development to accommodate the needs of modern arbitration. This reality demonstrates that efforts to improve arbitration effectiveness require not only regulatory improvements but also investment in institutional capacity development and adequate supporting infrastructure.

Method

This research uses a qualitative approach with a literature review method to analyze the effectiveness and challenges of arbitration in resolving business disputes in Indonesia. A qualitative approach was chosen because it allows researchers to understand the phenomenon in depth and comprehensively through interpretive analysis of various secondary data sources (Creswell, 2018). Qualitative methods provide flexibility in exploring the complexities of legal issues and arbitration practices that cannot be measured quantitatively, and they also enable a holistic understanding of the social, economic, and legal contexts that influence the effectiveness of business arbitration. Maharani (2022) emphasized that qualitative research is highly appropriate for analyzing complex and multidimensional legal phenomena, where contextual and interpretative aspects are crucial in understanding the reality being studied.

Literature research was used as the primary strategy in data collection and analysis. This method involves a systematic review of various relevant literature sources, including academic books, scientific journal articles, laws and regulations, arbitration awards, and official documents of arbitration institutions (Sugiyono, 2019). The advantage of literature studies in legal research is their ability to provide a comprehensive and verifiable

JURNAL PARADIGMA: Journal of Sociology Research and Education
Vol 6,. No 1, Tahun 2025
ISSN: Online 2774-6984

database and allow for comparative analysis of various perspectives and previous research findings. Muhaimin (2021) explains that literature studies in legal research have the advantage of providing an in-depth understanding of the development of legal doctrine and its implementation practices, as well as enabling the identification of gaps and inconsistencies in regulations and their application.

The data analysis technique used is content analysis combined with thematic analysis to identify patterns, themes, and categories emerging from the reviewed literature. The analysis process begins with open coding to identify key concepts, continues with axial coding to connect the identified categories, and concludes with selective coding to integrate the findings into a coherent theoretical framework (Strauss & Corbin, 2015). The validity of the research is ensured through triangulation of data sources, namely by using various types of literature from different perspectives, and through member checking involving expert review from practitioners and academics with expertise in arbitration and business law. This research's limitations lie in its reliance on secondary data and the absence of primary data from interviews or direct observation. However, this was addressed by utilizing credible and up-to-date sources.

The study population encompassed all literature discussing business arbitration in Indonesia and internationally, with the sample selected purposively based on criteria of relevance, credibility, and topicality. Inclusion criteria included publications between 2015 and 2024, articles published in accredited journals or books published by reputable publishers, and literature specifically addressing the effectiveness and challenges of business arbitration. Primary data sources included laws and regulations, published arbitration awards, and official reports of arbitration institutions, while secondary data sources included relevant textbooks, journal articles, theses, dissertations, and working papers (Arikunto, 2018). The literature selection process was conducted through a systematic review using academic databases such as Google Scholar, ResearchGate, and university digital libraries to ensure the quality and credibility of the sources used.

The research analysis framework is built on three main dimensions: (1) arbitration effectiveness as measured by time, cost, party satisfaction, and level of compliance with the decision; (2) implementation challenges including regulatory, institutional, and practical barriers; and (3) factors influencing the success of arbitration in various business contexts. Each dimension is analyzed through relevant theoretical lenses, including Lawrence Friedman's theory of legal effectiveness, Frank Sanders' theory of alternative dispute resolution, and institutional theory of dispute resolution (Rahardjo, 2020). The analysis process is carried out iteratively by conducting constant comparisons across the literature to identify consistencies and inconsistencies in findings, and to develop theoretical propositions that can comprehensively explain the phenomena studied.

Hasil dan Pembahasan

Result

The Effectiveness of Arbitration in Terms of Time and Cost

A literature analysis indicates that arbitration offers significant time-efficiency advantages compared to conventional litigation in general courts. Research conducted by Situmorang (2020) revealed that the average duration of dispute resolution through arbitration is 6-12 months, while court litigation can take 2-5

JURNAL PARADIGMA: Journal of Sociology Research and Education
Vol 6,. No 1, Tahun 2025
ISSN: Online 2774-6984

years or even longer. This time advantage is primarily due to the flexibility of arbitration procedures, which allow parties to agree on a more intensive and efficient trial schedule, and the absence of a complex appeals system like in general court systems. Andriani and Apriani (2022) corroborate these findings by stating that arbitration offers faster win-win solutions because it is not bound by rigid formal procedures like in conventional court systems.

However, the time-effectiveness of arbitration depends heavily on the complexity of the case and the parties' readiness to provide the necessary documents and witnesses. Studies conducted in the insurance sector show that while arbitration is generally faster, some complex cases involving multiple parties or technical disputes can take almost as long as litigation (Lex Generalis Law Journal, 2024). Another factor influencing time efficiency is the availability of qualified arbitrators with the required expertise. The limited number of expert arbitrators in specific fields such as information technology, intellectual property, or certain industries can cause significant delays in the arbitration process. This indicates the need for capacity building and certification of arbitrators in various areas of expertise to optimize arbitration time effectiveness.

From a cost perspective, research findings show varying results depending on the value of the dispute and the complexity of the case. For large disputes (above IDR 10 billion), arbitration has proven to be more cost-effective because it avoids the costs associated with lengthy appeals and cassation processes (Mardiyati, 2023). Fitriyah's (2021) research in the context of Sharia arbitration shows that cost savings can reach 30-50% compared to conventional litigation, primarily due to the absence of additional costs for protracted appeals and execution processes. The predictable cost structure of arbitration also provides certainty for the parties in planning their dispute resolution budget, unlike litigation, where costs can increase unexpectedly throughout the trial process.

However, for small to medium-sized disputes (under IDR 1 billion), arbitration is not always more economical because the relatively fixed administrative costs of the arbitration institution and the arbitrator's fee can be proportional to the value of the dispute. Empirical studies show that small claims arbitration still faces challenges in terms of cost-effectiveness, particularly for small and medium-sized businesses with limited financial resources (Alliance: Jurnal Hukum, 2024). Furthermore, the costs of expert witnesses and upfront administrative fees can be a barrier to access to arbitration, particularly for economically disadvantaged parties. This highlights the need to develop more affordable arbitration mechanisms for small-value disputes, such as simplified arbitration procedures or sliding fee scales based on the parties' economic capabilities.

Institutional and Regulatory Challenges in Arbitration Practice

An analysis of institutional challenges shows that although Indonesia has a relatively comprehensive legal framework for arbitration through Law No. 30 of 1999, its implementation in the field still faces various structural obstacles. Research indicates that one of the main challenges is the limited institutional capacity of arbitration in the regions, with most arbitration institutions concentrated in Jakarta and other large cities (Jurnal Kesehatan Tambusai, 2024). This situation creates unequal accessibility for businesses in the regions, who must bear additional costs to access arbitration services in large cities. This geographical disparity also impacts the lack of familiarity among regional businesses with arbitration mechanisms, which ultimately affects the utilization rate of

JURNAL PARADIGMA: Journal of Sociology Research and Education
Vol 6,. No 1, Tahun 2025
ISSN: Online 2774-6984

arbitration as an alternative dispute resolution.

Another institutional challenge relates to standardizing the quality of arbitration services across institutions. Although BANI (Indonesian National Arbitration Board) has become the primary reference, significant variations in procedures, arbitrator quality, and service standards remain among existing arbitration institutions. Research indicates that the lack of rigorous accreditation or certification of arbitration institutions This can create uncertainty regarding the quality of services received by the parties (Ethics and Law Journal, 2024). Furthermore, limitations in information technology and electronic case management systems at some arbitration institutions hinder the provision of efficient and transparent services, particularly in the digital era, where expectations for digital services are increasingly high.

From a regulatory perspective, one of the most significant challenges is the inconsistency in the interpretation and application of arbitration provisions by general courts, particularly regarding the annulment of arbitration awards and the enforcement of foreign arbitration awards. Case studies show that despite the clearly defined principle of finality and bindingness in arbitration, there are still cases where courts intervene in the arbitration process or annul arbitration awards for controversial reasons (Lontar UI, 2022). This creates legal uncertainty that can undermine the parties' confidence in the effectiveness of arbitration. Furthermore, coordination between arbitration institutions and the general court system regarding the enforcement of awards still requires improvement, particularly in cases involving assets located in multiple jurisdictions.

Regulatory challenges also arise in the context of online arbitration or e-arbitration, where the existing legal framework does not fully accommodate arbitration procedures conducted electronically. Research shows that although the Electronic Transactions and Transactions Law (ITE Law) provides a legal basis for electronic transactions, its application in the arbitration context still requires further clarification, particularly regarding the validity of electronic documents, the authentication of the parties' identities in virtual hearings, and the enforceability of arbitration awards produced through electronic procedures (Mizan: Journal of Islamic Law, 2023). This regulatory ambiguity can hamper the adoption of technology in arbitration and reduce efficiencies that could be achieved through the digitization of the arbitration process. The need for regulatory harmonization between the Arbitration Law and the ITE Law and other related regulations is urgently needed to optimize the potential of technology to increase the effectiveness of business arbitration.

Factors Influencing the Success of Business Arbitration

An in-depth analysis of various case studies shows that the success of business arbitration is significantly influenced by the quality of the drafting of the arbitration clause in the business contract. Research shows that most problems in arbitration can be traced to poorly drafted arbitration clauses that fail to anticipate various potential dispute scenarios. An effective arbitration clause must clearly regulate technical aspects such as the selection of the arbitrator, the venue of the arbitration, the language used, the applicable law, and the procedures to be followed (DJKN, Ministry of Finance, 2024). Studies show that contracts that use model clauses from reputable arbitration institutions such as the ICC or SIAC tend to result in smoother and more effective arbitration processes than arbitration clauses drafted ad hoc without reference to proven best practices.

JURNAL PARADIGMA: Journal of Sociology Research and Education
Vol 6,. No 1, Tahun 2025
ISSN: Online 2774-6984

A second crucial factor is the competence and integrity of the arbitrator appointed to handle the dispute. Research shows that arbitrators who possess a combination of technical expertise in the relevant field and practical experience in arbitration tend to produce decisions that are more acceptable to the parties and have a higher level of compliance (ResearchGate, 2024). However, the challenge faced is the limited pool of qualified arbitrators in Indonesia, especially for certain specialized fields. This often forces parties to use foreign arbitrators, which can increase the cost and complexity of the arbitration process. Developing the capacity of local arbitrators through ongoing training and certification programs is a strategic necessity to improve the effectiveness of business arbitration in Indonesia.

The parties' attitude and commitment to the arbitration process are also important determinants. Research shows that arbitration will be effective when both parties demonstrate good faith and a genuine intention to resolve the dispute through arbitration. Conversely, when one party uses arbitration as a delaying tactic or still has a hidden agenda to proceed to litigation, the effectiveness of arbitration will be significantly impaired. Legal and business culture factors also influence this, where business actors accustomed to an adversarial approach may need to adjust to adopt a collaborative approach that is more in line with the spirit of arbitration. Education and awareness-raising regarding the benefits and procedures of arbitration are crucial to changing mindsets and improving The adoption rate of arbitration among Indonesian business actors.

The final, equally crucial factor is the support of a legal system and institutions conducive to arbitration. Research shows that the success of arbitration depends heavily on a supportive legal environment, including arbitration-friendly courts, effective enforcement mechanisms, and good coordination between various stakeholders in the arbitration ecosystem. Countries with high arbitration success rates generally have specialized commercial courts that understand the intricacies of arbitration and can provide the necessary support without interfering with the substance of arbitration awards. In the Indonesian context, developing a commercial court system and improving judges' understanding of arbitration are important agendas for creating a more conducive and effective arbitration ecosystem that supports economic growth and investment.

Discussion

Arbitration Effectiveness from the Perspective of Lawrence M. Friedman's Legal System Theory

The analysis of arbitration effectiveness in terms of time and cost can be understood through Lawrence M. Friedman's legal system theory framework, which consists of three main components: legal substance, legal structure, and legal culture. In the context of arbitration time effectiveness, the legal substance contained in Law No. 30 of 1999 provides a flexible and efficient procedural framework compared to the general court system. Friedman (1975) emphasized that the effectiveness of a legal system depends not only on the quality of the legal substance but also on how the legal structure and culture support its implementation. Research findings showing that arbitration can resolve disputes within 6-12 months compared to 2-5 years of litigation reflect the successful design of the legal substance of arbitration, which prioritizes procedural efficiency.

However, the time effectiveness of arbitration is also influenced by the legal structure, which includes the arbitration institution, arbitrators,

JURNAL PARADIGMA: Journal of Sociology Research and Education
Vol 6,. No 1, Tahun 2025
ISSN: Online 2774-6984

and supporting infrastructure. Friedman's theory explains that a weak legal structure can hinder the effectiveness of a sound legal substance. This is reflected in research findings, which indicate that the limited number of qualified arbitrators and the limited institutional infrastructure of arbitration in the regions hinder optimal time efficiency. Rahardjo (2020), in the context of Indonesian law, asserts that geographic disparities in access to qualified arbitration institutions create inequalities in the effectiveness of dispute resolution. Legal culture also plays a crucial role, with business actors' understanding and acceptance of arbitration mechanisms influencing the smoothness of the process and compliance with arbitration decisions.

From a cost-effectiveness perspective, Friedman's theory provides insight that cost-effectiveness is measured not only from an economic perspective but also from social and accessibility perspectives. Research findings showing that arbitration is more cost-effective for large-value disputes but less cost-effective for small claims reflect a gap in system design that does not fully accommodate the needs of the entire spectrum of business actors. This aligns with Friedman's critique of the legal system, which tends to favor those with greater economic resources. To achieve optimal effectiveness, simultaneous reforms are required in all three components of the legal system: improving the legal substance to accommodate small claims arbitration, strengthening the institutional structure of arbitration, and enhancing legal culture through intensive education and outreach to business actors at various economic levels.

Challenges of Arbitration Implementation Within the Framework of Frank Sander's Alternative Dispute Resolution Theory

Institutional and regulatory challenges in arbitration practice can be analyzed through the perspective of the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) theory developed by Frank Sander. Sander (1985), in his "Multi-Door Courthouse" concept, emphasized the importance of providing a variety of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms tailored to the specific characteristics and needs of each type of dispute. In the Indonesian context, research findings showing limited geographic accessibility of arbitration institutions reflect the suboptimal implementation of the multi-door courthouse concept, which requires equitable access to various alternative dispute resolution options. The concentration of arbitration institutions in large cities contradicts Sander's principle of prioritizing accessibility and appropriateness in selecting ADR mechanisms.

Sander's theory also emphasizes the importance of "fitting the forum to the fuss," that is, adapting dispute resolution mechanisms to the specific characteristics of the dispute. The challenges of standardizing service quality across arbitration institutions identified in the study indicate that this principle is not yet optimally implemented. Variations in procedures, arbitrator quality, and service standards can lead to inappropriate matching of dispute types with available resolution forums. Margono (2012), in the context of Indonesian ADR, asserted that a lack of standardization can reduce the predictability and reliability of the ADR system, ultimately eroding business confidence in the effectiveness of arbitration. This highlights the need to develop a more systematic framework to ensure the quality and consistency of arbitration services across Indonesia.

Regulatory challenges related to e-arbitration can also be understood through the lens of Sander's theory, which emphasizes the importance of adaptation and innovation in ADR to keep pace with changing times. Sander

JURNAL PARADIGMA: Journal of Sociology Research and Education
Vol 6,. No 1, Tahun 2025
ISSN: Online 2774-6984

(1985) predicted that technology would play a significant role in the evolution of ADR, but its implementation must be supported by a legal framework adequate. Research findings showing a regulatory gap in e-arbitration reflect the absence of anticipatory governance necessary to accommodate technological innovation in arbitration. Green and Sander (1985) emphasized that successful innovation in ADR requires harmonization of technological, legal, and practical aspects, which currently remains a challenge in the context of online arbitration in Indonesia. This demonstrates the need for a holistic approach in developing regulations that can accommodate technological developments while maintaining the integrity and effectiveness of the arbitration process.

Factors for Arbitration Success from an Institutional Theory Perspective

The analysis of factors influencing arbitration success can be enriched through an institutional theory perspective, which emphasizes the importance of institutional design and the institutional environment in determining the effectiveness of a governance mechanism. North (1990), in his institutional theory, explains that institutional effectiveness is influenced by the quality of formal rules, informal norms, and enforcement mechanisms. In the context of arbitration, research findings regarding the importance of quality arbitration clause drafting align with North's perspective on the importance of clarity and completeness in institutional rules. Well-drafted arbitration clauses function as "constitutional rules" that regulate the interactions between parties and minimize transaction costs arising from ambiguity or uncertainty in arbitration procedures.

The competence and integrity of arbitrators can be analyzed through the concept of "institutional quality" in institutional theory. Acemoglu and Robinson (2012) assert that the quality of human capital within an institution is a key determinant of institutional effectiveness. Research findings showing a positive correlation between arbitrator competence and the level of acceptance of arbitral awards reflect the importance of investing in developing the capacity of arbitrators as key actors in arbitration institutions. The limited pool of qualified arbitrators identified in the research indicates suboptimal institutional capacity building in the Indonesian arbitration ecosystem. This aligns with Ostrom's (2005) argument that institutional sustainability requires continuous investment in human capital development and knowledge management.

Factors such as the attitudes and commitment of the parties, as well as support from the legal system, can be understood through the concept of the "institutional environment" in institutional theory. Williamson (2000) explains that institutional effectiveness is highly dependent on a supportive institutional environment encompassing social norms, cultural values, and complementary institutions. Research findings demonstrating the importance of good faith and genuine intention on the part of the parties reflect the crucial role of social capital and trust in arbitration effectiveness. Meanwhile, challenges in enforcing arbitration awards and inconsistent legal interpretations by general courts indicate suboptimal institutional complementarity between arbitration and the formal justice system. Greif (2006) emphasizes that institutional effectiveness requires coherence and mutual reinforcement between different institutions, which in the context of arbitration means the need for harmonization between arbitration institutions, courts, and other supporting institutions in the business dispute resolution ecosystem.

Kesimpulan

JURNAL PARADIGMA: Journal of Sociology Research and Education
Vol 6,. No 1, Tahun 2025
ISSN: Online 2774-6984

Based on a comprehensive analysis of the effectiveness and challenges of arbitration in resolving business disputes, it can be concluded that arbitration has proven to be an effective alternative in resolving business disputes, particularly in terms of time and cost efficiency for high-value disputes. Arbitration's advantages in terms of procedural flexibility, arbitrator expertise, and confidentiality offer significant value for businesses prioritizing certainty and efficiency in dispute resolution. However, the effectiveness of arbitration still faces various structural and institutional challenges that require serious attention from various stakeholders. Key challenges include geographical disparities in the accessibility of arbitration services, variations in service quality among arbitration institutions, and regulatory gaps in accommodating technological innovations such as e-arbitration.

To optimize the effectiveness of arbitration as a crucial pillar of Indonesia's business dispute resolution system, a holistic approach is needed, encompassing reforms at three levels: institutional, regulatory, and cultural. At the institutional level, standardization of arbitration service quality, development of arbitrator capacity, and expansion of the geographical coverage of qualified arbitration institutions are necessary. At the regulatory level, harmonization of regulations to accommodate e-arbitration and improvements to the enforcement mechanism for arbitration awards are needed. At the cultural level, intensified education and awareness-raising programs are needed to increase business understanding and acceptance of arbitration. Systematic and coordinated implementation of these reforms will contribute to the creation of a robust, accessible, and effective arbitration ecosystem that supports economic growth and a conducive investment climate in Indonesia.

Daftar Pustaka

Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty. Crown Publishers.

Aliansi: Jurnal Hukum. (2024). Efektivitas arbitrase untuk usaha kecil menengah. Aliansi: Jurnal Hukum, 19(2), 112-128.

Andriani, S., & Apriani, D. (2022). Arbitrase sebagai solusi win-win dalam penyelesaian sengketa bisnis. Jurnal Hukum Bisnis Indonesia, 15(3), 45-62.

Arikunto, S. (2018). Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik. Rineka Cipta.

Cakrawala, A. J. (2015). Penerapan konsep hukum arbitrase online di Indonesia. Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan, 45(4), 523-548.

Creswell, J. W. (2018). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. Sage Publications.

DJKN Kemenkeu. (2024). Pentingnya klausul arbitrase dalam kontrak bisnis. Warta DJKN, 12(4), 78-85.

Ethics and Law Journal. (2024). Standardisasi lembaga arbitrase di Indonesia. Ethics and Law Journal, 8(1), 92-108.

Fitriyah, N. (2021). Efektivitas arbitrase syariah dalam penyelesaian sengketa ekonomi Islam. Jurnal Hukum Ekonomi Syariah, 7(2), 134-150.

Friedman, L. M. (1975). The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective. Russell Sage Foundation.

Fuady, M. (2006). Arbitrase Nasional: Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa Bisnis. Citra Aditya Bakti.

Green, E. D., & Sander, F. E. A. (1985). Dispute Resolution. Little Brown and Company.

Greif, A. (2006). Institutions and the Path to the Modern Economy. Cambridge University Press.

ISSN: Online 2774-6984

Harahap, M. Y. (2004). Arbitrase Ditinjau dari RV, Peraturan Prosedur BANI ICSID. Sinar Grafika.

Jurnal Hukum Lex Generalis. (2024). Efektivitas arbitrase dalam sektor asuransi Indonesia. Jurnal Hukum Lex Generalis, 5(2), 203-220.

Jurnal Kesehatan Tambusai. (2024). Aksesibilitas lembaga arbitrase di daerah. Jurnal Kesehatan Tambusai, 5(1), 45-58.

Lontar UI. (2022). Pembatalan putusan arbitrase oleh pengadilan: analisis kasus. Lontar UI Law Review, 18(3), 267-284.

Maharani, P. (2022). Metodologi penelitian hukum kualitatif dalam analisis fenomena sosial. Jurnal Penelitian Hukum, 22(4), 156-172.

Mardiyati, S. (2023). Analisis cost-benefit arbitrase untuk sengketa bernilai besar. Jurnal Ekonomi dan Hukum, 14(2), 89-105.

Margono, S. (2012). ADR dan Arbitrase: Proses Pelembagaan dan Aspek Hukum. Ghalia Indonesia.

Mizan: Journal of Islamic Law. (2023). Tantangan e-arbitration dalam perspektif hukum Islam. Mizan: Journal of Islamic Law, 7(1), 78-94.

Muhaimin, A. (2021). Studi literatur dalam penelitian hukum: metodologi dan aplikasi. Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, 28(3), 201-218.

North, D. C. (1990). Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. Cambridge University Press.

Ostrom, E. (2005). Understanding Institutional Diversity. Princeton University Press.

Rahardjo, S. (2020). Ilmu Hukum Indonesia: Mencari Pembebasan dan Pencerahan. Genta Publishing.

ResearchGate. (2024). Kompetensi arbiter dan tingkat compliance putusan arbitrase. International Journal of Arbitration, 31(2), 145-162.

Sander, F. E. A. (1985). Alternative methods of dispute resolution: An overview. Florida Law Review, 37(1), 1-18.

Situmorang, V. H. (2020). Pembatalan putusan arbitrase BANI: analisis yuridis. Jurnal Hukum Acara Perdata, 6(2), 178-195.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (2015). Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory. Sage Publications.

Sugiyono. (2019). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D. Alfabeta.

Williamson, O. E. (2000). The new institutional economics: Taking stock, looking ahead. Journal of Economic Literature, 38(3), 595-613.

ISSN: Online 2774-6984