

Legal Negotiation Skills Training for Dispute Resolution

Montayana Meher¹, Agata Kurniati², Rosmalinda²

¹ University of Medan Area, Indonesia

² Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Legal Negotiation;
Dispute Resolution;
Non-Litigation, Training

Article history:

Received 2026-04-30

Revised 2026-06-02

Accepted 2026-07-07

ABSTRACT

Dispute resolution through non-litigation mechanisms has increasingly developed as an alternative approach that is faster, more efficient, and oriented toward achieving mutual agreement between the parties. However, legal negotiation skills remain a competency that is not yet optimally mastered by law students, as the learning process tends to emphasize theoretical aspects rather than practical application. This community service program aims to enhance students' knowledge and skills in applying legal negotiation techniques as one of the methods of out-of-court dispute resolution. The implementation method includes participant needs identification, material delivery, interactive discussions, case-based negotiation simulations, and evaluation through pre-test and post-test assessments. The participants consisted of 50 Faculty of Law students who actively participated in the training activities. The results show an improvement in participants' understanding of the concept of legal negotiation, negotiation stages, persuasive communication techniques, negotiation strategy development, and interest-based dispute resolution (*interest-based negotiation*). The case simulations also enhanced participants' ability to identify the legal positions of the parties, build effective communication, and produce mutually beneficial agreements. This program contributes to strengthening students' practical competencies in dealing with dispute resolution dynamics in professional practice..

This is an open access article under the [CC BY](#) license.



Corresponding Author:

Montayana Meher

University of Medan Area, Indonesia; montayana@staff.uma.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of a state based on law adopted by Indonesia as stated in Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia places law as the primary instrument in regulating social, national, and state life, including in the resolution of every legal dispute. In this perspective, the dispute resolution mechanism has a strategic function to guarantee the protection of the rights and obligations of the parties while realizing the three main objectives of law, namely legal certainty, justice, and benefit.

Thus, dispute resolution is not only seen as a process of ending conflict, but also as a means to maintain social order and provide effective legal protection to the community (Asshiddiqie, 2018).

In essence, disputes arise as a result of legal relationships that give rise to differences in interests, the implementation of rights and obligations, or differences in interpretation of legal provisions or agreements. The increasingly complex dynamics of social life have led to disputes developing in various fields, such as civil law, trade, industrial relations, land, consumer protection, and government administration. Therefore, the quality of a legal system is measured not only by the state's ability to impose sanctions for violations of the law, but also by its ability to provide effective, fair dispute resolution mechanisms that are capable of providing sustainable legal protection to all interested parties (Asshiddiqie, 2018).

Dispute resolution through litigation remains the primary option because court decisions are legally binding and provide legal certainty for the parties. However, the practice of resolving cases in court often faces various problems, such as lengthy examination processes, high settlement costs, formalistic procedures, and the potential for deteriorating relations between the parties due to the nature of decisions that produce winners and losers. These conditions have encouraged the development of various out-of-court dispute resolution mechanisms that offer simpler, faster, more flexible, and more efficient processes, making them increasingly preferred by the public in resolving legal conflicts (Rahmadi, 2017).

These developments have strengthened the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanism as a dispute resolution instrument that prioritizes deliberation and agreement between the parties. Compared to litigation, ADR provides greater freedom for parties to formulate their own resolutions that best suit their interests without relying entirely on court decisions. In addition to reducing costs and time, this mechanism is also considered more effective in maintaining good relations between the parties, thus supporting the creation of more equitable and mutually beneficial dispute resolutions (Winarta, 2020).

The existence of non-litigation dispute resolution mechanisms in Indonesia has a clear legal basis through Law Number 30 of 1999 concerning Arbitration and Alternative Dispute Resolution. This regulation provides parties with the flexibility to choose dispute resolution through consultation, negotiation, mediation, conciliation, or expert assessment according to the characteristics of the dispute at hand. This regulation reflects a paradigm shift in the Indonesian legal system, namely from dispute resolution that was initially oriented towards the litigation process to a resolution that prioritizes the agreement of the parties. This change is in line with the development of the modern legal system, which places peaceful dispute resolution as part of efforts to expand access to justice while increasing the effectiveness of out-of-court settlements (Winarta, 2020).

Among the various Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanisms, negotiation is the simplest form of dispute resolution and serves as the foundation for other dispute resolution methods. Negotiations are conducted directly by the parties without involving a third party authorized to make decisions. Through this mechanism, each party has the opportunity to express its interests, explain its legal position, and formulate mutually acceptable alternative solutions. The flexibility of the negotiation process allows the parties to determine the form of resolution that best suits the characteristics of the dispute at hand. According to Fisher, Ury, and Patton (2011), successful negotiations are determined more by the ability to identify the interests underlying the conflict than simply defending each party's legal position. This interest-based negotiation approach allows for the creation of a mutually beneficial agreement (win-win solution) and is able to maintain good relations between the parties after the dispute has ended.

From a legal practice perspective, negotiation is not merely understood as a bargaining process, but rather as a professional competency that integrates legal analysis, communication, persuasion, conflict management, and decision-making skills. A legal practitioner is required to be able to objectively identify legal facts, map the interests of the parties, analyze potential legal risks, and offer various rational and acceptable alternative solutions for all parties. Therefore, the success of the negotiation process is not only determined by mastery of legal norms, but also influenced by the ability to build effective communication, create trust, and manage conflict dynamics constructively. These competencies are an integral part of the

professions of advocates, mediators, notaries, legal consultants, and other legal professions whose practices prioritize dispute resolution through dialogue before resorting to litigation (Moore, 2014).

The development of economic globalization and increased business activity have driven the complexity of legal relations across various sectors. Consequently, the potential for disputes has also increased, both in the implementation of business contracts, industrial relations, consumer protection, investment, and other forms of commercial cooperation. In practice, business actors tend to prioritize dispute resolution through negotiation because this mechanism is considered capable of maintaining the continuity of business relationships while avoiding greater losses due to lengthy litigation processes. This condition indicates that the ability to negotiate has become one of the competencies that must be possessed by law school graduates so they can provide legal solutions that are not only oriented towards a win for one party, but also result in effective, efficient, and equitable resolutions (Fisher, Ury, & Patton, 2011).

On the other hand, the learning process in various law faculties is still dominated by an academic approach oriented toward mastery of theory, review of legislation, and analysis of court decisions. While this approach contributes to developing students' legal thinking skills, it fails to fully develop the practical legal skills needed in the professional world. Consequently, many students still have a good understanding of the substance of the law but lack adequate communication, negotiation, and conflict resolution skills when participating in moot courts, legal clinics, internships, or when interacting directly with clients. This situation indicates a gap between the academic competencies acquired during the educational process and the actual needs of the legal profession. Therefore, learning innovations are needed that not only emphasize mastery of normative aspects but also develop practical skills through applicable and experiential learning activities so that students are better prepared to face the dynamics of dispute resolution in the professional world (Susskind, 2023).

Based on these conditions, the implementation of community service activities through Legal Negotiation Skills Training to Improve Dispute Resolution Capabilities is one strategic effort to bridge the gap between academic competency and practical needs. This training is designed with a participatory approach through material delivery, discussions, case study analysis, negotiation simulations, and learning evaluations. This approach is expected to improve conceptual understanding while developing participants' practical skills in identifying legal problems, developing negotiation strategies, building effective communication, and reaching agreements that benefit all parties. Thus, this activity not only strengthens student competency in the field of dispute resolution, but also serves as a practice-based learning model that supports improving the quality of Law Faculty graduates in accordance with the needs of the workplace and the development of the legal profession.

2. METHODS

This community service activity implemented a participatory approach, one that provides participants with the opportunity to actively participate in the entire training series. This approach was chosen because the learning process is not only oriented towards delivering material but also directed towards developing practical skills through direct learning experiences (experiential learning). With the active involvement of participants, the learning process is expected to continuously improve knowledge, skills, and attitudes (Cornwall, 2011). All stages of the activity are systematically arranged, covering the preparation, implementation, and evaluation stages so that the training objectives can be achieved effectively.

The implementation of the activity is carried out through several stages as follows.

1. Preparation Stage

The preparation phase begins with coordination between the community service team and the Faculty of Law regarding the implementation time, number of participants, activity location, and facility and infrastructure requirements. This phase also includes the development of an activity schedule, the division of tasks among the implementation team, and the preparation of training

instruments, including modules, presentation materials, observation sheets, and evaluation instruments (Rossett, 2009).

2. Needs Identification Stage (Need Assessment)

Needs identification was conducted through the distribution of questionnaires and brief interviews with participants prior to the training. This activity aimed to determine participants' initial understanding of the concepts of legal negotiation, non-litigation dispute resolution, communication techniques, and their experience participating in dispute resolution simulations. The results of the needs identification served as the basis for determining the learning materials and methods used during the training (Rossett, 2009).

3. Training Module and Material Preparation Stage

Based on the needs identification results, the community service team developed a training module containing material on the basic concepts of legal negotiation, the principles of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), effective communication techniques, interest-based negotiation strategies, bargaining position development, professional ethics, and dispute resolution through a win-win solution approach. The material was developed by integrating theory, case studies, and practice to make learning more contextual (Merriam & Bierema, 2014).



Figure 1. Preparation of Training Modules and Materials

4. Training Implementation Stage

- a. The training is implemented using several complementary learning methods, namely:
 1. Interactive Lecture, to provide an understanding of the basic concepts of legal negotiation and non-litigation dispute resolution.
 2. Group Discussion, to train participants' abilities in analyzing legal facts, identifying the interests of the parties, and formulating alternative dispute resolutions.
 3. Case Study, using examples of disputes that frequently occur in legal practice so that participants are able to connect theory with real conditions.
 4. Negotiation Simulation (Role Play), where participants are divided into groups and play the roles of disputing parties, legal counsel, or negotiation facilitator. Through this simulation, participants are trained to develop negotiation strategies, build effective communication, engage in persuasion, and reach mutually beneficial agreements (Joyce, Weil, & Calhoun, 2015).

5. Activity Evaluation Stage

- a. Evaluation is carried out to measure the effectiveness of training through several instruments, namely
- b. Pre-test, to determine the participants' initial level of knowledge.

- c. Observation, to assess participants' abilities during the negotiation simulation, including communication skills, mastery of material, strategy development, teamwork, and ability to reach agreement.
 - d. Post-test, to measure the increase in participants' understanding after attending the training.
 - e. Participant Satisfaction Questionnaire, to obtain feedback on the quality of the material, delivery method, speakers, and benefits of the activity (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2011).
6. Analysis and Reporting Stage

Pre-test and post-test data were analyzed quantitatively by comparing the average scores before and after the training. Meanwhile, data from observations, documentation, and satisfaction questionnaires were analyzed qualitatively to illustrate the improvement in participants' skills during the training. Furthermore, all activity results were compiled into reports and scientific articles as outputs of community service (Sugiyono, 2023).

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Implementation of Legal Negotiation Skills Training

The implementation of legal negotiation skills training is a form of implementation to strengthen the practical competency of Law Faculty students in resolving disputes through non-litigation mechanisms. From a modern legal perspective, dispute resolution no longer relies solely on adjudicative mechanisms through the courts, but has also evolved through a consensual approach that places the parties as the primary actors in reaching an agreement. This aligns with the development of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), which emphasizes peaceful, expeditious, and low-cost dispute resolution (Boulle, 2011).

Theoretically, ADR is understood as an out-of-court dispute resolution mechanism that includes negotiation, mediation, conciliation, and arbitration. Among these forms, negotiation is the most basic because it does not involve a third party as a decision-maker. According to Fisher, Ury, and Patton (2011), effective negotiation must be based on the principle of interest-based negotiation, an approach that focuses on interests rather than positions. This approach allows for the creation of win-win solutions, not simply a victory for one party.

In the context of legal education, negotiation skills are a crucial component of legal skills education. According to Menkel-Meadow (2016), modern legal education emphasizes not only the cognitive aspect of understanding norms but also the development of practical skills such as legal communication, conflict resolution, and decision-making. Therefore, this training is designed to bridge the gap between legal theory learned in the classroom and the practical needs of the field.



Figure 2. Explanation of the Concept of Legal Negotiation

The training began with an explanation of the basic concept of legal negotiation as part of ADR. In this stage, participants were introduced to the possibility of dispute resolution through non-litigation mechanisms, based on the provisions of Law Number 30 of 1999 concerning Arbitration and Alternative Dispute Resolution, which legitimizes dispute resolution through negotiation and other forms of ADR. Normatively, this regulation demonstrates that the state provides space for parties to resolve conflicts independently based on agreement (Suyud Margono, 2010).

From a conflict theory perspective, Christopher W. Moore (2014) explains that conflict arises from differences in interests, values, and perceptions between parties. Therefore, resolving conflict requires more than just a formal legal approach; it also requires a communication approach that can identify the root of the problem. In this regard, negotiation is a crucial tool because it allows the parties to understand each other's underlying interests.

The training then emphasized that successful negotiations are determined not only by the strength of legal arguments, but also by interpersonal communication skills. In conflict communication theory, active listening, empathy, and persuasion are key factors in building trust between parties (Lewicki, Saunders, & Barry, 2016). Therefore, participants are trained not only to convey legal arguments but also to understand the other party's perspective more comprehensively.

Furthermore, in their approach to access to justice, Cappelletti and Garth (1978) emphasized that the ideal legal system is one that facilitates the public's ability to resolve disputes fairly, quickly, and affordably. In this context, negotiation is a crucial tool because it provides an alternative resolution without having to go through complex and expensive court procedures. Thus, this training also has a social dimension in improving public access to justice.

Pedagogically, the method used in this training is also based on the experiential learning theory proposed by David Kolb (2015), which emphasizes that the most effective learning occurs through direct experience. In this model, participants not only receive theoretical material but also directly experience the negotiation process through case simulations. This allows for a learning cycle ranging from concrete experience, reflection, conceptualization, and active experimentation.

The core training phase is conducted through negotiation simulations (role-plays) designed to mimic dispute situations in legal practice. These simulations provide a direct application of the previously presented theory, allowing participants not only to understand the concepts but also to experience the dynamics of real-world dispute resolution. In the simulations, participants are divided into groups, each playing the role of disputing parties and their legal representatives, with scenarios such as default, business partnership disputes, and debt receivables.

This simulation approach aligns with Kolb's (2015) experiential learning theory, which emphasizes that effective learning occurs through a cycle of concrete experience, reflection, conceptualization, and active experimentation. During the activity, participants directly encounter conflict situations, then reflect on the strategies used, and refine their negotiation approaches in subsequent stages. This process demonstrates that experiential learning can simultaneously enhance understanding and practical skills.

From a principled negotiation perspective, Fisher, Ury, and Patton (2011) assert that successful negotiation is determined by the ability to separate people from problems, focus on interests, not positions, and develop a variety of mutually beneficial solution options. Participants began to apply this principle throughout the simulation, particularly in their efforts to identify each party's interests before determining a settlement offer. This demonstrates an improvement in analytical skills in understanding the structure of legal conflicts more substantively.

Observations showed that participants experienced significant progress in legal communication. They began to apply active listening techniques, reduced defensiveness, and demonstrated the ability to build more constructive dialogue. According to Lewicki, Saunders, and Barry (2016), communication skills in negotiations are a key element in determining the success of the dispute resolution process. Therefore, improving participants' communication skills is an important indicator of the success of this training.

Furthermore, from a conflict resolution theory perspective, Moore (2014) explains that effective conflict resolution requires the ability to identify the sources of conflict, whether structural, interpersonal, or differing interests. In the simulation, participants began to identify that conflict stems not only from legal aspects but is also influenced by communication factors and the economic interests of the parties. This demonstrates an increase in critical thinking skills in understanding conflict multidimensionally.

The results of the pre- and post-test evaluations showed an increase in participants' understanding of the concept of legal negotiation. Prior to the training, most participants still understood negotiation as a simple bargaining process. However, after the training, participants began to understand that negotiation is a systematic process involving interest analysis, communication strategies, and reaching a win-win agreement. This improvement demonstrates the effectiveness of practice-based learning methods compared to conventional lectures.

From an access to justice perspective, Cappelletti and Garth (1978) emphasized that an effective legal system must provide simple and accessible dispute resolution for the public. In this context, legal negotiation training makes a significant contribution by equipping students with skills that can be used to help communities resolve disputes without resorting to lengthy and expensive litigation. Thus, this training not only impacts academic aspects but also has social value in strengthening access to justice.

Pedagogically, the success of this training is also inseparable from the application of the principles of adult learning theory proposed by Knowles (2015), which emphasizes that adult learning must be relevant, problem-centered, and experience-based. As adult learners, students require an approach that allows them to connect theory with real-world practice. Therefore, the simulation and case study methods used in this training proved effective in increasing participant engagement.

Furthermore, the evaluation questionnaire results showed that the majority of participants considered the training very beneficial in improving their understanding and practical skills. Participants also stated that the simulation method provided new experiences they hadn't gained in regular lectures. This demonstrates a gap between normative classroom learning and the practical skills needed in the legal profession.

Overall, the implementation of this legal negotiation skills training demonstrates that strengthening students' practical competencies is a crucial need in modern legal education. The integration of ADR theory, interest-based negotiation principles, and experiential learning yielded significant results in improving students' ability to resolve disputes effectively. Therefore, this training model can be used as an alternative learning model within the Faculty of Law curriculum to strengthen graduates' competencies, thus better preparing them for the practice of dispute resolution in the professional world, both through litigation and non-litigation channels.

Increasing Participants' Knowledge of Legal Negotiations

The increased understanding of participants in legal negotiation skills training activities indicates a shift in perspective from a normative approach to a more practical approach to dispute resolution. Within the framework of a state based on the rule of law, law is positioned not only as a set of norms governing societal behavior, but also as a means to achieve fair dispute resolution, provide legal certainty, and generate benefits for the parties (Asshiddiqie, 2018). Therefore, negotiation skills are a crucial competency in a modern legal system that relies not only on litigation but also prioritizes peaceful resolution.

Legally, negotiation as part of the dispute resolution mechanism is legally based through Law Number 30 of 1999 concerning Arbitration and Alternative Dispute Resolution. This law opens up space for parties to resolve disputes through various non-litigation mechanisms such as consultation, negotiation, mediation, conciliation, and expert assessment. This reflects that the Indonesian legal system is no longer a single, court-centered system, but has moved towards a multi-door dispute resolution system.

From a theoretical perspective, negotiation is a basic form of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) that does not involve a third party as a decision-maker. Fisher, Ury, and Patton (2011) explain that effective negotiation must use a principled negotiation approach, namely by separating individuals from problems, emphasizing interests over positions, developing various alternative solutions, and using objective standards in reaching agreement. This approach shifts the conventional competitive nature of negotiation toward a more collaborative resolution.

In the training process, negotiation is understood not only as a bargaining activity but also as a complex conflict analysis process. Moore (2014) states that conflict arises from differences in interests, needs, and values between parties, so its resolution must be achieved by comprehensively identifying the root cause. By understanding this, participants can develop more systematic dispute resolution strategies based on sound conflict analysis.

From the perspective of access to justice, Cappelletti and Garth (1978) assert that an effective legal system is one that facilitates quick, simple, and affordable dispute resolution. In this context, negotiation plays a crucial role because it can reduce reliance on formal, expensive, and time-consuming judicial processes, thereby expanding public access to justice.

Conceptually, participants are also equipped with an understanding of the stages of the negotiation process, including preparation, identification of interests, submission of initial offers, the bargaining process, and formulation of the final agreement. Each stage plays a strategic role in ensuring that the negotiation process is structured and results in a mutually beneficial agreement for all parties.

In addition, participants were introduced to two main approaches to negotiation: positional bargaining and interest-based negotiation. The former tends to defend each party's position, making it competitive, while the latter emphasizes the pursuit of fundamental interests that enable a win-win solution. Fisher, Ury, and Patton (2011) assert that the interest-based approach is more effective in producing long-term agreements and maintaining good relations between parties.

In terms of legal communication, Lewicki, Saunders, and Barry (2016) explain that successful negotiations are heavily influenced by interpersonal communication skills such as active listening, empathy, persuasion, and the ability to build trust. In this training, participants began to realize that communication plays just as important a role as mastery of legal material in determining successful negotiations.

Furthermore, Kolb (2015), using experiential learning theory, explains that the learning process will be more effective if based on direct experience. In this training, negotiation simulations provide participants with the opportunity to experience the dispute resolution process firsthand, enabling them to connect theory with practice more concretely through experience, reflection, and reapplication.

The training results demonstrated an increase in participants' understanding of the concept of legal negotiation. Prior to the training, most participants viewed negotiation as a simple, informal process. However, after the training, they began to understand that negotiation is a systematic process with a strong theoretical foundation, requiring a well-developed communication strategy and legal analysis.

Thus, this increase in knowledge is not limited to cognitive aspects but also reflects a paradigm shift in how dispute resolution is viewed. Negotiation is now understood as a crucial instrument in modern legal systems, capable of providing more effective, efficient, and justice-oriented resolutions.

4. CONCLUSION

The implementation of legal negotiation skills training demonstrated an increase in participants' understanding of the concept and practice of dispute resolution through non-litigation mechanisms. Participants understood that negotiation is part of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), which is oriented towards agreement between the parties and is based on the principle of principled negotiation. Legally, participants also understood the legal basis for negotiation in Law Number 30 of 1999

concerning Arbitration and Alternative Dispute Resolution, which legitimizes dispute resolution outside the courts. This reinforced the understanding that the Indonesian legal system does not only focus on litigation but also opens up space for peaceful resolution. Practically, the training improved participants' ability to understand the stages of negotiation, identify the interests of the parties, and apply legal communication techniques through experiential learning-based simulations. Thus, this training was effective in improving the conceptual competence and basic negotiation skills of law students and strengthening their readiness for dispute resolution practice.

REFERENCES

- Ali, Z. (2021). *Legal research methods*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- Asshiddiqie, J. (2018). *The Indonesian Constitution and Constitutionalism*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- Boulle, L. (2011). *Mediation: Principles, process, practice*. Sydney: LexisNexis.
- Cappelletti, M., & Garth, B. (1978). *Access to justice: The worldwide movement to make rights effective*. Milan: Giuffrè.
- Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (2011). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreements without giving in* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2011). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Joyce, B., Weil, M., & Calhoun, E. (2015). *Models of teaching* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Knowles, M. S. (2015). *The adult learner: A neglected species* (8th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kolb, D. A. (2015). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Lewicki, R. J., Saunders, D. M., & Barry, B. (2016). *Negotiation* (7th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Margono, S. (2010). *ADR and arbitration: Institutionalization process and legal aspects*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.
- Menkel-Meadow, C. (2016). *Dispute resolution: Beyond the adversarial model*. New York, NY: Aspen Publishers.
- Menkel-Meadow, C. (2020). *Negotiation: Processes for problem solving*. New York, NY: Aspen Publishers.
- Merriam, S. B., & Bierema, L. L. (2014). *Adult learning: Linking theory and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mikkelsen, B. (2011). *Methods for development work and research: A new guide for practitioners*. London: Sage Publications.
- Moore, C. W. (2014). *The mediation process: Practical strategies for resolving conflict* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rahmadi, T. (2017). *Mediation of dispute resolution through a consensus approach*. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Rossett, A. (2009). *First things fast: A handbook for performance analysis*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.
- Sugiyono. (2023). *Quantitative, qualitative, and R&D research methods*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Susskind, R. (2023). *Tomorrow's lawyers: An introduction to your future* (3rd ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 30 of 1999 concerning Arbitration and Alternative Dispute Resolution.
- Winarta, FH (2020). *Dispute resolution law*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.

