

Hybrid Dispute Resolution in Administrative Law: Toward an Integrated Model for Government Conflict Management

Rusli Subrata¹, Firdaus Arifin², Ihsanul Maarif³

¹Faculty of Law, Universitas Pasundan, Bandung, Indonesia

¹Faculty of Law, Universitas Pasundan, Bandung, Indonesia

¹Faculty of Law, Universitas Pasundan, Bandung, Indonesia

✉Corresponding email: rusli.subrata@unpas.ac.id

History of Article

Submitted : March 29, 2025

Revised : April 20, 2025

Accepted : May 20, 2025

Published : June 03, 2025

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.37253/jjr.v27i1.10462>

Copyright© 2025 by Author(s). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License. All writings published in this journal are personal views of the authors and do not represent the views of this journal and the author's affiliated institutions.

Abstract

The increasing complexity of citizen–government interactions in administrative law has revealed the limitations of litigation-based dispute resolution, which is often criticized for its rigidity, inefficiency, and lack of procedural inclusiveness. This study aimed to develop a conceptual model of Hybrid Dispute Resolution (HDR) that integrates judicial procedures with alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mechanisms to enhance fairness, participation, and institutional responsiveness in resolving administrative disputes. A normative juridical method was employed, incorporating statutory, conceptual, and comparative approaches. Legal frameworks and institutional practices in Singapore, China, and Poland were examined to identify key elements for HDR adaptation within the context of Indonesian administrative law. These findings indicate that HDR, particularly through models such as Med-Arb and Arb-Med, can effectively combine the legal certainty of litigation with the flexibility and participatory benefits of ADR. However, successful implementation requires a robust legal framework, trained mediators, institutional readiness, and public accountability mechanisms. HDR not only provides procedural alternatives but also contributes to the democratization of public administration by enabling citizens to directly engage with the state in resolving disputes. This reflects a paradigm shift toward more adaptive and humanistic governance. The HDR offers a viable framework for reforming administrative dispute resolution systems, with broad implications for access to justice, regulatory innovation, and the enhancement of citizen–state relations in democratic governance.

Keywords: Hybrid Dispute Resolution; Administrative Law; Mediation; Legal Reform; Procedural Justice

Introduction

Administrative dispute resolution plays a fundamental role in ensuring accountability and transparency of government actions in modern legal systems. Disputes between citizens and government institutions reflect power dynamics, and are an indicator of the effectiveness of legal mechanisms in balancing individual rights and state authority. However, the litigation approach, which has dominated administrative dispute resolution, has increasingly shown limitations, especially in responding to evolving social complexities. Rigid formal procedures, lengthy processes, and a lack of public participation make litigation less relevant in the context of democratic and participatory public services (Sherman & Momani, 2025).

This creates an urgent need for more adaptive, efficient, and substantive dispute-resolution mechanisms. Alternative dispute resolution (ADR), such as mediation and conciliation, has gained widespread acceptance in various jurisdictions as a fast, cost-effective, and responsive method. However, their application in administrative law is still limited both normatively and institutionally, especially in countries with hierarchical bureaucracies and legal systems that do not structurally accommodate ADR (Zainudin et al., 2025).

Some countries have integrated ADR in the context of public administration disputes to reduce the burden on the courts and strengthen trust between the state and its citizens, provided that it is supported by an adequate legal framework and institutional infrastructure (Abdul Malek et al., 2025). However, these practices have not yet been developed into a systematic model that combines litigation and ADR in a hybrid form that is legally operational.

In the academic realm, the concept of Hybrid Dispute Resolution (HDR), which combines litigation with ADR, has had limited application in civil and commercial sectors. Existing studies are descriptive and have not formulated an integrated conceptual model of HDR in the administrative law system. For example, Maksimentseva (2023) discussed only some aspects of

HDR without comprehensively linking it to the principles of public administrative law.

Therefore, a significant theoretical and practical gap exists in the development of HDR models for administrative disputes. This study responds to this gap by designing a conceptual model of HDR that combines the strengths of litigation - namely, legal certainty and the binding force of decisions - with the added values of ADR in the form of efficiency, flexibility, and participation. This approach is expected to contribute to the renewal of an administrative dispute resolution system that is more adaptive and aligned with the principles of good governance (Dragos & Neamtu, 2014).

The main objective of this study is to design an HDR model that can be legally and institutionally implemented to resolve disputes between citizens and governments. The model also aims to identify the necessary normative and institutional elements, and compare international practices to support more effective and fair administrative law policies.

The research focuses on how to design and implement the HDR model to resolve administrative disputes legally and effectively. The aspects studied include legal regulation (normative), institutional structure (implementation support), and procedural functionality (clarity of the stages and roles of stakeholders). The key questions raised include how to build an integrative model without compromising legal certainty and state accountability. How can international practices be contextually adopted in the national legal system?

Research Method

This study uses the normative juridical method as the main approach in formulating the Hybrid Dispute Resolution (HDR) conceptual model in the context of administrative law. The normative juridical method was chosen because the focus of this research is to analyze the applicable positive law, as well as search for legal norms that can be used as a basis for building an administrative dispute resolution system that is integrated between litigation and alternative mechanisms (ADR). Methodologically, the approaches used in this study include statutory, conceptual, and comparative. The statutory approach is used

to identify and review national legal regulations relating to administrative law and out-of-court dispute resolution, such as Law No. 30 of 2014 on Government Administration as well as laws and regulations governing mediation and arbitration.

A conceptual approach was utilized to build a theoretical framework underlying the integration of ADR and litigation. The theories used in this framework include procedural justice, legal pluralism, and therapeutic jurisprudence, all of which contribute to strengthening the legitimacy and effectiveness of the HDR model in the context of public administration law. In addition, a comparative approach was used to examine administrative dispute resolution practices in several countries that have adopted hybrid mechanisms, such as Singapore, China, and Poland. Through this approach, this study identifies similarities and differences in the regulatory structure, institutional readiness, and implementation challenges of HDR in each country, which are then used as the basis for designing a model relevant to the Indonesian legal context.

The types of legal material used in this study consisted of three categories. Primary legal materials include laws, regulations, regulations, and court decisions. Second is secondary legal materials in the form of books, scientific journal articles, research results, and opinions of legal experts. Third are tertiary legal materials such as legal dictionaries, legal encyclopedias, and indexes of relevant literature. The data were analyzed using prescriptive-analytic techniques, which is a method of legal analysis that not only describes the content of regulations but also evaluates the consistency, emptiness, and effectiveness of applicable legal norms. This technique also allows researchers to provide normative recommendations for the weaknesses of the regulations found, as well as formulate a more responsive, participatory, and efficient administrative dispute resolution model through a hybrid approach.

Results and Discussions

Normative and Theoretical Framework of Hybrid Dispute Resolution (HDR)

Hybrid Dispute Resolution (HDR) is an integrative approach that brings together the formal power of litigation with the flexibility and active participation of alternative mechanisms (ADR), such as mediation and arbitration. This concept is theoretically supported by legal pluralism, procedural justice, and therapeutic jurisprudence. Legal pluralism rejects a single approach to dispute resolution, particularly in complex, diverse administrative contexts. Procedural justice emphasizes the importance of participation, transparency, and equality of processes, whereas therapeutic approaches highlight the psychosocial impact of dispute resolution on the relationship between citizens and state institutions.

Normatively, HDR has not been explicitly accommodated in the Indonesian legal system. Although mediation has been recognized in Perma No. 1 Year 2016, its use was still limited to civil courts. There is no regulative scheme that allows for a procedural transition from ADR to litigation or vice versa in the realm of administrative law. Therefore, the urgency to establish a specific legal framework for HDR in this area has become very relevant.

Dispute resolution in administrative law is rooted in the principle of legality, in which government actions must be in accordance with the law. This tradition is reflected in the dominance of litigation as the main form of conflict resolution between citizens and the state (Susiana and Ardiansyah, 2024). However, along with the development of society, legal architecture, and demands for efficiency and public participation, the litigation system has begun to show its limitations.

Litigation is known to be formal, based on strict procedures, and often creates distance between disputants. This process can drain time and resources, creating additional burdens, particularly for citizens who lack adequate legal support (Syaputri & Ivanda, 2023). Litigation in an administrative context also risks exacerbating the relationship between citizens and the government, which should be a service.

In response to this rigidity, countries have introduced Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in the administrative realm as a solution to the complex relationship between state and society. ADR encompasses a range of non-litigative methods, such as mediation, conciliation, and negotiation, which are designed to resolve conflicts cooperatively. The advantage of ADR lies in its ability to facilitate direct communication, build mutual understanding, and create mutually beneficial outcomes (Suherman & Shinta Dwi Enggraini, 2022).

However, the application of ADR in administrative contexts still faces challenges. Some public institutions have shown resistance to informal methods because of concerns about disrupting bureaucratic hierarchies or reducing institutional control over settlement outcomes. Not all legal systems provide a strong normative foundation for ADR in the administrative sector. This makes the effectiveness of ADR highly dependent on political will and the available institutional infrastructure. Amid these challenges, the existence of ADR remains a milestone in the transformation of the dispute resolution paradigm in administrative law. ADR paves the way for a more humane, participatory, and efficient approach to managing administrative conflicts that are complex and multidimensional.

While ADR is a progressive step in dispute resolution systems, it does not fully address the needs of the complex domain of administrative law. One of the main weaknesses of ADR is the limited binding power of settlement results. Mediation, for example, is voluntary, and the results are only binding if both parties agree (Zaini, 2020). This poses a major challenge when the more powerful party (usually a government institution) refuses to implement the agreement without imposing strict legal sanctions.

In addition, in contexts involving the public interest, closed ADR processes are often seen as contrary to the principles of transparency and accountability (Alti Putra, 2021). Administrative disputes often relate to the right to public services, use of state funds, or abuse of authority. In such cases, it is in the public's interest to know the process and outcome of dispute resolution, which conventional ADR cannot guarantee.

In terms of practicality, ADR face challenges in terms of human and institutional resources. Not all jurisdictions have mediators or facilitators trained in administrative dispute resolution. The lack of clear guidelines or regulations often leads to inconsistent and illegitimate ADR processes. To address the shortcomings of litigation and ADR separately, a new approach, known as Hybrid Dispute Resolution (HDR), has emerged. HDR seeks to combine the strengths of litigation and ADR, creating a dispute resolution framework that is not only flexible, but also has executorial powers. For example, in the medium-arb model, mediation is conducted first, and if it fails, proceeds to arbitration, resulting in a binding award (Maulidya et al., 2023). This model provides the first opportunity for cooperative resolution, and if necessary, guarantees a final decision through the arbitration process.

HDR also creates room for adaptation to different types of disputes by customizing procedural combinations based on the needs of a particular case. This approach emphasizes the principles of efficiency, fairness, and continuity of the relationship between parties. In the administrative context, HDR has great potential to encourage a dialogical approach between citizens and the state while maintaining the principles of administrative law that prioritize legal certainty, legality, and protection of citizens' rights.

Hybrid Dispute Resolution (HDR) is not a single approach but rather a spectrum of methods that can be customized according to the characteristics of the dispute and the needs of the parties. HDR models are designed to provide flexibility in the settlement process, while maintaining the legal certainty and binding force of the settlement outcome (Prayudha Dinata et al., 2025). Among the various forms of HDR, the two most widely applied are as follows:

1. Med-Arb (Mediation-Arbitration): This model starts with mediation. If the parties manage to reach an agreement, the outcome can be set out in a legally binding agreement. However, if mediation fails, the process proceeds directly to the arbitration stage, resulting in a final and binding award. The advantage of med-arb lies in its time and cost efficiency, as it avoids the duplication of procedures. However, this model also raises ethical issues,

especially in relation to the neutrality of the mediator, who changes his role to become an arbitrator (Fitriani et al., 2024).

2. Arb-Med (Arbitration-Mediation): In this model, the arbitration process is initiated first, and the award is sealed. This is followed by mediation efforts. If the mediation is successful, then the mediation result becomes the basis of settlement and the arbitral award is not opened. However, if mediation fails, the arbitral award remains in force. This model offers a solution to the problem of neutrality in med-arb, as the mediator does not know the contents of the arbitral award when mediating. (Ruckteschler & Wendelstein, 2021).

Other evolving models include the following:

1. Med-Arb-Med: This combination allows for a back-and-forth process between mediation and arbitration in one flexible setting (Reza and Ramadhan 2018).
2. Multi-Tiered Dispute Resolution Clauses: Used in administrative and commercial contracts, these clauses structure the stages of resolution, ranging from negotiation, mediation, arbitration, to litigation (Khoshnazar & Sabagh, 2024).

In the context of administrative law, the HDR model requires adjustments to align itself with the basic principles of public law. This includes transparency, accountability, and fair public participation. For example, the outcome of mediation in administrative disputes should be reviewed by a supervisory authority or judicial body to ensure compliance with the applicable legal norms.

The relevance of HDR in administration is strongly influenced by each country's legal culture and institutional structure. HDR is easier to adopt in countries that already have a strong tradition of public participation and effective internal control systems. In contrast, in countries where bureaucracy is still hierarchical and closed, the implementation of HDR requires deep institutional reforms. With its flexibility and adaptability, HDR not only offers a middle ground between litigation and ADR but also opens up the possibility of creating a dispute resolution system that is more responsive to social justice and the protection of citizens' rights.

The Hybrid Dispute Resolution (HDR) approach is not only rooted in practical needs but also supported by a number of legal and social theories that explain its relevance and prominence in modern dispute resolution systems (Abdillah et al., 2025). Theoretically, HDR embodies a blend of legal pluralism, procedural justice, and therapeutic values that form the conceptual foundation of the approach.

Pluralism is one of the main theories supporting HDR. This idea rejects a one-size-fits-all approach to dispute resolution and emphasizes that the legal system should provide a variety of resolution mechanisms appropriate to the nature and context of the dispute (Wisudawan et al., 2019). Pluralism is particularly important in administrative law that intersects with various aspects of social, economic, and political life.

Furthermore, the theory of procedural justice is an important pillar of the development of HDR. According to this theory, justice is measured not only by the outcome (substantive justice) but also by the means or processes leading to that outcome. Elements such as the opportunity to be heard, participation in the process, transparency, and fairness in treatment determine the level of acceptance and legitimacy of settlement outcomes. Through the integration of mediation and arbitration, HDR allows for the active participation of disputants while ensuring that final decisions are enforceable (Munawaroh, 2017).

In addition, the therapeutic jurisprudence approach provides normative and psychosocial justifications for the use of more humanistic dispute resolution methods. This approach assesses how the legal process affects individuals' mental health and emotional well-being. HDR, which begins with mediation, provides space for dialogue, empathy, and reconciliation, which in turn can strengthen individuals' trust in the legal system as a whole (Prayuti et al., 2024).

Strategic interaction theory in the sociology of law also helps explain the dynamics of HDR, where parties act not only on legal rights, but also on social and political calculations. In administrative disputes, citizens are often in weaker positions than state institutions. HDR provides them with a better negotiating position through neutral facilitation and customizable procedures (Parlina, 2021).

This theoretical framework proves that HDR is not only a pragmatic solution to the limitations of litigation and ADR, but also reflects a holistic and contextual theoretical approach to justice. In administrative law, where disputes often involve power imbalances and public interests, HDR provides a bridge between formal and substantial justice values that have often been separated in practice.

Study Komparasi dan Implementation Hybrid Dispute Resolution

The transformation of the administrative dispute resolution approach from a rigid litigation system to a more flexible and adaptive mechanism reflects a paradigm shift in the public legal system. This new paradigm emphasizes the importance of accessibility, efficiency, and citizen participation in the dispute-resolution process, which cannot always be achieved through conventional litigation channels (Musaffa, 2025).

Litigation, as the main tool in upholding the principle of legality, is now considered not always able to provide quick and fair solutions for the community. In many cases, long and formal litigation processes create a distance between citizens and state institutions, thereby reducing trust in the legal system (Rachmadika et al., 2024). In this context, HDR is an answer to the need for a legal approach that is more responsive to the social dynamics and expectations of modern society.

HDR allows for the combination of a participatory mediation process with the certainty of an outcome from arbitration or judicial decisions. In administrative disputes where the power imbalance between citizens and state authorities is a major issue, HDR can create a more balanced and open negotiation space. Through mediation, citizens have the opportunity to express their aspirations directly, whereas state agencies can constructively improve policies or administrative actions without waiting for a binding judgment.

This transformation is also relevant to the democratization of public administration. Communities are no longer positioned as mere objects of law but as active subjects with the capacity to influence the dispute resolution process. In

this sense, HDR is not just a technical instrument but also a symbol of a shift towards more inclusive and accountable governance.

Furthermore, HDR's relevance also lies in its ability to respond to contemporary issues, such as case overload in administrative courts, the high cost of litigation, and the need for a social justice-sensitive approach. Amidst the demands for efficiency and digital transformation in public services, HDR opens up opportunities for integration with online settlement systems (ODR) that can increase efficiency without compromising the basic principles of administrative law. Thus, HDR is not just a technical option but a reflection of the transformation of values and paradigms in administrative conflict resolution in favor of public services, citizen participation, and substantive justice.

The application of HDR in various jurisdictions has shown great potential for improving the effectiveness of dispute resolution, including in the context of administrative law. This effectiveness is measured by several key aspects: the speed of resolution, satisfaction of the parties, reduced burden on the courts, and preservation of relations between citizens and the government. The most prominent example comes from Singapore, which, through the Singapore International Arbitration Centre (SIAC) and Singapore International Mediation Centre (SIMC), successfully developed the Arb-Med-Arb Protocol. This protocol combines the advantages of arbitration and mediation in a structured, flexible, and result-oriented framework(Pal, 2018). In practice, this protocol has been used in administrative disputes involving cross-border interests, with relatively quick and satisfactory results for parties.

The following is an international comparison table on the implementation of Hybrid Dispute Resolution (HDR) in Singapore, China, and Poland.

TABLE 1. Comparative Table of Hybrid Dispute Resolution (HDR) Practices

Aspect	Singapore	China	Poland
Regulatory Status of HDR	Established through SIAC-SIMC Protocol (Arb-Med-Arb)	Administered through sector-specific	Mostly limited to judicial policies and pilot projects

		government regulations	
Supporting Institutions	SIAC & SIMC as formal hybrid dispute resolution bodies	Supported by local mediation and arbitration agencies	Administrative mediators under the judiciary
Type of HDR Adopted	Arb-Med-Arb	Arb-Med (domestic and commercial sectors)	Administrative Mediation
Transparency of Proceedings	Procedurally open and transparent	Relatively closed, based on deliberative traditions	Semi-open; results subject to judicial review
Effectiveness (Speed & Satisfaction)	Very high	Moderate, particularly effective at the local level	Fairly high in certain regional applications
Implementation Challenges	Limited to certain cross-border cases	Reliance on cultural preference for harmony	Lack of systematic training and comprehensive legal structure

A comparative study of the three countries shows the diversity of approaches to adopting HDR for administrative disputes. Singapore formally implemented the Arb-Med-Arb protocol through the cooperation of SIAC and SIMC, with full support from the legal system and hybrid institutions. The effectiveness of this model has been proven to be high, especially in cross-border disputes, although its scope remains limited. China has adopted a more administrative approach with the integration of ADR into the local resolution system. The Arb-Med model is widely used in commercial disputes and is beginning to be applied in public contexts. However, the main challenge is its

closed procedural nature and reliance on harmonized values rather than formal justice. Poland exemplifies the gradual adoption of the HDR. Administrative mediation is starting to be adopted as part of administrative law reform. Although still based on pilot projects and judicial policy, its effectiveness is visible in regions with strong institutional support.

This comparison confirms that the success of HDR is highly dependent on institutional readiness, regulatory clarity, and support from legal culture. The Indonesian model needs to consider bureaucratic structures, public participation, and external authority. It shows that with adequate legal support and training for public officials, HDR can be an effective instrument for improving the quality of public services and legitimacy of legal processes (Romanko, 2023). The effectiveness of HDR is also apparent in the context of Scandinavian countries, which have long integrated the principles of dialogue and peaceful resolution in their legal systems. In Norway and Sweden, administrative mediation is not only part of the dispute resolution procedure, but also a public policy instrument that encourages bureaucratic responsiveness to citizen complaints (Logvynenko & Oleksenko, 2024).

Based on this explanation, the effectiveness of HDR in various jurisdictions is highly dependent on institutional readiness, human resources, and the existence of a supportive legal framework. In some developing countries, capacity constraints and lack of trust in the neutrality of mediators are major obstacles. Therefore, lessons learned from other countries' successes must be adapted to the local context, including factors such as legal culture, bureaucratic structure, and the level of civil society participation. Thus, comparative analysis shows that HDR is an instrument that is not only flexible but also highly contextualized. Its success is determined by the integration of procedural design, adequate legal framework, and organizational culture in the government system.

Hybrid Dispute Resolution (HDR) in the context of administrative law is not only practically relevant but also has strong theoretical foundations, especially in the realm of procedural justice and therapeutic jurisprudence approaches (Spivakovsky et al., 2018). These two concepts provide a framework

for a deeper understanding of the values to be realized through the application of HDR.

Procedural justice is an approach that emphasizes that perceptions of fairness are not only influenced by the end result of a legal process but also by the way the process is conducted. In administrative disputes, citizens often feel marginalized because they do not have enough information, are not given the opportunity to voice their opinions, or feel that the process is one-sided (Douglas & Hurley, 2017). HDR, with its early stage mediation mechanism, provides space for active participation and allows parties to express their views directly.

In HDR processes, the presence of a neutral facilitator helps to create a forum that is non-intimidating and emphasizes dialogue over confrontation. This strengthens citizens' perceptions of the fairness of the process, which in turn increases the legitimacy of the settlement outcome. Moreover, citizen participation in the settlement process enriches the democratic legitimacy of administrative decisions, especially in the context of public services and social policy (Beretta, 2024).

Therapeutic jurisprudence is an approach that values law not merely as a set of rules, but as a social institution that affects the psychological and emotional well-being of individuals. Within this framework, HDR is seen as an approach that can minimize the psychological harm of the dispute resolution process, such as stress, a sense of helplessness, or alienation of citizens from state institutions (Diesen & Koch, 2016). By allowing space for expression, negotiation, and reaching a joint solution, HDR encourages a more empathetic approach to law and focuses on restoring social relationships. This is particularly important in the context of administrative law as the relationship between citizens and the state is ongoing and not a one-off relationship.

The combination of procedural justice and therapeutic jurisprudence makes HDR an approach that is not only legally sound but also socially and psychologically sound. This model is in line with the values of good governance, which emphasizes not only efficiency and accountability but also social responsibility and citizen engagement (Igliazzi & Granot, 2022). As such, the implementation of HDR not only provides benefits in terms of efficiency and

court burden reduction but also elevates the quality of legal relations between the state and citizens. This makes HDR a symbol of a more humane, participatory, and recovery-oriented approach to law and justice.

Regulatory and Institutional Implications for Indonesia

Although Hybrid Dispute Resolution (HDR) promises a more adaptive and responsive approach to administrative dispute resolution, its implementation is challenging. These challenges include institutional, normative, professional, and ethical aspects and public trust in the hybrid mechanism itself.

First, from an institutional perspective, many administrative law systems do not have structures that support the systemic integration of HDR. For example, not all government agencies have internal mediation units or facilities to perform ADR procedures. Even if they do, the procedures are often ad hoc and not standardized (Kim, 2023). This makes it difficult to ensure the consistency, transparency, and accountability of dispute resolution outcomes.

Second, legislation in several countries has not explicitly recognized or regulated hybrid procedures in the context of administrative law. This legal ambiguity raises doubts about the binding force of HDR results, the legal status of mediators or arbitrators in the context of public administration, and the disclosure of mediation results related to public interest (Hasbi & Larissa, 2024).

Third, professional challenges concern the quality and integrity of the HDR actors. Not all mediators or arbitrators have a sufficient understanding of the dynamics of administrative law and the basic principles of public law (Menkel-Meadow, 2020). In this context, specialized training, professional accreditation, and ethical oversight are crucial to ensure that HDR is conducted by competent and independent parties.

Fourth, ethical aspects are of particular concern in the med-arb model, in which a mediator who fails to mediate a conflict acts as an arbitrator. This role shifts risks, creating a conflict of interest, and violating the principle of confidentiality of mediation (Uznadze, 2024). Therefore, some jurisdictions

prefer the armed model, or use different mediators and arbitrators to maintain process integrity.

Fifth, it is challenging to build public trust. As a new mechanism, HDR is often not widely recognized by the public. Unfamiliarity with the procedures, concerns about the neutrality of the facilitator, and unclear long-term benefits can hinder public acceptance of HDR (Brooklyn & Tioluwani, 2025). Therefore, continuous socialization and transparency in the settlement process and outcomes are key to building the legitimacy of the HDR.

A holistic policy approach is required to overcome these challenges. The government should develop a legal framework that supports HDR, provides institutional and professional resources, and develop mechanisms for continuous monitoring and evaluation. The synergy among the judiciary, government bureaucracy, civil society, and legal education institutions is an important foundation for building an effective HDR system with integrity in the realm of administrative law.

The effectiveness of Hybrid Dispute Resolution (HDR) in the context of administrative law is largely determined by the readiness of government agencies, as the parties most often involved in administrative disputes. Government institutions are not only interested parties but also responsible for creating a fair, inclusive, and transparent dispute resolution climate.

Government agencies must have an institutional commitment to resolving non-litigative disputes. This includes the formal recognition of HDR as part of the public administration system (Sherman & Momani, 2025). This commitment can be realized through the establishment of internal dispute resolution units, training public officials in mediation and negotiation skills, and integration of HDR into standard procedures for resolving public grievances.

Institutional readiness is highly dependent on human resource capacities. Administrative officials should be equipped with an understanding of the basic principles of administrative law as well as effective and conflict-sensitive communication skills (Nchaga, 2025). Regular training and collaboration with external mediation institutions are necessary to build these competencies.

Support for HDR requires the development of a clear procedural framework. Many institutions lack operational guidelines on when and how HDR can be used, who is authorized to facilitate it, and how the results will be evaluated and implemented (Kristiani & Santiago, 2024). Technical guidelines and derivative regulations are important for clarity and consistency.

Government agencies must demonstrate openness during the HDR process. This includes a willingness to actively listen to grievances, negotiate in good faith, and honor agreed-upon settlements (Zhang et al., 2025). This collaborative attitude increases public trust and strengthens the legitimacy of agencies as responsive public service providers.

The involvement of public oversight and accountability institutions, such as ombudsmen or audit institutions, is also important to ensure that the use of HDR does not neglect citizens' rights or avoid legal responsibility (Zainudin et al., 2025). Periodic reporting and evaluation mechanisms for the implementation of HDR should be part of the institution's internal and external oversight systems.

Thus, the success of the HDR in administrative law is highly dependent on the systemic readiness of government institutions. It is not enough to rely on professional mediators or procedural arrangements, but it is also necessary to transform the institutional culture that supports dialogic, adaptive, and public service-oriented dispute resolution. The integration of HDR into the administrative system is not only a matter of efficiency but also a mirror of democratic and equitable governance.

Although this research has identified the great potential of Hybrid Dispute Resolution (HDR) in the context of administrative law, there are still areas that require further empirical, normative, and multidisciplinary studies. Further research is needed to strengthen the theoretical foundations, test the effectiveness of the proposed policy, and explore HDR implementation models that best suit the local conditions.

The implementation of Hybrid Dispute Resolution (HDR) in the context of administrative law cannot be separated from the social and ethical implications surrounding it. Given the characteristics of administrative disputes that often

involve public interests, hierarchical relationships between citizens and the state, and broad social impacts, any innovation in dispute resolution must be evaluated not only in terms of efficiency but also in terms of social justice and democratic values.

From an ethical perspective, the most significant issue relates to potential role conflicts in the mid-arb model. When the mediator switches roles to arbitrator, neutrality, objectivity, and the principle of confidentiality may be compromised. This may reduce parties' trust in the fairness of the process (Silverman, 2025). Therefore, models such as arb-med or the use of different mediators and arbitrators are preferred to maintain process integrity.

HDR can be a means to expand access to justice, particularly for marginalized groups, who may be deterred by the complexity and cost of formal litigation processes. However, without proper design, HDR can also introduce new risks, such as pressure on weaker parties to agree to unfair deals or exclusion of parties who lack communication skills or legal representation (Marangoni & Pila, 2025). Therefore, it is important to ensure that all parties in the HDR process have access to adequate information, legal assistance, and grievance mechanisms in the case of inequality.

In the context of public administration, the principle of transparency is a challenge in HDR, particularly in the closed mediation phase. Confidentiality is important for creating a safe and open negotiation space. But on the other hand, since administrative disputes are in the public interest, there needs to be accountability mechanisms, such as the publication of anonymized mediation results or independent oversight of the settlement outcome (Sherman & Momani, 2025).

The quality and accountability of HDR professionals are crucial for the success and legitimacy of the process. This requires a strict code of ethics, training, and certification standards, and an effective ethical oversight system. Institutions such as the International Mediation Institute (IMI) can be used as models to build an international standard HDR professional governance system (Kristiani & Santiago, 2024).

The social legitimacy of HDR is strongly influenced by public involvement in the design process. A top-down approach that relies solely on regulation without public participation will risk creating resistance (Zhang et al., 2025). Therefore, it is necessary to establish mechanisms for public consultation, multi-stakeholder dialogue, and involvement of civil society organizations and advocacy institutions to ensure that the HDR system truly reflects the values and needs of the community.

By considering all these dimensions, the integration of HDR into the administrative law system is not just a procedural issue but also a social justice agenda. This process demands attention to the balance between efficiency and the ethical principles that underpin the legitimacy of the law in a democratic society. HDR, designed and implemented with social and ethical sensitivity, will make an important contribution to equitable and sustainable administrative law reform.

Conclusion

This study demonstrated that Hybrid Dispute Resolution (HDR), as an integrated mechanism combining litigation and alternative dispute resolution (ADR) methods, offers a viable and innovative solution for addressing the inefficiencies and rigidity of traditional administrative dispute settlement systems. By merging the procedural guarantees and legal certainty of judicial mechanisms with the flexibility and participatory advantages of ADR, the HDR presents a comprehensive model that is normatively sound and practically responsive to the complex nature of public law disputes.

The development of a conceptual HDR model in administrative law signifies a paradigm shift towards more adaptive, inclusive, and efficient dispute resolution processes. The model respects fundamental administrative law principles (legality, transparency, and accountability) while enhancing access to justice, procedural fairness, and institutional responsiveness. Evidence from jurisdictions such as Singapore, China, and Poland support the feasibility and impact of HDR under appropriate legal and institutional frameworks. The application of Hybrid Dispute Resolution (HDR) in administrative disputes

responds to the need for a more responsive, participatory, and efficient legal system. This model bridges the rigidity of litigation and the weaknesses of ADR by integrating them legally and institutionally. Based on a comparative study, successful implementation of HDR is highly dependent on regulatory and institutional readiness, as well as a supportive legal culture. Therefore, key policy recommendations include (1) explicit recognition of HDR in administrative legislation; (2) establishment of internal resolution units in state institutions with training of public mediators; (3) creation of HDR SOPs that are transparent, accountable, and based on the principles of administrative justice; and (4) external oversight through the Ombudsman and public reporting to ensure the legitimacy and sustainability of the system. Overall, Hybrid Dispute Resolution can be a strategic instrument for reforming the administrative law system in Indonesia towards inclusive and democratic governance.

References

- Abdillah, M. P., Alfiah, M. F., Hardyanto, Z. B., & Sukoco, M. (2025). Penyelesaian Inharmonis Hukum (Konsep, Tantangan, dan Pendekatan dalam Sistem Peradilan). *JUSTITABLE - Jurnal Hukum*, 7(2), 89–92. <https://doi.org/10.56071/justitable.v7i2.1163>
- Abdul Malek, Muhammad Rafiqul Hoque, & Mohi Uddin. (2025). The Dynamism of the Structure and Mechanism of the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) System in Bangladesh for Dispute Resolution Outside the Formal Courts. *International Journal of Law and Politics Studies*, 7(1), 08–18. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijlps.2025.7.1.2>
- Alti Putra, M. A. (2021). Bentuk Penyalahgunaan Wewenang Pejabat Pemerintah Yang Tidak Dapat Dipidana. *JUSTISI*, 7(2), 118–136. <https://doi.org/10.33506/js.v7i2.1362>
- Beretta, R. (2024). *Procedural justice in online dispute resolution: An empirical enquiry* [University of Antwerp]. <https://doi.org/10.63028/10067/2064580151162165141>
- Brooklyn, C., & Tioluwani, R. (2025). *The Impact of Institutional Arbitration Rules on Corporate Dispute Resolution Efficiency*. Social Sciences. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202501.2062.v1>

- Diesen, C., & Koch, H. (2016). Contemporary 21st century therapeutic jurisprudence in civil cases: Building bridges between law and psychology. *Ethics, Medicine and Public Health*, 2(1), 13–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemep.2016.01.003>
- Douglas, K., & Hurley, J. (2017). The Potential of Procedural Justice in Mediation: A Study into Mediators Understandings. *Bond Law Review*, 29(1). <https://doi.org/10.53300/001c.5647>
- Dragos, D. C., & Neamtu, B. (Eds.). (2014). *Alternative Dispute Resolution in European Administrative Law*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-34946-1>
- Fitriani, R., Asnawi, M. I., Muis, A., Fatimah, & Mirfa, E. (2024). Tinjauan Kepastian Hukum Terhadap Hasil Kesepakatan Perdamaian dalam Mediasi di Luar Pengadilan. *Recht Studiosum Law Review*, 3(1), 50–57. <https://doi.org/10.32734/rslr.v3i1.15935>
- Hasbi, H., & Larissa, D. (2024). Regulation of the Role of Mediators in Efforts to Resolve Employment Disputes: A Comparative Study of Indonesia and United Kingdom. *Golden Ratio of Data in Summary*, 4(2), 923–931. <https://doi.org/10.52970/grdis.v4i2.764>
- Iglioizzi, D., & Granot, Y. (2022). Procedural Justice. In *Procedural Justice*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780367198459-REPRW68-1>
- Khoshnazar, M. F., & Sabagh, Y. A. (2024). Comparative Study of Multi-Tiered Dispute Resolution Clauses in Iran and England: Legal Frameworks and Enforceability. *European Business Law Review*, 35(Issue 7), 989–1006. <https://doi.org/10.54648/EULR2024051>
- Kim, Y.-S. (2023). Challenges in Legal Policy-Making for Innovating the Institution of Administrative Mediation. *Korean Administrative Law Association*, 24, 27–55. <https://doi.org/10.59826/kdps.2023.24.27>
- Kristiani, E., & Santiago, F. (2024). Legal Reform of Mediation Towards Fair Industrial Conflict Resolution. *Journal of Comprehensive Science (JCS)*, 3(12), 5350–5358. <https://doi.org/10.59188/jcs.v3i12.2921>
- Logvynenko, M. I., & Oleksenko, K. D. (2024). Reconciliation of the parties: The role of mediation in the resolution of administrative conflicts. *Analytical and Comparative Jurisprudence*, 2, 479–482. <https://doi.org/10.24144/2788-6018.2024.02.81>
- Maksimentseva, N. O. (2023). The principles of administrative law vs. The principles of public administration. *Juris Europensis Scientia*, 6, 96–101. <https://doi.org/10.32782/chern.v6.2023.18>

- Marangoni, J., & Pila, A. D. (2025). Access To Justice: Innovative Solutions For Promoting Peace, Justice And Effective Institutions. In *Science and Connections: The Interdependence of Disciplines* (1st ed.). Seven Editora. <https://doi.org/10.56238/sevened2024.037-181>
- Maulidya, R. I., Revaganesya Abdallah, & Janine Marieta Ajesha Nugraha. (2023). Relevansi Kekuatan Eksekutorial Terhadap Sifat Kemandirian Putusan Arbitrase Ditinjau Dari Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 1999 Tentang Arbitrase Dan Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa. *Padjadjaran Law Review*, 11(2), 212–225. <https://doi.org/10.56895/plr.v11i2.1289>
- Menkel-Meadow, C. (2020). Hybrid and mixed dispute resolution processes: Integrities of process pluralism. In M. F. Moscati, M. Palmer, & M. Roberts (Eds.), *Comparative Dispute Resolution*. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781786433039.00038>
- Munawaroh, H. (2017). Praktik Mediasi Dalam Penyelesaian Sengketa Adat Di Indonesia. *Ijtihad: Jurnal Hukum Dan Ekonomi Islam*, 11(2), 297. <https://doi.org/10.21111/ijtihad.v11i2.2553>
- Musaffa, M. U. A. (2025). Optimalisasi Penyelesaian Sengketa dalam Perspektif Hukum Islam dan Sistem Hukum Indonesia: Studi Komparatif antara Litigasi dan Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR). *Az-Zarqa': Jurnal Hukum Bisnis Islam*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.14421/g1674m86>
- Nchaga, A. M. (2025). Integrating Technology in Public Administration Training. *IDOSR JOURNAL OF ARTS AND MANAGEMENT*, 10(1), 15–19. <https://doi.org/10.59298/IDOSRJAM/2025/101.151900>
- Pal, A. (2018). Understanding the Arb- Med- Arb Model in International Commercial Arbitration. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3493088>
- Parlina, N. (2021). Regulasi dan Implementasi Wajib Menempuh Upaya Administrasi dalam Sengketa Administrasi di Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara. *JATISWARA*, 36(2), 163–176. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jtsw.v36i2.285>
- Prayudha Dinata, A., Khalimi, K., & Emmy Mustafa, M. (2025). Kepastian Hukum Badan Penyelesaian Sengketa Konsumen (BPSK) dengan Cara Arbitrase. *Blantika: Multidisciplinary Journal*, 3(4). <https://doi.org/10.57096/blantika.v3i4.321>
- Prayuti, Y., Lany, A., Davin Takaryanto, Hamdan, A. R., Ciptawan, B., & Nugroho, E. A. (2024). Efektivitas Mediasi Dan Arbitrase Dalam

- Penyelesaian Sengketa Konsumen Kesehatan. *Syntax Idea*, 6(3), 1533–1544. <https://doi.org/10.46799/syntax-idea.v6i3.3165>
- Rachmadika, A. D., Zarkasi, A., & Syamsir, S. (2024). Kemandirian Kekuasaan Kehakiman Dalam Menegakkan Negara Hukum Yang Demokratis. *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 4(3), 11234–11245. <https://doi.org/10.31004/innovative.v4i3.11592>
- Reza, A. M., & Ramadhan, F. (2018). Proses Penyelesaian Sengketa Perasuransian di Badan Mediasi dan Arbitrase Asuransi Indonesia (BMAI). *Binamulia Hukum*, 7(2), 179–194. <https://doi.org/10.37893/jbh.v7i2.28>
- Romanko, A. (2023). Organy mediacyjne w postępowaniu przed sądami administracyjnymi. *Biuletyn Stowarzyszenia Absolwentów i Przyjaciół Wydziału Prawa Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego*, 10(2), 47–69. <https://doi.org/10.32084/bsawp.5035>
- Ruckteschler, D., & Wendelstein, A. (2021). Efficient Arb-Med-Arb Proceedings: Should the Arbitrator also be the Mediator? *Journal of International Arbitration*, 38(Issue 6), 761–774. <https://doi.org/10.54648/JOIA2021035>
- Sherman, N., & Momani, B. T. (2025). Alternative dispute resolution: Mediation as a model. *F1000Research*, 13, 778. <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.152362.2>
- Silverman, G. (2025). A qualitative systematic reinterpretation study into the role of future time perspective in organizational dispute resolution processes. *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, 28(1), 71–104. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-01-2024-0004>
- Spivakovsky, C., Seear, K., & Carter, A. (Eds.). (2018). *Critical Perspectives on Coercive Interventions: Law, Medicine and Society* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315158693>
- Suherman & Shinta Dwi Enggraini. (2022). Efektivitas Penyelesaian Sengketa Oleh Badan Penyelesaian Sengketa Konsumen (BPSK) Jakarta Melalui Proses Konsiliasi. *Reformasi Hukum*, 26(1), 98–115. <https://doi.org/10.46257/jrh.v26i1.393>
- Susiana & Ardiansyah. (2024). Mediasi Sebagai Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa Waris Bagi Keluarga Islam Di Indonesia Dan Malaysia. *Jurnal Az-Zawajir*, 4(2), 141–154. <https://doi.org/10.57113/jaz.v4i2.409>
- Syaputri, M. D., & Ivanda, A. C. (2023). Mediasi Sebagai Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa Bisnis Di Indonesia. *Yustitia*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.31943/yustitia.v10i2.185>

- Uznadze, N. (2024). Conceptual Models of Evaluative and Facilitative Mediation and Accompanying Ethical Challenges. *Alternative Dispute Resolution Yearbook*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.60131/adr.1.2024.8344>
- Wisudawan, I. G. A., Ismail, S., Suhartana, L. W. P., & Mulada, D. A. (2019). Mediasi Sebagai Salah Satu Penyelesaian Sengketa Bisnis: (Di Desa Gelogor, Kecamatan Kediri, Kabupaten Lombok Barat). *Journal Kompilasi Hukum*, 4(2), 143–154. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jkh.v4i2.23>
- Zaini, A. (2020). Mediasi Sebagai Salah Satu Bentuk Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa. *Al Qisthas: Jurnal Hukum Dan Politik*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.37035/alqisthas.v9i2.1573>
- Zainudin, A., Safa'at, M. A., Anshari, T., & Susmayanti, R. (2025). Reconceptualizing The Dispute Resolution Model for Village Head Elections Towards Independent and Fair Elections. *Audito Comparative Law Journal (ACLJ)*, 6(1), 48–72. <https://doi.org/10.22219/aclj.v6i1.38378>
- Zhang, W., Wang, Y., Li, E., Zhang, C., Li, H., & Hada, S. (2025). Evolutionary Mechanism of Trust for Public–Private Partnership Projects with Public Participation. *Buildings*, 15(3), 391. <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings15030391>
- Zunnuraeni, Z., Asmara, G., & Sili, E. B. (2020). Penyelesaian Sengketa Antara Warga Desa Melalui Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa Di Luar Pengadilan Di Desa Aikmual. *Jurnal PEPADU*, 1(3), 392–399. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jurnalpepadu.v1i3.127>

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express their deepest appreciation and gratitude to the academic supervisors and mentors who have provided valuable direction and input in the preparation of this research. We are especially grateful to the Dean of the Faculty of Law, University of Pasundan, for his constructive criticism and constant support throughout the preparation of this article. This research was financially supported by the Faculty of Law, University of Pasundan, whose contributions made this research possible. We would also like to thank the editorial team for their assistance in editing and proofreading this manuscript. Our appreciation also goes to the Law Laboratory of FH-UNPAS for providing materials and logistical support during the data collection and analysis. The

contributions of all these parties are meaningful for the successful completion of this article.

Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have influenced the work reported in this study.

This page intentionally left blank