Industrial Dispute Resolution as Legal Resilience for Workers' Rights Protection

Dinda Delfina
Fakultas Ilmu Sosial, Universitas Negeri Malang, Jl. Semarang No. 5, Malang 65145, Jawa Timur, Indonesia
dinda.delfina.fis@um.ac.id

Abstract. Industrial relations conflicts continue to test the effectiveness of workers' rights protection, especially where unequal bargaining power, prolonged procedures, and weak execution of outcomes restrict meaningful access to justice. This article conceptualizes industrial dispute settlement as a form of legal resilience: the capacity of the legal order to absorb employment conflict, respond through appropriate institutions, and restore a rights-based equilibrium. Using normative legal research, the study combines statutory, conceptual, and analytical approaches to examine bipartite negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, and proceedings before the Industrial Relations Court. The analysis finds that these mechanisms strengthen worker protection when they are accessible, prompt, impartial, and capable of producing enforceable outcomes. Their protective value, however, is reduced by procedural complexity and differences in the parties' legal resources. Industrial dispute settlement should consequently be understood not only as a sequence of procedural stages, but as an institutional infrastructure for sustaining justice, legal certainty, and stability within employment relations.
Keywords: Industrial dispute resolution, legal resilience, workers' rights, labor law, industrial relations.

1. Introduction

Industrial relations disputes should not be reduced to private disagreement between an employer and an employee. They engage statutory and constitutional interests because disputes over wages, job security, working conditions, and remedies directly affect the realization of workers' rights. The worker's comparatively weaker bargaining position makes an effective settlement system especially important; without it, individual violations can escalate into persistent industrial conflict and wider social instability. Indonesian law responds through Law Number 2 of 2004, which structures dispute settlement through bipartite negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, and adjudication in the Industrial Relations Court. The same statute distinguishes disputes over rights, disputes over interests, termination disputes, and disputes between trade unions within a single enterprise.[1]

The existence of formal rights does not in itself guarantee protection. Workers may still encounter costly procedures, limited legal capability, delays, and difficulty securing compliance with settlements or judgments. The transformation of labour regulation under the Job Creation framework, enacted through Law Number 6 of 2023, makes it necessary to reconsider how well the dispute-settlement system performs in a changing labour market. Constitutional Court Decision Number 168/PUU-XXI/2023 further sharpened this inquiry by addressing bargaining balance, trade-union participation, and the continuation of dispute resolution until a final and binding outcome is obtained. These developments support viewing dispute settlement through the broader concept of legal resilience, namely the ability of legal institutions and instruments to retain their normative function when confronted with social, economic, or institutional pressure. The question examined here is therefore how industrial dispute resolution contributes to that resilience while protecting workers' rights. [2], [3]

The first analytical foundation is legal protection theory. In Hadjon's formulation, protection has both preventive and repressive dimensions: the law should reduce the likelihood of rights violations, and it should also provide effective remedies after a violation occurs. In industrial relations, the preventive dimension appears in bipartite and other non-judicial processes intended to resolve disagreement before litigation becomes necessary. The repressive dimension appears in adjudication and in the enforceability of settlements

© The Author(s) 2026
S. Untari et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Citizenship Education and Democratic Issues (ICCEDI 2026)*, Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research 1039,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-626-0_12

and court decisions. This framework is important because statutory recognition of a worker's right has little practical value unless there is an accessible, fair, and enforceable pathway through which that right can be defended or restored. [4]

A second analytical layer combines legal-system theory with responsive law. Friedman explains legal effectiveness through the interaction of substance, structure, and legal culture. In the labour context, substance includes the governing norms and procedures; structure encompasses labour offices, mediators, conciliators, arbitrators, courts, and judges; and culture concerns the attitudes, expectations, negotiating behaviour, and compliance practices of employers, workers, unions, and public institutions. Responsive-law theory asks a different but complementary question: whether legal institutions respond to social vulnerability and substantive justice rather than merely applying formal rules. Nonet and Selznick argue that responsiveness requires law to remain attentive to social need and institutional purpose. A resilient dispute-settlement system must therefore be legally clear, institutionally dependable, socially responsive, and oriented toward substantive justice. [5], [6]

Earlier research has mapped the principal settlement routes and their protective function. Sudrajat, Arzam, and Witro identify bipartite, tripartite, and court-based mechanisms as avenues through which labour-law protection can be pursued. Tamba, Juita, and Astanti emphasize the role of bipartite negotiation, mediation, conciliation, and arbitration outside court and explain that a collective agreement can be registered with the Industrial Relations Court and enforced when a party fails to comply. Hanifah likewise distinguishes litigation from non-litigation settlement and treats unsuccessful bipartite negotiations as a gateway to further proceedings before the competent labour institution. These studies establish the procedural architecture, but their primary concern remains the operation of particular settlement mechanisms. [7], [8], [9]

More recent work has drawn attention to weaknesses within that architecture. Widyastuti and colleagues connect dispute-resolution design with the guarantee of basic workers' rights and equal treatment in the employment relationship. Arpangi and Sanni, meanwhile, locate obstacles to justice in deficiencies of legal substance, legal structure, and legal culture, including ineffective bipartite and tripartite processes. The implication is that a system cannot be judged solely by whether forums formally exist. Its quality depends on whether those forums produce usable remedies, reduce structural bargaining inequality, and discourage repetition of the underlying violation. [10]

What remains insufficiently developed is a unified account of industrial dispute resolution as legal resilience. Prior studies commonly address procedure, institutional authority, or rights protection as separate issues. This article links those strands by assessing dispute settlement as an integrated resilience mechanism whose quality depends on accessibility, procedural fairness, institutional responsiveness, legal certainty, and enforceability. Its objective is twofold: to explain how the existing Indonesian system protects workers' rights and to identify the conditions under which that system can function as a more robust and adaptive component of labour law.

2. Research Methods

This article uses normative juridical research, placing positive legal norms and their institutional application at the centre of the inquiry. Three approaches are combined. The statutory approach examines Law Number 2 of 2004 concerning Industrial Relations Dispute Settlement, Law Number 13 of 2003 concerning Manpower and subsequent amendments, and Law Number 6 of 2023 concerning Job Creation. The conceptual approach addresses legal protection, legal resilience, legal-system theory, and responsive law. The case approach considers Constitutional Court Decision Number 168/PUU-XXI/2023, particularly its relevance to bargaining balance and to the requirement that employment-termination disputes proceed to a legally final resolution. The study is descriptive-analytical because it first maps the rules, mechanisms, and recurring problems of industrial dispute settlement and then evaluates them through the concept of resilience and the objective of protecting workers' rights. [11], [12]

The materials are secondary legal data divided into primary, secondary, and tertiary sources. Primary materials consist of legislation and judicial decisions concerning employment and industrial dispute resolution. Secondary materials include books, scholarly articles, research findings, and expert commentary on worker protection, dispute settlement, legal-system theory, responsive law, and resilience. Tertiary materials, including legal dictionaries and encyclopaedias, are used where clarification of legal terminology is required. Library research is employed to trace, inventory, classify, and examine those materials. The analysis is qualitative and juridical: relevant norms are interpreted in relation to one another, linked to the selected theoretical frameworks, assessed for institutional strengths and weaknesses, and used to construct an argument about dispute resolution as a resilient mechanism for protecting labour rights.

3. Results and Discussion

Industrial dispute resolution in Indonesia operates as a multilayered form of legal protection rather than merely as a method for closing cases. Its broader functions include maintaining legal certainty, moderating bargaining inequality, and preventing employment conflict from destabilizing workplace relations. The Constitution recognizes the right to work and to receive fair and proper remuneration and treatment in employment. A settlement system must therefore give workers an effective means to assert and recover rights when disputes concern wages, termination, working conditions, collective arrangements, or union representation. In that sense, the system converts formal legal recognition into practical enforceability. [13]

Law Number 2 of 2004 organizes industrial conflict into four categories: disputes over rights, disputes over interests, termination-of-employment disputes, and disputes between trade unions within one company. The categories are not merely descriptive because they shape the available settlement route. A rights dispute concerns the non-fulfilment or differing interpretation of existing entitlements arising from legislation, employment agreements, company regulations, or collective agreements. An interest dispute concerns the creation or alteration of employment conditions. Termination disputes concern the legality or consequences of ending employment, while inter-union disputes involve representation or membership within the same enterprise. The statutory design is therefore differentiated rather than uniform, matching procedural pathways to the legal nature of the conflict.

Bipartite negotiation forms the first protective layer. The statutory scheme requires workers or trade unions and employers to attempt direct deliberation before the dispute moves further. Its preventive value lies in allowing the parties to establish the facts, identify the contested right or interest, and seek agreement before positions harden into litigation. Viewed through legal protection theory, bipartite negotiation can stop a rights violation from becoming a prolonged industrial dispute. That protective function, however, is conditional on the quality of participation. Where workers lack information, legal assistance, union support, or sufficient negotiating capacity, a formally completed bipartite stage may conceal rather than correct structural inequality.

Failure at the bipartite stage opens the way to mediation, conciliation, or arbitration. Mediation has a particularly central role because it serves as the default tripartite route where the parties do not select conciliation or arbitration and because certain disputes recorded with the labour authority must pass through mediation before reaching the Industrial Relations Court. Conciliation and arbitration depend more heavily on agreement and have narrower jurisdictional scopes. Arbitration is available only for disputes over interests and disputes between trade unions within one enterprise, and its award is final and binding subject to limited cancellation mechanisms before the Supreme Court. The overall structure therefore combines consensual resolution with access to binding adjudicative outcomes when agreement proves unattainable. [14], [15]

The Industrial Relations Court supplies the repressive component of the protection system when non-litigation processes do not resolve the dispute. As a specialized court within the general court structure, it is intended to provide settlement that is prompt, fair, accurate, and relatively inexpensive, including through a streamlined appellate design. Rights disputes and termination disputes may proceed directly to cassation before the Supreme Court, whereas decisions in interest disputes and inter-union disputes are final at first

instance. This institutional configuration seeks to limit delay and provide finality. For workers, the practical importance of timely legal certainty is substantial because unresolved disputes can immediately affect income, social security, household welfare, and continued access to employment. [16], [17]

These procedural layers can also be read as components of legal resilience. Resilience refers to the capacity of a legal order to continue functioning under pressure, adapt to disruption, and restore normative stability. Industrial conflict puts that capacity to the test because it can interrupt work, undermine income security, damage trust, and destabilize workplace cooperation. A resilient system must absorb conflict through negotiation where possible, transfer unresolved matters to impartial institutions, and restore legal order through outcomes that can actually be enforced. Indonesia's model contains those basic components in the form of mandatory bipartite engagement, state-supported mediation, optional conciliation and arbitration, specialized adjudication, and legally enforceable settlements or judgments. [18], [19]

From a legal-system perspective, resilience depends on the interaction of substance, structure, and culture. Substantive resilience requires clear and fair rules on dispute categories, procedure, evidence, time limits, remedies, and execution. Structural resilience depends on the competence and capacity of labour offices, mediators, conciliators, arbitrators, judges, ad hoc judges, and the Supreme Court. Cultural resilience concerns whether employers respect labour standards, whether workers and unions can confidently use the available procedures, and whether public institutions are committed to meaningful access to justice. Weakness in any one dimension can leave the system formally intact while substantially ineffective in protecting rights.

Responsive law adds a substantive-justice requirement to this institutional analysis. Procedures cannot be evaluated in isolation from workers' actual vulnerability, including dependence on wages, limited legal knowledge, fear of retaliation, and unequal access to professional representation. A system may therefore comply with procedural form yet still fail to deliver substantive justice. Mediators, judges, and labour authorities should understand their role as more than technical case administration; they also help correct the effects of unequal bargaining power. This is particularly significant in disputes over dismissal, unpaid wages, outsourcing, fixed-term employment, and breaches of collective agreements, where the consequences for workers may be immediate and difficult to reverse.

Constitutional Court Decision Number 168/PUU-XXI/2023 reinforces this protective interpretation. The Court emphasized that termination should function as a measure of last resort and that bipartite discussions must be conducted through deliberation aimed at consensus between employers and workers or their unions. It further clarified that, where bipartite efforts fail, termination should not become effective merely by unilateral managerial decision; the dispute must proceed through the industrial-relations settlement system until a final and binding determination is obtained. This constitutional reading strengthens workers' procedural position and confirms that dispute resolution serves as a safeguard against premature or arbitrary termination.

The same decision also illustrates the resilience function of the system. Requiring the process to continue until legal finality means that dispute resolution protects workers during the period of uncertainty, not only after a final judgment has been issued. If termination could take effect before the dispute was conclusively resolved, the worker would bear the economic cost of uncertainty while the legality of the employer's action remained contested. Final-and-binding review therefore operates as a barrier against irreversible loss occurring too early in the process. Legal resilience in this setting is not simply institutional continuity; it is the capacity of institutions to prevent vulnerable parties from suffering harm that cannot later be adequately repaired.

Important limitations nevertheless remain. Bipartite negotiation does not itself equalize bargaining power, and employees may accept disadvantageous outcomes because of immediate financial pressure, fear of dismissal, or lack of legal support. Mediation and conciliation may deteriorate into administrative formalities when labour officers lack independence, expertise, resources, or sufficient time. Court proceedings can also remain difficult for workers who must prepare legal submissions, evidence, witnesses,

and procedural documents. These problems demonstrate that institutional existence is an inadequate measure of resilience. Accessibility, quality of participation, and fairness of the process are equally important. [20]

The empirical and doctrinal literature supports that assessment. Sudrajat, Arzam, and Witro regard bipartite, tripartite, and court-based mechanisms as channels of legal protection. Tamba, Juita, and Astanti show that negotiated and other out-of-court processes can protect workers where the resulting collective agreement is legally binding and capable of registration and enforcement through the Industrial Relations Court. Widyastuti and colleagues nevertheless identify continuing difficulties in securing basic labour rights and equal treatment through the existing model. Arpangi and Sanni similarly argue for redesign because defects in legal substance, structure, and culture can obstruct access to justice. These studies collectively indicate that procedural availability is only one dimension of effectiveness; institutional quality and justice orientation are equally decisive. [

Two functions of industrial dispute resolution therefore operate simultaneously. One is remedial: the system gives workers a route to contest unpaid entitlements, unlawful termination, and other forms of non-compliance. The other is systemic: it helps preserve legal order when employment relationships are destabilized by conflict. These functions reinforce one another. Effective protection reduces the risk that unresolved grievances will turn into distrust, recurring non-compliance, or wider industrial unrest. At the same time, a resilient legal system supports rights protection by ensuring that remedies remain available even when employment relations are under significant economic or institutional strain. [20], [21]

Strengthening the system requires reforms at each stage. Bipartite negotiation would benefit from clearer documentation requirements, easier access to legal information, and meaningful union participation. Mediation and conciliation require competent and independent labour officers, transparent procedures, and measurable standards for timeliness. Access to the Industrial Relations Court can be improved through procedural simplification, stronger legal aid, and more consistent execution of decisions. Better coordination between labour inspection and dispute resolution is also necessary because many conflicts originate in repeated violations that could have been identified earlier. These measures would move the system away from ritual procedural compliance and toward genuine institutional resilience.

Indonesia already possesses the core institutional architecture needed for resilient industrial dispute resolution, but architecture alone is insufficient. The system's effectiveness depends on its ability to overcome procedural complexity, bargaining inequality, weak enforcement, and limited institutional responsiveness. Worker protection therefore requires more than the existence of multiple forums; those forums must be predictable, accessible, impartial, enforceable, and attentive to socio-economic vulnerability. Properly strengthened, industrial dispute resolution can function as a strategic element of labour law by protecting individual and collective rights, sustaining industrial harmony, and enabling the legal system to respond to conflict in a fair and durable manner.

4. Conclusion and Recommendation

Industrial dispute resolution should be understood as an element of legal resilience because it supplies an ordered pathway for receiving, processing, and resolving conflict between workers and employers. Indonesia's framework of bipartite negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, and Industrial Relations Court adjudication does more than provide procedural closure. It helps preserve wages, employment security, fair treatment, social protection, and access to justice when workplace relations are disrupted. In this way, dispute settlement links the formal recognition of labour rights with institutions capable of making those rights effective in practice. The resilience of that framework depends on the combined quality of legal substance, institutional structure, and legal culture. Rules must be clear, fair, and enforceable; mediators, conciliators, arbitrators, judges, and labour authorities must possess sufficient competence and independence; and bargaining practices must reflect good faith and respect for labour standards. Constitutional Court Decision Number 168/PUU-XXI/2023 strengthens these requirements by treating termination as a last resort and by requiring the dispute-settlement process to reach a final and binding outcome. The system therefore has a constitutional protective dimension in addition to its ordinary procedural role, particularly in preventing arbitrary or premature dismissal. At the same time, unequal bargaining power,

complicated procedures, limited access to legal assistance, institutional weakness, and difficulties enforcing outcomes continue to reduce the system's protective capacity. The presence of dispute-resolution bodies cannot, by itself, guarantee substantive justice. Legal resilience is achieved only when workers can use those institutions without prohibitive barriers and when the resulting process is impartial, timely, affordable, enforceable, and responsive to the socio-economic realities that shape employment disputes. The principal reforms should therefore focus on making each stage more substantive and usable. Bipartite negotiations need clearer standards, written records, adequate access to legal information, and genuine trade-union involvement. Mediation and conciliation should be supported by stronger professionalism, independence, and institutional capacity. The Industrial Relations Court should be made easier to access through simplified procedure, effective legal-aid mechanisms, reliable execution of decisions, and better coordination with labour inspection. Those improvements are necessary if industrial dispute resolution is to operate as an effective resilience mechanism for workers' rights rather than merely as a formal sequence of procedural requirements.

References

[1] Republik Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2004 tentang Penyelesaian Perselisihan Hubungan Industrial*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Republik Indonesia, 2004.

[2] Mahkamah Konstitusi Republik Indonesia, *Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Nomor 168/PUU-XXI/2023*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Mahkamah Konstitusi Republik Indonesia, 2024.

[3] Republik Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Nomor 6 Tahun 2023 tentang Penetapan Peraturan Pemerintah Pengganti Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2022 tentang Cipta Kerja Menjadi Undang-Undang*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Republik Indonesia, 2023.

[4] P. M. Hadjon, *Perlindungan Hukum bagi Rakyat di Indonesia: Sebuah Studi tentang Prinsip-Prinsipnya, Penanganannya oleh Pengadilan dalam Lingkungan Peradilan Umum dan Pembentukan Peradilan Administrasi Negara*. Surabaya, Indonesia: Bina Ilmu, 1987.

[5] L. M. Friedman, *The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective*. New York, NY: USA: Russell Sage Foundation, 1975.

[6] P. Nonet dan P. Selznick, *Law and Society in Transition: Toward Responsive Law*. New York, NY: USA: Harper & Row, 1978.

[7] I. Hanifah, "Non-litigation dispute resolution based on labor law in Indonesia," vol. 9, no. 1, hlm. 55–64, 2024.

[8] S. A. Sudrajat, A. Arzam, dan D. Witro, "Legal protection in labor dispute settlement through industrial relations mechanism," *Khazanah Huk.*, vol. 4, no. 1, hlm. 1–9, 2022, doi: 10.15575/kh.v4i1.17027.

[9] T. Tamba, S. R. Juita, dan D. I. Astanti, "Legal protection in the settlement of industrial relations disputes in Indonesia," *J. Justiciabelen*, vol. 6, no. 1, hlm. 14–23, 2023, doi: 10.30587/justiciabelen.v6i1.6165.

[10] A. Arpangi dan T. Sanni, "Redesigning the principle of justice in labor disputes," *J. Sustain. Dev. Regul. Issues*, vol. 3, no. 2, hlm. 247–285, 2025, doi: 10.53955/jsderi.v3i2.95.

[11] T. V. Widyastuti, E. Soponyono, A. I. Hamzani, B. T. Bawono, dan A. Mashdurohatun, "Industrial relations dispute resolution model in Indonesia," *Formosa J. Multidiscip. Res.*, vol. 3, no. 2, hlm. 323–334, 2024, doi: 10.55927/fjmr.v3i2.8116.

[12] Republik Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Nomor 13 Tahun 2003 tentang Ketenagakerjaan*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Republik Indonesi, 2003.

[13] Republik Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Republik Indonesia, 1945.

[14] F. Fuqoha, "Tinjauan yuridis kekuatan hukum penyelesaian perselisihan non-litigasi dalam perselisihan hubungan industrial," *Indones. State Law Rev.*, vol. 2, no. 2, hlm. 119–137, 2020.

[15] Kementerian Tenaga Kerja dan Transmigrasi Republik Indonesia, *Peraturan Menteri Tenaga Kerja dan Transmigrasi Nomor 17 Tahun 2014 tentang Pengangkatan dan Pemberhentian Mediator Hubungan Industrial serta Tata Kerja Mediasi*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Kementerian Tenaga Kerja dan Transmigrasi Republik Indonesia, 2014.
[16] I. N. J. Kesuma dan I. W. A. Vijayantera, "Mediasi hubungan industrial sebagai upaya alternatif penyelesaian perselisihan hubungan industrial," *J. Advokasi*, vol. 8, no. 1, hlm. 59–71, 2018.
[17] A. D. Yuliardi dan I. B. Santoso, "Upaya arbitrase dalam penyelesaian perselisihan hubungan industrial didasarkan adanya kesepakatan para pihak," *Perspekt. Huk.*, hlm. 139–165, 2022, doi: 10.30649/ph.v22i1.92.
[18] A. H. Zulkarnaen dan A. Sanjaya, "The authority of the Industrial Relations Court in resolving labour disputes in Indonesia," *Int. J. Soc. Sci. Hum. Res.*, vol. 7, no. 11, hlm. 8635–8641, 2024, doi: 10.47191/ijsshr/v7-i11-59.
[19] J. B. Ruhl, B. Cosens, dan N. Soininen, "Resilience of legal systems: Toward adaptive governance," dalam *in Multisystemic Resilience: Adaptation and Transformation in Contexts of Change*, M. Ungar, Ed., Oxford, U.K: Oxford University Press, 2021, hlm. 509–529. doi: 10.1093/oso/9780190095888.003.0027.
[20] J. Christo, R. Subekti, dan P. S. Raharjo, "Efektivitas penyelesaian perselisihan hubungan industrial melalui mediasi oleh Dinas Perindustrian dan Tenaga Kerja Kabupaten Sukoharjo," *Indones. J. Soc. Sci. Humanit.*, vol. 5, no. 1, hlm. 146–152, 2025.
[21] R. S. Ginting, "Penyelesaian perselisihan pemutusan hubungan kerja (PHK) atas kesalahan berat," vol. 2, 1 vol., Dharmasisya: Jurnal Program Magister Hukum FHUI, 2022, hlm. 495–512.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

