

Evaluating the Effectiveness of ADR Mechanisms in Cambodia: Implications for Justice Education and Policy

Phyny Sin^{1*}, Sarom Mok², Mengheang Hor³, Sovantha Ros⁴

¹ Ph.D., Candidate, Graduate School, Preah Sihanoniraja Buddhist University, Phnom Penh, Cambodia

² Ph.D., Professor and Dean, Graduate School, Preah Sihanoniraja Buddhist University, Phnom Penh, Cambodia

³ Ph.D., Professor and Advisor, Graduate School, Preah Sihanoniraja Buddhist University, Phnom Penh, Cambodia

⁴ Ph.D., Candidate, Graduate School, Preah Sihanoniraja Buddhist University, Phnom Penh, Cambodia

*Corresponding Author: sinphyny@email.com

ABSTRACT

This study investigated how well alternative dispute resolution (ADR) methods work in Cambodia, and how they relate to education about justice and the creation of policies. Data were collected from 300 respondents (ADR practitioners, conflict resolution practitioners, parties to disputes and the general public) using a structured questionnaire. Descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation and multiple regression analysis were conducted in SPSS based on the data. As a result of these findings, we have found that ADR mechanisms are highly effective in resolving disputes and improving procedures. Mediation was perceived to be effective ($M = 4.15$, $S.D. = 0.60$) among respondents and thus, it is a positive sign that ADR mechanisms are effective. The correlations show that mediation ($r = .68$, $p < .01$), reconciliation ($r = .66$, $p < .01$) and negotiation ($r = .65$, $p < .01$) are very positive for ADR mechanisms. Several regression analyses showed that ADR mechanisms significantly predict the overall effectiveness. The regression model was statistically significant ($R^2 = .52$, $p < .01$) with mediation being the most significant predictor. These results also confirmed the effectiveness of ADR systems with mediation. And, ADR is an effective driver for lower court workload, judicial efficiency and social harmony, in addition to the results. ADR systems also advance justice education through the development of legal awareness and professional and institutional capacities. These findings are in line with the requirement of ADR to be integrated into the system of law education and policy-building.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 2026-01-16

Accepted 2026-04-15

KEYWORDS

Alternative Dispute Resolution

Mediation

Justice Education

Effectiveness

Access to Justice

INTRODUCTION

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) has become part of modern justice systems with the growing limitations of formal courts that are already lengthy, expensive, and have procedural complexity. ADR in general is seen as a way to enhance access to justice, reduce the burden of the courts, and better resolve disputes globally (Cappelletti & Garth, 1978; Bingham, 2010). In this context, justice theory has to evolve from classical to contemporary in order to be fair, accessible, and effective in the legal system (Rawls, 1971; Sen, 2009).

ADR is playing a growing role in developing and developed countries (Blake et al., 2012; Boule, 2005) and contributes to participatory decision-making and sustainable dispute resolution outcomes. The Multi-Door Courthouse model proposes diverse dispute resolution paths based on the dispute (Sander, 1976), and

Procedural Justice Theory argues that the fairness of the process significantly influences what people accept as results (Tyler, 1990). The use of ADR, specifically mediation and negotiation, has also been shown to be effective to bring about mutually beneficial terms and long-term resolution of disputes (Fisher & Ury, 1981; Moore, 2014). ADR is important for dispute resolution as well as for overall social harmony and legal empowerment in these studies.

Despite these developments, the research is patchy in understanding the effectiveness of ADR mechanisms in the Cambodian context. ADR is used more in Cambodia, but the literature is limited, and the analysis of its effectiveness in different groups is lacking. There is insufficient attention to the role of ADR in supporting justice education and policy development. This gap speaks to the need for a systematic and data-based study of ADR implementation in Cambodia and how it can be improved in practice.

This study aims to investigate the effectiveness of ADR mechanisms in Cambodia and how they can contribute to justice education and policy development. This quantitative research method of the study provides empirical evidence for different ADR mechanisms and their impact on dispute resolution and public perceptions of justice. This study is new to the field of ADR, where it brings into focus the interrelationship between ADR practices of various stakeholders and the application of ADR practices in building a more effective justice system. The findings will be very useful for policymakers, legal practitioners, and educators and will help to enhance the adoption of ADR and reform Cambodia in a sustainable manner.

Theoretical Framework

This theoretical framework is a framework for understanding how the various types of dispute resolution, fairness, and overall justice delivery relate to the different ADR approaches and the process of dispute resolution. This study draws on legal theory, conflict resolution, and social justice frameworks to promote efficient, participatory, and fair treatment of disputes (Sander, 1976; Tyler, 1990). This theory not only has insights into the main variables but also helps to provide an analytical framework for the assessment of ADR mechanisms in Cambodia (Fisher & Ury, 1981; Moore, 2014). In this way, the study can be placed within these frameworks and made more systematic for justice education and policy purposes too.

Interest-Based Negotiation

Interest-Based Negotiation (IBN) is an important theory in ADR that is based on collaboration, mutual understanding, and problem-solving rather than an adversarial position. Rather than pursuing fixed positions in traditional bargaining approaches, interest-based negotiation attempts to accurately identify the needs, interests, and concerns of the parties involved and thus will result in more sustainable and mutually beneficial outcomes (Fisher & Ury, 1981).

Theoretically, interest-based negotiation is relevant as it can enhance the efficiency and fairness of conflict resolution processes. It is the process of negotiation, communication, trust-building, and voluntary agreement, which is associated with the concept of procedural justice (Tyler, 1990), and the idea is that people are more likely to accept outcomes when the process is perceived as fair due to a fair and inclusive process. Interest-based negotiation allows for flexible and fluid solutions, which are important in a variety of social and legal contexts in which formal legal procedures may not be able to address the needs of those who are disputing parties, such as family disputes, workplace conflicts, and community disagreements.

Interest-based negotiation is an important perspective for the study in connection with ADR, mediation, and negotiation. These strategies are based on interest-based approaches to facilitate dialogue and consensus between those parties. As such, the theory informs the independent variables in the study and can help explain how participatory and collaborative practices result in higher levels of perceived effectiveness (efficiency, accessibility, and user satisfaction). If this theoretical perspective were to be incorporated into the research, the study could better understand how ADR mechanisms work and could be improved to better serve justice education and policy development in Cambodia.

The Multi-Door Courthouse Theory

The Multi-Door Courthouse Theory (Sander 1976) offers a structural framework for understanding the variety of conflict resolution options in modern legal systems. This idea supports a system where "doors" are open for resolving disputes so that cases can be shifted to the best process for their kind, complexity, and the needs of the parties. Litigation, mediation, arbitration, negotiation, and other hybrid methods can all be used as "doors" to make the judicial system more efficient, accessible, and tailored to each person's needs. This theory's main point is that there isn't one way to settle all kinds of disagreements. A competent judicial system should have a lot of different ways to settle conflicts that are flexible and take the situation into account. The Multi-Door Courthouse model matches problems with the best feasible way to resolve them. This makes the courts less crowded, saves expenses, and makes users happier (Sander, 1976; Goldberg et al., 2012). The modern justice system is in line with current reform initiatives that aim to make it more accessible, efficient, and relevant to society. The Multi-Door Courthouse Theory helps us understand how different Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) methods fit into the larger judicial system and what their roles are. It shows that mediation, arbitration, negotiation, and reconciliation are all related and not substitutes for formal adjudication. This theoretical framework delineates the independent variables of the study as separate yet interconnected components of a multifaceted conflict resolution system.

The theory is especially important in Cambodia because the formal court system doesn't have enough resources (and it takes a long time to get things done and isn't very accessible). Setting up ADR systems in a "multi-door" framework can help the justice system work better by giving people more culturally appropriate and effective means to settle their differences. This study uses the Multi-Door Courthouse Theory to create the analytical model and show how having and using multiple ADR methods can make the system seem more effective, efficient, and satisfying to users. It also shows how important ADR is for teaching justice and making policies that will help make the judicial system better as a whole.

Access to Justice Theory

And access to justice theory has long been a core theory about the role of the legal system in fairness, equality and effective protection of rights. Justice should not only be a form of formalized delivery and access to justice to all people, not just for those with greater economic status and legal knowledge but also for all people without access to the legal system, and so it is critical to remove obstacles to people's access to justice (Cappelletti & Garth, 1978) like high cost, procedural complexity and delay, which, as a rule, prevent people from reaching or getting justice in the formal court system.

As Access to Justice Theory broadened to include alternative mechanisms and methods to improve the inclusiveness and responsiveness of legal systems, Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) is widely seen as a method for improving access to justice by providing flexible, cost-effective and timely ways of addressing disputes (Bingham, 2010). In mediation, negotiation, arbitration and reconciliation, people are able to participate in the resolution of disputes and are not dependent on formal judicial systems.

As the study is carried out, Access to Justice Theory provides an important lens to evaluate the impact of ADR systems in Cambodia. It promotes a framework for assessing the effectiveness of ADR systems in terms of accessibility, cost effectiveness, fairness and user satisfaction, which are very much the core concepts of the theory. Access to dispute resolution and better access to justice systems not only contribute to the individual justice outcome but in relation to the larger system (e.g., reducing congestion of courts and ensuring social equity) as well.

In developing countries the theory is also relevant to the context of legal systems which are often structural and resource constrained. In Cambodia, the development of ADR mechanisms is a pathway towards better access to justice and a greater public trust in the legal system. Thus this study will further develop upon Access to Justice Theory and how ADR can be used in practice to promote better justice delivery, improve legal

literacy and inform policy development. Based on this research we can get a more holistic understanding of the role of ADR in the development of institutional effectiveness and inclusive justice.

Experiential Learning Theory

The theory says learning is a cyclical process in which there are four stages: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization and active experimentation. This process is about making experience into knowledge and practical knowledge. Experiential Learning Theory (ELT), first developed by Kolb (1984), is a good model for how people acquire knowledge and skills through real experience, reflection and application. The relevance of Experiential Learning Theory to Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) lies in practice and interaction. ADR processes have an active role in mediation and negotiation and are based on real-time decision making, in the same way as the experiential learning. ADR participants not only develop communication skills and empathy but also negotiation skills and conflict management skills. These aspects of experiential learning aid deeper understanding of and long-lasting change in behavior in this field (Kolb, 1984; Mertens, 2014).

In the context of this study, Experiential Learning Theory provides us with a conceptual framework to analyze the role of ADR in justice education and professional development. ADR is that way of learning as individuals, including practitioners, disputing parties, and the general public will learn and apply legal knowledge in practice. This is consistent with the focus on justice education in this study, as ADR does not only resolve conflicts but also promotes legal knowledge, capacity building and institutional learning.

Also, Experiential Learning Theory is integrated into the analysis and contributes to the understanding of how ADR processes are effective and user satisfaction, accessibility and fairness are enhanced through engaging in ADR processes. The theory is consistent with the notion that ADR mechanisms can have a transformational impact on the development of responsive, participatory and education-oriented justice systems as they are based on experience. In this context (Cambodian environment) where legal education is still evolving and public knowledge is still evolving, ADR can be beneficial to bridge the gap between legal theory and practice and contribute to long-term justice reform and policy development.

Procedural Justice Theory

Procedural justice theory is an important theory for understanding how people perceive the fairness and legitimacy of dispute resolution processes. People are more likely to accept decisions and act in accordance with them if they perceive the process by which those decisions are made as fair, transparent, and inclusive (Tyler, 1990). It is not restricted to this theory to be concerned with neutrality, voice (the opportunity to be heard), respect, and trustworthiness in that these are the things that determine individuals' sense of justice in legal and quasi-legal processes.

The relevance of procedural justice theory for alternative dispute resolution (ADR) is rooted in participatory and user-centered processes. As dispute resolution processes in the ADR, through mediation and reconciliation, are inherently designed to help the parties and the process itself to be more participatory and user-oriented and thus more involved (Tyler, 1990; Moore, 2014). Unlike formal court procedures that are sometimes seen as rigid and adversarial in nature, in ADR processes, dialogue, mutual respect, and consensus are considered, and the law of procedural justice is in the heart of that.

We use procedural justice theory as a theoretical foundation for understanding the relation between ADR mechanisms and how they are perceived as effective in regard to fairness, accessibility, and user satisfaction. Such dimensions are part of the dependent variable in the study, which is ADR effectiveness. This theory is why mechanisms that are active participation and fair treatment (mediation and negotiation) lead to more acceptance and satisfaction among users. But procedural justice also promotes trust in the legal system and the need for education and policy reform. This theory is important in understanding how ADR works in Cambodia and in finding methods to enhance it.

METHODS

The research uses the descriptive quantitative method to quantify the research use in the data gathering and generation. A quantitative research design was used, which is a popular research methodology in social science research to investigate relationships between the variables and to test hypotheses (Bryman & Bell, 2003; Mertens, 2014). In this section, we describe how we conducted the analysis of ADR mechanisms in Cambodia and the application of them in the education of justice and policymaking. Data collection, data analysis, and the selection of the data were taken in accordance with the research goals and to ensure validity, reliability, and replicability. Such systematic and structured analysis is to provide clear empirical evidence of ADR in Cambodia and its effectiveness in Cambodian justice.

Sampling Techniques

This study used purposive and stratified sampling methodology to ensure that diverse groups of key stakeholders have been included in Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) processes in Cambodia. Purposive sampling was applied to select participants with local knowledge, experience, or direct involvement in ADR to provide analysis of information-rich cases that are crucial in order to achieve our research objectives (Bryman & Bell, 2003). Additionally, stratified sampling was used to select groups and to ensure a fair representation across the categories.

A total of 300 respondents were selected including ADR practitioners, disputing parties and the general public, of whom 100 were from each group. This sampling strategy was effective to broaden the perspectives and enhance the reliability and validity of the results with less sampling bias and fair representation of the groups (Mertens, 2014). The use of purposive and stratified sampling is therefore an appropriate way to provide expert and public insights on the effectiveness of ADR mechanisms.

Respondents of the Study

The survey included three key stakeholder groups in Cambodia involved in or impacted by ADR mechanisms: ADR practitioners, disputing parties, and the public. So this categorization is to cover a wider range of perspectives: professionals and users as they are the key stakeholders who will be critical to assessing the effectiveness of ADR processes.

ADR practitioners were those with direct professional experience in mediation, arbitration, negotiation or reconciliation. They provided expert information on ADR implementation and practice. Disputing parties were those who had been involved in ADR processes before and had lived with them in order to see how effective and fair they were. The public was included as part of the wider social climate and because of the level of knowledge about ADR as an educational tool as well as a policy tool.

The inclusion of different respondent groups and the triangulation of data from various stakeholders makes the analysis more detailed and valid (Bryman & Bell, 2003; Mertens, 2014). This is a common approach that is consistent with research that aims to find a representative and diverse sample composition to ensure the results are general and robust. The research is a mix of expert and non-expert perspectives so that the ADR effectiveness in Cambodia can be analyzed more accurately.

Instrument

The data for this study was collected from a structured questionnaire that assessed respondents' perceptions of ADR mechanisms and their effectiveness in the Cambodian context. The tool was developed based on the theoretical framework and previously cited empirical studies of ADR, dispute resolution and justice systems to consider the tool as conceptual as well as a measurement tool (Mertens, 2014; Moore, 2014). The questionnaire consisted of several parts: the first part provided demographic information of the respondents and in the next three sections, the main areas of the investigation (ADR (mediation, negotiation, arbitration and reconciliation) and ADR effectiveness) were measured. Likert scales allow for statistical analysis of latent constructs and allow for comparison across respondent groups. Subject-matter experts evaluated the

questionnaire according to the Index of Item-Objective Congruence (IOC), and changes were made before data collection. The reliability of the instrument was also measured using Cronbach's alpha to ensure the consistency of measurement items. These methods are used in quantitative research instruments to ensure the accuracy and credibility of quantitative research instruments (Mertens, 2014). The tool was designed and validated in order to precisely assess the constructs of ADR effectiveness and it was also applied to justice education and policy development.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Descriptive Analysis of ADR Effectiveness

This study employed descriptive statistics to characterize the effectiveness of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanisms in Cambodia. It shows the tendency and variability of the central elements of ADR—mediation, negotiation, arbitration, and reconciliation—and its overall effectiveness.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of ADR Variables

Variables	M	S.D.
Mediation	4.12	0.63
Negotiation	4.05	0.68
Arbitration	3.88	0.71
Reconciliation	4.10	0.65
Overall ADR Effectiveness	4.15	0.60

All components of ADR were found to have mean scores above 3.50, indicating a high level of perceived effectiveness among respondents. Mediation (M = 4.12, S.D. = 0.63) and reconciliation (M = 4.10, S.D. = 0.65) were the two that were rated the highest, as both are effective in dispute resolution and both of them are team-based and relationship-based. Negotiation was also successful (M = 4.05, S.D. = 0.68) and proved to be useful in the form of mutually acceptable outcomes. Arbitration had a lower mean score (M = 3.88, S.D. = 0.71) but a satisfactory score overall. The much higher standard deviation of arbitration suggests that the perception of arbitration is quite different from that of the other components. Respondents view alternative dispute resolution (ADR) methods as efficient and reliable for resolving disputes (M = 4.15, S.D. = 0.60), which makes them potentially useful for improving the Cambodian justice system.

Correlation Analysis

Pearson correlation was analyzed to figure out how the parts of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) relate to each other and how well they work as a whole. This analysis helps us figure out how strong and in what direction the relationship is between variables.

Table 2. Correlation Matrix of ADR Components and Effectiveness

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1. Mediation	1				
2. Negotiation	.62**	1			
3. Arbitration	.55**	.58**	1		
4. Reconciliation	.60**	.61**	.57**	1	
5. Effectiveness	.68**	.65**	.59**	.66**	1

There is a substantial and statistically significant positive relationship between all ADR components and overall effectiveness. Mediation had the strongest link to effectiveness ($r = .68, p < .01$), followed by reconciliation ($r = .66, p < .01$) and negotiation ($r = .65, p < .01$). These data show that taking part in all three of these ADR processes makes resolving disputes more effective. There is also a strong and positive link between arbitration and effectiveness ($r = .59, p < .01$), but it is not as strongly linked to the other components. This means that arbitration may help effectiveness, but it may not be as helpful as mediation, reconciliation, and negotiation in improving overall dispute resolution outcomes. Overall, the results show that ADR methods are connected and should help settle disputes, thus they should be combined to make the judicial system better.

Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the predictive impact of the ADR components (mediation, negotiation, arbitration, and reconciliation) on overall effectiveness. This study assesses the extent to which each component is involved in explaining ADR effectiveness variations.

Table 3. Multiple Regression Analysis of ADR Effectiveness

Variables	Beta (β)	t-value	p-value
Mediation	.34	5.82	.000***
Negotiation	.28	4.96	.000***
Arbitration	.15	2.87	.004**
Reconciliation	.30	5.21	.000***
R ²	.62		

Note: *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$

The model explains a significant portion of the variance in ADR effectiveness ($R^2 = .62$), demonstrating its high explanatory power. Mediation is the strongest predictor ($\beta = .34, p < .001$), followed by reconciliation ($\beta = .30, p < .001$) and negotiation ($\beta = .28, p < .001$), indicating that these components are important in terms of overall effectiveness. Arbitration is also significant but comparatively weak ($\beta = .15, p < .01$). The results indicate that ADR mechanisms strongly predict effectiveness outcomes and are therefore crucial for streamlining the procedure of the courts, reducing staff time in the courts, and facilitating peaceful dispute resolution.

Discussion

The study provides empirical evidence for ADR mechanisms in Cambodia as it is the theoretical framework of the study. The high impact of mediation and negotiation on the results of this study is consistent with interest-based negotiation theory which states that disputes should be resolved by addressing the interests of the parties rather than rigid positions (Fisher & Ury, 1981).

The strong statistical relationships shown in this study indicate that collaborative and dialogue-based processes will lead to mutually beneficial outcomes in a shorter time and so will be more satisfactory and sustainable to the parties.

The results in this study are also consistent with the Multi-Door Courthouse Theory (Sander, 1976) that the disputes should be resolved by the most appropriate mechanism. The powerful explanatory power of the regression model ($R^2 = .50$) of ADR suggests that all aspects of ADR are connected to the successful resolution of disputes. A multidisciplinary system that combines mediation, negotiation and arbitration can be implemented and the justice system can be more efficient.

In Cambodia where the courts are already overflowing with cases, ADR can also be implemented in practice where the burden of the judiciary is lessened and the justice system is still fair. Third, the results support the Access to Justice Theory: accessible, timely and affordable dispute resolution mechanisms (Cappelletti & Garth, 1978). The large mean and correlation indicators indicate that ADRs do help to overcome barriers to formal litigation (cost, delay and procedural complexity).

ADR increases the chance for people to resolve problems and for people to be in the justice system. It is consistent with Experiential Learning Theory (Kolb, 1984), which emphasizes active participation and practical experience in learning. In the ADR (mediation and negotiation) phase we develop core skills such as communication, critical thinking, and conflict resolution, and the results show that ADR is beneficial for dispute resolution as well as justice education through professional knowledge and public opinion.

The dual role of ADR can be used for both legal and educational purposes. In all these theoretical perspectives we need to formalize ADR practices and put them in law and policy frameworks to achieve effective justice reform.

CONCLUSION

There is no doubt that ADR structures from Cambodia are beneficial in the areas of dispute resolution and in the development of the justice system more generally. We found that mediation, negotiation, and reconciliation are all effective in reducing the number of cases to be heard in court and also in the efficiency and satisfaction of the users. This is consistent with previous studies in terms of efficiency and user-centered approach of ADR mechanisms (Bouille, 2005; Moore, 2014). Such alternative mechanisms are also inexpensive and effective for the delivery of justice in Cambodia.

Moreover, the research shows that ADR mechanisms are not only part of the formal judicial system but also are a crucial part of an equitable and inclusive justice system. The good relationship studied between ADR mechanisms and perceived effectiveness supports theories on procedural fairness and participatory dispute resolution (Tyler, 1990; Fisher & Ury, 1981). In this respect ADR contributes to broader goals, such as social harmony, institutional trust and justice education in line with access to justice (Cappelletti & Garth, 1978).

However, there are also limitations to these findings. The cross-sectional research design of the study limits causal relationships between variables (Bryman & Bell, 2003). Second, self-reported data could lead to response bias. Third, the research is context-specific in Cambodia and would be difficult to generalize to other legal and institutional settings.

Based on these results, we suggest some of the following recommendations: policymakers should improve institutional support for ADR mechanisms and embed them into both national and local justice systems. There has to be tighter coordination between formal courts and ADR bodies for ADR implementation to ensure effective implementation. In addition, integration of ADR into the legal education and professional training programs can enhance practitioners' competencies and public awareness of alternative dispute resolution methods. Longitudinal studies will be required for future research of ADR effects and causal relationships on the justice system performance and therefore to better understand the long-term impact of ADR on justice system performance (Mertens, 2014).

REFERENCES

- Austermiller, S. (2010). *Alternative dispute resolution in Cambodia: Challenges and opportunities*. East-West Management Institute.
- Aristotle. (350 BCE/2009). *Nicomachean ethics* (W. D. Ross, Trans.). Oxford University Press.
- Bentham, J. (1789/2000). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. Oxford University Press.
- Bingham, T. (2010). *The rule of law*. Penguin Books.

- Blake, S., Browne, J., & Sime, S. (2012). *A practical approach to alternative dispute resolution*. Oxford University Press.
- Boulle, L. (2005). *Mediation: Principles and practice*. LexisNexis Butterworths.
- Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2003). *Business research methods*. Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, J. M. (1997). *Is there a case for socialist jurisprudence?* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Glasgow).
- Cappelletti, M., & Garth, B. (1978). *Access to justice: The worldwide movement to make rights effective*. Sijthoff and Noordhoff.
- Fisher, R., & Ury, W. (1981). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. Penguin Books.
- Goldberg, S., Sander, F., Rogers, N., & Cole, S. (2012). *Dispute resolution: Negotiation, mediation, and other processes (6th ed.)*. Aspen Publishers.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice Hall.
- Low, J., & Quek Anderson, D. (2012). *Mediation in Singapore: A practical guide*. LexisNexis.
- Menkel-Meadow, C. (2016). *Negotiation and mediation: Theories and practices*. Wolters Kluwer.
- Mnookin, R. H. (1998). *Beyond winning: Negotiating to create value in deals and disputes*. Harvard University Press.
- Moore, C. W. (2014). *The mediation process: Practical strategies for resolving conflict (4th ed.)*. Jossey-Bass.
- Nolan-Haley, J. (2013). *Alternative dispute resolution in a nutshell (5th ed.)*. West Academic Publishing.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press.
- Rawls, J. (1999). *A theory of justice (Rev. ed.)*. Harvard University Press.
- Sander, F. E. A. (1976). *Varieties of dispute processing*. *Federal Rules Decisions*, 70, 111–134.
- Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of justice*. Harvard University Press.
- Sander, F. E. A. (1976). *Varieties of dispute processing*. In A. Levin & R. Wheeler (Eds.), *The Pound Conference: Perspectives on justice in the future (pp. 65–87)*. West Publishing.
- Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why people obey the law*. Yale University Press.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2020). *Access to justice for all: A global report*. <https://www.undp.org>
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). (2022). *Alternative dispute resolution in Southeast Asia*. <https://www.undp.org>
- Ury, W., Brett, J., & Goldberg, S. (1988). *Getting disputes resolved: Designing systems to cut the costs of conflict*. Jossey-Bass.
- Wissler, R. L. (2004). *The effectiveness of court-connected dispute resolution in civil cases*. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 22(1–2), 55–88.
- World Bank. (2021). *Resolving disputes efficiently: The role of ADR in improving access to justice*. <https://www.worldbank.org>
- Yarn, D. H. (1999). *Dictionary of conflict resolution*. Jossey-Bass.