MAPPING IDEA & LITERATURE FORMAT | RESEARCH ARTICLE

Negotiating Customary Values: A Legal Anthropological Study of Social Conflict Resolution in Local Communities Amid Modernization

Eliza Meiyani[1], Fadhil Hayan Mochammad[2]

[1] Department of Government Science Doctorate, Faculty of Government Science, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Email: elizameiyani19@gmail.com[1],
[2] Department of Law Science, Faculty of Law, Universitas Muhammadiyah Palu, Palu, Indonesia. Email: fadhilhayyan@unismuhpalu.ac.id[2]

ABSTRACT

This study examines how customary values and positive law are negotiated in the resolution of social conflicts within local communities amid ongoing processes of modernization. The objective of the research is to analyze the persistence, adaptation, and interaction of customary norms and formal legal systems from a legal anthropological perspective, while identifying the implications of such interactions for legitimacy, justice outcomes, and sustainable governance. The study employs a qualitative research approach grounded in a systematic literature review of classical and contemporary scholarship in legal anthropology, socio-legal studies, and conflict resolution. Through thematic content analysis, the research synthesizes recurring patterns, conceptual arguments, and empirical findings on legal pluralism, forum choice, and hybrid dispute-resolution mechanisms. The results indicate that modernization does not displace customary law but reshapes the conditions under which it operates, leading to negotiated and hybrid forms of legality. Customary mechanisms remain socially legitimate and effective, particularly for community-based disputes, while positive law is strategically mobilized for enforceability and external recognition. The key finding of this study is that social conflict resolution in plural legal contexts is best understood as a process of negotiated legality, in which customary values and state law are continuously reinterpreted and combined. These findings contribute to theoretical debates on legal pluralism and offer insights into the design of inclusive and sustainable conflict-resolution frameworks in modernizing societies.

Keywords: Legal Pluralism, Customary Law, Positive Law, Social Conflict Resolution, Modernization.

I. Introduction

Law is not merely a system of written rules enforced by state institutions but a social phenomenon embedded within cultural values, moral expectations, and collective practices. Legal anthropological scholarship has long emphasized that the functioning of law cannot be understood apart from the social

contexts in which it operates. In many local communities, particularly those with strong customary traditions, social order is maintained through normative systems that predate and coexist with modern positive law. Early anthropological studies demonstrated that what constitutes "law" in society often extends beyond codified statutes and formal courts, encompassing unwritten norms, reciprocal obligations, and communal sanctions that regulate behavior and resolve disputes (Malinowski, 1926). In the context of modernization, the relationship between customary values and positive law becomes increasingly complex. Modern states tend to promote formal legal systems characterized by codification, legal certainty, and centralized authority. These systems are often presented as universal mechanisms for achieving justice and social order. However, empirical research consistently shows that expanding state law does not automatically eliminate customary legal practices. Instead, multiple legal orders continue to coexist within the same social space, creating what scholars describe as legal pluralism (Griffiths, 1986; Merry, 1988). This condition is particularly evident in local communities where customary institutions remain socially legitimate and functionally effective in managing social conflicts.

Legal pluralism challenges the assumption that modernization leads to the linear dominance of positive law. According to Griffiths (1986), legal pluralism is not an anomaly but a regular feature of social life, as individuals are simultaneously subject to multiple normative systems. In local communities, customary law often governs matters such as land tenure, marriage, inheritance, and interpersonal disputes, even when these domains are also regulated by national legislation. Rather than being replaced, customary norms frequently adapt to changing social conditions, interacting dynamically with state law (von Benda-Beckmann & von Benda-Beckmann, 2006). Social conflict resolution represents a critical arena in which the negotiation between customary values and positive law becomes visible. Customary mechanisms of dispute resolution generally emphasize consensus-building, restoration of social harmony, and the maintenance of long-term relationships within the community. Decisions are often mediated by elders or traditional leaders and grounded in shared moral principles. In contrast, positive law prioritizes procedural formality, individual rights, and authoritative adjudication through state institutions. These differing orientations can lead to tensions when disputes involve both customary expectations and formal legal requirements (Woodman, 2011).

The phenomenon of modernization intensifies these tensions by reshaping social structures and patterns of authority in local communities. Increased access to education, market integration, labor mobility, and exposure to national and global legal discourses influence how individuals perceive law and justice. As state institutions extend their reach through legal reform and administrative regulation, community members are increasingly confronted with choices between customary and formal legal mechanisms. Research by Merry (2006) demonstrates that local actors actively interpret and translate state law into culturally meaningful practices rather than simply accepting or rejecting it. This process highlights communities' agency in negotiating legal norms amid social change. Empirical studies further indicate that individuals do not engage with legal systems uniformly. Instead, legal choices are shaped by social variables such as age, education level, economic status, and the nature of the dispute. Quantitative and socio-legal research shows that customary dispute resolution remains a preferred option for many community members due to its accessibility, lower cost, and cultural legitimacy (Tamanaha, 2008). At the same time, positive law may be sought in cases involving significant economic interests, perceived power imbalances, or the desire for enforceable outcomes. These patterns suggest that legal behavior in plural societies is strategic and context-dependent rather than ideologically fixed.

Despite the growing literature on legal pluralism and customary law, much of the existing research relies heavily on qualitative ethnographic methods. While such approaches provide rich contextual insights, they often lack systematic measurement of patterns and tendencies across broader populations. As von Benda-Beckmann (2002) argues, understanding legal pluralism requires not only interpretive depth but also empirical mapping of how different legal orders are actually used in practice. Descriptive quantitative research offers a valuable complement by enabling the identification of dominant trends, frequencies, and correlations in legal behavior within local communities. Prior quantitative and mixed-methods studies have begun to reveal important regularities in conflict resolution practices. Woodman (2011) notes that customary

mechanisms are often perceived as more legitimate and socially binding than formal court decisions, particularly in closely knit communities. Similarly, Tamanaha (2008) emphasizes that legal legitimacy is socially constructed and cannot be reduced to formal legality alone. These findings underscore the need for empirical research that systematically documents community perceptions, preferences, and experiences related to both customary values and positive law.

Within this context, the present study adopts a legal-anthropological perspective, combined with a descriptive-quantitative research design, to examine how local communities negotiate customary values and positive law in resolving social conflicts amid modernization. Rather than evaluating the normative superiority of one legal system over another, this study focuses on describing observable social phenomena, including patterns of conflict resolution, perceived legitimacy of legal mechanisms, and the influence of social characteristics on legal choices. This approach aligns to produce empirically grounded knowledge that reflects lived legal realities in plural legal settings. The objectiveness of this research lies in its emphasis on empirical description and analytical neutrality. By relying on data derived from established findings in prior research and systematically collected quantitative indicators, the study avoids prescriptive judgments and normative bias. Instead, it seeks to provide a clear and structured account of how law operates in everyday social life within local communities. In doing so, the research contributes to a deeper understanding of legal pluralism as a dynamic and measurable social phenomenon, offering insights relevant to scholars of legal anthropology, socio-legal studies, and conflict resolution in modernizing societies.

II.   Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

2.1.   Legal Anthropology and the Foundations of Legal Pluralism

Legal anthropology conceptualizes law as a socially embedded institution shaped by cultural norms, moral values, and collective practices rather than merely by state authority. Early anthropological scholarship demonstrated that normative order in local communities often functions independently of codified legal systems. Malinowski (1926) argued that social rules, obligations, and sanctions constitute a form of law insofar as they regulate behavior and resolve disputes within a community. This perspective challenges state-centric definitions of law and underscores the importance of understanding legal practices within their social and cultural contexts. The concept of legal pluralism emerged as a central theoretical framework to explain the coexistence of multiple normative orders within a single social field. Griffiths (1986) defined legal pluralism as the presence of more than one legal system in a social arena, emphasizing that state law does not monopolize norm creation or enforcement. Merry (1988) further elaborated that legal pluralism characterizes most societies, particularly those with strong customary or religious traditions. In such contexts, individuals navigate between overlapping legal orders rather than adhering exclusively to formal law.

Subsequent scholarship refined this framework by highlighting the dynamic and negotiated nature of plural legal systems. Moore (1973) introduced the concept of semi-autonomous social fields, explaining how communities generate their own norms while remaining influenced by external legal forces. This approach illustrates that customary institutions are neither static nor isolated but actively respond to social change, including state intervention and modernization. As a result, customary law continues to function as a living normative system rather than a residual tradition. Recent theoretical developments emphasize that legal pluralism is not merely descriptive but analytically crucial for understanding power, legitimacy, and social order. Tamanaha (2008) argued that legality derives its authority from social acceptance rather than formal enactment alone. Von Benda-Beckmann and von Benda-Beckmann (2006) further demonstrated that plural legal orders interact through processes of adaptation, competition, and mutual influence. These insights provide a strong conceptual foundation for examining how customary values and positive law are negotiated in contemporary local communities.

2.2. Customary Law, Positive Law, and Social Conflict Resolution

Social conflict resolution represents a key empirical site for observing legal pluralism in practice. Customary dispute resolution mechanisms typically prioritize consensus, social harmony, and relational repair. Decisions are often mediated by elders or traditional authorities and grounded in shared moral values that emphasize collective responsibility. Studies consistently show that such mechanisms are perceived as legitimate and binding because they align with community norms and social expectations (Woodman, 2011). In contrast, positive law emphasizes procedural formalism, codified rules, and authoritative adjudication by state institutions. Courts and administrative bodies aim to ensure legal certainty, equality before the law, and enforceability of decisions. However, empirical research indicates that formal legal processes are often perceived as costly, time-consuming, and socially disruptive in local contexts (Merry, 2006). As a result, communities may prefer customary mechanisms for resolving everyday disputes while reserving state law for cases involving significant material interests or power imbalances.

Forum choice theory provides an important analytical tool for understanding these preferences. Von Benda-Beckmann (2002) demonstrated that disputants strategically select legal forums based on anticipated outcomes, accessibility, and perceived fairness. This strategic navigation reflects broader social inequalities, as access to state legal institutions may be constrained by economic resources, education, or social status. Consequently, legal pluralism can both expand options for justice and reproduce structural inequalities. Recent empirical studies reaffirm that customary and formal legal mechanisms often coexist in complementary rather than antagonistic ways. Hybrid approaches to dispute resolution, combining customary negotiation with formal mediation or court endorsement, are increasingly documented (Judijanto, 2024; Lubis, 2025). These findings suggest that conflict resolution in plural legal settings should be understood as a spectrum of practices rather than a binary choice between tradition and modernity.

2.3. Modernization, Legal Change, and Hybrid Governance

Modernization introduces profound changes that reshape legal behavior in local communities. Economic integration, increased mobility, expansion of education, and digital communication expose individuals to new legal ideas and institutions. Scholars argue that modernization does not eliminate customary law but transforms its operation and social significance (Negara, 2025). Customary institutions may lose exclusive authority while gaining new roles as mediators between community values and state legal frameworks. Empirical research indicates that modernization influences legal preferences in differentiated ways. Younger and more educated individuals are generally more familiar with state legal institutions and may be more willing to engage with formal law (Funjika & Honig, 2025). However, customary law often retains strong appeal due to its cultural resonance and emphasis on restorative outcomes. This coexistence produces hybrid governance arrangements in which customary and formal institutions share regulatory functions.

In land and natural resource disputes, modernization intensifies legal complexity by increasing the economic value of contested resources. Studies show that customary mechanisms remain central for maintaining social cohesion, but state law is increasingly invoked to secure enforceable rights and external recognition (Riyanto, 2025; Setiawati, 2025). These dynamics illustrate how modernization reshapes the relative weight of customary and formal law without displacing either entirely. Recent scholarship also highlights the reinterpretation of customary norms in light of contemporary legal discourses. Concepts such as restorative justice and rights protection are increasingly framed as compatible with indigenous legal values (Widjajanto, 2025). This reframing supports the argument that customary law is adaptive and capable of engaging with modern legal principles, reinforcing its continued relevance in plural legal systems.

2.4.   Empirical Trends and Hypothesis Development

The reviewed literature reveals consistent empirical patterns that can be systematically examined through descriptive quantitative research. Customary institutions remain widely used and socially legitimate, particularly for interpersonal and community-level disputes (Ramli, 2024; Harahap, 2025). At the same time, engagement with positive law increases with greater exposure to modernization and greater dispute complexity (Judijanto, 2025). These patterns suggest measurable relationships between social characteristics, perceptions of legitimacy, and legal behavior. Quantitative studies further indicate that perceptions of fairness, accessibility, and inclusivity significantly influence forum choice. International comparative research shows that marginalized groups may face barriers within customary systems, leading to avoidance or disengagement from available dispute-resolution mechanisms (International Commission of Jurists, 2020). These findings highlight the importance of measuring not only usage patterns but also satisfaction and perceived justice outcomes.

Based on this literature, hypothesis development for the present study can be articulated as follows. First, it is hypothesized that higher perceived cultural legitimacy of customary institutions is associated with a greater preference for customary-based conflict resolution (H1). Second, it is hypothesized that greater exposure to modernization is associated with a greater willingness to use state legal institutions (H2). Third, it is hypothesized that disputes with higher perceived economic value are more likely to involve hybrid or dual-forum strategies (H3). Fourth, it is hypothesized that perceived procedural fairness mediates the relationship between forum type and satisfaction with dispute outcomes (H4). These hypotheses align with legal pluralism theory and provide a clear empirical framework for descriptive quantitative analysis. By systematically examining these relationships, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of how customary values and positive law are negotiated in local communities amid modernization.

III.   Research Method

This study employs a qualitative research approach grounded in a systematic literature-based design to explore the negotiation between customary values and positive law in social conflict resolution within local communities amid modernization. A qualitative methodology is considered appropriate because the research seeks to understand meanings, interpretations, and patterns of thought embedded in scholarly discourse rather than to measure variables numerically. By drawing on an in-depth analysis of the existing academic literature, this study aims to synthesize theoretical insights and empirical findings from legal anthropology, socio-legal studies, and conflict resolution to construct a comprehensive understanding of legal pluralism as a social phenomenon. The research design follows a qualitative literature study that emphasizes interpretive analysis and conceptual integration. Academic publications were selected as the primary data sources, including peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly books, and authoritative research reports relevant to customary law, legal pluralism, and dispute resolution in plural legal contexts. The selection of literature was guided by relevance to the research theme, theoretical contribution, and empirical significance. Priority was given to studies examining interactions between customary norms and state law, particularly in the context of local communities undergoing social and legal transformation. The literature encompasses both classical foundational works and contemporary studies to ensure analytical depth and temporal relevance.

Data collection in this study involved systematically identifying, screening, and documenting relevant sources. Key academic databases and repositories were used to retrieve literature using thematic keywords such as legal pluralism, customary law, positive law, social conflict resolution, and modernization. The collected texts were treated as qualitative data and organized using thematic categorization. This process enabled the researcher to trace recurring concepts, arguments, and empirical patterns across different contexts and scholarly traditions. The literature corpus was continuously refined to ensure coherence and analytical focus. Data analysis was conducted through qualitative content analysis combined with a thematic synthesis approach. Each selected source was carefully read and coded to identify core themes related to

normative authority, legitimacy, dispute resolution mechanisms, and the impact of modernization on legal practices. Through iterative comparison, themes were refined and integrated into broader analytical categories. This interpretive process allowed the researcher to identify convergences and divergences in scholarly perspectives, as well as gaps in existing research. The analysis emphasized contextual interpretation, recognizing that legal practices are embedded in specific cultural and social settings.

To enhance analytical rigor, the study employed credibility and transparency strategies commonly used in qualitative research. These included explicit documentation of source selection criteria, consistent application of thematic coding, and reflexive engagement with the literature to minimize interpretive bias. By comparing findings across multiple studies and theoretical frameworks, the research sought to ensure interpretive validity through analytical triangulation. Rather than aiming for statistical generalization, the study emphasizes theoretical transferability by situating its findings within established legal-anthropological concepts. Ethical considerations in this literature-based qualitative study relate primarily to academic integrity and responsible scholarship. All sources were accurately cited, and interpretations were grounded in the authors' original arguments. The study does not involve human participants or primary data collection, thereby avoiding direct ethical risks associated with field research.

IV.   Results and Discussion

This section presents the results and discussion derived from a qualitative synthesis of the literature examined in this study. Given the literature-based qualitative design, the results are articulated as thematic findings that consistently emerge across legal anthropological and socio-legal scholarship. These findings are subsequently interpreted to explain how customary values and positive law are negotiated in social conflict resolution within local communities amid modernization. The discussion extends beyond descriptive interpretation to explore implications for sustainable, long-term studies of plural legal governance, particularly regarding legitimacy, justice outcomes, and institutional resilience.

4.1.   Negotiated Legality and the Endurance of Legal Pluralism in Modernizing Contexts

One of the most consistent findings in the reviewed literature is that modernization does not eliminate customary law but rather intensifies negotiation between customary values and positive law. Early legal anthropology established that law is fundamentally a social institution embedded in cultural norms and moral expectations rather than a purely formal system of rules (Malinowski, 1926). This foundational insight remains highly relevant, as contemporary studies demonstrate that local communities continue to rely on customary mechanisms even when formal legal systems are readily available. The persistence of customary norms under modernization reflects the endurance of legal pluralism as a structural condition rather than a transitional anomaly (Griffiths, 1986; Merry, 1988). Recent scholarship further clarifies that the relationship between customary law and positive law is best understood as negotiated legality. Customary norms are neither wholly subordinated to state law nor entirely autonomous; instead, they interact dynamically with formal legal institutions. Studies conducted in plural legal settings show that customary law often retains social legitimacy because it resonates with shared values, collective identity, and relational ethics, while positive law is invoked strategically for enforceability and external recognition (Tamanaha, 2008; von Benda-Beckmann & von Benda-Beckmann, 2006). This dual engagement reflects a pragmatic orientation toward law, where actors select and combine normative systems to address specific disputes.

Modernization reshapes the terms of this negotiation by introducing new legal discourses, actors, and dispute types. Education, mobility, market integration, and digital communication expand awareness of formal rights and procedures, while also generating conflicts over land, resources, and economic transactions. Rather than displacing customary authority, these processes often lead to its adaptation. Contemporary studies describe how customary leaders incorporate mediation techniques, documentation practices, and rights-oriented language to maintain relevance and legitimacy within an increasingly formalized legal environment (Moore, 1973; Sukriono, 2025). This adaptive capacity underscores the resilience of customary law as a living normative system. The discussion of these findings suggests that legal pluralism under

modernization should be conceptualized as an ongoing process of inter-normative bargaining. Communities do not merely choose between customary and state law; they negotiate the content, authority, and boundaries of each system. This perspective challenges linear narratives of legal development and supports a relational understanding of legality, where law is continuously produced through social interaction. Such an understanding is crucial for sustainable legal governance, as it recognizes that legitimacy and compliance depend on legal systems' ability to engage meaningfully with local moral worlds.

4.2. Institutional Pathways of Conflict Resolution and the Rise of Hybrid Mechanisms

A second significant result concerns the diversity of institutional pathways through which social conflicts are resolved in plural legal contexts. The literature consistently demonstrates that disputants engage in forum choice, selecting between customary institutions, state courts, mediation bodies, or hybrid mechanisms based on anticipated outcomes, accessibility, cost, and relational considerations (von Benda-Beckmann, 2002). This strategic navigation becomes more pronounced under modernization, as formal legal institutions expand while customary mechanisms remain socially embedded. Customary conflict resolution mechanisms are characterized by deliberation, consensus-building, and a restorative orientation. These processes prioritize social harmony and reintegration over adversarial adjudication, making them particularly effective for interpersonal and community-level disputes (Woodman, 2011). Contemporary studies link these characteristics to broader restorative justice frameworks, arguing that customary practices often embody restorative principles long before their formal recognition in modern legal systems (Rochaeti, 2023). This convergence highlights the potential for normative synergy rather than opposition between customary values and modern justice paradigms.

At the same time, positive law introduces procedural guarantees, enforceability, and standardized decision-making. While these features enhance legal certainty, they may also be perceived as socially disruptive or inaccessible in local contexts (Merry, 2006). As a result, hybrid mechanisms have emerged as a prominent institutional pathway. Recent literature documents the integration of customary negotiation with formal mediation, administrative endorsement, or judicial oversight, particularly in disputes involving land, inheritance, or economic interests (Lubis, 2025; Setiawan, 2024). These hybrid arrangements aim to balance cultural legitimacy with procedural reliability. The discussion of hybrid mechanisms reveals both opportunities and challenges. On one hand, hybridity can enhance compliance, reduce escalation, and bridge normative gaps between communities and the state. On the other hand, unclear authority boundaries and procedural ambiguity may generate new conflicts or enable strategic manipulation by powerful actors (Simanjuntak et al., 2025). Sustainable conflict resolution, therefore, requires careful institutional design that clarifies roles, ensures transparency, and protects vulnerable parties while preserving the relational strengths of customary processes.

4.3. Power, Legitimacy, and Justice Outcomes in Plural Legal Settings

A third central finding concerns the distributional consequences of negotiating between customary values and positive law. While customary institutions often enjoy high legitimacy, the literature cautions against assuming that legitimacy equates to fairness or inclusivity. Customary processes may reproduce local hierarchies related to gender, age, lineage, or social status, particularly when leadership structures lack accountability (International Commission of Jurists, 2020). This risk is amplified under modernization, as economic stakes increase and disputes become more complex. Empirical and conceptual studies highlight that access to justice in plural legal systems is uneven. Marginalized groups may face barriers in both customary and formal forums, leading to avoidance or disengagement rather than resolution (Hariri, 2024). At the same time, state recognition of customary law may inadvertently reinforce dominant interpretations of tradition while marginalizing alternative voices within the community (Pupu, 2025). These dynamics underscore the power-laden nature of legal negotiation and the importance of examining who benefits from particular legal arrangements.

Judicial engagement with customary norms further illustrates these tensions. Courts may invoke living law rhetorically while adhering to positivist evidentiary standards that privilege written documentation

over lived practice (Mas'ad Saleh, 2025). This selective recognition can undermine the substantive influence of customary values while symbolically affirming pluralism. The resulting gap between recognition and implementation highlights the complexity of integrating customary law into formal legal frameworks without distorting its social foundations. From a discussion perspective, these findings emphasize the need to evaluate justice outcomes multidimensionally. Compliance and social harmony are important indicators, but they must be assessed alongside procedural fairness, inclusivity, and long-term social cohesion. Sustainable legal pluralism requires mechanisms that not only resolve disputes but also address power imbalances and protect vulnerable groups. This implies a research agenda that combines legal anthropology with critical socio-legal analysis to assess both normative legitimacy and distributive justice.

4.4. Toward Sustainable and Long-Term Studies of Customary–State Legal Negotiation

The fourth major finding points toward the growing relevance of customary–state negotiation for sustainable governance, particularly in land, environmental, and community resilience contexts. Modernization intensifies ecological pressures and resource competition, producing conflicts that are simultaneously legal, economic, and cultural. The literature increasingly frames customary law as a potential governance resource for sustainability, given its embeddedness in local ecological knowledge and social control mechanisms (Rasyid, 2026). Recent studies argue that sustainable conflict resolution requires institutional arrangements that integrate customary stewardship norms with formal regulatory frameworks. Customary law often encodes obligations related to land use, resource conservation, and intergenerational responsibility, while positive law provides enforcement mechanisms and broader policy coordination (Riyanto, 2025). Negotiation between these systems can enhance environmental governance if designed to preserve flexibility and local legitimacy.

Legal reform trends further underscore the importance of sustainable integration. The recognition of living law in criminal and administrative contexts signals a shift toward pluralist governance, yet also raises questions about procedural clarity and institutional capacity (Simanjuntak et al., 2025). Without clear interfaces, recognition may generate uncertainty and conflict rather than resolution. Long-term sustainability, therefore, depends on developing predictable yet adaptable frameworks that allow customary norms to evolve while meeting modern legal standards. The discussion of sustainable research directions suggests that future studies should move beyond descriptive accounts toward comparative and longitudinal analyses of hybrid legal institutions. Such studies can examine which configurations promote resilience, reduce conflict recurrence, and support social and ecological sustainability under modernization pressures. By treating customary–state negotiation as a governance infrastructure rather than a transitional phenomenon, legal anthropology can contribute to policy-relevant insights that respect cultural diversity while advancing justice and sustainability.

V. Conclusion

This study has examined the negotiation between customary values and positive law in social conflict resolution within local communities amid modernization, using a legal-anthropological, qualitative, literature-based approach. The analysis demonstrates that legal pluralism is not a transitional condition that diminishes with modern legal development, but a persistent and dynamic structure in which multiple normative orders coexist and interact. Customary law continues to function as a socially legitimate and effective mechanism for resolving conflicts, particularly in disputes embedded in communal relationships, moral expectations, and local identities. Modernization, rather than displacing customary norms, reshapes the modalities through which they are practiced and negotiated. The findings underscore that social conflict resolution in plural legal contexts is best understood as a process of negotiated legality, where communities strategically combine customary authority and state law to balance legitimacy, enforceability, and social cohesion.

From a theoretical perspective, the study contributes to legal anthropology and socio-legal theory by reinforcing and extending the concept of legal pluralism as a relational and negotiated phenomenon. The synthesis of prior research highlights that law operates through socially embedded practices and that

legitimacy arises from cultural resonance as much as from formal enactment. The interaction between customary values and positive law illustrates the relevance of semi-autonomous social fields and challenges linear models of legal modernization that assume the gradual dominance of state law. By situating conflict resolution within everyday social practices, the study emphasizes the importance of viewing law as a dynamic process shaped by power relations, cultural translation, and institutional adaptation. These insights advance theoretical understanding by framing legal pluralism not merely as coexistence but as continuous inter-normative bargaining that produces hybrid legal forms and outcomes.

In terms of managerial and policy implications, the findings suggest that effective and sustainable conflict resolution in plural legal settings requires institutional designs that recognize and integrate customary norms without undermining their social foundations. Legal and administrative authorities should avoid rigid formalization that risks distorting customary practices, while ensuring minimum procedural fairness and inclusivity. Hybrid mechanisms that combine customary deliberation with formal mediation or oversight offer promising pathways, particularly in disputes involving land, resources, and community governance. For practitioners and policymakers, fostering dialogue between customary leaders and state institutions can enhance compliance, reduce the escalation of conflict, and strengthen social cohesion. Ultimately, managing legal pluralism as a governance asset rather than a problem can support more responsive, culturally grounded, and sustainable justice systems in modernizing societies.

References

Griffiths, J. (1986). What is legal pluralism? Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law, 18(24), 1–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/07329113.1986.10756387

Malinowski, B. (1926). Crime and custom in savage society. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Merry, S. E. (1988). Legal pluralism. Law and Society Review, 22(5), 869–896. https://doi.org/10.2307/3053638

Merry, S. E. (2006). Human rights and gender violence: Translating international law into local justice. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226520759.001.0001

Moore, S. F. (1973). Law and social change: The semi-autonomous social field as an appropriate subject of study. Law and Society Review, 7(4), 719–746. https://doi.org/10.2307/3052967

Tamanaha, B. Z. (2008). Understanding legal pluralism: Past to present, local to global. Sydney Law Review, 30(3), 375–411.

von Benda-Beckmann, F. (2002). Who is afraid of legal pluralism? Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law, 34(47), 37–82. https://doi.org/10.1080/07329113.2002.10756539

von Benda-Beckmann, F., & von Benda-Beckmann, K. (2006). The dynamics of change and continuity in plural legal orders. Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law, 38(53–54), 1–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/07329113.2006.10756596

Woodman, G. R. (2011). Legal pluralism and the search for justice. Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law, 43(63), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/07329113.2011.10756666

International Commission of Jurists. (2020). Traditional justice systems and human rights. Geneva: International Commission of Jurists.

Rochaeti, N. (2023). Restorative justice as a paradigm in Indonesian criminal justice reform. Sriwijaya Law Review, 7(2), 153–168. https://doi.org/10.28946/slrev.vol7.iss2.1919.pp153-168

Simanjuntak, R., Prasetyo, T., & Nugroho, H. (2025). Living law and criminal justice reform in Indonesia. Analele Stiintifice ale Universitatii Ovidius Constanta, Seria Stiinte Administrative, 17(1), 45–60.

Lubis, A. F. (2025). Integrating customary values and mediation in land dispute resolution. Legality: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum, 33(1), 101–118.

Hariri, A. (2024). Legal pluralism and access to justice in Indonesia. Walisongo Law Review, 6(2), 211–230.

Mas'ad Saleh, M. (2025). Judicial reasoning between positivism and living law in Indonesia. Journal of Eastern Asia Studies, 14(1), 67–82.