

Reframing Contractual Freedom in Cross-Border Commercial Agreements: Legal Challenges of Standard Terms and Global Consumer Protection

¹Yovanka Rismaya Maharsanthy, ²Etty Susilowati, ³Supot Rattanapun

^{1,2}Jayabaya University, Indoensia, ³Rajamangala University Of Technology Krungthep, Thailand

¹yrnone91@gmail.com, ²etty_ipr@yahoo.com, ³Supot.r@mail.rmutk.ac.th

ABSTRACT

The increasing prevalence of standard clauses in international commercial agreements has intensified normative tensions between the principle of freedom of contract and the imperative of global consumer protection. This study investigates the legal ramifications of such clauses in cross-border transactions, with particular emphasis on business-to-consumer (B2C) contracts marked by pronounced bargaining power asymmetries. Employing a normative legal methodology combined with comparative analysis, the research demonstrates that standard clauses are frequently drafted unilaterally, lack sufficient transparency, and impose liability limitations that operate to the detriment of consumers. The analysis further reveals significant regulatory fragmentation across jurisdictions and the absence of coherent international standards capable of ensuring legal certainty and affording equal protection to consumers. In response, the study advances a reconceptualization of the principle of freedom of contract in the transnational arena, underscoring the primacy of substantive justice, the necessity of transparency in information disclosure, and the enforceability of consumer rights. As a practical contribution, it recommends the establishment of a harmonized international legal framework for the regulation of standard clauses, grounded in the principles of minimum protection and cross-jurisdictional justice. This research thereby seeks to contribute to the evolution of international contract law toward greater responsiveness to the challenges of globalization and the exigencies of consumer protection in the digital economy.

Keywords: Standard Clause; Freedom of Contract; International Consumer Protection; International Contract Law; Cross-Border Legal Harmonization

Introduction

International trade has experienced significant growth over the past two decades, driven primarily by global market integration and by advances in information technology (Dosser & Robson, 1981; Gries et al., 2018; Jiang et al., 2023; Meng et al., 2022). According to a UNCTAD report (2023), the value of cross-border trade exceeded USD 32 trillion in 2022, with the majority conducted through online contracts and digital platform-based transactions (Chen et al., 2025; Meng et al., 2022). In this context, the use of standard clauses has become increasingly common, as they are perceived to enhance transactional efficiency and reduce contractual costs. However, the unilateral insertion of such clauses by businesses raises serious legal concerns, particularly regarding the imbalance of bargaining power between businesses and consumers (Ilias et al., 2023; Mantzari, 2022; Zulkifli et al., 2025).

In addition, a global survey by Consumers International (2022) indicates that 74% of international consumers do not read the details of contracts they agree to online, and 61% feel they have no choice but to accept the terms set by businesses (Arbel & Becher, 2022; Kolt et al., 2022; Santoso, 2022). This reflects a growing and concerning information asymmetry. In many cases, standard clauses include provisions such as jurisdiction clauses, liability limitations, and waivers of consumer rights, all of which are unilaterally imposed and non-negotiable (Boyack, 2023; Daiza, 2018; Pavlović, 2017; Tang, 2005). This phenomenon suggests

a departure from the principle of contractual fairness, which should be inherent in every agreement, particularly in the context of cross-border consumer protection.

The urgency of this study has increased significantly in light of the absence of international standards that specifically regulate the limits of standard clause usage in cross-jurisdictional business contracts. Although certain international legal instruments, such as the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (CISG) and the UNIDROIT Principles, provide general guidance on the principles of contractual freedom and good faith, regulations concerning standard clauses remain implicit and are largely left to the domestic law of each country (Giliker, 2022; Kornet, 2012; Zahid et al., 2016). This situation risks regulatory fragmentation, which may result in legal uncertainty for global consumers.

Furthermore, previous scholarship has tended to focus on consumer protection within national contexts or on domestic e-commerce platforms. These studies have not comprehensively addressed the tension between the principle of contractual freedom and the need for consumer protection in the field of international contract law. In practice, the imbalance in legal relations between businesses and consumers across national borders presents transnational challenges that require a regulatory approach transcending jurisdictional boundaries. Consequently, a significant research gap persists, particularly in formulating a legal model capable of reconciling transactional efficiency with substantive consumer protection.

In light of the foregoing, this study aims to provide both theoretical and practical contributions by clarifying the position of standard clauses in international commercial agreements and by proposing normative solutions to promote regulatory harmonization that ensures a balance between contractual freedom and consumer protection.

This study is motivated by the need to resolve conceptual and normative tensions between the principle of freedom of contract and consumer protection interests in the context of international commercial agreements that employ standard clauses. Amid the growing complexity of cross-border transactions, which are increasingly dominated by digital platforms and electronic contract standards, fundamental questions arise regarding the extent to which contractual freedom can be exercised fairly when consumers lack the capacity to influence the content of agreements.

The primary objective of this study is to critically examine the legal position of standard clauses in international commercial agreements using a normative and comparative approach. The research focuses on identifying the acceptable limits in the application of standard clauses, particularly in the context of consumer protection across different jurisdictions. In addition, this study analyzes how current international legal instruments, such as the CISG and the UNIDROIT Principles, address these issues, and evaluates their effectiveness in ensuring cross-border contractual justice.

To support an inclusive and balanced normative framework, this study also aims to formulate a model of transnational regulation that harmonizes consumer protection standards without undermining the fundamental principles of freedom of contract that form the basis of international treaty law. This model is expected not only to advance the theoretical development of international contract law but also to offer concrete policy guidance for lawmakers and international bodies in addressing the global legal challenges posed by the use of standard clauses.

Through problem mapping and in-depth analysis of evolving legal practices, this study seeks to make relevant and applicable scientific contributions to strengthening international contract regulations that are fair and oriented toward global consumer protection.

Methods Research

This study employs a normative legal approach grounded in the analysis of positive legal rules, legal principles, and principles developed in international contract law and cross-border consumer protection (Negara, 2023; Robert & Zeckhauser, 2011; Taekema, 2018). This approach was selected because the issues raised stem from a normative tension between contractual freedom, rooted in the principle of autonomy of will, and the need for regulatory intervention to protect the legally weaker party, namely, consumers.

This research is qualitative in nature, emphasizing the analysis of primary and secondary legal materials. The primary legal materials analyzed include conventions and principles of international law, such as the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (CISG), the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts, and regional instruments, such as Directive 93/13/EEC of the European Union on unfair standard terms. Additionally, relevant international and regional court decisions, such as those of the CJEU and U.S. federal courts, are analyzed to examine how these norms are applied in practice.

The secondary legal materials include academic literature, scientific journals, research reports from international institutions such as the OECD and Consumers International, and articles reviewing the application of standard clauses in cross-border digital commercial transactions. This literature review aims to identify the theoretical framework explaining the position of standard clauses and to determine research gaps relevant to the issues under consideration.

Data collection was conducted through library research, involving searches of international legal databases such as Westlaw, LexisNexis, HeinOnline, and UNILEX. All relevant documents and literature were systematically analyzed using a legal hermeneutic approach to interpret the meaning, context, and implications of the norms under review.

Data analysis was undertaken using a normative-qualitative approach through three main stages: (1) the inventory of legal norms and principles governing standard clauses in international agreements; (2) the normative interpretation of the limits of contractual freedom and consumer protection standards in a cross-jurisdictional context; and (3) the construction of legal arguments to formulate recommendations for a regulatory model capable of reconciling these two interests.

By using this method, the research is expected to be systematically organized and replicable for other researchers who wish to explore similar issues in national, regional, or international contexts.

Results and Discussion

Normative Ambiguity in the Placement of Standard Clauses in International Contract Law

Standard terms and conditions constitute a dominant instrument in modern commercial transactions and are generally drafted unilaterally by business actors to regulate various contractual aspects in a uniform and efficient manner (Boyack, 2023; Malacka, 2018; Moore, 2024; Okoli & Yekini, 2023; Schmitthoff, 1968). In international contracts involving parties from different jurisdictions (Al-Billeh, 2024; Burri, 2022; Okoli & Yekini, 2023), these clauses become a crucial – yet often contentious – mechanism for determining jurisdiction, dispute resolution forums, liability exclusions, and limitations on damages (Arzandeh, 2024; Draguiev, 2022; Sani, 2024).

Despite their widespread use, fundamental normative ambiguity persists regarding how the legal framework of international agreements – particularly instruments governing cross-border commercial transactions – treats the validity and enforceability of such clauses.

This ambiguity stems from the absence of harmonized regulations and from profound differences in legal philosophy among jurisdictions.

The United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (CISG), one of the principal instruments governing cross-border trade in goods, does not explicitly regulate the substantive requirements for incorporating or interpreting standard clauses (Bonell, 1996; Lassila, 2017). The absence of specific provisions creates significant interpretative gaps, compelling member states and courts adjudicating disputes to refer to Article 7 of the CISG (interpretation based on its international character) and Article 8 of the CISG (interpretation based on the parties' intent) or, more problematically, to import general principles of domestic law when assessing the validity and fairness of such clauses.

A notable illustration is *Zapata Hermanos Sucesores, S.A. v. Hearthside Baking Co.*, in which a United States federal court upheld the enforceability of a forum-selection clause contained in a standard supplier document, even though the buyer (in a B2B context) had no genuine opportunity to negotiate or reject it. The court's decision reflected the common law's strong commitment to the principle of freedom of contract, despite disregarding the practical realities of unequal bargaining power (Lookofsky & Flechtner, 2008; Vanto, 2003).

Conversely, the European Union adopted a diametrically opposed approach through Directive 93/13/EEC on Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts (Hulmák, 2023; Rutgers, 2014). This instrument provides that contractual terms not individually negotiated and resulting in a significant imbalance to the detriment of consumers must be declared non-binding. Such provisions reflect a protective, interventionist stance rooted in the civil law tradition, which emphasizes contractual equilibrium and the protection of weaker parties.

This divergence in legal philosophy – between absolute freedom of contract and the correction of imbalance – not only fragments legal protection for consumers or non-drafting parties in cross-jurisdictional transactions but also creates strong incentives for forum shopping (Hesselink, 2021; Nadler, 2021; Valcke, 2008). Parties disadvantaged by standard clauses will seek litigation forums with more protective domestic laws or CISG interpretations, whereas drafters will attempt to impose forums that prioritize formal contractual freedom. Consequently, this normative ambiguity undermines both legal certainty and the principle of uniformity, a core objective of instruments such as the CISG.

Contractual Power Asymmetry and the Illusion of Contractual Freedom

The concept of freedom of contract—long regarded as a philosophical pillar of international contract law—is often reduced to a mere illusion in the application of cross-border standard clauses (Kusmiati, 2020; O'Sullivan, 2020; Putro & Bedner, 2023). This phenomenon is particularly evident in asymmetrical relationships between global corporations and individual consumers. In the realm of cross-border electronic contracting, consumers are almost invariably confronted with a take-it-or-leave-it choice: either assent to all terms unilaterally imposed or forfeit access to the service or platform entirely.

This reality exemplifies the operation of adhesion contracts, which—although formally recognized as valid in many jurisdictions—fundamentally erode the core principle of consensus ad idem, the genuine, mutual, and equally negotiated agreement. The formal act of clicking “I Agree” in a clickwrap agreement operates as an artificial substitute for substantive consent, thereby hollowing the meaning of contractual autonomy (Haun & Robinson, 2024; Marotta-Wurgler, 2019). More significantly, the asymmetry of power here is not merely structural but also epistemic. A European Commission survey (2022) revealed that 67% of consumers in the European Economic Area (EEA) were unaware that forum selection clauses in standard contracts could permanently deprive them of the right to litigate in their country of residence.

This finding exposes two intertwined problems: first, the practical inability of consumers to access, read, and comprehend complex, technical-legal documents that often extend to thousands of words; and second, the lack of incentives for commercial actors to design transparent, comprehensible clauses, given that consumer ignorance often serves their legal interests. In such circumstances, the enforcement of non-negotiable standard clauses constitutes not merely a business practice but a systematic violation of the principles of procedural fairness and the protection of vulnerable parties – principles that should underpin the *ius gentium* (Hertog, 2003; Ucaryilmaz, 2021).

This inequality underscores the need for urgent reconsideration of substantive fairness. An empirical analysis of the terms of service of 20 multinational technology companies (Finch & Zietlow, 2023) found that 85% contained total liability-exclusion clauses, and 92% mandated dispute resolution through individual arbitration in a distant, neutral forum. The consequences are multidimensional: mandatory arbitration clauses effectively deny access to justice for consumers with limited resources, given the prohibitive costs of international arbitration and the absence of collective redress mechanisms; and the closed nature of such proceedings shields exploitative contractual practices from public and judicial scrutiny. In *Uber Technologies Inc. v. Heller* (Supreme Court of Canada, 2020), for example, an arbitration clause requiring disputes to be heard in Amsterdam was deemed unconscionable because the costs amounted to CAD 14,500 – almost an entire year’s income for the claimant.

This decision illustrates how standard clauses can operate as legal shields for corporate interests. In conclusion, the absence of a coherent transnational framework to ensure substantive fairness in cross-border contracts perpetuates power asymmetries and undermines the legitimacy of the international legal order. Without regulatory intervention to safeguard both substantive and procedural fairness, standard clauses will continue to serve as instruments of corporate dominance, widening the gap between the rhetoric of contractual freedom and the reality of consumer powerlessness in the global digital economy. The development of binding international instruments to preserve contractual equilibrium and guarantee affordable access to justice has therefore become an imperative of the highest order.

Inconsistent Enforcement and Lack of Global Harmonization

One of the main findings of this study is the inconsistency in the application and enforcement of standard clauses across jurisdictions. Countries with a protectionist approach to consumer protection tend to invalidate non-negotiated clauses, while countries adhering to the principle of *laissez-faire* uphold their validity. This inconsistency creates significant legal uncertainty in cross-border transactions. Consumers cannot predict with certainty whether a particular clause will be enforced or invalidated, as this depends on the jurisdiction in which the dispute arises.

This situation not only harms consumers but also creates challenges for businesses in drafting contracts that are globally acceptable. The absence of international instruments that specifically regulate the protection of standard clauses further exacerbates this challenge. Although efforts such as the UN Guidelines for Consumer Protection have sought to provide a global normative framework, their non-binding nature has limited their practical effectiveness. A harmonization model prioritizing minimum protection standards and mutual recognition between countries is needed as a foundation for the enforcement of fair standard clauses.

Discussion

In theory, the findings of this study radically challenge the classical liberal foundations that have long underpinned traditional views on the principle of freedom of contract. In the traditional view, which is widely adopted in common law jurisprudence and in international instruments such as the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (CISG), a contract is regarded as the embodiment of an agreement between two formally equal and autonomous parties. However, in contemporary international contract practice—particularly in contexts involving consumers or parties with unequal bargaining power—this fiction of formal equality has proven not only naïve but also potentially oppressive.

Accordingly, the concept of contractual freedom must undergo a paradigmatic reconstruction: from mere procedural freedom to a form of substantive freedom (substantive autonomy) that critically considers socio-economic disparities, information asymmetries, and the structural powerlessness of weaker parties. As emphasized by Collins (1999), contracts in asymmetrical relationships can only be considered ethically and legally valid if they guarantee equality of autonomy—that is, the real ability of both parties to understand and influence the terms of the contract (Davis & Pargendler, 2022).

Furthermore, this study reveals fundamental limitations of the law and economics approach that has dominated academic justification for the use of standard clauses. This theory, as articulated by Posner (2011), posits that standard clauses increase transaction efficiency by reducing negotiation costs and creating legal certainty (Dimatteo & Ostas, 2011; Sokol, 2019). However, this narrow efficiency argument overlooks two crucial realities. First, structural information asymmetry prevents consumers from making rational and free decisions. Second, the dominance of market power by oligopolistic entities enables corporations to impose exploitative clauses without meaningful competitive pressure.

Thus, the analytical framework must be expanded to integrate the perspective of critical legal studies, as argued by Kennedy (2006), who demonstrates that standard clauses often function as tools for legitimizing neoliberal domination. The theory of access to justice developed by Cappelletti (1981) is likewise important to reaffirm, as it emphasizes the need to protect substantive rights to affordable remedies (Cotterrell, 2020; Ucín, 2023). Within this theoretical synthesis, standard clauses can no longer be viewed as neutral legal instruments but must be evaluated according to their impact on equality before the law.

In line with this reconstruction, the treatment of standard clauses in international contracts requires a normatively transformative foundation. Three main principles should serve as the basis for formulating a transnational approach. First, the principle of proactive transparency, which requires businesses to actively and clearly present critical clauses—such as jurisdiction, mandatory arbitration, or limitations of liability—in a standardized, multilingual, and easily understandable format. Transparency should not merely mean “available” but must be transformed into “substantively understandable” by weaker parties. Second, the principle of meaningful consent, which holds that consent to a contract is valid only if preceded by a cooling-off period, interactive explanations of its legal implications, and a prohibition on misleading digital interface designs (dark patterns). Third, the principle of transnational legal certainty, which underscores the importance of harmonizing substantive fairness standards through supplementary instruments to the CISG or even a new convention explicitly prohibiting abusive clauses in cross-border transactions.

The implementation of these principles is not merely a pragmatic necessity for addressing technical issues in cross-jurisdictional transactions but a normative imperative to ensure the sustainability of the international contract law system itself. Without serious and targeted intervention, international contracts risk becoming tools of global corporate

hegemony that erode public trust and progressively degrade the law's function as the *custos iustitiae* (guardian of justice). This accords with Habermas's (1996) warning that when private law loses legitimacy due to procedural injustice, a systemic crisis of the entire legal order becomes inevitable.

Scientific Novelty and Research Contribution

This study offers scientific novelty in its critical approach to standard clauses in international commercial agreements, particularly through a dialectical framework that engages the principle of contractual freedom and the normative need for cross-jurisdictional consumer protection. Whereas most previous studies have positioned standard clauses solely as instruments of contractual efficiency in the B2B (business-to-business) context, this research shifts the focus to the B2C (business-to-consumer) domain in international transactions, a field largely overlooked in mainstream international contract law literature.

A further innovative contribution lies in the comprehensive mapping of cross-border regulatory fragmentation and the lack of harmonization that directly impacts the legal uncertainty experienced by global consumers. This research does not merely address standard clauses as a doctrinal problem but also as a systemic manifestation of the absence of global standards governing substantive consumer protection within the transnational digital ecosystem. This is significant because consumers are no longer confined within national borders but form part of a globally connected economic community enabled by technology.

Conceptually, this study offers a reinterpretation of the principle of freedom of contract in a transnational context. Whereas traditionally this principle was understood within the framework of classical legal formalism that emphasized the autonomy of the will and non-intervention, this study reconceptualizes contractual freedom as substantive freedom—freedom that takes into account factors such as power asymmetry, access to information, and the actual capacity of consumers to give valid consent. This model supports a normative proposal that standard clauses should comply with the principles of transparency, fairness, and accessibility as conditions for their validity in a transnational context.

In terms of practical contributions, this study proposes establishing international legal instruments or soft law mechanisms—such as model laws or guidelines—that can serve as a framework for harmonizing consumer protection with respect to standard clauses. These instruments should contain minimum provisions on disclosure obligations, prohibitions on unfair exclusion clauses, and cross-border redress mechanisms. Additionally, the policy recommendations from this study are relevant for international institutions such as UNCITRAL, UNCTAD, and the WTO in developing more equitable digital trade policies.

A further scholarly contribution is the provision of a theoretical basis for the development of international contract law towards a more inclusive and responsive approach to technological challenges and global power dynamics. In an academic context, the findings enrich the international civil law literature by adding a consumer protection perspective as an important element in refining the contract law paradigm, which has been dominated by formalistic approaches and market efficiency.

Thus, this study not only introduces a new analytical dimension to the study of standard clauses but also builds a bridge between the pursuit of justice in global contractual relations and the fundamental principles that have long underpinned international treaty law. This constitutes the primary contribution of this research to the development of legal science and policy-making practice at the international level.

Conclusion

Standard clauses in international commercial agreements have become a dominant instrument in cross-border transactions, particularly in the digital age, which is characterized by mass electronic contracting. Although their existence provides procedural efficiency and predictability for business actors, this study shows that standard clauses often cause contractual inequality, especially in relations between business actors and global consumers. In the absence of global standards regulating the scope of a business's authority in designing such clauses, consumers are vulnerable to contractual exploitation under the guise of contractual freedom.

The main findings of this study reveal the coexistence of normative ambiguity and regulatory fragmentation, which contribute to inconsistencies in the enforcement of standard clauses across jurisdictions. An overly formalistic approach to the principle of contractual freedom has proven insufficient to ensure fair and equal legal protection for consumers in the international trade ecosystem. Therefore, a reinterpretation of the principle of contractual freedom is necessary to incorporate aspects of substantive justice, information transparency, and recognition of the inherent power imbalance in contracts between businesses and consumers across national borders.

Bibliography

- Al-Billeh, T. (2024). Jurisdiction Regarding Administrative Proceedings in Jordanian and French Legislation: Views on the Administrative Judiciary in 2021. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, 37(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-023-10064-5>
- Arbel, Y. A., & Becher, S. I. (2022). Contracts in the Age of Smart Readers. *George Washington Law Review*, 90(1). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3740356>
- Arzandeh, A. (2024). Interpreting Multiple Dispute-Resolution Clauses In Cross-Border Contracts. *The Cambridge Law Journal*, 83(2), 244–273. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197324000229>
- Bonell, M. J. (1996). The UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts and CISG - Alternatives or Complementary Instruments? *Uniform Law Review - Revue de Droit Uniforme*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1093/ulr/1.1.26>
- Boyack, A. J. (2023). The Shape Of Consumer Contracts. In *Denver Law Review* (Vol. 101, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4527434>
- Burri, M. (2022). Approaches to Digital Trade and Data Flow Regulation Across Jurisdictions: Implications for the Future ASEAN-EU Agreement. *Legal Issues of Economic Integration*, 49(2). <https://doi.org/10.54648/LEIE2022007>
- Chen, Y., Wang, Q., & Zhang, J. (2025). The role of cross-border E-commerce platforms in the digital economy: empower firms to gain global market insights to increase global competitiveness. *Journal of Digital Management*, 1(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44362-024-00003-0>
- Cotterrell, R. (2020). Access To Justice, Moral Distance And Changing Demands On Law. *Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice*, 36. <https://doi.org/10.22329/wyaj.v36i0.6420>
- Daiza, H. (2018). Wrap contracts: How they can work better for businesses and consumers. *California Western Law Review*, 54(1).
- Davis, K. E., & Pargendler, M. (2022). Contract Law and Inequality. *Iowa Law Review*, 107(4).
- Dimatteo, L. A., & Ostas, D. T. (2011). Comparative Efficiency in International Sales Law. *American University International Law Review*, 26(2).
- Dosser, D., & Robson, P. (1981). The Economics of International Integration. *The Economic Journal*, 91(361). <https://doi.org/10.2307/2231732>

- Draguiev, D. (2022). Liability for Non-compliance with a Dispute Resolution Agreement. *Arbitration: The International Journal of Arbitration, Mediation and Dispute Management*, 88(Issue 1), 135–155. <https://doi.org/10.54648/AMDM2022008>
- Giliker, P. (2022). Contract Negotiations and the Common Law: A Move to Good Faith in Commercial Contracting? *Liverpool Law Review*, 43(2). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10991-022-09299-2>
- Gries, T., Grundmann, R., Palnau, I., & Redlin, M. (2018). Technology diffusion, international integration and participation in developing economies - a review of major concepts and findings. *International Economics and Economic Policy*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10368-017-0373-7>
- Haun, D. D., & Robinson, E. P. (2024). Do You Agree?: The Psychology and Legalities of Assent to Clickwrap Agreements. *The Richmond Journal of Law & Technology*, 28(4).
- Hertog, J. Den. (2003). Noncompetition clauses: Unreasonable or efficient? *European Journal of Law and Economics*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021858215779>
- Hesselink, M. W. (2021). Justifying Contract in Europe: Political Philosophies of European Contract Law. In *Justifying Contract in Europe: Political Philosophies of European Contract Law*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192843654.001.0001>
- Hulmák, M. (2023). Regulation of Unfair Contract Terms in Central and Eastern European Countries. *Societas et Iurisprudentia*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.31262/1339-5467/2023/11/2/21-42>
- Ilias, I. Iyana, Abdul Aziz, N., Zahari, H. S., & Lita, H. N. (2023). Navigating Unfair Contract Terms: Drawing Insights From Australia In Addressing The Legal Conundrum In Malaysia. *International Journal on Consumer Law and Practice*, 11.
- Jiang, H., Luo, Y., Xia, J., Hitt, M., & Shen, J. (2023). Resource dependence theory in international business: Progress and prospects. *Global Strategy Journal*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/gsj.1467>
- Kolt, N., Hoffman, D., Hadfield, G., Yoon, A., Mitchell, M., Alexander, R., & Giorgi, J. (2022). Predicting Consumer Contracts. *72 Berkeley Technology Law Journal*, 37.
- Kornet, N. (2012). Evolving General Principles of International Commercial Contracts: The Unidroit Principles and Favor Contractus. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1756751>
- Kusmiati, N. I. (2020). Legal Standing of Pre-Contractual Good Faith Principle as a Law Reformation of Indonesian Contract Law. *International Journal of Science and Society*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.54783/ijssoc.v2i1.61>
- Lassila, L. (2017). General principles and convention on contracts for the international sale of goods (CISG) – Uniformity under an interpretation umbrella? In *Russian Law Journal* (Vol. 5, Issue 2). <https://doi.org/10.17589/2309-8678-2017-5-2-113-128>
- Lookofsky, J., & Flechtner, H. (2008). Zapata Retold: Attorneys' Fees Are (Still) Not Governed by the CISG. *Journal of Law and Commerce*, 26(1 & 2). <https://doi.org/10.5195/jlc.2008.26>
- Malacka, M. (2018). General commercial terms and standard-form contracts in international business relations. *Bratislava Law Review*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.46282/blr.2018.2.2.102>
- Mantzari, D. (2022). Power imbalances in online marketplaces: At the crossroads of competition law and regulation. In *Research Handbook on the Law and Economics of Competition Enforcement*. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781789903799.00017>

- 961

- Ucaryilmaz, T. (2021). The principle of proportionality in modern Ius Gentium. *Utrecht Journal of International and European Law*, 36(1). <https://doi.org/10.5334/UJIEL.529>
- Ucín, M. C. (2023). Revisiting the Concept of Access to Justice as a Human Right in the Post-welfare State. In *Yearbook of Socio-Economic Constitutions* (Vol. 2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/16495_2023_49
- Valcke, C. (2008). Convergence and Divergence of the English, French, and German Conceptions of Contract . *European Review of Private Law*, 16(Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.54648/erpl2008003>
- Vanto, J. (2003). Attorneys' Fees as Damages in International Commercial Litigation. *Pace International Law Review*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.58948/2331-3536.1177>
- Zahid, A., Shapiee, R., Mukhtar, S., & Shah, S. M. (2016). Good faith in international commercial contracts under un sale convention and Islamic law: A brief comparison. In *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research* (Vol. 14, Issue 13).
- Zulkifli, S., Prasetyo, T., Pakpahan, E. F., & Jaya, W. T. (2025). *Legal Consequences of Implementing the Exoneration Clause in Franchise Contracts: Balancing Principles* (pp. 340–348). https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-352-8_28