Conference Proceedings
The 4th International Conference on Finance, Business, and Banking (ICFBB)
Mataram, 25-27 November 2025

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TA'ZIR AND TA'WIDL IN PREVENTING MORAL HAZARD OF ISLAMIC BANK CUSTOMERS IN INDONESIA AND MALAYSIA

Muslihun[1], Safwira Guna Putra[2], Nuradli Ridzwan Shah Mohd Dali[3], Muhamad Azhari Wahid[4]

Universitas Islam Negeri Mataram[1, 2]; Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia [3, 4]

Correspondence: Gunaputra@uinmataram.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The paper examines the comparative implementation of ta'zir and ta'widl, two key Shariah-compliant mechanisms for addressing default and moral hazard in Islamic banking. Through regulatory analysis and empirical evidence from Indonesia and Malaysia, this study clarifies the philosophical, legal, and operational distinctions between these mechanisms. While both countries follow the Syafii jurisprudential tradition, implementation differs significantly due to varying regulatory frameworks and operational contexts. Ta'zir functions as a disciplinary instrument targeting capable customers who deliberately delay payment, whereas ta'widl operates as a compensatory mechanism recovering documented losses from default. The analysis reveals that both mechanisms serve critical functions in protecting depositor interests, enforcing contractual discipline, and maintaining systemic stability. However, implementation inconsistencies, particularly in Indonesia's discretionary approach, create potential market fragmentation. The study concludes that while ta'zir and ta'widl represent sophisticated Islamic legal responses to moral hazard, their effectiveness depends fundamentally on clear regulatory mandates, transparent communication with stakeholders, and careful balance between disciplinary enforcement and customer protection.

Keywords: *ta'zir, ta'widl, Islamic banking, moral hazard, regulatory compliance, shariah finance.*

INTRODUCTION

Islamic banking has emerged as a significant segment of the global financial system, expanding rapidly across Southeast Asia and beyond. However, However, this development necessitates stringent adherence to sharia compliance standards, which serve as the foundation for institutional integrity and public credibility (Shofyani et al., 2024), particularly regarding the treatment of customer default and contractual breach. Unlike conventional banking, which relies on interest-based penalties for delayed payments, Islamic banking prohibits ribawi (usurious) returns and must develop mechanisms that are simultaneously effective in deterring opportunistic behavior while remaining compliant with Shariah principles.

A fundamental challenge confronting Islamic banking institutions relates to financing risks inherent in their intermediary operations. In executing their core function of credit extension, Islamic banks face potential losses stemming from borrower defaults. Karim (2011) defines banking risk as potential events, anticipated or unanticipated, that negatively impact a bank's income and capital. Although such risks cannot be entirely eliminated, effective management and control mechanisms can substantially mitigate their adverse effects. When debtors fail to meet contractual obligations, whether through negligence or deliberate action, banks may pursue compensation, contract termination, or legal remedies (Arif & Latif, 2011)

Two key instruments have evolved to address this challenge: ta'zir and ta'widl. Ta'zir functions as a disciplinary fine directed at customers who deliberately avoid payment obligations despite possessing financial capacity. Ta'widl operates as a compensatory mechanism designed to recover legitimate losses incurred by Islamic banks when customers default or delay repayment. While both mechanisms are permitted under Shariah principles and incorporated into the regulatory frameworks of numerous

Islamic-majority countries, their precise definition, application criteria, and income treatment remain contested and inconsistently implemented.

This divergence is particularly evident in Indonesia and Malaysia, two neighboring jurisdictions with predominantly similar Islamic legal traditions yet notably different regulatory approaches. Indonesia's regulatory framework, established through fatwas by the Dewan Syariah Nasional–Majelis Ulama Indonesia (DSN-MUI), employs permissive language allowing discretionary implementation. Malaysia's Shariah Advisory Council (SAC) of Bank Negara Malaysia, by contrast, establishes more prescriptive guidelines, though with certain provisions that paradoxically render key mechanisms impractical.

Beyond regulatory mechanics, a deeper issue animates contemporary Islamic banking debates: the tension between Quranic injunctions emphasizing forbearance toward debtors in hardship and the institutional reality that Islamic banks hold deposits from numerous customers who depend on bank profitability for investment returns. This tension necessitates sophisticated mechanisms balancing justice across multiple stakeholder classes, a challenge classical Islamic jurisprudence did not anticipate in the context of financial intermediation.

METHOD

The present study addresses these complexities through three primary objectives: (1) to elucidate the conceptual and functional distinctions between ta'zir and ta'widl; (2) to compare their regulatory treatment and practical implementation in Indonesia and Malaysia; and (3) to evaluate their effectiveness in mitigating moral hazard while maintaining justice and Shariah compliance. By synthesizing regulatory analysis, empirical interviews with banking practitioners and jurisprudential authorities, and contemporary scholarly literature, this examination provides comprehensive insight into how Islamic banking resolves the fundamental tension between creditor protection, debtor compassion, and depositor safeguarding.

Conceptual Framework: Ta'zir and Ta'widl in Islamic Banking Jurisprudential Foundations and Common Elements

Both ta'zir and ta'widl derive legitimacy from Islamic jurisprudence concerning contract enforcement, breach remedies, and equitable dealings between transacting parties. Their theoretical foundation emerges from classical fiqh principles developed by the Syafii school of thought, which is predominant in both Indonesia and Malaysia. This shared jurisprudential basis creates substantial conceptual alignment between the two jurisdictions, despite divergent regulatory implementations.

The Quranic foundation supporting lenience toward debtors appears in Surah al-Baqarah (2:280): "And if (the debtor) is in difficulty, then give him respite until he is able. And giving in charity (some or all of the debt) is better for you, if you know." This verse establishes a normative principle favoring patience and forgiveness toward debtors experiencing genuine hardship. However, Islamic jurisprudence has long recognized that this principle cannot be absolutized in contexts involving multiple stakeholders and institutional complexity. The jurisprudential distinction between involuntary default due to force majeure and deliberate payment avoidance by capable customers constitutes a critical analytical framework supporting the development of ta'zir and ta'widl.

Ta'zir: Disciplinary Sanctions and Behavioral Incentives

Ta'zir, derived from the Arabic root meaning "to prevent" or "to chastise," functions as a disciplinary sanction imposed on customers who possess clear financial capacity to meet obligations but deliberately delay payment or breach contractual terms. The primary objectives of ta'zir are (1) to create behavioral incentives discouraging deliberate default; (2) to enforce contractual discipline through credible financial consequences; and (3) to uphold justice principles by distinguishing between involuntary hardship and opportunistic conduct.

The jurisprudential basis for ta'zir extends beyond contractual remedies to encompass Islamic principles concerning justice (*adl*) and ethical conduct. The Prophetic saying "*matlul ganiy zulmun*" (deliberately withholding payment by a person of wealth constitutes oppression) grounds ta'zir in a distinctively Islamic ethical framework that ties financial enforcement to moral principles. This theological grounding distinguishes Islamic banking approaches from purely economic analyses of default prevention and reflects commitment to justice as a core banking principle rather than merely an instrumental mechanism.

Empirical evidence from practitioner interviews reveals ta'zir's particular utility for customers managing multiple financing relationships. When a customer maintains loans across several Islamic banks, some implementing ta'zir and others not, the imposition of ta'zir creates payment prioritization incentives. Customers rationally direct available funds toward institutions enforcing disciplinary consequences, effectively distributing payments across all lenders rather than opportunistically defaulting on certain institutions while maintaining payments elsewhere.

Ta'widl: Compensatory Mechanisms and Opportunity Cost Recovery

Ta'widl operates according to fundamentally different logic. Rather than imposing penalties for deliberate misconduct, ta'widl compensates Islamic banks for legitimate losses arising from customer default or late payment. The compensatory character of ta'widl extends beyond administrative inconvenience to encompass genuine opportunity costs resulting from delayed fund deployment.

Illustratively, when a customer restructures repayment terms, shifting from monthly to quarterly installments, the bank experiences an opportunity cost. Funds that could have been reinvested monthly now must wait three months for redeployment, reducing cumulative investment returns. Ta'widl recovery of these documented opportunity costs aligns with Islamic principles permitting recovery of actual damages without imposing additional penalties.

Critically, ta'widl does not require proof of intentional misconduct or deliberate breach. It applies mechanically whenever payment is not made as scheduled, functioning as an automatic compensatory mechanism rather than discretionary disciplinary action. This distinction reflects ta'widl's compensatory rather than punitive character and positions it as a mechanism primarily protecting depositor interests rather than disciplining customer behavior.

Regulatory Distinctions Between Ta'zir and Ta'widl

The distinction between ta'zir and ta'widl acquires operational significance in regulatory treatment of collected funds. In both Indonesia and Malaysia, proceeds from ta'zir cannot be recognized as legitimate bank income. Instead, such funds must be allocated to charitable or social purposes, designated as "non-halal income" ineligible for profit distribution to shareholders or depositors.

This treatment reflects sophisticated jurisprudential reasoning about structural similarities between prohibited practices and ostensibly different mechanisms. When fines become connected to debt amounts and collected as banking income, they functionally resemble riba regardless of terminology. By mandating charitable allocation, regulatory authorities sever the functional link between the underlying transaction and penalty proceeds, preventing emergence of debt-linked returns constituting usury.

In contrast, ta'widl proceeds are universally recognized as legitimate compensation recoverable as bank income. This distinction creates institutional incentives: banks possess strong motivation to systematically implement ta'widl (recognized income) while remaining discretionary regarding ta'zir implementation (non-halal income). The differential treatment reflects regulatory sophistication in aligning institutional incentives with Shariah compliance objectives.

Regulatory Frameworks and Implementation Architectures

Indonesia: Permissive Framework and Institutional Discretion

Indonesia's regulatory approach to ta'zir and ta'widl operates through a series of fatwas issued by DSN-MUI. Fatwa No. 17 (September 2000) addresses ta'zir as sanctions against capable customers who delay payment. Fatwa No. 43 (August 2004) establishes ta'widl as compensation for losses due to default. Fatwa No. 129 extends ta'widl principles to real costs arising from late payment.

A defining characteristic of Indonesian fatwas is their employment of permissive language using the Arabic term *jawaz* (permissibility) rather than *wujub* (obligation). This linguistic choice indicates that ta'zir and ta'widl implementation remains discretionary, dependent on individual bank policy decisions rather than mandatory regulatory requirements. The DSN-MUI explicitly recognizes that banks may implement both mechanisms, either mechanism singularly, or neither mechanism, all approaches remain Shariah-compliant provided they comply with specified conditions.

This permissiveness reflects the DSN-MUI's recognition that operational circumstances vary substantially across Islamic banks, geographic regions, and market conditions. Some banks may calculate that the administrative burden and charitable allocation requirements associated with ta'zir collection exceed operational benefits. Other banks may determine that ta'widl's recognition as legitimate income justifies systematic implementation while maintaining discretion regarding ta'zir.
The practical consequence of this permissive framework is considerable variation in implementation across Indonesian Islamic banks. Research evidence documents institutions that implement neither mechanism, others that apply both systematically, and still others that implement ta'widl exclusively while forgoing ta'zir. This heterogeneity creates potential inconsistency in customer experience and competitive conditions but preserves institutional flexibility in operational decision-making.

Malaysia: Prescriptive Framework with Practical Implementation Barriers

Malaysia's regulatory approach operates through SAC Resolutions of Bank Negara Malaysia, which establish more specific implementation guidelines and rate parameters. Critically, Malaysian regulation distinguishes between gharamah (fines) and ta'widl (compensation), employing different procedural and enforcement mechanisms for each.
Gharamah application requires formal judicial sanction. Before collecting gharamah from a customer, Islamic banks must obtain a court judgment confirming the customer's obligation. This judicial requirement creates substantial practical barriers. Court proceedings are expensive, temporally protracted, and administratively burdensome. Research participants consistently reported that gharamah remains virtually unimplemented in Malaysian Islamic banking practice due to these procedural impediments. Despite regulatory authorization, the cost-benefit calculation effectively eliminates gharamah from institutional practice.
Ta'widl, conversely, operates on more flexible premises. SAC regulations establish a maximum ta'widl rate of 1% of outstanding principal, though banks may petition SAC for approval of higher rates upon demonstrating that actual costs incurred exceed this threshold. This mechanism balances standardization with institutional flexibility, regulatory authorities maintain predictability through rate caps while preserving adjustment capacity for legitimate cost variation across institutions and market conditions.
The practical consequence is stark differentiation in implementation prevalence. Malaysian Islamic banks systematically apply ta'widl as standard practice whenever customers miss payment deadlines, irrespective of underlying circumstances or customer capacity. In contrast, gharamah remains essentially theoretical, authorized in regulatory framework but absent from institutional practice.

Comparative Regulatory Efficacy

The Indonesian and Malaysian regulatory approaches exemplify different philosophies regarding the balance between prescriptive certainty and operational flexibility. Indonesia's permissive framework maximizes institutional adaptation but risks inconsistency and market fragmentation. Malaysia's prescriptive approach generates uniformity and predictability but creates implementation barriers preventing achievement of regulatory objectives, particularly regarding gharamah.
Neither approach appears optimal. Indonesia's discretion may disadvantage compliance-oriented banks competing against institutions adopting conservative approaches. Malaysia's judicial requirement for gharamah enforcement effectively nullifies regulatory authorization, rendering the mechanism nominal rather than substantive.

Philosophical Foundations: Justice, Stakeholder Protection, and Institutional Complexity The Multifaceted Stakeholder Problem

A fundamental distinction separates individual lending from Islamic banking intermediation. When an individual lender provides personal funds to a debtor, the lender's forbearance and patience become ethical virtues aligned with Quranic guidance. The lender's economic interests are singular and personal; generosity toward a struggling debtor harms no third party.
Islamic banking operates under fundamentally different structural circumstances. Banks function as financial intermediaries pooling deposits from numerous customers (fund providers or *sahib al-mal*)

and distributing financing to multiple clients (borrowers or debtors). When a financing customer defaults or delays payment, consequences extend beyond the bank-customer dyad to encompass all depositors whose funds are invested in that financing.

Research evidence clarifies this stakeholder complexity. A single financing customer may be supported by multiple depositors. In concrete terms, one debtor financed through ten different depositors experiences default bearing real consequences for all ten fund providers, each of whom has entrusted their capital to the bank under *mudharabah* (profit-sharing) contracts. From this perspective, unmitigated forbearance toward debtors represents unfairness toward innocent depositors whose interests suffer collateral damage.

This structural reality creates jurisprudential necessity for mechanisms protecting depositor interests while maintaining Shariah compliance. Classical Islamic jurisprudence developed during periods of individual lending and thus lacks established doctrines specifically addressing default management in institutional settings involving multiple stakeholders. Contemporary Islamic financial authorities must therefore develop regulatory frameworks that extend classical principles into new institutional contexts.

Justice Across Stakeholder Classes

The concept of justice (*adl*) constitutes a foundational principle in Islamic law and economics. However, justice in contexts of multiple stakeholders requires careful articulation of fairness across disparate interest groups. Practitioner interviews reveal sophisticated recognition of this complexity among Islamic banking authorities and practitioners.

Leading scholars emphasize that ta'zir and ta'widl implementation must maintain justice ("*keadilan*") across all stakeholder classes. From depositors' perspectives, ta'widl application appears eminently fair—it protects fund invested with the bank by compensating for opportunity costs resulting from debtor delay. From financing customers' perspectives, however, identical mechanisms may appear punitive or coercive, particularly if not adequately explained at contract inception.

This perception gap illuminates a critical implementation consideration: effective ta'zir and ta'widl application requires comprehensive customer education and transparent communication. When customers understand that ta'zir is discipline-oriented (designed to modify behavior rather than generate bank profits) and that ta'widl represents genuine compensation (protecting depositors from loss), the justice rationale becomes apparent. Conversely, absent such communication, customers perceive these mechanisms as oppressive impositions resembling usurious charges.

Practitioners emphasize that all employees involved in collection and enforcement must understand standard operating procedures and maintain recognition that customers are business partners rather than adversaries. This orientation, preserving customer dignity while enforcing institutional policies, reflects Islamic principles of fairness and ethical conduct that should permeate implementation.

Limitations of Absolute Forbearance

The jurisprudential evolution reflected in ta'zir and ta'widl authorization represents recognition that absolute forbearance toward debtors, while ethically compelling in individual lending contexts, proves untenable in institutional settings. An Islamic bank cannot simply absorb all losses resulting from customer default while continuing to offer competitive deposit returns. To do so would render the institution financially unsustainable and ultimately harm the depositor base by threatening institutional solvency.

However, this institutional necessity does not justify abandonment of Islamic principles regarding debtor protection. Rather, it necessitates careful calibration of enforcement mechanisms that maintain justice across stakeholders. Ta'zir targets deliberate default by capable customers, distinguishing willful misconduct from genuine hardship. Ta'widl compensates for documented losses without imposing additional penalties beyond those necessary to protect depositor interests.

Implementation Realities and Operational Effectiveness Disciplinary Effectiveness of Ta'zir

The effectiveness of ta'zir in preventing opportunistic default depends critically on customer awareness of consequences. For customers maintaining financing relationships across multiple institutions, knowledge that certain banks impose ta'zir for late payment creates incentive structures favoring timely payment to ta'zir-implementing institutions. Research evidence suggests ta'zir particularly influences payment prioritization when customers face liquidity constraints requiring selective payment allocation.

However, ta'zir effectiveness depends on several preconditions. First, contracts must explicitly stipulate ta'zir terms and amount, with customer consent documented at transaction inception. Surprise imposition of ta'zir violates contractual principles and generates customer resistance. Second, ta'zir cannot be imposed on customers experiencing genuine hardship due to force majeure. Attempting to penalize involuntary default contradicts Islamic principles and produces severe customer dissatisfaction. Third, collection procedures must maintain customer dignity and reflect principles of ethical conduct fundamental to Islamic finance.

Importantly, ta'zir's effectiveness operates differently than conventional interest-based penalties. Conventional banking imposes time-based interest regardless of culpability, payments delayed by one day attract identical charges as payments delayed by months, creating mechanical disincentive. Ta'zir, properly understood, applies only to deliberately culpable delays by capable customers and aims at behavioral modification rather than pure revenue generation. This distinction reflects its nature as disciplinary sanction rather than compensatory mechanism.

Compensatory Effectiveness of Ta'widl

Ta'widl functions more mechanically than ta'zir, applying automatically whenever payment is not made as scheduled. This automatic application generates systematic implementation, Malaysian evidence demonstrates that ta'widl is routinely applied across institutions, creating predictable customer expectations and standardized practice.

However, ta'widl's effectiveness in protecting depositor interests depends on rate-setting accuracy. If ta'widl rates are set below actual opportunity costs, depositors suffer losses despite ta'widl collection. Conversely, if rates exceed actual costs, they become punitive rather than compensatory, approaching the functional characteristics of prohibited penalties. Malaysia's framework addressing this through SAC review and adjustment mechanisms reflects sophisticated recognition of the rate-setting challenge.

An important empirical finding concerns Indonesian practice. Despite ta'widl's formal permissibility, implementation is less systematic than Malaysian practice, in part because discretionary implementation reduces institutional commitment. Moreover, the recognition of ta'widl as legitimate income in some institutional contexts but not others creates competitive distortions favoring less scrupulous operators over compliance-oriented banks that absorb more stringent internal controls.

Enforcement and Compliance Mechanisms

Indonesia's approach relies heavily on explicit contractual provision and customer consent at loan inception. Enforcement depends on banking institutions' commitment to contract terms and customer acceptance of consequences. This decentralized, contract-based approach preserves institutional flexibility but creates potential inconsistency across institutions and products.

Malaysia's more centralized approach, incorporating SAC oversight and prescribed rate limits, ensures greater uniformity but also creates the earlier-noted problem that judicial requirements for gharamah render it impractical. The gap between regulatory authorization and institutional practice represents a significant implementation failure, regulatory authorities authorized a mechanism that institutional realities have rendered inoperable.

Shariah Compliance and the Syibhul Riba Doctrine Functional Analysis versus Nominal Designation

A foundational principle in Islamic jurisprudence holds that prohibitions on riba cannot be evaded through nominal reclassification or procedural variation. If a mechanism functionally operates as usury despite different terminology, it remains prohibited. This principle, central to Shariah compliance analysis, underlies the differential treatment of ta'zir and ta'widl proceeds.

When ta'zir becomes systematically collected and recognized as bank income flowing from debt-based transactions, it functionally resembles riba despite nominal differentiation. The connection between the

underlying debt and the penalty becomes clear, creating the appearance of additional returns accruing to the creditor based on debt amount and duration, the precise mechanism riba prohibits.
To prevent this functional equivalence, regulatory frameworks mandate that ta'zir proceeds be allocated exclusively to charitable or social purposes, disconnected from bank profit and depositor distributions. This allocation mechanism serves to sever the functional link between debt and penalty, preventing transformation of discipline into usurious returns.

Distinguishing Compensation from Penalty

Ta'widl escapes this riba concern because it represents genuine compensation for documented losses rather than penalty linked to debt characteristics. When a customer delays repayment, causing the bank to experience opportunity cost or administrative expense, ta'widl recovery of such losses parallels standard contract law principles permitting compensation for actual damages. Islamic law permits such compensation without restriction, distinguishing it sharply from prohibited riba.
The jurisprudential distinction between compensation (permissible) and penalty (prohibited when debt-linked) reflects sophisticated legal analysis. Islamic authorities recognize that financial consequences flowing from genuine loss differ fundamentally from consequences imposed on debts themselves. A customer who damages property must compensate for actual damage; similarly, a customer whose default causes documented bank losses should compensate for those losses. Neither scenario constitutes prohibited riba.
This analysis explains why ta'widl is universally recognized as legitimate income while ta'zir remains problematic. Regulatory frameworks worldwide distinguish these mechanisms precisely because they function differently and carry distinct Shariah compliance implications.

Cross-Jurisdictional Synthesis and Policy Implications Regulatory Design Considerations

The comparative analysis of Indonesia and Malaysia reveals several design principles critical to effective ta'zir and ta'widl regulation:
First, clarity and transparency in regulatory mandate matters considerably. Malaysia's specific rate caps and SAC review procedures create institutional certainty, though at the cost of some operational flexibility. Indonesia's permissive approach preserves flexibility but creates potential inconsistency. Intermediate positions, establishing rate ranges rather than absolute caps, or creating streamlined review procedures, might balance competing objectives.
Second, enforcement procedures must remain practically feasible. Malaysia's judicial requirement for gharamah renders it theoretically authorized but practically inoperable. Regulatory authorities should design enforcement mechanisms that are administratively reasonable, cost-effective, and capable of systematic implementation. When regulatory authorization exceeds practical feasibility, regulatory authority itself becomes compromised.
Third, customer communication and education constitute essential implementation elements. Practitioners emphasize that effective ta'zir and ta'widl application depends on customers understanding the mechanisms' rationale and accepting their justice across stakeholder classes. Transparent explanation at contract inception, covering the distinction between involuntary hardship and deliberate default, the connection between ta'widl and depositor protection, and ta'zir's disciplinary rather than profit-generating intent, transforms mechanisms from appearing oppressive to appearing fair.
Fourth, differentiation between capable and incapable debtors requires institutional capacity for assessment. Ta'zir properly applies only to capable customers deliberately delaying payment, not to those experiencing genuine hardship. Institutions must develop procedural mechanisms for distinguishing these categories while respecting customer dignity and complying with Islamic principles of forbearance toward struggling debtors.

Market Consistency and Competitive Fairness

The heterogeneity in Indonesian Islamic banking practice, with some institutions implementing both mechanisms, others implementing one, and still others implementing neither, creates potential competitive distortions. Compliance-oriented banks absorbing stringent internal controls and more

rigorous customer requirements may face competitive disadvantage against less scrupulous operators. Over time, such conditions could create adverse selection pressures favoring lower-compliance institutions.
Malaysia's more uniform approach, while not perfect, generates competitive consistency. All institutions implement ta'widl according to prescribed parameters, creating level playing field and predictable customer experience. The gharamah problem aside, the uniformity principle offers advantages for market stability and consumer confidence.

Balancing Forbearance and Protection: Jurisprudential Evolution

Both jurisdictions demonstrate maturing jurisprudential approaches recognizing that Islamic principles require sophisticated balancing rather than simplistic application. The evolution from regulation focusing exclusively on ta'zir to contemporary frameworks incorporating both mechanisms reflects deepening understanding of Islamic banking's institutional complexity.
Significantly, neither jurisdiction has abandoned the principle of forbearance toward genuinely distressed debtors. Both frameworks explicitly permit deferral, restructuring, and other relief measures for customers experiencing legitimate hardship. Ta'zir and ta'widl apply only in contexts of capacity coupled with deliberate default (ta'zir) or demonstrable opportunity cost (ta'widl). The sophistication lies in distinguishing categories rather than imposing uniform treatment.

Effectiveness in Mitigating Moral Hazard: Empirical Findings Moral Hazard Prevention Through Multi-Institutional Relationships

Moral hazard in lending relationships occurs when borrowers have incentive to take excessive risk or avoid payment obligations because consequences are borne partially or wholly by lenders. In Islamic banking contexts, moral hazard manifests particularly when customers maintain financing relationships across multiple institutions and can selectively default to certain lenders while maintaining payments elsewhere.
Research evidence documents that ta'zir implementation significantly alters this calculus. Customers aware that certain Islamic banks impose disciplinary penalties for late payment prioritize payments to such institutions, effectively distributing available funds equitably across lenders. This payment prioritization represents a concrete mechanism through which ta'zir reduces moral hazard by creating credible consequences for selective default.

Depositor Protection Through Ta'widl

Ta'widl addresses moral hazard from depositor perspective. Depositors, trusting banks with funds under *mudharabah* contracts, expect returns commensurate with investment structure. When financing customers delay payment, depositors experience opportunity cost, expected returns decline due to reduced deployment returns. Ta'widl compensation protects depositor interests by ensuring investment returns reflect actual timing of fund deployment rather than theoretical deployment timing.
This protection mechanism proves particularly important because depositors typically lack direct visibility into individual financing arrangements. Depositors cannot inspect loan contracts or monitor debtor discipline directly. Ta'widl functions as institutional mechanism ensuring depositor protection without requiring individual monitoring by distant fund providers.

Limitations and Implementation Challenges

Despite their theoretical effectiveness, ta'zir and ta'widl face several practical limitations. First, they cannot address moral hazard stemming from genuine insolvency or force majeure events. A business facing bankruptcy through market conditions beyond its control cannot be effectively deterred by ta'zir; the mechanism assumes customer capacity and deliberateness that insolvency negates.
Second, overly aggressive implementation risks driving customers toward informal lending markets or conventional banks, potentially reducing Islamic banking market share and paradoxically increasing rather than decreasing systemic risk. The discipline ta'zir and ta'widl impose must be calibrated to affect behavior modification without provoking market exit.

Third, collection enforcement depends on institutional capacity and commitment. Banks lacking robust collection procedures, customer communication programs, and compliance monitoring systems may find ta'zir and ta'widl implementation ineffective or counterproductive.

CONCLUSION

Ta'zir and ta'widl represent sophisticated Islamic legal responses to the fundamental challenge of reconciling forbearance toward distressed debtors with protection of depositor interests in institutional banking contexts. The mechanisms reflect jurisprudential evolution responding to Islamic banking's practical operational realities while maintaining adherence to core Shariah principles.

The comparative analysis of Indonesia and Malaysia reveals significant regulatory divergence reflecting different philosophies regarding centralization, discretion, and enforcement. Indonesia's permissive approach preserves institutional flexibility but creates potential inconsistency and competitive distortion. Malaysia's prescriptive approach generates uniformity but faces practical barriers to gharamah implementation despite regulatory authorization.

Neither approach proves ideal. Optimal regulation would likely combine elements of both: establishing clear guidance and rate parameters (addressing Malaysian strengths) while preserving institutional discretion in implementation approaches (addressing Indonesian flexibility). Moreover, practical enforcement mechanisms must remain feasible, regulatory authorities should audit whether authorized mechanisms can actually be implemented or whether procedural requirements effectively nullify authorization.

Critically, both ta'zir and ta'widl effectiveness depends substantially on factors beyond regulatory framework: customer education and communication regarding mechanism rationale, institutional commitment to implementation, employee training in ethical collection practices, and clear differentiation between capable and incapable debtors. Regulatory framework provides necessary but insufficient conditions for effective implementation.

The jurisprudential principle underlying both mechanisms, that Islamic banking must maintain justice across multiple stakeholders including depositors, while simultaneously respecting principles of forbearance toward struggling debtors, represents an important development in Islamic financial jurisprudence. As Islamic banking continues expanding globally and institutionalizing further, refinement of mechanisms balancing these competing values will prove increasingly central to system credibility and sustainability.

Future research should examine empirical outcomes of ta'zir and ta'widl implementation, assess impact on customer behavior and default rates, analyze competitive effects, and investigate whether implementation practices differ systematically across institutions despite identical regulatory authorization. Longitudinal studies tracking borrower behavior before and after ta'zir and ta'widl implementation would provide evidence regarding behavioral modification effectiveness. Such research would ground policy discussions in empirical reality rather than theoretical speculation.

Ultimately, ta'zir and ta'widl exemplify how Islamic financial regulation develops through iterative dialogue between jurisprudential principles, institutional realities, and stakeholder interests. Their continued refinement and improvement depends on both regulatory authorities' commitment to coherent policy frameworks and banking institutions' dedication to implementation reflecting the ethical principles animating Islamic finance's theoretical foundations.

REFERENCES

Bank Negara Malaysia. (2010). *Resolutions of Shariah Advisory Council of Bank Negara Malaysia*. Bank Negara Malaysia.

Depag RI. (1971). *Al-Qur'an dan Terjamhnya*. YPPPQ.

Isnaliana & Inayatillah. (2021). Urgensi Penerapan Pada Perbankan Syariah. In *Proceeding of Dirundeng International Conference on Islamic Studies (Dicis 2021)* (p. 303).

Mardani. (2015). *Aspek Hukum Lembaga Keuangan Syariah di Indonesia*. Kencana.

Syaifullah, H. (2021). Ta'widl dan Ta'zir Perspektif Mufassir Klasik dan Implementasinya di Bank Syariah. *MALIA: Journal of Islamic Banking and Finance*, 5(1), 31–45.

Zulkipli, Z. N. (2020). Denda Keterlambatan Pembayaran: Ta'widh dan Gharamah yang Dikenakan kepada Debitur dari Perspektif Syariah. *Jurnal Yuridika*, 35(1), 1–15.

Dewan Syariah Nasional, *Himpunan Fatwa Dewan Syariah Nasional,* Jakarta: PT Intrermasa, 2003.

Ezani Yaakub Mohamed dkk: “Meninjau Kembali Biaya Keterlambatan Pembayaran oleh Bank Syariah di Malaysia”, Jurnal Pengurusan 42 (2014) 185-190.

Firman Wahyudi: “Mengontrol *Moral Hazard* Nasabah Melalui Instrumen *Ta’zir dan Ta’widl*, Jurnal *AL-BANJARI,* Vol. 16, No. 2, Juli-Desember 2017, h. 201.

Ahmad Juliadi, “Analisis Implementasi *Ta’zir* dan *Ta’widl* pada Pembiayaan Murabahah PT. Bank Aceh Syariah Cabang Banda Aceh.” Di Universitas Islam Negeri Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh**,** Tahun 2020.

Alal al-Fasi, *Maqashid As-Syariah al-Islamiyyah wa Makarimuha*, Cet. 1, ttp.: Maktabah al-Wihdah al-Arabiyah al-Dar al-Baida, tth.

Alvi Aulia Shofyani dkk, “Perbandingan Keberagaman Dewan Pengawas Syariah pada Bank Umum Syariah Indonesia dan Malaysia”, *Jurnal al-Musthofa*, Volume 06, Nomor 01, Juni 2024 Naskah Masuk: 26 Januari 2024; Direvisi: 28 Maret 2024; Diterima: 2 Mei 2024; Diterbitkan: 4 Juni 2024, h 2.

Andri Soemita, *Bank dan Lembaga Keuangan Syariah*, Edisi Pertama, Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group, 2009.

Arisson Hendry, “Maqashid Syari`ah: Riba, Garar, dan Kaidah-Kaidah Ekonomi Syariah”, PPT Program Pembinaan Pendidikan Anggota Inkopsyah Kerjasama dengan Bank Panin Syariah, h.7.

Asafri Jaya Bakri, *Konsep Maqāsid Syarī’ah Menurut As-Syātibi*, Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada, 1996.

Brik Kumala, “Pemberlakuan *Ta’zir* dan *Ta’widll* Sebagai Alternatif Penanganan Pembiayaan Bermasalah dalam Perbankan Syari’ah Indonesia (Suatu Tinjauan Yuridis)” Tesis Diajukan Untuk Memenuhi Sebagai Syarat-Syarat Memperoleh Gelar Magister Kenotariatan di Universitas Brawijaya Malang Tahun 2018.