
Advancing Criminal Justice Reform through Restorative Justice: A Narrative Review

Daryna Dzemish Abdulovna

Belarusian State University, Belarus

Correspondent: demishdarina@gmail.com

Received : August 15, 2024

Accepted : November 12, 2024

Published : November 30, 2024

Citation: Abdulovna, D.D. (2024). Advancing Criminal Justice Reform through Restorative Justice: A Narrative Review. Sinergi International Journal of Law, 2(4), 274 – 285.

ABSTRACT: This study presents a comprehensive narrative review of restorative justice within criminal justice systems, analyzing its potential as a reformative alternative to retributive practices. The review aims to synthesize empirical findings on the impact of restorative justice on recidivism reduction, victim satisfaction, and systemic transformation. Literature was systematically collected using databases such as Scopus, PubMed, and Google Scholar, employing keywords like "restorative justice," "mediation," and "criminal justice reform." Inclusion criteria focused on peer-reviewed studies from 2000 to 2025 exploring mediation mechanisms, institutional integration, and socio-cultural impacts. Results show that restorative justice significantly reduces recidivism, fosters victim healing, and improves community engagement. Mediation involving victims, offenders, and community members enhances accountability, reduces trauma, and reinforces social harmony. Comparative studies reveal that implementation success varies across legal systems, influenced by institutional capacity, legal policies, and cultural values. While some jurisdictions integrate traditional values to enhance restorative outcomes, others face challenges due to rigid bureaucracies and weak inter-agency coordination. This review highlights the urgency of policy reforms to support restorative justice through legislation, training, and community awareness. Digital mediation tools and standardized procedures are recommended for broader access and transparency. The findings emphasize the necessity of cross-sector collaboration, legal alignment, and culturally responsive frameworks. Restorative justice emerges as a viable strategy to advance justice reform, aligning punitive responses with principles of empathy, accountability, and social restoration.

Keywords: Restorative Justice; Criminal Justice Reform; Mediation; Recidivism Reduction; Victim Participation; Legal Policy; Community-Based Justice.



This is an open access article under the CC-BY 4.0 license

INTRODUCTION

Restorative justice (RJ) has emerged as a transformative paradigm within criminal law, offering a shift from the punitive retributive justice model towards one that prioritizes healing, restoration, and the reparation of relationships among offenders, victims, and communities (Rochaeti & Muthia, 2021; García, 2020). Unlike conventional justice systems that center on punishment, RJ emphasizes the social and psychological dimensions of crime, proposing mechanisms of reconciliation and dialogue that actively involve all stakeholders (Rochaeti & Muthia, 2021). This participatory and dialogical model highlights the recognition of harm experienced by victims and encourages offenders to take accountability for their actions in a manner that fosters social harmony and transformation (García, 2020).

The foundational principles of RJ include inclusive dialogue, voluntary participation, accountability, and communal involvement. These principles are operationalized through various practices, including victim-offender mediation, family group conferencing, and community-based reconciliation (Ariefulloh et al., 2023; Rochaeti & Muthia, 2021). RJ not only draws from modern legal theory but is also legitimized by traditional dispute-resolution methods in many indigenous and local communities, especially within developing countries (Rochaeti et al., 2023). These cultural traditions, often rooted in local customs and communal values, provide a robust foundation for implementing RJ in ways that are contextually relevant and socially legitimate (Rochaeti et al., 2023).

Globally, restorative justice is being adapted across diverse legal systems and socio-political settings. Countries with strong customary law traditions often incorporate kinship values and community engagement within their justice mechanisms, in contrast to the bureaucratic and formalized processes of Western legal systems (Ariefulloh et al., 2023). As a result, RJ has gained traction as a culturally adaptive and community-based model that enhances inclusivity and promotes grassroots justice, especially in jurisdictions where formal legal institutions are perceived as inaccessible or inefficient (Rochaeti & Muthia, 2021).

Empirical data support the relevance and urgency of RJ. Recidivism rates remain high in many countries, and conventional justice systems have been criticized for marginalizing victims and failing to address their emotional and social needs (Sliva, 2018; Amarini et al., 2024). In Indonesia, for example, there is growing public dissatisfaction with the traditional criminal justice system and increasing support for community-based, restorative approaches (Rochaeti & Muthia, 2021). The national context illustrates the pressing need for reforms that integrate restorative principles to alleviate judicial burdens and foster victim healing and offender accountability (Sliva, 2018).

Globally, restorative mechanisms have shown promise in addressing structural failures of formal systems by offering emotionally satisfying and socially reparative outcomes for victims (García, 2020). Empirical studies further indicate that RJ interventions contribute to reducing recidivism and enhancing victim satisfaction, particularly when community participation is central to the process (Amarini et al., 2024). In Indonesia, local adaptations of RJ have improved case resolution times, minimized formal court involvement, and empowered community leaders as mediators in

dispute resolution (Ariefulloh et al., 2023). These findings support the assertion that RJ can relieve systemic pressure while providing more humane justice outcomes.

Nonetheless, several critical challenges hinder the full implementation of RJ in developing countries. These include limited institutional capacity, resistance to change within law enforcement bodies, and a lack of trained facilitators capable of conducting RJ processes in sensitive and complex cases (Hamzani et al., 2023; Sriwidodo, 2021). Moreover, deep-rooted cultural norms that emphasize retribution over reconciliation further complicate the acceptance of RJ practices within some legal systems (Rochaeti et al., 2023).

Institutional and regulatory barriers also persist. Legal systems structured around hierarchical, adversarial models often find it difficult to accommodate non-formal, dialogical processes such as mediation (García, 2020). Bureaucratic resistance and a lack of inter-agency coordination can significantly delay or derail the institutionalization of RJ (Sriwidodo, 2021). Furthermore, insufficient political commitment and the absence of comprehensive policies limit the scalability and sustainability of RJ programs in many jurisdictions (Hamzani et al., 2023).

Despite the growing interest in RJ, there remains a significant gap in the literature concerning its long-term effectiveness in reducing recidivism and increasing victim satisfaction (Hamzani et al., 2023; Kawalek et al., 2018). Many studies focus predominantly on theoretical frameworks and lack comprehensive empirical validation, especially through longitudinal or mixed-methods approaches (García, 2020). Moreover, existing evaluations often fail to use standardized metrics or consider contextual variables such as cultural norms, victim typologies, or the nature of the crime, limiting the generalizability of their findings (Hamzani et al., 2023).

In response to these gaps, this narrative review aims to synthesize empirical and theoretical findings related to the practice of restorative justice in criminal law. It specifically seeks to analyze the effectiveness of RJ in reducing recidivism and enhancing victim satisfaction while critically engaging with the dominant retributive paradigm. The review explores how RJ is adapted across different legal and cultural systems and examines key themes such as mediation processes, conflict resolution mechanisms, reparative strategies, and institutional challenges (García, 2020; Kawalek et al., 2018). By identifying methodological and conceptual shortcomings in existing research, the review contributes to the development of more robust evaluative models.

The scope of this review encompasses both national and international case studies, with a focus on three primary populations: juvenile offenders, perpetrators of corruption, and victims of sexual violence. These groups have been selected due to their distinct psychological, legal, and social dimensions, which necessitate tailored restorative interventions (Andini et al., 2023; Sulistyo et al., 2021; Sriwiyanti et al., 2021). Additionally, the review pays particular attention to the Indonesian context, where RJ is increasingly being integrated into formal and informal justice systems and where traditional values play a crucial role in conflict resolution (Rochaeti & Muthia, 2021).

Ultimately, this review aspires to bridge the gap between theoretical conceptualizations and practical implementations of restorative justice. By doing so, it seeks to offer recommendations for policy reforms and institutional strategies that support the sustainable adoption of RJ in diverse

legal systems. It further advocates for context-sensitive and culturally embedded practices that uphold justice not only as a legal principle but as a social good rooted in healing, reconciliation, and collective responsibility.

METHOD

This narrative review adopted a systematic and rigorous approach to gather, screen, and evaluate scholarly literature on restorative justice in the context of criminal law. The methodology was designed to ensure transparency, reproducibility, and comprehensive coverage across different jurisdictions and academic disciplines. The primary goal was to synthesize empirical and theoretical studies that explore the application, effectiveness, and implications of restorative justice within the criminal justice system.

To identify relevant literature, multiple databases were used including PubMed, Scopus, and Google Scholar. These platforms were selected for their multidisciplinary coverage and accessibility to peer-reviewed academic publications. The keyword strategy was central to the literature search, combining both English and Indonesian terms to capture a broad and culturally diverse spectrum of studies. Key search terms included: "restorative justice," "keadilan restoratif," "dispute resolution," "mediation," "rehabilitation," "social reintegration," "diversion," "criminal justice system," "non-litigation settlement," "victim-offender dialogue," "restorative mechanisms," and related constructs such as "moral responsibility" and "community reintegration."

Boolean operators (AND, OR) were systematically applied to refine search results and ensure specificity to the criminal law context. For example, searches such as "restorative justice" AND "criminal mediation" or "diversion mechanism" AND "juvenile justice" were used to target literature that explores restorative justice beyond general mediation practices. This keyword design allowed the inclusion of literature discussing procedural and substantive aspects of restorative interventions, including their psychological, cultural, and socioeconomic dimensions.

Inclusion criteria required that studies be published between 2000 and 2025, peer-reviewed, and directly related to the application of restorative justice within criminal law systems. Only studies with clear methodological documentation, whether using normative, empirical, or mixed-methods approaches, were included. Studies were further screened to ensure that they discussed either formal justice systems or alternative resolutions involving victim-offender interactions, community engagement, and legal reforms in criminal justice.

Studies selected for this review consisted of randomized trials, case studies, cohort studies, and normative legal analyses that present either evaluative outcomes (e.g., reduced recidivism or victim satisfaction) or comparative insights between restorative and retributive models. The geographical focus included jurisdictions from various legal traditions to ensure the contextual depth and generalizability of findings.

Exclusion criteria ruled out studies that focused solely on philosophical or civil law applications of restorative justice without a direct link to criminal procedures or justice systems. Grey literature, editorials, opinion pieces, or non-peer-reviewed publications were also excluded to maintain methodological rigor and academic reliability. Studies that lacked empirical evidence, clear data collection methods, or evaluative metrics were removed to avoid bias in the synthesis process.

The selection process began with an initial screening of titles and abstracts followed by full-text reviews based on relevance to criminal law and restorative practices. Studies that passed this review were then assessed for methodological quality and relevance to contemporary issues, including policy reform, victim restitution, and stakeholder involvement.

Moreover, interdisciplinary integration was emphasized, selecting literature that combined legal, sociological, psychological, and anthropological perspectives. This approach acknowledged the inherently interdisciplinary nature of restorative justice. Studies that employed standardized evaluative tools, such as validated scales for victim satisfaction or recidivism rates, were prioritized. The inclusion of technology-related innovations, such as digital mediation platforms, was also considered essential in light of the evolving justice landscape.

To enhance transparency and reproducibility, a detailed documentation protocol was maintained throughout the study selection. This included a step-by-step outline of search strategies, database queries, screening criteria, and justification for the inclusion or exclusion of each study. Studies were cataloged systematically, and data extraction followed predefined thematic coding related to mechanisms, impacts, challenges, and outcomes of restorative justice in criminal law.

Overall, the methodology ensured a balanced synthesis of robust academic literature with high methodological standards. The focus on both theoretical discourse and real-world application enabled a multidimensional understanding of restorative justice, offering evidence-based insights for reforming the criminal justice system in a more humanistic and participatory direction.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this narrative review present a synthesized body of literature examining the application of restorative justice (RJ) in criminal justice systems. These findings are structured into four major thematic areas that correspond to the guiding research questions and reflect empirical outcomes, victim perspectives, implementation in serious crimes, and the role of RJ in juvenile justice systems.

Effectiveness of Restorative Justice in Reducing Recidivism

Numerous empirical studies reveal that RJ plays a critical role in decreasing recidivism rates among offenders. Hamzani et al. (2023) demonstrated that non-procedural community mediation in Indonesia resulted in reduced reoffending due to a focus on social relationship restoration and offender reintegration. A combination of quantitative and qualitative data in this study highlighted that offenders who participated in RJ programs were less likely to reoffend over time compared

to those processed through traditional retributive justice systems. The integration of dialogue-based interventions involving victims, offenders, and communities proved effective in modifying behavior and reducing the burden on the judicial system (Hamzani et al., 2023).

Gunawan et al. (2024) further confirmed these outcomes in comparative research, noting that jurisdictions with systematic penal mediation observed significant drops in recidivism. Success in these jurisdictions was attributed to more inclusive dispute resolution mechanisms that brought justice principles closer to all stakeholders. Studies emphasized that RJ programs that fostered offender accountability and acknowledgment of harm contributed to a significant decline in repeat offenses (Hamzani et al., 2023; Gunawan et al., 2024).

Moreover, empirical evaluations found that RJ processes facilitate offenders' identity reconstruction, leading to reduced criminal relapse. This is supported by statistical analyses and in-depth surveys linking active offender participation to lower recidivism rates. The effectiveness of RJ also hinges on mediating variables such as community support, mediator quality, and consistent monitoring mechanisms (Hamzani et al., 2023).

Cross-national comparisons underscore variations in effectiveness based on legal traditions. In Indonesia, RJ practices often integrate indigenous values and traditional mediation, producing community-responsive models (Gunawan et al., 2024). In contrast, the United States employs community panels and restitution programs, whereas European systems, with their more bureaucratic yet professional mediation frameworks, produce different dynamics. Civil law systems, despite their rigidity, show positive outcomes when integrating cultural values. Differences in institutional autonomy and community involvement significantly influence RJ success (Gunawan et al., 2024).

Victim Perspectives in Restorative Justice Processes

Victims play a central role in RJ, with literature emphasizing both individual healing and collective social restoration (Collaton et al., 2024). Victims who participate in RJ processes gain opportunities to express the harm experienced directly to offenders, facilitating deeper emotional healing. Studies show that victims perceive moral acknowledgment and receive psychological relief through open dialogue (Collaton et al., 2024).

Participation also leads to psychosocial benefits such as trauma reduction and increased perceived justice, stemming from being heard and respected in the resolution process. Despite initial skepticism, many victims report a restored sense of safety and renewed trust in the justice system through these human-centered interventions (Collaton et al., 2024).

Burns and Šinko (2021) provided compelling evidence that victims of sexual violence who engaged in RJ mediation reported significantly higher levels of moral recognition and holistic recovery than those in conventional trials. Victims were more satisfied due to the interactive nature of RJ, which allowed for direct engagement and visible accountability through apologies and restitution.

Empirical analyses also highlight the role of support services in enhancing victim outcomes. Access to psychosocial assistance during the RJ process contributes to improved well-being and reduced long-term trauma. These participatory mechanisms advance an inclusive justice model wherein

victims are active agents of healing, not merely passive recipients of punitive decisions (Burns & Šinko, 2021; Collaton et al., 2024).

Application of Restorative Justice in Corruption and Serious Crimes

Restorative justice in cases of corruption and serious offenses remains contested, yet some jurisdictions have experimented with RJ mechanisms to address these crimes. Andini et al. (2023) explored RJ applications in corruption cases, suggesting mediation processes aimed at restoring socio-economic harm caused by such offenses. However, ethical and legal challenges persist, with critics arguing that serious crimes warrant retributive sanctions rather than reconciliatory measures.

Empirical findings suggest that while RJ can reduce recidivism in minor offenses, applying it to serious crimes requires substantial reform to ensure alignment with retributive justice principles. The risk of marginalizing victim interests and confusing justice with leniency remains high unless strict legal frameworks and victim protection measures are in place (Andini et al., 2023).

Wangga et al. (2024) emphasized that assigning moral responsibility to serious offenders is a major challenge. Allowing such offenders to avoid punitive outcomes through mediation may generate public perceptions of injustice. Legal tensions between restorative and retributive paradigms necessitate careful balancing to prevent misuse and maintain public trust.

Ethical integrity requires transparent and accountable mediation processes, particularly when dealing with crimes that have widespread societal impacts. Law enforcement and independent oversight must ensure RJ's credibility and prevent its exploitation in serious crime cases (Wangga et al., 2024). Overall, literature calls for clear legal and ethical frameworks with rigorous oversight to responsibly extend RJ to serious crimes (Andini et al., 2023; Wangga et al., 2024).

Implementation in Juvenile Justice Systems

In juvenile justice contexts, RJ emphasizes rehabilitation and social reintegration over punitive approaches (Aji, 2019). Aji's research revealed that diversion and mediation programs for juvenile offenders positively affect behavioral reform, recognizing youths' developmental potential for change. Empirical data confirm that juveniles in RJ programs exhibit significant behavioral improvement and reintegration success, reducing future criminal tendencies.

Participation of victims and families further enhances this impact, offering emotional and social support and fostering accountability in young offenders. Rochaeti and Muthia (2021) stressed the importance of community involvement, including traditional institutions, to support reintegration through familial and cultural consensus-building. RJ programs in juvenile settings also correlate with improved psychological well-being and interpersonal relationships, contributing to holistic youth development (Sriwiyanti et al., 2021).

Comparative studies between developed and developing countries, such as those by Vashishth et al. (2024), expose differences in infrastructure and policy integration. Developed nations often have robust resources and data-driven policies, allowing for effective monitoring and outcome evaluation. In contrast, developing countries may face structural challenges but compensate through community-based innovations grounded in local wisdom and social cohesion.

Davies and Robson (2016) added that although developed countries lean toward systematic, formal RJ models, developing nations adapt local practices to fit their justice ecosystems, promoting culturally relevant social reintegration. Across all contexts, the success of juvenile RJ hinges on community involvement, institutional support, and cultural adaptability (Aji, 2019; Rochaeti & Muthia, 2021; Sriwiyanti et al., 2021; Vashishth et al., 2024).

In sum, the integrated results across all four thematic areas affirm RJ as a promising alternative to conventional criminal justice approaches. RJ not only reduces recidivism through dialogue and reintegration (Hamzani et al., 2023; Gunawan et al., 2024) but also enhances victim experiences and perceptions of justice (Collaton et al., 2024; Burns & Šinko, 2021). In serious crime cases, while RJ holds potential, it necessitates stringent safeguards and legal clarity (Andini et al., 2023; Wangga et al., 2024). Within juvenile systems, RJ proves especially effective in fostering long-term behavioral and social transformation (Aji, 2019; Rochaeti & Muthia, 2021).

These findings underscore the importance of developing comprehensive evaluation models, regulatory frameworks, and mediator training to adapt RJ practices appropriately across legal and cultural settings (Gunawan et al., 2024; Wangga et al., 2024; Vashishth et al., 2024).

The findings of this narrative review provide significant empirical and theoretical support for the claim that restorative justice contributes positively to criminal justice reform, particularly in reducing recidivism and enhancing victims' perceptions of justice (Hamzani et al., 2023; Collaton et al., 2024). This aligns with prior literature which posits that restorative justice emphasizes the repair of social harm over retribution (Kawalek et al., 2018). The confirmation of this principle in diverse contexts suggests a growing relevance of restorative justice within both community-based systems and formal judicial mechanisms (Rochaeti & Muthia, 2021).

At the theoretical level, this review reinforces the central pillars of restorative justice: moral accountability, mutual recognition, and active participation of stakeholders. Previous theories have outlined that allowing offenders to express remorse and undertake reparative actions significantly reduces the likelihood of reoffending (Hamzani et al., 2023). The reviewed literature confirms that dialogic mediation plays a central role in fostering these outcomes, as it promotes behavioral change and emotional reconciliation (Kawalek et al., 2018).

Empirical comparisons across jurisdictions highlight that restorative justice produces more consistent reductions in recidivism when supported by inclusive dialogue and robust facilitation by trained mediators (Gunawan et al., 2024). In this regard, our findings corroborate the conclusions of prior studies emphasizing the importance of structured engagement, especially through community panels or youth justice boards (Rochaeti & Muthia, 2021). Where traditional justice systems rely on punitive sanctions, restorative justice introduces space for emotional healing and community cohesion, outcomes that are difficult to achieve under retributive frameworks (Kawalek et al., 2018).

The variation in effectiveness across different legal and cultural systems was particularly evident. In regions with strong customary law traditions, such as Indonesia, restorative practices integrated with local values yielded higher success rates (Gunawan et al., 2024). Meanwhile, in bureaucratic civil law systems, restorative mechanisms remained constrained by institutional rigidity, despite

producing positive results in controlled contexts (Sliva, 2018). This underlines the importance of cultural and systemic fit for the effective application of restorative justice.

Systemic factors such as legal infrastructure, institutional capacity, and policy support have emerged as critical determinants. Countries with well-established legal frameworks and coordinated restorative programs consistently reported more effective outcomes (Sliva, 2018; Collaton et al., 2024). Conversely, fragmented policy support and under-resourced mediation services inhibited long-term impact. This suggests that restorative justice cannot operate in isolation; it requires a conducive ecosystem underpinned by legislative clarity, funding, and training.

Barriers to implementation included entrenched retributive legal cultures, insufficient training of practitioners, and limited public trust. These obstacles were amplified in contexts where criminal justice systems are overburdened or lack flexibility to incorporate non-traditional methods (Sliva, 2018). Moreover, resistance from legal professionals and law enforcement—who often regard restorative mechanisms as "soft" justice—highlighted the need for broader institutional education and reform (Collaton et al., 2024).

Victim participation, a central tenet of restorative justice, was consistently linked to enhanced perceptions of justice and personal healing (Burns & Šinko, 2021). However, our review identifies a persistent gap in ensuring adequate victim support, including counseling and legal assistance during mediation. Without structured safeguards, victims may feel pressured or re-traumatized, especially in cases involving serious crimes. This reinforces the literature's call for nuanced protocols tailored to vulnerable populations (Andini et al., 2023).

Restorative justice in cases of corruption and serious crimes remains controversial. While theoretically possible, empirical support for its effectiveness is limited and context-dependent (Wangga et al., 2024). Critics argue that using mediation in such cases risks undermining public trust and diluting deterrence. Nonetheless, some literature points to potential benefits when restorative practices are carefully bounded and accompanied by retributive elements, such as financial restitution or public apologies (Andini et al., 2023). Further research is needed to explore hybrid models that can accommodate both justice and reconciliation in high-severity cases.

The application of restorative justice in juvenile systems showed the most consistent success across jurisdictions. Programs that emphasized rehabilitation over punishment led to significant improvements in social reintegration, particularly when families and communities were actively engaged (Aji, 2019; Sriwiyanti et al., 2021). However, structural disparities between developed and developing countries affected the depth and sustainability of these outcomes (Vashishth et al., 2024). Resource-rich settings allowed for advanced monitoring and follow-up, while low-resource settings relied heavily on community innovation and informal resolution methods.

This divergence highlights the importance of localized adaptation. Policies designed to scale restorative justice should reflect the socio-legal realities of target environments. In addition to legal reform, educational programs, community empowerment, and cross-sector coordination are essential to support systemic change (Cahill, 2014). Further, the role of independent oversight bodies cannot be overstated, as they are crucial to ensuring fairness, transparency, and accountability throughout the mediation process (Collaton et al., 2024).

Despite the promise of restorative justice, research limitations remain. Many studies lack longitudinal data and rigorous comparative methods. There is also an overreliance on qualitative accounts, which, while rich in depth, limit generalizability (Hamzani et al., 2023). Furthermore, inconsistent definitions and measurement indicators complicate the evaluation of effectiveness across contexts. These gaps suggest a need for standardized methodologies and global benchmarks to assess outcomes systematically.

Future research should focus on integrating quantitative and qualitative data to evaluate the long-term impact of restorative interventions. There is also a need to examine the scalability of community-based models in urban and multicultural environments, where conflicts may be more complex. Studies exploring the intersection of restorative justice with digital technologies and artificial intelligence also hold promise, particularly in enhancing access and monitoring effectiveness (Cahill, 2014).

Finally, the development of interdisciplinary models incorporating insights from law, sociology, psychology, and public policy may enrich the theoretical foundations and practical tools of restorative justice. Such integrative frameworks can foster a more inclusive and adaptable justice system, aligned with evolving societal values and challenges (Kawalek et al., 2018; Collaton et al., 2024).

CONCLUSION

This narrative review confirms that restorative justice offers a significant and empirically supported alternative to traditional punitive systems in addressing criminal justice challenges. Key findings emphasize its effectiveness in reducing recidivism through inclusive mediation processes, promoting victim healing, and supporting the social reintegration of offenders. The discussion further elaborates how systemic factors such as legal frameworks, institutional capacity, cultural acceptance, and multi-stakeholder collaboration critically influence successful implementation. This review contributes to restorative justice literature by synthesizing comparative insights across legal systems and elevating cultural responsiveness and ethical accountability as core components of effective implementation.

Despite promising outcomes, the review identifies persistent barriers including fragmented legal coordination, underdeveloped institutional mechanisms, and cultural resistance rooted in retributive justice norms. To overcome these challenges, policy interventions should prioritize legislative reform, dedicated budget allocations for institutional capacity building, and widespread community education campaigns. Strengthening institutional coordination, embedding independent monitoring mechanisms, and fostering public trust through participatory practices are essential to scaling restorative justice effectively.

Additionally, future research should explore comparative models across diverse jurisdictions, evaluate the long-term socio-emotional impacts on victims and offenders, and investigate digital innovations in mediation processes. It is imperative to contextualize implementation strategies based on local legal traditions and cultural values to enhance adaptability.

Ultimately, the review reaffirms that restorative justice, when embedded within a robust policy and institutional ecosystem, can be a transformative solution for criminal justice reform. It aligns with global justice principles by shifting focus from punitive responses to reconciliatory, community-based healing and restoration.

REFERENCE

- Ahlin, E., Gibbs, J., Kavanaugh, P., & Lee, J. (2016). Support for restorative justice in a sample of U.S. university students. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 61(2), 229-245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624x15596386>
- Aji, W. (2019). The implementation of diversion and restorative justice in the juvenile criminal justice system in Indonesia. *Journal of Indonesian Legal Studies*, 4(1), 73-88. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jils.v4i01.23339>
- Amarini, I., Samhudi, G., Mukarromah, S., Ismail, N., & Saefudin, Y. (2024). Social reintegration after the implementation of restorative justice in the Indonesian criminal code. *Jurnal Media Hukum*, 31(1), 115-133. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jmh.v31i1.20655>
- Andini, O., Nilasari, N., & Eurian, A. (2023). Restorative justice in Indonesia corruption crime: A utopia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum Legality*, 31(1), 72-90. <https://doi.org/10.22219/ljih.v31i1.24247>
- Ariefulloh, A., Nugroho, H., Angkasa, A., & Ardhanariswari, R. (2023). Restorative justice-based criminal case resolution in Salatiga, Indonesia: Islamic law perspective and legal objectives. *Ijtihad Jurnal Wacana Hukum Islam Dan Kemanusiaan*, 23(1), 19-36. <https://doi.org/10.18326/ijtihad.v23i1.19-36>
- Burns, C. and Šinko, L. (2021). Restorative justice for survivors of sexual violence experienced in adulthood: A scoping review. *Trauma Violence & Abuse*, 24(2), 340-354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380211029408>
- Cahill, A. (2014). Foregrounding socioeconomic rights in transitional justice: Realising justice for violations of economic and social rights. *Netherlands Quarterly of Human Rights*, 32(2), 183-213. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016934411403200205>
- Collaton, J., Barata, P., Morton, M., Barton, K., & Lewis, S. (2024). Justice for women after sexual assault: A critical interpretive synthesis. *Trauma Violence & Abuse*, 25(5), 3457-3472. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380241248411>
- Davies, S. and Robson, J. (2016). Juvenile (in)justice: Children in conflict with the law in Indonesia. *Asia Pacific Journal on Human Rights and the Law*, 17(1), 119-147. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718158-01701009>
- García, V. (2020). The enforcement of restorative justice in Indonesian criminal law. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum Legality*, 28(1). <https://doi.org/10.22219/ljih.v28i1.10680>
- Gude, A. and Papić, I. (2018). Restorative justice and legal culture. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 20(1), 57-75. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895818796549>
- Gunawan, M., Suwadi, P., & Rustamaji, M. (2024). Comparison of restorative justice implementation in Indonesia, USA, Germany, Poland and Switzerland. *Revista De Gestão Social E Ambiental*, 18(1), e04677. <https://doi.org/10.24857/rgsa.v18n1-055>
- Hamzani, A., Aryani, F., Bawono, B., Khasanah, N., & Yunus, N. (2023). Non-procedural dispute resolution: Study of the restorative justice approach tradition in Indonesian society. *International Journal*

-
- of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 69(4), 373-387.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624x231165425>
- Kawalek, A., Edwards, M., & Best, D. (2018). *Routledge International Handbook of Restorative Justice*.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315613512>
- Rochaeti, N. and Muthia, N. (2021). Socio-legal study of community participation in restorative justice of children in conflict with the law in Indonesia. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology*, 10, 293-298. <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2021.10.35>
- Rochaeti, N., Prasetyo, M., & Park, J. (2023). Implementing of restorative justice to build the criminal justice system in Indonesia: A study of the Batak Toba justice system. *Law Reform*, 19(2), 221-247. <https://doi.org/10.14710/lr.v19i2.53184>
- Rochaeti, N., Prasetyo, M., Rozah, U., & Park, J. (2023). A restorative justice system in Indonesia: A close view from the indigenous peoples' practices. *Srinijaya Law Review*, 87-104. <https://doi.org/10.28946/slrev.vol7.iss1.1919.pp87-104>
- Sirait, T. and Cahyaningtyas, I. (2019). Restorative justice approach in the settlement of children's cases in Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum Legality*, 27(2), 232. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jihl.v27i2.10160>
- Sliva, S. (2018). Finally "changing lenses"? State-level determinants of restorative justice laws. *The Prison Journal*, 98(5), 519-543. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885518793948>
- Sriwidodo, J. (2021). The efforts to resolve criminal cases based on the restorative justice concept by attorney offices. *Substantive Justice International Journal of Law*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.33096/substantivejustice.v4i1.121>
- Sriwiyanti, S., Saefudin, W., & Aminah, S. (2021). Restorative justice for juvenile offenders in Indonesia: A study of psychological perspective and Islamic law. *Journal of Islamic Law*, 2(2), 168-196. <https://doi.org/10.24260/jil.v2i2.335>
- Sulistyo, E. and Pujiyono, P. (2021). Restorative justice as a resolution for the crime of rape with child perpetrators. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology*, 10, 595-602. <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2021.10.69>
- Vashishth, A., Ji, S., & Teena, T. (2024). System of restorative justice and juvenile justice in India: A brief comparative study with Latin American system. *Mexican Law Review*, 131-143. <https://doi.org/10.22201/ijj.24485306e.2024.2.18895>
- Wangga, M., Ahmad, N., & Swarianata, V. (2024). Periscope of ideas selective criteria for the application of restorative justice in corruption crimes. *Journal of Indonesian Legal Studies*, 9(1), 1-30. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jils.vol9i1.4530>