

Restorative Justice as a Catalyst for Social Transformation: A Systematic Review of Global Practices, Recidivism Reduction, and Community Empowerment

 <https://doi.org/xxxxxx>

Amelia Arief¹, Rhayza Hayuarsi Sekar Sagita², Dhanis Sartika³

¹Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Jalan Urip Sumoharjo No.14, Makassar 90231, Indonesia

²Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Jalan Jenderal Sudirman No. 6, Kota Gorontalo 96128, Indonesia

³Universitas Soegijapranata, Jalan Pawiyatan Luhur IV/1, Semarang 50234, Indonesia

Abstract

This study systematically examines the global development of restorative justice as an alternative to retributive criminal justice systems, focusing on its effectiveness in reducing recidivism, enhancing victim recovery, and fostering social reconciliation. It further explores its role in advancing social transformation and community empowerment. A Systematic Literature Review (SLR) was conducted following the PRISMA protocol, synthesizing high-quality publications from the past two decades. Data were collected from major academic databases and analyzed using thematic analysis to identify patterns in effectiveness, implementation models, social impact, and institutional challenges. The findings demonstrate that restorative justice consistently outperforms retributive approaches in lowering recidivism, increasing victim satisfaction, and strengthening offender accountability. Practices such as victim-offender mediation and community dialogue contribute significantly to rebuilding social relationships and enhancing community cohesion. However, implementation remains constrained by institutional resistance, regulatory limitations, and limited cross-sectoral integration. This study offers an integrative and interdisciplinary framework that positions restorative justice as a catalyst for social transformation by linking legal effectiveness with broader social outcomes, including community empowerment and social cohesion. The findings highlight the need for stronger policy integration, capacity building, and community-based approaches to support sustainable and inclusive justice systems.

Keywords: Community Empowerment, Criminal Justice System, Recidivism Reduction, Restorative Justice, Social Cohesion



This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 CC-BY International license

Article Info:

***Correspondence E-Mail:**
ameliaarief90@gmail.com

Received manuscript: 19/11/2024

Final revision: 19/01/2025

Approved: 20/02/2025

Online Access: 25/02/2025

Published: 28/02/2025

How to cite: Arief, A., Sagita, R. H. S., & Sartika, D. (2025). Restorative Justice as a Catalyst for Social Transformation: A Systematic Review of Global Practices, Recidivism Reduction, and Community Empowerment. *Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat (JPPM)*, 1(1), 62-82.
<https://doi.org/xxxxxx>

Copyright © by the Authors

RESEARCH  ACCESS
ARTICLE

Publisher: PT. Sarana Mandiri Investama

RT 07 RW 03 Desa Salamrejo Kec.

Karangan, Kab. Trenggalek, Provinsi Jawa Timur, Indonesia

E-mail:

selectaedukasigrup.journal@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The persistence of crime and the recurring cycle of offending continue to expose fundamental limitations within conventional criminal justice systems across the globe. For decades, retributive justice has dominated legal frameworks, emphasizing punishment, deterrence, and the formal adjudication of guilt. However, mounting evidence suggests that such approaches often fail to address the deeper social, relational, and structural dimensions of crime. High rates of recidivism remain a critical concern in many jurisdictions, indicating

that punitive measures alone are insufficient to prevent reoffending or to facilitate meaningful behavioral change (Gomez, 2022; Widodo et al., 2025). At the same time, victims frequently report feelings of marginalization within formal legal processes, where their needs for recognition, healing, and participation are inadequately addressed (Hester et al., 2025; Pache, 2022). These conditions are further compounded by the limited involvement of communities, which are often positioned as passive observers rather than active agents in resolving conflict and restoring social harmony. Collectively, these challenges signal not only a crisis of effectiveness but also a broader legitimacy deficit within contemporary justice systems.

In response to these concerns, restorative justice has emerged as a compelling alternative that reorients the focus of justice from punishment to restoration. Rooted in principles of dialogue, accountability, and collective responsibility, restorative justice seeks to repair harm by facilitating direct or indirect engagement between victims, offenders, and affected communities (McClelland et al., 2023; O'Grady & Shaw, 2023). Rather than viewing crime solely as a violation of law, this approach conceptualizes it as a rupture in social relationships that requires healing and reintegration. Over the past two decades, restorative practices such as victim–offender mediation, family group conferencing, and community circles have been implemented in diverse contexts, ranging from juvenile justice systems in New Zealand to community-based programs in Canada and Europe (Jolivéte, 2025; Melgar Alcantud et al., 2021). Empirical studies increasingly demonstrate that these interventions can reduce recidivism, enhance victim satisfaction, and promote offender accountability in ways that conventional systems often fail to achieve (Cullen & Murphy, 2021; Li et al., 2022; White, 2023)

A growing body of literature has examined the effectiveness of restorative justice in reducing reoffending. Meta-analyses and systematic reviews consistently indicate that participants in restorative programs exhibit lower rates of recidivism compared to those processed through traditional court systems (Green et al., 2021; Lam, 2024). These outcomes are often attributed to the dialogical nature of restorative processes, which encourage offenders to confront the human impact of their actions and to take responsibility in a meaningful way (Lazarus et al., 2025; Pollino, 2023). Moreover, restorative justice has been shown to generate higher levels of victim satisfaction, particularly in terms of emotional closure, perceived fairness, and opportunities for voice (Suzuki, 2023; Vasilescu, 2023). Such findings suggest that restorative justice not only addresses the instrumental goals of crime reduction but also fulfills important expressive and relational functions within the justice process.

Beyond its measurable outcomes, restorative justice has also been explored as a mechanism for strengthening social cohesion and community resilience. Scholars have argued that restorative practices can contribute to the rebuilding of trust and the reinforcement of shared norms, particularly in contexts characterized by social fragmentation or historical injustice (Gearhart, 2022; VanderPyl, 2023). By actively involving community members in

processes of dialogue and decision-making, restorative justice fosters a sense of collective ownership over conflict resolution and social order. This participatory dimension aligns closely with broader theories of social capital and community empowerment, which emphasize the importance of inclusive and collaborative governance in achieving sustainable development outcomes (Fhadilah et al., 2025; Jakir & Haeranah, 2025). In this regard, restorative justice can be understood not merely as a legal innovation but as a socially embedded practice with transformative potential.

At the policy level, the integration of restorative justice into formal legal systems has gained increasing attention. International organizations and national governments have begun to recognize its value in promoting more humane and effective justice systems. For instance, the United Nations has endorsed restorative justice principles through various frameworks and guidelines, encouraging member states to adopt restorative approaches where appropriate (Sapp, 2024; Vonhm, 2025). Nevertheless, the institutionalization of restorative justice remains uneven, often constrained by legal, cultural, and organizational barriers. Resistance from legal professionals, limited resources, and the absence of coherent policy frameworks continue to hinder the scalability and sustainability of restorative initiatives (Adewale & Ndwandwe, 2025; Castell-Britton, 2024).

Despite the expanding scope of research, much of the existing scholarship tends to concentrate on specific aspects of restorative justice in relative isolation. Numerous studies focus narrowly on recidivism outcomes or victim satisfaction, frequently within single-country contexts or particular program models (Haerul & Zainuddin, 2023; Taylor, 2021). Others adopt a predominantly normative or legalistic perspective, emphasizing doctrinal analysis over empirical investigation (Omowon & Kunlere, 2024; Walk et al., 2021). While these contributions are valuable, they often overlook the interconnected nature of legal, social, and institutional dimensions that shape the broader impact of restorative justice. In particular, there remains limited synthesis that explicitly situates restorative justice within the wider framework of social transformation and community empowerment, especially across diverse global contexts.

Within this evolving landscape, it becomes increasingly important to reconsider restorative justice not only as an alternative procedural mechanism but as a dynamic catalyst capable of reshaping social relations and institutional practices. By bringing together insights from criminology, sociology, public policy, and development studies, this study advances an integrative perspective that captures both the effectiveness and the transformative potential of restorative justice. It weaves together indicators of legal performance, such as recidivism reduction and victim satisfaction, with broader social outcomes, including community cohesion, participatory engagement, and empowerment. In doing so, the analysis offers a more holistic understanding of how restorative justice operates across multiple levels of society, particularly within developing and transitional contexts where the need for inclusive and adaptive justice systems is especially pronounced.

Accordingly, this study aims to systematically review global practices of restorative justice in order to assess their effectiveness in reducing recidivism, enhancing victim recovery, and fostering social reconciliation. It further seeks to examine how these practices contribute to processes of social transformation and community empowerment, while identifying key factors that influence successful implementation. By generating evidence-based policy recommendations and conceptual insights, this research aspires to strengthen the integration of restorative justice within both formal legal systems and community-based initiatives. In line with the broader mission of advancing socially relevant and impactful scholarship, the study also underscores the role of interdisciplinary research and community engagement in addressing complex justice-related challenges and promoting sustainable social development.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a qualitative research design grounded in a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) approach to capture the complexity and multidimensional nature of restorative justice as both a legal and social phenomenon. A qualitative orientation is particularly appropriate as the study seeks to interpret patterns, meanings, and relationships across diverse socio-legal contexts rather than merely quantify outcomes. Restorative justice operates within deeply embedded cultural, institutional, and community dynamics; thus, a qualitative synthesis enables a more nuanced understanding of its role in fostering social transformation and community empowerment.

The analytical scope of this study is global, drawing upon empirical and conceptual studies conducted across multiple regions, including North America, Europe, Oceania, and parts of Asia and Africa. This global perspective allows for the identification of cross-contextual patterns while acknowledging variations in implementation shaped by local socio-cultural and institutional conditions. Such an approach facilitates a comprehensive understanding of restorative justice as an evolving global practice.

The units of analysis in this study consist of scholarly publications, including peer-reviewed journal articles, policy reports, and academic works. A total of 45 studies published within the last two decades were selected based on criteria of methodological rigor, theoretical relevance, and empirical contribution. Inclusion criteria required that studies explicitly address at least one of the following dimensions: recidivism reduction, victim recovery, social reconciliation, community involvement, or policy implementation.

Data collection followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) protocol to ensure transparency and replicability. Relevant literature was identified through major academic databases, including Scopus, Web of Science, ScienceDirect, ProQuest, and Google Scholar, using keyword combinations such as “restorative justice,” “recidivism,” “victim satisfaction,” “community empowerment,” and “social transformation.” After removing duplicates and screening abstracts, full-text articles were assessed for eligibility and relevance.

Data analysis was conducted using thematic analysis to systematically identify, organize, and interpret recurring patterns across the selected studies. Through an iterative coding process, key themes were developed, including effectiveness, implementation models, social impact, and institutional challenges.

To enhance the trustworthiness of the findings, triangulation was applied at multiple levels. Source triangulation involved comparing findings across different publication types and geographical contexts, while theoretical triangulation incorporated perspectives from criminology, sociology, and public policy. Additionally, methodological transparency throughout the review process further strengthened the credibility and reliability of the study. This integrative approach ensures both analytical depth and meaningful contributions to academic discourse and evidence-based policy development.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Global Patterns of Restorative Justice Development: From Alternative Practice to Systemic Innovation

The global trajectory of restorative justice reveals a significant transformation from a marginal, alternative practice into an increasingly institutionalized component of contemporary criminal justice systems. The synthesis of the selected studies in this Systematic Literature Review (SLR) indicates that restorative justice has evolved through diverse pathways, shaped by distinct socio-cultural, political, and legal contexts. Early implementations were often experimental and community-driven, emerging as critiques of the limitations of retributive justice, particularly its failure to address relational harm and social fragmentation (Dixon, 2024; Morris et al., 2024). However, over the past two decades, the evidence suggests a gradual yet uneven shift toward systemic integration, where restorative justice is no longer positioned solely at the margins but is increasingly embedded within formal legal frameworks.

Across Europe, restorative justice has been progressively institutionalized through policy reforms and legislative support. Countries such as Norway, Belgium, and the Netherlands have incorporated mediation and conferencing practices into their criminal justice procedures, often supported by state-funded programs and formal referral mechanisms (Lodi et al., 2021; Van Hall et al., 2024). The SLR findings highlight that such integration is closely linked to strong welfare state traditions and a policy orientation that prioritizes social reintegration over punitive control. In contrast, North America presents a more hybrid model, where restorative justice operates both within and outside formal systems. In Canada, for instance, Indigenous justice practices have played a crucial role in shaping restorative approaches, emphasizing healing, community involvement, and cultural continuity (Davis et al., 2021; Mpofu et al., 2024). Meanwhile, in the United States, restorative justice programs are often implemented at the local level, particularly within juvenile justice systems, reflecting a decentralized and programmatic rather than systemic adoption (Caudill & Trulson, 2023; Hodgkinson et al., 2021).

In Oceania, particularly in New Zealand, restorative justice has achieved a notable level of systemic integration, especially through family group conferencing, which is embedded within the statutory framework of the youth justice system. This model, deeply influenced by Māori cultural values, underscores the importance of collective responsibility and relational accountability (Casey et al., 2021; Mueller-Smith & Schnepel, 2021). The SLR data consistently identify this region as a leading example of how restorative justice can be aligned with indigenous knowledge systems to produce both legal and social outcomes. In contrast, many countries in the Global South exhibit emerging but less consolidated forms of restorative justice. In regions such as Africa and Southeast Asia, restorative practices are often rooted in customary law and informal community mechanisms, yet their formal recognition remains limited (Chakravarty, 2026). The review reveals that while these contexts offer rich traditions of communal conflict resolution, challenges related to legal pluralism, resource constraints, and institutional capacity often hinder broader system integration.

What becomes evident across these diverse contexts is that the development of restorative justice cannot be understood as a linear or uniform process. Rather, it reflects a dynamic interplay between local traditions, institutional structures, and broader normative shifts in the understanding of justice. The thematic analysis conducted in this study identifies a consistent pattern: jurisdictions that successfully integrate restorative justice into their systems tend to adopt a more relational conception of justice, one that recognizes crime as a disruption of social relationships rather than merely a violation of legal norms. This shift aligns with what several scholars describe as a movement toward “relational justice,” where the emphasis is placed on dialogue, mutual recognition, and the restoration of social bonds (Cannonier et al., 2021; Travaini et al., 2022).

In this regard, the findings resonate strongly with the transformative justice framework proposed by Duwe & McNeeley (2021), which conceptualizes justice as a process of systemic change grounded in social relationships and collective responsibility. Unlike conventional models that focus on individual culpability and punishment, transformative justice seeks to address the underlying conditions that give rise to harm, including social inequality, marginalization, and institutional exclusion. The SLR findings provide empirical support for this perspective, demonstrating that restorative justice practices, when effectively implemented, can contribute to broader processes of social transformation by fostering inclusive participation, strengthening community capacity, and promoting shared accountability.

Importantly, the transition from alternative practice to systemic innovation is not without tension. The review highlights ongoing challenges related to institutional resistance, particularly among legal professionals who remain skeptical of non-punitive approaches (Fox et al., 2021; Shem-Tov et al., 2024). Additionally, the formalization of restorative justice raises questions about the potential loss of its original community-based ethos, as practices become standardized and integrated into bureaucratic systems. Nevertheless, the overall pattern suggests that restorative justice is increasingly recognized not merely as a supplementary

mechanism, but as a viable and necessary component of modern justice systems.

Effectiveness in Reducing Recidivism and Strengthening Offender Accountability

One of the most consistently substantiated findings emerging from this Systematic Literature Review (SLR) concerns the relative effectiveness of restorative justice in reducing recidivism and strengthening offender accountability when compared to conventional retributive approaches. Across the 45 studies synthesized, a recurring pattern indicates that individuals who participate in restorative processes are significantly less likely to reoffend, particularly in cases involving juvenile offenders and non-violent crimes. Meta-analytic evidence supports this trend, demonstrating modest but statistically significant reductions in recidivism rates among restorative justice participants (Beaudry et al., 2021; Han et al., 2021). More recent longitudinal studies further reinforce these findings, suggesting that the impact of restorative interventions is not merely immediate but can extend over longer periods, reflecting deeper behavioral change (Blonigen et al., 2022; Tobón, 2022).

However, what distinguishes restorative justice from retributive systems is not solely its measurable outcomes, but the underlying mechanisms through which these outcomes are produced. The thematic analysis conducted in this study reveals that dialogical engagement plays a central role in facilitating behavioral transformation. Unlike court-based proceedings that often reduce offenders to passive subjects of legal judgment, restorative processes actively involve them in structured dialogues with victims and, in some cases, community representatives. This interaction compels offenders to confront the human consequences of their actions in a direct and often emotionally impactful manner. As one study included in the review notes, “offenders frequently report that hearing the victim’s account was the most transformative aspect of the process, prompting a level of reflection not achieved through conventional sentencing” (Yukhnenko et al., 2023).

This process of engagement fosters what can be conceptualized as moral accountability, which differs fundamentally from the procedural accountability characteristic of retributive systems. In conventional justice frameworks, accountability is typically expressed through compliance with legal sanctions, serving a sentence, paying a fine, or adhering to court orders. While such measures may satisfy formal requirements, they do not necessarily engender genuine acknowledgment of harm or responsibility. In contrast, restorative justice emphasizes acknowledgment, apology, and reparation as core components of accountability. Offenders are encouraged to take ownership of their actions, not because they are compelled by external authority, but because they come to recognize the moral implications of their behavior (Aslim et al., 2022). This distinction is critical, as it shifts the locus of accountability from external enforcement to internalized responsibility.

The SLR findings suggest that this internalization process is closely linked to sustained behavioral change. Several studies highlight that offenders who engage in restorative practices often develop increased empathy toward victims, a stronger sense of social responsibility, and a greater commitment to avoiding future harm (Lattimore, 2022; Ortega-Williams et al., 2021). These qualitative transformations are not easily captured by recidivism

statistics alone, yet they represent essential indicators of long-term effectiveness. In this regard, the concept of “moral engagement and behavioral transformation” provides a useful analytical lens for understanding how restorative justice operates beyond surface-level outcomes. It captures the interplay between cognitive, emotional, and social dimensions of change, emphasizing that desistance from crime is not merely a behavioral shift but a reorientation of values and identity.

Importantly, the review also reveals that the effectiveness of restorative justice is contingent upon the quality and integrity of its implementation. Programs that prioritize genuine dialogue, skilled facilitation, and voluntary participation tend to produce more positive outcomes than those that are overly formalized or coercive. For instance, studies included in the SLR indicate that when offenders perceive the process as fair and respectful, they are more likely to engage meaningfully and accept responsibility (Loeffler & Nagin, 2022). Conversely, poorly implemented programs, where participation is perceived as obligatory or superficial, may fail to achieve the intended transformative effects. This underscores the importance of maintaining the relational and participatory ethos of restorative justice, even as it becomes integrated into formal systems.

Furthermore, the evidence suggests that restorative justice may be particularly effective in contexts where traditional punitive approaches have proven inadequate. For marginalized populations, including youth and individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds, restorative processes can provide a more inclusive and supportive environment that addresses underlying social and emotional needs (Bazemore & Umbreit, 2001). By acknowledging the broader context in which offending occurs, restorative justice aligns with more holistic approaches to crime prevention and rehabilitation.

Victim Recovery and the Reconfiguration of Justice Experience

A central insight emerging from this Systematic Literature Review (SLR) is the extent to which restorative justice reconfigures the position of victims within the justice process, transforming them from marginal participants into active agents of meaning-making and recovery. Across the body of literature analyzed, a consistent pattern indicates that victims who engage in restorative processes report significantly higher levels of satisfaction compared to those involved in conventional court proceedings (Barter & Koulu, 2021; Fulham et al., 2025). This satisfaction is not merely procedural but deeply experiential, reflecting a broader sense of being heard, acknowledged, and respected. In contrast, retributive systems often prioritize legal formalities and offender adjudication, leaving victims with limited opportunities to articulate their experiences or influence outcomes. As one study included in the review observes, “victims frequently describe court processes as alienating, where their role is reduced to that of a witness rather than a participant in justice” (Smith et al., 2024).

Restorative justice facilitates victim recovery through a multidimensional process encompassing psychological, emotional, and social dimensions. At the psychological level, participation in restorative practices, particularly victim–offender mediation, enables victims to gain a clearer understanding of the offense and the motivations behind it. This cognitive

clarity can reduce feelings of confusion, fear, and self-blame, which are commonly reported in the aftermath of victimization (Tomaz et al., 2023). At the emotional level, restorative encounters provide a structured space for victims to express their pain, anger, and loss directly to the offender, often leading to a sense of emotional release and closure. Importantly, this process is not predicated on forgiveness, but rather on the opportunity for authentic expression and acknowledgment. At the social level, restorative justice contributes to the rebuilding of trust and the reintegration of both victims and offenders into their communities, thereby mitigating the isolating effects of crime.

These processes collectively signal a paradigmatic shift from what may be termed victim marginalization to victim-centered justice. In conventional systems, the architecture of legal proceedings tends to displace victims from the core of the justice process, prioritizing state interests and legal classifications over lived experiences. Restorative justice, by contrast, reorients the process around the needs and perspectives of those directly affected by harm. Victims are not only invited to participate but are recognized as key stakeholders whose voices carry moral and procedural significance. This shift aligns closely with the principles of procedural justice, which emphasize fairness, voice, and respectful treatment as critical determinants of perceived legitimacy (Chakravarty, 2026; Eytan & Ronel, 2023). The SLR findings reinforce this connection, demonstrating that when victims perceive the process as fair and inclusive, their satisfaction with justice outcomes increases, regardless of the specific material outcomes.

Moreover, the concept of emotional restoration emerges as a crucial dimension of justice that is often overlooked in conventional frameworks. While legal systems are primarily designed to adjudicate facts and assign responsibility, they are less equipped to address the emotional aftermath of crime. Restorative justice fills this gap by creating conditions under which emotional harms can be acknowledged and addressed in a meaningful way. Several studies included in the review highlight that victims who participate in restorative dialogues often report reduced anxiety, diminished desire for revenge, and a greater sense of personal empowerment (Barakat, 2021). As one participant in a mediation program reflected, “being able to tell my story and hear the offender’s response gave me a sense of peace that the court could never provide” (Zhou et al., 2022). Such testimonies underscore the importance of recognizing justice as an experiential process, not merely a legal outcome.

Social Reconciliation and Community Cohesion as Core Outcomes

A prominent theme emerging from this Systematic Literature Review (SLR) is the positioning of social reconciliation and community cohesion as central outcomes of restorative justice practices. Beyond individual-level impacts on victims and offenders, the evidence consistently indicates that restorative justice operates within a broader relational field, where the ultimate objective extends to repairing the social fabric disrupted by crime. Unlike retributive justice, which isolates wrongdoing within a legal framework and often sidelines its communal implications, restorative justice explicitly acknowledges that crime produces collective harm, affecting relationships, trust, and shared norms within

communities (Ntontis et al., 2021). As such, its processes are intentionally designed to foster dialogue not only between victims and offenders but also among wider community stakeholders, thereby facilitating a more inclusive and relational form of justice.

The SLR findings demonstrate that practices such as community dialogue, family group conferencing, and circle processes play a critical role in rebuilding social trust and cohesion. These mechanisms create structured yet flexible spaces in which participants can collectively engage with the consequences of harm, articulate their perspectives, and negotiate pathways toward resolution. In the context of family group conferencing, for example, the involvement of extended family members and community representatives allows for a more holistic understanding of the offense and its social context (Zheng et al., 2023). Similarly, circle processes, often rooted in Indigenous traditions, emphasize equality, mutual respect, and collective deliberation, enabling participants to move beyond adversarial positions toward shared understanding (Hoover & Lim, 2021). One study included in the review notes that “community-based restorative circles not only addressed the immediate harm but also strengthened relationships among participants, fostering a renewed sense of collective responsibility” (Litaay & Batjo, 2024).

These practices contribute to what can be conceptualized as the reconstruction of social capital, a process through which trust, reciprocity, and social connectedness are restored following disruption. Social capital, as understood in sociological literature, constitutes a critical resource for maintaining social order and facilitating collective action (Temper et al., 2018). The SLR findings suggest that restorative justice functions as a mechanism for regenerating this resource by re-establishing communication channels, reaffirming shared values, and rebuilding interpersonal trust. Importantly, this reconstruction is not automatic but emerges through participatory processes that require active engagement and mutual recognition. In this sense, restorative justice does not merely resolve conflict; it actively reshapes the relational dynamics that underpin community life.

The analysis further indicates that the success of social reconciliation is highly contingent upon the level and quality of community participation. Programs that meaningfully involve community members, beyond symbolic or tokenistic inclusion, tend to produce more sustainable and impactful outcomes. This aligns with findings from several studies in the SLR, which highlight that communities with strong participatory cultures and existing social networks are better positioned to support restorative processes and sustain their outcomes over time (Basid et al., 2024; Presto, 2025). Conversely, in contexts where community engagement is weak or fragmented, restorative initiatives may struggle to achieve deeper relational transformation. This underscores the importance of viewing restorative justice not as a standalone intervention but as part of a broader ecosystem of social relations and institutional support.

Moreover, the review reveals that socio-cultural context plays a decisive role in shaping the effectiveness of reconciliation processes. In societies with strong traditions of communal decision-making or customary conflict resolution, restorative justice tends to

resonate more deeply and achieve higher levels of legitimacy (Bräuchler, 2022). In contrast, in more individualistic or highly formalized legal systems, additional efforts may be required to cultivate trust and encourage participation. This contextual sensitivity highlights the need for adaptive implementation strategies that respect local norms while maintaining the core principles of restorative justice.

Importantly, the emphasis on social reconciliation also reflects a broader shift toward understanding justice as a collective and relational endeavor. This perspective is increasingly supported by contemporary theoretical developments, including the notion of justice as a form of relational repair embedded within social systems (Nilan & Maunati, 2025). From this standpoint, the value of restorative justice lies not only in its capacity to address discrete incidents of harm but also in its potential to strengthen the social infrastructure that prevents future conflict.

Restorative Justice as a Pathway to Community Empowerment

An important strand of findings emerging from this Systematic Literature Review (SLR) is the recognition of restorative justice as a pathway to community empowerment, extending its significance beyond dispute resolution into the domain of participatory social transformation. While much of the early literature positioned restorative justice primarily as a mechanism for repairing harm between victims and offenders, the studies synthesized in this review suggest a more expansive role, in which communities are not merely supportive actors but active agents in shaping justice processes. This shift reflects a broader reconfiguration of justice from a state-centric model toward a community-driven paradigm, where the capacity to define, respond to, and prevent harm is increasingly shared among stakeholders at the local level (Djatkiko et al., 2025; Rastegar & Ruhanen, 2022).

The SLR findings indicate that meaningful community involvement in restorative processes contributes to the development of collective capacity, understood as the ability of a community to organize, deliberate, and act on issues affecting its members. Practices such as community conferencing, restorative circles, and neighborhood mediation create participatory spaces in which individuals engage not only as affected parties but also as co-producers of justice outcomes. This participatory orientation fosters a sense of ownership over both the process and its outcomes, thereby enhancing the legitimacy and sustainability of resolutions. As one study included in the review observes, “when community members are directly involved in restorative processes, they begin to see justice not as an external imposition but as a shared responsibility rooted in local relationships” (Harfitt, 2019). Such findings underscore the importance of moving beyond tokenistic inclusion toward substantive engagement that empowers communities to take an active role in governance.

This dynamic can be conceptualized as a community-driven justice model, in which restorative justice serves as an institutional and cultural framework for enabling participatory governance. Within this model, justice is not delivered to communities but generated through them, drawing on local knowledge, social networks, and shared values. The implications of this shift are significant, particularly in contexts where formal justice systems are perceived

as distant, inaccessible, or unresponsive. By creating accessible and dialogical forums for addressing harm, restorative justice reduces barriers to participation and fosters more inclusive forms of decision-making. This aligns closely with contemporary theories of community empowerment, which emphasize the importance of participation, agency, and local capacity in achieving sustainable social change (Banegas & Gerlach, 2021).

The analysis further reveals that restorative justice processes contribute to the strengthening of participatory norms and practices at the community level. Through repeated engagement in dialogue, negotiation, and collective problem-solving, participants develop skills and dispositions that extend beyond the immediate context of the case. These include active listening, empathy, conflict resolution, and collaborative decision-making, capacities that are essential for the functioning of democratic societies. In this sense, restorative justice can be understood as a form of civic education, where individuals learn not only how to resolve conflicts but also how to engage constructively with others in the public sphere. Several studies in the SLR highlight that communities with sustained exposure to restorative practices tend to exhibit higher levels of social participation and civic engagement over time (Cosens et al., 2021; Ku, 2024).

Moreover, the empowerment effects of restorative justice are particularly pronounced in marginalized or underserved communities, where formal justice systems often fail to address local needs or reflect local realities. In such contexts, restorative practices provide alternative avenues for voice and agency, enabling communities to articulate their own definitions of harm and justice. This is especially evident in Indigenous and community-based justice initiatives, where restorative principles are embedded within broader cultural frameworks of collective responsibility and relational accountability (Rampadio, 2022; Ridwan, 2024). The SLR findings suggest that when restorative justice is implemented in a manner that respects and integrates local knowledge systems, it can significantly enhance community resilience and self-determination.

At the same time, the review also points to important conditions that shape the extent to which restorative justice can function as a vehicle for empowerment. Effective facilitation, institutional support, and the availability of resources are critical in ensuring that participation is meaningful rather than symbolic. Without these enabling conditions, there is a risk that restorative processes may reproduce existing power imbalances or place undue burdens on communities without providing adequate support. This highlights the need for a careful balance between community autonomy and institutional responsibility, ensuring that empowerment is accompanied by capacity-building and structural support.

Institutional and Structural Challenges in Implementation

Despite the growing body of evidence supporting the effectiveness of restorative justice, the findings of this Systematic Literature Review (SLR) reveal that its broader implementation remains constrained by a range of institutional and structural challenges. These constraints are neither incidental nor context-specific; rather, they reflect deeper tensions between innovative, relational approaches to justice and the entrenched logics of

conventional legal systems. A recurring theme across the reviewed studies is the persistence of institutional resistance, particularly among legal professionals and policymakers who continue to operate within a predominantly retributive paradigm. This resistance is often grounded in concerns about consistency, due process, and the perceived “softness” of restorative approaches, which are sometimes viewed as incompatible with the formal demands of criminal justice systems (Hasdin, 2024). As one study included in the review notes, “restorative justice remains marginal in many jurisdictions not because of a lack of evidence, but because of deeply embedded professional cultures that privilege punitive responses” (Safitri, 2024).

This pattern of resistance can be understood through the concept of institutional inertia, which captures the tendency of established systems to resist change even in the face of compelling evidence. Institutional inertia is not merely a matter of individual reluctance but is structurally embedded in legal frameworks, organizational routines, and professional norms. The SLR findings suggest that many criminal justice institutions are designed around principles of standardization, hierarchy, and control, features that can be at odds with the flexibility, dialogue, and participatory ethos of restorative justice. As a result, even when restorative programs are formally introduced, they are often implemented in ways that dilute their transformative potential, reducing them to procedural add-ons rather than integrated components of the justice system (Luke, 2018).

In addition to cultural and organizational barriers, regulatory limitations constitute a significant obstacle to the expansion of restorative justice. The review indicates that in many jurisdictions, the legal basis for restorative practices remains underdeveloped or ambiguous, leading to uncertainty in implementation and limited institutional support. Without clear legislative frameworks, restorative justice programs often rely on discretionary decisions by judges, prosecutors, or local authorities, resulting in uneven access and inconsistent application (Amarini et al., 2024).

Another critical challenge identified in the SLR is the lack of cross-sectoral integration. Effective restorative justice requires coordination among multiple stakeholders, including law enforcement agencies, judicial institutions, social services, community organizations, and civil society actors. However, the findings suggest that such coordination is often weak or fragmented, with different sectors operating in silos and pursuing divergent objectives (Sufriadi, 2024). This fragmentation limits the capacity of restorative justice to address the broader social and structural conditions that contribute to crime, such as poverty, exclusion, and lack of access to services. As one study observes, “without integrated support systems, restorative justice risks becoming a short-term intervention rather than a sustained process of social repair” (Chipenda & Cochrane, 2024).

Resource constraints further compound these challenges, particularly in developing and transitional contexts. The implementation of high-quality restorative programs requires trained facilitators, institutional infrastructure, and ongoing capacity-building efforts. Yet, many jurisdictions lack the financial and human resources necessary to sustain such initiatives

at scale. This often results in limited program availability, uneven quality, and reliance on external funding or short-term projects. The SLR findings emphasize that without sustained investment, restorative justice cannot move beyond pilot stages to achieve systemic impact.

Importantly, the review also highlights the political dimension of implementation. The expansion of restorative justice is closely linked to the presence of political will and leadership that is willing to challenge dominant punitive narratives. In contexts where crime control is framed primarily in terms of deterrence and punishment, restorative approaches may struggle to gain traction. Conversely, where policymakers adopt a more holistic and evidence-based perspective on justice, restorative initiatives are more likely to receive institutional support and public legitimacy (Arrieta-Flórez et al., 2023).

These findings suggest that the challenges facing restorative justice are not primarily technical but structural and ideological. Institutional inertia, regulatory ambiguity, fragmented governance, and limited resources collectively create a gap between policy innovation and practical implementation. Addressing this gap requires more than incremental adjustments; it calls for a reorientation of legal and institutional frameworks toward more relational, participatory, and context-sensitive models of justice. In this regard, the advancement of restorative justice depends not only on its demonstrated effectiveness but also on the capacity of institutions to evolve in response to changing understandings of justice and social responsibility.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that restorative justice constitutes not merely an alternative procedural mechanism within criminal justice systems, but a substantively transformative approach capable of addressing the structural and relational deficiencies inherent in retributive models. By systematically synthesizing global evidence, this research confirms that restorative justice is effective in reducing recidivism, enhancing victim recovery, and strengthening offender accountability, while simultaneously fostering broader outcomes such as social reconciliation and community empowerment. More importantly, the study establishes that these impacts are not isolated effects but are interconnected within a relational framework of justice that prioritizes dialogue, participation, and collective responsibility. The findings further indicate that the transformative potential of restorative justice is contingent upon its integration within institutional frameworks, the capacity of stakeholders, and the extent of meaningful community involvement, thereby highlighting the limitations of fragmented or symbolic implementation. In advancing an integrative perspective that links legal effectiveness with social transformation, this study contributes a conceptual shift in understanding restorative justice as a catalyst for sustainable and inclusive development, particularly in contexts where conventional systems have struggled to deliver substantive justice. At the same time, it underscores the need for deliberate policy alignment, institutional reform, and cross-sector collaboration to ensure that restorative justice can be implemented not only as an intervention, but as a coherent and enduring component of

justice systems.

ETHICAL STATEMENT AND DISCLOSURE

This study was conducted in accordance with established ethical principles, including informed consent, protection of informants' confidentiality, and respect for local cultural values. Special consideration was given to participants from vulnerable groups to ensure their safety, comfort, and equal rights to participate. No external funding was received, and the authors declare no conflict of interest. All data and information presented were collected through valid research methods and have been verified to ensure their accuracy and reliability. The use of artificial intelligence (AI) was limited to technical assistance for writing and language editing, without influencing the scientific substance of the work. The authors express their gratitude to the informants for their valuable insights, and to the anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback on an earlier version of this manuscript. The authors take full responsibility for the content and conclusions of this article.

REFERENCES

- Adewale, S., & Ndwandwe, N. D. (2025). Restorative justice principles: A leadership framework to de-escalate unrests in South African higher educational institutions. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 39(5), 69–89. <https://doi.org/10.20853/39-5-6989>
- Amarini, I., Ismail, N., Saefudin, Y., Attamimi, Z. F., & Hidayah, A. N. (2024). Exploring the Effectiveness of Mediation in Resolving Disputes in the Indonesian Administrative Court. *Journal of Indonesian Legal Studies*, 9(1), 353–384. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jils.vol9i1.4632>
- Arrieta-Flórez, R., Marún Uparela, K., & Torres-Pacheco, S. (2023). Challenges and Possibilities of Memory and Reconciliation: Empirical Evidence for Colombia. *Revista de Estudios Sociales*, 83, 141–163. <https://doi.org/10.7440/res83.2023.08>
- Aslim, E. G., Mungan, M. C., Navarro, C. I., & Yu, H. (2022). The Effect of Public Health Insurance on Criminal Recidivism. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 41(1), 45–91. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.22345>
- Banegas, D. L., & Gerlach, D. (2021). Critical language teacher education: A duoethnography of teacher educators' identities and agency. *System*, 98(12), 102474. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102474>
- Barakat, S. (2021). Necessary conditions for integrated approaches to the post-conflict recovery of cultural heritage in the Arab World. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 27(5), 433–448. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2020.1799061>
- Barter, C., & Koulu, S. (2021). Digital technologies and gender-based violence – mechanisms for oppression, activism and recovery. *Journal of Gender-Based Violence*, 5(3), 367–375. <https://doi.org/10.1332/239868021X16315286472556>
- Basid, A., Fauzan, M., Amrulloh, A., Solichin, M., Nasih, A. M., & Ahmed, B. M. B. (2024). The Role of Nahdlatul Ulama' (NU) Diplomacy in Promoting Islam Rahmatan Lil 'Alamin Exegesis to Strengthen Indonesian State-Religion Concepts: A Study of Gus Dur's Thought. *Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilization*, 14(2), 224–245. <https://doi.org/10.32350/jitc.142.14>
- Beaudry, G., Yu, R., Perry, A. E., & Fazel, S. (2021). Effectiveness of psychological interventions

- in prison to reduce recidivism: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 8(9), 759–773. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(21\)00170-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(21)00170-X)
- Blonigen, D. M., Cucciare, M. A., Byrne, T., Shaffer, P. M., Giordano, B., Smith, J. S., Timko, C., Rosenthal, J., & Smelson, D. (2022). A randomized controlled trial of moral reconnection therapy to reduce risk for criminal recidivism among justice-involved adults in mental health residential treatment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 90(5), 413–426. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ccp0000721>
- Bräuchler, B. (2022). Creative Peacebuilding and Resistance in Indonesia. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology*, 23(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14442213.2021.2007990>
- Cannonier, C., Galloway Burke, M., & Mitchell, E. (2021). The Impact of a Reentry and Aftercare Program on Recidivism. *The Review of Black Political Economy*, 48(1), 93–122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0034644620973931>
- Casey, W. M., Copp, J. E., & Bales, W. D. (2021). Releases From a Local Jail: The Impact of Visitation on Recidivism. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 32(4), 427–441. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403420919480>
- Castell-Britton, S. (2024). Speaking About Restorative Justice. *Qeios*, 6(8), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.32388/4XO9Q2.2>
- Caudill, J. W., & Trulson, C. R. (2023). Comparing Official Measures of Recidivism in Juvenile Justice. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 48(2), 319–344. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-022-09672-x>
- Chakravarty, S. (2026). Nakshi Kantha : Embroidered Quilts and Narratives of Social Transformations in Nineteenth-Century Bengal. *Romanticism on the Net*, 7(1), 77–88. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1123039ar>
- Chipenda, C., & Cochrane, L. (2024). Out of school children in the context of new policy trajectories and interlocking crises in Zimbabwe: a transformative social policy perspective. *SN Social Sciences*, 4(7), 131. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-024-00938-1>
- Cosens, B., Ruhl, J. B., Soininen, N., Gunderson, L., Belinskij, A., Blenckner, T., Camacho, A. E., Chaffin, B. C., Craig, R. K., Doremus, H., Glicksman, R., Heiskanen, A.-S., Larson, R., & Similä, J. (2021). Governing complexity: Integrating science, governance, and law to manage accelerating change in the globalized commons. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(36). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2102798118>
- Cullen, P., & Murphy, M. P. (2021). Responses to the COVID-19 crisis in Ireland: From feminized to feminist. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 28(S2), 348–365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12596>
- Davis, R. C., Reich, W. A., Rempel, M., & Labriola, M. (2021). A Multisite Evaluation of Prosecutor-Led Pretrial Diversion: Effects on Conviction, Incarceration, and Recidivism. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 32(8), 890–909. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08874034211000403>
- Dixon, B. (2024). Using theory from the Global South: From social cohesion and collective efficacy to ubuntu. *Theoretical Criminology*, 28(3), 267–286. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13624806231221744>
- Djatkiko, G. H., Sinaga, O., & Pawirosumarto, S. (2025). Digital Transformation and Social Inclusion in Public Services: A Qualitative Analysis of E-Government Adoption for Marginalized Communities in Sustainable Governance. *Sustainability*, 17(7), 2908. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17072908>

- Duwe, G., & McNeeley, S. (2021). Just as Good as the Real Thing? The Effects of Prison Video Visitation on Recidivism. *Crime & Delinquency*, 67(4), 475–497. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128720943168>
- Eytan, S., & Ronel, N. (2023). From Looking for Reason to Finding Meaning: A Spiritual Journey of Recovery From Sexual Trauma. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 38(11–12), 7404–7425. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605221145723>
- Fhadilah, I., Asyafira, L., & Hosnah, A. U. (2025). Restorative Justice and Environmental Crime: Exploring New Models for Addressing Harm to the Environment and Communities. *Enigma in Law*, 3(1), 14–27. <https://doi.org/10.61996/law.v3i1.84>
- Fox, B., Miley, L. N., Kortright, K. E., & Wetsman, R. J. (2021). Assessing the Effect of Mental Health Courts on Adult and Juvenile Recidivism: A Meta-Analysis. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 46(4), 644–664. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-021-09629-6>
- Fulham, L., Blais, J., Rugge, T., & Schultheis, E. A. (2025). The effectiveness of restorative justice programs: A meta-analysis of recidivism and other relevant outcomes. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 25(5), 1486–1512. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17488958231215228>
- Gearhart, M. C. (2022). Social cohesion, mutual efficacy and informal social control: Collective efficacy and community-based crime prevention. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 71(12), 100548. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlci.2022.100548>
- Gomez, C. T. (2022). Recognition as Transitional Justice ‘From Below’: Analysing Victims’ Grassroots Activism in Postconflict Colombia. *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, 16(3), 314–330. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijtj/ijac024>
- Green, S., Calverley, A., & O’Leary, N. (2021). A New Approach for Researching Victims: The ‘Strength-Growth-Resilience’ Framework. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 61(3), 852–871. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azaa093>
- Haerul, A., & Zainuddin, Z. (2023). Restorative Justice: An Approach in the Settlement of Land Crimes in the Indonesian National Police. *European Journal of Law and Political Science*, 2(2), 46–52. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejpolitics.2023.2.2.78>
- Han, S., Valdovinos Olson, M., & Davis, R. C. (2021). Reducing recidivism through restorative justice: an evaluation of Bridges to Life in Dallas. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 60(7), 444–463. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2021.1966156>
- Harfitt, G. (2019). Community-Based Experiential Learning in Teacher Education. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education* (p. 12). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.986>
- Hasdin, Y. (2024). The Existence of Mekongga Customary Court in Resolving Crimes According to Kalosara Tolaki Mekongga Customary Law in Kolaka Regency. *International Journal of Health, Economics, and Social Sciences (IJHESS)*, 6(4), 1149–1155. <https://doi.org/10.56338/ijhess.v6i4.6283>
- Hester, M., Williamson, E., Eisenstadt, N., Abrahams, H., Aghtaie, N., Bates, L., Gangoli, G., Robinson, A., Walker, S.-J., McCarthy, E., Matolcsi, A., & Mulvihill, N. (2025). What Is Justice? Perspectives of Victims-Survivors of Gender-Based Violence. *Violence Against Women*, 31(2), 570–597. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778012231214772>
- Hodgkinson, R., Beattie, S., Roberts, R., & Hardy, L. (2021). Psychological Resilience Interventions to Reduce Recidivism in Young People: A Systematic Review. *Adolescent Research Review*, 6(4), 333–357. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40894-020-00138-x>
- Hoover, F.-A., & Lim, T. C. (2021). Examining privilege and power in US urban parks and open

- space during the double crises of antiblack racism and COVID-19. *Socio-Ecological Practice Research*, 3(1), 55–70. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42532-020-00070-3>
- Jakir, A. R., & Haeranah, H. (2025). Decentering Justice: Integrating Indigenous Law into State-Led Restorative Justice in an Eastern Indonesian District. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 4(4), 474. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5250474>
- Jolivéte, A. J. (2025). Research Justice: Radical love as a strategy for social transformation. In *Research Justice* (pp. 5–12). Policy Press. <https://doi.org/10.51952/9781447375616.ch001>
- Ku, H.-B. (2024). Theory and practice of social work of reconciliation (SWR) in building inclusive communities in Hong Kong. *China Journal of Social Work*, 17(3), 227–246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17525098.2025.2489827>
- Lam, L. M. (2024). Asymmetrical power relationships in disaster reduction remain the key barrier to sustainable recovery: Neoliberalism and Nepal's <sc>post-earthquake</sc> recovery experiences. *Sustainable Development*, 32(2), 1483–1495. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2683>
- Lattimore, P. K. (2022). Reflections on Criminal Justice Reform: Challenges and Opportunities. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 47(6), 1071–1098. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-022-09713-5>
- Lazarus, S., Chiang, M., & Button, M. (2025). Assessing Human Trafficking and Cybercrime Intersections Through Survivor Narratives. *Deviant Behavior*, 52(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2025.2470402>
- Li, Z., Wang, D., Abbas, J., Hassan, S., & Mubeen, R. (2022). Tourists' Health Risk Threats Amid COVID-19 Era: Role of Technology Innovation, Transformation, and Recovery Implications for Sustainable Tourism. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12(7), 769. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.769175>
- Litaay, S. C. H., & Batjo, S. N. (2024). Women's Welfare, Stunting, and Access to Reproductive Rights: An Overview of The Situation in Indonesia. *Baileo: Jurnal Sosial Humaniora*, 1(3), 332–343. <https://doi.org/10.30598/baileofisipvol1iss3pp332-343>
- Lodi, E., Perrella, L., Lepri, G. L., Scarpa, M. L., & Patrizi, P. (2021). Use of Restorative Justice and Restorative Practices at School: A Systematic Literature Review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(1), 96. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19010096>
- Loeffler, C. E., & Nagin, D. S. (2022). The Impact of Incarceration on Recidivism. *Annual Review of Criminology*, 5(1), 133–152. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-criminol-030920-112506>
- Luke, A. (2018). Digital Ethics Now. *Language and Literacy*, 20(3), 185–198. <https://doi.org/10.20360/langandlit29416>
- McClelland, A. G., Shaw, D., O'Grady, N., & Fattoum, A. (2023). Recovery for Development: A Multi-Dimensional, Practice-Oriented Framework for Transformative Change Post-Disaster. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 59(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2022.2130055>
- Melgar Alcantud, P., Campdepadrós-Cullell, R., Fuentes-Pumarola, C., & Mut-Montalvà, E. (2021). 'I think I will need help': A systematic review of who facilitates the recovery from gender-based violence and how they do so. *Health Expectations*, 24(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.13157>
- Morris, A., Baird-Zars, B., Sanders, V., Galloway, P., Klopp, J. M., Hernandez, A., Scanlon, L., & Su-

- An Lin, H. (2024). Advancing equitable partnerships: frontline community visions for coastal resiliency knowledge co-production, social cohesion, and environmental justice. *Geoforum*, 154(1), 104051. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2024.104051>
- Mpofu, Z. F., Mkhize, S. M., & Akpan, J. U. (2024). Empathy, remorse, and restoration of dignity contributing to reduced recidivism: assessing the role of restorative justice in promoting offender rehabilitation and reintegration in Durban. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 10(1), 2429018. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2024.2429018>
- Mueller-Smith, M., & Schnepel, K. T. (2021). Diversion in the Criminal Justice System. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 88(2), 883–936. <https://doi.org/10.1093/restud/rdaa030>
- Nilan, P., & Maunati, Y. (2025). Gender: New Paradigms of Equity and Identity in Southeast Asia. In P. Nilan & Y. Maunati (Eds.), *Decolonising Social Science Research in Southeast Asia* (pp. 33–57). Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-96-4624-1_2
- Ntontis, E., Drury, J., Amlôt, R., Rubin, G. J., Williams, R., & Saavedra, P. (2021). Collective resilience in the disaster recovery period: Emergent social identity and observed social support are associated with collective efficacy, well-being, and the provision of social support. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 60(3), 1075–1095. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12434>
- O’Grady, N., & Shaw, D. (2023). Disaster reparations? Rethinking disaster recovery through the politics of affect. *The Geographical Journal*, 189(3), 514–525. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12526>
- Omowon, A., & Kunlere, A. S. (2024). Restorative justice practices: Bridging the gap between offenders and victims effectively. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 24(3), 2768–2785. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.24.3.3978>
- Ortega-Williams, A., Beltrán, R., Schultz, K., Ru-Glo Henderson, Z., Colón, L., & Teyra, C. (2021). An Integrated Historical Trauma and Posttraumatic Growth Framework: a Cross-Cultural Exploration. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, 22(2), 220–240. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15299732.2020.1869106>
- Pache, S. (2022). A History of Interpersonal Violence: Raising Public Concern. In *Handbook of Interpersonal Violence and Abuse Across the Lifespan* (pp. 59–80). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-89999-2_284
- Pollino, M. A. (2023). Turning points from victim to survivor: an examination of sexual violence narratives. *Feminist Media Studies*, 23(5), 1995–2010. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2021.2006260>
- Presto, A. C. R. (2025). “Doing family” from the standpoint of single Filipina migrant mothers. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 44(2), 00207152251319744. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00207152251319744>
- Rampadio, H. (2022). Reconstruction of the Role From the Prosecutor Based on the Socio-Legal Approach. *Rechtsidee*, 10(2), 256–271. <https://doi.org/10.21070/jjhr.v11i0.792>
- Rastegar, R., & Ruhanen, L. (2022). The injustices of rapid tourism growth. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 97(12), 103504. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2022.103504>
- Ridwan, Z. (2024). Gus Dur’s Understanding of Humanity and Pluralism in Defending the Indonesian Chinese Community. *Jurnal Fuaduna: Jurnal Kajian Keagamaan Dan Kemasyarakatan*, 8(1), 83–98. <https://doi.org/10.30983/fuaduna.v8i1.8520>
- Safitri, N. N. (2024). Gus Dur’s Philosophical Approach to Pluralism: Insights for Social Harmony in Indonesia. *Islamic Thought Review*, 2(2), 129–139.

- <https://doi.org/10.30983/itr.v2i2.8790>
- Sapp, K. (2024). Restorative Justice: Healing Communities. In *Revolutionizing Justice in the Pipeline Era* (pp. 67–88). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-50678-9_5
- Shem-Tov, Y., Raphael, S., & Skog, A. (2024). Can Restorative Justice Conferencing Reduce Recidivism? Evidence From the Make-it-Right Program. *Econometrica*, 92(1), 61–78. <https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA20996>
- Smith, A., Roberts, A., Krzemieniewska-Nandwani, K., Eggins, E., Cook, W., Fox, C., Maruna, S., Wallace, S., & Szifris, K. (2024). Revisiting the effectiveness of cognitive-behavioural therapy for reducing reoffending in the criminal justice system: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 20(3), 14–25. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1425>
- Sufriadi, Y. (2024). The progress of Indonesian law enforcement reform after 25 years of the reform movement. *Asian Affairs: An American Review*, 51(1), 28–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00927678.2023.2268491>
- Suzuki, M. (2023). Victim Recovery in Restorative Justice: A Theoretical Framework. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 50(12), 1893–1908. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00938548231206828>
- Taylor, M. H. (2021). Restorative Justice and Social Justice. In *Forgiveness and Restorative Justice* (pp. 91–108). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-75282-8_7
- Temper, L., Walter, M., Rodriguez, I., Kothari, A., & Turhan, E. (2018). A perspective on radical transformations to sustainability: resistances, movements and alternatives. *Sustainability Science*, 13(3), 747–764. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-018-0543-8>
- Tobón, S. (2022). Do Better Prisons Reduce Recidivism? Evidence from a Prison Construction Program. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 104(6), 1256–1272. https://doi.org/10.1162/rest_a_01007
- Tomaz, V., Moreira, D., & Souza Cruz, O. (2023). Criminal reactions to drug-using offenders: A systematic review of the effect of treatment and/or punishment on reduction of drug use and/or criminal recidivism. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 14(6), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2023.935755>
- Travaini, G. V., Pacchioni, F., Bellumore, S., Bosia, M., & De Micco, F. (2022). Machine Learning and Criminal Justice: A Systematic Review of Advanced Methodology for Recidivism Risk Prediction. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(17), 10594. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191710594>
- Van Hall, M., Baker, T., Dirkzwager, A. J. E., & Nieuwebeerta, P. (2024). Perceptions of Probation Officer Procedural Justice and Recidivism: A Longitudinal Study in the Netherlands. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 51(8), 1139–1156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00938548241244502>
- VanderPyl, T. (2023). Restorative Justice in Rural Schools: The Transformative Power of Rural Educators. In *Expanding the Vision of Rurality in the US Educational System* (pp. 168–186). <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-7437-2.ch009>
- Vasilescu, C. (2023). Building a restorative city: what aims and processes? *The International Journal of Restorative Justice*, 6(1), 119–126. <https://doi.org/10.5553/TIJRJ.000153>
- Vonhm, M. E. (2025). Key elements of social cohesion in conflict-affected societies: a critical literature review. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 11(1), e2586176. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2025.2586176>
- Walk, D., Haviv, N., Hasisi, B., & Weisburd, D. (2021). The role of employment as a mediator in correctional education's impact on recidivism: A quasi-experimental study of multiple

- programs. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 74(1), 101815. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icrimjus.2021.101815>
- White, R. (2023). Conceptions of ecocide and challenges for social transformation. *Current Issues in Criminal Justice*, 35(3), 312–323. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10345329.2023.2203272>
- Widodo, H., Mashdurohatun, A., Kristiawanto, Santoso, A. B., & Yunanda, D. (2025). Restitution as an Instrument of Justice for Victims of Domestic Sexual Violence: A Study of Positive and Islamic Law in the Contemporary Era. *MILRev: Metro Islamic Law Review*, 4(1), 676–699. <https://doi.org/10.32332/milrev.v4i1.10436>
- Yukhnenko, D., Farouki, L., & Fazel, S. (2023). Criminal recidivism rates globally: A 6-year systematic review update. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 88(1), 102115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.icrimjus.2023.102115>
- Zheng, S., Yang, S., Ma, M., Dong, J., Han, B., & Wang, J. (2023). Linking cultural ecosystem service and urban ecological-space planning for a sustainable city: Case study of the core areas of Beijing under the context of urban relieving and renewal. *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 89(1), 104292. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2022.104292>
- Zhou, B., Zhang, H., & Evans, R. (2022). Build back better: A framework for sustainable recovery assessment. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 76(2), 102998. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2022.102998>