

Restorative Justice as an Alternative to Punitive Models in Domestic Violence: Challenges and Prospects in Indonesia

Sutoyo ¹, Sigit Irianto ², Bambang Joyo Supeno ³, Afif Noor ^{4*}

^{1,2,3} Doctor of Law Program, Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia.

⁴ Master of Law Program, Universitas Islam Negeri Walisongo Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia.

*Corresponding author: afif_noor@walisongo.ac.id

© Authour(s)

OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development, Ontario International Development Agency, Canada.

ISSN 1923-6654 (print) ISSN 1923-6662 (online) www.oidaijsd.com

Also available at <https://www.ssm.com/index.cfm/en/oida-intl-journal-sustainable-dev/>

Abstract: Domestic violence (DV) remains a serious problem in Indonesia and is a form of human rights violation with a consistently high incidence. To date, the existing legal system relies on a punitive approach, with a primary focus on punishing the perpetrator, while victim rehabilitation efforts are often neglected. This situation has prompted the need for alternatives, such as restorative justice, a more humane approach that focuses on victim recovery, promotes perpetrator awareness, and prioritizes balance in social relations. This study seeks to examine in more depth the various obstacles and opportunities that may exist in implementing restorative justice for domestic violence cases in Indonesia. The study employed qualitative methods, incorporating both normative and empirical legal approaches. Data were analyzed descriptively and analytically. The research findings reveal that the implementation of restorative justice in the context of domestic violence is still hampered by several factors, including the lack of precise regulation in the Domestic Violence Law, resistance from law enforcement officials who are still rigid with old approaches, and a patriarchal culture that often "forces" victims to reconcile without considering justice for them. Nevertheless, opportunities to develop this approach remain open through legal reform, inter-institutional collaboration, optimal victim support, and the utilization of relevant local cultural values. By prioritizing the principles of gender justice and victim protection, restorative justice has the potential to create a justice system that is not only humane but also responsive to the needs of victims, offering a hopeful outlook for the future.

Keywords: Restorative justice, Domestic violence, Punitive law, Gender justice, Victim protection.

Introduction

Domestic violence (DV), a persistent and pressing social and legal issue in Indonesia, continues to demand our attention [1]. The data from the National Commission on Violence Against Women (Komnas Perempuan) in 2024 is alarming, with 330,097 cases of gender-based violence in the personal sphere, out of a total of 445,502 reported cases of violence against women [2]. This significantly increased from the 326,534 cases recorded in 2022 [3]. DV, defined as any act that causes physical, sexual, or psychological harm, or neglect [4,5], it is a hidden crime due to victims' reluctance to report it to maintain family integrity or avoid dishonor. This act impacts partners and children who are witnesses or direct victims. Although Law Number 23 of 2004 concerning the Elimination of Domestic Violence (PKDRT Law) is in place, its implementation faces various obstacles, both from the perspective of victims and law enforcement officials.

Traditionally, DV has been addressed through the criminal justice system, employing a retributive justice approach that focuses on punishing the perpetrator, often neglecting the needs and recovery of the victim. The current legal framework for addressing DV in Indonesia, based on Law Number 23 of 2004 concerning the Elimination of Domestic Violence, provides a normative basis for prevention, victim protection, and prosecution of perpetrators. However, its implementation faces significant obstacles, including social stigma, limited access to protection services, inter-

institutional coordination issues, and a tendency for the criminal justice system to emphasize retributive punishment over victim recovery [6]. These limitations underscore the urgent need for reform in our approach to DV.

As an alternative, the concept of Restorative Justice (RJ) has emerged, enshrined in various regulations such as Police Regulation No. 8 of 2021, Prosecutor's Regulation No. 15 of 2020, and most recently, the Supreme Court's Regulation No. 1 of 2024 concerning Guidelines for Adjudicating Criminal Cases Based on Restorative Justice. This approach prioritizes case resolution through mediation involving the perpetrator, victim, and relevant parties to seek a just solution that emphasizes restoration to the original state, rather than retaliation. With its potential to align with substantive justice, which considers moral and humanitarian aspects to satisfy all parties, RJ offers hope to create and maintain peace.

Various previous studies have examined the application of RJ in cases of DV in Indonesia from multiple perspectives. Suartini and Maslihati (2023) highlighted legal protection for women and children victims of DV during the pandemic, emphasizing the limitations of RJ in safeguarding victims' rights [7]. Research by Rizaldi et al. (2022) at Bale Mediasi in Mataram City found that implementing RJ is often not accepted by the community because it is perceived as not providing a sense of justice for victims [8]. A study by Wibowo et al. (2023) revealed significant limitations in the application of RJ in cases of sexual violence in Indonesia [9].

While existing studies often focus on normative aspects or specific case studies, they rarely provide a comprehensive analysis of the relationship between RJ implementation, victim protection, and the prevention of recurrent violence. Moreover, few studies delve into the applicability of RJ principles within Indonesia's predominantly punitive legal system and the sustainable integration of RJ with victim protection mechanisms. This study, however, takes a unique approach by analyzing the challenges and prospects of implementing RJ in domestic violence cases in an integrative manner. It covers positive legal, sociocultural, and institutional aspects to formulate a justice model that is more just, participatory, and pro-victim recovery.

Literature Review

Restorative justice refers to a paradigm of criminal case handling that serves to repair relationships among perpetrators, victims, and the community, rather than relying on retribution through punishment. Zehr asserted that restorative justice was based on three principles: restoration, participation, and accountability [10]. This process puts the victim in the center, enables them to express psychological and social impacts, and opens space for offenders to take responsibility for their actions constructively.

This approach has begun to be incorporated into several national regulations in Indonesia, such as National Police Regulation Number 8 of 2021, which pertains to the Handling of Criminal Acts Based on Restorative Justice. However, it has not been explicitly applied in the context of domestic violence cases. The concept of restorative justice is particularly relevant to efforts aimed at reforming criminal justice to be more humane and recovery-oriented, especially in cases involving personal and family relationships. Domestic violence is governed by Law Number 23 of 2004 concerning the Elimination of Domestic Violence (PKDRT Law). The law is punitive in nature and protects the victim through criminal enforcement. However, the criminal provisions in the Domestic Violence Law often encounter difficulties during implementation due to victims' reluctance to pursue legal proceedings because of family pressure, economic dependence, or psychological reasons.

The literature indicates many challenges that face the application of restorative justice in cases of domestic violence, including normative, sociological, and ethical issues. Summerer (2025) asserts that the restorative paradigm tends to marginalize victims' experiences if they are not equipped with adequate protection, especially when victims are in unequal power relationships [11]. On the other hand, feminist legal scholars generally warn that the restorative processes can normalize violence as an issue of private spheres, hence jeopardizing victims' rights [12,13]. Despite significant challenges, the prospect of applying restorative justice to domestic violence in Indonesia remains worth studying. Research by Syaiful Munandar (2024) notes that an approach based on custom or local wisdom to resolve domestic conflicts does have elements of reconciliation, for instance [14], in the Minangkabau and Balinese communities, which could be a reference for restorative models contextual to Indonesia.

Methods

This research adopts a normative legal approach. It combines the analysis of positive legal norms with secondary data [15]. To ensure a comprehensive analysis, this study integrates a statutory approach to examine all relevant legal regulations and a conceptual approach to construct legal arguments based on legal doctrines and concepts. This research utilizes various data collection techniques, including secondary data studies, encompassing primary,

secondary, and tertiary legal materials. The primary legal materials are laid down in various sources, including binding laws and regulations such as the 1945 Constitution, domestic violence laws, and the main criminal code, as well as the latest restorative justice regulations issued by the Police, the Prosecutor's Office, and the Supreme Court. This analysis is further deepened by secondary legal materials, including textbooks, scientific journals, and research findings from scholars who provide explanations and context for the primary material. Complementarily, tertiary legal materials such as legal dictionaries and encyclopedias are used to guide and clarify terms, ensuring a comprehensive understanding.

The collected data were analyzed qualitatively and descriptively using data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion-drawing techniques to identify emerging legal and social patterns in the implementation of restorative justice (RJ) in domestic violence cases. To minimize internal bias in the qualitative and normative legal data analysis, this study employed a legal source triangulation method, systematically comparing primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials, thus ensuring that norm interpretations were not dependent on a single source or perspective.

To mitigate bias, the interpretation of norms was also conducted using accountable legal interpretation methods such as grammatical, systematic, and teleological interpretations, to avoid partial or subjective readings. The data reduction and categorization process was also conducted transparently, noting the basis for selecting the norms and legal concepts analyzed. Furthermore, the analysis results were critically compared with previous research findings to ensure consistency and rationality of the conclusions. With this approach, this study strives to maintain objectivity, logical consistency, and academic accountability in drawing legal conclusions to formulate policy perspectives and recommendations. These recommendations are designed to be practical and actionable, supporting the implementation of fair and victim-centered restorative justice.

Results And Discussion

The Restorative Justice Paradigm in Handling Domestic Violence

Domestic violence (DV), as defined in Article 1 of the Domestic Violence Law, is any act against a person, especially a woman, that results in physical, psychological, or sexual suffering, and/or neglect of the household. These forms of domestic violence are regulated explicitly in Article 5 of Law No. 23 of 2004, which includes physical, psychological, sexual violence, and neglect. This violence is triggered by various complex factors, ranging from cultural influences, low social control, judicial decisions that lack a deterrent effect, to the perpetrator's inability to control their emotions. Achieving justice in handling DV requires a holistic approach that not only focuses on criminal accountability for the perpetrator but also on protection, recovery, and psychological support for victims to overcome trauma. This comprehensive approach is crucial in addressing the multifaceted nature of DV. RJ can be one approach while ensuring that there is no impunity for the perpetrator.

The legal basis for RJ in domestic violence rests on Law Number 23 of 2004 concerning the Elimination of Domestic Violence (PKDT Law) and various technical regulations from law enforcement agencies. This sociological approach views domestic violence not simply as a legal violation but as a social issue rooted in patriarchal culture, gender inequality, and unequal power relations within the family. Implementation of the existing legal framework faces sociological challenges such as economic dependence on victims, social stigma, and the perception that domestic violence is an internal problem. The state's responsibility, therefore, extends beyond law enforcement to address socioeconomic and cultural factors through education, creating a supportive environment for recovery where victims can heal and rebuild their lives.

To fully understand the advantages of RJ, it is necessary to compare it with the punitive (retributive) justice approach, which remains the dominant approach in the Indonesian legal system.

Next Page

Table 1: Comparison of Retributive and Restorative Justice

Aspects	Punitive/Retributive Approach	Restorative Approach
Main Objectives	To provide sanctions, retribution, deterrent effects, and punishment for perpetrators.	Victim recovery, perpetrator accountability, and social and emotional reconciliation
Focus	Perpetrators and violations of the law; punishment resulting from violations	Victims, the harm caused, and how to repair it
The victim's role	Limited; victims are often restricted to those who are witnesses or those experiencing the consequences.	Centered, victims participate, are listened to, and are given space to recover.
The role of society/community	Limited, the law operates between the state (through law enforcement agencies) and the perpetrator and the victim as individuals.	Broader, the community facilitates and supports recovery, providing social space so that victims/perpetrators are not isolated.
Psychological impact on victims	Can leave lasting trauma: victims may feel unheard and ignored after the verdict is delivered.	It is hoped that the trial will be more humane, acknowledging suffering, allowing for emotional resolution, and restoring harmonious relationships (as far as possible).
Safety/risk	If the perpetrator is considered dangerous, imprisonment can protect the community and prevent reoffending.	The potential risk is high if the victim is unsafe or the perpetrator is irresponsible; therefore, strong protection mechanisms are necessary.

Source: secondary data, 2025

The table shows that the RJ paradigm offers a more holistic and humane approach than punitive punishment. The application of restorative justice in handling DV cases has several advantages, as seen through the perspectives of two key thinkers. Jürgen Habermas, with his theory of communicative justice [16, 17], observes that this approach creates space for healthy and inclusive dialogue among the perpetrator, the victim, and the community. This process enables problem-solving to emerge from mutual agreement, rather than relying solely on coercion or unilateral decisions by law enforcement. The involvement of the community in the process not only fosters a sense of collective responsibility but also can gradually repair previously damaged social relations.

On the other hand, through "reintegrative shaming," John Braithwaite explains that RJ can encourage perpetrators to recognize their mistakes without social ostracization [18]. Through genuine remorse and reintegration of perpetrators into society after taking responsibility for their actions, this approach avoids the negative stigma that can trigger relapse. This contrasts with the retributive legal system, which often leads to ostracism and increases the potential for repeated violence. Thus, the advantage of RJ lies not only in its efforts to restore the victim but also in preventing the recurrence of violence, paving the way for reconciliation, and strengthening humanitarian values within the Indonesian legal system, which has historically been dominated by a revenge-based approach. This approach allows the law to play a role beyond mere punishment, namely, restoring the social and moral balance disturbed by DV.

Challenges of Implementing Restorative Justice in the Indonesian Legal System

Restorative justice (RJ) exists as an alternative within the criminal justice system, shifting the focus from simply punishing the perpetrator to restoring relationships through the active participation of victims, perpetrators, and the community. This approach is highly relevant to cases of Domestic Violence (DV), especially after the PKDRT Law made a legal breakthrough by expanding the definition of violence to include psychological, sexual, and economic neglect, rather than just physical violence. The implementation of RJ aims to achieve substantive justice beyond mere deterrence, which aligns with the United Nations' recommendation for its broader use in the criminal justice system. At the regional level, this commitment is being realized, for example, by the Semarang City Government through the SERUNI Integrated Service Center. Data from Central Java Province in 2024 showed that psychological violence was

the most frequently reported form of DV (35.8 %), followed by sexual violence (14.6 %) [19]. Many of these cases were classified as minor, with losses under IDR 2.5 million and a criminal penalty of less than five years, thus qualifying for resolution through a restorative mechanism based on a peaceful agreement between the parties without coercion.

In practice, the resolution of DV cases still faces various obstacles despite the enactment of the Domestic Violence Law. A patrilineal culture that places women in a subordinate position is a major hindering factor. This situation, coupled with the perception that DV is a family disgrace, often discourages victims from reporting or pursuing legal proceedings. The phenomenon of a cycle of violence, where the cycle of violence, apology, and cooling-off period repeats itself, makes it difficult for victims to emerge from the situation. Restorative justice through penal mediation is accommodated in this context as an alternative resolution focused on recovery. However, its implementation still requires careful regulation to avoid burdening victims and ensure a just outcome.

Although a legal framework is in place, there are no specific standard operating procedures (SOPs) for DV cases to ensure aspects such as victim safety, psychological support, and voluntary requirements that are truly free from intimidation. These are crucial aspects that must be addressed to ensure the successful implementation of RJ. Another normative barrier is sectoral regulations; each law enforcement institution has its own guidelines that are sometimes not synchronized across institutions, so implementing RJ in one institution can be very different from that in another.

Institutional obstacles to implementing RJ also arise from issues with human resources and work culture. Many law enforcement officers have not received adequate training in this concept, resulting in a limited understanding of the theoretical and ethical foundations underlying the restorative approach. Furthermore, a strong work culture prioritizing a retributive legal approach, focusing more on punishment, makes implementing alternatives like RJ difficult. For example, in the case of assault in Bantul, investigators were often caught between public pressure for harsh punishment and calls from victims or local communities to resolve cases peacefully. This dilemma ultimately makes the police institution hesitant and skeptical about choosing a restorative approach [20].

In addition to institutional challenges, the resistance of law enforcement officials is a significant obstacle. Many still view retributive criminal penalties as the primary means of achieving justice and legal certainty, particularly in cases involving severe or repeated offenses. They worry that implementing RJ will reduce its deterrent effect. Another concern is that victims could potentially be exploited through 'false peace' arrangements that fail to address the root of the problem. Furthermore, law enforcement officials in the field also face technical challenges. They are often not equipped with clear guidelines or detailed SOPs on when RJ should be implemented, how to protect victims during the process, and how to ensure peace agreements are implemented. Providing clear guidelines is crucial to reducing legal uncertainty and guaranteeing consistency in case handling.

Legal certainty is a crucial principle in the context of RJ. Victims and the public need assurance that their rights are protected, and that RJ options will not harm them or undermine the need for proportionate sanctions. This lack of clarity ultimately fuels resistance, both from law enforcement and from victims themselves. The implementation of RJ in DV cases faces multidimensional challenges, including legal certainty, institutional resistance, and cultural inequality.

According to Gustav Radbruch's legal certainty theory, the law must provide clarity, predictability, and equal protection for all parties [21,22]. In the context of DV, the unclear boundaries of RJ and differing guidelines between law enforcement agencies create uncertainty for both victims and authorities. Victims are often unaware of their rights in the RJ process, while authorities hesitate to implement it for fear of violating the principles of strict law enforcement.

Strengthening the Restorative Justice Model to Realize Protection and Recovery for Victims

Restorative justice (RJ) is an approach that needs to be seriously considered in the criminal justice system in Indonesia for cases of domestic violence. This approach is considered capable of guaranteeing the fulfillment of victims' rights as stipulated in Article 28G paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, focusing on restoring damage and preventing future violations. The conventional punishment-oriented justice system often harms victims who do not receive physical or mental recovery and can threaten the integrity of the household. The concept of restorative justice, which is rooted in local wisdom values, offers a more balanced and fair solution. RJ provides opportunities to strengthen the legal response to victims in an inclusive and humane manner. However, the urgency and importance of normative strengthening and supportive policies cannot be overstated for this model to be effective and truly victim-centered.

From a legal perspective, the regulatory framework needs to be strengthened. Although RJ is currently mentioned in several regulations, such as the Chief of Police Regulation, the Attorney General Regulation, and the Supreme Court Regulation, the legal basis is not strong enough for domestic violence cases. Therefore, the door for legal reform remains wide open; for example, the PKDRT Law should be revised to explicitly regulate RJ mechanisms from a gender justice perspective. By prioritizing victim recovery, the law no longer merely punishes but also creates space for reconciliation that restores the psychological and social condition of victims.

The victim assistance system in every RJ process also needs to be strengthened. Based on the principle of victim-centered justice, victims must be at the center of the judicial process, not just passive parties. This is where the role of assistance institutions such as the Integrated Service Center for Women and Children Empowerment, which exists in almost every district, women's legal aid organizations, and forensic psychologists becomes crucial. They can ensure a balance of power between victims and perpetrators during negotiations, while preventing "forced peace" that is detrimental to victims. With adequate assistance, RJ agreements can be made consciously and voluntarily.

Another crucial aspect is the need for a seamless synergy between law enforcement agencies. In the theory of an integrated criminal justice system, coordination between the police, prosecutors, courts, and social institutions is paramount for the success of RJ [23]. However, the differences in perspective between these agencies often pose significant obstacles to their practice. For instance, the criteria for cases that can be resolved restoratively may vary between the police and prosecutors. Standard guidelines and an integrated coordination system are imperative to overcome these challenges. This will ensure that RJ can be consistently applied without compromising the protection of victims.

From a socio-cultural perspective, the potential for RJ in Indonesia is significant [24]. The country's rich tradition of resolving disputes through deliberation, as seen in the practices of Minangkabau, Bugis, and Bali, aligns well with the principles of RJ. This local wisdom can seamlessly integrate into the formal legal system through a living law approach. As a result, RJ is not an imported concept, but rather an organic growth from the societal values of harmony and moral responsibility.

In this era of information technology development, RJ can also be developed through digital technology [25]. In this modern era, the RJ process can be supported by digital platforms that record all stages of mediation, agreements, and post-peace monitoring. Such a system enhances accountability, promotes greater transparency, and provides better protection for victim data. With the support of the rule of law principle, digital innovation can ensure that perpetrators do not misuse RJ to avoid responsibility. On the contrary, RJ can genuinely become a means of victim recovery and a reinforcement of gender-just legal legitimacy in Indonesia. Strengthening restorative justice as an alternative or complementary approach to the legal system, which has tended to be retributive in cases of DV, is a strategic step. This step is essential to realize more tangible and fair protection and recovery, especially for women and children who are often the most vulnerable parties.

Conclusions

This research consciously implemented measures to minimize internal bias that could affect the objectivity of the analysis. This effort was achieved through the triangulation of sources and perspectives, specifically by comparing findings from various legal materials, academic perspectives, and the practical implementation of restorative justice in the field. Furthermore, the analysis was conducted reflectively and critically, separating empirical findings, positive legal norms, and the researcher's normative assessments, so that interpretations were not solely based on subjective assumptions. Data reduction and categorization were also systematically conducted to ensure that only data relevant to the problem formulation were used as the basis for the conclusion.

Based on this approach, it can be concluded that restorative justice offers a new perspective in addressing domestic violence cases in Indonesia. This approach focuses not only on punishing the perpetrator but also emphasizes efforts to restore the victim's well-being, encourage perpetrators to take responsibility, and repair damaged social relationships. Unfortunately, the current legal system is still dominated by a mindset that places punishment as the primary goal. As a result, victims are often passive participants in the legal process, without adequate space for psychological and social healing. Furthermore, the implementation of restorative justice in domestic violence cases still faces several obstacles. From a legal perspective, existing regulations do not clearly define this mechanism, so its implementation is often tentative and subject to individual interpretation.

Meanwhile, on the ground, many law enforcement officers remain reluctant to shift from a retributive approach to a restorative approach to justice. A strong patriarchal culture also complicates the situation, as victims are often pressured to reconcile without considering the justice they truly need. Therefore, the following steps that need to be

taken are developing clearer and more comprehensive regulations, building solid cooperation between law enforcement agencies, and strengthening the role of victim advocates. These efforts must be gender-sensitive, as this will ensure that the restorative justice process is fair and does not harm victims a second time. This approach should also leverage local wisdom, emphasizing deliberation. With these deliberate efforts, restorative justice can not only protect and rehabilitate victims of domestic violence but also move the Indonesian legal system toward a more humane, inclusive, and socially just direction.

References

- [1] Arief H. Domestic violence and victim rights in Indonesian law concerning the Elimination Of Domestic Violence. *J Leg Ethical Regul Issues* 2018;21:1–7.
- [2] Komnas Perempuan. CATAHU 2024 : Menata Data, Menajamkan Arah 2024.
- [3] Komnas Perempuan. Kekerasan terhadap Perempuan di Ranah Publik dan Negara: Minimnya Perlindungan dan Pemulihan. Catatan Tah Komnas Peremp Tahun 2022 2023.
- [4] Chhikara P, Jakhar J, Malik A, Singla K, Dhattarwal SK. Domestic violence: The dark truth of our society. *J Indian Acad Forensic Med* 2013;35:71–5. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0971097320130120>.
- [5] Daruwalla N, Kanougiya S, Gupta A, Gram L, Osrin D. Prevalence of domestic violence against women in informal settlements in Mumbai, India: A cross-sectional survey. *BMJ Open* 2020;10:1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-042444>.
- [6] Meilisa M, Fitri SN. Evaluation of Legal Protection for Women and Children’s Victims of Violence by the Bengkulu City Office of Women’s Empowerment and Child Protection. *J Penegakan Huk Dan Keadilan* 2025;6:56–65. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jphk.v6i1.24339>.
- [7] Suartini S, Maslihati Nur Hidayati. Pendekatan Restorative Justice Dalam Rangka Perlindungan Hukum Bagi Perempuan dan Anak Sebagai Korban KDRT. *Binamulia Huk* 2023;12:161–75. <https://doi.org/10.37893/jbh.v12i1.598>.
- [8] Rizaldi M. Penerapan Restorative Justice Dalam Penyelesaian Kasus Kekerasan Dalam Rumah Tangga (Kdrt) Di Bale Mediasi Kota Mataram. *Unizar R J* 2025;4:1–11.
- [9] Wibowo RH, Busro A, Purwanti A. Reassessing Restorative Justice: Addressing Sexual Violence Cases in Indonesia. *Indones Law Rev* 2023;13:117–23.
- [10] Hamamah F, Sukardi D, Kulkarni S. The Application of Restorative Justice in Domestic and Child Violence Cases in Indonesia and Finland. *Sasi* 2025;31:44–59.
- [11] Summerer K. Beyond Victims : Exploring Restorative Justice Beyond Victims : Exploring Restorative Justice. *Univ Pacific Law Rev* 2025;56.
- [12] Goodmark L. Restorative justice as feminist practice. *Int J Restor Justice* 2019. <https://doi.org/10.5553/IJRJ/258908912018001003003>.
- [13] Syafa S, Zanubiya A, Waluyo B, Harefa B. International Journal of Social Science and Human Research Restorative Justice from a Feminist Perspective in Domestic Violence Cases. *Int J Soc Sci Hum Res* 2025;7:1630–40. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v8-i3-38>.
- [14] Munandar S. Penyelesaian Konflik Keluarga Oleh Masyarakat Hukum Adat. *Pros. Semin. Nas. Progr. Dr. Ilmu Huk. UMS* 2024, 2024, p. 265–74.
- [15] Noor A. Socio-Legal Research: Integration of Normative and Empirical Juridical Research in Legal Research. *J Ilm Dunia Huk* 2023;7:61–5. <https://doi.org/10.56444/jidh.v7i2.3154>.
- [16] Habermas J. *The Theory of Communicative Action*. vol. 1. Boston: Beacon Press; 1984.
- [17] Febriani R, Supartiningsih S, Tjahyadi S. Jurgen Habermas’s views on legal validity and discourse ethics: A literature review. *J Civ Media Kaji Kewarganegaraan* 2025;22:20–31. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jc.v22i1.1289>.
- [18] Braithwaite J. Reintegrative shaming. *Routledge Companion to Criminol Theory Concepts* 2017:475–9. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315744902-107>.
- [19] Dinas P3APPKB. *Data Kekerasan Perempuan dan Anak Provinsi Jawa Tengah*. 2025.
- [20] Rosyid M, Winarni H. Penegakan Hukum Melalui Restorative Justice dalam Penyelesaian Tindak Pidana Penganiayaan di Wilayah Hukum Polres Bantul. *Terang J Kaji Ilmu Sos Polit Dan Huk* 2025;2:2–7.
- [21] Alexy R. Gustav Radbruch’s Concept of Law. *Law’s Ideal Dimens* 2021;26:107–18. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198796831.003.0008>.
- [22] Radburch, Gustav LH. An Extraordinary Legal Philosopher. *J Laws Policy* 2000;2:489.

- [23] Sikumbang A, Sara R. Harmonization of Restorative Justice Regulations within the Indonesian Criminal Justice System. *Greenation Int J Law Soc Sci* 2025;3:318–28. <https://doi.org/10.38035/gijlss.v3i2.426>.
- [24] Rasmussen CW. The politics of accountability: violence, mass punishment and restorative justice. *Contemp Justice Rev Issues Crim Soc Restor Justice* 2023;26:357–75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2024.2315019>.
- [25] Triasari D, Hanum WN, Firmandiaz V. Mapping Restorative Justice in Information and Electronic Transaction Criminal Regulation. *J Hum Rights, Cult Leg Syst* 2023;3:1–16. <https://doi.org/10.53955/jhcls.v3i1.75>.

