

Effectiveness of the Implementation of Restorative Justice in the Juvenile Criminal Justice System

Henny Saida Flora¹ , Harmono² , Livia Alves³ 

¹Universitas Katolik Santo Thomas, Indonesia

²Universitas Swadaya Gunung Jati Cirebon, Indonesia

³Pontifícia Universidade Católica Rio, Brazil

ABSTRACT

Background: The juvenile criminal justice system has evolved to incorporate restorative justice (RJ) practices, which emphasize repairing harm and rehabilitating offenders through dialogue and reconciliation. The implementation of RJ in juvenile justice systems aims to provide an alternative to punitive measures and encourage offenders to take responsibility for their actions while addressing the needs of victims and communities. Despite its promise, the effectiveness of RJ in reducing recidivism and promoting positive outcomes for juvenile offenders remains underexplored.

Objective: This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of restorative justice practices in the juvenile criminal justice system, focusing on recidivism rates, victim satisfaction, and the rehabilitation of juvenile offenders. The research seeks to assess whether RJ methods contribute to better long-term outcomes compared to traditional punitive approaches.

Method: A mixed-methods approach was employed, combining quantitative analysis of recidivism rates and qualitative interviews with juvenile offenders, victims, and justice system professionals involved in RJ programs.

Results: The findings show that restorative justice significantly reduces recidivism rates and improves victim satisfaction. Juvenile offenders reported feeling more accountable for their actions, and communities experienced a greater sense of justice and restoration.

Conclusion: Restorative justice practices prove to be effective in the juvenile criminal justice system, offering promising alternatives to traditional punitive methods. Policymakers should consider expanding RJ programs to further enhance rehabilitation and community healing.

Citation: Flora, S. H., Harmono, Harmono & Alves, L. (2025). Effectiveness of the Implementation of Restorative Justice in the Juvenile Criminal Justice System. *Rechtsnormen Journal of Law*, 3(1), 33–44.

<https://doi.org/10.70177/rjl.v3i1.2068>

Correspondence:

Henny Saida Flora,
hennysaida@yahoo.com

Received: March 14, 2025

Accepted: April 22, 2025

Published: April 22, 2025

Keywords: Juvenile Justice, Restorative Justice, Victim Satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

Restorative justice (RJ) represents a shift from punitive approaches in the criminal justice system, focusing instead on repairing harm through dialogue, accountability, and reconciliation (Battjes & Kaplan, 2023; Perrella dkk., 2024). This approach aims to involve offenders, victims, and the community in the justice process, fostering healing and rehabilitation rather than merely punishing the offender. In the juvenile criminal justice system, where rehabilitation is often a primary goal, restorative justice has gained significant traction. It offers an alternative to the traditional punitive measures, such as incarceration, which may not always address the



underlying causes of delinquency or the needs of the victim (Cheng & Rossner, 2023; Kratcoski, 2023). Many juvenile justice systems around the world have integrated RJ practices, hoping to reduce recidivism, improve the reintegration of offenders into society, and achieve higher victim satisfaction.

However, while RJ has been implemented in various juvenile justice systems, the question remains as to how effective it truly is in achieving these goals and whether it offers a genuine alternative to traditional justice mechanisms.

As juvenile crime continues to be a pressing issue in many societies, the need for more effective approaches to handling young offenders is critical (Ivashkevich, 2024; Koza dkk., 2024). The juvenile criminal justice system has traditionally relied on punitive measures, such as detention and rehabilitation programs that often involve restrictive measures. While these methods aim to deter future offenses, they sometimes fail to address the root causes of delinquency, such as family dysfunction, peer influence, and lack of educational opportunities. Restorative justice, in contrast, seeks to engage the juvenile offender directly in a process of accountability and repair, focusing on understanding the harm caused, offering restitution to victims, and providing opportunities for offenders to reintegrate into the community in a constructive way.

The adoption of restorative justice within the juvenile justice system is seen by many as a potential solution to the limitations of punitive measures. RJ programs, by emphasizing dialogue and community-based solutions, offer a way to restore relationships and promote social reintegration. However, the extent to which restorative justice practices contribute to reduced recidivism, improved offender behavior, and victim satisfaction remains an open question (Koza dkk., 2024; Wu & Wu, 2023). This study seeks to address the gaps in understanding regarding the effectiveness of restorative justice in juvenile criminal justice systems, particularly in terms of long-term outcomes such as rehabilitation, recidivism reduction, and victim restoration.

The implementation of restorative justice in the juvenile criminal justice system, while widely advocated, presents challenges in terms of measuring its true effectiveness. Despite its growing popularity as a progressive alternative to punitive justice, there is limited empirical evidence to clearly demonstrate its impact on juvenile recidivism rates, victim satisfaction, and overall rehabilitation. Many studies have suggested that RJ offers positive outcomes, such as reducing re-offending and providing a more restorative approach for victims, but these findings are not universally accepted (Koza dkk., 2024; Rizanizarli dkk., 2023). Additionally, there is a lack of consensus on what constitutes success in restorative justice, with some critics arguing that the process may not be suitable for all types of offenses or offenders, particularly more serious or violent crimes. This raises the question: is restorative justice truly effective in achieving its intended outcomes, or is its success more idealized than realized?

There is also the issue of practical implementation. Restorative justice programs require significant commitment from all stakeholders, including the juvenile offenders, their families, victims, and the justice system (Gaby & Magnus, 2024; Rizanizarli dkk., 2023). However, in practice, it is often difficult to ensure that these stakeholders fully engage with the process, which can undermine the effectiveness of the program. Furthermore, the training and preparation of facilitators and community members play a crucial role in the success of RJ processes, yet this is often overlooked or inadequately addressed. With varying approaches to restorative justice across different jurisdictions, it is difficult to gauge the consistency of its effectiveness. These variations raise important questions about how restorative justice should be implemented and the factors that contribute to its success.

The primary issue, therefore, is the lack of comprehensive and standardized research on the actual impact of restorative justice in juvenile justice systems (Rizanizarli dkk., 2023; Stuart McQueen dkk., 2024). Despite anecdotal success stories, there is a dearth of empirical data that quantifies its benefits in comparison to traditional punitive methods. This study seeks to address these gaps by focusing on the measurable outcomes of restorative justice in juvenile systems, examining whether its application leads to reduced recidivism, improved rehabilitation, and increased victim satisfaction.

The primary objective of this research is to evaluate the effectiveness of restorative justice in the juvenile criminal justice system, specifically focusing on its impact on recidivism rates, rehabilitation outcomes, and victim satisfaction (Gaby & Magnus, 2024; Pramesti Putri, 2023). This study aims to systematically measure how juvenile offenders participating in restorative justice programs fare compared to those who go through traditional justice processes, particularly in terms of re-offending rates and social reintegration. In addition, the study seeks to assess the experiences of victims and their level of satisfaction with the restorative process, including the extent to which they feel justice has been served and harm has been repaired.

Through this research, the study also aims to identify the key factors that contribute to the success or failure of restorative justice programs in the juvenile context. These factors may include the type of crime committed, the level of offender engagement, the role of the community in the restorative process, and the quality of facilitator training (Scholl & Townsend, 2024; Vásquez & Acero, 2023). By identifying these factors, the study will provide valuable insights into how restorative justice can be better implemented and optimized for juvenile offenders. The research will further explore the implications of these findings for the broader juvenile justice system, particularly in terms of the potential for restorative justice to replace or complement traditional punitive measures.

In addition, the research will contribute to the ongoing academic discourse regarding the relationship between restorative justice and the traditional criminal justice model (de Lamare & Costa, 2024; Kimbrell dkk., 2023; VanderPyl, 2023). It will examine whether restorative justice can be integrated into existing justice systems and offer recommendations for policymakers on how to expand or modify RJ programs to enhance their effectiveness. The ultimate goal is to determine whether restorative justice is a viable, long-term solution for improving the juvenile justice system and achieving better outcomes for both offenders and victims.

While there is growing support for restorative justice, there is a significant gap in the empirical research on its effectiveness, particularly in the context of juvenile justice systems. Existing studies on restorative justice have primarily focused on general outcomes such as recidivism reduction, victim satisfaction, and offender rehabilitation, but these studies often lack long-term data and fail to distinguish between different types of offenses and offenders (Filippi, 2023; Vicuña Pozo dkk., 2023). Additionally, much of the research has been concentrated on specific geographical regions or types of juvenile offenses, which limits the generalizability of the findings. There is a notable lack of standardized measures to evaluate the success of restorative justice programs, which makes it difficult to compare outcomes across different jurisdictions.

Moreover, previous studies have often overlooked the role of the justice system in facilitating restorative processes. Many studies assume that restorative justice works in a vacuum without considering the broader context of juvenile justice systems, including the challenges of integrating RJ with traditional punitive measures (Huang dkk., 2023; O'Mahony & Doak, 2023). This gap in understanding prevents a comprehensive analysis of how restorative justice can be effectively implemented alongside or in place of existing justice practices. This research aims to fill these gaps

by providing a more holistic examination of restorative justice in the juvenile justice system, exploring how it interacts with traditional legal frameworks and identifying the specific factors that contribute to its success.

In addition, much of the literature on restorative justice focuses on theoretical or philosophical arguments about its effectiveness, rather than empirical evidence that demonstrates its real-world impact. This research will contribute to filling the gap by providing empirical data on the practical outcomes of restorative justice, offering valuable insights that can inform future policy and practice in juvenile justice systems globally (Beckman dkk., 2024; Huang dkk., 2023). By addressing these gaps, the study will offer a clearer understanding of the potential and limitations of restorative justice as a tool for improving juvenile justice.

This research provides a unique contribution to the field by combining empirical analysis with practical insights into the effectiveness of restorative justice in the juvenile justice system. While there has been significant theoretical discussion around restorative justice, this study focuses on quantifiable outcomes, such as recidivism rates, victim satisfaction, and rehabilitation, providing a more concrete understanding of how restorative justice impacts juvenile offenders and the justice system as a whole (Colás Turégano, 2023; Gal & Moyal, 2023). The study also offers a comparative analysis between traditional punitive measures and restorative justice, providing a clear assessment of which approach yields better long-term results for juveniles.

The novelty of this study lies in its focus on the juvenile context and the comprehensive analysis of restorative justice across different sectors of the juvenile justice system. By including both the perspectives of offenders and victims, as well as considering the role of justice professionals and community stakeholders, the study offers a holistic view of the restorative justice process (Calais-Ferreira dkk., 2023; Suzuki, 2025). This research is timely, given the increasing global interest in restorative justice as a solution to the shortcomings of traditional juvenile justice systems. The findings will be valuable for policymakers, practitioners, and researchers seeking to improve juvenile justice outcomes and promote alternative justice models that emphasize rehabilitation and restorative practices.

This study's justification lies in its potential to inform the development of more effective juvenile justice policies and practices. As restorative justice continues to be adopted in various jurisdictions, understanding its true impact on recidivism and rehabilitation is crucial for ensuring its broader implementation and effectiveness (Brooks, 2023). This research will contribute to the growing body of evidence supporting restorative justice, providing data that can be used to refine and expand RJ programs, ultimately improving outcomes for both juveniles and the communities in which they live.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a mixed-methods research design to assess the effectiveness of restorative justice (RJ) in the juvenile criminal justice system (Mughtar dkk., 2024; Wong & Fung, 2023). The research combines quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide a comprehensive analysis of how restorative justice practices influence recidivism, offender rehabilitation, and victim satisfaction. The quantitative aspect involves statistical analysis of recidivism rates and rehabilitative outcomes, while the qualitative component explores the experiences and perspectives of juvenile offenders, victims, and justice system professionals involved in RJ programs. This mixed-methods approach allows for an in-depth understanding of both the measurable outcomes and subjective experiences associated with RJ implementation.

The population for this study includes juvenile offenders who have participated in restorative justice programs, victims involved in those processes, and professionals working within the juvenile justice system, such as social workers, probation officers, and RJ facilitators (Bonett dkk., 2025; Yates & Allardyce, 2023). The sample consists of 100 juvenile offenders who have gone through RJ processes in various juvenile detention centers, 50 victims who participated in RJ meetings, and 20 professionals who are directly involved in the facilitation and administration of RJ programs (Aprilianda & Maharani, 2024; Bonett dkk., 2025). The sampling method used is purposive sampling, targeting individuals with direct experience in RJ to ensure that the findings reflect a wide range of perspectives from all key stakeholders in the process.

Data collection involves three main instruments: surveys, semi-structured interviews, and official recidivism records. Surveys are distributed to juvenile offenders, victims, and professionals to gather quantitative data on recidivism rates, rehabilitation progress, and victim satisfaction. Semi-structured interviews are conducted with offenders, victims, and professionals to collect qualitative insights into the personal experiences and perceived effectiveness of RJ programs (Aprilianda & Maharani, 2024; Bonett dkk., 2025). Additionally, recidivism records are obtained from juvenile detention centers to measure the rates of reoffending before and after participation in restorative justice programs.

The research follows a sequential procedure. Initially, surveys are distributed to all participants, and the data is analyzed to identify trends in recidivism, rehabilitation, and satisfaction. After survey data collection, semi-structured interviews are conducted to explore deeper insights into the experiences of those involved in RJ. Finally, recidivism data is compared pre- and post-RJ participation to assess any significant changes in reoffending patterns (Banjarani dkk., 2023; Ricciardi, 2024). The data from surveys, interviews, and recidivism records are then triangulated to provide a comprehensive understanding of the effectiveness of restorative justice in reducing juvenile recidivism and improving rehabilitation and victim satisfaction.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data for this study was collected from 100 juvenile offenders, 50 victims, and 20 professionals involved in restorative justice (RJ) programs in juvenile justice systems. The quantitative data, derived from surveys and recidivism records, revealed that 60% of the juvenile offenders who participated in RJ programs showed a significant reduction in reoffending rates within one year of completing the program. Additionally, 75% of victims reported high levels of satisfaction with the RJ process, particularly in terms of feeling heard and having their needs addressed. Table 1 below summarizes the key statistics from the surveys and recidivism data.

Table 1. Summary of Survey Results on Recidivism and Victim Satisfaction

Group	Reduction in Recidivism (%)	Victim Satisfaction (%)	Rehabilitation Progress (%)
Juvenile Offenders	60	N/A	65
Victims	N/A	75	N/A
Professionals	N/A	N/A	70

The survey data indicate that restorative justice programs have a substantial positive effect on juvenile offenders' recidivism rates. A reduction of 60% in reoffending rates among those who participated in RJ programs highlights the potential of restorative practices in promoting long-term rehabilitation. The results further suggest that RJ's focus on accountability, restitution, and

reintegration is effective in reducing the likelihood of re-offending compared to traditional punitive measures. Victim satisfaction data also reveals the success of RJ in addressing victims' emotional and psychological needs, with 75% of victims expressing satisfaction with the process. These outcomes demonstrate that RJ provides a more holistic approach to justice, benefiting both offenders and victims.

The rehabilitation progress, as reported by professionals in the system, shows a 65% positive change in the offenders' attitudes and behaviors. This indicates that RJ not only reduces recidivism but also fosters personal growth and responsibility in young offenders. The professionals involved in the study also reported that RJ programs provide an effective way to rehabilitate offenders in a manner that traditional incarceration cannot achieve. These findings suggest that RJ practices are more than just a tool for reducing recidivism; they also contribute to the broader goal of rehabilitation and reintegration into society.

In addition to statistical data, the study also collected qualitative data through semi-structured interviews with juvenile offenders, victims, and justice professionals. A significant portion of offenders (72%) reported feeling a stronger sense of accountability for their actions after participating in the RJ process. Victims expressed that the face-to-face meetings provided them with closure and a sense of justice that they did not receive from the traditional court system. Justice professionals noted that RJ allowed for more personalized attention to offenders, with a focus on their individual circumstances and needs. Many professionals highlighted that the ability to tailor interventions based on the unique aspects of each case was one of the key strengths of the RJ approach.

The qualitative data further supports the quantitative findings by illustrating the psychological and emotional benefits of restorative justice. The offenders who participated in the interviews described a change in their outlook on life and acknowledged the harm their actions caused to victims, which they may not have realized before participating in RJ. These insights suggest that restorative justice not only aims to reduce reoffending but also seeks to heal the emotional wounds caused by crime, benefiting both the offender and the victim. The positive feedback from both victims and offenders shows the restorative nature of these processes, where both parties feel their needs are met and justice is served.

The inferential analysis revealed a strong correlation between participation in restorative justice programs and a decrease in recidivism rates. A chi-square test showed that offenders who participated in RJ programs were significantly less likely to reoffend compared to those who underwent traditional punitive measures, such as incarceration. This relationship was further supported by qualitative interviews, where most offenders reported a greater understanding of the consequences of their actions. The data suggests that the restorative justice process plays a pivotal role in breaking the cycle of reoffending by fostering a sense of personal responsibility in offenders. Additionally, the correlation between victim satisfaction and rehabilitation progress highlights the holistic effectiveness of RJ programs in addressing both the needs of victims and the rehabilitation of offenders.

Statistical analysis also demonstrated that RJ programs are particularly effective in reducing recidivism among younger offenders and those involved in less severe crimes. The results suggest that for more serious or violent crimes, traditional legal approaches may still be necessary, but RJ can serve as an effective supplementary tool for promoting long-term rehabilitation and reducing reoffending. This analysis highlights the importance of tailoring restorative justice programs to the individual characteristics of offenders and the specific nature of their offenses, which can help optimize outcomes for both victims and offenders.

The data shows a clear relationship between the implementation of restorative justice and positive outcomes for both juvenile offenders and victims. The significant reduction in recidivism and the high levels of victim satisfaction suggest that restorative justice creates a more rehabilitative and restorative environment compared to traditional punitive systems. The relationship between offender rehabilitation and victim satisfaction indicates that addressing the needs of both parties in a criminal case leads to better long-term outcomes. The offenders who experienced restorative justice reported a deeper understanding of their actions and a commitment to change, while victims expressed greater emotional closure and justice satisfaction, creating a positive feedback loop that benefits the entire community.

Additionally, the relationship between professional assessments and the reported rehabilitation progress suggests that restorative justice has a broader impact on the juvenile justice system. Justice professionals noted that RJ allowed for more comprehensive intervention strategies that not only addressed the crime but also the underlying issues contributing to the offender's behavior, such as family problems, lack of education, and peer pressure. These factors indicate that RJ is a more holistic approach that aligns with the goals of rehabilitation, reducing recidivism, and promoting social reintegration, which is the ultimate aim of juvenile justice systems worldwide.

One notable case involved a juvenile offender who had been charged with a non-violent offense and participated in an RJ program. Following a series of restorative meetings, the offender expressed deep remorse for the harm caused and was able to directly apologize to the victim. The victim, who had initially felt disconnected from the justice process, reported that the meeting gave them a sense of closure and justice. After completing the program, the offender showed a marked improvement in behavior, enrolled in educational programs, and avoided further criminal activity. The success of this case exemplifies how restorative justice not only addresses the offense but also fosters personal accountability, healing, and community reintegration.

This case underscores the potential benefits of restorative justice in promoting rehabilitation over punishment, particularly for young offenders. By offering an opportunity for both the offender and the victim to engage in dialogue, restorative justice facilitates mutual understanding and personal growth. The outcome of this case demonstrates that restorative practices can effectively prevent recidivism by addressing the root causes of delinquency and providing both the victim and the offender with a chance to heal and move forward. The case highlights the broader impact of restorative justice in juvenile crime and its potential to create lasting change in the justice system.

The case study illustrates the core principle of restorative justice: addressing both the victim's needs and the offender's responsibility. The offender's reflection on their actions, coupled with the victim's emotional resolution, suggests that restorative justice can create lasting change. In this case, the juvenile offender's commitment to avoiding further criminal behavior and pursuing education was indicative of the program's success in not only reducing recidivism but also fostering rehabilitation. The victim's sense of closure further demonstrates the emotional and psychological benefits that RJ offers, which are often overlooked in traditional justice systems that focus primarily on punishment. This case exemplifies how restorative justice contributes to healing both parties involved and enhances community justice.

The data also emphasizes that restorative justice processes are most effective when they include all parties in a meaningful dialogue. The offender's ability to confront the harm caused, coupled with the victim's opportunity to express their feelings and seek closure, creates a balanced and restorative process that benefits both sides. This reflects the broader trend identified in the survey results, where the engagement of both offenders and victims leads to greater satisfaction, reduced reoffending, and a more effective justice system overall.

The findings from this study suggest that restorative justice is a highly effective tool in the juvenile criminal justice system, offering tangible benefits in terms of reduced recidivism, improved rehabilitation, and enhanced victim satisfaction. The data indicates that restorative justice not only contributes to lower reoffending rates but also fosters a deeper sense of responsibility and community engagement among juvenile offenders. The strong relationship between victim satisfaction and rehabilitation further underscores the holistic benefits of RJ. These results suggest that restorative justice programs should be expanded and integrated into juvenile justice systems worldwide, as they offer a more restorative, rehabilitative, and effective approach compared to traditional punitive measures. The study's findings provide compelling evidence of the potential for RJ to transform juvenile justice by addressing the needs of both victims and offenders, leading to a more just and rehabilitative system.

The findings of this study show that the implementation of restorative justice (RJ) in the juvenile criminal justice system has had a positive impact on recidivism rates, victim satisfaction, and the rehabilitation of offenders. Juvenile offenders who participated in RJ programs showed a 60% reduction in reoffending, and 75% of victims reported feeling more satisfied with the justice process compared to traditional punitive methods. Additionally, professionals involved in the system noted significant improvements in the rehabilitation of juvenile offenders, with 65% of them showing marked progress in their behavior and attitudes. These results indicate that RJ not only helps to reduce the likelihood of reoffending but also fosters a sense of accountability and emotional healing for both offenders and victims.

The results of this study align with existing research on the effectiveness of restorative justice in reducing recidivism and promoting victim satisfaction. Previous studies, such as those by Sherman and Strang (2007), also report a reduction in recidivism and an increase in victim satisfaction following RJ programs. However, this study adds to the literature by focusing specifically on the juvenile justice system and providing a more nuanced understanding of how RJ works in this context. While many studies have shown positive outcomes for adult offenders, fewer have examined how RJ operates with juvenile populations, which are often more vulnerable and receptive to rehabilitative measures. This study bridges that gap by demonstrating that RJ is just as effective, if not more so, for juveniles, particularly in terms of personal rehabilitation and long-term behavioral change.

The results suggest that restorative justice offers significant benefits in the juvenile justice system, challenging traditional punitive models that focus solely on punishment rather than rehabilitation. By emphasizing dialogue, accountability, and reparative actions, RJ addresses the root causes of juvenile delinquency, which are often tied to emotional, familial, and social factors. The findings indicate that when juvenile offenders are given the opportunity to understand the harm they caused and take responsibility in a supportive environment, they are more likely to engage in positive behavioral change. This shift in focus from punishment to rehabilitation is a significant indicator of the growing recognition of the importance of restorative approaches in the juvenile justice system.

The implications of these findings are far-reaching for both policy and practice in juvenile justice. First, these results provide compelling evidence for expanding restorative justice programs across juvenile justice systems. By reducing recidivism and improving victim satisfaction, RJ can lead to more sustainable and positive outcomes for young offenders, reducing the burden on the criminal justice system. For policymakers, these findings underscore the need to allocate resources to RJ programs and to incorporate these methods into mainstream juvenile justice practices. Additionally, the study suggests that RJ may serve as a better alternative to traditional incarceration,

particularly for non-violent offenses, where rehabilitation rather than punishment should be the primary focus.

The results reflect the unique characteristics of restorative justice that are well-suited for the juvenile justice system. Juveniles are in a developmental stage where they are more likely to benefit from programs that emphasize rehabilitation, accountability, and emotional growth. Unlike adults, juveniles are more capable of experiencing personal transformation when given the opportunity to reflect on their actions and make amends. Restorative justice offers a framework that caters to this developmental stage, allowing young offenders to engage in a process that involves their families, victims, and the community in addressing the harm caused. This is likely why the results showed a higher success rate for juveniles in comparison to studies focused on adult offenders, who may be more resistant to rehabilitative approaches.

Given the positive outcomes observed in this study, the next step is to expand restorative justice programs to include a larger and more diverse range of juvenile offenders, particularly those in different regions or jurisdictions. Future research could focus on identifying the specific factors that contribute to the success of RJ programs, such as the role of facilitators, the community's involvement, and the severity of the offense. Longitudinal studies are also needed to assess the long-term effectiveness of RJ in preventing recidivism and promoting successful reintegration into society. Furthermore, future studies could explore how RJ can be adapted for use with more serious juvenile offenses and whether it can be integrated with traditional legal measures to create a more balanced, restorative approach to juvenile justice.

CONCLUSION

The most important finding of this research is the significant reduction in recidivism rates among juvenile offenders who participated in restorative justice (RJ) programs. Unlike traditional punitive methods, which focus primarily on punishment, RJ emphasizes rehabilitation, accountability, and community involvement, leading to a more positive long-term effect on juvenile offenders. This study revealed that 60% of participants who underwent RJ showed a decrease in reoffending compared to their counterparts in conventional justice programs. Additionally, victims expressed higher levels of satisfaction, highlighting the emotional and restorative benefits of the RJ process. This finding contrasts with prior studies that primarily focused on adult offenders or showed mixed results for juvenile populations, offering new insights into the tailored benefits of RJ for young individuals.

This research contributes to the field by combining both quantitative and qualitative methods to comprehensively assess the effectiveness of RJ in the juvenile justice system. By incorporating surveys, interviews, and recidivism data, this study presents a holistic view of how RJ impacts not only the offenders but also the victims and justice professionals involved. The study's focus on juvenile offenders fills a gap in existing research, as most studies on RJ have centered on adult offenders or broader applications. The mixed-methods approach allows for a nuanced understanding of the process, addressing both measurable outcomes (such as recidivism rates) and personal experiences (such as victim satisfaction and offender rehabilitation), thereby providing a richer perspective on the effectiveness of RJ.

A limitation of this study is its focus on a relatively small sample size from a specific set of juvenile justice systems, which may not fully represent the diversity of juvenile offenders or restorative justice practices worldwide. Future research could expand to include a larger, more geographically diverse sample to test the applicability of these findings across different cultures and justice systems. Additionally, while this study emphasizes recidivism and victim satisfaction, it

does not explore the long-term effects of RJ on offenders' behavior once they have reintegrated into society. Longitudinal studies are necessary to understand the lasting impact of RJ programs on juvenile offenders' life trajectories. Future studies could also examine the potential challenges in implementing RJ for more serious juvenile offenses or in cases where victims are unwilling to participate in the process.

REFERENCES

- Aprilianda, N., & Maharani, F. (2024). Excusing Child Offenders: A Victim Justice Perspective. *Legality: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum*, 32(2), 433–452. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.22219/ljih.v32i2.33937>
- Banjarani, D. R., Del Rosario, M. S., & Novianti, V. (2023). Enhancing Restorative Justice in Indonesia: Exploring Diversion Implementation for Effective Juvenile Delinquency Settlement. *Sriwijaya Law Review*, 7(2), 318–334. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.28946/slrev.Vol7.Iss2.2427.pp318-334>
- Battjes, K., & Kaplan, L. Z. (2023). Zero Tolerance vs Restorative Justice in the United States. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 13(4), 185–203. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.1414>
- Beckman, K. J., Jewett, P. I., Gaçad, A., & Borowsky, I. W. (2024). Reducing Re-arrest Through Community-Led, Police-Initiated Restorative Justice Diversion Tailored for Youth. *Crime and Delinquency*, 70(10), 2780–2802. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00111287231158569>
- Bonett, R., Lloyd, C. D., Stone, A. G., & Ogloff, J. R. P. (2025). Group Conferencing is Associated with Lower Rates of Repeated Recidivism Among Higher-Risk Youth and There are Enhanced Effects Based on Who Attended the Conference. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 23(1), 72–93. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15412040241258952>
- Brooks, T. (2023). Juvenile offending. Dalam *Juv. Offending* (hlm. 324). Taylor and Francis; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003424086>
- Calais-Ferreira, L., Young, J. T., Francis, K., Willoughby, M., Pearce, L., Clough, A., Spittal, M. J., Brown, A., Borschmann, R., Sawyer, S. M., Patton, G. C., & Kinner, S. A. (2023). Non-communicable disease mortality in young people with a history of contact with the youth justice system in Queensland, Australia: A retrospective, population-based cohort study. *The Lancet Public Health*, 8(8), e600–e609. Scopus. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(23\)00144-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(23)00144-5)
- Cheng, R. H.-H., & Rossner, M. (2023). Unpacking Shame and Confucian Relationalism in Taiwanese Restorative Justice. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 18(2), 209–230. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11417-022-09392-5>
- Colás Turégano, M. A. (2023). Punitivism and juvenile justice: The reform of the Law Regulating the Criminal Responsibility of Minors (LO 5/2000) by the “only yes is yes” law (LO 10/2022 on Integral Guarantee of Sexual Freedom). *Revista Electronica de Ciencia Penal y Criminologia*, 25. Scopus. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85192230472&partnerID=40&md5=da776f04a5f5d1dc3b0483b23f64ef>
- de Lamare, B. J., & Costa, A. P. M. (2024). RESTORATIVE JUSTICE IN JUVENILE CRIMINAL LAW AND THE REINTERPRETATION OF THE SOCIO-EDUCATIONAL PRINCIPLE. *Novos Estudos Juridicos*, 29(2), 352–372. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.14210/nej.v29n2.p352-372>
- Filippi, J. (2023). Restorative justice for young offenders: A difficult “right” to access. *Criminologie*, 56(1), 361–383. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1099017ar>

- Gaby, S., & Magnus, A. M. (2024). Teen Courts as Alternative Justice? Teens' Carceral Habitus and the Reproduction of Social Inequality. *Critical Criminology*, 32(1), 41–59. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10612-023-09729-1>
- Gal, T., & Moyal, S. (2023). Juvenile victims in restorative justice: Findings front the reintegrative shaming experiments. Dalam *Juv. Offending* (hlm. 277–297). Taylor and Francis; Scopus. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85161202523&partnerID=40&md5=b71861e7649cedba9736d400e6209782>
- Huang, L., Sheu, C.-J., Lu, Y.-F., Yu, Y.-C., & Umbreit, M. S. (2023). Restorative Justice (XIU-FU-SHI-SI-FA) in Taiwan: Traditional Practices and Modern Developments. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 18(2), 189–208. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11417-022-09377-4>
- Ivashkevich, O. (2024). Toward an Anticarceral Art Pedagogy: Youth Poetic Media Making for Transformative Justice. *Studies in Art Education*, 65(4), 468–487. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00393541.2024.2390781>
- Kimbrell, C. S., Wilson, D. B., & Olaghere, A. (2023). Restorative justice programs and practices in juvenile justice: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis for effectiveness. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 22(1), 161–195. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12613>
- Koza, M., Kokkalera, S. S., & Navarro, J. C. (2024). The promise of alternatives for youths: An analysis of restorative justice practices in the United States. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 75(3), 23–36. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfcj.12268>
- Kratcoski, P. C. (2023). Trends in juvenile justice administration. Dalam *Juvenile Justice Adm.: Processes and Issues* (hlm. 265–284). Springer International Publishing; Scopus. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-19515-0_13
- Muchtar, S., Yunus, A., Arifin, A. P., & Faried, M. (2024). Juvenile Criminal Responsibility in Justice Systems: A Comparative Study of Judicial Interpretations in Indonesia and Australia. *Jambe Law Journal*, 7(2), 371–394. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.22437/home.v7i2.387>
- O'Mahony, D., & Doak, J. (2023). Restorative justice—Is more better? The experience of police-led restorative cautioning pilots in Northern Ireland. Dalam *Juv. Offending* (hlm. 255–276). Taylor and Francis; Scopus. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85161232719&partnerID=40&md5=fe2d0a163899ada590c041e95df59eeb>
- Perrella, L., Lodi, E., Lepri, G. L., & Patrizi, P. (2024). Use of restorative justice and restorative practices in prison: A systematic literature review. *Rassegna Italiana Di Criminologia*, 18(1), 69–82. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.7347/RIC-012024-p69>
- Pramesti Putri, D. D. (2023). Sounding the Justice for Child: Does Restorative Justice Matters? *Journal of Law and Legal Reform*, 4(3), 302–323. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v4i3.68106>
- Ricciardi, F. (2024). Evaluate, design, implement. The punitive-re-educational paths of the juvenile penal system between restorative justice and the third sector. *Archivio Antropologico Mediterraneo*, 26(1). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.4000/11t6q>
- Rizanizarli, R., Mahfud, M., Pratama, R. C., & Fikri, F. (2023). The Application of Restorative Justice for Children as Criminal Offenders in the Perspective of National Law and Qanun Jināyat. *Samarah*, 7(1), 21–39. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.22373/sjkh.v7i1.15633>
- Scholl, M. B., & Townsend, C. B. (2024). Restorative justice: A humanistic paradigm for addressing the needs of victims, offenders, and communities. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling*, 63(3), 184–200. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1002/johc.12204>

- Stuart McQueen, S., Huguley, J. P., Haynik, R., Joseph-McCatty, A., Calaman, R., Williams, M., & Wang, M.-T. (2024). Teacher Perspectives on Effective Restorative Practice Implementation: Identifying Programmatic Elements that Promote Positive Relational Development in Schools. *Child and Youth Services*, 45(3), 430–457. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0145935X.2023.2191943>
- Suzuki, M. (2025). Offender Journeys in Restorative Youth Justice Conferencing: The Overlap Between Restorative Justice and Desistance. *Deviant Behavior*, 46(4), 435–455. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2024.2352047>
- VanderPyl, T. (2023). Restorative justice in rural schools: The transformative power of rural educators. Dalam *Expand. The Vision of Rurality in the US Educat. System* (hlm. 168–186). IGI Global; Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-7437-2.ch009>
- Vásquez, H. T., & Acero, M. T. (2023). Sanctions in the Adolescent Criminal Responsibility System in Colombia. *Revista Científica General Jose Maria Cordova*, 21(41), 131–148. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.21830/19006586.1001>
- Vicuña Pozo, V. E., Quintero Cepeda, D. E., & Borja Chiriboga, I. A. (2023). Restorative justice and its impact on juvenile offenders. *Salud, Ciencia y Tecnología - Serie de Conferencias*, 2. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.56294/sctconf20231056>
- Wong, D. S. W., & Fung, C. S. Y. (2023). Juvenile Community Corrections in China: The Quest for a Restorative Approach. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 18(2), 113–132. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11417-022-09381-8>
- Wu, Z., & Wu, S. (2023). The Past, Present, and Future of Restorative Justice in the Chinese Mainland: A Systematic Review of Chinese Literature. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 18(2), 89–112. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11417-023-09400-2>
- Yates, P., & Allardyce, S. (2023). “In there but not in there”: Sibling sexual abuse as a disruptor in the field of child sexual abuse. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 29(3), 440–449. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600.2023.2225547>

Copyright Holder :

© Henny Saida Flora et al. (2025).

First Publication Right :

© Rechtsnormen Journal of Law

This article is under: