

Restorative Justice in Indigenous Communities as a Path to Contextual Justice

Rahman^{1*}, Ridwan Fariz Maulana², Rizki Adreni Saragih³, Moh Ainul Yakin⁴, Laila Dwi Rohmadhayanti⁵

¹ Universitas Adiwangsa, Jambi, Indonesia

^{2,3} Universitas Brawijaya, Jakarta, Indonesia

⁴ Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia

⁵ Albukhary International University, Alor Setar, Malaysia

*Author's correspondence email: rahman@unaja.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Contextual justice, Indigenous communities, Law enforcement, Legal paradigm, Restorative justice

DOI:

10.65586/jpr.v1i2.22

Article History:

Submitted: 21-03-2025

Revised: 01-06-2025

Accepted: 23-07-2025

Published online: 15-08-2025

Published by:

Mahkota Science Publishers

ABSTRACT

In an era of decentralisation and strengthening regional autonomy, recognition of the role of indigenous peoples in social governance is becoming increasingly important. This study integrates a community-based restorative justice approach into national legal policy, thereby strengthening efforts to reform the criminal justice system, reducing the burden on law enforcement agencies, and increasing the sense of justice at the grassroots level. This study primarily focuses on integrating relevant theories to construct a comprehensive framework for understanding restorative justice in Indonesian indigenous communities as a form of contextual justice. The results confirm that restorative justice in Indonesian indigenous communities is not merely a traditional legacy, but an intellectual discourse of resistance against the state's monopoly on defining and enforcing justice. Amid national laws that remain colonial in nature, the practice of customary justice shows that true justice arises from the depths of human relationships, not from the rigidity of procedures. The tension between state law and customary law, the decolonial function of restorative justice, and the risk of domestication through institutionalisation all emphasise the need for a paradigm shift in Indonesian law. Thus, the future of justice in Indonesia depends on the state's courage to be the sole centre of legitimacy no longer, but to become a space for dialogue that allows customary justice to grow as an equal partner in upholding humanity and restoring communal life.

A. Introduction

Justice in Indonesian indigenous communities has long occupied a unique philosophical space, where social harmony, cosmic balance, and the principle of deliberation are central to its orientation. The customary legal systems in various regions, such as Bali, Minangkabau, Dayak, Papua, and Maluku, demonstrate that conflict resolution is often carried out through a dialogical, collective process grounded in the moral value of togetherness. For example, research by Benda-Beckmann (2001) on Minangkabau customary law shows that customary justice aims not to punish the perpetrator but to restore the social balance disrupted by the actions of one party. Similarly, Tamanaha's (2020) study confirms that, in many indigenous communities, dispute resolution is restorative, emphasising reconciliation and community solidarity.

The Indonesian context shows historical continuity between such practices and the fundamental values of Pancasila, especially the second and fifth principles, which emphasise humanity and social justice (Boiliu et al., 2022). Therefore, the meaning of restorative justice in the context of Indonesian indigenous communities is not new; rather, it is a revitalisation of the tradition of justice that has long existed within society. Restorative justice has been widely discussed in Indonesia over the past two decades, in line with efforts to reform the national criminal justice system (Wangga, 2022). This discourse gained momentum with the application of the concept of restorative justice in police, prosecution and court practices, especially for certain small-scale cases, such as minor offences or juvenile offenders. However, most of these implementations are still formalistic and often detached from the socio-cultural context of local communities.

Several studies have criticised this approach as being restorative justice in form but not in substance (Zehr & Mika, 2017), merely imitating formal procedures without regard for the fundamental values and social practices that are the spirit of restorative justice itself. In fact, the essence of restorative justice is not merely mediation or administrative reconciliation, but rather the transformation of social relations and the restoration of the dignity of the people involved in the conflict. In this context, the role of indigenous communities is significant as a source of epistemology and praxis capable of reviving the true meaning of restorative justice in the Indonesian legal landscape.

Many customary institutions in Indonesia have long contained restorative elements, for example, in the practice of customary fines in Papua or *sasi* in Maluku, which are not merely sanctions but social mechanisms to restore balance and maintain social relations. In another study, John Braithwaite (2020; 2018) introduced the theory of reintegrative shaming, which states that punishment accompanied by social reintegration can foster moral awareness without causing permanent stigma. This theory is in line with indigenous values in Indonesia, which view offenders not as enemies of society, but as part of the community who must be rehabilitated so that social harmony can continue. Therefore, developing a community-based restorative justice model is not merely a pragmatic choice but an epistemological necessity to deliver more contextually and meaningfully just outcomes.

Indonesia's national legal system still shows a structural bias towards a positive legal approach, oriented towards the state and formal procedures. Customary justice is often considered a form of non-formal or complementary justice that exists outside the official legal system (Zhao et al., 2025). As a result, many customary decisions lack binding legal force, even though the local community socially recognises them. In fact, the 1945 Constitution and various derivative regulations have provided space for the recognition of customary law communities, as contained in Article 18B, paragraph (2), of the 1945 Constitution and in Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages.

From a theoretical perspective, restorative justice can be seen as the antithesis of the retributive paradigm that dominates the modern criminal justice system. In the retributive paradigm, justice is understood as retribution for wrongdoing: the perpetrator must be

punished in proportion to their actions to satisfy the sense of justice of the victim and the community. In contrast, restorative justice departs from the assumption that crime is a violation of people and social relations, not merely of the state. Therefore, the focus is not on retribution, but on restoration. Restorative justice places victims, perpetrators, and the community in a dialogical process aimed at repairing the damage caused by crime. This approach is participatory, inclusive, and emphasises moral responsibility. When this concept is linked to the tradition of Indonesian customary law, it appears that fundamental values such as deliberation, consensus, and social harmony have long been principles aligned with the idea of restorative justice.

One of the fundamental issues in this discourse is how to operationalise the concept of restorative justice within a modern, bureaucratic, and centralised national legal system. The experiences of countries such as Canada and New Zealand show that a community-based approach can be an effective solution to overcome the limitations of the formal justice system (Wood et al., 2021). In New Zealand, for example, the practice of family group conferencing, which originated in Māori tradition, has been adopted into the national legal system as a form of recognition of local wisdom. In the Indonesian context, a similar approach can be adapted by strengthening existing customary institutions to function as partners of the state legal system. However, this integration requires a profound paradigm shift, particularly in terms of recognising legal pluralism and the social legitimacy of indigenous communities as agents of justice. Without this, restorative justice will remain a slogan without substance.

In a broader theoretical framework, the concept of contextual justice is essential to bridge the gap between universal values of justice and local socio-cultural conditions. This theory rejects the view that justice can be applied uniformly without regard for a society's historical and cultural context. In Western legal tradition, justice is often understood in abstract and formal terms, focusing on written rules and legalistic procedures. In contrast, contextual justice emphasises that values of justice must be rooted in the experiences, norms, and social structures of the community. In the Indonesian context, contextual justice means justice that not only enforces the law but also preserves the values of humanity, solidarity, and social balance at the core of local wisdom (Rahardjanto et al., 2025). Therefore, indigenous community restorative justice can be understood as a concrete form of contextual justice, namely a justice system rooted in local culture and capable of responding to the community's social needs in a humanistic and participatory manner.

The theoretical objective of this study is to formulate a conceptual model of indigenous community-based restorative justice that can function as a form of contextual justice in Indonesia. This model is expected to integrate local wisdom values with the universal principles of restorative justice, thereby producing a theoretical framework that contributes to the discourse on legal pluralism and criminal law reform. In practical terms, this study aims to identify mechanisms and practices of customary conflict resolution that can be incorporated into the national legal system, while accounting for community participation, victim recovery, and the social responsibility of perpetrators. Thus, this study is not only descriptive but also transformative, as it seeks to encourage a paradigm shift in the way justice is viewed in Indonesia.

B. Method

This study does not primarily focus on field-based fact-gathering, but rather on integrating relevant theories to construct a comprehensive framework for thinking about restorative justice in Indonesian indigenous communities as a form of contextual justice. This approach places the study in the reflective and normative realm, not to describe social reality directly, but to interpret, synthesise, and construct new understandings through dialogue between restorative justice theory, legal pluralism, and contextual justice. Theories such as those put forward by Howard Zehr (2017) on the restoration of social relations, John

Braithwaite (2018) on reintegrative shaming, and studies of legal pluralism by Benda-Beckmann and Hooker are integrated to produce a conceptual model that explains how indigenous practices in Indonesia can reflect universal restorative values without losing their local character (K. von Benda-Beckmann & Turner, 2018; F. von Benda-Beckmann, 2002). Thus, the absence of empirical data actually provides a broader analytical space to re-examine the philosophical, epistemological, and normative foundations of justice that exist in indigenous communities.

C. Results and Discussion

1. Tension between state law and customary law

The tension between state law and customary law in Indonesia is not merely a technical matter concerning procedural or institutional differences, but rather an epistemological and political conflict over who has the right to define justice, where justice derives its legitimacy, and whose value system takes priority in resolving social disputes. Since the establishment of the modern nation-state, state law has tended to claim a monopoly over the formal judicial system with the logic that only the state has the legitimate authority to adjudicate, punish, and restore social order (Teeple, 2025). This claim is reinforced by the tradition of positive law, which holds that statutes, written regulations, and formal judicial institutions are the only legitimate sources of law. However, amid Indonesia's diverse social reality, which is supported by hundreds of indigenous communities with their own laws and justice mechanisms, this claim to monopoly appears increasingly problematic.

In the tradition of legal positivism inherited from Continental European colonialism, law is understood as a legitimate command from the highest authority, in this case, the state, which is objectified in the form of written rules and enforced through official institutions (Faisal et al., 2024). This model gave rise to what Griffiths calls legal centralism, namely the idea that only state law is law, while other social norms are non-law or merely non-binding customs. Within this framework, customary law is only given space to the extent that it is recognised and legitimised by the state, often through the formula of being alive and in accordance with national interests.

The validity of customary law is placed in a subordinate and contingent position, rather than as an autonomous legal system with its own authority (Mukaddam, 2024). This concept is contrary to Eugen Ehrlich's idea of living law, namely that the law that actually governs society is the law that lives in everyday social practice, not merely that written in law books. The connection and clash between state law and living law create a field of latent conflict in the Indonesian legal system, because on the one hand, the state claims a monopoly on formal justice. On the other hand, indigenous communities continue to practise a form of justice that is alive, known, and trusted by their own communities.

Community-based restorative justice then emerged as a serious challenge to Indonesia's centralised, procedural-positive law paradigm (Jakir & Haeranah, 2025). In the formal criminal justice system, crime is understood as a violation against the state, so that the state appears as the primary victim with the right to take over the conflict from those directly affected, namely the victim and the perpetrator. The judicial process becomes a technocratic arena in which law enforcement officials subjugate victims and perpetrators to rigid, formal roles.

In the logic of restorative justice, as formulated by Howard Zehr and John Braithwaite, crime is understood as a violation against people and social relations. The focus is not on retribution, but on restoration, namely the restoration of the victim's dignity, meaningful accountability from the perpetrator, and the restoration of community harmony. When this logic is implemented in indigenous communities, it not only becomes an alternative model for dispute resolution but also a form of epistemic resistance to the state's claim that only the formal system can validly uphold justice. Restorative customary justice shows that, in many

contexts, community laws are more sensitive to victims' needs and more effective at restoring social relations than formal verdicts that result in imprisonment without reconciliation.

Many cases across Indonesia show that communities have greater faith in customary mechanisms for resolving disputes because they are considered more humane, faster, and more context-specific (Suhardono et al., 2024). In disputes over land between families, conflicts between villagers, violations of morality, and even sensitive cases of violence, customary institutions are often the first and foremost port of call. At the same time, formal courts are the last resort or are even avoided altogether. This trust is not without reason. Customary mechanisms usually involve deliberation, mediation, and dialogue that consider not only legal aspects but also kinship relations, shame, and collective honour (Anyieth, 2025).

Customary sanctions are often both symbolic and substantive, taking the form of fines, public apologies, peace rituals, or other socially recognised restorative measures. At this point, a fundamental tension arises for the state, because many of these customary decisions are not formally recorded, do not follow formal legal procedures, and are therefore considered informal or non-legal. Meanwhile, for indigenous peoples, it is precisely these decisions that are most recognised, feared, and obeyed. This tension shows that the concept of justice is not singular but plural, layered, and highly dependent on the community's cultural framework and recognised social authority structures.

Instead of viewing law as a single system monopolised by the state, legal pluralism views that various normative systems can coexist in a society: state law, customary law, religious norms, community rules, and even corporate rules (Fabra-Zamora, 2022). Griffiths refers to this pluralism as strong legal pluralism, in which these legal systems have their own logic, sanction mechanisms, and forms of authority, without depending on state recognition. Indonesia is a concrete example of this kind of pluralism.

In many regions, customary law, religious law, and state law intersect, compete, or compromise in regulating community life (Jayantiari et al., 2025). In this plural landscape, the state's claim to a monopoly on formal justice appears increasingly difficult to defend, not only sociologically but also morally. When communities choose customary mechanisms to resolve disputes, they are in fact affirming that justice need not come from the state and that the moral legitimacy of a decision can arise from community recognition, rather than just the stamp of a formal institution. In this context, community-based restorative justice can be seen as a manifestation of living law that challenges the dominance of state law. Living law here does not merely refer to customs passed down from generation to generation, but rather a practice of justice that has social cohesion and is internalised as a shared moral norm (Widjajanto et al., 2025).

When an indigenous community holds a customary hearing to resolve a conflict, what is taking place is not merely social mediation, but a substantive judicial process, i.e., there is a forum, there is a recognised authority (traditional elders, customary institutions), there are norms to refer to, there are mechanisms of proof, and there are sanctions imposed. The difference with the formal system is the value orientation and perspective towards the perpetrator and the victim. In many indigenous communities, perpetrators are not removed from the community through imprisonment, but are reprimanded, reintegratively shamed, and required to repair the damage they have caused (Gaffney et al., 2024). This aligns with Braithwaite's theory of reintegrative shaming, in which shame is used not to exclude the perpetrator permanently, but to reintegrate them into the community after they acknowledge their wrongdoing and make amends. The state, accustomed to viewing sanctions as formal imprisonment and fines, often struggles to understand this logic of justice and therefore tends to dismiss it as non-legal.

Shifting to a critical and socio-legal perspective, justice derives its legitimacy precisely from the acceptance and recognition of those affected by the decision (Kirby & WELSH, 2025). Within Habermas' framework, legitimacy arises from a process of free and rational

communication between equal parties (Latif et al., 2025). In many customary practices, although not ideal and still containing certain power relations, there is room for deliberation that allows victims and perpetrators to voice their views and reach a mutually acceptable agreement (Kirkwood, 2022). From the perspective of justice as recognition, customary mechanisms are often better able to recognise the identity, dignity, and experiences of victims than formal court proceedings, which tend to reduce them to mere evidence. This is where customary justice derives its legitimacy, not from legislation, but from the moral and social recognition of the community. However, recognition of the legitimacy of customary justice should not fall into uncritical romanticisation.

The relationship between state law and living law is not only one of harmony, but also of conflicting interests and power imbalances. The state often uses narratives of modernity, rationality, and legal certainty to delegitimise customary practices deemed traditional, unscientific, or in violation of human rights (Hibbatulloh et al., 2025; Kurniawan et al., 2025). Conversely, some indigenous communities can also use tradition as a pretext to maintain patriarchal or hierarchical structures that are discriminatory.

This is where the integration of various theories of justice is essential in assessing and directing the transformation of both systems. Restorative justice theory reminds us that every dispute resolution mechanism must be oriented towards restoring victims and social relations, not merely maintaining authority. Legal pluralism theory emphasises that the recognition of customary law should not be simply symbolic but must be reflected in the real distribution of authority (Al Hamid et al., 2025; Muttaqin et al., 2025; Nuriskandar et al., 2025). Meanwhile, contextual justice theory emphasises that universal standards such as human rights must be translated and negotiated within local cultural contexts rather than unthinkingly imposed (Parhi et al., 2025).

The tension between state law and customary law also reveals that the concept of justice itself is plural and multi-layered. From a positivist perspective, justice is often reduced to legal certainty, since as long as the rules are applied consistently, justice is considered achieved. However, from the perspective of indigenous communities, justice is much more complex, encompassing a sense of peace, harmony, honour, inter-family relationships, and even cosmic balance. A decision that is formally correct under state law may be considered unfair by the community because it ignores the context of relationships and values in society. Conversely, a customary decision considered fair by the community may be deemed invalid by the state if it does not comply with formal procedures. The clash between these two logics of justice shows that there is no single definition of justice that can be applied universally without accounting for cultural context.

At the political level, the state's monopoly over the formal judicial system is in fact also a control strategy. By concentrating the authority to interpret the law in state institutions, such as the police, the prosecutor's office, and the courts, the state positions itself as the only legitimate actor in managing social conflicts. The authority of indigenous communities to resolve disputes is seen as an exception that can be revoked at any time. Indigenous community-based restorative justice, when practised more systematically and recognised by citizens, becomes a form of decentralised justice that subtly challenges this centralism. It shows that communities can manage their own conflicts, enforce their own norms, and restore harmony without always relying on the state apparatus. In the context of an ideal democracy, this is not a threat but an opportunity to expand citizen participation in the administration of justice. However, from the perspective of a state accustomed to monopolising authority, there are concerns about fragmentation, disorder, and loss of control, so that the state's response is often ambiguous: on the one hand, it recognises adat in discourse, but on the other hand, it maintains the dominance of formal procedures.

If we take this further, the connection and conflict between state law and living law in Indonesia are essentially debates over the source of legitimacy and the direction of justice

transformation. Integrating theory into the analysis of this phenomenon shows that a solution cannot be found by affirming one and negating the other. Placing state law as the sole source of justice means disregarding the fact that millions of Indonesians live and interact within a framework of absolute customary values and authority. Conversely, absolutising customary justice without criticism means ignoring the potential for abuse of power in local communities and undermining efforts to guarantee the rights of individuals who may be marginalised. This is where the importance of a meaningful synthesis lies: a configuration of justice that recognises the plurality of legal systems, respects local wisdom, and at the same time upholds the basic principles of humanity, equality, and the protection of vulnerable groups.

Community-based restorative justice can be understood as a potential meeting point between local justice and universal values. It combines cultural sensitivity, recognising that conflicts and their resolution are always linked to concrete social relations, with broader moral principles such as responsibility, restoration, and respect for human dignity. The integration of restorative justice theory with the concept of living law recognises that indigenous practices are not merely a legacy of the past, but a source of inspiration for imagining a more humanistic and participatory future of justice. At the same time, integrating contextual justice theory and human rights reminds us that not all customary practices must be preserved; some must be revised, negotiated, or even abandoned when proven to perpetuate structural injustice.

2. Restorative Justice as a Practice of Legal Decolonisation

The most tangible legacy of legal colonialism in Indonesia is evident in the way the criminal justice system is structured and operated. Even the newly enacted Criminal Code remains intertwined with the conceptual structure of the *Wetboek van Strafrecht* (Penal Code) from the Dutch East Indies era, which was oriented towards punishment, deterrence, and the maintenance of colonial order (Butt, 2023). In the colonial paradigm, the colonised population was positioned as objects of control rather than as citizens whose dignity and social relations deserved restoration when violations occurred (Chechi, 2023). This logic continues to resonate in contemporary legal practice because crime is understood as a violation against the state, so that the state takes over conflicts from the community, monopolises the right to punish, and marginalises the dimension of social restoration. Prison, fines, and criminal records became the main symbols of justice. At the same time, the feelings of victims, community balance, and the restoration of human relations were relegated to secondary status or ignored altogether.

Legal decolonisation, in this sense, is not merely a matter of replacing colonial legal products with national ones, but of shifting the way we think about law and justice (Diala, 2024). The decolonial approach criticises the assumption that modern Western law is universal and neutral, while opening up space for other epistemologies by interpreting the world through the experiences, values, and histories of silenced local communities. Within this framework, the practice of customary justice in Indonesia can no longer be seen merely as folkloric local wisdom, but as a legitimate epistemic source for formulating alternative models of justice.

In many indigenous communities in Indonesia, justice is understood as a process of restoring disturbed balance, not merely inflicting suffering as retribution for violations. Inter-family conflicts, land disputes, violations of moral norms, and even some instances of violence are seen as events that tear apart the social and spiritual networks that support the community. Therefore, the response to these violations is not individual and retributive, but collective and restorative, as the victim's family, the perpetrator's family, traditional elders, and other community members participate in deliberations to acknowledge wrongdoing, address losses, and repair relationships. Customary sanctions can take the form of fines in the form of objects, ritual obligations, community service, or other symbolic actions aimed at restoring dignity rather than merely punishment. This perspective, when compared to the modern criminal law

paradigm, appears to be a deviation, but viewed through a decolonial lens, it is an expression of an epistemology of justice suppressed by colonial law's hegemony.

When the state began adopting the discourse of restorative justice into its policies, it often did so within a framework that remained very positivistic and procedural. Restorative justice is reduced to a model of penal mediation facilitated by the authorities, limited to certain types of crimes, and framed within the concept of law enforcement discretion (Maglione, 2022). The basic structure of the criminal justice system, which places the state at the centre, procedure as truth, and imprisonment as the main sanction, remains virtually untouched. Under these conditions, restorative justice risks becoming a technocratic instrument for efficiently handling cases rather than for changing perspectives on justice. This is where the importance of placing customary restorative justice as a practice of decolonisation lies: it is not merely a local version of policies imported from Western theory, but a long-standing tradition that has the potential to subvert the colonial legal domination that still resides within the state.

The idea of epistemological defiance becomes relevant in this context. Customary restorative justice, when consistently implemented and socially recognised by the community, is a form of silent rejection of the claim that only state law can legitimately define and manage justice. Indigenous communities that choose to resolve conflicts through customary mechanisms, rather than bringing cases to formal courts, are in fact engaging in decolonial action by asserting that the source of legitimacy for justice lies not only in the text of the law, but also in the norms that are alive and recognised by themselves. Here, decolonisation does not present itself as harsh rhetoric of resistance, but as a daily practice in which communities maintain and develop their own justice systems. This action challenges the epistemic superiority of modern law, which claims to be the only rational model of justice. It opens up space for the recognition that there are many ways to be fair, many ways to repair social damage, and many ways to rebuild human relationships.

From the perspective of legal pluralism, the space for decolonisation through customary restorative justice becomes increasingly apparent. Legal pluralism rejects the view of legal centralism, which holds that only state law is worthy of being called law (Fabra-Zamora, 2022). Instead, it recognises the existence of various normative systems that coexist, interact, and often compete in regulating behaviour. In Indonesia, customary law, religious law, and state law are the three principal axes that intertwine and collide. Community-based restorative justice operates in a space where living law, that is, law that truly lives in social practice, challenges and negotiates the boundaries of state law.

When citizens more widely obey customary rulings than court rulings, when customary sanctions are more effective in preventing further conflict than imprisonment, when reconciliation rituals are more effective in healing victims' wounds than mere guilty verdicts, it becomes clear that the state does not monopolise the legitimacy of justice. However, the decolonisation of law through customary restorative justice cannot be separated from questions about the sovereignty of indigenous communities. As long as the state only partially and conditionally recognises the rights of indigenous peoples, or only as long as they are alive and in line with national interests, the space for customary justice will always be vulnerable and can be restricted at any time. Decolonisation demands a more radical recognition that indigenous communities are not merely objects of protection, but subjects with the authority to determine their own way of life, including how to resolve conflicts and uphold justice. In this framework, indigenous restorative justice becomes one of the pillars of that sovereignty because it marks the community's ability to manage social wounds, regulate internal relations, and implement the norms they themselves have formulated.

Recognition of this sovereignty is not only a matter of legal regulation of authority, but also a matter of recognising that the epistemology of justice they adhere to is valid, dignified, and worthy of standing on equal footing with the epistemology of state law. Positioning indigenous restorative justice as a practice of decolonisation does not mean absolutising it as

a form of justice free of problems. Like all social systems, indigenous communities can also be characterised by hierarchy, patriarchy, and unequal power relations. Critical decolonisation must be able to distinguish between restorative values that restore collective dignity and indigenous practices that perpetuate injustice against vulnerable groups. At this point, legal decolonisation requires dialogue between universal human rights principles and local values that exist within communities (Ibrahim et al., 2024; Insani et al., 2024).

Decolonial customary restorative justice is not closed to criticism; instead, it dares to reflect on itself, correct discriminatory aspects, and expand the space for participation for women, children, and marginalised groups (Hayatullah, Ikhsan, et al., 2025; Wiranti et al., 2025). When viewed from a longer historical perspective, the practice of customary justice in Indonesia actually predates the emergence of colonial and national law. It has been the primary means for local communities to maintain order, heal wounds, and preserve social balance long before the introduction of written rules.

Colonialism held that only written law was rational and modern, so customary law had to be administered, codified, or even ignored if it conflicted with colonial interests. After independence, many post-colonial countries, including Indonesia, inherited this legal structure without thoroughly criticising the underlying epistemic logic. Customary restorative justice, when placed in this context, is a memory that has not been completely extinguished about another way of administering justice, one that was not born in a colonial laboratory, but from the historical experience of the community itself. Reviving this method, not exclusively and unthinkingly, but through critical reflection, is part of the effort to restore stolen legal memory and identity.

3. Legitimacy and Risks of Institutionalising Customary Justice

When indigenous restorative justice mechanisms are adopted into the formal system, whether through provisions in the Criminal Code, the Draft Criminal Code, other legislation, or law enforcement policies such as prosecution or police guidelines, what occurs is not merely a technical alignment, but a clash between two different logics of justice. The logic of customary justice is based on harmony, balance, and the restoration of social relations, where conflict is understood as a rupture in the network of relationships that must be healed collectively. Meanwhile, the logic of state law, which remains strongly influenced by colonial and positivist legal traditions, views crime as a violation of state authority that warrants a measured response in the form of formal sanctions. When the state says it recognises customary justice and incorporates it into law, it is not simply accepting it; it is also performing a forced translation, drawing customary values into cold, abstract legal language. This process risks cutting off the symbolic, spiritual, and relational dimensions that are at the heart of customary justice, leaving only a procedural framework that appears restorative but has lost its socio-cultural spirit.

This risk of domestication is evident when the state regulates customary restorative justice in the form of rigid administrative requirements, limiting the types of cases that can be resolved restoratively, requiring agreements to be recorded in official reports, requiring certain parties to be present in a formal capacity, and requiring the results to be controllable or voidable by law enforcement officials. On the surface, this appears to be an effort to ensure accountability; however, at a deeper level, the state is subtly placing customary mechanisms under its own supervision and legal criteria. Customary justice no longer stands as an autonomous system of justice. Still, it has been downgraded to a legitimate alternative dispute resolution mechanism if it meets the standards set by formal law.

This is a form of domestication because the state is saying, 'we recognise you, as long as you conform to our understanding of justice'. The epistemic and normative autonomy of indigenous communities is reduced to merely a local variation of the state's broader legal framework, no longer a truly equal source of justice. On the other hand, completely rejecting

institutionalisation is not a simple option. Without formal recognition and protection, customary justice risks being continuously marginalised and weakened, especially when faced with capital interests, development projects, or authorities that repressively enforce national law.

Indigenous communities may have practical and socially legitimate dispute-resolution mechanisms, but when confronted by authorities, these mechanisms are suddenly deemed invalid simply because they are not written into law. At this point, state recognition of customary justice appears to be a strategic necessity because it provides a formal basis for communities to negotiate their rights, protest the criminalisation of customary practices, and demand space in public policy (Jackson & Stratford-Tuke, 2023; Nurizka, Islami, et al., 2025; Wahyudi et al., 2025). A dilemma is inevitable because recognition is needed to survive and strengthen positions, but misguided recognition can become a tool of control from above.

The debate between cultural autonomy and national integration is particularly evident in this context. Modern nation-states, including Indonesia, are built on the idea of integration, with all regions and population groups united under a single national legal framework to promote certainty and unity (Kamisuna, 2023; Rembulan et al., 2025; Riandi et al., 2025). In this logic, legal pluralism is often seen as a threat because the existence of multiple justice systems is perceived as capable of causing disorder, jurisdictional conflicts, or even threats to national interests. On the other hand, indigenous communities claim the right to maintain distinct value systems and justice systems as integral to their cultural identity and history.

Normatively, state recognition of indigenous justice should ideally be enabling rather than controlling, as the state's role is to create a general framework that protects, facilitates, and provides space, rather than to format and control the content (Widjajanto et al., 2025). Within this framework, the institutionalisation of customary justice should be carried out through principles that guarantee community autonomy by recognising the authority of customary institutions to resolve certain disputes, recognising the validity and binding nature of customary decisions, and recognising that customary procedures do not have to be identical to formal judicial procedures, as long as they do not violate the basic principles of human rights. Unfortunately, in practice, the state tends to adopt a logic of control whereby customary justice is allowed to exist, but within a space that is fenced in by certain conditions, with the types of cases limited, procedures made as close as possible to the formalities of state law, and formal apparatus retaining the right of veto. The autonomy of indigenous communities in developing their own restorative mechanisms is reduced, as they are forced to conform to forms deemed legal by the state.

Efforts to incorporate the principles of restorative justice into the Draft Criminal Code or law enforcement regulations can be interpreted in two ways that conflict with each other (Maglione, 2021). On the one hand, this can be seen as a form of progress because the state recognises the importance of recovery, peace, and victim participation in the case resolution process, and opens up space for out-of-court settlements. On the other hand, when the accommodated mechanism is closer to a formal mediation model facilitated by the authorities than to organic, living customary settlement practices, what occurs is not recognition of local wisdom, but rather recolonisation with a new face.

Restorative justice is reduced to a criminal policy instrument whose function is pragmatic in reducing prison overcrowding, expediting the settlement of minor cases, or building a humanistic image of law enforcement institutions (Aminah et al., 2024; Karimullah, 2023). Customary values, such as the symbolism of peace rituals, community involvement as subjects, and the restoration of long-term relationships, are not inherent in the design of this policy, but merely inspiration that can be taken or left behind as needed.

If recognition is carried out by treating customary justice as an extension of formal criminal policy, the legitimacy that results is instrumental legitimacy, in which customary justice is used only to the extent it helps manage the state's legal system. However, if

recognition is intended to affirm that indigenous communities have their own authority to define and realise justice, then the legitimacy strengthened is substantive legitimacy, because indigenous justice is recognised for containing values and rationalities that are valid in their own right, on a par with state law (Rifa'i et al., 2025). This difference is significant because it determines whether institutionalisation leads to empowerment or subjugation. In the pluralistic context of Indonesia, with its history steeped in centralism, the risk that institutionalisation will lead to subjugation is very real and must therefore be critically highlighted.

Once the state begins to recognise customary institutions as formal partners, there is often a need to standardise structures, issue written rules, and appoint official representatives. This process can have ambivalent effects. On the one hand, it can clarify authority, prevent unwarranted claims in the name of custom, and provide certainty for outside parties. On the other hand, it risks concentrating power in the hands of a small elite of customary leaders who are close to the authorities. At the same time, the logic of formalities erodes the diversity of local practices that were previously flexible and participatory. Customary institutions that originally functioned based on social recognition can be transformed into small bureaucracies bound by procedures and reports, and even vulnerable to manipulation for local political interests (Hayatullah, Rohman, et al., 2025; Nurizka, Jamil, et al., 2025).

In this situation, the institutionalisation of customary justice at the state level can, ironically, give rise to internal colonialism at the community level, because power that was previously dispersed and negotiated collectively becomes concentrated in institutions that have received the state's legal stamp of approval. From the perspective of victims and perpetrators, institutionalisation also carries the risk that customary justice will lose its intimacy and flexibility (Ayu et al., 2025).

When customary settlement processes must be attended by officials, formally documented, and regulated according to standard procedures, the space for informal dialogue and authentic emotional processes can narrow. Victims may feel less free to express their pain and need. At the same time, the perpetrators may view the process as merely an administrative requirement to avoid formal legal proceedings, rather than a genuine opportunity to take responsibility and change.

When customary restorative mechanisms are brought into the logic of formal law, they may become merely a procedural shortcut, losing the moral and relational dimensions that give them their power (Widjajanto et al., 2025). Here, the state may succeed in adopting the outward form of customary justice but fail to internalise the values that make it meaningful to the community. However, it must be acknowledged that not all forms of institutionalisation must end in domestication. It is possible that, through careful negotiation, state recognition can be structured to expand the scope of customary justice without eroding its identity.

The state must have the courage to acknowledge that it is not the sole source of justice, and be prepared to adopt the principles of legal pluralism substantively, not merely symbolically. For example, the state can recognise that for certain types of disputes, such as internal conflicts within indigenous communities, disputes over customary land, or certain violations that directly impact social cohesion, indigenous institutions have primary jurisdiction. In contrast, formal institutions only play a minimal supervisory role to ensure that fundamental rights are not violated. The state can also provide resource support, capacity-building and political protection for indigenous institutions without imposing specific forms and procedures. In this kind of model, institutionalisation becomes a bridge, not a cage.

D. Conclusion

Restorative justice in indigenous communities is not merely a reflection of traditional values, but a form of epistemic resistance against the state's monopoly on justice. Amidst a national legal system that remains shackled by a colonial legacy that punishes rather than

restores, indigenous communities demonstrate that true justice grows from social spaces where people recognise one another, not from rigid legal texts that are far removed from lived experience. The tension between state law and customary law is not a mistake that must be erased, but an essential arena in which this nation learns about the plurality of truth and the moral sovereignty of society. Through living and organic restorative practices, indigenous communities affirm that justice is not singular, as it has multiple faces, is rooted in context, and is valid only to the extent that it restores harmony to communal life. Thus, customary restorative justice is not an alternative to state law, but a reminder that the state itself needs ethical and cultural correction to avoid losing its human dimension.

When the state attempts to institutionalise customary justice through formal regulations, a dangerous paradox arises whereby recognition intended to protect can instead tame. States that recognise customary law often impose their own language and procedures, subjugating living values to a sterile, hierarchical legal framework. It is at this point that political courage and a new legal imagination are needed, with the courage to create a legal system that not only tolerates differences but makes them its foundation. The state must transform itself from a ruler of truth into a guardian of dialogue between legal systems, allowing indigenous communities to administer justice with moral autonomy, while still guaranteeing protection for vulnerable groups. The future of Indonesian law will not be determined by how many new laws are passed, but by the extent to which the law dares to learn from the wisdom of indigenous communities, places where justice is not only upheld but also lived.

E. Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express their sincere appreciation to the journal's Editor and the anonymous reviewers for their careful evaluation of the manuscript and for the constructive, detailed feedback provided throughout the review process. Their insightful comments, methodological suggestions, and editorial guidance have substantially strengthened the clarity, rigour, and overall quality of this article, and we are grateful for the time and expertise they dedicated to improving the final version. Any remaining limitations or errors are solely the responsibility of the authors.

References

- Al Hamid, R., Jamil, M. S., Nimah, R., & Siregar, M. A. H. (2025). Political Conflict between Islamic Law and National Law in Indonesia. *Insani: Jurnal Pranata Sosial Hukum Islam*, 1(1), 48–62. <https://doi.org/10.65586/insani.v1i1.4>
- Aminah, S., Sugitanata, A., & Karimullah, S. S. (2024). Restorative Justice for the Survivor of Sexual Violence. *Restorative: Journal of Indonesian Probation and Parole System*, 2(1), 15–23. <https://doi.org/10.61682/restorative.v2i1.10>
- Anyieth, A. K. (2025). African Customary Law and Family Violence. In *Decolonising Family Violence Legal Intervention Orders in African-Australian Communities* (pp. 81–101). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-95404-7_4
- Ayu, R. F., Albab, M. U., Yakin, M. A., & Hibbatulloh, I. (2025). Legal Challenges in Countering Religion-Based Terrorism in Asia. *Jurnal Lentera Insani*, 1(1), 1–15.
- Benda-Beckmann, K. von, & Turner, B. (2018). Legal pluralism, social theory, and the state. *The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, 50(3), 255–274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07329113.2018.1532674>
- Benda-Beckmann, F. von. (2001). Legal pluralism and social justice in economic and political development. *IdS Bulletin*, 32(1), 46–56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-5436.2001.mp32001006.x>
- Boiliu, N. I., Sihombing, A. F., Sampaleng, D., Widjaja, F. I., & Simanjuntak, F. (2022). Human rights: The convergence of the second sila of Pancasila and Hans Kung's global ethics in

- Indonesia. *HTS Theologies Studies/Theological Studies*, 78(4), 6933. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v78i4.6933>
- Braithwaite, J. (2020). Restorative justice and reintegrative shaming. In *Criminal Justice Theory, Volume 26* (pp. 281–308). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003016762-12>
- Braithwaite, J., Braithwaite, V., & Ahmed, E. (2018). Reintegrative shaming 1. In *the essential criminology reader* (pp. 286–296). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429496592-36>
- Butt, S. (2023). Indonesia's new Criminal Code: indigenising and democratising Indonesian criminal law? *Griffith Law Review*, 32(2), 190–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10383441.2023.2243772>
- Chechi, A. (2023). The return of cultural objects displaced during colonialism. What role for restorative justice, transitional justice and alternative dispute resolution? *The International Journal of Restorative Justice*, 6(1), 95–118. <https://doi.org/10.5553/TIJRJ.000060>
- Diala, A. C. (2024). The Case against Decolonization: A Legal Perspective. In *Beyond Decolonial African Philosophy* (pp. 212–231). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781032683522-15>
- Fabra-Zamora, J. L. (2022). The conceptual problems arising from legal pluralism. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society/La Revue Canadienne Droit et Société*, 37(1), 155–175. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cls.2021.39>
- Faisal, Yanto, A., Rahayu, D. P., Haryadi, D., Darmawan, A., & Manik, J. D. N. (2024). Genuine paradigm of criminal justice: rethinking penal reform within Indonesia New Criminal Code. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 10(1), 2301634. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2301634>
- Gaffney, H., Jolliffe, D., Eggins, E., Ferreira, J. G., Skinner, G., Ariel, B., & Strang, H. (2024). Protocol: The effect of restorative justice interventions for young people on offending and reoffending: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 20(2), e1403. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1403>
- Hayatullah, M., Ikhsan, M., Ramadhany, S. S. M., Rohman, I. N., & Hidayat, T. (2025). Media Discourse Analysis on Religious Tolerance Issues in Indonesia. *Jurnal Pelita Raya*, 1(1), 61–75. <https://doi.org/10.65586/jpr.v1i1.8>
- Hayatullah, M., Rohman, M. A., & Gonzales, N. (2025). Analysis of Shiite Political Thought in Iran and Its Influence in Indonesia. *Jurnal Lentera Insani*, 1(1), 16–31.
- Hibbatulloh, I., Najhan, A. S., Dzulfikar, M. L., & Maburur, R. (2025). The Secularisation of Islamic Criminal Law and Its Implications for the Protection of Human Rights in Indonesia. *Insani: Jurnal Pranata Sosial Hukum Islam*, 1(1), 17–31. <https://doi.org/10.65586/insani.v1i1.7>
- Ibrahim, Z. S., Karimullah, S. S., Gönan, Y., & Okur, H. (2024). Islamic Law and Human Rights: Convergence or Conflict? *Nurani: Jurnal Kajian Syari'ah Dan Masyarakat*, 24(2), 431–448. <https://doi.org/10.19109/nurani.v24i2.19595>
- Insani, N., Ibrahim, Z. S., Karimullah, S. S., Gönan, Y., & Sulastri, S. (2024). Empowering Muslim Women: Bridging Islamic Law and Human Rights with Islamic Economics. *De Jure: Jurnal Hukum Dan Syar'iah*, 16(1), 88–117. <https://doi.org/10.18860/j-fsh.v16i1.26159>
- Jackson, P., & Stratford-Tuke, V. (2023). Whose security? Whose justice? Customary authorities in security and justice interventions in the Horn of Africa. *Conflict, Security & Development*, 23(6), 611–633. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14678802.2023.2283553>
- Jakir, A. R., & Haeranah, H. (2025). Decentering Justice: Integrating Indigenous Law into State-Led Restorative Justice in an Eastern Indonesian District. *Available at SSRN 5250474*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5250474>
- Jayantiari, I. G. A. M. R., Rumiarta, I. N. P. B., Arjawa, I. G. P. B. S., Laksana, I. G. N. D., & Indradewi, A. A. S. N. (2025). The Rights of Customary Law Communities to Resources: The Relationship of Coexistence of State Law and Customary Law. *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum Dan Keadilan*, 13(1), 187–198. <https://doi.org/10.29303/ius.v13i1.1329>

- Kamisuna, T. (2023). International origin and development of nationalism: Generational transformation of East Timorese nationalism under Indonesia's occupation (1975–1999). *Nations and Nationalism*, 29(3), 1125–1141. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12952>
- Karimullah, S. S. (2023). Prison System Transformation: Delving into Restorative Justice, Rehabilitation, and Religious Life Based on Islamic Law. *FITRAH: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu-Ilmu Keislaman*, 9(2), 201–224. <https://doi.org/10.24952/fitrah.v9i2.8804>
- Kirby, A., & WELSH, L. (2025). Socio-legal studies and criminal justice: Reflections on 'participation.' *Journal of Law and Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jols.12545>
- Kirkwood, S. (2022). A practice framework for restorative justice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 63, 101688. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2021.101688>
- Kurniawan, M. R., Fathony, M. R., Yasin, D. T., Jibu, S. A., & Shamat, A. (2025). Political Analysis of Islamic Law on the Regulation of Interfaith Marriage in Indonesia. *Insani: Jurnal Pranata Sosial Hukum Islam*, 1(1), 32–47. <https://doi.org/10.65586/insani.v1i1.2>
- Latif, F. A., Dahhur, M., & Ramadhany, S. S. M. (2025). Protection of Freedom of Religion in Islamic Law in Secular Turkey and Its Relevance for Indonesia. *Insani: Jurnal Pranata Sosial Hukum Islam*, 1(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.65586/insani.v1i1.1>
- Maglione, G. (2021). Restorative justice and criminal justice reform: Forms, issues and counter-Strategies. In *Handbook of issues in criminal justice reform in the United States* (pp. 717–736). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-77565-0_36
- Maglione, G. (2022). Restorative justice and criminal justice reform: Forms, issues and counter-Strategies. *Handbook of Issues in Criminal Justice Reform in the United States*, 717–736. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-77565-0_36
- Mukaddam, F. (2024). Contextualising Legal Pluralism. In *Muslim Women between Community and Individual Rights: Legal Pluralism and Marriage in South Africa* (pp. 23–43). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-54614-3_3
- Muttaqin, M. A., Rifa'i, S. D., Yahya, H., & Sakinah, H. (2025). The Dynamics of the Relationship between Islamic Law and Customary Law in Inheritance Disputes in Indonesia. *Insani: Jurnal Pranata Sosial Hukum Islam*, 1(1), 80–95. <https://doi.org/10.65586/insani.v1i1.6>
- Nuriskandar, L. H., Muhammad, A. A., Alam, S., & Khiyaroh, L. (2025). The Convergence of Islamic Law and Customary Law in the Management of Zakat in Indonesia and Malaysia. *Insani: Jurnal Pranata Sosial Hukum Islam*, 1(1), 63–79. <https://journal.mahkotascience.org/index.php/insani/article/view/5>
- Nurizka, M. S., Islami, A., Rofi'ieh, M., & Dzulfikar, M. L. (2025). Criticism of the Neoclassical Approach in Islamic Economic Policy in Indonesia. *Jurnal Pelita Raya*, 1(1), 17–30. <https://doi.org/10.65586/jpr.v1i1.9>
- Nurizka, M. S., Jamil, M. S., & Sholeh, B. (2025). Analysis of the Impact of Sharia Regulations on Halal Trade in Southeast Asia. *Jurnal Lentera Insani*, 1(1), 32–47.
- Parhi, N. Z., Hudafi, H., Pangestu, R., & Elmurtadho, F. (2025). Tension between Islamic Law and Human Rights in Child Marriage Cases in Indonesia. *Insani: Jurnal Pranata Sosial Hukum Islam*, 1(1), 96–110. <https://doi.org/10.65586/insani.v1i1.3>
- Rahardjanto, A., Hudha, A. M., & Permana, T. I. (2025). Ecocultural practices in East Java, Indonesia: A hermeneutic phenomenological study on "Reresik Kali" as local wisdom for river conservation. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 12, 102176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.102176>
- Rembulan, C., Maghfur, I. R., Siregar, M. A. H., Jakfar, M. A., & Solehah, S. (2025). The Impact of the Digital Economy on Economic Empowerment Models for Muslim Youth in Indonesia. *Jurnal Lentera Insani*, 1(1), 48–63.
- Riandi, M. R., Safitri, A., & Munawaroh, K. (2025). Indonesian Diaspora Halal Cuisine as Cultural Diplomacy. *Jurnal Lentera Insani*, 1(1), 64–79.
- Rifa'i, S. D., Siregar, M. A. H., Utami, I. P., Mujahid, A., & Fakhis, A. Z. P. (2025).

- Deconstructing Colonial Law Through Critical Race Theory in Indonesian Regulations. *Jurnal Pelita Raya*, 1(1), 46–60. <https://doi.org/10.65586/jpr.v1i1.12>
- Suhardono, S., Fitria, L., Septiariva, I. Y., Sari, M. M., Ulhasanah, N., Prayogo, W., Arifianingsih, N. N., Buana, D. M. A., & Suryawan, I. W. K. (2024). Community-centric importance and performance evaluation of human-orangutan conflict management in Aceh, Indonesia. *Trees, Forests and People*, 15, 100510. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tfp.2024.100510>
- Tamanaha, B. Z. (2020). Sociological jurisprudence past and present. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 45(2), 493–520. <https://doi.org/10.1017/lsi.2019.26>
- Teeple, G. (2025). The Law and Judiciary. In *The Democracy That Never Was: A Critique of Liberal Democracy* (pp. 349–417). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-68020-5_9
- von Benda-Beckmann, F. (2002). Who's Afraid of Legal Pluralism? *The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, 34(47), 37–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07329113.2002.10756563>
- Wahyudi, Mahrus, Kurniyadi, Munawwarah, U. D., & Khoiruddin. (2025). Carl Rogers' Humanistic Approach in Character Education in Pesantren. *Jurnal Pelita Raya*, 1(1), 31–45. <https://doi.org/10.65586/jpr.v1i1.10>
- Wangga, M. S. E. (2022). Implementation of Restorative Justice in Criminal Cases in Indonesia. *Law and Humanities Quarterly Reviews*, 1(3). <https://doi.org/10.31014/aior.1996.01.03.25>
- Widjajanto, A., Astawa, I. G. P., & Rulyandi, M. (2025). Decolonising restorative justice in Indonesia: a comparative study across Customary Law traditions. *Legality: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum*, 33(2), 470–492. <https://doi.org/10.22219/ljih.v33i2.40481>
- Wiranti, B., Latif, F. A., Hibbatulloh, I., Sakinah, H., & Hidayatullah, M. W. (2025). Political Feminism and Women's Representation in Public Policy in Indonesia. *Jurnal Pelita Raya*, 1(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.65586/jpr.v1i1.11>
- Wood, W. R., Suzuki, M., Hayes, H., & Bolitho, J. (2021). Roadblocks and diverging paths for restorative justice in Australia and Aotearoa/New Zealand. In *Comparative restorative justice* (pp. 197–221). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-74874-6_10
- Zehr, H. (2017). A restorative lens. In *Restorative Justice* (pp. 31–68). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315264868-3>
- Zehr, H., & Mika, H. (2017). Fundamental concepts of restorative justice. In *Restorative Justice* (pp. 73–81). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351150125-4>
- Zhao, G., Guo, L., & Ma, X. (2025). Bridging Law and Custom: Resolving Bridge Worship Disputes in Grassroots China Through Pluralistic Integration. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law-Revue Internationale de Sémiotique Juridique*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-025-10324-6>