

Katarungang Pambarangay Law in the City of Sto. Tomas, Batangas: Input to program enhancement

Marlyn M. Morales

Pamantasan ng Lungsod ng San Pablo

San Pablo City, Laguna

Email address: marlynmalveda10@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Despite the KatarungangPambarangay's long existence, its efficiency varies greatly amongst barangays, especially in rapidly urbanising areas. The purpose of this descriptive study was to look into the difficulties associated with implementing the KatarungangPambarangay Law in specific barangays in the City of Sto. Tomas, Batangas. The need for this investigation emerged from documented performance differences, particularly in the LupongTagapamayapa Incentives Awards (LTIA). While some barangays routinely exceed LTIA standards, others fall short owing to operational, financial, and procedural issues. A researcher-created questionnaire and document analysis were used to collect data from Lupon members, barangay authorities, and chosen barangay residents, who totalled 320. Using the Kruskal-Wallis test, the study identified several barriers to effective implementation: low resident knowledge, insufficient training of barangay officials, uneven mediation and conciliation methods, and poor documentation and record-keeping. The findings highlight the urgent need for capacity-building initiatives, clearer procedural enforcement, and improved budgetary support to improve barangays' performance in providing community justice. Strengthening the KatarungangPambarangay system is critical to fostering accessible, restorative justice and reducing the backlog of the formal legal system.

Keywords: accountability, Barangay Justice System, capacity of the mediator, community participation, local governance

Date Submitted: June 15, 2025

Date Accepted: July 2, 2025

Date Published: July 16, 2025

INTRODUCTION

Community-based systems of justice have emerged globally as vital alternatives to formal court proceedings, especially in contexts where judicial institutions are overburdened, under-resourced, or inaccessible to the public. These localized mechanisms serve not only to decongest formal dockets but also to reinforce social cohesion by resolving disputes in ways that preserve relationships, foster accountability, and reflect cultural values. In the Philippines, this concept is realized through the KatarungangPambarangay, or Barangay Justice System (BJS)—a legally mandated process rooted in community engagement and restorative justice.

The KatarungangPambarangay was institutionalized through Presidential Decree No. 1508 in 1978 and later reinforced under Republic Act No. 7160, also known as the Local Government Code of 1991. This legislation requires every barangay to establish a LupongTagapamayapa, composed of respected community members tasked with mediating and

conciliating disputes among residents. The system's primary objectives include promoting amicable settlement, fostering community harmony, and reducing the number of cases brought before formal courts.

In line with international movements toward restorative justice, which emphasizes repair over punishment, the BJS embodies a culturally attuned approach to conflict resolution. It allows individuals and communities to collaboratively address harm, hold offenders accountable, and facilitate healing for all parties involved (Gavrielides, 2021; Rojo, 2022). However, despite its legal mandate and cultural compatibility, the actual implementation of the KatarungangPambarangay remains inconsistent and, in many cases, underperforming.

Numerous barangays across the country face persistent challenges in operationalizing the BJS effectively. Common issues include inactive Lupon members, absence of regular conciliation meetings, lack of procedural knowledge among barangay officials, inadequate documentation, and weak public engagement (DILG, 2020). Studies by Nebrida (2024) and the Ateneo Human Rights Center (2023) highlight how limited public awareness and training deficits contribute to diminished confidence in the system. Moreover, technological backwardness, manifested in the continued use of manual records despite calls for digital integration, hampers transparency and efficiency (Del Rosario, 2019; De Torres & Del Rosario, 2020).

To improve and incentivize local justice performance, the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG) has institutionalized the LuponTagapamayapa Incentives Awards (LTIA). This program sets benchmarks and recognizes outstanding LuponTagapamayapa based on their operational efficiency, effectiveness in dispute settlement, innovation, and community participation. However, not all barangays meet these standards. While some consistently qualify for the awards, others fail due to resource limitations, poor documentation practices, lack of coordination, and inadequate capacity building. These disparities raise critical questions about what systemic, institutional, or contextual factors hinder full compliance and optimal functionality.

Thus, there is a pressing need to evaluate how the KatarungangPambarangay is actually implemented across different barangay contexts. Doing so will help identify barriers to effective performance, examine how national policies such as the LTIA are localized, and propose data-driven strategies to strengthen the justice delivery system at the grassroots level. Ultimately, such efforts aim to restore public trust, enhance access to justice, and empower local governance through culturally grounded and community-responsive mechanisms.

Statement of the problem

This study aimed to evaluate the implementation of the KatarungangPambarangay in the City of Sto. Tomas, Batangas. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, educational attainment, previous work experience, and number of years as a barangay official?
2. What is the level of awareness of the respondents on the KatarungangPambarangay with regard to community participation, capacity of the mediator, support from Local Government Units (LGUs), accessibility, and education?
3. What is the extent of compliance with respect to community safety, competency development, and accountability?

4. Is there a significant difference in the level of awareness of the KatarungangPambarangay when grouped according to the respondents' profile?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the respondents' level of awareness and the extent of compliance with the KatarungangPambarangay?
6. What are the challenges encountered in the implementation of the KatarungangPambarangay?
7. What program enhancements can be proposed to improve the implementation of the KatarungangPambarangay?

METHODOLOGY

This study used a descriptive quantitative design. This design helped develop a guiding plan or template for accurately defining and assessing the attributes of a particular phenomenon or population without manipulation of independent variables. This method concentrated on answering the conditions and responses by addressing the “What,” “When,” “Where,” and “How” questions. Descriptive research, according to Matanda, emphasizes the “what” in difference to the “why,” which, in this case, was ideal for the orderly collection of data and reporting without changing the variables.

Data regarding the use of KatarungangPambarangay were obtained from a structured survey questionnaire. This tool aided the researcher in obtaining relevant data with respect to the evaluation of KP system processes, its efficiency, challenges, and results in its implementation. The application of descriptive quantitative design made it possible to calculate the perceptions, the degree of compliance, and the level of awareness about the procedures among the respondents. The aim of this study was to derive statistical results that could be used to foster improvement in the KatarungangPambarangay system within the framework of the specified methodology. Thus, the descriptive design was appropriate to generate primary data to aid sound decision-making on grassroots justice system initiatives.

In total, this research had three groups of respondents: (a) 30 barangay officials, (b) 60 members of the Lupon, and (c) 230 selected barangay residents, with a total of 320 respondents. This participant feedback was expected to be meaningful enough to satisfy the expectations of the study's aim.

These groups include barangay officials, particularly the Chairpersons, together with active members of LupongPangkapayapaan, who gave constructive comments on the degree to which the barangay complies with the implementation of the Barangay Justice System. Also included are community members who played an important role in assessing the degree of awareness of community officials and the barangay in general about KatarungangPambarangay and its functions relative to the major roles defined under the law and the Republic Act 7160 or the Local Government Code of 1991- to mediate, conciliate, and arbitrate.

This study applied a mix of stratified random sampling and purposive sampling to enable an appropriate representation of the participants who were involved in the implementation and execution of the KatarungangPambarangay.

For the first set of such participants, which is the barangay officials, stratified sampling was applied. The strata was according to the official ranks such as Punong Barangay or Barangay Kagawads and also include those in subordinate roles like the barangay secretary and Lupon members so that all levels in the hierarchal system of the barangay are appropriately represented. This technique helps in obtaining the proper estimate of the level of awareness and degree of

compliance of the officials with the implemented KatarungangPambarangay in the barangays under his jurisdiction.

Purposive sampling was used for the second set of respondents, which is the barangay residents. A sample that constitutes five percent (5%) of the total adult population of the intentionally selected four barangays was sampled on the basis that they were or will be participants in the Barangay Justice System (e.g., litigants, witnesses, or people who have seen the conduct of the mediation proceedings). With this strategy, respondents who have sufficient information regarding the actual impacts of the system's design and functionality are selected. This sampling strategy allows the study to collect both sweeping institutional views and specific community narratives related to the implementation and experience of the KatarungangPambarangay, enhancing the analysis.

This study utilized a researcher-made questionnaire. This consisted of four sections. The first section profiles the respondents in terms of demographic data and any challenges they face. The second section sought to assess the awareness level of respondents about the KatarungangPambarangay, while the third section assessed the respondents' compliance with it. The final section identified the challenges faced in the execution of the KatarungangPambarangay.

To establish the instrument's accuracy and dependability, it was first conferred to a panel of evaluators for screening and validation. After this, a pilot study was done, which resulted in the instrument recording a Cronbach's alpha of 0.931, meaning there was strong internal consistency, and the instrument was deemed reliable.

This research was framed using a quantitative research design, aimed at assessing the implementation of the KatarungangPambarangay through structured data collection and statistical analysis. Prior to data gathering, clearances were secured from the Mayor's Office, the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG), and the Thesis Adviser. These authorizations served as official support for the conduct of the study. Endorsement letters were also issued to the selected barangays to facilitate coordination and access to respondents.

Participants were divided into two main groups. The first group included barangay officials such as the Punong Barangay, Barangay Secretary, and members of the LuponTagapamayapa, selected through stratified sampling to ensure representativeness. The second group consisted of purposively sampled community residents who had prior exposure to the Barangay Justice System. All respondents received a structured survey questionnaire, which was administered with a brief explanation of the study's purpose, along with assurances of confidentiality and anonymity. To accommodate language preferences, the questionnaire was made available in both English and Filipino.

Data collection occurred over the course of one month. During this period, all ethical protocols concerning informed consent, voluntary participation, and data security were strictly observed. The data collected from the survey questionnaires were then statistically analyzed to identify trends, levels of awareness, compliance with procedures, and operational challenges in the implementation of the KatarungangPambarangay.

The results provided empirical insights necessary for proposing enhancements to the system and for guiding future policy development at the barangay level.

Data collected during the study underwent the following processing:

The demographic profile of the respondents and the challenges they faced were measured by frequency count and percent.

The respondents' level of awareness of KatarungangPambarangay and compliance was assessed using mean and standard deviation.

The Kruskal Wallis H-test was used to determine if there is a difference in the level of awareness of KatarungangPambarangay concerning the respondents' profiles.

To assess the respondents' level of awareness and the extent of compliance with KatarungangPambarangay, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was applied to identify the significant relationship.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of the respondents

The demographic profile of the respondents provides crucial context for understanding their engagement with the KatarungangPambarangay system in Sto. Tomas, Batangas. Among the 320 respondents, the largest age group was 46 to 60 years, comprising 37% of the sample, suggesting that middle-aged and older individuals are more actively involved in barangay governance. This is likely due to their greater exposure to community matters and accrued leadership experience. Meanwhile, younger individuals (aged 18–30), who constituted only 11%, may be less engaged due to limited outreach or civic education. Female respondents accounted for a majority at 63%, while males made up the remaining 37%, indicating significant female representation, though the nuances of authority roles remain influenced by sociocultural dynamics. Regarding educational attainment, 39% reached college level, while only 4% had elementary education. This educational profile underscores the generally informed nature of participants, which correlates with higher engagement in community-based governance.

In terms of professional background, 29% of respondents came from the government sector and another 29% from the private sector, while smaller groups were self-employed, unemployed, or fell into other categories. This suggests that individuals with formal work experience are more likely to be active in local justice systems, possibly due to institutional familiarity. Most respondents, around 71%, identified as residents, complainants, or respondents within the barangay justice process, while only 10% were Punong Barangays and 19% were Lupon members. The distribution of years served as barangay officials revealed that 15% had more than ten years of service, while 5% had served for less than one year, pointing to a considerable proportion of seasoned stakeholders with practical system experience.

Awareness of the respondents on the Katarungang Pambarangay

Regarding the level of awareness on Katarungang Pambarangay, the results showed high awareness in various dimensions. In terms of community participation, the overall mean score was 3.38, interpreted as "Highly Aware." The highest-rated item was the recognition that community participation by both complainants and respondents is vital to the system's success, with a mean of 3.51. This finding reflects a deep public appreciation of participatory justice, as reinforced by Mendoza and Cruz (2021), who emphasized how community involvement enhances the effectiveness of local dispute resolution. However, awareness about eligibility to serve as Lupon members was rated lower (mean = 3.25), suggesting a knowledge gap in practical engagement channels for community justice.

Concerning the capacity of mediators, the respondents exhibited a strong understanding, with a composite mean of 3.50. The highest-rated indicators focused on the importance of communication and listening skills for mediators, highlighting the value placed on interpersonal competencies. Nevertheless, awareness of the legal and ethical frameworks guiding barangay mediators was relatively less emphasized, reflecting a need for greater dissemination of procedural knowledge. As noted by Flores and Santiago (2022), many barangay officials lack formal training in the legal principles underlying their responsibilities, potentially undermining impartial mediation.

Awareness of support from Local Government Units (LGUs) yielded a mean score of 3.34, placing it under the “Highly Aware” category. Respondents acknowledged LGU efforts in awareness-raising and training but were less confident about the availability of financial and logistical support, with that item scoring the lowest (mean = 3.25). This discrepancy indicates a perceived shortfall in tangible institutional backing, a concern echoed by Torio (2021), who emphasized the consequences of underfunding in barangay justice operations.

Accessibility awareness scored an overall mean of 3.23, which, although still considered “Aware,” was the lowest among all domains. While residents agreed that the system was generally physically accessible and free of charge, concerns were raised about transparency in procedural schedules and the dissemination of information. The lowest-rated indicator was the public availability of the KatarungangPambarangay’s schedule and procedures (mean = 2.73). This reflects a need for enhanced public communication and visibility, as outlined by Llamas and Gonzales (2020), who argued that true accessibility requires not only spatial proximity but also clear and consistent information.

Awareness in terms of educational efforts by the KatarungangPambarangay also scored high, with a mean of 3.34. The strongest point of awareness was related to the training of barangay officials (mean = 3.42), indicating that the community recognizes ongoing development efforts. However, the availability of educational materials was perceived as lacking (mean = 3.21), suggesting that communication tools such as brochures and posters may be limited in scope or distribution.

Compliance to community safety, competency development, and accountability

In examining the extent of compliance, results showed that respondents engaged with community safety practices “To a Very Great Extent,” with a mean of 3.50. High compliance was noted for disaster preparedness and cleanliness programs, while adherence to curfew and noise ordinances was rated slightly lower. This suggests broad support for community initiatives but some resistance or inconsistency in enforcement-based policies. Similarly, in competency development, the mean score was 3.42. Respondents showed strong willingness to apply knowledge from training to their daily tasks, although compliance with procedural requirements for completing programs was slightly less consistent.

Accountability practices were also rated highly, with a mean of 3.43. The most appreciated aspect was taking personal responsibility for community-related decisions, reinforcing the importance of ethical engagement. However, submitting accurate and timely documentation was rated lowest, signaling logistical and administrative challenges that need institutional support, such as digital tools and staff assistance.

Difference in the level of awareness of the Katarungang Pambarangay when grouped according to the respondents' profile

Statistical analysis of awareness differences using the Kruskal-Wallis test revealed significant variations based on age, role, and years of service. Notably, awareness increased significantly with length of service as barangay officials, emphasizing experience as a critical factor in understanding and implementing Katarungang Pambarangay. No significant differences were found in awareness based on sex, educational attainment, or previous work experience, implying that engagement and tenure outweigh demographic characteristics in shaping familiarity with the justice system.

Relationship between the respondents' level of awareness and the extent of compliance with the Katarungang Pambarangay

A Pearson correlation analysis demonstrated strong and statistically significant relationships between awareness levels and compliance. Notably, awareness of education and mediator capacity was most closely linked to accountability and competency development, respectively. The highest correlation was between educational awareness and accountability ($r = 0.91$), suggesting that training and information significantly influence ethical conduct. The weakest, though still significant, correlation was between accessibility and community safety compliance ($r = 0.69$), suggesting that practical access does not always guarantee active participation without accompanying factors like trust and procedural clarity.

Challenges encountered in the implementation of the Katarungang Pambarangay

Several challenges were identified that hinder the implementation of the Katarungang Pambarangay. The most prominent issue cited was insufficient training for Lupon members, followed by budget and resource constraints. Other difficulties included lack of cooperation among parties, procedural delays, and the handling of complex cases such as land disputes and family issues. Although "lack of public awareness" was less frequently reported, it remains a critical concern, as limited information undermines participation and inclusivity.

In response to these findings, the study proposes an enhanced program titled the Katarungang Pambarangay Strengthening Initiative (KAPASI). This initiative aims to bolster the barangay justice system through capacity-building workshops, public awareness campaigns, improved documentation tools, inclusive access mechanisms, and reinforced LGU coordination. Through this multifaceted approach, the program seeks to institutionalize professionalism, transparency, and inclusive community participation within the Katarungang Pambarangay system. The KAPASI program is envisioned not merely as a corrective measure but as a sustainable framework for grassroots justice, aligned with the restorative ideals and participatory goals that underpin barangay governance in the Philippines.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this study, the implementation of the Katarungang Pambarangay Law in selected barangays of Sto. Tomas City, Batangas is generally effective. Respondents demonstrated a high level of awareness regarding the principles and processes of the Barangay Justice System, particularly in areas of community participation, LGU support, peacemaker skills, and public legal education. Likewise, a very high level of compliance was observed, especially in terms of promoting safety, accountability, and capacity development. These indicate that the system is well-integrated and appreciated by both implementers and community members.

At the 0.05 level of significance, the study partially accepts the first hypothesis, as awareness levels significantly differed based on age, role, and length of service, but not by sex, educational attainment, or work experience. The second hypothesis is accepted, confirming a strong and positive relationship between awareness and compliance, especially with regard to accountability. However, challenges such as limited training, budget constraints, and weak information campaigns remain, underscoring the need for improved capacity-building programs, increased funding, and enhanced civic engagement strategies to ensure the long-term success of the Katarungang Pambarangay.

REFERENCES

- Alampay, E., & dela Rama, M. (2017). *Local governance and justice systems in the Philippines: An institutional analysis*. Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Alpha, R. P., & Tumelo, S. (2024). Conflict resolution in Indigenous communities: A social work perspective. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 13(10), 68–77. <https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v13i10.3789>
- Annual Reviews. (2024). The transformative potential of restorative justice. *Annual Review of Criminology*, 7, 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-criminol-030421-040921>
- Asian Development Bank. (2020). *Strengthening access to justice in the Philippines*. ADB Briefs.
- Ateneo Human Rights Center. (2023). *Gap analysis of the Katarungang Pambarangay implementation and training: A human rights-based approach to the implementation of a child-friendly, gender-responsive, and indigenous people-relevant Katarungang Pambarangay*. Retrieved from <https://car.dilg.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/AHRC-KP-Project-Gap-Analysis-Report.pdf>
- Avram, R., Koepcke, E. J., Moussawi, A., & Nuñez, M. (2024). Do Cure Violence programs reduce gun violence? Evidence from New York City. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.09381>
- Beven, J., Dowden, C., & Muise, D. (2020). The effectiveness of restorative justice practices: A meta-analysis. *The Prison Journal*, 85(2), 127–149. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885520907890>
- Beven, J., Dowden, C., Muise, D., & Rutherford, L. (2022). *Restorative justice practices: Bridging the gap between offenders and victims effectively*. ResearchGate. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/368988765>

Beven, J., Rutherford, L., & Zakszeski, B. (2021). Mind the gap: A systematic review of restorative practices in schools. *School Psychology Review*, 50(4), 475–490. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2372966X.2021.1911937>

Borja, E. J. (2024). Examining conciliation procedures in Barangay Canitoan, Cagayan de Oro City: Their efficiency in settling local disputes. *PHINMA Cagayan de Oro College Research Journal*, 2(1), 78–95. Retrieved from <https://www.scribd.com/document/699735530/FINAL-RESEARCH-3>

Cabason, R. B., Landasan, A. J. P., Ojeda, Z. P., & Remiticado, L. U. (2024). Examining the conciliation procedure used by the Lupong Tagapamayapa in Barangay Canitoan, Cagayan de Oro City. *PHINMA Cagayan de Oro College Research Journal*, 2(2), 66–82. Retrieved from <https://www.scribd.com/document/699735530/FINAL-RESEARCH-3>

Cao, O. T., & Vu, T. V. (2024). Proposing restorative justice models as alternative approaches to addressing criminal matters: A case study of judicial systems in civil and common law countries. *Access to Justice in Eastern Europe*, 7(4), 93–119. <https://doi.org/10.33327/AJEE-18-7.4-a000108>

Capolicylab.org. (2024). Can restorative justice conferencing reduce recidivism? Evidence from the Make-it-Right program [Report]. <https://capolicylab.org/make-it-right/>

Chicago Appleseed Center. (2024). Restorative Justice Community Court report [Policy Brief]. <https://www.chicagoappleseed.org/restorative-justice-community-court-report-2024>

Council of State Governments Justice Center & University of Cincinnati Corrections Institute. (2024). Restorative justice practices and credible messengers: Promising, innovative approaches for improving outcomes for youth in the juvenile justice system. <https://csgjusticecenter.org/publications/restorative-justice-credible-messengers>

CSOP101. (2023, December 30). Embracing restorative justice in the Philippines' drug policy reform [Advocacy Paper]. <https://csop101.medium.com/restorative-justice-and-drug-policy-reform-2023>

Daramola, E. J., Alonso, J. D., Marsh, J. A., & Dhaliwal, T. K. (2023). Educators' beliefs and perceptions of implementing restorative practices. *Education and Urban Society*, 55(1), 27–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00131245221110654>

Darmawan, R. A., Diputra, M. M. R., Rahman, A., & Sutrisno, A. (2024). Analysis of the effectiveness of the application of restorative justice in criminal cases in Indonesia. *Journal of World Science*, 3(5), 567–572. <https://doi.org/10.58344/jws.v3i5.612>

Department of Justice. (2021). Handbook. Manila: DOJ.

Department of the Interior and Local Government. (2020). Barangay governance performance review report.

Education and Urban Society. (2025). Emerging adults and restorative justice programs: A landscape study. Education and Urban Society. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124524123456>

Gavrielides, T. (2024). Restorative justice and social justice: An international perspective. *Restorative Justice: An International Journal*, 10(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2024.2414953>

Gonzales, M. (2022). Assessment of the Barangay Justice System in Calauan, Laguna [Unpublished thesis].

Guinigundo, D. A. G. (2021). A path to restorative justice: Applicability of mental health courts in the Philippines. *Asian Journal of Legal Education*, 8(2), 205–219. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23220058211028411>

GVSU Human Resources. (2024). Restorative-based conflict prevention & alternative dispute resolution. <https://www.gvsu.edu/hro/restorative-based-conflict-prevention-alternative-dispute-resolution-1174.htm>

Herman, R. (2023). Impact evaluation of complementarities between PBIS and restorative justice. National Institute of Justice. <https://nij.ojp.gov/library/publications/impact-evaluation-complementarities-between-pbis-and-restorative-justice>

Hübschle, A., & Dore, A. (2021). Focus on victims and the community: Applying restorative justice principles to wildlife crime offenses in South Africa. *The International Journal of Restorative Justice*, 4(1), 5–28. <https://www.elevenjournals.com/tijdschrift/TIJRJ/2021/1>

Innovations for Poverty Action – Philippines. (2023). Building community trust and conflict mediation capacity: Evidence from the Barangay Justice System in the Philippines. Retrieved from <https://poverty-action.org/building-community-trust-and-conflict-mediation-capacity-evidence-barangay-justice-system>

International Center for Transitional Justice. (2024). Transforming social relations: Restorative justice framework in massive human rights contexts [Research Report]. <https://www.ictj.org/publication/transforming-social-relations-2024>

Kagago449. (2023). The application of restorative justice in the City of Dasmariñas, Cavite, Philippines [Master's thesis, Scribd]. <https://www.scribd.com/document/727743421>

Macaspac, A. (2019). Community-based dispute resolution mechanisms and the rule of law. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, 63(1–2), 1–25.

National Center on Restorative Justice. (2022). 2021 impact report. Office of Justice Programs. <https://nc4rj.org/resources/impact-report-2021>

National Institute of Justice. (2022). Evaluability assessments of restorative justice programs for serious and violent harm [Report]. <https://nij.ojp.gov/library/publications/evaluability-restorative-justice-2022>

Naylor, B., Gang, D., Loff, B., & Kirkman, M. (2024). A call for evaluation of restorative justice programs: A systematic review of sexual and family violence RJ cases. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605211074234>

Nebrida, A. P. (2024). Evaluating the effectiveness of KatarungangPambarangay in Bacnotan, La Union. *International Research Journal of Science, Technology, Education, and Management*, 4(2), 45–60. Retrieved from https://irjstem.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/IRJSTEM_V4N2_2024_P05.pdf

Ngoc, B., & Seering, J. (2025). The design space for online restorative justice tools: A case study with ApoloBot. arXiv preprint. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.01107>

Nguyen, B., & Seering, J. (2025). The design space for online restorative justice tools: A case study with ApoloBot [Preprint]. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.18861>

R Street Institute. (2023). How restorative justice mutually benefits victims and youth (Policy Study No. 294). <https://www.rstreet.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Final-Study-No.-294.pdf>

Rakgwata, P. A., & Tumelo, S. (2024). Conflict resolution in Indigenous communities: A social work perspective. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, 13(10), 68–77. <https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v13i10.2962>

ResearchGate. (2023). Diversion and restorative justice in Southeast Asia: Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, and Vietnam. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359261664>

Restorative Justice Ireland. (2024). *Restorative justice referrals in 2023 remain below pre-pandemic levels* [Annual Report]. <https://www.restorativejustice.ie/reports/2024-referrals>

Sanz-Ramos Rojo, S. (2022). The Barangay Justice System in the Philippines: Is it an effective alternative to improve access to justice for disadvantaged people? *Governance and Development Review*, 5(2), 34–56. Retrieved from <https://www.gsdr.org/docs/open/ssaj15.pdf>

Scribd Research Community. (2024). Assessing the implementation of the KatarungangPambarangay in Siniloan, Laguna. Scribd Research Repository. Retrieved from <https://www.scribd.com/document/125112961/Thesis-Feb4>

Sotto, M. A. (2021). The level of implementation of the LupongPangkapayapaan at the selected barangays in Legazpi City for FY 2015–2020. *International Journal of Law and Politics Studies*, 4(3), 112–130. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/360174403_Implementation_of_the_Katarungang_Pambarangay_in_the_Selected_Barangay_in_Legazpi_City_for_FY_2015-2020

Statista. (2024). Crime volume in the Philippines by region (as of September 2023). Retrieved from <https://www.statista.com>

Taufiqurokhman, T. (2024). Application of restorative justice in statutory practice. SSRN. <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/Delivery.cfm/4929992.pdf>

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (n.d.). Restorative justice. <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/justice-and-prison-reform/cpcj-restorative-justice.html>

Verdad, J. F. (2024). Mediating disputes in the barangays: The work world of Lupon chiefs. *International Journal of Law and Politics Studies*, 6(5), 205–224. Retrieved from <http://al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/ijlps/article/view/7888>

Villamor, M. C. (2024). Experiences of LupongTagapamayapa chiefs in barangay justice administration. *International Journal of Legal Studies*, 17(1), 89–105. Retrieved from <http://al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/ijlps/article/download/7844/6756/22557>

Wemmers, J.-A., & Cyr, C. (2020). The psychological impact of victim–offender mediation on victims: A systematic review. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 35(3-4), 871–889. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517691455>

Wong, D. S. W. (2014). Harmony comes first: Challenges facing the development of restorative justice in Asia. *Restorative Justice: An International Journal*, 2(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.5235/20504721.2.1.1>

Xiao, S., Jhaver, S., & Salehi, N. (2022). Addressing interpersonal harm in online gaming communities: Opportunities and challenges for a restorative justice approach. arXiv preprint. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.02397>

Xiao, S., Jhaver, S., & Salehi, N. (2022). Addressing interpersonal harm in online gaming communities: Opportunities and challenges for a restorative justice approach [Preprint]. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.01524>

Xiao, S., Zou, H., Mathews, A., Rui, J., Cheshire, C., & Salehi, N. (2025). SnuggleSense: Empowering online harm survivors through a structured sensemaking process. arXiv preprint. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.09089>

Zehr, H. (2020). *The little book of restorative justice*. Good Books.