



Reconstructing a Local Wisdom-Based Model for Family Conflict Resolution (A Study of the Majelis Krama Desa in North Lombok)

Ziadul Ulum Wahid^{*}, Fakhruddin², Khoirul Hidayah³, Zaenul Mahmudi⁴, Musataklima⁵

¹ Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University Malang 240201310004@student.uin-malang.ac.id

² Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University Malang fakhruddinsyarif@gmail.com

³ Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University Malang khairul.hidayah@syariah.uin-malang.ac.id

⁴ Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University Malang zenmahmudi@as.uin-malang.ac.id

⁵ Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University Malang musa@syariah.uin-malang.ac.id

*Corresponding author: Ziadul Ulum Wahid 240201310004@student.uin-malang.ac.id

Article Info

Article history:

Received 12 Jan, 2026

Revised 27 Mar, 2026

Accepted 18 Apr, 2026

Keywords:

Family Conflict; Local Wisdom;
Majelis Krama Desa; Restorative
Deliberation; Legal Pluralism

ABSTRACT

Family conflict constitutes an inherent dynamic of domestic life, demanding resolution mechanisms that prioritize relational restoration and sustainable peace over mere conflict cessation. In North Lombok Regency, the Majelis Krama Desa (MKD) serves as a traditional local institution authorized to resolve various disputes, including domestic ones. Nevertheless, its implementation remains constrained by several challenges, such as suboptimal multi-stakeholder collaboration, underutilized local wisdom, inadequate documentation of agreements, and a lack of post-settlement monitoring. This study aims to analyze the existence of local wisdom within family conflict resolution through the MKD and to reconstruct a more integrative dispute resolution model. Employing empirical legal research with a sociology of law approach, this study gathered field data that was subsequently analyzed qualitatively. The findings reveal that the community of North Lombok Regency consistently preserves local wisdom, as manifested in *weweran*, *sasimbangan*, the philosophy of *mempolong merenten*, and moral values embedded in traditional manuscripts like the *Piagam Baru Satan* and *Takepan Lontar Rengganis*. These values serve as moral guidelines in fostering social relations and have been partially integrated into MKD practices. Furthermore, this study proposes a reconstructed model for domestic conflict resolution comprising five integrated components: initial assessment, multi-stakeholder collaboration, restorative deliberation, documentation of agreements, and post-peace monitoring and evaluation. While maintaining traditional deliberation as its core foundation, this model strengthens the protection of vulnerable parties, relational recovery, legal certainty of agreements, and long-term peace sustainability.

INTRODUCTION

In the increasingly complex dynamics of modern society, social conflict—including disputes arising within the domestic sphere—has become an inevitable phenomenon (Poitras et al., 2020). Although the formal judicial system is fundamentally designed as the primary instrument for dispute resolution (Arianto, 2024), its practical execution frequently encounters significant hurdles. These include protracted legal proceedings, relatively exorbitant litigation costs, and a highly formalistic legal approach that often fails to accommodate the living local values embraced by the community (Rumadan, 2017).

This situation is further exacerbated by recurring instances of ethical violations and bribery involving law enforcement officials, particularly judges who serve as the core representation of judicial power (Hidayat, 2025). Such misconduct has triggered a decline in public trust toward judicial institutions, given that the integrity, professionalism, and independence of law enforcement personnel are fundamental prerequisites for administering an equitable justice system. Consequently, these circumstances have fostered public skepticism regarding the capacity of the judiciary to execute its law enforcement functions impartially, accountably, transparently, and free from external interventions or conflicting interests that could compromise the administration of justice (Mayla Putri Farbadi et al, 2025).

As a response to the various limitations of the formal judicial mechanism, the paradigm of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) has emerged, offering a more flexible, effective, and participatory approach to conflict resolution (Raquib, 2025). These alternative dispute resolution methods encompass mediation, negotiation,

conciliation, and arbitration, which principally prioritize peaceful settlements outside court litigation (Hasballah & Rahmadani, 2019).

Through dialogic and deliberative approaches, alternative dispute resolution is considered better equipped to accommodate substantive justice compared to litigation approaches that tend to be strictly formalistic and procedural (Imam Syaroni and Tuti Widyaningrum, 2024). Therefore, the existence of ADR is viewed not merely as a supplement to the formal judicial system, but also as a vital instrument in constructing dispute resolution mechanisms that are more responsive to the social, cultural, and local values of the community.

Amidst this situation, customary institutions consistently demonstrate their endurance as social instruments that play a pivotal role in maintaining order, balance, and harmony within community life (Sitti Mawar, 2025). These customary bodies grow and develop organically from the community's social structure, rooted in cultural values, customary norms, and local wisdom passed down through generations. In practice, customary institutions serve not only as guardians of the social order but also as dispute resolution mechanisms that align closely with the character and needs of the local populace (Achmad et al., 2022).

Various academic studies indicate that customary law plays a significant role as a conflict resolution instrument, both at the local level and within broader contexts. One such study by Kase outlines the involvement of customary law in international conflict resolution between Indonesia and Timor-Leste. This research demonstrates that customary values are not only relevant within the social sphere of local communities but also contribute to building reconciliation and resolving cross-border conflicts through cultural approaches and social relationships among indigenous peoples in border regions (Dhesy A. Kase, 2018, p. 120).

Within the Sasak community of North Lombok, the *Majelis Krama Desa* serves as a highly strategic institution in preserving social order and resolving various community issues. This institution fulfills not only social and cultural functions but also provides a deliberative space for settling diverse forms of conflict, including domestic disputes. Utilizing a familial approach, mutual deliberation, respect for customary leaders, and an orientation toward restoring social relationships, the *Majelis Krama Desa* strives to deliver resolutions acceptable to all parties. This mechanism highlights that domestic conflict resolution within customary communities does not solely focus on formal legal aspects, but rather on preserving social harmony as its ultimate goal.

Nonetheless, academic inquiries discussing the *Majelis Krama Desa*, such as the works of Suci (Putri, 2022) and Afriandi, generally remain confined to the existence of customary institutions, the function of traditional mediation, or the effectiveness of customary dispute resolution within specific contexts. These studies have not extensively developed a theoretical construction regarding models of family conflict resolution emerging from local community practices. In other words, previous research tends to be descriptive of the ongoing mechanisms, whereas efforts to reconstruct these practices into a systematic, conceptual, and replicable conflict resolution model remain relatively limited.

This research gap underscores the necessity for a study that not only documents the practices of family conflict resolution by the *Majelis Krama Desa* but also reconstructs the critical elements shaping these mechanisms into a local wisdom-based conflict resolution model. Model reconstruction becomes imperative given that ongoing social changes demand the formulation of conflict resolution mechanisms that are adaptive, oriented toward restorative justice, and firmly rooted in the local community's cultural values.

Based on the aforementioned context, this study aims to analyze the family conflict resolution mechanisms implemented by the *Majelis Krama Desa* in North Lombok, identify the local wisdom values that underpin these practices, and reconstruct a local wisdom-based model for family conflict resolution that can serve as an alternative in developing the domestic conflict resolution system in Indonesia.

METHODS

This study employs empirical legal research using a sociology of law approach, which conceptualizes law not merely as a collection of written statutes, but as a living social phenomenon that evolves within community dynamics. According to Soerjono Soekanto, empirical legal inquiry concentrates on law as an observable manifestation of actual behavior (*law in action*) within social interactions (Asikin, n.d., 133). Consequently, this investigation seeks to examine the practical implementation and dynamics of law through field data collection. Primary data sources were gathered firsthand through in-depth interviews with informants directly involved with the research object in North Lombok Regency. Meanwhile, secondary data were compiled from various statutory regulations, official documents, books, academic journals, prior research findings, and other relevant literature. The accumulated data were then analyzed using a descriptive-qualitative method to achieve a comprehensive understanding of the interplay between legal norms and the social realities unfolding within the community.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The *Majelis Krama Desa*

Etymologically, the term *Majelis Krama Desa* is derived from three constituent words: "*Majelis*," which denotes an assembly or a physical venue; "*Krama*," representing behaviors, customs, or procedures anchored in prevailing societal moral codes and norms; and "*Desa*," which signifies a specific geographic territory or village community. Consequently, the *Majelis Krama Desa* operates as a community-based organization dedicated to

preserving the rich traditions and noble values passed down through ancestral lineages (Kamardi et al, n.d.). Furthermore, this institution provides a collaborative platform where customary leaders, community figures, and religious elders assemble to conduct mutual deliberations aimed at resolving diverse societal disputes through the application of local wisdom (Putri, 2022).

Within North Lombok Regency, the *Majelis Krama Desa* plays a monumental role as a dispute resolution body rooted in vibrant, living local traditions that command deep-seated social legitimacy from the community (NTB, 2025). In practice, this customary tribunal does not solely adjudicate strictly traditional or cultural infractions; it also manages an array of contemporary social friction, spanning civil grievances, minor criminal offenses, and intricate intra-familial or domestic conflicts. The broad spectrum of handled cases demonstrates that the local population consistently regards the *Majelis Krama Desa* as a highly effective dispute resolution forum due to its emphasis on mutual consensus (*musyawarah*), the restoration of disrupted social networks, and the formulation of amicable agreements. This enduring public confidence in customary dispute mechanisms underscores the resilience of the living law, which operates seamlessly alongside the formal national legal framework.

Local Wisdom of the North Lombok Community

The cultural wealth and local wisdom of the Sasak ethnic group are predominantly preserved within the treasury of oral traditions. Through this medium, cultural knowledge systems and core values are transformed and transmitted, allowing insights regarding traditional medicine, architecture, calendars, and various other aspects to be transferred orally across generations. This knowledge is typically conveyed to specific descendants or individuals deemed capable of preserving and passing it down. Furthermore, diverse forms of traditional wisdom are packaged within these oral traditions, constituting an integral component of the Sasak cultural heritage (Fathurrahman, 2017, 224).

Currently, North Lombok Regency possesses an exceptionally rich array of local wisdom, preserved either in manuscript records like the *Piagam Baru Satan* or in oral expressions that serve as moral guidelines for cultivating harmonious social relations within the community. In their actualization, these forms of local wisdom crystallize into social mechanisms that act as a moral foundation and social spirit, fostering social solidarity, empathy, and a mutual commitment to harmony, as exemplified by the famous expression: *saling sidut, saling peliwat, saling bantel, saling jot, saling tulong, saling jengok* (mutual support, tolerance, assistance, and caring).

Beyond oral expressions, local wisdom is also embedded within ancient manuscripts, such as the *Lontar* or *Takepan Rengganis*. This text features symbols like the Sasak word *pandita*, which signifies a guide who provides direction within the domestic context, ensuring that individuals entering marriage do not lose their way while navigating domestic life toward divine goodness (I Putu Kamasan Sanjaya et al, 2016, 105). In addition to these symbols, the *Takepan Rengganis* conveys moral values and advice encompassing religious insights for the spiritual life of the Sasak community, pointing toward the core religious teaching of *ripatmaja* (spiritual gnosis/enlightenment) toward *imam swongse* (humanity as a whole) (I Putu Kamasan Sanjaya et al, 2016).

Grounded in this wealth of local wisdom integrated with religious values, the local government of North Lombok Regency is highly committed to empowering customary institutions through regional regulations. As articulated by Najmul Ahyar, "*We do not merely recognize the MKD, but we formalize it through regional regulations (Perda). With this legal framework, the MKD becomes a role model and possesses legal standing to resolve community issues*" (Indonesia, 2026). Furthermore, he emphasized that the community perceives religion and custom as two mutually reinforcing entities that shape harmonious social behavior: "*Our customary principle is Adat Luwir Gama. Religious teachings do not eradicate custom, and custom functions to strengthen religious teachings. Neither is discarded*" (Indonesia, 2026).

Based on field findings, specific elements of local wisdom serve as the foundation for domestic conflict resolution. For instance, in the context of inheritance division, the principle of *menyon melembah* is widely recognized. *Menyon melembah* is a piece of local wisdom emphasizing that in the distribution of family wealth, men receive a larger portion than women due to their higher burden of responsibility. Additionally, there is the principle of *soloh*. This concept represents a form of local wisdom born from the integration of religious teachings and local culture, aimed at restoring family relationships fractured by conflict. As expressed by Supardi, "*One piece of local wisdom we inherited from our ancestors is the term soloh. Soloh means that in resolving family conflicts, we must prioritize peace; there should be no winners or losers, because if there are winners and losers, it will breed future resentment, and that is precisely what we aim to avoid*" (Supardi, wawancara 2025).

Conflict Resolution Practices through the *Majelis Krama Desa*

Based on field findings, family conflict represents one of the most frequent types of disputes resolved through the *Majelis Krama Desa*. These domestic disputes are commonly triggered by inheritance distribution issues, domestic violence (*kekerasan dalam rumah tangga/KDRT*), and marital infidelity, all of which disrupt family harmony and social relations within the community. These three categories of conflict create not only legal complications but also social ramifications that demand a comprehensive solution. Consequently, rather than focusing solely on dispute adjudication, the *Majelis Krama Desa* endeavors to rehabilitate the relationships between

the disputing parties by employing persuasive approaches, customary values, and kinship principles. This characteristic highlights that the local wisdom-based dispute resolution mechanism possesses a restorative orientation that emphasizes the creation of peace, preservation of social cohesion, and maintenance of harmony within community life.

The dispute resolution mechanism within the *Majelis Krama Desa* is structurally operationalized through the *Majelis Krama Desa* Guidebook (*Buku Pedoman Majelis Krama Desa*) alongside specific village regulations throughout North Lombok Regency, serving as the procedural benchmark for handling public grievances. This phased mechanism is systematically structured to guarantee that each dispute is managed objectively, transparently, and with a commitment to achieving an equitable outcome. The resolution process initiates with a formal complaint or report lodged by the aggrieved party, followed by a verification stage to ascertain the jurisdictional competence of the *Majelis Krama Desa* and the sufficiency of the initial case information.

Once the verification process satisfies the procedural requirements, the *Majelis Krama Desa* conducts an in-depth case assessment by gathering detailed information and seeking clarifications from the directly involved parties and other relevant stakeholders. The outcomes of this assessment are subsequently deliberated upon in a plenary meeting—a collective forum designed to determine the most appropriate intervention based on customary values, equity principles, and the concrete circumstances of the parties. The succeeding stage involves establishing an initial agreement with the parties as a manifestation of their commitment to resolving the dispute amicably through deliberative mechanisms. Following this, the *Majelis Krama Desa* facilitates dialogue, negotiation, and mediation sessions until a mutual agreement acceptable to all parties is reached. This sequence of stages illustrates that the dispute resolution framework within the *Majelis Krama Desa* looks beyond mere legal finality, prioritizing the restoration of social relationships, family harmony, and the sustainability of community life as the ultimate goals of conflict resolution.

When analyzed through the prism of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), the dispute resolution mechanism implemented by the *Majelis Krama Desa* displays characteristics that align seamlessly with out-of-court settlement principles. The progression from complaints, verification, case assessments, and plenary sessions to the cultivation of initial commitments and facilitated dialogues forms a process that positions mutual deliberation (*musyawarah*) as the primary instrument for reaching a consensus (Kamardi et al, n.d.). In contrast to litigation mechanisms that focus on rights enforcement through judicial verdicts, dispute resolution within the *Majelis Krama Desa* prioritizes open communication, active participation of the parties, and the attainment of a mutual agreement. Hence, the *Majelis Krama Desa* functions not merely as a dispute settlement body, but also as a social mediator that preserves the stability of communal relationships.

In addition to its alignment with ADR principles, this mechanism reflects a restorative justice framework. Each stage of resolution is not geared toward producing winners and losers, but rather toward healing the relationships fractured by conflict. Deep case assessments are undertaken to comprehend the root problems holistically, while plenary sessions and facilitated dialogues offer a space for the parties to articulate their interests, foster mutual understanding, and construct a just consensus. Such an approach is highly relevant for addressing domestic disputes—such as inheritance conflicts, domestic violence, or infidelity—because the success of the resolution is measured not merely by the cessation of the dispute, but by the recovery of familial bonds and social harmony within the community.

The uniqueness of the dispute resolution mechanism within the *Majelis Krama Desa* lies in its integration of local wisdom values with modern dispute resolution principles (Putri & Sumiadi, 2026). While ADR generally relies on contractual agreements between parties and restorative justice typically operates within the framework of modern judicial systems, the *Majelis Krama Desa* blends both approaches with the living law of customary norms, the social authority of traditional leaders, and cultural legitimacy deeply rooted in community life. This integration creates a dispute resolution model that is highly effective in settling conflicts (Zuhdi, 2018), while simultaneously strengthening social cohesion, sustaining community harmony, and preserving customary values as an active component of the living legal system within North Lombok society.

Table 1. Comparative Analysis of Conflict Resolution: Litigation, ADR, and the Majelis Krama Desa

Aspect	Litigation	Modern ADR	Majelis Krama Desa
Objective	Determining winners and losers (<i>win-lose</i> outcome).	Attaining a mutual agreement (<i>win-win</i> outcome).	Rehabilitating relationships and preserving social harmony.
Approach	Adjudicative framework.	Negotiation, mediation, and conciliation.	Customary deliberation, mediation, and guidance from traditional elders.
Source of Legitimacy	Statutory legislation and state regulations.	Contractual consensus between the disputing parties.	Local wisdom, customary law, and deep-seated community

			acceptance.
Role of the Third Party	Binding judicial verdicts.	Amicable settlement agreements.	The <i>Majelis Krama Desa</i> council and traditional leaders.
Final Outcome	Binding judicial verdicts.	Amicable settlement agreements.	Amicable consensus reinforced by social and customary legitimacy.
Orientation	Formal legal certainty.	Efficiency and flexibility in dispute settlement.	Domestic harmony, long-term peace, and communal cohesion.

Reconstructing a Local Wisdom-Based Model for Family Conflict Resolution

The research findings demonstrate that the existing mechanism for family conflict resolution through the *Majelis Krama Desa* remains heavily dominated by a kinship-based framework, utilizing mutual deliberations conducted internally by its members. The entire progression of dispute resolution—spanning from complaint registration, verification, and in-depth case assessments to plenary sessions and the actual consensus-building process—falls exclusively under the jurisdiction of the *Majelis Krama Desa*, without a structured coordination mechanism with external agencies. While this model is relatively effective in settling interpersonal domestic friction, such as misunderstandings, familial inheritance arguments, or disputes where reconciliation remains highly viable, it encounters limitations when addressing broader human rights dimensions. Specifically, regarding the protection of women and children as vulnerable groups, the current framework does not fully guarantee comprehensive safeguards.

This gap is particularly evident in the management of domestic violence (*kekerasan dalam rumah tangga*/KDRT) cases and marital infidelity accompanied by physical or psychological abuse. Customary resolution through traditional deliberation tends to prioritize the attainment of peace and familial reconciliation. Consequently, victim protection, risk assessment, psychological support services, and active coordination with authorized protective institutions have not yet been seamlessly incorporated into the settlement process. This dynamic creates a risk where the rights of victims, particularly women and children, might be sidelined if the resolution concentrates solely on achieving an amicable settlement without thoroughly evaluating the victim's vulnerability and safety.

Grounded in these empirical findings, this study proposes a reconstructed model for domestic conflict resolution rooted in local wisdom by establishing a collaborative framework between the *Majelis Krama Desa* and institutional bodies specializing in victim protection. Within this reconstructed framework, the *Majelis Krama Desa* retains its frontline role in facilitating traditional deliberation guided by local wisdom values. However, for disputes involving elements of violence, violations of women's and children's rights, or indicators of criminal offenses, structured coordination is initiated with the Police, the Regional Technical Implementation Unit for the Protection of Women and Children (UPTD PPA), social workers, or other legal advocacy groups based on the case's characteristics. Consequently, dispute resolution expands beyond mere conflict cessation to actively secure victim protection, legal certainty, and the long-term sustainability of communal social relations. This model represents a vital synthesis of local ancestral wisdom, the national legal framework, and human rights approaches, ultimately yielding a more comprehensive domestic conflict resolution mechanism that is highly responsive to societal needs.

Based on these field observations, the reconstructed domestic conflict resolution model conceptualized in this study is formulated into five primary, interconnected components designed to serve as an operational benchmark for the *Majelis Krama Desa* when managing family disputes.

Initial Assessment

The practice of in-depth case evaluations is fundamentally already conducted by the *Majelis Krama Desa* prior to the mediation phase. Based on an account by Muhyin, this stage is designed to extract information from both disputing parties to serve as the groundwork for conflict resolution. However, the ongoing evaluations remain narrowly focused on compiling facts and chronological events, failing to encompass the identification of conflict escalation levels, potential risks, or specific vulnerabilities faced by women, children, and other family members.

The proposed conflict assessment framework is executed as an initial phase to identify the characteristics of domestic disputes, including the conflict type, escalation level, and potential risks that could threaten safety or infringe upon the rights of the involved parties—particularly women, children, and other family members in vulnerable positions. The outcomes of this assessment serve as a foundational benchmark to determine the most appropriate resolution mechanism, specifically deciding whether the dispute can be successfully resolved through internal mediation within the *Majelis Krama Desa* or if it demands the involvement of external bodies, such as law enforcement agencies or institutions specializing in women and children protection.

Furthermore, conflict identification within this proposed reconstructed model is intended to trace the structural roots underlying domestic disharmony, looking beyond superficial symptoms like visible arguments or ongoing disputes. This approach draws upon the dialectical conflict theory formulated by Ralf Dahrendorf, which conceptualizes social conflict—including disputes within society's smallest unit, the family—as an inevitable

consequence of the unequal distribution of authority among parties involved within an imperatively coordinated association (Dahrendorf, 2013).

As an antithesis to his predecessor, Karl Marx, who positioned the ownership of the means of production as the primary source of class struggle, Dahrendorf shifted the analytical focus toward power relations and the legitimacy of authority (Kühne et al., 2019). Within this context, the family can be understood as a miniature social structure featuring dominant positions (*superordinate*) and submissive positions (*subordinate*)—such as husband over wife, parents over children, or even son/daughter-in-law over parents-in-law within the extended family structures of North Lombok society (Nurfatlah et al., 2024). This authority imbalance breeds what Dahrendorf terms latent interests, which are objective interests inherently attached to an individual's structural position, even if the person involved has not yet explicitly recognized them (Kühne, 2020).

When these latent interests articulate into a collective consciousness and become organized—for instance, when the party in the subordinate position begins to challenge the partner's dominance over economic decision-making, child-rearing, or the public-domestic sphere—they manifest as manifest interests, which have the potential to trigger open conflict (Weingart, 1969). Consequently, from this perspective, domestic conflict is not merely a psychological anomaly but rather a manifestation of shifting awareness regarding structural inequalities that have long been embedded within domestic power relations.

The core emphasis of the reconstructed model proposed in this study is the transformation of the case evaluation stage into a more comprehensive conflict assessment. This expansion ensures that the stage functions not only as a means to acquire information but also as an active instrument to dictate the most appropriate resolution mechanism while guaranteeing the protection of vulnerable parties' rights. This reconstruction aligns closely with the principles of the rule of law (*rechtsstaat*), which position the protection of human rights as a paramount goal within any dispute resolution process.

Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration

The reconstructed domestic conflict resolution model formulated in this study reframes the *Majelis Krama Desa* not as an isolated actor, but as a central coordinator that orchestrates collaboration among diverse stakeholders. These include religious figures, traditional elders, community leaders, and other specialized institutions chosen based on the unique traits of the dispute. Engaging these various actors aims to enrich the analytical perspective during the resolution process, ensuring that every outcome balances legal, social, cultural, and religious dimensions equitably.

This collaborative dispute resolution model mirrors the dynamics of legal pluralism conceptualized by John Griffiths ((Griffiths, 2013). Acknowledging legal pluralism implies that the domestic conflict resolution process no longer relies on a singular, monolithic legal system. Instead, it actively integrates customary norms and religious laws that are already deeply embedded within community life. This collaborative dynamic demonstrates that family dispute resolution unfolds within a social space characterized by multiple, intersecting legal systems, thereby producing contextual decisions that align with community characteristics and command social legitimacy. This mechanism reflects a vibrant practice of legal pluralism, positioning customary law, state law, and religious law in a symbiotic relationship tailored to the nature and complexity of the conflict.

Furthermore, multi-stakeholder collaboration fortifies the social legitimacy of the conflict resolution outcomes. Within the social architecture of North Lombok society, the moral authority and leadership of religious figures, customary elders, and community leaders still hold a profound influence in shaping public compliance and acceptance of a decision (Fahrurrozi, 2018). Consequently, resolutions derived through this collaborative framework do not merely terminate disputes at a procedural level; they are significantly more likely to be honored and sustained within the social lives of the involved parties.

Moreover, this collaborative model serves as a tangible manifestation of North Lombok's local wisdom, which highly reveres the values of *dedaitan toaq lokak* and the spirit of *mempolong merenten*. Both cultural concepts emphasize collective problem-solving through mutual deliberation, mutual reinforcement, and shared responsibility in safeguarding family harmony and community cohesion. Hence, reconstructing the resolution model not only heightens the efficacy of dispute settlements but also preserves the socio-cultural identity of the community as the bedrock for sustainable peace.

This collaborative paradigm stands in stark contrast to the family conflict resolution models found within the formal judicial system, which operate on adversarial logic and focus on win-lose verdicts (Fadillah, 2023). In formal court proceedings, judges position themselves as independent third parties who deliver a final judgment based strictly on normative evidence and procedural rules. As a result, one party is legally declared the loser, even though the psychosocial core of the domestic conflict remains unresolved (Istirahat, 2023).

Restorative Deliberation

Deliberation to achieve consensus (*musyawarah untuk mufakat*) constitutes a foundational element of local wisdom that the North Lombok community consistently preserves to resolve domestic disputes. Historically, these deliberative practices have focused primarily on reaching a consensus as an immediate solution to active conflict. The reconstruction proposed in this study does not alter the status of deliberation as the primary mechanism

for conflict resolution; instead, it transforms its orientation into a more comprehensive dialogic space. Through this refined approach, deliberation is directed not only toward generating an agreement but also toward diagnosing the root causes of the friction, rehabilitating intra-familial relationships, rebuilding the trust eroded by the dispute, and proactively preventing future conflicts.

Under this orientation, successful conflict resolution is no longer evaluated solely by the creation of a written agreement, but rather by the restoration of social bonds and the cultivation of sustainable harmony within family life. Concurrently, this deliberative process becomes a venue for actualizing North Lombok's core local wisdom values, including *empak bau aik meneng tunjung tilah* (achieving goals without causing collateral damage), *mempolong merenten* (brotherhood/kinship), and *keang jari aik setambang* (unity and collective cooling of tensions). These ancestral principles reinforce the paramount importance of settling disputes through meaningful dialogue, togetherness, balanced interests, and shared responsibility in safeguarding the harmony of both the family and the wider community.

Documentation of Agreements

Based on the empirical findings, the *Majelis Krama Desa* generally only issues a settlement deed (*akta perdamaian*) that serves as proof of a mutual agreement between the disputing parties. However, the substance of this deed does not yet incorporate detailed descriptions of the specific rights, obligations, and commitments that each party must execute after the peace agreement is established. This lack of specificity creates a vulnerability where divergent interpretations of the agreement's terms may arise, ultimately increasing the risk that the settlement outcomes will not be implemented optimally.

Consequently, this study reconstructs the substance of the settlement deed so that it functions not merely as an administrative document, but as a binding instrument that explicitly delineates the rights, obligations, and commitments of the parties, alongside their corresponding execution mechanisms. This reconstruction is expected to provide execution certainty regarding the consensus outcomes, fortify the parties' commitments, and minimize the potential for recurring conflicts. Thus, the settlement deed transcends its role as simple evidence of dispute termination, becoming a legal protection instrument that reinforces the realization of sustainable peace.

Post-Settlement Monitoring and Evaluation

Based on the empirical findings, the *Majelis Krama Desa* does not currently possess a structured monitoring and evaluation mechanism to oversee the execution of peace agreements once the mutual deliberation process is officially concluded. Consequently, the practical implementation of the settlement outcomes is left entirely to the disputing parties, lacking any formal oversight or assistance to ensure that the agreed-upon rights, obligations, and commitments are genuinely fulfilled. This absence of supervision creates a structural vulnerability that fosters non-compliance with the agreement terms, thereby paving the way for the resurgence of future disputes.

To address this gap, this study proposes a reconstructed conflict resolution model that incorporates a post-settlement monitoring and evaluation framework as an inseparable component of the domestic conflict resolution process. Through this mechanism, the *Majelis Krama Desa* systematically conducts periodic evaluations regarding the implementation of the consensus outcomes, diagnoses the hurdles encountered by the parties, and provides subsequent facilitation if non-compliance or new conflict-triggering developments are detected. Accordingly, dispute resolution does not merely terminate upon reaching a consensus; rather, it actively focuses on the sustainability of peace, the structural recovery of family relationships, and the proactive prevention of recurring conflicts.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Based on the empirical findings and subsequent analysis, this study draws two primary conclusions. First, the community of North Lombok Regency consistently preserves diverse forms of local wisdom manifested through oral expressions, such as *weweran* and *sasimbingan*, alongside the overarching philosophy of *mempolong merenten*. These traditional tenets are also formally documented within classical manuscripts, including the *Piagam Baru Satan* and *Takepan Lontar Rengganis*. These collective values serve as vital moral parameters for cultivating and sustaining harmonious social relationships. In its evolution, several of these local wisdom principles have been adopted and actualized by the *Majelis Krama Desa* (MKD) as a foundational framework for dispute resolution, including domestic conflicts. Second, this study reconstructs a local wisdom-based domestic conflict resolution model comprising five systematically integrated components. This begins with an initial assessment executed to identify the specific type of conflict, its escalation trajectory, and potential hazards concerning the safety and rights of the disputing parties—particularly women, children, and family members in vulnerable structural positions. This framework is followed by multi-stakeholder collaboration facilitated through the active involvement of relevant actors, thereby fortifying the practical application of legal pluralism within the family conflict resolution framework. Furthermore, the model incorporates restorative deliberation, which preserves traditional collective deliberation (*musyawarah*) as the core mechanism while transforming its paradigm into a more comprehensive dialogic arena focused on relationship rehabilitation and balancing the parties' core interests. The final stages involve the documentation of agreements formulated to strengthen legal certainty regarding execution, solidify the

parties' mutual commitments, and proactively mitigate the risk of recurring disputes, which is seamlessly paired with a post-settlement monitoring and evaluation framework deployed as a vital oversight mechanism to guarantee the sustained implementation of the consensus outcomes and the long-term effectiveness of the domestic conflict resolution process.

Limitations and Future Research

This study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting its findings. First, the empirical analysis focuses on the preservation and actualization of local wisdom in North Lombok Regency, particularly through the Majelis Krama Desa (MKD). Although the study identifies local wisdom as an important foundation for domestic conflict resolution, the findings do not necessarily represent the practices of all customary institutions or communities in Indonesia. Differences in local values, institutional arrangements, and social structures may influence the applicability of the reconstructed model in other settings.

Second, the reconstructed model is derived from the identified local wisdom principles and the institutional practices examined in this study. Its five integrated components—initial assessment, multi-stakeholder collaboration, restorative deliberation, agreement documentation, and post-settlement monitoring and evaluation—represent a conceptual and normative reconstruction of domestic conflict resolution. The study does not establish the model's effectiveness through a systematic longitudinal evaluation or comparative assessment of outcomes before and after its implementation. Consequently, its practical effectiveness, particularly in preventing recurring conflicts and ensuring the sustained fulfilment of settlement agreements, remains to be empirically examined.

Third, although the model incorporates an initial assessment of conflict escalation and potential risks to the safety and rights of disputing parties, the study does not claim that deliberative settlement is appropriate for every domestic conflict. Conflicts involving violence, coercion, or serious threats to vulnerable family members require careful consideration of applicable legal protections and appropriate referral mechanisms. Further research is therefore needed to clarify the operational boundaries between community-based dispute resolution and formal legal intervention.

Future research should address these limitations through empirical and comparative approaches. First, longitudinal studies could examine the implementation of the reconstructed model across different MKD institutions, focusing on the fulfilment of settlement agreements, recurrence of domestic conflicts, and the sustainability of post-settlement monitoring. Second, comparative research involving other customary institutions and local communities could assess how variations in local wisdom, institutional capacity, and legal culture influence the adaptation of the model. Third, future studies should investigate the experiences of women, children, and other vulnerable family members in domestic conflict resolution processes, including their participation, protection, and access to appropriate legal remedies. Finally, interdisciplinary research involving legal studies, anthropology, sociology, and conflict resolution could further develop the model's institutional and procedural dimensions while examining its relationship with state law, Islamic law, and customary law. Such research would contribute to the empirical validation and contextual refinement of a local wisdom-based domestic conflict resolution model.

REFERENCES

- Achmad, D., Septiana, D., Shafira, M., & ... (2022). Penyelesaian sengketa hukum keluarga & kekerasan dalam rumah tangga di luar pengadilan Desa Negeri Katon. *Jurnal Sumbangsih*, 3(September), 21–25.
- Arianto, A. F. (2024). The Role of Law Enforcement Agencies in the Asset Confiscation Process. *Jurnal USM Law Review*, 7(3), 1601–1615. <https://doi.org/10.26623/julr.v7i3.10516>
- Asikin, A. and Z. (n.d.). *Pengantar Metode Penelitian Hukum*. PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Dahrendorf, R. (2013). Toward a Theory of Social Conflict. *Sage: The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2(2), 170–183.
- Dhesy A. Kase. (2018). *Model Penyelesaian Sengketa Internasional Berbasis Hukum Adat*. Media Centre Publishing.
- Fadillah, N. (2023). Prinsip Peradilan Bebas dan Tidak Memihak dalam Negara Hukum : Studi Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Nomor 53 / PUU-XIV / 2017 Mengenai Verifikasi Partai Politik. *Lex Renaissance*, 8(1), 1–19.
- Fahrurrozi. (2018). Tuan guru and social change in Lombok, Indonesia. *Indonesia and the Malay World*, 46(135), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639811.2018.1452487>
- Fathurrahman, A. (2017). *Kosmologi Sasak: Risalah Inen Paer (I)*. Penerbit Genius.
- Griffiths, J. (2013). What is Legal Pluralism ? *The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, (May 2015), 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07329113.1986.10756387>
- Hasballah, K., & Rahmadani. (2019). Studi pemikiran Ibnu Qayyim al-Jauziyyah tentang hakam dan relevansinya dengan mediasi di pengadilan agama. *Samarah*, 3(1), 53–68. <https://doi.org/10.22373/sjhc.v3i1.4430>
- Hidayat, R. (2025). Kasus Suap Hakim, Lisa Rachmat Dituntut 14 Tahun Bui dan Pencabutan Profesi Advokat. *Hukum Online*.
- I Putu Kamasan Sanjaya et al. (2016). *Kajian Naskah Kuno Lontar Rengganis di Lombok Barat Provinsi Nusa*

- Tenggara Barat. In Kementerian Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan Direktorat Jenderal Kebudayaan Balai Pelestarian Nilai Budaya Ball. Penerbit Kepel Press.
- Imam Syaroni and Tuti Widyaningrum. (2024). Peningkatan efektivitas penyelesaian sengketa administrasi negara melalui pendekatan alternatif. *Wacana Paramarta Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 23(1), 80–92. <https://doi.org/10.32816/paramarta.v23i1.566>
- Indonesia, M. J. (2026). Bupati Najmul : Perkuat Peran Majelis Krama Desa Lewat Perda untuk Jaga Harmoni Adat dan Agama. *Media Jurnal Indonesia*. Com.
- Istirahat, I. (2023). Rekonstruksi Peran Hakim dalam Mewujudkan Keadilan Substantif di Pengadilan Indonesia. *Jurnal Yurisprudensi, Hukum Dan Peradilan*, 1(2), 44–51. <https://doi.org/10.59966/yudhistira.v1i2.1704>
- Kamardi et al. (n.d.). Pengembangan Restoratif Justice di Kabupaten Lombok Utara (Perundingan, Mediasi dan Ajudikasi). Lembaga Perlindungan Anak Provinsi Nusa Tenggara Barat.
- Kühne, O. (2020). Landscape Conflicts A Theoretical Approach Based on the Three Worlds Theory of Karl Popper and the Conflict Theory of Ralf Dahrendorf, Illustrated by the Example of the Energy System Transformation in Germany. *Sustainability*, 12(17), 6772. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12176772>
- Kühne, O., Weber, F., & Berr, K. (2019). The productive potential and limits of landscape conflicts in light of Ralf Dahrendorf's conflict theory. *Società Mutamento Politica*, 10(19), 78–90. <https://doi.org/10.13128/smp-25391>
- Mayla Putri Farbadi et al, . (2025). Pelanggaran Etika dan Profesi Hukum Kasus Suap Hakim Ronald Tannur: Analisis Kritis terhadap Integritas Penegakan Hukum di Indonesia. *Media Hukum Indonesia (MHI)*, 2(6), 128–134. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15486869>
- NTB, S. (2025). MKD, Garda Depan Mediasi Konflik Horizontal. *Suara NTB*. Com.
- Nurfatlah, T., Dudy, A. A., Ashady, S., & Taufik, Z. (2024). Power Relations in Domestic Violence in West Lombok Regency. *Unram Law Review*, 8(2), 180–192. <https://doi.org/10.29303/ulrev.v8i2.365>
- Poitras, K., Birnbaum, R., Saini, M., Bala, N., & Cyr, F. (2020). Family dispute resolution: Characteristics of cases resolved by trial. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 123, 105832. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2020.105832>
- Putri, S. R. (2022). Implementasi Peraturan Bupati Nomor 20 Tahun 2017 Tentang Pedoman Majelis Krama Desa Terhadap Pencegahan Pernikahan Dini (Studi Di Kabupaten Lombok Utara). Universitas Islam Negeri Mataram.
- Putri, S. R., & Sumiadi, R. (2026). Family Conflict Resolution Patterns : A Study of Wet Sesait in North Lombok. *JIHAD: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Administrasi*, 8(2), 542–550. <https://doi.org/10.36312/jihad.v8i2.10630/https>
- Raqui, N. (2025). Alternative Dispute Resolution Mechanism for Sustainable Development. *INNOVATIVE: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 1(February), 19–27. <https://doi.org/10.69971/dss.1.2.2024.25>
- Rumadan, I. (2017). Peran lembaga peradilan sebagai institusi penegak hukum dalam menegakkan keadilan bagi terwujudnya perdamaian. *Jurnal Rechts Vinding: Media Pembinaan Hukum Nasional*, 6(April), 69–88.
- Sitti Mawar, M. I. (2025). Multicultural Dispute Resolution System in Aceh Before and After the Issuance of the Customary Institution Qanun. *Samarah: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Dan Hukum Islam*, 9(1), 560–574. <https://doi.org/10.22373/sjhk.v9i1.19767>
- Weingart, P. (1969). Beyond Parsons? A Critique of Ralf Dahrendorf's Conflict Theory. *Social Forces*, 48(2), 151–165. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/48.2.151>
- Zuhdi, M. H. (2018). Local Wisdom of Sasak Tribe as A Model For Lombok Society Conflict Management. *Mabasan*, 12(1), 64–85.
-