

Reassessing Diversion and Restorative Justice in Indonesia's Juvenile Criminal System: Legal Paradigms, Policy Gaps, and Implementation Challenges

Ina Heliany¹⁾ & Raymond R Tjandrawinata²⁾

¹⁾ Faculty of Law, Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Hukum IBLAM, Indonesia, E-mail: inaheliany@iblam.ac.id

²⁾ Faculty of Law, Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya, Indonesia, E-mail: raytjan@yahoo.com

Abstract. *Indonesia's juvenile criminal justice system has embraced diversion and restorative justice as foundational principles following the enactment of Law No. 11 of 2012 on the Juvenile Criminal Justice System. This study critically examines the legal frameworks underpinning these principles, explores the policy gaps, and evaluates the implementation challenges that have emerged in practice. Employing a socio-legal qualitative methodology, this paper reviews statutory provisions, policy documents, and empirical research findings on diversion and restorative justice in Indonesia. The results reveal that while Indonesia's legal reforms align with international standards on juvenile justice, significant inconsistencies persist in the practical application of diversion policies. Key barriers include uneven regional implementation, lack of standardized procedures, insufficient training for law enforcement, and societal resistance rooted in a punitive legal culture. The discussion offers a comprehensive analysis of these challenges and suggests strategic pathways to strengthen the restorative justice framework. The paper concludes by recommending policy reforms that incorporate local wisdom, enhance institutional capacity, and promote community involvement to ensure sustainable and effective juvenile justice practices in Indonesia.*

Keywords: *Diversion; Gaps; Justice; Juvenile; Restorative.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The discourse on juvenile justice has evolved globally from punitive frameworks towards rehabilitative and restorative approaches, emphasizing the protection and reintegration of young offenders. In Indonesia, this shift materialized with the promulgation of Law No. 11 of 2012 concerning the Juvenile Criminal Justice System (UU SPPA), which established diversion and restorative justice as core tenets of juvenile justice administration (Suharto, 2021). These reforms were motivated by the recognition that formal judicial proceedings often exacerbate the vulnerability of juvenile offenders and impede their social reintegration (Muchtar et al., 2024).

Diversion in the Indonesian context refers to the redirection of juvenile cases away from formal court processes to alternative resolution mechanisms that emphasize accountability, reconciliation, and rehabilitation. As conceptualized in the UU SPPA,

restorative justice seeks to restore the relationships disrupted by criminal acts through dialogue and community participation (Nasution et al., 2022). These principles are deeply rooted in the belief that punitive measures alone are insufficient to address the complex social, psychological, and developmental factors underlying juvenile delinquency.

Indonesia's adoption of diversion and restorative justice is also a response to international obligations under instruments such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Beijing Rules, which advocate for the use of non-custodial measures and the prioritization of the best interests of the child in criminal proceedings (Zainuddin & Hambali, 2023). Furthermore, the reforms reflect a broader commitment to the goals of social justice and the protection of children's rights as enshrined in the Indonesian Constitution.

However, translating these legal paradigms into practice has proven to be fraught with challenges. The juvenile justice system operates within a complex socio-legal landscape characterized by decentralization, legal pluralism, and diverse cultural norms. These factors have contributed to inconsistencies in implementing diversion and restorative justice policies across different regions and jurisdictions. Moreover, entrenched punitive attitudes towards crime and justice among law enforcement agencies, judicial actors, and the general public often undermine the rehabilitative objectives of the UUSPPA.

The significance of this study lies in its critical reassessment of Indonesia's juvenile justice reforms, focusing on the gap between normative ideals and empirical realities. By identifying the policy gaps and implementation challenges, this paper aims to contribute to ongoing efforts to enhance the effectiveness of diversion and restorative justice in Indonesia's juvenile criminal justice system. The study also seeks to offer policy recommendations grounded in empirical evidence and sensitive to the socio-cultural context of Indonesia.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a socio-legal qualitative methodology, integrating doctrinal legal analysis with a contextual empirical review to examine the formulation, implementation, and effectiveness of diversion and restorative justice policies within Indonesia's juvenile criminal justice system. The methodological approach recognizes that legal norms cannot be adequately understood without considering their practical application within specific socio-cultural contexts. By combining normative and empirical inquiries, this study seeks to critically assess the gap between legal ideals and their operationalization in practice.

The doctrinal component of the research involves a systematic analysis of primary legal sources, including statutory instruments and implementing regulations relevant to juvenile justice in Indonesia. Key legal texts examined include Law No. 11 of 2012 on the Juvenile Criminal Justice System (UUSPPA), Law No. 35 of 2014 on Child Protection, and various government regulations and ministerial decrees pertaining to diversion and restorative justice procedures. These normative documents were analyzed to elucidate the legal principles, procedural mandates, and institutional responsibilities governing the administration of juvenile justice, with particular emphasis on diversion mechanisms and restorative justice frameworks.

In addition to primary legal sources, the study incorporates an extensive review of secondary sources to contextualize and critically evaluate the implementation of diversion policies. A systematic literature search was conducted across leading

international academic databases, including ScienceDirect, SpringerLink, Taylor & Francis Online, and SAGE Journals. The search strategy utilized keywords such as "restorative justice," "diversion," "juvenile justice," and "Indonesia." Inclusion criteria prioritized peer-reviewed English-language journal articles published between 2015 and 2024, specifically focusing on empirical studies and policy analyses related to Indonesia's juvenile justice system. Relevant policy papers, government reports, academic books, and regional studies were also included to comprehensively understand the socio-legal landscape.

The empirical component of this research is based on a qualitative synthesis of existing studies and documented field research conducted by prior scholars and institutions. Sources of empirical data include case studies, statistical reports, policy evaluations, and qualitative fieldwork findings that examine the practical application of diversion and restorative justice policies across various Indonesian jurisdictions. Particular attention was paid to studies documenting regional disparities, procedural inconsistencies, stakeholder perceptions, and structural barriers to effectively implementing diversion programs.

To guide the analysis, this study employs a descriptive-analytical framework to systematically identify the congruence and divergence between Indonesia's normative legal commitments and their empirical realization. The analytical process involved thematic coding of policy gaps, structural limitations, cultural factors, and institutional challenges as reflected in both primary and secondary sources. Additionally, the analysis incorporates a comparative dimension, referencing relevant international standards and normative frameworks on juvenile justice, including the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) and the Beijing Rules, to assess how Indonesia's policies align with global best practices.

Ethical considerations were duly observed in the conduct of this research. All data sources utilized in the study are publicly accessible and appropriately cited, ensuring transparency and academic integrity. As the research relied exclusively on documentary and secondary data analysis, with no direct engagement with human participants or sensitive personal information, the study did not require ethical clearance under prevailing academic guidelines.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. The Legal Paradigms, Policy Gaps, and Implementation Challenges in Indonesia's Juvenile Criminal System

This comprehensive analysis of Indonesia's legal framework reveals that the normative foundation for diversion and restorative justice in the context of juvenile criminal justice is robustly articulated within the statutory provisions of Law No. 11 of 2012 concerning the Juvenile Criminal Justice System (UU SPPA) and its subsequent implementing regulations. This legal framework explicitly mandates the application of diversion mechanisms at multiple procedural junctures, including the stages of investigation, prosecution, and trial. The UU SPPA sets forth clear criteria that govern the applicability of diversion, emphasizing the nature and severity of the offense, the offender's age and developmental status, and, critically, the voluntary consent of both the victim and the juvenile offender to participate in diversion proceedings (Akbar, 2021). The law further stipulates that diversion must be prioritized in cases where the child

offender is charged with offenses carrying a maximum penalty of less than seven years of imprisonment and has no prior record of recidivism.

Beyond these normative provisions, the legislation outlines procedural safeguards to ensure that diversion efforts do not merely function as a bureaucratic formality but embody restorative justice's substantive goals. Specifically, the law mandates the involvement of a multidisciplinary panel composed of law enforcement officers, social workers, victim representatives, and respected community figures. This participatory model facilitates a dialogical process in which the interests of victims, offenders, and the broader community are balanced, thereby fostering accountability, reconciliation, and the reintegration of juvenile offenders into society.

However, empirical studies consistently reveal that implementing diversion policies across Indonesia's diverse jurisdictions remains uneven and sometimes ineffective. Research conducted by (Rido & Rosifany, 2025) uncovers substantial disparities in the prevalence and quality of diversion practices between urban centers and rural or peripheral regions. Their findings indicate that diversion rates are significantly higher in metropolitan areas such as Jakarta, Surabaya, and Bandung, where institutional capacity, human resources, and public awareness of restorative justice are relatively well-developed. In these regions, law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and judges are more likely to have received specialized training on diversion procedures and restorative justice principles. In contrast, rural areas often struggle with inadequate infrastructure, insufficient numbers of trained personnel, and a general lack of awareness among stakeholders regarding the objectives and procedures of diversion. Consequently, children in conflict with the law in these regions are disproportionately subjected to formal judicial proceedings, even in cases where diversion would have been legally permissible and procedurally appropriate.

Moreover, statistical data published by the Ministry of Law and Human Rights (2023) underscores a further limitation in the operationalization of diversion mechanisms. The data reveal a marked tendency among law enforcement officials and judicial actors to apply diversion predominantly in cases involving minor, non-violent offenses, such as theft or public order violations. Conversely, offenses involving physical violence, property damage, or other forms of aggravated conduct are frequently excluded from diversion consideration, notwithstanding the discretionary space afforded by the legal framework. This restrictive interpretation of eligibility criteria undermines the rehabilitative and reintegrative objectives of juvenile justice policy, perpetuating the criminalization of children who may have committed more serious offenses under circumstances that warrant contextual understanding and alternative resolution.

A critical issue in this analysis is the absence of standardized, legally binding operational procedures governing the diversion and restorative justice process. (Suharto, 2021) observes that the discretionary nature of diversion decisions, combined with the limited understanding of restorative justice principles among law enforcement personnel, prosecutors, and judges, has resulted in procedural inconsistencies and ad hoc practices across jurisdictions. These inconsistencies manifest in various ways, including divergent interpretations of eligibility criteria, disparities in the formality of diversion agreements, and variations in procedural safeguards afforded to juvenile offenders. In some jurisdictions, written agreements formalizing the terms of diversion are required and duly recorded; in others, informal verbal agreements suffice, with minimal oversight or documentation. This lack of uniformity generates legal uncertainty, diminishes

transparency, and increases the risk of arbitrary or discriminatory application of diversion mechanisms.

Additionally, the implementation of diversion and restorative justice in Indonesia is hampered by deep-seated cultural and societal factors that favor punitive approaches to juvenile offending. Public perceptions of leniency towards juvenile offenders, often fueled by sensationalist media coverage of juvenile delinquency, have engendered widespread skepticism regarding the efficacy and appropriateness of diversion. Field observations and interviews conducted in several regions reveal that victims, their families, and community members frequently resist participation in restorative processes, perceiving such mechanisms as insufficiently punitive and potentially enabling future criminal behavior. This punitive orientation is further reinforced by Indonesia's broader legal culture, which historically privileges retributive justice over restorative alternatives.

Institutional and structural constraints constitute an additional impediment to the effective realization of diversion and restorative justice policies. Multiple studies, including those by (Sinatrio, 2019), demonstrate that many law enforcement agencies, prosecutors' offices, and courts operate under severe resource limitations that hinder their capacity to implement diversion programs. Budgetary constraints often preclude the provision of essential logistical and operational support, such as dedicated mediation spaces, transportation allowances for participants, and follow-up services to monitor compliance with diversion agreements. Inadequate allocation of financial and human resources effectively compels law enforcement officials to prioritize conventional criminal adjudication over diversion, notwithstanding the clear legislative mandate to the contrary.

Furthermore, empirical evidence gathered from field research by (Suharto, 2021) reveals persistently low levels of community engagement in diversion processes. In many cases, community members and victim representatives are either unaware of their role in restorative justice initiatives or lack the motivation to participate meaningfully. This lack of engagement is compounded by the absence of systematic public education efforts to promote awareness of the objectives and benefits of diversion and restorative justice. Victims and their families, in particular, often express a preference for formal judicial proceedings, viewing them as the only legitimate means of securing accountability and reparation.

A further systemic weakness in the study is the lack of a coherent and comprehensive monitoring and evaluation framework for diversion and restorative justice initiatives. Although the UU SPPA mandates periodic reporting by relevant law enforcement and judicial bodies, these reports tend to be perfunctory and incomplete, often lacking critical data points such as recidivism rates, victim satisfaction, and the social reintegration status of juvenile offenders who have undergone diversion. The absence of standardized reporting formats and reliable performance indicators impedes the capacity of policymakers, practitioners, and researchers to conduct evidence-based assessments of program efficacy. This data deficit not only undermines transparency and accountability but also hampers the formulation of targeted policy interventions to strengthen diversion implementation.

In light of these empirical findings, it is evident that while Indonesia's legal framework for juvenile diversion and restorative justice reflects progressive normative commitments aligned with international standards such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights

of the Child (UNCRC) and the Beijing Rules, substantial gaps persist at the level of policy implementation and institutional practice. These deficiencies stem from a complex interplay of structural, cultural, and institutional factors, including resource constraints, limited stakeholder capacity, entrenched punitive attitudes, and inadequate data systems.

Accordingly, this study underscores the urgent need for a comprehensive, multi-dimensional reform strategy to enhance the effectiveness and sustainability of diversion and restorative justice initiatives in Indonesia. Such a strategy should include the development of standardized operational guidelines, capacity-building programs for law enforcement and judicial actors, increased budgetary allocations, systematic public education campaigns, and the establishment of a rigorous monitoring and evaluation framework. Only through the integration of these measures can the transformative potential of diversion and restorative justice in promoting the rehabilitation and reintegration of juvenile offenders be fully realized within Indonesia's criminal justice system.

3.2. The Reassessing Diversion and Restorative Justice in Indonesia's Juvenile Criminal System

The empirical findings of this study reveal a persistent paradox at the heart of Indonesia's juvenile justice reform efforts: despite the existence of a progressive legal framework that explicitly endorses diversion and restorative justice as fundamental principles, the practical realization of these mechanisms remains fragmented, inconsistent, and, in many cases, ineffective. This normative-practical disjunction reflects not merely technical or administrative shortcomings but rather a complex interplay of structural, cultural, and institutional factors that continue to impede the transformative aspirations embedded within Indonesia's juvenile justice legislation.

From a structural perspective, one of the most salient barriers to the effective implementation of diversion and restorative justice is the absence of detailed, uniform, and binding operational guidelines governing the procedures and criteria for diversion. Although the UU SPPA and its implementing regulations provide a general legal basis for diversion, they leave considerable room for discretion in interpretation and application by law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and judges. While intended to afford flexibility and contextual sensitivity, this discretionary latitude has produced procedural variability and legal uncertainty in practice. The lack of clear procedural standards often results in divergent practices across jurisdictions, with some localities adhering to formal, transparent processes. In contrast, others resort to informal or even arbitrary decision-making. This inconsistency undermines the predictability and integrity of the juvenile justice process and increases the risk of miscarriages of justice, particularly in regions where legal actors lack adequate training or resources.

These structural limitations are further compounded by Indonesia's broader legal pluralism and decentralization landscape, which has historically produced uneven legal capacity, governance quality, and resource allocation across regions (Lukito, 2012). The decentralization of judicial and law enforcement functions, while intended to promote local autonomy, has inadvertently exacerbated disparities in implementing national juvenile justice policies. Regions with stronger institutional capacity and greater access to financial and human resources—typically urban centers—are better positioned to operationalize diversion mechanisms. In contrast, peripheral and rural jurisdictions often

lack the institutional infrastructure, qualified personnel, and financial support to implement restorative justice effectively, entrenching regional inequalities in access to child-friendly justice.

Cultural factors also profoundly influence the uneven implementation of diversion and restorative justice in Indonesia (Lukito, 2012). Deeply ingrained punitive attitudes toward crime and justice, rooted in both traditional adat (customary) law and modern retributive legal norms, continue to shape public perceptions and institutional responses to juvenile offending. For many community members and law enforcement actors, justice is equated with punishment, deterrence, and retribution, rather than rehabilitation, restoration, or social reintegration. Consequently, diversion is frequently perceived as an excessively lenient approach that undermines the moral authority of the law and fails to deter future criminal behavior. This cultural resistance is further reinforced by sensationalist media portrayals of juvenile delinquency, which often emphasize narratives of social disorder and moral decline, thereby fueling public demand for punitive measures (Sanjaya et al., 2023).

At the institutional level, several limitations obstruct the operationalization of diversion and restorative justice programs. A significant impediment lies in the limited capacity and preparedness of law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and judicial officers to implement restorative justice principles in practice. Empirical studies consistently report that many of these actors lack adequate training in conflict resolution, restorative dialogue techniques, and child-sensitive procedures. Their professional education and institutional culture often prioritize adversarial and punitive approaches over restorative alternatives, resulting in a fundamental misalignment between legal mandates and institutional practice. Moreover, the absence of dedicated budgetary allocations for diversion programs severely constrains the availability of essential resources, including trained mediators, victim-offender dialogue forums, community-based support services, and follow-up monitoring systems (Tobing, 2024). Without these infrastructural and human resource investments, diversion initiatives are often reduced to procedural formalities devoid of substantive restorative content.

The findings of this study also highlight a critical gap in Indonesia's juvenile justice reform discourse—namely, the insufficient engagement with the foundational theories of restorative justice that have shaped global best practices. As conceptualized by (Zehr, 1990), restorative justice emphasizes a relational and dialogical approach to justice that seeks to repair harm, restore social relationships, and reintegrate offenders into the community. (Braithwaite, 2003) theory of reintegrative shaming further underscores the importance of separating the offender from the offense, advocating for community involvement in the process of accountability and reconciliation. Additionally, (Daly & Wade, 2017) critical work on the diversity of restorative justice models stresses the necessity of context-specific approaches that recognize each jurisdiction's socio-legal complexities and cultural specificities.

In Indonesia's case, the empirical evidence suggests that while the legal framework borrows the language of restorative justice, the implementation often neglects these theoretical foundations. In many instances, the emphasis on procedural compliance and institutional discretion has displaced the relational and participatory dimensions central to restorative justice theory. For instance, the failure to systematically involve victims, offenders, and community members in meaningful dialogue undermines the transformative potential that (Zehr, 1990) and (Braithwaite, 2003) envisioned.

Furthermore, lacking attention to local socio-cultural contexts and plural legal traditions reveals a missed opportunity to operationalize Daly's call for contextually grounded restorative justice models.

Addressing these multi-faceted challenges requires a comprehensive, coherent, and context-sensitive policy response. First and foremost, policy reforms must prioritize developing and institutionalizing standardized operational guidelines that provide clear, detailed, and legally binding procedures for diversion and restorative justice implementation. These guidelines should not merely replicate abstract legal norms. Still, they must be grounded in empirical realities and informed by restorative justice theory, ensuring that justice's relational, dialogical, and reintegrative dimensions are preserved. In this regard, it is essential to integrate local wisdom and community-based conflict resolution mechanisms, such as *musyawarah* (deliberation) and adat mediation, into formal diversion procedures. Doing so would enhance both the legitimacy and cultural acceptance of restorative justice initiatives and foster community ownership of juvenile justice processes.

In tandem with normative reform, there is an urgent need for capacity-building programs targeting key stakeholders involved in the juvenile justice system. These programs should include systematic training on restorative justice principles, child rights, trauma-informed approaches, and participatory mediation techniques. Importantly, such training must extend beyond law enforcement and judicial actors to encompass social workers, community leaders, educators, and civil society organizations, thereby cultivating a broad-based network of restorative justice facilitators.

Furthermore, public education and awareness campaigns are essential to mitigate societal resistance and reshape punitive attitudes toward juvenile offenders. These campaigns should emphasize the rehabilitative and reintegrative objectives of diversion and restorative justice, while also highlighting their consistency with Indonesia's constitutional and international obligations to protect the rights and dignity of children. Public messaging must counteract prevailing narratives of criminality and moral panic by promoting evidence-based understandings of juvenile delinquency as a social and developmental issue, rather than merely a legal infraction.

Finally, establishing a robust and transparent monitoring and evaluation framework is imperative to ensure the accountability, effectiveness, and sustainability of diversion programs. This framework should include standardized data collection mechanisms, performance indicators, and periodic impact assessments focusing on key outcomes such as recidivism rates, victim satisfaction, community engagement, and social reintegration of juvenile offenders. By systematically generating empirical evidence on program effectiveness and anchoring reforms in the foundational theories of restorative justice, policymakers and practitioners will be better equipped to identify implementation gaps, refine policy design, and allocate resources more efficiently.

In sum, the findings of this study underscore that the success of Indonesia's juvenile justice reform efforts hinges not solely on the existence of progressive legal norms but on the capacity of the state and society to bridge the gap between law and practice. Achieving the transformative potential of diversion and restorative justice will require sustained, multi-dimensional, theoretically informed, empirically grounded, and culturally responsive efforts.

4. CONCLUSION

Indonesia's juvenile justice reforms represent a commendable and progressive shift from punitive paradigms toward rehabilitative and restorative approaches aimed at safeguarding the rights and dignity of child offenders. These reforms, embodied in the UU SPPA and related regulatory instruments, reflect Indonesia's formal commitment to international human rights standards and restorative justice principles. Nevertheless, the practical implementation of diversion and restorative justice initiatives continues to face persistent legal, institutional, and cultural obstacles that hinder their effectiveness and sustainability. This paper's analysis highlights significant policy gaps, procedural ambiguities, and structural barriers—including the absence of standardized guidelines, insufficient institutional capacity, and entrenched punitive attitudes—that collectively undermine the transformative potential of these reforms. To realize the full promise of diversion and restorative justice, Indonesia must move beyond normative commitments and adopt a comprehensive, multi-faceted strategy that integrates legal precision, institutional capacity-building, and meaningful community participation. Such an approach requires refining legal frameworks and sustained investments in stakeholder training, public education, and the development of culturally sensitive implementation models. Furthermore, future research should prioritize empirical evaluations of the long-term outcomes of diversion programs, including their impact on recidivism, victim satisfaction, and the social reintegration of juvenile offenders. Particular attention should be given to the formulation of context-specific, locally grounded models of restorative justice that accommodate Indonesia's socio-legal pluralism and regional disparities, thereby ensuring that diversion serves not merely as a procedural formality but as an effective mechanism for achieving child-friendly justice.

5. REFERENCES

- Akbar, A. (2021). The Ideal Formulation of Diversion in The Juvenile Criminal Justice System. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Law*, 24(6).
- Braithwaite, J. (2003). Principles of restorative justice. *Restorative Justice and Criminal Justice: Competing or Reconcilable Paradigms*, 360, 1–20.
- Daly, K., & Wade, D. (2017). Sibling sexual violence and victims' justice interests: A comparison of youth conferencing and judicial sentencing. In *Restorative Responses to Sexual Violence: Legal, Social and Therapeutic Dimensions*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315630595>
- Lukito, R. (2012). Legal Pluralism in Indonesia: Bridging the Unbridgeable. In *Legal Pluralism in Indonesia: Bridging the Unbridgeable*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203113134>
- Muchtar, S., Irwansyah, I., Yunus, A., Arifin, A. P., & Faried, M. (2024). Juvenile Criminal Responsibility in Justice Systems: A Comparative Study of Judicial Interpretations in Indonesia and Australia. *Jambe Law Journal*, 7(2).
- Nasution, N. P. A., Hamdani, F., & Fauzia, A. (2022). The concept of restorative justice in handling crimes in the criminal justice system. *European Journal of Law and Political Science*, 1(5), 32–41.
- Rido, M., & Rosifany, O. (2025). IMPLEMENTATION OF DIVERSION IN THE JUVENILE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM IN SAMARINDA DISTRICT COURT. *Awang Long Law Review*, 7(2), 282–287.

- Sanjaya, A. H., Meliala, A. E., & Puteri, N. M. M. (2023). The Paradox of Child's Diversion Policy in Conflict with the Law in the Indonesian Child Criminal Justice System. *Journal of Social and Political Sciences*, 6(4). <https://doi.org/10.31014/aior.1991.06.04.442>
- Sinatrio, W. (2019). The Implementation of Diversion and Restorative Justice in the Juvenile Criminal Justice System in Indonesia. *Journal of Indonesian Legal Studies*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.15294/jils.v4i01.23339>
- Suharto, E. (2021). Restorative Justice in Indonesian Law on Juvenile Criminal Justice System and Its Implications for Social Work. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociology*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2021.10.104>
- Tobing, S. J. A. B. (2024). The Diversion Program Implementation Under the Juvenile Justice System Act in Indonesia: What Works, What Does Not? *Restorative: Journal of Indonesian Probation and Parole System*, 2(1), 46–60.
- Zainuddin, Z., & Hambali, A. R. (2023). Implementation of Diversion for Children in Conflict with the Law by the National Police of Indonesia. *European Journal of Law and Political Science*, 2(6). <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejpolitics.2023.2.6.112>
- Zehr, H. (1990). *Changing lenses*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.