



HOME VISIT IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN THE INDONESIAN JUVENILE JUSTICE LAW AND INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENTS

Setya Wahyudi*, Rani Hendriana, Dwi Hapsari Retnaningrum, Dwiki Oktobrian, Eva Dwi Dayati, Eriene Chindy Octaviandini, Palupi Rantau, Rohadhatul Aisy

Faculty of Law, Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Purwokerto, 53122, Central Java, Indonesia

*Email: setya.wahyudi@unsoed.ac.id

Abstract. Home visits are an important instrument in the juvenile justice system, ensuring that children's rehabilitation aligns with the principle of the best interests of the child. Their implementation reflects a rehabilitative and restorative approach that emphasizes family and community involvement. This study examines the scope of home visits as regulated under Indonesia's Juvenile Criminal Justice System Law and relevant international instruments. Using secondary data and legislative, comparative, and conceptual approaches, the study finds that Indonesia's law defines home visits as part of the supervision of diversion and social reintegration programs. Relevant international instruments include the Beijing Rules (1985), the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), the Riyadh Guidelines (1990), and the Havana Rules (1990). Among these, only the Beijing Rules explicitly regulate home visits, covering monitoring of children's behavior, participation in community programs, and residence in halfway houses. Thus, the scope of home visits in both Indonesian law and the Beijing Rules extends beyond home supervision to include children's social interactions. The study recommends that Indonesia's Juvenile Justice Law explicitly define the scope of home visits in line with the Beijing Rules as part of community-based rehabilitation and enhanced supervision by Community Guidance Officers.

Keywords: Community-based rehabilitation, child rehabilitation, home visit, juvenile criminal justice system, restorative justice

1. Introduction

Home visits are an important instrument in the juvenile justice system that emphasizes rehabilitation and restoration, rather than retribution. This restorative approach is in line with the principles of juvenile justice that focus on recovery, responsibility, and reconciliation with the victim [1]. The implementation of juvenile responsibility requires family guidance and support from the government and community to ensure that the recovery process is effective and prevents recidivism [2]. The recovery process is realized through dialogue and mediation involving the perpetrator, victim, family, and related parties to reach a fair agreement [3]. The involvement of various parties can be strengthened through the application of a participatory approach that emphasizes deliberation and shared responsibility [4]. Thus, home visits are a strategic means of realizing restorative justice through synergy between families, communities, and institutions in the child recovery process.

In practice, home visits have been carried out as part of the supervision and assistance of children in conflict with the law, particularly by involving families and communities in the social reintegration process. The involvement of families and communities plays an important



role in creating an environment conducive to behavioral change and successful reintegration of children [5]. Such a conducive environment can be created through good communication, emotional support, and cooperation between families, communities, and child guidance institutions [6]. A collaborative approach between families, communities, and relevant institutions is important to ensure the successful rehabilitation of children and the application of the principles of restorative justice [7]. Thus, home visits are a strategic instrument in the juvenile justice system to support rehabilitation, social reintegration, and the effective application of restorative justice.

Terminologically, home visits refer to visits made by community counselors or social workers to the child's residence to ensure that the rehabilitation process is carried out in accordance with the principle of the best interests of the child. Although the aspect of home visits has not been explicitly discussed much, research on rehabilitation and coordination of juvenile justice institutions mentions the need for family- and community-based interventions that involve field visits or direct supervision and the importance of alternative approaches that involve the child's environment [8]. When a child undergoes an investigation, it is the responsibility of the police, but when they are placed in a detention center or prison, it becomes the responsibility of the Ministry of Law and Human Rights [9]. Home visit programs can reduce the risk of children becoming involved in the justice system and strengthen the social rehabilitation process [10]. Similar practices are carried out through social assessments by Community Counselors as stipulated in Law Number 11 of 2012 (the Juvenile Justice Law), in which social workers conduct home visits to ensure the continuity of the diversion process and guidance for children in the family environment [11]. Home visit programs combined with social support and the justice system can strengthen the reintegration of children and prevent recidivism [12]. Home visits are not only interpreted as administrative activities, but as an implementative instrument of the principles of restorative justice and the protection of children's rights at all stages of the juvenile justice system.

However, the provisions regarding home visits in the the Juvenile Justice Law are still limited, resulting in a normative gap compared to international standards. Although space limitations do not allow for a detailed discussion of specific state laws, a comparative analysis of representative provisions is discussed in relation to the application of home visits as an instrument to support the social reintegration of children [13]. The concept of home visits in international instruments is found explicitly in the Beijing Rules, which include monitoring of children's behavior, participation in community programs, and the existence of shelters. Monitoring children's behavior is also in line with the Malaysian juvenile justice system, which has actively involved community actors as recommended by UNICEF through family involvement mechanisms, community mobilization, and monitoring efforts [14]. In order to achieve harmonization with international standards, Indonesia needs to consider developing guidelines for implementing home visits that include procedures for family involvement, monitoring by social workers, and indicators of successful reintegration.

This study aims to conduct a comparative assessment of the scope of home visits in national law and international instruments, as well as to contribute to strengthening child justice practices in line with global principles. This study is also expected to provide relevant policy recommendations to strengthen child protection through an effective, humane, and child-centered approach to home visits. According to the principle of the best interests of the child, all decisions concerning children, including those made by parents, communities, and governments, must be made with the best interests of the child in mind [15]. The principle of the best interests of the child emphasizes that decisions regarding a child's future should focus on protection and rehabilitation, not retribution, and that imprisonment or placement in care should be a last resort [16]. Although jurisprudence places comprehensive protection as the main principle, effective implementation still requires institutional reform, ongoing judicial



commitment, and integrated public policies that provide support [17]. This research is expected to serve as an academic foundation and practical reference for policymakers, law enforcement officials, and social service agencies in implementing a more structured home visit mechanism.

2. Methods

This study aims to examine the scope of home visits based on the Juvenile Criminal Justice System Law and international instruments, particularly the Beijing Rules (1985), the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), the Riyadh Guidelines (1990), and the Havana Rules (1990). To achieve this objective, a legislative, comparative, and conceptual approach was used. This article is the result of doctrinal research focusing on the use of secondary data. Secondary data consists of legislation, international instruments, institutional reports, and academic references. National legal sources include the Juvenile Justice Law and its implementing regulations, while international sources include the Beijing Rules, CRC, Riyadh Guidelines, and Havana Rules. Institutional data was obtained from reports and statistics published by the Ministry of Law and Human Rights, particularly the Directorate General of Corrections. Academic literature on juvenile justice and restorative justice was also reviewed to establish a conceptual foundation. All data were analyzed qualitatively by combining legal interpretation, comparative analysis, and conceptual discussion, and triangulation between primary and secondary data was conducted to ensure validity and reliability.

3. Results And Discussion

3.1. The scope of home visits in national legal framework

Law No. 11 of 2012 on the Juvenile Criminal Justice System (the Juvenile Justice Law) marks a paradigm shift in the handling of juvenile cases in Indonesia, from a retributive approach to a restorative approach. One important instrument in this framework is the implementation of home visits to children in conflict with the law. Home visits are part of the social investigation process conducted by Social Counselors to obtain a complete picture of the child's personal, family, and social environment. The results of these visits are important material for law enforcement officials, particularly investigators, prosecutors, and judges, in making decisions that take into account the best interests of the child.

In the Juvenile Justice Law, provisions regarding home visits are regulated implicitly through Articles 60 to 65, which regulate social research and the reporting of its results. Although the term "home visit" is not explicitly mentioned, this practice is an integral part of the process of collecting social data on children, which must be carried out by Social Counselors. To further understand the scope and role of home visits within this legal framework, see the following description of each article:



Table 1. Regulations on Home Visits in the Juvenile Justice Law

Pasal	Article Substantive	Regulation Relevance to Home Visits
60	Regulates that the Correctional Center (Bapas) through the Community Counselor is required to conduct social research on children in conflict with the law.	This is the main legal basis for conducting home visits because social research requires data on the child's social situation, which can only be obtained through direct visits to the child's home and surrounding environment.
61	Social investigations are conducted from the investigation stage, through prosecution, to examination in court.	This implies that home visits can be conducted at every stage of the juvenile justice process to ensure that information about the child's social circumstances is always up to date and relevant for decision-making.
62	The results of social research contain data on the personal circumstances, family, education, and social environment of the child.	These data elements can only be obtained comprehensively through home visits, where Community Counselor conducts direct observations of the child's living conditions, family relationship patterns, and environmental dynamics.
63	The results of social investigations must be submitted to investigators, prosecutors, and judges as material for consideration in the judicial process.	This shows that the results of home visits have legal value and form an objective basis for law enforcement officials in determining the form of handling of the child (e.g., diversion or formal judicial process).
64	Social research is also conducted on child victims and witnesses to determine the social and psychological impacts they experience.	Expanding the scope of home visits not only to child perpetrators, but also to child victims and witnesses, in order to obtain a comprehensive social picture in restorative settlement efforts.
65	Emphasizing that the social research report is an integral part of the child's case file.	Strengthening the legal position of home visits as a mandatory procedure and not merely an administrative supplement, as the results of the visits become part of the official case documents.

Source: Law on the Criminal Justice System for Children

The scope of home visits in the the Juvenile Justice Law is closely related to the law's orientation towards diversion and restorative justice mechanisms. Restorative justice is the main objective of diversion, a resolution mechanism that has long been known and practiced by indigenous communities in various regions of Indonesia [18]. Indigenous communities in Indonesia tend to prioritize deliberation to restore relationships between perpetrators, victims, and communities in resolving problems. This pattern of resolution is in line with the concept of diversion. Diversion and restorative justice are adopted in the juvenile criminal justice system with the aim of providing legal protection for child offenders without neglecting their criminal responsibility [19]. This protection means that child offenders will avoid imprisonment or stigmatization from the criminal justice process [20]. Thus, the scope of home visits in the the Juvenile Justice Law shows a close relationship with the law's orientation towards diversion and restorative justice mechanisms.

Home visits combined with effective education intervene in juvenile justice, reducing criminal involvement by 4% according to Petitclerc and Brooks-Gunn [10]. Education in the application of welfare protection plays an important role in the guidance and correction of children who exhibit deviant behavior and are still below the age of criminal responsibility [21]. The guidance of children in conflict with the law is carried out based on the principle of the best interests of the child, in order to support the process of improvement, protection, and optimal growth and development of children. According to the principle of the best interests of the child, every decision related to children, whether by parents, the community, or the government, must be oriented towards the protection and welfare of children [15]. Therefore, the implementation of home visits combined with education can reduce deviant behavior in children, in line with the principle of the best interests of the child in the context of protection and guidance.



The regulation of home visits in the Juvenile Justice Law strengthens the rehabilitative framework by ensuring that children remain connected to their families and communities. The family, especially parents, has an important role in increasing supervision and attention to children so that they do not repeat their mistakes and encourage positive behavioral change in society [22]. The community has an important role in resolving children's cases, helping children and victims restore social relationships, adapt, and reintegrate harmoniously into their surroundings. The community environment plays an important role in providing moral support, creating a safe and inclusive atmosphere, and helping children restore social relationships and reintegrate harmoniously. The implementation of home visits in the Juvenile Justice Law emphasizes the importance of family and community involvement in supporting the process of recovery, guidance, and sustainable social reintegration of children.

However, the absence of a detailed definition can lead to differences in practice and inequality in the protection of children in different jurisdictions. These differences have the potential to cause disparities in child protection, as each region interprets and implements home visits differently, resulting in inconsistent program effectiveness. This inconsistency has the potential to weaken the impact of the home visit program, so that the protection, guidance, and social reintegration of children are not maximally achieved in all regions. Thus, the objective of implementing home visits to provide protection for children is difficult to achieve if it is not supported by clear guidelines. Therefore, the implementing regulations of the Juvenile Justice Law should explicitly delineate the definition, objectives, procedures, and evaluation standards of home visits. Such regulation should establish clear operational guidelines, including periodic supervision schedules, structured behavioral monitoring tools, documentation standards, and inter-agency coordination mechanisms. Explicit procedural codification is essential to transform home visits from an implied administrative practice into a legally recognized instrument of structured community supervision.

From the perspective of restorative justice theory, home visits serve as a practical mechanism for implementing community-based rehabilitation. The main objective of restorative justice is to restore the condition of victims, perpetrators, and the community through solutions that focus on recovery, especially for cases involving children [23]. In this context, the success of restorative justice itself is highly dependent on the level of willingness of the parties and the community to actively participate in the recovery process [24]. The recovery process in restorative justice not only aims to restore the situation to its original state, but also to foster awareness and moral responsibility for all parties involved [25]. The active involvement of the community, family, and state is key to ensuring that the restorative justice process truly achieves its goal of comprehensive recovery [22]. Thus, home visits as part of community-based rehabilitation are an important element in realizing restorative justice that restores all parties.

Conversely, within the framework of deterrence theory, limited regulation may not be sufficient to ensure accountability and behavioral change in children. Behavioral change in children requires comprehensive guidance so that they understand the consequences of their actions, develop positive values, and take responsibility for their own behavior [26]. This emphasizes the importance of the active role of families, schools, and communities in supporting children and creating an environment that fosters positive behavior [6]. Holistic interventions, including moral education and guidance, support long-term behavioral change and prevent repeat offenses [27]. In addition, the application of clear and consistent penalties can reinforce the deterrent effect and provide clear behavioral boundaries [25]. In other words, successful prevention requires a combination of legal certainty and guidance that can ensure accountability and shape better behavior in children.

This article proposes that the Juvenile Justice Law explicitly define the scope and procedures of home visits in accordance with international standards, particularly the Beijing Rules. The principles in the Beijing Rules are oriented towards protecting the best interests of the child



through diversion from the legal process and a more restorative approach [28]. The best interests of the child must be a priority in every action and decision, including the application of diversion, to ensure effective protection, recovery, and rehabilitation [15]. The success of rehabilitation also depends on effective synergy between social workers, families, and relevant institutions in supporting the child's recovery [29]. Thus, establishing clear home visit procedures in accordance with international standards is the main basis for ensuring optimal protection, rehabilitation, and recovery of children.

A clearer formulation not only strengthens the role of social workers in supervision, but also ensures consistency and fairness in the implementation of child rehabilitation programs. Capacity building and support for social workers are needed so that their role in handling children in conflict with the law is more effective and recovery-oriented [30]. This is in line with the spirit of the Juvenile Justice Law, which places Community Counselors at the forefront of child protection and assistance throughout the judicial process.[31] The active role of Community Counselors at every stage of case handling has a major impact on the success of the rehabilitation and social reintegration process for children [32]. The limited number and reach of Community Counselors indicates the need to strengthen resources and institutional support so that the function of child assistance can be carried out optimally [33]. Thus, clear formulations and adequate support are important foundations for optimizing the role of Community Counselors in realizing justice and successful rehabilitation for children.

3.2. The scope of home visits in international instruments

The concept of home visits as visits by social workers has a normative basis in international instruments governing the juvenile justice system. Although the term “home visit” is not explicitly mentioned in all international instruments, this practice was first formally recognized in the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice, or the Beijing Rules (1985). In this context, home visits are seen as part of the social inquiry report conducted by social workers or probation officers to identify the personal, family, and environmental background of the child. The data obtained from these visits form the basis for judges and judicial institutions to make decisions that are proportionate, taking into account the welfare of the child and efforts for their social rehabilitation.

Apart from the Beijing Rules, several other international instruments such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), the Riyadh Guidelines (1990), and the Havana Rules (1990) do not directly regulate home visits, but they contain principles that are relevant to community-based sentences or forms of community-based treatment of children. This concept is closely related to home visits, as both emphasize social intervention that is not oriented towards punishment, but rather towards the social recovery of children within their family and community environments. To clarify the relationship between these international instruments and the practice of home visits, the substance of each is described below:



Table 2. Substance of International Instruments Related to Home Visits and Community-Based Sentences

International Instrument	Relevant Regulatory Substance	Relevance to Home Visits / Community-Based Sentences
Beijing Rules (1985) <i>United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice</i>	Regulates the importance of social inquiry reports conducted by social workers or probation officers to assess the background of children before sanctions are imposed (Rules 5.1, 16.1, and 16.2).	Forms the conceptual basis for home visits, as home visits are part of the collection of social data on children conducted by social workers to support decisions oriented towards rehabilitation rather than punishment.
Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989)	Article 40 emphasizes the importance of alternatives to detention and punishment, including community-based measures that take into account the welfare of the child.	Reinforces the relevance of home visits as an instrument to support the implementation of community-based sentences, by ensuring the readiness of the child's family and social environment in the implementation of alternative sentencing.
Riyadh Guidelines (1990) <i>United Nations Guidelines for the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency</i>	Encourages policies for the prevention of juvenile delinquency through family, school, and community-based social interventions (Guidelines 10, 13, and 21).	<i>Home visits can be positioned as a form of preventive and rehabilitative approach in line with the spirit of community-based intervention as stipulated in these guidelines.</i>
Havana Rules (1990) <i>United Nations Rules for the Protection of Juveniles Deprived of their Liberty</i>	States that restricting a child's liberty should be a last resort and kept to a minimum, and emphasizes the importance of the child's social reintegration (Rules 17, 28, and 79).	<i>Home visits play a role in the assessment and social reintegration of children, ensuring family and community support as an alternative to incarceration.</i>

Source: Beijing Rules, CRC, Riyadh Guidelines, and Havana Rules

The explicit reference to home visits in the Beijing Rules is rooted in their objective of establishing minimum standards for the administration of juvenile justice that emphasize alternatives to incarceration. The Beijing Rules do not mention “home visits,” but the principles of well-being & proportionality, social inquiry, least restrictive, non-custodial measures including supervision/guidance, and last resort operationally support home visits as a medium for family/community-based assessment, guidance, and monitoring. The provision for home visits is justified because visits to the child's living environment allow for a comprehensive assessment of family, school, and community factors as a basis for individualized placement and intervention [34]. Meanwhile, causal evidence shows that the detention/arrest of juveniles has a negative impact on education and increases adult recidivism, so community-based alternatives are more in line with the principle of least restrictive [35]. Home visits also support restorative diversion, verify the readiness of the parties, establish realistic obligations, and monitor compliance with the support of meta-analysis findings that restorative practices in juvenile cases reduce subsequent offenses [36]. The effectiveness of community supervision increases when combined with structured services that practically require home visits [37]. In Indonesia, the functionality of home visits is evident in the mandate of Community Counselor to conduct investigations, guidance, and supervision within the framework of the Juvenile Justice Law and the implementation of diversion [38].



The Beijing Rules' support for home visits as part of social inquiry, guidance, and community supervision provides concrete operational tools for juvenile justice systems around the world to promote community-based rehabilitation. Conversely, the absence of explicit provisions in the CRC, Riyadh Guidelines, and Havana Rules means that the implementation of home visits depends on each country's interpretation and implementation of the principle of child welfare. Diversion mechanisms are carried out at all levels of the juvenile criminal justice system, starting from the investigation stage at the police, during prosecution in court, and during the execution of the verdict [39]. Article 21 of the Juvenile Justice Law and Government Regulation No. 65 of 2015 concerning Guidelines for the Implementation of Diversion stipulate that children under the age of 12 who commit or are suspected of committing a criminal offense must be returned to their parents and included in education, guidance, and assistance programs at government agencies or Social Welfare Institutions [40]. Capturing the link between the Beijing Rules and the Juvenile Justice Law practices is useful as a theoretical reinforcement when linking home visits with the prevention of stigmatization and community-based recovery [41]. Field/home visit-based guidance and supervision support compliance, reduce stigma, and strengthen reintegration in line with the spirit of the Beijing Rules and the objectives of the Juvenile Justice Law [42]. Juvenile justice services must be developed and coordinated systematically with the aim of improving and maintaining the competence of personnel involved in the services, including their methods, approaches, and attitudes [43].

Harmonization with the Beijing Rules requires a more substantive alignment than mere conceptual acknowledgment. The Beijing Rules emphasize individualized treatment, proportionality, and the use of non-custodial measures supported by social inquiry and supervision. Interpreted systematically, these principles imply that home visits must function not only as pre-decision assessments but also as dynamic instruments of continuous community supervision. Thus, harmonization entails expanding the scope of home visits to include structured behavioral monitoring and evaluation within the child's social ecosystem. In line with the spirit of Rules 5 and 16 of the Beijing Rules, home visits should incorporate direct observation of the child's interaction within family, school, and peer environments. This broader monitoring function ensures that community-based measures operate as meaningful alternatives to detention rather than symbolic procedural formalities. Through continuous engagement, Community Guidance Officers can identify early signs of recidivism risk, social vulnerability, or family dysfunction, allowing timely intervention consistent with the best interests of the child.

From a restorative justice perspective, the Beijing Rules demonstrate a normative commitment to social reintegration through family and community-based supervision, in which home visits play a central role. According to Vivi, the objective of diversification as stated in Article 11 of the Beijing Rules explicitly emphasizes that diversification is a mechanism for resolving cases outside the formal judicial process, with the main purpose of protecting children from the stigmatization that arises from the juvenile criminal justice process. Although the Beijing Rules do not elaborate on the provisions regarding diversion because they are only general guidelines for countries to implement, it can be understood that the main objective of diversion in these rules is to prevent criminal cases involving children from entering the criminal justice system. In this context, when compared to the provisions on diversion regulated in the Indonesian Juvenile Criminal Justice System Law, it appears that the law has not fully implemented the principles of protection as referred to in the Beijing Rules. One practice that reflects the objective of diversion more consistently can be found in South Australia, which makes a real effort to prevent children from becoming involved in the criminal justice system [28].

Meanwhile, from a human rights-based theory perspective, the CRC, Riyadh Guidelines, and Havana Rules emphasize that the absence of explicit regulations does not reduce the state's



obligation to create practical measures to ensure the fulfillment of children's rights. According to Ursula Kilkelly and Stefaan Pleysier, although the standards of justice applied to children in conflict with the law are directly aimed at protecting this group, it is important to understand that children's rights are interrelated and inseparable. International provisions such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and other related instruments have established consistent guidelines regarding the treatment of children in conflict with the law [44]. According to Ursula Kilkelly, the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) establishes a complaint mechanism that provides individuals with the opportunity to submit complaints about alleged violations of the rights set out in the Convention to the European Court of Human Rights. This convention has also acquired legal force in various forms in most member states of the Council of Europe. Thus, the ECHR not only serves as a basis for the development of more specific human rights standards in the field of juvenile justice, but also creates a mechanism that ensures the application and legal force of these standards [45].

This article proposes that Indonesia adopt the Beijing Rules as a normative benchmark for explicitly defining home visits in national legislation. It also suggests the best way to gain the support of guidance officers if guidance institutions promote home visits [46]. In her analysis, Monica emphasizes that positive relationships between adolescents and guidance officers who are known to be friendly, caring, and fair will be associated with fewer rule violations during the guidance period and fewer criminal acts committed by adolescents. Similarly, when adolescents feel supported by their parents and parents have better knowledge about their children's conditions, this will also be associated with fewer guidance violations and juvenile crimes [47]. Thus, clear regulations regarding home visits in the juvenile justice system in Indonesia will not only strengthen the effectiveness of guidance, but also have the potential to foster more constructive relationships between children, parents, and guidance officers, so that the rehabilitative objectives of the juvenile justice system can be optimally achieved.

At the same time, the general principles contained in the CRC, Riyadh Guidelines, and Havana Rules can serve as a complementary foundation for strengthening comprehensive protection for children in the juvenile justice system. As outlined by Ursula Kilkelly, in international law, a country can make exceptions to provisions that it does not want to apply, for example, the continued practice of placing children with adults in correctional institutions. In fact, because there is no strong enforcement mechanism, some countries may not fully comply with these provisions. Nevertheless, international standards remain important as a measure of whether a country's laws, policies, and practices of juvenile justice are in line with the principles of child protection. These standards not only set minimum requirements that every country must meet, but are also universal, applicable to countries recovering from conflict as well as those that still take a harsh approach to children. Most importantly, these standards serve as a fixed guideline that is not easily swayed by public opinion, thereby providing a basis for legitimacy and sustainability in the administration of child justice. Thus, among various different systems, these standards can be seen as a common language in realizing justice for children and adolescents [45].

4. Conclusion

Home visits are an important instrument in the juvenile justice system that serves to ensure the protection, rehabilitation, and social reintegration of children in conflict with the law. Based on a comparison between the the Juvenile Justice Law and international instruments, it was found that home visits in Indonesia play a central role in supporting the implementation of diversion and restorative justice, even though they are not explicitly defined in national regulations. In the the Juvenile Justice Law, their implementation is reflected through social research and guidance conducted by Community Counselors as a form of community-based supervision and assistance. Meanwhile, the Beijing Rules (1985) are the only international



instrument that conceptually affirms the importance of social inquiry and community-based sentences, which are in line with the practice of home visits. Thus, both in the national and international contexts, home visits serve as a bridge between the juridical, social, and psychological aspects to ensure the best interests of the child and encourage the realization of restorative justice in the juvenile justice system.

This study suggests that the government explicitly establish definitions, procedures, and standards for the implementation of home visits in the implementing regulations of the Juvenile Justice Law to be in line with the Beijing Rules and the principle of the best interests of the child. Strengthening the capacity of Community Guidance Officers needs to be a priority through training, resource support, and inter-agency coordination to ensure the effectiveness of community-based rehabilitation. In addition, integrating home visits with education, family counseling, and community involvement can strengthen the prevention and recovery of children from deviant behavior. The limitation of this study lies in the use of secondary data that does not empirically describe the variation in home visit practices in various regions of Indonesia. Therefore, further field-based research is needed to assess the effectiveness and consistency of home visit implementation in the context of juvenile justice at the national level.

5. Acknowledgement

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to the Rector of Universitas Jenderal Soedirman and the Institute for Research and Community Service (LPPM UNSOED) for providing research funding and support that made this study possible.

References

- [1]. Supriyanta. Paradigma Baru Penyelesaian Tindak Pidana Anak. *J Glob Citiz J Ilm Kaji Pendidik Kewarganegaraan* [Internet]. 2022 Jul 1;11(1):8–13. Available from: <https://ejournal.unisri.ac.id/index.php/glbctz/article/view/7396>
- [2]. Rima Khuriatul Rakhmatiah. Diversi Dan Pelaksanaan Tanggung Jawab Anak Yang Berkonflik Dengan Hukum (Abh). *J Syntax Transform* [Internet]. 2020 Sep 23;1(7):366–76. Available from: <https://jurnal.syntaxtransformation.co.id/index.php/jst/article/view/112>
- [3]. I Wayan Puspa, Made Suradana, Muhammad Ikbal, Tri Laksono Kurniawan, Baihaqi Syakbani. Penanganan Tindak Pidana Anak Persepektif Pendekatan Restorative Justice. *Unizar Law Rev* [Internet]. 2023 Jun 24;6(1). Available from: <https://ulr.unizar.ac.id/ulr/article/view/33>
- [4]. Sitanggang BF, Cahyaningtyas I. Penanganan Perkara Anak Dalam Perspektif Jaksa Penuntut Umum. *J Pembang Huk Indones* [Internet]. 2020 Jan 10;2(1):66–81. Available from: <https://ejournal2.undip.ac.id/index.php/jphi/article/view/7211>
- [5]. Febriansari KM, Cahyaningtyas I. Ide Family Group Conference Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Anak Di Indonesia. *J Pembang Huk Indones* [Internet]. 2021 Sep 17;3(3):370–83. Available from: <https://ejournal2.undip.ac.id/index.php/jphi/article/view/12851>
- [6]. Hizba Ahshaina FHA, Wibhawa B, Hidayat EN. Interaksi di dalam Keluarga dengan Anak Berhadapan dengan Hukum di Panti Sosial Masurdi Putra Bambu Apus Jakarta. *Pros Penelit dan Pengabd Kpd Masy* [Internet]. 2016 Jul 1;3(3):349. Available from: <http://jurnal.unpad.ac.id/prosiding/article/view/13777>
- [7]. Latumahina EJ, Sakalessy A. Synergy Between Legal and Child Protection Agencies in Juvenile Justice. *Indones J Innov Stud* [Internet]. 2024 Dec 13;26(1). Available from: <https://ijins.umsida.ac.id/index.php/ijins/article/view/1313>
- [8]. Sinatrio W. The Implementation of Diversion and Restorative Justice in the Juvenile



Criminal Justice System in Indonesia. *J Indones Leg Stud*. 2019;

- [9]. Irmayani I. Peranan Orang Tua, Penegak Hukum Dan Pekerja Sosial Dalam Mengatasi Masalah Psikososial Anak Yang Berkonflik Dengan Hukum (ABH) Di Rutan/Lapas. *Sosio Inf*. 2017 Sep;3(2).
- [10]. Petitclerc A, Brooks-Gunn J. Home Visiting and Early Childhood Education for Reducing Justice System Involvement. *Prev Sci*. 2022 Aug;23(6):982–95.
- [11]. Herlina E. Peran Pekerja Sosial Dalam Proses Diversi Anak Berhadapan Dengan Hukum (Abh): Studi Di Balai Pemasarakatan Kelas I Bandung. *J Ilm Pekerja Sos Politek Pekerj Sos Bandung*. 2022;8(2).
- [12]. Fauth RC, Winestone JG. Home visiting and justice system collaborations: Two Programs' approaches to advocating for justice system-involved parents. *Child Youth Serv Rev*. 2021 Jan;120:105742.
- [13]. Roby JL, Vincent, Melanie. Federal and State Responses to Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: The Evolution of Policy. *Soc Work*. 2017;62(3):201–10.
- [14]. Abu Bakar SH, Mohd Azam SB, Mohd Yusoff JZ, Syed Alwi SM. Alternative Approaches In Handling Child Offenders: A Case Study Of Community-Based Diversion Programmes In Malaysia. *J Legal Stud*. 2025;16(2):162–93.
- [15]. Istriani I, Marotus Khoiriyah L. Penerapan Asas Kepentingan Terbaik Bagi Anak berdasarkan Perpektif Undang-Undang Sistem Peradilan Pidana Anak. *Literatus [Internet]*. 2022 Oct 22;4(2):685–91. Available from: <https://journal.neolectura.com/index.php/Literatus/article/view/871>
- [16]. Wiratny NK. Prinsip Kepentingan Terbaik Bagi Anak Dalam Diversi Pada Sistem Peradilan Pidana Anak. *J Ilm Raad Kertha*. 2020;
- [17]. Odette MP, Freire FG. The Integral Protection of Children and Adolescents in Ecuadorian Case Law: Analysis and Application. *Eur Public Soc Innov Rev*. 2026;11.
- [18]. Budoyo S, Kumala Sari R. Eksistensi Restorative Justice Sebagai Tujuan Pelaksanaan Diversi Pada Sistem Peradilan Anak Di Indonesia. *J Meta Yuridis*. 2019 Sep;79–90.
- [19]. Hambali AR. Penerapan Diversi terhadap Anak yang Berhadapan dengan Hukum dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana. *J Ilm Kebijak Huk*. 2019;
- [20]. Triwati A, Kridasaksana D. Pijakan Perlunya Diversi bagi Anak dalam Pengulangan Tindak Pidana. *J USM LAW Rev*. 2021 Nov;4(2):828.
- [21]. Zhang S. Reflection on Lowering the Minimum Age of Criminal Responsibility. *Commun Humanit Res*. 2023;
- [22]. Cornelius A, Harefa B. Penerapan Restorative Justice dalam Undang-Undang Sistem Peradilan Pidana Anak. *J Yuridis [Internet]*. 2021 Jun 29;8(1):83. Available from: <https://ejournal.upnvj.ac.id/index.php/Yuridis/article/view/2734>
- [23]. Lathifah Azhar Saptaningrum. Penerapan Restorative Justice terhadap Perlindungan Anak yang Berhadapan dengan Hukum ditinjau dari Teori Utilitarianisme. *J Equitable [Internet]*. 2023 Feb 25;8(1):95–110. Available from: <https://ejournal.umri.ac.id/index.php/JEQ/article/view/4554>
- [24]. Miftahuddin. Peran Masyarakat dalam Penegakan Keadilan Restoratif di Indonesia: Perspektif Sosiologi Hukum (The Role of Society in Upholding Restorative Justice in Indonesia: Perspectives of Legal Sociology). *Wacana Umat [Internet]*. 2023 Feb 12;8(1).



- Available from: <https://jurnal.stainatuna.org/index.php/wacanaumat/article/view/7>
- [25]. Krisnalita LY. Diversi Pada Tindak Pidana yang Dilakukan Oleh Anak. *Binamulia Huk* [Internet]. 2019 Jul 30;8(1):93–106. Available from: <http://fh-unkris.com/journal/index.php/binamulia/article/view/41>
- [26]. Fitriana F, Safrina S, Nurbuana N, Nurhasan N. Pembinaan Karakter Anak Berhadapan dengan Hukum (ABH) Melalui Page Grup di Lembaga Penyelenggaraan Kesejahteraan Sosial (LPKS) Dharmapala Indralaya. *J Pengemb dan Pengabd Masy Multikultural* [Internet]. 2023 Jul 25;1(2):60–5. Available from: <https://journal.irpi.or.id/index.php/batik/article/view/775>
- [27]. Warliyah H, Sofyan A. Bimbingan Sosial sebagai Tindak Lanjut Pembinaan pada Klien (ABH) Anak Berhadapan dengan Hukum Korban Penyalahgunaan Napza oleh Pembimbing Kemasyarakatan BAPAS. *J Heal Sains* [Internet]. 2020 Dec 22;1(8):1111–7. Available from: <https://jurnalsyntaxadmiration.com/index.php/jurnal/article/view/149>
- [28]. Nurqalbi V. Analysis of Diversion Arrangements in the Beijing Rules and the Juvenile Criminal Justice System in Indonesia. *Eur J Law Polit Sci* [Internet]. 2023 Feb 26;2(1):52–5. Available from: <https://www.ej-politics.org/index.php/politics/article/view/53>
- [29]. Riyadi R. Peran Pembimbing Kemasyarakatan dalam Penanganan Anak yang Berhadapan dengan Hukum. *J Syntax Admiration* [Internet]. 2023 Sep 5;4(9):1357–64. Available from: <https://jurnalsyntaxadmiration.com/index.php/jurnal/article/view/721>
- [30]. Widiatmoko W. Peran Pembimbing Kemasyarakatan Balai Pemasyarakatan (BAPAS) dalam Penanganan Anak yang Berhadapan Dengan Hukum. *Huk Pidana dan Pembang Huk* [Internet]. 2021 Apr 30;3(2):19–31. Available from: <https://e-journal.trisakti.ac.id/index.php/hpph/article/view/12897>
- [31]. Sofyan A. Peran Pembimbing Kemasyarakatan dalam Perlindungan Anak yang Berhadapan dengan Hukum. *J Heal Sains* [Internet]. 2020 Dec 22;1(8):1029–38. Available from: <https://jurnalsyntaxadmiration.com/index.php/jurnal/article/view/148>
- [32]. Isnandar. Pendampingan Anak Berhadapan Dengan Hukum (ABH) Pelaku Kekerasan Oleh Pembimbing Kemasyarakatan. *Maksigama* [Internet]. 2023 Jun 7;17(1):45–57. Available from: <http://maksigama.wisnuwardhana.ac.id/index.php/maksigama/article/view/142>
- [33]. Santoso MB, Darwis RS. Peran Pembimbing Kemasyarakatan dalam Penanganan Anak Berkonflik Dengan Hukum oleh Balai Pemasyarakatan. *Share Soc Work J* [Internet]. 2017 Jul 30;7(1):61. Available from: <http://jurnal.unpad.ac.id/share/article/view/13819>
- [34]. Pappas LN, Dent AL. The 40-year debate: a meta-review on what works for juvenile offenders. *J Exp Criminol*. 2023;19(1):1–30.
- [35]. Aizer A, Doyle JJ. Juvenile Incarceration, Human Capital, and Future Crime: Evidence from Randomly Assigned Judges *. *Q J Econ*. 2015 May;130(2):759–803.
- [36]. Kimbrell CS, Wilson DB, Olaghere A. Restorative justice programs and practices in juvenile justice: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis for effectiveness. *Criminol Public Policy*. 2023 Feb;22(1):161–95.
- [37]. Bouchard J, Wong JS. Examining the Effects of Intensive Supervision and Aftercare Programs for At-Risk Youth: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol*. 2018 May;62(6):1509–34.



- [38]. Aman Santoso, Hartoyo Hartoyo, Moh. Taufik. Peradilan Pidana Anak di Indonesia: Analisis terhadap Perlindungan Dan Implementasi Upaya Diversi. *Polit Progresif J Hukum, Polit dan Hum*. 2025 Feb;2(1):196–211.
- [39]. Aidy WR. Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Anak Yang Berkonflik Dengan Hukum. *J Huk Sasana*. 2020;
- [40]. Muhaimin M. Reconstruction of The Juvenile Criminal Justice System and The Giving of Diversion. *J Penelit Huk Jure*. 2021;21(2).
- [41]. Chandra SD. How Juvenile Criminal Justice System in Indonesia Works? A Book Review “Peradilan Pidana Anak di Indonesia”, Marlina, PT Refika Aditama, Jakarta, 2009, 232 Pages, ISBN 9798-602-8650-06-9. *Indones J Advocacy Leg Serv*. 2021 Mar;3(1):113–6.
- [42]. Sunariyah S, Warka M, Zeinudin M. Peran Pembimbing Kemasyarakatan Dalam Menurunkan Angka Residivis Di Kabupaten Pamekasan. *Indones J Bus Law*. 2025 Mar;4(1):122–30.
- [43]. Geraldine Van Bueren. United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice (The Beijing Rules) 1985. In: Brill | Nijhoff. 2024. p. 199–216.
- [44]. Kilkelly U, Pleysier S. Rights of the Child in the Child Justice System. *Youth Justice*. 2023;23(2):135–9.
- [45]. Kilkelly U. Youth justice and children’s rights: Measuring compliance with international standards. *Youth Justice*. 2008;8(3):187–92.
- [46]. Ahlin EM, Dari B, Kejahatan P, Lagi K. Ulasan tentang Kunjungan Rumah dalam Masa Percobaan : Apa yang Kita Ketahui ? 2012;32–7.
- [47]. Etc MCS. 乳鼠心肌提取 HHS Public Access. *Physiol Behav*. 2019;176(3):139–48.