

Graduated Capacity for Responsibility of Children Under Twelve in the Indonesian Juvenile Criminal Justice System: A Mental-Capacity-Based Reformulation

Syakhiya Aprilia Wardani¹, Milda Istiqomah², Faizin Sulistio³

Master of Law Program, Faculty of Law, Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia
Corresponding author: syakhiya.aprilia@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Indonesian juvenile criminal law treats children below the age of twelve as outside the category of children in conflict with the law and restricts the available legal response to non-penal measures. Article 21 of Law No. 11 of 2012 on the Juvenile Criminal Justice System, together with Government Regulation No. 65 of 2015, allows the return of such children to their parents or guardians, or their placement in education, guidance, or social-welfare programmes. This model protects young children from punitive criminalization, but it also creates a normative difficulty when an under-twelve child commits a serious unlawful act, including sexual violence or homicide, because the law provides no meaningful gradation based on the gravity of the act, the child's individual mental capacity, or the victim's need for justice and protection. This article applies normative juridical research using statutory, conceptual, and policy-oriented approaches. It analyses Indonesian child justice law through the doctrine of fault, Jean Piaget's theory of cognitive and moral development, contemporary developmental science, and international child-rights standards. The article argues that chronological age remains indispensable as a protective threshold, but it should not operate as the sole determinant of legal response. A new category of diminished legal responsibility is proposed for children under twelve who are shown, through multidisciplinary assessment, to possess cognitive and moral understanding beyond their biological age. The category should not authorize imprisonment or criminal conviction. Instead, it should enable proportionate, restorative, rehabilitative, and victim-sensitive measures tailored to the child's maturity, risk profile, family environment, and the seriousness of the unlawful act.

Keywords:

child criminal responsibility; diminished legal responsibility; Indonesian juvenile criminal justice; Jean Piaget; mental capacity; restorative justice; children under twelve

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56442/ijble.v7i1.1478>

INTRODUCTION

Criminal liability is traditionally grounded in the principle of fault, often expressed through the maxim *geen straf zonder schuld*, meaning that punishment cannot be justified without culpability. In doctrinal terms, criminal responsibility requires not only the commission of a prohibited act but also the capacity to be held responsible, the presence of fault in the form of intent or negligence, and the absence of grounds of excuse (Fadlian, 2020; Hiariej, 2020). This foundational principle becomes more complex when the alleged perpetrator is a child, because child development is characterized by ongoing cognitive, emotional, and moral maturation. A legal system that treats children identically to adults risks ignoring developmental vulnerability; yet a system that treats all children of the same chronological age identically may fail to respond proportionately to substantial differences in mental capacity and the seriousness of harm.

Indonesian law recognizes childhood as a protected legal status. Law No. 35 of 2014 on Child Protection defines a child as a person who has not reached eighteen years of age, including a child in the womb (Republic of Indonesia, 2014). Law No. 11

of 2012 on the Juvenile Criminal Justice System narrows the operational category of a child in conflict with the law to a child who has reached the age of twelve but has not yet reached eighteen and is suspected of committing a criminal offence (Republic of Indonesia, 2012). As a consequence, children below twelve are not treated as criminally liable subjects under the juvenile criminal process. Article 21 of Law No. 11 of 2012 and Government Regulation No. 65 of 2015 regulate the handling of children below twelve through non-penal measures, particularly return to parents or guardians and participation in education, guidance, or social-welfare programmes (Republic of Indonesia, 2012, 2015).

This legal choice contains a strong child-protection rationale: children under twelve should not be subjected to punitive prosecution or imprisonment. This rationale is compatible with the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which requires child justice systems to promote the child's dignity, reintegration, and constructive role in society (United Nations General Assembly, 1989). It is also consistent with the Beijing Rules, which require responses to juvenile offending to be proportionate not only to the offence but also to the circumstances and needs of the juvenile and society (United Nations General Assembly, 1985). However, the Indonesian model becomes normatively problematic when the same limited set of measures is applied to very different forms of unlawful conduct. A child below twelve who commits minor theft and a child below twelve who commits a serious act of sexual violence are subject to the same formal range of responses. Such uniformity can weaken victim protection, reduce public confidence in the justice system, and obscure the individualized developmental assessment that child justice requires.

The issue is intensified by changes in children's digital environments. The rapid expansion of children's access to smartphones, social media, online video, games, and other digital platforms expands learning opportunities but also exposes children to age-inappropriate content, including violent and sexualized material. UNICEF's work on children in digital environments emphasizes that digital access may generate both opportunities and risks, including risks of exploitation, abuse, and harm to well-being when protective systems do not keep pace with technological change (UNICEF, 2017, 2019). This does not mean that exposure to harmful content automatically produces criminal behaviour. It does, however, make it plausible that some children may acquire practical scripts, vocabulary, imitation patterns, or technical knowledge that exceed assumptions embedded in rigid age-based rules.

Secondary reports cited in the Indonesian literature indicate that, during the 2020-2022 period, the National Legal Development Agency recorded thousands of cases involving children as perpetrators, including reports of homicide and sexual violence (Ayuningtyas, 2026; Hayati & Haiti, 2024). The literature also discusses the Mojokerto case involving under-twelve perpetrators and a younger victim as an illustration of planned, concealed, and peer-influenced sexual violence (Hayati & Haiti, 2024). These cases should be treated carefully: they do not justify punitive criminalization of very young children, and they cannot be generalized without empirical caution. Nevertheless, they reveal the need for a differentiated legal response that can address serious harm, protect victims, and rehabilitate the child based on individual maturity and risk-needs assessment.

This article therefore asks: how should Indonesian juvenile criminal law conceptualize the capacity for responsibility of children under twelve who display mental capacity beyond their biological age, without violating the protective logic of child

justice? The article contributes to the literature by proposing a reformulation of Article 21 through a category of diminished legal responsibility. The proposed category does not lower the minimum age for criminal conviction and does not authorize imprisonment. Instead, it introduces a legally structured, multidisciplinary, and restorative mechanism for differentiating responses to serious unlawful acts committed by children below twelve.

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

1. Criminal responsibility, fault, and capacity

In criminal law doctrine, the capacity for responsibility is connected to the actor's ability to understand the nature, wrongfulness, and consequences of conduct and to regulate behaviour accordingly. Van Hamel's conception, as cited in Indonesian criminal law scholarship, links accountability to psychological normality and maturity (Fadlian, 2020). This doctrinal structure explains why children are treated differently from adults: immature cognition, emotional regulation, impulse control, and social dependence affect the degree to which blame can fairly be attributed to a child.

Indonesian criminal law scholarship commonly identifies four elements of criminal responsibility: the commission of a criminal act, the capacity to be responsible, fault in the form of intent or negligence, and the absence of excuses (Hiariej, 2020; Mahaliya, 2025). In the child-justice context, these elements cannot be applied mechanically. The child's age, maturity, psychological condition, family environment, and educational-social context must be integrated into the legal assessment. A formal age threshold is necessary for legal certainty, but it is insufficient when used as an exclusive proxy for maturity.

2. Indonesian legal framework on children under twelve

Law No. 11 of 2012 divides children's legal treatment into several age-based categories. Children below twelve are handled through measures outside criminal punishment. Children aged twelve to below fourteen may be subject only to measures, not criminal punishment. Children aged fourteen to below eighteen may be subject to criminal sanctions, although imprisonment must remain a last resort and is reduced compared with adult sentencing (Republic of Indonesia, 2012; Rosidah, 2019). This model reflects a graduated approach to age but not a sufficiently graduated approach to mental capacity within the under-twelve category.

Table 1. Existing age-based framework under Indonesian juvenile criminal justice law

Age category	Legal position	Available response	Doctrinal implication
Below 12 years	Outside the category of child in conflict with the law for criminal prosecution purposes; handled under Article 21.	Return to parents/guardians or participation in education, guidance, or social-welfare programmes.	No criminal punishment; current model does not differentiate minor and serious unlawful acts sufficiently.
12 to below 14 years	May be processed as a child in conflict with the law but only measures may be imposed.	Return, placement, treatment, education/training, revocation of licence, and restoration-related measures.	Recognizes partial responsibility but excludes criminal punishment.
14 to below 18 years	May be held criminally responsible within juvenile justice safeguards.	Criminal sanctions possible; imprisonment is last resort	Recognizes greater responsibility while

Age category	Legal position	Available response	Doctrinal implication
		and sentence is limited compared with adults.	retaining child-protection safeguards.

3. Cognitive and moral development: Piagetian foundation and contemporary nuance

Jean Piaget's theory of cognitive development remains useful for analysing the relationship between age, reasoning, and moral judgment, even though contemporary developmental science has refined and criticized several aspects of the stage model. Piaget identifies the sensorimotor stage, pre-operational stage, concrete operational stage, and formal operational stage (Piaget, 1952). Children between approximately seven and eleven years are generally associated with the concrete operational stage, in which they increasingly use logical reasoning, understand causal relations, organize information more systematically, and reduce egocentric thinking. However, their reasoning remains more reliable in relation to concrete situations than abstract doctrines.

Piaget's account of moral development is also relevant. In the heteronomous stage, younger children tend to treat rules as fixed commands imposed by authority and to judge wrongdoing by physical consequences rather than intention. In the autonomous stage, which generally emerges later in middle childhood, children begin to evaluate intention, reciprocity, responsibility, and fairness (Piaget, 1932/1965; Safitri & Dewantoro, 2025). This transition supports the claim that some children below twelve may understand that an action is prohibited, may anticipate consequences, and may intentionally conceal conduct from adults.

The point should not be overstated. A child's ability to understand concrete wrongfulness does not mean that the child possesses adult-like culpability. Contemporary developmental research shows that adolescents, and even more so children, continue to develop psychosocial maturity, self-regulation, future orientation, and resistance to peer pressure (Steinberg & Cauffman, 1996; Cauffman & Steinberg, 2000). Neuroscientific research also indicates that brain systems relevant to impulse control and risk regulation mature over a prolonged period (Casey et al., 2008). Therefore, a mental-capacity approach should not convert under-twelve children into adult-like legal subjects; rather, it should justify differentiated, therapeutic, and restorative measures within a protective framework.

4. International child-rights standards

International standards place two boundaries around the present debate. First, child justice must avoid punitive responses that undermine the dignity, reintegration, and constructive development of children (United Nations General Assembly, 1989). Second, minimum-age rules should not be set at a level that exposes very young children to criminal prosecution. The Committee on the Rights of the Child, in General Comment No. 24, encourages States parties to raise the minimum age of criminal responsibility and indicates that a minimum age below fourteen is generally inconsistent with contemporary child-rights expectations (Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2019).

This international framework means that any reformulation of Indonesian law should not be designed as a pathway to imprison children under twelve. The better legal question is not whether under-twelve children should be punished, but whether the law

should be able to distinguish between levels of maturity and seriousness when selecting non-penal, restorative, protective, and rehabilitative measures. The proposed category of diminished legal responsibility is formulated within that boundary.

METHOD

This article uses normative juridical research. The object of analysis is not the statistical measurement of child offending but the coherence, adequacy, and reform potential of legal norms governing children below twelve who commit unlawful acts. The research applies three approaches. The statute approach examines Law No. 11 of 2012 on the Juvenile Criminal Justice System, Law No. 35 of 2014 on Child Protection, Government Regulation No. 65 of 2015, and the broader criminal-law framework in Law No. 1 of 2023 (Republic of Indonesia, 2012, 2014, 2015, 2023). The conceptual approach examines fault, capacity for responsibility, diminished responsibility, restorative justice, and child development. The policy-oriented approach evaluates how Indonesian law may be reformulated while remaining consistent with child-rights standards.

The legal materials consist of primary legal materials, including statutes, government regulations, and international instruments; secondary legal materials, including books, journal articles, theses, and reports on juvenile justice and child development; and tertiary legal materials, including legal dictionaries and doctrinal summaries used to clarify concepts. The materials are analysed through grammatical, systematic, teleological, and contextual interpretation. Grammatical interpretation is used to interpret age categories and statutory terms. Systematic interpretation locates Article 21 within the broader Juvenile Criminal Justice System Act. Teleological interpretation evaluates whether the existing rule advances the purposes of child protection, rehabilitation, restorative justice, and victim protection. Contextual interpretation connects legal doctrine with developmental science and digital-era realities.

Because this is normative legal research using publicly available legal and secondary materials, it does not involve human participants, interviews, or experimental data. Ethical approval is therefore not applicable. The case examples discussed in the article are used only as secondary illustrations and are described in a non-identifying manner to avoid stigmatization of children.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. The normative gap in the current under-twelve model

The Indonesian under-twelve model has a defensible protective foundation. By excluding children below twelve from punitive criminal liability, the law recognizes that young children lack full maturity and should be shielded from the harmful consequences of criminal prosecution. This position is particularly important in a system where formal criminal processing may stigmatize a child, disrupt education, and increase criminogenic risk. For that reason, the reform proposed in this article does not seek to introduce imprisonment or criminal conviction for children below twelve.

The weakness lies in the absence of proportional differentiation. Article 21 and its implementing regulation provide a narrow range of measures, while the factual spectrum of unlawful conduct is broad. A uniform response may be acceptable for minor conduct but inadequate for serious violence, sexual violence, or homicide. The inadequacy is not only symbolic. It may fail to address victim safety, family supervision failures, digital exposure risks, behavioural treatment needs, and the child's risk of

repeating harmful conduct. A child who intentionally plans a serious act, conceals it from adults, pressures peers, and understands that the act is prohibited may require more intensive and structured intervention than a child involved in a minor impulsive act.

This is the central normative gap: Indonesian law recognizes age gradation between twelve, fourteen, and eighteen, but it does not adequately recognize mental-capacity gradation among children below twelve. In this respect, the law uses chronological age as a conclusive presumption rather than a rebuttable starting point for selecting non-punitive measures.

2. Mental capacity beyond biological age: legal relevance and limits

The concept of mental capacity is legally relevant because fault presupposes an ability to understand and control conduct. Piagetian theory suggests that many children aged seven to eleven can reason logically about concrete events, understand cause and effect, and begin to appreciate intention and fairness (Piaget, 1932/1965, 1952). This supports the article's core argument that some children below twelve may have sufficient concrete understanding to know that specific conduct is wrong and harmful.

At the same time, the same theory and contemporary developmental science warn against equating concrete understanding with adult culpability. Children may know that an action is forbidden but still have poor impulse control, limited future orientation, heightened susceptibility to peer pressure, and immature emotional regulation (Cauffman & Steinberg, 2000; Casey et al., 2008; Steinberg & Cauffman, 1996). Mental capacity therefore has two functions: it may justify differentiated legal measures, but it does not justify adult punishment. The proper legal consequence is not criminal conviction; it is individualized rehabilitative and restorative intervention.

This distinction is crucial. If the proposed reform is framed as lowering the age of criminal responsibility, it would conflict with international child-rights standards. If, however, it is framed as a mechanism for differentiating non-custodial, child-protective measures, it remains compatible with the child's best interests while better addressing serious harm and victim protection.

3. Digital exposure, cognitive scripts, and the risk of overclaiming acceleration

The original manuscript correctly identifies digital exposure as an important contemporary factor. Children's access to digital media may expose them to violence, pornography, coercive social scripts, and imitation patterns. International research on children's digital lives shows that digital access produces both opportunities and risks; children's exposure to online risks varies according to age, parental supervision, platform design, socioeconomic context, and digital literacy (Livingstone et al., 2011; UNICEF, 2017, 2019).

For purposes of legal argument, the phrase cognitive acceleration should be used carefully. Exposure to violent or sexualized content does not necessarily accelerate moral maturity. It may instead provide premature technical knowledge, behavioural scripts, desensitization, or curiosity without corresponding emotional and ethical maturity. A more precise formulation is that digital exposure may create a gap between practical knowledge and psychosocial maturity. This gap strengthens the case for multidisciplinary assessment: the law should examine not only whether the child knew how to perform an act, but also whether the child understood its moral meaning, consequences, victim impact, and wrongfulness.

Thus, digital-era evidence should be used to support individualized assessment, not punitive escalation. The relevant legal problem is that a rigid age rule may fail to identify

children who need intensive intervention, digital-safety education, psychological treatment, and family-system supervision after serious harmful conduct.

4. Victim justice and restorative proportionality

A child-centred approach should not erase the victim. In serious cases, particularly sexual violence, victims may experience long-term psychological harm and require protection, recognition, trauma-informed support, and assurance of non-repetition. The current uniform under-twelve response may appear to victims and families as if the legal system treats all harm as equivalent. This perception can undermine the legitimacy of child justice and intensify trauma.

Restorative justice provides a more balanced pathway, but it must be applied carefully. Restoration does not mean forcing direct encounter between victim and child perpetrator. In cases involving sexual violence, victim safety and consent must be paramount. Restorative proportionality may include apology only when appropriate, restitution or symbolic repair, family accountability plans, non-contact orders, school-safety arrangements, therapy, digital-safety restrictions, and periodic review by child protection authorities. Such measures are not punishment in the adult criminal sense; they are structured responses to harm.

The proposed diminished legal responsibility category therefore combines three principles: child protection, proportional intervention, and victim-sensitive restoration. It rejects imprisonment while also rejecting the idea that all under-twelve cases must receive identical treatment.

5. Proposed category: diminished legal responsibility for children under twelve

This article proposes a new statutory category: diminished legal responsibility for children under twelve. The term should be understood as a legal basis for differentiated non-penal measures, not as a basis for criminal conviction. The category would apply only when a child below twelve is alleged to have committed a serious unlawful act and a multidisciplinary assessment indicates that the child possessed concrete cognitive and moral understanding beyond what is normally presumed for the child's biological age.

The category should have strict safeguards. First, it should be limited to serious unlawful acts involving grave bodily harm, sexual violence, homicide, or repeated harmful conduct. Second, the assessment must be conducted by qualified professionals, including at minimum a child psychologist or child psychiatrist, a social worker, and a probation or child-guidance officer. Third, the assessment must examine cognitive understanding, moral understanding, impulse control, peer influence, family supervision, exposure to harmful content, trauma history, education, and risk of repetition. Fourth, the child must never be placed in prison or ordinary detention. Fifth, every measure must be reviewed periodically and must end when the child's welfare and public-safety objectives have been achieved.

Table 2. Proposed multidisciplinary assessment matrix for diminished legal responsibility

Assessment domain	Core question	Indicative sources of assessment
Cognitive understanding	Can the child explain the concrete nature of the act, the immediate consequences, and why adults prohibit it?	Child interview, developmental testing, school information, behavioural chronology.
Moral understanding	Can the child distinguish accident from intention, understand victim harm, and recognize responsibility?	Psychological assessment, narrative reconstruction, caregiver and teacher reports.

Assessment domain	Core question	Indicative sources of assessment
Self-regulation and susceptibility	Was the conduct impulsive, peer-driven, coerced, imitated, or planned?	Timeline analysis, peer context, digital-content exposure, family history.
Victim impact and safety	What protective measures are necessary to prevent further harm and support recovery?	Victim-support assessment, non-contact needs, school/community safety plan.
Family and rehabilitation needs	Can caregivers supervise effectively, and what treatment or education is required?	Home assessment, parenting capacity, treatment availability, periodic review.

6. Reformulation of Article 21 and implementing regulation

The reform may be implemented either through amendment of Article 21 of Law No. 11 of 2012 or through detailed revision of Government Regulation No. 65 of 2015. The preferred approach is statutory amendment, because the concept affects the architecture of responsibility capacity and should not be introduced only through subordinate regulation. However, implementing regulations would still be necessary to define assessment procedures, institutional responsibilities, review periods, and victim-protection mechanisms.

A possible formulation is as follows: in handling a child who has not reached twelve years of age and who is alleged to have committed a serious unlawful act, the investigator, community adviser, professional social worker, and child-development expert shall conduct an individual assessment of the child's mental capacity, psychosocial maturity, family environment, victim impact, and risk of repetition. If the assessment shows diminished legal responsibility, the child shall not be subject to criminal punishment or detention, but may be subject to intensive education, therapeutic intervention, family-based supervision, restorative measures, and social rehabilitation proportionate to the child's needs and the seriousness of the act, subject to judicial or administrative review.

Such formulation preserves the protective age threshold while creating a more responsive mechanism for serious cases. It also aligns with the principle of proportionality in the Beijing Rules and the reintegration orientation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (United Nations General Assembly, 1985, 1989).

Table 3. Proposed graded non-penal responses for children under twelve

Case profile	Legal category	Possible response
Minor unlawful act without significant harm	Ordinary under-twelve handling	Return to parents/guardians; brief counselling; school and family guidance; monitoring when necessary.
Serious act but low demonstrated understanding or strong coercion/trauma factors	Protective and therapeutic response	Social-welfare placement if needed; trauma-informed treatment; caregiver intervention; educational support; no punitive label.
Serious act with demonstrated concrete understanding, planning, concealment, or repeated conduct	Diminished legal responsibility	Intensive rehabilitation plan; psychological treatment; digital-safety restrictions; family supervision order; victim-protection measures; restorative repair when safe and voluntary; periodic review.

7. Why imprisonment remains inappropriate

The proposed reform expressly rejects imprisonment for children under twelve. There are doctrinal, developmental, and international reasons for this position. Doctrinally, diminished legal responsibility means that the child's understanding and control are incomplete. Developmentally, children in this age group remain highly

dependent on caregivers and have immature self-regulatory systems. Internationally, deprivation of liberty must be a measure of last resort for children, and the Committee on the Rights of the Child has consistently emphasized the need to avoid criminalizing very young children (Committee on the Rights of the Child, 2019; United Nations General Assembly, 1989).

Imprisonment would also be counterproductive. It may intensify stigma, expose children to harmful peer environments, disrupt education, and weaken family and community reintegration. A child below twelve who commits serious harm needs intensive intervention, but that intervention should be clinical, educational, familial, and restorative rather than punitive.

8. Theoretical contribution

The article's theoretical contribution is the distinction between criminal liability, legal responsibility, and responsibility-sensitive measures. Criminal liability denotes conviction and punishment. Legal responsibility, in the diminished sense proposed here, denotes recognition that the child's conduct requires a differentiated legal response because the child has some concrete understanding of wrongfulness and consequences. Responsibility-sensitive measures then translate that recognition into non-penal interventions.

This distinction allows Indonesian law to move beyond a binary model: either the child is fully non-responsible and receives minimal intervention, or the child reaches the age threshold and enters the juvenile criminal process. A graded model better captures the developmental reality that maturity evolves unevenly and that serious harm requires a structured response even when punishment is inappropriate.

CONCLUSION

Indonesian juvenile criminal justice law currently contains a gap between age-based legal categorization and the diverse realities of children's mental capacity in the digital era. Law No. 11 of 2012 rightly protects children below twelve from criminal punishment, but Article 21 provides insufficient gradation when serious unlawful acts are committed by children who display concrete cognitive and moral understanding beyond what the law presumes from their biological age. The problem is not that under-twelve children should be punished like adults. The problem is that the law needs a more precise way to differentiate rehabilitative, restorative, and protective measures.

Jean Piaget's theory of cognitive and moral development supports the view that some children aged seven to eleven can understand concrete consequences, intention, and wrongfulness. Contemporary developmental science, however, cautions that such understanding is incomplete and should not be equated with adult culpability. Digital exposure may further complicate the relationship between practical knowledge and psychosocial maturity. Therefore, the appropriate legal response is individualized assessment and non-penal intervention, not imprisonment.

This article proposes diminished legal responsibility as a new category for children under twelve who commit serious unlawful acts and who are shown through multidisciplinary assessment to possess mental capacity beyond their biological age. The category should enable more progressive, proportionate, restorative, and rehabilitative action-based sanctions while preserving the prohibition of prison sentencing. In this way, Indonesian law can better balance child protection, victim justice, public safety, and developmental science.

Policy Recommendations

- a. Amend Article 21 of Law No. 11 of 2012 to recognize a differentiated non-penal response for serious unlawful acts committed by children below twelve.
- b. Define diminished legal responsibility as a child-protective category that authorizes intensive rehabilitative and restorative measures but never imprisonment or criminal conviction.
- c. Require multidisciplinary assessment involving child psychology or psychiatry, social work, and juvenile probation expertise before imposing any intensive measure.
- d. Develop victim-sensitive safeguards, including non-contact arrangements, trauma-informed support, school-safety planning, and voluntary restorative processes only when safe.
- e. Integrate digital-safety education and family supervision plans into rehabilitation for cases involving exposure to violent, pornographic, coercive, or exploitative online content.
- f. Establish periodic review to ensure that measures remain proportionate, child-centred, and oriented toward reintegration rather than punishment.

Limitations and Future Research

This article is limited to normative legal analysis. It does not empirically measure the prevalence of serious unlawful acts by children below twelve, the psychological profiles of child perpetrators, or the long-term effects of different interventions. Future research should conduct interdisciplinary empirical studies involving child psychologists, legal scholars, social workers, judges, community advisers, educators, victims' services, and digital-safety experts. Such research should develop validated assessment tools for children below twelve and evaluate whether differentiated restorative-rehabilitative measures reduce recurrence while supporting victim recovery and child reintegration.

Declarations

Funding: No specific funding was declared for this manuscript. Authors should revise this statement if funding was received.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest. Authors should revise this statement if any conflict exists.

Ethical approval: Not applicable. This is normative legal research using statutes, regulations, international instruments, and secondary literature.

Data availability: All legal materials and secondary sources used in this article are publicly available or cited in the reference list.

Author contributions: Conceptualization, legal analysis, writing, review, and editing should be completed according to the authors' actual contributions before submission.

References

- Agra Dwi, S., Novita, W., et al. (2023). Penerapan teori perkembangan kognitif oleh Jean Piaget terhadap kemampuan memecahkan masalah siswa SD/MI. Hypothesis: Multidisciplinary Journal of Social Sciences, 1(2), 126-127.
- Ayuningtyas, A. D. (2026). KPAI catat 33 kasus pelanggaran hukum melibatkan anak di bawah umur. [Online news report].
- Casey, B. J., Jones, R. M., & Hare, T. A. (2008). The adolescent brain. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1124, 111-126.
<https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1440.010>

- Cauffman, E., & Steinberg, L. (2000). (Im)maturity of judgment in adolescence: Why adolescents may be less culpable than adults. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 18(6), 741-760. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.416>
- Committee on the Rights of the Child. (2019). General comment No. 24 (2019) on children's rights in the child justice system (CRC/C/GC/24). United Nations.
- Fadlian, A. (2020). Pertanggungjawaban pidana dalam suatu kerangka teoritis. *Jurnal Hukum Positum*, 5(2), 14.
- Grisso, T., Steinberg, L., Woolard, J., Cauffman, E., Scott, E., Graham, S., Lexcen, F. J., Reppucci, N. D., & Schwartz, R. (2003). Juveniles' competence to stand trial: A comparison of adolescents' and adults' capacities as trial defendants. *Law and Human Behavior*, 27(4), 333-363. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024065015717>
- Gultom, M. (2010). *Perlindungan hukum terhadap anak dalam sistem peradilan pidana anak di Indonesia*. Refika Aditama.
- Hayati, M., & Haiti, D. (2024). Pertanggungjawaban pidana terhadap pelaku anak di bawah umur 12 tahun. *Rio Law Jurnal*, 5(2), 591-592.
- Hiariej, E. O. S. (2020). *Prinsip-prinsip hukum pidana (Edisi revisi)*. Cahaya Atma Pustaka.
- Karmiyati. (2023). *Telaah teori perkembangan kognitif Jean Piaget dalam pengajaran etika lingkungan anak usia dini [Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Intan Lampung]*.
- Krisnawati, D., & Utami, N. S. B. (2020). Penanganan terhadap anak belum berumur 12 (dua belas) tahun yang melakukan tindak pidana berdasarkan sistem peradilan pidana anak. *Mimbar Hukum*, 32(3), 412-416.
- Livingstone, S., Haddon, L., Görzig, A., & Ólafsson, K. (2011). Risks and safety on the internet: The perspective of European children: Full findings and policy implications from the EU Kids Online survey of 9-16 year olds and their parents in 25 countries. *EU Kids Online*.
- Mahaliya, W. (2025). *Pertanggungjawaban pidana terhadap anak yang belum berumur 14 tahun melakukan tindak pidana berat perspektif kepastian dan keadilan hukum [Master's thesis, Universitas Jambi]*.
- Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children*. International Universities Press.
- Piaget, J. (1965). *The moral judgment of the child*. Free Press. (Original work published 1932)
- Republic of Indonesia. (2012). Law No. 11 of 2012 on the Juvenile Criminal Justice System. *State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Year 2012 No. 153, Supplement No. 5332*.
- Republic of Indonesia. (2014). Law No. 35 of 2014 amending Law No. 23 of 2002 on Child Protection. *State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Year 2014 No. 297, Supplement No. 5606*.
- Republic of Indonesia. (2015). Government Regulation No. 65 of 2015 on Guidelines for Diversion and Handling of Children Under the Age of Twelve. *State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Year 2015 No. 194, Supplement No. 5732*.
- Republic of Indonesia. (2023). Law No. 1 of 2023 on the Criminal Code. *State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Year 2023 No. 1, Supplement No. 6842*.
- Rosidah, N. (2019). *Sistem peradilan pidana anak*. Aura Publishing.

- Safitri, C. N., & Dewantoro, M. H. (2025). Penerapan teori perkembangan moral Jean Piaget dan Kohlberg dalam pendidikan anak usia dini. *Al-Ubudiyah*, 6(1), 313.
- Scott, E. S., & Steinberg, L. (2008). Adolescent development and the regulation of youth crime. *The Future of Children*, 18(2), 15-33.
- Steinberg, L., & Cauffman, E. (1996). Maturity of judgment in adolescence: Psychosocial factors in adolescent decision making. *Law and Human Behavior*, 20(3), 249-272. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01499023>
- Syafnita, T., et al. (2023). Psikologi perkembangan anak usia dini. PT Literasi Nusantara Abadi Group.
- UNICEF. (2017). *The State of the World's Children 2017: Children in a digital world*. United Nations Children's Fund.
- UNICEF Office of Research-Innocenti. (2019). *Global Kids Online: Growing up in a connected world*. UNICEF Office of Research-Innocenti.
- United Nations General Assembly. (1985). *United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Administration of Juvenile Justice (The Beijing Rules)*, G.A. Res. 40/33.
- United Nations General Assembly. (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*, G.A. Res. 44/25, 1577 U.N.T.S. 3.