



CRIMINALIZATION OF TEACHER DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS: A JURIDICAL ANALYSIS OF THE CONFLICT BETWEEN CHILD PROTECTION AND PEDAGOGICAL AUTHORITY

Harmono

Faculty of Law, Swadaya Gunung Jati University, Cirebon, West Java.

Email: harmono@ugj.ac.id



DOI 10.33603/responsif.v18i1.12474

Accepted: July 2026; Revised: July 2026; Published: August 2026

Abstract

Background. The phenomenon of increasing teacher reporting by students' parents due to the imposition of disciplinary sanctions shows that there is a change in relations in the world of education that has an impact on the legal position of teachers. Disciplinary actions that are actually part of the pedagogical process are often questioned as a violation of the law, thus leading to a tendency to criminalize.

Aims. This study aims to analyze the legal limitations of teacher disciplinary actions from a positive legal perspective, examine the criminalization practices that occur, and formulate a proportionate legal protection model.

Methods. The method used is normative-juridical, with legislative, conceptual, and case approaches. Data were obtained through literature studies of primary and secondary legal materials and were then analyzed qualitatively using a prescriptive approach.

Result. The results of the study show that there is no clear boundary between disciplinary action and violence in positive law, thus creating legal uncertainty. In practice, it is found that there is a tendency to use criminal law excessively for pedagogical actions without considering the context and educational purpose.

Conclusion. This research offers a legal protection model based on the principle of proportionality, a restorative justice approach, standardization of disciplinary actions, and limited immunity for teachers who act in good faith. This model is expected to strike a balance between protecting children's rights and protecting the teaching profession.

Implication. This condition has implications for the weakening of teachers' authority and the emergence of concerns in carrying out educational functions.

Keywords: *criminalization, teacher discipline, child protection, education law, proportionality.*

I. INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of parents reporting teachers to students in recent years reflects a fundamental change in the relationship among educators, students, and families. The practice of imposing disciplinary sanctions, once understood as an inherent part of the pedagogical process, is now often questioned in the context of criminal law. This shift cannot be separated from the growing public awareness of children's rights, as well as the heightened sensitivity to actions that may violate the principles of child protection. On the one hand, this development is a normative progress in ensuring the safety and dignity of children; on the other hand, there is a new tendency toward the criminalization of teachers' actions that are actually within the educational corridor (Fitriani, 2020).

In the context of national law, the position of teachers has gained legitimacy as a profession with a certain degree of autonomy in carrying out educational functions. Law Number 14 of 2005 concerning Teachers and Lecturers affirms that teachers have the authority to educate, teach, and assess students, which implicitly includes the imposition of disciplinary actions, provided they are for educational purposes. However, this norm is faced with a child protection regime that places children as subjects who must be protected from all forms of violence, both physical and psychological. The tension between these two legal regimes creates a gray area that often leads to differences in interpretations within law enforcement practices (Suyanto, 2019).

The reality on the ground shows that the line between disciplinary action and violence is not always clear. One of the cases that had captured public attention occurred in Gowa Regency, when a teacher was reported to the police after giving light physical punishment to students who were considered to have violated school rules. Although the school considers this action as part of coaching, the parents of the students view it as a form of violence that violates the rights of children. This case led to a legal process that designated teachers as reported parties and sparked a wide debate about the limits of teachers' authority to discipline students (Hidayat, 2021).

Another case occurred in Bekasi City, where a teacher was reported for imposing sanctions, including additional assignments and harsh reprimands, on students who committed repeated violations. The student's parents consider the action as psychological pressure that has an impact on the child's mental state. Although there was no element of physical violence, the

reporting process was still ongoing and raised concerns among teachers about potential legal risks in carrying out their duties. This event shows that criminalization does not always depart from extreme actions, but also from subjective interpretations of disciplinary practices in the classroom (Prasetyo, 2022).

The two cases reflect a tendency to expand the meaning of violence in the context of education, which, at some point, has the potential to blur the line between pedagogical acts and punishable acts. From the perspective of criminal law theory, this condition can be associated with the concept of overcriminalization, the tendency to use criminal law against acts that should be resolved through non-penal mechanisms. When every disciplinary action is at risk of being deemed a criminal act, the professional space for teachers to move becomes increasingly limited and can interfere with the educational process itself (Husak, 2008).

Furthermore, this problem is not solely related to law enforcement practices, but also reflects the disharmonization of regulations. On the one hand, the child protection regime emphasizes a zero-tolerance approach to violence, while on the other hand, the world of education still needs disciplinary instruments as part of character building. The absence of clear parameters regarding the form and limits of legally justified disciplinary action causes uncertainty for both teachers and law enforcement officials when assessing an event (Siregar, 2021).

Based on this description, the problem of the criminalization of teacher discipline cannot be seen as a mere causal phenomenon but as a structural problem that requires a comprehensive juridical study. This research is important for exploring the normative boundaries between disciplinary action and violence, identifying tendencies toward criminalization in practice, and formulating a proportionate legal protection model for teachers without neglecting the principle of child protection. Thus, this study is expected not only to make a theoretical contribution to the development of education law but also to offer a more balanced and equitable direction for policy reform.

Although prior studies have explored child protection, teacher authority, and criminalization in educational settings, a significant gap remains in understanding how legal conflicts among these regimes can be resolved through a coherent and proportionate framework. Existing research lacks operational criteria to distinguish pedagogical discipline from unlawful violence and has not proposed an integrated legal protection model that balances children's rights with teachers' professional autonomy. This study seeks to fill that gap by

formulating a proportional legal-protection model grounded in restorative justice, disciplinary standardization, and qualified-immunity principles.

Unlike previous studies that separately examine child protection, teacher authority, or criminalization, this research develops an integrated juridical framework grounded in proportionality principles, restorative justice, disciplinary standardization, and qualified immunity. The study contributes a novel legal protection model that harmonizes child protection norms with teachers' pedagogical authority, thereby addressing the growing phenomenon of teacher criminalization while maintaining the best interests of the child

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of disciplinary actions in education generally departs from the understanding that the learning process is not only cognitive but also involves character formation and the internalization of values. In a classical pedagogical perspective, discipline is seen as an instrument for shaping the responsibility and regularity of student behavior through mechanisms of proportional social habituation and control. This approach positions teachers as authoritative figures with moral and professional legitimacy to determine the form of intervention in student behavior, as long as it is educational and does not exceed the limits of humanity (Durkheim, 1990).

Along with the development of the modern educational paradigm, the concept of discipline has shifted from a coercive to a more participatory, rights-based model. Discipline is no longer interpreted as a mere means of control but as part of a dialogue process that respects students' dignity. In this framework, there is a demand that every teacher's actions take into account the psychological aspects and human rights of the child, so that disciplinary practices must align with the principles of protection and the best interests of the child (Noddings, 2013).

In the legal realm, the tension between teacher authority and child protection can be explained through normative conflict theory, which posits a clash between two legitimate legal regimes. On the one hand, education law provides teachers with discretion in carrying out their pedagogical functions, while on the other hand, child protection law sets strict limits on all actions that have the potential to cause physical and psychological suffering. These conflicts are not always resolved in harmony, so they often lead to different interpretations within law enforcement practices (Alexy, 2002).

Furthermore, the phenomenon of teacher reporting can be analyzed using the theory of overcriminalization in criminal law. This concept explains the tendency of the state or society

to expand the use of criminal law to acts that can actually be resolved through non-penal mechanisms. In the context of education, overcriminalization occurs when disciplinary actions of an administrative or pedagogical nature are treated as criminal acts without regard to the context and purpose of the act. As a result, criminal law loses its nature as an ultimum remedium and becomes a repressive instrument (Husak, 2008).

In addition, the restorative justice approach offers an alternative perspective on conflicts between teachers and students. Instead of binary portrayals of teachers as perpetrators and students as victims, this approach emphasizes the restoration of social relationships through dialogue and understanding. In the context of schools, restorative justice can be a more relevant mechanism for resolving disciplinary disputes because it accommodates the interests of all parties without resorting to the criminal route. This approach is also in line with the goal of education that emphasizes coaching rather than punishment (Zehr, 2002).

From the perspective of professional protection, the theory of legal protection emphasizes that every profession that performs public functions requires safeguards against legal risks arising from the performance of its duties. Teachers, as a profession responsible for educating the younger generation, should be protected from actions taken in good faith within the scope of their duties. Without adequate protection, there is a potential chilling effect, in which teachers become hesitant or even reluctant to take disciplinary action for fear of legal proceedings (Hadjon, 1987).

On the other hand, human rights theory still places children as subjects who must be protected from all forms of violence and degrading treatment. The principles of non-violence and respect for children's integrity are normative boundaries that cannot be violated in educational practice. Therefore, every form of disciplinary action must be tested not only in terms of purpose but also in terms of its method and impact on the child, so as not to cause trauma or violate rights (Freeman, 2011).

Thus, this literature review shows that the problem of criminalization of teacher disciplinary actions is at the intersection of various thought regimes: pedagogy, criminal law, professional protection, and human rights. The imbalance in accommodating these four dimensions has the potential to give birth to disproportionate practices, both in the form of allowing violence and excessive criminalization. Therefore, an integrative approach is needed that can place disciplinary actions within a more contextual, proportional, and equitable framework.

III. RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses a normative juridical method to analyze the legal norms governing teacher disciplinary actions in relation to child protection and the potential for criminalization. This approach was chosen to systematically examine various provisions of laws and regulations, especially those related to the legal regimes of education and child protection, and to identify conflicts or ambiguities in norms. To enrich the analysis, this research also employs a conceptual approach to understand relevant legal doctrines and a case-based approach by examining several concrete events that reflect the criminalization of teachers.

The data sources used consist of primary and secondary legal materials. Primary legal materials include laws and regulations and, to the extent available, court judgments or other legal documents relevant to the research issue. Meanwhile, secondary legal materials are obtained from the academic literature, including books, scientific journal articles, and prior research on education law, criminal law, and child protection. The collection of legal materials is carried out through library research, with an emphasis on up-to-date, academically authoritative sources.

Data analysis is carried out qualitatively using a prescriptive approach, namely, by interpreting existing legal norms to formulate logical and systematic legal arguments. The analysis process not only describes the applicable provisions but also examines the consistency, adequacy, and relevance of the norms in addressing the criminalization of teacher disciplinary actions. Through this approach, the research is expected to produce conceptual formulations that not only explain the problem but also offer directions for improvement within the framework of more proportionate and equitable legal reform.

IV. RESULTS and DISCUSSION

4.1. Legal Limitations of Teacher Disciplinary Action in a Positive Legal Perspective

The fundamental problem in current educational practice lies in the lack of a clear boundary between pedagogical disciplinary actions and actions that can be qualified as violence. In the context of positive law, disciplinary action is an inherent part of the educational function, which aims to shape students' character, discipline, and responsibility. However, the existing legal norms have not explicitly articulated operational parameters for the form, intensity, and permissible methods of discipline, thereby leaving ample room for interpretation in practice (Suyanto, 2019).

Normatively, Law Number 14 of 2005 concerning Teachers and Lecturers grants teachers the authority to carry out the functions of educating, guiding, and assessing students. This authority implicitly includes disciplinary action as part of the learning process. However, these norms are not accompanied by adequate technical guidelines on the limits of action that teachers may take. As a result, the interpretation of this authority is highly dependent on the social context and perception of each party, including parents and law enforcement officials (Prasetyo, 2022).

On the other hand, Law Number 35 of 2014 concerning Child Protection affirms the prohibition of all forms of violence against children, both physical and psychological. This provision has a strong protective character and tends to place children as subjects who must be protected to the maximum. Problems arise when these protection norms are applied without considering the pedagogical context, leading to the interpretation of educational disciplinary actions as a form of violence. In such conditions, the line between protection and criminalization becomes blurred (Fitriani, 2020).

The absence of clear boundaries is also evident in law enforcement practices that often fail to apply proportionality criteria when assessing teachers' actions. In some cases, actions such as harsh reprimands, additional assignments, or light physical punishment are immediately deemed violations of the law without first examining their purpose, context, and impact on the learner. In fact, from a legal perspective, an act should be judged not only by its form, but also by the intention (*mens rea*) and the purpose behind it (Husak, 2008).

Furthermore, this condition reflects a normative gap in the legal system governing the education sector. Existing regulations have not been able to bridge the need for discipline in the education process with the demands for comprehensive protection of children's rights. As a result, teachers are in a vulnerable position because any disciplinary action can be legally challenged, while they are still required to maintain order and the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process (Siregar, 2021).

Thus, the legal limits of teacher disciplinary action from the perspective of positive law remain abstract and have not been formulated in operational terms. This ambiguity not only creates legal uncertainty but also has the potential to disrupt the function of education itself. Therefore, it is necessary to formulate more concrete and proportionate parameters, which are able to clearly distinguish between legitimate disciplinary actions and acts that fall under the category of violence against children.

4.2. Criminalization of Pedagogical Actions in Practice

In recent years, the phenomenon of parents reporting teachers to authorities has contributed to the expansion of the use of criminal law in education. Disciplinary actions that were previously understood as part of the school's internal mechanism are now often brought into the realm of formal law, even up to the investigation stage. This change not only reflects an increase in public legal awareness but also signals a shift in perspective on the relationship between teachers and students, in which pedagogical actions are increasingly assessed through rigid, legalistic lenses (Hidayat, 2021).

In practice, criminalization of teachers often occurs without a clear separation between actions that are educational in nature and actions that have a criminal element. Some cases show that actions such as harsh reprimands, the imposition of light physical punishment, or administrative sanctions at schools are directly reported as forms of violence against children. In fact, when viewed in context, these actions are carried out within the framework of maintaining discipline and order in the learning process. Inaccuracy in the qualification of this act is one of the main factors that encourage criminalization (Prasetyo, 2022).

This tendency can be analyzed through the concept of overcriminalization, a situation in which criminal law is used excessively to regulate behavior that could still be addressed through non-penal mechanisms. In the context of education, the use of criminal law should be reserved as a last resort (*ultimum remedium*), not as the primary instrument for resolving conflicts between teachers and students. When every disciplinary action is punishable, there is a shift in the function of criminal law from its original protective role to a repressive one (Husak, 2008).

In addition, the role of law enforcement officials in responding to reports against teachers also affects the dynamics of this criminalization. In some cases, reports submitted by parents are processed immediately without going through an adequate clarification mechanism with the school. This shows that the approach still tends to be formalistic, failing to consider the social and pedagogical context of the events. As a result, the legal process proceeds linearly, leaving no room for a more proportionate alternative settlement (Suyanto, 2019).

The impact of this condition is felt not only by teachers as individuals but also by the education system as a whole. The emergence of fear and concern among teachers when administering disciplinary action can cause a chilling effect, in which teachers become passive and reluctant to take action against student violations. In the long term, this condition can

weaken the role of education in shaping students' character and discipline by eroding teachers' authority in classroom management (Siregar, 2021).

Thus, the criminalization of pedagogical acts in practice cannot be separated from a combination of factors, ranging from unclear norms and heightened sensitivity to child protection to less contextualized law-enforcement approaches. This situation shows the need to reposition criminal law in the realm of education, so that it is not used excessively and still respects the main purpose of education as a coaching process, not solely the enforcement of sanctions.

4.3. The Ideal Model of Teacher Legal Protection from the Perspective of Proportionality

The absence of a clear line between disciplinary and violent acts, as well as the tendency to criminalize in practice, points to the need to formulate a more proportionate legal protection model for teachers. The protection is not intended to provide absolute immunity, but rather to ensure that any action taken within the framework of professional duties and based on good faith does not necessarily lead to criminal proceedings. In this context, the law needs to be placed as an instrument that maintains a balance between the interests of child protection and the sustainability of the educational function (Hadjon, 1987).

One relevant approach is to apply the principle of proportionality when assessing teachers' disciplinary actions. This principle requires a balance between the goals to be achieved and the means used. Thus, disciplinary action cannot be immediately deemed a violation of the law without first determining whether it has an educational purpose, is carried out reasonably, and does not cause a significant adverse impact on students. This approach is important to avoid black-and-white judgments in a context that is actually complex (Alexy, 2002).

In addition, strengthening non-penal settlement mechanisms is an important part of the ideal legal protection model. The restorative justice approach can be used as an alternative in resolving conflicts between teachers and students by emphasizing the restoration of relationships and constructive dialogue between the parties involved. In the context of education, this approach is more in line with the purpose of coaching, because it not only resolves conflicts but also provides a learning space for all parties to understand mistakes and correct them (Zehr, 2002).

The legal protection model also needs to be supported by national standards for the forms and limits of disciplinary action permitted in the school environment. This standard can

be formulated as technical guidelines that provide clarity for teachers in acting, as well as a reference for parents and law enforcement officials when assessing an event. With clear standards, the potential for differences in interpretation can be minimized, resulting in better legal certainty (Suyanto, 2019).

Furthermore, it is important to consider the concept of qualified immunity, or limited immunity, for teachers, which provides legal protection for actions taken in a professional capacity and in good faith. This concept does not rule out legal liability, but it sets a limit: not all disciplinary actions can be prosecuted criminally. Thus, teachers can still carry out their pedagogical functions without excessive fear of legal consequences (Prasetyo, 2022).

By integrating the principles of proportionality, restorative approaches, standardization of disciplinary measures, and limited immunity, a legal protection model for teachers can be formulated more comprehensively. This approach not only provides legal certainty but also maintains a balance between protecting children's rights and the need for pedagogical authority in the educational process. In the end, the law is no longer a threat to teachers, but rather a framework that supports the creation of a safe, fair, and productive educational environment.

Current scholarship has extensively examined child protection, teacher authority, overcriminalization, restorative justice, and regulatory conflicts. However, these studies remain fragmented and tend to analyze the issues separately. There is still no integrated juridical framework that simultaneously accommodates children's rights, pedagogical authority, legal certainty, and proportionality principles.

Research Focus	Previous Findings	Limitations
Child Protection in Education	Studies emphasize the importance of protecting children from physical and psychological violence in schools (Fitriani, 2020; Freeman, 2011).	Focuses predominantly on children's rights without adequately examining teachers' professional authority.
Teacher Authority and Discipline	Research confirms that teachers possess pedagogical authority to educate, guide, and discipline students within educational objectives (Prasetyo, 2022).	Does not clearly define legal boundaries between legitimate discipline and unlawful conduct.
Criminalization of Teachers	Studies indicate increasing reports against teachers due to disciplinary measures, creating legal vulnerability (Hidayat, 2021).	Mostly descriptive and lacks a comprehensive legal protection framework.

Research Focus	Previous Findings	Limitations
Overcriminalization Theory	Criminal law scholars argue that excessive use of criminal sanctions may undermine social institutions (Husak, 2008).	Rarely applied specifically to educational disciplinary contexts.
Restorative Justice in Education	Restorative approaches are increasingly promoted for resolving school conflicts (Zehr, 2002).	Limited integration with legal protection mechanisms for teachers.
Regulatory Disharmonization	Research identifies conflicts between education law and child protection law (Siregar, 2021).	No operational model proposed to harmonize both legal regimes.

Research Gap

Theoretical Gap

Existing studies discuss either child protection or teacher authority independently. Few studies examine the normative conflict between these legal regimes through the lens of proportionality and legal balancing.

Empirical Gap

Research on teacher criminalization generally focuses on individual cases and social impacts rather than systematically analyzing the legal ambiguity that triggers criminalization.

Regulatory Gap

There is no clear operational standard distinguishing:

- Legitimate pedagogical discipline;
- Administrative misconduct;
- Psychological violence;
- Criminal acts against children.

This regulatory ambiguity creates legal uncertainty for teachers and law enforcement agencies.

Policy Gap

Previous studies have not proposed a comprehensive protection model combining:

- proportionality principles,
- restorative justice,
- disciplinary standardization, and
- qualified immunity for teachers.

Novelty of the Research

Main Novelty

This study develops an Integrated Proportional Legal Protection Model for Teachers that balances child protection and pedagogical authority within the Indonesian legal system.

Conceptual Novelties

1. Proportionality-Based Assessment Framework

- Introduces proportionality as the primary legal test for evaluating teacher disciplinary actions.
- Considers educational purpose, method, context, and impact before determining legal liability.

2. Integration of Overcriminalization Theory and Education Law

- Applies overcriminalization theory specifically to teacher disciplinary practices, an area rarely explored in previous studies.

3. Qualified Immunity Concept for Teachers

- Proposes limited legal immunity for teachers acting in good faith and within professional standards.
- Distinguishes pedagogical mistakes from criminal conduct.

4. Restorative Justice-Oriented Resolution Model

- Repositions disciplinary disputes from punitive criminal processes toward restorative educational mechanisms.

5. Normative Harmonization Framework

- Offers a harmonization model between:
 - Law No. 14/2005 on Teachers and Lecturers; and
 - Law No. 35/2014 on Child Protection.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the results and discussions, it can be emphasized that the legal limitations on teacher disciplinary actions in the Indonesian positive legal system remain abstract and have not been operationalized. This ambiguity gives rise to a wide range of interpretations, so that actions that should be within the pedagogical corridor often have the potential to qualify as violations of the law. In practice, the absence of strict parameters regarding the form and limits of disciplinary action has created legal uncertainty for both teachers and law enforcement officials when assessing an event. Furthermore, the phenomenon of students' parents reporting teachers shows a tendency to criminalize pedagogical actions. The use of criminal law in this context often fails to consider the purpose, context, and proportionality of disciplinary actions

taken by teachers. As a result, criminal law, which should function as a last resort, is used excessively, potentially shifting the role of education and weakening teachers' authority in managing the learning process. Within this framework, a legal protection model is needed that balances the interests of child protection with the need for teachers' pedagogical authority. The ideal model includes applying the principle of proportionality in assessing disciplinary actions, strengthening non-penal settlement mechanisms through restorative approaches, national standardization of permissible forms of disciplinary action, and recognizing limited immunity for teachers who act in good faith. With this approach, the law is expected not only to provide protection but also to optimally support the sustainability of the educational function.

Recommendations

First, the government needs to formulate derivative regulations that specify the limits and standards for disciplinary action in the educational environment. This regulation must be able to provide clear and operational guidelines for teachers, as well as be a reference for parents and law enforcement officials in assessing an action objectively and proportionately.

Second, educational institutions need to develop and implement standard operating procedures (SOPs) for handling student disciplinary violations that are grounded in educational and restorative approaches. This SOP is important to ensure that every action taken by teachers has a clear, measurable, and legally and professionally accountable basis.

Third, law enforcement officials are expected to prioritize a contextual approach in handling reports against teachers, taking into account pedagogical aspects and educational objectives. In this case, criminal law should be placed as the ultimate remedy, so that not every conflict in the world of education must be resolved through repressive channels.

Fourth, there is a need to strengthen teachers' capacity through training in classroom management, effective communication, and non-violent disciplinary approaches. This effort not only aims to prevent potential violations but also to improve the quality of interaction between teachers and students in the learning process. With the implementation of these recommendations, it is hoped that a fairer balance will be struck between protecting children's rights and protecting the teaching profession, so that the education system can operate effectively without being overshadowed by legal uncertainty. Closing

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexy, R. (2002). *A theory of constitutional rights*. Oxford University Press.

- Durkheim, E. (1990). *Moral education: A study of the theory and application of the sociology of education*. Erlangga.
- Fitriani, R. (2020). Legal protection of children in the criminal justice system in Indonesia. *Journal of Law Ius Quia Iustum*, 27(2), 235–250. <https://doi.org/10.20885/iustum.vol27.iss2.art3>
- Freeman, M. (2011). *Human rights: An interdisciplinary approach* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.
- Hadjon, P. M. (1987). *Legal protection for the people in Indonesia*. Build Knowledge.
- Hidayat, R. (2021). Criminalization of teachers in the perspective of education law in Indonesia. *Journal of Education and Culture*, 6(1), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.24832/jpnk.v6i1.1820>
- Husak, D. (2008). *Overcriminalization: The limits of the criminal law*. Oxford University Press.
- Noddings, N. (2013). *Caring: A relational approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed.). University of California Press.
- Prasetyo, T. (2022). The authority of teachers in providing disciplinary sanctions against students in the perspective of national law. *Journal of Law and Development*, 52(1), 112–130. <https://doi.org/10.21143/jhp.vol52.no1.3456>
- Siregar, B. (2021). Disharmonization of regulations in the protection of teachers and children in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Legislation*, 18(3), 389–402. <https://doi.org/10.54629/jli.v18i3.789>
- Suyanto, B. (2019). *Children's social problems*. Kencana.
- Law Number 14 of 2005 concerning Teachers and Lecturers.
- Law Number 35 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law Number 23 of 2002 concerning Child Protection.
- Zehr, H. (2002). *The little book of restorative justice*. Good Books.