



Criminal Liability of Parents for Economic Exploitation of Children

Laverda Daffa Marva Ria¹, Ariy Khaerudin², Femmy Silaswati Farried³

^{1,2,3}Prodi Ilmu Hukum, Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Islam Batik Surakarta, Indonesia

Abstract: The economic exploitation of children by parents reflects social inequalities and weak legal protections for vulnerable groups in Indonesia, exacerbated by poverty, low education levels, and inadequate state oversight in the informal sector. This study aims to analyze the criminal liability of parents for the economic exploitation of children based on Indonesian positive law, including the Child Protection Law and the Criminal Code (KUHP 1946 and KUHP 2023), as well as identify gaps between legal norms and their implementation. The research employs a normative juridical approach with a statutory approach, utilizing secondary legal materials such as laws, doctrines, and relevant literature, analyzed through qualitative-descriptive methods. The results indicate that regulations prohibiting the economic exploitation of children align with the principle of child protection in Indonesia's legal system, which is vertically harmonious from the Constitution to sectoral regulations, and consistent with international instruments like the CRC and ILO Conventions. However, the criminal liability of parents is strongly based on the Child Protection Law (Articles 76I and 88) and Criminal Code provisions on participation, with theories such as strict liability and vicarious liability applicable. Despite a strong normative framework, law enforcement is hindered by low legal awareness, permissive culture, and narrow interpretations of exploitation. In conclusion, although legal norms effectively criminalize exploitation by parents, practical implementation requires stricter enforcement, consistent interpretations prioritizing the best interests of the child, and social policies to address root causes, to ensure substantive child protection.

Keywords: Criminal Liability Of Parents, Child Protection Law, Criminal Code, Economic Exploitation Of Children, Law Enforcement.

1. Introduction

The economic exploitation of children is a clear reflection of social inequality and weak legal protection for vulnerable groups in society. This practice often occurs due to family economic pressures, poor access to education, and minimal state supervision of the informal labour market. These conditions trap children in a cycle of poverty that is difficult to break, where they must work not by choice, but out of necessity to survive. The economic exploitation of children is a form of human rights violation that has been a global concern over the past two decades. In many developing countries, children are still involved in economic activities that threaten their health, education, and normal growth and development.

The study makes a crucial theoretical contribution by addressing a significant scientific gap in the academic discourse on child protection in Indonesian law, 1) Filling the Normative-Legal Gap while previous studies on child exploitation in Indonesia focused primarily on sexual exploitation or child trafficking, or only contained social analysis of parental exploitation, this research provides the first in-depth normative study of the issue, 2) Affirming Legal Accountability in Family Relationships the study strengthens the academic discourse by affirming core criminal law principles that challenge the notion of family immunity.

The gap between legal norms explicitly prohibiting economic child exploitation and the permissive social reality in Indonesia is primarily caused by three interrelated factors,

Correspondence:

Name: Laverda Daffa Marva Ria

Email: Laverdadmr3@gmail.com

Received: Nov 19, 2025;

Revised: Nov 23 2025;

Accepted: Nov 30, 2025;

Published : Dec 30, 2025;



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors.

Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons

Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) license (

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

1) Narrow Interpretation of "Exploitation" and Weak Enforcement that the strong legal framework, including the Child Protection Law (Articles 76I and 88) and the Criminal Code, is undercut by lax implementation, 2) Permissive Culture and Low Legal Awareness that the social environment lacks the necessary legal consciousness to support strict enforcement, 3) Structural Roots of the Problem that the problem is exacerbated by persistent structural issues that push children into the workforce.

The practice of economic exploitation of children in Indonesia reflects the continuing weakness of the child protection system, both legally and socially. This phenomenon is not only caused by poverty, but also by low public awareness of children's rights and the lack of law enforcement against perpetrators of exploitation, including parents themselves. National data shows an increase in the number of child labourers from 1.72% in 2023 to 2.17% in 2024. The percentage of children working in rural areas even reached 2.82%, much higher than in urban areas at 1.72% (Purwanto & Ratri, 2025). This condition confirms that even though regulations related to child protection exist, their implementation is still far from optimal. Legal protection for children has not been effective, and exploitation often involves the parents themselves, who are closest to the children. Many children are forced to work on the streets begging, busking, or peddling small goods to help support their families, which indirectly places them in situations of exploitation and causes them to lose their right to education and a proper childhood.

The problem of child exploitation in Indonesia is not only caused by economic factors, but also by the community's weak legal awareness of children's rights. Many families still view children as part of the family's assets who can be involved in economic activities to help with household finances. In fact, this view blurs the line between family responsibilities and violations of children's rights. The main problem in this context lies in the weak enforcement of the law against perpetrators of exploitation, especially when the perpetrators are parents or guardians who have a legal responsibility to protect children. Many cases of child exploitation are not followed up because they are considered part of family responsibilities or economic reasons. Research shows that family relationships are often used as a justification to avoid criminal responsibility, even though normatively such actions constitute economic exploitation of children (Julianti, 2020). This creates a dilemma between family moral values and the state's legal obligation to protect the rights of children as subjects of law who must be protected.

In the context of national law, the position of children as legal subjects is affirmed in Article 28B paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which states that every child has the right to survival, growth and development, and the right to protection from violence and discrimination. This provision is reinforced in Law No. 35 of 2014 on Child Protection, particularly Article 76I, which prohibits anyone from exploiting children economically, and Article 88, which regulates the criminal penalties for such acts (Azhari et al., 2022). However, there is still a gap between the law that should apply and the reality on the ground, as many cases of exploitation are not prosecuted due to family or economic reasons. Therefore, it is important to assess the effectiveness of the application of legal norms in enforcing criminal liability against parents who exploit children, considering that the effectiveness of child protection laws is still hampered by low public legal awareness and the lack of strict criminal sanctions against perpetrators who have family ties with the victims.

In modern child protection theory, children are no longer considered objects of protection, but subjects of law with inherent rights. The state, family, and community have a legal obligation to ensure that these rights are fulfilled. Economic exploitation by parents violates the principles of the best interests of the child and non-discrimination, which form the legal basis for child protection in Indonesia and around the world. Recent research confirms that family relationships cannot be used as a reason to exempt perpetrators from criminal responsibility (Freeman, 2020). Thus, blood ties or family ties between the perpetrator and the victim should not be used as a legal shield to negate

criminal responsibility. Morally, parents bear a greater responsibility to protect their children, and in the event of a violation, the state is obliged to uphold justice and ensure that children's rights are guaranteed in the criminal justice process.

Studies on child exploitation in Indonesia have so far focused more on sexual exploitation or child trafficking, while research on economic exploitation by parents is still very limited. Studies discussing this issue usually only contain social analysis and, although they find practices of economic exploitation by parents, they have not yet examined in depth the aspect of criminal liability under positive law. This situation creates a scientific gap, as there has been no normative study discussing how criminal law regulates and enforces the responsibility of parents as perpetrators of child exploitation, thus demonstrating the need for legal research oriented towards norms and the application of criminal law in the context of family relationships. The increase in cases of economic exploitation of children in Indonesia shows the weak application of criminal law against perpetrators, especially when the perpetrators are their own parents. This condition illustrates the imbalance between the legal norms stipulated in the Child Protection Law and the Criminal Code and their implementation in law enforcement practice (International Labour Organization, 2024). Therefore, this research is important to review the effectiveness of legal norms governing child protection and to ensure that criminal law is not only repressive but also promotes the principles of humanity and the best interests of the child.

Based on the above description, this study is important to review how criminal law, both the 1946 Criminal Code and the 2023 Criminal Code as well as the Child Protection Law, can be effectively applied to perpetrators of economic exploitation of children by parents. Thus, the results of this study are expected to make a real contribution to the reform of national criminal law, while strengthening the position of children as legal subjects who have dignity and the right to grow and develop humanely without the threat of exploitation from any party, including their own parents.

2. Materials and Methods

This study uses a normative legal research approach with a statute approach as proposed by Peter Mahmud Marzuki (Marzuki, 2024). This approach is used to examine and analyse the legal norms governing the criminal liability of parents for the economic exploitation of children in the Indonesian criminal law system. This study examines the provisions contained in the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Law Number 35 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law Number 23 of 2002, the 1946 Criminal Code (KUHP), Law No. 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code Book which will come into effect in 2026, Law No. 13 of 2003 concerning Manpower as amended by Law No. 6 of 2023, Government Regulation No. 78 of 2015, Minister of Manpower Regulation No. 5 of 2018, Presidential Decree No. 36 of 1990, Law No. 20 of 1999, and Law No. 1 of 2000.

This study utilised secondary legal materials, including various scientific literature relevant to the theme of child protection and parental criminal responsibility, such as books on criminal law, child protection law, scientific articles, expert opinions, official reports from international institutions such as UNICEF and the ILO, as well as tertiary legal materials such as legal dictionaries, encyclopaedias, and indexes of legislation. Data was collected through library research by examining legislation, legal doctrines, and relevant previous research results. Data analysis was conducted using qualitative-descriptive methods, namely by interpreting applicable positive legal provisions and relating them to criminal law concepts and principles regarding parental responsibility for children (Marzuki, 2010).

The scope of this study is limited to a normative analysis of the application of criminal sanctions against parents who exploit their children economically, both according to the 1946 Criminal Code and the 2023 Criminal Code, as well as in the context of the implementation of the Child Protection Law. The main focus of the study is to identify the gap between ideal legal norms and law enforcement practices. The results of this analysis

are expected to contribute to the renewal of national criminal law that is more responsive to the protection of children's rights in Indonesia.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. *The Compatibility of Regulations Prohibiting the Economic Exploitation of Children with the Principles of Child Protection in the Indonesian Legal System*

Economic exploitation of children is a serious violation of human rights because it treats children as objects of economic exploitation rather than as legal subjects who have the right to protection and welfare (International Labour Organization, 2024). In the Indonesian legal system, regulations prohibiting the exploitation of children are clearly stipulated in various laws and regulations. Article 28B paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia states that 'every child has the right to survival, growth and development, and the right to protection from violence and discrimination' (MPR RI, 2025). This provision forms the constitutional basis for all subordinate regulations relating to child protection. Thus, all forms of child exploitation, including those committed by parents themselves, must be regarded as violations of the constitutional mandate. This principle is in line with the view that the state has a positive obligation to actively guarantee, protect and fulfil human rights through the formulation of laws, policies and effective enforcement throughout its jurisdiction (Asshiddiqie, 2013).

Regulations concerning the prohibition of economic exploitation of children in Indonesia have a solid legal basis, both in terms of the constitution and sectoral regulations. Article 28B paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution states, 'Every child has the right to survival, growth and development, and the right to protection from violence and discrimination'. This article affirms the fundamental rights of children to live, develop optimally, and be protected from all forms of violence and unfair treatment. This shows that the state has a legal obligation to guarantee children's rights, not just a moral obligation. Within the framework of constitutional law, children's rights are positioned as part of human rights that have constitutional force binding on all state institutions (Asshiddiqie, 2019). This constitutional provision is the philosophical basis for all regulations relating to children, as it emphasises that the protection of children is not a product of the state's compassion, but rather the embodiment of the principles of social justice and constitutional responsibility. Thus, any act of child exploitation, including by parents themselves, directly contradicts the basic values of the rule of law (*rechtsstaat*), which requires that all citizens be subject to the law without exception (Hadi & Michael, 2024).

Vertical synchronisation between various laws and regulations concerning child protection demonstrates a consistent hierarchical relationship from the constitutional level to the implementing regulations. The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, particularly Article 28B paragraph (2), serves as the basic norm that affirms children's rights to survival, growth and development, as well as their right to protection from violence and discrimination. This norm is the *grundnorm* (highest norm) that binds all legal products below it. These constitutional provisions are then elaborated in Law No. 35 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law No. 23 of 2002 concerning Child Protection (Law No. 35 of 2014). Article 76I prohibits economic and/or sexual exploita-

tion of children, while Article 88 stipulates criminal sanctions for anyone who violates these provisions. In this context, the norms of the Child Protection Law serve as an operational elaboration of the constitutional mandate that places child protection as the responsibility of the state.

At the implementation level, vertical synchronisation is also evident in Law No. 13 of 2003 concerning Manpower, as amended by Law No. 6 of 2023 concerning the Stipulation of the Job Creation Perppu. Article 68 of the Law stipulates a prohibition on employing children under the age of 18, except for light work that does not interfere with their physical, mental, and social development (Law No. 6 of 2023). This provision is further clarified through Government Regulation No. 78 of 2015 concerning Wages and Minister of Manpower Regulation No. 5 of 2018 concerning Occupational Safety and Health in the Workplace, which regulates safety standards and working hours for children in certain sectors (Government Regulation No. 78 of 2015). According to the explanation in Article 69 paragraph (2) of the Manpower Law, children who are permitted to work must obtain written permission from their parents and may not be exploited for the economic benefit of others. This norm reinforces the prohibition of child exploitation as stipulated in the Child Protection Law, so that hierarchically there is no conflict, but rather a harmonious and complementary relationship.

This synchronisation is important to ensure that there is no overlap or gap in the norms relating to the economic exploitation of children. From a normative perspective, all of these regulations have the same objective, namely to guarantee the fulfilment of children's rights and prevent the abuse of parental power over children. However, overlap can still occur at the implementation level, for example in the enforcement of labour laws against child workers within the family. Therefore, consistency is needed between law enforcement agencies and policy implementing agencies to interpret the concept of 'economic exploitation' uniformly so as not to create legal loopholes that could potentially harm children.

Legally, more detailed provisions on the prohibition of child exploitation are regulated in Law No. 35 of 2014 concerning Child Protection, which is an amendment to Law No. 23 of 2002. Article 76I of the Child Protection Law prohibits anyone from placing, allowing, committing, ordering, or participating in the economic and/or sexual exploitation of children. thus explicitly prohibiting anyone, including parents, from exploiting children economically or sexually, while Article 88 stipulates a maximum criminal penalty of ten years' imprisonment and a fine of up to two hundred million rupiah for perpetrators. The wording of the article indicates that child exploitation is classified as a formal offence, meaning that the act is punishable without the need to prove any actual harm to the child (Prasetyo, 2020). However, in practice, law enforcement officials often interpret the elements of 'placing' and "allowing" narrowly, so that many acts of economic exploitation are not subject to criminal sanctions because they are considered part of 'child support for the family'. In fact, from a child protection perspective, the main principle that must be upheld is the best interests of the child, namely that every legal decision or action must prioritise the best interests of the child (UNICEF Indonesia, 2020).

In legal protection theory, Soerjono Soekanto emphasises that child protection must encompass three main dimensions, namely preventive and repressive (Soekanto, 2021). However, in Indonesia, these two dimensions are not yet balanced. Preventive efforts undertaken by the government and relevant institutions generally still focus on socialisation, public campaigns, and community education, and thus have not been fully effective in reducing economic exploitation of children, especially in the informal sector and in domestic settings. Meanwhile, repressive law enforcement mechanisms have not been optimally implemented. Many cases of child labour are not reported or are terminated at an early stage of the handling process due to family economic factors, limited resources of the authorities, or a preference for non-judicial settlements. This situation means that only a small proportion of cases proceed to court, so that the effectiveness of legal protection cannot guarantee substantive justice and recovery for children as vulnerable subjects of the law.

Based on data from the Indonesian Child Protection Commission (KPAI), around 18,000 street children in Indonesia are vulnerable to economic exploitation, including being forced to beg, busk or sell goods on the streets (Humas KPAI, 2016). This situation highlights the gap between normative progress in the national legal system and the social reality on the ground. Although Indonesia has a comprehensive legal framework for child protection, its effectiveness remains low due to weak public awareness of the law and a lack of enforcement of sanctions against perpetrators, including parents. Conceptually, legal norms prohibiting child exploitation should be absolutely imperative, meaning that they cannot be set aside on moral or economic grounds. In modern criminal law theory, any perpetrator who exploits children for economic gain, including parents, must be punished regardless of the family's economic motives. This principle is in line with the theory of strict liability applied to crimes against children in various international jurisdictions.

In addition, the theory of legal protection put forward by Satjipto Rahardjo is relevant for assessing the extent to which national law protects children. Rahardjo emphasises that the law must be alive and work to protect the weak, rather than merely being a passive normative text. According to him, the law should not stop at the procedural level, but must be a means to achieve substantive justice for those who are vulnerable to oppression and exploitation (Rahardjo, 2010). In the context of child protection, this view demands that criminal law not only function as an instrument of punishment, but also as a tool for social transformation that ensures children obtain guarantees of their rights to live, grow and develop properly. The exploitation of children by parents for economic reasons shows that the law has not yet worked responsively as intended by Rahardjo. The law tends to stop at the text, without considering the social dimensions behind these violations.

Based on the entire description of the compatibility of regulations prohibiting the economic exploitation of children with the principle of child protection in the Indonesian legal system, it can be concluded that these regulations are normatively strongly aligned with the principle of child protection in international instruments such as the CRC and ILO Conventions No. 138 and No. 182, and are reflected in the vertical harmonisation between the 1945 Constitution, the Child Protection Law, the Criminal

Code, and labour regulations. However, this normative alignment has not yet fully impacted the effectiveness of protection at the practical level, as there are still serious gaps between the legal rules and their implementation. These gaps are mainly due to low public awareness, a culture of tolerance towards child labour within families, weak supervision in the informal sector, and a tendency for officials to interpret the element of 'exploitation' narrowly, resulting in many cases not being prosecuted. Thus, protecting children from economic exploitation requires strengthening more assertive law enforcement mechanisms, consistent legal interpretations based on the principle of the best interests of the child, and social policies capable of addressing the structural roots of child labour, so that advanced normative protection can be substantively realised in social reality.

3.2 Criminal Liability of Parents for Economic Exploitation of Children

Criminal liability in the context of Indonesian criminal law is always associated with a person's ability to bear the legal consequences of unlawful acts. Criminal liability is a logical consequence of acts that are prohibited by law and committed with fault, whether intentional or negligent (Moeljatno, 2008). In cases of economic exploitation of children, the position of parents becomes problematic because they have two roles at once, namely as protectors of children according to the law and as perpetrators of exploitation according to legal facts. When parents employ children for the economic benefit of the family, they have legally abused the functions and authority attached to their position as parents. This principle explains that family relationships are not an excuse or justification in criminal law, because everyone has the same position before the law.

In the positive legal system, the form of criminal liability of parents for child exploitation is clearly regulated in Article 76I in conjunction with Article 88 of Law Number 35 of 2014 concerning Child Protection. Article 76I states that 'everyone is prohibited from exploiting children economically and/or sexually,' while Article 88 stipulates a maximum criminal penalty of 10 years' imprisonment and a maximum fine of Rp200,000,000. The term 'everyone' has a universal meaning without exception, thus including parents, guardians, or parties who have family ties with the child. Thus, the criminal liability of parents is not only regulated in moral terms, but also becomes a legal obligation that must be enforced by the state to protect the best interests of the child.

The criminal liability of parents for the economic exploitation of children must be examined through two main elements, namely the element of action (*actus reus*) and the element of fault (*mens rea*) (Hakim, 2020). In this context, acts committed by parents, such as forcing children to work, exploiting children's income, or allowing children to work in hazardous environments, fulfil the *actus reus* element. Meanwhile, fault arises when parents are aware that these actions violate the law and harm children. In modern criminal law, it is not necessary to prove deep malicious intent in order to establish liability; knowledge and willingness to commit an act that violates norms is sufficient.

The legal obligation of parents to protect their children is also regulated in Article 26 paragraph (1) of Law Number 35 of 2014, which stipulates that parents are obliged to care for, nurture, educate, and protect their children (Usman, 2023). Thus, when parents

exploit their children economically, they not only violate criminal provisions but also violate public legal obligations derived from the law. Consequently, criminal liability is not only intended to punish but also to uphold justice for the children who have been harmed and to restore the protective function of the family as a safe social unit for the growth and development of children.

Based on the 1946 Criminal Code and the 2023 Criminal Code, the act of parents ordering or forcing their children to work for economic gain can be categorised as a criminal offence of complicity (*medeplegen*) as stipulated in Articles 55 and 56 of the 1946 Criminal Code, and Articles 132 to 134 of the 2023 Criminal Code (Soesilo, 1991). In this case, parents can be considered as parties who participate in the crime because they have control and authority over the actions of their children. In addition, the amendments to the 2023 Criminal Code show a strengthening of the principle of criminal accountability, especially for perpetrators who abuse their position or power to commit crimes in hierarchical relationships, including family relationships. Thus, the role and responsibilities of parents are not only assessed from a moral perspective, but also from the perspective of positive criminal law, which emphasises the importance of protecting children from economic exploitation. The 2023 Criminal Code explicitly expands the forms of criminal liability for perpetrators who use their position of power to commit criminal acts, including within the family.

The theory of strict liability in modern criminal law is also relevant to cases of child exploitation. Under this theory, a person can be held criminally liable without the need to prove fault in depth; it is sufficient to prove that an act has been committed that violates a legal obligation (ChildX, 2022). This principle is important to apply to crimes involving vulnerable groups, such as children, so that legal protection is effective. When applied in the context of parents, any form of involvement in child exploitation, whether direct or indirect, can still be subject to criminal sanctions regardless of economic motives.

In addition to strict liability, the principle of vicarious liability can also be used as a basis for assessing the criminal responsibility of parents. This principle places individuals in a position of responsibility for the actions of others under their supervision (Pranayani & Parwata, 2021). In this case, parents can be held responsible not only for directly exploiting their children, but also for failing to supervise their children, resulting in their involvement in harmful economic activities. This principle broadens the scope of legal responsibility from merely active actions to include passive negligence that results in violations of children's rights.

In Satjipto Rahardjo's perspective on legal protection theory, the main purpose of law is to provide protection to the weak, not merely to punish perpetrators (Rahardjo, 2021). Thus, the application of criminal liability to parents should not be solely repressive, but should also contain educational and rehabilitative dimensions. The state must ensure that the legal process not only restores justice for the child victim, but also provides guidance for parents so that they do not repeat their actions.

Based on the overall analysis, the criminal liability of parents for the economic exploitation of children has a strong legal basis through the Child Protection Law, the 1946 Criminal Code and the 2023 Criminal Code, as well as principles in modern criminal law

theory which emphasise that family relationships cannot be used as an excuse or justification for acts of exploitation. Conceptually, parents who force, allow, or exploit their children for economic gain have fulfilled the elements of criminal acts (*actus reus*) and guilt (*mens rea*), and can even be held accountable through the construction of participation, strict liability, and vicarious liability. However, the effectiveness of the application of these norms is still hampered by a permissive culture, low legal awareness, and the tendency of officials to consider exploitation as part of 'family norms'. Therefore, law enforcement must be carried out consistently by prioritising the principle of the best interests of the child, strengthening supervision and reporting mechanisms, and ensuring that the legal process does not stop at the normative level, but truly guarantees the protection of children from all forms of abuse of power by parents.

4. Conclusions

Based on an analysis of the compatibility of regulations prohibiting the economic exploitation of children with the principle of child protection in the Indonesian legal system, as well as the criminal liability of parents for exploitation, it can be concluded that, normatively, the Indonesian legal system has provided a strong foundation for prohibiting and punishing the economic exploitation of children. The provisions in the 1945 Constitution, the Child Protection Law, the 1946 Criminal Code and the 2023 Criminal Code, as well as labour regulations, show consistency with the principle of the best interests of the child and international standards such as the CRC and the ILO Convention. However, this normative harmony has not been fully implemented effectively due to gaps at the practical level, mainly as a result of a permissive culture, weak law enforcement, and a narrow interpretation of the concept of 'exploitation'.

The research highlights significant practical implications for law enforcement officials (LEOs) in addressing child economic exploitation, especially within the domestic sphere, where prosecution is often hindered by cultural and economic factors, 1) Shift from Moral to Legal Accountability, LEOs must shift their perspective from viewing child labor within the family as a mere moral or economic issue to recognizing it as a serious criminal offense, 2) Utilizing Broader Criminal Liability Theories, LEOs should utilize the full scope of modern criminal law theories, which broaden accountability beyond direct, active intent, 3) Overcoming Narrow Interpretation of "Exploitation" A key practical hurdle is the tendency of officials to interpret the elements of "placing" or "allowing" narrowly, resulting in cases being dropped or un-prosecuted.

Criminal liability of parents for economic exploitation of children can be enforced through the construction of offences in the Child Protection Law, provisions in the Criminal Code, and theoretical approaches such as strict liability and vicarious liability that are relevant to the protection of vulnerable groups. Family relationships cannot be used as justification or excuse, because parents have a greater legal obligation to protect their children. However, the implementation of criminal liability still faces obstacles in the form of low legal awareness and the tendency of officials to normalise child labour in the family context. According to the findings of this study, law enforcement needs to be strengthened through consistent interpretation based on the principle of child protection, increased capacity of law enforcement officials to identify and take action

against exploitation occurring within the domestic sphere, and the renewal of social policies that address the root causes of problems such as poverty and the lack of social protection for families. Without such structural interventions, legally advanced provisions will not be able to provide substantive protection for children. Further research is recommended to examine the effectiveness of cross-sectoral handling mechanisms and community-based intervention models that can strengthen the prevention of child exploitation at the family level. Further research should focus on gathering empirical evidence to assess the real-world effectiveness of the current normative framework and identify practical interventions. This research should take two main directions: 1) Cross-Sectoral Implementation and Law Enforcement Efficacy future studies need to move beyond normative analysis to investigate the practical application of the law, 2) Intervention Models and Root Cause Policies research should focus on the impact of social and policy interventions designed to address the root causes of exploitation.

References

Books

- Asshiddiqie, J. (2013). *Hak Asasi Manusia: Hak Asasi Manusia, Konstitusi, Dan Demokrasi*. Kencana.
- Asshiddiqie, J. (2019). *Hak Asasi Manusia Dalam Perspektif Hukum Tata Negara Indonesia* (4th ed.). Sinar Grafika.
- Hadi, S., & Michael, T. (2024). *Negara Hukum*. Jejak Pustaka.
- Hakim, L. (2020). *Asas-asas hukum pidana*. Deepublish.
- Marzuki, P. M. (2010). *Penelitian Hukum*. Prenada Media.
- Marzuki, P. M. (2024). *Penelitian Hukum*. Prenada Media Group.
- Moeljatno. (2008). *Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana* (7th ed.). Rineka Cipta.
- Prasetyo, T. (2020). *Hukum Pidana*. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Rahardjo, S. (2010). *Ilmu Hukum* (6th ed.). Citra Aditya Bakti.
- Rahardjo, S. (2021). *Ilmu Hukum* (9th ed.). PT Citra Aditya Bakti.
- Soekanto, S. (2021). *Pengantar Penelitian Hukum*. UI-Press.
- Soesilo, R. (1991). *Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana (KUHP): Serta Komentar-Komentarnya Lengkap Pasal Demi Pasal*. Politeia Bogor.

Articles

- Azhari, A., Asmara, R., & Dameria, E. (2022). Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Anak Dalam Tindak Pidana Eksploitasi Pekerja Anak Ditinjau Dari Undang-Undang Perlindungan Anak. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Fakultas Hukum Universitas Malikussaleh*, 5(2), 187–196. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.29103/jimfh.v5i2.6878>
- Julianti, F. (2020). Pertanggungjawaban Pidana Terhadap Orang Tua Yang Menjadikan Anak Kandung Sebagai Pengemis Dan Pengamen. *Jurist-Diction*, 5(3), 1713.
- Pranayani, L. P. V., & Parwata, I. G. N. (2021). Vicarious Liability Dalam Tindak Pidana Anak Dditinjau Dari Hukum Positif Indonesia. *Jurnal Kertha Wicara*, 10(2), 118.

Documents/Internasional Reports

- International Labour Organization. (2024). *Child Labour Global Estimates 2024, Trends and The Road Forward*.
- UNICEF. (2014). *Child Rights Education Toolkit: Rooting Child Rights in Early Childhood Education, Primary and Secondary Schools*.
- UNICEF Indonesia. (2020). *Child Protection in Indonesia – Developing Strong Policy and Regulations for Every Child*. <https://www.unicef.org/indonesia/reports/child-protection-resource-pack>

Laws

- Kementerian Ketenagakerjaan Republik Indonesia. (2018). *Peraturan Menteri Ketenagakerjaan Nomor 5 Tahun 2018 tentang Keselamatan dan Kesehatan Kerja Lingkungan Kerja*, Pub. L. No. Permenaker No. 5 Tahun 2018.
- MPR RI. (2025). *Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945*.
- Pemerintah Republik Indonesia. (2015). *Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 78 Tahun 2015 tentang Pengupahan*, Pub. L. No. PP No. 78 Tahun 2015.
- Pemerintah Republik Indonesia. (2023). *Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2023 tentang Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana*, Pub. L. No. UUU No. 1 Tahun 2023.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia. (2014). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 35 Tahun 2014 tentang Perubahan atas Undang-Undang Nomor 23 Tahun 2002 tentang Perlindungan Anak*.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia. (2023). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 6 Tahun 2023 tentang Penetapan Peraturan Pemerintah Pengganti Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2022 tentang Cipta Kerja Menjadi Undang-Undang*, Pub. L. No. LN 2023/No. 41, TLN No. 6856.

Publications

- ChildX. (2022). *strict Liability for Perpetrators of Child Exploitation*.
- Freeman, M. (2020). *Children's Rights: Towards Social Justice* (7th ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.
- Humas KPAI. (2016). *Catat! 18.000 Anak Jalanan Rentan Jadi Obyek Eksploitasi*. Kpai.Go.Id. Alih Usman. "Siapa yang wajib memberikan perlindungan terhadap anak?" BPSDM Kementerian Hukum RI, 2023. https://bpsdm.kemenkum.go.id/informasi-publik/publikasi/pojok-penyuluhan-hukum/siapa-yang-wajib-memberikan-perindungan-terhadap-anak?utm_source=. Antonius Purwanto, Zikrina Ratri. "Pekerja Anak Meningkatkan, Perlindungan Kian Jadi Tantangan," 2025. <https://www.kompas.id/artikel/pekerja-anak-meningkat-perindungan-kian-jadi-tantangan>. ChildX. "Strict Liability for Perpetrators of Child Exploitation," 2022. Humas KPAI. "Catat! 18.000 Anak Jalanan Rentan Jadi Obyek Eksploitasi." <https://www.kpai.go.id/publikasi/catat-18-000-anak-jalanan-rentan-jadi-obyek-eksploitasi-2>
- Purwanto, A., & Ratri, Z. (2025). *Pekerja Anak Meningkatkan, Perlindungan Kian Jadi Tantangan*. kompas.id. <https://www.kompas.id/artikel/pekerja-anak-meningkat-perindungan-kian-jadi-tantangan>
- Usman, A. (2023). *Siapa yang wajib memberikan perlindungan terhadap anak?* BPSDM Kementerian Hukum RI. https://bpsdm.kemenkum.go.id/informasi-publik/publikasi/pojok-penyuluhan-hukum/siapa-yang-wajib-memberikan-perindungan-terhadap-anak?utm_source=