

Research Horizon

ISSN: 2808-0696 (p), 2807-9531 (e)

Research Horizon

Volume: 06

Issue: 02

Year: 2026

Page: 1027-1038

Citation:

Nabil, A., & Nugroho, F. (2026). Policy implementation of child welfare institutions in fulfilling children's rights. *Research Horizon*, 6(2), 1027-1038.

Article History:

Received: March 21, 2026

Revised: April 15, 2026

Accepted: April 28, 2026

Online since: April 30, 2026

Policy Implementation of Child Welfare Institutions in Fulfilling Children's Rights

Alwan Nabil^{1*}, Fentiny Nugroho¹

¹Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia

*Corresponding author: Alwan Nabil (alwannabil29@gmail.com)

Abstract

The fulfillment of neglected children's rights remains a major challenge in Indonesia's social welfare system. This study critically examines the implementation of social policies at Child Welfare Institutions (*Lembaga Kesejahteraan Sosial Anak/LKSA*) in fulfilling the rights of neglected children in Jember Regency. Using a qualitative case study approach, data were collected through interviews, observations, and document analysis. Findings reveal a significant implementation gap, where policies are reduced to administrative practices rather than serving as instruments for fulfilling children's rights. Although the regulatory framework is relatively comprehensive, its normative nature, lacking operational technical standards, encourages the dominance of implementers' discretion and results in varied implementation. Furthermore, problematic interactions between inconsistent communication, resource constraints, actor dispositions, and fragmented bureaucratic structures reinforce the ineffectiveness of the policy. These conditions indicate a weak policy design in anticipating the complexities of implementation. Therefore, a policy reorientation is needed, shifting from administrative compliance toward a rights-based approach through the strengthening of operational standards, actor capacity, and institutional integration.

Keywords

Children's Rights, Neglected Children, Policy Implementation, Social Policies, Social Welfare System.

1. Introduction

The issue of neglected children remains a critical concern in social welfare policy at both global and national levels. Neglected children are a vulnerable group whose basic rights are often unmet due to poverty, family dysfunction, and limited access to social services. From a child rights perspective, this condition reflects weaknesses in the social protection system in ensuring children's well-being and development. An effective child protection system should guarantee the comprehensive fulfillment of children's rights, including protection, participation, and development (Wulczyn et al., 2010; Gabel, 2014). However, the implementation of child protection policies often faces challenges in translating global norms into contextually appropriate national practices (Freeman, 2011; Welbourn & Dixon, 2016).

In the global context, studies indicate that children in institutional care are more vulnerable to cognitive, emotional, and social developmental delays due to deprivation in caregiving environments (Berens & Nelson, 2015). Institutional care systems also tend to inadequately fulfill children's individual emotional and social needs (Van IJzendoorn et al., 2020). Furthermore, children in institutional settings are at risk of experiencing physical and psychological abuse, which may intensify their long-term vulnerability (Aminah, 2018).

In Indonesia, the child protection system has developed through various policies, including the National Child Care Standards, which encourage the transformation of care services from an institution-based approach toward a family-based approach. This transformation, known as deinstitutionalization, aims to reduce dependence on institutional care (Agastya et al., 2024). However, child welfare institutions remain dominant in practice due to limited family support and community-based social services. This condition indicates that Indonesia's child protection system is still in a transitional phase and has not been fully integrated or implemented optimally.

Empirically, the number of neglected children in Indonesia remains high across various regions, reflecting structural and systemic problems related to poverty, social inequality, and limited access to basic services. In this context, Child Welfare Institutions (*Lembaga Kesejahteraan Sosial Anak/LKSA*) function as the main alternative for fulfilling children's needs, although care should ideally be provided within a family environment (Aminah, 2018). The continued dependence on institutional care indicates that the social protection system has not fully succeeded in preventing children's separation from their families.

As part of the social protection system, LKSA plays a strategic role in providing protection, care, and fulfilling the basic needs of neglected children. These institutions function not only as places of residence but also as environments that support children's social development and character formation. In addition, the presence of social workers is essential to ensuring the quality of care and the holistic fulfillment of children's rights (Yolanda & Sariningsih, 2025). However, the effectiveness of LKSA services largely depends on institutional capacity, including human resources, funding, and organizational governance.

In practice, the implementation of services in LKSA still faces various challenges, including limited resources, weak oversight, and suboptimal application of care standards. Studies show that service quality is strongly influenced by accreditation systems, organizational capacity, and funding sustainability (Kartikawati et al., 2025). In addition, caregiving practices in many institutions still tend to focus on fulfilling basic needs rather than adopting a rights-based approach (Nastia et al., 2023). Furthermore, challenges in implementing LKSA policies are not only technical but also involve policy and institutional dynamics among various actors. Policy fragmentation, limited inter-agency coordination, and differences in actor capacity affect the effectiveness of child protection policy implementation. This suggests that policy success is determined not only by policy design, but also by the

interaction between actors, resources, and the broader social context (Agastya et al., 2024).

Based on the discussion, a significant research gap exists. First, limited studies comprehensively analyze LKSA policy implementation from a social policy perspective. Second, there is a lack of research on the substantive fulfillment of children's rights, particularly participation, psychological protection, and self-development. Third, few studies integrate policy dimensions, institutional capacity, and local context in LKSA implementation. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the implementation of LKSA social policies in fulfilling the rights of neglected children in Jember Regency, emphasizing the interaction between regulations, actors, and institutional capacity in policy implementation practices.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Social Welfare and Children

McTavish et al. (2022) define the concept of child social welfare as the fulfillment of children's basic physical, psychological, social, and long-term developmental needs. Isokuortti et al. (2020) further explain that, from a modern welfare perspective, children are viewed as subjects of development who require protection through an integrated social system. Taylor et al. (2021) add that this approach not only focuses on protection from violence but also emphasizes strengthening family capacity, improving access to social services, and ensuring support from a conducive social environment.

In empirical studies, Isokuortti et al. (2020) explain that the child welfare system has evolved into two main approaches: child protection and family welfare. The child protection approach focuses on addressing cases of violence, neglect, and exploitation, whereas McTavish et al. (2022) describe the family welfare approach as being more preventive in nature, emphasizing the provision of comprehensive and sustainable social services. Furthermore, Taylor et al. (2021) highlight that child welfare is strongly influenced by structural factors such as poverty, unequal access to education, and the quality and availability of social services. Thus, child social welfare should not be understood merely as an individual issue, but rather as the outcome of complex interactions between policy systems, social institutions, and the family environment. This underscores the importance of an integrated and holistic approach in ensuring sustainable child well-being.

2.2. Social Policy

Feely et al. (2020) define social policy as a series of government decisions and actions aimed at improving societal well-being, particularly for vulnerable groups such as children. These policies cover various sectors, including social protection, education, health, and welfare services, which are interrelated in shaping community welfare outcomes. In the context of child protection, social policy functions as both a normative and operational instrument to guarantee children's rights, including the rights to protection, development, and participation. The implementation of social policy has been recognized as a key factor in ensuring the fulfillment of children's rights across various public service sectors, as it translates legal and normative frameworks into practical interventions (Berens & Nelson, 2015).

However, the effectiveness of social policies is highly dependent on policy design quality and the degree of coordination among implementing actors (Bouckaert et al., 2022). Agastya et al. (2024) find that child protection policies in Indonesia still encounter various implementation challenges, including limited resources, weak inter-agency coordination, and low levels of service integration across institutions. These constraints often lead to gaps between policy formulation and implementation outcomes at the field level. Therefore, social policy should not only be understood as a set of regulatory products, but also as a dynamic and continuous process involving

multiple actors, institutional arrangements, and competing interests that collectively shape policy effectiveness in practice.

2.3. Policy Implementation

Edwards (1980) and Pülzl and Treib (2017) emphasize that policy implementation is a crucial stage in the public policy cycle, as it ultimately determines whether a policy succeeds or fails. Edwards implementation model identifies four key variables that influence policy outcomes: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. These variables are interrelated and collectively shape how policies are translated into action at the field level. Weak communication, inadequate resources, and rigid bureaucratic structures are often major causes of implementation failure. In the Indonesian context, these challenges are frequently compounded by limited administrative capacity and complex bureaucratic procedures, which reduce the effectiveness of policy delivery and create gaps between policy formulation and implementation.

Winter (2012) views policy implementation as a dynamic process influenced by the interaction between actor behavior, organizational capacity, and socioeconomic conditions. This model highlights the important role of street-level bureaucrats, who have discretion in interpreting and applying policies in practice. Their decisions and behavior significantly affect policy outcomes at the operational level. Therefore, policy implementation success is not solely determined by policy design, but also by the capacity of implementing institutions, the behavior of actors involved, and the broader social and institutional environment in which the policy operates.

2.4. Child Welfare Institutions

Child Welfare Institutions are institutions that play a crucial role in providing protection and services for children in need, such as abandoned children, victims of violence, and those without adequate family care (Familda, 2023; Mustaqim, 2024). LKSA functions as a provider of alternative care services, social rehabilitation, and child capacity development within the broader child welfare system. In this system, LKSA operates as part of a social service network involving the government, community, and private sector. Isokuortti et al. (2020) explain that its role is not only curative but also preventive and rehabilitative, particularly in supporting the reintegration of children into their families or community environments.

Familda (2023) states that the effectiveness of LKSA is highly influenced by the quality of services, the competence of social workers, and the level of integration with broader public policies. In addition, global trends show a shift from institution-based care toward family- and community-based approaches to improve children's long-term well-being (Mctavish et al., 2022). This shift emphasizes the importance of strengthening alternative care systems that are more child-centered and rights-based. Therefore, LKSA serves as a key actor in the implementation of child welfare policies, requiring strong policy support, adequate resources, professional human resources, and effective governance to ensure optimal service delivery.

3. Methods

This research employs a qualitative approach with a case study design to obtain an in-depth and contextual understanding of the implementation of social policies in fulfilling the rights of neglected children through Child Social Welfare Institutions, particularly focusing on interactions among actors, institutional capacity, and contextual factors within the policy implementation framework (Creswell & Poth, 2016). The qualitative case study design was chosen because it allows for a comprehensive exploration of real-life phenomena within their natural context, especially in understanding complex policy implementation processes. The research was conducted in Jember Regency, East Java, which was selected purposively based

on the relatively high number of neglected children and the existence of relevant local child protection policies. The study focuses on one LKSA that actively provides alternative care services, allowing for an in-depth examination of institutional practices and policy implementation at the micro level.

The data in this study consist of primary and secondary sources. Primary data were obtained through semi-structured interviews with LKSA managers, caregivers, local government officials, and service-receiving children, with strict ethical considerations to ensure confidentiality and protection of vulnerable participants. Secondary data were collected from policy documents, institutional reports, and relevant academic literature to strengthen the contextual and analytical depth of the study. Data collection techniques included semi-structured interviews, non-participatory observation, and documentation. These techniques were used in a complementary manner to ensure data richness and triangulation across different sources. The combination of methods allows the researcher to capture both stated practices and observed realities within the institution. Data analysis followed the interactive model proposed by Miles et al. (2014), which consists of data condensation, data display, and iterative conclusion drawing and verification. This process was conducted continuously throughout the research to ensure that emerging patterns and meanings were systematically identified and validated. To enhance the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings, triangulation of sources, techniques, and time was applied.

4. Results

4.1. Policy Implementation of Child Welfare Institutions

The implementation of policies for managing LKSA in Jember Regency is grounded in a relatively comprehensive regulatory framework, including Law Number 11 of 2009 on Social Welfare, Law Number 35 of 2014 on Child Protection, and relevant Minister of Social Affairs regulations. These regulations function as normative guidelines for local governments in carrying out supervision, monitoring, and verification processes, which are implemented through field inspections covering both administrative document checks and direct assessments of institutional conditions (Nastia et al., 2023). However, the findings indicate that the policy framework remains largely normative and lacks detailed operational standards, particularly regarding facility requirements, room capacity, and child-to-caregiver ratios. As a result, eligibility assessments often depend on subjective judgment by officers. While licensing is conducted through a Registration Certificate as an initial administrative filter, institutions primarily interpret these regulations as administrative obligations, including documentation and reporting. Nevertheless, frequent regulatory changes also create adaptation challenges in implementation (Gilbert, 2012).

Research findings show that the implementation of LKSA policies in Jember Regency is carried out through a collaborative organizational approach. The Social Affairs Office does not work in isolation but emphasizes teamwork in performing monitoring and guidance functions for social welfare institutions. Although task distribution follows each unit's main duties and functions, in practice, there is flexibility where staff support each other in field activities, particularly during monitoring that involves both administrative checks and direct observation of institutional conditions. Organizational restructuring through bureaucratic reform has also shifted the structure toward functional positions, replacing section-based divisions, while coordination and responsibility sharing continue through an integrated internal work system (Hupe & Hill, 2016).

In terms of authority, the Social Affairs Office in Jember Regency has a limited role in strategic decision-making, as key functions such as licensing and accreditation

are handled at the provincial or central government level. Consequently, the local government primarily focuses on guidance, supervision, and facilitation, supported by an LKSA forum that facilitates communication, coordination, and policy dissemination among stakeholders (Nasirin & Lionardo, 2021). At the operational level, policy implementers, including social service staff and social workers, play a crucial role in monitoring, data verification, and supervision of LKSA institutions. Their activities involve not only document reviews but also direct field observations to ensure consistency between administrative reports and actual conditions, as well as providing guidance on service standards and administrative requirements. They also assist institutions in licensing and documentation processes. However, the effectiveness of implementation is constrained by the limited number of social workers, which results in uneven mentoring coverage across institutions (Lipsky, 2010).

The behavior of the target group in the implementation of LKSA policies indicates varying responses to the policies implemented. Most institution managers demonstrate efforts to adapt by fulfilling established administrative requirements, such as recording child data, documenting activities, and preparing institutional reports. Additionally, institutions have internal mechanisms in the child admission process, such as conducting surveys of families' socioeconomic conditions to ensure that admitted children truly meet the criteria for social service recipients. However, the research findings also revealed practices that do not fully comply with regulations, particularly regarding discrepancies between reported data and actual conditions on the ground. Some institutions reportedly have discrepancies in the number of foster children between administrative records and actual conditions. On the other hand, the institutions' ability to understand regulations also varies, particularly between long-established institutions and those that have recently begun operations. Newer institutions tend to require more intensive guidance in understanding applicable policies. Furthermore, regarding sustainability, the institutions do not rely solely on government assistance but also depend on support from the community and donors as alternative funding sources (Waid & Choy-Brown, 2021).

Table 1. Summary Findings

Dimension	Key Findings	Implications
Policy Content	Implementation is based on national regulations (Law Number 11 of 2009, Law Number 35 of 2014, Ministerial Regulations Number 30 of 2011, and Number 5 of 2024). However, policies remain normative and lack detailed technical standards.	Creates flexibility but also inconsistency in interpretation and implementation at the local level.
Organizational Behavior	Implementation is collaborative and team-based. Organizational restructuring into functional positions supports flexibility, but authority is limited at the regency level.	Strengthens coordination but limits strategic decision-making capacity
Street-Level Bureaucrats	Implementers play a direct role in monitoring, verification, and mentoring. However, the number of social workers is limited.	High dependency on individual discretion and uneven mentoring intensity.
Target Group Behavior	Institutions generally comply administratively, but discrepancies in data reporting still occur. Understanding of regulations varies across institutions.	Indicates partial compliance and challenges in accountability and policy understanding.

Table 1 summarizes the key findings of the study, highlighting four main dimensions of LKSA policy implementation in Jember Regency, namely policy content, organizational behavior street level bureaucrats and target group behavior. The findings show that although implementation is based on a strong regulatory framework the lack of technical standards limited local authority constrained human resources and varying institutional compliance create gaps between policy design and practice at the field level.

4.2. Supporting and Inhibiting Factors

Research findings indicate that communication between local governments and LKSA in Jember occurs through both formal and informal mechanisms. The primary channel is monitoring and evaluation activities conducted by the District Social Affairs Office at institutional sites, where communication serves not only to deliver information but also to clarify and verify institutional conditions. In addition, the LKSA forum functions as a coordination platform for policy dissemination from government agencies and for institutions to convey field conditions and operational challenges (Kondolele et al., 2025). Communication is also supported by coordination activities prior to monitoring visits and by policy socialization from provincial and central government levels. However, several obstacles remain, including differences in understanding among institution managers, frequent regulatory changes that lead to multiple interpretations, and the involvement of multiple government levels, which complicates coordination. Although communication channels exist, their effectiveness is constrained by inconsistencies in understanding and information flow (Edwards, 1980).

The availability of resources is a key factor in the implementation of LKSA management policies in Jember Regency, encompassing human resources, institutional capacity, and external community support. Social workers play a central role in institutional development by assisting with monitoring activities, providing guidance, and supporting administrative processes. Resource availability is also reflected in the task-sharing system within the Social Affairs Office, where a team-based approach enables multiple staff members to participate in monitoring and capacity-building activities despite limited personnel. In addition, many institutions rely on community contributions and donor support, as well as self-reliance initiatives, to sustain operational activities, while basic facilities such as housing, food, and a supportive care environment remain essential indicators of service readiness (McTavish et al., 2022). However, significant constraints persist, particularly the limited number of social workers, inconsistent budget allocation, and restricted local government authority, which collectively hinder effective policy implementation (Thulin et al., 2019).

The disposition or attitude of policy implementers is an important factor influencing the implementation of LKSA management policies in Jember Regency. Officials from the Jember District Social Affairs Office demonstrate a strong commitment to carrying out guidance and supervision functions, reflected in continuous efforts to educate institution managers and conduct proactive on-site monitoring to ensure compliance with established standards. From the institutional perspective, managers also show commitment to child care services, including selective admissions and service continuity despite resource constraints, as well as participation in government coordination and socialization activities. However, variations in disposition still exist across institutions, particularly in terms of understanding and commitment to regulations, which result in inconsistencies in implementation. Some institutions also face issues related to transparency and accountability, including discrepancies between reported data and actual field conditions. Implementer disposition is reflected not only in attitude and commitment, but also in understanding, consistency, and integrity in policy execution (Winter, 2012; Gilbert, 2012).

The bureaucratic structure in the implementation of LKSA management policies in Jember Regency is characterized by a hierarchical distribution of authority across central, provincial, and regency governments. This arrangement defines the roles of each level, where the regency government primarily focuses on monitoring and supervising social welfare institutions, while licensing and accreditation are largely managed by provincial or central authorities. This reflects a decentralized yet layered governance system. At the operational level, the structure is evident in the procedures of the Social Affairs Office, including monitoring schedules, reporting mechanisms, and internal coordination, while the LKSA forum also plays a role in facilitating communication and coordination between government and institutions (Hupe & Hill, 2016). However, this structure also creates challenges, as multi-level authority can prolong administrative processes and slow decision-making. Regulatory changes and the absence of detailed technical standards further lead to interpretative differences among implementers, resulting in inconsistencies in field practices. The bureaucratic structure, therefore, significantly shapes policy implementation through authority distribution, procedures, and regulatory clarity (Nasirin & Lionardo, 2021).

Table 2. Summary Findings

Factor	Supporting Aspects	Inhibiting Aspects
Communication	Regular communication through monitoring, LKSA forums, and socialization programs. Two-way interaction exists.	Differences in policy understanding, multiple interpretations, and a complex communication structure across government levels.
Resources	Support from social workers, teamwork within the Social Affairs Office, and community/donor contributions.	Limited number of social workers, budget constraints, and restricted authority of local government.
Disposition	Strong commitment from government officials and institution managers; proactive monitoring and service orientation.	Variations in understanding, lack of transparency, and inconsistencies in data reporting.
Bureaucratic Structure	Clear division of roles between central, provincial, and regency levels; structured procedures and coordination forums.	Complex hierarchy, slow decision-making, regulatory inconsistencies, and lack of technical standards.

Table 2 summarizes the key findings across four implementation factors: communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure. It shows that although each factor has supporting strengths, such as coordination mechanisms, teamwork, commitment, and structured governance, there are still inhibiting factors, including limited resources, inconsistent understanding, complex bureaucracy, and weak technical standards, that collectively affect the effectiveness of LKSA policy implementation in Jember Regency.

5. Discussion

The study finds that LKSA management policy implementation in Jember Regency is still dominated by administrative and legal compliance rather than substantive child care quality. This indicates an implementation gap between policy design and field practice, where clarity and operationalization are crucial for effectiveness (Winter, 2012). Although the regulatory framework is comprehensive, it remains normative and lacks detailed technical standards for care quality, institutional capacity, and service delivery (Asamoah, 2025). Consequently, implementers prioritize measurable aspects such as legality and institutional

existence. This pattern supports Thulin et al. (2019), who argue that the absence of operational guidelines in social welfare policies shifts implementation toward procedural rather than substantive outcomes, thereby limiting policy effectiveness.

Limited policy clarity fosters discretionary practices among implementers, with Social Service officials and social workers acting as both executors and interpreters of policy. Although this discretion enables flexibility in handling complex field conditions, it results in inconsistent implementation across institutions. Gilbert (2012) notes that such discretion in ambiguous policies can create variability without clear standards and control mechanisms. Meanwhile, despite adaptive organizational collaboration in resource-constrained settings, limited local government authority within a multi-level governance system reduces its role to that of facilitator rather than decision maker, as emphasized by Hupe and Hill (2016).

In this context, street-level bureaucrats occupy a strategic position because they directly translate policy into practice through monitoring, guidance, and negotiation with institutions. As emphasized by Lipsky (2010), policy outcomes are largely shaped by actors at the operational level. With limited resources and insufficient technical guidance, implementation quality becomes highly dependent on individual capacity, reinforcing Winter (2012). Meanwhile, target group behavior shows general administrative compliance, but variations in reporting accuracy and policy interpretation remain evident. This indicates that implementation outcomes are also shaped by institutional capacity and adaptation strategies, as noted by Waid and Choy-Brown (2021).

The determinants of policy implementation further show that communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure do not operate separately but interact in a systemic manner. Communication mechanisms such as LKSA forums, monitoring activities, and socialization programs are already in place, yet findings show they have not fully ensured a uniform understanding of policies. Differences in interpretation among stakeholders reflect weaknesses in clarity and consistency of communication, in line with Edwards (1980) and Kondolele et al. (2025), who emphasize that ineffective communication leads to inconsistent implementation.

Resource constraints also remain a major barrier, particularly the limited number of social workers and inconsistent funding support, which reduces the intensity of supervision and guidance. This aligns with Thulin et al. (2019), who state that resource availability is a fundamental prerequisite for effective social service implementation. In terms of disposition, implementers demonstrate strong commitment to carrying out supervision and guidance functions, but their understanding of policy substance is not always adequate. This confirms Winter (2012), who argues that implementation effectiveness depends on both the motivation and cognitive capacity of actors.

Meanwhile, the bureaucratic structure across central, provincial, and district levels creates complexity in authority distribution. The regency government functions mainly as a supervisor and facilitator, while licensing and accreditation lie at higher levels. This fragmented structure can slow decision-making and create inconsistencies in implementation, as explained by Hupe and Hill (2016). Regulatory changes that are not always accompanied by adequate socialization further worsen interpretive differences, reinforcing Howlett and Ramesh (2003), who state that weak policy design and communication tools can distort implementation outcomes.

These findings demonstrate that policy implementation is a systemic and multidimensional process in which communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure are deeply interdependent. Weakness in one factor affects the others, creating cumulative implementation challenges. Therefore, improving LKSA policy implementation requires a comprehensive approach that strengthens technical standards, enhances human resource capacity, improves communication consistency,

and optimizes intergovernmental coordination to ensure more substantive child welfare outcomes.

6. Conclusion

This study concludes that the implementation of policies governing Child Welfare Institutions in Jember Regency has not yet been fully optimized. The implementation process remains predominantly administrative and has not adequately addressed the substantive quality of child care. This condition reflects a gap between the normative and general nature of policy design and the practical demands of field implementation, which require clearer and more operational technical guidelines. In addition, policy implementation is influenced by the interaction of communication, resources, disposition, and bureaucratic structure, where limited resources, multiple policy interpretations, and fragmented authority across levels of government become the main obstacles. Nevertheless, the commitment of implementers and the adaptability of institutions serve as important supporting factors in maintaining policy implementation continuity. These findings reinforce the importance of policy clarity and inter-factor interaction in implementation studies, particularly within multi-level governance systems. The study implies the need to strengthen technical standards, improve human resource capacity, enhance communication mechanisms, and streamline coordination among institutions to improve the effectiveness of child protection policies.

However, this study has several limitations. It focuses on a single regency and one institutional context, which may limit the generalizability of the findings. In addition, the study relies on qualitative data, which may reflect subjective interpretations from informants and may not fully capture broader quantitative trends in policy implementation. Future research is recommended to expand the scope by comparing multiple regions or integrating quantitative approaches to measure the effectiveness of policy implementation more comprehensively. Further studies may also explore the perspectives of children as service recipients to enrich understanding of policy outcomes from a rights-based perspective.

References

- Agastya, N. L. P. M., Wise, S., Kertesz, M., & Kusumaningrum, S. (2024). Transformation of child welfare institutions in Bandung, West Java: A case of deinstitutionalization in Indonesia. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *159*(10), 107-115.
- Aminah, S. (2018). Child abuse and neglect in orphanages in East Java Province (Study on forms of child abuse, anticipatory efforts developed by children and the role of the orphanage). *Children and Youth Services Review*, *93*(10), 24-29.
- Asamoah, D. (2025). The role of health services regulation in healthcare delivery. *Electr J Med Dent Stud*, *14*(1), 88-98.
- Berens, A. E., & Nelson, C. A. (2015). The science of early adversity: Is there a role for large institutions in the care of vulnerable children? *The Lancet*, *386*(91), 388-398.
- Bouckaert, G., Peters, B. G., & Verhoest, K. (2022). Policy design for policy coordination. In *Research Handbook of Policy Design* (pp. 351-370). New York: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2016). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. London: Sage Publications.
- Edwards, G. C. (1980). *Implementing public policy*. Washington: Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Familda, F. (2023). Implementasi kebijakan pengangkatan anak domestik dalam meningkatkan kesejahteraan anak: Kajian literatur. *Sosio Informa*, *9*(1), 101-112.
- Feely, M., Raissian, K. M., Schneider, W., & Bullinger, L. R. (2020). The social welfare policy landscape and child protective services: Opportunities for and barriers to creating systems synergy. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *692*(1), 140-161.

- Freeman, M. (2011). *Human rights of children*. London: Routledge.
- Gabel, S. G. (2014). Social protection and children's rights in developing countries. *Journal of International and Comparative Social Policy*, 30(3), 199-216.
- Gilbert, N. (2012). A comparative study of child welfare systems: Abstract orientations and concrete results. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 34(3), 532-536.
- Howlett, M., & Ramesh, M. (2003). *Studying public policy: Policy cycles and policy subsystems*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hupe, P. L., & Hill, M. J. (2016). 'And the rest is implementation.' Comparing approaches to what happens in policy processes beyond Great Expectations. *Public Policy and Administration*, 31(2), 103-121.
- Isokuortti, N., Aaltio, E., Laajasalo, T., & Barlow, J. (2020). Effectiveness of child protection practice models: a systematic review. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 108(12), 104-112.
- Kartikawati, D., Rusyidi, B., Apsari, N. C., & Sulastri, S. (2025). Institutional accreditation and its impact on children's health in orphanages: A systematic literature review on learning organizations and quality assurance. *Social Sciences*, 14(5), 307-318.
- Kondolele, S., Sultan, M. I., Akbar, M., & Putra, B. A. (2025). The nexus between public communication and policy implementation revisited: insights from the Population and Civil Registration Service of South Sulawesi, Indonesia. *Frontiers in Communication*, 10(2), 155-167.
- Lipsky, M. (2010). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public service*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- McTavish, J. R., McKee, C., Tanaka, M., & MacMillan, H. L. (2022). Child welfare reform: A scoping review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(21), 14-21.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis*. London: Sage.
- Mustaqim, M. (2024). Strengthening the role and function of the child social welfare institution (LKSA) of orphanages: Literature analysis and best practices in child care and education. *International Journal of Health, Economics, and Social Sciences (IJHESS)*, 6(4), 1187-1200.
- Nasirin, C., & Lionardo, A. (2021). Decentralization, public services and neglected children in Mataram City, West Nusa Tenggara. *Research Horizon*, 1(2), 55-61.
- Nastia, G. I. P., Sulastri, S., & Hidayat, E. N. (2023). Neglected children protection standard in Indonesian child social welfare institutions. *Sosiohumaniora*, 25(3), 336-345.
- Pülzl, H., & Treib, O. (2017). Implementing public policy. In *Handbook of public policy analysis* (pp. 115-134). London: Routledge.
- Taylor, D. J., Shlonsky, A., Albers, B., Chakraborty, S., Lewis, J., Mendes, P., ... & Williams, K. (2021). Protocol for a systematic review of policies, programs or interventions designed to improve health and wellbeing of young people leaving the out-of-home care system. *Systematic Reviews*, 10(1), 240-250.
- Thulin, J., Kjellgren, C., & Nilsson, D. (2019). Children's experiences with an intervention aimed to prevent further physical abuse. *Child & Family Social Work*, 24(1), 17-24.
- Van IJzendoorn, M. H., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., Duschinsky, R., Fox, N. A., Goldman, P. S., Gunnar, M. R., ... & Sonuga-Barke, E. J. (2020). Institutionalisation and deinstitutionalisation of children 1: A systematic and integrative review of evidence regarding effects on development. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 7(8), 703-720.
- Waid, J., & Choy-Brown, M. (2021). Moving upstream: The Family First Prevention Services Act and re-imagining opportunities for prevention in child welfare practice. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 127(11), 106-118.
- Welbourne, P., & Dixon, J. (2016). Child protection and welfare: cultures, policies, and practices. *European Journal of Social Work*, 19(6), 827-840.
- Winter, S. C. (2012). Implementation perspectives: Status and reconsideration. In *Handbook of Public Administration*. London: Sage Publications.
- Wulczyn, F., Daro, D., Fluke, J., Feldman, S., Glodek, C., & Lifanda, K. (2010). *Adapting a systems approach to child protection: Key concepts and considerations*. New York: UNICEF.
- Yolanda, H., & Sariningsih, Y. (2025). The role of social workers to empower children in care at the LKSA Nurul Ihsan Orphanage, Bandung. *Journal of Economic Empowerment Strategy (JEES)*, 8(02), 103-114.

Acknowledgment

We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of individuals who supported the completion of this article.

Funding Information

This research did not receive any funding.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Ethical Approval and Originality Statement

Ethical approval was obtained for this study. The manuscript represents original work and has not been previously published, nor is it under consideration by another journal.

Data Disclosure Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors.

This work is licensed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

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