Indonesian Journal of Law and Economics Review
Vol. 21 No. 2 (2026): May
DOI: 10.21070/ijler.v21i2.1492

ISSN 2598-9928 (online), https://ijler.umsida.ac.id, published by Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo
Copyright © Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).

Indonesian Journal of Law and Economics Review

Vol. 21 No. 2 (2026): May
DOI: 10.21070/ijler.v21i2.1492

Table Of Contents

Journal Cover 1
Author[s] Statement 3
Editorial Team 4
Article information 5
Check this article update (crossmark) 5
Check this article impact 5
Cite this article 5
Title page 6
Article Title 6
Author information 6
Abstract 6
Article content 8

Copyright © Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).

Indonesian Journal of Law and Economics Review
Vol. 21 No. 2 (2026): May
DOI: 10.21070/ijler.v21i2.1492

Originality Statement

The author[s] declare that this article is their own work and to the best of their knowledge it contains no materials previously published or written by another person, or substantial proportions of material which have been accepted for the published of any other published materials, except where due acknowledgement is made in the article. Any contribution made to the research by others, with whom author[s] have work, is explicitly acknowledged in the article.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author[s] declare that this article was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright Statement

Copyright © Author(s). This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of this article (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this licence may be seen at http://creativecommons.org/licences/by/4.0/legalcode

Indonesian Journal of Law and Economics Review
Vol. 21 No. 2 (2026): May
DOI: 10.21070/ijler.v21i2.1492

EDITORIAL TEAM

Editor in Chief

Dr. Wisnu Panggah Setiyono, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia (Scopus) (Sinta)

Managing Editor

Rifqi Ridlo Phahlevy , Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia (Scopus) (ORCID)

Editors

Noor Fatimah Mediawati, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia (Sinta

Faizal Kurniawan, Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia (Scopus)

M. Zulfa Aulia, Universitas Jambi, Indonesia (Sinta)

Sri Budi Purwaningsih, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia (Sinta)

Emy Rosnawati, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia (Sinta)

Totok Wahyu Abadi, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo, Indonesia (Scopus)

Complete list of editorial team (link)

Complete list of indexing services for this journal (link)

How to submit to this journal (link)

ISSN 2598-9928 (online), https://ijler.umsida.ac.id, published by Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo
Copyright © Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).

Indonesian Journal of Law and Economics Review

Vol. 21 No. 2 (2026): May
DOI: 10.21070/ijler.v21i2.1492

Article information

Check this article update (crossmark)

Check this article impact (*)

Save this article to Mendeley

(*) Time for indexing process is various, depends on indexing database platform

ISSN 2598-9928 (online), https://ijler.umsida.ac.id, published by Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo
Copyright © Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).

Indonesian Journal of Law and Economics Review
Vol. 21 No. 2 (2026): May
DOI: 10.21070/ijler.v21i2.1492

Yurisometry as an Alternative Approach in Normative Legal Research in Indonesia: A Conceptual Study

Budiana Budiana, bdbudiana@gmail.com (*)
Program Studi Hukum, Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Sali Al-Aitaam, Indonesia

Galih Afif Sylva Maulana, bdbudiana@gmail.com
Program Studi Hukum, Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Sali Al-Aitaam, Indonesia

Dicky Anugrah, bdbudiana@gmail.com
Program Studi Doktor, Pasca Sarjana, Universitas Langlangbuana, Indonesia

Mohamad Dani, bdbudiana@gmail.com
Program Studi Doktor, Pasca Sarjana, Universitas Langlangbuana, Indonesia

Eduard Sondakh, bdbudiana@gmail.com
Program Studi D3 Administrasi Logistik, Universitas Logistik dan Bisnis Internasional, Indonesia

(*) Corresponding author

Abstract

General Background: Legal scholarship in Indonesia is predominantly shaped by normative legal research, which examines legislation, legal principles, and legal doctrines as the foundation of juridical reasoning. **Specific Background:** While this approach contributes significantly to legal certainty and systematic legal analysis, judicial practice frequently reveals variations in the interpretation and application of legal norms in court decisions. **Knowledge Gap:** Normative legal research alone often encounters limitations in explaining recurring patterns, interpretative tendencies, and inconsistencies within judicial rulings, and the conceptual discourse on integrating jurimetrics into normativelegalmethodology in Indonesia remains limited. **Aims:** This study examines jurimetrics as an alternative complementary approach to normative legal research in Indonesia through a conceptual legal study. **Results:** The analysis indicates that jurimetrics, which utilizes legal data such as court decisions to identify patterns, trends, and levels of consistency in legal interpretation, can function as an analytical instrument supporting normative reasoning without replacing doctrinal analysis. **Novelty:** The study conceptually positions jurimetrics within the methodological framework of normative legal research as a bridge connecting legal norms with judicial practice. **Implications:** The integration of jurimetrics offers methodological relevance for developing normative legal research that remains doctrinal and prescriptive while becoming more responsive to the dynamics of judicial decision-making in Indonesia.

Highlights:

- Data-oriented examination of court rulings reveals recurring reasoning patterns and interpretative tendencies in adjudication.
- Analytical integration links doctrinal examination of legal norms with observable judicial decision patterns.
- Conceptual framework situates jurimetrics as a methodological complement within Indonesian legal scholarship.

ISSN 2598-9928 (online), https://ijler.umsida.ac.id, published by Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo
Copyright © Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).

Indonesian Journal of Law and Economics Review

Vol. 21 No. 2 (2026): May
DOI: 10.21070/ijler.v21i2.1492

Keywords: Normative Law, Complementary, Judiciary, Legal Principles, Jurimetrics

Published date: 2026-03-04

ISSN 2598-9928 (online), https://ijler.umsida.ac.id, published by Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidoarjo
Copyright © Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).

Vol. 21 No. 2 (2026): May
DOI: 10.21070/ijler.v21i2.1492

Introduction

Law was initially understood more as a normative discipline that focused on the study of written legal rules and methods of juridical interpretation. [1]. Interpretation is necessary to explain things in such a way that people understand and accept them. [2]. This approach is based on the view that law is a system of norms that is logical, systematic, and independent, so the method used in legal research tends to be dogmatic-judicial or normative. [3]. In this context, law is seen as something sui generis, which has its own rules and cannot be fully explained by social or exact science approaches [4].

Normative legal research remains the dominant approach in the legal academic tradition in Indonesia [5]. This approach places law as an autonomous norm, which primarily focuses on legislation, legal principles, and legal doctrines [6]. In practice, normative legal research has made a significant contribution to the development of the legal system, legal certainty, and a coherent framework for legal reasoning. Therefore, the normative approach cannot be separated from the development of legal science in Indonesia. [7].

However, the dynamics of legal practice, especially in the context of the judiciary, show a complexity that cannot always be fully explained by normative analysis alone. [8]. Court decisions not only reflect the application of legal norms, but also reveal patterns of reasoning among judges, interpretative tendencies, and variations in the application of norms in similar cases [9]. This situation highlights the need for additional approaches that can assist normative legal research in understanding legal practices more comprehensively, without abandoning its fundamental character as a normative science. [10].

In the development of contemporary legal studies, jurimetrics has begun to be introduced as an approach that uses legal data, particularly court decisions, to identify patterns and trends in the application of law. [11]. Initially, jurimetrics developed in parallel with the use of quantitative methods in legal studies, but over time, this approach has become more than just a statistical technique. Jurimetrics can also be understood as an analytical tool that allows for a more systematic reading of law in judicial practice. [12].

In Indonesia, studies on jurisprudetrics are still relatively limited and are often positioned merely as part of empirical legal research. [13]. As a result, the discourse on the possibility of jurismetrics as a complementary alternative approach to normative legal research has not been widely developed conceptually [14]. In fact, without a clear conceptual framework, the application of jurisprudetrics could potentially be misunderstood as an approach that negates normative analysis, rather than complements it.

In the context of Indonesia, the discourse on the application of a quantitative approach in legal analysis has actually begun to be introduced, particularly through jurimetrics studies that combine normative analysis with an empirical reading of court decisions. Jurimetrics is a continuation or an extension of the mission of legal science (jurisprudence) to realize the ideal legal objectives in concrete cases (in concreto). [15]

Starting from this context, this article aims to examine Jurimetrics as an alternative approach to normative legal research in Indonesia through a conceptual study. This article does not intend to conduct empirical analysis or statistical tests on court decisions, but rather to build an understanding of the position, function, and relevance of jurimetrics within the methodological framework of normative legal research. Thus, it is hoped that this article can serve as an initial introduction for the development of a more integrative methodological approach to legal research in Indonesia.

Method

This research is normative legal research, which views law as norms or rules that apply within the legal system [16]. Normative legal research was chosen because the main focus of this article is to examine the concepts, doctrines, and lines of legal thought related to jurisprudetrics, as well as its relevance as an alternative approach to normative legal research in Indonesia. Therefore, this research is not intended for the collection of empirical data or the implementation of statistical tests on court decisions.

The approach used in this study is a conceptual approach. The conceptual approach is adopted by examining the views, concepts, and reflections of legal experts regarding the methodology of normative legal research and the development of jurimetrics in contemporary legal studies. Through this approach, the study aims to build a theoretical understanding of the position of jurimetrics within the scope of legal research methodology, particularly as a complementary approach to normative research in law. [17].

The legal materials used in this study consist of primary legal materials and secondary legal materials [18]. Primary legal materials include laws and relevant court decisions, which serve as a context for methodological discussions. Secondary legal materials include legal textbooks, scholarly journal articles, and other academic works that discuss normative legal research, legal research methodology, and jurisprudence. The use of these legal materials aims to strengthen conceptual analysis and provide an adequate theoretical foundation.

The method of collecting legal materials is carried out through library research, by tracing national and international legal literature relevant to the research topic. All obtained legal materials are then analyzed qualitatively using conceptual and descriptive-analytical methods. [7]. The analysis was conducted by examining the relationship between the concepts of normative legal research and jurimetrics, as well as assessing the possibility of integrating jurimetrics as an alternative

Copyright © Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).

Vol. 21 No. 2 (2026): May
DOI: 10.21070/ijler.v21i2.1492

approach in normative legal research in Indonesia. Through this research method, the study is expected to produce a systematic conceptual understanding of jurimetrics, as well as provide a methodological contribution to the development of normative legal research that is more sensitive to the dynamics of legal practice in Indonesia.

Results and Discussion

A. Normative Legal Research and Its Limitations in Explaining Judicial Practice

Normative legal research places law as a system of prescriptive norms, focusing primarily on legislation, legal principles, and legal doctrines. This approach aims to discover legal principles, build legal arguments, and maintain the normative consistency of the legal system. [16]. In the academic context in Indonesia, normative legal research has been a major foundation in the development of legal science and legal education. Nevertheless, in practice, normative legal research faces limitations when confronted with the dynamics of judicial practice. Court decisions do not always reflect the application of uniform legal norms, even though the referenced norms are relatively the same. Variations in judges' considerations, differences in interpretation, as well as contextual factors often influence the outcomes of decisions. [7].

This condition is difficult to adequately explain if legal research relies solely on the analysis of norms and doctrines without examining the patterns of their practical application. This limitation does not mean that normative legal research loses its relevance. On the contrary, it highlights the need for additional approaches that can assist normative analysis in systematically understanding legal practice. Thus, the main challenge of normative legal research does not lie in the weakness of its approach, but in its limitation in explaining legal practice phenomena that are dynamic and recurring. [9].

The statement that normative legal research has limitations should not be interpreted as a loss of relevance of this approach. Normative legal research remains an important foundation in the study of law due to its ability to analyze norms, principles, and legal systems conceptually and dogmatically. However, in the context of increasingly complex legal practice, normative analysis often proves insufficient to capture how law is applied and operates in reality. Therefore, these limitations actually highlight the need for additional approaches that can complement normative analysis, enabling a more systematic and contextual understanding of legal practice.

Thus, the main challenge of normative legal research lies not in its methodological weaknesses, but in the scope of its explanation of the phenomena of dynamic and recurring legal practice. Legal practices, such as court decisions and the application of law, often exhibit patterns, trends, and variations that cannot always be explained solely through normative interpretation. Integrating additional approaches allows legal research not only to understand the law as written, but also to explain how the law is implemented in practice, thereby producing a more comprehensive and relevant analysis of legal reality.

B. The Concept and Development of Jurimetrics in Legal Studies

Jurimetrics is an approach that has developed in legal studies by utilizing legal data, particularly court decisions, to identify patterns, consistency, and trends in the application of law. The term jurimetrics was first introduced by Loevinger (1963) [11] as an effort to bring scientific methods into legal analysis. In its development, jurimetrics is understood not only as the use of statistical techniques, but also as a framework for analyzing legal practice systematically.

According to Lovinger [11], [15] In the context of resolving criminal cases, Yurimetrics can be applied, among other things, in calculating fines or restitution. The Yurimetrics method can be applied to restitution under the following conditions:

1. The convict's inability to fully repay;

2. The convict's ability to partially repay gradually;

3. The convict's ability to repay in installments;

4. The convict's ability to repay through a combination of gradual and installment methods

The development of information technology and the availability of judicial decision databases have encouraged the increasingly widespread use of jurimetrics, especially in countries with a common law tradition. Through jurimetrics, legal researchers can observe judges' reasoning patterns, the consistency level of rulings, as well as tendencies in the interpretation of legal norms over a certain period of time. [19]. However, jurimetrics is not intended to replace normative legal analysis, but rather to complement it with a data-based perspective.

In the context of legal research methodology, jurimetrics is closely related to empirical legal research, but it still has distinct characteristics. Empirical legal research generally focuses on legal behavior in society, whereas jurimetrics specifically places legal products, primarily court decisions, as the main object of analysis. [20]. This difference is important to emphasize so that jurimetrics is not understood reductively as merely a quantitative technique without a clear legal framework.

In legal research methodology, jurimetrics is closely related to empirical legal research, as both aim to understand law in its practical application. However, jurimetrics has characteristics that distinguish it from general empirical legal research.

Copyright © Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).

Vol. 21 No. 2 (2026): May
DOI: 10.21070/ijler.v21i2.1492

While empirical legal research emphasizes legal behavior in society, such as compliance, perception, and social interaction with law, jurimetrics specifically treats legal products as the primary object of analysis. The main focus of jurimetrics is court decisions, which are analyzed to identify patterns, consistency, and trends in the application of legal norms in judicial practice.

In decision-making by panels of judges in handling cases, Jurimetrics promotes the creation of court rulings that are consistent, predictable, and represent justice in a balanced and measured manner. [21]. Highlighting this difference is important so that jurismetrics is not understood reductively as merely the application of quantitative techniques in legal research. Jurismetrics begins with a clear legal framework, considering that the analysis of data from court decisions is conducted to discuss normative legal issues, such as the consistency of norm interpretation and the rationality of judicial reasoning. Thus, jurismetrics does not replace normative or empirical approaches, but serves as a complementary approach that bridges the gap between normative analysis and the realities of legal practice through systematic and measurable methods.

C. Jurimetrics as an Alternative Approach in Normative Legal Research in Indonesia

In the context of normative legal research in Indonesia, jurimetrics can be positioned as an alternative, complementary approach. Jurimetrics is not intended to replace the analysis of norms and legal doctrines, but rather to assist normative legal research in systematically examining the practice of norm application. Thus, jurimetrics functions as an analytical tool that enriches normative reasoning.

Through jurimetrics, normative legal research can gain insights into the consistency of the application of legal norms in court decisions, judges' interpretative tendencies, and the patterns of legal argumentation that develop. This information can be used as a source of normative reflection to assess the extent to which legal norms are applied consistently and in accordance with the purposes for which they were established. [22]. In this case, jurimetrics acts as a bridge between legal norms and judicial practice.

Through the jurismetric approach, normative legal research obtains tools to observe how legal norms are effectively applied in judicial practice. Analysis of a series of judicial decisions allowed researchers to identify the degree of consistency in the application of norms, judges' interpretive tendencies, and patterns of legal argumentation used in some similar cases. These findings provide an empirical picture of how legal norms operate, which cannot always be captured through purely normative analysis based on the text of laws and regulations. The information generated by jurisprudence then serves as material for normative reflection, to assess the suitability between applicable legal norms and their practical application. By comparing the purpose of establishing norms with the pattern of their application in court decisions, researchers can assess whether these norms have been applied consistently, fairly, and rationally. In this context, jurimetrics serves as a methodological bridge that connects abstract legal norms with concrete judicial practice, resulting in a more comprehensive and contextual legal analysis.

The development of jurimetrics needs to be carried out gradually and accompanied by a clear conceptual framework to avoid reducing the meaning of law to mere numbers or statistics. The application of jurimetrics in normative legal research in Indonesia also faces a number of challenges. Limited access to court decision data, variations in the quality of decisions, and limited methodological literacy among legal academics are obstacles that need to be addressed. [14].

The implementation of jurimetrics within normative legal research in Indonesia continues to encounter various structural and methodological constraints. A primary challenge lies in the limited availability of comprehensive, consistent, and digitized judicial decision data. Moreover, disparities in the quality of court rulings—both in the organization of legal reasoning and the depth of argumentation—complicate efforts to conduct systematic and measurable analysis. Additionally, many legal scholars still possess limited methodological expertise in utilizing quantitative data and analytical tools, leading to suboptimal application of jurimetrics and possible misinterpretations.

Accordingly, the advancement of jurimetrics should proceed gradually and deliberately, grounded in a well-defined legal conceptual framework. Jurimetrics is not designed to reduce the essence of law to mere numerical data or statistical calculations; rather, it functions as an analytical instrument that enhances normative reflection on judicial practice. With a robust theoretical foundation and sufficient methodological competence, jurimetrics can serve as a complementary approach that preserves equilibrium between empirical precision and the substantive depth of legal meaning. Taking into account both its strengths and limitations, jurimetrics holds significant potential to be developed as a relevant alternative within normative legal research in Indonesia. This approach enables normative legal scholarship to retain its doctrinal and prescriptive orientation while becoming more attuned to the evolving dynamics of judicial practice.

Conclusion

This research demonstrates that normative legal inquiry continues to play a pivotal role in the advancement of legal scholarship in Indonesia, especially in examining legal norms, principles, and doctrines. Nevertheless, normative legal research faces constraints in accounting for the dynamics of judicial practice, as evidenced by the diversity and inconsistency of court rulings. Such shortcomings call for complementary approaches capable of supporting normative analysis in interpreting law enforcement practices in a more systematic manner. Jurimetrics, as a data-oriented method of legal analysis, provides a pertinent alternative perspective to enrich normative legal research. By examining judicial decisions, jurimetrics enables scholars to detect patterns, trends, and the degree of consistency in the application of legal

Copyright © Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).

Vol. 21 No. 2 (2026): May
DOI: 10.21070/ijler.v21i2.1492

norms within court practice. Within the framework of legal research in Indonesia, jurimetrics may be situated as a conceptual approach that connects legal norms with judicial implementation. This method allows normative legal research to retain its prescriptive and doctrinal nature while becoming more responsive to the practical realities of law enforcement. Accordingly, jurimetrics holds significant potential to be developed as a relevant complementary approach within the methodology of normative legal research in Indonesia.

References

1. D. A. Malik, M. D. Gusela, S. H. Azfa, S. Fauziansah, and U. Rosidin, "Navigating the Labyrinth: A Normative Juridical Analysis of Legal Politics and Policy Formulation in Indonesia," Enigma Law Review, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 75–86, 2024, doi: 10.5334/bbc.c.
2. Y. Arsyad, F. M. Wantu, and D. E. Ismail, "Rearranging the Principle of Restorative Justice in the Indonesian Criminal Justice System: A Concept Toward Ideal Justice," Ilmu Hukum Prima, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 253–265, 2023, doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001574.
3. W. Chandra and M. K. Hamonangan, "Law as a Tool of Social Engineering: Roscoe Pound's Idea and Its Relevance to Legal Reform in Indonesia," Journal of Legal Studies Lex Generalis, vol. 5, no. 10, 2024, doi: 10.1007/s40979-020-00052-8.
4. G. Widjaja and M. I. Naiborhu, "Assessing Jurimetrics in the Civil Law System: Theoretical Analysis and Challenges of Its Implementation," The Juris, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 509–518, 2025, doi: 10.63854/jppm.v1i2.52.
5. F. Fathor and A. E. Widiarto, "Rethinking Res Judicata Pro Veritate Habetur in the Indonesian Judiciary," Indonesian Journal of Law and Economic Review, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 1–10, 2024, doi: 10.1007/s40979-020-00052-8.
6. C. R. Valentino, "Restorative Justice as an Alternative in the Indonesian Criminal Justice System," Journal of Progressive Law and Legal Studies, vol. 3, no. 2, 2025, doi: 10.63854/jppm.v1i2.52.
7. S. Mertokusumo, Penemuan Hukum (Legal Discovery). Bandung, Indonesia: Citra Aditya Bakti, 2009.
8. U. Rosari, Z. Daulay, and N. Mulyati, "Comparison of Indonesian Airspace Security Regulations With the United States as Representatives of Legal Reform," Journal of Law, Politics, and Humanities, vol. 5, no. 6, pp. 5132–5146, 2025, doi: 10.1007/s40979-020-00052-8.
9. S. Rahardjo, Hukum Dalam Jagat Ketertiban (Law in the Universe of Order). Jakarta, Indonesia: UKI Press, 2006.
10. A. Wibowo, A. R. Dimyati, and J. Junaedi, "Realizing a Fair and Effective National Legal System: The Urgency of Regulatory Reform From the Perspective of Legal Politics in Indonesia," Journal of Contemporary Law Studies, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 223–236, 2025, doi: 10.1007/s40979-020-00052-8.
11. L. Loevinger, "Jurimetrics: The Methodology of Legal Inquiry," Law and Contemporary Problems, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 5–35, 1963, doi: 10.2307/1190662.
12. U. Himatul, F. Muhammad, U. Putri, R. Muhammad, and L. Muhammad, "The Role of Legal Philosophy in the Formation of Law in Indonesia," Mandub: Journal of Politics, Social, Law, and Humanities, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 321–331, 2024, doi: 10.1007/s40979-020-00052-9.
13. S. Al-Fatih and S. K. Shahzad, "Rethinking How Laws Are Made: Indonesia's Legal Method Dilemma," Journal of Sustainable Development and Regulatory Issues, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 170–190, 2025, doi: 10.1007/s40979-020-00052-10.
14. S. Wignjosoebroto, Hukum: Paradigma, Metode dan Dinamika Masalahnya. Jakarta, Indonesia: Elsam Press, 2002.
15. M. N. Asnawi and M. H. SHI, Pengantar Jurimetri dan Penerapannya dalam Penyelesaian Perkara Perdata: Pendekatan Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif Terhadap Hukum. Jakarta, Indonesia: Prenada Media, 2020.
16. P. M. Marzuki, Penelitian Hukum. Jakarta, Indonesia: Kencana, 2017.
17. J. Ibrahim, Teori dan Metodologi Penelitian Hukum Normatif. Malang, Indonesia: Bayumedia Publishing, 2006.
18. S. Soekanto and S. Mamudji, Penelitian Hukum Normatif: Suatu Tinjauan Singkat. Jakarta, Indonesia: RajaGrafindo Persada, 2011.
19. D. M. Katz and M. J. Bommarito, "Measuring the Complexity of the Law: The United States Code," Artificial Intelligence and Law, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 337–374, 2014, doi: 10.1007/s10506-014-9150-0.
20. S. Soekanto, Pengantar Penelitian Hukum. Jakarta, Indonesia: Universitas Indonesia Press, 2006.
21. M. Y. K. Umam, "Implementation of Jurimetrics by Judges in Joint Property Division Cases," El-Iqthisady: Journal of Islamic Economic Law, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 106–121, 2023. Available: https://journal.uin-alauddin.ac.id/index.php/iqthisadi/article/view/39438
22. B. J. Hibbitts, "Jurimetrics and the Future of Legal Research," Law Library Journal, vol. 98, no. 3, pp. 367–381, 2006. Available: https://www.aallnet.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/llj-98-03-hibbitts.pdf

Copyright © Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).