

# Justice-Based Social Work Punishment: Reformulating Humanist Criminal Policy

Ismiyanto<sup>1</sup>, Edy Lisdiyono<sup>2</sup>, Krismiarsi<sup>3</sup>, Afif Noor<sup>4\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Doctoral Law Study Program, Universitas 17 Agustus 1945, Semarang, Indonesia.

<sup>2,3</sup>Faculty of Law, Universitas 17 Agustus 1945, Semarang, Indonesia.

<sup>4</sup>Universitas Islam Negeri Walisongo, Semarang, Indonesia; afif\_noor@walisongo.ac.id

## Keywords:

Criminal policy reform;  
Humanist criminal law;  
Justice-based sanctions;  
Restorative justice;  
Social work punishment.

**Abstract.** The growing global concern over prison overpopulation and the ineffectiveness of retributive punishment has led to a growing demand for more humane and justice-based alternatives. This article explores the concept of justice-based community service sentences as a form of criminal sanction that aligns with restorative and rehabilitative goals. Using a normative juridical approach and comparative legal analysis, this study proposes reforming criminal policy by incorporating community service as a viable and humanist alternative to punishment. The research findings show that justice-oriented social sanctions can encourage offender accountability, reduce recidivism, and improve social reintegration. These outcomes are primarily supported by legal clarity and institutional readiness, providing a solid foundation for the proposed reforms.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Modernization and globalization rapidly reshape the 21st century, significantly impacting various aspects of human life, including the national criminal law system (Dastjerdi & Sheikholeslami, 2019). The escalating crime rates and evolving social dynamics demand an urgent and responsive reform of the criminal law system by the state (Lattimore, 2022). This urgency is underscored by the fact that the criminal law system not only regulates and controls deviant behavior but also serves as a crucial instrument in upholding the values of social justice within society. In Indonesia, the need for criminal law reform is becoming increasingly pressing as the existing laws no longer reflect the empirical conditions of society and the values of Pancasila, the state's foundational principles (Faisal et al., 2024).

The Indonesian criminalization system, with its reliance on criminal sanctions, particularly imprisonment, has long been the dominant tool in criminal law (Anwary, 2022). However, the effectiveness of this system is now being called into question. Instead of preventing crime and rehabilitating offenders, imprisonment often leads to serious problems such as over-capacity, dehumanization, social stigma, and high recidivism rates. These issues are challenges and urgent calls for reform in the Indonesian criminal law system.

Data from the Correctional Database System (SDP) as of April 1, 2024, shows that the number of inmates in correctional institutions in Indonesia reached 270,207 people, while the capacity is only 132,107 (Kanwil Hukum dan HAM Bangka Belitung, 2024). This overcapacity of more than 100% reflects the imbalance between the punishment policy applied and the available capacity of correctional institutions. Meanwhile, according to data from the World Prison Brief, prisons in Indonesia have an overcapacity of 104% (Nugraha, 2021). The large number of prisoners in prison raises various obstacles in efforts to fulfill the rights of prisoners in prison. As a result, the guidance of prisoners does not run optimally; even in many cases, it creates an environment conducive to the reproduction of crime.

The critique of imprisonment's effectiveness is not limited to Indonesia. It is a global discourse that has gained momentum since the International Conference on Prison Abolition (ICOPA) in Toronto (1983) and Amsterdam (1985). This global conversation, involving national academics, legal practitioners, and international forums, has led to various alternative, more humane, and functional forms of punishment. As part of this global movement, developed countries have been exploring alternatives such as social work punishment, supervision punishment, and restorative justice, offering a more hopeful future for the criminal justice system.

In response to these criticisms, through Law Number 1 Year 2023 on the Criminal Code (KUHP), Indonesia introduced social work punishment as one of the five types of basic punishment that the judge can impose. This innovative form of sanction, with its potential to deter and embody educative and corrective values, offers a hopeful prospect for the social reintegration of convicts. The provision of social work punishment, as outlined in Article 65 and Article 85 of Law Number 1 Year 2023, offers judges the discretion to impose this punishment as an alternative to imprisonment or fines, particularly for minor offenders. This approach promises to bring about positive change in the criminal justice system.

However, introducing social work punishment as a new form of punishment is not without its challenges, both normatively and implementatively (Prayitno et al., 2018). From a normative perspective, Article 85 of the Criminal Code Law regulation is still general and requires detailed implementation guidelines to ensure fairness and consistency in practice. On the implementation front, factors such as infrastructure readiness, human resources, and public awareness play a crucial role in determining the effectiveness of this punishment. It is crucial to note that the successful implementation of social work punishment hinges on a justice-based approach, encompassing retributive, distributive, and restorative justice (Karpf, 2019). Without this foundation, social work punishment risks becoming a mere legal formality, failing to address the root of the problem. Therefore, the need to reform criminal law policies to ensure that social work punishment is a fair and effective instrument of justice cannot be overstated (Levin, 2023).

This reformulation includes several important aspects. First, the renewal of normative construction in the Criminal Code and its

implementing regulations in order to provide clarity on the criteria for cases, perpetrators, and mechanisms for implementing social work punishment. Second, institutional strengthening and the role of community supervisors in carrying out control and guidance functions. Third, an integrated information and reporting system should be developed to monitor the effectiveness of this punishment. Fourth, education in the community is crucial to reducing stigma towards offenders who undergo social work punishment, thereby changing public perception and fostering a more supportive environment for rehabilitation (Hadi et al., 2023).

In the context of the modern punishment system, social work punishment is not only an alternative punishment but also a reflection of the paradigm shift from a retaliation-oriented system to a system that prioritizes rehabilitation and social reintegration (Sirait & Panjaitan, 2024). The Tokyo Rules adopted by the United Nations emphasize the importance of using non-imprisonment sanctions for human rights protection and law enforcement effectiveness. Indonesia must align its legal system with these progressive international criminal law principles through the proposed reform.

This research is of utmost importance and will examine how social work punishment in Law Number 1 Year 2023 can be reformulated within the justice-based criminal law policy framework. The urgency of criminal law reform in creating a system that does not only impose sanctions but also a justice-based criminal law policy cannot be overstated.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The reformulation of criminal law policy that prioritizes a humanist approach requires adjusting to the paradigm of punishment that a retributive approach has long dominated. In this context, social work punishment is one of the alternatives to punishment that has received serious attention from academics, policymakers, and legal practitioners. Tonry stated that the correctional system in many countries is under severe pressure due to overcrowding, high recidivism rates, and criticism of the dehumanization of prisoners (Tonry, 2022). In Indonesia, the phenomenon of overcapacity and the weakness of the rehabilitation process encourage the need to find alternative sanctions that are more effective and oriented toward improving offenders (Rahardjo et al., 2024). Short-term imprisonment, according to Newburn, is not only ineffective in changing offender behavior but also increases the risk of reoffending (Wermink et al., 2018).

To overcome this problem, there is an idea to humanize punishment based on the values of justice. Criminal justice has evolved from the classic retributive theory towards restorative and rehabilitative approaches. According to Rawls, distributive justice requires the state to create a system that benefits the most vulnerable, including offenders vulnerable to social marginalization (Rawls, 1999). As developed by Zehr, restorative justice theory places punishment in the context of restoring social relations between offenders, victims, and society (Zehr, 1995). In social work punishment, such justice is realized in the active participation of offenders in constructive social activities without losing their fundamental rights as human beings.

According to Doob and Webster, social work punishment is a form of non-custodial sentencing that allows offenders to take responsibility for their actions without experiencing total social separation (Doob et al., 2006). In Indonesia, social work punishment has been regulated in Article 85 of Law No. 1 Year 2023 on the Criminal Code, but in-depth studies on its implementation and effectiveness are still limited. Several authors highlighted the importance of detailed technical regulations and the need for changes in the legal culture of law enforcement officials so that this punishment can be carried out fairly and non-discriminatively (Supeno & Krismiarsi, 2023; Toule, 2022). In addition, humanist punishment also requires active community participation and a community-based justice approach (Scholl & Townsend, 2023). As stated by Braithwaite, the social integration of offenders can only be realized if the community is also empowered to accept individuals who have made mistakes, which, in this case, is facilitated through social work (Braithwaite, 2002).

In developed countries such as the UK and the Netherlands, social work punishment has become an integral part of the modern punishment system and is used to deal with minor offenses or crimes with low-risk levels. Research by Doob and Webster shows that social work punishment can reduce recidivism rates, accelerate the social reintegration of offenders, and reduce the burden on the state budget for correctional services (Doob et al., 2006). Braithwaite strengthens this argument by stating that the restorative approach through community punishment creates participatory justice and strengthens social relations in the community (Braithwaite, 2002).

## 3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This research uses the normative juridical method, also known as doctrinal research, and is the foundation of legal science. This method involves the study of written legal norms, such as legislation and other legal sources (Noor, 2023). This method is crucial as it allows us to examine and analyze the law as norms or rules that regulate human behavior in society. The primary focus is understanding the concepts, principles, and legal doctrines and how they are applied in specific contexts.

In reformulating criminal law policy concerning social work punishment, the normative juridical approach evaluates the provisions outlined in Law Number 1 of 2023 on the Criminal Code (KUHP), particularly Articles 65 and 85. These articles serve as the legal foundation for introducing social work punishment as one of Indonesia's primary alternative penalties. Through this approach, a systematic and comprehensive analysis of the relevant national criminal law framework is performed, allowing for the identification of norms that require reformulation to achieve substantive justice.

In addition, this research also uses a comparative approach, namely by comparing the legal systems in several countries that have previously and successfully implemented forms of non-punitive punishment, such as community service, as part of a justice-based punishment policy. This global perspective is essential, as it enables us to draw valuable lessons from the experiences of countries like the Netherlands and the UK, which have successfully and fairly implemented community sanctions for an extended period. This approach will analyze the normative framework, procedural aspects, and social implications of applying social work as punishment in these nations. It will serve as a basis for reflection aimed at enhancing Indonesian criminal law policy, aligning it with global best practices.

The data sources used in this research are comprehensive and diverse, ensuring a thorough examination of the topic. First, national laws and regulations, such as the Criminal Code, Corrections Law, and regulations related to punishment, provide a solid foundation. Second, relevant court decisions from the Supreme Court and courts of first instance that have applied alternative forms of punishment offer real-world examples. Third, international conventions and international legal instruments, such as the Tokyo Rules (The United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for Non-custodial Measures), are a global reference in applying non-custodial sanctions. Fourth, scientific articles and academic publications nationally and internationally discuss the development of alternative punishment policies, adding a scholarly perspective to the research.

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1. Formulation of Social Work Punishment in Law No. 1 of 2023 on Criminal Code

Social work punishment, a non-imprisonment punishment that places convicts to serve their sentences through social work outside correctional institutions, has gained international recognition (Goldson, 2020). This unique characteristic makes social work punishment interesting to study because it differs from conventional punishment, which is repressive and isolates the offender. As a more humanist and rehabilitative alternative, this punishment allows offenders to continue contributing to society without losing social interaction. Its recognition through UN General Assembly Resolution No. 45/110 of 1990 concerning Standard Minimum Rules for Non-Custodial Measures (Tokyo Rules) reassures its effectiveness. It encourages countries to develop similar forms of criminal sanctions that are not imprisonment.

In the context of reforming Indonesian criminal law, this punishment represents a shift towards a more modern and progressive paradigm, one that is focused on restorative justice. Restorative justice is a theory that prioritizes the repair of harm caused by criminal activities (Decker et al., 2022). It is best achieved through collaborative processes that involve all stakeholders. In Indonesia, social work punishment was introduced as the main punishment in Law Number 1 Year 2023 on the Criminal Code (KUHP) as a response to the ineffectiveness of imprisonment in rehabilitating convicts. Prisons often become a place for inmates to develop new criminal knowledge rather than a place of guidance. Therefore, social work punishment, with its educative aspect, is expected to be an alternative repressive and enlightening solution for convicts.

Article 65, paragraph (1) of the 2023 Indonesian Penal Code (KUHP) is a key provision that outlines the principal punishments, including community service, in Article 64. The order of these punishments, as mentioned in the paragraph, determines the severity or leniency of the sentence. Meanwhile, Article 85 provides detailed provisions such as the duration of community service (between 8 to 240 hours), conditions for its imposition (such as the offender's consent, confession, social history, work capability, and beliefs), as well as forms of supervision and alternative sanctions if the offender fails to comply.

According to the provision, community service may be imposed on offenders who commit crimes punishable by imprisonment of less than five years. This is applicable when the judge imposes a sentence of no more than six months of imprisonment or a Category II fine, which is a maximum of IDR 10,000,000. Community service is intended for minor offenses and is an alternative to short-term imprisonment or unpaid fines.

Community service represents an alternative form of punishment that functions as a substitute for short-term deprivation of liberty or fines—particularly in cases where the offender is financially incapable of paying the fine. This sentence is carried out outside correctional institutions and is unpaid but remains binding as a formal criminal sanction, albeit limited to minor offenses. Its inclusion in the Penal Code reflects a concrete step in the reform of Indonesia's criminal justice system, a reform that is notably humanistic, rehabilitative, and socially responsive. Furthermore, this form of punishment contributes to reducing the adverse effects of conventional incarceration, such as stigmatization, dehumanization, and social marginalization. Its regulation in the 2023 Penal Code marks a significant milestone in transforming Indonesia's criminal sentencing framework, especially considering that such a model had never been explicitly accommodated in Indonesia's positive law before.

Although community service has been formally recognized as a principal type of punishment under Articles 65 and 85 of Law No. 1 of 2023 on the Indonesian Penal Code (KUHP), its normative formulation still contains several significant shortcomings that may hinder its practical implementation.

1. The absence of age restrictions for offenders eligible for community service sentencing. Age is a crucial factor in aligning the physical and psychological capacities of the offender, ensuring that the punishment is humane and proportional.
2. Lack of regulation regarding the types of work considered appropriate and respectful of human dignity. Community service should never subject offenders to degrading, humiliating, or publicly shameful tasks. It must align with the principles of human dignity enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).
3. There is no provision for psychological support or social psychology interventions during community service. Social psychological approaches are essential in helping offenders cope with social pressure, rebuild meaning in life, and restore self-confidence (Nascimento et al., 2023). Without psychological intervention, community service may become a psychological burden rather than a tool for rehabilitation.
4. The absence of exclusion criteria for specific offender groups, such as recidivists, sexual offenders, or those who have previously received community service sentences, is a significant gap in the current system. Excluding such groups is necessary to uphold the credibility and selectivity of community-based sentencing. This is a crucial aspect that needs to be addressed to ensure the effectiveness and fairness of the system.
5. There is a significant opportunity for improvement in the current system. By introducing performance-based incentives, such as sentence reduction for offenders who demonstrate excellent conduct during their community service, we can transform community service from a mere punishment to a tool for rehabilitation. Without detailed technical and operational implementing regulations, this could serve as a motivational stimulus to promote responsibility and active participation.
6. Article 85 does not clearly define which institutions are responsible, the nature of supervision, or the mechanisms for reporting and monitoring. According to Article 621 of the KUHP, all implementing regulations must be issued no later than two years from the law's enactment, i.e., by September 2025.

In many other jurisdictions, delegated legislation is critical in operationalizing non-custodial sentences (Roberts & Hough, 2013). Therefore, Indonesia must urgently formulate detailed implementing regulations for social work punishment (Krismiyarsi, 2025). This is not just a matter of compliance but a crucial step towards ensuring the effective and humane administration of justice, guided by international standards such as the Tokyo Rules (1990), which outline the basic principles for administering non-custodial measures.

### 4.2. Social Work Punishment from a Justice Perspective

The concept of justice in social work punishment rests on two main principles, rehabilitation and restoration (Kholdaa & Pujiyono, 2024). Rehabilitation aims to restore the offender's attitude of responsibility, moral awareness, and self-confidence by involving them in social activities that benefit the community. Through these activities, offenders make amends for their mistakes and have the opportunity to improve themselves and return to being productive members of society. Meanwhile,

restoration focuses on restoring social relationships disrupted by the criminal offense. The focus is not only on individual offenders and victims but also on the community. Restoration creates a space for dialogue, ensuring that everyone is engaged and part of the conversation. This public involvement in the justice process ensures that punishment does not only function as a means of retribution but also as a social healing process. Thus, social work punishment reflects a justice-based punishment model that is more humanist and inclusive and is relevant to be applied in a society that upholds the values of participation, restoration, and social responsibility.

By directly involving offenders in social activities such as cleaning the environment, helping in orphanages, or participating in humanitarian programs, social work punishment can form a new awareness within the offender. This awareness acknowledges that the criminal acts committed are unlawful and detrimental to the broader community. This approach transforms criminal law from a mere instrument of punishment into an educative and integrative tool that can foster long-term behavior change. Social work punishment offers an opportunity for offenders to atone for their mistakes through positive contributions to society. This aligns with the principle of restorative justice, which emphasizes the restoration of relationships and shared responsibility between the offender, victim, and community. This emphasis on restoration reassures the audience about the potential of social work punishment in repairing relationships.

The approach to justice in social work punishment is not simply a punishment imposed for mistakes but rather an effort to restore and return the offender to a productive social life. This is in line with the direction of the reform of Indonesian criminal law, which no longer focuses only on revenge (retribution) but also pays attention to restoring relations between offenders, victims, and society. Justice-based social work punishment means that criminal offenders serve their punishment by doing work beneficial to the community, without receiving wages, and carried out outside the correctional institution. This work can be helping in orphanages, cleaning public facilities, helping disaster victims, or other social work. Thus, this punishment aims to make amends by providing direct benefits to the social environment in which he lives.

From a utilitarian point of view, as proposed by Jeremy Bentham, the law is fair if it can bring maximum benefits to society (Pratiwi et al., 2022). In this context, punishment for social work benefits various parties. For offenders, this punishment provides an opportunity to improve themselves without having to experience the stigma of being imprisoned. For the community, this punishment provides a direct contribution through social work performed by the offender. For the state, this punishment not only reduces correctional institutions' financial burden and overcapacity but also offers a cost-effective solution to the issue of prison overcrowding. The effectiveness of social work punishment also lies in its public implementation, thus creating a shame penalty, which can prevent the repetition of criminal acts.

The effectiveness of this approach is supported by research showing that restorative justice programs can reduce recidivism rates. Syahwami and Hamirul's study found that restorative justice programs significantly reduced recidivism compared to the traditional criminal justice system (Syahwami & Hamirul, 2024). In addition, the application of restorative justice in minor cases in Indonesia has shown satisfactory results, with better offender rehabilitation and higher victim satisfaction. Thus, justice-based social work punishment reflects a more humanist and inclusive model of punishment and is relevant in a society that upholds the values of participation, recovery, and social responsibility. This approach provides an alternative to conventional punishment and contributes to reforming a fairer and more sustainable criminal law system.

#### 4.3. Social Work Punishment in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom

In reformulating social work punishment in Indonesia, it is important to understand the societal shifts that led to its adoption in the Netherlands. By the mid-1960s, the public's perception of incarceration was changing. Imprisonment was increasingly viewed as inhumane, and it believed it should be applied selectively in response to criminal offenses (Boone, 2010). This changing perception, along with the rising number of prisoners, which exceeded the available prison capacity, prompted the Netherlands government to seek alternative forms of punishment, eventually leading to the implementation of social work punishment in 2001.

In Netherlands criminal law, social work punishment is known as reclassering, regulated under Article 9 in conjunction with Articles 22c to 22k of the Criminal Code of the Netherlands. Reclassering is a form of punishment in which the convicted individual performs unpaid social work. This work is typically assigned by a reclassering officer, responsible for supervising the offender's progress and ensuring the work is completed. The officer also plays a crucial role in assessing the offender's suitability for social work punishment. Article 22c explicitly states that this form of work is unpaid and that the court ruling must specify the number of hours to be completed, and the nature of the work assigned.

In the Netherlands, social work punishment cannot be imposed on offenders who commit serious crimes, such as aggravated assault, child pornography, or sexual violence against children. In cases involving severe physical or psychological harm, social work punishment is not given as the sole form of punishment. A revision of the Netherlands Criminal Code in 2012 further tightened the implementation of social work punishment. One of the key changes was the prohibition of imposing this punishment on offenders who commit the same offense within five years of a prior sentence of social work punishment. This punishment is also applied to juvenile offenders with a more educational and rehabilitative approach. Juveniles sentenced to social work punishment often attend special classes designed to help them address issues such as addiction or behavioral problems.

In the Netherlands, social work punishment can be imposed in three forms: a maximum of 240 hours for general implementation, a maximum of 480 hours for educational sentences, and a combination with other types of punishment. This sentence is often combined with short-term imprisonment, probation, or fines. When combined with imprisonment, the maximum allowed prison sentence is six months. Social work punishment is implemented in government or private institutions engaged in healthcare, environmental protection, and social or cultural work. Offenders may choose to carry out the work individually or in groups, with the decision often based on the nature of the offense and the offender's circumstances. For those with regular employment, social work may be scheduled on weekends.

Although the Netherlands Criminal Code does not explicitly list the types of offenses eligible for social work punishment, there are apparent exceptions for repeat offenders, as well as those who commit serious violent crimes and sexual offenses. The maximum duration of social work punishment is 240 hours and must be completed within 12 months, extendable for another 12 months by the public prosecutor. While not strictly required, judges typically seek the offender's consent before imposing this sentence. This is intended to ensure that the punishment is beneficial and encourages behavioral change.

In terms of supervision, the implementation of social work punishment in the Netherlands is monitored electronically. This supervision is regulated under the *Penitentiare-Beïnvloedingswet* and the Act of 25 November 2015, Stb. 2015, 460 on Long-Term

Supervision, Behavioral Influence, and Freedom Restriction. Electronic monitoring is divided into six conditions and restrictions that can be applied from the early stages of the judicial process. These include conditions for pre-trial detention suspension, conditions under reintegration programs at the end of a prison term, conditions for sentence suspension based on the eligibility assessment by probation services, conditions for parole monitored via GPS, restrictions on entering specific locations as a condition of parole, and conditions for *Terbeschikkingstelling* (TBS), which is the placement of offenders in special institutions due to mental health reasons. Each of these conditions and restrictions is designed to ensure the safety of the community and the successful reintegration of the offender.

The public prosecutor is responsible for overseeing the implementation of social work punishment, assisted by probation services and coordinators in each jurisdiction. If the offender fails to fulfill their obligations, every two hours of uncompleted work may be substituted with one day of detention. The public prosecutor can order the execution of this detention by submitting a report of the failure to the prosecution office. However, it is important to note that the offender still has the right to appeal the detention order to the court. This means that the offender can present their case to a judge, who will review the circumstances and decide based on the principles of justice and fairness.

In addition to the Netherlands, the United Kingdom has implemented social work punishment as an alternative form of sentencing, particularly for less serious criminal offenses. Introduced through the Criminal Justice Act in 1972 and piloted in 1973, this form of punishment is known as a community service order (Kholdaa & Pujiyono, 2024). The UK views social work punishment as an imaginative penal approach, a testament to the innovative nature of the system, as it combines elements of criminal sanctions with direct social reparation. The concept was later elaborated in Section 46 of the Powers of Criminal Courts (Sentencing) Act 2000.

According to this provision, social work punishment can be imposed on any individual aged 16 or older convicted of a criminal offense that would typically warrant imprisonment. The sentence must take the form of unpaid work, with a duration ranging from 40 to 240 hours, and is carried out under the supervision of a probation officer. This work, which is usually performed in hospitals, orphanages, schools, or other social institutions, is adapted to match the offender's background and capabilities, demonstrating the flexibility of the UK's social work punishment system.

The primary objective of a social work punishment is to enable offenders to contribute directly to society as a form of punishment without depriving them of their liberty, as in custodial sentences. This punishment also aims to generate public value and serves as a long-established community-based alternative within the UK's criminal justice system. Social work punishment is not only a socially beneficial approach but also a more economically efficient one than imprisonment. In practice, it is often combined with other forms of sentencing, such as probation, fines, or short-term imprisonment. Thus, social work punishment not only stands as an independent sentence but also functions as a component of an integrated penal system.

Another legal basis for applying social work punishment in the UK is the Criminal Justice Act 1983. This legislation emphasizes that the offender must consent to undertaking the punishment. Before issuing the order, the court must consider a welfare officer's report and assess the offender's readiness and suitability for the assigned social tasks. These tasks are usually determined based on the offender's skills, the needs of the community, and the potential for the task to contribute to the offender's rehabilitation. It is important to note that offenders must comply with several administrative requirements, such as reporting any change of address, attending on time, and completing the assigned tasks within the scheduled timeframe. Failure to comply without reasonable excuse may result in a fine of up to £300, as stipulated in Act 7 (4).

Social work punishment in the UK not only alleviates the burden on correctional facilities and strengthens social cohesion but also fosters the offender's moral awareness through meaningful engagement within the community. More importantly, this model has become an international reference point for penal reform, embodying a more inclusive, humane, and restorative justice-oriented system. It offers the potential for positive change and rehabilitation, making it a significant aspect of the UK's criminal justice system.

## 5. CONCLUSION

Justice-based social work punishment represents a transformative reformulation of criminal law policy that embraces a more humane, rehabilitative, and restorative approach. Unlike conventional sentencing models that emphasize retribution through deprivation of liberty, social work punishment creates opportunities for offenders to actively and constructively atone for their actions through direct involvement in meaningful community service, offering a hopeful vision for the future of criminal justice.

This concept seeks to punish and restore disrupted social relationships among offenders, victims, and the community. By providing offenders with the opportunity to reform themselves without the stigma of imprisonment while contributing positively to society, social work punishment serves as a bridge between the goals of criminal sentencing and the values of substantive justice, offering the potential for healing and reconciliation.

Normatively, the inclusion of social work punishment in Law No. 1 of 2023 on the Indonesian Criminal Code reflects the state's commitment to developing a more adaptive and effective penal system. Its successful implementation, however, hinges on clear technical regulations, institutional readiness, and public acceptance. The active involvement and support of the community are crucial to ensure the objectives of social work punishment are fully realized, making it a key instrument in Indonesia's criminal law reform agenda toward a more just, humane, and dignified system.

## REFERENCES

- Anwary, I. (2022). Evaluation of the effectiveness of public administration policies in the development of stringent legal framework: An analysis of the criminal justice system in Indonesia. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*, 17(2), 312–323. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4756127>
- Boone, M. (2010). Only for minor offences: Community service in the Netherlands. *European Journal of Probation*, 2(1), 22–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/206622031000200103>
- Braithwaite, J. (2002). *Restorative justice & responsive regulation* (Vol. 11, Issue 1). Oxford University Press. <http://scioteca.caf.com/bitstream/handle/123456789/1091/RED2017-Eng-8ene.pdf?sequence=12&isAllowed=y>
- Dastjerdi, S. A., & Sheikholeslami, A. (2019). The effect of globalization on the national criminal law systems. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 2019.

- Decker, M. R., Holliday, C. N., Hameeduddin, Z., Shah, R., Miller, J., Dantzler, J., & Goodmark, L. (2022). Defining justice: Restorative and retributive justice goals among intimate partner violence survivors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(5–6), NP2844–NP2867. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520943728>
- Doob, A. N., & Webster, C. M. (2006). Countering punitiveness: Understanding stability in Canada's imprisonment rate. *Law & Society Review*, 40(2), 325–368. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2006.00266.x>
- Faisal, Yanto, A., Rahayu, D. P., Haryadi, D., Darmawan, A., & Manik, J. D. N. (2024). Genuine paradigm of criminal justice: Rethinking penal reform within Indonesia new criminal code. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2301634>
- Goldson, B. (2020). Juvenile justice social work in England and Wales: Past, present future? In *The role of social work in juvenile justice: international experiences*.
- Hadi, A. M., Fajrin, Y. A., & Ishwara, A. S. S. (2023). The construction of social work criminal sanctions in Indonesian criminal law. *Unram Law Review*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.29303/ulrev.v7i2.299>
- Kanwil Hukum dan HAM Bangka Belitung. (2024). 159.557 narapidana dan anak binaan muslim terima remisi dan pengurangan masa pidana khusus Idulfitri 1445 Hijriah. *Babel.Kemenkum.Go.Id*. <https://babel.kemenkum.go.id/profil/sekilas-kantor-wilayah?view=article&id=1079:159-557-narapidana-dan-anak-binaan-muslim-terima-remisi-dan-pengurangan-masa-pidana-khusus-idulfitri-1445-hijriah&catid=67>
- Karpf, M. J. (2019). Sociology and social work. *Readings in Social Case Work 1920–1938*, 2, 665–676. <https://doi.org/10.7312/lowr92538-064>
- Kholdaa, M. C., & Pujiyono, P. (2024). Social work crime as an alternative to resolving institutions overcrowding in correctional. *Justisi*, 10(July), 806–816.
- Krismiarsy, K. (2025). The urgency of community service imposed as punishment on juvenile delinquents: A study of al-Shatibi's Maqhasid al-Syariah concept. 17(1), 132–148.
- Lattimore, P. K. (2022). Reflections on criminal justice reform: Challenges and opportunities. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 47(6), 1071–1098. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-022-09713-5>
- Levin, B. (2023). After the criminal justice system. *Washington Law Review*, 98(3), 899–946. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4372330>
- Nascimento, A. M., Andrade, J., & de Castro Rodrigues, A. (2023). The psychological impact of restorative justice practices on victims of crimes—a systematic review. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, 24(3), 1929–1947. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380221082085>
- Noor, A. (2023). Socio-legal research: Integration of normative and empirical juridical research in legal research. *Jurnal Ilmiah Dunia Hukum*, 7(2), 61–65. <https://doi.org/10.56444/jidh.v7i2.3154>
- Nugraha, R. A. (2021). Penerapan peraturan Menteri Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia Republik Indonesia nomor 10 tahun 2020 dalam pelaksanaan asimilasi narapidana dan anak karena Covid-19 (Studi di Lembaga Pemasyarakatan Kelas I Malang). *Dinamika*, 27(17), 1–9.
- Pratiwi, E., Negoro, T., & Haykal, H. (2022). Teori utilitarianisme Jeremy Bentham: Tujuan hukum atau metode pengujian produk hukum? *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 19(2), 268. <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1922>
- Prayitno, K. P., Retnaningrum, D. H., & Hendriana, R. (2018). Social work penalty as the alternative of imprisonment. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 54, 04005. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20185404005>
- Rahardjo, G., Perbawa, K. S. L. P., Permadhi, P. L. O., & Suharyanti, N. P. N. (2024). Alternative punishment based on restorative justice to reduce the overcapacity of Indonesian community institutions. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences*, 22(1), 5241–5247. <https://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2024-22.1.00386>
- Rawls, J. (1999). *A theory of justice*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Roberts, J. V., & Hough, M. (2013). Sentencing riot-related offending. *British Journal of Criminology*, 53(2), 234–256. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azs069>
- Scholl, M. B., & Townsend, C. B. (2023). Restorative justice: A humanistic paradigm for addressing the needs of victims, offenders, and communities. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling*, May 2022, 184–200. <https://doi.org/10.1002/johc.12204>
- Sirait, A. S., & Panjaitan, B. S. (2024). Community service order punishment: Alternatives in the criminal law system from Maqāsid al-Sharī'ah perspective. *Nurani: Jurnal Kajian Syari'ah Dan Masyarakat*, 24(2), 273–296. <https://doi.org/10.19109/nurani.v24i2.24276>
- Supeno, B. J., & Krismiarsy, K. (2023). Criminal politics criminal actions of information and electronic transactions (within the framework of criminal law reform). In *International Conference On Law, Economics, and Health (ICLEH)* (pp. 321–340). [https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-024-4\\_34](https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-024-4_34)
- Syahwami, S., & Hamirul, H. (2024). A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of restorative justice programs in reducing recidivism: A global perspective. *Enigma in Law*, 2(1), 64–74. <https://doi.org/10.61996/law.v2i1.55>
- Tonry, M. (2022). Punishments, politics, and prisons in Western countries. *Crime and Justice*, 51(1), 7–57. <https://doi.org/10.1086/721278>
- Toule, E. R. M. (2022). Rule of law and rule of ethic in law enforcement in Indonesia. *Sasi*, 28(1), 56. <https://doi.org/10.47268/sasi.v28i1.752>
- Wermink, H., Nieuwbeerta, P., Ramakers, A. A. T., de Keijser, J. W., & Dirkzwager, A. J. E. (2018). Short-term effects of imprisonment length on recidivism in the Netherlands. *Crime and Delinquency*, 64(8), 1057–1093. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128716687290>
- Zehr, H. (1995). Justice paradigm shift? Values and visions in the reform process. *Mediation Quarterly*, 12(3), 207–216. <https://doi.org/10.1002/crq.3900120303>