

Reconstruction of Inmate Rehabilitation Regulations Based on Principles of Legal Justice

**Fri Hartono¹, Desy Kartika Caronina Sitepu², Anis Mashdurohatun^{3*},
Debiantho⁴, Mohamed Abdel Samad Mehanna⁵**

^{1,2,3,4}Universitas Sultan Agung Semarang, Indonesia

⁵Cairo University, Egypt

Email: anism@unissula.ac.id*

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18357689

*Corresponding Author

|| Received: 29-07-2025 || Revised: 23-11-2025 || Accepted: 22-12-2025 || Published On: 31-12-2025

Abstract: This study examines the reconstruction of inmate rehabilitation regulations grounded in principles of legal justice to address normative inconsistencies and practical disparities in the implementation of correctional policies. The research aims to critically analyse the extent to which existing rehabilitation regulations reflect substantive, procedural, and distributive justice, and to formulate a justice-oriented regulatory framework for inmate rehabilitation. Employing a qualitative juridical-normative approach, this study analyses statutory instruments governing correctional institutions, judicial doctrines on justice, and relevant scholarly literature, complemented by conceptual and comparative legal analysis. The findings reveal that current inmate rehabilitation regulations tend to prioritise administrative compliance and institutional order, while inadequately accommodating principles of proportionality, equality before the law, and restorative justice. Such regulatory orientation often results in unequal access to rehabilitation programs and undermines the correctional system's reintegrative objectives. This study proposes a reconstructed regulatory model grounded in legal justice principles, emphasising rights-based rehabilitation, restorative mechanisms, and fair assessment criteria for inmates. The study contributes to the development of correctional law by offering a normative framework that integrates legal justice into rehabilitation regulations, thereby supporting a more humane, equitable, and effective correctional system aligned with contemporary justice paradigms.

Keywords: Correctional Law; Inmate Rehabilitation; Legal Justice; Regulatory Reconstruction; Restorative Justice.

Copyright (c) 2025 Fri Hartono et al.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

Abstrak: Penelitian ini mengkaji rekonstruksi regulasi pembinaan narapidana berbasis prinsip keadilan hukum guna menjawab inkonsistensi normatif dan kesenjangan praktik dalam implementasi kebijakan pemasarakatan. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis secara kritis sejauh mana regulasi pembinaan yang berlaku telah mencerminkan keadilan substantif, prosedural, dan distributif, sekaligus merumuskan kerangka regulasi pembinaan narapidana yang berorientasi pada keadilan. Dengan menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif yuridis-normatif, penelitian ini menganalisis instrumen peraturan perundang-undangan yang mengatur lembaga pemasarakatan, doktrin hukum mengenai keadilan, serta literatur ilmiah yang relevan, yang dilengkapi dengan analisis konseptual dan perbandingan hukum. Temuan penelitian menunjukkan bahwa regulasi pembinaan narapidana saat ini cenderung menitikberatkan pada kepatuhan administratif dan ketertiban institusional, namun belum secara memadai mengakomodasi prinsip proporsionalitas, persamaan di hadapan hukum, dan keadilan restoratif. Orientasi regulasi tersebut kerap berimplikasi pada ketidaksetaraan akses terhadap program pembinaan serta melemahkan tujuan reintegratif sistem pemasarakatan. Penelitian ini menawarkan model rekonstruksi regulasi pembinaan narapidana yang berlandaskan prinsip keadilan hukum dengan menekankan pembinaan berbasis hak, mekanisme restoratif, dan kriteria penilaian yang adil bagi narapidana. Secara ilmiah, penelitian ini berkontribusi pada pengembangan hukum pemasarakatan melalui perumusan kerangka normatif yang mengintegrasikan prinsip keadilan hukum dalam regulasi pembinaan, sehingga mendukung terwujudnya sistem pemasarakatan yang lebih manusiawi, berkeadilan, dan efektif sesuai dengan paradigma keadilan kontemporer.

Kata Kunci: Hukum Pemasarakatan; Keadilan Hukum; Keadilan Restoratif; Pembinaan Narapidana; Rekonstruksi Regulasi.

Introduction

The correctional system is an integral part of the criminal justice system, which is not only oriented toward criminal sentencing but also toward the development and social reintegration of prisoners. The modern penitentiary paradigm places prisoners as subjects of law who have human rights and the potential to be improved, not merely objects of punishment. Therefore, the development of prisoners is a strategic instrument for realising the goals of justice, humanity, and sustainable social order. However, in practice, the regulation of inmate development still leaves various normative and implementive problems that have implications for the reduction of the value of legal justice in the correctional system.¹

One of the fundamental problems lies in the tendency of prison development regulations to emphasize administrative aspects and institutional security rather than the

¹ Fajar Putra Prastina R, 'Guarantee of Human Rights of Prisoners in the Development of Prisoners in Correctional Institutions', *Jurist-Diction* 4, no. 1 (January 2021): 111–140, <https://doi.org/10.20473/jd.v4i1.24295>.

principles of legal justice. Regulations are often formulated procedurally and formally, with a focus on correctional system governance, bureaucratic compliance, and internal control, without being balanced with substantive justice guarantees for inmates. As a result, the coaching of prisoners in practice is often discriminatory, disproportionate, and does not fully support the goals of social reintegration. This condition creates a gap between the humanist ideals of penitentiary law and the normative and empirical realities faced by inmates.²

In addition, the inconsistency between regulations and the principles of legal justice is also reflected in access to coaching programs. Differences in treatment between prisoners, whether based on the type of crime, legal status, or non-juridical considerations, often do not have a clear basis for justice. The principle of equality before the law has not been fully implemented in the coaching mechanism, while the principles of proportionality and distributive justice are still marginalised. This has the potential to weaken the legitimacy of the correctional system and hinder the achievement of punishment goals oriented towards improving behaviour and social recovery.³

In the academic context, the issue of inmate development has become the concern of several researchers. The first study highlighted the effectiveness of the correctional system in shaping inmate behaviour through a skill-based coaching approach and institutional discipline.⁴ This study emphasises the importance of orderly and efficient management of correctional institutions, but it has not examined in depth the dimensions of legal justice as a normative foundation for coaching. The research focuses more on technical and operational aspects, so that justice is understood implicitly and limited to compliance with internal rules.

The second study examined the protection of prisoners' human rights within the penitentiary system.⁵ This study makes a significant contribution by identifying violations of prisoners' fundamental rights and the urgency of reforming correctional policy. However, the research tends to place justice within the framework of human

² Rahel Huta uruk and Janpatar Simamora, 'Implementation of Prisoner Development By The Correctional Institution Of The Ministry Of Law And Human Rights Of North Sumatra', *Journal of Informatics Media* 6, no. 2 (January 2025): 1030–1037, <https://doi.org/10.55338/jumin.v6i2.5344>.

³ Purwanto Purwanto et al., 'Restorative Justice in the Criminal Justice System: An Alternative Approach to Offenders' Rehabilitation and Victims' Recovery', *Research Horizon* 5, no. 6 (December 2025): 2831–2844, <https://doi.org/10.54518/rh.5.6.2025.947>.

⁴ Ferinando Fachrudin Putra and Padmono Wibowo, 'Analysis Of Prisoner Development Policies In Order To Realize A Humane And Fair Correctional System', *Trivikrama: Journal of Social Sciences* 1, no. 12 (October 2023): 81–90, <https://doi.org/10.6578/tjis.v1i12.554>.

⁵ Ade Kusmanto and H. S. Tisnanta, 'The Implementation of Fair Prisoner Development in Realizing the Philosophy of Prisoner Corrections', *Al-Zayn : Journal of Social Sciences & Law* 3, no. 4 (September 2025): 4862–4871, <https://doi.org/10.61104/alz.v3i4.2064>.

rights alone, without systematically linking it to the principle of legal justice, which includes substantive, procedural, and distributive justice in the regulation of prisoner development. As a result, the submitted recommendations have not addressed comprehensive regulatory reconstruction.

Meanwhile, the third study highlights the application of restorative justice in the correctional system as an alternative to the criminal approach.⁶ This study confirms the potential of restorative justice to encourage social reintegration and reduce recidivism. However, the study emphasises the implementation of restorative programs and practices, without critically examining the regulatory foundations that underpin inmate development. In other words, restorative justice is presented as a practical approach rather than a normative principle systematically integrated into coaching regulations.

Based on the three previous studies, a significant research gap can be identified. First, there has been no study that specifically reconstructs the regulation of inmate development, using the principle of legal justice as the main analytical framework. Second, existing research tends to separate the regulatory and justice dimensions, so that legal justice has not been fully articulated in the design of coaching regulations. Third, the integration of substantive, procedural, distributive, and restorative justice in a single framework of coaching regulations has not received adequate academic attention. Departing from this research gap, the novelty of this research lies in its effort to formulate a comprehensive reconstruction of prisoner development regulations based on the principles of legal justice. This research not only examines the normative weaknesses of the applicable regulations but also offers a model of coaching regulations that systematically integrates substantive, procedural, distributive, and restorative justice. Thus, this study places legal justice not as an abstract value, but as an operational principle that animates the entire mechanism of inmate development.

In addition, this study has a methodological novelty by combining juridical-normative, conceptual, and comparative legal analysis to evaluate the regulation of inmate development. This approach enables a more comprehensive mapping of the tensions among legal norms, justice doctrines, and correctional practices. Through this approach, this research is expected to produce regulatory recommendations that are applicable and justice-oriented. Based on this background, the research questions posed in this study are: How can the reconstruction of prisoner development regulations grounded in principles of legal justice be realized to support the goal of social reintegration in the correctional system? This research has both theoretical and practical significance. Theoretically, this research contributes to the development of correctional law by enriching the discourse on legal justice in the regulation of prisoner development.

⁶ Andree Washington Hasiholan, 'Integration Of Restorative Justice In Prisoner Development Programs: The Benefits Of Victim-Perpetrator Mediation On Recidivism Reduction', *Gerangen : Journal of Correctional Institution Studies* 1, no. 2 (November 2025): 40–50.

This research also broadens the understanding of the integration of justice principles in criminal and correctional law. In practice, the findings and recommendations of this research are expected to serve as a reference for policymakers and correctional institution managers in formulating more fair, humane, and effective coaching regulations. Thus, this research supports the realisation of a penitentiary system that is not only oriented towards order, but also towards justice and social restoration in accordance with contemporary legal paradigms.

Method

This study uses a qualitative method with a juridical-normative approach, focusing on the regulation of inmate development from the perspective of legal justice. This type of research was chosen to examine in depth the legal norms that govern the correctional system, the principles of legal justice, and relevant legal doctrines and theories. The research data are sourced from primary legal materials, including laws and regulations governing correctional and inmate development, as well as secondary legal materials such as scientific literature, journal articles, legal textbooks, and expert opinions. The data collection technique involved a literature review and a systematic search of relevant legal sources and academic literature, complemented by conceptual analysis and legal comparison to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the regulatory model of justice-based prisoner development.

Data analysis was conducted qualitatively using normative-interpretive methods, namely, interpreting legal norms, principles, and the concept of justice to identify weaknesses and inconsistencies in applicable prisoner development regulations. Data is analysed through the stages of data reduction, categorisation based on the principles of substantive, procedural, distributive, and restorative justice, and the drawing of argumentative and systematic conclusions. Data validation is carried out through triangulation of sources and theories, by comparing various regulations, legal doctrines, and academic views to ensure the consistency and validity of the analysis.⁷ In addition, peer review of the analytical framework and normative findings is used to strengthen validity, provided that the research results have an adequate level of reliability and academic accountability.

Results and Discussion

This section presents and discusses research findings on the reconstruction of prison development regulations grounded in the principles of legal justice. The discussion was systematically prepared to answer research questions about how the regulation of inmate development can be reconstructed to align with the principles of

⁷ Matthew B Miles and A. Michael Huberman, *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Source Book on New Methods* (Jakarta: University of Indonesia Press, 2014).

legal justice and support the goal of social reintegration. The analysis is carried out by integrating normative findings on applicable regulations, legal justice theory, and critical reflection on contemporary correctional practices.

Characteristics of Prisoner Development Regulations from the Perspective of Legal Justice

The analysis of regulations governing the development of prisoners shows that the main characteristics of those in effect to date remain dominated by administrative and institutional approaches. Coaching regulations are primarily formulated to ensure the internal stability of correctional institutions by regulating order, security, and compliance with formal procedures. In this framework, the development of inmates is better understood as part of the institution's internal control mechanism, rather than as a rehabilitation process oriented towards individual recovery and social reintegration. This orientation implicitly reflects the retributive-administrative criminal paradigm, which remains strong and influential in the contemporary penitentiary system.⁸

This administrative approach is evident in the emphasis on disciplinary regulations, grouping prisoners by administrative categories, and measuring coaching success through formal discipline and compliance indicators. Coaching in this context tends to be reduced to a series of obligations that inmates must fulfil as administrative prerequisites, such as following certain programs or complying with internal rules, without being accompanied by substantive evaluations of behavioural changes, legal awareness, and social readiness. As a result, coaching loses its transformative dimension and becomes a formalistic bureaucratic procedure.⁹

From the perspective of legal justice, this condition raises fundamental problems. Legal justice is not only related to the certainty of norms and consistency in the application of rules, but also requires the fulfilment of substantive justice, namely the protection of the rights, dignity, and interests of legal subjects in a proportionate manner. In the context of corrections, prisoners remain legal subjects who have the right to fair, humane, and meaningful development. However, the applicable coaching regulations tend to place inmates as policy objects that must conform to the institutional logic of the penitentiary, rather than as individuals with diverse rehabilitative needs.¹⁰

⁸ Inbal Peleg-Koriat and Dana Weimann-Saks, 'Restorative Justice Behind Bars: People in Custody's Facilitators and Barriers to Participating in Restorative Justice', *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 51, no. 10 (October 2024): 1493–1510, <https://doi.org/10.1177/00938548241257608>.

⁹ '(PDF) The Effectiveness of Correctional Rehabilitation: A Review of Systematic Reviews', *ResearchGate*, ahead of print, 6 August 2025, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.3.081806.112833>.

¹⁰ '(PDF) Human Rights and the Rehabilitative Purpose of Punishment: A Critical Legal Perspective', *ResearchGate*, ahead of print, 31 December 2025, <https://doi.org/10.15175/gq7hrf02>.

This approach implies limited space for recognizing prisoners' rights in the coaching process. Access to coaching, skills training, and social reintegration programs is often not determined by inmates' individual needs but by situational administrative considerations, institutional capacity, and internal policies. In practice, this causes inequality in access between inmates, based on the type of criminal act, the criminal period, and other non-juridical factors. Such inequality is contrary to the principle of substantive justice, which demands fair treatment based on necessity and proportionality. In addition to substantive justice, the regulation of inmate development has also not fully accommodated the principle of procedural justice. Procedural justice demands a transparent, consistent, and testable mechanism in every decision-making that impacts the rights and obligations of legal subjects. However, the mechanism for assessing inmates' eligibility to participate in certain coaching programs and to obtain integration rights, such as remission or parole, is often not accompanied by clear, open assessment standards. This closed procedure opens up space for the apparatus's subjectivity and has the potential to give rise to discriminatory practices.¹¹

The vagueness of the procedure also weakens the principle of equality before the law. In a fair legal system, every legal subject should have an equal opportunity to obtain fair legal treatment based on objective criteria. However, when the procedures for coaching and granting inmates rights are not formulated in a transparent and accountable manner, the principle of equality becomes difficult to realise. Inmates are in a vulnerable position because they lack adequate mechanisms to test or challenge administrative decisions that are detrimental to them.¹²

Furthermore, the dominance of the administrative approach in coaching regulations also contributes to the neglect of the distributive justice dimension. Distributive justice demands the equitable distribution of resources and opportunities, especially in contexts of limited facilities and coaching programs. However, the applicable regulations have not explicitly regulated the mechanism for distributing access to coaching based on the principle of justice. As a result, the allocation of coaching programs is often determined by pragmatic considerations, such as the availability of facilities or internal institutional policies, rather than by an analysis of inmates' needs and risk levels.¹³

¹¹ Muhammad Alfikri, Fadillah Sabri, and Nani Mulyati, 'The Implementation of Coaching for Inmates with Deviant Sexual Behavior in the Class IIA Pekanbaru Women's Prison is Associated with Legal Certainty', *UNES Law Review* 6, no. 1 (September 2023): 2086–2101, <https://doi.org/10.31933/unesrev.v6i1.993>.

¹² Umi Enggarsasi, 'Pattern of inmate development in contributing to the success of inmate development in indonesia', *PERSPECTIVE: A Study of Legal and Development Issues* 18, no. 3 (September 2013): 157–168, <https://doi.org/10.30742/perspektif.v18i3.27>.

¹³ Putu Devi Komala Arisna Putri, Ni Ketut Sari Adnyani, and I. Wayan Landrawan, 'The Effectiveness Of Coaching For Inmates And Its Implications For Over Capacity In Class Ii

This condition shows that the regulation of inmate development does not fully reflect the balance between legal certainty, utility, and justice as ideally emphasised in modern legal theory. Legal certainty is indeed needed to ensure order and predictability in the correctional system, but this certainty must not be achieved at the expense of justice and humanity. Regulations that overemphasise procedural certainty without regard for substantive justice can give rise to systemic structural injustice.¹⁴

The findings of this study strengthen the argument that the problem of inmate development cannot be understood solely as a policy implementation issue. So far, coaching failures are often associated with limited resources, institutional capacity, or the quality of correctional apparatus. Although these factors cannot be ignored, this study shows that the design of coaching regulations itself has a significant contribution to the emergence of various justice issues. Administratively oriented regulations tend to give birth to formalistic coaching practices that are less effective in encouraging sustainable changes in prisoners' behaviour.¹⁵

From the perspective of legal justice, coaching regulations should be designed as a normative instrument that ensures the fulfillment of prisoners' rights while supporting the goals of correctional services. Coaching should not be reduced to a tool of control, but must be understood as a process of recovery and empowerment oriented towards social reintegration. For this reason, coaching regulations need to integrate the principles of substantive justice by ensuring access to needs-based coaching, procedural justice through transparent and accountable mechanisms, and distributive justice in the allocation of coaching programs.¹⁶ Thus, the characteristics of the regulation of inmate development, which is still dominated by an administrative approach, indicate an urgent need to reconstruct regulations. The reconstruction is not only technical, but also paradigmatic, namely by shifting the regulatory orientation from institutional control to legal justice and social recovery. Without fundamental changes to the regulatory design, inmate coaching will remain mired in formalistic practices that make it challenging to achieve the goals of social reintegration and sustainable justice.

B Singaraja Correctional Institution', *Journal of Gender and Human Rights* 1, no. 1 (March 2023): 60–69.

¹⁴ St Fatmawati.L and Rifkah Anniza Rahman, 'A Model of Coaching for Inmates in the Class III Kendari Women's Correctional Institution', *Social Journal and Humanities Flow* 2, no. 2 (August 2022): 102–110, <https://doi.org/10.57250/ajsh.v2i2.73>.

¹⁵ Ulfa Safira Soliha and Zulkarnain M. A, 'The System Of Coaching Prisoners Of Correctional Institutions In The Study Of Islamic Criminal Law', *Legal Standing : Journal of Legal Sciences* 8, no. 3 (July 2024): 535–544, <https://doi.org/10.24269/lsl.v8i3.9803>.

¹⁶ Ega Anggara, Iwan Setiawan, and Yuliana Suryagalih, 'The Implementation Of The Coaching Program For Inmates Is Linked To Article 11 Paragraph (1) Letter B Of The Law Of The Republic Of Indonesia Number 22 Of 2022 Concerning Correctional Facilities In The Ciamis Class Iib Correctional Institution', *Library of Justice* 3, no. 1 (October 2024): 156–179, <https://doi.org/10.25157/pustaka.v3i1.4581>.

The Gap between the Principles of Legal Justice and the Practice of Prisoner Development

Further analysis of the practice of inmate development reveals a fundamental gap between the principle of legal justice as a normative foundation and the reality of coaching in correctional institutions. This gap is not only technical-operational, but also reflects paradigmatic problems in interpreting the goals of coaching itself. Ideally, the development of prisoners is a legal instrument that returns the perpetrators of criminal acts to responsible, dignified, and capable members of society who can carry out their social functions reasonably. However, in practice, coaching often gets stuck on an administrative approach that emphasises uniformity, bureaucratic efficiency, and institutional control, thus moving away from the substance of legal justice.¹⁷

From a substantive justice perspective, inmate coaching should be designed with each inmate's individual needs in mind. The principle of substantive justice emphasises that fair treatment does not always mean equal treatment, but relatively proportionate treatment in accordance with the legal subject's conditions, needs, and level of vulnerability. In the context of corrections, inmates have a very diverse social background, education level, type of crime, and psychological conditions. Therefore, uniform, non-adaptive coaching programs may fail to address specific rehabilitative needs. When coaching is not tailored to individual characteristics, recovery goals, and behaviour change, achieving them optimally becomes difficult.¹⁸

Reality on the ground shows that many coaching programs are generally designed without adequate assessment instruments to identify inmates' individual needs. Skills programs, personality development, and religious activities are often carried out in a one-way, mass approach. As a result, coaching functions more as a fulfillment of correctional institutions' administrative obligations, rather than as a process of social and moral transformation of inmates. In the long term, this condition has the potential to increase the risk of recidivism because inmates do not have the relevant provisions to face post-sentence life.¹⁹

The gap between the principles of legal justice and coaching practice is also evident in the aspect of distributive justice. Distributive justice requires a fair and proportionate distribution of resources, opportunities, and coaching facilities. However, in practice,

¹⁷ Mahmud Aprian Mabruri et al., 'Implementation of Independence and Spirituality Development Program for Narcotics Inmates in Class IIb Lamongan Correctional Institution', *Madani Journal of Political and Social Society* 17, no. 02 (August 2025): 239–257.

¹⁸ Dina Wirzahayati, Asril, and Rudiadi, 'Implementation of Inmate Development In Medium Security Prison In Class II A Bukittinggi Correctional Institution', *Student Journal of the Faculty of Sharia and Law UIN Suska Riau* 2, no. 2 (April 2023): 452–469.

¹⁹ Argendo Siahaan and Wido Cepaka Warih, 'William N Dunn's Evaluation Model on the Prisoner Independence Development Program at the Pematangsiantar Class IIA Correctional Institution', *Tambusai Education Journal* 9, no. 3 (September 2025): 29136–29141.

access to skills coaching and training programs is often uneven. Some inmates gain greater access to job training, education, or social reintegration programs, while others receive only minimal coaching. This inequality is not always based on transparent legal considerations, but is often influenced by administrative factors, institutional capacity, or even personal relationships with correctional officers.²⁰

This distributive injustice has a direct impact on the opportunity for inmates to prepare for returning to society. Inmates who do not have access to adequate coaching are in a more vulnerable position after release, both economically and socially. From the perspective of legal justice, this condition is contrary to the principles of equality before the law and non-discrimination. Fair coaching should ensure that every inmate has an equal opportunity to develop their own capacity, although the form and intensity of coaching may differ according to their individual needs and risk levels. In addition to substantive and distributive justice, procedural justice is also a weak point in the practice of inmate development. Procedural fairness emphasises the importance of a transparent, participatory, and accountable process in every decision-making. In the context of corrections, decisions regarding placement in a coaching program, granting remission, or granting access to a social reintegration program should be based on clear, testable procedures. However, reality shows that many of these decisions are taken behind closed doors, and there is little participation of prisoners as legal subjects.²¹

The lack of an effective and independent complaint mechanism further strengthens the vulnerability of prisoners to the unilateral decisions of correctional officers. When inmates lack adequate channels to raise objections or complaints, the principle of accountability weakens. From the perspective of justice theory, this situation has the potential to give rise to systematic structural injustices. Injustice no longer arises as individual deviations, but rather as a consequence of the design of a system that leaves no room for internal control and correction. Furthermore, procedural justice weakness contributes to declining trust in the correctional system as a whole. Trust is an essential element in the coaching process, as changes in inmates' behaviour are greatly influenced by their perception of the justice of the system that governs their lives. When the system is seen as unfair, inmates tend to be passive, resistant, or simply undergo formal coaching

²⁰ Asri Ainun Bakhtiar et al., 'Study on the Coaching of Inmates in Class I Correctional Institution Makassar', *Equator: Journal of Educational and Social Humanities* 5, no. 4 (September 2025): 144–159, <https://doi.org/10.55606/khatulistiwa.v5i4.7478>.

²¹ Doris Rahmat, Santoso Budi Nu, and Widya Daniswara, 'The Function of Correctional Institutions in the Development of Inmates in Correctional Institutions', *Widya Pranata Law : Journal of Legal Studies and Research* 3, no. 2 (September 2021): 134–150, <https://doi.org/10.37631/widyapranata.v3i2.423>.

without internalising the expected values. Thus, coaching loses its educational and transformative dimensions.²²

The gap between the principle of legal justice and the practice of inmate development also shows that the problem of coaching cannot be separated from the design of the regulations that underlie it. Regulations that overemphasise administrative aspects tend to result in rigid coaching practices that are less sensitive to justice. In such conditions, correctional officers focus more on procedural compliance than on achieving the substantive goals of coaching. As a result, coaching has become a bureaucratic routine with minimal innovation and critical reflection.²³ Therefore, efforts are needed to reconstruct the regulation of inmate development that explicitly integrates the principles of substantive, distributive, and procedural justice. The reconstruction not only aims to improve the implementation mechanism but also to reorient coaching toward the normative. Fair regulations must provide a flexible yet accountable framework that allows coaching to be tailored to individual needs without sacrificing legal certainty.

Thus, this analysis confirms that the gap between the principles of legal justice and the practice of prisoner development is a structural problem that requires a normative and comprehensive policy response. Without fundamental improvements in the design of regulations and coaching mechanisms, achieving corrections as a means of rehabilitation and social reintegration will be challenging to sustain. The affirmation of the principle of legal justice in the development of prisoners is not only a normative demand but also an important prerequisite for the long-term effectiveness of the correctional system.

The following table summarises the nature of the gap between the principles of legal justice and the practice of inmate development:

Principles of Legal Justice	Normative Ideal	Coaching Practice
Substantive Justice	Individual needs-based coaching	Uniform and administrative coaching
Procedural Justice	Transparent and accountable procedures	Unclear and closed procedures
Distributive Justice	Access to proportional coaching	Uneven access
Restorative Justice	Social recovery and reintegration	Focus on discipline and order

²² Ahmad Sanusi, 'Evaluation of the Implementation of Prisoner Development in Open Correctional Institutions', *Scientific Journal of Legal Policy* 13, no. 2 (July 2019): 123–138, <https://doi.org/10.30641/kebijakan.2019.V13.123-138>.

²³ Mrs. Arfa, Syofyan Nur, and Yulia Monita, 'Patterns of Coaching for Lifelong Prisoners in Implementation Policies', *Journal of Socio-Humanities* 3, no. 2 (November 2019): 250–260, <https://doi.org/10.22437/jssh.v3i2.8428>.

Source: author's interpretation

The table illustrates the gap between the normative ideals of the principle of legal justice and the reality of inmate development in correctional institutions. In the context of substantive justice, normative coaching should be designed to address the individual needs of inmates, taking into account each inmate's social background, risk level, and rehabilitative needs. However, the practice observed shows uniform, administrative coaching, so it tends to ignore differences in the character and needs of inmates. This condition causes coaching to function more as an institutional routine than as a meaningful recovery instrument. Similarly, in procedural justice, ideally every coaching process is carried out through transparent, accountable procedures, but in practice these procedures are often unclear and closed, thereby creating space for unilateral decisions and undermining the principle of accountability.

Furthermore, the gap is also evident in the areas of distributive and restorative justice. Normatively, distributive justice requires that access to coaching programs be provided in proportion to and relatively to all inmates. However, practice shows that such access is uneven and often depends on administrative factors or internal policies of correctional institutions. Meanwhile, the principle of restorative justice, which emphasises social recovery and reintegration, has not yet become the main orientation of coaching. Coaching practices are still dominated by a focus on discipline and order, so that aspects of restoring social relationships and inmates' readiness to return to society do not receive adequate attention. Thus, this table confirms a significant gap between the normative goal of justice-based inmate development and its implementation in the field.

Reconstruction of Prisoner Development Regulations Based on the Principles of Legal Justice

Based on previous research, the fundamental problem in the prison development system lies not only in the weak implementation of policies but also in regulations that are not fully grounded in the principles of legal justice. The applicable coaching regulations still treat coaching as an administrative and institutional instrument, rather than as an integral part of fulfilling prisoners' rights. Therefore, this study proposes the reconstruction of regulations governing the development of inmates, grounded in legal justice as the primary normative foundation of the correctional system. This reconstruction is intended to transform the coaching paradigm from a control approach to a just approach to social recovery and reintegration.²⁴

The first step in reconstructing the regulation of inmate development is to conceptualize the meaning of coaching itself. Coaching needs to be understood as a fundamental right of prisoners as well as a constitutional obligation of the state, rather than merely additional facilities

²⁴ Riska Marpaung and Mangido Nainggolan, "The Role of Wardens in the Development of Prisoner Morality in the Class 1 Tanjung Gusta Medan Correctional Institution (Lapas)", *Journal of Social Humanities and Education* 4, no. 3 (July 2025): 522–529, <https://doi.org/10.55606/1novasi.v4i3.4522>.

provided at the discretion of correctional institutions. From the perspective of substantive justice, the state is obliged to ensure that every prisoner receives adequate, proportionate, and meaningful coaching in line with the goals of modern penalties, which emphasise individual improvement and social reintegration. With this repositioning, coaching is no longer seen as a mere disciplinary instrument but as a means of advancing human dignity and social justice in the criminal justice system.²⁵

Regulatory reconstruction must also be directed at strengthening procedural justice.²⁶ So far, the process of fostering inmates has often been carried out through a closed internal mechanism, with unclear assessment standards and difficult to test objectively.²⁷ This puts prisoners in a weak position, as strategic decisions related to coaching, remission, or reintegration programs are often unilaterally determined by the correctional authorities. Therefore, coaching regulations need to be formulated by establishing clear, transparent, and measurable indicators and assessment criteria, so that every decision can be legally accounted for.²⁸

Strengthening procedural justice also requires an effective mechanism for participation and complaints. Inmates must be given the space to understand, assess, and participate in the coaching process they are undergoing, and have the right to object to decisions they consider unfair. This mechanism not only serves as a control tool against potential abuse of authority but also as an educational tool that encourages prisoners' legal awareness and responsibility. Thus, coaching procedures are no longer hierarchical and repressive, but participatory and accountable.²⁹

In addition to procedural justice, the principle of distributive justice is an essential element that must be explicitly integrated in the reconstruction of prisoner development regulations.³⁰

²⁵ Rahmat Bayu Wibisono and Rani Yuwati, 'Functionalization of the Prisoner Development System in Realizing the Purpose of Criminalization', *Syntax Literate; Indonesian Scientific Journal* 8, no. 10 (October 2023): 5716–5728, <https://doi.org/10.36418/syntax-literate.v8i10.13734>.

²⁶ Itok Dwi Kurniawan and Souad Ezzerouali, 'Revisiting the Principle of Legal Certainty: A Contemporary Analysis through the Lens of Legal Positivism', *NUSANTARA: Journal Of Law Studies* 3, no. 02 (December 2024): 137–146, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17385496>.

²⁷ Nur Azisa et al., 'Psychological Recovery of Crime Victims within Contemporary Restorative Justice: An Islamic Legal Perspective', *MILRev: Metro Islamic Law Review* 4, no. 2 (September 2025): 1098–1127, <https://doi.org/10.32332/milrev.v4i2.11184>.

²⁸ Mudzakkir Mudzakkir, 'Ideal Penitentiary Model The concept of ideal prisoner development, a comparative study of Islamic law', *IUS QUILA IUSTUM Legal Journal* 2, no. 4 (1995): 31–44, <https://doi.org/10.20885/iustum.vol2.iss4.art6>.

²⁹ Agus Zuono, Hadi Mahmud, and Raharno, 'The Application of Coaching for Recidivist Inmates in Class IIB Wonogiri Correctional Institution', *JOURNAL FINDINGS* 1, no. 07 (September 2023): 82–89.

³⁰ Ahmad Kholil Siregar, 'The Role of Correctional Officers as Prisoner Coaches: (Study on Binjai Class II Prison)', *Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review* 4, no. 4 (July 2025): 223–237, <https://doi.org/10.56128/ljoalr.v4i4.517>.

Distributive justice demands that access to coaching programs, skills training, and social reintegration support facilities be provided in proportion to, and relative to, all inmates. In current practice, the distribution of such access is often uneven and influenced by non-juridical factors, such as institutional capacity, internal policies, or other administrative considerations. As a result, certain inmates benefit from greater coaching than others, without a clear legal basis.³¹

Regulatory reconstruction should ensure that the distribution of access to coaching is based on prisoners' rehabilitative needs, risk levels, and potential for social reintegration.³² This approach not only reflects the principles of distributive justice but also enhances the long-term effectiveness of coaching. Targeted and proportionate coaching has the potential to reduce recidivism rates and strengthen the preventive function of the correctional system.³³ Thus, distributive justice has not only normative value, but also pragmatic value in supporting sustainable correctional goals.³⁴

Another aspect that is no less important in the reconstruction of prisoner development regulations is the integration of restorative justice principles.³⁵ Restorative justice emphasises the restoration of social relations among perpetrators, victims, and society as the primary goal in resolving legal conflicts. In the context of inmate coaching, the restorative approach expands the meaning of coaching beyond the mere formation of discipline to a social recovery process oriented towards responsibility and reconciliation. The integration of restorative justice into the regulation of coaching allows inmates to actively participate in the recovery process, whether through mediation with victims, social work, or community-based coaching programs.³⁶

The restorative approach also provides space for the community to be involved in the coaching and reintegration of inmates. This involvement is essential to reduce social stigma and

³¹ Umi Enggarsasi, 'Pattern of Inmate Development In Contributing To The Success Of Inmate Development In Indonesia', *PERSPECTIVE: A Study of Legal and Development Issues* 18, no. 3 (September 2013): 157–168, <https://doi.org/10.30742/perspektif.v18i3.27>.

³² Rizki Kurniawan and Mitro Subroto, 'Prisoner Development Program through Assimilation Given with Community Based Correction', *Journal of Intellectual Affairs: Islam, Social and Science* 10, nos. 2-A (2021), <https://doi.org/10.19109/intelektualita.v10i2-a.12167>.

³³ Ahmad Gunawan and Mitro Subroto, 'Implementation of Coaching Programs for Female Inmates in Class IIB Women's Correctional Institution Bengkulu during the Covid 19 Pandemic', *Journal Of Application And Innovation Of Science And Technology 'Solidity' (J-SOLID)* 5, no. 1 (March 2022): 1–8, <https://doi.org/10.31328/js.v5i1.2872>.

³⁴ Lukman Hakim Lubis, 'The Implementation of Inmate Development in Class IIA Pancur Batu Overcrowded Correctional Institutions', *Locus: Journal of Legal Concepts* 1, no. 1 (December 2021): 20–29, <https://doi.org/10.56128/jkjh.v1i1.14>.

³⁵ Valerian Debita Spisy, M. Nanda Setiawan, and Chindi Oeliga Yensi Afita, 'Efforts to Fulfill The Rights of Prisoners in the Class II B Muara Bungo Correctional Institution', *FORMER LAW JOURNAL* 6, no. 1 (February 2025): 1–25, <https://doi.org/10.36355/dlj.v6i1.1702>.

³⁶ Muhammad Ali Equatora and Herry Fernandes Butar Butar, 'Fostering Furniture Independence for Inmates in Realizing the Goals of the Correctional System', *Socio-e-Kons* 16, no. 3 (December 2024): 304–311, <https://doi.org/10.30998/sosioekons.v16i3.25774>.

create an environment conducive to the return of prisoners to community life. Coaching regulations based on restorative justice are thus not only oriented to the internal interests of correctional institutions, but also to broader social interests. This is in line with the modern criminal paradigm, which views the penitentiary as part of the social justice system.³⁷

Normatively, the reconstruction of prison development regulations based on the principle of legal justice requires a harmonisation between legal certainty, utility, and justice. Good regulation must not only be clear and firm, but also fair and beneficial to all legal subjects involved.³⁸ By making substantive, procedural, distributive, and restorative justice the central pillars, coaching regulations can function optimally as an instrument for the recovery and empowerment of prisoners. Thus, the reconstruction of the regulation on prisoner development is not just a normative update, but an effort to transform the correctional system. This reconstruction is expected to shift the orientation of coaching from an administrative-disciplinary approach to a sustainable approach to justice and rehabilitation. In the end, fair coaching regulations not only protect the rights of prisoners but also strengthen the legitimacy of the correctional system as an instrument of social justice in the state of law.³⁹

The following table illustrates the differences between conventional coaching regulations and the legal justice-based reconstruction model:

Regulation Aspects	Conventional models	Reconstruction Model
Orientation	Administrative and security	Legal justice and reintegration
Construction Subject	Policy objects	Legal subjects
Procedure	Closed and hierarchical	Transparent and participatory
Approach	Discipline	Restorative and rehabilitative

Source: Author's Interpretation

The table shows the fundamental difference between the conventional prisoner development regulatory model and the regulatory reconstruction model based on the principle of legal justice. In the traditional model, the orientation of coaching remains focused on administrative and security aspects, so the primary goal of regulation is control, order, and procedural compliance within the correctional institution. Within this framework, prisoners are often positioned as policy objects subject to institutional rules. The coaching procedure is carried out in a closed and hierarchical manner, with minimal space for inmates to participate

³⁷ Asniar Karolina Sarumaha, 'Juridical Analysis of the Development of Female Prisoners Based on Law Number 12 of 1995 Concerning Corrections (Study of Decision Number 222/Pid.B/2013/PN-Gst)', *Legal Arrow Journal* 1, no. 2 (2022): 42–54, <https://doi.org/10.57094/jph.v1i2.774>.

³⁸ Erina Suhestia Ningtyas, 'The Implementation of the Inmate Development Program in Correctional Institutions in the Context of Human Resources Development (Study on Class IA Correctional Institution Lowokwaru Malang)', *Journal of Public Administration* 1, no. 6 (August 2013): 1266–1275.

³⁹ Petrus Irwan Panjaitan, 'Development of Prisoners According to the Social System', *Sun-to-Sun* 4, no. 3 (2018): 111–116, <https://doi.org/10.33541/JtVol5Iss2pp102>.

in determining or understanding the coaching process they are undergoing. The approach used is also disciplinary, emphasising compliance and control as a measure of coaching success.

In contrast, the regulatory reconstruction model offers a more progressive paradigm by placing legal justice and social reintegration at the core of coaching. In this model, prisoners are understood as legal subjects who have rights and dignity that must be respected, including the right to receive fair and meaningful guidance. The coaching procedure is designed in a transparent and participatory manner, so that every decision can be accounted for and understood by the inmate. The approach put forward is restorative and rehabilitative, aiming to restore prisoners' social functions and prepare them to reintegrate constructively into society. Thus, this table confirms that reconstructing the regulation of prisoner development is a strategic step toward transforming the correctional system from a control model to one of justice and recovery.

Conclusion

This study concludes that the applicable inmate development regulations remain dominated by administrative and institutional approaches, thereby failing to fully reflect the principles of legal justice fully. The study's findings show a gap between regulatory norms and the principles of substantive, procedural, distributive, and restorative justice, which affects unequal access to coaching and a weak orientation toward social reintegration. Therefore, reconstructing the regulation of prisoner development based on the principle of legal justice is an urgent need to ensure that development is recognized as a prisoner's right and an obligation of the state. This reconstruction emphasises the importance of regulations oriented towards the fulfilment of rights, procedural transparency, equal access, and integration of restorative approaches to realise a more humane, fair, and effective correctional system. As a suggestion, further research is needed to develop a socio-legal approach grounded in empirical data, such as interviews with inmates, correctional officers, and policymakers, to test the implementation of legal-justice-based coaching regulations in practice. In addition, cross-border comparative studies are essential for enriching the regulatory reconstruction model with best practices from the correctional system that have successfully applied the principles of justice in an integrated manner. Further research is expected to strengthen the foundation of correctional policies that are not only oriented towards institutional order, but also towards social recovery and sustainable justice.

Acknowledgments

The author expresses his highest appreciation and gratitude to the Rector of Sultan Agung University of Semarang for the support, policies, and facilitation provided to enable this research to be carried out correctly. This institutional support makes a significant contribution to a smooth research process, both from academic and administrative perspectives. The author

hopes that the results of this research can make a positive contribution to the development of legal science and practice, especially in the field of corrections and legal justice.

Authors Contribution

The author's contribution to this research was carried out collaboratively and in a structured manner. Fri Hartono plays a significant role in the formulation of research concepts, the preparation of methodologies, data analysis, and the writing of initial draft manuscripts. Desy Kartika Caronina Sitepu contributes to data collection and curation, literature search and review, and manuscript refinement through the review and editing process. Anis Mashdurohatun provides academic supervision, strengthening the theoretical framework, and validating research approaches and findings. Debiantho plays a role in legal analysis and comparative analysis, as well as the systematic presentation of data to support research arguments. Meanwhile, Mohamed Abdel Samad Mehanna contributed through critical manuscript reviews, the enrichment of international perspectives, and language editing to improve the academic quality and readability of articles.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest in the preparation, writing, and publication of this article. The research was conducted independently and objectively, without any financial, academic, or personal influences.

References

Alfikri, Muhammad, Fadillah Sabri, and Nani Mulyati. "The implementation of coaching for inmates with deviant sexual behavior in the Pekanbaru Class IIA Women's Prison is associated with legal certainty'. *UNES Law Review* 6, no. 1 (September 2023): 2086–2101. <https://doi.org/10.31933/unesrev.v6i1.993>.

Anggara, Ega, Iwan Setiawan, and Yuliana Suryagalih. 'The Implementation Of The Coaching Program For Inmates Is Linked To Article 11 Paragraph (1) Letter B Of The Law Of The Republic Of Indonesia Number 22 Of 2022 Concerning Correctional Facilities In The Ciamis Class Iib Correctional Institution'. *Pustaka Galuh Justisi* 3, no. 1 (October 2024): 156–179. <https://doi.org/10.25157/pustaka.v3i1.4581>.

Arfa, Nys, Syofyan Nur, and Yulia Monita. 'Pattern of Coaching for Life Prisoners in Implementation Policy'. *Journal of Socio-Humanities Science* 3, no. 2 (November 2019): 250–260. <https://doi.org/10.22437/jssh.v3i2.8428>.

Azisa, Nur, Audyna Mayasari Muin, M. Aris Munandar, Muhammad Mutawalli Mukhlis, and Aspalella A. Rahman. 'Psychological Recovery of Crime Victims within Contemporary Restorative Justice: An Islamic Legal Perspective'. *MILRev: Metro*

Islamic Law Review 4, no. 2 (September 2025): 1098–1127. <https://doi.org/10.32332/milrev.v4i2.11184>.

Bakhtiar, Asri Ainun, Heri Tahir, Nurharsyah Khaer Hanafie, and Najamuddin. 'Study on the Coaching of Inmates in Class I Correctional Institution Makassar'. *Equator: Journal of Educational and Social Humanities* 5, no. 4 (September 2025): 144–159. <https://doi.org/10.55606/khatulistiwa.v5i4.7478>.

Enggarsasi, Umi. 'Patterns Of Inmate Development In Contributing To The Success Of Inmate Development In Indonesia'. *PERSPECTIVE: Legal and Development Issues Review* 18, no. 3 (September 2013): 157–68. <https://doi.org/10.30742/perspektif.v18i3.27>.

———. 'Patterns of inmate development in contributing to the success of inmate development in indonesia'. *Perspective: Legal and Development Issues Review* 18, no. 3 (September 2013): 157–168. <https://doi.org/10.30742/perspektif.v18i3.27>.

Equatora, Muhammad Ali, and Herry Fernandes Butar Butar. 'Fostering Furniture Independence for Inmates in Realizing the Goals of the Correctional System'. *Sociology e-Kons* 16, no. 3 (December 2024): 304–311. <https://doi.org/10.30998/sosioekons.v16i3.25774>.

Fatmawati.L, St, and Rifkah Anniza Rahman. 'A model of coaching for inmates in the Kendari Class III Women's Correctional Institution'. *Journal of Social and Humanities* 2, no. 2 (August 2022): 102–110. <https://doi.org/10.57250/ajsh.v2i2.73>.

Gunawan, Ahmad, and Mitro Subroto. 'Implementation of Coaching Program for Female Inmates at the Bengkulu Class IIB Women's Correctional Institution during the Covid 19 Pandemic'. *Journal Of Application And Innovation Of Science And Technology 'Solidity' (J-SOLID)* 5, no. 1 (March 2022): 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.31328/js.v5i1.2872>.

Hasiholan, Andree Washington. 'Integration Of Restorative Justice In Prisoner Development Programs: The Benefits Of Victim-Perpetrator Mediation On The Reduction Of Recidivism'. *Gevangenен :Journal of Correctional Studies* 1, no. 2 (November 2025): 40–50.

Hutauruk, Rahel, and Janpatar Simamora. 'The Implementation Of Prisoner Development By The Correctional Institution Of The Ministry Of Law And Human Rights Of North Sumatra'. *Journal of Media Informatics* 6, no. 2 (January 2025): 1030–1037. <https://doi.org/10.55338/jumin.v6i2.5344>.

Kurniawan, Itok Dwi, and Souad Ezzerouali. 'Revisiting the Principle of Legal Certainty: A Contemporary Analysis through the Lens of Legal Positivism'.

NUSANTARA: Journal Of Law Studies 3, no. 02 (December 2024): 137–146.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17385496>.

Kurniawan, Rizki, and Mitro Subroto. 'Prisoner Development Program Through Assimilation Provided with Community Based Correction'. *Journal of Intellectualita: Islam, Social and Science* 10, nos. 2-a (2021).
<https://doi.org/10.19109/intelektualita.v10i2-a.12167>.

Kusmanto, Ade, and H. S. Tisnanta. 'The Implementation of Fair Prisoner Development in Realizing the Philosophy of Prisoner Corrections'. *Al-Zayn : Journal of Social and Legal Sciences* 3, no. 4 (September 2025): 4862–4871.
<https://doi.org/10.61104/alz.v3i4.2064>.

Lubis, Lukman Hakim. 'The Implementation of Inmate Development in the Overcrowded Pancur Batu Class IIA Correctional Institution'. *Locus: Journal of Legal Concepts* 1, no. 1 (December 2021): 20–29.
<https://doi.org/10.56128/jkih.v1i1.14>.

Mabruri, Mahmud Aprian, Alif Firdaus Zamzam, Midkhulus Surur, Eva Nur Laily Rohmah, and Sri Handayawati. 'Implementation of the Independence and Spirituality Development Program for Narcotics Inmates in Class IIb Lamongan Correctional Institution'. *Madani Journal of Political and Social Society* 17, no. 02 (August 2025): 239–257.

Marpaung, riska, and mangido Nainggolan. 'The Role of Wardens in the Development of Morality of Inmates in the Class 1 Tanjung Gusta Correctional Institution (Lapas) Medan'. *Journal of Social Humanities and Education* 4, no. 3 (July 2025): 522–529. <https://doi.org/10.55606/inovasi.v4i3.4522>.

Miles, Matthew B, and A. Michael Huberman. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Source Book on New Methods*. Jakarta: University of Indonesia Press, 2014.

Mudzakkir, Mudzakkir. 'Ideal Penitentiary Model the concept of ideal inmate development, a comparative study of Islamic law'. *Legal Journal IUS QULA IUSTUM* 2, no. 4 (1995): 31–44.
<https://doi.org/10.20885/iustum.vol2.iss4.art6>.

Ningtyas, Erina Suhestia. 'Implementation of the Prisoner Development Program in Correctional Institutions in the Context of Human Resources Development (Study on Class IA Correctional Institution Lowokwaru Malang)'. *Journal of Public Administration* 1, no. 6 (August 2013): 1266–1275.

Panjaitan, Petrus Irwan. 'Development Of Prisoners According To The Correctional System'. *Toxicology* 4, no. 3 (2018): 111–116.
<https://doi.org/10.33541/JtVol5Iss2pp102>.

'(PDF) Human Rights and the Rehabilitative Purpose of Punishment: A Critical Legal Perspective'. *ResearchGate*, ahead of print, 31 December 2025. <https://doi.org/10.15175/gq7hrf02>.

'(PDF) The Effectiveness of Correctional Rehabilitation: A Review of Systematic Reviews'. *ResearchGate*, ahead of print, 6 August 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.3.081806.112833>.

Peleg-Koriat, Inbal, and Dana Weimann-Saks. 'Restorative Justice Behind Bars: People in Custody's Facilitators and Barriers to Participating in Restorative Justice'. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 51, no. 10 (October 2024): 1493–1510. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00938548241257608>.

Purwanto, Purwanto, Putri Damayanti, Muhammad Faizal, and Bahrul Fawaid. 'Restorative Justice in the Criminal Justice System: An Alternative Approach to Offenders' Rehabilitation and Victims' Recovery'. *Research Horizon* 5, no. 6 (December 2025): 2831–2844. <https://doi.org/10.54518/rh.5.6.2025.947>.

Putra, Ferinando Fachrudin, and Padmono Wibowo. 'Analysis Of Prisoner Development Policies In Order To Realize A Humane And Just Correctional System'. *Trivikrama: Journal of Social Sciences* 1, no. 12 (October 2023): 81–90. <https://doi.org/10.6578/tjs.v1i12.554>.

Putri, Putu Devi Komala Arisna, Ni Ketut Sari Adnyani, and I. Wayan Landrawan. 'The Effectiveness Of Coaching For Inmates And Its Implications For Overcapacity In Class II B Singaraja Correctional Institution'. *Journal of Gender and Human Rights* 1, no. 1 (March 2023): 60–69.

R, Fajar Putra Prastina. 'Guarantee of Prisoners' Human Rights in the Development of Prisoners in Correctional Institutions'. *Jurist-Diction* 4, no. 1 (January 2021): 111–140. <https://doi.org/10.20473/jd.v4i1.24295>.

Rahmat, Doris, Santoso Budi Nu, and Widya Daniswara. 'The Function of Correctional Institutions in the Development of Inmates in Correctional Institutions'. *Widya Pranata Hukum : Journal of Legal Studies and Research* 3, no. 2 (September 2021): 134–150. <https://doi.org/10.37631/widapranata.v3i2.423>.

Sanusi, Ahmad. 'Evaluation of the Implementation of Prisoner Development in Open Correctional Institutions'. *Legal Policy Scientific Journal* 13, no. 2 (July 2019): 123–138. <https://doi.org/10.30641/kebijakan.2019.V13.123-138>.

Sarumaha, Asniar Karolina. 'Juridical Analysis Of The Development Of Female Prisoners Based On Law Number 12 Of 1995 Concerning Corrections (Study of Decision No. 222/Pid.B/2013/PN-Gst)': *Legal Arrow Journal* 1, no. 2 (2022): 42–54. <https://doi.org/10.57094/jph.v1i2.774>.

Siahaan, Argendo, and Wido Cepaka Warih. 'William N Dunn's Evaluation Model on the Prisoner Independence Development Program at the Pematangsiantar Class IIA Correctional Institution'. *Journal of Tambusai Education* 9, no. 3 (September 2025): 29136–29141.

Siregar, Ahmad Kholil. 'The Role of Correctional Officers as Prisoner Coaches: (Study on Binjai Class II Prison)'. *Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review* 4, no. 4 (July 2025): 223–237. <https://doi.org/10.56128/ljoalr.v4i4.517>.

Soliha, Ulfa Safira, and Zulkarnain M. A. 'Correctional Institution Prisoner Development System in the Study of Islamic Criminal Law'. *Legal Standing : Journal of Legal Sciences* 8, no. 3 (July 2024): 535–544. <https://doi.org/10.24269/ljs.v8i3.9803>.

Spisy, Valerian Debita, M. Nanda Setiawan, and Chindi Oeliga Yensi Afita. 'Efforts To Fulfill The Rights Of Prisoners In The Muara Bungo Class II B Correctional Institution'. *DATIN LAW JOURNAL* 6, no. 1 (February 2025): 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.36355/dlj.v6i1.1702>.

Wibisono, Rahmat Bayu, and Rani Yuwafi. 'Functionalization of the Prisoner Development System in Realizing the Purpose of Criminalization'. *Syntax Literate; Indonesian Scientific Journal* 8, no. 10 (October 2023): 5716–5728. <https://doi.org/10.36418/syntax-literate.v8i10.13734>.

Wirzahayati, Dina, Asril, and Rudiadi. 'Implementation Of Inmate Development In Medium Security Prison In Class II A Bukittinggi Correctional Institution'. *Student Journal of the Faculty of Sharia and Law UIN Suska Riau* 2, no. 2 (April 2023): 452–469.

Zuono, Agus, Hadi Mahmud, and Raharno. 'The Implementation of Coaching for Recidivist Inmates in Class IIB Wonogiri Correctional Institution'. *JOURNAL FINDINGS* 1, no. 07 (September 2023): 82–89.