

## Implementation of Policy on Providing Narcotics Rehabilitation Services in Handling Overcrowded in Class I Correctional Institutions in Medan

Rahmah Novia Sari Bancin\*<sup>1</sup>, Asima Yanty Silvanya Siahaan<sup>2</sup>, Tunggul Sihombing<sup>3</sup>

Universitas Sumatera Utara

**Corresponding Author:** Rahmah Novia Sari Bancin: [rahmahbancin@gmail.com](mailto:rahmahbancin@gmail.com)

---

### ARTICLE INFO

*Keywords:* Policy Implementation, Narcotics Rehabilitation, Overcrowded, Prison

*Received:* 7, January

*Revised:* 28, February

*Accepted:* 15, March

©2026 Bancin, Siahaan, Sihombing (s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



### ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the implementation of the narcotics rehabilitation service policy in addressing overcrowding at Class I Correctional Institution in Medan. The focus is directed at two main variables based on Merilee S. Grindle's policy implementation theory: content of policy and context of implementation. The research employs a qualitative approach with a descriptive method, utilizing data collection techniques such as in-depth interviews, observation, and document analysis. The findings reveal that while the rehabilitation policy has been carried out through various social rehabilitation programs, it has not significantly reduced the issue of overcrowding. Several inhibiting factors were identified, including limited human resources, the imbalance between the number of inmates and facility capacity, and weak coordination among implementing institutions. On the other hand, the rehabilitation program contributes positively to behavioral change and social reintegration readiness of inmates. This study recommends strengthening institutional capacity, reformulating sentencing policies for drug users, and enhancing inter-stakeholder coordination to optimize the rehabilitation policy implementation within a sustainable overcrowding management framework.

---

## **INTRODUCTION**

Correctional institutions, commonly abbreviated as prisons, are places for the rehabilitation of criminals in Indonesia. Prisons are the final destination for criminals sentenced to prison after a trial. Prisons are Technical Implementation Units under the Directorate General of Corrections, Ministry of Law and Human Rights. The purpose of prisons is to prepare inmates for reintegration into society. This is intended to enable inmates to return to their role as free and responsible members of society (Fajri, 2023: 36).

Prisonments, as places for inmates based on the criminal system, carry out complex punishments, aiming to promote and restore a proper and beneficial social life. In reality, many problems arise within prisons in Indonesia. Evidence from the field indicates that numerous disturbances to security and public order persist in correctional institutions (Anisa & Wibowo, 2021: 1086). Currently, there is a problem related to overcrowding in detention centers and prisons in Indonesia (Fajri, 2023: 36).

It was recorded that in 2019, of the total 533 correctional institutions and detention centers, only 113 had sufficient inmates, while the remaining 407 were overcrowded. Meanwhile, an ideal correctional institution has a capacity of 126,837 inmates. Regionally, only three regions in Indonesia are not experiencing overcrowding: the Special Region of Yogyakarta, Maluku, and North Maluku (Anisa & Wibowo, 2021: 1086). This overcrowding problem has led to several other problems in prisons. These problems include inmate-on-inmate conflict and even murder, violence by prison officers, prison escapes, drug trafficking, sexual harassment, and various other negative topics frequently heard from behind bars (Citrawan & Zainuddin, 2015: 2-3).

The majority of inmates in prisons are convicted of drug offenses. This is because one of the biggest crimes facing Indonesia today is drug abuse. Every prison and state detention center (Rutan) is dominated by drug inmates. Drug crimes are generally not committed by single individuals but are carried out collectively, even by syndicates, in a well-organized and secretive manner. Furthermore, drug crimes have become a serious threat or extraordinary crime to human life (Hardiansyah & Widoyoko, 2024: 114).

Medan Class I Penitentiary is one of the correctional institutions specifically handling narcotics cases in North Sumatra. It is expected to fulfill its function as a penal institution and as a rehabilitation center, especially for drug users. Based on current statistics from the Medan Class I Penitentiary, the number of inmates in the prison is 1,474 (SDP data as of January 23, 2024), of which 1,338 are incarcerated for narcotics offenses, of which 378 are recidivists. Data shows that 1,020 inmates have participated in the social rehabilitation program, which was implemented from 2020 to 2023.

Through the implementation of social rehabilitation programs, it is hoped that inmates, especially drug users, will receive comprehensive counseling services so that upon returning to society they will not repeat their drug abuse behavior. Social rehabilitation programs are one of the most effective behavioral change therapy programs implemented in correctional institutions (LAPAS).

An evaluation conducted by NIDA at Donovan California State Prison, comparing inmates undergoing social rehabilitation programs with those not undergoing social rehabilitation programs, showed that inmates undergoing social rehabilitation programs exhibited more positive behavior and decreased levels of violence during the program (Fattah, 2022: 9).

Over time, despite policies related to rehabilitation for inmates who abuse drugs in correctional institutions, detention centers and prisons in Indonesia still face various problems ranging from security, services, facilities and infrastructure to overcrowding (Azizah et al., 2023: 1). This indicates that the tendency for criminal behavior, especially drug-related, remains quite significant in criminal involvement.

The topics of overcrowding, the implementation of Merilee S. Grindle's policy, and social rehabilitation for drug inmates were used as reading material for previous research by the author so that the author could identify research gaps in the research that will be conducted. Azizah in her research analyzes the implementation and inhibiting factors of the overcrowding policy at the Class IIB Siak Sri Indrapura Detention Center (Azizah, et al., 2023: 1). And Parape in his research analyzes the implementation of drug rehabilitation at the Class IIA Sungguminasa Narcotics Special Prison (Parape, et al., 2021: 113). Then, Fajri in his research analyzes the implementation of drug rehabilitation as an effort to treat drug abuse inmates at the Class IIA Cibinong Prison (Fajri, 2023: 35). Furthermore, Rahmania & Nirmala in their research analyze the relationship or relevance of drug rehabilitation to overcrowding (Rahmania & Nirmala, 2023: 119). There are also previous studies that use other theories to examine this overcrowding problem. In Tobing's study entitled "Community-Based Correction: Alternative Methods for Overcoming Overcrowding," this study analyzes alternative methods for overcrowding in a prison or rehabilitation center, with the results that several basic principles are needed to implement an open prison operational program (Tobing, 2019: 49). Furthermore, Aini & Wibowo's study entitled "Implementation of the Grand Design for Overcrowding Management at the Sibolga Class IIA Penitentiary" shows that the implementation of Minister of Law and Human Rights Regulation Number 11 of 2017 concerning the Grand Design for Overcrowding Management at the Sibolga Class IIA Prison is carried out through four approaches: regulatory structuring, institutional strengthening, provision of facilities and infrastructure, and empowerment of human resources (Aini & Wibowo, 2022: 145). Furthermore, a study by Fauziah, Fatrika, & Pratiwi titled "Alignment of Law Enforcement Agencies in the Implementation of Restorative Justice for Drug Abusers in Indonesia" examines the restorative justice approach, an alternative to sentencing that has been implemented in various countries, as an alternative solution to correctional overcrowding (Fauziah et al., 2022: 64).

Based on this description, a research gap was identified between this study and previous research. No study has used Merilee S. Grindle's policy implementation theory to analyze the implementation of social rehabilitation policies as an effort to address overcrowding in Medan Class I Correctional Institution.

Based on the aforementioned issues, the authors are interested in conducting further research, entitled "Implementation of Narcotics Rehabilitation Service Delivery Policy in Addressing Overcrowding in Medan Class I Correctional Institution."

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

Public policy is fundamentally concerned with how decisions are planned, formulated, implemented, and evaluated in relation to their impacts on the wider population particularly the target groups affected by those decisions. In this sense, policy functions as an instrument through which governing authorities structure social behavior, directing collective action "from the top" so that public conduct becomes patterned in line with formal rules and objectives. Eulau and Prewitt conceptualize policy as a relatively stable decision characterized by consistency and repeated patterns of compliance, often reinforced through mechanisms of rewards and sanctions. From this perspective, a policy is not merely a statement of intention; it is a practical blueprint that shapes behavior across time through institutionalized expectations and enforcement. Dye's well-known formulation strengthens this view by defining public policy as whatever the government chooses to do or not to do, emphasizing that governmental inaction can be just as consequential as action (Dye, 1992). Taken together, these conceptualizations show that policy is inseparable from the core analytical questions of what is decided, why it is decided, who decides, where decisions are applied, and how implementation is carried out questions that ultimately connect policy design to real outcomes in society.

Policy has little meaning without implementation. Implementation is widely recognized as a decisive phase because it translates formal decisions into concrete actions and measurable changes in the real world. In line with this logic, Sugiana explains implementation as the practical process of executing an enacted policy, ensuring that formal decisions are transformed into operational activities (Sugiana, 2012). Suharto further positions implementation as an integral bridge between policy formulation and policy impact, arguing that it is not simply a technical step but part of a broader policy process involving problem identification, implementation, and evaluation (Suharto, 2012). Complementary perspectives describe implementation as a cycle of strategic planning, policy development, program execution, and comprehensive evaluation (Freeman & Sherwood, as discussed in social policy literature). In the same vein, Mazmanian and Sabatier conceptualize implementation as the stage in which fundamental policy decisions often embodied in laws, executive decisions, or court rulings are operationalized into institutional strategies and administrative routines. Pressman and Wildavsky capture this operational emphasis by describing implementation as carrying out policy, fulfilling its promises, producing intended outputs, and completing the mission embedded in formal decisions (Pressman & Wildavsky, as discussed in Agus & Rati, 2012). These perspectives collectively highlight that even well-written regulations can fail if the operational environment undermines the translation of policy intent into practice.

Because implementation is complex and frequently political, scholarly attention has produced multiple frameworks to analyze why policies succeed or fail. Van Meter and Van Horn define implementation as actions undertaken by individuals, officials, or groups public or private directed toward achieving policy goals. Their approach suggests that implementation is inherently multi-actor and therefore vulnerable to coordination problems, competing interests, and uneven capacities. Edward III's top-down model identifies four determining factors: communication, resources, implementer disposition, and bureaucratic structure. Effective implementation requires clear and consistent policy communication; sufficient resources such as competent personnel and adequate funding; implementers' commitment, honesty, and democratic orientation; and an organizational structure that avoids excessive fragmentation and rigid red tape. Korten's framework adds a "fit" dimension by arguing that program success depends on the compatibility between the program and its beneficiaries, the program and implementing organizations, and the beneficiaries and implementing organizations (Korten, 1988). This perspective is especially relevant when policies target vulnerable populations whose ability to meet administrative requirements may be limited. Among the most widely applied models, Grindle argues that implementation outcomes are shaped by two broad variables: the content of policy and the context of implementation (Grindle, 1998). Policy content includes whose interests are affected, what benefits are offered, the degree of change envisioned, the locus of decision-making, the characteristics of implementers, and the resources committed. Implementation context includes the power, interests, and strategies of actors; institutional and regime characteristics; and implementer compliance and responsiveness. This model is particularly useful for understanding implementation as both an administrative process and a political arena where institutional coordination, resource constraints, and actor strategies intersect.

The importance of these frameworks becomes clear when policy implementation is examined in service-oriented sectors, where public policy is tested directly through citizens' lived experiences. Public service is often described as a set of activities aimed at helping, preparing, and managing the provision of goods or services from one party to another (Hardiyansyah, 2011). Conceptualizes service as a form of assistance that demands interpersonal sensitivity to achieve satisfaction and effectiveness (Darwis et al., 2017), while Ratminto and Atik emphasize that service products are intangible and depend on human effort supported by tools or systems (Imasti & Subroto, 2023). Within public administration, public service delivery is closely tied to policy design, organizational management, and administrative processes that enable government institutions to meet public needs (Lubis, 2021). In this regard, public services are not merely administrative routines; they represent the state's accountability to citizens, where service quality, accessibility, and fairness become indicators of policy performance. Barata further clarifies service delivery by highlighting four essential elements: service providers, service recipients, types of service, and citizen satisfaction as the core outcome of service processes.

Meanwhile, Mahmudi distinguishes basic services (e.g., health and education) from general services, including administrative services such as identity documents areas where failures in implementation can directly harm citizens' rights and well-being (Octaviani & Komalasari, 2017).

This linkage between policy implementation and citizen outcomes is particularly visible in the governance of correctional institutions, where overcrowding has emerged as a major and persistent policy problem. Overcrowding in prisons refers to conditions in which the number of inmates exceeds institutional capacity, resulting in reduced living space, strained sanitation facilities, limited access to healthcare, and heightened risks of violence and disease transmission. Azizah and colleagues define overcrowding as a capacity crisis driven by inmate growth that outpaces available correctional infrastructure (Azizah et al., 2023). Imasti and Subroto further note that excessive density intensifies facility use and contributes to unequal access to resources, deepening the degradation of prisoners' living conditions (Imasti & Subroto, 2023). Classic scholarship also identifies overcrowding as a structural driver of human suffering inside prisons. Sykes argues that overcrowding aggravates the "pains of imprisonment," including intensified psychological distress, reduced privacy, and increased tensions, which can escalate conflict and weaken rehabilitation programs (Sykes, 1958). Toch similarly shows that overcrowding tends to increase aggression, anxiety, and interpersonal conflict, while limiting access to institutional services that support recovery and reintegration (Toch, 1977). From a human rights perspective, international standards such as those promoted by the United Nations emphasize that overcrowding can undermine minimum conditions of humane treatment and increase risks to health and safety, thereby creating systemic rights violations.

In the Indonesian context, overcrowding has been widely recognized as a chronic problem that carries social, economic, security, and human rights consequences. High prison density strains public budgets, reduces the capacity of correctional staff to prioritize rehabilitation over security, and increases the risk of unrest and institutional instability. Scholars argue that overcrowding is not solely a facility management issue but a downstream consequence of broader criminal justice practices particularly the reliance on imprisonment as the primary sanction. Subagyo highlights that narcotics cases are among the most significant contributors to inmate populations, indicating that without policy alternatives to incarceration, capacity crises will persist (Subagyo, 2021). These realities frame overcrowding as a policy problem requiring both system-level reform and targeted interventions that reduce inmate inflows, especially for drug-related offenders.

Within this policy landscape, social rehabilitation, especially for narcotics offenders has been positioned as both a recovery mechanism and a structural strategy to reduce overcrowding. Rehabilitasi is commonly understood as restoration toward normal functioning, encompassing physical, psychological, and social recovery so that individuals can reintegrate into society.

Social rehabilitation for drug offenders typically complements medical rehabilitation: the former focuses on restoring social roles and adaptive functioning, while the latter addresses clinical dependency. Ramadhani and colleagues argue that social rehabilitation is a deliberate effort to reintegrate individuals facing social problems into community life through enhanced self-adjustment across family, community, and work environments (Ramadhani et al., 2017). One widely used approach is the Therapeutic Community (TC) model, which relies on structured peer interaction, staged responsibility development, and behavioral reinforcement through reward and punishment mechanisms. Utami and Sokhivah underline that TC-based social rehabilitation aligns with behavioral approaches to change and is often implemented through group-based norms, routines, and psychosocial interventions (Utami & Sokhivah, 2024).

At the policy level, rehabilitation is not only a treatment pathway but also a governance instrument. By diverting eligible narcotics offenders from incarceration or by emphasizing rehabilitation programs that reduce recidivism rehabilitation policy can contribute to capacity reduction in prisons. Wulandari notes that rehabilitation can function as a more humane and potentially more effective alternative to imprisonment for narcotics users who often occupy a dual status as both offenders and victims of addiction (Wulandari, 2017). Yet, the effectiveness of such rehabilitation policies depends heavily on implementation quality: resource availability, institutional coordination, implementer capacity, and public legitimacy. This is precisely where implementation frameworks become analytically useful. For example, Edward III's emphasis on resources and implementer disposition helps explain why rehabilitation programs may falter when staff capacity is limited or commitment is uneven (Edward III, 1980). Korten's "fit" approach highlights the need for alignment between program design and beneficiary needs, as well as the implementing organization's capacity to deliver meaningful rehabilitation (Korten, 1988). Grindle's model provides an even broader lens by capturing how policy content (e.g., benefits, resources, implementers) and implementation context (e.g., actor power, institutional characteristics, compliance) jointly shape outcomes (Grindle, 1998). In short, rehabilitation policy may be formally well-designed, but without strong implementation conditions effective coordination, adequate staffing, stable resources, and responsive governance, its promise to reduce overcrowding and protect human rights may remain unrealized.

The literature indicates that policy should be understood not only as a formal decision but as a structured intervention that becomes meaningful through implementation and service delivery. Implementation determines whether policy outputs reach target groups and translate into real social change. In correctional governance, overcrowding illustrates how systemic policy choices, especially penal reliance on imprisonment generate severe institutional and human consequences. Rehabilitation, particularly social rehabilitation for narcotics offenders, has emerged as an alternative policy strategy that can simultaneously address recovery needs and reduce prison capacity pressures.

Nevertheless, the sustainability and effectiveness of rehabilitation as a solution depend on the governance environment and the implementation dynamics that connect policy intent to institutional practice. Therefore, examining rehabilitation policy through implementation theories, especially Grindle's content-context framework offers a comprehensive way to analyze why rehabilitation initiatives may succeed, stagnate, or fail in addressing overcrowding and in safeguarding humane correctional standards.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This study adopts a descriptive qualitative method with a field research orientation to examine the implementation of narcotics rehabilitation service policies as an institutional strategy to address overcrowding in Class I Medan Correctional Facility. A qualitative descriptive approach is selected because it enables the researcher to explore social situations comprehensively, reconstruct events and contexts with a high level of accuracy, and identify the micro-processes that sustain stability and patterns of interaction within a complex institutional setting (Neuman, 2014). Consistent with qualitative inquiry, data collection, analysis, and interpretation are conducted in a largely simultaneous and iterative manner, allowing the research design to remain flexible and responsive to the dynamics of the field. Rather than merely testing pre-existing theories, this approach also allows conceptual refinement and the development of new theoretical insights grounded in empirical realities (Neuman, 2014). In qualitative research, the emphasis lies primarily on meaning-making through words and interpretive reasoning, not numerical measurement. Accordingly, three foundational characteristics guide this study: (1) an inductive relationship between theory and evidence; (2) the central role of the researcher as the key instrument who translates data into interpretations; and (3) a constructionist stance that views social norms, values, and structures as outcomes of ongoing interactions rather than as detached or fixed realities. Based on these principles, the study focuses on how rehabilitation policy is operationalized in practice, how institutional actors interpret and enforce procedures, and how the policy environment shapes outcomes related to overcrowding.

The research was conducted in Class I Medan Correctional Facility, selected purposively because it represents a highly relevant locus for policy implementation analysis. As a field study, the choice of location is essential, since it is the site where the researcher obtains contextual and empirical information needed to address the research problem (Thousani et al., 2015: 5). This facility was also chosen because it actively runs rehabilitation programs intended to support recovery and social reintegration of inmates, while simultaneously facing a severe and persistent overcrowding condition. The facility's formal capacity is approximately 1,500 persons, whereas recorded inmate counts demonstrate substantial overcapacity across multiple years: 3,382 (2019), 2,998 (2020), 2,710 (2021), 3,113 (2022), and 3,134 (2023). This combination active rehabilitation implementation alongside chronic overcrowding provides a strong empirical basis for analyzing policy implementation gaps, constraints, and enabling factors.

Informants are determined using purposive sampling, a technique in which participants are selected based on specific criteria aligned with the objectives of the study and their capacity to provide relevant, experience-based information. Purposive sampling is appropriate for policy implementation research because not all individuals within the population possess equal knowledge or involvement in the policy process. This approach enables the researcher to concentrate on individuals who have direct roles, responsibilities, or lived experiences related to rehabilitation services and overcrowding management (Octaviani & Komalasari, 2017: 82). It also reflects efficiency and analytical relevance because sample selection is guided by informed judgment regarding the suitability of each informant to illuminate the phenomenon under study (Prihastuty, 2023: 106). In practical terms, the sampling strategy prioritizes key persons who understand how rehabilitation-based correctional development is positioned as an intervention for overcrowding and how that intervention operates in day-to-day institutional practice.

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

This study examines the implementation of the narcotics rehabilitation policy at Class I Medan Correctional Facility through Grindle's implementation framework, which emphasizes that policy success is shaped not only by the inherent design of the policy (content of policy) but also by the institutional and political environment in which it is executed (context of implementation) (Grindle, 1980). Empirically, the rehabilitation policy is widely perceived as urgent and highly relevant because narcotics cases dominate the inmate population, making rehabilitation a core institutional need rather than a peripheral program. Inmates, officers, medical staff, counselors, and even families consistently describe rehabilitation as a practical pathway to break addiction cycles, reduce relapse risk, improve health and self-control, rebuild family trust, and prepare inmates for reintegration. Participants report substantial personal transformation discipline improves, thinking becomes more positive, social relations recover, and in some cases vocational productivity increases, while non-participants also recognize visible behavioral differences among those who join the program. These findings indicate that the policy produces meaningful and observable benefits at the micro level, confirming that rehabilitation can function as a transformative intervention for individuals when implemented in a structured manner.

At the same time, the same evidence reveals a persistent mismatch between the policy's normative intention and its operational reach. Although the policy targets a population that is numerically dominant and in urgent need, access to rehabilitation is restricted by quotas, administrative eligibility requirements (such as minimum sentence considerations), and, most decisively, limited funding. As a result, many inmates who want to participate cannot do so, generating perceptions of exclusion and inequity among the target group. In Grindle's terms, the interests affected by policy are only partially accommodated because the implementation capacity does not match the magnitude of need, producing selective rather than comprehensive delivery (Grindle, 1980). This

limitation is reinforced by the structure of decision-making: while operational coordination and team formation occur at the facility level through formal decrees and cross-unit planning, the most strategic levers program quota, scope, and budget remain largely controlled at higher administrative levels. The facility may manage screening and participant selection, but its room to expand coverage, protect funding, or redesign the program is constrained by centralized allocation and fiscal priorities, which can abruptly restrict implementation continuity. Consequently, the program tends to function within a narrow corridor of feasibility rather than as a fully scalable institutional intervention.

The characteristics of implementers further explain why micro-level success does not translate into macro-level outcomes. The program is delivered by a mixed network of internal staff medical officers, internal counselors, security personnel, instructors, and structural officials supported by external partners who provide specialized addiction counseling capacity. Coordination is generally reported as effective, helped by the fact that rehabilitation is tied to institutional performance targets that encourage inter-unit cooperation. However, internal implementers face role overload because rehabilitation duties must be performed alongside routine correctional tasks, and not all staff have received specialized addiction rehabilitation training. This makes the program dependent on external counselors to sustain service quality and maintain the counselor-to-client ratio needed for consistent psychosocial support. In the logic of Grindle's model, commitment may be strong, but implementer capacity and resource sufficiency remain decisive constraints that shape the actual intensity, continuity, and coverage of implementation (Grindle, 1980).

The strongest and most consistent barrier is the resources committed human resources, budget, and infrastructure. The study shows that the rehabilitation program is structurally under-resourced relative to the scale of narcotics-related incarceration, with limited trained internal counselors, budget vulnerability due to the absence of consistently protected funding lines, and constrained facilities where counseling and group activities must compete for limited space. These constraints directly determine program quota and continuity, meaning that the policy's reach remains small compared to the population in need. Even where the facility has a dedicated rehabilitation block, capacity limitations and the broader spatial pressures of overcrowding reduce flexibility, privacy, and service depth. This resource gap not only narrows program access but also weakens sustainability: after completing rehabilitation, many participants must return to general housing blocks due to long remaining sentences and limited separation space. In an overcrowded environment, the social ecology of the prison can be counterproductive peer influence, normalized deviance, and exposure to negative routines can erode the behavioral gains achieved during the program. Staff and inmates repeatedly identify this as a key relapse trigger, indicating that while the type of benefits is strong during participation, the maintenance environment is insufficient to stabilize long-term change.

These dynamics clarify why the degree of change envisioned by the policy is achieved only partially. At the individual level, the program intends to produce recovery, sustained behavioral transformation, and improved quality of life, and these changes are indeed visible during the program cycle. The use of WHOQOL-BREF as an evaluation tool supports this claim, as the facility measures perceived quality of life across physical, psychological, social, and environmental domains at multiple time points, and staff report positive shifts particularly in psychosocial functioning (WHO, 1998). Yet at the systemic level, the policy also implicitly carries expectations of contributing to overcrowding reduction either through reduced recidivism, better reintegration, or a broader shift toward rehabilitative handling of users. The study indicates that this systemic change has not emerged in a significant way because the program's internal coverage is too limited and because the primary drivers of overcrowding lie upstream in the criminal justice process. As long as narcotics users continue to enter prison in large numbers and diversion to community-based rehabilitation is inconsistently applied, prisons remain the final accumulation point of narcotics enforcement. Under these conditions, rehabilitation inside the facility becomes a downstream corrective measure that cannot meaningfully suppress inflow or reduce population pressure, even if it performs well for the minority it serves.

The context of implementation further consolidates this conclusion. Power and interests are distributed unevenly: leadership and structural officials have formal authority and strong institutional incentives to run the program, frontline staff exercise operational control in delivering daily interventions, while inmates, despite strong motivation to recover have limited power over access because selection is constrained by quota and administrative screening. External authorities retain decisive power over funding and targets, while partner organizations contribute expertise-based influence by supplying counselors and technical support. The resulting strategies are largely administrative and adaptive focused on delivering a structured daily regimen to a selected group rather than transforming the conditions that reproduce overcrowding. Institutional characteristics amplify these constraints: the facility's severe overcrowding simultaneously justifies rehabilitation and undermines its sustainability by restricting separation space and exposing post-program participants to adverse influences. Regime-level characteristics also matter, particularly the broader orientation of narcotics law enforcement that remains heavily punitive toward users in practice and the fiscal controls that can lock or limit rehabilitation funding, producing a gap between national mandates and local implementation capacity. Finally, compliance and responsiveness appear strong at the operational level staff generally follow procedures, inmates respond positively once enrolled, and demand among non-participants is high, but responsiveness at the system level remains capped by resource limits and structural pressures. Thus, compliance exists where the program can be run, yet many who need rehabilitation cannot be served, and many who complete it struggle to sustain gains without structured aftercare and environmental protection.

Taken together, the findings demonstrate that narcotics rehabilitation in Class I Medan Correctional Facility functions effectively as a micro-level recovery mechanism, producing real behavioral and psychosocial improvements among participants, but it has not yet become a macro-level solution to overcrowding because its coverage is restricted, resources are insufficient and unstable, post-program sustainability is undermined by the overcrowded prison environment, and upstream criminal justice practices continue to channel large numbers of narcotics cases into incarceration. In Grindle's terms, the content of policy is normatively strong and supported by stakeholders, but limited resources and constrained authority weaken its translation into broad action, while the context of implementation overcrowding, centralized budget control, and punitive upstream handling reduces the policy's ability to generate systemic change (Grindle, 1980). Therefore, achieving the dual goal of inmate recovery and overcrowding reduction requires more than maintaining rehabilitation inside the prison; it requires vertical integration between central policy design and local operational realities, protected and expanded funding, strengthened internal capacity and training, structured post-rehabilitation support within the prison, and consistent diversion or community-based rehabilitation mechanisms upstream so that rehabilitation is not merely a downstream remedy but part of a coherent system-wide strategy (WHO, 1998; Grindle, 1980).

## **CONCLUSION**

This study aimed to analyze the implementation of narcotics rehabilitation services in addressing overcrowding at Class I Medan Correctional Facility using the policy implementation framework proposed by Merilee S. Grindle. Based on the results of the data analysis and discussion, several key conclusions can be drawn. From the perspective of the content of policy, the implementation of the narcotics rehabilitation program has generally fulfilled several essential elements of policy design, including the clarity of affected interests, the provision of tangible benefits for inmates, and efforts to promote behavioral transformation as well as the development of social capacity among narcotics users. Nevertheless, the implementation process continues to face significant challenges, particularly in terms of limited human resources, inadequate facilities and infrastructure, and the suboptimal involvement of program implementers in delivering comprehensive rehabilitation services. From the standpoint of the context of implementation, the findings indicate that correctional actors at the institutional level demonstrate a relatively strong commitment to implementing rehabilitation policies. However, coordination among stakeholders both vertically with central authorities and horizontally across related institutions has not yet functioned synergistically. Furthermore, policy support from the central government is not always followed by responsive adaptation at the local level, resulting in a persistent gap between formal policy directives and their practical realization within the correctional environment.

Empirical evidence also confirms that the rehabilitation program contributes positively to reducing relapse rates and improving the socio-psychological condition of inmates participating in the program. Despite these individual-level benefits, the program's contribution to structurally addressing overcrowding remains limited. This is primarily due to the absence of legal instruments that explicitly enable rehabilitated inmates to access alternative sentencing mechanisms capable of reducing detention periods, such as community-based reintegration programs. Moreover, overcrowding in correctional institutions cannot be attributed solely to the high number of narcotics users but must also be understood within the broader framework of a sentencing system that remains predominantly incarceration-oriented. The existing system has yet to fully accommodate decriminalization measures or restorative justice approaches for narcotics users. Overall, these conclusions demonstrate that the study has systematically addressed its primary research focus concerning the implementation of narcotics rehabilitation policies in managing overcrowding at Class I Medan Correctional Facility. Through the application of Grindle's implementation theory, the analysis of both policy content and implementation context has enabled the identification of achievements, limitations, and implementation barriers. The empirical findings suggest that while rehabilitation programs yield positive outcomes in terms of inmate recovery and behavioral development, the policy has yet to significantly contribute to resolving overcrowding at a structural level.

## **REFERENCES**

- Agus, E., & Rati, D. 2012. Implementasi Kebijakan Publik: Konsep dan Aplikasinya Di Indoensia. Gava Media, Yogyakarta.
- Aini, K., & Wibowo, P. 2022. Implementasi Grand Design Penanganan Overcrowded Pada Lembaga Pemasyarakatan Kelas IIA Sibolga. *Innovative: Journal of science Research*: 145.
- Anisa, P., & Wibowo, P. 2021. Strategi Pencegahan Gangguan Keamanan dan Ketertiban di dalam Lapas Kelas III Surulangun Rawas. *Nusantara: Jurnal Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial*: 1085-1090.
- Azizah, E., Herawati, A. R., & Afrizal, T. 2023. Implementasi Kebijakan Penanganan Overcrowded di Rumah Tahanan IIB Siak Sri Indrapura (Studi Kasus Permenkumham No 11 Tahun 2017). *e-journal Universitas Diponegoro*: 1-15.
- Christianingsih, E. 2018. Implementasi Kebijakan Administrasi Kependudukan di Kabupaten Bandung. *Jurnal Ilmiah Magister Ilmu Administrasi*, 12(2): 1-14.
- Citrawan, H., & Zainuddin, D. 2015. Metode Analisis Konflik dalam Penerapan Regulasi Pencegahan Gangguan Keamanan dan Ketertiban di Lembaga Pemasyarakatan. *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia*: 1-33.
- Darwis, A., Dalimunthe, G. I., & Riadi, S. 2017. Narkoba, Bahaya dan Cara Mengantisipasinya. *Amaliyah: Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*: 36-45.
- Dye, T. R. 1992. *Understanding Public Policy*. Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- Fajri, A. H. 2023. Pelaksanaan Rehabilitasi Narkotika sebagai Upaya Perawatan Warga Binaan Pemasyarakatan Penyalahgunaan Narkotika di Lapas Kelas IIA Cibinong. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kajian Ilmu Sosial dan Budaya*: 35-53.
- Fattah, K. S. 2022. Efektivitas Pelaksanaan Program Rehabilitasi Sosial dalam Menekan Angka Residivis Pelaku Tindak Pidana Narkotika di Lembaga Pemasyarakatan Narkotika Kelas IIB Muara Sabak. *Jambi: Universitas Batanghari*.
- Fauziah, E., Fatrika, S., & Pratiwi, U. D. 2022. Keselarasan Lembaga Penegak Hukum dalam Implementasi Restorative Justice bagi Penyalahguna Narkotika di Indonesia. *Jurnal Kajian Stratejik ketahanan Nasional*: 64.
- Grindle, M. S. 1998. *Politics and Policy Implementation in The Third World*. Princeton University Press, New Jersey.

- Hardiansyah, T., & Widoyoko, W. D. 2024. Penegakan Hukum Peredaran Narkotika yang Terjadi di Lembaga Pemasyarakatan. *Judiciary: Jurnal Hukum dan Keadilan*: 113-126.
- Imasti, A. T., & Subroto, M. 2023. Dampak Overcrowded bagi Kesehatan Narapidana Wanita Hamil di Lembaga Pemasyarakatan. *Jurnal Intelektualita: Keislaman, Sosial dan Sains*: 491-497.
- Korten, D. C. 1988. *Pembangunan Berdimensi Kerakyatan*. Yayasan Obor, Jakarta.
- Lubis, L. H. 2021. Pelaksanaan Pembinaan Narapidana di Lembaga Pemasyarakatan Kelas IIA Pancur Batu Yang Overcrowded . *Locus: Jurnal Konsep Ilmu Hukum*: 27. (Studi tentang Kendaraan Dinas Operasional). *Jurnal MODERAT*, 7(4): 713-724.
- Octaviani, S., & Komalasari, D. 2017. Pengaruh Likuiditas, Profitabilitas dan Solvabilitas Terhadap Harga Saham (Studi Kasus pada Perusahaan PERbankan yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia). *Jurnal Akuntansi*, 3(2): 77-89.
- Parape, M. F., Muhadar, & Musakkir. 2021. mplementasi Pelaksanaan Rehabilitasi Narapidana Narkotika di Lembaga Pemasyarakatan Khusus Narkotika Kelas II A Sungguminasa. *PETITUM*, 9(2): 113-126.
- Prihastuty, D. 2023. *Pengantar Statistika*. PT. Mafy Media Literasi Indonesia, Solok.
- Rahmania, N., & Nirmala, A. Z. 2023. Relevansi antara Rehabilitasi Penyalahguna Narkotika dengan Lembaga Pemasyarakatan di Indonesia yang Mengalami Kelebihan Kapasitas. *Jurnal Risalah Kenotariatan*: 397-406.
- Ramadhani, W. S., Sulastri, S., & Nurhaqim, S. A. 2017. Proses Rehabilitasi Sosial Wanita Tuna Susila di Balai Rehabilitasi Sosial Karya Wanita (BRSKW) Palimanan Kabupaten Cirebon. *Jurnal Penelitian & PKM*: 241-245.
- Sugiana, P. M. 2012. Implementasi Kebijakan Penanggulangan Kemiskinan Melalui Program Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Kelompok Usaha Bersama (KUBE) Di Jakarta Selatan. Universitas Indonesia, Jakarta.
- Suharto, E. 2012. *Analisis Kebijakan Publik: Panduan Praktis Mengakaji Masalah Dan Kebijakan Sosial*. Alfabeta, Bandung.

- Thousani, H. F. 2015. Upaya Pengembangan E-Business dalam Pemasaran Produk secara Internasional. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, 23(1): 1-8.
- Tobing, N. T. 2019. COMMUNITY BASED CORRECTION: METODE ALTERNATIF. *Literacy : Jurnal Ilmiah Sosial*, Vol. 1 (1): 49.
- Utami, B. A., & Sokhivah. 2024. Intervensi Kelompok dalam Program Therapeutic Community bagi Warga Binaan Pemasyarakatan Penyalahguna Napza di Lembaga Pemasyarakatan Pemuda Kelas IIA Tangerang. *WISSEN : Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora*: 76-86.
- Wulandari, S. 2017. REHABILITASI SEBAGAI UPAYA PEMERINTAH DALAM PENANGGULANGAN PENYALAHGUNA NARKOTIKA. *Jurnal Spektrum Hukum*, 14 (2): 300.