Proceedings of ICILLP 2025 Symposium: Digital Governance: Inter-Firm Coopetition and Legal Frameworks for Sustainability
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BR28076

The Expansion of the Scope of Applicable Subjects for Community Correction from the Perspective of Socialized Execution: A Reference to the "Alternative Imprisonment" Model in Western Countries

Zhenghao Li

School of Humanities and Law, Northeast Forestry University, Harbin, China
19862478826@163.com

Abstract. Against the backdrop of the deepening concept of socialized execution, the connotation and function of the community corrections system urgently need broader expansion and reconstruction. This paper, based on the legislative status and practical dilemmas regarding the applicable objects of community corrections in China, systematically examines the operational mechanisms and institutional logic of the "alternative to incarceration" model in Western developed countries through a comparative law perspective, offering a critical deconstruction of its conceptual foundations, applicability standards, and practical effectiveness. Building on this analysis, the paper proposes a gradual expansion plan for the scope of applicable objects in China's community corrections, clarifying a reconstruction path combining "intra-system optimization and gradual reform." This aims to enable the community corrections system to play a greater role in effectively alleviating the burdens of imprisonment and promoting offender reintegration, thereby providing intellectual support for the modern transformation of China's criminal execution system.

Keywords: Socialized Execution, Community Corrections, Alternative to Incarceration

1. Introduction

Traditional closed prison models can not meet the requirement of the offender resocialization in the modern society. Socialized execution is based on rehabilitation and educational punishment theories. It has become major trend in global criminal justice. In fact, China still has high application rate of imprisonment. This leads to rising costs and prison cross-infection and the reintegration of offenders becomes difficult. So there are growing calls to expand non-custodial punishments [1]. Among these, community corrections can stand out as a mature measure that is used in socialized execution [2].

China's community corrections system has developed over twenty years. It started from local pilots and then the Community Corrections Law of the People's Republic of China was enacted in 2020. However, because China is late adopter of this Western model, the system faces many

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BR28076

challenges. The law gives basic framework. But specific rules and procedural links remain underdeveloped. Also, social support mechanisms are not fully developed in current stage. Non-custodial punishment rates have stayed around 30%. This can reflect that the systemic underperformance is serious. Low probation usage, poor implementation of control punishments, dysfunctional fine systems, and strict parole conditions can limit effectiveness [1]. In fact, cases such as revocation of probation for Chen in Anhui due to repeated violations reveal operational flaws like "nominal supervision" and "loss of control", and these problems can hinder deeper reform.

Academic debate still continues between "narrow-scope" and "institutional-conservatism" views, and it highlights the tension between penal leniency and China's dual-punishment structure. In fact, we suggest to expand scope of community corrections with caution. It is worth noting that we examine "alternative imprisonment" models from U.S. and U.K., and we also look at Japan to find useful institutional experience, and then we propose a path that can expand the system according to China's criminal policy and actual conditions. Also, using socio-legal perspective, we evaluate if the proposed reforms can adapt to local conditions and have scientific soundness.

2. Overview of socialized execution and applicable objects of community corrections

2.1. The dual implications of socialized execution

Socialized execution mainly aims to help offenders return to society. It includes some concepts and institutional systems, and we can see that its meaning is quite rich because it includes both participation of social forces and use of social resources during punishment execution process, and it also shows the value change from retributivism towards restorative justice. This concept can help reduce recidivism, save judicial resources, and we also believe it can support offender resocialization.

2.1.1. Socialized execution at the conceptual level

Socialized execution tries to move beyond the closed punitive models through societal participation. It can help improve offenders' social reintegration by using education, correction, psychological intervention and other community resources, and in fact it reflects humanitarian values because we respect dignity and developmental rights at the same time. Also, it has pragmatic goals such as reducing recidivism and lowering costs for government.

It is worth noting that socialized execution is different from humanized execution. The latter focuses on idealistic rights protection, while the former includes practical crime control and policy efficiency, so we can see that these two concepts can have different goals in the criminal justice system and can be treated separately in our research. Rooted in legal humanism, this approach should use a human-centered principle in criminal legislation and justice, as well as enforcement. Its realization can go beyond execution into legislative design and post-sentence support, and multi-agent participation is needed together with updated public attitudes, as well as systematic institutional construction that can support the whole system and make the policy work well in practice.

2.1.2. Socialized execution at the institutional level

Institutional socialized execution has two core dimensions: within-prison and extra-prison.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BR28076

Within-prison socialized execution brings social resources and relations into prison environment, and this approach can in principle reduce the isolation caused by imprisonment and help offenders with reintegration when they eventually return to society after completing their sentences in the facility. We can see this in open and semi-open prisons, where some or all physical isolation is removed under the security supervision so that restraints are relaxed and offenders can contact society, or they can work, or they can study, and all these are under monitoring. The key point is to balance "security control" and "reintegration preparation". It prevents risks. At the same time it provides social adaptation training. Also there are external communication systems and temporary release for family visits, and it is worth noting that these maintain offenders family ties and social cognition for life after release, and this is important for their future reintegration process. The progressive treatment system divides sentences into different stages and adjusts methods by prison performance, and this can reflect the idea we mentioned before, and it gives incentives for reform and can restore social capacity for the offenders. Extra-prison socialized execution is about punishment execution or correction in the social environments. It mainly includes ex-offender protection and community corrections. Ex-offender protection focuses on post-release social acceptance. In fact, it gives guidance and uses employment support and counseling, and also assistance. This can reduce reintegration barriers and avoid recidivism. Community corrections (a non-custodial alternative to imprisonment) puts eligible offenders in the communities, and it uses social resources for supervision and education, and also assistance, so it can in principle achieve the goals of punishment and support, and also reintegration for the offenders who are placed there.

Now, within-prison socialized execution has a mature system with much research and practice. But extra-prison socialized execution, especially community corrections, is still developing. In fact, application scope can be limited. Also, measure diversity is insufficient and the social support systems are not complete, so further theoretical innovation and institutional optimization are needed.

2.2. Overview of applicable objects for community corrections

2.2.1. Basic theory of community corrections

Community corrections also has many other names. People call it "community punishment," "community treatment," "rehabilitation protection," or "rehabilitation service" in different countries. It is worth noting that there is no unified definition internationally [3]. In China, 2003 Notice first defined it as a non-custodial punishment which can be used for rehabilitating eligible offenders in the community, and this process should be supported by state organs and social forces. Then, 2020 Community Corrections Law of the People's Republic of China does not give a explicit definition, and it focuses instead on the functional goal that can ensure the proper execution of criminal sentences.

If we compare with Western countries, we can find that China's understanding of community corrections is narrow because it covers mainly the execution of punishments within community and does not include broader aspects such as post-release support and juvenile protection which are very important for the whole correction process. Western systems have a different approach and they include tracking assistance, employment support, psychological services and other welfare measures, so the system shows a stronger welfare orientation and a resocialization approach that can help offenders return to society and reduce the possibility of recommitting crimes in the future. Also, with progress in socialized execution and minor offense governance, we should redefine community corrections in a broad way. It should be understood as an integrated social treatment system that can

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BR28076

combine sentence execution and post-release assistance together so that the whole process can form a continuous support network for the offenders and help them adapt to social life after release.

About the legal nature, most researchers in China support the "punishment execution theory," and they treat community corrections as alternative to imprisonment. But this view is too narrow. It is worth noting that we can regard community corrections as a full criminal justice activity that includes both punishment and social governance. It is based on socialized execution, penal humanitarianism, restorative justice, and the principle of moderation in criminal law, and it can protect human rights while helping with social integration. Because of influence from social welfare ideas and the "Big Society" concept since the 1960s, community correctionshas balanced individual development with social interests.

With ongoing criminal justice reform, community corrections can be seen as a dual-purpose institution which includes punitive elements and can fulfill educational, social support and welfare functions. It is a method of non-custodial punishment. Also, it is a socialized treatment system integrating supervision, correction, assistance and reintegration. In fact, this definition can enhance its inclusivity and align with its role as a modern governance tool.

2.2.2. The concept of applicable objects for community corrections

In fact, the applicable objects of community corrections means those persons subjected to it and we think this concept should be defined as:"offenders eligible for community corrections, also ex-offenders, and those illegal persons undergoing re-education through labor who do not yet constitute a crime, within criminal law enforcement activities." [4]

2.3. Legislative and developmental status of applicable objects in community corrections

2.3.1. Legislative status of applicable objects in community corrections

The development of China's community corrections system is gradual. It is a phased legislative process. In 2003, the Supreme People's Court, Supreme People's Procuratorate, Ministry of Public Security, and Ministry of Justice issued the "Notice on Carrying out Pilot Work on Community Corrections". This document defined five categories of offenders who can be placed in community corrections: those sentenced to control, granted probation, serving sentences temporarily outside prison, granted parole, or deprived of political rights serving in the community. In fact, this Notice can be regarded as the initial framework for the system.

Then legal revision made the scope more clear. The Criminal Law Amendment (VIII) started from May 1, 2011, and it specified that community corrections can apply to offenders sentenced to control, probation and also parole, while temporary release and deprivation of political rights were omitted at this stage. Then the Criminal Procedure Law Amendment became effective on January 1, 2013. It reinstated temporary release from prison so the four categories were finalized and are in force today, which includes control, probation, parole, and temporary release. In fact, the Community Corrections Law of the People's Republic of China became effective on July 1, 2020, and it affirmed this scope, which is expected to maintain the consistency with basic criminal laws and can provide legal basis for current practice.

Based on the legal principles that "superior law prevails over inferior law" and "new law prevails over old," applicable objects of community corrections are now limited to these four types. It is worth noting that this evolution reflects practical constraints. Also, lawmakers maintain cautious approach when expanding the scope and this can help avoid risks in system development.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BR28076

2.3.2. Analysis of unfavorable factors in the development of applicable objects in community corrections

We can see that community corrections system has developed for nearly two decades. However, applicable scope is still constrained by many unfavorable factors. This leads to slow progress in socialized execution and the effectiveness can be limited. It is worth noting that criminal law structure still shows severe punishment characteristics. The dominant position of imprisonment has not been shaken. Also, recognition of socialized execution in social governance and criminal justice is still insufficient. Statistics show that minor offense cases remain around 80% over the past decade and this ratio has a slowly rising trend, however the actual application rate of non-custodial punishments has long stagnated at about 30% which reflects weak promotion of community corrections in practice and its function is underutilized. In fact, the criminal circle is expanded and the threshold for incriminating some offenses is increased which has increased the base for applying imprisonment and at the same time strict requirements for minimum service periods in punishment execution exist and these requirements have lengthened the actual time served by offenders. This can further limit the application space for community corrections. We note that these structural factors exacerbate prison population pressure. Also, they compress the institutional capacity of community corrections. This causes its application rate to hover at a low level for a long time [5].It can be argued that community corrections endeavor faces a practical dilemma. Legislative progress and judicial conservatism coexist.

2.3.2.1. Conceptual factors

The tradition of severe punishmentism is deeply rooted in criminal culture. It is worth noting that modern legal system construction has not fully removed its influence. Under this concept, imprisonment is seen as main way to maintain social order, while non-custodial measures like community corrections are often questioned for their punitive effect and social safety. The mindset of "emphasizing crackdown, neglecting correction" can make the public tend to exclude offenders from normal society and not support reintegration through social channels, and the judicial practice sector also tends to avoid responsibility characterized by "preferring left over right" and "preferring severe over lenient," and this can be seen in the case-handling convention of "emphasizing sentence reduction, neglecting parole." Judicial officers tend to adopt conservative punishment execution strategies to avoid potential recidivism risks associated with community corrections. In fact, these conceptual obstacles can constrain reasonable expansion of community corrections objects.

2.3.2.2. Institutional factors

There exist long-standing problems regarding criminal execution power. The allocation is dispersed and execution resources are not well integrated. Courts, public security organs and prison administration authorities exercise execution power separately, so the power structure is dispersed and linkage mechanisms can be poor. Also, execution power has a weak status in criminal justice system. It is less emphasized compared with investigative power, prosecution power and adjudication power. In fact, this structural imbalance affects execution efficiency. Also, it can hinder the establishment of execution authority for community corrections. Although the "Community Corrections Law" designates judicial administrative organs as executing bodies, basic-level judicial offices face many problems. These include limited authority, insufficient professional capacity, and

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BR28076

they lack coercive means. So it is hard to undertake the compound functions of supervision, correction, risk control and social assistance.

2.3.2.3. Technical factors

Community corrections should rely on scientific supervision methods and also a professional workforce. Currently, our country is in preliminary exploration stage regarding modern correction technologies such as electronic monitoring, big data tracking, and psychological assessment, while the recidivism prediction is also not mature, and we have not yet established a nationally unified intelligent management platform and risk classification assessment system. It is worth noting that proportion of professionals with interdisciplinary backgrounds in criminology, sociology, psychology, etc., among the community corrections staff is relatively low, and many areas rely on traditional manual supervision methods. This can constrain refinement and scientific level of correction work.

2.3.2.4. Community building factors

We observe that implementing community corrections effectively needs a mature community governance system. But in fact, many regions still face problems like low community organization level and weak resource integration capacity. Also, resident participation awareness is insufficient. The multi-department collaboration mechanisms and channels for introducing social forces required for community corrections are not yet sound, and volunteer service systems also have problems, so it can be difficult to form a sustained and effective support environment. Also, the public's exclusionary attitude and labeling mindset towards offenders can increase the difficulty of community acceptance and cooperation, and correctional objects are left in the dilemma of "adequate supervision but insufficient integration."

In short, expanding scope of applicable objects for community corrections is not just legal amendment. It is a systematic project. This project involves conceptual renewal, institutional reform, and also the technological empowerment with social construction. In fact, we need multi-party linkage and gradual advancement and we can achieve deep institutional breakthroughs on path of socialized execution.

3. Overview, summary, and insights from overseas applicable objects of community corrections

Western countries have built mature normative and operational systems for community corrections through decades of practice. This experience can provide reference for other regions. In fact, we examine United States and United Kingdom (common law systems) and Japan (civil law system) as representative models, and their legal traditions and socio-cultural contexts are considered. These jurisdictions have extensive expertise in classification and treatment of offenders. Also they have rich experience in management.

The U.S. has decentralized approach. It includes pre-trial diversion, probation, parole and intermediate sanctions. Also, social participation and judicial discretion are emphasized.The U.K. combines criminal justice with social welfare. It applies community corrections to juveniles, short-term offenders and also low-risk individuals. Structured risk-assessment system is used.Japan combines the modern correctionalthoughtwith social contexts through probation and rehabilitation systems, and it can focus on reintegration and societal acceptance. We compare these systems. It is

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BR28076

worth noting that some key principles can be identified, such as scientific classification, risk assessment, judicial-administrative coordination and also dynamic adjustment. Then, we propose recommendations for specific contexts. These can help expand community corrections and advance socialized execution.

3.1. Overview of overseas applicable objects for community corrections

It is worth noting that United States is the origin of community corrections. It has developed full system over century of practice, and under the Minnesota Community Corrections Act, it can cover adult and youth offenders, pre-trial detainees, convicted individuals, and also released prisoners, so we can say the applicable subjects include almost all stages of criminal process and this makes the scope very wide in principle. Also, we can see the scope is very broad. Then, the Model Community Corrections Act covers misdemeanants, non-violent felony offenders, probation or parole violators, and even offenders outside these categories that are suitable for community-based handling under judicial discretion, which means the system is expected to include many different offender types in practice.

In UK, community corrections is put in the penal system as a middle level punishment between fines and imprisonment. It is mainly applied through court orders for medium severity crimes. These include probation orders for people over 16 (excluding murder), community service orders requiring unpaid work, and curfew orders to restrict movement for people older than 10. Also we have attendance centre orders for young people with activities led by volunteers, and drug treatment orders can be used for people over 16 who choose to join. And action plan orders require juveniles to follow supervised behavior guidelines.

We review that Japan's community corrections system was built in the 20th century and offender community treatment was expanding at that time. Scope of social treatment can be broad. But its core has two systems—probation and rehabilitation protection (Hogo Kansatsu, Kosei Hogo)—which we can see as broad-sense community corrections. Now we look at the probation system. It can give conditional social protection with time limits and it supervises probationers. Targets are delinquent youths in social treatment and offenders sentenced to probation or parole. Specialized agencies and personnel can support this. In fact, rehabilitation protection system comes from social protection for released prisoners. It is worth noting that the 1950 Emergency Rehabilitation Protection Law required emergency aid for released prisoners who struggle to reintegrate. This includes temporary shelter and supplies like food, money and medical care. Also, instruction and training are provided to improve their conditions and prevent desperate acts. According to the Rehabilitation Protection Law, Japan's community corrections objects include probation supervisees, those with criminal suspension of execution (probation), parolees, bail recipients, medical parolees, released or pardoned prisoners, and others who need legal rehabilitation protection such as those wanting to stay after facility residence expires.

3.2. Summary of overseas applicable objects for community corrections

The applicable objects of community corrections in the above three countries have their own characteristics, but through summarization, they can provide reference for the development and improvement of community corrections.

In United States, the applicable objects of community corrections are not strictly limited to certain offenders. It covers various types. In fact, the judgment on whether to apply is based on whether they can endanger public safety [6]. Also, there are diverse forms in U.S., including

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BR28076

diversion and intermediate sanctions, and it integrates probation, intensive parole supervision, etc., so community corrections can run through the entire criminal justice process—pre-trial, trial, and post-trial—and in principle the applicable objects can be expanded to cover more offenders at different stages.

In UK community corrections, the community order form can make individualization prominent. Based on the case and offender, we apply different types of community orders, which can expand scope and precision of application throughout execution process. Attendance centre orders and action plan orders can show that community corrections is separately applied to juvenile delinquency.

Japanese community corrections can be seen as combination of probation and rehabilitation protection systems. In fact, it can apply to many people including offenders who are still in community and also released prisoners who have finished their prison terms, and this means the coverage is quite wide compared to other systems. It has punishment and reform. Also, assistance and welfare characteristics are demonstrated.

3.3. Insights from overseas applicable objects for community corrections

The three countries mentioned above can have different specific types of community corrections subjects, but their scope can include offenders and delinquent juveniles, and also released prisoners are covered in system, which means classification is not fixed because it depends on individual crime circumstances and offender characteristics. So the measures can be applied when conditions are met. This approach is consistent with socialized execution principles. In fact, it can fit trend of minor offenses era. In contrast, we find that subjects in China are clearly defined and they are fixed, and the scope is narrow, so we need to expand the scope and then system can realize its intended functions in practice. Juveniles account for large part of subjects in these countries where non-custodial measures can be applied to youth offenses, and this embodies socialized execution and best interests of child principle, and also it considers optimal minor welfare. So it can help education and reformation and rehabilitation work is also supported. But China's provisions for minors do not have these features. Probation is where community corrections originated abroad, and it forms core of subjects globally with parole, and this is proved through extensive practice in many countries, and foreign probation rates and conditions are more expansive and open than those in China.

4. Lessons and warnings from the western "alternative to incarceration" model

4.1. Deconstruction of typical western models

4.1.1. United States: pre-trial diversion programs and intermediate sanctions

China can expand community corrections eligibility to meet the requirement of socialized execution and penal leniency. At present, this eligibility is limited to those under control, probation, parole, or temporary release. We should adopt Western "alternative imprisonment" models through intra-system optimization and gradual reform. In China legal framework, practices like France's public work requirements and Finland's probation system can help improve probation and parole. Also, individualized sentencing with graded interventions, referring to UK community orders, and pre-trial measures like bail or conditional non-prosecution can cover unsentenced suspects and re-offending risks can be reduced. For juveniles, social resources and special schools, similar to UK attendance centre orders, can improve rehabilitation. Pre-trial diversion is a non-criminal approach

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BR28076

for minor offenders, particularly juveniles, and it can avoid labeling effects and "prisonization" by allowing prosecutors to dismiss charges when the program is completed. However, unchecked prosecutorial discretion raises fairness concerns [7]. Gradual expansion should target minor offenders, including juveniles, elderly, non-violent economic criminals and first-time offenders, through legislative updates and detailed rules. Intermediate sanctions emerged in the 1980s as a compromise between incarceration and probation, and they include intensive supervision, home confinement, and community service, which can balance public safety and offender reform through tiered control [7]. These sanctions can alleviate prison pressure, reduce costs, and support fair sentencing, but they face issues like state overreach, privacy concerns, and recidivism [7]. In fact, US diversion programs and intermediate sanctions can balance crime control, public safety, judicial economy and cost reduction, and they offer lessons for China's cautious expansion, and this should be supported by scientific assessments and robust post-release systems so that effectiveness can be ensured.

4.1.2. United Kingdom: community order system

As we mentioned before, the UK's community order system includes many punishment types with various community correction orders, and we have detailed the specific types before and we do'nt repeat them here. In fact, we focus on the entire community order system. The construction of community order system can be related to the formation and improvement of each correction order, which in turn depends on the legislature's summary of experiences from criminal law and criminal policy research and practical judgments based on specific situations. Each correction order has applicable objects and conditions, and it reflects the principles of penal individualization and balance. We can combine correction orders based on assessments of crime severity, offender risk level, and also needs, so personalized sentencing schemes can be formed, and this can broaden scope of community corrections application while it can improve the precision. Community orders complement each other and work together, so it builds a systematic community order system that provides institutional support for community corrections.

4.1.3. Germany: probation assistance and conduct supervision

We introduce the probation system in German Criminal Code. Probation helpers should assist and supervise the probationers. Their work includes helping the court to check if probationers follow court orders and obligations, and they should also give guidance and care to those people who are under supervision, which can help them return to society and avoid committing crimes again. In fact, there are two main functions. One is assistance and another is supervision. Assistance can help probationers to build self-confidence and life skills. Also, it includes educational guidance and financial guidance. Supervision means enforcing regulations about daily life, work, leisure and finances, and it requires regular reporting, and at the same time contact with people or groups that can lead to re-offending should be restricted according to the court's decision. It is worth noting that if violations happen or new offenses occur, the probation can be revoked or extended [8].

Probation helpers collect information by phone calls, office meetings, or through home visits. They want to know the living conditions, family situation, money status, and social relations of the probationer so that they can understand the full picture of this person and make proper plans according to the actual situation they found in community. They look at why the offense happened. Also they make assistance plans and visit regularly. For the balance of public security and privacy protection, the offices are put in communities in a discreet way that can avoid too much attention. It

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BR28076

is worth noting that they avoid contacting family or employers if there is no consent from the probationer, and they will discuss the report content with probationers before submitting it to the court for review. They have no power to give rewards or punishment. But they can report to the judge or give recommendations about what actions should be taken in the next step. This approach can support the rehabilitation process, and at the same time it should protect the rights of probationers and can help improve the final outcomes. Conduct supervision is a stricter form of oversight for high-risk offenders who need more control in the community, and it includes residence restrictions, limits on activities and associations, treatment mandates, and electronic monitoring such as ankle bracelets that can track the location of the offender at any time. Germany's probation assistance and conduct supervision show the concept of state-society cooperation, which is a key feature of the system, and they emphasize giving offenders help and support while protecting the public so that the reintegration into society can be promoted and the community safety can be ensured.

4.2. Possibility and warnings of system transplantation

The term "model" means a standard pattern for people to copy, and it evolves from physical objects to include non-physical systems like methods and structures, while the core attributes of typicality and imitability can be kept in this long and complex development process [9]. The Western "alternative to incarceration" model is a example, and it is a mature system based on evidence and developed through extensive practice, and it has typicality and imitability. It includes universal objectives across jurisdictions, and it balances public safety with offender resocialization while it minimizes imprisonment and can curb recidivism, which is in line with socialized execution principles that are accepted in many countries. In fact, shared global challenges exist, including high prison costs and overcrowding, and these challenges provide a practical rationale for borrowing that many countries can accept as a common solution. Also it is supported by China's 20 years of community corrections experience and supportive legal structures like Community Corrections Law and parole, which offer a solid institutional base for integration in current system. Nonetheless, adopting such systems demands attention to institutional compatibility and cultural fit, and we should also consider new space, because mere replication falls short and we need creative adaptation and localization to address variances in legal traditions and societal contexts, and also public views, so we can ensure efficacy in China's distinct environment. We examine strategies for realizing this adaptation.

5. Path reconstruction for expanding the scope of community corrections objects: intra-system optimization and gradual reform

China should expand the scope of offenders who can receive the community corrections. This is important for the socialized execution and penal leniency. In fact, at present, the system only includes four categories: individuals sentenced to control, probation, parole, or temporary release. It has a gap compared to Western "alternative imprisonment" models. We propose a two-track strategy and it includes intra-system optimization and gradual reform. This can help broaden eligibility in a careful way. Intra-system optimization can adapt international measures within China's existing legal framework. This includes diversifying probation and parole. We draw on France's unpaid public work and Finland's full probation models. It is worth noting that supervision and correction methods should be enriched. We use graded interventions inspired by the UK's community orders and France's community service. Pre-trial measures—bail, conditional non-prosecution, as well as

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BR28076

prosecutorial discretion—can also integrate with the community corrections. This covers unsentenced suspects and improves oversight. It reduces risks like evidence tampering. For juveniles, introducing social resources and open education approaches is helpful. This is similar to UK attendance centres, and in fact this can support rehabilitation.

This approach gives a practical base for deeper reform. We should align the gradual expansion with legislative, judicial, enforcement, and public awareness efforts, and also stronger supervision and diversified measures, so that we can ensure the system works well in practice. Legislation should include minor offenders such as certain juveniles, the elderly, non-violent economic criminals, and less severe duty-related violators. In fact, detailed implementation rules for Community Corrections Law are needed and can standardize procedures. Pre-trial expansion inspired by U.S. diversion programs and the principle of leniency can allow prosecutors to direct minor and juvenile cases to community corrections and enables earlier intervention. At the same time, integrating social resources as in Germany probation assistance can improve public participation and modernize attitudes toward rehabilitation. Intermediate sanctions like those in U.S. can help balance wider eligibility with public safety and we should also build scientific assessment mechanisms. Also, stronger post-release support is needed to ensure prudent and effective expansion.

6. Conclusion

It is worth noting that socialized execution is now becoming a global trend in many countries. Expanding the scope of community corrections has become a necessary task in penal reform and we cannot avoid it because the traditional incarceration system faces many pressures from both budget constraints and humanitarian concerns that require new solutions in current criminal justice practice. We examine both conceptual dimension and institutional dimension of socialized execution. In fact, we can build a theoretical foundation that is expected to support the rational broadening of eligibility for community corrections in criminal justice system so that more suitable offenders can be included in community-based treatment programs according to their specific conditions and risk levels. We also make a comparison with Western countries. Their "alternative to incarceration" models include systematic categorization of applicable subjects and risk assessment mechanisms, and they also have social participation channels that can help integrate offenders into society so valuable references can be offered for conditional adaptation in China.

Using a comparative approach focused on the United States, the United Kingdom, and Japan, this paper proposes a dual strategy of "intra-system optimization" and "gradual reform." This entails refining existing supervisory procedures while progressively incorporating specific groups such as short-term, elderly, and juvenile offenders into community corrections, adapted to China's social context and policy environment. It should be acknowledged that this study remains primarily theoretical and normative; further empirical research is needed to verify the feasibility and effectiveness of the proposed expansion. Future efforts should focus not only on operational standards, risk control, and outcome evaluation, but also on contextual factors such as community resources, public acceptance, and interagency collaboration. Ultimately, the expansion of community corrections requires legislative support and judicial practice to truly take root. It is hoped that this research provides academic reference for future legal revisions and practical guidance in criminal justice.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BR28076

References

[1] Hong Hao, Yu Dawei. Problems, Causes and Their Resolution of Socialized Execution of Minor Crimes in China [J]. Journal of People's Public Security University of China (Social Sciences Edition), 2025, 41(02): 1-14.
[2] Yang Fan. Exploration of the Socialization of Execution Mechanisms [J]. Nanjing Social Sciences, 2013, (02): 92-96+103. DOI: 10.15937/j.cnki.issn1001-8263.2013.02.011.
[3] Wang Aili, Jiang Aidong. Interpretation of the Community Corrections Law of the People's Republic of China [M]. Beijing: China Democratic Legal System Publishing House, 2020: 28.
[4] Zhang Cuicui. Reflection and Reconstruction of the Applicable Objects of Community Corrections from a Comparative Law Perspective [D]. Jilin University, 2013.
[5] Ma Jianbo. Research on Community Corrections Issues under the Background of Socialized Execution [D]. Soochow University, 2017.
[6] Li Ming. Investigation and Reference of Major Foreign Community Corrections Models [J]. Chinese Judiciary, 2008, (01): 99-105.
[7] Cai Guoqin. The Intermediate Sanction System in the American Community Corrections System [J]. Present Day Law Science, 2007, (06): 83-91.
[8] Jiang Aidong, Lu Lan, Fei Xianghong, et al. Overview of Community Corrections in Germany [J]. Chinese Judiciary, 2005, (11): 100-105.
[9] Tian Xinghong. On the Community Participation Model in Community Corrections in China and Its Optimization Path—From the Perspective of Comparative Research on Community Participation Models in Community Corrections between China and the United States [J]. Journal of Social Science of Hunan Normal University, 2015, 44(02): 94-100.