



SOCIAL SANCTIONS AS PRESSURE INSTRUMENTS IN COMPLIANCE WITH NON COURT INHERITANCE DIVISION AGREEMENTS

Reno Suhandoko, Rommy Hardyansah, Rafadi Khan Khayru

Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya

correspondence: dr.rommyhardyansah@gmail.com

Abstract

Non court inheritance division often relies on family agreement upheld by community judgment. This article offers a normative account of social sanctions as a pressure instrument that sustains compliance with privately made inheritance arrangements. It clarifies the forms of social sanctioning such as reputational labeling, exclusion from kin support, moral shaming, and narrative control, and explains how these mechanisms operate through expectations of honor and reciprocity. The discussion distinguishes legitimate social reminders that protect fairness from coercive pressures that erode voluntary consent and silence justified objection. It proposes criteria for assessing consent quality, procedural fairness in deliberation, and responsibility in execution after agreement is reached. The article further outlines governance principles for mediation and documentation that respect family autonomy while preserving individual dignity and equal voice among heirs. The framework highlights how informal enforcement can stabilize agreements yet also reproduce hierarchy when left unchecked. It concludes by identifying normative safeguards that help align social enforcement with justice oriented settlement in inheritance matters resolved outside court. Attention is given to the timing of sanctions during negotiation and during distribution, showing why compliance may persist even without formal authority.

Keywords: social sanctions, inheritance agreement, compliance, honor, informal oversight, consent quality, procedural fairness.

Introduction

The distribution of inheritance in social life is often understood as a private family event, yet it is actually a convergence of norms, interests, and social evaluations. When someone passes away, ownership transforms into a collective matter for the heirs, and this shift demands a relatively simultaneous recognition of who is entitled to what (Sholeh, 2023). It is at this level that family agreements function as a regulatory mechanism, particularly when non-litigation paths are chosen to maintain familial relationships and avoid public exposure. Such agreements are not merely a list of shares, but also a statement of a sense of justice, propriety, and the shame associated with violations. In many situations, compliance with the agreement arises due to moral bonds formed by blood relations, family reputation, and the views of the surrounding community. This compliance is often maintained through the language of honor and obligation, which binds individuals to restrain themselves from unilateral claims. Thus, non-litigation inheritance provides a rich space to read how social norms become controllers of behavior.

The non-litigation path in inheritance distribution places family deliberation (*musyawarah*) at the center of legitimacy, as decisions are born from consent that is viewed as voluntary (Mandasari et al., 2022). However, voluntariness within family relations is often intertwined with strong social expectations. These expectations manifest in collective assessments of who is considered devoted, who is considered greedy, and who is considered a defiler of the family name. In such circumstances, social sanctions can function as subtle yet effective instruments of pressure, for example, in the form of ostracism, gossip, loss of kin support, or a decrease in respect within social circles. Such sanctions work through the fear of losing recognition, so that adherence to the agreement is often maintained without the need for formal threats. However, because social sanctions rely on perception and relations, the same pressing force can be used to maintain order or to close the space for legitimate objections. This is where sociological and normative discussions become essential, as compliance can be born from moral consciousness, but it can also arise from pressure that locks down freedom of opinion.

The settlement of inheritance distribution outside of court is often idealized as a more peaceful choice (Wibowo et al., 2022). This idea rests on the belief that a family knows its internal needs and can find common ground without summoning state authority. However, the process of reaching an agreement is often influenced by hierarchies of age, economic status, emotional closeness, and symbolic positions within the family. Those considered elders or respected figures can become the deciders of the conversation's direction, while others adapt for the sake of maintaining harmony (Sholeh, 2023). At the implementation stage, the agreement demands sustained compliance, as distribution is not always completed in a single meeting, and realization may require time. In this phase, social sanctions appear as a reminder mechanism that links promises with informal oversight. Informal oversight is not always intentional, as family and neighbors may judge behavior through circulating stories. This judgment reinforces moral pressure so that promises are fulfilled, while simultaneously creating the risk of stigma if any party delays or disputes the matter.

Social sanctions as a pressuring instrument work through several mutually reinforcing paths. First, they utilize reputation as social capital, so that a breach of agreement is understood as a character flaw that can affect work relations, business relations, and community relations. Second, they work through group solidarity, where a party deemed to be in violation may lose support in other family events, such as weddings, deaths, or the need for economic assistance. Third, they utilize shame, which is a social emotion that arises when actions are judged inconsistent with standards of honor. Fourth, they are linked to the fear of isolation, especially for individuals whose lives still depend on the family network. In many cases, environmental pressures like these are often the primary factors driving someone to follow existing rules (Aidan Bin Abdullah, 2021). In non-litigation inheritance distribution, these paths often react faster than formal mechanisms, as social evaluation can emerge immediately after news spreads. However, high pressing power also raises normative questions about appropriate boundaries. If social sanctions are used to force consent, then the agreement loses its moral quality as a responsible consensus. This indicates that cultural influences and local

beliefs play a very large role in determining how law is implemented in the midst of society (Aliyah & Evendi, 2023).

It is essential to position non-litigation inheritance agreements as normative events that demand clarity regarding freedom, consent, and responsibility (Hasanah et al., 2019). An agreement considered valid should ideally be born from an adequate understanding of the inheritance objects and from a reasonable opportunity to express an opinion. However, within family relations, the opportunity to voice an opinion can be constrained by a sense of psychological reluctance (*rasa sungkan*), by pressure to obey elders, or by the anxiety of becoming a subject of public gossip. Social sanctions reinforce these limitations when an objection is perceived as defiance. On the other hand, social sanctions can act as internal guardians of justice when they prevent a powerful party from taking an excessive share. This ambivalence indicates that social sanctions cannot be assessed solely as tools for order, but must be understood as mechanisms that can strengthen compliance while simultaneously harboring the risk of injustice (Khilmi et al., 2021). A careful normative reading needs to evaluate when social pressure maintains a fair agreement and when it transforms deliberation into forced compliance through fear and stigma.

The issues that emerge relate to the basis of the legitimacy of compliance in non-litigation inheritance distribution agreements. Compliance is often praised as a sign of maturity and brotherhood, yet the critical question is what makes that compliance morally worthy. If compliance rests on threats of ostracism or a decline in dignity, then compliance becomes a product of pressure rather than a result of high-quality consent. In the family sphere, the dividing line between persuasion and coercion is often blurred because persuasion can be accompanied by cues regarding social consequences. When a family judges that maintaining a good reputation is more paramount than examining the fairness of the distribution, individuals may feel obligated to agree to something they do not actually understand or support. This dilemmatic situation often causes the interests of weaker individuals to be neglected for the sake of maintaining communal peace (Fajar et al., 2021). This problem demands a conceptual formulation of social sanctions as a pressing instrument, including how the instrument shapes

compliance, how it produces compliance that appears voluntary, and how it regulates the boundaries of speech during deliberation. Without a firm normative explanation, agreements are easily treated as final even if the process leaves behind ambiguity.

Another problem lies in the relationship between social sanctions and the sustainability of the agreement. Non-litigation inheritance agreements are often considered settled once a document or statement of consent is made, whereas compliance is truly tested during the realization phase. In this phase, social sanctions can change form—from pressure to agree into pressure to remain silent when discrepancies occur. Therefore, traditional methods of resolving problems are usually preferred because they are considered more capable of embracing various differing interests (Futriyah et al., 2023). An individual who witnesses a deviant implementation may hesitate to offer a correction for fear of being labeled a conflict-starter. Consequently, social order appears maintained, but that order is paid for with the sedimentation of a sense of injustice that may resurface in the future. Here, social sanctions work as regulators of social memory, determining the narrative of who is to be blamed and who is to be defended. When a narrative is formed unilaterally, compliance becomes fragile because it depends on fear rather than normative acceptance. This issue requires a discussion on how social sanctions shape the climate of family communication, including how they limit clarification, renegotiation, and moral accountability after the agreement has been voiced.

Non-litigation inheritance distribution is often cited as an ideal reference for family dispute resolution, yet the dimension of social pressure is frequently overlooked in academic discourse. Without an orderly understanding of how social sanctions operate, deliberation can be treated as if it is always peaceful and always fair. In reality, pressing instruments sourced from social evaluation can influence the quality of consent and the quality of compliance. We must realize that every decision taken through family mechanisms certainly has a complex social background (Aliyah & Evendi, 2023; Fitriyah et al., 2023). A normative description can help clarify the ethical boundaries of social pressure while distinguishing between reasonable moral oversight and dignity-lowering coercion. This urgency is also related to the need for conceptual

development in normative legal studies and the sociology of law, specifically regarding the relationship between social norms and compliance with private agreements. With strong conceptual mapping, the discussion on non-litigation inheritance can shift from simplistic moral judgments toward an assessment capable of reading social mechanisms responsibly, while simultaneously safeguarding the value of justice for all parties.

The problem formulation of this writing is how social sanctions function as pressing instruments that shape compliance with non-litigation inheritance distribution agreements through the mechanisms of legitimacy, informal oversight, and honor evaluation within family relations. The objective of this writing is to formulate a normative theoretical framework on the ways social sanctions shape compliance in non-litigation inheritance distribution agreements. The description is directed toward explaining the mechanisms of social pressure that work through reputation, shame, ostracism, and the control of family narratives, while simultaneously assessing their moral implications for the quality of consent and the quality of accountability. This writing also aims to clarify the ethical boundaries between reasonable social reminders and coercion that undermines the freedom of expression, so that family deliberation can be understood as a process demanding procedural justice. This framework is expected to enrich academic discussions on compliance with private agreements and provide a conceptual foundation for formulating more orderly non-litigation guidelines.

Method

This writing employs a qualitative literature study oriented toward normative legal research, with an emphasis on conceptual formulation, the structuring of argumentation, and normative assessment of social sanctions as coercive instruments in ensuring compliance with non-litigation inheritance division agreements. Diantha (2016) emphasizes that normative legal research operates through the justification of legal theory; therefore, the initial step is directed toward establishing working definitions regarding social sanctions, compliance, agreements, and the legitimacy inherent in family deliberations. The focus of the reading materials is filtered to capture a variety of ideas concerning social norms,

honor, shame, and informal oversight, which are then organized into a thematic map illustrating the relationships between concepts. The construction of this thematic map aims to maintain the order of reasoning so that the discussion can explain the mechanisms of social pressure without depending on field findings.

The methodological framework is supplemented by the perspective of normative Islamic legal research, which prioritizes the explanation of rules, values, and normative rationality within family social events. Arfa and Marpaung (2016) highlight the importance of caution in positioning normative sources and reasoning; thus, the description is directed toward distinguishing between agreements based on proper consent and those built through relational pressure. At the same time, social studies demand a discipline of categorization so that concepts do not become blurred. Bailey (2008) assists in maintaining this discipline through an emphasis on procedures for processing reading materials, including the grouping of ideas, comparison of arguments, and testing of coherence between propositions. The result is a normative synthesis that examines how social assessment shapes compliance, and when that assessment shifts from a moral reminder into coercion that degrades the quality of consent.

To ensure that the argumentation is not monotonous and remains focused, a comparative reading is conducted on texts that highlight norms, informal authority, and the dynamics of family deliberations. Henn et al. (2005) emphasize the importance of sharp research questions and traceable explanations; consequently, each part of the discussion is structured as a conceptual answer to the research problem. The synthesis process is carried out through three stages: the extraction of key concepts, the formulation of normative propositions, and the preparation of assessment criteria for the quality of consent and the quality of compliance. This writing does not utilize interview or observation data; therefore, the boundaries of the conclusions are placed within the normative and conceptual realms. In this manner, the manuscript presents a framework that can be used to assess compliance with non-litigation inheritance agreements through the lens of social sanctions, family honor, and the procedural justice of deliberations.

Result and Discussion

The inheritance law system in Indonesia does not stand upon a single codification, but rather rests on the phenomenon of legal pluralism, which divides the application of rules based on personal identity, religious beliefs, and the legal submission of the parties (Affarudin & Darmawan, 2021). Constitutionally, this diversity is recognized as a manifestation of state protection toward cultural identity and human rights in practicing one's beliefs. This necessitates that every legal event regarding inheritance must first have its legal subjects identified to determine "which law" is most appropriate and authoritative to be applied, thereby preventing juridical malpractice in the distribution of estates.

For citizens who practice Islam, the primary regulation used as a reference is the Compilation of Islamic Law (KHI), which was established through Presidential Instruction No. 1 of 1991 as a result of the collective *ijtihad* of Indonesian scholars. The KHI regulates in detail in Book II regarding who is entitled to be an heir, the specific portions of *faraid*, and the resolution of disputes through the Religious Courts. The formal basis of this authority is strengthened by Law No. 7 of 1989 concerning Religious Courts, which has been amended several times, most recently by Law No. 50 of 2009, asserting that inheritance cases for Muslims fall under the absolute competence of that judicial institution.

The second system is Western Inheritance Law, which originates from the Civil Code (*Burgerlijk Wetboek*), specifically in Book Two, Chapter 12 through Chapter 18. This regulation was historically intended for the European group, Foreign Eastern Chinese, and other non-Muslim citizens who submit themselves to general civil law. The primary characteristics of this regulation are the principles of individualism and absolute equality, where there is no difference in portions between male and female heirs. Furthermore, Western civil law recognizes the concept of *Legitieme Portie*, or the absolute share of an heir that cannot be reduced or eliminated through a will by the testator.

Beyond written law, Indonesia officially recognizes the existence of Customary Inheritance Law, which stems from values, norms, and traditions living within indigenous law communities across various regions (Pratiwi & Fitri, 2023). This recognition has a strong constitutional basis in Article 18B paragraph (2) of the 1945

Constitution and is reinforced in Law No. 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power. In this system, judges are required to explore and understand unwritten legal values that are nevertheless obeyed by the community. Customary inheritance law is heavily influenced by kinship systems, such as patrilineal in Batak or Bali, matrilineal in Minangkabau, and bilateral or parental in Java and Madura.

The interaction of these three legal systems creates a unique dynamic in Indonesian legal practice, where overlaps sometimes occur between religious, state, and customary norms. For instance, in rural Muslim communities, inheritance distribution is often initiated through deliberation based on the "equal share" custom before being formalized through Islamic legal channels if a dispute arises. This demonstrates that although regulations have divided boundaries of authority, in sociological reality, society often performs independent synchronization to achieve the justice they consider most harmonious for family integrity. Fundamentally, every community group will always strive to adapt to the circumstances around them to maintain their collective survival (Oluwatoyin & Mardikaningsih, 2022).

The choice of forum in resolving inheritance disputes depends heavily on the initial classification of the legal subject. If a dispute arises, the Religious Court serves as the last bastion for Muslims, while the District Court serves disputes for those subject to general civil law (Malayudha et al., 2023). A deep understanding of these three pillars of regulation is an absolute requirement in conducting legal literature studies, whether normative-juridical or sociological, so that the resulting analysis has an accurate and comprehensive foundation of legality.

In family and community relationships, every member has a moral obligation to respect shared norms that maintain collective harmony (Sholeh, 2023). This obligation demands an awareness of the social consequences of personal actions, so that individual choices are always considered within the framework of responsibility toward the continuity of the relationship. Sincerity in deliberation and compliance with the results of the agreement become indicators of social ethical maturity that maintains trust between parties. Therefore, the formation of shared norms must be encouraged through value education, behavioral examples, and appreciation for actions that uphold intergenerational

justice. By placing the principles of distributive justice and mutual respect as a foundation, the decision-making process regarding inheritance assets can proceed fairly and with dignity (Iasra et al., 2023).

In the application of social mechanisms in the realm of inheritance distribution, the involvement of all parties openly and responsibly is a normative necessity. Social oversight mechanisms should function to encourage compliance based on honesty and a sense of responsibility, not to pressure to the point of eliminating legitimate space for dialogue. Every form of social reprimand or correction must be proportional and consider individual dignity as well as the right to convey reasoned objections (Suwarti et al., 2022). Therefore, the community is obligated to build fair deliberation procedures, guarantee the representation of vulnerable voices, and provide mediation channels when disputes arise. These steps will ensure that social sanctions act as a driver of civilized order and not as a tool that stifles substantive justice.

Social sanctions can be understood as collective evaluation mechanisms inherent in the relationships between family and community members (Lembang et al., 2022). This mechanism works through moral labeling, relational distancing, and the regulation of access to social support. In non-litigation inheritance distribution, social sanctions gain pressing power because agreements are usually born from deliberations that presuppose compliance as a form of courtesy and respect. When compliance is viewed as a measure of nobility of character, a breach of agreement is easily interpreted as a character flaw. This kind of moral reading activates social control, as individuals tend to avoid positions viewed as shameful. The pressing power of social sanctions does not require formal threats; the risk of losing recognition is sufficient. Therefore, social sanctions deserve to be discussed as pressing instruments tools that encourage individuals to restrain themselves from actions perceived as deviant. However, this pressing instrument requires careful normative assessment, as pressure can maintain order, but it can also limit the space for legitimate objections in inheritance distribution.

In the framework of compliance, it is important to distinguish between compliance born from normative acceptance and compliance born from fear. Normative acceptance means someone complies with an agreement because they consider it fair, accountable, and aligned with

moral obligations toward the family (Khilmi et al., 2021). Fear means someone complies with an agreement to avoid ostracism, gossip, or a decline in dignity, even if they harbor serious objections. On the surface, both types of compliance may appear the same, yet their moral qualities differ. Non-litigation inheritance distribution often relies on the assumption that family consent signifies acceptance, whereas consent can be shaped by reputational pressure. Here, social sanctions function as a controller that smoothens coercion. Normatively, the quality of an agreement needs to be assessed by the freedom to express opinions, clarity of information, and the existence of space to question and refute. Without these prerequisites, compliance can become a pseudo-compliance that is fragile and harbors potential for future conflict.

Social sanctions work through reputation as social capital that determines a person's position within the family network (Faizal, 2021). Reputation functions like a moral record that is remembered and discussed, so that actions at the time of inheritance distribution can affect how someone is treated in subsequent family events. If an individual is labeled greedy, they may lose trust and access to assistance. This pressing power makes many people choose to comply to maintain their good name, even when the distribution is considered unbalanced. In the mechanism of reputation, the community becomes a reinforcer, as repeated talk can strengthen a label. From a normative standpoint, reputation can be a tool for moral education when it reinforces honesty and rejects manipulation. However, reputation can become a tool of oppression when labels are formed by more influential parties and used to silence criticism. Therefore, the discussion of social sanctions needs to include questions about who has the right to define a violation, who controls the narrative, and how that narrative is disseminated. If the narrative is controlled unilaterally, reputation turns into a tool of dominance that reduces the quality of non-litigation inheritance deliberation.

Ostracism is a form of social sanction that transforms closeness into distance. Within a family, ostracism can take the form of not being invited to meetings, not being provided with information, or not being involved in other decisions. Ostracism can also be symbolic, such as cold greetings, a lack of respect, or a loss of recognition. This form is effective as a pressing instrument because humans tend to seek a sense of belonging and

acceptance. This often has a detrimental impact on those considered weak or different, forcing them to follow the group's will (Zahid et al., 2022). In inheritance distribution, the threat of ostracism can drive certain parties to sign agreements without sufficient negotiation in order to maintain access to the family network. At the implementation stage, ostracism can be used to pressure parties who wish to demand explanations or corrections. Normatively, ostracism should be strictly evaluated, as it transforms family relations into a tool of control. Ostracism can only be morally justified when it is aimed at protecting vulnerable parties from violence or fraud, not to secure unilateral gains. If ostracism is used to close the space for dialogue, it damages the principle of proper consent and obscures justice in inheritance distribution.

Shame is a social emotion that serves as an important medium for social sanctions. Shame arises when an individual feels judged for violating standards of honor, thus being driven to correct their behavior or withdraw. In non-litigation inheritance deliberation, shame is often activated through the language of family obligations, sacrifice, and respect for deceased parents. This kind of language can strengthen the willingness to comply and share, especially when the distribution is carried out in a spirit of kinship. The values taught at home since childhood significantly determine how a person behaves when facing family problems (Safira et al., 2022). However, shame can also be used to direct decisions without clear argumentation, for example, by attaching a stigma to parties who ask for explanations. When shame is used in this manner, deliberation loses its deliberative quality. Normative assessment needs to position shame as a tool that must be limited. Reasonable shame restrains oneself from greed, whereas forced shame restrains oneself from legitimate questions. This difference determines whether social sanctions reinforce justice or close off opportunities for correction in inheritance distribution. Social sanctions often work through the control of family narratives. Narrative control means determining which stories circulate, who is considered right, and who is considered wrong (Goodnow & Lawrence, 2010). In inheritance distribution, narratives can highlight someone's service in caring for parents, emphasize closeness, or emphasize economic needs; then, that narrative becomes the moral basis to pressure other parties to agree. Narratives can be useful when they remind parties of responsibilities

and encourage empathy. However, narratives can become pressing instruments when they are constructed to "whitewash" the taking of a larger share without commensurate justification. From a normative standpoint, narratives must be tested through the principles of transparency and equality of voice. Fair deliberation provides space for every heir to convey their own narrative, not just accept the dominant one. If the narrative is centered on one party, social sanctions will follow that narrative and lock in the results. Therefore, the discussion of social sanctions needs to assess the structure of family communication, as communication structures determine whether social sanctions become guardians of a fair agreement or pillars of inequality.

The legitimacy of non-litigation inheritance agreements is often built through symbols of consent, such as verbal agreement, signatures, or statements before the extended family. These symbols give an impression of finality. However, symbols of consent do not always signify sufficient understanding. Within family relations, a person may state their agreement due to subtle pressure, psychological reluctance (*rasa sungkan*), or fear of being labeled a troublemaker. Many changes in family rules ultimately affect how the rights of family members, especially women and children, are protected (Aliyah & Mardikaningsih, 2023). Social sanctions reinforce the symbol of consent because once agreement is voiced, cancellation or correction can be considered shameful. Consequently, consent transforms into a social trap. Normatively, legitimacy must be tied to the quality of the deliberation procedure. Procedural quality includes adequate time, the opportunity to ask questions, access to information about assets, and equality in presenting reasons. If the procedure is inadequate, symbolic legitimacy should be viewed as weak. Thus, social sanctions as pressing instruments must be assessed alongside the quality of legitimacy. If legitimacy is weak but social sanctions are strong, the resulting compliance risks becoming an unjust compliance that nurtures relational wounds.

Informal oversight is another channel that makes social sanctions effective. Informal oversight emerges when the family and community observe behavior, compare promises with actions, and then evaluate whether an individual is compliant. Informal oversight does not require officers; it works through daily conversations. In inheritance

distribution, informal oversight can encourage the realization of agreements, such as ensuring that the submission of documents or the distribution of assets proceeds as promised. This oversight is crucial to ensure that all parties carry out their obligations honestly and openly (Aliyah, Safira, El-Yunusi, Khayru, & Hardyansah, 2023). However, informal oversight can cause excessive pressure if every action is read with suspicion. Normatively, healthy oversight must be proportional and aimed at maintaining order, not controlling personal freedom. Excessive oversight can erode dignity, create new conflicts, and trigger defensiveness. Therefore, balance is necessary. An agreement needs to be clear enough so that oversight does not turn into wild interpretation. The clarity of the agreement also protects compliant parties from groundless accusations. Within this framework, social sanctions become effective when the agreement is clear and oversight is proportional, so that social pressure leads to orderly and accountable compliance.

Social sanctions tend to strengthen in families that have high economic and social attachment (Rizkillah & Arinda, 2023). When daily assistance and support depend on the family network, the risk of losing support makes individuals more likely to submit. In inheritance distribution, this kind of dependence can pressure more vulnerable parties to accept an inadequate share for the sake of maintaining access to assistance. Normatively, this situation requires attention to equality of voice. Equality of voice does not mean every person must have the same influence, but rather that every person has a reasonable opportunity to express an opinion without the threat of stigma. Fair deliberation needs to provide specific space for those who tend to remain silent. If this space does not exist, social sanctions will reinforce existing hierarchies. Thus, social sanctions as a pressing instrument must be understood as a mechanism that follows the structure of relations. It flows in a direction that strengthens the more dominant party. A good normative framework must be able to identify the direction of this flow and establish boundaries that prevent the use of social sanctions to subjugate the weak.

Family honor is often used as a moral basis to demand compliance. Honor here is not merely pride, but a measure of collective reputation that is deemed necessary to maintain. In non-litigation inheritance

distribution, honor is often linked to messages about maintaining unity and avoiding quarrels. This message can encourage a swift resolution, but speed can close the opportunity to examine the fairness of the distribution. If problems are not resolved wisely, it can have a long-term impact on the welfare and future of all family members (Aliyah, Atmari, Darmawan, Rizky, & Farid, 2023). Social sanctions work by equating objections with threats to honor, so that the party who questions can be labeled as destructive. Normatively, honor needs to be reinterpreted as a commitment to justice, not merely surface-level peace. If honor is understood as justice, then an objection presented with orderly reasoning actually becomes a form of maintaining honor. With this interpretation, social sanctions are directed toward pressuring manipulation and dishonesty, rather than pressuring dialogue. This framework addresses the problem formulation by showing that social sanctions shape compliance through honor, but honor must be given the proper normative content so that social pressure does not damage consent.

The quality of consent in inheritance agreements can be assessed through several normative criteria. First, the existence of sufficient information about the objects being divided and the consequences of the decision. Second, the existence of a reasonable opportunity to ask questions and state objections. Third, freedom from social threats that are demeaning to dignity. Fourth, clarity in the language of the agreement so as not to open space for manipulation. Providing honest explanations is highly necessary so that the rights of everyone, including children, remain well-protected (Priyatama et al., 2022). Social sanctions interact with these criteria because reputational pressure can reduce the courage to question, and narrative control can limit the information shared. Therefore, social sanctions need to be positioned as a factor that can decrease the quality of consent if not limited. However, social sanctions can also increase the quality of consent if they encourage openness for example, by stigmatizing lies and blaming parties who hide information. Normative assessment must maintain this balance. Essentially, social sanctions as a pressing instrument must be directed toward protecting fair deliberation procedures, not replacing procedures with fear. If social sanctions become a substitute for procedure, the resulting compliance tends to be fragile and dependent on oversight.

The discussion of compliance also needs to evaluate the timing of stages, as social sanctions can work differently during negotiation versus during implementation. At the negotiation stage, social pressure often drives quick agreement and reduces debate. At the implementation stage, social pressure can maintain the discipline of realization, but it can also pressure parties who wish to seek explanations regarding discrepancies. We must remember that justice is often achieved through peaceful means that prioritize the restoration of relationships (Wijaya et al., 2022). Normatively, a distinction must be made between pressure that maintains commitment and pressure that silences correction. Correction is a part of moral responsibility if the agreement is found to be understood differently or if its realization deviates. If correction is always labeled as shameful, the agreement turns into a document immune to criticism. In fact, family agreements should open a space for civilized adjustment if errors are discovered. Thus, social sanctions need to be given time limits and functional boundaries. It is reasonable as a reminder to keep promises, but it is unreasonable when used to block clarification. This framework helps explain how social sanctions shape compliance through the regulation of social emotions at each stage.

In family deliberation, moral language is the primary medium for social sanctions (Imron & Huda, 2023). Moral language contains words such as devoted, self-aware, or maintaining brotherhood. This language forms a value map that determines who is praised and who is censured. The power of moral language lies in its ability to transform choices into obligations. Someone who initially wanted to discuss things may turn compliant due to the fear of being seen as undutiful. Normatively, moral language needs to be placed within a framework of reasonableness. Reasonable moral language invites consideration, whereas pressing moral language closes off the space for reasoning. Healthy deliberation should provide a place for rational reasons, such as clarity of rights, legitimate needs, and the division of responsibilities. If moral language erases reasoning, then social sanctions work as pressing instruments that damage deliberation. Therefore, the cultivation of deliberative ethics needs to affirm that conveying reasons is not a divisive act, but a responsible one. Consequently, social sanctions can be directed to reject

the manipulation of moral language, so that the compliance formed has a more worthy quality.

Social sanctions are closely related to informal authority. Informal authority often resides in family figures, religious figures, or relatives considered wise. This authority can direct deliberation and close off debate through a decisive word. If informal authority is used to maintain order and mediate fairly, it strengthens compliance through trust. However, if informal authority is excessively biased, social sanctions will follow the direction of that authority and pressure those who are not in alignment. Therefore, the role of parents and community figures is very large in determining whether a decision will be considered fair or not (Safira & El-Yunusi, 2023). Normatively, informal authority needs to be assessed by how it uses its influence. Fair influence provides space to speak and summarizes reasons, whereas pressing influence frames objections as social sins. Thus, social sanctions as pressing instruments do not stand alone; they often depend on who produces the evaluation. This framework explains that compliance with non-litigation inheritance agreements is shaped by the relationship between informal authority and social sanctions. For compliance to be of high quality, informal authority must refrain from using stigma and ensure that consent is built through reason and clarity.

Procedural justice is the key to assessing whether social pressure is within appropriate boundaries. Procedural justice includes the orderliness of the forum, equality of opportunity to speak, and orderliness in the verification of inheritance objects. When procedures are fair, social sanctions can function as moral reminders to honor decisions that have been mutually understood. However, when procedures are weak, social sanctions tend to lock in results that have not actually been examined. Good education and understanding will help everyone have the courage to voice what is right (Hartono & Sulisty, 2022). In inheritance distribution, fair procedures also include orderly documentation, so that the agreement does not depend on memory or shifting interpretations. Good documentation reduces the room for social sanctions that are not based on facts, as criticism can be directed toward the text of the agreement rather than toward personal accusations. Normatively, fair procedures also provide room for a pause,

as decisions concerning rights should not be pursued in haste. A pause provides an opportunity for reflection and consultation, so that consent becomes higher in quality. Thus, the framework of the answer to the problem formulation positions social sanctions as pressing instruments that need to be fenced in by procedural justice so that the compliance formed is not coercive in nature.

The discussion must also incorporate the concept of responsibility following the agreement. Responsibility means that each party maintains the realization in accordance with the content of the agreement and is willing to provide explanations if questions arise. Responsibility differs from passive compliance. Passive compliance merely follows, whereas responsibility involves the willingness to explain and rectify if errors occur. Social sanctions often demand passive compliance for the sake of tranquility, so that parties requesting explanations are considered disruptive. Normatively, this attitude needs to be criticized. A healthy agreement requires a culture of accountability, not a culture of silence. Without openness, harmonious family relationships will be difficult to maintain in the long term (Safira & El-Yunusi, 2023). A culture of accountability allows for questions, because questioning is part of upholding a mandate (*amanah*). Here, social sanctions need to be directed at parties who avoid accountability, not at those who ask questions in an orderly manner. Thus, social sanctions can function as a pressing instrument that strengthens responsibility rather than suppressing transparency. If social pressure is directed toward transparency, compliance becomes more meaningful because each party understands that what is valued is openness, not voiceless obedience.

In non-litigation inheritance agreements, equality of voice does not mean equality of outcome, but rather equality of dignity within the process. Every heir has the right to be heard and the right to be treated as a subject capable of reasoning. Social sanctions often interfere with equality of voice because they provide an advantage to parties capable of dominating family opinion. When opinion is dominated, other parties become hesitant to speak. Normatively, equality of voice demands a deliberation mechanism that prevents dominance. Dominance can take the form of interruption, harassment, or the framing of objections as acts

of disloyalty. Everyone has the same right to obtain justice, regardless of their social status or background (Fajar et al., 2022). Orderly deliberation requires rules of conversation, such as speaking in turns, summarizing reasons, and opportunities to respond. When the rules of conversation are clear, social sanctions lose the space to operate through vague pressures. Social evaluation will follow the quality of the reasoning, not merely social position. Thus, the framework for answering the problem formulation shows that social sanctions shape compliance primarily when the process fails to safeguard equality of voice. Increasing equality of voice means reducing the pressing nature of social sanctions without eliminating their function as moral reminders.

Social sanctions are often used to maintain family stability, but stability must be distinguished from justice (Gunawan et al., 2023). Stability means there is no open conflict, whereas justice means that the distribution and procedures are accountable. In inheritance distribution, stability built through silencing can hide dissatisfaction. Hidden dissatisfaction may emerge in the form of strained relationships, quarrels during other events, or refusal to help. Normatively, healthy stability is a stability born of justice, not of fear. Social sanctions can lead to healthy stability when they pressure actions that clearly violate rules, such as fraud, forgery, or unilateral taking. However, social sanctions lead to false stability when they suppress conversations about the lack of clarity regarding rights. Therefore, the normative framework demands a shift in the focus of social sanctions from maintaining surface-level tranquility toward maintaining procedural justice and the clarity of the agreement. With such a focus, compliance will be more stable because people comply with something they understand and consciously accept. This explains that the power of social sanctions as a pressing instrument must be placed in a corrective function, not a silencing function.

The pressing mechanism can also be read through the distribution of guilt. Guilt arises when an individual feels they have violated an obligation, whereas engineered guilt emerges when an individual is made to feel wrong even though they are fighting for clarity of rights. In inheritance deliberation, certain parties can inject guilt by mentioning sacrifices or services, so that others feel it is inappropriate to ask for a share. Normatively, guilt needs to be linked to valid criteria. Requesting

an explanation regarding the distribution is not a wrong act, and discussing the clarity of rights is not an act that divides the family. It is very important for us to continue protecting the basic rights of every individual so they are not neglected by undue feelings (Fajar et al., 2022; Hartono & Sulisty, 2022). If guilt is used to coerce, social sanctions operate as an illegitimate pressing instrument. Conversely, legitimate guilt can arise from acts of cheating or manipulating, and here social sanctions can help correct behavior. Thus, the discussion of social sanctions demands a distinction between guilt that leads to accountability and guilt that leads to subjugation. This distinction clarifies when compliance is meaningful and when it is merely the result of emotional pressure.

The discussion of compliance also touches upon the moral dimension of promises. An inheritance agreement is a form of collective promise, and a promise is binding because it creates expectations (Yogahastama, 2020). Social sanctions reinforce the bond of a promise by judging a violation as disloyalty. However, a meaningful promise requires a clear understanding of its content. If a promise is made in haste, social sanctions will demand the fulfillment of a vague promise. This is dangerous because people can be blamed for violations that actually stem from differences in interpretation. Normatively, agreements need to be written in clear language so that the promise has a distinct object. Clarity reduces the space for conflict and lowers the need for excessive social pressure. Furthermore, a high-quality promise provides room for requests for clarification without stigma. Clarification is not a cancellation of the promise, but an effort to ensure the promise is understood identically. Thus, social sanctions should be directed toward maintaining the orderliness of clarification, not suppressing it. If clarification is respected, compliance will emerge as a form of integrity, not as a form of fear. This answers the problem formulation by showing that social sanctions shape compliance through promises and reputation, but the quality of the promise determines whether social pressure is appropriate.

Social sanctions are often mixed with the fear of losing access to family resources. This access can be in the form of financial assistance, emotional support, or social protection. When access is at stake, social sanctions function as a very effective pressing instrument. Normatively,

this situation requires caution because dependence can damage free consent. Free consent requires that a person can say no without the threat of losing basic needs. In inheritance deliberation, this means the family needs to ensure that social assistance is not used as a bargaining chip. If assistance is used as a bargaining tool, the agreement transforms into a power transaction (Nariswari et al., 2023). The normative framework offered in this discussion places individual dignity as a boundary. Dignity means people must not be forced to choose between their rights and their relationships. A healthy relationship acknowledges that questioning the distribution is not identical to severing brotherhood. Thus, healthy social sanctions need to separate moral evaluation from access to basic assistance. Moral judgment may exist, but it must not take the form of severing support that collapses vulnerable parties.

The strength of social sanctions is also influenced by the proximity of the social space. In tight-knit communities, news spreads rapidly and evaluations are quickly formed. This speed increases the pressing power, as individuals feel they have no time to explain themselves. In inheritance distribution, the speed of evaluation can drive quick agreements for the sake of avoiding rumors. Normatively, the speed of evaluation must be balanced with the principle of prudence, as justice requires time. Orderly deliberation must provide opportunities to collect documents, clarify assets, and draft agreements that are mutually understood. Otherwise, social sanctions force a decision before reasons are tested. We must all learn to be wiser in evaluating things so as not to disadvantage others based solely on incorrect information (Zahid et al., 2022). This framework demands a community communication ethic, namely, refraining from spreading rumors until a proper explanation is provided. This ethic is vital so that social sanctions do not operate through inaccurate information. Thus, social sanctions as a pressing instrument need to be understood alongside the quality of the circulating information. When information is accurate and the process is orderly, social pressure can help maintain compliance. When information is blurred, social pressure tends to oppress the wrong party or suppress those attempting to provide clarity.

Compliance with non-litigation inheritance agreements is also influenced by symbols of religiosity and morality attached to the actions

(Khilmi et al., 2021). A party who rejects a certain distribution can be accused of lacking sincerity (*ikhlas*) or being uncivilized, while the party who accepts can be praised as a role model. These symbols strengthen social sanctions because they lend high moral weight to the decision. Normatively, moral symbols must be tied to the principles of justice. Sincerity does not mean accepting ambiguity, and being civilized does not mean remaining silent when there is an error. If moral symbols are detached from justice, they become tools of pressure. The normative framework constructed here proposes that moral symbols be used to demand transparency and trustworthiness (*amanah*)—for example, by encouraging those who hold information to share it and encouraging powerful parties to exercise restraint. Thus, social sanctions are directed toward suppressing deviations rather than suppressing questions. This demonstrates that the power of social sanctions can be managed to align with justice, provided the community has norms that honor honesty and reject manipulation. Compliance born from such norms is more morally worthy because it is built upon consistent values.

The function of social sanctions as a pressing instrument in compliance with non-litigation inheritance agreements can be summarized as a relationship between legitimacy, informal oversight, and honor. Legitimacy provides the basis for why an agreement is considered binding. Informal oversight provides a mechanism to assess whether promises are being kept. Honor provides the emotional energy that drives compliance. These three elements can produce stable compliance if deliberation is fair and information is open. By understanding this, we can see that fair problem-solving is the main key to peace within the family (Aliyah & Mardikaningsih, 2023; Wijaya et al., 2022). However, all three can produce coercive compliance if legitimacy is merely symbolic, oversight turns into control, and honor is used for silencing. The proposed normative framework places the quality of consent and procedural justice as the primary criteria. Social sanctions are considered appropriate when they serve as a reminder of the obligation to keep a fair promise, suppress fraud, and maintain transparency. Social sanctions are considered inappropriate when they force consent, demean dignity, or close off space for clarification. Thus, the answer to the problem formulation affirms that social sanctions shape compliance through

powerful social mechanisms, yet that power must be limited by the principles of justice so that non-litigation inheritance agreements are truly of high quality.

Conclusion

The conclusion of this writing is that social sanctions possess the power as coercive instruments that shape compliance with non-litigation inheritance division agreements through reputation, exclusion, shame, and the control of family narratives. This power operates because inheritance agreements are understood as moral promises linked to honor; thus, a violation incurs the risk of losing recognition and support. However, the resulting compliance is not always of high quality, as compliance can arise from normative acceptance or from the fear of stigma. Therefore, the quality of an agreement needs to be assessed based on the procedural justice of the deliberations, the clarity of information regarding the inheritance objects, equality of voice, and the existence of space for clarification during the implementation stage. Social sanctions can maintain order if directed toward suppressing manipulation and dishonesty, but they can undermine consent if used to silence legitimate objections. Consequently, social sanctions must be understood as an ambivalent social mechanism that requires normative boundaries so that compliance remains aligned with justice.

The implications and suggestions are directed toward the cultivation of family deliberation ethics and the structuring of non-litigation procedures that preserve the dignity of the heirs. Deliberations need to establish equality of voice as a fundamental principle, with conversational rules that provide opportunities to ask questions, state reasons, and summarize points of agreement in an orderly manner. Agreements should be drafted in clear language so that informal oversight does not devolve into wild judgments that trigger stigma. Families also need to build the habit of distinguishing between clarification and defiance, so that requests for explanation are not automatically labeled as shameful. Those holding informal authority are advised to direct their influence toward maintaining information transparency and restraining the dominance of one-sided narratives. At the implementation stage, accountability needs to be viewed as a

collective moral obligation, ensuring each party is willing to explain the realization of the agreement. Through these steps, social sanctions can continue to function as moral reminders that preserve commitment without evolving into relational coercion that degrades the quality of consent and the fairness of division.

References

- Affarudin, M. A. I., & D. Darmawan. 2021. Implementasi Pasal 183 KHI dalam Pembagian Harta Waris pada Surat Perjanjian Bermaterai (Perspektif Masalah Mursalah). *Al-Qanun: Jurnal Pemikiran dan Pembaharuan Hukum Islam*, 24(2), 385-416.
- Aidan Bin Abdullah, M. H. 2021. Street Children and the Layered Failure of Protection Systems: An Analysis of Driving Factors and the Cycle of Vulnerability Reproduction. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*. 1(1), 93-112.
- Aliyah, N. D., & Evendi, W. 2023. Inheritance Law in Indonesia: Challenges, Solutions, and the Role of Culture and Religion. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 2(2), 1-4.
- Aliyah, N. D., & Mardikaningsih, R. 2023. Legal Dynamics of Divorce, Transformation of Social Structure, and Protection of Women-Children in the Family Regulatory System. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(1), 223-230.
- Aliyah, N. D., Atmari, A., Darmawan, D., Rizky, M. C., & Farid, M. 2023. Revealing the Impact of Underage Marriage: How Is Household Welfare Adversely Affected?. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 2(1), 1-5.
- Aliyah, N. D., Safira, M. E., El-Yunusi, M. Y. M., Khayru, R. K., & Hardyansah, R. 2023. Legal Analysis of Marriage Contracts Through Video Calls in the Perspective of Marriage Law and Islamic Law in Indonesia. *Legalis et Socialis Studiis (L355)*, 1(1), 45-61.
- Arfa, F. A., & W. Marpaung. 2016. *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum Islam*. Kencana, Jakarta.
- Bailey, K. 2008. *Methods of Social Research*. Simon and Schuster, New York.
- Diantha, I. M. P. 2016. *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum Normatif dalam Justifikasi Teori Hukum*. Prenada Media, Jakarta.
- Faisal, M. 2021. *Etos Kerja dan Modal Sosial: Dalam Perspektif Sosiologis*. CV. Azka Pustaka, Pasaman Barat.
- Fajar, A. S. M., Darmawan, D., & El-Yunusi, M. Y. M. 2021. The Principle of the Child's Best Interests in Custody and Post-Divorce Care. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 113-128.
- Fajar, A. S. M., A. Fauzi, D. Darmawan, & M. Y. M. El-Yunusi. 2022. Child Status Outside Marriage and the Right to Education in Family Law, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(2), 259-288.

- Futriyah, S., Mardikaningsih, R., & Aliyah, N. D. 2023. Legal Pluralism and the Role of Traditional Mediation in the Settlement of Inheritance Disputes in Multicultural Societies. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(1), 249-258.
- Goodnow, J. J., & J. A. Lawrence. 2010. Inheritance Norms for Distributions of Money, Land, and Things in Families. *Family Science*, 1(2), 73-82.
- Gunawan, Y., B. L. Dialog., & D. Fitriana. 2023. Land Dispute Resolution: Village Deliberation and Consensus to Establish Public Order. *Unifikasi: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 10(02), 136-142.
- Hartono, R., & Sulistyono, B. 2022. The Role of Education in the Social Mobility of Poor Children in Urban Settings. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(1), 109-126.
- Hasanah, U., M. A. Hamzah., & M. Ikhwan. 2019. Mediation as Alternative Disputes Resolution for Land Heritage of Madurese Society. *The First International Conference on Islamic Development Studies 2019, ICIDS 2019*, 1-8.
- Henn, M., M. Weinstein., & N. Foard. 2005. *A Short Introduction to Social Research*. Sage, London.
- Iasra, R. F., Y. Yaswirman., & Y. Yasniwati. 2023. Penyelesaian Sengketa Waris Tanah Pusako Tinggi sebagai Tanah Adat melalui Pengadilan Agama Kelas 1a Padang. *Unes Law Review*, 6(1), 375-383.
- Imron, M., & M. Huda. 2023. Fungsionalisme Pembagian Waris Sebelum Pewaris Meninggal Dunia dalam Keberlanjutan Keluarga. *Sakina: Journal of Family Studies*, 7(4), 514-529.
- Khilmi, E. F., A. Hafidzah., & P. S. Familia. 2021. The Implementation of Inheritance Dispute Arrangement Based on Local Wisdom in Gayasan A, Jenggawah, Jember Regency. *International Journal of Social Science and Religion (IJSSR)*, 77-92.
- Lembang, A. A. R., N. Nababan., & D. Latifiani. 2022. Limitation of Absolute Authority of Religious Courts and District Courts in Settlement of Inheritance Disputes. *Wacana Hukum*, 28(1), 7-15.
- Malayudha, A. G., W. Sari., & A. P. Asiandu. 2023. Indonesian Inheritance System Based on Islamic Law, Civil Code, Matrilineal Customs, and Gender Equality Perspectives. *Sangkep*, 6(1), 55-73.
- Mandasari, P. A., Djanuardi, D., & Supriyatni, R. 2022. Penyelesaian sengketa pembagian waris kepada golongan dzawil arham melalui litigasi dan non litigasi dalam perspektif sistem pewarisan Islam. *ACTA DIURNAL Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Kenotariatan*, 6(1), 144-158.
- Nariswari, N., A. Artaji., & B. Rubiati. 2023. Penyelesaian Sengketa Harta Warisan yang Belum Terbagi antara Para Ahli Waris Terkait dengan Pilihan Hukum pada Masyarakat Adat Patrilineal. *Hakim: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum dan Sosial*, 1(3), 76-89.
- Oluwatoyin, F., & Mardikaningsih, R. 2022. Community adaptation strategy to climate change based on socio-cultural perspective. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 167-172.

- Pratiwi, W., & S. N. Fitri. 2023. Towards the Unification of Inheritance Law in Indonesia: Challenges and Opportunities in the Context of Religious and Cultural Diversity. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 06(12), 5900-5912.
- Priyatama, S., Aliyah, N. D., Mardikaningsih, R., Safira, M. E., & Issalillah, F. 2022. Juridical Analysis of the Implementation of Artificial Insemination in Indonesia: Legal Status and Children's Rights in a Positive Legal Perspective. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 1(2), 27-32.
- Rizkillah, R., & F. Arinda. 2023. Pengaruh Tekanan Ekonomi dan Dukungan Sosial terhadap Ketahanan Keluarga Narapidana. *JKKP (Jurnal Kesejahteraan Keluarga dan Pendidikan)*, 10(01), 1-13.
- Safira, M. E., Aliyah, N. D., Evendi, W., & Yulianis, M. S. F. 2022. Parental Education in Shaping Children's Life Values at Home. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 131-134.
- Safira, M. E., & El-Yunusi, M. Y. M. 2023. The Dynamics of Violence Against Children in the Family Environment: An Analysis According to the Principles of Islamic Law and the Perspective of Law No. 35 of 2014 on the Amendment to Law No. 23 of 2002 on Child Protection. *Legalis et Socialis Studiis (L355)*, 1(2), 34-42.
- Sholeh, M. I. 2023. Sinergi Hukum Keluarga Islam dan Manajemen Pendidikan dalam Membangun Generasi Berkualitas dan Harmoni Keluarga Islami. *JURISY: Jurnal Ilmiah Syariah*, 3(2), 23-46.
- Suwarti, S., D. Khunmay., & S. Abannokovya. 2022. Conflicts Occurring Due to the Application of Different Legal Inheritance Systems in Indonesia. *Legality: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum*, 30(2), 214-227.
- Wibowo, R. A., R. Apriliana., & E. H. Candrarini. 2022. Settlement of Inherited Land Conflicts for Sale Unilaterally. *East Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 1(9), 1739-1744.
- Wijaya, F. P., Safira, M. E., & Darmawan, D. 2022. Application of Restorative Justice in Criminal Case Settlement in Indonesia: A Literature Perspective. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 1(3), 30-36.
- Yogahastama, R. 2020. Tinjauan Hukum Pembagian Harta Waris sebagai Obyek Perjanjian dalam Sengketa Kewarisan Adat di Indonesia. *Justitia Jurnal Hukum*, 4(1), 151-165.
- Zahid, R. A., D. Darmawan, & R. K. Khayru. 2022. Mental Illness Stigma in Families and the Reach of Private Law Protection, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(2), 207-230.