



NORM CERTAINTY AND ENFORCEMENT LEGITIMACY IN LOCAL PUBLIC ORDER REGULATION

Muchammad Rafi Wibisono, Muchamad Catur Rizky, Sudjai

Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya

correspondence: muchamadcaturrizky@gmail.com

Abstract

Local public order regulations aim to shape everyday conduct in shared spaces through prohibitions, duties, and administrative measures. This article presents a normative account of how such regulation can be appraised within social practice by linking norm certainty, enforcement legitimacy, and citizen compliance. It argues that clear legal language limits excessive discretion and supports equal treatment across comparable cases. It also maintains that legitimacy arises when officials act with proportionality, provide reasons, follow orderly procedures, and communicate goals in accessible terms. Compliance is described as most stable when it flows from understanding and acceptance of the public order purpose, rather than fear or short term calculation. The discussion outlines criteria for procedural fairness, including consistent stages of action, recorded reasons for urgent measures, and opportunities for clarification in minor cases. It further emphasizes that enforcement messages should target measurable conduct and avoid stigmatizing identity, so that informal social judgments reinforce civility rather than exclusion. The article concludes that durable public order requires alignment between rule clarity, accountable authority, and dignified interaction in public space governance.

Keywords: local regulation, public order, norm certainty, legitimacy, procedural fairness, discretion, compliance.

Introduction

Public order is often understood as a condition of a shared living space that allows people to move, work, strive, and interact without excessive disruption. In dense urban life, order becomes a prerequisite for security, health, smooth traffic flow, and comfort in using public spaces. However, order is not merely a physical state, but also a result of the intersection of legal norms, social habits, and perceptions of propriety. In streets, markets, parks, and public service areas, people interpret rules through experience, conversation, and visible examples. When that interpretation meets enforcement, assessments arise regarding whether the authorities' actions are fair, whether prohibitions are reasonable, and whether public space is managed humanely. At this point, regional regulations emerge as instruments that seek to translate the notion of order into prohibitions, obligations, enforcement procedures, and sanctions. The way regional regulations are understood and obeyed in social practice becomes an important normative issue, as it determines the quality of the relationship between citizens and the local government (Nurdin, 2017).

Regional regulations on public order usually govern various activities situated on the borderline between individual and collective interests. Activities such as the use of sidewalks, environmental cleanliness, noise, signage, vendors in public spaces, parking, and activities deemed to disturb comfort often become the focus of regulation. In everyday situations, citizens do not face regulations merely as texts, but as lived experiences. This indicates that public understanding of rules is heavily influenced by how their identities and social attachments are formed within diverse environments (Oluwatosin & Rojak, 2023). These experiences shape judgments about the fairness of a rule. If a rule is perceived to align with a sense of justice, compliance tends to arise as a willingness. If a rule is perceived as vague or inconsistent, compliance tends to become conditional. In a heterogeneous social space, a single rule may be accepted by a certain group but rejected by another due to differing interests. Therefore, it is crucial to see how differences in background and potential discrimination can influence how an individual responds to public policy amidst society (Pakpahan et al., 2022). Discussions on public order

regional regulations need to position social practice as an arena for proving meaning, rather than as a passive backdrop.

Public order is also linked to the ethics of local governance, particularly concerning how the state exercises authority over its citizens (Melati, 2020). Regional regulations provide the basis for administrative and enforcement actions, yet that basis must be read alongside the principles of legality, certainty, and proportionality. In the experience of citizens, actions perceived as excessive can create emotional distance and distrust, while actions that are too lenient may be seen as allowing recurring disturbances. This is where the discussion of public order touches upon the dimension of legitimacy. Legitimacy is not just the existence of a rule, but the belief that the rule was drafted for the common interest and is implemented fairly. When legitimacy is strong, citizens can view enforcement as an effort to maintain shared space. When legitimacy is weak, enforcement can be interpreted as selectivity or as an attempt to display power. Such interpretations affect compliance, as compliance requires a sense that the procedures and objectives of enforcement are acceptable. Thus, public order regional regulations need to be placed within the relationship between governance, public ethics, and daily practice.

Public space demonstrates that order is a process that is constantly negotiated (Gayet-Viaud, 2017). People form habits—for instance, where vehicles stop, where to trade, or how to manage waste—and those habits can endure long enough to be considered normal. When regional regulations are introduced to change habits, that change touches upon small-scale economies, mobility, and an individual's sense of security. At the same time, change can also reduce risks, improve cleanliness, and increase access for vulnerable groups such as pedestrians. This means that regional regulations on public order often face two equally strong demands: the demand for orderly spatial planning and the demand for the sustainability of citizens' livelihoods. In social practice, citizens evaluate whether the rules provide room for adjustment, whether there is adequate communication, and whether enforcement provides an opportunity for self-improvement (Hutasuhut et al., 2022). These evaluations shape how citizens respond, ranging from compliance, negotiation, and delay, to symbolic resistance. Thus, public order cannot

be understood as a result of sanctions alone, but as a result of social relations influenced by how rules are presented and implemented.

The discussion regarding the effectiveness of regional regulations on public order demands clarity concerning the normative measures used. Effectiveness in the realm of regional law can be understood as the ability of a rule to achieve the desired goal of order through citizen compliance, consistent enforcement, and procedural regularity. However, these measures must not be detached from the principle of justice, because order achieved by degrading dignity or eliminating the living space of certain groups will create moral and legal problems (Fitriansyah et al., 2023). Therefore, effectiveness needs to be understood as valid success that is, success aligned with legality, transparency, and proportionality. In social practice, effectiveness also relates to whether citizens understand the substance of prohibitions and obligations, whether officers have clear guidelines, and whether enforcement is carried out with reasons acceptable to common sense. Without this clarity, effectiveness can turn into an administrative claim that does not address social reality. From this perspective, the topic of public order regional regulations becomes essential to discuss normatively, as it concerns power relations, compliance, and the quality of shared living space.

The problem that arises is the tension between the certainty of regional regulation norms and the diversity of interpretations in social practice. Regional regulations usually contain terms such as disturbing order, littering, obstructing, or unsettling, which require further elaboration so as not to result in overly broad interpretations. The lack of clarity in enforcing these rules is often similar to the challenges faced in handling other violation cases, where legal certainty is the primary key so that the actions of officers in the field are truly effective (Mahmud et al., 2023). When key terms are left flexible, the decision-making space shifts to the field, and those decisions can vary. This variation makes it difficult for citizens to build stable expectations about what is permitted and what is prohibited. In such circumstances, compliance can become calculated—obeying only when there is supervision. Without an orderly reading of the certainty of norms, the discussion of effectiveness will be

trapped in surface-level results and overlook the fundamental quality of the norm itself.

Another problem relates to the proportionality of public order regional regulation enforcement within a social space characterized by inequality. Enforcement often intersects with groups whose livelihoods depend on public space, such as small-scale vendors, informal workers, or citizens with limited access to legal business spaces. When regional regulations are felt to close off living spaces without providing a path for adjustment, enforcement can be perceived as an action that ignores social justice. Conversely, if enforcement is too lenient, public space can be dominated by practices that harm many people, such as obstructing pedestrians or creating safety risks. This tension shows that effectiveness cannot be measured by compliance alone, but also by whether enforcement preserves dignity, prevents violence, and provides reasonable justification. In social practice, citizens evaluate the quality of enforcement through the way officers speak, the way warnings are given, and the way sanctions are applied. If these methods are judged to be disproportionate, enforcement can trigger moral resistance that undermines long-term compliance. It is important to outline this problem without offering solutions, so that the conceptual foundation is clear before entering a more systematic discussion.

This writing is urgent because regional regulations on public order stand at the intersection between the need for public space orderliness and respect for citizens' rights. The enforcement of order is the most visible face of local government, thus influencing public trust. Maintaining this trust requires efforts to unite various layers of society through an inclusive approach that avoids any impression of discrimination (Oluwatosin & Rojak, 2023; Pakpahan et al., 2022). Discussion regarding the effectiveness of these regulations is important to clarify the measures of success that align with legality and justice. Just as with law enforcement in other sectors, the success of regional rules depends heavily on the strength of the legal basis used and how the law addresses the needs of the wider community (Mahmud et al., 2023). With a strong conceptual basis, regional regulations can be assessed as tools for civilized shared space governance, rather than mere instruments of discipline. This urgency also concerns the need to clarify the boundaries

of authority so that enforcement actions do not lead to violations that damage the legitimacy of regional law.

The problem formulation in this writing is how the effectiveness of regional regulations on public order can be understood normatively through the relationship between the certainty of norms, the legitimacy of enforcement, and citizen compliance in social practice. The purpose of this writing is to construct a normative theoretical framework for understanding the effectiveness of public order regional regulations in social practice. The description is directed toward explaining valid measures of effectiveness through the certainty of norms, the proportionality of enforcement, and citizen acceptance of the objectives of order. This writing also aims to organize the distinction between compliance born of willingness and compliance born of pressure, so that the assessment of regional regulations can examine the legitimacy of administrative actions. This framework is expected to enrich the discussion of local government law and provide a conceptual footing for reading the ethics of public space enforcement.

Method

This study is structured as a qualitative literature study with a normative orientation toward reading public order regional regulations as norms operating through the language of prohibitions, obligations, enforcement authority, and administrative sanctions. The problem formulation is directed toward assessing the interconnectedness of norm certainty, enforcement legitimacy, and citizen compliance as normative phenomena in communal life. Methodological references in the legal field from Tahir et al. (2023) are used to organize research steps that emphasize the orderliness of argumentative construction, the boundaries of the object of study, and the neatness of processing reading materials. Reading materials were selected based on the clarity of the concept of public order, alignment with local government law discourse, and the sources' ability to explain the relationship between written norms and social practices without requiring field data.

The normative legal research framework is utilized to enrich assessments regarding justice, public welfare, and enforcement ethics that respect citizen dignity. Arfa and Marpaung (2016) provide a foundation

for how normative reasoning can be structured through explanations of rules, values, and the rationality of obligations, ensuring that the discussion of public order does not stop at formal legality. This approach is used to distinguish between reasoned enforcement and enforcement that merely demonstrates power, while simultaneously positioning proportionality as both a moral and legal principle. Through comparative reading, the concept of compliance is discussed as a willingness based on acceptance, as well as compliance based on fear, with an emphasis on the quality of social consent toward the goals of order. Henn et al. (2005) emphasize that scholarly texts need to demonstrate a traceable flow of questions, reasoning, and boundaries of conclusions, so that each section of the discussion is structured as a series of mutually reinforcing normative claims. The first stage extracts key concepts such as norm certainty, discretion, sanctions, legitimacy, and compliance. The second stage constructs propositions regarding the relationship of these concepts within public order regional regulations. The third stage formulates adequate normative assessment criteria to evaluate the regularity of enforcement in social practice. Since this is purely a literature study, the description does not present field findings and does not position conclusions as empirical generalizations.

Result and Discussion

The regulation of public space must be based on the principles of justice and respect for the dignity of every citizen so that the established rules become a form of moral responsibility of public organizers (Nugraha, 2022). Policymakers are obligated to formulate clear, rational, and easily understood norms so that citizens can assess the fairness of these rules. Citizen participation in the formulation process is a normative prerequisite so that the voices of vulnerable groups are heard and the reasons underlying the regulations can be rationally accepted. When moral legitimacy is formed through a fair and transparent process, compliance will grow as a voluntary action that gives birth to social order. Therefore, every legislative step must be directed towards strengthening procedural justice and protecting citizens' rights so that rules become an ethical reference for collective behavior. The preparation of this

sustainable policy requires a balance of economic, social, and environmental aspects (Mardikaningsih & Hariani, 2021).

The implementation of rules requires consistent accountability from enforcement officers so that citizens can predict the consequences of their actions and organize their behavior based on legal certainty (Gunarto, 2023). Rule enforcers are obligated to apply norms fairly so that selective or discriminatory practices can be avoided. Transparent oversight mechanisms and effective grievance channels must be available to prevent abuse of authority and ensure correction when violations occur. Such accountability strengthens the moral bond between citizens and public organizers and solidifies social stability through sustained trust. This increase in trust is also supported by employee competence and the utilization of information technology in the transformation of public services (Darmawan, et al., 2023).

The language and presentation of rules play an important normative role in shaping public acceptance of the enforced norms. The drafting of regulations must be accompanied by explanations of goals and reasons that are easily understood so that the norms become a reasonable reference for collective action. If rules are drafted with abstract technical terms without adequate explanation, public acceptance will decrease and resistance may potentially emerge. Therefore, policymakers are obligated to provide communicative and educational information so that citizens are able to internalize norms and act with an awareness of collective responsibility. Education and public awareness are key to encouraging changes in community behavior towards a more sustainable direction (Gautama & Mardikaningsih, 2022).

The decision-making process regarding public order must be designed to ensure inclusivity and protection for vulnerable groups so that the distribution of benefits and burdens of the rules is fair (Tyler, 2003). The formulation of norms needs to consider their social impact and provide mediation and review mechanisms when such impacts show injustice. The ethical obligations of rule-makers include monitoring the effects of rules and readiness to conduct revisions based on empirical evidence and community aspirations. With these steps, regulations will be more responsive and possess strong legitimacy in the eyes of citizens. Periodic evaluation of rule implementation is a moral

obligation for the government and stakeholders to guarantee the sustainability of civilized public space governance. Evaluation results must be submitted openly and used as a basis for policy improvement so that the legislative process becomes a responsive learning cycle. The principles of collective responsibility and openness in assessing and revising norms will allow for the creation of a public space that is fair and resilient for the common welfare. Due to dynamic social changes, sustainability policies must be accommodative to remain relevant for the wider community (Halizah & Mardikaningsih, 2022).

Regional regulations on public order can be understood as a concrete form of the local government's obligation to manage shared space so that it can be used reasonably by all citizens (Jackson et al., 2015). Public order norms contain the direction of expected behavior, while simultaneously establishing the limits of actions deemed disruptive. In the normative realm, the success of regional regulations is not sufficiently understood as the presence of prohibitions and sanctions, but rather as the ability of norms to become a reference that is reasonable, understandable, and compliant without damaging dignity. When citizens judge that rules organize public space fairly, compliance emerges as willingness. When citizens judge that rules are vague or applied selectively, compliance can turn into conditional compliance—obeying when supervised and evading when loose. Therefore, a normative understanding of public order must examine how the language of norms, the purpose of enforcement, and the communicated reasons shape the social acceptance that forms the basis of stable compliance. Moreover, the management of spaces such as urban forests plays a strategic role in improving the quality of the urban environment for public comfort (Dahar, et al., 2022).

Normative certainty is the primary requirement for interpreting public order as a rule worthy of obedience. Normative certainty means that the boundaries of prohibitions and obligations can be understood by citizens and can be applied consistently by officers (Melati, 2020). In regional regulations, terms such as disturbance, comfort, or order often require further elaboration so they do not turn into an overly broad gateway for discretion. Discretion is indeed necessary to face situational variations, but unfenced discretion can lead to inequality. Normatively,

inequality arises when similar cases are treated differently without accountable reasons. From this, it is evident that normative certainty is not merely a matter of drafting, but a matter of justice. Citizens will find it difficult to respect rules if they cannot predict the consequences of their actions. Therefore, the discussion on the effectiveness of regional public order regulations needs to place normative certainty as the basis of legitimacy, because legitimacy grows from the belief that rules operate through reason, not through momentary will. Social inequality resulting from urbanization is a major challenge in building social cohesion in urban environments (Mardikaningsih, 2021).

The legitimacy of enforcement becomes the next key because regional regulations operate through encounters between officers and citizens (Pambudi, 2020). In the normative realm, legitimacy means that citizens view enforcement as a reasoned, proportional action that aligns with the objectives of order. Valid enforcement treats citizens as subjects capable of understanding reasons, rather than objects to be moved. When enforcement is conducted with clear communication, reasonable warnings, and orderly procedures, citizens are more likely to judge the action as fair. Conversely, harsh enforcement without explanation produces a sense of humiliation, which can damage long-term compliance. Legitimacy is also linked to consistency. If enforcement only targets specific groups while other violations are ignored, enforcement is perceived as selectivity. Normatively, selectivity weakens the authority of the norm and turns compliance into a calculation. Thus, the legitimacy of enforcement does not stand outside the text of the rule, but is born from the way authority is practiced within social relations. This is related to community consumption practices, which are often used as a means of identity formation as well as social distinction in public spaces (Aisyah & Mardikaningsih, 2023).

Citizen compliance can be understood as the result of a combination of three elements: understanding, acceptance, and the repetition of habits (Moroni & Chiodelli, 2014). Understanding is born when rules are conveyed in a language that can be followed, including explanations regarding the goals and reasons for prohibitions. Acceptance is born when citizens judge the goal of order as a collective need and view enforcement as fair. The repetition of habits is born when

compliance becomes a social routine, such as the habit of disposing of trash in its proper place or the habit of maintaining pedestrian paths. In normative assessment, the highest quality of compliance is that which rests on acceptance, because it is more stable than compliance based on fear. Compliance based on fear easily collapses when supervision weakens. Therefore, regional public order regulations need to be read as a project for forming civilized social habits. This project requires clear norms, proper enforcement, and communication that fosters a sense of ownership toward public spaces.

Sanctions in regional regulations are often understood as the primary driver of compliance (Anwar et al., 2017). Normatively, sanctions do indeed carry a message about the seriousness of a norm, yet they cannot replace clarity and procedural fairness. Sanctions applied without reasonable stages, such as warnings and opportunities to rectify, can produce a sense of injustice. This sense of injustice fosters moral resistance that lowers the acceptance of the objectives of order. Conversely, the absence of real sanctions can make a norm appear as a moral appeal without weight. Therefore, what is required is alignment between the goal of order, the form of the sanction, and the method of application. In the normative realm, proportionality means that the burden imposed on citizens does not exceed the interests being protected. Proportionality also demands a distinction between violations that endanger the public and those of a minor nature. This distinction ensures that enforcement does not turn into coercion that damages dignity.

Officer discretion in the enforcement of public order is a vulnerable space, yet an unavoidable one (Jackson et al., 2015). It is vulnerable because discretion can be used to expand prohibitions beyond what is written, or to grant unequal leniency. It is unavoidable because situations in public spaces often change rapidly and cannot be entirely predicted by norms. Within a normative framework, valid discretion must be guided by clear guidelines, a record of reasons that can be examined, and openness to correction. Valid discretion places safety, order, and dignity as the primary considerations, rather than personal proximity or momentary interests. When citizens see discretion used in an orderly manner, they can accept that enforcement

requires wisdom. When citizens see discretion used without reason, enforcement is understood as an arbitrary act. Thus, the relationship between normative certainty and discretion must be organized through the principle of accountability. This principle asserts that discretion is not boundless freedom, but rather an authority that must be accounted for morally and legally.

Public order often intersects with the informal economic space. In the normative realm, the informal economic space is not automatically synonymous with disturbance, as it can be a morally legitimate means of livelihood (Ross & Caron, 2018). However, the use of public space for economic activities can lead to conflicts over space utilization, such as obstructing pedestrians or creating safety risks. Regional regulations exist to manage these conflicts. The normative question is how this management is carried out without producing injustice. When enforcement erases livelihoods without providing a reasonable space for adjustment, it can be perceived as disregarding dignity. Conversely, when enforcement allows the occupation of public space, the rights of other citizens to move freely are neglected. Therefore, the measure of effectiveness in social practice must include the element of balanced interests. Balance is not a vague compromise, but rather an order of reasoning, the differentiation of cases, and the establishment of clear boundaries. Within this framework, regional regulations can be judged by their ability to manage shared space fairly, rather than by strictness alone.

The relationship between public order and citizen freedom needs to be read normatively through the principle of reasoned limitation. Order demands limitations, such as prohibitions on noise at certain hours or bans on the use of space that endangers others (Backus, 2023). However, limitations must have a legitimate aim, appropriate means, and a burden that is not excessive. If limitations are too broad, citizens feel their living space is constricted without clear reason. If limitations are too narrow, disturbances are permitted and the goal of order fails. In social practice, citizens test the reasonableness of limitations through daily experience, such as whether a prohibition aligns with public needs and whether there is room to explain special circumstances. Therefore, a regional regulation that is effective in a normative sense must be able to

formulate sharp categories, so that limitations can be applied without sweeping across all situations. Sharp categories also protect officers, as they can act based on established measures rather than feelings. Thus, reasoned limitations strengthen both certainty and legitimacy simultaneously, while fostering more stable compliance.

Normative communication is an element often overlooked in discussions of public order, even though it determines whether citizens understand the direction of the rules. Normative communication means delivering the content of rules in an accessible manner, including explanations regarding the reasons, objectives, and enforcement procedures. In the normative realm, good communication respects citizens as subjects capable of weighing reasons (Pambudi, 2020). Poor communication treats citizens as objects that merely need to be intimidated. Regional regulations socialized only through enforcement will produce fragile compliance, as citizens perceive the rules as a threat. Conversely, communication accompanied by dialogue can foster acceptance, because citizens feel that the goal of order is a shared interest. Communication must also be consistent, as changes in messaging without explanation breed uncertainty. In social practice, uncertainty gives rise to rumors, and rumors weaken the authority of the norm. Therefore, normative communication is part of the legitimacy of enforcement. It forms a bridge between the text of the regional regulation and the habits of the citizens, allowing compliance to grow as a habit rather than a mere reaction to patrols.

The ethics of enforcement demand special attention because public order is often displayed through actions visible to many people (Backus, 2023). Normatively, these visible actions form a social lesson regarding how the state treats its citizens. Enforcement carried out with humiliation or verbal violence creates moral wounds and lowers trust. Enforcement carried out with orderly procedures and appropriate language affirms that order is a collective matter. The ethics of enforcement also include explanations of the reasons for an action, so that citizens understand why a particular act is viewed as a violation. Such explanations are not a formality but a part of procedural justice. Procedural justice demands that citizens be given the opportunity to understand and, to a certain extent, respond. When the ethics of enforcement are maintained,

sanctions become more acceptable because they appear as a consequence of understood rules, rather than as a sudden blow. Thus, the legitimacy of enforcement is produced by ethics within interaction, and those ethics are an essential requirement for interpreting effectiveness normatively.

Procedural justice in the enforcement of public order can be formulated through several elements. First, transparency regarding the basis of action and the stages taken. Second, equality of treatment in similar cases. Third, the opportunity to rectify minor violations through reasonable warnings. Fourth, the recording of reasons when immediate action is required due to danger. In the normative realm, these elements ensure that authority does not transform into coercion. Procedural justice also provides space for internal evaluation by the local government, as recorded actions can be examined for consistency. In social practice, citizens do not judge procedures from documents, but from experience. If procedures feel random, citizens build a narrative that enforcement depends on who encounters the officer (Jackson et al., 2015). This narrative damages compliance because citizens no longer see the norm as a general guide. Therefore, a normatively effective regional regulation requires procedures that can be perceived as fair, not just procedures that are written. With fair procedures, compliance can become a habit supported by trust.

Public order often contains a moral dimension that invites social judgment, such as assessments of behavior considered appropriate in public spaces (Setiyono, 2016). However, regional regulations must not depend on vague morality, as vague morality opens the door to excessive interpretation. Normatively, a norm must refrain from categories that stigmatize certain groups without a clear basis. When a norm contains stigma, enforcement tends toward labeling rather than spatial management. Labeling damages legitimacy, as citizens see enforcement as an effort to expel rather than to organize. A good regional regulation manages behavior through verifiable measures, such as safety, cleanliness, and ease of access. These measures are easier to understand and easier to use as justifications. Thus, public order needs to be understood as a shared conduct of behavior that can be measured, rather than as a unilateral preference. When measures are clear, citizens can assess themselves and adjust without waiting for enforcement. Self-adjustment

is the most stable form of compliance, and it serves as an important sign of effectiveness in a normative sense.

Regional regulations also function as a tool for coordination between regional agencies involved in enforcement, such as regional regulation enforcement units and other service units (Melati, 2020). In the normative realm, coordination is necessary so that enforcement does not conflict with itself. When one unit enforces a regulation while another unit grants permits without aligned conditions, citizens receive a confusing message. Confusing messages breed uncertainty, and uncertainty weakens compliance. Coordination also concerns the clear division of authority, so that citizens know where to inquire and what the correct procedures are. In social practice, procedural confusion is often resolved through informal means, and informal methods expand the space for inequality. Therefore, the effectiveness of regional regulations cannot be read solely from the formulation of prohibitions, but also from the orderliness of the governance supporting enforcement. Orderly governance reduces the need for coercive action, as citizens are provided with a clear path to comply. Thus, a normatively effective regional regulation combines clear norms with consistent governance, allowing compliance to grow through order rather than through tension.

Proportionality in enforcement needs to be read alongside the principle of prevention. Prevention means striving to ensure that violations do not occur through spatial planning, information, and warnings. In the normative realm, prevention is more aligned with the dignity of citizens compared to sudden enforcement actions. If public space is organized with clear signage, adequate facilities, and easy-to-follow paths, citizens are more likely to comply because compliance becomes easy (Masysyath et al., 2023). When compliance is made difficult, violations become a habit, and enforcement becomes an exhausting cycle. Therefore, the effectiveness of regional regulations needs to be interpreted as the ability to make compliance a reasonable habit. Prevention also demands risk differentiation. For violations that pose a danger, swift action can be justified. For minor violations, a warning can be a reasonable first step. This differentiation avoids uniform enforcement across all cases. Uniform enforcement often feels unfair because it ignores circumstances. Thus, proportionality and

prevention mutually reinforce each other as a normative basis for assessing whether public order is achieved through valid means.

Compliance in social practice is also shaped by institutional exemplarity. Institutional exemplarity means that the local government itself demonstrates compliance with procedures, administrative discipline, and transparency of reasoning (Nurdin, 2017). If a local government establishes prohibitions but neglects the arrangement of facilities, citizens will perceive an imbalance of obligations. If a local government demands cleanliness but fails to maintain waste management services, citizens will view the rules as a unilateral burden. This assessment weakens acceptance. Within a normative framework, citizen acceptance depends on the sense that obligations are shared fairly (Salet & Vries, 2019). Institutional exemplarity is also visible in the way officers conduct themselves. Officers who are polite and consistent send a message that order is a respected social agreement. Officers who are harsh send a message that order is dominance. Therefore, a regional regulation that is effective in social practice requires apparatus ethics as part of the normative framework. Apparatus ethics are not an addition, but rather a requirement for the norm to be accepted. Without apparatus ethics, the text of the rule loses its persuasive power and remains merely a threat.

Citizen compliance is often influenced by social sanctions, namely the environment's assessment of behavior in public spaces. Regional regulations can utilize social sanctions indirectly by establishing clear standards of appropriateness (Buijze et al., 2018). For example, when cleanliness is viewed as a collective obligation, citizens remind one another. However, social sanctions can also give rise to stigma against certain groups if enforcement sends a signal that disturbances always originate from the same group. Such stigma is dangerous because it shifts the goal of order toward symbolic expulsion. In the normative realm, regional regulations must ensure that their public messaging does not produce labeling. Labeling damages dignity and triggers resistance. Therefore, enforcement communication needs to emphasize behavior, not identity. When what is assessed is measurable behavior, social sanctions can become a reinforcer of civilized compliance. When what is assessed is identity, social sanctions become a tool for discrimination.

Thus, the effectiveness of regional regulations in social practice must include the quality of the moral message formed by enforcement, as that message determines the direction of social sanctions.

Public space also presents issues regarding the use of time, such as operational hours, quiet hours, and limitations on certain activities. In the normative realm, time restrictions can be justified to protect the right to rest and environmental tranquility (Melati, 2020). However, time restrictions must be clearly formulated and consistently applied. If the restricted hours change through non-transparent practices, citizens will become confused. Confusion lowers compliance because citizens lack a benchmark. Time restrictions also need to consider variations in legitimate activities. For example, religious or social activities may require different regulations compared to commercial activities that generate high noise levels. This distinction demands measurable criteria and acceptable reasons. In social practice, citizens accept time restrictions when they see consistent reasoning, such as the protection of health and peace. Citizens reject time restrictions when they see injustice, such as strict limitations on certain groups but leniency for others. Thus, the effectiveness of regional regulations regarding time restrictions depends on the certainty of measures and equality of application, as both determine legitimacy.

Regional public order regulations are often related to the management of local traffic, parking, and pedestrian access (Setiyono, 2016). In the normative realm, the primary goals are safety and fair access. Fair access means that road space is not dominated by just one type of user. If sidewalks are used for parking or trading, pedestrians lose their right to safe movement. However, management that only removes without reorganizing can create new problems, as mobility and economic needs persist. Normative assessment demands that regional regulations be read as norms that direct behavior while simultaneously directing spatial governance. When spatial governance is not aligned, repetitive enforcement does not produce new habits. In social practice, citizens learn from patterns. If enforcement patterns appear only occasionally without changes in spatial management, citizens perceive enforcement as a raid rather than the formation of order. This perception affects compliance. Therefore, effectiveness in social practice relates to the

ability of the norm to foster new behavioral patterns through clarity, consistency, and the formation of easy-to-follow routines.

Compliance is also linked to a sense of distributive justice, which is the feeling that the burdens and benefits of order are shared fairly. If order is perceived to benefit only certain groups, acceptance weakens. For example, if enforcement pressures small-scale traders while ignoring violations by large businesses, citizens perceive an injustice. In the normative realm, distributive injustice damages legitimacy because regional law is understood as a tool of power serving only a few (Surjan et al., 2016). This is also related to the dynamics of civil society movements and citizen political participation in safeguarding a healthy democracy (Rojak, Khayru, & Darmawan, 2021). Damaged legitimacy will lead to strategic compliance, where one obeys to avoid sanctions rather than out of acceptance of the objectives. Therefore, discussions on effectiveness need to assess the equality of enforcement targets and procedural equality. Procedural equality means all parties are given comparable treatment, including opportunities for clarification and warnings for minor violations. When equality is maintained, public order norms can become a shared reference. When equality is broken, the norm turns into an arena of conflict, and social practice becomes filled with exhausting negotiations.

Within a normative framework, regional public order regulations must also be understood as a tool for citizen education regarding spatial and behavioral order. Education here is not a lecture, but the formation of habits through clear rules and orderly enforcement. When enforcement is consistent, citizens can predict consequences and adjust accordingly (Pambudi, 2020). The importance of this civic education aims to increase public legal awareness comprehensively (Rojak, 2021). When enforcement is inconsistent, citizens learn that rules can be negotiated through proximity or specific circumstances. This kind of learning weakens the norm. Citizen education also requires the correct symbols, such as signs, markers, and information that is not confusing. In social practice, symbols help citizens follow rules without having to read legal texts. Therefore, the effectiveness of regional regulations does not only depend on the quality of the legal draft but also on the local government's ability to present the norm in a form that can be

experienced daily. If the norm exists as an understandable experience, compliance becomes a habit. If the norm exists as a surprise enforcement, compliance becomes a temporary reaction. This framework places social practice as an arena for the formation of citizen knowledge about order, so that effectiveness can be normatively assessed through the quality of education built by enforcement.

Accountability in enforcement is a crucial element because it closes the space for the abuse of authority (Anwar et al., 2017). In the normative realm, accountability demands that every action restricting a citizen can be explained by its legal basis and concrete reasons. The manifestation of effective leadership in governance must always be oriented toward public service (Rojak, 2021). This explanation protects citizens from arbitrary actions and protects officers from unfounded accusations. Accountability also demands the existence of correction mechanisms, both internal and administrative. In social practice, citizens judge accountability by the willingness of officers to explain and by the willingness of institutions to respond to complaints. If complaints are always viewed as resistance, social distance increases. Social distance damages compliance because citizens stop seeing the local government as the manager of a shared space (Nuridin, 2017). Therefore, accountability must be read as part of legitimacy. Legitimacy is not a gift, but the result of consistency between authority and reasoning. Thus, the effectiveness of regional public order regulations can be normatively understood as the ability of the norm to produce accountable and understandable enforcement, so that compliance grows through a sense of justice. Professional integrity in the legal system becomes an ethical principle to maintain sustainable justice (Saktiawan, et al., 2021).

Stable compliance requires a clear relationship between prohibitions and objectives. If the goal of order is unclear, prohibitions are perceived as a list of disruptive restrictions. If the goal of order is understood as the protection of shared space, prohibitions are more easily accepted. In the normative realm, objectives must be stated in a language that citizens can understand, such as safety, cleanliness, equal access, and tranquility. Efforts to build such social order involve both preventive and repressive perspectives toward acts of vandalism as well as other legal violations (Suwito, et al., 2023). These objectives need to serve as the basis for enforcement so that actions appear reasoned. If actions

do not appear reasoned, citizens judge enforcement as a routine of power. Such an assessment lowers acceptance. Therefore, a good regional regulation must maintain consistency between objectives, measures of violation, and types of sanctions. This consistency also helps officers choose the appropriate steps. In social practice, consistency fosters a sense that rules do not fluctuate. This sense strengthens compliance born from willingness. The adaptation of constitutional law is necessary to respond to the dynamics of globalization and urbanization in contemporary society (Rizky, et al., 2022). Thus, the relationship between objectives and prohibitions is a normative bridge that determines the effectiveness of regional regulations in social practice.

Normatively, regional public order regulations can be understood as effective when the norms provide clear measures, enforcement is carried out with fair and proportional procedures, and citizens accept the goal of order as a collective interest. Normative certainty reduces the space for excessive interpretation and upholds equality. The legitimacy of enforcement ensures that authority is practiced through reasoning, rather than through dominance. Citizen compliance becomes the result of understanding and acceptance, not merely the result of fear. In social practice, these three elements are interconnected. Certainty without legitimacy can lead to cold, mechanical compliance. Legitimacy without certainty can lead to sympathy without order. Compliance without certainty and legitimacy will be a fragile compliance. The pro-environmental behavior of citizens is influenced by environmental insights as well as the internal locus of control in maintaining sustainability (Nuraini, et al., 2022). Thus, the normative answer places effectiveness as the quality of regional legal governance reflected in the consistency of reasoning, the ethics of interaction, and the formation of civilized habits in public spaces.

Conclusion

The conclusion of this writing states that the effectiveness of regional regulations on public order in social practice, in a normative sense, is determined by the interconnectedness of three main elements: norm certainty, enforcement legitimacy, and citizen compliance. Norm certainty provides boundaries for prohibitions and obligations that can

be understood and applied consistently, ensuring that citizens have a stable benchmark for behavior. Enforcement legitimacy arises from fair procedures, clear communication, and the proportionality of actions, so that authority is not perceived as demeaning coercion. Quality citizen compliance is compliance rooted in the acceptance of the goals of order as a common interest, rather than compliance rooted in fear or momentary calculation. The relationship between these three elements demonstrates that public order norms function as a shared code of conduct that requires acceptable reasoning and administrative ethics in interactions. Thus, regional regulations are not sufficiently assessed by the neatness of their sanction formulations, but rather by the ability of the norms to form stable habits of compliance through certainty, procedural justice, and respect for citizen dignity.

Implications and suggestions are directed toward strengthening the normative quality of regional regulations and the ethical quality of enforcement so that public order is understood as a collective affair. The formulation of norms needs to avoid terms that are too flexible without specific measures, ensuring that field discretion remains within accountable boundaries. Enforcement guidelines should include clear stages, including reasonable warnings for minor violations, the recording of justifications for immediate actions, and standards of equal treatment for similar cases. Public communication must emphasize the objectives of order using easily understood language, so that citizens can link prohibitions to the protection of shared spaces. Enforcement should reject identity labeling and emphasize measured behavioral adjustment, so that social sanctions do not turn into stigma. Internal accountability mechanisms and administrative complaint channels need to be positioned as part of procedural justice to maintain public trust. Through these steps, compliance can grow as a willingness, and public order can become a civilized social habit.

References

- Aisyah, S., & Mardikaningsih, R. 2023. Assembling the Self, Marking Boundaries: Consumption as a Practice of Identity and Social Distinction. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(2), 315-326.

- Anwar, Y., S. Suseno., & N. S. Putri. 2017. Law Enforcement of the Bandung Regional Regulations on the Orderliness, Cleanliness, and the Beauty. *Sriwijaya Law Review*, 1(1), 093-109.
- Arfa, F. A., & W. Marpaung. 2016. *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum Islam*. Kencana, Jakarta.
- Backus, J. D. 2023. *Maintaining Order in the Face of Disagreement*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Buijze, A., W. Salet., & M. Van. Rijswijk. 2018. *How to Contextualize Legal Norms in Practices of Sustainable Development? Distinguishing Principles, Rules and Procedural Norms*. Routledge, London.
- Dahar, D., Arifin, S., Nuraini, R., & Mardikaningsih, R. 2022. Urban Forest: The role of improving the quality of the urban environment. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 1(1), 25-29.
- Darmawan, D., Anjanarko, T. S., & Masithoh, N. 2023. Transformasi Pelayanan Publik: Memahami Perankompetensi Pegawai Kecamatan dan Teknologi Informasi dalam Meningkatkan Kepuasan Publik. *Jurnal Ilmiah Satyagraha*, 6(2), 262-275.
- Fariz, F. A. B. M. 2021. Populist Ethno-Religious Nationalism: Challenges to Global Governance and Domestic Social Integration, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 75-92.
- Fitriansyah, S., Harmiati, & E. Darmawati. 2023. Evaluation of Bengkulu Province Regional Regulation Number 02 of 2018 Concerning the Implementation of Public Order, Community Peace, and Community Protection (Study of Street Vendors in the Panorama Traditional Market of Bengkulu City). *Indonesian Journal of Social Sciences, Policy and Politics*, 1(3), 66-70.
- Gautama, E. C., & Mardikaningsih, R. 2022. Driving Sustainable Behavior Change Through Education and Public Awareness. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 259-264.
- Gayet-Viaud, C. 2017. French Cities' Struggle Against Incivilities: from Theory to Practices in Regulating Urban Public Space. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 23(1), 77-97.
- Gunarto, G. 2023. Legal Reconstruction of Regional Government Public Safety Based on Justice Values. *Scholars International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 6(04), 239-244.
- Halizah, S. N., & Mardikaningsih, R. 2022. Accommodating Social Change in Sustainability Policy: Solutions for a Just and Relevant Society. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(2), 299-304.
- Henn, M., M. Weinstein., & N. Foard. 2005. *A Short Introduction to Social Research*. Sage, London.
- Hutasuhut, U. M., Z. Zuhraeni., A. Hermanto., & T. Triono. 2022. Problematika Implementasi Kebijakan Kota Bandar Lampung dalam Mewujudkan

- Ketentruman dan Ketertiban Umum: Perspektif Siyasa Dusturiyah. *The Journal Of Constitutional Law*, 2(2), 133-148.
- Jackson, J., T. R. Tyler., M. Hough., B. Bradford., & A. Mentovich. 2015. Compliance and Legal Authority. In *the International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1-11.
- Khayru, R. K., & Darmawan, D. 2023. Collective Empathy Fatigue Governance in Public Service Care Workforces and Systems. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 3(1), 237-268.
- Mahmud, M., Darmawan, D., Khayru, R. K., Nuraini, R., & Issalillah, F. 2023. Enforcement of Criminal Law Against Perpetrators of Environmental Pollution. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 4(1), 43-46.
- Mahmudah, S. 2022. Economic Informality and Urban Worker Precarity in City Governance, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(2), 231-258.
- Mardikaningsih, R. 2021. Urbanization and Social Inequality: Challenges in Building Social Cohesion in a City-Based Environment. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 135-140.
- Mardikaningsih, R., & Hariani, M. 2021. Realizing Sustainability in Public Policy: Building a Balance between Economy, Social, and Environment. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 191-196.
- Masysyath, H., U. Umar., & H. Husni. 2023. Analisis Operasional Dinas Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja dalam Menegakkan Ketertiban dan Kepatuhan terhadap Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Sumbawa Barat. *Ganec Suara*, 17(4), 1580-1585.
- Melati, H. B. 2020. Regulation Implementation Effectiveness of Outdoors Users in Town Square of Bandung, Indonesia. *Journal of Contemporary Governance and Public Policy*, 1(2), 108-121.
- Moroni, S., & F. Chiodelli. 2014. Municipal Regulations and the use of Public Space: Local Ordinances in Italy. *City, Territory and Architecture*, 1(1), 1-11.
- Nugraha, J. H. 2022. Upaya Penegakan Hukum melalui Penguatan Kesadaran Hukum Pkl dalam Rangka Menciptakan Tertib Penataan Pkl. *Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan Ekonomi*, 10(2), 338-338.
- Nuraini, R., Darmawan, D., Mardikaningsih, R., Hariani, M., & Halizah, S. N. 2022. Keberlanjutan kelestarian lingkungan: Peran kunci lokus kendali internal dan wawasan lingkungan dalam mendorong perilaku pro-lingkungan. *TIN: Terapan Informatika Nusantara*, 3(3), 116-122.
- Nurdin, I. 2017. *Etika Pemerintahan: Norma, Konsep, dan Praktek bagi Penyelenggara Pemerintahan*. Lintang Rasi Aksara Books, Yogyakarta.
- Oluwatosin, A., & Rojak, J. A. 2023. The Role of Cultural Identity to Build Social Cohesion: Challenges, Implications, and Integration Strategies in Multicultural Societies. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 2(1), 56-62.

- Pakpahan, N. H., Darmawan, D., & Rojak, J. A. 2022. Racial Discrimination and How Psychological Wellbeing and Social Engagement Impacts: A Review of the Literature on Identity, Stigma, and Coping Strategies in Multicultural Societies. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 87-94.
- Pambudi, A. 2020. Effectiveness of Street Vendor Regulation Policies to Improve Public Order in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University*, 55(3), 1-9.
- Rizky, M. C., Herisasono, A., Hardyansah, R., Saktiawan, P., & Saputra, R. 2022. Constitutional Law Adaptation in Response to Globalization and Urbanization in Contemporary Societies. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 195-200.
- Rojak, J. A. 2021. The Effectively Leading Manifestation of Public Service-Oriented Governance. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 89-96.
- Rojak, J. A. 2021. The Importance of Civic Education to Increase Community Legal Awareness. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 44-50.
- Rojak, J. A., R. K. Khayru, & D. Darmawan. 2021. Citizens' Political Participation in Electoral Democracy and the Dynamics of Civil Society Movements, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 161-176.
- Ross, D., & M. Caron. 2018. Bad Behaviours and Disorderly Public Spaces. *Urban History Review-Revue D Histoire Urbaine*, 47, 5-9.
- Saktiawan, P., Hardyansah, R., Darmawan, D., & Putra, A. R. 2021. Ethical Principles in Indonesian Legal Advocacy: Sustaining Justice in Adversarial Systems Through Professional Integrity. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 239-244.
- Salet, W., & J. de. Vries. 2019. Contextualisation of Policy and Law in Sustainable Urban Development. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 62(2), 189-204.
- Setiyono, J. 2016. Human Rights Based Law Enforcement for the Violation of Local Regulation by Civil Service Police of Semarang Municipality. *Diponegoro Law Journal*, 1(1), 61-80.
- Surjan, A., Atta-ur-Rahman, G. A. Parvin., & R. Shaw. 2016. Urban Regulation and Enforcement: A Challenge. In *Urban Disasters and Resilience in Asia*, 69-78.
- Suwito, S., Terubus, T., Pakpahan, N. H., Darmawan, D., & Bangsu, M. 2023. Vandalism and Law Enforcement: Preventive and Repressive Perspectives in Building Social Order. *Legalis et Socialis Studiis (L355)*, 1(3), 1-9.
- Tahir, R., I. G. P. Astawa., A. Widjajanto., M. L. Panggabean., M. M. Rohman., N. P. P. Dewi., & S. R. Paminto. 2023. *Metodologi Penelitian Bidang Hukum: Suatu Pendekatan Teori dan Praktik*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia, Yogyakarta.
- Tyler, T. R. 2003. Procedural Justice, Legitimacy, and the Effective Rule of Law. *Crime and Justice*, 30, 283-357.