pISSN 2798-2106 eISSN 2808-4470

Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia
Vol. 3, No. 2, 247-276

Environmental Violation Recidivism in Industrial Estates Under Organizational Compliance Frameworks

Fadhilah Rahmawati, Rahayu Mardikaningsih, Fayola Issalillah

Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya

correspondence: rahayumardikaningsih@gmail.com

Abstract

This article presents a sociological analysis of recurring environmental violations in industrial zones, viewing recidivism as a pattern of flawed organisational learning rather than merely a technical error. The author argues that violations persist due to a gap between formal compliance and on-the-ground practices. This is driven by an organisational culture that prioritises administrative documentation over concrete action, hierarchical communication that hinders problem reporting, and an incentive system that values production targets over environmental obligations. This cycle of violations is exacerbated by collective rationalisations that normalise deviations and the fragmentation of responsibility across work units. As a solution, this article offers a normative framework for evaluating substantive compliance through four key criteria: coherence of managerial decisions, procedural fairness, risk transparency, and alignment of incentives. This approach aims to guide academics and practitioners in strengthening accountability standards and promoting ethically grounded organisational corrections to prevent the recurrence of violations in the future.

Keywords: recidivism, environmental compliance, industrial estates, organizational authority, internal social control, procedural fairness, accountability.

Rahmawati, F., R. Mardikaningsih, & F. Issalillah. 2023. Environmental Violation Recidivism in Industrial Estates under Organizational Compliance Frameworks, Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia, 3(2), 247-276.

Introduction

Industrial areas are often perceived as production spaces governed by technical standards, work schedules, and orderly governance. However, behind this image of order, environmental management practices remain dependent on human decisions, labor relations, and habits that grow within the organization. In the daily life of industry, choices regarding disposal, storage, transport, and emission control are not merely matters of machinery and documentation, but also matters of shared knowledge, negotiated compliance, and determined priorities. Social interaction within digital society also influences how internal organizational communication patterns develop and how virtual communities within the industrial sphere build discourses regarding social responsibility (Darmawan, 2021). It is in this place that repeated violations acquire sociological meaning, as repetition indicates the existence of patterns that transcend single incidents. These patterns can be formed through the way workers understand risk, the way management signals what is considered important, and the way the company's social environment processes guilt and justification. When violations occur repeatedly, the issue that emerges is not merely a technical failure, but a question of how environmental norms are treated as social obligations (Räthzel & Uzzell, 2019). Thus, environmental recidivism in industrial areas opens a space for reading regarding power relations, the culture of compliance, and the values that guide collective action.

Environmental regulations in industrial areas usually combine prohibitions, obligations, licensing, reporting, and sanctions (Silva & Namen, 2022). On paper, these instruments form a clear fence. However, in the workspace, these instruments exist as procedures that must be carried out, costs that must be allocated, and time that must be taken from the production process. Socially formed environmental values within the organization have a significant influence on operational decisions aligned with sustainability principles (Mardikaningsih et al., 2022). The tension between the logic of production and the logic of environmental protection can produce practical compromises that are difficult to see from documentation. These compromises often appear in the form of delays, simplification of procedures, or adjustments justified as work habits. When these compromises are repeated and become routine, repeated

violations transform into part of the organizational pattern. At this stage, recidivism can no longer be understood as isolated individual errors, but rather as a result of the way the organization learns. Organizations can learn to comply, but organizations can also learn to evade. The latter learning is often supported by work methods that normalize risk and communication methods that dampen critical questions.

Industrial areas are also social spaces that bring together many actors with different interests. There are workers chasing targets, managers managing costs, compliance units handling documentation, and external parties who monitor. Among these actors, environmental knowledge often circulates unevenly. When knowledge is unevenly distributed, responsibility can be shifted or narrowed (Sanseverino-Godfrin, 2014). Organizational diversity and inclusion function as a social order that ensures the distribution of knowledge and the involvement of actors from various backgrounds in the contemporary workplace (Irfan & Hariani, 2023). Repeated violations can then emerge as a result of blurred divisions of responsibility, where one unit feels that the environment is the business of another unit. Furthermore, hierarchical relations in the workplace can limit the courage to convey warnings. The transformation of masculinity and femininity in modern society also has implications for leadership dynamics and the courage to speak up within corporate authority structures (Negara & Khayru, 2022). In such relationships, those who understand the risks may choose to remain silent for fear of being judged as hindering work. Repeated silence can become a social habit that closes the space for correction. At the same time, organizations can develop a language of justification that sounds rational, for example, by citing operational emergencies or simplifying the meaning of compliance into minimum fulfillment. This language of justification is important to discuss because it shapes the collective way of viewing violations.

Repeated environmental violations in industrial areas can also be understood as a matter of norm legitimacy (Sanseverino-Godfrin, 2014). Environmental norms demand consistent control because the environment does not forgive negligence through administrative pauses (Hunter, 2023). However, the legitimacy of norms within an organization is often tested by practical questions such as who bears the costs, who receives the benefits, and who bears the reputational risks. The

construction of social identity in contemporary society is influenced by environmental dynamics and group affiliations that determine how individual norms are aligned with collective norms (Hariani, 2023). If norms are perceived as a unilateral burden, compliance can turn into a formality with minimal commitment. In such circumstances, organizations tend to build document-based compliance, while operational practices move on a different track. When the gap between documentation and practice becomes a habit, environmental recidivism finds its place. It grows from an internal assessment that certain violations can be tolerated as long as they are not visible, or as long as the consequences can be managed. A sociological reading pays attention to this logic of tolerance. This logic is not merely a technical choice, but also a reflection of social norms within the organization regarding what is considered acceptable, who is allowed to take risks, and how the organization processes recurring events.

In industrial areas, repeated violations are also related to social control mechanisms within the company (Vacher et al., 2017). Control does not always manifest as formal sanctions; rather, it can take the form of work supervision, performance evaluations, and rewards for production achievements. If rewards are predominantly given for output while environmental compliance is relegated to an administrative matter, the organizational signals become imbalanced. Gender dynamics and work-life balance in the hybrid work era demonstrate how significantly social work arrangements impact employee focus and priorities (Irfan et al., 2023). These signals guide behavior because workers read what is truly valued. In the long run, skewed signals can encourage the neglect of procedures perceived as hindrances. Recidivism then emerges as a habit passed down from one team to another. This habit can be maintained by work group solidarity that views environmental compliance as an additional burden, or by the habit of solving problems quickly without waiting for full procedures (Gray, 2011). Current feminist sociological perspectives also highlight how the double burden experienced by female workers can affect their participation in maintaining ethical standards in the workplace (Fauzi, 2023). Discussions narrowing in on environmental recidivism need to place these habits as objects of normative study. This is because work habits are not just routines, but also the embodiment of living social norms within the organization that influence the quality of compliance.

The issue that needs to be explained is how environmental recidivism can persist even though regulatory frameworks and compliance procedures are available. At a normative level, the existence of rules is often assumed to be sufficient to prevent the repetition of violations. However, repetition indicates that the presence of rules does not automatically form substantive compliance. Adaptive capacity and the transformation process in social resilience discourse determine the extent to which an organization is able to survive while simultaneously improving itself from established patterns of violation (Oluwatosin et al., 2023). Repetition can signify that the organization has found ways to reduce the risk of sanctions without changing the practices that birthed the violations (Martín et al., 2008). Repetition can also signify that the violation has become a form of organizational adjustment to production pressure, such that the violation is understood as a natural consequence of the job. In such circumstances, environmental norms experience a decline in authority in the eyes of internal actors. Analysis of algorithmic bias and the automation of justice shows that without critical human intervention, procedural systems can perpetuate social injustice (Mardikaningsih & Oluwatoyin, 2023). This decline in authority is visible in the way people talk about procedures, the way people delay corrective actions, and the way the organization classifies violations as minor incidents. All of these are sociological issues because they involve the formation of meaning, justification, and habituation.

Another issue lies in the interpretation of responsibility and error within an organization when repeated violations occur. In many organizations, violations can be explained away as individual errors, even though repetitive patterns often indicate the existence of structures that encourage similar actions to recur (Räthzel & Uzzell, 2019). Such structures may include a division of labor that masks vulnerable points, decision-making flows that prioritize speed, or a communication culture that suppresses warnings. Disparities in access to education and technical knowledge in developing countries often become the main obstacles in systemic solution strategies for handling environmental issues (Rojak & Khayru, 2022). When responsibility is narrowed down to specific individuals, the organization risks ignoring the social sources of the repetition. Conversely, if responsibility is dissolved into a shared responsibility without clarity, then no party feels obligated to make

improvements. Both conditions can sustain recidivism. At the same time, the handling of violations often produces internal narratives—for example, narratives that the incident was a coincidence, narratives that the risk was already managed, or narratives that the violation occurred due to external pressure. Digital marketing communication strategies, such as email marketing relevance, show how consistently built narratives can shape perceptions and influence the loyalty of actors toward organizational values (Sinambela & Darmawan, 2021). These narratives are important because they shape organizational memory. If organizational memory is built through soothing narratives, then compliance learning does not evolve. This is the issue that must be explained normatively, as it concerns how an organization forms moral standards regarding environmental responsibility.

This writing is important because environmental recidivism in industrial areas touches the core of the relationship between production, compliance, and organizational morality. Repeated violations are not merely a repetition of events, but rather a marker of social learning patterns that rearrange the boundaries between what is permitted and what is prohibited. The performance of authenticity in popular culture, which often commodifies parasocial bonds on social media, provides an illustration of how external images can mask fragile operational realities (Hariani & Mardikaningsih, 2022). If these patterns are not understood, compliance evaluations can easily get trapped in a list of violations, thereby ignoring the social mechanisms that cause violations to recur. A normative description is necessary to organize the concept of environmental recidivism as a social phenomenon, as well as to clarify how work culture, authority structures, and internal controls can strengthen or weaken compliance. With such a framework, the discussion can place environmental actions as part of organizational ethics, rather than just a formal obligation. This urgency is also related to the need to build a scientific language capable of explaining why norm enforcement often yields different results between organizations, despite seemingly similar sets of rules. Targeted writing can help clarify valid assessment measures for interpreting substantive compliance within the industrial space.

The problem formulation in this writing is how patterns of environmental violation recidivism in industrial areas can be sociologically explained through the relationship between the formation of compliance

meaning, organizational authority structures, and internal social control mechanisms. The purpose of this writing is to develop a sociological normative framework to explain the formation of environmental violation recidivism in industrial areas by organizing the relationship between the meaning of compliance, the division of responsibility, and organizational social control mechanisms. The description is directed toward clarifying the distinction between formal compliance and substantive compliance, as well as demonstrating how narratives of justification, work habits, and internal reward signals can sustain the repetition of violations. This writing also aims to formulate conceptual criteria that can be used to interpret the quality of organizational accountability for environmental obligations, without depending on field data. With such a framework, scientific discussion gains a foothold to assess recidivism as a social phenomenon that can be understood through organizational structure and culture.

Method

This study employs a qualitative literature study to develop a normative sociological explanation regarding environmental offense recidivism in industrial areas as a recurring and institutionalized social pattern. Reading materials were selected by emphasizing conceptual alignment with themes of compliance, recurring deviation, social control, organizational culture, and the rationality of action within industrial work environments. The reading process was conducted in stages by separating descriptive ideas, normative propositions, and theoretical consequences, ensuring that every claim can be traced through a well-structured argumentation. The principles of problem structuring, formulation of research questions, and the discipline of social reasoning follow the social research methodology guidelines presented by Edgerton and Babbie (2023), particularly regarding how to build relationships between concepts and how to maintain the boundaries of conclusions when the research does not utilize field data.

The processing of legal materials and environmental policy materials is positioned as part of the normative reading, especially when the concept of recidivism intersects with compliance obligations and corporate accountability. Within the framework of legal research methodology, Susiani (2024) assists in organizing how to read norms as prescriptions that carry values, as well as how to assess the coherence between environmental

protection goals, organizational obligations, and the consequences of repeated violations. From this point, recidivism is understood as an indication that the norm has not yet become a stable behavioral guide within the organization, or that the organization constructs justifications that diminish the authority of the obligation (Romdoni, 2022). The reading technique emphasizes conceptual interpretation, the sharpening of operational definitions, and the synthesis of normative categories that can explain how recurring violations are produced through work habits, decision-making flows, and the division of responsibility.

The qualitative approach to social reasoning refers to Lune and Berg (2017), with an emphasis on interpretative work toward texts, consistency of categories, and sensitivity to organizational language that forms the justification for actions. This process generates a series of interrelated propositions, such as the relationship between internal reward signals and the normalization of violations, as well as the relationship between narratives of individual error and the blurring of collective accountability. Because this research is purely literature-based, the results are presented as normative arguments tested through logical coherence, conceptual precision, and the readability of cause-meaning relationships within organizational social practices.

Result and Discussion

Public regulation must be supported by a normative foundation that affirms the moral obligation of organizers to protect the dignity of citizens and maintain the balance of public interest. The formulation of clear and rational rules is a prerequisite for norms to be accepted as reasonable behavioral guidelines. In this process, regulations such as Government Regulation (PP) No. 27 of 2020 and PP No. 23 of 2021 must be used as normative references because both affirm the principles of spatial planning and fair governance. Normative certainty and the legitimacy of law enforcement in regional public order regulations are crucial to ensuring social stability (Wibisono et al., 2023). Policymakers are obliged to open spaces for public participation so that the aspirations of vulnerable groups are accommodated, ensuring that the legitimacy of rules grows through fair procedures. When citizens view rules as the result of accountable policies,

compliance develops as a form of moral responsibility rather than merely a consequence of the threat of sanctions.

The implementation of regulations requires strict accountability and trustworthy enforcement mechanisms. Enforcement officials must apply norms consistently so that citizens gain certainty over the consequences of their actions. In this regard, PP No. 22 of 2021 provides the administrative framework and relevant procedures to ensure orderliness in the implementation of regional policies. The ethical obligations of law enforcement include transparency in the enforcement process, access to complaint channels, and responsive corrective procedures. The effectiveness of work supervision has a significant influence on job satisfaction and the integrity of officials in carrying out their professional duties (Sinambela et al., 2023). Such accountability strengthens the moral relationship between citizens and public organizers and solidifies social stability through the growth of public trust.

The language and presentation of rules play an important role in shaping social acceptance of the enforced norms. Regulations drafted with technical terminology without explanation will find it difficult to become guidelines understood by the general public. Therefore, relevant regulations such as Minister of Health Regulation (Permenkes) No. 2 of 2023 need to be communicated in an educational manner so that the implications for public health can be understood and internalized. Policymakers are obliged to prepare communicative socialization materials so that the objectives of enforcement and the rational reasons behind each norm become clear. Digital literacy through social media has now become a vital contemporary instrument for distributing policy information to the younger generation (Kurniawan et al., 2021). This information openness allows citizens to assess the fairness of rules and act based on collective responsibility.

The process of formulating rules must pay attention to the distribution of benefits and burdens so as not to deepen social inequality. The principle of substantive justice must serve as a benchmark when drafting norms so that vulnerable groups do not become the parties most disadvantaged by the enforcement of public order. The phenomenon of urbanization often brings challenges in the form of social inequality that require the strengthening of social cohesion through inclusive policies (Mardikaningsih, 2021). Law No. 32 of 2009 concerning Environmental Protection and Management

emphasizes the importance of considering environmental and social impacts in public policy. Therefore, the ethical obligation of rule-makers includes a comprehensive impact evaluation and the provision of mediation mechanisms to accommodate reasonable objections. Citizen involvement in managing ecological issues through participatory practices strengthens community-based social support (Zulkarnain et al., 2021). In this way, rules will be more legitimate and sustainable.

The drafting of regulations must be equipped with systematic evaluation and revision mechanisms so that policies can adapt to changing social and technical conditions. Publication documents such as PP No. 22 of 2021 and PP No. 23 of 2021 provide an administrative framework that allows for periodic reviews of regional policies. The ethical obligation for regional governments is to ensure that evaluation results are published and serve as the basis for policy improvements. An in-depth analysis of work experience and the demographic background of development actors is necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of long-term policies (Khayru et al., 2022). This type of learning cycle encourages responsiveness and provides opportunities for correction when rules turn out to have impacts that harm public welfare.

Collective responsibility in public space governance requires active community participation, public oversight, and synergy between institutions. Civilized norm enforcement is based on the principles of transparency, accountability, and respect for human rights so that policy mechanisms can maintain social harmony. In addition to formal adjudication, dispute resolution through mediation mechanisms is a concrete manifestation of protecting community rights (Zahid et al., 2021). Regulations such as Permenkes No. 2 of 2023 and relevant PPs must be integrated into spatial planning practices so that health objectives and public order can be achieved simultaneously. Through inclusive legislative practices and the application of the principles of justice and environmental care, public space can be managed for collective welfare and become an ethical reference for collective behavior.

Environmental recidivism in industrial areas can be explained as a social pattern born from the encounter between formal norms and repetitive work habits (Räthzel & Uzzell, 2019). Repetition indicates that violations do not stand as incidental events, but rather as the result of a

process of habituation that rearranges the boundaries of propriety. Within an organization, work habits are formed through operational routines, target pressures, and the way knowledge is shared from senior workers to new employees. The construction of self-identity within a long-term social environment also influences how individuals respond to collective norms (Warin, 2015). When a deviant action does not immediately trigger felt consequences, that action tends to be judged as safe and worthy of repetition (Blondiau & Rousseau, 2011). That assessment of safety then transforms into a collective belief that reduces moral sensitivity toward environmental obligations. At this stage, recidivism becomes a symptom of misguided social learning, as the organization learns that compliance can be replaced by minimal actions that keep the production process running. Sociological explanation pays attention to how these collective beliefs are formed and maintained. It demands an interpretation of the language of justification, the grouping of responsibilities, and the forms of internal control that determine whether a deviation is considered a violation or merely a work variation.

The meaning of compliance is the first knot that explains why violations can recur. Compliance is often understood as the fulfillment of documents, reporting, or the completeness of administrative procedures, whereas substantive compliance demands the alignment of actual behavior with environmental protection goals (Hunter, 2023). Social vulnerability in poor households in densely populated areas often complicates the narrative of compliance with ideal environmental standards (Mahmudah, 2021). When an organization focuses its attention on administrative evidence, the space for operational deviation becomes larger. Organizational members learn to distinguish between what must appear compliant and what can be negotiated in the field. This separation turns compliance into a game of presentation, where what matters is the completeness of the paper trail and the readiness of answers, rather than the discipline of risk control. Social perception of violations is also influenced by the mental health impacts arising from social environmental instability (Issalillah & Khayru, 2021). In such an atmosphere, recidivism emerges because violations can be repeated while still maintaining the image of compliance. This explanation leads to the normative conclusion that the quality of compliance cannot be measured solely by administrative orderliness. The quality of compliance

must be read from the organization's willingness to bind work habits to environmental goals, including when those goals conflict with cost, time, and production demands.

The organizational authority structure influences recidivism through the way decisions are made and held accountable (Rivers et al., 2015). In highly hierarchical structures, environmental decisions often follow a long chain of command, causing corrective actions to be easily delayed. Repeated delays send a signal that environmental compliance is a secondary priority. Furthermore, hierarchy can form a culture of silence, where field workers are reluctant to report deviations for fear of being seen as troublemakers. When warnings do not move upward, management receives an overly neat picture of operational conditions. This neat picture makes it easier for the organization to maintain the belief that the system is functioning well, thus no urge arises to change work habits. On the other hand, hierarchy can also create protection mechanisms for decision-makers, as errors can be shifted toward the implementers. If this pattern repeats, recidivism gains structural support. Violations become risks borne by the workers, while the benefits of smooth production are enjoyed by the management line. Sociological explanation assesses that this kind of burden-sharing weakens the legitimacy of environmental norms in the eyes of the implementers.

Internal social control is often understood as audits, inspections, or compliance checks (Zheng & Chun, 2017). However, sociologically, internal control also works through performance evaluations, the language of rewards, and forms of reprimand that are considered reasonable. If an organization rewards primarily speed, production volume, and cost savings, workers learn that environmental compliance is a mere supplement. Control that prioritizes output creates hidden incentives to cut procedures, delay maintenance, or tolerate actions that reduce the quality of control. Continuous tolerance becomes a new social norm. This new social norm is often stronger than written rules because it is supported by social relations and the need to survive in the workplace. Recidivism then emerges when violations become a form of compliance with internal social norms namely, the norm to meet targets and avoid conflict with superiors. From a normative perspective, this situation shows that environmental compliance requires alignment between written rules and

the reward system. Without alignment, organizations risk forming a double compliance that maintains the repetition of violations.

The language of justification holds an important position in maintaining recidivism. Repeated violations are rarely acknowledged as deliberate decisions. They are often wrapped in soothing phrases, such as emergency measures, temporary adjustments, or non-ideal operational conditions. This language works as a moral tool to alleviate guilt and shut down the need for evaluation. When an organization repeatedly uses soothing language, it builds a culture of rationalization. A culture of rationalization makes violations feel acceptable as long as they can be explained. The primary strength of rationalization lies in its ability to transform a violation into a plausible story, allowing the individuals involved to maintain a self-image as responsible workers. In the long run, rationalization lowers corrective capacity because criticism can be dismissed as a lack of understanding of the work reality (Beamish, 2000). Sociological explanation assesses that recidivism persists when the language of justification moves faster than the learning process. When justification arrives first, the organization loses the opportunity to rearrange habits, as the incident is already considered morally settled.

The blurred division of responsibility becomes fertile ground for the repetition of violations (Räthzel & Uzzell, 2019). In many industrial organizations, there are operational units, maintenance units, safety units, and compliance units. Each unit has its own perspective and priorities. If the boundaries of responsibility are unclear, violations are easily shifted as the business of another unit. This shifting creates space for negligence, as each party can feel they have performed a small part that is deemed sufficient. Recidivism emerges when no single actor holds full responsibility for environmental outcomes. Here, repeated violations are the result of fragmentation. Fragmentation turns environmental obligations into a list of separate tasks rather than a collective commitment. Sociological explanation points toward the need for a concept of connected accountability. Connected accountability means that every unit understands the link between its actions and environmental results, and recognizes that the failure of another unit still impacts the organization as a whole. Without this understanding, organizations tend

to respond to violations as administrative nuisances, rather than as indicators that work habits need to be reorganized.

The repetition of violations can also be explained through the dynamics of knowledge and ignorance that are socially produced (Rorie et al., 2015). Ignorance does not always mean an absence of information. Ignorance can be shaped through the way an organization chooses what is discussed and what is avoided. If environmental issues are considered sensitive, discussions may be narrowed to avoid creating additional responsibilities. In meeting rooms, reports can be summarized, terminology can be softened, and questions can be diverted. This practice creates functional ignorance ignorance that is useful for maintaining organizational stability. Functional ignorance facilitates recidivism because the organization can claim not to know the details or regard incidents as exceptions. In labor relations, this ignorance is contagious, as people learn that asking too many questions risks being seen as disruptive. Ultimately, recidivism becomes a consequence of a communication culture that limits clarity. Normatively, this condition shows that environmental compliance requires an ethics of knowledge namely, the obligation to maintain the openness of relevant information, especially information relating to risks and consequences.

The difference between compliance based on fear of sanctions and compliance based on the acceptance of norms also explains recidivism. Fear-based compliance tends to be situational, strengthening when supervision exists and weakening when supervision is loose. Within an organization, this type of compliance encourages behavior aimed at covering tracks and shifting blame. If the main goal is to avoid consequences, then attention is focused on how to appear compliant rather than how to be compliant. Recidivism emerges because the root of the problem remains untouched. Conversely, acceptance-based compliance demands that environmental norms be considered reasonable and fair, and be understood as part of the dignity of work (Silva & Namen, 2022). Acceptance requires an understanding of the objectives and a sense that the burden of compliance is shared appropriately. Sociological explanation shows that recidivism is more likely to occur when an organization fails to build acceptance. This failure can be seen in how the organization positions the environment as a peripheral matter, or how the

organization treats compliance as a cost that must be suppressed. Thus, recidivism is not merely a matter of supervision, but a matter of normative legitimacy within the organization.

Patterns of recidivism are also related to how an organization builds collective memory regarding incidents of violation (Rorie et al., 2015). Collective memory is formed through evaluation meetings, reports, and informal stories in the workplace. If an incident of violation is recorded as an event that has been handled, without discussion regarding the social causes and the underlying habits, collective memory becomes shallow. Shallow memory stores events but does not store lessons. This condition allows similar incidents to recur easily because the organization does not change its way of thinking and working. If evaluations are performed as a formality, then recidivism becomes a natural consequence. Conversely, if an organization builds an honest collective memory, incidents of violation become a source of normative knowledge about what should be avoided and how to improve. Sociological explanation emphasizes that collective memory is also influenced by who has the right to tell the story. If the narrative is dominated by parties interested in maintaining an image, the lessons tend to be narrowed. Within this framework, recidivism can be understood as an organization's failure to form a memory that binds behavior.

The normalization of deviance is a classic mechanism that explains the repetition of violations. Normalization occurs when a deviant action is performed repeatedly, does not cause immediate consequences, and is then accepted as common practice. In industrial areas, the normalization of deviance can be driven by habits of quick problem-solving, procedural fatigue, or the belief that procedures are too ideal (Bottoms & Bottoms, 2019). Every time a deviation succeeds without a real incident, the belief that the deviation is safe strengthens. This belief is then passed down to new members through informal training. The normalization of deviance can also be supported by management's reluctance to acknowledge systemic problems, as acknowledgment would require changes in costs and work reorganization. Sociologically, the normalization of deviance shows that recidivism is not merely a violation of rules, but a shift in internal social norms. These new internal norms judge deviance as a form of work proficiency. From a normative standpoint, this situation raises questions about the boundaries of justifiable tolerance. When tolerance becomes a

habit, it ceases to be an exception and turns into a standard. At that point, recidivism becomes part of a misguided work identity.

Procedural justice within an organization influences whether recidivism decreases or persists. Procedural justice means the existence of clear internal rules, consistent application, the opportunity to explain, and non-arbitrary assessment. If the handling of violations is done selectively, workers learn that what matters is position, not compliance. Selectivity strengthens cynicism and weakens commitment. In a cynical atmosphere, repeated violations can be viewed as a reasonable response to injustice. At the same time, if the organization turns field workers into scapegoats, collective learning is not formed because the root causes are not addressed. Human relationship patterns in contemporary urban society, which tend to be transactional, often exacerbate the loss of mutual trust in the work environment (Irfan & Al Hakim, 2022). Poor procedural justice also encourages a culture of hiding problems, because people fear disproportionate consequences (Zhang & Zhu, 2019). A culture of hiding problems makes recidivism difficult to see, so the organization feels no need to change habits. Sociological explanation places procedural justice as a moral prerequisite for stable compliance. When people feel treated fairly, they are more willing to accept the burden of compliance. When people feel treated as tools, compliance turns into a pretense that opens the space for the repetition of violations.

The dimension of internal reputation is also relevant to environmental recidivism. Within an organization, reputation is not just a matter of the company's external image, but also involves assessments between units and individuals (Hald et al., 2021). Operational units often want to be known as units that are fast and capable of solving problems. Compliance units want to be known as units that are orderly and neat. When reputation becomes a competition, information about violations may be hidden so as not to damage the unit's image. This practice of withholding information encourages recidivism because the same problem can emerge elsewhere without any learning taking place. The involvement of women in human resource management practices can bring new perspectives that prioritize transparency and a balance of values within the organization (Infante & Darmawan, 2022). Furthermore, reputation can lead people to choose quick solutions that appear successful, even if they

ignore environmental goals. Quick solutions provide reputational victories, while environmental costs remain hidden. Sociological explanation shows that recidivism occurs when reputation is deemed more important than the reform of habits. From a normative standpoint, organizations need to view reputation as a moral responsibility, not merely as social capital. The emancipation and active role of women in community development prove that collective integrity is far more valuable than a pseudo-image (Issalillah et al., 2022). A reputation built through the concealment of violations is a fragile reputation, as it depends on ignorance. Conversely, a reputation built through openness and improvement provides a foundation for substantive compliance. Without a change in the meaning of reputation, recidivism easily persists behind production achievements.

Economic rationality is often used to explain the choices that lead to repeated violations (Ghilagaber, 2018). However, sociological explanation rejects simplifying recidivism as merely the result of cost-benefit calculations. Economic calculations are always wrapped in values, norms, and moral judgments. When an organization chooses to delay investment in control systems, that choice is presented as a rational decision. Yet, the rationality employed often separates financial costs from social and environmental costs. Psychological perspectives in industrial society emphasize that individual well-being is often marginalized by an obsession with material efficiency (Darmawan et al., 2021). This separation is a moral construction. It shows that organizations choose what is considered real and what is considered abstract. Recidivism emerges when environmental costs are always positioned as abstract costs that can be dealt with later. In daily work, this separation is evident in the way people talk about improvements as expenses, while violations are viewed as minor nuisances. Sociological explanation emphasizes that behavioral change requires a change in the way things are valued. If environmental costs are understood as a moral burden that must be faced now, the space for the normalization of deviance narrows. Therefore, recidivism can be read as a result of an internal valuation regime that narrows the meaning of loss and expands the meaning of profit.

The relationship between external rules and internal organizational policies can also produce recidivism (Tran & Adomako, 2022). External

rules demand compliance and accountability. Internal policies translate those demands into procedures and the division of labor. This translation can produce a gap when internal policies emphasize administrative orderliness over changes in work habits. Legal guarantees of basic rights, such as health and education, should be the primary reference in every internal policy to prevent systemic failure (Hariani et al., 2021). If internal policies are created as a tool for institutional protection, they tend to be oriented toward proving that the organization has fulfilled formal obligations. In such circumstances, procedures can become tools of pseudo-legitimacy. People learn that the main goal is to meet inspection requirements, not to change the practices that birth violations. Recidivism emerges when procedures become rituals. Rituals repeat steps but do not touch meaning. Sociological explanation regards the ritualization of compliance as a form of norm weakening. The principle of the best interests of vulnerable legal subjects must always be prioritized so that policies do not merely become soulless formal procedures (Fajar et al., 2021). Norms are formally recognized but are not internalized as moral guidelines. To understand recidivism, it is important to assess how internal policies are constructed whether they guide operational decisions or merely provide a language of defense when problems occur. If policies are used as a defense, recidivism becomes a predictable consequence.

The moral skill of an organization is a factor often overlooked in discussions of repeated violations. Moral skill means the ability to recognize risks, discuss dilemmas, and choose actions aligned with environmental obligations despite pressure. This skill is not born automatically from technical training. It is formed through honest discussion practices, leadership by example, and a safe space to convey warnings. Gender structures and the double burden experienced by workers are often hidden obstacles in developing a complete moral awareness within the organization (Khairi, 2021). If an organization suppresses talk regarding dilemmas, moral skills weaken. In organizations with low moral skills, people tend to see violations as a matter of procedure rather than a matter of responsibility. Collective empathy fatigue in public service systems shows how fragile moral skills are when individuals feel unsupported by the system (Khayru & Darmawan, 2023). Recidivism emerges because violations can be handled with administrative shortcuts,

without reflection on value choices. Sociological explanation emphasizes that moral skill influences the quality of learning. When an organization is able to discuss dilemmas, incidents of violation become a source for reforming habits. When an organization closes off discussion, incidents of violation become mere records. From a normative standpoint, recidivism is a sign that the organization has not yet developed adequate moral skills to resist the normalization of deviance. Moral skill is the bridge between written norms and real action.

The emotional dimension within an organization also influences recidivism, especially through shame, fear, and pride. Shame can become a social control if directed at destructive actions; however, shame can also become a reason to hide problems. If an organization uses shame as a harsh social punishment, people learn to withhold information. This concealment of information increases the likelihood of repetition because the source of the problem remains invisible. Fear of a superior's assessment can also drive workers to choose shortcuts in order to appear successful. These shortcuts can give rise to repeated violations. On the other hand, pride in orderly work can be a source of substantive compliance. However, this kind of pride needs to be built as an ethical pride, not merely a production pride. Sociological explanation views recidivism as a result of the management of collective emotions. Collective emotions are shaped by the way an organization responds to mistakes. If the organizational response provides space for learning without diminishing dignity, people are more courageous in conveying problems and making improvements. If the organizational response prioritizes disproportionate punishment, people tend to hide. Thus, recidivism is related to an emotional culture that determines whether a violation becomes a secret or a lesson.

The pattern of communication between units in industrial areas can strengthen recidivism when communication is symbolic and a mere formality. Symbolic communication means meetings are held and reports are sent, but critical questions do not emerge. In this condition, the organization produces a pseudo-agreement that everything is functioning. Pseudo-agreement closes the space for correction. Good communication should allow for differences of opinion, especially between production units chasing targets and environmental units guarding obligations. If differences of opinion are considered a nuisance, communication

transforms into a one-way delivery. In one-way communication, units that are hierarchically weak tend to conform and reduce the intensity of their warnings. This creates recidivism because risk signals become dim. Sociological explanation positions recidivism as a consequence of the failure of deliberative communication namely, communication that weighs reasons and organizes decisions based on obligations. Without deliberative communication, organizations tend to choose decisions that provide short-term satisfaction. Short-term decisions often ignore structural improvements (Besio, 2014). Thus, recidivism can be understood as an accumulation of short-term decisions that are never corrected by communication oriented toward environmental obligations.

Substantive compliance requires consistency between leadership messages and daily practices. If leadership declares environmental commitment but tolerates violations for the sake of targets, the message becomes contradictory (Etienne, 2010). This contradiction is read by workers as a disguised permission. Disguised permission strengthens recidivism because workers feel safe repeating deviations as long as production results are achieved. Sociological explanation views leadership messages as having significant normative weight because they shape the boundaries of what is considered reasonable. Messages are not only present in speeches but also in small decisions, such as when maintenance is performed, how complaints are handled, and how performance evaluations are set. If small decisions consistently sacrifice environmental obligations, commitment turns into a slogan. Slogans lower trust and strengthen cynicism. In a cynical atmosphere, repeated violations become part of work realism. From a normative standpoint, recidivism means there is a gap between stated ethics and practiced ethics. This gap must be understood as a matter of organizational integrity. Without integrity, environmental norms find it difficult to become binding guidelines. The organization then lives within two moralities: a declarative morality and a practical morality that sustains repetition.

The relationship between contract workers, vendors, and the core company can also influence recidivism. Long chains of work often fragment responsibility. The party performing the risky work may lack the authority to change procedures, while the party with the authority risks not seeing field practices firsthand. In this gap, violations can recur because

each party feels its obligations are limited. Furthermore, contractual relationships can drive the fulfillment of tight time and cost targets. When targets are strict, environmental control measures may be viewed as an additional burden. If vendors are evaluated primarily on speed, they will adjust their practices to meet that speed (Thornton et al., 2009). Sociological explanation assesses recidivism as a result of work chain governance that fails to unify environmental obligations as a shared standard. In good governance, environmental obligations become moral and operational criteria for all parties. In weak governance, environmental obligations become a debatable matter. Repeated debates without a unification of standards give birth to the repetition of violations. Thus, recidivism can be read as a symptom of moral fragmentation within the industrial work network.

Time as an organizational resource is also related to recidivism. Environmental compliance often demands time for inspections, maintenance, recording, and corrective actions. If an organization views this time as a nuisance, then compliance time is truncated (Gunningham et al., 2005). Truncating time encourages risky improvisations. Repeated improvisations give rise to similar patterns of violation. Sociological explanation shows that time management is value management. What is given time is considered important. What is not given time is considered something that can be circumvented. When environmental obligations do not receive adequate time space, the organization sends a signal that these obligations are negotiable. Repeated negotiations form recidivism. At the level of habit, workers learn to complete tasks in the fastest way, including skipping control steps considered non-urgent. Ultimately, recidivism is a form of habit grown from a pressurized time structure. Normatively, this shows that compliance requires resource arrangements aligned with obligations. If time resources are consistently sacrificed, the organization prepares the conditions for the repetition of violations, even if there are written procedures that appear complete.

The handling of repeated violations often gets trapped in the search for a culprit, whereas recidivism demands an interpretation of the conditions that allow the violation to recur. A focus on the culprit can result in disciplinary action, but disciplinary action alone does not change the work habits that birthed the violation. Within an organization,

searching for a culprit can also create fear that exacerbates the practice of withholding information (Barrett et al., 2018). If people fear being blamed, they will reduce openness. A lack of openness causes the organization to lose information about vulnerable points. Unknown vulnerable points will produce repeated violations. Sociological explanation asserts that recidivism is an indication of an existing opportunity structure for violation. Opportunity structures can take the form of weak supervision, weak coordination, or tacitly agreed-upon tolerance. From a normative standpoint, this opportunity structure must be understood as a matter of institutional accountability. If the institution allows the opportunity, the institution shares responsibility for the repetition. Thus, accountability cannot be resolved by merely blaming individuals. Accountability must touch upon how the organization designs work, divides authority, and manages learning after a violation.

When recidivism occurs, organizations often build a recovery narrative oriented toward case closure. Case closure means the incident is considered settled once specific actions are taken and documents are updated. This orientation satisfies administrative needs, but does not necessarily satisfy the need for behavioral change. Rapid case closure can create an illusion of progress. This illusion of progress makes the organization feel it has learned, when what has actually occurred is the tidying of documents. Sociological explanation sees that recidivism persists when learning is understood as file resolution. Authentic learning demands changes in work methods, changes in reward signals, and changes in communication (Dekker, 2009). If these three things do not change, violations tend to reappear in similar forms. From a normative standpoint, the recovery narrative needs to be assessed by its moral content whether it acknowledges environmental obligations as non-negotiable boundaries, or merely constructs excuses so the organization appears in control. If the recovery narrative only restores the image, recidivism will return. If the recovery narrative restores moral discipline, recidivism decreases because work habits are redirected.

The presence of standard procedures sometimes provides a false sense of security. Procedures provide a list of steps, but procedures do not supervise themselves. If procedures are treated as formal tools, people can fill out checklists without executing the substance. This false sense of security

strengthens recidivism because the organization feels it has complied, then ignores signs of deviation. Sociological explanation assesses that procedures need to be translated into meaningful practices. Understanding the principles of organizational behavior becomes an important foundation so that every element in the system substantively understands the dynamics of interaction and responsibility (Darmawan, 2013). Meaningful practice occurs when people understand the reasoning behind the steps, rather than just following a sequence. If the reasoning is understood, people can assess situations and remain loyal to environmental goals. If the reasoning is not understood, people will look for loopholes to simplify. Repeated simplification produces repeated violations. From a normative standpoint, recidivism indicates that procedures have not yet become living norms. A living norm is a norm present in daily habits, language, and decisions. It lives when people feel obligated even in the absence of an inspection. A living procedure binds itself to the dignity of work, as protecting the environment is understood as part of professional honor. Without living norms, procedures become rituals that beautify the organization while allowing the repetition of violations.

Understanding internal social control must include informal supervision. Informal supervision exists through peer comments, habits of mutual imitation, and group assessments of who is considered competent. If a group praises those who dare to take shortcuts, those shortcuts become the standard of competence. This flawed standard of competence sustains recidivism. Within work groups, solidarity can also lead members to protect one another from consequences, for instance, by withholding information. Dynamics of social mobility within communities show that the influence of peer groups is often stronger than formal regulations in directing individual actions (Amri & Khayru, 2021). This protection may arise from good intentions, but the result is the repetition of violations because problems are not brought to light. Sociological explanation sees that recidivism often persists through group morality that places loyalty above environmental obligations. This group morality is formed from shared experiences in facing target pressures. In such an atmosphere, environmental obligations may be viewed as external rules that do not understand work reality. From a normative standpoint, it is important to build alignment between group morality and environmental obligations,

so that loyalty is directed toward responsible work. Active individual involvement in decision-making, such as domestic roles in green consumption, reflects how personal commitment can align group values with environmental sustainability (Halizah & Nuraini, 2021). If loyalty remains directed toward concealment, recidivism will continue to emerge because informal control works against the goal of substantive compliance.

The recurrence of violations can also be read as a problem of normative order within the organization. Normative order means the existence of a clear hierarchy of values, where safety and environmental obligations have a firm place in decisions (Hasmira & Rahmi, 2023). When the hierarchy of values is blurred, decisions will follow the strongest impulse, usually the production impulse. The production impulse has clear and immediate indicators, whereas environmental obligations are often considered long-term. The failure of multi-layered protection systems often reproduces cycles of vulnerability that cause deviations to recur repeatedly without effective structural intervention (Aidan Bin Abdullah, 2021). When an organization consistently chooses immediate indicators, repeated violations become the consequence. Sociological explanation emphasizes that normative order needs to be manifested in decision-making tools. Decision-making tools include priority-setting forums, time allocation rules, and accountability standards. If decision-making tools do not include environmental obligations as a boundary, the organization will always find reasons to delay. Repeated delays produce recidivism. Within a normative framework, recidivism indicates that the organization has not yet organized its moral boundaries. The emergence of populist ethno-religious nationalism shows how fragile social integration becomes when moral boundaries and universal values are ignored for the sake of momentary group interests (Fariz, 2021). A moral boundary is the point where production must not override obligation. When moral boundaries are firm, deviation becomes an exception that is immediately corrected. When moral boundaries are blurred, deviation becomes a rationalized habit. Therefore, recidivism is a reflection of value disorder within the organization.

Recidivism persists when compliance is narrowly interpreted as administrative completeness, allowing operational deviations to be concealed within procedural rituals (Zheng & Chun, 2017). Recidivism also persists when authority structures produce delays and a culture of

silence, so that risk signals do not flow and accountability can be shifted. Issues of household welfare impacted by hasty and immature decisions illustrate how operational failures have a broad impact on social stability (Aliyah et al., 2023). Recidivism grows stronger when internal social controls reward output and tolerate shortcuts, causing the social norms of the work group to move away from environmental obligations. These three elements reinforce each other and form a stable pattern. Within this pattern, repeated violations are not merely individual failures, but the result of misguided organizational social learning. Through this reading, recidivism can be understood as a shift in living norms the norms that truly bind actions. If living norms shift, written rules become weak. This answer affirms that a sociological explanation of recidivism must highlight mechanisms of justification, the division of responsibility, and the reward system, because it is there that repetition gains support. Thus, recidivism is an organizational moral indicator that needs to be read through structure and culture, rather than through a single event.

Conclusion

The pattern of environmental offense recidivism in industrial areas can be understood as the result of social habit formation within organizations that makes operational deviations feel natural and repeatable. Sociological explanation reveals that repetition is linked to three mutually reinforcing nodes. First, compliance is interpreted narrowly as administrative order, such that environmental protection goals are not always present as guidelines for daily work decisions. Second, authority structures organize the flow of information and responsibility, subsequently forming delays, a culture of silence, and a tendency to shift blame onto executors, which ultimately weakens collective learning. Third, internal social control operates through reward signals, performance evaluations, and workgroup norms, which can encourage shortcuts when output is treated as the primary metric. In this arrangement, recidivism is not a series of isolated events, but rather a misdirected organizational learning pattern, maintained by rationalization, fragmentation of responsibility, and a collective memory that closes cases without actual changes in work habits.

The theoretical implications of this study suggest the need to assess environmental compliance as a social practice rooted in meaning, authority,

and internal control, so that compliance metrics do not stop at administrative evidence. Practically, improvements must be directed toward restructuring the quality of organizational accountability. First, environmental commitment must be reflected in concrete managerial decisions, particularly in time allocation, maintenance, and the handling of deviations, so that leadership messages align with work habits. Second, internal procedural justice needs to be upheld through the consistent application of rules, adequate space for explanations, and proportional assessments, thereby increasing transparency and weakening the practice of withholding information. Third, reward systems and performance evaluations need to be aligned with environmental obligations so that shortcuts do not gain social legitimacy. Fourth, cross-unit communication mechanisms must foster clear discussions of reasoning and risk assessment, allowing warnings to escalate without stigma. With these steps, organizations possess a normative foundation to reduce recurring violations through learning that binds work habits to environmental obligations.

References

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., 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.

Amri, M. W., & Khayru, R. K. 2021. The Dynamics of Social Mobility: A Comparison Between Urban and Rural Communities. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, *1*(2), 39-43.

Babbie, E., & J. D. Edgerton. 2023. *Fundamentals of Social Research*. Cengage Canada, Toronto.

Barrett, K. L., M. J. Lynch., M. A. Long., & P. B. Stretesky. 2018. Monetary Penalties and Noncompliance with Environmental Laws: a Mediation Analysis. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 43(3), 530–550.

Beamish, T. D. 2000. Accumulating Trouble: Complex Organization, a Culture of Silence, and a Secret Spill. *Social Problems*, 47(4), 473–498.

Besio, C. 2014. Transforming Risks into Moral Issues in Organizations. In *Business Ethics and Risk Management*, 71–84.

Blondiau, T., & S. Rousseau. 2011. Repeat Offenders – Intentional and Accidental Environmental Violations. *Social Science Research Network*, 1-27.

Bottoms, A., & A. Bottoms. 2019. Understanding Compliance with Laws and Regulations: A Mechanism-Based Approach. In *Financial Compliance: Issues, Concerns and Future Directions*, 1–45.

Darmawan, D. 2013. *Prinsip Prinsip Perilaku Organisasi*. Pena Semesta - PT. JePe Press Media Utama, Surabaya.

Darmawan, D. 2021. Social Interaction in Digital Society: Changes in Online Communication Patterns and Dynamics of Virtual Communities, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 325-350.

Darmawan, D. et al. 2021. *Psychological Perspective in Society 5.0*. Zahir Publishing.

Dekker, S. 2009. Just Culture: Who Gets to Draw the Line?. *Cognition, Technology & Work*, 11(3), 177–185.

Etienne, J. 2010. *Self-Reporting Untoward Events to External Controllers: Accounting for Reporting Failure by a Top Tier Chemical Plant*. Centre for Analysis of Risk and Regulation at the London School of Economics and Political Science, London.

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.

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.

Fauzi, A. 2023. Career Women and Double Burden in Feminist Sociological Perspective Today. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 3(1), 269-292.

Ghilagaber, G. 2018. Environmental Recidivism in Sweden : Distributional Shape and Effects of Sanctions on Duration of Compliance. *Quality & Quantity*, 52(2), 869–882.

Gray, G. C. 2011. Constraints to Upholding Workplace Safety Laws and Regulations within Organizations. *Droit et société*, 77(1), 57–68.

Gunningham, N., D. Thornton., & R. A. Kagan. 2005. Motivating Management: Corporate Compliance in Environmental Protection. *Law & Policy*, 27(2), 289–316.

Hald, J., A. Gillespie., & T. W. Reader. 2021. Causal and Corrective Organisational Culture: A Systematic Review of Case Studies of Institutional Failure. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 174(2), 1–27.

Halizah, S. N. & R. Nuraini. 2021. Women's Household Involvement and Decisions on Green Consumption, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 177-192.

Hariani, M. & R. Mardikaningsih. 2022. The Performance of Authenticity and the Commodification of Parasocial Bonds: Twin Pillars of Influencer Culture on Social Media, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(2), 385-412.

Hariani, M. (2023). Social Identity Construction in Contemporary Society: A Study an Group Affiliation and Influence of Social Status and Environmental Dynamics. Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia, 3(1), 393-422.

Hariani, M., Aliyah, N. D., & Issalillah, F. 2021. Legal Guarantee of Children's Rights in Education and Health. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, *1*(2), 177-180.

Hasmira, M. H., & S. R. Rahmi. 2023. Community Labeling: Former Drug Convicts Become Drug Convicts Again. *Digital Press Social Sciences and Humanities*, 10, 1-6.

Hunter, B. R. 2023. Pinpointing Persistent Polluters: Environmental Offending and Recidivist Companies in England. *Deviant Behavior*, 1–16.

Infante, A., & Darmawan, D. 2022. Gender equality: women's involvement in human resource management practices. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, *2*(1), 27-30.

Irfan, M. & Y. R. Al Hakim. 2022. Changing Patterns of Human Relations in Contemporary Urban Society, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(1), 333-356.

Irfan, M., & Hariani, M. 2023. Organizational Diversity and Inclusion as Social Order in Contemporary Workplaces. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 3(1), 211-236.

Irfan, M., Darmawan, D., & da Costa, L. 2023. Gender Dynamics and Work-Life Balance in the Era of Hybrid Work: The Social Impact of Remote Work on Families. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, *3*(2), 161-168.

Issalillah, F., & Khayru, R. K. 2021. Social Perceptions of Domestic Violence and its Implications forthe Mental Health and Recovery Process of Victims. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, *1*(2), 125-130.

Issalillah, F., Khayru, R. K., & Wisnujati, N. S. 2022. Women's Emancipation and Role in Community Development. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, *2*(2), 35-38.

Kementerian Kesehatan. 2023. *Peraturan Menteri Kesehatan Republik Indonesia Nomor 2 Tahun 2023 tentang Peraturan Pelaksanaan Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 66 Tahun 2014 tentang Kesehatan Lingkungan*. Berita Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2023 Nomor 55. Jakarta.

Khairi, M. 2021. Career Women, Double Burden, and Gendered Structures in Feminist Sociological Perspective. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 173-186.

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.

Khayru, R. K., Darmawan, D., & Kurniawan, Y. 2022. An Analysis of the Impact of Age, Work Experience, and Gender on Job Search Duration Among Graduates. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, *2*(2), 139-144.

Kurniawan, Y., D. Darmawan, & R. K. Khayru. 2021. Social Media and Contemporary Youth Digital Literature, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 109-124.

Lune, H., & B. L. Berg. 2017. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Pearson, Boston.

Mahmudah, S. 2021. Food Vulnerability of Poor Households in Densely Populated Urban Areas, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 125-140.

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., & Oluwatoyin, F. 2023. Analyzing Algorithmic Bias, Automated Justice, and Social Transformation in Artificial Intelligence Implementation. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia,* 3(1), 107-128.

Mardikaningsih, R., R. Nuraini, & S. N. Halizah. 2022. Socially Formed Environmental Values and Green Consumer Purchasing Decisions, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(2), 125-150.

Martín, A. M., M.-E. Salazar-Laplace., S. Hess., C. Ruiz., M. F. Kaplan., B. Hernández., & E. Suárez. 2008. Individual Breaches of Environmental Laws in Cases from Public Administration Files. *Deviant Behavior*, 29(7), 611–639.

Negara, D. S., & Khayru, R. K. 2022. Transformations of Masculinity and Femininity in Modern Society: Dynamics and Implications. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, *2*(1), 153-156.

Oluwatosin, A., Rojak, J. A., & Darmawan, D. (2023). The Dynamics of Adaptive Capacity and Transformation Processes in the Discourse of Social Resilience. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 3(2), 119-142.

Peraturan Pemerintah. 2020. *Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 27 Tahun 2020 tentang Pengelolaan Sampah Spesifik*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2020 Nomor 141. Sekretariat Negara, Jakarta.

Peraturan Pemerintah. 2021. *Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 22 Tahun 2021 tentang Penyelenggaraan Perlindungan dan Pengelolaan Lingkungan Hidup*. Jakarta.

Peraturan Pemerintah. 2021. *Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 23 Tahun 2021 tentang Penyelenggaran Kehutanan*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2021 Nomor 33. Sekretariat Negara, Jakarta.

Räthzel, N., & D. Uzzell. 2019. Environmental Policies and The Reproduction of Business as Usual: How Does It Work?. *Capitalism Nature Socialism*, 30(1), 120–138.

Republik Indonesia. 2009. *Undang-Undang Nomor 32 Tahun 2009 tentang Perlindungan dan Pengelolaan Lingkungan Hidup*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2009 Nomor 140. Sekretariat Negara, Jakarta

Republik Indonesia. 2023. *Undang-Undang Nomor 17 Tahun 2023 tentang Kesehatan.* Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2023 Nomor 105. Sekretariat Negara, Jakarta.

Rivers, L., T. Dempsey., J. Mitchell., & C. Gibbs. 2015. Environmental Regulation and Enforcement: Structures, Processes and the Use of Data for Fraud Detection. *Journal of Environmental Assessment Policy and Management,* 17(04), 1-29.

Rojak, J. A., & Khayru, R. K. 2022. Disparities in access to education in developing countries: Determinants, impacts, and solution strategies. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, *2*(1), 31-38.

Romdoni, M. 2022. A Literature Review of Coercive Isomorphism on Corporate Legal Responsibility in Indonesia. *Pranata Hukum: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 17(2), 121–132.

Rorie, M., S. R. Rinfret., & M. C. Pautz. 2015. The Thin Green Line: Examining Environmental Regulation and Environmental Offending from Multiple Perspectives. *International Journal of Law Crime and Justice*, 43(4), 586–608.

Sanseverino-Godfrin, V. 2014. Safety and Environmental Control of Industrial Activities in France: A Negotiated Relationship. In *Safety and reliability: methodology and applications–proceedings of the European safety and reliability conference, ESREL*, 695–700.

Silva, V. F., & A. A. Namen. 2022. Compliance with Legal and Other Requirements Related to the Environmental Licensing Processes in Companies Located in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil). *Revista De Gestão Social E Ambiental*, 16(1), 1-18.

Sinambela, E. A. & D. Darmawan. 2021. Relevance of Email Marketing in the Contemporary Digital Marketing Communication Mix, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 301-324.

Sinambela, E. A., Halizah, S. N., Naufalia, S., Amelia, F. N., Arifin, S., Darmawan, D., & Putra, A. R. 2023. The Effect of Experience, Work Supervision and Career Development on Job Satisfaction. *Indonesian Journal of Innovation Multidisipliner Research*, *1*(2), 96-107.

Susiani, D. 2024. *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum*. Penerbit Tahta Media, Yogyakarta.

Thornton, D., R. A. Kagan., & N. Gunningham. 2009. When Social Norms and Pressures Are Not Enough: Environmental Performance in the Trucking Industry. *Law & Society Review*, 43(2), 405–436.

Tran, M. D., & S Adomako. 2022. How Environmental Reputation and Ethical Behavior Impact the Relationship Between Environmental Regulatory Enforcement and Environmental Performance. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 31(5), 2489-2499.

Vacher, A., J. Albentosa., & Y. Auroy. 2017. Safety Management and Compliance with Rules. *Transfusion Clinique Et Biologique*, 24(3), 138–142.

Warin, J. 2015. Identity Capital: An Application From A Longitudinal Ethnographic Study Of Self-Construction During The Years Of School. *British Journal Of Sociology Of Education*, 36(5), 689–706

Wibisono, M. R., M. C. Rizky, & Sudjai. 2023. Norm Certainty and Enforcement Legitimacy in Local Public Order Regulation, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 3(2), 223-246.

Zahid, R. A, A. S. M. Fajar, D. Darmawan, & M. Y. M. El-Yunusi. 2021. The Role of Religious Courts in Resolving Family Disputes Through Adjudication and Mediation, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 141-156.

Zhang, H.-D., & Y. Zhu. 2019. Organizational Errors and Individual Errors: Perspective on Accident Causation. DEStech Transactions on Economics, Business and Management.

Zheng, Q., & R. Chun. 2017. Corporate Recidivism in Emerging Economies. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 26(1), 63–79.

Zulkarnain, M. A. B., Khayru, R. K., Issalillah, F., & da Cruz, C. 2021. Citizen Engagement in Ecological Issue Management through Participatory Practices and Community-Based Social Supports. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, *1*(1), 227-232.