



PUBLIC MEANINGS OF BLACK MARKETS, LAW ENFORCEMENT, AND COMPLIANCE FORMATION

Dwi Purwanto, Arif Rachman Putra, Sarwo Waskito

Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya

correspondence: arifrachmanputra@gmail.com

Abstract

This article examines how the public understands black market practices and law enforcement through legitimacy, procedural justice, and compliance formation. Black markets persist when informal transactions are viewed as accessible, affordable, and socially tolerable, while official rules are seen as inconsistent or insufficiently justified. Enforcement is evaluated by observable process quality, including clarity of reasons, respectful treatment, consistency, and accountable discretion. Perceived selectivity and informal bargaining undermine trust, foster cynicism, and shift obedience toward situational calculation rather than principled commitment. Public classifications of goods, perceived risk, and perceived victimhood shape support for sanctions and willingness to cooperate with authorities. The discussion also highlights how communication about legal boundaries affects unintentional involvement and how perceived availability of lawful channels influences acceptance of regulation. The article concludes that durable compliance requires credible institutions and fair procedures that strengthen public acceptance of legal authority and reduce normalization of illicit exchange.

Keywords: black market, enforcement legitimacy, procedural justice, public trust, compliance, informal exchange, legal boundaries.

Introduction

Trade and the exchange of goods routinely construct spaces of interaction involving rules, customs, and economic interests. When the state establishes prohibitions, restrictions, or licensing requirements on specific goods, the circulation of these items moves either through recognized channels or hidden routes. These hidden routes are commonly referred to as the black market—a series of transactions aimed at evading surveillance, taxes, duties, quality standards, or regulatory bans. In social practice, the black market is not understood merely as an infraction; rather, it is often perceived as a rapid means to acquire goods, cut costs, or circumvent scarcity. This type of perception indicates that legal norms and public judgments do not always align. Up to a certain point, society distinguishes between infractions deemed severe and those deemed minor, depending on needs, risks, and prevailing narratives. Therefore, law enforcement against the black market must be read as a convergence between normative systems and the social meanings active within the lived experiences of citizens. This normative tension aligns with the dynamics of civil society movements that frequently evaluate the trajectory of electoral democracy and citizen political participation in response to state policies (Rojak et al., 2021).

For many types of commodities, the black market is formed through a combination of stable demand, sufficient profit margins, and opportunities to evade control. Demand can stem from official prices perceived as high, restricted access, or requirements viewed as overly complex. When this demand intersects with an agile supply network, an unrecorded distribution mechanism takes shape. This mechanism frequently utilizes chains of intermediaries, cash transactions, closed communication, and non-transparent identities. Within it, functions are divided among suppliers, couriers, intermediaries, and end-sellers. Citizens interacting with this mechanism may position themselves as buyers simply seeking to satisfy a need, or as actors deliberately seeking profit. This differentiation in positioning influences both moral and legal judgments regarding the act. On the enforcement side, authorities face the need for proof, network mapping, and selecting enforcement priorities. Within the social sphere, these priority choices are evaluated by citizens and shape the perceived authority of the law. Consequently, the black market is directly linked to how society understands the legitimacy of prohibitions and state

actions. In the context of food commodity protection, this tension demands the strict implementation of criminal regulations against the circulation of hazardous chemical substances to guarantee consumer safety within the official distribution chain (Noor et al., 2023).

Developments in communication technology expand the form of the black market from physical transactions to platform-based transactions. Encounters between sellers and buyers can occur without direct contact, while payments and deliveries can be decoupled through third parties. This transformation accelerates transaction speeds and increases the distribution scale of prohibited or restricted goods. Simultaneously, technology generates digital footprints that can be utilized for enforcement, yet these footprints are often cloaked using various anonymity techniques. Citizens as platform users face a choice: comply with official channels at a certain cost, or opt for unofficial routes with prices and access deemed more attractive. This choice is not always driven by malicious intent, as some individuals assess the infractions as merely administrative or justifiable under specific circumstances. This assessment forms a social tolerance that can expand if law enforcement appears inconsistent. When enforcement seems selective, society may view the law as a non-neutral tool. Such a view reinforces pragmatic attitudes namely, complying when the risk of getting caught is present, and violating when the risk is deemed low. Therefore, discussions on the black market and law enforcement must examine the structure of public perception toward compliance. In this digital era, optimizing fair business competition principles and the active role of the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU) becomes crucial for creating an equitable economic ecosystem and minimizing market distortions (Wibowo, Darmawan, et al., 2023).

The black market is also linked to public trust in economic governance. If society believes that official channels involve reasonable costs, adequate services, and navigable procedures, the incentive to enter the black market tends to decrease. However, if procedures are perceived as complex, fulfillment times as prolonged, or service quality as poor, informal routes become a practical choice. This decision is often justified through narratives of necessity and narratives of injustice. Here, the black market becomes a symptom of the gap between formal rules and the lived experiences of

citizens in acquiring goods. At the same time, the black market creates social risks, such as the circulation of goods lacking quality standards, reduced state revenues, and expanded space for criminal networks. Law enforcement is expected to mitigate these risks, yet its success depends heavily on public support and the perceived legitimacy of its actions. If the public views enforcement as excessive or disproportionate, support will weaken. If the public judges enforcement as firm yet fair, support tends to strengthen. Therefore, public perspective serves as an essential element for interpreting the normative effectiveness of enforcement, without necessarily measuring the statistical rate of occurrence. Normative research can unpack the structure of public evaluation regarding prohibitions and sanctions. This disparity in accessing official channels frequently hits the micro, small, and medium enterprise (MSME) sector hardest, even though this sector plays a vital role in economic value transmission mechanisms aimed at poverty alleviation (Wisnujati & Mardikaningsih, 2021). Furthermore, the transformation toward economic digitalization also brings its own challenges and opportunities for the sustainable development of human resources in the Industry 4.0 era (Oluwatoyin & Mardikaningsih, 2024).

Discussions concerning the black market frequently confront the issue of boundaries namely, the boundary between transactions that are entirely prohibited and transactions that merely breach administrative requirements. This boundary shapes how society classifies infractions. For certain goods, prohibitions are understood as a protection of the public interest, leading infractions to be judged severely. For other goods, restrictions are understood as fiscal policies or trade regulations, leading infractions to be viewed merely as a method to evade costs. This social classification influences compliance, as individuals more readily comply with rules perceived as fair and rational. In terms of enforcement, authorities must construct interpretations that align with the principle of legality, yet they must also manage public communication to prevent actions from being misunderstood. If communication is weak, enforcement can be perceived as the criminalization of behaviors considered ordinary. Such a perception breeds resistance, manifesting as the justification of infractions and solidarity with offenders. Conversely, if communication is strong, enforcement is perceived as a protection of society from risk. Thus, the relationship between the black market and law enforcement is

fundamentally a relationship between written norms and social acceptance. Normative studies need to dissect the intersection of the two through the concepts of legitimacy, trust, and compliance. The complexity of these legal boundaries is also found in the regulation of partnership businesses, such as the legal clarity regarding royalty fees in franchise businesses along with its legal implications in Indonesia (Putra & Wibowo, 2023).

The primary problem of this topic lies in the tension between the existence of the black market as a social practice and the objective of law enforcement as a mechanism to maintain order. The black market can persist because society perceives direct benefits, such as fast access, lower prices, or availability of goods. Law enforcement operates on the principle that infractions must be penalized for the sake of certainty and the protection of the public interest. Tension arises when a portion of citizens views the infraction as an excusable act, while the law views it as an offense or an administrative violation that must still be addressed. Under such circumstances, law enforcement is evaluated through the lens of experience: whether authorities act fairly, whether enforcement targets are appropriate, and whether sanctions are proportional. When public evaluation is negative, compliance can morph into a pseudo-compliance that depends entirely on fear. This pseudo-compliance is fragile and easily shifts when controls weaken. On a normative level, this issue relates to enforcement legitimacy, which is the rational acceptance by society of state authority. Legitimacy requires consistency, transparency, and equal treatment, yet discussions at this stage position the issue as a normative fact demanding conceptual deconstruction. Without this deconstruction, the black market will continue to be read merely as a moral issue. In a broader perspective, the provision of legal protection and justice for franchise business actors can also be reviewed through the framework of Islamic law to ensure moral alignment and compliance (Wibowo, Hardyansah, et al., 2024).

Another problem is the complexity of proof and the attribution of responsibility, which affect public perception of enforcement. The black market often involves a chain of actors, ranging from suppliers and intermediaries to end-buyers, each possessing varying levels of legal awareness. The public may judge that enforcement should be directed at the actors who reap the largest profits, rather than at end-buyers who are perceived as merely fulfilling a need. However, criminal and administrative

law feature specific elements that demand exact evidentiary proof, meaning enforcement choices often follow the easiest path to securing a conviction. At this point, a risk arises that enforcement is perceived as opportunistic namely, penalizing those who are easiest to catch. Such a perception can damage citizen trust in law enforcement institutions. Furthermore, there is the issue of selectivity, which creates an impression that certain actors are more protected while others are more vulnerable. This impression of selectivity can emerge even in the absence of discriminatory intent, as the public judges based on visible outcomes. Within a normative framework, apparent selectivity disrupts the principle of equality before the law and undermines the authority of the rules. This issue does not demand a solution at this stage, but rather requires a mapping of the factors that shape public evaluation regarding procedural and substantial justice in black market enforcement. The need for legal certainty and procedural justice is also reflected in evaluations of the effectiveness of competition law enforcement, particularly in addressing cross-border business competition practices (Zulkarnain et al., 2024).

There is a need to construct a normative framework that explains the relationship between black market practices and law enforcement from the standpoint of society. Without such a framework, discussions tend to get trapped between two extremes: viewing the black market strictly as a malicious act, or viewing enforcement strictly as a repressive measure. A normative analysis enables the mapping of compliance concepts, legitimacy, public trust, and perceptions of justice within the enforcement process. Through this mapping, it becomes possible to explain why certain prohibitions are accepted, why others are contested, and how enforcement is perceived in the daily lives of citizens. This framework is vital to ensure that enforcement remains aligned with the principle of legality and the protection of rights, while simultaneously safeguarding the objectives of economic order. This study is also relevant for positioning legal communication as an integral part of governance, given that public acceptance of enforcement is shaped by information and procedural experiences. Consequently, the urgency of this study is both scientific and practical: clarifying the conceptual foundations for organizing accountable enforcement policies within a constitutional state.

The research problems of this study are formulated as follows: how are black market practices and law enforcement understood by society within the frameworks of legitimacy, procedural justice, and the shaping of regulatory compliance? This question guides the discussion toward how citizens evaluate prohibitions, how they classify infractions, and how they assess enforcement actions. The focus is placed on the structure of meaning and evaluation rather than on measuring statistical rates of occurrence. Through this question, the analysis can unpack the connections among written norms, citizen experiences, and the institutional image of law enforcement agencies. This question also allows for a mapping of the boundary between social acceptance of rules and social resistance to enforcement. Thus, the research problem is sharp and focused on the core of the topic: the public perspective toward two interconnected elements, black market practices and law enforcement. This formulation serves as the foundation for structuring a systematic and consistent discussion in the subsequent stages.

The objective of this writing is to formulate a conceptual explanation regarding the public's understanding of black market practices and law enforcement through the concepts of legitimacy, perceptions of procedural justice, and the mechanisms of compliance formation. The discussion is directed toward identifying categories of public assessment regarding prohibitions, sanctions, selectivity, and the authority of law enforcement officers. Theoretically, this writing clarifies the relationship between legal norms and social acceptance in shaping compliance. Practically, the writing provides an argumentative basis for improving legal communication, organizing enforcement priorities, and strengthening public trust. This objective keeps the discussion normative, structured, and focused on the public perspective without requiring field data.

Method

This study uses a qualitative literature study to construct a normative synthesis regarding black market practices and law enforcement from a public perspective. The materials used include social research methodology books, works on compliance and legitimacy theory, as well as legal writings discussing the principles of legality, enforcement, and procedural justice. The selection of materials was conducted through relevance screening against the research problem, clarity of definitions, and consistency of

argumentation. Bryman (2016) is used as a reference to organize the source tracing design, direct the focus toward the research questions, and maintain coherence between the concepts used and the conclusions drawn. With this design, the research is positioned as a conceptual work that links legal norms with the way society interprets enforcement actions, without relying on interviews, surveys, or field observations.

The processing of materials was conducted through systematic reading and thematic coding to group the main ideas, such as categories of understanding the black market, categories of assessment toward the authority of law enforcement, and categories of perception regarding justice in the enforcement process. Crano et al. (2014) is employed to maintain conceptual precision, particularly in distinguishing normative propositions, assumptions, and implications, as well as to ensure that the argumentative flow does not jump from one concept to another without a bridge. Variations in citation forms are used appropriately, for instance, narrative forms such as Henn et al. (2005) to emphasize scientific writing discipline, and parenthetical forms such as (Crano et al., 2014) when reference affirmation is required without disrupting the sentence flow. This technique helps produce a narrative that is non-monotonous and remains academic.

Although Gagnon (2010) is synonymous with case studies, his principles regarding the establishment of the unit of discussion and the discipline of study boundaries are used to maintain focus on the structure of public interpretation, rather than on specific event narratives. Conceptual validity is maintained through consistency of terms, the strict boundary between normative descriptions and claims requiring data, and the direct link between the discussion themes and the research problem. To strengthen the reliability of reasoning, each section is organized using the same pattern: conceptual definition, the relationship between concepts, and then the normative consequences for the interpretation of enforcement. Henn et al. (2005) is employed to ensure that the synthesis remains directed at the research questions and does not broaden into unrelated policy discussions. Thus, this method is sufficient to explain the black market and law enforcement from a public perspective as a conceptual construction that is academically accountable.

Result and Discussion

Black market practices can be explained as a series of transactions deliberately positioned outside official regulations to evade prohibitions, restrictions, tax obligations, or specific standards. Within a normative framework, the black market is not merely a question of the goods traded, but of how transactions are designed to remain undetected and unrecorded. These methods can take the form of severing administrative trails, utilizing layered intermediaries, and employing payment methods that are difficult to trace. The public perspective toward these practices is shaped by needs, by evaluations regarding the fairness of regulations, and by experiences with official channel services. When regulations are understood to actively protect the public interest, the black market tends to be viewed as a serious infraction. When regulations are understood as a disproportionate economic burden, the black market can be viewed as an excusable infraction. Within this space, law enforcement becomes a social event that is judged, rather than a mere formal procedure. The public evaluates whether enforcement is oriented toward protection, toward the accumulation of sanctions, or toward easily accessible targets. These evaluations shape enforcement legitimacy. Consequently, the relationship between the black market and law enforcement must be understood through three layers: written norms, transactional practices, and the social meanings attached to the actions of authorities. Within the landscape of international trade, the vulnerabilities of official channels demand strategic risk management in global supply chains to identify, evaluate, and manage distribution disruptions (Mardikaningsih et al., 2024).

From the standpoint of society, the black market is frequently read through the logic of availability and affordability. When official routes are perceived as expensive or slow, informal channels are viewed as providing faster access. This interpretation can evolve into normalization, which is the social acceptance that purchasing through unofficial routes is ordinary behavior. Normalization lowers moral barriers and reduces guilt, so that the decision to buy is no longer weighed as a legal infraction. Within a normative framework, normalization disrupts the preventive goals of the law, because the law depends on the social conviction that rules are worthy of compliance. If that conviction weakens, the law must rely on fear. Fear produces situational compliance, which alters when the perceived chance

of getting caught is minimal. At this stage, the public may develop avoidance strategies, such as purchasing through trusted networks or utilizing specific methods of communication. These strategies demonstrate that the black market does not stand as an isolated act, but as a learned practice. Inconsistent law enforcement can reinforce this learning, as citizens observe patterns regarding when enforcement occurs and when it does not. Therefore, the public perspective toward the black market is directly linked to perceptions of risk and perceptions of regulatory fairness. This shift in orientation is also reflected in changes in public opinion and consumption behavior when confronted with crisis situations or macro-uncertainties (Khayru, 2021).

Law enforcement in black market cases sits at the intersection of the principle of legality and enforcement policy demands. The principle of legality requires clear formulations, lawful procedures, and adequate proof. Enforcement policy demands require priorities, since resources are limited and infractions are diverse. In the public perspective, priorities are frequently judged by visible outcomes rather than internal considerations. If small-scale actors are frequently penalized while large-scale actors remain untouched, an impression of injustice emerges. This impression damages legitimacy because citizens judge that the law does not operate equally. Within a normative framework, equality does not mean that everyone is treated identically regardless of the gravity of the act, but rather that everyone is subject to the same standard and is not shielded by status. Thus, enforcement that is perceived as selective invites social rejection, even when the formal actions are lawful. Social rejection can manifest as defense of the offender, the obscuring of information, or an unwillingness to act as a witness. This behavior increases evidentiary difficulties and strengthens the black market. Consequently, law enforcement against the black market cannot be separated from the procedural justice perceived by citizens. Therefore, evaluations of the efficiency of government licensing services serve as a vital parameter to support legality and the development of micro and small enterprises so that they are not pushed into the informal sector (Hardyansah, 2023).

Procedural justice is key to understanding why society complies with or rejects enforcement. Procedural justice refers to the judgment that enforcement processes are conducted in an orderly, predictable manner

that respects citizen dignity. In black market cases, citizens pay attention to whether authorities provide explanations, whether inspections are conducted politely, and whether space for clarification exists. If the process is perceived as harsh or demeaning, citizens tend to view enforcement as a threat rather than a protection. Threats trigger avoidance rather than awareness-based compliance. Conversely, if the process is perceived as orderly and fair, citizens are more likely to accept the outcomes of enforcement, even when they are unpleasant. Within a normative framework, the acceptance of these outcomes is crucial because it prevents social conflict and reinforces the authority of the rules. Procedural justice is also linked to consistency in applying evidentiary standards. When citizens see evidence ignored or procedures bypassed, doubts arise regarding the integrity of the process. These doubts erode trust and expand the space for rumors. Ultimately, rumors can become more trusted than official information. Therefore, law enforcement from a public perspective must be read through the quality of the process, rather than merely through the intensity of enforcement. The authority of this legal process heavily depends on the consistent implementation of the principle of good faith in executing every transaction agreement as well as enforcing regulations (Irfansyah et al., 2024).

Public interpretation of the black market is frequently influenced by how they classify goods and risk. Goods tied to public safety tend to be understood as high-risk, making infractions appear more serious. Conversely, goods viewed as ordinary consumption needs tend to be understood as low-risk, making infractions appear less severe. This classification influences citizen judgment regarding the proportionality of sanctions. If a sanction is deemed too severe for an infraction perceived as minor, citizens may judge the law as inhumane. If a sanction is deemed too light for an infraction perceived as dangerous, citizens may judge the law as weak. Within a normative framework, proportionality is a principle that maintains a balance between deterrence and the protection of rights. This principle demands a rational explanation regarding the objective of a prohibition. A rational explanation strengthens social acceptance. Without it, citizens fill the void with their own narratives, such as the narrative that prohibitions are created for the benefit of certain groups. Such narratives reinforce the justification of the black market. Thus, normatively effective

enforcement requires communication capable of explaining the connection between prohibitions and the protection of the public interest. It is here that the public perspective becomes a vital indicator of enforcement legitimacy. This distortion of risk classification is increasingly evident in the rise of intellectual property rights violations, such as the counterfeiting of well-known brands on marketplaces that harms official manufacturers and misleads consumers (Aziz et al., 2024).

At the behavioral level, society may view the black market as a rational economic choice. This rationality emerges when citizens compare the benefits obtained against the perceived risks. Perceived risks encompass legal risks, social risks, and product quality risks. If the legal risk is perceived as low due to limited surveillance, and the quality risk is perceived as manageable through a trusted network, the black market choice appears sensible. Within a normative framework, this condition indicates that the deterrence function has weakened. Deterrence requires the certainty of enforcement, not merely the severity of sanctions. However, severe sanctions without certainty of enforcement can foster injustice, as only a fraction of offenders are caught. This injustice reinforces perceptions of selectivity. Furthermore, citizens frequently construct moral justifications, such as assuming that transactions are conducted for survival. Moral justifications suppress guilt and drive normalization. At this point, law enforcement that relies solely on crackdowns can generate resistance. The public perspective demands enforcement that can demonstrate the reason for protection, such as protection from hazardous goods or protection from fraud. If the protective rationale is trusted, the rationality of the black market can shift. Consequently, the interpretation of citizens' economic and moral rationality must be mapped as part of shaping compliance. In formal commodity markets, optimizing the services marketing mix and the competitive advantage of official service providers is necessary to shift consumers' rational preferences away from illegal channels (Darmawan & Grenier, 2021).

Public trust in law enforcement institutions is a decisive factor in the acceptance of enforcement actions. Trust is shaped by experiences, reputation, and circulating narratives. Within a normative framework, trust influences whether citizens are willing to cooperate, provide information, or act as witnesses. Public cooperation is essential because the black market is

hidden and often network-based. When trust is low, citizens tend to close themselves off and view authorities as parties to be avoided. This avoidance complicates the gathering of proof. Moreover, trust influences how citizens interpret the actions of authorities. The exact same action can be perceived as protection when trust is high, or perceived as extortion when trust is low. Therefore, enforcement legitimacy cannot be built solely on rules, but also on the behavioral integrity of the institution. Within the normative realm, integrity is linked to accountability, procedural transparency, and behavioral consistency. When citizens observe informal spaces for negotiation that alter enforcement outcomes, trust collapses. The collapse of trust drives citizens back to the black market because official channels are viewed as unreliable. Thus, law enforcement against the black market from a public perspective requires a discussion on the relationship between institutions, integrity, and compliance. Efforts to restore this trust align with the importance of building regional economic stability through effective legal protection for the MSME sector in Indonesia (Hardyansah & Putra, 2023).

The black market also shapes a specific set of social values, particularly within communities that frequently interact through informal transactions. This value system can give rise to group norms that diverge from state-defined regulations. For instance, group norms often emphasize loyalty, secrecy, and the protection of network members. Within a normative framework, these group norms present a barrier to enforcement because they block the flow of information. However, from the perspective of citizens, group norms can be understood as a social safety mechanism, especially when citizens feel the state does not provide adequate protection. When individuals experience economic insecurity, informal networks become a source of safety. Enforcement that attacks these networks without building an alternative sense of security can be perceived as a threat to solidarity. This perception reinforces resistance. At this point, law enforcement must be understood as a process confronting well-established social norms. Normative studies can explain that the law competes with social norms in shaping compliance. This competition does not necessarily have to be resolved through force, but rather through legitimacy; yet this stage continues to deconstruct the causal structures rather than offering prescriptions. Thus, the black market persists not merely due to economic benefits, but also because of social norms that

provide justification and protection. Enforcement that ignores social norms risks failing to secure public support.

Public perception regarding the victims in the black market also influences evaluations of enforcement. In certain transactions, the victim may be a defrauded consumer, a public exposed to hazardous goods, or the state losing revenue. However, society does not always view the state as an immediate victim, as fiscal losses feel abstract. Conversely, a defrauded consumer feels close and easily triggers empathy. Within a normative framework, how citizens define the victim influences their support for crackdowns. If enforcement showcases consumer protection and hazard prevention, support tends to increase. If enforcement emphasizes administrative violations that are difficult for citizens to comprehend, support tends to decline. This highlights the importance of normative framing namely, how the goals of enforcement are communicated. The public perspective demands enforcement that can explain concrete losses, such as health and safety risks. However, enforcement must also avoid narratives that oversimplify all actors as criminals. When small-scale actors are perceived as being driven by desperation, the public can react negatively. Negative reactions can trigger delegitimization. Therefore, enforcement must be understood as an action requiring sensitivity toward how the public identifies victims and offenders. This sensitivity is an integral part of perceived substantive justice. The ambiguity surrounding the status of actors within this chain is similar to the polemics regarding the legal positioning of middlemen in commodity distribution, which carries specific transactional legal consequences for both producers and end-consumers (Yustiargo et al., 2024).

The classification of offenders from a public perspective frequently separates actors seeking large profits from those who are merely surviving. This separation influences citizen judgment regarding enforcement targets. Citizens tend to accept enforcement against actors perceived as exploitative, yet reject enforcement against actors perceived as vulnerable. Within a normative framework, the law does indeed distinguish culpability based on elements, intent, and consequences. However, these distinctions are not always visible to the public. The public judges based on symbols, such as the scale of the business and the lifestyle of the actor. If enforcement appears to target small-scale actors, the public judges the state as insensitive. This

judgment can trigger solidarity with the offender, including assistance in evading authorities. Conversely, enforcement against large-scale actors is frequently viewed as evidence of courage. Yet, enforcement against large-scale actors requires more complex evidentiary proof, meaning it rarely yields rapid, visible results. This delay can be interpreted as protection of the elite. Within a normative framework, this impression damages equality before the law. Consequently, the public perspective positions distributive justice as a baseline measure specifically, whether enforcement is felt to target the center of profits. When distributive justice is not felt, compliance weakens. Thus, black market enforcement needs to be read through public perceptions of who should be held accountable. This perception shapes legitimacy and influences public cooperation.

In many situations, society views informal negotiation as a reality of enforcement. Informal negotiations encompass efforts to reduce sanctions, alter records, or halt processes through specific agreements. Within a normative framework, informal negotiation undermines legal certainty and drives the black market because actors judge that risk can be managed with money or connections. This view creates a moral hazard namely, the tendency to violate rules because the consequences can be negotiated. From the perspective of society, the existence of informal negotiation reinforces cynicism, which is the conviction that the law cannot be trusted. Cynicism transforms compliance into a game of strategy rather than a value-based choice. When cynicism spreads, previously compliant citizens can be driven to commit infractions because they feel the system is unfair. Therefore, law enforcement against the black market demands integrity as a prerequisite for legitimacy. Integrity cannot merely be declared; it must be visible in consistent procedures and in the rejection of intervention. The public perspective evaluates integrity based on circulating narratives and direct experiences. Consequently, normative discussions position internal accountability and oversight as elements that influence public acceptance. Although this text does not discuss institutional design in detail, the consequence is clear: without integrity, enforcement becomes part of the black market ecosystem. This ecosystem reinforces illegal practices through the prediction that processes can be manipulated. This lack of accountability is equivalent to organizational governance distortions, whereas an

accountable distribution of six primary factors is highly necessary to enhance overall organizational effectiveness (Darmawan, 2024).

The dimension of legal communication also influences how society interprets the black market and its enforcement. Communication encompasses information regarding prohibitions, the underlying rationales for those prohibitions, sanctions, and enforcement procedures. When communication is limited strictly to the threat of sanctions, citizens may judge that the state relies merely on power. Conversely, if communication explains public risks, citizens can judge that the state is providing protection. Within a normative framework, effective communication strengthens legitimacy because citizens are enabled to evaluate the rationality of regulations. Regulatory rationality helps foster stable compliance. Furthermore, communication influences the interpretation of culpability. Citizens need to understand the distinctions among illegal goods, counterfeit goods, and unlicensed goods. Without this understanding, citizens can unwittingly become buyers. When enforcement actions take place, these citizens feel treated unfairly. This sense of injustice triggers resistance. Therefore, the public perspective emphasizes the need for easily understandable information. Cryptic or complex information creates a gap between norms and actual behavior. This gap provides space for black market actors to manipulate situations, such as by convincing buyers that the goods are safe and legal. Consequently, legal communication directly affects the supply and demand structures of the black market. Strong enforcement coupled with weak communication can generate social tension. Conversely, balanced enforcement accompanied by communication can yield social acceptance. This demonstrates that enforcement is not merely a repressive measure, but also an educational act in the sense that it enhances public interpretation of norms. The fragmentation of understanding resulting from weak communication is frequently exacerbated by the rise of populist ethno-religious nationalism, which poses a serious challenge to global governance and domestic social integration (Fariz, 2021).

The black market frequently intersects with issues of product quality and the protection of public safety. Society may judge that quality risks are the primary reason to reject the black market. However, risk assessments often depend on personal experience and trust in suppliers. When citizens

trust a particular network, they assume that quality can be guaranteed without official standards. Within a normative framework, network-based trust cannot replace public standards, as public standards are designed to protect everyone, including those without network access. Here, law enforcement possesses the objective of preventing harm. However, this objective must be clearly visible to secure public support. If enforcement appears focused strictly on administrative infractions without highlighting safety issues, the public feels less motivated to cooperate. Public perspective toward safety is also influenced by the proximity of risk. Immediate risks, such as poisoning, are easily comprehended. Indirect risks, such as reduced state revenue, are difficult to grasp. Therefore, enforcement legitimacy will be stronger when linked to direct protection. This is not a matter of propaganda, but of testable normative rationales. If the protective rationale is genuine and explainable, the public accepts it. If the protective rationale appears contrived, the public rejects it. Thus, normative discussions emphasize that the black market is an issue capable of creating victims, and the interpretation of who constitutes a victim influences public support for crackdowns. Public support is a social prerequisite for effective enforcement. The cultural tension involved in evaluating public standards versus local customs is similar to the clashes that frequently occur between local values and green marketing approaches within traditional communities (Mardikaningsih, Halizah, et al., 2021).

Substantive justice from the perspective of society evaluates whether enforcement outcomes align with a sense of fairness. This sense of fairness is not identical to mere emotion; rather, it constitutes an evaluation of equality, proportionality, and protection. When citizens see severe sanctions imposed on small-scale actors, they judge the outcome as unfair. When they see large-scale actors escape accountability, they likewise judge the outcome as unfair. Within a normative framework, substantive justice must be constructed through alignment between the objective of a prohibition and the chosen enforcement actions. The objective of a prohibition can take the form of safety protection or economic protection. Chosen enforcement actions must demonstrate a clear connection to that objective. If the connection is ambiguous, the public judges enforcement as a mere formality. Formality undermines the authority of the law. Furthermore, substantive justice relates to remediation. Society frequently

asks whether enforcement mitigates risk or merely multiplies conflict. If enforcement is not followed by remediation, the public judges that no benefit has been achieved. This judgment reduces support. In black market cases, remediation can mean halting the circulation of hazardous goods, restoring consumer rights, or dismantling illicit networks. If the public does not observe remediation, they view enforcement as useless. Hence, enforcement needs to be read as a process that generates social outcomes. Public perspective toward these social outcomes influences future compliance. Consequently, substantive justice serves as a bridge connecting crackdowns to compliance. This substantive barrier resembles the operational hurdles experienced by copyright holders, as observed in the analysis of inhibiting factors in filing civil lawsuits by copyright holders (Hardyansah, Darmawan, & Negara, 2021).

Within the compliance framework, society can develop two distinct forms of compliance: normative compliance and instrumental compliance. Normative compliance arises when citizens perceive regulations as legitimate and fair. Instrumental compliance arises when citizens fear sanctions. The black market flourishes when normative compliance weakens and instrumental compliance proves insufficient. Normative compliance erodes when prohibitions are perceived as irrational or inconsistent. Instrumental compliance erodes when the likelihood of getting caught is perceived as low or when the process can be negotiated. Within a normative framework, ideal law enforcement builds normative compliance by strengthening legitimacy. This legitimacy is constructed through consistency, transparency, and respect for procedure. The public perspective serves as the cornerstone because legitimacy resides within public evaluation, not merely within legal texts. Consequently, discussions on the black market must explain how citizens translate their assessments of institutions into everyday choices. These everyday choices encompass the decision to buy or not to buy, to report or to remain silent, and to evade or to cooperate. If citizens feel safe to report, enforcement is facilitated. If citizens feel that reporting carries risks, the black market remains shielded. Thus, law enforcement from a public perspective is a matter of relationships. This relationship cannot be understood solely through legal articles; rather, it requires a mapping of concepts regarding trust, safety, and risk perception. This framework explains why the black market persists even when sanctions are available.

The dynamics of corporate compliance at this operational level are also influenced by regulatory restructuring, including the juridical implications of the Job Creation Law on the concept and legal liability of individual companies in Indonesia (Hardyansah, Putra, et al., 2023).

In the realm of evidence, the black market challenges enforcement because transactions are intentionally designed to leave a minimal trail. However, the public perspective regarding proof often views it merely as an excuse for why large-scale actors are rarely apprehended. If citizens conclude that large-scale actors are always capable of evading justice, faith in equality before the law collapses. The collapse of this faith triggers cynicism and reinforces justifications to participate in violations. Within a normative framework, the gathering of proof demands an accountable process to ensure that rights are not violated. This requirement limits enforcement methods, as enforcement must never sacrifice procedure. Yet, strict procedures must be balanced by professionalism so that visible results are still achieved. The public perspective evaluates professionalism based on targeted accuracy, clarity of rationale, and procedural orderliness. If the process appears chaotic, the public views enforcement as incompetent. Incompetence diminishes the deterrent effect. Consequently, black market enforcement requires a high quality of work. This quality of work is not merely a matter of technical capability, but also of communication and procedural ethics. In normative studies, these factors translate into the principles of due process and accountability. These principles influence legitimacy, and legitimacy, in turn, influences compliance. Therefore, the gathering of proof is not solely an internal affair, but an integral part of how the public evaluates the authority of the law. To overcome jurisdictional limitations in transnational evidence gathering, fostering a fair investment climate now relies on optimizing the extraterritorial authority of the KPPU in enforcing competition law (Firmansyah et al., 2023).

The public perspective is also influenced by experiences with official channel services. When official routes are judged to be easy, citizens are more ready to comply. When official routes are judged to be difficult, citizens are more prepared to seek alternatives. This assessment affects the black market through a substitution mechanism. Within a normative framework, substitution is not a legal justification, but a social explanation of why an infraction is chosen. Law enforcement that ignores the

substitution factor can result in repetitive crackdowns without ever reducing demand. Unchanged demand continuously drives supply to persist. Therefore, enforcement must be understood in connection with the governance of official services. The public perspective evaluates whether the state provides a realistic pathway to compliance. If the compliance pathway is unrealistic, enforcement is perceived as unfair. This perception erodes legitimacy. However, this discussion remains normative namely, explaining that legitimacy depends on a combination of prohibitions and the ease of compliance. Without the ease of compliance, a prohibition is viewed as coercion. Coercion amplifies resistance. Thus, the black market can be seen as an indicator that the compliance pathway has not been fully accepted. Enforcement then becomes an arena to evaluate whether the state is capable of managing that relationship fairly. The public perspective toward the ease of compliance is an integral part of shaping normative compliance. This situation underscores the importance of in-depth studies regarding the educational levels of entrepreneurs alongside the administrative consequences of licensing on the interest of business actors in managing the legality of their small businesses (Mardikaningsih & Arifin, 2021). On the other hand, a smooth transition toward official channels frequently relies on the strength of social capital, as observed in the vital role of social networks in helping economic actors obtain legitimate and protected market access (Lestari & Mardikaningsih, 2012).

When the black market involves goods tied to identity and social status, enforcement confronts a symbolic dimension. Buyers may purchase items not out of necessity, but for image. Under these conditions, the black market draws support from specific social desires. The public perspective toward enforcement then becomes a mixture of social jealousy, tolerance, and rejection. Some citizens support crackdowns, viewing them as a correction of injustice. Others reject them, judging that enforcement interferes with freedom of consumption. Within a normative framework, freedom of consumption is restricted by law when a public interest is present. However, the acceptance of that boundary depends on legitimacy. If citizens perceive that a rule is made for the public interest, the boundary is accepted. If citizens perceive that a rule is made for a narrow interest, the boundary is rejected. Thus, enforcement against symbolic goods frequently sparks public debate. Public debate influences institutional image, and

institutional image, in turn, influences compliance. Therefore, the public perspective must be mapped to understand how crackdowns are perceived within public discourse. Discourse can either strengthen or weaken deterrence. Within a normative framework, public discourse is not an enemy of enforcement, but an arena for legitimacy. If an institution can demonstrate fair rationales and procedures, discourse can culminate in support. If not, discourse leads to delegitimization. This confirms that black market enforcement is simultaneously a legal process and a social process. Economic pressures on specific commodities often force business actors to seek shortcuts, as studied in comparative research regarding development strategies for shallot farming at the village level to maintain official supply stability (Darmawan, 2018). This supply instability within official channels risks triggering an erosion of public compliance, necessitating accurate strategies to overcome the erosion of customer loyalty amid intense market competition so that the public does not divert to illegal commodities (Sinambela & Aprilianti, 2011).

In the perspective of society, differences in treatment across regions or time periods frequently serve as indicators of injustice. If strict enforcement occurs at a certain time, only to become lax at another time without explanation, citizens judge the law as inconsistent. Consistency is vital because citizens construct predictions of behavior. Predictions influence purchasing choices. When predictions indicate that oversight is lax, black market activity increases. Within a normative framework, consistency does not imply an absence of discretion, but discretion must be accountable. The accountability of discretion reduces public suspicion. However, when accountability is not visible, citizens fill the void with assumptions. Assumptions reinforce rumors, and rumors weaken compliance. Therefore, law enforcement requires a reasonable management of openness namely, providing general explanations about priorities without revealing operational techniques. The public perspective views openness as a sign of respect, and respect strengthens legitimacy. In black market cases, openness also means clarifying what constitutes an infraction and what does not. If the boundaries of an infraction are blurred, citizens feel they are at risk unintentionally. The feeling of being at risk lowers the sense of security and erodes trust. Consequently, consistency and openness become two normative elements that shape public acceptance. Public acceptance

determines the long-term success of enforcement. Efforts to uphold consistent legal standards are fundamentally parallel to the urgency of rigorous product development and quality improvement processes to meet market needs legally and safely (Sinambela & Aprilianti, 2012). Through such credible standardization, the state can optimize mechanisms for creating and protecting core competencies for sustainable competitive advantage in the real sector while simultaneously restricting the operational space of illegal trade (Putra et al., 2014). Ultimately, the effectiveness of law enforcement in the eyes of society heavily depends on the synergy between consistency of action and the transparency of accountability.

Conclusion

The practice of the black market and law enforcement from a public perspective is a relationship determined by legitimacy, perceptions of procedural justice, and the formation of compliance. The black market persists when informal transactions are seen as providing direct benefits, when rules are perceived as irrational or inconsistent, and when legal risks are perceived as avoidable. Law enforcement is evaluated by citizens through the quality of the process namely, the regularity of procedures, treatment that respects dignity, consistency of application, and the accuracy of enforcement targeting. Perceptions of selectivity and perceptions of informal negotiation damage public trust, lower the authority of the rules, and turn compliance into fragile instrumental compliance. The citizens' interpretation of victims, types of goods, and the classification of actors shapes the support for or rejection of enforcement and determines the level of public cooperation. Thus, the normative success of enforcement cannot be separated from social acceptance of the rationality of the rules and the integrity of the institution, as such acceptance forms stable compliance and closes the space for the normalization of the black market.

The implications and suggestions emphasize the importance of organizing enforcement that strengthens legitimacy through procedural justice and proportional transparency. Clarity regarding the boundaries of violations needs to be communicated in easily understandable language so that citizens can distinguish between legal and infringing transactions. Consistency in application and accountability in discretion must be maintained to prevent the public from forming suspicions of selectivity. The

enforcement process must demonstrate respect for citizens and evidentiary order so that outcomes are acceptable, while simultaneously preventing rumors that damage trust. Enforcement also needs to be understood as part of a governance system that provides realistic pathways for compliance, as the acceptance of rules is influenced by citizens' experiences with official service channels. At the institutional level, internal integrity and supervision serve as the primary pillars to close the space for informal negotiations that reinforce moral hazard. The conceptual framework in this writing can be used as a basis for formulating enforcement communication guidelines, organizing enforcement priorities, and public legal education oriented toward the formation of normative compliance.

References

- Aziz, T. S., Terubus, T., Sudjai, S., Darmawan, D., & Putra, A. R. 2024. Perlindungan dan penegakan hukum terhadap pemalsuan merek terkenal yang terjadi di marketplace. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 14(2), 12-18.
- Bryman, A. 2016. *Social Research Methods*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Crano, W. D., M. B. Brewer., & A. Lac. 2014. *Principles and Methods of Social Research*. Routledge, New York.
- Darmawan, D. 2018. Strategi Pengembangan Usahatani Bawang Merah Di Desa Sajen, Kecamatan Pacet, Kabupaten Mojokerto. *Jurnal Agrimas*, 2(1), 13-22.
- Darmawan, D. 2024. Distribution of Six Major Factors Enhancing Organizational Effectiveness. *Journal of Distribution Science*, 22(4), 47-58.
- Darmawan, D., & Grenier, E. 2021. Competitive advantage and service marketing mix. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 75-80.
- 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.
- Firmansyah, S., Negara, D. S., & Hardiyansah, R. 2023. Realizing a Fair Investment Climate: The Role of KPPU's Extraterritorial Authority in Competition Law Enforcement. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(2), 11-22.
- Gagnon, Y. C. 2010. *The Case Study as Research Method: A Practical Handbook*. PUQ, Quebec.
- Hardiyansah, R. 2023. Assessment of the Efficiency of Government Licensing Services in Supporting the Development of Micro and Small Enterprises. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 2(2), 5-12.
- Hardiyansah, R., & Putra, A. R. 2023. Building Regional Economic Stability Through Effective Legal Protection for Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises in Indonesia. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(1), 15-22.
- Hardiyansah, R., D. Darmawan, & D. S. Negara. 2021. Analysis of Inhibiting Factors in the Filing of Civil Lawsuits by Copyright Holders, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 223-248.
- Hardiyansah, R., Putra, A. R., Khayru, R. K., & Arifin, S. 2023. Legal Implications of the Job Creation Law on the Concept and Liability of Individual Companies in Indonesia. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(1), 259-270.
- Henn, M., M. Weinstein., & N. Foard. 2005. *A Short Introduction to Social Research*. Sage, London.

- Irfansyah, M. F., Darmawan, D., & Hardyansah, R. 2024. Implementation of the Principle of Good Faith in Contract Performance. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 3(2), 51-56.
- Khayru, R. K. 2021. Opinions about Consumer Behavior during the Covid-19 Pandemic, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 31-36.
- Lestari, U. P., & Mardikaningsih, R. 2012. Peran Jaringan Sosial untuk Membantu Mendapatkan Akses Pasar. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 2(2), 73-83.
- Mardikaningsih, R, S. N. Halizah, R. Nuraini, & D. Darmawan. 2021. Clashes Between Local Values and Green Marketing Approaches in Traditional Communities, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 157-172.
- Mardikaningsih, R., & Arifin, S. 2021. Study on Education Level and Consequences of Licensing and Interest in Making Small Business Licensing. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 19-24.
- Mardikaningsih, R., Halizah, S. N., Nuraini, R., Darmawan, D., & Hardyansah, R. 2024. Manajemen Risiko Pada Penerapan Manajemen Rantai Pasokan Global: Kajian Terhadap Pendekatan Strategis Untuk Mengidentifikasi, Mengevaluasi, dan Mengelola Risiko. *Yos Soedarso Economic Journal (YEJ)*, 6(2), 1-15.
- Noor, T., Putra, A. R., Suyuti, M., Khayru, R. K., Hariani, M., Issalillah, F., & Mardikaningsih, R. 2023. Implementation of Criminal Regulations on The Use of Hazardous Chemicals in Food Distribution. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 4(3), 13-17.
- Oluwatoyin, F., & Mardikaningsih, R. 2024. Challenges and Opportunities for Sustainability of Human Resource Development in Industry 4.0. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 3(2), 9-16.
- Putra, A. R., & Wibowo, A. S. 2023. Royalty Fee Arrangement in Franchise Business and its Legal Implication in Indonesia. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(1), 171-176.
- Putra, A. R., Darmawan, D., & Al Hakim, Y. R. 2014. Mekanisme Penciptaan dan Perlindungan Keahlian Inti untuk Keunggulan Kompetitif Berkelanjutan. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 4(1), 37-50.
- 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.
- Sinambela, E. A., & Aprilianti, E. T. 2011. Strategi mengatasi erosi loyalitas pelanggan di tengah intensitas persaingan pasar. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 1(2), 76-89.
- Sinambela, E. A., & Aprilianti, E. T. 2012. Proses Pengembangan Produk dan Peningkatan Kualitas Sesuai Kebutuhan Pasar. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 2(2), 26-37.
- Wibowo, A. S., Darmawan, D., Halizah, S. N., & Mardikaningsih, R. 2023. Optimizing the Principles of Healthy Business Competition and the Role of KPPU for a Fair Economy in the Digital Era. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(1), 95-100.
- Wibowo, A. S., Hardyansah, R., Darmawan, D., Saputra, R., & Negara, D. S. 2024. Legal Protection and Justice for Franchise Business Operators from an Islamic Law Perspective. *Journal of Ecohumanism*, 3(6), 27-40.
- Wisnujati, N. S. & R. Mardikaningsih. 2021. The Role of the Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise Sector in Poverty Alleviation Efforts: An Analysis of Economic Value Transmission Mechanisms and Determining Factors, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(1), 275-302.
- Yustiargo, A. T., Hardyansah, R., & Darmawan, D. 2024. Legal Status of Tengkulak in Commodity Distribution and Transactional Legal Consequences. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 4(1), 141-172.
- Zulkarnain, A., Darmawan, D., & Hardyansah, R. 2024. Effectiveness of Law No. 5 of 1999 in Handling Cross-Border Business Competition. *SAPIENTIA ET VIRTUS*, 9(2), 461-475.