MIKAILALSYS
Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences

e-ISSN : 2987-2286
p-ISSN : 2987-3924
Index: Harvard, Boston, Sydney, Copernicus, Sinta 4, Scilit, Semantic, Google, etc

https://doi.org/10.58578/mikailalsys.v4i3.12555

When Subsidies Are Misused: A Social Psychology Perspective on the Misuse of Subsidized Fuel in Indonesia

Ghadhidha D. Cinta, Bonar Hutapea, Zahra P. Oktavian Ramadhini, Fiora Syania, Dzikrina I. Ramadhani
Universitas Tarumanagara, Indonesia
bonarh@fpsi.untar.ac.id

Submitted:	Revised:	Accepted:	Published:
Sep 24, 2026	Oct 23, 2026	Nov 3, 2026	Nov 8, 2026

Abstract

The misuse of subsidized diesel fuel presents an energy governance challenge involving individual decisions, social influence, moral considerations, and distribution conditions. This article develops a psychosocial explanation of such behavior and examines its implications for distributive justice and energy resilience. A critical narrative literature review was combined with an examination of scientific, regulatory, and institutional documents. Police disclosures cited in the review reported 658 cases of subsidized fuel and liquefied petroleum gas misuse involving 583 suspects in 2025, followed by 97 cases involving 89 suspects through April 2026. These figures contextualize reported enforcement activity and do not estimate prevalence. The synthesis identifies attitudes, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, and behavioral intentions within the Theory of Planned Behavior as relevant explanatory constructs. To address moral justification and enabling conditions more explicitly, the review integrates descriptive and injunctive norms, moral norms, moral disengagement, techniques of neutralization, regulatory legitimacy, procedural justice, and opportunity structure. The resulting Psychosocial Model of Subsidized-Fuel Misuse conceptualizes misconduct as a possible outcome of interactions among perceived benefits, social influence, moral rationalization, actual opportunities, and perceived certainty of detection. Subsidy misuse may compromise distributional targeting, increase inefficiency, generate potential fiscal burdens, and weaken equitable access to energy. The proposed model provides a conceptual framework for examining subsidized

Mikailalsys is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

diesel misuse and connecting psychosocial processes with broader energy governance concerns. It requires empirical testing and does not establish causal relationships or demonstrate individual perpetrators' motives.

Keywords: Subsidized Diesel Fuel; Social Psychology; Moral Disengagement; Social Norms; Energy Resilience

INTRODUCTION

Fuel is an essential energy source for mobility, goods distribution, agriculture, fisheries, and economic activities. The government regulates the supply and distribution of specific types of fuel to ensure that their benefits reach user groups that meet the established requirements. In Indonesia, the distribution framework for specific types of fuel is regulated, among other provisions, under Presidential Regulation Number 191 of 2014 and its subsequent amendments. Therefore, subsidized fuel should not merely be regarded as a lower-priced commodity but also as a policy instrument with distributive objectives.

This article focuses on the misuse of subsidized diesel fuel. Conceptually, misuse refers to the acts of obtaining, possessing, transporting, storing, distributing, or trading subsidized diesel fuel outside the stipulated provisions governing its use and distribution, particularly for the personal or collective benefit of individuals or groups. This definition distinguishes legitimate consumption by eligible users from acts of stockpiling, illegal transportation, the use of inappropriate identities or QR codes, and resale. Accordingly, not all subsidized diesel fuel users can be classified as perpetrators of misuse.

In 2025, the Directorate of Certain Crimes (Dittipidter) of the Indonesian National Police Criminal Investigation Agency (Bareskrim Polri) reported 658 cases of subsidized fuel misuse involving 583 suspects (ANTARA, 2026). Furthermore, the Indonesian National Police uncovered 97 cases involving 89 suspects in 2026. The reported evidence included 112,663 liters of diesel fuel (ANTARA, 2026). These figures represent cases uncovered and processed by the Indonesian National Police. Similarly, the potential state financial losses resulting from fuel subsidy misuse cases throughout 2025–2026 reached IDR 1.26 trillion (ANTARA, 2026).

Monitoring findings reported by the Downstream Oil and Gas Regulatory Agency (BPH Migas) in 2026 also illustrate several modus operandi, including repeated purchases, the use of multiple QR codes or vehicle registration numbers, and vehicle tank modifications

(Badan Pengatur Hilir Minyak dan Gas Bumi, 2026). These cases are important not merely as a list of violations but also as indications that such behavior may involve a combination of motivations, social support or learning, access to resources, and weaknesses in control mechanisms. Nevertheless, enforcement evidence does not directly reveal what each perpetrator thinks or feels. Therefore, the psychological mechanisms discussed in this article are treated as possible explanations based on the literature rather than as diagnoses of particular individuals.

A social psychological perspective can extend explanations that focus exclusively on regulations and law enforcement. The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) explains that attitudes toward behavior, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control are important determinants of behavioral intentions, which subsequently influence actual behavior (Hagger & Hamilton, 2025). Meta-analyses support the applicability of TPB but also indicate that the strength of these relationships may vary depending on the behavior and research design (Hagger & Hamilton, 2024). In explaining rule-breaking behavior, the analysis needs to be extended to include processes of moral justification, social norms, the legitimacy of regulations, and actual opportunities.

Descriptive norms refer to perceptions of what other people commonly do, distinguishing them from injunctive norms, which refer to perceptions of socially approved or expected actions (Legros & Cislaghi, 2020). On the other hand, moral disengagement explains how individuals cognitively reconstruct unethical actions to make them appear morally acceptable, while techniques of neutralization provide specific forms of justification that enable individuals to rationalize violations without experiencing moral self-condemnation (McCormack & Chowdhury, 2024). The availability of actual opportunities, situational constraints, and the likelihood of behavioral enactment are also important because intentions do not always translate into actual behavior. This phenomenon, commonly referred to as the intention–behavior gap, demonstrates that having a behavioral intention does not necessarily guarantee its implementation (Sheeran & Webb, 2016).

The gap addressed by this article is not based on the claim that no previous studies have examined fuel misuse, but rather on the need to integrate psychological, social, moral, and situational explanations when examining the phenomenon of subsidized diesel fuel misuse in Indonesia. Available local literature has largely focused on legal or criminological aspects (Ha'e et al., 2024; Nanda, 2023), whereas social psychology literature offers

constructs that can help develop a more integrated analytical framework. The perspective of responsible consumption is employed as a complementary approach to highlight the impact of individual decisions on other parties, rather than as a primary theory that assumes all perpetrators are ordinary consumers (Falcão & Roseira, 2022; Hutapea, 2018).

The phenomenon of subsidized fuel misuse described above is closely related to several Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly SDG 7 (Affordable and Clean Energy), SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production), and SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions). SDG 7 aims to ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable, and modern energy for all. SDG 12 aims to ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns. SDG 16 aims to promote just, peaceful, and inclusive societies, as well as build effective, accountable, and inclusive institutions at all levels.

The objectives of this study are to: (1) identify relevant psychosocial mechanisms for understanding subsidized diesel fuel misuse; (2) synthesize TPB with social norms, moral norms, moral disengagement, neutralization, legitimacy, and opportunity structures; and (3) conceptually explain the pathways linking misuse to the accurate targeting of subsidies and energy security. This article does not empirically test causal relationships and does not seek to generalize the motives of all perpetrators.

METHODS

This study employs a critical narrative literature review approach combined with an examination of regulatory and institutional documents. This approach was selected because the objective of the article is to develop a conceptual synthesis rather than calculate prevalence, conduct a meta-analysis, or test hypotheses involving participants. A narrative literature review enables the critical examination, interpretation, and synthesis of relevant scholarly publications without claiming to follow a systematic review protocol (Pautasso, 2019). Accordingly, this study is not classified as a systematic review and does not claim compliance with PRISMA guidelines. A targeted literature search was conducted through Google Scholar, journal publishers' websites, Crossref/DOI, and official institutional websites to identify publications addressing the Theory of Planned Behavior, social norms, moral norms, moral disengagement, techniques of neutralization, the intention–behavior gap, legitimacy and procedural justice, responsible consumption, energy subsidies, and fuel subsidy misuse in Indonesia. The search employed combinations of Indonesian and English

keywords, including "penyalahgunaan BBM bersubsidi," "subsidized diesel," "fuel subsidy misuse," "Theory of Planned Behavior," "social norms," "moral disengagement," "neutralization," "procedural justice," "responsible consumption," and "energy security." Sources were selected based on their relevance to the research concepts, scholarly credibility, traceability, theoretical significance, and institutional authority. Peer-reviewed journal articles were prioritized for theoretical and empirical arguments, while official regulations, institutional reports, and news reports based on statements from law enforcement authorities were selectively used to examine the Indonesian context. Classical publications were retained when they provided foundational theoretical explanations, while more recent publications were prioritized whenever relevant. Regulatory and institutional documents were examined through document analysis, considering their content, institutional context, and relevance to the research questions (Asdal & Reinertsen, 2022; Grant, 2022). Given the narrative nature of this review, the study does not report the total number of initially identified records, excluded publications, or inter-reviewer agreement. The analysis was conducted through four stages: (1) identifying patterns of cases and reported modus operandi in institutional documents; (2) mapping relevant psychological and social constructs; (3) synthesizing conceptual relationships among individual, normative, moral, institutional, and situational factors; and (4) connecting the resulting synthesis to distributive justice and energy security. Enforcement data were not used to establish causal relationships or infer the psychological mechanisms of individual perpetrators because direct psychological data were unavailable.

RESULTS

Enforcement Patterns and Modus Operandi of Subsidized Fuel Misuse

Enforcement data indicate 658 cases of subsidized fuel and LPG misuse involving 583 suspects throughout 2025, as well as 97 cases involving 89 suspects up to April 2026. The seized diesel fuel amounted to 1,182,388 liters and 112,663 liters, respectively. The identified modus operandi included repeated purchases, the use of multiple QR codes or vehicle identities, tank modifications, storage, and resale. These data describe cases successfully uncovered rather than the overall prevalence of misuse.

The Roles of Attitudes, Subjective Norms, and Behavioral Control in Misuse

Subsidized diesel fuel misuse can be understood through the interaction of attitudes toward perceived benefits, social environmental influences, perceived ease of committing violations, and individual intentions. However, intentions are not always translated into actions because of factors such as supervision, detection risks, and actual barriers or opportunities within the distribution system.

Social Norms, Learning, and the Normalization of Violations

The perception that subsidy misuse occurs frequently and does not always result in consequences may encourage tolerance toward deviant behavior. Observing the actions of others that generate benefits may also potentially become a process of social learning. These conditions may reinforce the normalization of violations when not accompanied by compliance norms and consistent supervision.

Moral Norms, Moral Disengagement, and Behavioral Rationalization

Subsidy misuse is also associated with the possibility of weakened moral considerations through the justification of actions, displacement of responsibility, disregard for harmful consequences, and denial of the parties affected. Such rationalizations may cause violations to be perceived as acceptable actions despite contradicting the objectives of subsidy distribution.

Distributive Justice, Legitimacy, and Social Responsibility

Perceptions of distributive justice and consistency in law enforcement are important aspects of building compliance. Transparent supervision, fair procedures, and consistent enforcement have the potential to strengthen policy legitimacy. Conversely, distrust in monitoring processes may undermine public acceptance of subsidy regulations.

Development of the Psychosocial Model of Subsidized-Fuel Misuse

The synthesis results in a conceptual model integrating four groups of factors, namely individual factors, moral evaluation and rationalization processes, social and institutional contexts, and situational conditions. These four groups indicate that subsidized diesel fuel misuse is not only associated with individual motivations but is also influenced by social norms, regulatory legitimacy, the availability of opportunities, and the certainty of detection.

DISCUSSION

Enforcement Patterns and Limitations of Data Interpretation

Table 1 summarizes the reported enforcement figures for two periods. These figures indicate disclosure and enforcement activities rather than the total number of misuse incidents that have occurred. Furthermore, the reported number of cases includes subsidized fuel and LPG, whereas the number of liters presented in the table refers to seized diesel fuel. This difference in scope must be maintained to ensure that the data are not interpreted beyond what is supported by the sources.

Table 1. Enforcement Data on the Misuse of Subsidized Fuel and LPG and Seized Diesel Fuel

Period	Fuel/LPG Cases	Suspects	Seized Diesel Fuel
2025	658	583	1,182,388 liters
January–April 2026	97	89	112,663 liters

Source: ANTARA (2026a). The figures represent reported disclosure/enforcement data, not prevalence estimates.

Patterns involving repeated purchases, the use of multiple QR codes or vehicle identities, modified tanks, storage, and resale can be interpreted as indications of potential vulnerabilities within the distribution system. In this analysis, these modus operandi are not used to directly infer individual motives. Instead, they help formulate questions concerning how access, actual control, incentives, and the certainty of detection may interact with intentions.

Theory of Planned Behavior and the Intention–Behavior Gap

TPB positions behavioral intention as the immediate predictor of behavior, while attitudes toward behavior, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control serve as the three primary determinants of intention formation (Ajzen, 2020). In the context of subsidized diesel fuel misuse, attitudes may be associated with evaluations of perceived benefits, such as price differences or profits from resale. This explanation does not imply that economic motives are always the primary cause; rather, perceived benefits may interact with norms, moral judgments, and opportunities.

Subjective norms refer to perceptions of the expectations of individuals or groups considered important. This construct is not equivalent to simply knowing that other people engage in violations. Therefore, the analysis of social norms needs to distinguish between

descriptive and injunctive norms. Perceived behavioral control (PBC) must also be distinguished from objective opportunities. PBC concerns individuals' perceptions of the ease or ability to perform an action, whereas the opportunity structure refers to actual conditions such as access, administrative loopholes, storage facilities, and the quality of verification.

This distinction is important for understanding the intention–behavior gap. An individual may have an intention but refrain from acting because of supervision, detection risks, or actual barriers. Conversely, available opportunities may facilitate the translation of intentions into actions. Research on the relationship between intentions and behavior indicates that changes in intentions do not always produce proportional changes in actual behavior (Sheeran & Webb, 2016). Therefore, prevention should not focus solely on increasing knowledge or issuing moral appeals but should also improve system controls and narrow opportunities for misuse.

The Theory of Planned Behavior and the intention–behavior gap are relevant to SDG 12, particularly regarding the inefficient allocation of subsidies and the promotion of wasteful consumption. TPB emphasizes that intentions are not always automatically translated into behavior. Factors such as supervision, detection risks, and actual barriers also determine whether such intentions result in actions. Therefore, prevention efforts need to improve system controls, strengthen verification, and narrow opportunities for misuse.

Social Norms, Learning, and the Normalization of Violations

Descriptive norms provide information about behaviors commonly practiced within a social group, whereas injunctive norms reflect behaviors that are socially approved or considered appropriate. Both types of social norms can influence individual behavior, particularly when they become salient within a specific social context (Geber et al., 2021). In the context of subsidy misuse, the perception that violations occur frequently and do not result in consequences may diminish the moral distinctiveness of such actions. However, frequently reported cases do not prove that society generally approves of these violations.

The concept of social learning helps explain how individuals acquire and modify behaviors by observing others, imitating their actions, and evaluating the consequences associated with those behaviors. Through observational learning and modeling, individuals may adopt behaviors that they observe being rewarded or avoid those associated with

negative consequences (Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2023). If deviant actions appear to generate benefits without being accompanied by consistent sanctions, such actions may potentially be perceived as viable strategies. The normalization of deviance may also develop when practices that were initially considered unacceptable gradually become regarded as ordinary within a particular environment, particularly when repeated deviations occur without negative consequences (Sedlar et al., 2023). This concept is used as an analytical lens, rather than as a claim that normalization has been proven to occur in every case of subsidized fuel misuse.

Public communication needs to be carefully designed. Messages that merely emphasize the high number of violations risk unintentionally reinforcing descriptive norms suggesting that violations are common. Prevention messages should instead emphasize clear injunctive norms, examples of compliance, protection of eligible beneficiaries' access, and the actual consequences of misuse without disseminating information on how to commit violations.

Social norms, social learning, and the normalization of violations are associated with SDG 16, particularly the strengthening of the rule of law, institutional accountability, and the reduction of corruption. The perception that violations are common and do not result in consequences may undermine the legitimacy of regulations and encourage subsidy misuse. Therefore, preventive communication needs to emphasize injunctive norms, examples of compliance, protection of beneficiaries' access, and actual consequences without reinforcing the perception that violations are common practices.

Moral Norms, Moral Disengagement, and Techniques of Neutralization

Moral norms refer to an individual's internalized sense of moral obligation to perform or refrain from certain actions. These norms can provide additional explanatory power for behavioral intentions beyond the conventional Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) constructs, particularly when decisions involve ethical considerations. In the context of subsidies, moral norms may be associated with individuals' recognition that subsidies represent public resources intended to meet the needs of eligible groups and should therefore be distributed and utilized responsibly (White et al., 2023).

Moral disengagement explains the cognitive mechanisms through which individuals can act contrary to their internal moral standards while maintaining a positive perception of

themselves. Through cognitive reconstruction and the deactivation of moral self-sanctions, individuals may rationalize unethical actions without experiencing self-condemnation or guilt (Schaefer & Bouwmeester, 2021). These mechanisms include moral justification, euphemistic labeling, advantageous comparison, displacement or diffusion of responsibility, minimizing consequences, and blaming affected parties. A meta-analysis by Luo and Bussey (2023) identifies an association between moral disengagement and transgressive behavior while also emphasizing the roles of personal and environmental factors.

Sykes and Matza's techniques of neutralization provide a complementary lens for examining rationalizations such as denial of responsibility, denial of injury, denial of the victim, condemnation of the condemners, and appeals to higher loyalties. These techniques describe how individuals may justify norm-violating actions by minimizing personal responsibility, denying harmful consequences, shifting blame, criticizing those who condemn their actions, or prioritizing other loyalties (Bryant et al., 2018). Statements such as "others do it too" or "no one is actually harmed" in this article are illustrative examples of theoretical categories, not quotations from interviewed perpetrators. In the absence of interview data or direct assessments, this article cannot establish whether particular mechanisms are employed in individual cases.

Knowledge of regulations is also not equivalent to compliant behavior. An individual may understand the objectives of subsidies but still choose to engage in violations if perceived benefits are high, group norms are supportive, moral consequences are minimized, or opportunities are available. Therefore, education needs to be combined with the development of social norms, strengthened accountability, and the control of opportunities.

Moral norms, moral disengagement, and techniques of neutralization are associated with SDG 12, particularly regarding the inefficient allocation of energy subsidies and the promotion of wasteful consumption. In the context of subsidized diesel fuel, the moral recognition that subsidies constitute public resources intended for eligible beneficiaries is consistent with the principles of efficient and responsible energy resource management.

Justice, Legitimacy, and Social Responsibility

Perceptions of distributive and procedural justice can influence how individuals evaluate regulations and regulatory authorities. Distributive justice concerns the perceived fairness of how benefits and burdens are allocated, whereas procedural justice focuses on the

fairness, consistency, and impartiality of decision-making and law enforcement processes. Research on legal legitimacy indicates that compliance does not depend solely on the threat of punishment but also on whether individuals perceive authorities and their enforcement procedures as legitimate and fair. Therefore, perceptions that regulations are inconsistently applied or that supervision targets only certain groups may undermine institutional legitimacy and voluntary compliance, although such perceptions do not justify legal violations (Rorie et al., 2018).

Deterrence theory highlights the role of the likelihood of detection and the consequences faced by individuals who violate regulations. Contemporary research on deterrence emphasizes that the certainty of enforcement may have a more consistent deterrent effect than simply increasing the severity of threatened punishment. However, the effectiveness of deterrence remains dependent on the type of offense, enforcement conditions, and individuals' perceptions of the likelihood of detection and punishment (Abramovaite et al., 2023). Accordingly, consistent supervision, auditable verification, and fair enforcement processes need to operate together. Enforcement perceived as arbitrary may reduce trust, whereas transparent enforcement has the potential to strengthen legitimacy.

The perspective of responsible consumption broadens the focus from individual benefits to impacts on other parties. Falcão and Roseira (2022) demonstrate that the gap between responsible attitudes and behavior may be influenced by economic factors, information, a sense of responsibility, social context, and availability. In this context, legitimate users and perpetrators of misuse must not be treated as equivalent. The concept of social responsibility serves as a complementary perspective for assessing distributive consequences, rather than as a basis for assigning moral labels to all subsidy users (Hutapea, 2018).

Distributive justice, procedural justice, the legitimacy of authorities, and social responsibility are related to SDG 16, particularly the strengthening of the rule of law, institutional accountability, transparency, and the reduction of corruption. Perceptions that regulations are inconsistently applied or that supervision targets only certain groups may undermine the legitimacy of subsidy policies, although they do not justify violations. Therefore, consistent supervision, auditable verification, and fair enforcement processes need to operate together to strengthen legitimacy and compliance.

Psychosocial Model of Subsidized-Fuel Misuse

Based on this synthesis, this article proposes the *Psychosocial Model of Subsidized-Fuel Misuse* as a conceptual contribution. This model consists of four interrelated clusters. First, individual factors include attitudes toward benefits, subjective norms, PBC, and moral norms. Second, evaluation and rationalization processes encompass moral disengagement and techniques of neutralization that may weaken moral restraints. Third, the social and institutional context includes descriptive or injunctive norms, social learning, perceptions of justice, regulatory legitimacy, and trust. Fourth, situational conditions encompass the opportunity structure, administrative verification, access to resources, and the certainty of detection.

Within this framework, intention is not the only pathway leading to behavior. Intentions may be translated into actions when actual opportunities are available and controls are insufficient to restrict such actions. Conversely, effective supervision, fair procedures, and strong compliance norms may inhibit the actualization of intentions. This model does not suggest that every factor is always present or carries equal weight. Relationships among the constructs represent propositions for future research rather than causal relationships established by the data presented in this article.

The model's primary contribution is to position misuse not merely as a problem of knowledge or moral character but as a possible outcome of interactions among benefit considerations, social pressures, rationalization, opportunities, and governance. This model also helps explain why awareness messages alone may be insufficient. Knowledge may increase without behavioral changes if norms, incentives, opportunities, and supervision remain unchanged.

The *Psychosocial Model of Subsidized-Fuel Misuse* contributes to the achievement of SDG 16 by emphasizing the importance of fair, transparent, accountable, and effective subsidy governance in reducing opportunities for misuse. The model also supports SDG 7 through efforts to ensure that energy subsidies reach their intended beneficiaries and promote energy efficiency, while remaining relevant to SDG 12 by encouraging more responsible energy consumption patterns through changes in attitudes, social norms, rationalization, and opportunity structures.

Implications for Energy Security and Prevention

The relationship between subsidized diesel fuel misuse and energy security must be explained through mechanisms rather than presented as an automatic direct relationship. Misuse has the potential to divert benefits away from intended beneficiaries, reduce distribution efficiency, increase potential fiscal burdens, and create inequities in access. In the Indonesian context, the analysis of energy subsidies also needs to consider benefit distribution and fiscal impacts, as discussed in studies of energy subsidy economics (Abimanyu & Imansyah, 2023; Dartanto, 2013). Accordingly, misuse may constitute one of the factors undermining the effectiveness of subsidy governance when it occurs cumulatively.

Preventive implications need to be implemented at several levels. At the individual level, communication can employ concrete moral reminders regarding the objectives of subsidies, eligible beneficiaries, and the impact of misuse on other people's access. At the social level, campaigns need to present compliant behavior as an expected norm and avoid messages that inadvertently create the impression that violations are common. At the institutional level, verification and enforcement procedures need to be consistent and transparent and provide complaint mechanisms. At the technological level, matching QR codes, vehicle data, purchase volumes, and transaction records can help narrow opportunities for misuse while maintaining data accuracy, privacy, and accountability.

At the policy level, prevention effectiveness should be evaluated through observable indicators, such as compliance among eligible users, the number of verified transaction anomalies, the speed of complaint follow-up, the consistency of inspection processes, and perceptions of procedural justice. These indicators are proposed evaluation measures rather than findings that have been tested by this article. A combined approach is more appropriate than relying on a single instrument because compliance may be influenced simultaneously by motivation, norms, opportunities, and legitimacy.

This framework also intersects with the Sustainable Development Goals, particularly SDG 7 on affordable and sustainable energy, SDG 12 on responsible consumption and production, and SDG 16 on effective and accountable institutions (United Nations, n.d.). This relationship does not mean that subsidized diesel fuel misuse directly proves a failure to achieve the SDGs; rather, it indicates that targeting accuracy, responsibility for public resources, and fair governance are relevant aspects of these objectives.

This study has several limitations. First, enforcement data only describe detected cases and cannot be used to estimate prevalence. Second, direct psychological data from perpetrators were unavailable. Therefore, the discussion of psychosocial mechanisms represents a theoretical synthesis rather than a diagnosis. Third, Indonesian literature directly examining the psychological mechanisms underlying subsidized diesel fuel misuse remains limited; consequently, some explanations are derived from international literature on transgressive behavior, norms, and compliance. Fourth, the narrative approach does not employ a full systematic review protocol and is subject to the risk of source selection bias. Fifth, the proposed model has not yet been tested and should not be treated as a validated causal model.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that subsidized diesel fuel misuse needs to be understood as a behavioral and governance issue that cannot be adequately explained solely through economic motives or law enforcement. TPB helps explain the relationships among attitudes, subjective norms, PBC, and intentions, while social norms, moral norms, moral disengagement, techniques of neutralization, legitimacy, procedural justice, and opportunity structures extend the explanation of how such behavior may develop and be carried out. In particular, the distinction between PBC and actual opportunities is important because intentions do not always translate into actions.

This study proposes the *Psychosocial Model of Subsidized-Fuel Misuse*, which integrates individual, social, moral, institutional, and situational factors. This model can serve as a foundation for formulating interventions that combine normative communication, strengthened social responsibility, improved verification, consistent supervision, certainty of detection, and fair procedures. The relationship between misuse and energy security is understood through the potential misallocation of subsidies, inefficiency, fiscal burdens, and unequal access; this relationship is conceptual and was not directly measured in this study.

Future research needs to empirically test the model using appropriate research designs, distinguish legitimate users from actors involved in stockpiling or resale, and measure attitudes, norms, PBC, moral norms, rationalization, perceived legitimacy, opportunities, and the certainty of detection. Case studies also need to be complemented by

data that enable psychological analysis without assuming motives solely on the basis of reported modus operandi.

REFERENCES

Abimanyu, A., & Imansyah, M. H. (2023). The impact of fuel subsidy to the income distribution: The case of Indonesia. *Indonesian Treasury Review: Jurnal Perbendaharaan, Keuangan Negara dan Kebijakan Publik, 8*(3), 189–203. https://doi.org/10.33105/itrev.v8i3.932

Abramovaite, J., Bandyopadhyay, S., Bhattacharya, S., & Cowen, N. (2023). Classical deterrence theory revisited: An empirical analysis of Police Force Areas in England and Wales. *European Journal of Criminology, 20*(5), 1663–1680. https://doi.org/10.1177/14773708211072415

Ajzen, I. (2020). The theory of planned behavior: Frequently asked questions. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies, 2*(4), 314–324. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.195

Asdal, K., & Reinertsen, H. (2022). *Doing document analysis: A practice-oriented method*. SAGE Publications. https://us2.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/doing-document-analysis/book276193

Badan Pengatur Hilir Minyak dan Gas Bumi. (2026a, May 31). *BPH Migas Lakukan Pengawasan di Jepara, Dapati Dugaan Penyalahgunaan BBM Subsidi*. https://www.bphmigas.go.id/bph-migas-lakukan-pengawasan-di-jepara-dapati-dugaan-penyalahgunaan-bbm-subsidi/

Badan Pengatur Hilir Minyak dan Gas Bumi. (2026b, July 12). *Menindaklanjuti Aduan Masyarakat, BPH Migas Temukan Dugaan Penyalahgunaan Penyaluran BBM Subsidi di Jambi*. https://www.bphmigas.go.id/menindaklanjuti-aduan-masyarakat-bph-migas-temukan-dugaan-penyalahgunaan-penyaluran-bbm-subsidi-di-jambi/

Bryant, E., Schimke, E. B., Nyseth Brehm, H., & Uggen, C. (2018). Techniques of neutralization and identity work among accused genocide perpetrators. *Social Problems, 65*(4), 584–602. https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spx026

Falcão, D., & Roseira, C. (2022). Mapping the socially responsible consumption gap research: Review and future research agenda. *International Journal of Consumer Studies, 46*(5), 1718–1760. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.12803

Geber, S., Baumann, E., Czerwinski, F., & Klimmt, C. (2021). The effects of social norms among peer groups on risk behavior: A multilevel approach to differentiate perceived and collective norms. *Communication Research, 48*(3), 319–345. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650218824213

Grant, A. (2022). *Doing your research project with documents: A step-by-step guide to take you from start to finish*. Policy Press. https://policy.bristoluniversitypress.co.uk/doing-your-research-project-with-documents

Ha'e, D. R., Leo, R. P., & Amalo, H. (2024). Tinjauan Kriminologis terhadap Penimbunan Bahan Bakar Minyak Bersubsidi Jenis Solar dan Pertalite di Kabupaten Belu. *Artemis Law Journal, 1*(2), 712–717. https://doi.org/10.35508/alj.v1i2.15955

Hagger, M. S., & Hamilton, K. (2024). Longitudinal tests of the theory of planned behaviour: A meta-analysis. *European Review of Social Psychology, 35*(1), 198–254. https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2023.2225897

Hagger, M. S., & Hamilton, K. (2025). Progress on theory of planned behavior research: Advances in research synthesis and agenda for future research. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 48*(1), 43–56. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10865-024-00545-8

Han, T.-I., & Stoel, L. (2017). Explaining socially responsible consumer behavior: A meta-analytic review of theory of planned behavior. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing, 29*(2), 91–103. https://doi.org/10.1080/08961530.2016.1251870

Hutapea, B. (2018). Orientasi Keberagamaan dan Perilaku Mahasiswa sebagai Konsumen yang Bertanggung Jawab secara Sosial. In R. A. Achmad, D. N. Rachmah, & S. N. Akbar (Eds.), *Prosiding Seminar Nasional & Call for Paper "Harmonisasi Perilaku Manusia dengan Lingkungan"* (pp. 60–67). Program Studi Psikologi, Fakultas Kedokteran, Universitas Lambung Mangkurat.

Legros, S., & Cislaghi, B. (2020). Mapping the social-norms literature: An overview of reviews. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 15*(1), 62–80. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619866455

Luo, A., & Bussey, K. (2023). Moral disengagement in youth: A meta-analytic review. *Developmental Review, 70*, Article 101101. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2023.101101

McCormack, R., & Chowdhury, R. M. M. I. (2024). Moral disengagement and neutralization techniques as explanations of unethical behavior. *Journal of Consumer Affairs, 58*(2), 630–662. https://doi.org/10.1111/joca.12575

Nanda, A. A. F. (2023). Kebijakan Hukum Tindak Pidana Penimbunan BBM Bersubsidi Jenis Solar pada Wilayah Hukum Polrestabes Semarang. *Jurnal JURISTIC, 4*(2), 150–159. https://doi.org/10.56444/jrs.v4i02.4264

Pautasso, M. (2019). The structure and conduct of a narrative literature review. In M. M. Shoja, A. Arynchyna, M. Loukas, A. V. D'Antoni, S. M. Buerger, M. Karl, & R. S. Tubbs (Eds.), *A guide to the scientific career: Virtues, communication, research, and academic writing* (pp. 299–310). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118907283.ch31

Rahmani, N. P. (2026a, April 7). *Polri: Potensi Kerugian Akibat Penyalahgunaan BBM-LPG Subsidi Rp1,26 T*. ANTARA News. https://www.antaranews.com/berita/5516019/polri-potensi-kerugian-akibat-penyalahgunaan-bbm-lpg-subsidi-rp126-t

Rahmani, N. P. (2026b, April 7). *Polri Ungkap 755 Kasus Penyalahgunaan BBM dan LPG Subsidi di 2025–2026*. ANTARA News. https://www.antaranews.com/berita/5515820/polri-ungkap-755-kasus-penyalahgunaan-bbm-dan-lpg-subsidi-di-2025-2026

Rorie, M. L., Simpson, S. S., Cohen, M. A., & Vandenbergh, M. P. (2018). Examining procedural justice and legitimacy in corporate offending and beyond-compliance behavior: The efficacy of direct and indirect regulatory interactions. *Law & Policy, 40*(2), 172–195. https://doi.org/10.1111/lapo.12100

Schaefer, U., & Bouwmeester, O. (2021). Reconceptualizing moral disengagement as a process: Transcending overly liberal and overly conservative practice in the field. *Journal of Business Ethics, 172*(3), 525–543. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04520-6

Schunk, D. H., & DiBenedetto, M. K. (2023). Albert Bandura's legacy in education. *Theory Into Practice, 62*(3), 205–206. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2023.2226560

Sedlar, N., Irwin, A., Martin, D., & Roberts, R. (2023). A qualitative systematic review on the application of the normalization of deviance phenomenon within high-risk industries. *Journal of Safety Research, 84*, 290–305. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsr.2022.11.005

Sheeran, P., & Webb, T. L. (2016). The intention–behavior gap. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 10*(9), 503–518. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12265

White, K. M., Starfelt Sutton, L. C., & Zhao, X. (2023). Charitable donations and the theory of planned behaviour: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLOS ONE, 18*(5), Article e0286053. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0286053