Volume 1, Issue 01, 2026, CARE, Page 57-70

CARE INDONESIA

JOURNAL OF ISLAMIC PSYCHOSPIRITUAL COUNSELING

e-ISSN: xxxx-xxxx

Homepage: https://carejournals.id/index.php/jipc/index

Cognitive Distortions and Automatic Thoughts of Consumers in Counterfeit Product Purchases: A Review of Consumer Protection and Intellectual Property Law Using the CBT Cognitive Model

Anugrah Ade Putra[1], Andi Istiana Inayah Dwi Putri[2]

[1] Universitan Islam Negeri Palopo, Indonesia.

[2] Universitas Sawerigading, Indonesia.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received:
29 May 2026

Accepted:
30 June 2026

Avaliable online:
31 July 2026

Corresponding Author:
Anugrah Ade Putra,
Universitas Islam Negeri Palopo, Indonesia
Email:
anugrah_ade_putra@uinpalopo.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Consumers increasingly purchase counterfeit products knowingly, raising questions about cognition and legal protection. This article examines cognitive distortions and automatic thoughts behind such purchases using the cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) model and explores implications for Indonesian consumer protection and intellectual property law. A conceptual-normative review integrates empirical studies published between 2022 and 2026 with doctrinal analysis of consumer protection, trademark, copyright, and electronic commerce regulations. Findings suggest that minimizing harm, blaming brand owners, and assuming "everyone does it" resemble cognitive distortions and reflect neutralization and moral rationalization. Indonesian law primarily targets deceptive sellers and protects misled consumers, while knowing purchasers occupy an ambiguous position: they are rarely direct targets of criminal enforcement, but their protection claims may be limited. The article proposes an integrated cognitive-legal framework combining consumer education, cognitive restructuring campaigns, and digital platform enforcement. It also develops propositions for future empirical testing of purchasing motivations and prevention strategies.

Keywords: Cognitive Distortions; Automatic Thoughts; Counterfeit Products; Consumer Protection; Intellectual Property Rights

ABSTRAK

Pembelian produk palsu secara sadar semakin marak dan menimbulkan persoalan terkait proses kognitif serta perlindungan hukum. Artikel ini menganalisis distorsi kognitif dan pikiran otomatis yang melatarbelakanginya melalui model terapi perilaku kognitif (CBT), sekaligus mengkaji implikasinya bagi hukum perlindungan konsumen dan kekayaan intelektual di Indonesia. Kajian konseptual-normatif ini mengintegrasikan penelitian empiris terbitan 2022–2026 dengan analisis doktrinal atas regulasi perlindungan konsumen, merek, hak cipta, dan perdagangan elektronik. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahwa tindakan meremehkan kerugian, menyalahkan pemilik merek, serta menganggap "semua orang melakukannya" menyerupai distorsi kognitif dan mencerminkan netralisasi serta rasionalisasi moral. Hukum Indonesia terutama menindak penjual yang menipu dan melindungi konsumen yang terkecoh, sedangkan pembeli yang mengetahui kepalsuan produk berada dalam posisi ambigu: jarang menjadi sasaran penegakan pidana, tetapi klaim perlindungannya dapat terbatas. Artikel ini menawarkan kerangka kognitif-hukum yang memadukan edukasi konsumen, kampanye restrukturisasi kognitif, dan penegakan aturan platform digital serta merumuskan proposisi untuk menguji motivasi pembelian dan strategi pencegahan secara empiris.

Kata kunci: Distorsi Kognitif; Pikiran Otomatis; Produk Palsu; Perlindungan Konsumen; Hak Kekayaan Intelektual.

How to cite: Putra, A. A., & Putri, A. I. I. D. (n.d.). Cognitive distortions and automatic thoughts of consumers in counterfeit product purchases: A review of consumer protection and intellectual property law using the CBT cognitive model. *Journal of Islamic Psychospiritual Counseling*. https://carejournals.id/index.php/jipc/article/view/11

INTRODUCTION

Trade in counterfeit goods is a structural problem of the global economy. A joint report by the OECD and the European Union Intellectual Property Office estimates that counterfeit trade was worth about USD 467 billion in 2021, or 2.3% of world imports, rising to 4.7% of EU imports (OECD/EUIPO, 2025). The same report notes that hazardous fakes, including automotive parts, medicines, cosmetics, toys, and food, are increasingly prevalent and pose serious risks to consumer health and safety (OECD/EUIPO, 2025). Counterfeits can therefore no longer be understood solely as a matter of luxury brands and the rights of brand owners; they are also a consumer protection issue.

The demand side shows a pattern of particular interest to psychology. The EUIPO (2023) survey of 25,824 respondents across EU Member States found that 13% admitted to intentionally buying counterfeits in the previous twelve months, rising to 26% among those aged 15–24. About one in three respondents (31%) considered buying counterfeits acceptable when the price of the genuine product is too high, and this proportion rose to 50% in the youngest group. At the same time, around 80% agreed that counterfeits support criminal organisations and harm businesses and jobs, and 83% stated that buying counterfeits supports unethical behaviour (EUIPO, 2023). This gap between attitude and behaviour suggests that consumers do not lack moral knowledge. What needs to be explained is the thinking process that allows that knowledge to be set aside at the moment of purchase.

Recent consumer behaviour research has approached this process from several directions. Garas, Mahran, and Mohamed (2023), in a survey of 361 counterfeit buyers in Egypt, showed that neutralisation, perceived risk, and susceptibility to social influence significantly affect attitudes and purchase intention. Jiang, Cui, and Shan (2023) examined the roles of moral rationalisation and embarrassment, while Khan, Fazili, and Bashir (2023) showed that buyers of counterfeit luxury goods are driven by competing motives, namely the desire for approval and the desire to avoid disapproval. Alam et al. (2024) applied a behavioural-bias approach in a comparison of China and Pakistan, and Bardey, Turner, and Piccardi (2022) explored buyers' emotional experiences. However, these studies have not used a framework that systematically separates situations, automatic thoughts, cognitive distortions, emotions, and behaviour, which is the core structure of the cognitive model in CBT. The model is well established in psychotherapy, and cognitive restructuring, which

tests automatic thoughts through evidence, alternatives, and implications, has been linked to therapy outcomes in meta-analytic review (Ezawa & Hollon, 2023).

In Indonesia, legal scholarship on counterfeits has concentrated on the liability of businesses and platform operators. Ansa, Umam, and Asrianto (2023) examined the responsibility of an online marketplace operator for the sale of counterfeits of well-known marks, while Munira et al. (2025) highlighted regulatory gaps and weak online dispute resolution in trademark protection within the e-commerce ecosystem. Lestari and Putra (2023) and Nafisah and Fikri (2026) examined the protection of consumers who receive non-conforming or fake goods. In the corpus reviewed here, relatively little attention is paid to how knowing consumers justify their purchases, even though this group is precisely the one that the deception-based logic of consumer protection reaches least adequately.

Based on this gap, the article answers three questions. First, which cognitive distortions and automatic thoughts can be conceptually mapped onto counterfeit purchases by knowing consumers? Second, what is the position of such consumers under Indonesia's consumer protection and IP regimes? Third, how can this cognitive mapping inform interventions that connect psychological and legal approaches? The contribution is conceptual: the article offers a preliminary mapping and testable propositions, not empirical claims about the prevalence of particular distortions among Indonesian consumers.

One ethical note is needed at the outset. The term "cognitive distortion" is used here as an analytic category for thinking errors commonly experienced by healthy people, not as a diagnosis or a suggestion that buyers of counterfeits have a psychological disorder.

METHODS

This study is a conceptual-normative review combining two components. The first is a structured narrative review of empirical studies and policy reports on counterfeit consumption, cognition in buying behaviour, and applications of the cognitive model. The second is a doctrinal legal analysis of relevant legislation, interpreting the text of provisions and relating them to secondary legal literature.

Literature was searched through publisher websites and online repositories (Emerald Insight, Springer, Frontiers, MDPI, Wiley, OECD iLibrary, and the Garuda portal) using keywords including counterfeit, neutralisation, cognitive distortion, automatic thoughts, compulsive buying, consumer protection, counterfeit goods, and trademark. Inclusion

criteria were (a) publication in 2022 or later, (b) addressing intention or behaviour in buying counterfeits, cognition in purchasing, applications of cognitive restructuring, or the legal protection of consumers and IP owners against counterfeits, and (c) a source traceable through a DOI or publisher link. Policy documents from the OECD and EUIPO were included because they contain large-scale empirical data. The literature meeting these criteria and used in this article comprises 18 sources, of which 14 are international and 4 are national, in addition to primary legal sources.

Primary legal sources include Law No. 8 of 1999 on Consumer Protection (UUPK), Law No. 20 of 2016 on Trademarks and Geographical Indications (Trademark Law), Law No. 28 of 2014 on Copyright (Copyright Law), regulations on electronic information and transactions and on trade through electronic systems, and the TRIPS Agreement as an international reference. The mapping of cognitive distortions in Section 3.3 is the author's analytical construction, built by matching distortion categories in the cognitive model with justifications reported in the counterfeit consumption literature. It has not been empirically validated and is treated as a working hypothesis. Because no human subjects were involved, ethical approval was not required.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Knowing consumers and deceived consumers

Both legal and psychological discussion should begin with the distinction between deceptive and non-deceptive counterfeiting. In the first, the consumer believes the product is genuine. In the second, the consumer knows or reasonably suspects that it is counterfeit but buys it anyway. EUIPO (2023) records both phenomena: some respondents intentionally buy counterfeits, while about four in ten (39%) have wondered whether something they bought was counterfeit. The distinction matters because the two groups occupy different psychological and legal positions, and the discussion below focuses mainly on the second.

Recent empirical evidence shows that the decisions of knowing consumers are not explained by price and quality alone. Garas et al. (2023) found that neutralisation, that is, justifications that relieve moral discomfort, affects attitudes and purchase intention, and that attitudes mediate the effects of neutralisation, perceived risk, and susceptibility to social influence. Jiang et al. (2023) tested embarrassment and moral rationalisation as boundary conditions for the intention to buy counterfeit luxury goods in China, while Khan et al. (2023) showed that buyers who are highly conscious of their public image are more likely

to buy counterfeits, but that anticipated embarrassment before a higher-class audience can lower that intention. Alam et al. (2024) examined behavioural biases in the consumer paradox toward counterfeit luxury products in Chinese and Pakistani samples using PLS modelling. Other studies address dual envy among online shoppers (Gupta & Lyndem, 2024), the effect of being envied through luxury brand social media word of mouth (Feng et al., 2023), and the role of religiosity in luxury and counterfeit consumption in an emerging market (Kasber et al., 2023). Bardey et al. (2022) add a study of the lived experience of buyers who negotiate their emotions.

Taken together, this literature shows that buying a counterfeit involves an inner negotiation among desire, norms, and discomfort. In CBT terms, this negotiation takes place through automatic thoughts and cognitive distortions. These findings come from varied cultural contexts and mostly concern luxury goods, so generalisation to Indonesian consumers and to non-luxury categories must be made with caution.

2. The CBT cognitive model as an analytic lens

The cognitive model developed by Aaron T. Beck holds that emotions and behaviour are not determined directly by situations but by how situations are interpreted. Interpretations that arise spontaneously and almost without awareness are called automatic thoughts. Automatic thoughts may contain systematic errors called cognitive distortions, and both rest on deeper beliefs about the self, others, and the world. Cognitive restructuring is the core technique for testing automatic thoughts, commonly using three questions about the evidence for, the alternatives to, and the implications of the thought (Ezawa & Hollon, 2023).

Applying this framework to consumer behaviour is not new, although it has been done more for compulsive buying than for counterfeit purchases. Rocha et al. (2023) showed, among 365 students in Portugal, that early maladaptive schemas are associated with impulsive and compulsive buying tendencies, and described how beliefs such as “if I shop I will be appreciated more” help maintain compulsive buying. Nori et al. (2022) reported that working memory deficits and a spontaneous decision-making style predict compulsive buying tendencies, and Fioravanti et al. (2024) showed the role of metacognitions in compulsive online shopping. These studies do not address counterfeits, so here they serve only as indirect evidence that the cognitive processes described by CBT are relevant to consumption decisions. The difference matters: buying counterfeits knowingly is not necessarily compulsive, and most such buyers do not meet criteria for any disorder.

3. Mapping cognitive distortions in counterfeit purchases

Table 1 sets out common CBT distortion categories alongside examples of automatic thoughts that may arise in knowing buyers, their psychological functions, and restructuring questions that could be used in interventions. The example thoughts are the author's analytic illustrations, not quotations from respondents. The link to the literature lies in function: justifications reported as neutralisation and moral rationalisation (Garas et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2023) serve to relieve moral discomfort, and the same function can be described through cognitive distortions.

Table 1. Conceptual mapping of cognitive distortions in counterfeit purchases by knowing consumers

Cognitive distortion	Example automatic thought	Psychological function	Restructuring question
Minimisation	"It's just a bag; nobody is harmed."	Shrinks the impact on brand owners, workers, and oneself; consistent with the justification that no one is hurt.	Who is affected if many people make purchases like this?
All-or-nothing thinking	"If I can't afford the original, I buy the fake. No other choice."	Reduces options to two poles so that alternatives (licensed local products, second-hand, postponing) become invisible.	What lies between these two options?
Overgeneralisation	"Everyone uses fakes, every shop sells them."	Normalises the behaviour through exaggerated social proof, in line with the role of social influence in Garas et al. (2023).	How many people actually do this? Does the number of people doing it make it right or safe?
Emotional reasoning	"It feels safe, so it can't be dangerous."	Treats a feeling of calm as evidence of safety, especially for cosmetics, electronics, and spare parts.	What evidence beyond my feeling shows this product passed safety testing?
Fortune-telling and mind-reading	"No one will take action." "Others can't tell the difference."	Lowers perceived legal and social risk; relevant to the role of anticipated embarrassment in Khan et al. (2023) and Jiang et al. (2023).	What is my basis for this prediction? What happens if I am wrong?
Labelling and belittling others	"Big brands are greedy; they deserve to be copied."	Shifts blame to the brand owner; functions as moral justification.	Does one party's fault justify my action? Who bears the consequences?
"Should" statements	"Good products should be affordable."	Turns a price preference into a moral demand so that infringement appears as a correction of injustice.	Does this expectation change what happens to sellers and their workers?

Disqualifying the positive	"Even originals may not be real, so it's the same."	Rejects evidence distinguishing genuine from counterfeit, such as warranties, standards, and oversight.	What do I get from the genuine product that I do not get from this one?

Note: this mapping is the author's analytic construction based on distortion categories in the cognitive model and justifications reported in the literature; it has not been empirically validated

The mapping yields three observations. First, most distortions operate on the assessment of *impact* and *risk*, not on the assessment of desire. This makes sense, since wanting a product is not cognitively problematic; the problem lies in judging that the purchase harms no one and carries no risk. Second, price plays a dual role. The EUIPO (2023) survey shows that a genuine product priced too high is the most commonly accepted justification, and the same report notes that 43% of respondents cite more affordable originals as the main reason for not buying fakes. In CBT terms, price can be both a fact and material for distortion: it becomes a distortion when used as the sole reason that closes off alternatives and erases consideration of impact. Third, cognitive distortions rarely work alone. Thoughts such as "everyone does it" and "no one will take action" reinforce each other and, in CBT terms, may form part of intermediate beliefs held with considerable strength.

Table 2. Illustrative situation–thought–emotion–behaviour chain and its legal position

Component	Knowing consumer	Deceived consumer
Situation	Finds a "premium" branded bag on a marketplace far below the official price; the description says "super KW" or "replica".	Finds a branded bag on a marketplace at a bargain price; the description says genuine or does not mention counterfeit status.
Automatic thought	"It's for my own use; nobody is harmed." "Everyone does it."	"This must be genuine; the seller has lots of good reviews."
Emotion	Excited, with slight discomfort that quickly fades.	Trusting; later shocked, angry, or disappointed on learning the product is counterfeit.
Behaviour	Buys knowingly; may conceal counterfeit status from others.	Buys in trust; later files a complaint or requests a return.
UUPK position	No misleading information; claim for compensation is weak; the duty of good faith (Art. 5(b)) may be questioned. The right to safety (Art. 4(a)) remains relevant if the product is dangerous.	Right to correct information (Art. 4(c)) and compensation (Art. 4(h), Art. 19) can be claimed; the seller potentially violates Art. 8 and Art. 62(1).
Trademark Law position	Not the main target of Arts. 100–102, which address use and trade; the offences are complaint-based (Art. 103).	Same: the seller may be charged under Arts. 100 and 102; the brand owner must file a complaint for the case to proceed.

Note: the illustration was prepared by the author to explain the framework; the legal analysis is the author's normative interpretation of the text of the provisions.

4. Consumer protection review

The UUPK is designed to correct information asymmetry between businesses and consumers. Consumers' rights to security and safety (Art. 4(a)), to correct, clear, and honest information (Art. 4(c)), and to compensation (Art. 4(h)) are paired with the business's duty to provide correct, clear, and honest information (Art. 7(b)) and the prohibition on trading goods that do not meet standards or do not match promises on labels, packaging, descriptions, advertisements, or promotions (Art. 8(1)(a) and (f)). Businesses are liable to compensate consumers for losses arising from goods they trade (Art. 19), and violations of the Article 8 prohibitions carry up to five years' imprisonment or a fine of up to two billion rupiah (Art. 62(1)). For electronic transactions, the Electronic Information and Transactions Law, as amended by Law No. 1 of 2024, prohibits spreading false or misleading information that harms consumers in electronic transactions (Art. 28(1)).

For deceived consumers, this regime works fairly directly. A seller who advertises counterfeits as genuine breaches the information duty and the Article 8 prohibitions, and the buyer may claim compensation or pursue dispute resolution. National studies are consistent on this legal basis: Lestari and Putra (2023) show that protection of buyers of non-conforming goods in e-commerce rests on the UUPK and the ITE Law, while Nafisah and Fikri (2026) conclude that implementation is not yet optimal because fake products are still sold and business accountability is weak.

For knowing consumers, this logic falters. UUPK protection essentially answers misleading information, whereas a knowing consumer is not misled. Two issues follow. The first is doctrinal. Article 5(b) UUPK requires consumers to act in good faith, so a consumer who knows a product is counterfeit may be judged not to have acted in good faith when claiming compensation because the product fell short of expectations. This is the author's interpretation and needs testing in case law or further legal scholarship. The second is protective. A consumer's awareness that a product is counterfeit does not mean they are aware of, or accept, the safety risks; distortions such as emotional reasoning and minimisation of risk make those risks invisible. Because OECD/EUIPO (2025) records increasing circulation of dangerous counterfeits, protection of consumers' safety rights should not disappear merely because the buyer knew the product was counterfeit.

The platform dimension complicates matters. Munira et al. (2025) note that marketplaces and social media are frequently used to trade counterfeit goods, while comprehensive regulation is lacking and external control over online dispute resolution is weak. At the regulatory level, trade through electronic systems is governed by Government Regulation No. 80 of 2019 and Minister of Trade Regulation No. 31 of 2023, which regulate obligations of businesses and electronic trade operators. The specific obligations of operators in handling counterfeits should be checked directly against the text of those regulations in further analysis.

5. Intellectual property review

The Trademark Law sets out criminal provisions in Articles 100 to 102. Article 100 targets anyone who, without right, uses a mark identical in its entirety or in its essential parts to another party's registered mark for similar goods or services that are produced and/or traded, with imprisonment and/or fines of up to two billion rupiah. Where the infringement causes health problems, environmental harm, and/or death, the penalty rises to up to ten years' imprisonment and/or a fine of up to five billion rupiah (Art. 100(3)). Article 102 provides for up to one year's confinement or a fine of up to two hundred million rupiah for anyone who trades goods known or reasonably suspected to result from the offences in Articles 100 and 101. All these offences are complaint-based under Article 103.

Two analytic observations matter here. First, Articles 100 and 102 are formulated around the acts of using a mark and trading goods, so their main targets are producers and sellers, not end buyers. A knowing buyer purchasing for personal use is not at the centre of these offences. Second, because they are complaint-based, enforcement depends on rights-holders' initiative. Ansa et al. (2023) conclude that action against sales of counterfeits of well-known marks on online marketplaces occurs when brand owners report them, and that preventive protection for brand owners is inadequate. Consequently, at the behavioural level, the message "this breaks the law" is easily neutralised by thoughts like "no one will take action" (Table 1), because the likelihood of enforcement really does depend on others.

For products that touch on copyright, the Copyright Law adds an obligation for managers of trading venues not to allow sales of copyright-infringing goods in venues they manage (Art. 10), with fines as provided in Article 114. Whether this applies to marketplace operators is a question of interpretation beyond the scope of this article, but it shows that national law already recognises the idea of responsibility for trading spaces. Internationally, the TRIPS Agreement, which Indonesia ratified through Law No. 7 of 1994 on the Ratification of the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, requires members to provide criminal procedures at least for wilful trademark counterfeiting and copyright piracy on a commercial scale (Art. 61). This commercial-scale orientation is consistent with Indonesian law's focus on supply chains and sellers.

A structural gap therefore appears. The consumer protection regime centres on deceived consumers, while the IP regime centres on commercial actors. The knowing consumer sits between them: not fully protected, yet not a primary target. This gap is not in itself a legal failure, since many legal systems deliberately choose not to penalise end

buyers. However, it means that law's influence on knowing buyers' behaviour is mainly indirect, working through ease of access, information, and social norms. This is where a cognitive approach adds value.

6. An integrated cognitive-legal framework

Integrating the cognitive mapping and the legal analysis, this article proposes that efforts to reduce counterfeit purchases by knowing consumers should target three points in the situation–thought–emotion–behaviour chain.

a. First entry point: situation and information. Changes to triggering situations, such as seller verification, labelling of reported products, and takedowns by platforms, reduce exposure to counterfeit offers. This point rests on law: information duties in the UUPK and e-commerce regulations, and rights-holder complaint mechanisms. Munira et al. (2025) show that weaknesses here, such as incomplete regulation, are real problems in Indonesia's e-commerce ecosystem.
b. Second entry point: automatic thoughts. Campaign messages and purchase interfaces can be designed to prompt evaluation of evidence, alternatives, and implications, the three core questions of cognitive restructuring (Ezawa & Hollon, 2023), rather than merely stating prohibitions. Table 1 can serve as a basis for message design: for example, confronting the thought "nobody is harmed" with concrete information on impacts on workers and product safety risks. This approach aligns with Garas et al.'s (2023) recommendation that efforts to curb demand address the effects of neutralisation and demonstrate the various risks.
c. Third entry point: behaviour and consequences. Consistent enforcement against sellers and platforms changes consumers' estimates of risk, weakening the thought "no one will take action". Because the Trademark Law makes these offences complaint-based, partnership among rights-holders, platforms, and authorities is a prerequisite (Ansa et al., 2023).

Three propositions for empirical testing follow. Proposition 1: the stronger consumers' endorsement of distorted automatic thoughts such as minimisation of impact, labelling of brand owners, and overgeneralisation, the lower the perceived risk and moral discomfort and the higher the intention to buy counterfeits; this is consistent with Garas et al.'s (2023) findings on neutralisation but has not been tested with CBT-based instruments. Proposition 2: messages that prompt evaluation of evidence, alternatives, and implications reduce endorsement of distortions more than generic moral messages or legal threats alone. Proposition 3: the effect of cognitive messages is stronger in contexts where platforms

actively screen counterfeit offers, because triggering situations and messages reinforce each other.

Testing these propositions requires two methodological steps. First, developing and validating an instrument that measures endorsement of cognitive distortions specific to counterfeit purchases, which is currently absent from the reviewed corpus. Second, a mixed design: surveys with structural equation modelling, as is common in the reviewed studies (Garas et al., 2023; Alam et al., 2024), combined with message experiments to test Propositions 2 and 3. The Indonesian context also offers an opportunity to examine religious values, given that Kasber et al. (2023) have studied religiosity in luxury and counterfeit consumption in an emerging market; studies of Islamic commercial jurisprudence on deception and the rights of others could enrich this inquiry.

The policy implications are as follows. First, campaigns should not rely only on sanctions, since the legal formulation places end buyers outside the centre of criminalisation and enforcement depends on complaints. Second, messages will be more effective if they acknowledge price realities and offer concrete alternatives, because all-or-nothing distortions thrive when alternatives are invisible; EUIPO (2023) notes that more affordable genuine products are the main reason for not buying fakes. Third, the language used must avoid judging buyers. The CBT approach is collaborative and tests thoughts rather than shaming people, and shaming messages risk provoking resistance. Fourth, consumers' safety protection should be affirmed separately from their state of awareness, especially for the high-risk product categories highlighted by OECD/EUIPO (2025).

CONCLUSION

This article shows that counterfeit purchases by knowing consumers can be understood through a chain of situation, automatic thought, emotion, and behaviour, with cognitive distortions such as minimisation, overgeneralisation, emotional reasoning, and labelling of others functioning to relieve moral discomfort and lower perceived risk. The mapping is consistent with evidence on neutralisation and moral rationalisation, but remains conceptual and has not been tested on Indonesian consumers.

Legally, consumer protection works most clearly for deceived consumers, while trademark and copyright regimes focus on producers and sellers and depend on rights-holder complaints. Knowing consumers occupy a grey area: not the main target of criminal sanctions, yet weakly positioned in consumer protection claims, while the safety risks they

may face remain real. The proposed integrated cognitive-legal framework, with three entry points of situation and information, automatic thoughts, and behaviour and enforcement, offers a basis for designing interventions that do not merely prohibit but also change how consumers weigh evidence and impact.

This article has limitations. The literature corpus is limited to sources published from 2022 onward that can be traced online and was not assembled through a full systematic review protocol; most empirical studies concern luxury goods outside Indonesia; the distortion mapping is not validated; and the legal interpretation, especially regarding the standing of knowing consumers, has not been tested in court decisions. Further research should develop instruments to measure cognitive distortions, test the propositions through surveys and experiments with Indonesian consumers, and examine enforcement practices at the platform level.

REFERENCES

Alam, S. H., Jiang, Y., Zaman, S. I., Jalees, T., & Ahmed, R. R. (2024). Behavioral biases in consumer paradox towards counterfeit luxury products: A comparative study between China and Pakistan. *Current Psychology, 43*(9), 8117–8132. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-04868-8

Ansa, F., Umam, H., & Asrianto, M. T. (2023). Tanggung jawab pihak pengelola aplikasi jual beli online (Shopee) terhadap penjualan produk tiruan merek terkenal [Liability of the online marketplace operator (Shopee) for the sale of counterfeit well-known-brand products]. *UNES Law Review, 6*(2).

Bardey, A. C., Turner, R., & Piccardi, P. (2022). Bargaining our emotions: Exploring the lived experience of purchasing luxury fashion counterfeit. *Strategic Change, 31*(5), 505–514. https://doi.org/10.1002/jsc.2521

European Union Intellectual Property Office. (2023). *European citizens and intellectual property: Perception, awareness and behaviour 2023*.

Ezawa, I. D., & Hollon, S. D. (2023). Cognitive restructuring and psychotherapy outcome: A meta-analytic review. *Psychotherapy, 60*, 396–406. https://doi.org/10.1037/pst0000474

Feng, W., Yang, M. X., & Yu, I. Y. (2023). From devil to angel: How being envied for luxury brand social media word of mouth discourages counterfeit purchases. *Journal of Business Research, 165*, Article 113919. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.113919

Fioravanti, G., Spada, M. M., Bocci Benucci, S., Casale, S., & Gori, A. (2024). How metacognitions contribute to compulsive online shopping: An exploratory study. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.23752

Garas, S. R. R., Mahran, A. F. A., & Mohamed, H. M. H. (2023). Do you consider buying a counterfeit? New evidence from the theory of planned behaviour and cognitive dissonance theory. *Journal of Product & Brand Management, 32*(4), 544–565. https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-11-2021-3734

Gupta, T., & Lyndem, P. K. (2024). Dual envy influences online shoppers' intention to purchase luxury counterfeits. *International Journal of Consumer Studies, 48*(2), Article e13036. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.13036

Jiang, L., Cui, A. P., & Shan, J. (2023). The risk of embarrassment in buying luxury counterfeits: Do face-conscious consumers care? *European Journal of Marketing, 57*(8), 1996–2020. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-11-2021-0891

Kasber, A., El-Bassiouny, N., & Hamed, S. (2023). Can religiosity alter luxury and counterfeit consumption? An empirical study in an emerging market. *Journal of Islamic Marketing, 14*(7), 1768–1792. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIMA-02-2022-0058

Khan, S., Fazili, A. I., & Bashir, I. (2023). I feel so embarrassed, still, I want it! The self-presentational dilemma of counterfeit luxury buyers. *Journal of Consumer Marketing, 40*(1), 87–101. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCM-11-2020-4236

Lestari, N. N. B., & Putra, M. A. P. (2023). Perlindungan hukum terhadap konsumen atas pembelian barang yang tidak sesuai di e-commerce [Legal protection of consumers for purchases of non-conforming goods in e-commerce]. *Kertha Wicara: Journal Ilmu Hukum, 12*(4).

Munira, Novitasari, I., Riskayanti, & Abbas, R. Y. (2025). Alternatif penyelesaian sengketa perdata di era digital: Upaya perlindungan merek dalam ekosistem e-commerce Indonesia [Alternative civil dispute resolution in the digital era: Efforts to protect trademarks in Indonesia's e-commerce ecosystem]. *Semarang Law Review, 6*(2).

Nafisah, A., & Fikri, A. (2026). Perlindungan hukum konsumen atas penjualan album K-pop palsu di e-commerce [Legal protection of consumers against the sale of fake K-pop albums in e-commerce]. *Jurnal Ilmiah Advokasi, 14*(2).

Nori, R., Zucchelli, M. M., Piccardi, L., Palmiero, M., Bocchi, A., & Guariglia, P. (2022). The contribution of cognitive factors to compulsive buying behaviour: Insights from

shopping habit changes during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Behavioral Sciences, 12*(8), Article 260. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs12080260

OECD/EUIPO. (2025). *Mapping global trade in fakes 2025: Global trends and enforcement challenges*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/94d3b29f-en

Rocha, S., Fernández, X. M., Rodríguez Castro, Y., Ferreira, S., Teixeira, L., Campos, C., & Rocha, N. B. (2023). Exploring the associations between early maladaptive schemas and impulsive and compulsive buying tendencies. *Frontiers in Psychiatry, 14*, Article 1157710. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2023.1157710

Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). (1994). Articles 51 and 61.

Kementerian Perdagangan Republik Indonesia. (2023). *Peraturan Menteri Perdagangan Republik Indonesia Nomor 31 Tahun 2023 tentang Perizinan Berusaha, Periklanan, Pembinaan, dan Pengawasan Pelaku Usaha dalam Perdagangan Melalui Sistem Elektronik*.

Republik Indonesia. (1994). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 7 Tahun 1994 tentang Pengesahan Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization*.

Republik Indonesia. (1999). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 Tahun 1999 tentang Perlindungan Konsumen*.

Republik Indonesia. (2008). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik* (sebagaimana terakhir diubah dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2024).

Republik Indonesia. (2014). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 28 Tahun 2014 tentang Hak Cipta*.

Republik Indonesia. (2016). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 20 Tahun 2016 tentang Merek dan Indikasi Geografis*.

Republik Indonesia. (2019). *Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 80 Tahun 2019 tentang Perdagangan Melalui Sistem Elektronik*.