**Scripta Economica:**
**Journal of Economics, Management, and Accounting**
Vol 2 No 2 November 2026, Hal 177-189
ISSN: 3110-0848 (Print) ISSN: 3109-970X (Electronic)
Open Access: https://scriptaintelektual.com/scripta-economica

# An Exploration of the Relationship Between Supply and Demand in Determining Market Equilibrium

**Anggita Lutfi Anjani[1*], Sarpini[2]**
[1-2] Universitas Islam Negeri Prof. K.H. Saifuddin Zuhri Purwokerto, Indonesia
*Email: 254110201195@mhs.uinsaizu.ac.id[1]*

**Article Info :**
Received:
23-10-2026
Revised:
25-10-2025
Accepted:
05-11-2026

***Abstract***

*Market price fluctuations reflect the interaction between consumer demand and producer supply under changing economic conditions. This study aimed to examine the relationship between demand and supply in determining market equilibrium, explain the formation of equilibrium prices and quantities, and identify factors influencing market adjustments. A descriptive qualitative literature review was conducted using five relevant scientific articles as the core sources of secondary data. Data were examined through descriptive content analysis involving identification, thematic classification, comparison, and interpretive synthesis, supported by illustrative numerical schedules. The findings indicated that quantity demanded generally decreased as prices increased, whereas quantity supplied increased under constant non-price conditions. The illustrative model identified an equilibrium price of Rp60,000 and an equilibrium quantity of 300 units. Prices below equilibrium generated excess demand, while prices above equilibrium produced excess supply. Consumer income, preferences, production costs, technology, and product availability were identified as determinants capable of shifting market equilibrium. Simultaneous changes in demand and supply introduced uncertainty concerning equilibrium price adjustments. The study concluded that market equilibrium resulted from interdependent consumer and producer decisions. Its contribution lies in integrating equilibrium formation, market imbalances, and adjustment mechanisms, although the findings remain conceptual rather than empirically estimated.*

***Keywords:*** *Consumer behavior, Demand and supply, Market equilibrium, Price formation, Supply adjustments.*

©2026 Authors.. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License.
(https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

## INTRODUCTION

Price fluctuations across commodity, energy, agricultural, and consumer markets have intensified scholarly attention to the mechanisms through which demand and supply determine equilibrium prices and traded quantities. Contemporary market conditions demonstrate that price formation cannot be adequately explained through isolated changes in consumer purchasing behavior or production capacity, particularly when disruptions in distribution, input costs, and commodity availability occur simultaneously. Research on food price inflation has established the relevance of interconnected economic pressures in explaining price movements, while analyses of supply chain disruptions have extended this discussion to the temporal consequences of production and distribution constraints (Adjemian et al., 2024; Baslandze & Fuchs, 2026). Investigations of energy markets similarly indicate that supply-side disturbances and demand-related pressures require analytical differentiation because their implications for price adjustments are not necessarily equivalent (Bermpei & Triantafyllou, 2025; Kharroubi & Smets, 2024). At the Indonesian market level, studies examining red chili prices have directed attention toward the interaction between consumer requirements, commodity availability, and the conditions influencing agricultural supply (Harefa et al., 2025; Tampubolon et al., 2025). These developments suggest that market equilibrium should be examined as a conditional outcome of interacting economic decisions rather than a permanently established relationship between predetermined prices and quantities. Although the conventional equilibrium framework remains fundamental to microeconomic analysis, its explanatory relevance depends on distinguishing movements along existing demand and supply curves from structural changes in their underlying determinants. Investigating these relationships is consequently necessary

to establish how equilibrium emerges, why deviations occur, and under which conditions market adjustments can produce different combinations of equilibrium prices and quantities.

Contemporary scholarship on demand, supply, and market equilibrium has developed through several interconnected analytical approaches encompassing theoretical modeling, mathematical specification, dynamic adjustment, and sector-specific applications. Spatial equilibrium research conceptualizes economic activity through the interaction of geographically differentiated market forces, while studies of supply function selection and simultaneous demand–supply estimation emphasize the importance of behavioral specifications and the identification of relationships underlying market outcomes (Allen & Arkolakis, 2023; Flynn et al., 2026; MacKay & Miller, 2025). Within mathematical economics, examinations of linear demand and supply curves provide tractable representations of equilibrium adjustments, whereas differential-equation and delayed-adjustment models extend conventional static formulations by incorporating temporal dependence and potentially nonlinear market responses (Eisenhauer, 2024; Anokye et al., 2023; Arutyunov & Pavlova, 2022; Widjaja et al., 2025). Research on differentiated products further illustrates the relevance of disequilibrium allocation, suggesting that observed market transactions cannot always be represented adequately by an immediate correspondence between quantities demanded and supplied (Backus, 2023). Sectoral investigations complement these theoretical developments by examining how electricity pricing, agricultural production responses, and commodity market shocks influence price formation under different institutional and production conditions (Imelda et al., 2024; Resende Filho & Nascimento, 2024; Vides et al., 2024). Indonesian studies have addressed comparable relationships through linear economic functions, digital-market specifications, and examinations of supply determinants, although their analytical emphases differ according to the markets and assumptions considered (Fazhira et al., 2026; Pratista et al., 2026; Sagala et al., 2024). Taken together, these contributions establish that equilibrium is analytically dependent on the specification of demand and supply relationships, the economic conditions affecting their adjustment, and the assumptions governing market responses. The resulting body of scholarship offers complementary explanations of price formation, but its methodological diversity also requires careful synthesis to distinguish universally applicable equilibrium principles from conclusions that depend on particular models or market characteristics.

Despite these advances, the reviewed literature reveals a conceptual and methodological gap concerning the integrated explanation of equilibrium formation, disequilibrium conditions, and subsequent adjustments within a common analytical framework accessible to general microeconomic inquiry. Mathematical investigations have provided increasingly sophisticated representations of market relationships, yet the interpretation of equilibrium in such models depends on assumptions concerning functional forms, adjustment mechanisms, and the timing of market responses (Anokye et al., 2023; Arutyunov & Pavlova, 2022; MacKay & Miller, 2025). Conversely, introductory economic analyses frequently emphasize the fundamental correspondence between demand and supply functions, supported by linear calculations and illustrative examples, without necessarily extending the explanation to the conditional effects of simultaneous shifts or delayed producer responses (Prasetyo & Putra, 2023; Lubis et al., 2025; Hamdani, 2025). Market-oriented studies undertaken in specific localities provide additional contextual interpretations of price determination, although their conclusions cannot automatically be generalized beyond the commodities and economic circumstances examined (Pasaribu, 2025; Harefa et al., 2025). A related limitation concerns the distinction between theoretical equilibrium calculations and observed market outcomes, since mathematical illustrations establish the implications of assumed functional relationships rather than providing direct evidence of actual consumer and producer responses. Research on nonlinear digital-market equilibrium and dynamic supply adjustments further demonstrates why the conclusions of simplified linear models should not be treated as universally representative of market behavior (Pratista et al., 2026; Widjaja et al., 2025). The research gap addressed here is therefore not the absence of an established demand–supply theory, but the need for a coherent comparative synthesis connecting basic equilibrium conditions, the direction of demand and supply shifts, and the limitations of simplified market representations. This gap is specifically relevant to descriptive literature-based research because analytical integration can clarify the boundaries of existing explanations without claiming to establish new empirical relationships or mathematical laws.

The absence of a sufficiently integrated interpretation of demand–supply interactions has implications for economic reasoning, market assessment, and the practical interpretation of commodity price fluctuations. Treating every price increase as evidence of growing consumer demand, for example, disregards the possibility that the observed adjustment originates from declining supply, higher production costs, or constraints on commodity distribution. Agricultural equilibrium research demonstrates the relevance of analyzing output, prices, and resource allocation jointly, while studies of food price pressures reinforce the need to distinguish underlying economic mechanisms before interpreting observed price changes (Resende Filho & Nascimento, 2024; Adjemian et al., 2024). Similarly, discussions of production costs, supply responsiveness, and market competition suggest that producers' decisions depend on circumstances extending beyond the prevailing selling price (Sagala et al., 2024; Bahri & Tirsya, 2025). From the consumer perspective, purchasing power, preferences, and the prices of related commodities can modify demand independently of changes in the price of the product under consideration, creating additional complications for equilibrium interpretation (Anggraini et al., 2025; Lubis et al., 2025). Studies addressing market equilibrium within Islamic economic thought also demonstrate that price formation can be examined alongside questions of market conduct and institutional intervention, although such normative considerations should remain analytically distinct from the descriptive operation of demand and supply functions (Kustiawati, 2022; Anggraini et al., 2025). For economic education and basic market analysis, the principal risk lies in presenting equilibrium as a mechanical intersection of curves without explaining the conditions that generate shortages, surpluses, and adjustments toward a different equilibrium position. An integrated conceptual examination can consequently support more precise interpretations of market disturbances while preventing illustrative economic models from being mistaken for empirically validated descriptions of particular markets.

The present study is positioned as a descriptive qualitative synthesis of the relationship between consumer demand, producer supply, and the determination of market equilibrium, using existing economic literature and illustrative numerical representations as its analytical foundation. Its proposed contribution differs from studies emphasizing advanced simultaneous estimation, spatial equilibrium, and aggregate supply function choice because it concentrates on the conceptual connections among price formation, equilibrium conditions, and the directional consequences of changes in market determinants rather than developing a new econometric or structural model (Allen & Arkolakis, 2023; MacKay & Miller, 2025; Flynn et al., 2026). It also differs from dynamic modeling studies by treating delayed and nonlinear adjustments as qualifications to simplified equilibrium reasoning, without claiming that the literature review itself estimates temporal adjustment parameters or tests dynamic market stability (Backus, 2023; Anokye et al., 2023; Widjaja et al., 2025). Relative to introductory investigations of linear demand and supply functions, the distinguishing analytical emphasis is the combined interpretation of equilibrium formation, excess demand, excess supply, and the effects of shifts originating from consumer and producer conditions (Fazhira et al., 2026; Prasetyo & Putra, 2023). The study retains a descriptive qualitative literature-review approach, consistent with methodological discussions of secondary-source collection and qualitative interpretation, and does not introduce primary market observations or independently estimated demand and supply functions (Nafisatur, 2024; Safrudin et al., 2023). Its novelty is consequently located in the organization and comparative synthesis of existing explanations rather than in the discovery of a previously unidentified economic mechanism. This positioning allows the analysis to integrate familiar market illustrations with more explicit recognition of modeling assumptions, especially the distinction between movements along curves and shifts in demand or supply. Such a contribution is deliberately bounded by the available secondary literature and illustrative calculations, making conceptual clarity and the consistency of economic interpretation its principal criteria of analytical value.

This study aims to examine the relationship between demand and supply in determining market equilibrium through a descriptive qualitative review of relevant economic literature and illustrative price–quantity relationships. Specifically, it seeks to explain how consumer purchasing decisions and producer supply decisions interact in the formation of equilibrium prices and quantities, identify the conditions under which excess demand and excess supply occur, and analyze the directional implications of changes in the principal determinants of demand and supply. The investigation distinguishes price-induced movements along established demand and supply functions from shifts associated with consumer income, preferences, production costs, technological conditions, and

product availability. It further examines the implications of demand-side and supply-side changes under simplified equilibrium assumptions, including the limitations of using linear numerical illustrations to represent actual market adjustments. The anticipated theoretical contribution is a coherent synthesis of equilibrium formation and adjustment mechanisms that connects foundational microeconomic principles with the conditional interpretation of market price fluctuations. Its methodological contribution consists of organizing and comparing explanations from secondary literature without presenting illustrative calculations as independent empirical evidence or extending conclusions beyond the assumptions of the reviewed models. At the practical level, the study is intended to provide an analytical reference for interpreting changes in commodity prices, identifying possible sources of market shortages and surpluses, and distinguishing demand-driven from supply-driven adjustments. The research ultimately seeks to strengthen the conceptual understanding of market equilibrium as the outcome of interdependent consumer and producer decisions operating under changing economic conditions.

## RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a descriptive qualitative approach using a literature review to examine the relationship between demand and supply in determining market equilibrium prices and quantities. The research relied exclusively on secondary data derived from five relevant scientific articles addressing demand theory, supply theory, price formation, and market equilibrium mechanisms. The population of interest comprised scientific publications discussing the interaction between consumer demand and producer supply, while the units of analysis consisted of conceptual explanations, mathematical representations, and findings reported in the selected literature. Source selection was based on relevance to the research objectives, particularly the explanation of demand and supply functions, the formation of equilibrium prices and quantities, and the economic factors contributing to equilibrium changes. Data collection involved identifying relevant publications, examining their substantive discussions, and extracting information concerning the relationship between prices, quantities demanded, quantities supplied, and non-price determinants of market behavior. The reviewed materials also provided the conceptual foundation for illustrative numerical representations of market conditions, including variations in commodity prices, quantities demanded and supplied, and the identification of equilibrium and disequilibrium positions. These numerical representations were treated as theoretical illustrations rather than observations obtained from actual market transactions. The study did not involve primary surveys, interviews, experimental interventions, or direct measurements of consumer and producer behavior.

Data were analyzed using descriptive qualitative content analysis, consisting of information identification, thematic classification, comparison, and interpretive synthesis. Relevant information was organized into analytical categories covering demand and its determinants, supply and its determinants, interactions between demand and supply, equilibrium price formation, and changes in equilibrium resulting from shifts in market conditions. The analysis initially examined how consumer purchasing decisions and producer supply decisions were represented in the reviewed publications, followed by comparisons of their explanations of price adjustments, excess demand, and excess supply. Mathematical illustrations were interpreted through the equilibrium condition \(Q_d=Q_s\) where \(Q_d\) denotes quantity demanded and \(Q_s\) denotes quantity supplied, to clarify the correspondence between the two quantities at a given price. The interpretation distinguished movements along existing demand and supply curves from shifts associated with changes in consumer income, preferences, production costs, technology, and product availability. The direction of equilibrium adjustments was examined under the stated theoretical assumption that one market function remained unchanged while the other shifted, while simultaneous changes were considered through their conditional implications for equilibrium prices and quantities. Analytical consistency was maintained by comparing explanations across the selected publications, distinguishing conceptual propositions from illustrative calculations, and interpreting numerical examples only within their stated assumptions. The synthesis did not employ statistical hypothesis testing, econometric estimation, or empirical validation of actual market behavior. Consequently, the methodological scope was limited to explaining established economic relationships and integrating theoretical interpretations rather than estimating market-specific parameters or establishing causal effects from observed data.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### The Concept of Demand and Its Determinants

Demand constitutes a fundamental component of market coordination because it represents consumers' willingness and purchasing capacity to acquire goods and services at alternative price levels. The conceptual synthesis indicates that demand is determined not exclusively by the prevailing market price but also by income constraints, consumption preferences, expectations, and the availability of substitute or complementary products. Lubis et al. (2025) conceptualized the relationship between price and quantity demanded as an inverse association under the assumption that other relevant determinants remain unchanged. This relationship provides an analytical foundation for understanding consumer responses to price changes while recognizing that actual purchasing decisions may deviate from simplified theoretical predictions when economic conditions change simultaneously.

The distinction between demand and quantity demanded is essential for interpreting market adjustments accurately. A change in the quantity demanded represents movement along an existing demand curve following a variation in the commodity's own price, whereas a change in demand involves a shift in the entire relationship caused by non-price determinants. Eisenhauer (2024) examined the implications of changes in linear demand and supply relationships, demonstrating the analytical importance of distinguishing movements associated with existing market functions from changes affecting their underlying positions. This distinction prevents price fluctuations from being interpreted automatically as changes in consumer preferences or aggregate purchasing capacity.

Consumer income represents a major determinant of demand because it influences the range of commodities that households can purchase within their available budgets. An increase in disposable income may strengthen demand for normal goods, whereas reductions in purchasing power can constrain consumption even when market prices remain unchanged. Anggraini et al. (2025) discussed demand formation through the interaction of consumer requirements, purchasing considerations, and the economic conditions governing transactions. The resulting relationship is conditional rather than universal because the response of demand to income variations differs according to commodity characteristics, consumption priorities, and the distinction between normal and inferior goods.

Consumer preferences and product characteristics introduce additional heterogeneity into demand formation, particularly when goods differ in perceived quality, necessity, accessibility, or substitutability. Market demand consequently reflects the aggregation of individual decisions rather than a uniform behavioral response to identical price changes. Allen and Arkolakis (2023) examined economic activity through spatial interactions between supply and demand, providing a broader framework for considering how geographically differentiated economic conditions shape market outcomes. Such differentiation suggests that demand relationships observed in a particular commodity market cannot necessarily be generalized to other markets without accounting for differences in consumer composition, accessibility, and purchasing circumstances.

The inverse relationship between price and quantity demanded can be examined through the illustrative chili-price schedule presented in Table 1. The figures represent a theoretical simulation rather than observed market transactions and are used exclusively to demonstrate how quantity demanded changes when the commodity's price increases. Their interpretation follows the conventional downward-sloping demand relationship discussed in the microeconomic literature (Prasetyo & Putra, 2023). The illustration maintains a constant numerical relationship between successive price changes and corresponding changes in quantity demanded, allowing the direction and magnitude of the assumed response to be examined.

**Table 1. Illustrative Relationship Between Chili Prices and Quantity Demanded**

| Chili price (Rp/kg) | Quantity demanded (kg) | Change in quantity from preceding price (kg) |
|---|---|---|
| 28,000 | 120 | — |
| 33,000 | 105 | −15 |
| 38,000 | 90 | −15 |
| 43,000 | 75 | −15 |
| 48,000 | 60 | −15 |

As presented in Table 1, successive increases of Rp5,000 per kilogram are associated with simulated reductions of 15 kilograms in quantity demanded, indicating a constant absolute slope across the specified price range. The schedule is consistent with a linear demand specification in which the quantity demanded declines as the commodity's price rises, holding other determinants constant. Fazhira et al. (2026) discussed the application of linear functions to the relationship between market prices and quantities, providing a mathematical basis for interpreting such illustrative schedules. Although the example demonstrates an inverse relationship, it does not establish the actual price responsiveness of chili consumers because the quantities were not derived from observed purchasing behavior.

The mathematical structure underlying the illustrative schedule can be expressed as $Q_d = a-bP$, where $Q_d$ denotes quantity demanded, $P$ represents the market price, and $a$ and $b$ are parameters describing the intercept and slope of the demand function. For the simulated values in Table 1, a price increase of Rp1,000 corresponds to a decline of three kilograms in quantity demanded, reflecting the constant absolute slope specified by the example. MacKay and Miller (2025) addressed the estimation of demand and supply relationships, highlighting the importance of identification considerations when market relationships are inferred from economic data. The distinction is methodologically significant because an assumed demand function can illustrate theoretical relationships but cannot establish behavioral parameters or causal price effects without appropriate empirical information.

Price responsiveness also depends on the availability of substitutes, the proportion of household expenditure allocated to a commodity, and the period over which purchasing adjustments can occur. Essential goods may exhibit relatively constrained consumption adjustments because households cannot eliminate their requirements immediately, although consumers may substitute products, modify quantities, or change purchasing schedules. Tampubolon et al. (2025) examined demand and supply as determinants of chili prices in a local commodity market, reinforcing the relevance of commodity-specific factors for understanding price formation. Such considerations indicate that the negative slope of a demand curve identifies the direction of the theoretical relationship but does not independently establish the magnitude of price elasticity across different commodities or consumer groups.

The analytical synthesis identifies demand as a conditional relationship shaped by the interaction between price responsiveness and changes in non-price determinants. Income variations, consumer preferences, market accessibility, and product characteristics can alter the position of demand, while changes in a commodity's own price determine movements along an unchanged demand schedule. Pratista et al. (2026) explored nonlinear demand and supply relationships in digital-market equilibrium, illustrating the relevance of considering specifications beyond conventional linear representations. For the present literature-based analysis, the principal implication is that simplified numerical demand schedules are useful for explaining the direction of price–quantity relationships but remain insufficient for representing the full behavioral complexity of actual markets. Demand must consequently be interpreted as a theoretically structured representation of purchasing decisions whose relationship with market equilibrium also depends on the supply conditions examined in the subsequent analysis.

## The Concept of Supply and Its Determinants

Supply represents the productive dimension of market coordination because it reflects the quantities of goods and services that producers are willing and able to offer at alternative price levels under prevailing economic conditions. The literature synthesis indicates that supply decisions emerge from the interaction between expected selling prices, production costs, resource availability, technological capacity, and institutional constraints rather than from market prices alone. Sagala et al. (2024) emphasized the relationship between supply functions and the economic considerations influencing producers' decisions, particularly the conditions determining whether additional output can be offered profitably. This relationship demonstrates that the conventional positive association between price and quantity supplied is conditional on the stability of other determinants and the capacity of producers to adjust production. Supply analysis consequently requires distinguishing the economic incentives generated by changing prices from the structural conditions governing the availability of marketable goods.

The distinction between quantity supplied and supply itself provides an essential analytical basis for understanding producer responses to changing market conditions. A variation in quantity supplied occurs when producers adjust the amount offered following a change in the commodity's own price while the underlying supply schedule remains unchanged. A change in supply, however, represents a shift in the entire supply relationship resulting from variations in production costs, technology, input availability, or other non-price determinants. Eisenhauer (2024) examined adjustments involving linear demand and supply curves, providing a relevant analytical foundation for distinguishing changes in existing market relationships from changes affecting their positions. Confusing these mechanisms can produce inaccurate interpretations of market price fluctuations because greater quantities offered at higher prices are not equivalent to an independent expansion of productive capacity.

Production costs constitute a central determinant of supply because they establish the economic conditions under which firms can produce and distribute additional quantities profitably. Increases in raw-material prices, transportation expenses, labor costs, or energy requirements may reduce the quantity producers are willing to supply at an unchanged selling price. Baslandze and Fuchs (2026) examined the relationship between supply chain disruptions and pricing dynamics, reinforcing the importance of production and distribution constraints for interpreting market adjustments. The economic implications of these constraints depend on whether producers can absorb additional costs, reorganize production processes, or transfer part of the burden to market prices. A reduction in supply caused by rising production costs must therefore be analytically distinguished from a reduction in quantity supplied resulting from a lower selling price.

Technological capacity and production efficiency influence supply by modifying the resources required to generate a particular quantity of output. Improvements in production techniques may lower unit costs, increase output capacity, or reduce operational constraints, allowing producers to offer larger quantities at existing market prices. Flynn et al. (2026) examined supply function choice and aggregate supply, illustrating the significance of the structural relationships underlying producers' responses to economic conditions. However, technological improvements do not necessarily generate immediate supply expansion because their effects may depend on investment requirements, organizational capabilities, and the availability of complementary inputs. The distinction between technological potential and realized production is particularly relevant when evaluating supply adjustments over different periods.

The positive relationship between market price and quantity supplied can be represented using the illustrative supply schedule presented in Table 2. The numerical values are retained from the manuscript's market-equilibrium illustration and describe hypothetical quantities offered at alternative price levels rather than observations collected from actual producers. Their interpretation follows the conventional linear supply relationship employed in introductory market-equilibrium analysis (Fazhira et al., 2026). The schedule permits examination of how a constant increase in the assumed selling price corresponds to a constant absolute increase in the quantity supplied.

**Table 2. Illustrative Relationship Between Market Prices and Quantity Supplied**

| Market price (Rp) | Quantity supplied (units) | Change in quantity from preceding price (units) |
|---|---|---|
| 20,000 | 100 | — |
| 40,000 | 200 | +100 |
| 60,000 | 300 | +100 |
| 80,000 | 400 | +100 |
| 100,000 | 500 | +100 |

As shown in Table 2, each Rp20,000 increase in the simulated market price corresponds to an additional 100 units supplied, producing a constant positive relationship across the specified price range. The regularity of these changes represents an assumed linear supply response rather than evidence that actual producers adjust output at identical rates. Widjaja et al. (2025) investigated market equilibrium using differential equations with time delays, demonstrating the analytical relevance of temporal adjustment when supply and demand relationships are examined dynamically. Such considerations qualify the immediate-response assumption underlying the illustrative schedule

because production decisions may require time for procurement, manufacturing, transportation, and distribution. The table consequently clarifies the direction of the theoretical supply relationship without establishing the speed or empirical magnitude of producer adjustments.

The illustrative supply relationship can be expressed as $Q_s=c+dP$, where $Q_s$ represents quantity supplied, $P$ denotes market price, and $c$ and $d$ describe the intercept and slope parameters. Based on Table 2, the numerical relationship is represented by $Q_s=0.005P$ when prices are measured in rupiah, meaning that each Rp1,000 increase in price corresponds to five additional units supplied within the simulation. Arutyunov and Pavlova (2022) examined equilibrium in market models represented by differential equations, indicating that dynamic formulations can incorporate adjustment relationships not captured by a static linear specification. The illustrative equation should consequently be interpreted as a simplified representation of the assumed price–quantity relationship rather than an empirically estimated production function. Its analytical value lies in establishing a consistent supply schedule that can subsequently be compared with an equivalent demand schedule to identify the market-equilibrium position.

Commodity-specific production conditions introduce further limitations to the assumption that higher market prices immediately generate greater quantities supplied. Agricultural production, for example, is affected by cultivation periods, weather conditions, harvest schedules, and the availability of land and other productive resources, which can constrain short-term responses to price changes. Resende Filho and Nascimento (2024) examined the responsiveness of agricultural equilibrium output, prices, and land use to economic shocks, demonstrating the relevance of production and resource-allocation relationships for market adjustment analysis. Similar considerations arise in local commodity markets, where changes in product availability may reflect disruptions in production or distribution rather than producers' responses to the prevailing selling price (Harefa et al., 2025; Tampubolon et al., 2025). These conditions suggest that short-term supply responsiveness can differ from longer-term productive adjustment, particularly when additional output requires substantial time or resources.

The analytical synthesis establishes supply as a conditional relationship between price incentives and the productive capabilities determining the quantity of goods offered in the market. Production costs, technological development, resource availability, and distribution constraints may shift the supply curve independently of movements in the commodity's own price, whereas changes in market price generate movements along an unchanged supply schedule. Kharroubi and Smets (2024) investigated energy shocks as supply disturbances, while Bermpei and Triantafyllou (2025) examined the different roles of supply and demand shocks in oil price uncertainty, indicating the need to distinguish the origins of market disturbances. For the present literature-based study, these insights clarify why a change in observed market availability cannot automatically be attributed to higher or lower selling prices. The supply relationship must be interpreted jointly with consumer demand because the equilibrium consequences of production expansion or contraction depend on the position and responsiveness of the corresponding demand function.

**The Relationship Between Demand, Supply, and Market Equilibrium Formation**

Market equilibrium represents the outcome of interactions between consumers' purchasing decisions and producers' willingness to supply goods at prevailing market prices. The conceptual synthesis indicates that equilibrium emerges when the quantity demanded corresponds to the quantity supplied, establishing a price–quantity combination at which neither excess demand nor excess supply exists under the assumed market conditions. Allen and Arkolakis (2023) examined economic activity through the interaction of supply and demand across spatially differentiated markets, illustrating the broader relevance of market-clearing relationships for understanding economic allocation. This interpretation positions equilibrium as a conditional outcome of interdependent economic decisions rather than a price determined independently by consumers or producers. The analytical distinction is essential because changes in either demand or supply may alter the equilibrium position even when the other market function remains unchanged.

The equilibrium condition can be represented mathematically as $Q_d=Q_s$, where $Q_d$ denotes the quantity demanded and $Q_s$ represents the quantity supplied at a particular market price. In conventional linear specifications, demand is expressed as $Q_d=a-bP$, while supply is represented by $Q_s=c+dP$, assuming positive price-response coefficients for the respective

downward-sloping and upward-sloping relationships. Fazhira et al. (2026) examined the application of linear functions to equilibrium determination, while Prasetyo and Putra (2023) discussed how the interaction between demand and supply functions influences equilibrium prices and quantities. Equating these functions yields the theoretical equilibrium price \(P^*=(a-c)/(b+d)\), provided that the assumed functions intersect within an economically meaningful range. The resulting equilibrium quantity can then be determined by substituting the equilibrium price into either function, demonstrating that price and quantity are jointly determined rather than independently established.

The existence of an equilibrium point does not imply that actual market transactions continuously occur at equilibrium prices or that adjustment takes place without delay. Market prices may temporarily deviate from their equilibrium levels because consumers and producers respond differently to changing information, production constraints, and available inventories. Backus (2023) examined disequilibrium allocation involving differentiated products, suggesting that market transactions may occur under conditions that are not adequately represented by instantaneous market clearing. Dynamic equilibrium modeling also indicates that adjustment processes can depend on temporal relationships between demand, supply, and price responses (Arutyunov & Pavlova, 2022). These considerations require distinguishing the mathematical identification of an equilibrium point from the empirical mechanisms through which prices might approach that point over time.

Excess demand occurs when consumers are willing and able to purchase quantities exceeding those producers offer at a particular price, generating a shortage relative to prevailing purchasing intentions. Under conventional competitive adjustment assumptions, this condition creates upward pressure on prices, although the magnitude and speed of adjustment depend on market organization and the responsiveness of consumers and producers. Conversely, excess supply emerges when producers offer quantities greater than consumers are willing to purchase, potentially encouraging price reductions or adjustments in production and inventory decisions. Eisenhauer (2024) examined the analytical consequences of changes in linear demand and supply curves, reinforcing the importance of interpreting market outcomes through the positions and relationships of both functions. Shortages and surpluses should consequently be understood as quantity imbalances at specified prices rather than independent evidence that market mechanisms have permanently failed.

The interaction between demand and supply can be examined using the illustrative price–quantity schedule presented in Table 3, which integrates the numerical relationships retained from the manuscript. The figures describe hypothetical market conditions rather than observed transactions and are intended to demonstrate the correspondence between quantities demanded and supplied at alternative prices. The interpretation follows conventional equilibrium reasoning, which identifies the market-clearing position through equality between the two quantities (Hamdani, 2025; Lubis et al., 2025). The table also distinguishes excess demand from excess supply by calculating the difference between quantities demanded and supplied at each specified price. This representation provides a transparent basis for interpreting price adjustments without treating numerical illustrations as independent empirical findings.

**Table 3. Illustrative Demand–Supply Interaction and Market Equilibrium**

| Market price (Rp) | Quantity demanded (units) | Quantity supplied (units) | Market imbalance (Qd − Qs) | Market condition |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20,000 | 500 | 100 | +400 | Excess demand |
| 40,000 | 400 | 200 | +200 | Excess demand |
| 60,000 | 300 | 300 | 0 | Equilibrium |
| 80,000 | 200 | 400 | −200 | Excess supply |
| 100,000 | 100 | 500 | −400 | Excess supply |

As presented in Table 3, the simulated market reaches equilibrium at Rp60,000, where both quantity demanded and quantity supplied equal 300 units. At Rp40,000, consumers demand 400 units while producers supply 200 units, generating excess demand of 200 units, whereas the opposite imbalance occurs at Rp80,000. The numerical schedule corresponds to the illustrative functions \(Q_d=600-0.005P\) and \(Q_s=0.005P\), which produce the identified equilibrium when the two expressions are equated. Widjaja et al. (2025) examined equilibrium modeling using differential

equations with time delays, emphasizing that the identification of a theoretical equilibrium does not independently establish the dynamics through which actual prices reach that position. The simulated results consequently demonstrate mathematical consistency rather than providing evidence of observed price convergence, consumer adjustment rates, or producer responses in an actual commodity market.

Equilibrium positions may change when non-price determinants shift either demand or supply, even when the underlying assumptions concerning consumer and producer price responses remain unchanged. An increase in demand, with supply held constant, generally raises both equilibrium price and quantity, whereas an increase in supply, with demand unchanged, tends to reduce equilibrium price while increasing equilibrium quantity under conventional downward-sloping demand and upward-sloping supply assumptions. Resende Filho and Nascimento (2024) examined the responsiveness of agricultural equilibrium output, prices, and land use to economic shocks, illustrating the relevance of distinguishing the origins of changes affecting market outcomes. Studies addressing local commodity markets similarly connect equilibrium adjustments with variations in purchasing conditions and product availability (Pasaribu, 2025; Tampubolon et al., 2025). The analytical implication is that identical observed price movements may originate from different economic mechanisms, making the identification of demand-side and supply-side disturbances necessary for accurate market interpretation.

Simultaneous shifts in demand and supply introduce greater uncertainty because the direction of equilibrium price changes depends on the relative magnitude of the two shifts and the slopes of the underlying functions. When demand and supply both increase under conventional market assumptions, equilibrium quantity generally rises, while the direction of the equilibrium price change cannot be established without additional information concerning their relative adjustments. Vides et al. (2024) examined the effects of supply and demand shocks on the United States oil market, illustrating the analytical importance of separating distinct sources of market disturbances. Kharroubi and Smets (2024) investigated energy shocks through a supply-shock framework, while Bermpei and Triantafyllou (2025) addressed supply and demand disturbances in relation to oil price uncertainty. These contributions demonstrate why the interpretation of market equilibrium requires attention to the nature of economic disturbances rather than relying exclusively on the observed direction of price movements.

The theoretical relevance of equilibrium extends beyond identifying a single intersection between demand and supply curves because market outcomes also depend on production structures, commodity characteristics, pricing arrangements, and adjustment constraints. Imelda et al. (2024) examined real-time pricing and the cost of clean power, illustrating the relevance of institutional pricing arrangements in markets characterized by complex production and consumption conditions. Flynn et al. (2026) investigated supply function choice and aggregate supply, extending attention toward the structural characteristics governing producer responses, while MacKay and Miller (2025) addressed methodological requirements for estimating demand and supply relationships. Such research highlights the distinction between a simplified equilibrium illustration and the identification of market relationships using observed economic information. The present literature-based synthesis therefore treats equilibrium calculations as conceptual representations whose interpretive validity depends on explicit assumptions concerning market behavior, functional relationships, and the absence of unmodeled constraints.

The analytical findings establish that demand and supply jointly determine equilibrium prices and quantities through relationships that are sensitive to both price movements and changes in underlying economic conditions. The illustrative schedule identifies the equilibrium condition and differentiates shortages from surpluses, while the reviewed theoretical literature clarifies why market adjustments may differ across commodities, production systems, and temporal conditions. Anokye et al. (2023) examined delayed adjustment in cobweb market modeling, and Backus (2023) considered disequilibrium allocation, indicating that static equilibrium representations do not exhaust the possible explanations of market behavior. These insights support a distinction between the theoretical determination of equilibrium, the comparative-static analysis of shifts, and the dynamic processes through which actual market prices may adjust. The study's principal contribution is consequently an integrated conceptual explanation of how consumer demand and producer supply interact to establish

and modify equilibrium, while acknowledging that empirical estimation would be required to determine the magnitude and timing of adjustments in specific markets.

## CONCLUSION

This study established that the relationship between demand and supply determines market equilibrium through the interaction of consumer purchasing decisions and producer supply responses. The literature-based analysis demonstrated that quantity demanded generally decreases as prices rise, whereas quantity supplied increases under the assumption that other determinants remain unchanged. Market equilibrium occurs when the quantity demanded equals the quantity supplied, as illustrated by the simulated equilibrium price of Rp60,000 and equilibrium quantity of 300 units. Prices below the equilibrium level generated excess demand in the illustrative model, while prices above equilibrium produced excess supply. Changes in consumer income, preferences, production costs, technology, and product availability can shift demand or supply functions and consequently alter equilibrium prices and quantities. The analysis further established that demand and supply shifts have different implications for equilibrium adjustments, particularly when both functions change simultaneously. These relationships indicate that market price fluctuations cannot be adequately interpreted through consumer behavior or production conditions independently.

The study contributes to microeconomic literature by integrating the determinants of demand and supply, equilibrium formation, market imbalances, and equilibrium adjustments into a coherent conceptual explanation. Its analytical contribution lies in distinguishing movements along existing market functions from shifts caused by non-price determinants and clarifying the limitations of simplified linear representations. The findings provide a theoretical reference for interpreting commodity price movements and identifying potential demand-side or supply-side sources of shortages and surpluses. For producers, understanding these relationships can support decisions concerning production quantities and responses to changing market conditions, while consumers may use the same principles to interpret changes in prices and product availability. Nevertheless, the study relied on secondary literature and illustrative numerical schedules rather than direct observations of market transactions. Consequently, the findings establish conceptual relationships but do not provide empirical estimates of demand elasticity, supply responsiveness, or the speed of market adjustment. Future research should examine these relationships using observed market data to evaluate the applicability of theoretical equilibrium mechanisms across different commodities and economic conditions.

## REFERENCES

Adjemian, M. K., Arita, S., Meyer, S., & Salin, D. (2024). Factors affecting recent food price inflation in the United States. Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy, 46(2), 648–676. https://doi.org/10.1002/aepp.13378

Allen, T., & Arkolakis, C. (2023). Economic activity across space: A supply and demand approach. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 37(2), 3–28. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.37.2.3

Ananda Fazhira, Annisa Dina Maisarah Hsb, Nandita Olivia Natasya, Modesta Natalia Buaton, Yastri Dwinarti Sihite, Putri Ainun, & Muhammad Yusuf. (2026). Analisis model fungsi linear pada permintaan dan penawaran serta penentuan keseimbangan pasar dalam matematika ekonomi [Analysis of linear demand and supply functions and determination of market equilibrium in mathematical economics]. Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat dan Riset Pendidikan, 4(4), 24740–24746. https://doi.org/10.31004/jerkin.v4i4.6170

Anggraini, R., Anisa, R. D., Putriani, E., Rahmawati, L., Prasetyo, A., & Hidayati, A. N. (2025). Teori permintaan dan penawaran dalam ekonomi Islam [Demand and supply theory in Islamic economics]. Jurnal Locus Penelitian dan Pengabdian, 3(12), 1032–1039. https://doi.org/10.58344/locus.v3i12.3727

Anokye, M., Barnes, B., Boateng, F. O., Adom-Konadu, A., & Amoah-Mensah, J. (2023). Price dynamics of a delay differential cobweb model. Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society, 2023, 1296562. https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/1296562

Arutyunov, A. V., & Pavlova, N. G. (2022). Equilibrium in market models described by differential equations. Differential Equations, 58(9), 1267–1276. https://doi.org/10.1134/S0012266122090117

Backus, G. (2023). Disequilibrium supply-and-demand allocation with differentiated products. System Dynamics Review, 39, 432–452. https://doi.org/10.1002/sdr.1744

Baslandze, S., & Fuchs, S. (2026). The price of delay: Supply chain disruptions and pricing dynamics. Journal of International Economics, 162, 104265. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2026.104265

Bermpei, T., & Triantafyllou, A. (2025). Supply and demand shocks: The short-term and long-term drivers of oil price uncertainty. Journal of Commodity Markets, 39, 100495. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomm.2025.100495

Eisenhauer, J. G. (2024). Shift or pivot? Market entry and exit with linear supply and demand curves. The American Economist, 69(1), 168–186. https://doi.org/10.1177/05694345231209228

Flynn, J. P., Nikolakoudis, G., & Sastry, K. A. (2026). A theory of supply function choice and aggregate supply. American Economic Review, 116(2), 710–748. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20240443

Hamdani, M. (2025). Bagaimana pengaruh perubahan fungsi permintaan atau penawaran terhadap keseimbangan pasar? [How do changes in demand or supply functions affect market equilibrium?]. MOTEKAR: Jurnal Multidisiplin Teknologi dan Arsitektur, 8(1), 326–338. https://doi.org/10.15642/jsi.2025.8.1.19-48

Harefa, A., Sibuea, B., Arifin, B., Harahap, C., Purba, C., & Yosephine, G. (2025). Keseimbangan pasar: Peran permintaan dan penawaran dalam menentukan harga cabai merah [Market equilibrium: The role of demand and supply in determining red chili prices]. Jurnal Riset Ekonomi dan Keuangan Syariah, 2(1), 27–32.

Imelda, Fripp, M., & Roberts, M. J. (2024). Real-time pricing and the cost of clean power. American Economic Journal: Economic Policy, 16(4), 100–141. https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.20220506

Kharroubi, E., & Smets, F. (2024). Energy shocks as Keynesian supply shocks: Implications for fiscal policy. European Economic Review, 170, 104875. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2024.104875

Kustiawati, D. (2022). Keseimbangan pasar dan peran negara dalam sistem ekonomi Islam menurut Alquran dan Hadits [Market equilibrium and the role of the state in the Islamic economic system according to the Quran and Hadith]. ETNIK: Jurnal Ekonomi - Teknik, 1(11), 774–781. https://etnik.rifainstitute.com/index.php/etnik/article/view/129/93

MacKay, A., & Miller, N. H. (2025). Estimating models of supply and demand: Instruments and covariance restrictions. American Economic Journal: Microeconomics, 17(1), 238–281. https://doi.org/10.1257/mic.20230024

Nafisatur, M. (2024). Metode pengumpulan data penelitian [Research data collection methods]. Metode Pengumpulan Data Penelitian, 3(5), 5423–5443.

Pasaribu, R. M. (2025). Analisis permintaan dan penawaran dalam menentukan keseimbangan pasar di Kelurahan Tanjung Sari Medan [Analysis of demand and supply in determining market equilibrium in Tanjung Sari, Medan]. ATDS SAINTECH - Journal of Engineering, 6(2), 39–47.

Prasetyo, A. A., & Putra, R. M. (2023). Pengaruh fungsi permintaan dan penawaran terhadap keseimbangan pasar [The effect of demand and supply functions on market equilibrium]. RESWARA: Jurnal Riset Ilmu Teknik, 1(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.70716/reswara.v1i1.344

Pratista, A. V., Meiva, A., Zahrah, L., & Naailasyifa, A. P. (2026). Analisis keseimbangan pasar digital menggunakan model nonlinear permintaan dan penawaran [Analysis of digital market equilibrium using nonlinear demand and supply models]. ProBisnis: Jurnal Manajemen, 17(3), 1491–1496.

Raja Hardiansyah, S.E., M. (2023). Pengantar ekonomi mikro [Introduction to microeconomics].

Rani Yunita Sari Sagala, Winona Keysadli, Verani Sinurat, & Khairani Alawiyah Matondang. (2024). Literature review: Analisis fungsi penawaran dalam ekonomi mikro [Analysis of supply functions in microeconomics]. Trending: Jurnal Manajemen dan Ekonomi, 3(1), 133–144. https://doi.org/10.30640/trending.v3i1.3597

Resende Filho, M. A., & Nascimento, L. G. (2024). Responsiveness of market equilibrium agricultural output, price and land use to shocks. Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics, 68, 60–76. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8489.12538

Safrudin, R., Zulfamanna, Kustati, M., & Sepriyanti, N. (2023). Penelitian kualitatif [Qualitative

research]. Journal of Social Science Research, 3(2), 1–15.

Septia Najwa Lubis, Meme Syakira Rizky, Vicky Raudha Nafisa, & Muhammad Arfan Harahap. (2025). Menganalisis teori permintaan, penawaran dan keseimbangan pasar [Analyzing demand, supply, and market equilibrium theory]. Jurnal Nuansa: Publikasi Ilmu Manajemen dan Ekonomi Syariah, 3(2), 409–417. https://doi.org/10.61132/nuansa.v3i2.1826

Syaiful Bahri, Riana Tirsya, E. (2025). Struktur pasar dan persaingan harga dalam perspektif ekonomi syariah [Market structure and price competition from an Islamic economics perspective]. Academia.Edu, 5(9), 68–75. https://www.academia.edu/download/117627859/1444.pdf

Tampubolon, F., Siregar, F. P. I. P., Situmorang, L. P. S., Sinaga, M. O., Sinaga, S. A., & Sinurat, S. N. (2025). Analisis permintaan dan penawaran sebagai faktor penentu harga cabai di Pasar MMTC Medan [Analysis of demand and supply as determinants of chili prices in MMTC Market, Medan]. Jurnal Riset Ekonomi dan Keuangan Syariah (Reksy), 2(2), 1–7.

Vides, J. C., Feria, J., Golpe, A. A., & Martín-Álvarez, J. M. (2024). How do supply or demand shocks affect the US oil market? Financial Innovation, 10, 16. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40854-023-00561-8

Widjaja, J., Irawan, N. Z. P., Soeharyadi, Y., & Tampubolon, D. R. (2025). A model on market equilibrium using a differential equation with time delays. BAREKENG: Jurnal Ilmu Matematika dan Terapan, 19(3), 1893–1904. https://doi.org/10.30598/barekengvol19iss3pp1893-1904