

DIGITAL REGULATORY COMMUNICATION AND YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN INDONESIA'S DIGITAL ECONOMY

Ryndian Gusty^{1*}, Ira Nur Dewita Siregar², Maya Syahlina³, Ervina Rosarina Hasibuan⁴, Ade Rasinta Herli Kristiani Purba⁵

^{1,2,3,4,5}Politeknik Negeri Medan, Indonesia

*E-mail: ryndian@polmed.ac.id

Diterima: 20 Agustus 2025 Direvisi: 28 Agustus 2025 Disetujui: 1 September 2025

Abstract

This study investigates the intersection between digital regulatory communication and youth participation in Indonesia's evolving digital economy. As the nation approaches its demographic bonus era (2030–2040), young people have become key drivers of digital innovation, entrepreneurship, and creative economy growth. However, their potential remains constrained by a regulatory environment that is fragmented, reactive, and inadequately adaptive to the dynamic nature of digital transformation. Using a qualitative juridical-normative and conceptual approach, this research critically analyzes the alignment between existing legal frameworks—such as the Electronic Information and Transactions Law, the Youth Law, the Job Creation Law, and the Creative Economy Regulation—and the practical realities of youth-driven digital innovation. Findings reveal a persistent structural gap between regulatory intentions and implementation, marked by legal ambiguity, administrative rigidity, and limited youth participation in policymaking processes. These conditions weaken institutional trust and hinder the inclusiveness of Indonesia's digital transformation agenda. The study identifies that the dominance of control-oriented regulation (rule-based approach) often restricts innovation freedom, while the absence of adaptive mechanisms—such as regulatory sandboxes and co-regulation frameworks—reduces opportunities for legal experimentation and creative growth among young innovators. This research contributes theoretically by integrating youth empowerment theory, digital governance theory, and socio-legal perspectives to conceptualize adaptive digital regulation as a facilitative rather than restrictive instrument. Practically, it proposes a participatory regulatory communication model emphasizing inclusivity, policy harmonization, and digital legal literacy as prerequisites for sustainable youth engagement. The study concludes that achieving Indonesia's "Golden Vision 2045" requires a shift from security-oriented to empowerment-based regulation—where law functions not merely as control, but as a communicative, enabling, and transformative medium for youth-led digital innovation.

Keywords: digital regulation, youth empowerment, socio-legal study, digital economy, Indonesia Emas 2045, adaptive governance

INTRODUCTION

Digital transformation has reshaped economic growth globally and in Southeast Asia, where the adoption of digital technologies, cross-border innovation, and digital trade continues to accelerate (Zhang et al., 2025; Suranto et al., 2025). Supported by massive mobile internet penetration, youth have emerged as key actors in digital entrepreneurship, platform collaboration, and technological innovation (Srisathan et al., 2022; Ahmad, 2025; Maulana & Dečman, 2025). Consequently, ASEAN emphasizes youth involvement to build an inclusive and competitive digital society (Harris & Johns, 2021; Khussainova et al., 2024). However, optimal youth participation requires regulatory frameworks that are adaptive, future-oriented, and participatory (Pemer & Werr, 2025; Ciarli et al., 2021; Lee & Trimi, 2021).

Despite strong digital literacy and motivation, youth still face barriers such as regulatory complexity, gaps in digital competence, and limited legal protection for digital assets and economic activities (Putrevu & Mertzanis, 2024; Litvinenko, 2020; Shi & Wei, 2024; Ibrahim et al., 2025). This shows the urgency of redesigning regulatory models to reflect contemporary digital realities. In Indonesia, the demographic bonus—where 64% of the population is of productive age (BPS, 2023)—positions youth as drivers of the digital economy, yet current regulations do not sufficiently empower or protect them (Gazzola et al., 2017).

Youth digital participation is further constrained by procedural uncertainties, weak guarantees for digital intellectual property, and limited dialogue between policymakers and young innovators (Wang et al., 2024). Rigid top-down regulation risks suppressing creativity and innovation (Fu, 2021; Henrekson et al., 2022), highlighting the need for a regulatory shift

aligned with Indonesia Emas 2045. Effective digital regulation in developing countries depends on adaptive frameworks capable of addressing technological complexity (Tan & Taeiagh, 2020; Finck, 2017). Thus, Indonesia must position youth not only as beneficiaries of demographic potential, but as strategic co-architects of regulatory transformation.

A gap persists between rapidly evolving youth innovation and rigid laws unable to accommodate emerging digital interactions, including NFTs, creative digital content, and algorithm-based contracts (Tran et al., 2020; Chang & Chang, 2023). From a socio-legal perspective, the tension between *law in books* and *law in action* (Kretschmann, 2025) illustrates that command-and-control regulation is incompatible with dynamic digital ecosystems. This demands collaborative, flexible regulatory models involving multiple stakeholders (Van Mierlo & Beers, 2020; Avelino et al., 2019).

Previous research highlights youth participation in the digital economy (Herani & Pranandari, 2024), yet remains focused on economic or behavioral aspects. Regulatory studies also remain descriptive and overlook the gap between youth digital innovation and legal frameworks (Čela et al., 2025). Few studies adopt inclusive regulation through youth involvement in policymaking (Leino & Puumala, 2021), even though digital complexity requires regulation that reflects youth characteristics (Tarakanov et al., 2019). Critical socio-legal analysis in the context of youth-driven digital innovation remains scarce.

Therefore, this research addresses scholarly gaps across: (1) youth digital innovation, (2) digital regulation as an enabling framework, and (3) youth engagement as agents of change. Using a normative-conceptual and comparative

approach, the study maps the disjunction between legal norms and youth digital practices and proposes adaptive policy models for Indonesia Emas 2045.

The novelty of this research lies in integrating youth empowerment, digital economic transformation, and legal-regulatory perspectives into a unified analytical framework (Mourby et al., 2022). Grounded in youth empowerment theory (Ogamba, 2019) and progressive legal scholarship, this study not only identifies challenges but formulates concrete recommendations for inclusive digital regulatory reform. Unlike prior studies that emphasize digital literacy or participation (Luthfia et al., 2021), this research positions youth as co-creators in shaping digital regulation.

METHOD

This study employs a qualitative method aimed at gaining an in-depth understanding of public policies and regulations that influence youth engagement in digital marketing practices. The main emphasis lies on the interpretation of normative aspects, examination of actual phenomena, and a thorough literature review.

The primary objective is to understand the role of public policy and regulation in promoting youth participation in the digital marketing sector as part of the national economic growth strategy through innovation toward achieving Indonesia's Golden Vision 2045.

To strengthen the research findings, a juridical-normative approach is employed, combined with a comparative approach by examining and contrasting digital marketing practices and regulatory frameworks in Indonesia with those of

other countries that have successfully fostered youth participation in the digital economy. Furthermore, a conceptual approach is utilized to analyze the interrelated concepts of digital marketing, law, and youth empowerment.

The use of the juridical-normative approach is justified as this study evaluates government policies and legal norms that support, regulate, or constrain the capacity of young people to enhance their skills and business development within the digital marketing sector. The main focus is placed on analyzing the discrepancies between ideal policy objectives and actual implementation.

The key regulations and policies analyzed in this study include:

1. Law No. 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions (ITE Law),
2. Law No. 40 of 2009 concerning Youth,
3. Law No. 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation,
4. Government Regulation No. 24 of 2022 concerning the Creative Economy, and
5. Minister of Communication and Information Regulation on Digital Literacy, Digital Economy, and Digital Transformation for MSMEs.

The primary data sources consist of scholarly journals in the fields of creative economy, digital marketing, and digital regulation, national laws and regulations, and research reports from national and

international institutions related to digital economy and youth digital empowerment.

The data analysis method involves several stages:

1. Data condensation, by filtering and extracting information relevant to the research theme from academic and legal literature;
2. Issue categorization, by grouping technological, legal, and policy issues that either facilitate or hinder youth participation in the digital marketing ecosystem;
3. Normative interpretation, by analyzing the content of relevant regulations to determine their influence on a youth-inclusive and adaptive digital marketing transformation.

Table 1. Theoretical Framework and Research Focus

Aspect	Explanation
Theoretical Framework	Digital Marketing Theory (Chaffey et al.) Youth Empowerment Theory Regulatory Governance Theory Digital Economy and Open Innovation
Analytical Focus	Effectiveness of public policies and regulations in promoting youth participation in the digital marketing ecosystem. Discrepancies between digital business practices and legal norms.
Expected Outcomes	Strategic policy recommendations and legal insights to

	strengthen youth engagement in digital marketing, enhance MSME competitiveness, and contribute to digital economy growth toward Indonesia's Golden Vision 2045.
--	---

Table 2. Research Methods

Aspect	Description
Type of Research	Qualitative Exploratory
Approach	Juridical-normative, Conceptual, Case Study
Research Objective	To understand public policies and regulations that promote youth-driven development of digital marketing.
Rationale for the Approach	The topic involves the intersection of digital policy, legal norms, and real-world practices in the digital economy.
Key Legal Instruments Analyzed	1. Law No. 11 of 2008 on Electronic Information and Transactions (ITE Law) 2. Law No. 40 of 2009 on Youth 3. Law No. 11 of 2020 on Job Creation 4. Government Regulation No. 24 of 2022 on the Creative Economy 5. Ministerial Regulation of Communication and Information Technology on Digital Literacy, Digital Economy, and Digital Transformation for MSMEs.
Data Sources	1. National digital policies and regulations 2.

	Reports from ministries, Statistics Indonesia (BPS), and digital economy agencies ³ . Academic studies on digital marketing
Analytical Methods	1. Data condensation ² . Classification of technological, market, legal, and policy issues ³ . Normative interpretation of policies ⁴ . Gap analysis between policy and practice

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Alignment of Regulation with Digital Economic Dynamics

A fundamental prerequisite for the dynamics of the digital economy is the presence of responsive regulations that support young people as key innovation actors. However, in the Indonesian context, existing regulations tend to be slow, unsynchronized, and reactive to technological changes—particularly those related to the creative economy and digital entrepreneurship. In this regard, Indonesian students demonstrate a high tendency toward entrepreneurial intensity in the digital sector, yet their development remains negatively affected by external environmental uncertainties. Regulatory aspects and perceptions of an unsupportive legal environment hinder business development processes (Nyarku & Oduro, 2018). These findings emphasize the importance of policy clarity and institutional encouragement as significant predictors of progress in digital entrepreneurship.

Furthermore, entrepreneurship literacy in Indonesia has not been fully integrated with the national digital transformation agenda (Rauf et al., 2024; Raharjo et al., 2024). These studies

advocate that educational policy and regulatory support must be directed toward accommodating digital skills. The readiness of young people in digital legal literacy, especially in complying with legal obligations across various digital platforms, must ensure data protection and adherence to ethical digital marketing standards. This assertion is strengthened by the findings of Song (2019) and Satalkina & Steiner (2020), which demonstrate that the growing trend of digital entrepreneurship increasingly requires a clear regulatory framework at the national level to shape a healthy and innovative economic ecosystem.

From a public policy perspective, strategic investment policies that aim to accelerate Indonesia's digital transformation still face bureaucratic challenges and regulatory fragmentation (Hafel, 2023). These findings underscore the urgency of co-regulation and cross-sector policy orchestration approaches to prevent overlapping or redundant policy formulations among agencies and ministries. The absence of an appropriate legal framework not only generates legal uncertainty but also hampers cross-sectoral collaboration and digital innovation—particularly for emerging young innovators.

This issue becomes more complex when examined from the perspective of data protection and digital platforms. Studies by Rohmy & Nihayaty (2023) and Hafel (2023) reveal that Indonesia's digital regulation remains in a transitional phase, wherein digital ethics and personal data protection frameworks are still under adaptation. Although efforts such as the enactment of the Personal Data Protection Law (UU PDP) have been made, there is still no direct integration with the broader legal system that governs digital business activities. Hartley et al. (2018) demonstrate that other Southeast Asian countries, such

as Malaysia and Singapore, have already provided regulatory space for young innovators. These nations have also developed regulatory sandbox systems in the digital sector, allowing them to avoid the rigidity of bureaucratic processes.

This clearly indicates that regulatory systems based on sectoral integration and adaptability are crucial components for creating a broad and inclusive digital economic environment for young generations. In conclusion, both conceptual and empirical evidence presented above consistently suggest that Indonesia's regulatory framework has yet to keep pace with the rapid and complex evolution of the digital economy. The absence of a comprehensive legal support system, coupled with insufficient harmonization across regulations affecting young innovators, reveals a substantial gap between legal norms and practical realities. Moreover, the protection afforded to digital entrepreneurs—particularly young business actors—remains suboptimal. To bridge this gap, a comprehensive policy reform is required, one that promotes an adaptive digital regulatory model that is contextual, iterative, and participatory, positioning youth not merely as passive regulatory subjects but as active agents of transformation.

Legal and Administrative Barriers in Youth Innovation Practices

The younger generation in Indonesia has demonstrated steadily increasing participation in the digital innovation ecosystem. However, in practice, the realization of this potential remains constrained by administrative and regulatory systems that are highly systematic and structural in nature. These challenges not only impede efficiency but also erode young people's trust in institutions that are expected to facilitate their growth (Mayako & Wulandari, 2025).

Legal problems often manifest in the form of regulatory ambiguity and overlapping policies enacted by multiple agencies.

Empirical findings reveal an important observation: numerous entrepreneurial acceleration programs and digital training initiatives targeting young people frequently encounter obstacles due to unstandardized procedures and slow bureaucratic systems (Rauf et al., 2024; Amjad et al., 2020; Bläse et al., 2025). The inconsistency of inter-agency policies has resulted in the absence of clear guidance for young entrepreneurs seeking to transition from education to practical digital marketing (Purba et al., 2025; Wulandari et al., 2025). These administrative barriers have directly affected the level of youth participation in digital entrepreneurship programs. Furthermore, they have also limited the effectiveness of implementing digital curricula in higher education institutions.

Other studies highlight the weakness of legal protection for young innovators, particularly in terms of legal instruments (Veugelers et al., 2019; Živojinović et al., 2019). This is evident from the lack of micro digital contract security systems that can guarantee the safety of small-scale business transactions. The absence of accessible, affordable, and expedited mechanisms for digital dispute resolution has also been identified as a key obstacle to digital economic acceleration. Legal uncertainty in responding to emerging digital business models makes young innovators' outputs vulnerable to platform exploitation, copyright violations, and unresolved consumer complaints (Peukert & Windisch, 2025; Schneider & Kokshagina, 2021).

This situation is exacerbated by the fact that most young digital entrepreneurs lack access to professional legal services and even basic knowledge regarding their rights and obligations within the digital

sphere. In contrast, Thailand and Singapore have implemented agile policy environments that allow young people to experiment legally without going through excessively complicated licensing processes (ElZarrad et al., 2022; Thawesaengskulthai et al., 2024). Such approaches have proven effective in stimulating innovation and fostering trust between governments and young entrepreneurs.

Another equally important issue is the disparity in digital legal literacy among young digital actors. Many talented and technologically proficient youth exhibit strong communication and innovation skills yet possess weak understanding of digital legal frameworks (Mawaddah et al., 2025). These challenges are closely linked to regulations governing electronic transactions, content licensing, and personal data storage. Supporting studies (Li & Zhang, 2025; Kaitatzi-Whitlock, 2021; Demchenko et al., 2021) note that most digital training programs still lack modules on digital law and ethics, thereby creating a gap between legal compliance and creative expression.

The current legal and administrative challenges illustrate that regulatory frameworks remain lagging behind in terms of substance, structure, and service delivery. Comprehensive reform should not only focus on legislative adjustments but also encompass the design of a decentralized governance system and the development of legal awareness among young people. Moreover, it is crucial to involve youth in the policy formulation process, not merely as passive objects of regulation, but as active contributors to shaping a fair, dynamic, and innovation-oriented digital ecosystem.

The Potential of Youth as Key Actors in the Digital Economy

Indonesia is currently experiencing what is often described as a demographic bonus, in which more than 65% of its total population is within the productive age group, dominated by young people aged 17 to 30. In this demographic context, youth are not merely consumers of technology but have become primary actors within the technological and digital economic sectors. This reality is reflected in the growing proliferation of digital marketing ventures, creative content production, e-commerce activities, and micro-fintech enterprises (Kosasih & Wulandari, 2025; Wulandari & Ibrahim, 2023). A 2024 national survey conducted by the Ministry of Communication and Digital Affairs reported that young people account for over 70% of all economic activities involving social media, digital platforms, collaborative applications, and online marketplaces.

The level of digital entrepreneurial intensity is remarkably high among Indonesia's youth, particularly university students (Oktaviani, 2025). This entrepreneurial activity is largely motivated by a desire for economic independence and self-sufficiency. The ability to use technology effectively, coupled with broad access and a rapidly developing digital economic ecosystem, has become a driving force behind the continuous growth of young entrepreneurs. Nonetheless, this immense potential for economic digitalization cannot be fully optimized without systematic support through educational policy, legal protection, and clear business regulations (Xu et al., 2022; Demchenko et al., 2021).

High levels of digital literacy alone are insufficient to sustain the economy if not accompanied by the capacity to manage risks and comply with digital regulatory standards. Awe (2021), Bhardwaj et al.

(2024), and Czyżewska et al. (2025) have observed that, globally, youth have made increasingly significant contributions to digital entrepreneurship. Indonesia occupies a strategic position within this trend; however, gaps persist in the areas of education, access, and legal infrastructure. This is evidenced by the large number of young entrepreneurs operating in the informal digital sector, lacking proper licensing, legal recognition, and legal protection for their products and services.

Across Southeast Asia, young people have emerged as the backbone of digital economic transformation in the post-COVID-19 era (Ssenyonga, 2021; Mohamed, 2023). Yet, only countries that have implemented adaptive and inclusive regulatory approaches, such as Singapore and Vietnam, have been able to capitalize fully on this momentum. The energy of young generations serves as a crucial generator of digital economic growth. Despite Indonesia's substantial demographic advantage, policy interventions are still required to fully integrate youth into the formal digital economy.

Such integration would enable young people to become legally recognized, creative, and globally competitive entrepreneurs, rather than remaining mere consumers or spectators. Indonesian youth have already demonstrated their ability to generate economic value through non-traditional activities such as content creation, digital influencing, freelancing, and affiliate marketing. However, informal digital economic activities carried out without adequate legal protection expose young people to significant risks of criminalization due to limited digital legal literacy (Sandvik, 2021; Colomb & Moreira De Souza, 2024).

Therefore, enabling regulation and a robust legal ecosystem are urgently

needed to cultivate the potential of youth as digital economic actors. This can be achieved through the implementation of digital legal education and training programs as integral components of capacity-building efforts for the digital generation. Such initiatives will help ensure that the participation of young people in the digital economy is not only innovative but also legally sound, sustainable, and ethically grounded.

The Gap Between Innovation Freedom and Regulatory Security

The demand among young innovators for freedom to innovate represents a pivotal issue in the governance dynamics of Indonesia's digital ecosystem. The regulatory tension between ensuring digital security and enabling freedom of economic expression has emerged as a tangible challenge experienced by young digital entrepreneurs. This condition is both epistemological and structural, stemming from a control-oriented regulatory paradigm (rule-based regulation) that emphasizes restriction rather than facilitation. Moreover, the existing approach remains misaligned with the characteristics of digital innovation, which inherently require flexibility and adaptability.

Rigid regulatory approaches tend to foster an atmosphere of apprehension that ultimately constrains digital creativity and citizen participation in the context of digital transformation (Eom & Lee, 2022; Nambisan et al., 2019; Hinings et al., 2018). In many developing countries, such phenomena persist due to the unfinished evolution of their legal systems. In Indonesia, the application of ambiguous legal provisions within the Information and Electronic Transactions Law (UU ITE)—particularly Articles 27 and 28—has become a clear manifestation of this regulatory gap. Numerous cases of

criminalization involving creative content and digital expression illustrate how “digital security” is often interpreted as a mechanism of social control rather than as a rights-based protection framework.

Comparative studies indicate that countries with stringent security-oriented regulations tend to experience slower digital innovation growth (Shi & Wei, 2024; Niebel, 2021). This occurs because creative economic actors, especially young people, are less willing to assume high legal and financial risks. In Indonesia, this trend is reflected in the declining participation of youth communities in digital platform development initiatives. Only a small portion of youth digital communities remain active in government partnership programs.

This gap can also be analyzed through the lens of responsive regulation theory (Ayres & Braithwaite, 1992), which emphasizes the need for a tiered regulatory approach—beginning with persuasion and facilitation, and only applying sanctions as a final measure (Sun & Gu, 2025). In Indonesia, the absence of a facilitative regulatory approach has deprived young digital innovators of a safe space to test their products and pursue technology-based social initiatives. The situation is further aggravated by the lack of a regulatory sandbox mechanism for non-financial sectors, which could otherwise encourage responsible experimentation among young innovators.

Amid the accelerating globalization of digital technology, it is imperative that young Indonesians be equipped to operate within transnationally integrated innovation environments. In Southeast Asia, many young digital professionals prefer jurisdictions that provide legal certainty and avoid repressive regulatory systems. A potential digital brain drain could thus become an inevitable consequence if Indonesia fails to offer an

adaptive and secure legal environment for its young innovators.

This discussion reveals that current security-based regulatory frameworks are not yet supported by principles of justice that are transparent, procedural, and participatory. The limited involvement of the public in digital policymaking only deepens the divide between digital citizens and the state, thereby weakening the strategic empowerment of youth as agents of national digital transformation.

Recommendations for Strengthening Regulatory and Policy Frameworks

In response to the administrative and regulatory challenges outlined in the preceding sections, a paradigm shift is urgently required—from a static system toward a collaborative and adaptive digital regulatory model. The involvement of young generations must not only serve a regulatory purpose but also function as a form of empowerment within the context of ideal digital innovation governance. The regulatory system’s capacity for real-time responsiveness must be designed in alignment with the dynamic nature of digital transformation (Macdonald et al., 2021). Moreover, the innovative potential of youth can create opportunities for safe experimentation spaces for young digital entrepreneurs.

Policy harmonization between national and regional governments should be prioritized as a key strategic agenda. Persistent policy asymmetry and misalignment between central and local regulatory implementation have resulted in uneven opportunities and inefficiencies (Hong et al., 2019; Wigger, 2023). Therefore, an inter-institutional coordination mechanism is necessary—one that ensures the digitalization of all licensing processes across all levels of bureaucracy. Harmonization should also encompass the synchronization of the

Personal Data Protection Act (UU PDP), the Job Creation Act (UU Cipta Kerja), the Creative Economy Law (UU Ekonomi Kreatif), and other sectoral regulations to foster a coherent digital economic ecosystem for youth.

Another crucial aspect involves the government's responsibility to develop affirmative policies and incentive models for young digital actors. Comparative analyses indicate that countries that have successfully integrated youth into the digital economy have implemented competency-based incentives, such as digital vouchers, regulatory sandboxes, and startup matching grants (Plekhanov Russian University of Economics et al., 2021). Indonesia could adopt similar mechanisms through collaboration among the Creative Economy Agency (Badan Ekonomi Kreatif), the Ministry of Youth and Sports (Kemenpora), and regional governments in the provision of performance-based financial support.

Educational policy and national training programs must also integrate digital legal literacy as a core component. The weak understanding of digital legal regulations among young people has contributed to the proliferation of informal digital enterprises operating under significant legal risk (Darbi et al., 2018; Prasetyo, 2022). Therefore, in-depth modules on online consumer protection, digital business contracts, personal data management, and digital ethics should be incorporated into formal curricula, professional training, and community-based digital workshops. A minimum prerequisite for every young digital actor should include basic legal knowledge to promote a sustainable and ethical digital economy.

Furthermore, the long-term reform of Indonesia's digital regulation must reinforce public-private innovation governance and co-regulation frameworks.

This aligns with Sharma et al. (2025), who emphasize the necessity of including non-governmental actors in digital policymaking to ensure societal acceptance, particularly among youth (Nooren et al., 2018). The active participation of digital creator associations, startup communities, and higher education institutions must be continuously facilitated to generate regulations that are relevant and grounded in practical realities (Ratzinger et al., 2018; Al Hashimi et al., 2021).

Ultimately, the strengthening of digital policy and regulatory frameworks should not merely focus on governance but also on addressing the structural challenges faced by young innovators. Providing legal assurance and regulatory flexibility is essential for fostering an inclusive digital environment that supports innovation. The implementation of adaptive, inclusive, and enabling regulations will serve as a fundamental pillar of Indonesia's strategic pathway toward achieving the national vision of "Golden Indonesia 2045."

CONCLUSION

This study reveals a structural gap between the needs of young people for regulations emphasizing digital security orientation and the creation of an adaptive and inclusive innovative space. In the context of national development toward *Indonesia Emas 2045*, law should function as a facilitative instrument that encourages youth engagement within the creative digital economy ecosystem. The study further finds that certain regulations remain ambiguous, rigid, and lack youth participation in the policy formulation stage. This situation creates tension between the innovative rights of digital youth and the state's protectionist interests. Consequently, most youth initiatives have not yet received adequate legal support and are hindered by unresponsive legal

instruments. The gap between legal norms (*das sollen*) and practical implementation (*das sein*) underscores the need for a new approach in designing and managing regulatory frameworks. Theories of adaptive regulation, youth empowerment, and responsive legal frameworks serve as critical foundations for transforming the paradigm of law—from one of control to one of sustainable empowerment.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, Z. (2025). Unlocking AI capabilities: Exploring strategic fit, innovation ambidexterity and digital entrepreneurial intent in driving digital transformation. *Journal of Management Development*, 44(2), 194–218.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-05-2024-0171>
- Al Hashimi, S., Zaki, Y., Al Muwali, A., & Mahdi, N. (2021). The Role of Nurturing Technopreneurship Education and Building University Students' Entrepreneurial Mindsets and Skill Sets in Fostering Digital Innovation and Augmenting the Tech Start-Up Ecosystem in Bahrain. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 20(6), 152–173.
<https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.6.8>
- Amjad, T., Abdul Rani, S. H. B., & Sa'atar, S. B. (2020). Entrepreneurship development and pedagogical gaps in entrepreneurial marketing education. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 18(2), 100379.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2020.100379>
- Avelino, F., Wittmayer, J. M., Pel, B., Weaver, P., Dumitru, A., Haxeltine, A., Kemp, R., Jørgensen, M. S., Bauler, T., Ruijsink, S., & O'Riordan, T. (2019). Transformative social innovation and (dis)empowerment. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 145, 195–206.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2017.05.002>
- Awe, Y. N. (2021). *Enhancement of Micro Small Businesses in The Gambia through Digitalization: Investigating youth Entrepreneurs Perception, Use and Inhibitor of E-commerce Technology*.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.5519304>
- Bhardwaj, S., Agarwal, S., & Tripathi, V. (2024). Exploring factors influencing the entrepreneurial intentions of the youth community towards green ICT to encourage environmental sustainability: Evidence from an emerging economy. *THE ELECTRONIC JOURNAL OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES*, 90(6), e12331.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/isd2.12331>
- Bläse, R., Filser, M., Weise, J., Björck, A., & Puumalainen, K. (2025). Identifying institutional gaps: Implications for an early-stage support framework for impact entrepreneurs. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 32(1), 679–697.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2939>
- Çela, A., Mansi, E., & Morina, F. (2025). Young adults' pathway to digital entrepreneurship: From ideas to innovation. *European Journal of*

- Innovation Management*, 28(7), 2909–2939.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-04-2024-0486>
- Chang, C.-W., & Chang, S.-H. (2023). The Impact of Digital Disruption: Influences of Digital Media and Social Networks on Forming Digital Natives' Attitude. *Sage Open*, 13(3), 21582440231191741.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231191741>
- Ciarli, T., Kenney, M., Massini, S., & Piscitello, L. (2021). Digital technologies, innovation, and skills: Emerging trajectories and challenges. *Research Policy*, 50(7), 104289.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2021.104289>
- Colomb, C., & Moreira De Souza, T. (2024). Illegal short-term rentals, regulatory enforcement and informal practices in the age of digital platforms. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 31(4), 328–345.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/09697764231155386>
- Czyżewska, M., Szczygieł, E., Tsaples, G., Manou, D. B., & Papathanasiou, J. (2025). The Future of Sustainable Entrepreneurship: Youth Perspectives in Greece and Poland. *Sustainability*, 17(11), 5226.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su17115226>
- Darbi, W. P. K., Hall, C. M., & Knott, P. (2018). The Informal Sector: A Review and Agenda for Management Research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 20(2), 301–324.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12131>
- Demchenko, M. V., Mehriban E. Gulieva, Larina, T. V., & Simaeva, E. P. (2021). Digital Transformation of Legal Education: Problems, Risks and Prospects. *European Journal of Contemporary Education*, 10(2).
<https://doi.org/10.13187/ejced.2021.2.297>
- ElZarrad, M. K., Lee, A. Y., Purcell, R., & Steele, S. J. (2022). Advancing an agile regulatory ecosystem to respond to the rapid development of innovative technologies. *Clinical and Translational Science*, 15(6), 1332–1339.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/cts.13267>
- Eom, S.-J., & Lee, J. (2022). Digital government transformation in turbulent times: Responses, challenges, and future direction. *Government Information Quarterly*, 39(2), 101690.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2022.101690>
- Finck, M. (2017). Digital Regulation: Designing a Supranational Legal Framework for the Platform Economy. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.
<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2990043>
- Fu, P. (2021). From bottom-up to top-down: Governance, institutionalisation, and innovation in Chinese makerspaces. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 33(10), 1226–1241.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2021.1950680>
- Gazzola, P., Colombo, G., Pezzetti, R., & Nicolescu, L. (2017). Consumer Empowerment in the Digital Economy: Availing Sustainable Purchasing Decisions. *Sustainability*,

- 9(5), 693.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su9050693>
- Hafel, M. (2023). Digital Transformation in Politics and Governance in Indonesia: Opportunities and Challenges in the Era of Technological Disruption. *Society*, 11(2), 742–757.
<https://doi.org/10.33019/society.v11i2.577>
- Harris, A., & Johns, A. (2021). Youth, social cohesion and digital life: From risk and resilience to a global digital citizenship approach. *Journal of Sociology*, 57(2), 394–411.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1440783320919173>
- Hartley, K., Woo, J. J., & Chung, S. K. (2018). Urban innovation policy in the postdevelopmental era: Lessons from Singapore and Seoul. *Asia & the Pacific Policy Studies*, 5(3), 599–614.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/app5.255>
- Henrekson, M., Kärnä, A., & Sanandaji, T. (2022). Schumpeterian entrepreneurship: Coveted by policymakers but impervious to top-down policymaking. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 32(3), 867–890.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00191-022-00761-y>
- Herani, R., & Pranandari, A. (2024). Promote or inhibit? Examining the influence of youth digital advocacy on digital social entrepreneurship. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 20(5), 654–677.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/SEJ-11-2023-0136>
- Hinings, B., Gegenhuber, T., & Greenwood, R. (2018). Digital innovation and transformation: An institutional perspective. *Information and Organization*, 28(1), 52–61.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2018.02.004>
- Hong, T., Yu, N., & Mao, Z. (2019). Does environment centralization prevent local governments from racing to the bottom? --Evidence from China. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 231, 649–659.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.05.181>
- Ibrahim, M., Dalimunthe, R., & Wulandari, P. (2025). Indonesian migrant workers in the framework of legal protection and business existence. *Priviet Social Sciences Journal*, 5(7), 1–10.
<https://doi.org/10.55942/pssj.v5i7.376>
- Kaitatzi-Whitlock, S. (2021). Toward a digital civil society: Digital ethics through communication education. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society*, 19(2), 187–206.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JICES-03-2020-0029>
- Khussainova, Z., Kankulov, M., Petrova, M., Assanova, M., Zhartay, Z., Atabayeva, A., & Bektleyeva, D. (2024). The Potential of Youth and Older People's Inclusion in the Sustainable Development of the Creative Economy. *Sustainability*, 16(10), 4095.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su16104095>
- Kretschmann, A. (2025). On Pierre Bourdieu's Legal Thought: Toward a Classic of Socio-Legal Studies. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 21(1), 17–34.

- <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-062124-122138>
- Lee, S. M., & Trimi, S. (2021). Convergence innovation in the digital age and in the COVID-19 pandemic crisis. *Journal of Business Research*, 123, 14–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.09.041>
- Leino, H., & Puumala, E. (2021). What can co-creation do for the citizens? Applying co-creation for the promotion of participation in cities. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 39(4), 781–799. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2399654420957337>
- Li, Z., & Zhang, W. (2025). Technology in education: Addressing legal and governance challenges in the digital era. *Education and Information Technologies*, 30(7), 8413–8443. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-024-13036-9>
- Litvinenko, V. S. (2020). Digital Economy as a Factor in the Technological Development of the Mineral Sector. *Natural Resources Research*, 29(3), 1521–1541. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11053-019-09568-4>
- Kosasih, H., & Wulandari, P. (2025). Financial Technology and Green Financing: A Blend of Technology, Economy, and Environment. *Indonesian Journal of Social Economics and Agricultural Policy*, 1(1), 27–32. <https://doi.org/10.70895/ijseap.v1i1.41>
- Luthfia, A., Wibowo, D., Widyakusumastuti, M. A., & Angeline, M. (2021). The Role of Digital Literacy on Online Opportunity and Online Risk in Indonesian Youth. *Asian Journal for Public Opinion Research*, 9(2), 142–160. <https://doi.org/10.15206/AJPOR.2021.9.2.142>
- Macdonald, J. C., Isom, D. C., Evans, D. D., & Page, K. J. (2021). Digital Innovation in Medicinal Product Regulatory Submission, Review, and Approvals to Create a Dynamic Regulatory Ecosystem—Are We Ready for a Revolution? *Frontiers in Medicine*, 8, 660808. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2021.660808>
- Maulana, R. Y., & Dečman, M. (2025). The Collaborative Digital Transformation Model—The Case of Indonesian Youth. *Journal of Public Affairs*, 25(4), e70077. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.70077>
- Mawaddah, Wulandari, P., Panjaitan, A., & Dwianita. (2025). THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MARKETING COMMUNICATION IN DIGITAL BUSINESS: A CASE STUDY OF MARKETING ON TIKTOK LIVE. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 14(1), 91–102. <http://dx.doi.org/10.35967/jkms.v14i1.7651>
- Mayako, P. A., & Wulandari, P. (2025). Higher Education Institution Marketing: Factors Influencing Students' Decision To Choose Politeknik Negeri Medan (POLMED). *IKRAITH-EKONOMIKA*, 8(1), 643–649. <https://doi.org/10.37817/IKRAITH-EKONOMIKA>

-
- Mohamed, H. A. (2023). The role of digital transformation in the socio-economic recovery post COVID-19. *Applied Economics*, 55(32), 3716–3727. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2022.2117779>
- Mourby, M., Bell, J., Morrison, M., Faulkner, A., Li, P., Bicudo, E., Webster, A., & Kaye, J. (2022). Biomodifying the ‘natural’: From Adaptive Regulation to Adaptive Societal Governance. *Journal of Law and the Biosciences*, 9(1), 1sac018. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jlb/lsac018>
- Nambisan, S., Wright, M., & Feldman, M. (2019). The digital transformation of innovation and entrepreneurship: Progress, challenges and key themes. *Research Policy*, 48(8), 103773. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2019.03.018>
- Niebel, C. (2021). The impact of the general data protection regulation on innovation and the global political economy. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 40, 105523. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2020.105523>
- Nooren, P., Van Gorp, N., Van Eijk, N., & Fathaigh, R. Ó. (2018). Should We Regulate Digital Platforms? A New Framework for Evaluating Policy Options. *Policy & Internet*, 10(3), 264–301. <https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.177>
- Nyarku, K. M., & Oduro, S. (2018). Effect of legal and regulatory framework on SMEs growth in the Accra Metropolis of Ghana. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 19(3), 207–217. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1465750317742842>
- Ogamba, I. K. (2019). Millennials empowerment: Youth entrepreneurship for sustainable development. *World Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, 15(3), 267–278. <https://doi.org/10.1108/WJEMSD-05-2018-0048>
- Oktaviani, R. F. (2025). Revealing Digital Literacy of Young Entrepreneurial Intentions: A Case of University Students in Indonesia. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences (PJLSS)*, 22(1). <https://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2025-23.1.0035>
- Pemer, F., & Werr, A. (2025). Defusing Digital Disruption Through Creative Accumulation: Technology-Induced Innovation in Professional Service Firms. *Journal of Management Studies*, 62(5), 1945–1990. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12972>
- Peukert, C., & Windisch, M. (2025). The economics of copyright in the digital age. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 39(3), 877–903. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joes.12632>
- Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Sokolov, M., Marushko, D., Belarus State Economic University, Zhigun, L., Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Morozov, I., Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Surilov, M., & Plekhanov Russian University of Economics. (2021). Youth innovative entrepreneurship under digitalization of economics: Analysis of foreign experience in assessing the effectiveness of support. *Economic Annals-XXI*, 193(9–10), 34–44. <https://doi.org/10.21003/ea.V193-04>
-

- Prasetyo, E. H. (2022). Legitimacy building of digital platforms in the informal economy: Evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 14(6), 1168–1187. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-02-2021-0073>
- Purba, A. R. H. K., Syahlina, M., & Wulandari, P. (2025). The Influence of Integrated Marketing Communication Strategies on Enhancing the Adoption of GoPaylater Services. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi Dan Informasi (IKOMIK)*, 5(1), 16–27. <https://doi.org/10.33830/ikomik.v5i1.12109>
- Putrevu, J., & Mertzanis, C. (2024). The adoption of digital payments in emerging economies: Challenges and policy responses. *Digital Policy, Regulation and Governance*, 26(5), 476–500. <https://doi.org/10.1108/DPRG-06-2023-0077>
- Raharjo, K., Afrianty, T. W., & Prakasa, Y. (2024). Digital literacy and business transformation: Social-cognitive learning perspectives in small business enterprises. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), 2376282. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2376282>
- Ratzinger, D., Amess, K., Greenman, A., & Mosey, S. (2018). The impact of digital start-up founders' higher education on reaching equity investment milestones. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 43(3), 760–778. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-017-9627-3>
- Rauf, R., Raheni, C., Tovan, T., Mardia, M., Setiawan, L., & Rodliyaton, M. (2024). Entrepreneurship education and digital transformation, opportunities and challenges in Indonesia. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*, 8(12), 7740. <https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd.v8i12.7740>
- Rohmy, A. M., & Nihayaty, A. I. (2023). Green Economy Policies in the Digital Transformation of Forest Management in Indonesia. *Environmental Policy and Law*, 53(4), 289–302. <https://doi.org/10.3233/EPL-230026>
- Sandvik, K. B. (2021). Digital Refugee Lawyering: Risk, Legal Knowledge, and Accountability. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, 40(4), 414–432. <https://doi.org/10.1093/rsq/hdab013>
- Satalkina, L., & Steiner, G. (2020). Digital Entrepreneurship and its Role in Innovation Systems: A Systematic Literature Review as a Basis for Future Research Avenues for Sustainable Transitions. *Sustainability*, 12(7), 2764. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12072764>
- Schneider, S., & Kokshagina, O. (2021). Digital transformation: What we have learned (thus far) and what is next. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 30(2), 384–411. <https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12414>
- Sharma, S. K., Mahajan, Y., & Sharma, V. (2025). Innovation in higher education universities (entrepreneurship education), start-ups and MSMEs: A state-of-the-art technology-based mentorship centre for business scalability. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and*

- Small Business*, 56(3), 304–327.
<https://doi.org/10.1504/IJESB.2025.149172>
- Shi, Y., & Wei, F. (2024). Comparative Analysis of Digital Economy-Driven Innovation Development in China: An International Perspective. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 16(1), 4422–4464.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-024-02128-z>
- Song, A. K. (2019). The Digital Entrepreneurial Ecosystem—A critique and reconfiguration. *Small Business Economics*, 53(3), 569–590. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-019-00232-y>
- Srisathan, W. A., Ketkaew, C., Jitjak, W., Ngiwphrom, S., & Naruetharadhol, P. (2022). Open innovation as a strategy for collaboration-based business model innovation: The moderating effect among multigenerational entrepreneurs. *PLOS ONE*, 17(6), e0265025. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0265025>
- Ssenyonga, M. (2021). Imperatives for post COVID-19 recovery of Indonesia's education, labor, and SME sectors. *Cogent Economics & Finance*, 9(1), 1911439. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2021.1911439>
- Sun, J., & Gu, S. (2025). Responsive policing for cyberfraud prevention: An empirical inquiry into the regulatory pyramid to protect cyberfraud victims in China. *Policing and Society*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2025.2548237>
- Suranto, B., Kovač, N., Haryono, K., Abdul Rahman, S. F., Mohd Shukri, A. F., Suder, M., Kusa, R., & Žugić, D. (2025). State of digitalization in the Southeast Asia region – bibliometric analysis. *Quality & Quantity*.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-025-02296-3>
- Tan, S., & Taeihagh, A. (2020). Smart City Governance in Developing Countries: A Systematic Literature Review. *Sustainability*, 12(3), 899. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12030899>
- Tarakanov, V. V., Inshakova, A. O., & Dolinskaya, V. V. (2019). Information Society, Digital Economy and Law. In E. G. Popkova (Ed.), *Ubiquitous Computing and the Internet of Things: Prerequisites for the Development of ICT* (Vol. 826, pp. 3–15). Springer International Publishing.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-13397-9_1
- Thawesaengskulthai, N., Chatmarathong, A., & Koiwanit, J. (2024). Impact and policy supporting Thailand innovation driven enterprise: Orchestrating university innovation and entrepreneurship ecosystem with public and private stakeholders. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 13(1), 16. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-024-00371-x>
- Tran, T., Ho, M.-T., Pham, T.-H., Nguyen, M.-H., Nguyen, K.-L. P., Vuong, T.-T., Nguyen, T.-H. T., Nguyen, T.-D., Nguyen, T.-L., Khuc, Q., La, V.-P., & Vuong, Q.-H. (2020). How Digital Natives Learn and Thrive in the Digital Age: Evidence from an Emerging Economy. *Sustainability*,

- 12(9), 3819.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su12093819>
- Van Mierlo, B., & Beers, P. J. (2020). Understanding and governing learning in sustainability transitions: A review. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 34, 255–269.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2018.08.002>
- Veugeliers, R., Ferrando, A., Lekpek, S., & Weiss, C. T. (2019). Young SMEs as a Motor of Europe's Innovation Machine. *Intereconomics*, 54(6), 369–377.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10272-019-0855-7>
- Wang, S., Li, Y., & Khaskheli, M. B. (2024). Innovation Helps with Sustainable Business, Law, and Digital Technologies: Economic Development and Dispute Resolution. *Sustainability*, 16(10), 3910.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su16103910>
- Wigger, A. (2023). The New EU Industrial Policy and Deepening Structural Asymmetries: Smart Specialisation Not So Smart. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 61(1), 20–37.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.13366>
- Wulandari, P., & Ibrahim, M. (2023). Fintech Lending Business Ethics in Indonesia: A Case Study of Shopee Pinjam (SPinjam). *InFestasi*, 19(1), 13–21.
<https://doi.org/10.21107/infestasi.v19i1.19413>
- Wulandari, P., Mawaddah, & Purba, A. R. H. K. (2025). Post-acquisition TikTok and Tokopedia: Optimization marketing media to encourage entrepreneurship on Sumatra Island. *Priviet Social Sciences Journal*, 5(6), 1–13.
<https://doi.org/10.55942/pssj.v5i6.383>
- Xu, J., She, S., & Liu, W. (2022). Role of digitalization in environment, social and governance, and sustainability: Review-based study for implications. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 961057.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.961057>
- Zhang, L., Pham, T. D., Li, R., & Do, T. T. (2025). Enhancing the Sustainable Development of the ASEAN's Digital Trade: The Impact Mechanism of Innovation Capability. *Sustainability*, 17(4), 1766.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su17041766>
- Živojinović, I., Ludvig, A., & Hegl, K. (2019). Social Innovation to Sustain Rural Communities: Overcoming Institutional Challenges in Serbia. *Sustainability*, 11(24), 7248.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su11247248>