



# Prosperia: Journal of Economic Development, Accounting, and Global Markets

Vol 1 No 2 May 2026, Hal 128-137

ISSN: 3125-117x (Print) ISSN: 3125-1181 (Electronic)

Open Access: <https://sovereignresearch.org/prosperia>

## Reestablishing Legal Certainty in Dispute Resolution for Digital Transactions Based on Influencer Marketing in Indonesia

Hilda Pebriani<sup>1\*</sup>, Muhamad Abdul Ghofur Subekhi<sup>2</sup>, Bunga Metha<sup>3</sup>, Naufal Farhan<sup>4</sup>, Regina Nur Fuadzah<sup>5</sup>, Muhamad Reja Zaelani<sup>6</sup>, Hilmansyah<sup>7</sup>, Nandang Najmudin<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1-8</sup> UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia

email: [hildapebriani49@gmail.com](mailto:hildapebriani49@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>

### Article Info :

Received:  
23-04-2026  
Revised:  
10-05-2026  
Accepted:  
15-05-2026

### Abstract

*This study examines the reconstruction of legal certainty in dispute resolution for digital transactions based on influencer marketing in Indonesia through a normative juridical approach. The research employs statutory and conceptual analyses to evaluate the adequacy, coherence, and normative consistency of legal instruments governing relationships among businesses, influencers, consumers, and digital platforms. Primary legal materials include the Indonesian Civil Code, Consumer Protection Law, Electronic Information and Transactions Law and its amendment, and Government Regulation concerning Electronic Systems and Transactions. The findings reveal that existing legal arrangements have not provided a sufficiently integrated framework for determining liability, resolving disputes, and ensuring accountability within influencer driven commercial activities. Normative ambiguity emerges from the complex interaction among contractual obligations, consumer protection principles, electronic transaction regulations, and platform governance responsibilities. The study further demonstrates that legal certainty depends on a clear allocation of rights and obligations among transactional actors supported by effective institutional mechanisms. A reconstruction model is proposed through regulatory harmonization, integrated online dispute resolution, strengthened consumer protection, explicit influencer liability provisions, and shared platform accountability. The proposed framework aims to improve dispute resolution effectiveness, enhance market trust, and support sustainable governance of Indonesia's digital economy.*

**Keywords :** Digital Transactions, Influencer Marketing, Legal Certainty, Online Dispute Resolution, Consumer Protection.



©2022 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

The rapid expansion of digital commerce has fundamentally transformed contemporary market structures by integrating social media platforms into commercial ecosystems where consumer decisions are increasingly shaped by personalized digital communication rather than conventional advertising channels. Within this transformation, influencer marketing has emerged as one of the most influential mechanisms connecting businesses, digital intermediaries, and consumers across jurisdictional boundaries, creating new forms of contractual and quasi contractual relationships that challenge traditional legal frameworks governing commercial transactions. The growing dependence of businesses on influencer driven promotional strategies has intensified concerns regarding legal certainty, accountability, and consumer protection, particularly when disputes arise from misleading endorsements, undisclosed sponsorship arrangements, inaccurate product representations, or failures in digital transaction performance. At the same time, broader developments in digital governance demonstrate that legal certainty has become a central prerequisite for economic resilience, regulatory legitimacy, and trust in digital markets, particularly in emerging economies navigating rapid technological transformation (Valencia & Oliviere, 2025). In Indonesia, the increasing complexity of digital transactions intersects with existing legal regimes embodied in the Civil Code (Indonesia, 1847), the Consumer Protection Act (Indonesia, 1999), the Electronic Information and Transactions Act (Indonesia, 2008), and Government Regulation Number 71 of 2019 concerning Electronic Systems and Transactions (Indonesia, 2019), yet the accelerating evolution of influencer based commercial activities raises fundamental questions regarding the adequacy of these instruments in delivering predictable and enforceable dispute resolution mechanisms.

Existing scholarship has extensively examined legal certainty within digital governance and consumer protection frameworks, producing important insights into the relationship between technological innovation and regulatory adaptation. Studies have emphasized that legal certainty functions not merely as a doctrinal principle but as an institutional mechanism that enhances public trust and transactional security within digitally mediated environments (Toyi & Hamidun, 2025). Research on Indonesian digital governance has further highlighted the necessity of adaptive regulatory institutions capable of addressing emerging technological risks, including data governance and platform accountability (Widiatedja & Mishra, 2023). Similar concerns are reflected in analyses of digital banking regulation, where legal modernization is viewed as essential for maintaining regulatory coherence amid technological disruption (Yuspin et al., 2023). Meanwhile, investigations into consumer protection within electronic marketplaces reveal that digital intermediaries increasingly exercise functions that extend beyond passive facilitation, creating expanded expectations regarding accountability for consumer losses and transactional harms (Tohadi et al., 2026). Complementing this perspective, studies examining marketplace responsibility in Indonesia demonstrate that effective consumer protection depends upon the clear allocation of legal obligations among interconnected actors operating within digital ecosystems (Ubay et al., 2026). Collectively, these contributions suggest that legal certainty in digital transactions requires an integrated understanding of accountability structures, institutional oversight, and dispute resolution mechanisms rather than reliance on isolated legal doctrines.

Despite these advances, the existing literature remains fragmented in its treatment of influencer marketing as a legally distinctive transactional phenomenon. Most studies focus either on platform liability, consumer protection, data governance, or electronic transactions without systematically examining how influencer generated representations alter traditional assumptions regarding contractual responsibility and legal accountability. The conceptual architecture underlying current scholarship frequently presumes a bilateral relationship between businesses and consumers or between platforms and users, whereas influencer marketing introduces a multidimensional legal relationship involving businesses, influencers, consumers, and digital platforms simultaneously. This complexity generates unresolved questions concerning the attribution of liability when misleading promotional content induces consumer loss, the evidentiary status of influencer communications within dispute resolution processes, and the extent to which existing consumer protection and electronic transaction regulations can accommodate these emerging forms of market interaction. The resulting literature exhibits significant conceptual inconsistency regarding the legal position of influencers, the boundaries of intermediary responsibility, and the procedural mechanisms capable of ensuring effective remedies in digitally mediated disputes (Tohadi et al., 2026; Ubay et al., 2026; Toyi & Hamidun, 2025).

The persistence of these unresolved issues creates substantial scientific and practical urgency. From a practical perspective, the absence of clear legal standards governing influencer marketing disputes increases regulatory uncertainty, weakens consumer confidence, and generates inconsistent outcomes in dispute resolution processes. Such uncertainty becomes particularly problematic in Indonesia's rapidly expanding digital economy where commercial transactions increasingly rely upon social media based promotional activities. From a scientific perspective, the inability of existing legal frameworks to clearly allocate responsibility among multiple actors exposes deeper theoretical tensions concerning the applicability of conventional private law principles to platform mediated and influence driven commercial relationships. Existing statutory instruments provide important normative foundations for consumer protection and electronic transactions, yet their fragmented application often leaves critical gaps regarding attribution of fault, evidentiary evaluation, and enforcement mechanisms in influencer related disputes (Indonesia, 1999; Indonesia, 2008; Indonesia, 2019). Concurrently, broader discussions on legal certainty in digital governance indicate that unresolved regulatory ambiguities may undermine the effectiveness of legal institutions in responding to technological innovation (Widiatedja & Mishra, 2023; Yuspin et al., 2023).

Against this background, the present study positions itself at the intersection of digital transaction law, consumer protection, and dispute resolution scholarship by focusing specifically on the reconstruction of legal certainty in disputes arising from influencer marketing activities in Indonesia. Unlike previous studies that predominantly examine marketplace liability, digital governance structures, or consumer protection in general digital commerce contexts, this research conceptualizes influencer marketing as a distinct legal configuration requiring a dedicated analytical framework

capable of addressing the interdependent responsibilities of businesses, influencers, consumers, and digital platforms. By situating influencer marketing within the broader discourse on legal certainty and digital accountability, the study seeks to bridge the existing gap between doctrinal legal analysis and the evolving realities of social media driven commercial practices. Such a perspective enables a more comprehensive understanding of how fragmented regulatory provisions interact in practice and where normative reconstruction becomes necessary to ensure coherence, predictability, and fairness in dispute resolution processes.

This study aims to analyze the legal uncertainty surrounding dispute resolution in digital transactions based on influencer marketing in Indonesia and to formulate a legal reconstruction model capable of strengthening accountability, consumer protection, and procedural effectiveness within the digital commercial environment. The research contributes theoretically by developing an integrated framework that reconceptualizes legal certainty within multiparty digital transactions characterized by influence based commercial communication. Methodologically, it contributes through a normative juridical approach that systematically synthesizes statutory interpretation and conceptual legal analysis to identify regulatory fragmentation and formulate a coherent reconstruction model for future dispute resolution governance. The findings are expected to enrich contemporary debates on digital market regulation while providing a foundation for more adaptive and responsive legal frameworks capable of addressing the continuing evolution of influencer driven commerce.

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

This study adopts a non empirical legal research design grounded in normative juridical inquiry to examine the reconstruction of legal certainty in dispute resolution for digital transactions based on influencer marketing in Indonesia. The research employs a statute approach and a conceptual approach to investigate the adequacy, coherence, and normative consistency of the existing legal framework governing digital commercial relationships involving businesses, influencers, consumers, and digital platforms. The primary legal materials consist of the Indonesian Civil Code (Indonesia, 1847), Law Number 8 of 1999 concerning Consumer Protection (Indonesia, 1999), Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions and its subsequent amendment under Law Number 1 of 2024 (Indonesia, 2008; Indonesia, 2024), and Government Regulation Number 71 of 2019 concerning Electronic Systems and Transactions (Indonesia, 2019). Secondary legal materials were selected through a purposive literature review emphasizing authoritative academic sources on digital commerce, cyber law, consumer protection, legal certainty, and regulatory governance in digital markets, including major scholarly contributions from Marzuki (2021), Soekanto and Mamudji (2022), Shidarta (2022), Makarim (2022), Fuady (2024), and the OECD Digital Economy Outlook (Organisation for Economic Co operation and Development, 2024). The literature selection process prioritized relevance to digital dispute resolution, conceptual rigor, contemporary regulatory developments, and theoretical contributions to legal certainty within emerging digital economies.

The analytical framework is based on normative legal analysis combined with systematic conceptual interpretation to evaluate the interaction between existing statutory provisions and the evolving characteristics of influencer based digital transactions. Legal materials were examined through textual interpretation, doctrinal analysis, and legal systematization to identify regulatory fragmentation, normative overlaps, and legal gaps affecting dispute resolution mechanisms in digital commerce. The analysis further employed a prescriptive approach that moved beyond descriptive examination by assessing the effectiveness of current legal norms in allocating responsibility, protecting consumers, and ensuring procedural certainty within complex digital transaction environments. Through comparative interpretation across interconnected legal instruments and relevant theoretical constructs, the study developed a reconstruction model aimed at strengthening legal certainty, enhancing accountability among transactional actors, and improving the institutional architecture of digital dispute resolution in Indonesia.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Regulatory Fragmentation and the Crisis of Legal Certainty in Influencer Based Digital Transactions**

The normative examination reveals that the rapid expansion of influencer marketing has generated legal relationships that extend beyond the traditional bilateral structure of commercial

transactions. Business actors, influencers, consumers, and digital platforms simultaneously participate in a single transactional ecosystem that creates overlapping legal interests. Existing legal norms were developed within conventional commercial settings and were not specifically designed to govern digitally mediated influence driven transactions. This mismatch has produced interpretative uncertainty regarding the allocation of rights and obligations among the parties involved (Fuady, 2024).

The concept of legal certainty requires legal norms to provide predictability, consistency, and enforceability within social and economic interactions. Digital transactions increasingly depend on these elements because commercial decisions are often executed instantaneously through technological infrastructures. Legal certainty functions as an institutional foundation that reduces transactional risks and strengthens market confidence in digital environments (Toyi & Hamidun, 2025). Contemporary digital economies demonstrate that regulatory coherence directly influences the sustainability of online commercial activities (Organisation for Economic Co operation and Development, 2024).

A doctrinal review of Indonesian legislation indicates that influencer marketing disputes are regulated indirectly through several separate legal instruments. Contractual dimensions are primarily governed by the Civil Code, while consumer rights are addressed through consumer protection legislation. Electronic evidence and digital transactions are regulated through information technology legislation and electronic system governance regulations. The coexistence of these frameworks creates regulatory intersections that frequently generate inconsistent legal interpretations (Makarim, 2022).

The challenge becomes more apparent when disputes involve misleading promotional statements disseminated through social media platforms. Influencers frequently influence purchasing decisions despite lacking formal status as product owners or direct sellers. Existing legislation does not explicitly determine whether influencers should be treated as advertisers, intermediaries, or independent commercial actors. Ambiguity concerning legal classification complicates the determination of liability when consumer losses occur (Shidarta, 2022).

The normative structure also reveals tension between freedom of contract and consumer protection objectives. Digital transactions are increasingly characterized by standardized agreements and platform generated contractual arrangements. Contemporary critiques of digital consent demonstrate that formal acceptance mechanisms do not always reflect meaningful contractual autonomy within digital markets (Mubarak, 2026). Such conditions become more problematic when promotional content influences consumer decisions before contractual engagement occurs.

**Table 1. Normative Mapping of Legal Instruments Relevant to Influencer Marketing Disputes in Indonesia**

Legal Instrument	Regulatory Focus	Relevance to Influencer Marketing	Identified Limitation
Civil Code 1847	Contractual obligations and liability	Governs cooperation agreements between businesses and influencers	Does not regulate digital promotional conduct
Consumer Protection Act 1999	Consumer rights and business obligations	Protects consumers harmed by misleading information	Does not explicitly define influencer liability
EIT Law 2008 and Amendment 2024	Electronic transactions and digital evidence	Regulates electronic communications and evidence	Limited guidance on promotional accountability
Government Regulation 71 of 2019	Electronic system governance	Governs digital transaction infrastructure	Focuses on systems rather than influencer conduct

Source: Constructed by the author based on Indonesia (1847), Indonesia (1999), Indonesia (2008), Indonesia (2019), and Indonesia (2024).

The legal mapping presented in Table 1 demonstrates that no single regulatory instrument provides comprehensive governance for influencer marketing disputes. Existing norms operate within

separate legal domains that address isolated aspects of digital transactions. Fragmentation generates interpretative gaps concerning accountability and procedural enforcement. Similar regulatory deficiencies have been identified in studies examining legal certainty across emerging digital sectors in Indonesia (Yuspin et al., 2023).

The absence of explicit legal positioning for influencers also affects the effectiveness of consumer protection mechanisms. Consumer harm frequently originates from representations communicated through social media rather than from direct contractual interactions with sellers. Research concerning online consumer protection consistently indicates that accountability mechanisms become less effective when multiple intermediaries participate in the transaction process (Baqi et al., 2026). Comparable challenges have also been identified in digital health device transactions where information asymmetry significantly affects consumer vulnerability (Sulaiman et al., 2024).

Institutional fragmentation further affects dispute resolution pathways available to injured consumers. Existing mechanisms require consumers to navigate multiple legal regimes depending on the nature of the dispute. Consumer dispute settlement institutions continue to face structural challenges in responding to increasingly sophisticated forms of digital commercial interaction (Kerti, 2023a). Similar observations have been reported regarding the institutional capacity of consumer dispute settlement bodies within globalized economic environments (Kerti, 2023b).

Comparative developments in digital governance suggest that regulatory certainty is strengthened when legal responsibilities are clearly distributed among all participants in digital ecosystems. Studies addressing marketplace accountability demonstrate that effective consumer protection depends upon precise delineation of legal duties rather than broad normative assumptions regarding responsibility (Tohadi et al., 2026). Related findings concerning marketplace liability indicate that fragmented obligations weaken enforcement effectiveness and reduce legal predictability for market participants (Ubay et al., 2026). The same structural weakness can be observed within influencer based commercial transactions.

The analytical findings indicate that the principal source of legal uncertainty does not arise from the complete absence of regulation but from the coexistence of disconnected regulatory frameworks that were developed for different legal contexts. This condition creates uncertainty regarding legal status, liability attribution, evidentiary standards, and institutional competence in dispute resolution. Normative coherence requires a legal reconstruction capable of integrating contractual principles, consumer protection norms, and digital governance standards within a unified framework. Such integration aligns with contemporary perspectives emphasizing that legal certainty constitutes a prerequisite for resilient and trustworthy digital markets (Valencia & Oliviere, 2025).

### **Allocation of Legal Responsibility Among Businesses, Influencers, Consumers, and Digital Platforms in Influencer Based Digital Transactions**

The expansion of influencer based digital transactions has transformed the traditional structure of commercial responsibility by introducing multiple actors whose legal positions intersect within a single transactional ecosystem. Normative analysis indicates that legal certainty depends not only on the existence of enforceable obligations but also on the clarity of responsibility allocation among participating actors. Consumer protection theory emphasizes that accountability mechanisms become effective when rights and obligations are distributed according to the functional role of each actor within the transaction chain (Shidarta, 2022). This perspective is particularly relevant in influencer marketing because commercial communication and purchasing decisions are mediated through digital interaction rather than direct seller consumer engagement.

Businesses occupy the primary legal position as providers of goods and services offered through digital promotion channels. Their responsibility extends beyond contractual performance because consumer expectations are frequently shaped by representations communicated through influencer generated content. The Consumer Protection Law establishes that business actors remain accountable for product quality, accuracy of information, and losses arising from misleading commercial practices (Indonesia, 1999). Similar observations appear in contemporary studies of digital consumer protection, which identify business entities as the principal bearers of commercial responsibility despite the increasing involvement of technological intermediaries (Baqi et al., 2026).

The legal position of influencers presents a more complex issue because they function simultaneously as independent content creators and commercial intermediaries. Their influence over

consumer behavior creates normative expectations concerning honesty, transparency, and responsible disclosure of promotional content. Digital commercial communication cannot be separated from accountability principles because consumer reliance often derives from perceived authenticity rather than formal advertising mechanisms (Fuady, 2024). The increasing commercial significance of influencers supports the argument that promotional activities generate legal consequences when inaccurate statements contribute to consumer harm (Santoso et al., 2024).

Contractual relationships between businesses and influencers further shape the allocation of legal responsibility in digital transactions. Cooperation agreements commonly specify promotional obligations, performance indicators, compensation arrangements, and risk allocation mechanisms. Legal doctrine recognizes that contractual commitments create enforceable duties whose violation may trigger claims based on breach of contract principles contained within the Indonesian Civil Code (Indonesia, 1847). Research concerning digital commercial agreements similarly demonstrates that contractual nonperformance remains a significant source of disputes in contemporary online business relationships (Anggoro et al., 2024).

The position of consumers requires particular attention because they frequently possess less information than commercial actors regarding the characteristics of promoted products. Information asymmetry becomes more pronounced when promotional content resembles personal recommendations rather than commercial advertising. Studies on online consumer protection consistently identify informational vulnerability as a central challenge affecting digital market fairness (Sulaiman et al., 2024). Legal certainty therefore requires a framework that enables consumers to identify responsible parties whenever economic losses emerge from misleading promotional practices.

**Table 2. Normative Allocation of Rights, Obligations, and Legal Responsibilities in Influencer Based Digital Transactions**

Actor	Legal Position	Main Obligations	Potential Liability	Regulatory Basis
Business	Product provider	Product accuracy and lawful commercial conduct	Consumer loss arising from defective or misleading products	Consumer Protection Law
Influencer	Promotional intermediary	Honest disclosure and accurate promotional communication	Misleading information and deceptive endorsements	ITE Law and Civil Code
Consumer	End user	Good faith participation in transactions	Limited liability under applicable legal principles	Consumer Protection Law
Platform	Digital intermediary	Monitoring systems and complaint handling mechanisms	Governance related liability in digital services	Government Regulation No. 71 of 2019

Source: Author's normative synthesis based on Indonesia (1999), Indonesia (2008), Indonesia (2019), Indonesia (2024), Shidarta (2022), Makarim (2022), and Fuady (2024).

Table 2 illustrates that legal responsibility within influencer based transactions cannot be concentrated exclusively on a single actor because each participant performs a distinct commercial function. The normative structure presented in the table demonstrates the interconnected nature of rights and obligations across the digital transaction ecosystem. Accountability theory suggests that effective governance emerges when legal duties correspond to the actual capacity of actors to influence transactional outcomes (Ubay et al., 2026). This allocation model provides a foundation for evaluating responsibility in complex digital disputes involving multiple contributors to consumer decision making.

Digital platforms represent another important component of responsibility allocation because they facilitate communication, transactions, and consumer engagement. Although platforms often characterize themselves as neutral intermediaries, their governance functions include content moderation, reporting systems, and algorithmic dissemination of promotional material. Cyber law scholarship increasingly recognizes that digital intermediaries exercise significant influence over commercial interactions occurring within their technological infrastructure (Makarim, 2022). Liability discussions therefore extend beyond traditional contractual relationships and incorporate questions concerning platform governance responsibilities.

The emergence of platform related accountability reflects broader developments in digital market regulation. Consumer losses may arise not only from defective products or misleading endorsements but also from inadequate monitoring mechanisms that permit harmful content to circulate without effective oversight. Legal analyses concerning marketplace responsibility indicate that intermediary entities cannot be entirely detached from consumer protection objectives when they derive economic benefits from digital transactions (Tohadi et al., 2026). Comparable arguments appear in studies emphasizing the necessity of stronger institutional safeguards for consumers operating within technology driven markets (Libert et al., 2026).

Another source of uncertainty concerns the interaction between contractual and noncontractual liability. Consumers rarely enter direct contractual agreements with influencers despite relying on influencer statements when making purchasing decisions. This separation creates difficulties in determining whether liability should arise from contractual obligations, tort based principles, consumer protection norms, or electronic transaction regulations. Critical examinations of digital consent and contractual autonomy demonstrate that conventional legal doctrines often encounter interpretive challenges when applied to digitally mediated relationships (Mubarak, 2026).

Normative evaluation indicates that legal certainty in influencer based digital transactions depends on a coherent allocation of responsibility among businesses, influencers, consumers, and platforms according to their respective capacities and roles. A responsibility model centered exclusively on one actor fails to capture the multidimensional character of contemporary digital commerce and weakens the effectiveness of dispute resolution mechanisms. Consumer protection scholarship emphasizes that accountability becomes meaningful when legal obligations reflect actual participation in the creation, dissemination, and commercialization of digital information (Shidarta, 2022). This analysis supports the need for a more precise framework of liability allocation as a prerequisite for strengthening legal certainty within Indonesia's evolving digital economy.

### **Reconstructing a Legal Certainty Model for Digital Dispute Resolution in Influencer Driven Commerce**

The normative analysis demonstrates that legal certainty in influencer driven digital commerce cannot be achieved solely through the expansion of substantive obligations. Legal certainty requires an integrated institutional model that connects regulatory standards, enforcement mechanisms, and accessible dispute resolution procedures within a coherent governance structure. Contemporary scholarship emphasizes that legal certainty in digital environments depends on predictability, accountability, and institutional coordination rather than isolated statutory interventions (Toyi & Hamidun, 2025). The reconstruction proposed in this study therefore prioritizes systemic integration as the principal foundation for sustainable digital market governance.

A central finding of the analysis concerns the necessity of harmonizing consumer protection principles with cyber law regulation. Existing legal instruments already recognize elements of consumer rights and electronic transaction governance, yet they operate through different regulatory logics that are not sufficiently synchronized (Indonesia, 1999; Indonesia, 2008; Indonesia, 2024). The OECD identifies regulatory convergence as a critical requirement for managing increasingly complex digital economic relationships (Organisation for Economic Co operation and Development, 2024). Normative harmonization is consequently required to ensure that dispute resolution standards remain consistent across different categories of digital transactions.

The proposed reconstruction model places legal certainty within a governance framework that integrates preventive and corrective regulatory functions. Preventive functions focus on transparency standards, digital disclosure obligations, and procedural accountability mechanisms. Corrective functions address dispute resolution processes, remedial measures, and enforcement pathways after

legal violations occur. Similar governance approaches have been recommended in broader digital regulatory reforms where institutional certainty is viewed as an essential element of market stability (Yuspin et al., 2023).

The analysis further indicates that dispute resolution mechanisms should be redesigned through institutional integration rather than procedural expansion alone. Existing legal remedies often require affected parties to navigate multiple forums with differing procedural standards. Such conditions may reduce accessibility and increase uncertainty regarding the enforceability of legal outcomes (Melawati, 2025). A unified dispute resolution architecture would strengthen procedural predictability while reducing transaction costs associated with legal enforcement.

The reconstruction model also incorporates a stronger accountability framework that links regulatory compliance to dispute resolution outcomes. Accountability functions as a mechanism that transforms legal obligations into enforceable standards capable of producing measurable legal consequences. Studies on digital governance reforms demonstrate that accountability structures are essential for maintaining public trust within technologically mediated economic systems (Annan, 2025). Effective legal certainty therefore depends on the capacity of institutions to connect responsibility allocation with dispute resolution effectiveness.

**Table 3. Proposed Reconstruction Model for Legal Certainty in Influencer Marketing Dispute Resolution**

Regulatory Component	Existing Condition	Identified Gap	Proposed Reconstruction
Influencer liability	Partial regulation	Ambiguous responsibility	Explicit liability provisions
Consumer protection	Reactive mechanism	Weak digital enforcement	Digital consumer protection framework
Platform governance	Limited obligation	Unclear accountability	Shared responsibility model
Dispute resolution	Fragmented forums	Procedural uncertainty	Integrated online dispute resolution
Regulatory coordination	Sectoral approach	Institutional overlap	Harmonized governance framework

Source: Developed by the author based on normative analysis of Indonesia (1847), Indonesia (1999), Indonesia (2008), Indonesia (2019), Indonesia (2024), Organisation for Economic Co operation and Development (2024), and relevant literature.

The reconstruction model presented in Table 3 illustrates that legal certainty requires simultaneous reform across multiple regulatory dimensions. The proposed framework does not focus on isolated amendments to individual legal provisions. Instead, it emphasizes institutional coherence between substantive norms, enforcement structures, and dispute resolution mechanisms. Comparative legal development literature consistently associates governance coherence with higher levels of legal predictability and regulatory effectiveness (Valencia & Oliviere, 2025).

An integrated online dispute resolution mechanism constitutes a core component of the proposed model. Digital transactions generate disputes that frequently involve geographically dispersed actors operating through electronic systems. Conventional litigation procedures may not adequately address the speed and complexity of such interactions (Melawati, 2025). The adoption of a centralized online dispute resolution framework would improve procedural accessibility while supporting more efficient dispute management.

Institutional architecture also requires the establishment of stronger coordination mechanisms among regulatory bodies responsible for consumer protection, electronic transactions, and digital governance. Research concerning data governance reform in Indonesia highlights the importance of independent and coordinated institutional oversight in addressing complex digital challenges (Widiatedja & Mishra, 2023). Similar considerations apply to influencer based digital commerce where multiple authorities exercise overlapping regulatory functions. Greater institutional interoperability would strengthen consistency in legal interpretation and enforcement practices.

The proposed reconstruction further incorporates comparative governance principles derived from broader regulatory reform experiences. Regulatory modernization in banking, investment supervision, and financial governance demonstrates that legal certainty emerges when institutions adopt integrated oversight models supported by clear accountability standards (Napitupulu et al., 2025; Sugianto & Tokuyama, 2025). Comparable patterns can be observed in studies examining governance harmonization and institutional legitimacy within other sectors of Indonesian law (Amiruddin et al., 2026; Hasbullah et al., 2026). These comparative lessons support the argument that dispute resolution reform should be embedded within a wider governance transformation strategy.

The final reconstruction envisions a legal certainty model grounded in harmonized regulation, integrated dispute resolution, and accountable digital governance institutions. Normative consistency must be accompanied by procedural accessibility and effective institutional coordination to ensure meaningful legal protection in digital markets. Similar approaches have been associated with enhanced legal resilience across areas involving technology, intellectual property, ethical governance, and consumer protection (Ghina & Syukri, 2024; Hidayat et al., 2026; Khasanah et al., 2026). The proposed model therefore offers a prescriptive framework capable of strengthening dispute resolution effectiveness and reinforcing legal certainty within Indonesia's evolving influencer driven digital economy.

## CONCLUSION

The study demonstrates that legal certainty in influencer based digital transactions in Indonesia remains challenged by the inability of existing legal instruments to provide a coherent framework for resolving disputes arising from increasingly complex digital commercial relationships. Normative analysis indicates that uncertainty is manifested through fragmented legal interpretation, unclear allocation of responsibility among businesses, influencers, consumers, and digital platforms, and the absence of an integrated institutional mechanism capable of addressing disputes in a timely and predictable manner. The findings further establish that legal certainty cannot be achieved solely through the existence of statutory regulations but requires substantive coherence between consumer protection principles, electronic transaction governance, contractual accountability, and digital platform oversight. Reconstruction of the legal framework should therefore prioritize harmonized regulatory governance, explicit liability provisions for influencer driven transactions, strengthened digital consumer protection mechanisms, and the institutionalization of integrated online dispute resolution. Such a model provides a more predictable and accountable dispute resolution architecture capable of enhancing public trust, supporting digital market stability, and promoting sustainable development of Indonesia's digital economy.

## REFERENCES

- Amiruddin, M. M., Hidayati, U., Rasyid, N. F., & Faradiba, B. (2026). Re-evaluating Islamic Banking Fatwas in Indonesia: Governance, Legal Certainty, and Global Harmonization in Contemporary Sharia Finance. *Parewa Saraq: Journal of Islamic Law and Fatwa Review*, 5(1), 63-84.
- Anggoro, F., Saputra, R., Wibowo, A. S., Putra, A. R., & Wijaya, K. (2024). Consequences of Default in Commercial Marketplace-Based Digital Business Space Leases. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 4(1), 483-498.
- Annan, A. (2025). Legal Analysis: Developing Artificial Intelligence with Financial Data in Indonesia. *Journal of Financial Sector Law & Policy*, 1(2), 148-175.
- Baqi, A., Pratama, R. A., Saskia, D., & Sukmana, G. (2026). Legal Protection for Consumers in Online Sales and Purchase Agreements from the Perspective of Commercial Law. *ISNU Nine-Star Multidisciplinary Journal*, 3(1), 45-53.
- Fuady, M. (2024). *Hukum bisnis dalam era digital*. Citra Aditya Bakti.
- Ghina, G. R. J., & Syukri, K. S. (2024). Application of Islamic Law in Economic Dispute Resolution in the Digital Era. *Alhamdulillah: Jurnal Agama Islam*, 3(01), 7-12.
- Hasbullah, H., Adolf, H., & Suseno, S. (2026). State Loss Settlement Policies in the Bank Indonesia Liquidity Assistance Case. *Journal of Human Rights, Culture and Legal System*, 6(1), 1-30.
- Hidayat, A. A., Anwari, A. N., Zulvia, R. A., & Kholid, M. (2026). Negotiating Haqq al-Ibtikar and State Patent Law: A Socio-Legal Study of Maslahah and Intellectual Property among Indonesian Muslim SMEs. *DIKTUM: Jurnal Syariah dan Hukum*, 24(2), 138-167.

- Indonesia. (1847). *Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Perdata (KUHPerdata)*.
- Indonesia. (1999). *Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 1999 tentang Perlindungan Konsumen*.
- Indonesia. (2008). *Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik*.
- Indonesia. (2019). *Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 71 Tahun 2019 tentang Penyelenggaraan Sistem dan Transaksi Elektronik*.
- Indonesia. (2024). *Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2024 tentang Perubahan Kedua atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik*.
- Kerti, N. R. M. (2023). Consumer protection institutions strengthening in the digitalization era. *Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary Science*, 3(1), 55-63.
- Kerti, N. R. M. (2023). The existence and challenges of consumer dispute settlement agency in Indonesia in globalization era. *Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary Science*, 3(3), 233-238.
- Khasanah, K., Yaqin, A., & Rukmini, N. V. N. (2026). Digital Halal Assurance: A Comparison of Consumer Protection in Indonesia and Malaysia. *Al-Mustashfa: Jurnal Penelitian Hukum Ekonomi Syariah*, 11(1), 35-53.
- Libert, A. S. Y., Widyanti, Y. E., & Herlindah, H. (2026). Consumer Protection Challenges in In-House Installment Agreements within The Real Estate Sector. *IBLAM LAW REVIEW*, 6(2), 124-42.
- Makarim, E. (2022). *Hukum siber Indonesia*. Rajawali Pers.
- Marzuki, P. M. (2021). *Penelitian hukum*. Kencana.
- Melawati, N. (2025). Online dispute resolution in Indonesian e-commerce: Arbitration law and shariah consumer protection. *Al'Adalah*, 28(2), 187-204.
- Mubarak, A. (2026). A Critique of Digital Consent and Freedom of Contract in Clickwrap Agreements. *Nusantara: Journal of Law and Islamic Law*, 2(1), 51-65.
- Napitupulu, J. H., Panggabean, M. L., Panjaitan, H., & Widiarty, W. S. (2025). An Integrated Legal Framework for Digital Investment Fraud Prevention in Indonesia. *Journal of Sustainable Development and Regulatory Issues (JSDERI)*, 3(3), 540-567.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). *OECD digital economy outlook 2024*. OECD Publishing.
- Santoso, S., Waksito, S., Wijaya, K., Pakpahan, N. H., & Dirgantara, F. (2024). Legal Construction of Breach of Contract Indicating Fraud in Business Cooperation Agreements. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 4(2), 319-332.
- Shidarta. (2022). *Hukum perlindungan konsumen Indonesia*. Grasindo.
- Soekanto, S., & Mamudji, S. (2022). *Penelitian hukum normatif*. Rajawali Pers.
- Sugianto, F., & Tokuyama, S. (2025). Beyond Administrative Sanctions: Reforming Insider Trading Regulation to Strengthen Investor Protection in Indonesia. *Jurnal Media Hukum*, 32(2), 210-228.
- Sulaiman, L. Y., Khayru, R. K., & Darmawan, D. (2024). Legal Protection for Consumers in the Online Purchase of Personal Health Devices. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 4(2), 223-236.
- Tjahjadi, B. G., & Teeja, N. W. (2025). Beyond Conventional Insider Trading: Indonesia's Shadow Trading Dilemma. *Anthology: Inside Intellectual Property Rights*, 138-158.
- Tohadi, T., Sianturi, G., Betani, C., Astari, P. D. A., Palka, A. J., & Pahlevi, M. R. (2026). Liability of online marketplaces for consumer losses in online transactions as reviewed under law number 8 of 1999 on consumer protection. *Priviet Social Sciences Journal*, 6(2), 402-412.
- Toyi, A. R., & Hamidun, E. Z. P. (2025). Establishing Legal Certainty in the Digital Era: Challenges and Solutions. *Estudiante Law Journal*, 7(2), 444-460.
- Ubay, I. S. N., Saputra, R., Harmono, H., & Umar, J. (2026). Legal Responsibility of Marketplaces in Online Buying and Selling Transactions in Indonesia: An Analysis of the Effectiveness of Digital Consumer Protection. *Jurnal Legisci*, 3(4), 340-368.
- Valencia, J., & Oliviere, S. (2025). The Impact of Global Economic Wars on Emerging Markets: Legal Certainty and Capital Market Resilience in Indonesia. *Anthology: Inside Intellectual Property Rights*, 159-176.
- Widiatedja, I. G. N. P., & Mishra, N. (2023). Establishing an independent data protection authority in Indonesia: a future-forward perspective. *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology*, 37(3), 252-273.
- Yuspin, W., Sukirman, A. N., Budiono, A., Pitaksantayothin, J., & Fauzie, A. (2023). Legal reconstruction of Indonesian banking laws: challenges and opportunities for digital bank regulation. *Varia Justicia*, 19(1), 52-69.