

The Dual Impact of Digital Technology on Adolescents' Legal Awareness: Opportunities, Risks, and Educational Implications

Crystal Yao

Guangdong Overseas Chinese High School, Guangzhou 510000, China

Abstract: Digital technology has been deeply integrated into adolescents' daily life, providing them with new channels for legal socialization but also exposing them to new legal risks at the same time. In this article, we conduct a systematic review of interdisciplinary literature to examine the twofold effect of digital technology on adolescents' legal awareness, including legal knowledge, rights consciousness, obligation consciousness, compliance dispositions and legal trust/procedural justice. The conclusion from this review is that digital tools offer potential to expand legal knowledge, enable participatory legal learning and enhance rights consciousness using online civic discussion. Algorithmic curation, cyberbullying, privacy violations, exposure to online crime, digital inequality and divided attention might work in a direction to undermine trust in the law, normalize deviant behavior and promote unequal legal socialization. These effects are mediated by developmental stage, family and school mediation, platform design, and digital literacy. The article positions digital technology as not inherently good or bad, and its legal socialization outcomes are conditioned by the uses and the surrounding institutional environment. It rounds out with stakeholder-specific implications for education, platforms, policy, and parents.

Keywords: digital technology; adolescents; legal awareness; legal socialization; digital citizenship; digital risks

1. Introduction

In just two decades, digital technology has moved from the periphery to the center of adolescents' lives. Smartphones, social media, short-video services, online games, and algorithmically personalized content now constitute a large part of young people's information environment and social life [1–3]. At the same time, legal awareness—the combination of knowledge, attitudes, and dispositions through which people understand, judge, and act with regard to law—has emerged as an increasingly salient educational and policy issue. Legal awareness is not only the knowledge of law: it consists of rights consciousness, obligation consciousness, compliance dispositions and trust in legal institutions and procedural justice [4–6]. The formation of the legal awareness of adolescents is at the core of the process of legal socialization through which youth acquire their beliefs about law, authority and citizenship [4,6].

The digital environment provides a new and uncertain context for this process. On the one hand, digital technology gives us access to legal information, interactive civic education, and public debate on rights and justice as never before. On the other, it exposes adolescents to cyberbullying, privacy violations, algorithmically amplified extreme content, and inequitable opportunities to participate meaningfully [7–9]. Existing research is

either optimism about the educational possibilities of digital tools or caution about their dangers in isolation. An integrated and critical consideration of the twofold impact of digital technology on adolescents' legal awareness is painfully needed.

This article follows a systematic literature review method to provide a synthesis of interdisciplinary evidences from education, media studies, law, psychology and youth studies to answer the following questions: (a) How does digital technology influence the cognitive, attitudinal and behaviour aspects of adolescents' legal awareness? (b) What are the mechanisms leading to positive and negative effects? (c) Under which conditions does digital technology facilitate, rather than hamper legal socialization? The article begins with the conceptual framework followed by positive and negative influences, followed by the moderating factors and ends with educational and policy implications.

2. Methodology

A systematic literature review was conducted following the main stages of identification, screening and eligibility, and thematic synthesis. Searches were performed in Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, Google Scholar, and SSRN combining the following search terms: “digital technology”, “adolescents”, “legal awareness”, “legal socialization”, “digital citizenship”, “online legal education”, “cyberbullying”, “algorithmic harm”, and “digital inequality”. We included peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, and policy reports published in English between 2000 and 2024. Studies were included when they examined the relationship between digital media/technology and at least one aspect of adolescents' legal awareness or legal socialization. Purely technical studies lacking any legal, educational, or developmental component were excluded.

The original search returned 1246 records. Duplicates were removed, and titles and abstracts screened, leaving 214 full-text documents which were reviewed. In total, 87 sources were included for the final thematic synthesis. The analysis was deductive-inductive: the themes were pre-determined by the research questions, but the subthemes were generated from the literature. Table 1 contains a summary of the conceptual dimensions which were used to structure the findings.

Table 1. Dimensions of adolescents' legal awareness in digital environments.

Dimension	Definition	Digital Examples
Legal knowledge	Understanding of laws, rights, legal processes	Online law teaching, short video legal explainers, virtual court simulations.
Rights consciousness	Being aware of entitlements and being able to claim rights.	Social media campaign, digital civic discussion, exposure to rights talk, etc.
Obligation consciousness	Recognition of duties towards other people and the community.	Digital citizenship curricula, platform community rules, et cetera.
Compliance dispositions	Willingness of obeying the law and to reject illegal behaviour.	Note: norm enforcement, peer discussion of cyberbullying cases are being observed online as well.
Legal trust/procedural justice	Belief that legal institutions are fair and legitimate	Online court transparency, news reporting of law cases, digital complaints systems.

3. Conceptual Framework: Legal Awareness and Digital Socialization

Legal awareness is acquired through legal socialization which is affected by the family, school, peers, media and institutional experiences. Tyler and Trinkner [6] suggest that adolescents' legal orientations are developed less through formal instruction than perceptions of procedural justice in everyday life. In the digital environment these interactions are increasingly mediated by platforms, algorithm and peer-networks [3, 7] and digital citizenship frameworks also emphasise that young people need to learn how to navigate rights and responsibilities on-line [1,10].

Thus the digital environment is more than a neutral channel for legal information. It is a new socialization field, where adolescents witness norm violations, experience rights claims, institutional responses and form

beliefs regarding fairness and authority [11, 12]. This framework allows the subsequent analysis to isolate between different types of digital technology—legal education platforms, social media, algorithmically-curated feeds, and online games—and different aspects of legal awareness.

4. Positive Influences of Digital Technology on Adolescents' Legal Awareness

4.1. Expanded Access to Legal Knowledge

Digital platforms have dramatically reduced the cost of legal information access. Short-video legal explainers, online legal clinics, government legal education websites, and youth-oriented apps offer accessible introductions to rights, responsibilities, and procedures [12, 13]. The latter can fill crucial gaps for adolescents not receiving a systematic legal education at school. They also enable repeated at one's own pace learning and can take the form of engaging presentations of the legal content.

But access does not necessarily mean understanding. The quality and reliability of online legal information is very diverse and algorithmically promoted content may privilege sensational cases over balanced legal explanation [7, 14]. Hence, whether or not the access provides benefits relies on young people's source evaluation skills and their ability to piece together disparate information into coherent legal knowledge.

4.2. Participatory and Experiential Learning

Digital technology can facilitate active, rather than passive, forms of legal learning. Through online simulations, digital role-play and virtual courts, adolescents can practice legal reasoning in realistic settings [13, 15]. More participatory digital projects can engage students in developing rules for online communities, critiquing platform policies or designing digital rights campaigns. Digital civic engagement projects have also been associated with more favorable knowledge of rights and duties [16]. Such projects potentially could increase obligation consciousness and compliance dispositions, by increasing the salience to the self of legal norms [1, 10].

4.3. Enhanced Rights Consciousness and Civic Discussion

Social media and online discussion space also give adolescents a peek into public debates on rights, equality and justice. Movements advocating for anti-discrimination, privacy, freedom of expression often find footholds among the young users [17-19]. Although sometimes illegally formal, these discussions can be rights consciousness-raising and provide impetus for adolescents to gain knowledge about their legal protections. Online civic participation—for example through signing petitions, disseminating legal information, or participating in public consultations—can also help to solidify the relationship between rights and democratic participation [18, 19].

4.4. Potential Improvement in Legal Trust through Transparency

Digital access to court proceedings, official legal information and public accountability mechanisms may, under certain conditions, enhance perceptions of legal transparency and procedural justice [6, 20]. If young people can see that institutions react to wrongdoing fairly and consistently, they may gain more trust in the legal authority. But this potential is not absolute: trust may be enhanced only when digital experiences are perceived to be fair, respectful and responsive.

Table 2 summarizes the positive mechanisms alongside the corresponding digital technology types and legal awareness dimensions.

Table 2. Positive mechanisms of digital technology on adolescents' legal awareness.

Mechanism	Technology Type	Legal Awareness Dimension
Increased access to legal knowledge	Short-video explainers, legal websites, apps	Legal knowledge
Participatory legal learning	Virtual courts, simulations, digital projects	Obligation consciousness, compliance dispositions
Rights-oriented civic discussion	Social media, online campaigns	Rights consciousness
Observing institutional transparency	Online court information, official accounts	Legal trust/procedural justice

5. Negative Influences of Digital Technology on Adolescents' Legal Awareness

5.1. Algorithmic Curation, Filter Bubbles, and Extreme Content

Algorithm recommended content is forcing the need of engagement and at times that means pushing emotional, fake news, or illegal content [7, 21]. For teens specifically, this means they can potentially get exposed to conspiracy theories, hate speeches, or criminal activities as if they were facts without context or critical thinking about the information. This can skew law knowledge and normalize atypical perceptions of rights and duties. Instead of delivering balanced understanding, algorithmically-curated feeds may lead to filter bubbles where readers are repeatedly exposed to one-sided or radical perspectives on the law [7].

5.2. Cyberbullying, Doxxing, and Privacy Violations

Digital environments afford new mediums for interpersonal harm, such as cyberbullying, doxxing, and non-consensual image sharing [8,9,22]. If adolescents are victims of or witnesses to such behavior and they feel that their institution or the law do little to address it, they may come to feel that the law and its rules are weak and irrelevant. Victimization reports less legal trust and more cynicism of authority [20]. Even bystanders might pick up norms that online aggression is okay, which undermines obligation consciousness and compliance dispositions.

5.3. Exposure to Online Crime and Imitation

Adolescents are growingly exposed online to fraud, hacking tools and recruitment by peers into illegal activities [23,24]. The online disinhibition effect may lower psychological inhibitions that otherwise keep in check illegal behaviour [24]. Exposure to online criminal communities or grey-zone semi-legal areas could lead young people to believe that illegal behaviour is common, has low risks, or may even be rewarding. All this contributes to weaken compliance dispositions and distort perceptions of the legitimacy of the legal rules.

5.4. Digital Inequality and Unequal Legal Socialization

The advantages of digital legal education are inequitably concentrated. adolescents from higher-income families with digitally literate parents are more likely to find high-quality legal information and get advice on how to understand it [2, 25, 26]. Those from more disadvantaged backgrounds may have less access to safe digital spaces, adult mediation and may be exposed to more risky content. Digital inequality thus becomes legal socialization inequality: some young people acquire rights empowering resources while others are exposed mainly to risks and fragmented information.

5.5. Attention Fragmentation and Shallow Legal Reasoning

The architecture of many digital spaces incentivizes fast scrolling, quick engagement, and emotional response instead of slow deliberation [14, 27]. Legal concepts get distilled into Soundbite aphorisms or decontextualized clips. This may diminish adolescents' ability to do complex legal and moral reasoning that involves attention, perspective-taking, and toleration of ambiguity. As a result, legal awareness will be shallow—good on slogan-level rights claims but poor on duties and procedures and competing interests.

6. Moderating Factors and Mechanisms

Not all digital technology effects on legal awareness are the same. The literature reveals a few moderators.

6.1. Developmental Stage

Early, mid and late adolescence differ in their cognitive ability, susceptibility to peer influence and moral reasoning [6, 9]. The younger is more vulnerable to disinformation, online disinhibition and emotional manipulation; the older, potentially more able to analyse critically but also more exposed to politically polarised or legally complex content.

6.2. Family and School Mediation

Parental mediation and school-based law and digital citizenship education programs have a significant influence on how adolescents engage with online law content [1,13,27]. Active mediation—discussing online law issues, co-viewing law videos and encouraging critical questions—can enhance positive effects. Restrictive mediation alone may limit opportunities for learning while not developing the skills for safe use.

6.3. Platform Design and Algorithmic Governance

The design of digital platforms define what content appears, how disputes are resolved, and whether users can report harm. Transparent algorithms, rigorous content moderation, good age-appropriate design, and accessible complaint mechanisms may mitigate harm [7, 21]. On the other hand, engagement-maximizing designs can increase risk.

6.4. Individual Digital Literacy

Adolescents with higher digital literacy can critically evaluate legal information, recognize misinformation, protect privacy and engage in productive online discussions [10, 27]. Digital literacy, thus, is an important protective factor that can turn digital exposure into valuable legal learning.

Table 3 integrates the moderating factors and their implications.

Table 3. Moderating factors and intervention implications.

Moderating Factor	Influence on Legal Awareness	Intervention Implication
Developmental stage	Shapes cognitive and moral interpretation of digital content of law.	Age-appropriate curriculum and platform design
Family and school mediation	Can support critical reflection or reinforce risk	1.1. Parents' digital literacy; training for teachers; open communication.
Platform design and governance	Determines content visibility and norm enforcement	Clear Algorithms; Age verification; Reporting mechanisms.
Individual digital literacy	Helps to increase critical evaluation and participate safely.	Teach digital citizenship at school. Forcibly.

7. Conclusions and Implications

This review shows that the digital technology has a two-fold impact on adolescents' legal awareness. On the one hand, it can expand legal knowledge, enrich interactive legal learning, boost consciousness of rights and—under fair and transparent circumstances—improve legal trust. Simultaneously, it can also distort legal knowledge through algorithmic curation, normalize online harm, expose adolescents to crime, and exacerbate unequal legal socialization. Its net effect is not determined by technology per se, but by how digital tools are designed, deployed, mediated, and governed.

The results allow no other than a conditional conclusion. Digital technology is neither a panacea for legal education nor an unavoidable danger for legal socialization. It is a battle ground of social forces whose outcome can be directed by intentional educational, technological and legal measures.

For governments and schools, the most important first step is to bring digital citizenship and online legal education into compulsory education. This is more than just information provision but involves critical assessment of sources, discussing ethically online harms, and practical work on rights conflict resolution. For platform providers, the review favors design that is better age-related, transparency behind algorithmic recommendation, clear community standards, and open and accessible reporting and remedy mechanisms. For policy makers, it indicates coherent regulation of algorithmic harms, protection of adolescent data, and digital literacy investment in schools and families. For parents, mediation and open discussion about online legal issues are more potent than restriction.

Future studies along the lines of longitudinal designs on how digital experiences affect legal socialization over the life course, and comparative designs observing how platform regulation and digital literacy education are implemented in different jurisdictions should be undertaken.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- 1 Ribble M. *Digital Citizenship in Schools*, 3rd ed.; ISTE: Eugene, OR, USA, 2015.
- 2 Livingstone S, Helsper E. Gradations in Digital Inclusion: Children, Young People and the Digital Divide. *New Media & Society* 2007; **9**(4): 671–696.
- 3 Boyd D. *It's Complicated: The Social Lives of Networked Teens*; Yale University Press: New Haven, CT, USA, 2014.
- 4 Fagan J, Tyler TR. Legal Socialization of Children and Adolescents. *Social Justice Research* 2005; **18**(3): 217–241.
- 5 Tapp JL, Levine FJ. Legal Socialization: Strategies for an Ethical Legality. *Stanford Law Review* 1974; **27**(1): 1–72.
- 6 Tyler TR, Trinkner R. *Why Children Follow Rules: Legal Socialization and the Development of Legitimacy*; Oxford University Press: New York, NY, USA, 2017.
- 7 Pariser E. *The Filter Bubble*; Penguin: New York, NY, USA, 2011.
- 8 Hinduja S, Patchin JW. *Bullying beyond the Schoolyard: Preventing and Responding to Cyberbullying*, 2nd ed.; Corwin: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 2015.
- 9 Livingstone S, Smith PK. Annual Research Review: Harms Experienced by Child Users of Online and Mobile Technologies. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 2014; **55**(6): 635–654.
- 10 Mossberger K, Tolbert CJ, McNeal RS. *Digital Citizenship: The Internet, Society, and Participation*; MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 2008.
- 11 OECD. *Educating 21st Century Children: Emotional Well-Being in the Digital Age*; OECD Publishing: Paris, France, 2019.
- 12 UNICEF. *Children in a Digital World*; UNICEF: New York, NY, USA, 2017.
- 13 European Commission. *Digital Education Action Plan 2021–2027*; European Commission: Brussels, 2020.
- 14 Selwyn N. *Education and Technology: Key Issues and Debates*, 2nd ed; Bloomsbury: London, UK, 2016.
- 15 Jenkins H, Clinton K, Purushotma R, et al. *Confronting the Challenges of Participatory Culture*; MacArthur Foundation: Chicago, IL, USA, 2006.
- 16 Cho A. *Digital Civic Engagement by Young People*; UNICEF Office of Global Insight and Policy: New York, NY, USA, 2020.
- 17 Kahne J, Bowyer B. *Educating for Democracy in a Partisan Age: Confronting the Challenges of Motivated*

- Reasoning and Misinformation. *American Educational Research Journal* 2017; **54**(1): 3–34.
- 18 Bennett WL, Segerberg A. *The Logic of Connective Action*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 2013.
- 19 Vromen A, Xenos MA, Loader B. Young People, Social Media and Connective Action: From Organisational Maintenance to Everyday Political Talk. *Journal of Youth Studies* 2015; **18**(1): 80–100.
- 20 Trinkner R, Cohn ES. Putting the “Social” Back in Legal Socialization: Procedural Justice, Legitimacy, and Cynicism in Legal and Nonlegal Authorities. *Law and Human Behavior* 2014; **38**(6): 602–617.
- 21 Zuboff S. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*; PublicAffairs: New York, NY, USA, 2019.
- 22 Nocentini A, Calmaestra J, Schultze-Krumbloz A, et al. Cyberbullying: Labels, Behaviours and Definition in Three European Countries. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling* 2010; **20**(2): 129–142.
- 23 Wachs S, Wright MF. Associations between Bystanders and Perpetrators of Online Hate: The Moderating Role of Toxic Online Disinhibition. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2018; **15**(9): 2030.
- 24 Suler J. The Online Disinhibition Effect. *CyberPsychology & Behavior* 2004; **7**(3): 321–326.
- 25 Mossberger K, Tolbert CJ, Hamilton A. Broadband Adoption and Digital Citizenship in the United States. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* 2012; **9**(4): 352–369.
- 26 van Deursen AJ, van Dijk JA. The Digital Divide Shifts to Differences in Usage. *New Media & Society* 2014; **16**(3): 507–526.
- 27 Buckingham D. *The Media Literacy of Children and Young People*; Ofcom: London, UK, 2005.

