Rajendra Pratap Singh
Doctoral Research Scholar
Department of Sociology
Banaras Hindu University
Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, India

Digital Divide as Cultural Exclusion: A Sociological Study of Marginalized Communities

Rajendra Pratap Singh

DOI: https://www.doi.org/10.33545/26648679.2025.v7.i2g.240

Abstract

Digital expansion is often celebrated as a neutral and inclusive force capable of reducing long-standing social inequalities. Yet lived social realities suggest a more uneven story. This paper examines the digital divide not simply as a problem of access to devices or internet connectivity but as a deeper process of cultural exclusion that mirrors and reproduces existing structures of power. Drawing on sociological theory and secondary sources the study argues that digital inequality operates through language, symbolic competence, confidence and everyday cultural familiarity with digital spaces. For many marginalized communities digital platforms remain unfamiliar, intimidating, socially coded in ways that privilege middle-class and dominant cultural norms. As a result exclusion persists even where formal access exists. Using a conceptual framework informed by Pierre Bourdieu's ideas of cultural capital and habitus along with insights from power and governance perspectives, the paper demonstrates how digital systems subtly discipline users while rewarding those already socially advantaged. The analysis highlights how caste, class, gender and educational background shape patterns of digital participation affecting access to online education, e-governance, welfare services and public expression. Rather than enabling equal citizenship, digitalization often deepens feelings of dependency, invisibility and loss of agency among marginalized groups. The paper concludes that bridging the digital divide requires more than technological solutions. Without attention to cultural inclusion, language diversity, socially grounded digital literacy digital growth risks becoming another mechanism of exclusion. A sociological approach is therefore essential for reimagining digital citizenship as genuinely inclusive rather than formally universal.

Keywords: Digital divide, Cultural exclusion, Marginalized communities, Digital citizenship, Social inequality, Cultural capital, Digital governance

Introduction

Digitalization has rapidly become a defining feature of contemporary social life quietly restructuring how people learn, work, worship, access welfare and even imagine their place in society yet this expansion has unfolded unevenly producing new forms of inclusion and exclusion that cannot be understood only through the lens of technology itself. In governance, digital platforms now mediate access to basic citizenship services such as identification, welfare transfers, health records and grievance redressal while in education online classrooms, digital assignments, algorithmic evaluation systems increasingly shape academic trajectories (Castells, 2010; van Dijk, 2020) [4, 18]. Religious practices too have entered digital space, with sermons, rituals and devotional communities migrating to screens subtly privileging those who possess the cultural ease to navigate these formats, while everyday life from banking to social interaction has become deeply dependent on digital competence. Early debates on the digital divide largely framed the issue as a matter of technological inequality emphasizing access to devices, connectivity and infrastructure but such explanations now appear insufficient, as evidence shows that exclusion persists even where access formally exists (Norris, 2001; Warschauer, 2003) [14, 19]. This shift demands a sociological rethinking of the digital divide as a form of cultural exclusion embedded in language, symbolic competence, confidence and habitus rather than merely in hardware and bandwidth. Digital platforms are not culturally neutral spaces; they are structured by dominant languages, middle-class communication styles, bureaucratic rationalities, implicit norms of self-presentation that reward familiarity and penalize hesitation (Bourdieu, 1984) [1].

Corresponding Author:
Rajendra Pratap Singh
Doctoral Research Scholar
Department of Sociology
Banaras Hindu University
Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, India

For marginalized communities shaped by histories of caste oppression, poverty, gendered constraints and limited educational exposure digital environments often appear alien, intimidating and unforgiving generating fear of error, dependency on intermediaries and withdrawal from participation. In this sense, the digital divide operates through the unequal distribution of digital cultural capital where those already endowed with linguistic fluency, educational credentials and symbolic confidence convert technology into advantage while others remain structurally positioned outside meaningful participation despite nominal inclusion (Selwyn, 2016) [16]. The research problem addressed in this paper lies precisely in this gap between access and agency as why does digital expansion fail to translate into empowerment for marginalized communities and how does digitalization reproduce existing social hierarchies in subtle but powerful ways? The central argument advanced here is that the digital divide functions as a mechanism of cultural exclusion that reorganizes inequality through symbolic means, reinforcing social distance while appearing progressive and inclusive on the surface. The objectives of the study are threefold like first, to reconceptualize the digital divide beyond infrastructural explanations by situating it within sociological theories of culture and power; second, to examine how language, habitus, and symbolic competence shape patterns of digital participation among marginalized groups; and third, to highlight the broader social consequences of digital exclusion for citizenship, dignity, and everyday agency. The scope of the paper is limited to a sociological analysis based on secondary literature, policy documents and existing empirical studies allowing for a structural reading of digital inequality without reducing it to localized or individual deficits. Its significance lies in challenging dominant policy narratives that equate digital inclusion with access alone and in emphasizing that without cultural inclusion, digitalization risks deepening rather than diminishing social inequality. Ultimately, the study asserts that the digital divide is not a temporary lag to be solved by infrastructure, but a durable social process rooted in power, culture, and historical marginalization, demanding sociological attention rather than purely technical solutions.

Conceptual and Theoretical Framework
The concept of the digital divide has undergone a significant transformation over the last two decades, moving from a narrow concern with technological access to a more complex sociological understanding of inequality rooted in culture, power and social positioning, a shift that is crucial for interpreting contemporary forms of exclusion. Early formulations described the digital divide primarily as a first-level divide focused on disparities in access to devices, internet connectivity and infrastructure assuming that once access was ensured, participation and empowerment would naturally follow (Norris, 2001) [14]. However, empirical evidence soon challenged this assumption revealing that access alone did not guarantee meaningful use, leading scholars to identify a second-level digital divide centered on differences in digital skills, patterns of usage and the ability to navigate online environments effectively (Hargittai, 2002; van Dijk, 2020) [18, 12]. More recent work has further extended this framework toward a third-level digital divide emphasizing unequal outcomes, social returns, cultural participation etc. where digital engagement translates into tangible advantages for some groups while leaving others symbolically and materially excluded (Ragnedda &

Muschert, 2018) [15]. It is within this third level that the digital divide most clearly reveals itself as a cultural and sociological problem rather than a technical one. Pierre Bourdieu's concepts of cultural capital and habitus offer a powerful lens for understanding how digital spaces privilege certain dispositions while marginalizing others as digital competence is not simply learned but embodied through long-term socialization within particular class, caste and educational contexts (Bourdieu, 1986) [2]. Digital platforms implicitly reward linguistic fluency, bureaucratic literacy, confidence in self-expression, familiarity with abstract systems forms of capital unevenly distributed across social groups thereby converting pre-existing cultural advantages into digital dominance. For individuals from marginalized communities whose habitus has been shaped by histories of exclusion, surveillance and limited institutional trust, digital environments often appear hostile and opaque producing hesitation, fear of making mistakes and reliance on intermediaries which further undermines autonomy and participation. These dynamics intersect closely with Michel Foucault's notion of power/knowledge particularly in relation to digital governance, where platforms, databases and algorithms function as instruments of classification, monitoring, and normalization while presenting themselves as neutral and efficient (Foucault, 1980) [11]. Digital governance regimes such as online welfare systems, biometric identification, algorithmic decision-making etc. embed specific forms of rationality that discipline users by demanding compliance with standardized procedures, technical language and constant visibility, thereby disproportionately burdening those least equipped to perform digital citizenship convincingly (Eubanks, 2018) [10]. In this process, exclusion often operates symbolically rather than overtly, giving rise to what can be described as symbolic exclusion and digital stigma where individuals internalize feelings of inadequacy, incompetence or dependency, not because they lack intelligence or motivation but because the digital field is structured against their habitus (Selwyn, 2016) [16]. Errors made online are less forgiving, mistakes are permanently recorded, bureaucratic interactions are stripped of human mediation intensifying anxiety among marginalized users and reinforcing withdrawal from participation. These invisible norms speed, fluency, documentation and performative confidence reproduce cultural hierarchies by transforming social disadvantage into apparently personal failure masking structural inequality behind the language of efficiency and innovation. The relevance of sociological imagination as articulated by C. Wright Mills, lies in its ability to connect these individual experiences of frustration, fear or exclusion to broader historical and structural forces, revealing how private troubles related to digital exclusion are in fact public issues rooted in power relations, institutional design and cultural domination (Mills, 1959) [13]. By situating digital inequality within this conceptual and theoretical framework, the digital divide emerges not as a temporary developmental lag but as a durable mechanism through which contemporary societies reorganize inequality under the guise of technological progress. Digital platforms, far from being neutral tools, act as cultural filters that amplify existing hierarchies, reward dominant forms of capital and quietly marginalize those who do not fit their implicit norms making it essential to analyze digital inequality as a sociological problem of culture and power rather than a purely technical deficit.

Methodology and Data Sources

The present study adopts a descriptive and analytical sociological approach to examine digital exclusion as a structural and cultural phenomenon rather than as an individual or purely technological deficit, a choice that aligns with the conceptual framing of the digital divide as embedded within broader relations of power, inequality, and social stratification. The research design is secondary data based relying on the systematic analysis of existing literature, policy documents and institutional reports to trace patterns of digital inequality across marginalized communities, an approach widely recognized as effective for studying large-scale social processes that extend beyond specific localities. Secondary data is particularly suitable for this study because digital exclusion operates at multiple structural levels state policy, institutional design, cultural norms and social hierarchies which cannot be adequately captured through limited primary fieldwork alone. The sources of data include a diverse range of materials such as government reports on digital inclusion, e-governance, education, welfare delivery which provide insight into official narratives, policy intentions and implementation frameworks surrounding digitalization. These are complemented by academic literature drawn from sociology, media studies and critical digital studies offering theoretical depth and empirical evidence on how digital technologies intersect with caste, class, gender and education to reproduce inequality (Selwyn, 2016; Ragnedda & Muschert, 2018) [16, 15]. In addition, policy briefs, institutional evaluations, media reports and published ethnographic studies are used to capture lived experiences, public debates, everyday encounters with digital systems allowing the analysis to move beyond abstract policy language toward social realities without conducting new fieldwork. The analytical strategy employed in this study combines thematic analysis with sociological interpretation where recurring patterns related to access, skills, cultural competence, fear, dependency and exclusion are identified across sources and interpreted through established sociological concepts such as cultural capital, habitus and power/knowledge. Rather than treating data as neutral facts, the study reads texts critically, attending to silences, assumptions and normative frameworks that shape how digital inclusion is imagined and operationalized. Ethical considerations in this research primarily involve responsible representation, ensuring that marginalized communities are not portrayed as technologically deficient or culturally lacking but as structurally constrained by unequal social arrangements, a concern emphasized in critical sociological methodology. The study also acknowledges its limitations particularly the absence of original primary data and the reliance on existing sources which may reflect institutional biases or uneven documentation; however, this limitation is also its strength, as secondary data allows for the identification of broader structural patterns and systemic tendencies that cut across regions and contexts, thereby justifying the methodological choice and reinforcing the study's focus on digital exclusion as a sociological rather than localized, phenomenon.

Digital Divide as Cultural Exclusion

The lived experience of digital marginality reveals that digital exclusion operates less as a sudden absence and more as a slow everyday process through which individuals and communities are reminded of their unequal position within contemporary society reshaping how citizenship, belonging and agency are felt and practiced. Language barriers constitute one of the most immediate and powerful forms of cultural exclusion as digital interfaces, official portals and instructional content are overwhelmingly designed in dominant languages and bureaucratic idioms making participation difficult for those whose linguistic worlds are rooted in vernacular speech or limited formal literacy, a gap that cannot be bridged simply by providing devices or connectivity (Warschauer, 2003; van Dijk, 2020) [18, 19]. Digital illiteracy in this sense is not a cognitive failure but a cultural mismatch where users are expected to already know how to navigate menus, forms, passwords and abstract categories that presuppose long-term exposure to institutionalized education and administrative systems. Gender further deepens this exclusion, as women from marginalized communities often experience restricted access to devices limited autonomy over digital usage and heightened surveillance within households, resulting in patterned inequalities in confidence, skills, visibility online (UNESCO, 2018). Even when women are formally included in digital initiatives, their usage tends to be instrumental and mediated focused on welfare or family needs rather than expressive or empowering reinforcing gendered hierarchies within digital participation. Education, caste and class intersect sharply in shaping digital engagement as individuals from socially dominant backgrounds are more likely to convert digital access into social mobility, information capital, public voice while marginalized caste and class groups encounter digital spaces as unfamiliar terrains marked by fear of error, humiliation, or exclusion (Bourdieu, 1986; Ragnedda & Muschert, 2018) [2, 15]. This uneven participation becomes especially visible in domains such as e-governance, online education and digital welfare systems where formal inclusion often masks substantive exclusion; online forms, biometric authentication, and app-based services presume uninterrupted connectivity, stable documentation, procedural fluency, conditions rarely met by the most vulnerable leading to missed benefits, bureaucratic delays, and dependence on intermediaries who may exploit their position (Eubanks, 2018) [10]. Online education, widely promoted as democratizing access similarly reproduces inequality by privileging students with quiet study spaces, digital confidence and linguistic fluency while marginalized learners struggle with fragmented access, limited guidance, and a sense of isolation that undermines learning itself (Selwyn, 2016) [16]. Beyond material consequences, digital exclusion produces profound psychological effects, including anxiety, fear of making irreversible mistakes, loss of confidence, and a persistent sense of inadequacy, as individuals internalize their exclusion as personal failure rather than recognizing its structural roots. This internalization reflects what can be described as symbolic domination, where digital platforms function as sites that silently enforce norms of speed, efficiency, documentation and self-presentation, rewarding those who conform while marginalizing those who hesitate or deviate (Bourdieu, 1984) [1]. Errors in digital spaces are less forgiving, often permanently recorded or consequential, intensifying apprehension among marginalized users and encouraging withdrawal from participation altogether. In this way, digital spaces become arenas where power operates invisibly aligning with Foucault's insight that modern governance increasingly functions through subtle forms of discipline and normalization rather than overt coercion (Foucault, 1980) [11]. The consequences of such exclusion are not limited to one generation, as digital inequality is

increasingly reproduced intergenerationally; children raised in digitally confident households accumulate skills, exposure and symbolic ease from an early age while those from marginalized families inherit fear, dependency and limited digital imagination, thereby transforming digital exclusion into a durable social inheritance (van Dijk, 2020) [18]. This intergenerational reproduction ensures that digital inequality becomes embedded within broader patterns of social stratification, reinforcing caste, class and gender hierarchies under the appearance of technological progress. Taken together, these lived dimensions demonstrate that digital exclusion fundamentally reshapes everyday citizenship by determining who can speak, claim, learn and belong within digital society making participation conditional upon cultural conformity rather than formal access. The key insight that emerges from this analysis is that digital exclusion is not merely about being offline, but about being positioned at the margins of contemporary social life where rights exist in theory but remain inaccessible in practice and where digitalization, instead of dissolving inequality, often deepens the distance between those who are digitally at home and those who remain perpetual outsiders.

Conclusion

This paper has argued that the digital divide must be understood not merely as a technical or infrastructural gap but as a deeply sociological process through which cultural hierarchies, symbolic power and historical inequalities are reproduced in digital form shaping who can meaningfully participate in contemporary social life. By tracing the evolution of the digital divide from access to skills and finally to outcomes and cultural participation, the discussion has shown that digital exclusion persists even where connectivity exists, operating through language, habitus, confidence and symbolic competence rather than through hardware alone. Drawing on Bourdieu's insights into cultural capital and symbolic domination and Foucault's understanding of power embedded in everyday governance, the study reaffirmed that digital platforms are not neutral spaces but culturally coded environments that privilege dominant norms while marginalizing those positioned outside them. The implications of this understanding are significant for policy and practice, as initiatives focused solely on access, devices or connectivity risk mistaking formal inclusion for substantive participation. Policies aimed at digital inclusion must therefore move beyond infrastructure toward cultural inclusion, addressing language diversity, contextual usability and the everyday fears and dependencies that shape digital engagement among marginalized communities. This also underscores the need for sociologically informed digital literacy programs that recognize learners not as deficient users but as socially situated actors whose digital experiences are shaped by caste, class, gender, educational histories. Such programs must emphasize confidence, critical awareness and agency rather than procedural compliance alone. In terms of future research, there remains considerable scope for ethnographic and longitudinal studies that examine how digital exclusion is lived, negotiated and transmitted across generations as well as comparative work exploring regional and institutional variations in digital governance. The central conclusion that emerges is clear like without cultural inclusion and sociological sensitivity, digital expansion risks deepening existing inequalities while presenting itself as progress, thereby transforming digital citizenship into yet another unevenly distributed social privilege.

References

1. Bourdieu P. Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 1984.
2. Bourdieu P. The forms of capital. In: Richardson J, editor. Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education. New York: Greenwood Press; 1986. p. 241-258.
3. Bryman A. Social research methods. 5th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2016.
4. Castells M. The rise of the network society. 2nd ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell; 2010.
5. Mitra DP. Caste, food and identity: Understanding the socio-economic and religious dimensions of Dalit dietary practices in Eastern Uttar Pradesh. Int J Soc Res Dev. 2025;7(2):189-195.
6. Mitra DP. The ascetics of Kashi: A sociological exploration. Int J Sociol Humanit. 2025;7(2):257-267. doi:10.33545/26648679.2025.v7.i2d.208
7. Mitra DP. Religious tourism and ascetic integrity: A sociological study of economic dependency and sacred authenticity in Varanasi. J Res Humanit Soc Sci. 2025;13(7):72-80.
8. Mitra DP. From Durkheim's anomie to Bauman's liquid love: A sociological exploration of the alienation of affection. Int J Arts Humanit Soc Sci. 2025;7(2):395-400.
9. Mitra DP, Kumar R. Caste, food and identity: Understanding the socio-economic and religious dimensions of Dalit dietary practices in Eastern Uttar Pradesh. Int J Soc Res Dev. 2025;7(2):189-195.
10. Eubanks V. Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor. New York: St. Martin's Press; 2018.
11. Foucault M. Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977. New York: Pantheon Books; 1980.
12. Hargittai E. Second-level digital divide: Differences in people's online skills. First Monday. 2002;7(4). doi:10.5210/fm.v7i4.942
13. Mills CW. The sociological imagination. New York: Oxford University Press; 1959.
14. Norris P. Digital divide: Civic engagement, information poverty, and the Internet worldwide. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2001.
15. Ragnedda M, Muschert GW. Theorizing digital divides. London: Routledge; 2018.
16. Selwyn N. Education and technology: Key issues and debates. 2nd ed. London: Bloomsbury; 2016.
17. UNESCO. I'd blush if I could: Closing gender divides in digital skills through education. Paris: UNESCO; 2018.
18. Van Dijk J. The digital divide. Cambridge: Polity Press; 2020.
19. Warschauer M. Technology and social inclusion: Rethinking the digital divide. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press; 2003.