Pedagogy Insights
An International Peer reviewed Journal of Multidisciplinary research
Vol. 1, Issue. 2, July-September 2026, 65–78
ISSN: 3139-843X
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23009453

Changing Nature of Indian Democracy in the Digital Age: Political Participation, Digital Communication and Emerging Democratic Challenges

Dr. Sunanda. M. Madar

Associate Professor, Dept of Political Science, GFGC Yaragatti, Karnataka, India

ABSTRACT

Democracy in India has undergone considerable changes with the rapid expansion of digital technologies. The spread of smartphones, internet connectivity, social media platforms, digital news and online government services has created new ways for citizens to communicate, participate in political processes and interact with public institutions. Political communication, which was once largely dependent on political meetings, newspapers, radio and television, is now increasingly taking place through social media, messaging platforms, online campaigns and other digital networks. These developments have created new possibilities for political participation and access to information, but they have also introduced important challenges for democratic politics. Misinformation, disinformation, political polarisation, privacy concerns, online abuse and unequal access to digital technologies have raised questions about the quality and inclusiveness of digital participation. The Election Commission of India has also recognised the increasing importance of social media and digital communication in electoral politics and voter engagement. At the same time, emerging technologies, including artificial intelligence, have made the political information environment more complex. This paper examines the changing nature of Indian democracy in the digital age by focusing on political participation, electoral communication, public opinion, digital governance, transparency, accountability and the emerging challenges associated with digitalisation. The study is based primarily on secondary sources, including government documents, Election Commission publications, academic literature and relevant policy materials. The paper argues that digital technology by itself does not automatically strengthen or weaken democracy. Its democratic consequences depend on how technology is used, how institutions respond to it, how platforms are regulated and how effectively citizens are equipped with digital and media literacy. The study concludes that India's digital democratic transformation needs to be guided by constitutional values, political equality, freedom of expression, privacy, transparency, inclusion and institutional accountability.

Keywords: Indian Democracy, Digital Democracy, Political Participation, Social Media, Electoral Politics, Digital Governance.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 30 July 2026**; Accepted:** 30 August 2026**; Published:** 20 September 2026

CITATION

Madar, M.S., (2026). Changing Nature of Indian Democracy in the Digital Age: Political Participation, Digital Communication and Emerging Democratic Challenges. *Pedagogy Insights*, 1(2), 65–78.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23009453

Introduction

Democracy is based on the idea that citizens should have the opportunity to participate in public

COPYRIGHT: © 2026 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0International License (CC-BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. See http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

ISSN: 3139-843X

affairs, choose their representatives and hold political institutions accountable. Since independence, Indian democracy has developed through elections, political parties, legislatures, social movements, newspapers, radio, television and public meetings. These institutions and forms of participation continue to be important, but the emergence of digital technology has added a new dimension to the functioning of Indian democracy. The internet and social media have changed not only the way political information is communicated but also the way citizens receive, discuss and circulate that information.

The growth of digital communication has made political interaction considerably faster and more direct. A political leader can communicate with millions of people through a social-media post, while citizens can respond, comment or circulate political messages almost immediately. Political parties increasingly use digital platforms for campaigning, public communication and mobilisation. Citizens, too, are no longer simply consumers of political information. They can create videos, write posts, share news, participate in online discussions and raise public issues through digital platforms. In this sense, digital technology has reduced some of the traditional barriers between political institutions and citizens.

The Election Commission of India has recognised the growing significance of social media in electoral communication and has developed institutional mechanisms for dealing with the changing media environment. The Commission's publications and initiatives also demonstrate the increasing use of digital technologies in election administration and voter communication. However, the expansion of digital politics also creates serious questions for democracy. The same technologies that allow citizens to access information quickly can also facilitate the rapid circulation of false or misleading information. Political communication can become highly polarised, and citizens may increasingly encounter information that confirms their existing political preferences. Concerns relating to privacy, online harassment, manipulation, artificial intelligence-generated content and unequal access to digital technologies have further complicated the democratic environment.

The changing nature of Indian democracy therefore cannot be understood simply as a story of technological progress. It represents a broader transformation in the relationship between citizens, political parties, media organisations, government institutions and private digital platforms. The central concern of this paper is to understand this transformation and examine whether digitalisation is creating new opportunities for democratic participation while also generating new forms of democratic inequality and political risk.

Statement of the Problem

The digital transformation of Indian democracy has created a political environment in which citizens

ISSN: 3139-843X

can participate in public discussions through multiple online platforms. Political parties and candidates can reach citizens directly, while government institutions can communicate information and services through digital channels. These developments have the potential to make democracy more accessible and interactive. At the same time, the digital environment has become increasingly difficult to regulate and interpret because information can be produced and circulated at an extraordinary speed. The spread of misinformation and disinformation is particularly significant in this context. During elections, inaccurate information about candidates, political parties, voting procedures or electoral events can create confusion among citizens. The Election Commission of India has identified misinformation and disinformation as important challenges in the contemporary electoral environment, particularly with the increasing availability of manipulated and AI-generated content.

Another important concern is that not all citizens participate in the digital environment on equal terms. Access to the internet, smartphones, digital skills, education, income and reliable connectivity differs considerably across social and geographical groups. Consequently, digital democracy may create new opportunities for some citizens while leaving others behind. The central problem, therefore, is to understand how India can benefit from digital technologies without allowing technological inequalities and information-related challenges to weaken democratic participation.

Objectives of the Study

The primary objective of this study is to examine the changing nature of Indian democracy in the digital age. It seeks to understand how digital technologies have influenced political participation and communication and how social media has become an important part of contemporary electoral politics. The study also examines the opportunities created by digital governance for improving the relationship between citizens and the state. At the same time, it analyses the challenges created by misinformation, disinformation, political polarisation, privacy concerns and the digital divide. Finally, the study attempts to identify institutional and democratic measures that can help ensure that India's digital transformation remains consistent with constitutional values and democratic principles.

Research Questions

The study is guided by several questions. How has digital technology changed political participation in India? What role does social media play in contemporary political communication and electoral politics? In what ways can digital governance improve the relationship between citizens and government institutions? What challenges are created by misinformation and disinformation? How does unequal access to digital technology influence political participation? Finally, what measures are required to make India's emerging digital democracy more inclusive, transparent and accountable?

ISSN: 3139-843X

Research Methodology

The study adopts a qualitative and analytical approach and is primarily based on secondary sources. Information has been collected from government publications, Election Commission of India documents, policy papers, academic books, research articles and other relevant literature concerning democracy and digital technology. Official documents relating to digital governance, intermediary regulation and data protection have also been considered. The study does not attempt to establish a statistical causal relationship between digital technology and democratic outcomes. Instead, it examines the broader political and institutional changes associated with digitalisation and interprets them from a Political Science perspective. The scope of the study covers major dimensions of digital democracy, including political participation, political communication, electoral politics, public opinion, digital governance, transparency, accountability, misinformation, privacy and digital inequality. The discussion is primarily concerned with India, although some broader theoretical concepts relating to digital democracy and network society are used to understand the Indian experience.

Understanding Digital Democracy

Digital democracy can broadly be understood as the use of digital technologies to facilitate political participation, communication, public discussion, representation and governance. It is much broader than the use of electronic technology for conducting elections. It includes the ways in which citizens obtain political information, communicate with public representatives, participate in political debates, access government services and express their views on public issues. The emergence of digital democracy has changed the traditional pattern of political communication. In the conventional political environment, political parties and leaders generally depended on newspapers, television, radio, public meetings and party organisations to reach citizens. The digital environment has created a more direct and interactive relationship. A political message can now move from a political actor to citizens through a digital platform without necessarily passing through a traditional media organisation.

This transformation can be represented as a movement from a relatively simple communication model of political party to media to citizen towards a more complex network in which political parties, citizens, journalists, influencers, government institutions and digital platforms interact with one another. This networked environment provides greater opportunities for participation but also makes the flow of political information more difficult to control and verify. Digital democracy therefore has two dimensions. The first is its participatory potential, through which citizens can communicate, organise and express themselves more easily. The second is the challenge of maintaining the quality of democratic communication in an environment where information is abundant, rapidly circulated and

ISSN: 3139-843X

sometimes unreliable.

Digital Transformation of Political Participation

Political participation is one of the areas most visibly affected by digitalisation. Traditionally, citizens participated in politics mainly through voting, joining political parties, attending public meetings, participating in demonstrations and communicating directly with elected representatives. Digital platforms have expanded these forms of participation by allowing citizens to engage in political discussions from their homes and workplaces. Citizens can now follow political developments in real time, communicate with representatives, share political information, participate in online campaigns and express their views on public issues. Young people in particular have gained new avenues for political expression through social-media platforms. Political participation has consequently become less dependent on physical political spaces. Nevertheless, online participation should not automatically be equated with meaningful democratic participation. A citizen may like, share or comment on a political message without becoming involved in sustained political activity. Digital participation can therefore be understood as an additional form of political engagement rather than a complete replacement for conventional participation.

The important question is not simply how many citizens participate online but whether such participation contributes to informed discussion, political awareness, representation and accountability. Digital democracy becomes meaningful when online engagement is connected to broader democratic processes.

Social Media and Political Communication

Social media has fundamentally changed political communication in India. Political leaders and parties can now communicate directly with citizens through posts, videos, live broadcasts and messaging platforms. Citizens can respond to these communications immediately, creating a much more interactive political environment than was possible through traditional forms of mass communication. This change has also altered the role of citizens. They are no longer merely recipients of political messages. They can produce and circulate political content themselves. A local political issue, for example, can receive wider public attention after a citizen posts a video or describes an incident online. In this way, social media can provide visibility to issues that might otherwise receive limited attention from traditional media.

At the same time, political communication on social media is often shaped by platform algorithms. The information that users see is influenced not only by what political actors publish but also by how digital platforms organise and recommend content. This means that political communication in the digital age involves a relationship between political actors, citizens and technological systems. The

ISSN: 3139-843X

growing importance of social media has also encouraged political parties to develop specialised digital communication strategies. Campaign organisations increasingly combine traditional meetings and rallies with online messaging, videos, digital advertisements and social-media engagement. Political parties have consequently become hybrid organisations that operate through both physical political networks and digital networks.

Digital Technology and Electoral Politics

Digital technology has become an increasingly important part of electoral politics. Political parties and candidates use digital platforms to communicate with voters, explain policies, promote campaign messages and mobilise supporters. Digital platforms can also allow citizens to obtain election-related information more quickly.

The Election Commission of India has increasingly incorporated digital tools into electoral communication and administration. Its digital initiatives include voter-information mechanisms and broader efforts to integrate electoral services through technology. The benefits of digital electoral communication, however, are accompanied by significant challenges. False information about candidates or voting procedures can circulate rapidly. Manipulated photographs, edited videos and artificially generated content can make it difficult for ordinary citizens to determine whether political information is genuine. The growing availability of generative artificial intelligence has added another dimension to this problem because realistic synthetic audio, images and videos can be produced relatively easily.

The Election Commission has highlighted misinformation, disinformation and AI-generated content as emerging concerns for election management and democratic communication. This makes digital literacy and reliable institutional communication increasingly important for the protection of informed electoral participation.

Digital Governance and the Citizen–State Relationship

Digitalisation has also changed the relationship between citizens and government institutions. Government services, applications, certificates, grievance mechanisms and public information are increasingly available through online platforms. This can reduce the need for citizens to visit government offices physically and can make certain services more accessible. Digital governance also has the potential to improve transparency. When government information is made available online, citizens, journalists, researchers and civil-society organisations can examine public programmes and administrative activities more easily. Digital grievance systems can provide additional channels through which citizens communicate problems to government departments. However, digital governance also creates new forms of dependence on technology. Citizens who lack internet access or

ISSN: 3139-843X

digital skills may find it difficult to benefit from online services. Technical failures, cybersecurity risks and privacy concerns can also affect public trust.

Consequently, digital governance should not be understood simply as replacing physical administration with online administration. A genuinely democratic digital state must ensure that technology improves accessibility without excluding citizens who are unable to participate effectively in digital systems.

Digital Media and the Formation of Public Opinion

Public opinion is an essential component of democratic politics because elections and political decision-making depend partly on citizens' understanding of public issues. Digital media has significantly expanded the amount and variety of political information available to citizens. The advantage of this development is that people can obtain information from multiple sources rather than relying exclusively on a small number of traditional media organisations. Citizens can access speeches, government documents, interviews, political debates and alternative viewpoints through digital platforms. However, greater availability of information does not necessarily mean greater availability of reliable information. Citizens may encounter rumours, manipulated content, partisan narratives and inaccurate claims alongside genuine information. The enormous volume of information can itself make verification difficult.

Digital platforms may also contribute to the formation of information bubbles in which users repeatedly encounter views similar to their own. This can limit exposure to alternative perspectives and contribute to political divisions. Nevertheless, political polarisation cannot be attributed solely to social media. Existing social divisions, political competition, media structures and broader socioeconomic conditions also influence political attitudes.

Misinformation and Disinformation

Misinformation and disinformation have emerged as important concerns in the digital democratic environment. Misinformation generally refers to inaccurate information that may be shared without an intention to deceive, whereas disinformation refers to false or manipulated information deliberately circulated to mislead people. The distinction is important because the political consequences can be different. An individual may unknowingly share an incorrect claim, while organised actors may deliberately create misleading content for political or other purposes. In both cases, the rapid circulation of inaccurate information can affect public understanding. The challenge becomes particularly serious during elections because citizens make political decisions within a limited period and require reliable information about candidates, parties, voting procedures and public issues. The Election Commission has recognised misinformation and disinformation as significant contemporary

ISSN: 3139-843X

challenges and has emphasised the importance of institutional responses and public awareness.

India's regulatory framework has also evolved in response to concerns surrounding online platforms and digital content. The Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021 established responsibilities and grievance-related mechanisms for intermediaries and digital platforms. The continuing development of India's digital regulatory framework reflects the difficulty of balancing platform accountability with democratic freedoms.

Digital Divide and Democratic Inequality

One of the most important questions concerning digital democracy is whether all citizens have an equal opportunity to participate. Digital access is influenced by income, education, geographical location, language, age, gender, infrastructure and digital skills. For citizens with reliable internet access and sufficient digital literacy, online platforms can provide new opportunities for political information and participation. For citizens without such access, however, digitalisation may create additional barriers. This is particularly relevant in rural and economically disadvantaged areas where connectivity and digital skills may be more limited. The digital divide should therefore be treated as a democratic issue rather than simply a technological issue. If important political information and government services become increasingly digital while sections of society remain digitally excluded, existing social inequalities may be reproduced in new forms.

Inclusive digital democracy consequently requires more than expanding internet connectivity. Citizens also need affordable access, digital literacy, multilingual content and opportunities to use technology effectively. Democratic participation must remain accessible to citizens regardless of their technological circumstances.

Privacy and Democratic Citizenship

Privacy has become an increasingly important dimension of democratic citizenship in the digital age. Citizens leave digital traces when they use social-media platforms, search engines, online services and mobile applications. Political communication can therefore occur within an environment where large amounts of personal data may be generated and processed. The question of data privacy becomes particularly significant when digital information is used to understand political preferences or behaviour. Citizens need to know how their information is collected, processed and protected. Transparency regarding data practices is therefore closely connected to democratic trust. India's digital regulatory framework has continued to develop in response to concerns surrounding personal data protection and online governance. The Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology lists the Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025 among its policy materials.

The protection of privacy is important because democratic citizenship involves not only the freedom to

ISSN: 3139-843X

express political opinions but also the ability to participate in public life without unnecessary or unjustified intrusion into personal information.

Political Polarisation in the Digital Environment

The digital environment has also changed the nature of political disagreement. Social media provides space for citizens with different political perspectives to express themselves, but political conversations can sometimes become highly confrontational. Users may primarily interact with people who share similar opinions, while opposing views may be dismissed or encountered mainly in hostile forms. This can contribute to political polarisation, although the causes of polarisation are broader than technology itself. Political parties, social divisions, economic inequalities, identity-based conflicts and traditional media also influence the political environment. Digital platforms nevertheless have an important role because they influence the speed and visibility with which political messages circulate. Content that generates strong emotional reactions may receive considerable attention, making the quality of political discussion an important concern. For democracy, disagreement itself is not necessarily a problem. Democratic politics depends on the existence of different opinions. The greater concern is whether disagreement can take place through informed, respectful and constitutional forms of public discussion.

Changing Role of Political Parties

Political parties remain central to Indian democracy, but their methods of communication and organisation have changed with digitalisation. Traditional party structures involving local offices, workers, public meetings and rallies continue to operate, but they are increasingly complemented by digital communication networks. Political parties now use social-media accounts, messaging groups, online videos and digital campaign teams to reach supporters and communicate political messages. This can allow parties to respond quickly to political developments and maintain continuous communication with citizens. At the same time, digital campaigning creates questions concerning transparency, political advertising, data use and the circulation of campaign material. The increasing role of private digital platforms also means that political parties operate within communication environments whose rules and algorithms are largely determined by technology companies. The contemporary political party can therefore be understood as a hybrid organisation that combines conventional political structures with digital networks.

Digital Democracy and Accountability

Accountability is one of the fundamental principles of democracy. Citizens should be able to obtain information about public institutions and question political authorities regarding their decisions and

ISSN: 3139-843X

actions. Digital technologies can support this process by making government information more accessible. Online government portals, public dashboards, digital grievance mechanisms and social-media communication can provide citizens with additional opportunities to interact with public institutions. Journalists and civil-society organisations can also use digital information to monitor public programmes and political developments. However, transparency alone does not guarantee accountability. Information must be accurate, accessible, understandable and available at the appropriate time. Citizens must also have institutional mechanisms through which they can question decisions and seek remedies. Digital democracy can therefore strengthen accountability only when technological access is combined with responsive institutions and meaningful opportunities for citizen oversight.

Theoretical Framework

The changing nature of Indian democracy in the digital age can be understood through several theoretical perspectives. Participatory democratic theory is particularly relevant because it emphasises active involvement of citizens in political affairs. Digital platforms can provide additional opportunities for citizens to communicate and participate without depending entirely on traditional political organisations. The concept of deliberative democracy is also useful because it focuses on the importance of reasoned public discussion. Digital platforms have the potential to expand public debate, but misinformation, abusive communication and polarisation may affect the quality of deliberation. The democratic value of digital communication therefore depends partly on whether citizens are able to engage with reliable information and different perspectives. The idea of the network society provides another useful perspective. Manuel Castells argues that networks have become increasingly important in the organisation of modern societies. From this perspective, political power is not exercised exclusively through formal institutions; it also operates through communication networks. The digital transformation of Indian democracy can therefore be understood as a shift towards increasingly networked forms of political communication and mobilisation. Together, these perspectives suggest that digitalisation is transforming democracy through three interconnected processes: the expansion of participation, the transformation of public communication and the emergence of network-based political relationships.

Major Findings

The study demonstrates that digital technology has significantly expanded the possibilities for political communication in India. Citizens can communicate with political actors more directly, obtain information from multiple sources and participate in political discussions without always depending upon traditional political organisations.

ISSN: 3139-843X

The study also finds that digital platforms have become an important part of electoral politics. Political parties and candidates increasingly use digital communication to reach citizens, while election authorities are developing digital mechanisms for voter communication and election administration.

Another important finding is that digitalisation has created new forms of political participation but has not eliminated traditional forms. Instead, Indian democracy is developing a hybrid form in which rallies, public meetings, party organisations and conventional media coexist with social media, messaging platforms and online political networks.

The study further finds that misinformation and disinformation represent important challenges for democratic communication. The problem has become more complicated because artificial intelligence can be used to create increasingly realistic synthetic content.

Digital inequality is another major concern. Differences in internet access, digital literacy, income, education and geographical connectivity mean that citizens do not necessarily enjoy equal opportunities for digital political participation. Digital democracy can therefore reproduce some existing social inequalities unless inclusion is treated as a central policy objective.

Finally, the study finds that the democratic impact of technology depends largely on institutions and social conditions. Technology itself does not determine democratic outcomes. The same digital platform can facilitate political participation and public accountability while also being used to circulate misinformation or deepen political divisions.

Suggestions

The development of India's digital democracy requires greater attention to digital literacy. Citizens should be equipped not only to operate digital devices but also to assess the reliability of political information, identify manipulated content and verify claims before sharing them. Educational institutions can play an important role in developing critical media and digital literacy among young citizens.

Election-related information should continue to be communicated through reliable institutional channels. Election authorities can strengthen public awareness by providing accessible and multilingual information about voting procedures, candidates, election dates and misinformation-related concerns.

Transparency in digital political communication is also important. Citizens should be able to distinguish political communication from other forms of online content, particularly when political advertisements and campaign messages are distributed through digital platforms.

The digital divide requires sustained attention. Expanding internet connectivity should be accompanied by affordable access, digital education and multilingual digital services. Rural and economically

ISSN: 3139-843X

disadvantaged communities should receive particular attention so that digitalisation does not create new forms of political exclusion.

Privacy protection should remain central to digital citizenship. Citizens need greater awareness of their digital rights, while institutions and platforms should operate within appropriate legal and accountability frameworks.

At the same time, responses to misinformation should preserve democratic freedoms. Measures intended to address false or harmful information should be transparent and consistent with constitutional principles, lawful procedures and freedom of expression. The objective should be to create a trustworthy information environment without unnecessarily restricting legitimate political debate.

Conclusion

The digital transformation of Indian democracy is a continuing process rather than a completed development. Digital technologies have changed how citizens receive political information, communicate with political leaders, participate in public discussions and interact with government institutions. Political parties have also adapted their organisational and campaign strategies to the new digital environment. In this sense, digitalisation has become an important part of contemporary Indian political life. At the same time, the expansion of digital democracy has brought new challenges. Misinformation, disinformation, political polarisation, privacy concerns and digital inequality demonstrate that technological progress does not automatically produce democratic progress. Digital platforms can widen political participation, but they can also create new forms of exclusion and manipulation. The democratic consequences of digitalisation therefore depend on the institutional environment in which technology operates.

The future of Indian democracy will increasingly involve an interaction between constitutional institutions, citizens, political organisations, media and digital platforms. The central challenge is to ensure that technological development remains connected to democratic principles. Digital democracy should not merely make political communication faster; it should contribute to more meaningful participation, greater transparency, stronger accountability and wider political inclusion. India therefore needs a digital democratic framework that combines technological innovation with constitutional values. Freedom of expression, privacy, political equality, inclusion, accountability and access to reliable information must remain central to this process. Ultimately, the success of digital democracy will depend not simply on the availability of technology but on the ability of democratic institutions and citizens to use that technology responsibly and inclusively.

References

1. Bennett, W. L., & Segerberg, A. (2013). *The logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Castells, M. (2010). *The rise of the network society* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
3. Chadwick, A. (2017). *The hybrid media system: Politics and power* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
4. Dahlgren, P. (2009). *Media and political engagement: Citizens, communication, and democracy*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Dahlgren, P. (2013). *The political web: Media, participation and alternative democracy* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
6. Election Commission of India. (2024a). *Myth vs reality register: General elections 2024*. Election Commission of India.
7. Election Commission of India. (2024b). *Responsible and ethical use of social media platforms by political parties and their representatives*. Election Commission of India.
8. Election Commission of India. (2024c). *Social media and elections*. Election Commission of India.
9. Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society* (T. Burger, Trans.). MIT Press. (Original work published 1962)
10. Howard, P. N. (2006). *New media campaigns and the managed citizen*. Cambridge University Press.
11. Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. New York University Press.
12. Kumar, K. J. (2014). *Mass communication in India* (4th ed.). Jaico Publishing House.
13. Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology. (2021). *Information Technology (Intermediary Guidelines and Digital Media Ethics Code) Rules, 2021*. Government of India.
14. Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology. (2023). *Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023*. Government of India.
15. Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology. (2025). *Digital Personal Data Protection Rules, 2025*. Government of India.
16. Norris, P. (2001). *Digital divide: Civic engagement, information poverty, and the Internet worldwide*. Cambridge University Press.
17. Papacharissi, Z. (2010). *A private sphere: Democracy in a digital age*. Polity Press.
18. Pariser, E. (2011). *The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you*. Penguin Press.
19. Sunstein, C. R. (2017). *#Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media*. Princeton University Press.

ISSN: 3139-843X

20. Thompson, J. B. (1995). *The media and modernity: A social theory of the media*. Stanford University Press.
21. van Dijk, J. (2020). *The network society* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
22. West, D. M. (2013). *Air wars: Television advertising and social media in election campaigns, 1952–2012*. SAGE Publications.