

Digital Divide and the Reproduction of Structural Inequalities

Ashwani Kumar^{1*}

¹Assistant Professor, University Institute of Legal Studies, Chandigarh University, Mohali, India

* Corresponding Author Email: ashwinsociology@gmail.com

Abstract: Digital technologies have become integral to contemporary social life, mediating education, employment, welfare, governance, and civic participation. Early accounts of digital expansion often assumed that technological diffusion would reduce social inequalities. Yet, sociological research increasingly demonstrates that digitalisation frequently reproduces and intensifies existing social stratification. This paper reconceptualises the digital divide, portraying it not as a temporary technological gap or mere issue of access, but as a structural mechanism rooted in broader systems of social inequality.

Building on this theoretical foundation and drawing on classical and contemporary sociological theories—specifically Bourdieu’s theory of capital, Weberian notions of life chances, political economy perspectives, and intersectional frameworks—this paper critically reviews literature on digital inequality. The analysis reveals that unequal access to digital resources, skills, institutional design, and algorithmic governance perpetuates hierarchies based on class, gender, caste, race, education, and spatial location. As digital systems become embedded in core social institutions, a lack of digital capability increasingly leads to institutional exclusion and diminishes equality of opportunity in democratic societies. This paper contends that, while social inequality persists, democratic legitimacy depends on ensuring reasonably equal opportunities for participation. The enduring digital divide represents not just a technical gap, but a structural barrier to opportunity, raising concerns about substantive equality and rights. By connecting digital inequality to debates on stratification and power, this analysis calls for a justice-based, rather than merely access-based, approach and asserts that digital capability is fundamental to citizenship in digital societies process.

Keywords: Digital divide; structural inequality; equality of opportunity; digital capital; social stratification; digital governance; democracy.

1. Introduction

Crime Digital technologies are now deeply embedded in the organisation of contemporary social life. In today’s world, education, employment, governance, welfare provision, communication, and cultural participation are routinely mediated through digital infrastructures. These systems shape both everyday interactions and institutional processes [3]. The digital does not function as a separate, autonomous sphere, increasingly forms an integral dimension of social structure. In this context, both access to digital technologies and the ability to use them meaningfully have emerged as crucial determinants of social participation, visibility, and life chances.

Strong techno-optimism characterised early scholarly and policy accounts of digital expansion. Many expected the internet and digital devices to democratise information, weaken longstanding hierarchies, and offer new opportunities for social mobility. This perspective framed the digital divide primarily as a temporary technical gap between those with and without access, presuming this gap would close as technologies became more widespread and affordable [6]. However, over the past two decades, research has repeatedly challenged this assumption. Rather than reducing inequality, digitalisation has mirrored, reproduced, and sometimes intensified existing structures of social stratification[15].

In light of these developments, this paper argues that the digital divide cannot be adequately understood as a narrow issue of connectivity or technical skills. Instead, it must be conceptualised as a structural mechanism embedded within broader systems of inequality related to class, gender, caste, race, education, and spatial location. As digital systems become central to core social institutions—such as schools, labour markets, welfare regimes, and state governance—digital exclusion increasingly translates into institutional exclusion. Unequal digital access thus generates cumulative disadvantages that extend beyond the technological domain and contribute directly to the reproduction of social inequality [9].

Multiple and intersecting pathways shape digital inequality from a sociological perspective. For instance, access to devices and connectivity is driven by economic resources. In addition, digital competencies closely relate to educational attainment and

cultural capital [2]. Social networks and institutional recognition also affect how individuals convert digital engagement into tangible social advantages, reinforcing patterns of privilege and disadvantage [13]. Technology’s supposed neutrality is thus challenged by these dynamics, which highlight how digital technologies help sustain class-based inequalities.

In addition, critical political economy scholarship demonstrates that digital infrastructures and platforms are shaped by relations of power, capital, and governance rather than operating as neutral tools [10]. The increasing reliance on algorithmic systems in domains such as welfare administration, education, policing, and employment has raised concerns about the reproduction of bias and discrimination through data-driven decision-making [7]. These systems often encode historical inequalities into technical processes, producing forms of exclusion that are difficult to contest because they appear objective and automated.

The structural significance of digital inequality has become particularly visible in recent years, especially during periods of accelerated digitalisation such as the COVID-19 pandemic. For instance, as education shifted online, welfare services adopted digital interfaces, and employment processes became increasingly platform-mediated, individuals lacking reliable access or adequate digital skills faced heightened vulnerability and exclusion [14]. These developments underscore that digital capability is no longer optional but functions as a prerequisite for full social participation. In this sense, digital exclusion increasingly resembles earlier forms of structural disadvantage, such as illiteracy or exclusion from formal education systems.

Against this backdrop of increasing digital embedding across society, the present paper offers a critical sociological review of literature on the digital divide, reconceptualising it as a dimension of structural inequality rather than a discrete technological problem. Drawing on classical and contemporary sociological theories—including Bourdieu’s theory of capital, Weberian notions of life chances, political economy perspectives, and intersectional frameworks—the paper synthesises existing scholarship to examine how digital inequalities are produced, sustained, and normalised within contemporary societies. Central to this argument is the claim that digital society is not separate from social life but embedded within it, such that the lack of digital access generates

new forms of inequality related to participation, recognition, and rights [4].

By embedding the digital divide within sociological concerns of stratification, power, and social reproduction, this paper argues for moving beyond purely access-focused or policy-driven solutions. It advocates for a justice-oriented view, emphasizing digital capability as integral to social equality in digitally embedded societies, and stresses that digital access must be seen as a foundational component of contemporary citizenship.

2. Review of Literature

Early scholarly engagement with the digital divide emerged alongside the rapid diffusion of information and communication technologies in the late twentieth century. Initial studies conceptualised the digital divide primarily as a problem of unequal access to computers and internet connectivity, assuming that such disparities would diminish naturally with technological expansion and market saturation [6]. This access-oriented framing reflected broader modernization and diffusionist assumptions, according to which technology was expected to function as an equalising force across social groups. However, sociological research over the past two decades has consistently demonstrated that this expectation was misplaced. Rather than dissolving inequality, digitalisation has reproduced—and in some contexts intensified—existing structures of social stratification [16].

2.1 From Digital Divide to Digital Inequality

A significant shift in literature occurred when scholars began reframing the digital divide as a multidimensional form of social inequality rather than a binary distinction between users and non-users.[6] were among the first to argue that inequalities persist even after access becomes widespread, manifesting instead in differences in skills, autonomy of use, and the capacity to translate digital engagement into social and economic advantages. This reconceptualization gave rise to the notions of second-level and third-level digital divides, which emphasize inequalities in digital skills and differential outcomes derived from digital participation[15].

Empirical studies across diverse social contexts demonstrate that individuals from higher socioeconomic backgrounds are more likely to use digital technologies in ways that enhance educational attainment, occupational mobility, and civic participation, while marginalised groups often remain confined to limited or passive forms of use [13]. These findings challenge the assumption that connectivity alone leads to social inclusion and instead highlight how digital inequalities are shaped by pre-existing social structures.

2.2 Digital Capital and the Reproduction of Class

Advantage

Drawing on Pierre Bourdieu's theory of capital, a growing body of sociological literature conceptualises digital resources as a form of "digital capital" that is closely intertwined with economic, cultural, and social capital [2]. Digital capital encompasses not only material access to devices and connectivity but also the competencies, dispositions, and institutional recognition necessary to benefit from digital technologies.

Studies show that individuals possessing higher levels of cultural capital—such as formal education, linguistic competence, and familiarity with institutional norms—are better positioned to convert digital access into symbolic and material advantages [9]. Conversely, individuals lacking such resources often experience digital participation as fragmented, inefficient, or exclusionary. From a Bourdieusian perspective, digital technologies thus function as mechanisms of class reproduction, enabling dominant groups to consolidate

advantage while framing inequality as a matter of individual competence rather than structural constraint.

2.3 Life Chances, Institutions, and Digital Mediation

Max Weber's concept of life chances offers a powerful framework for understanding the institutional consequences of digital inequality. Life chances are shaped by individuals' positions within social and economic structures and determine access to valued resources such as education, employment, and welfare [17]. In digitally embedded societies, access to these opportunities is increasingly mediated by digital systems.

Sociological research highlights that as education systems, labour markets, and welfare regimes adopt digital-first or digital-only interfaces, individuals lacking adequate digital access or skills face cumulative disadvantage [9]. Online admissions processes, digital classrooms, platform-based recruitment, and e-governance portals assume a baseline level of digital competence that is unevenly distributed across social groups. As a result, digital exclusion increasingly translates into institutional exclusion, reinforcing stratified life chances along lines of class, gender, caste, and spatial location.

2.4 Political Economy and Algorithmic Inequality

Critical political economy approaches further deepen sociological understanding of the digital divide by foregrounding power, capital, and governance. From this perspective, digital infrastructures are not neutral tools but are shaped by corporate interests, state priorities, and market logics [10]. The concentration of ownership and control over digital platforms has significant implications for how access, visibility, and participation are structured.

Recent scholarship on algorithmic governance demonstrates that data-driven systems used in welfare administration, policing, education, and employment often reproduce historical patterns of inequality [7] [11]. Algorithms trained on biased datasets encode classed, racialised, gendered, and caste-based assumptions, producing discriminatory outcomes that appear objective due to their technical form. Sociologists argue that these systems extend traditional forms of domination into digital space, generating what has been described as automated or algorithmic inequality.

2.5 Intersectionality and Uneven Digital Exclusion

Intersectional analyses have been crucial in revealing how digital inequalities are not experienced uniformly across social groups. Gender, caste, race, ethnicity, disability, and geography intersect to shape access to technology, control over its use, exposure to digital risks, and the benefits derived from participation [5]. Research from the Global South highlights how patriarchal norms, caste hierarchies, and infrastructural disparities intersect to produce distinct patterns of digital exclusion [8].

Women, lower-caste groups, and rural populations often face restrictions on device ownership, heightened surveillance of online activity, and greater vulnerability to harassment and exclusion. These findings challenge universalist digital inclusion models and underscore the need for sociologically informed, context-sensitive approaches that address structural inequalities rather than focusing narrowly on access provision.

2.6 Digital Society as an Embedded Social Structure

An important consensus emerging from contemporary sociological literature is that the digital realm cannot be analytically separated from "offline" social life. Digital technologies are embedded within institutions, social relations, and cultural practices that structure everyday existence [3]. Education, work, governance, and cultural production increasingly operate through digital infrastructures, rendering digital capability integral to social participation.

From this embeddedness perspective, digital exclusion constitutes a new form of social exclusion affecting visibility, voice, recognition, and access to rights [4]. Scholars argue that digital inequality today functions similarly to illiteracy or lack of formal

education in earlier phases of modernity—producing cumulative disadvantage and shaping intergenerational mobility. The digital divide, therefore, must be understood as a structural feature of contemporary stratification rather than a transitional technological problem.

2.7 Synthesis and Research Implications

The reviewed literature demonstrates that the digital divide is deeply embedded within existing systems of social inequality. Digital access, skills, institutional design, and algorithmic governance interact with class, gender, caste, race, and spatial hierarchies to reproduce structural disadvantages. Sociological scholarship thus calls for moving beyond access-centric and policy-driven frameworks toward justice-oriented approaches that address the social conditions under which digital technologies are produced, distributed, and governed.

3. Theoretical Orientation

This paper is anchored in a critical sociological understanding of inequality that treats digitalisation not as a neutral technological process but as a socially embedded transformation shaped by existing structures of power, stratification, and institutional design. The theoretical orientation draws primarily on four complementary sociological frameworks: (1) Bourdieu's theory of capital and social reproduction, (2) Weberian notions of life chances and social closure, (3) political economy approaches to technology and governance, and (4) intersectional theory. Together, these perspectives enable an analysis of the digital divide as a structural mechanism that produces inequality of opportunity within democratic societies.

3.1 Digital Capital and Social Reproduction

Pierre Bourdieu's theory of capital provides a foundational lens for understanding how digital inequality is socially produced and reproduced. Bourdieu conceptualized social life as structured by unequal distributions of economic, cultural, and social capital, which shape individuals' capacities to compete, participate, and succeed within institutional fields (Bourdieu, 1986). Building on this framework, the notion of digital capital highlights how access to digital technologies, skills, and dispositions is unevenly distributed and deeply dependent on pre-existing forms of capital[12].

Within this orientation, digital technologies do not operate as independent equalizing forces. Rather, they amplify existing advantages by allowing those with greater cultural and educational resources to convert digital access into academic credentials, occupational mobility, and symbolic recognition. Conversely, individuals lacking such resources encounter digital systems as opaque, restrictive, or exclusionary. This process transforms structural inequality into seemingly meritocratic differentiation, thereby legitimising unequal outcomes while obscuring the social conditions that produce them.

3.2 Life Chances, Social Closure, and Digital Institutions

Max Weber's concept of life chances further informs the theoretical orientation of this study. Life chances refer to the probabilities individuals have of accessing valued resources based on their position within social and institutional structures [17]. In digitally embedded societies, access to life chances is increasingly mediated through digital institutions—such as online education systems, digital labour markets, and e-governance platforms.

From this perspective, digital capability functions as a new mechanism of social closure. When institutions presume universal digital access and competence, individuals without such resources are systematically excluded from opportunity structures, not through explicit discrimination but through

procedural and technical barriers. This form of exclusion is particularly significant in democratic contexts, where legitimacy depends not on equal outcomes but on reasonably equal access to institutional pathways that shape life chances.

3.2 Political Economy, Power, and Algorithmic Governance

The theoretical framework is further strengthened by political economy approaches that situate digital technologies within broader relations of power, capital, and governance[10]. Digital infrastructures are shaped by market logics, corporate interests, and state priorities, rather than by egalitarian principles. As a result, digital platforms and algorithmic systems frequently prioritise efficiency, data extraction, and control over inclusivity and justice.

This orientation is especially relevant for understanding algorithmic governance. Automated decision-making systems used in welfare administration, education assessment, policing, and employment often encode historical inequalities into technical processes [7] [11]. When access to rights and resources is mediated by such systems, unequal digital access effectively translates into unequal legal and civic standing. This raises critical sociological questions about substantive equality, procedural fairness, and democratic accountability.

3.3 Intersectionality and Differentiated Opportunity Structures

Intersectional theory provides an essential corrective to class-centric analyses by highlighting how multiple axes of inequality intersect to shape digital experiences[5]. Gender, caste, race, disability, and spatial location do not operate independently but interact to produce differentiated patterns of access, control, surveillance, and vulnerability.

Within this theoretical orientation, the digital divide is understood as unevenly structured across social locations. For example, women and marginalised caste groups may face cultural restrictions on device use, heightened monitoring of online activity, or increased exposure to harassment. These intersecting barriers produce compounded inequalities of opportunity that cannot be addressed solely through universal access models.

3.4 Digital Divide, Democracy, and Equality of Opportunity

Underlying these theoretical perspectives is a normative sociological concern with democracy and equality of opportunity. While inequality is an inherent feature of social life, democratic societies derive legitimacy from their commitment to providing fair and comparable opportunities for participation in education, employment, welfare, and civic life. When digital capability becomes a prerequisite for accessing these domains, unequal digital access constitutes a structural violation of equality of opportunity.

From a legal-sociological standpoint, this creates a tension between formal equality before law and substantive equality in practice. Digitally mediated governance assumes equal access to digital systems, thereby rendering those structurally excluded invisible. The digital divide thus emerges as both a sociological and an institutional problem—one that requires attention not only to technology but also to the social and legal frameworks within which it operates.

4. Results and Discussion

Although this study is based on a critical review of existing literature rather than primary empirical data, clear and consistent patterns emerge from the synthesis of sociological scholarship. These patterns constitute the analytical “results” of the study and are discussed here in relation to the theoretical orientation adopted. Collectively, the findings demonstrate that the digital divide operates as a structural mechanism reproducing inequality of opportunity within digitally embedded democratic societies.

4.1 Digital Access as a Structuring Condition of Opportunity

A central finding across the reviewed literature is that digital

access has shifted from being an enabling resource to becoming a structuring condition of social participation. Access to education, employment, welfare services, and civic engagement is increasingly mediated through digital platforms. As a result, individuals and groups lacking adequate digital access or skills are not merely disadvantaged but systematically excluded from institutional pathways that shape life chances.

This finding aligns closely with Weberian notions of life chances and social closure. Digital capability now functions as a gatekeeping mechanism within institutions that were previously accessible through multiple channels. When online admissions portals, digital recruitment systems, and e-governance platforms presume universal access and competence, those without such resources face procedural exclusion. The result is an inequality of opportunity rather than simply unequal outcomes, as individuals begin from structurally unequal positions in accessing institutions that distribute social rewards.

4.2 Digital Capital and the Reproduction of Class Advantage

The literature consistently shows that digital inequalities closely track existing class hierarchies. Access to devices, quality connectivity, and advanced digital skills are disproportionately concentrated among groups with higher economic and cultural capital. More importantly, individuals from privileged backgrounds are better positioned to convert digital access into educational credentials, professional mobility, and symbolic recognition.

From a Bourdieusian perspective, these findings illustrate how digital capital operates alongside economic, cultural, and social capital to reproduce class advantage. Digital competence is often framed as an individual achievement, obscuring the structural conditions that make such competence possible. This framing legitimises inequality by presenting differential outcomes as meritocratic, while masking how unequal distributions of capital shape digital participation. Thus, digitalisation does not disrupt class structures but rather embeds them more deeply within everyday institutional processes.

4.3 Institutional Digitalisation and Cumulative Disadvantage

Another key result emerging from the literature is the cumulative nature of digital disadvantage. Individuals with limited digital access face layered exclusions across multiple institutional domains. For example, a lack of digital skills constrains educational participation, which in turn limits employment prospects, thereby reducing the economic resources needed for digital access. This recursive process generates cumulative disadvantage across the life course.

This finding reinforces the argument that digital inequality must be understood structurally rather than episodically. Digital exclusion is not a single event but a process that compounds over time. As institutions increasingly operate through digital infrastructures, the costs of exclusion escalate, transforming digital disadvantage into long-term social marginalisation. This dynamic mirrors earlier sociological analyses of illiteracy and educational exclusion, but with greater speed and scale due to the pervasiveness of digital systems.

4.4 Algorithmic Governance and Unequal Legal Standing

The review also reveals that digital inequality increasingly intersects with governance and legal processes. Automated decision-making systems are now widely used in welfare administration, policing, education assessment, and employment screening. While these systems are often portrayed as neutral and efficient, the literature shows that they often encode historical inequalities along lines of class, gender, race, and caste.

From a political economy perspective, these findings highlight

how digital governance extends existing power relations into algorithmic form. Unequal digital access and literacy reduce individuals' capacity to contest decisions, access grievance mechanisms, or even understand how decisions are made. Consequently, unequal digital capability translates into unequal legal and civic standing. This challenges the principle of substantive equality in democratic societies, where formal equality before law is insufficient if access to rights is digitally mediated.

4.5 Intersectionality and Differentiated Inequality of Opportunity

A further result concerns the uneven distribution of digital exclusion across intersecting social locations. The literature consistently shows that gender, caste, race, disability, and spatial location interact to produce differentiated digital experiences. Women, lower-caste groups, rural populations, and persons with disabilities face compounded barriers, including restricted access to devices, cultural surveillance, safety concerns, and infrastructural deficits.

These findings underscore the limitations of universal access models that treat the digital divide as homogeneous. Intersectional analysis reveals that inequality of opportunity is not only class-based but socially patterned across multiple axes. As a result, digitalisation can deepen existing social hierarchies even when aggregate access indicators improve. This reinforces the need to conceptualise digital inequality as embedded within broader structures of domination rather than as a residual technical gap.

4.6 Digital Divide, Democracy, and Equality of Opportunity

One of the most significant outcomes of the analysis is the normative implication for democratic societies. Classical sociology recognises inequality as an inherent feature of social organisation. However, democratic legitimacy depends on the assurance of reasonably equal opportunities for participation in education, employment, welfare, and civic life. The literature reviewed here demonstrates that the digital divide directly undermines this assurance.

When digital capability becomes a prerequisite for accessing core institutions, unequal digital access produces inequality of opportunity. This is not merely a sociological concern but a democratic and legal one. Formal equality before the law assumes equal capacity to access state mechanisms, an assumption that no longer holds in digitally governed societies. The digital divide thus represents a structural tension between democratic ideals and digital governance practices.

4.7 Synthesis of Findings

Taken together, the results of this review demonstrate that the digital divide functions as a structural mechanism of social reproduction. Digital access, skills, institutional design, and algorithmic governance interact with existing hierarchies of class, gender, caste, race, and space to reproduce inequality of opportunity. Digital society is not separate from social life but embedded within it, making digital exclusion a form of institutional exclusion.

The discussion confirms the paper's theoretical orientation: digital inequality is best understood through frameworks of capital, life chances, political economy, and intersectionality. Addressing the digital divide, therefore, requires more than expanding connectivity. It demands institutional and legal interventions that recognise digital capability as a foundational condition for equality of opportunity and democratic participation.

5. Conclusion

Although this study is based on a critical review of existing literature rather than primary empirical data, clear and consistent patterns emerge from the synthesis of sociological scholarship.

These patterns constitute the analytical “results” of the study and are discussed here in relation to the theoretical orientation adopted. Collectively, the findings demonstrate that the digital divide operates as a structural mechanism reproducing inequality of opportunity within digitally embedded democratic societies.

5.1 Digital Access as a Structuring Condition of Opportunity

A central finding across the reviewed literature is that digital access has shifted from being an enabling resource to becoming a structuring condition of social participation. Access to education, employment, welfare services, and civic engagement is increasingly mediated through digital platforms. As a result, individuals and groups lacking adequate digital access or skills are not merely disadvantaged but systematically excluded from institutional pathways that shape life chances.

This finding aligns closely with Weberian notions of life chances and social closure. Digital capability now functions as a gatekeeping mechanism within institutions that were previously accessible through multiple channels. When online admissions portals, digital recruitment systems, and e-governance platforms presume universal access and competence, those without such resources face procedural exclusion. The result is an inequality of opportunity rather than simply unequal outcomes, as individuals begin from structurally unequal positions in accessing institutions that distribute social rewards.

5.2 Digital Capital and the Reproduction of Class Advantage

The literature consistently shows that digital inequalities closely track existing class hierarchies. Access to devices, quality connectivity, and advanced digital skills are disproportionately concentrated among groups with higher economic and cultural capital. More importantly, individuals from privileged backgrounds are better positioned to convert digital access into educational credentials, professional mobility, and symbolic recognition.

From a Bourdieusian perspective, these findings illustrate how digital capital operates alongside economic, cultural, and social capital to reproduce class advantage. Digital competence is often framed as an individual achievement, obscuring the structural conditions that make such competence possible. This framing legitimises inequality by presenting differential outcomes as meritocratic, while masking how unequal distributions of capital shape digital participation. Thus, digitalisation does not disrupt class structures but rather embeds them more deeply within everyday institutional processes.

5.3 Institutional Digitalisation and Cumulative Disadvantage

Another key result emerging from the literature is the cumulative nature of digital disadvantage. Individuals with limited digital access face layered exclusions across multiple institutional domains. For example, a lack of digital skills constrains educational participation, which in turn limits employment prospects, thereby reducing the economic resources needed for digital access. This recursive process generates cumulative disadvantage across the life course.

This finding reinforces the argument that digital inequality must be understood structurally rather than episodically. Digital exclusion is not a single event but a process that compounds over time. As institutions increasingly operate through digital infrastructures, the costs of exclusion escalate, transforming digital disadvantage into long-term social marginalisation. This dynamic mirrors earlier sociological analyses of illiteracy and educational exclusion, but with greater speed and scale due to the pervasiveness of digital systems.

5.4 Algorithmic Governance and Unequal Legal Standing

The review also reveals that digital inequality increasingly intersects with governance and legal processes. Automated decision-making systems are now widely used in welfare administration, policing, education assessment, and employment screening. While these systems are often portrayed as neutral and efficient, the literature shows that they often encode historical inequalities along lines of class, gender, race, and caste.

From a political economy perspective, these findings highlight how digital governance extends existing power relations into algorithmic form. Unequal digital access and literacy reduce individuals’ capacity to contest decisions, access grievance mechanisms, or even understand how decisions are made. Consequently, unequal digital capability translates into unequal legal and civic standing. This challenges the principle of substantive equality in democratic societies, where formal equality before law is insufficient if access to rights is digitally mediated.

5.5 Intersectionality and Differentiated Inequality of Opportunity

A further result concerns the uneven distribution of digital exclusion across intersecting social locations. The literature consistently shows that gender, caste, race, disability, and spatial location interact to produce differentiated digital experiences. Women, lower-caste groups, rural populations, and persons with disabilities face compounded barriers, including restricted access to devices, cultural surveillance, safety concerns, and infrastructural deficits.

These findings underscore the limitations of universal access models that treat the digital divide as homogeneous. Intersectional analysis reveals that inequality of opportunity is not only class-based but socially patterned across multiple axes. As a result, digitalisation can deepen existing social hierarchies even when aggregate access indicators improve. This reinforces the need to conceptualise digital inequality as embedded within broader structures of domination rather than as a residual technical gap.

5.6 Digital Divide, Democracy, and Equality of Opportunity

One of the most significant outcomes of the analysis is the normative implication for democratic societies. Classical sociology recognizes inequality as an inherent feature of social organization. However, democratic legitimacy depends on the assurance of reasonably equal opportunities for participation in education, employment, welfare, and civic life. The literature reviewed here demonstrates that the digital divide directly undermines this assurance.

When digital capability becomes a prerequisite for accessing core

institutions, unequal digital access produces inequality of opportunity. This is not merely a sociological concern but a democratic and legal one. Formal equality before the law assumes equal capacity to access state mechanisms, an assumption that is no longer holds in digitally governed societies. The digital divide thus represents a structural tension between democratic ideals and digital governance practices.

5.7 Synthesis of Findings

Taken together, the results of this review demonstrate that the digital divide functions as a structural mechanism of social reproduction. Digital access, skills, institutional design, and algorithmic governance interact with existing hierarchies of class, gender, caste, race, and space to reproduce inequality of opportunity. Digital society is not separate from social life but embedded within it, making digital exclusion a form of institutional exclusion.

The discussion confirms the paper's theoretical orientation: digital inequality is best understood through frameworks of capital, life chances, political economy, and intersectionality. Addressing the digital divide, therefore, requires more than expanding connectivity. It demands institutional and legal interventions that recognise digital capability as a foundational condition for equality of opportunity and democratic participation.

Ethical Statement

This study is a doctrinal-cum-analytical research article based entirely on secondary published sources, including peer-reviewed literature, government reports, policy documents, international organization reports, and judicial decisions. It does not involve human participants, personal data, or primary empirical data collection. Therefore, ethical approval was not required.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this manuscript.

Funding Statement

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Data Availability Statement

This study does not generate or analyze primary datasets. All sources supporting the findings are publicly available and have been appropriately cited in the References section.

Author Contribution Statement

Author 1: Conceptualization, Research Design, Literature Review, Data Collection, Data Analysis, Writing – Original Draft, Writing – Review & Editing.

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the support of their affiliated institution for providing an enabling academic environment for this research. The author(s) also thank the reviewers and the editorial team for their valuable comments and suggestions, which have helped improve the quality of the manuscript.

Reference

- [1]. Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the new Jim code*. Polity.
- [2]. Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.
- [3]. Castells, M. (2010). *The rise of the network society* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- [4]. Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). *The costs of connection: How data is colonizing human life and appropriating it for capitalism*. Stanford University Press.
- [5]. Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241–1299. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039>
- [6]. DiMaggio, P., & Hargittai, E. (2001). From the digital divide to digital inequality: Studying internet use as penetration increases. *Princeton Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies Working Paper*.
- [7]. Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.
- [8]. Gangadharan, S. P. (2020). Data portals and the governance of personal data in India: The challenge of caste. In D. Gray & S. Suri (Eds.), *Digital transformations in the Global South* (pp. 155–174). Oxford University Press.
- [9]. Helsper, E. J. (2012). A corresponding field model for the links between social and digital exclusion. *Communication Theory*, 22(4), 403–426. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2012.01416.x>
- [10]. Mosco, V. (2009). *The political economy of communication* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- [11]. Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. NYU Press.
- [12]. Ragnedda, M. (2018). Conceptualizing digital capital. *Telecommunications Policy*, 42(2), 291–301. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2017.10.006>
- [13]. Robinson, L., Cotten, S. R., Ono, H., Quan-Haase, A., Mesch, G., Chen, W., Schulz, J., Hale, T. M., & Stern, M. J. (2015). Digital inequalities and why they matter. *Information, Communication & Society*, 18(5), 569–582. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1012532>
- [14]. UNESCO. (2019). *I'd blush if I could: Closing gender divides into digital skills through education*. UNESCO.
- [15]. Van Deursen, A. J. A. M., & Helsper, E. J. (2015). The third-level digital divide: Who benefits most from being online? In *Communication and Information Technologies Annual* (Vol. 10, pp. 29–52). Emerald Group Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S2050-206020150000010002>
- [16]. van Dijk, J. (2020). *The digital divide*. Polity Press.
- [17]. Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology* (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). University of California Press.