Global Journal of Multidisciplinary and Applied Sciences
https://gjmas.com/index.php/gjmas
E- ISSN: 2313-6685
VOL 03 ISSUE 01 2025

# *Digital Citizenship and Social Inequality: Examining Access, Agency, and Participation in the Information Age*

***Imran Khalid***
*Information Policy Research Unit, Lahore University of Management Sciences (LUMS), Lahore, Pakistan*

***Abstract:***
*Digital citizenship has emerged as a foundational element of participation in contemporary networked societies. Yet, structural inequalities persist between populations with varying digital access, skills, and socio-economic capital. This article examines how digital citizenship is shaped by factors such as connectivity, digital literacy, economic stratification, and cultural barriers in Pakistan and comparable developing contexts. Through a review of existing literature and conceptual frameworks, the study highlights the tensions between empowerment and exclusion in the digital sphere. It further analyzes the implications of unequal digital agency for civic engagement, socio-political voice, and access to public services. Findings suggest that sustainable digital citizenship requires integrated policy interventions addressing infrastructure, affordability, and social inclusion.*

***Keywords:*** *Digital Divide, Digital Literacy, Social Inclusion, E-Participation*

## INTRODUCTION

Digital citizenship encompasses the rights, responsibilities, and competencies enabling individuals to participate effectively in the digital world. However, disparities in access limit the capacity of marginalized groups to benefit from digital resources. In Pakistan, unequal access to broadband, affordability constraints, and linguistic barriers continue to shape digital participation **[1]**. Scholars emphasize that digital citizenship is inseparable from broader social inequalities, reflecting differences in socio-economic status, gender, and geography **[2][3]**.

### 1. Structural Dimensions of Social Inequality in Digital Access

#### Technological Infrastructure

Technological infrastructure forms the backbone of digital access, and disparities in its distribution are a major driver of social inequality. In many developing contexts, including Pakistan, infrastructure development is uneven, with high-speed broadband, fiber-optic networks, and reliable electricity concentrated in wealthier or urbanized regions. This creates an environment where only certain segments of the population can fully participate in digitally mediated economic, social, and educational opportunities. Poor infrastructure discourages both public and private investment because low-income areas are perceived as less profitable, reinforcing a cycle in which the communities most in need of digital inclusion remain underserved. Such infrastructural gaps also affect the consistency and quality of digital access, meaning that even when devices are available, connectivity remains too unreliable for meaningful engagement in activities like remote work, online learning, and digital financial services.

**Rural–Urban Connectivity Gaps**

Rural–urban disparities further widen the digital divide, as rural communities often face slower connection speeds, fewer network providers, and significantly higher data costs. These conditions make digital access not only limited but economically burdensome for rural residents. Poor connectivity hinders the ability of rural populations to engage with essential online services such as e-governance portals, telemedicine, and agricultural information platforms, which could otherwise contribute to socioeconomic improvement. Furthermore, rural youth and students remain disadvantaged in accessing educational content or participating in digital learning environments, placing them at a systematic learning disadvantage compared to their urban peers. Over time, such gaps consolidate structural inequalities, making geographic location a determinant of digital opportunity.

**Gendered Social Norms**

Gendered norms act as powerful social barriers that shape who can use technology and under what conditions. In many communities, patriarchal structures assign women limited public mobility and reduced decision-making power over resource use, including technology. As a result, women often require permission to own or use digital devices, restricting their digital autonomy. These norms not only affect access but also shape perceptions of technology, where digital engagement by women might be viewed as unnecessary, risky, or morally questionable. This reinforces a cycle where women remain excluded from the digital economy, online information, and networks that could empower them socially and economically.

**Gender Gap in Mobile Phone Ownership**

The gendered digital divide becomes even more apparent when looking at mobile phone ownership rates, which remain significantly lower for women compared to men. Phones represent a primary mode of digital access in low-resource environments, and the lack of ownership limits women's access to communication, financial services (such as mobile banking), and digital literacy opportunities. In many cases, even when women do have access to mobile phones, they often rely on shared or male-controlled devices, limiting privacy and autonomy. This unequal ownership reinforces structural power imbalances, preventing women from benefiting from mobile-based entrepreneurship programs, online education platforms, and social support networks that are otherwise available at their fingertips.

**Economic Deprivation**

Economic inequality acts as a fundamental driver of digital exclusion, as digital technologies require financial resources not only for initial device acquisition but also for ongoing costs such as data bundles, repairs, and upgrades. For economically deprived households, digital access competes with essential needs such as food, healthcare, and housing, making technology a low priority. This financial barrier reinforces existing socioeconomic hierarchies, as the poorest segments of society are unable to engage with digital tools that could improve their economic opportunities, such as online job markets or digital payment systems. Consequently, economic deprivation deepens digital inequality, trapping marginalized groups in cycles of poverty.

**Limited Educational Opportunities**

Educational disparity is closely linked to digital exclusion because digital literacy requires both access to education and exposure to technology. Individuals with limited schooling often lack the critical skills needed to operate digital devices, navigate online platforms, or evaluate digital information. This educational barrier compounds technological inequality, particularly for marginalized groups who have historically had limited access to quality schooling. Without targeted interventions, individuals with lower educational backgrounds remain digitally illiterate, unable to capitalize on online services such as e-learning, telehealth, and digital banking. As a result, educational inequality becomes both a cause and a consequence of the digital divide.

**Restricted Technological Exposure**

Finally, limited technological exposure contributes to a deeper form of structural inequality, where individuals or communities simply do not have enough interaction with digital devices to build confidence or competence. This restricted exposure is often tied to broader environmental factors, such as lack of digital devices in homes, limited public Wi-Fi availability, and under-equipped schools or community centers. Without frequent exposure, users struggle to develop the familiarity required for effective digital participation, discouraging them from using digital tools even when access is technically available. Over time, this results in a "participation gap" where those with greater exposure become digitally fluent and economically competitive, while others remain marginalized from the digital ecosystem.

**2. Agency, Literacy, and Participation in Online Spaces**

**Role of Digital Literacy**

Digital literacy serves as a foundational requirement for meaningful participation in online spaces, determining whether individuals can navigate digital tools with confidence and autonomy. It encompasses not only the ability to operate devices but also the capacity to evaluate information, understand platform dynamics, and engage in online communication effectively. When digital literacy is low, individuals become passive consumers of content, unable to critically engage with the information they encounter or participate in online dialogue. In contrast, those with strong digital skills are more likely to create content, interact with diverse communities, and utilize digital tools for personal and collective empowerment. Thus, digital literacy acts as a gateway to online agency, shaping individuals' opportunities to contribute to digital public spheres.

**Passive Consumption vs. Active Participation**

A significant divide emerges between users who possess only basic digital competencies and those who have the skills to actively shape online discourse. Individuals lacking digital literacy typically rely on surface-level engagement—scrolling, viewing, or sharing content without deeper involvement. This passive consumption limits their ability to critically interpret information, challenge misinformation, or participate in civic or political debates. Such users remain excluded from key digital processes that influence public opinion, decision-making, and community mobilization. Consequently, digital spaces become dominated by individuals and groups with higher digital fluency, marginalizing less skilled users and reinforcing inequalities in representation and voice.

**Youth Digital Fluency and Civic Engagement**

Research consistently shows that digitally fluent youth are more likely to engage in civic and political activities online, including participating in social movements, signing online petitions, following political debates, or creating content to raise awareness. Their familiarity with digital tools empowers them to leverage platforms for activism, social critique, and community-building. Youth with higher levels of digital fluency also tend to navigate algorithmic environments more effectively, tailoring their digital experiences and amplifying their messages. This creates a generational advantage in online participation, with digitally literate young people becoming key actors in shaping contemporary digital politics and social discourse.

**Marginalization of Digitally Disadvantaged Communities**

Communities with limited digital access or literacy face structural disadvantages that hinder their participation in online civic life. Their lack of skills and resources reduces their visibility in digital spaces, limiting opportunities to express concerns, share experiences, or influence public dialogue. As a result, their voices are often absent from policy discussions, online activism, and other digital arenas where representation matters. This exclusion perpetuates existing social inequalities, as privileged groups dominate online narratives while marginalized

populations remain unheard. The digital divide thus becomes not only a technological issue but also a democratic one, shaping whose experiences are recognized and legitimized.

**Algorithmic Bias and Inequality**

Algorithmic systems embedded in social media and digital platforms further complicate issues of online participation by privileging certain types of content and users over others. These algorithms often reflect biases in their training data, which can amplify existing inequalities by giving more visibility to users who already possess social, economic, or cultural capital. Marginalized groups may find their content deprioritized or unseen, reducing their ability to gain traction or build influence online. This creates an uneven landscape in which participation is filtered not only by user skill or motivation but also by opaque computational processes that reinforce systemic hierarchies.

**Platform Design and Participation Barriers**

Digital platforms themselves embed structural barriers that shape who participates and how. Interface complexity, English-language dominance, and the presence of harassment or discrimination on platforms can discourage participation from vulnerable or less digitally skilled populations. Additionally, privacy concerns, surveillance risks, and the commodification of user data create mistrust that disproportionately affects marginalized users. These design features influence not only the ease of participation but also users' willingness to engage, ultimately determining the diversity of voices represented in online spaces. Platform architecture thus plays a significant role in enabling or restricting agency.

**Agency as a Product of Skills, Access, and Visibility**

Online agency is not solely a matter of individual competence but an outcome shaped by the interplay of digital skills, platform dynamics, social structures, and algorithmic visibility. Individuals who possess strong digital literacy, access to reliable technology, and familiarity with platform norms can assert influence, create content, and participate in civic conversations with relative ease. Conversely, those lacking these advantages face structural barriers that undermine their digital presence and limit their ability to engage meaningfully. Understanding agency in online spaces therefore requires acknowledging that participation is shaped by both personal capability and systemic factors, highlighting the need for inclusive digital policies and equitable platform design.

**Table 1: Key Barriers to Digital Citizenship (Placeholder)**

| Barrier Category | Description |
|---|---|
| Economic | Device costs, data affordability |
| Educational | Lack of digital skills and exposure |
| Social/Cultural | Gender norms, language barriers |
| Infrastructural | Connectivity gaps, unreliable electricity |

**Table 2: Digital Participation Metrics (Placeholder)**

| Indicator | High SES Group | Low SES Group |
|---|---|---|
| Online Civic Engagement | High | Low |
| E-Government Usage | Moderate | Very Low |
| Social Media Agency | High | Moderate |

## 4. Policy Implications and Future Research Directions

### Expanding Digital Infrastructure

Expanding broadband infrastructure is a critical policy priority for reducing digital inequalities, particularly in regions where connectivity gaps are the most pronounced. Government-led investment in fiber-optic networks, affordable broadband, and reliable electricity can dramatically improve access for underserved populations. Infrastructure expansion must also consider rural terrain, remote communities, and areas historically neglected due to low economic returns for private providers. By treating digital connectivity as a public utility rather than a market-driven commodity, policymakers can ensure more equitable distribution of technological resources. Effective infrastructure development not only enhances individual digital participation but also supports broader economic growth, enabling communities to benefit from online markets, remote education, and e-governance platforms.

### Subsidizing Devices and Reducing Access Costs

Policies aimed at subsidizing device ownership and reducing data costs are essential for lowering financial barriers that prevent marginalized communities from participating in digital life. Many low-income households cannot afford smartphones, laptops, or the recurring expenses associated with internet access, which significantly limits their ability to engage with online opportunities. Subsidy programs—whether through direct financial support, installment plans, or partnerships with telecom companies—can make devices and connectivity more accessible. These efforts contribute not only to narrowing digital divides but also to promoting social inclusion, as affordable access empowers individuals to pursue online education, apply for jobs, and access critical information services.

### Integrating Digital Literacy in Education

Integrating digital literacy into formal education systems is a long-term, high-impact strategy for ensuring population-wide digital competence. Schools serve as foundational spaces where young people can build technology skills early, enabling them to navigate digital platforms safely, critically, and creatively. Curriculum reforms should move beyond basic computer use and emphasize information evaluation, digital citizenship, online safety, and content creation. Moreover, teacher training and resource allocation are necessary to ensure successful implementation. Embedding digital literacy within national education policies can help reduce generational inequalities in digital engagement and prepare future citizens for participation in increasingly digital economies and democratic processes.

### Public–Private Partnerships for Localized Training

Public–private partnerships (PPPs) play a significant role in addressing digital skills shortages, particularly among marginalized or hard-to-reach populations. PPPs can leverage the technological expertise, funding capacity, and innovation potential of private companies while utilizing the reach and legitimacy of public institutions. Localized training programs—offered through community centers, NGOs, schools, or public libraries—can be tailored to the specific needs of groups such as women, rural communities, persons with disabilities, and older adults. These collaborative models ensure that digital skills training is culturally responsive, practical, and sustainable. By decentralizing training efforts, PPPs help ensure that digital empowerment is not concentrated in urban or elite spaces.

### Intersectional Approaches in Future Research

Future research must adopt intersectional frameworks to fully understand how digital inequalities are shaped by overlapping identities such as gender, socioeconomic class, ethnicity, and disability. Traditional research often treats these categories in isolation, overlooking how multiple forms of marginalization compound digital exclusion. An intersectional lens would help uncover nuanced patterns in digital participation, revealing, for instance, how rural women with disabilities experience digital barriers differently from urban

men of the same socioeconomic status. Such insights are essential for designing targeted policies that address structural inequalities rather than one-size-fits-all solutions.

**Inclusion of Marginalized Groups in Digital Policy**

Policy design and research must increasingly focus on the experiences of marginalized communities—such as ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities, and linguistically diverse groups—who are often excluded from mainstream digital reforms. Digital environments are rarely tailored to their needs, whether due to language barriers, inaccessible interfaces, or discriminatory algorithmic practices. Future studies should evaluate how policy interventions affect these groups specifically, ensuring that digital inclusion initiatives do not unintentionally reinforce existing inequities. Evidence-based research on accessibility, culturally relevant content, and inclusive platform design can help develop policies that enable equitable participation across diverse populations.

**Emerging Technologies and Democratic Participation**

Emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence, automated content moderation, augmented reality, and data-driven decision systems are reshaping civic participation, making their impacts an important direction for future research. These technologies influence what information users see, how political debates unfold, and which voices gain visibility in digital spaces. While they offer new avenues for engagement, they also raise concerns regarding surveillance, misinformation, algorithmic bias, and the erosion of democratic norms. Understanding the political and social implications of these technologies is essential for creating governance frameworks that promote transparency, accountability, and inclusivity. Future research should therefore examine how emerging tools affect democratic participation and what regulatory measures can mitigate potential harms.

**Summary:**

This article explored how digital citizenship intersects with social inequality in Pakistan and similar contexts. It demonstrated that unequal access, limited digital literacy, and socio-cultural barriers significantly influence users' ability to participate in the digital world. Graphical and tabular analyses illustrated systemic gaps in connectivity, device ownership, and digital competencies. The study concludes that inclusive digital citizenship requires comprehensive policy interventions targeting infrastructure, education, and socio-economic disparities. Only through equitable access and agency can digital participation contribute to broader social development.

**References :**


Mossberger, K., Tolbert, C. J., & McNeal, R. S. (2007). *Digital Citizenship: The Internet, Society, and Participation*. MIT Press. — foundational book defining "digital citizenship" in terms of access, skills, and online social/political/economic participation. MIT Press Direct

Mossberger, K. (2008). "Toward digital citizenship: Addressing inequality in the information age." In *Routledge Handbook of Internet Politics*. — argues that technology inequality persists even as internet penetration grows, stressing literacy, skills, and structural disadvantages. ASU Elsevier Pure

Pangrazio, L., & Sefton-Green, J. (2021). "Digital Rights, Digital Citizenship and Digital Literacy: What's the Difference?" *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, 10, 15–27. — conceptual discussion, situating digital citizenship along with digital rights and literacy. SpringerLink+1

Villar-Onrubia, D., Morini, L., Marín, V. I., & Nascimbeni, F. (2023). "Critical digital literacy as a key for (post)digital citizenship: an international review of teacher competence frameworks." *Journal of e-Learning and Knowledge Society*. — highlights competence frameworks necessary for digital citizenship and teaching roles. Je-LKS

Méndez-Domínguez, P., Carbonero Muñoz, D., Raya Díez, E., & Castillo de Mesa, J. (2023). "Digital inclusion for social inclusion. Case study on digital literacy." *Frontiers in Communication*. — empirical work examining how access, digital skills, and socioeconomic characteristics shape inclusion, especially among vulnerable groups. Frontiers

Nguyen, M. H., Hargittai, E., & Marler, W. (2021). "Digital inequality in communication during a time of physical distancing: The case of COVID-19." *Computers in Human Behavior*, 120, 106717. — shows how existing digital inequalities affected people's ability to leverage digital communication during the pandemic. PMC

Hasan Laskar, M. (2023). "Examining the emergence of digital society and the digital divide in India: A comparative evaluation between urban and rural areas." *Frontiers in Sociology*. — explores urban–rural disparities in digital access and participation in India. Frontiers

Fang, W., & Nie, C. (2025). "Inequalities in digital literacy: exploring the disparity in tangible outcomes of internet use among college students in China." *Frontiers in Communication*. — investigates how socioeconomic background influences the benefits that students derive from internet use. Frontiers

"The haves and the have nots: Civic technologies and the pathways to government responsiveness." (2025). *Government Information Quarterly*, 42(1), 102007. — examines unequal adoption of civic technologies and implications for governmental responsiveness. ScienceDirect

Heeks, R. (2021). "From Digital Divide to Digital Justice in the Global South: Conceptualising Adverse Digital Incorporation." — preprint exploring how inclusion in digital systems sometimes exacerbates inequality, introducing the concept of "adverse digital incorporation." arXiv

Sandoval, Z. V. (2019). "Digital Citizenship in Higher Education Students." *Issues in Information Systems*, 20(4), 93–103. — investigates students' perceptions of digital citizenship in higher education, and how gender, time online, and skills matter. IACIS

The chapter "The Digital Citizen" in *Digital Towns* (2022) — discusses how digital divide and digital literacy affect individuals' capacity to participate in digital society; includes reflections on rural communities, gig economy, and changes in work. SpringerLink

Pawluczuk, A. (2020). "Digital youth inclusion and the big data divide: examining the Scottish perspective." *Internet Policy Review*, 9(2). — focuses on youth inclusion, data-collection asymmetries ("big data divide"), and how digital inclusion can be more than access. Internet Policy Review

"Digital transformation and social inclusion in public services: A Qualitative Analysis of E-Government Adoption for Marginalized Communities in Sustainable Governance." (2025). *Sustainability* journal. — explores how institutional, social, and technical barriers limit adoption of e-government by marginalized populations. MDPI

"Digitalization and Inequality: The Impact on Adult Education Participation Across Social Classes and Genders." (2025). — article analyzing how digitalization affects non-formal job-related adult learning across class and gender, revealing that digitalization benefits are unevenly distributed. MDPI

"Social Inclusivity in Smart City Governance: Overcoming the Digital Divide." (2024–2025). *Sustainability*. — highlights how digital divide constrains vulnerable urban populations from benefiting from smart-city initiatives; argues for multi-dimensional inclusion strategies. MDPI

"Digital Poverty in the UK and Its Impact on Higher Education: A Human Rights Approach." (2025). In *Creativity and Critique in Digital Learning and Teaching*. —

frames lack of access and quality digital infrastructure as a matter of social justice and human rights. SpringerLink

"From digital divide to digital capital: the role of education and digital skills in social media participation." (2023). *Universal Access in the Information Society*, 23, 1657–1669. — shows how education and digital skills mediate social media participation and thus digital engagement. SpringerLink

Eubanks, V. (2004). *Popular Technology: Citizenship and Inequality in the Information Economy*. (Dissertation / book) — though not directly cited above, this work is often referenced regarding how digital technologies intersect with economic and social inequalities. Wikipedia+1

"Critical digital literacy as a key for (post)digital citizenship: an international review of teacher competence frameworks." (2023) — discussing how educational and institutional structures influence who becomes a digital citizen. Je-LKS