

Inclusive Communication and the Role of Social Media in Shaping an Equitable Community

Waska Warta¹, Tansah Rahmatullah²

¹ Graduate School of Nusantara Islamic University, Bandung, Indonesia

² Faculty of Communication Science, Nusantara Islamic University, Bandung, Indonesia

e-mail: waskawarta@gmail.com, tansah_rahmatullah@uninus.ac.id

Abstract

Public spaces are becoming increasingly open due to the dynamic development of social media, which allows citizens to communicate freely and equally. However, access gaps, algorithmic bias, and the marginalization of certain groups show that not everyone has the same opportunity to participate. This study highlights the issue of inequality in digital communication and the importance of creating an inclusive space for all groups. The objective of this research is to analyze how inclusive communication is defined and implemented on social media and in digital communities, as well as to evaluate the role of social media in shaping communities that are equitable, inclusive, and participatory. The method used is a literature review relying on a systematic literature review based on a multi-database approach and tactically developed a combination of keywords relevant to the research topic. The study results indicate that social media platforms have great potential in democratizing participation, amplifying the voices of marginalized groups, and building cross-cultural solidarity. Serious obstacles still exist in the form of the digital divide, algorithmic bias, and experiences of online hostility. Case studies from various platforms show that the success of inclusive communication depends on strategies that are culturally sensitive, community-based, and sustainability-oriented. This research recommends the importance of cross-sector collaboration and the integration of inclusive values into digital platform design, public policy, and organizational communication strategies. These findings are expected to contribute both conceptually and practically to creating a more fair, safe, and representative digital space for all.

Keywords: *Digital public space, equitable communities, inclusive communication, social media.*

INTRODUCTION

The introduction should provide a clear background, a clear statement of the problem. The digital age has not only brought technological change, but has also fundamentally transformed human communication. In a matter of seconds, someone in rural Kalimantan can now chat directly with colleagues in Europe, access the world's libraries, or voice their aspirations to a wide audience through social media. Global connectivity, once considered a utopian dream, is now a reality that is ingrained in everyday life [1][2]. However, behind this rapid wave of innovation and unlimited connectivity lies a significant and crucial challenge: how to ensure that this digital space is truly open and accessible to everyone [3][4]. This space is not only intended for those who have sophisticated devices, stable networks, or high digital literacy.

Advances in digital technology that open up cross-border communication access leave real problems. There is still a reality that is often overlooked, namely that not all individuals have equal opportunities to participate meaningfully in the digital space (digital divide) [5][6].

Infrastructure gaps, economic limitations, and digital literacy disparities are major obstacles and challenges for many communities, especially those in disadvantaged areas, the elderly, and people with disabilities [7][8][9]. It is not only a matter of technical access, but also the ability to understand, evaluate, and use information critically [10][11][12]. As a result, the digital space, which should be a shared space, risks widening the gap of new digital-based social exclusion.

In addition, the digital space holds an irony that is increasingly evident in everyday life. Amidst claims of unlimited connectivity, more and more individuals are experiencing social alienation despite being physically close to one another [13][14][15]. Direct interactions full of empathy and affection are slowly being replaced by fast-paced virtual relationships, which are often shallow and fragmented. Social media does provide a space for self-expression, but it also creates new social pressures that encourage comparison, image-building, and even digital fatigue [16][17][18]. This is where the urgency of digital literacy cannot be delayed. Digital literacy encompasses not only the technical ability to operate devices, but also ethical, empathetic, and critical awareness in interacting in the digital space. Effective digital literacy programs emphasize the importance of ethics, empathy, and awareness as core competencies, enabling individuals to behave responsibly, understand the social impact of their actions, and be sensitive to the feelings and perspectives of others [19][20][21][22]. Education, both formal and informal, plays a key role in equipping society to not only be users of technology, but also active subjects who are able to maintain their quality of life amid the rapid pace of digitalization.

Not all citizens enter the digital space from the same starting point or line. There are still many marginalized groups due to economic, geographical, age, gender, or disability factors, who are unable to fully enjoy the benefits of the digital space. In fact, in some cases, the digital space reinforces existing inequalities, as access to information, job opportunities, and social representation is more easily obtained by those who are already digitally literate [23][24]. Therefore, amid the euphoria of technological transformation, a fundamental question arises: is this shared digital space truly inclusive, or does it only belong to a select few who are already prepared?

Social media, as one of the most prominent manifestations of the digital revolution, has transformed far beyond its original function as a communication tool. Social media has become a new, highly dynamic public space, where various discourses, from the lighthearted to the revolutionary, grow and spread rapidly [25][26][27][28]. Platforms such as Facebook, X (formerly Twitter), Instagram, TikTok, and various other local applications have now become open stages where anyone, from ordinary citizens to public figures, can speak, be heard, and even influence collective opinion. This transformation has made social media a new arena for public discussion, civil mobilization, and oversight of power, thereby playing an important role in social change and the formation of civil society [29][30][31][32]. It is in this space that ideas flow endlessly, social issues gain traction, and new solidarity is formed organically.

We can see how humanitarian campaigns can go viral in a matter of hours, social movements grow from simple hashtags, and small businesses find their market without having to rent physical stores [33][34][35]. Social media has blurred the lines between the private and public spheres, between entertainment and advocacy, between consumers and producers of information [36][37][38]. However, it is important to realize that the power of social media also has serious consequences. When everyone has the opportunity to speak, new challenges arise, such as misinformation, hate speech, and polarization becoming part of the mainstream that is difficult to

control [39][40][41]. This is where social media becomes a complex political, economic, and social arena, a place where power is renegotiated, values are questioned, and collective identities are constantly being shaped and reframed [42][43][44]. Therefore, understanding social media is not just about understanding the technology, but also about understanding how it shapes our lives today. The transformative potential of social media in building equitable communities does not automatically materialize. Without the right approach, digital platforms can deepen existing gaps, create echo chambers, and exclude certain groups from full participation in public discourse [45][46][47]. In this context, the concept of inclusive communication becomes very relevant.

The research questions for this study encompass two aspects. First, how can the concept and implementation of inclusive communication be realized through social media platforms in forming an equitable digital community? Second, what are the contextual challenges, structural barriers, and relevant effective strategies in building inclusive digital communication, particularly in the context of Indonesian and Southeast Asian societies? In line with this, the objective of this research is to analyze how inclusive communication is defined and implemented in social media spaces and digital communities, as well as to evaluate the role of social media in forming equitable, inclusive, and participatory digital communities.

The significance of this research lies in its contribution to three main aspects. From a theoretical perspective, it enriches our understanding of inclusive communication in the digital age, particularly in social media and online communities. From a practical perspective, it can serve as a reference for communication practitioners, social media managers, policymakers, and activists in creating a more open and equitable digital space. From a social perspective, this research supports efforts to create a fair digital society where everyone can participate without exception.

METHOD

Methodology A literature study was used in this research with a comprehensive systematic literature review approach to analyze the role of inclusive communication and social media in building an equitable digital community. This approach was chosen for its ability to synthesize findings from various relevant research sources and provide a holistic picture of the topic under study. The systematic literature review methodology enables researchers to identify, evaluate, and synthesize all research relevant to the research question objectively and transparently [48][49]. This approach also allows for the identification of gaps in existing research and provides recommendations for future research [50][51][52].

The literature search using a multi-database approach involving SciSpace, Google Scholar, PubMed, and ArXiv was followed by a combination of keywords relevant to the research topic. The questions (queries) and criteria used are as follows:

Table 1. Query and Criteria

Database	Query
SciSpace	How does inclusive communication on social media platforms contribute to building an equitable digital community?
Google Scholar	Inclusive social media communication in digital communities builds equity in Indonesia.
PubMed	Social media, inclusive communication, digital communities, health equity
ArXiv	Inclusive technology, social media platforms, building communities, and equitable access
Criteria	
Inclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publications discussing inclusive communication in a digital context • Research on social media and community building • Studies on digital inclusion and equitable access • Publications in English and Indonesian • Publications from 2015–2024 to ensure contemporary relevance
Exclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publications not relevant to the research topic • Articles without full-text access • Publications without clear methodology • Duplicate publications

(source: Researcher's compilation)

This study involved a gradual literature selection process, beginning with the identification of relevant titles and abstracts, followed by a review of articles that passed the initial stage. Each piece of literature was then evaluated based on its methodological quality and contribution to the topic, while important information was extracted for further analysis [50][53][54]. The analysis was conducted using a thematic approach, which enabled researchers to identify patterns and key themes from various sources. Coding, data grouping, and synthesis were carried out to strengthen understanding of the issues under review [55][56]. The entire process was conducted with validity in mind, through the use of various credible sources, systematic recording, and peer review [48][57]. However, limitations such as access to paid publications and a lack of sources in languages other than English/Indonesian remain important considerations. This study also upholds academic ethics to ensure that every citation is properly acknowledged and that the results of the study are presented honestly and constructively for the development of inclusive digital communication science and practice.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on systematic searches, this study successfully identified and analyzed literature from various academic databases. The distribution of literature based on the source is as follows:

Table 2. Literature Review Results

Database	Results
<i>SciSpace</i>	100 publications relevant to inclusive communication and social media.
<i>Google Scholar</i>	20 academic publications on digital community building.
<i>PubMed</i>	5 publications focusing on the public health aspects of digital inclusion.
ArXiv	10 publications on inclusive technology and social media platforms

Temporal analysis shows that research interest in the topic of digital inclusive communication has increased significantly in the last five years, with peak publication occurring in the 2020-2024 period. This is an indication that the relevance and urgency of this topic are in a contemporary context. From reviewing various literature, a number of main themes emerge that provide a complete picture of the dynamics of inclusive communication in the current digital landscape. First, there is a growing consensus on how digital inclusive communication is defined and understood. Although each source has a different approach, the common thread remains clear. Digital inclusive communication is understood as a collective effort to ensure that digital spaces are accessible, representative of diversity, and open to the widest possible participation. Three aspects form its foundation: (1) technical accessibility, where digital technology and content must be user-friendly for everyone, including those with physical or cognitive disabilities; (2) content representation, which requires the inclusion of diverse voices and experiences without marginalization; and (3) equal participation, which opens space for everyone to engage meaningfully, not just symbolically.

Second, social media, as one of the main architectures of digital communication today, plays a multifaceted role. Its role is highly complex, and sometimes even contradictory. On the one hand, these platforms are facilitative, providing the technological infrastructure that enables people from diverse backgrounds to form communities, share views, and interact through various forms of communication such as text, images, sound, and video. However, social media platforms also act as mediators. Through algorithms and policies, platforms determine what is visible and what is hidden, as well as who gets a platform and who is barely heard. Interactions are regulated in such a way and often without users fully realizing it. Furthermore, social media also acts in a transformative way, not only facilitating communication but also changing how people communicate. New social norms emerge, political and social participation practices evolve, and even personal and collective identities are reshaped within these digital spaces.

This study found that inclusive communication in the digital age cannot be viewed from one perspective alone, but rather is the result of dynamic interactions between technology, platform policies, and constantly evolving social actors. Therefore, understanding the role of social media in this context is not just a matter of recognizing its features, but also of delving deeper into how it influences the way we present ourselves, express ourselves, and connect in the digital space.

Longitudinal analysis shows the evolution of progressive and relevant research on digital inclusive communication in response to technological dynamics and social demands. From 2015 to 2017, researchers focused primarily on issues of access to technology and the digital divide. These issues were seen as the foundational starting point for understanding the structural barriers

hindering equitable participation in the digital space, particularly for vulnerable and marginalized groups. Entering the period from 2018 to 2020, research directions began to accommodate issues of inclusive design and digital accessibility, with an emphasis on how communication platforms and systems can be designed to ensure fair engagement for all users. Meanwhile, from 2021 to 2024, recent studies have begun to highlight the dimensions of algorithmic justice and representation. This focus marks a more critical epistemological shift toward the role of technology in reproducing or correcting social inequalities, while also emphasizing that inclusive communication is not solely about infrastructure but also concerns fairness in digital visibility and narratives.

Research in the field of inclusive communication in the digital space shows a diversity of methodological approaches that reflect the complexity of the topics studied. Qualitative studies still dominate with a share of around 40%, using methods such as digital ethnography, in-depth interviews, and content analysis. These approaches enable researchers to delve deeply into subjective experiences, social dynamics, and communication practices that take place in an ever-changing digital context. Meanwhile, quantitative studies account for about 35% of total publications, using methods such as surveys, analysis of data from digital platforms, and experiments. These approaches provide a broader generalization and support the statistical mapping of communication patterns. On the other hand, the use of mixed methods reached 25%, combining the strengths of qualitative and quantitative approaches. This combination is widely used to gain a more holistic understanding, both from a social context and empirical data perspective, especially in examining complex issues such as digital exclusion, algorithmic justice, and the representation of marginalized groups.

An analysis of inclusive communication practices in the digital space shows that the success of their implementation is greatly influenced by several key supporting factors. Platforms that adopt universal design principles tend to be more inclusive because they are able to accommodate the needs of users from various backgrounds. In addition, the existence of a proactive and responsive content moderation system that addresses potential discrimination or symbolic violence helps to create a safer and friendlier digital environment. Communities with leadership that represents diversity in terms of gender, ethnicity, and life experiences also exhibit more open and participatory communication patterns. Furthermore, digital literacy programs that emphasize the importance of ethical and inclusive communication have proven to enhance users' awareness of their social responsibility when interacting online.

However, there are still a number of structural barriers that hinder the creation of truly inclusive communication. Algorithms on various digital platforms often reproduce and reinforce existing biases in society, such as gender and ethnic stereotypes. The gap in access to technology and low digital literacy among vulnerable groups also deepens social exclusion. Patriarchal or non-accommodating social norms further reinforce these barriers. Equally important, the business model of digital platforms that prioritize engagement for economic gain tends to sacrifice the values of inclusion and equality.

Various social media platforms currently play a crucial role in shaping inclusive communication, each with its approaches and challenges. Facebook, through its Groups and Communities features, enables individuals to connect based on shared interests and identities, while providing tools such as moderation and fundraising to support advocacy. However, user trust is often tested by privacy issues and algorithms that can exacerbate polarization. Meanwhile,

Twitter (or X) is known as a real-time public discussion platform. With features like hashtag activism and Spaces, this platform can serve as a tool for social empowerment. Unfortunately, character limits and the risk of online harassment make it less welcoming for vulnerable groups. TikTok offers a different approach, emphasizing young people's creative expression through short videos. Features like duets and adaptive algorithms open up space for diverse voices, though concerns remain regarding moderation and data security. On the other hand, local platforms like LINE, WeChat, Zalo, and others emphasize the importance of cultural context. With a deep understanding of language, norms, and local preferences, these platforms create a more emotionally and socially connected digital space for their users. All these examples show that building inclusive communication in the digital world is not just about technology, but also about sensitivity to the diverse needs and identities of people.

In the context of Southeast Asia, inclusive digital communication practices face unique regional challenges. Linguistic diversity requires communication strategies that are sensitive to the plurality of languages and dialects. Disparities in digital infrastructure development between countries or regions reveal inequalities in online participation. Dominant collectivist values can strengthen social cohesion, but also have the potential to suppress diverse individual expression. Variations in regulations between countries result in differences in the level of digital rights protection and inclusion policy frameworks.

Literature studies have found that Indonesia is an interesting case due to its combination of rapid growth in social media users and high demographic complexity. With a huge number of internet users and a wide range of cultural and socioeconomic diversity, Indonesia is an important arena for the formulation of inclusive communication policies and practices. However, there are still major challenges, particularly in ensuring equal access in remote areas.

Theoretically, these findings emphasize the importance of developing a new conceptual framework that aligns the principles of inclusive communication with the dynamics of the digital space. An interdisciplinary approach that integrates communication science, technology studies, and social studies is needed to produce a more contextual and responsive theory. The practical implications of these findings include the need for inclusive platform design in terms of both features and policies, the development of organizational communication strategies that take into account audience diversity, and advocacy for public policies that guarantee digital rights and equal participation for all citizens.

Based on a literature review, this study proposes a “digital inclusive communication model” that is integrative and adaptive to the dynamics of the digital space. This model consists of four main interconnected components: input, process, output, and feedback. The input component includes the basic elements that form the foundation of inclusive communication, such as participant diversity, content and perspective variation, availability of technological and human resources, and the surrounding social and cultural context. Next, the process component contains the interaction mechanisms that enable inclusive communication, including moderation and facilitation, content curation and distribution, dialogic interaction among members, and continuous learning and adaptation. The output component describes the concrete results of the inclusive communication process, such as increased participation from diverse groups, the formation of more equitable dialogue quality, the growth of a cohesive digital community, and the emergence of collective innovation. Finally, the feedback component plays a crucial role in sustaining the model through evaluating the effectiveness of strategies, identifying barriers,

adapting to changes in community needs, and learning from best practices that have proven to be inclusive and transformative.

Indicators of success in inclusive digital communication must be formulated comprehensively and multidimensionally to capture the complexity of interactions that occur in the digital space. Quantitatively, success can be measured through participation rates among diverse demographic groups, equitable distribution of content contributions, member retention rates, and the reach and visibility of content that reflects the representation of groups that have historically been marginalized. Meanwhile, qualitative indicators emphasize deeper and more contextual dimensions, such as the quality of interactions and dialogue among users, the level of satisfaction and sense of belonging felt by community members, perceptions of fairness and engagement, and the impact of communication on the overall psychosocial well-being of the community. This approach enables the evaluation of inclusive communication not only from a statistical perspective but also in terms of how effectively the digital space fosters a sense of community, equality, and mutual respect among its participants.

The implementation of inclusive digital communication faces interrelated challenges in the technical, social, and economic spheres. Technically, resource constraints, the complexity of accessible systems, difficulties in evaluation, and the need for continuous innovation are major obstacles. Socially, resistance from dominant groups, differences in values, the difficulty of building consensus, and the risk of tokenism complicate inclusion efforts. Meanwhile, economic challenges include high implementation costs, business models that do not support inclusion, uncertainty about benefits, and competition with other commercial interests. These three aspects require a strategic, cross-sectoral, and long-term approach.

Effective inclusive communication strategies start with a deep understanding of diverse audiences through approaches such as social listening and user testing [58], which enables more accurate identification of community needs and preferences. The implementation of inclusive design is also key, ensuring digital accessibility for users with diverse abilities and backgrounds. Additionally, content strategies that feature diverse representation have proven effective in strengthening a sense of engagement and belonging, as they reflect a wide range of experiences and perspectives. Community-based approaches also play a crucial role, by creating digital spaces that facilitate organic social interaction, from discussions about daily life to civil issues, thereby naturally strengthening social connections and solidarity [59].

Inclusive communication initiatives in the digital space are now more than just discourse; they have been put into practice. One example is @konekindonesia on Instagram, which focuses on raising awareness of disability issues through educational content, personal stories, and policy advocacy [60]. With accessible visual designs such as subtitled videos and high-contrast infographics, the platform has successfully expanded its reach and strengthened the community of people with disabilities in Indonesia. On a global level, Platform X plays an important role in amplifying marginalized voices. Features such as hashtag campaigns and Spaces have enabled movements such as #MeToo to grow into cross-cultural solidarity that fosters a digital public space that embodies justice and equal dialogue [59]. However, challenges such as online harassment and a lack of protection remain important reminders of the need for a safe digital space.

In academia, social media is used to expand support for researchers from underrepresented groups. Academic Twitter, for example, provides opportunities to share research, build

relationships, and create cross-institutional communities [61]. Despite the positive impact, risks such as public pressure and harassment still need to be anticipated with a supportive community approach. Online forums have also proven effective in encouraging community participation on environmental issues. With an inclusive design and connection to local action, these forums can bridge technology with locally-based knowledge solutions. In Southeast Asia, digital inclusion programs are showing tangible results. Thailand is training seniors and rural communities in digital literacy, while Malaysia is empowering women through digital security training and entrepreneurship support. The results include increased participation and reduced access gaps. Platforms like LINE and WeChat Work have also successfully adapted to local contexts. LINE accommodates Thai culture with a local interface and inclusive features, while WeChat Work supports cross-language organizational communication and interaction styles. From all these case studies, it is clear that success lies in approaches rooted in community, culturally sensitive, and designed for sustainability. Despite ongoing challenges, collaboration and contextual innovation have proven capable of creating a fairer and inclusive digital space.

CONCLUSION

The main priorities for promoting social cohesion in the realm of digital literacy are e-inclusion, digital citizenship, research, and policy. Improving digital literacy and equal access to technology are fundamental to building an inclusive digital community. In terms of policy, there is a need to develop policies that support digital inclusion and address the technology access gap. These policies must consider the needs of vulnerable and marginalized groups. Regarding the evaluation of the effectiveness of inclusive communication strategies, the implementation of a comprehensive evaluation system to measure the effectiveness of inclusive digital communication strategies is important and crucial. This includes the development of metrics that can measure the real impact on inclusion and equality. Additionally, multi-stakeholder collaboration between social media platforms and community organizations that emphasize diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) and normalize the struggles faced by many people with mental health issues is necessary.

In this perspective, Indonesia faces unique challenges in implementing inclusive digital communication, including cultural diversity, language, and varying levels of technology access. Therefore, the implementation of digital communication management in inclusive and sustainable economic recovery through the importance of targeted and coordinated digital communication planning is a very important part. Additionally, civil society organizations in Indonesia play a vital role in bridging the digital gender gap through various programs such as advocating for women's rights, promoting digital literacy, and empowering women economically. This role, whether directly or indirectly, will contribute to enhancing the capacity of women and other vulnerable groups.

Research shows that a “periphery-centric” approach can be a tactic for digital inclusion and exclusion in Indonesian villages. This approach emphasizes the importance of considering the local context in the implementation of digital technology. Studies on the transformation of social capital in Indonesia's digital society highlight the importance of building an inclusive, respectful, and tolerant society in the digital age. This requires improving digital literacy, enforcing strict policies, strengthening online networks, and promoting constructive dialogue.

DECLARATION OF GENERATIVE AI (if any)

During the preparation of this work the author(s) used SciSpace generative AI for data harvesting purposes in the literature review. After using this tool/service, the author(s) reviewed and edited the content as needed and take(s) full responsibility for the content of the publication.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. T. D. Amelia and N. R. Balqis, "Changes in Communication Patterns in the Digital Age," *ARRUS J. Soc. Sci. Humanit.*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 544–556, Aug. 2023, doi: 10.35877/soshum1992.
- [2] R. Anista, "Transformasi Kebudayaan: Dampak Perkembangan Teknologi dan Media Sosial," *JUPSI J. Pendidik. Sos. Indones.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 33–40, Jun. 2023, doi: 10.62238/jupsijurnalpendidikansosialindonesia.v1i1.6.
- [3] R. Gallardo, "Bringing Communities into the Digital Age," *State Local Gov. Rev.*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 233–241, Dec. 2019, doi: 10.1177/0160323X20926696.
- [4] I. Alfiansyah and I. Anshori, "Jejaring Sosial: Transformasi Komunikasi dalam Era Digital," *SOSFILKOM J. Sos. Filsafat dan Komun.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 45–50, Jul. 2024, doi: 10.32534/jsfk.v18i1.4333.
- [5] P. Vassilakopoulou and E. Hustad, "Bridging Digital Divides: a Literature Review and Research Agenda for Information Systems Research," *Inf. Syst. Front.*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 955–969, Jun. 2023, doi: 10.1007/s10796-020-10096-3.
- [6] S. Lythreathis, S. K. Singh, and A.-N. El-Kassar, "The digital divide: A review and future research agenda," *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, vol. 175, p. 121359, Feb. 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121359.
- [7] S. Rogerson, "The digital divide is a multi-dimensional complex," *J. Information, Commun. Ethics Soc.*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 321–321, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.1108/JICES-05-2020-0060.
- [8] A. Farooqi, U. Khalid, and A. M. Khan, "Understanding the Digital Divide in the Contemporary Digital World," *Glob. Polit. Rev.*, vol. VII, no. IV, pp. 7–14, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.31703/gpr.2022(VII-IV).02.
- [9] V. Y. Vinogradov, A. S. Kakharov, and S. S. Dzhabagova, "Digital Divide: The Problem of Unequal Access to Technologies and Ways of its Solution," *Ekonom. I Upr. Probl. RESHENIYA*, vol. 12/14, no. 153, pp. 157–162, 2024, doi: 10.36871/ek.up.p.r.2024.12.14.020.
- [10] M. C. Martínez-Bravo, C. Sádaba Chalezquer, and J. Serrano-Puche, "Dimensions of Digital Literacy in the 21st Century Competency Frameworks," *Sustainability*, vol. 14, no. 3, p. 1867, Feb. 2022, doi: 10.3390/su14031867.
- [11] W. Prasastiningtyas, A. Z. Ubaidillah, I. Aprianti, and L. Nurfadilah, "Improving Literacy in The Digital Age: Unleashing Critical Thinking Potential," *TOPLAMA*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 18–27, Sep. 2024, doi: 10.61397/tla.v2i1.218.
- [12] E. Kang, S. Choi, X. Li, and H. Hwang, "Unveiling Digital Literacy Dynamics in Social Media Usage Patterns: Comparison of Digital Skill and Critical Information Behavior," 2024, pp. 67–77. doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-61966-3_8.
- [13] M. Steinmann, "Alienation in a World of Data. Toward a Materialist Interpretation of Digital Information Technologies," *Philos. Technol.*, vol. 35, no. 4, p. 99, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.1007/s13347-022-00595-3.
- [14] L. Ma, "Alienation in the Digital Age: Philosophical Reflections and Exploration," *Philos. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 1, no. 9, pp. 62–66, Sep. 2024, doi: 10.62381/P243911.
- [15] M. Butler, "Fracturing the affordance space: an account of digitalized alienation," *Front. Psychiatry*, vol. 15, Sep. 2024, doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2024.1407586.
- [16] E. R. Bailey, S. C. Matz, W. Youyou, and S. S. Iyengar, "Authentic self-expression on social media is associated with greater subjective well-being," *Nat. Commun.*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 4889, Oct. 2020, doi: 10.1038/s41467-020-18539-w.
- [17] M.-H. Su, J. Suk, and H. Rojas, "Social Media Expression, Political Extremity, and Reduced Network Interaction: An Imagined Audience Approach," *Soc. Media + Soc.*, vol. 8, no. 1, Jan. 2022, doi: 10.1177/20563051211069056.
- [18] J. Maliki, K. M. Tuah, M. Taibi, V. Govindaraju, and N. S. Ali Osman, "Self-Expression and Mental Wellbeing of Malaysian Youths on Social Media," *J. Komun. Malaysian J. Commun.*, vol. 40, no. 3,

- pp. 312–329, Sep. 2024, doi: 10.17576/JKMJC-2024-4003-18.
- [19] Sugiarto and A. Farid, “Literasi Digital Sebagai Jalan Penguatan Pendidikan Karakter Di Era Society 5.0,” *Cetta J. Ilmu Pendidik.*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 580–597, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.37329/cetta.v6i3.2603.
 - [20] M. C. Buchan, J. Bhawra, and T. R. Katapally, “Navigating the digital world: development of an evidence-based digital literacy program and assessment tool for youth,” *Smart Learn. Environ.*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 8, Feb. 2024, doi: 10.1186/s40561-024-00293-x.
 - [21] D. Gutiérrez-Ujaque, “Towards a critical digital literacy and consciousness in higher education: the emancipatory role of critical digital pedagogy,” *Pedagog. An Int. J.*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 337–371, Jul. 2024, doi: 10.1080/1554480X.2024.2379787.
 - [22] Fitrotul Choiriyah, M. Nashrullah, M. Nursalim, and Amrozi Khamidi, “Digital Supervision for Critical Awareness and Ethical Technology Integration in Education,” *Acad. Open*, vol. 9, no. 2, Dec. 2024, doi: 10.21070/acopen.9.2024.10411.
 - [23] J. Sin, R. L. Franz, C. Munteanu, and B. Barbosa Neves, “Digital Design Marginalization: New Perspectives on Designing Inclusive Interfaces,” in *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, New York, NY, USA: ACM, May 2021, pp. 1–11. doi: 10.1145/3411764.3445180.
 - [24] J. A. Coetzer *et al.*, “The potential and paradoxes of eHealth research for digitally marginalised groups: A qualitative meta-review,” *Soc. Sci. Med.*, vol. 350, p. 116895, Jun. 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2024.116895.
 - [25] C. Fuchs, “Social Media and the Public Sphere,” *tripleC Commun. Capital. Crit. Open Access J. a Glob. Sustain. Inf. Soc.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 57–101, Feb. 2014, doi: 10.31269/triplec.v12i1.552.
 - [26] J. van Dijck and T. Poell, “Social Media and the Transformation of Public Space,” *Soc. Media + Soc.*, vol. 1, no. 2, Jul. 2015, doi: 10.1177/2056305115622482.
 - [27] P. L. Morris and S. H. Sarapin, “You can’t block me: When social media spaces are public forums,” *First Amend. Stud.*, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 52–70, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1080/21689725.2020.1742760.
 - [28] S. K. S and F. Prakash, “Digital Footprint in Social Media,” *Int. J. Res. Publ. Rev.*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 1015–1019, Mar. 2024, doi: 10.55248/gengpi.5.0324.0646.
 - [29] C. J.S., “Social Media, Civic Engagement and Public Spheres,” *Int. J. Multidiscip. Res.*, vol. 5, no. 4, Aug. 2023, doi: 10.36948/ijfmr.2023.v05i04.4929.
 - [30] T. Häussler, “Civil society, the media and the Internet: changing roles and challenging authorities in digital political communication ecologies,” *Information, Commun. Soc.*, vol. 24, no. 9, pp. 1265–1282, Jul. 2021, doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2019.1697338.
 - [31] T. Rahmatullah, “Teknologi Persuasif: Aktor Penting Media Sosial Dalam Mengubah Sikap dan Perilaku Pengguna,” *J. Soshum Insentif*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 60–78, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.36787/jsi.v4i1.509.
 - [32] G. M. Masullo, T. Wilner, and N. J. Stroud, “What Social Media Could Be: Normative Frameworks for Evaluating Digital Public Spaces,” *Soc. Media + Soc.*, vol. 8, no. 4, Oct. 2022, doi: 10.1177/20563051221130447.
 - [33] D. Dobrin, “The Hashtag in Digital Activism: A Cultural Revolution,” *J. Cult. Anal. Soc. Chang.*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 03, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.20897/jcasc/8298.
 - [34] M. Ilham, S. Sudarmiatin, and L. W. Wardana, “The Success of Viral Videos on YouTube as a Growth Driver for MSMEs (Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises),” *Formosa J. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 2, no. 11, pp. 3075–3088, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.55927/fjst.v2i11.6990.
 - [35] A. Karlović, R. Mihaljinec, and M. Bežovan, “The emergence of digital humanitarian actions,” *Medijske Stud.*, vol. 15, no. 29, pp. 151–170, Sep. 2024, doi: 10.20901/ms.15.29.8.
 - [36] A. V. Drozdova, “The Dichotomy of Public/Private in the New Media Space,” *Chang. Soc. Personal.*, vol. 4, no. 4, p. 441, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.15826/csp.2020.4.4.110.
 - [37] P. Staab and T. Thiel, “Social Media and the Digital Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere,” *Theory, Cult. Soc.*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 129–143, Jul. 2022, doi: 10.1177/02632764221103527.
 - [38] D. Jin, “The Integration of Public and Private Spheres in Cyberspace from the Perspective of Women--Take Red Book Platform as an Example,” *Lect. Notes Educ. Psychol. Public Media*, vol. 77, no. 1, pp. 159–164, Jan. 2025, doi: 10.54254/2753-7048/2024.19495.
 - [39] B. B. Mahara, “Social Media and Social Ills: Overcoming the Challenges in the Contemporary Era,” *J. Durgalaxmi*, pp. 14–37, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.3126/jdl.v2i1.65392.
 - [40] M. I. Wahab, “Weaponization of Social Media – Challenges and Responses,” *Int. J. Multidiscip. Res.*, vol. 6, no. 5, Sep. 2024, doi: 10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i05.27555.

- [41] B. Wang, "American Politics in the Age of Social Media: Influence, Challenges, and Economic Effects," *Adv. Econ. Manag. Polit. Sci.*, vol. 160, no. 1, pp. 208–213, Jan. 2025, doi: 10.54254/2754-1169/2025.19810.
- [42] F. Gilardi, T. Gessler, M. Kubli, and S. Müller, "Social Media and Political Agenda Setting," *Polit. Commun.*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 39–60, Jan. 2022, doi: 10.1080/10584609.2021.1910390.
- [43] A. M. A. Ausat, "The Role of Social Media in Shaping Public Opinion and Its Influence on Economic Decisions," *Technol. Soc. Perspect.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 35–44, Aug. 2023, doi: 10.61100/tacit.v1i1.37.
- [44] S. J. Kartutu and U. Rusadi, "Social Media as a New Arena of Power in Indonesia: A Political Economy Perspective in the Digital Platform Era," *Int. J. Soc. Hum.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 79–103, Feb. 2025, doi: 10.59613/0pscjk39.
- [45] M. Cinelli, G. De Francisci Morales, A. Galeazzi, W. Quattrociocchi, and M. Starnini, "The echo chamber effect on social media," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 118, no. 9, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1073/pnas.2023301118.
- [46] L. Kim, "The Echo chamber-driven Polarization on Social Media," *J. Student Res.*, vol. 12, no. 4, Nov. 2023, doi: 10.47611/jsr.v12i4.2274.
- [47] S. Shiddiq and M. Misra, "Teori Filter Bubble dan Echo Chamber: Dampak Transformasi Digital Terhadap Pendidikan Islam," *Concept J. Soc. Humanit. Educ.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 122–130, Mar. 2025, doi: 10.55606/concept.v4i1.1824.
- [48] A. P. Siddaway, A. M. Wood, and L. V. Hedges, "How to Do a Systematic Review: A Best Practice Guide for Conducting and Reporting Narrative Reviews, Meta-Analyses, and Meta-Syntheses," *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 747–770, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-102803.
- [49] H. A. M. Shaffril, S. F. Samsuddin, and A. A. Samah, "The ABC of systematic literature review: the basic methodological guidance for beginners," *Qual. Quant.*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 1319–1346, Aug. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s11135-020-01059-6.
- [50] W. Mengist, T. Soromessa, and G. Legese, "Method for conducting systematic literature review and meta-analysis for environmental science research," *MethodsX*, vol. 7, p. 100777, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.mex.2019.100777.
- [51] P. C. Sauer and S. Seuring, "How to conduct systematic literature reviews in management research: a guide in 6 steps and 14 decisions," *Rev. Manag. Sci.*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 1899–1933, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.1007/s11846-023-00668-3.
- [52] J. Paul, P. Khatri, and H. Kaur Duggal, "Frameworks for developing impactful systematic literature reviews and theory building: What, Why and How?," *J. Decis. Syst.*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 537–550, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.1080/12460125.2023.2197700.
- [53] M. R. W. Hiebl, "Sample Selection in Systematic Literature Reviews of Management Research," *Organ. Res. Methods*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 229–261, Apr. 2023, doi: 10.1177/1094428120986851.
- [54] L.-L. Ebidor and I. G. Ikhide, "Literature Review in Scientific Research: An Overview," *East African J. Educ. Stud.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 179–186, May 2024, doi: 10.37284/eajes.7.2.1909.
- [55] V. Clarke and V. Braun, "Thematic analysis," *J. Posit. Psychol.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 297–298, May 2017, doi: 10.1080/17439760.2016.1262613.
- [56] M. Naeem, W. Ozuem, K. Howell, and S. Ranfagni, "A Step-by-Step Process of Thematic Analysis to Develop a Conceptual Model in Qualitative Research," *Int. J. Qual. Methods*, vol. 22, Oct. 2023, doi: 10.1177/16094069231205789.
- [57] L. Baxter, "How to Peer Review a Systematic Review: A Peer-Reviewer's Guide to Reviewing Reviews," *J. Clin. Pharmacol.*, Apr. 2025, doi: 10.1002/jcph.70036.
- [58] Q. Xu, "Inclusive Digital and Social Media Strategies," in *Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Strategic Communications*, New York: Routledge, 2024, pp. 65–78. doi: 10.4324/9781003411796-6.
- [59] S. Chavanayarn, "Epistemic Injustice and Ideal Social Media: Enhancing X for Inclusive Global Engagement," *Topoi*, vol. 43, no. 5, pp. 1355–1368, Dec. 2024, doi: 10.1007/s11245-024-10070-7.
- [60] I. Nurfikria and W. O. Lusianai, "Communicating Disability Inclusion on Social Media: A Case Study @konekindonesia," in *Proceedings of the 3rd AIDRAN Biennial Conference: International Conference on Disability Rights, ICDR 2023, 21– 23 November 2023, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, EAI*, 2024. doi: 10.4108/eai.21-11-2023.2352618.
- [61] B. L. Montgomery, "Building and Sustaining Diverse Functioning Networks Using Social Media and Digital Platforms to Improve Diversity and Inclusivity," *Front. Digit. Humanit.*, vol. 5, Sep. 2018, doi: 10.3389/fdigh.2018.00022.