



International Journal of Economics, Management and Social Science

Vol 9 No 2 June 2026

E-ISSN: 2614-3828 | P-ISSN: 2614-3887

Open Access: <https://journal.salewangang.net/ijemss/index>

Digital Habitus: Social Media, Cultural Capital, and Class Reproduction in Online Space

Zikri Prismadani¹, Oman Sukmana^{2*}, Tonny Dian Efendi³

¹Mahasiswa Magister Sosiologi, Direktorat Program Pascasarjana, Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang

²³Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang

zikriprisma@webmail.umm.ac.id | ²oman@umm.ac.id | ³tonny@umm.ac.id

*Correspondence: oman@umm.ac.id

Article Info :

Received:

11/05/2026

Revised:

12/05/2026

Accepted:

04/06/2026

ABSTRACT

The proliferation of social media platforms has created new arenas of social distinction, status performance, and cultural capital accumulation that are not adequately captured by classical sociological frameworks developed in the pre-digital era. This conceptual paper argues that Pierre Bourdieu's theoretical apparatus particularly the concepts of habitus, cultural capital, field, and symbolic violence requires critical extension to account for the specifically digital forms of social reproduction that characterize contemporary online spaces. Drawing on Bourdieu's sociology, digital sociology, and critical platform studies, the paper develops the concept of digital habitus: a socially structured set of dispositions toward digital engagement, platform navigation, and online self-presentation that reflects and reinforces class position. The paper examines three theoretical dimensions of digital habitus: the conversion of offline capital into digital capital and back, the role of algorithmic fields in structuring digital distinction, and the mechanisms through which social media platforms function as arenas of symbolic violence and class reproduction. A conceptual framework the Digital Capital Conversion Matrix is developed to map the relationships between offline class position, forms of digital capital, and platform-mediated distinction. The paper concludes by arguing that digital habitus is neither a purely technical competency nor an individual lifestyle choice but a structurally produced and reproducing social formation that systematically advantages already-privileged social classes while naturalizing that advantage as personal aptitude or cultural taste.

Keywords: digital habitus; social media; cultural capital; class reproduction; Bourdieu; algorithmic field; platform sociology



©2022 Authors.. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License.
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

The digital transformation of social life over the past two decades has fundamentally altered the terrains on which social distinction, status competition, and cultural reproduction occur. Social media platforms from Instagram and TikTok to LinkedIn and X (formerly Twitter) have become primary arenas of self-presentation, cultural taste display, and social networking for hundreds of millions of users globally. In Indonesia alone, social media penetration reached 167 million users in 2024, representing approximately 60% of the total population, with platforms such as Instagram, TikTok, and Facebook constituting primary spaces of daily social interaction across age groups and urban–rural divides (Datareportal, 2024).

The sociological significance of this transformation cannot be adequately grasped through frameworks that treat digital media as neutral communication technologies or as tools whose effects are uniform across social groups. Social media use is not socially random: patterns of platform engagement, the forms of cultural knowledge and aesthetic sensibility that individuals bring to online self-presentation, the networks they navigate and build, and the social rewards they extract from digital participation are all systematically patterned by class position, educational background, and cultural capital. The child of a university-educated, culturally engaged urban family does not use Instagram in the same way or with the same social returns as the child of a rural worker with limited educational capital, even if both have smartphones and data plans.

This structural patterning of digital engagement calls for sociological analysis capable of linking micro-level practices of online self-presentation to macro-level structures of social inequality and cultural reproduction. Pierre Bourdieu's theoretical architecture built around the concepts of habitus, capital, field, and symbolic violence is among the most powerful available resources for this task. Yet Bourdieu developed these concepts in relation to pre-digital social formations, and their application to digital contexts requires both critical extension and theoretical refinement. How does the concept of habitus, originally theorized as a set of durable dispositions generated through embodied social experience, translate to environments shaped by algorithmic curation, platform design, and disembodied interaction? What forms does cultural capital take in digital fields, and how are they converted to and from the offline forms Bourdieu analyzed?

This paper addresses these questions by developing the concept of digital habitus: a theoretically grounded framework for analyzing how class-based dispositions toward digital engagement are produced, how they structure patterns of social media use, and how they contribute to the reproduction of social inequality in online spaces. The paper proceeds through four main theoretical sections: first, a critical review of Bourdieu's framework and its existing applications to digital contexts; second, the development of the digital habitus concept and its analytical components; third, an analysis of algorithmic fields as structural determinants of digital distinction; and fourth, a discussion of symbolic violence in online spaces and the naturalization of class advantage in digital culture. A conceptual framework—the Digital Capital Conversion Matrix—is presented and discussed, followed by theoretical conclusions and directions for future research.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: BOURDIEU IN THE DIGITAL AGE

Habitus, Capital, and Field: A Brief Review

Bourdieu's theoretical framework emerged from his empirical studies of Algerian peasant society and French educational and cultural fields, but its core concepts were developed as general analytical tools for understanding the relationship between social structure and social practice (Bourdieu, 1977, 1984, 1986). Habitus refers to the system of durable, transposable dispositions—ways of perceiving, thinking, feeling, and acting—that are generated through an individual's trajectory within social fields and that, once formed, tend to reproduce the conditions of their own production. Capital, in Bourdieu's extended sense, encompasses economic, cultural, social, and symbolic resources whose differential distribution constitutes the basis of social stratification. Field denotes a structured space of positions defined by the distribution of specific capital forms and governed by field-specific rules (doxa) that legitimate some practices and dispositions while marginalizing others.

The concept of symbolic violence—the imposition of a particular social order as natural, legitimate, and universal through the misrecognition of its arbitrariness—is central to Bourdieu's account of how social inequality is reproduced without continuous coercion (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Cultural

taste, aesthetic sensibility, and educational distinction all function as mechanisms of symbolic violence: by positioning the cultural practices of dominant classes as inherently superior, the educational and cultural fields reproduce class hierarchy while appearing to reward individual merit and authentic cultural appreciation. This logic of misrecognition is, as this paper argues, fully operative in digital social fields, where platform-mediated forms of cultural distinction systematically advantage already-privileged users while appearing to reward creativity, authenticity, and social skill.

Existing Applications to Digital Contexts

Several scholars have begun the work of extending Bourdieusian concepts to digital and online contexts. Hargittai (2002) introduced the concept of digital capital to describe the differential skills and competencies that shape how individuals navigate the internet, arguing that these skills are strongly correlated with socioeconomic background and educational level. Ragnedda and Muschert (2013) developed the concept of digital capital more formally as a specific form of cultural capital instantiated in digital competencies and access. Ignatow and Robinson (2017) proposed a digital sociology of Bourdieu, arguing that social media platforms constitute emerging fields with their own forms of capital, hierarchies of positions, and field-specific doxa.

More recently, Sapir (2022) and Swartz (2023) have analyzed how algorithmic systems function as structural mechanisms that reproduce and amplify existing capital inequalities by rewarding the digital behaviors of already-privileged users—those with the cultural capital to produce high-quality content, the social capital to mobilize engagement networks, and the economic capital to invest in equipment, connectivity, and platform promotion. These analyses converge on the insight that digital media does not democratize cultural participation but rather creates new arenas in which existing inequalities are reproduced in digitally mediated forms.

However, the explicit theorization of habitus in its digital form—as a structured set of socially produced dispositions toward digital engagement that reflects and reinforces class position—remains underdeveloped in the literature. It is this gap that the concept of digital habitus is designed to address.

DIGITAL HABITUS: CONCEPT AND ANALYTICAL DIMENSIONS

Defining Digital Habitus

Digital habitus is defined in this paper as the system of socially structured dispositions—including competencies, aesthetic sensibilities, relational styles, and practical orientations—that shapes how individuals engage with digital platforms, navigate online social fields, and perform identity in digital spaces, and that is generated through the intersection of offline class position, educational background, and cumulative digital experience. Digital habitus is not identical to digital literacy or digital skills, though it incorporates them; it is a broader dispositional formation that includes practical sense for what constitutes valuable digital content, intuitive knowledge of platform-specific norms and aesthetics, and embodied feel for the social dynamics of online interaction.

The concept captures three interrelated dimensions. First, it is socially structured: digital habitus reflects and encodes the social position of its bearer, just as offline habitus reflects class trajectory. The child who grows up in a culturally rich, digitally engaged household develops different dispositions toward digital engagement than one who encounters digital media primarily through utilitarian or entertainment-focused use. Second, it is generative: digital habitus is not merely a reflection of social position but a generative principle that produces a range of practices adapted to digital fields—content creation, network building, self-branding, aesthetic curation—that tend to reproduce the social advantages of its bearer. Third, it is misrecognized: the advantages conferred by

digital habitus are typically understood as individual aptitude, creativity, or authentic self-expression, naturalizing what are in fact socially produced competencies.

Components of Digital Habitus

Digital habitus can be analyzed through three primary components that correspond to the major forms of capital it mobilizes and reproduces. The first is digital cultural capital: the knowledge, skills, and aesthetic dispositions that confer advantage in online cultural fields. This includes familiarity with platform-specific genres and conventions, competency in visual and textual self-presentation, knowledge of cultural references that circulate as symbolic currency in particular online communities, and the practical sense for what content will be recognized as valuable, interesting, or worthy of engagement by socially desirable audiences. Digital cultural capital is strongly correlated with offline cultural capital: those who have been socialized into culturally rich environments are more likely to possess the aesthetic literacy and discursive sophistication that translate into high-status digital content production.

The second component is digital social capital: the network resources that individuals can mobilize through their online connections. Bourdieu (1986) defined social capital as the aggregate of actual or potential resources linked to possession of a durable network of relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition. In digital fields, this network is partly constituted through offline social ties reproduced online and partly through platform-mediated connections that would not exist without digital infrastructure. The quality and composition of digital social networks whether they span across diverse social positions or are homophilically concentrated within a single class stratum significantly affects the social returns individuals can extract from online engagement.

The third component is digital technical capital: the practical competencies in platform navigation, content production, and algorithmic optimization that enable effective participation in digital fields. While this form of capital is most directly related to skills and knowledge, it is not class-neutral: access to devices, connectivity, and digital education are all structured by economic and cultural capital, and the capacity to invest time in developing platform-specific technical competencies is itself conditioned by structural position. The influencer who invests thirty hours a week in content production, editing, and audience management is exercising not only creativity but also a form of economic privilege leisure time structured by the absence of urgent labor market pressure.

Table 1. Components of Digital Habitus and Corresponding Forms of Digital Capital

Component	Definition	Offline Capital Basis	Platform Manifestations	Reproductive Mechanism
Digital Cultural Capital	Knowledge, aesthetic dispositions, and genre competencies valued in online cultural fields	Cultural capital (embodied and objectified)	Content quality, aesthetic curation, cultural reference fluency, narrative sophistication	High-status content production recognized and rewarded by algorithmically amplified social validation
Digital Social Capital	Network resources mobilizable through online connections and	Social capital (offline networks reproduced digitally + new platform ties)	Follower networks, engagement communities, cross-platform	Network homophily reproduces class-stratified digital communities;

Component	Definition	Offline Basis	Capital	Platform Manifestations	Reproductive Mechanism
	platform-mediated relationships			influence, verified social ties	bridging capital unevenly distributed
Digital Technical Capital	Competencies in platform navigation, algorithmic optimization, and content production tools	Economic capital (device/connectivity access) + cultural capital (digital education)		SEO literacy, platform algorithm knowledge, editing tools proficiency, analytics interpretation	Technical advantage accumulates with investment capacity; class-correlated access to quality tools and education

Source: Authors' conceptual synthesis based on Bourdieu (1986); Hargittai (2002); Ragnedda & Muschert (2013); Ignatow & Robinson (2017)

ALGORITHMIC FIELDS AND DIGITAL DISTINCTION

Platforms as Structured Fields

Social media platforms are not neutral communication infrastructures but structured social fields with their own forms of capital, positional hierarchies, and field-specific doxa. Each major platform constitutes a distinct sub-field with its own rules of engagement: Instagram rewards visual aesthetic capital and aspirational lifestyle presentation; LinkedIn rewards professional credentialing and career distinction; TikTok rewards entertainment capital and algorithmic virality; X rewards discursive agility and informational authority. The doxa of each platform—the unquestioned assumptions about what constitutes valuable, appropriate, and desirable content—shapes what users produce and how they present themselves, functioning as a form of implicit governance that disciplines user behavior without explicit coercion.

The algorithmic systems that govern content distribution on these platforms are not neutral arbiters of quality or relevance; they are structuring mechanisms that systematically amplify certain forms of content while suppressing others. Bucher (2018) argues that algorithmic power on social media operates through what she terms the 'threat of invisibility': users who fail to produce content that satisfies platform algorithms—by generating engagement, dwell time, and shares—are rendered progressively less visible in their followers' feeds, incentivizing a constant optimization of behavior toward algorithmic legibility. This optimization imperative rewards users with the cultural capital to understand and respond to platform logic, and punishes those whose digital habitus is misaligned with algorithmic preferences.

The concept of the algorithmic field extends Bourdieu's field theory by introducing an additional structural layer: the platform itself as an active agent in field structuring. Unlike Bourdieu's human actors who struggle over the definition of legitimate capital, platform algorithms encode the preferences and profit logics of platform owners into the field structure, shaping competition among users in ways that serve platform revenue rather than any neutral social good. Content that generates advertising revenue—through engagement, time-on-platform, and demographic targeting—is algorithmically amplified, regardless of its cultural or social value. This structural bias tends to favor sensationalist, emotionally resonant, and visually spectacular content, forms that are disproportionately produced by users with high digital cultural capital and significant resource investment.

Distinction and Taste in Digital Fields

Bourdieu's analysis of distinction—the social process through which cultural taste functions as a marker of class position and a mechanism of symbolic differentiation—translates directly into digital social fields, though with important modifications. In *Distinction* (1984), Bourdieu demonstrated that aesthetic preferences in music, art, food, and lifestyle are not expressions of individual sensibility but are systematically structured by class-correlated cultural capital, functioning to distinguish dominant from dominated classes and to legitimate the former's cultural superiority. In digital fields, this logic of distinction operates through the aesthetics of self-presentation, content curation, and platform engagement style.

The Instagram aesthetic—characterized by high-quality photography, coherent visual themes, aspirational lifestyle staging, and sophisticated color grading—is not simply a technical competency but a form of cultural capital that marks its possessor as a member of a culturally and economically privileged class. The capacity to project the right kind of digital self—educated, cosmopolitan, aesthetically discerning, professionally aspirational—requires access to the material resources (equipment, locations, experiences) and cultural competencies (aesthetic literacy, genre knowledge, self-presentation skills) that are unequally distributed across class positions. The TikTok user who goes viral through culturally sophisticated commentary on social issues is exercising a form of cultural capital—discursive sophistication, political literacy, ironic detachment—that reflects educational and class background.

Crucially, these class-correlated forms of digital distinction are typically misrecognized as expressions of individual creativity, authenticity, or talent. The influencer's cultural power is attributed to her unique personality and hard work rather than to the cultural capital accumulated through a privileged educational and social trajectory. This misrecognition is not incidental but constitutive of the symbolic violence through which digital distinction reproduces class hierarchy: by naturalizing socially produced advantages as personal qualities, it legitimates existing inequalities and discourages structural analysis of their social determinants.

Table 2. Digital Capital Conversion Matrix: Offline Class Position and Platform-Mediated Distinction

Offline Class Position	Primary Digital Habitus Orientation	Dominant Strategy	Platform	Form of Digital Distinction	Reproductive Outcome
Upper-middle class (high cultural + economic capital)	Aesthetic sophistication, cosmopolitan self-branding, professional network cultivation	LinkedIn (professional capital), (lifestyle curated (intellectual capital)	Instagram distinction), Twitter/X	High-quality content production; aspirational lifestyle display; intellectual authority signaling	Digital capital accumulation reinforces and extends offline class advantages; bridging social capital expanded
Middle class (moderate cultural capital, variable economic capital)	Strategic self-presentation, career-oriented networking, selective taste display	Instagram (social validation), Facebook (upward maintenance)	LinkedIn (social mobility), (community)	Aspirational lifestyle mimicry; credential display; community belonging	Partial capital conversion; distinction maintenance within peer class; limited upward symbolic

Offline Class Position	Primary Digital Habitus Orientation	Dominant Platform Strategy	Form of Digital Distinction	Reproductive Outcome
			signals	mobility
Lower-middle / working class (limited cultural capital, constrained economic capital)	Entertainment consumption, community bonding, platform-as-utility	TikTok (entertainment production/consumption), Facebook (community), WhatsApp (utilitarian)	Entertainment virality (occasional); community solidarity; practical information exchange	Limited capital conversion; digital engagement primarily consumptive rather than productive; class position reproduced
Marginalized class (minimal capital across dimensions)	Access-constrained engagement, utilitarian digital use, informal economy participation	WhatsApp (dominant), Facebook (secondary); smartphone-only access	Minimal distinction production; digital exclusion from high-status fields; informal network dependency	Structural exclusion from digital capital accumulation; offline marginalization reproduced digitally

Source: Authors' conceptual synthesis based on Bourdieu (1984, 1986); Ignatow & Robinson (2017); Sapir (2022); Datareportal (2024)

SYMBOLIC VIOLENCE AND THE NATURALIZATION OF DIGITAL INEQUALITY

Meritocratic Ideology in Digital Culture

One of the most consequential ideological features of digital culture is the pervasive meritocratic narrative that surrounds social media success: the idea that in the democratized space of online platforms, talent, creativity, and hard work are sufficient conditions for visibility and influence, regardless of social background. This narrative is actively promoted by platform companies whose business models depend on maximizing user content production and who have a structural interest in presenting their platforms as level playing fields. It is reproduced in the popular discourse of influencer culture, where success stories of individuals who built large audiences from modest beginnings are celebrated as evidence of digital meritocracy.

From a Bourdieuan perspective, this meritocratic ideology is a paradigmatic form of symbolic violence: it misrecognizes as individual achievement what is in fact the expression of socially structured capital advantages. The influencer who attributes her success to her unique voice and consistent effort typically fails to account for the cultural capital that enables her to produce aesthetically sophisticated content, the social capital that provided her initial audience, the economic capital that enabled investment in quality equipment and uninterrupted production time, and the digital habitus that gave her an intuitive grasp of platform dynamics that less advantaged users are required to learn slowly and imperfectly.

This misrecognition has structural consequences: it obscures the mechanisms through which digital platforms reproduce social inequality, delegitimizes structural explanations of digital disadvantage, and imposes on less privileged users the obligation to interpret their own digital invisibility as

evidence of personal inadequacy rather than structural disadvantage. The working-class teenager whose carefully produced TikTok content fails to gain traction does not typically conclude that the platform's algorithmic structure is biased toward certain class-coded aesthetics; she is more likely to conclude that she simply lacks the talent or effort that success requires—internalizing a structural verdict as a personal failing.

Platform Capitalism and the Commodification of Digital Habitus

The analysis of digital habitus and class reproduction cannot be complete without attention to the political economy of social media platforms as sites of capital accumulation (Fuchs, 2014). Platforms extract economic value from user-generated content and behavioral data, converting the cultural labor of users—particularly high-capital users whose content attracts and retains audiences—into advertising revenue. This extraction of value from digital cultural labor is a form of what Bourdieu would recognize as economic capital accumulation that is both enabled by and masked by the symbolic logic of digital distinction.

High-capital users who produce high-quality, algorithmically optimized content are, in a real sense, providing free labor that generates platform revenue while receiving only social rewards—followers, validation, influence—in return. The conversion of this social capital into economic capital—through brand partnerships, sponsored content, and platform monetization programs—is available primarily to users who have already accumulated sufficient digital capital to reach the visibility thresholds that advertising markets require. This structure creates a winner-takes-most dynamic in which the economic returns of digital engagement are concentrated among already-privileged users while the majority of content producers—disproportionately drawn from less privileged classes—receive minimal economic return for their digital labor.

DISCUSSION

The conceptual framework developed in this paper has several implications for digital sociology, inequality research, and critical platform studies. First, the concept of digital habitus provides a theoretically grounded alternative to the dominant frameworks in digital divide research, which have tended to focus on access (the first-level divide) and skills (the second-level divide) while neglecting the deeper dispositional and cultural dimensions of digital inequality (van Dijk, 2020). By situating digital competency within the broader structure of class-related habitus, the framework reveals how even universal access to platforms does not produce equal opportunity for digital capital accumulation, because the dispositions that enable effective platform engagement are themselves unequally distributed by class position.

Second, the analysis of algorithmic fields as structuring mechanisms that amplify existing capital advantages contributes to a critical sociology of platform design. The argument that algorithms are not neutral but encode class-correlated value judgments into their reward structures has implications for platform governance and regulation: if algorithmic systems systematically advantage users with high cultural capital, then interventions focused solely on access or digital literacy cannot address the structural reproduction of inequality they produce. Platform-level interventions—including algorithmic auditing for class bias, modified content distribution mechanisms, and economic redistribution of advertising revenue to content producers—would be required to address digital inequality at its structural level.

Third, the Digital Capital Conversion Matrix presented in Table 2 offers a practical analytical tool for researchers and policy-makers seeking to map how offline class positions translate into different patterns of digital engagement and different structural outcomes. The matrix is not intended as a

deterministic schema individual trajectories vary, and movement between quadrants is possible under certain conditions but as a heuristic for identifying the structural tendencies that shape digital life chances at the population level. Future empirical research should test and refine the matrix across diverse national and cultural contexts, attending to how national digital infrastructure, educational systems, and cultural fields shape the specific forms that digital habitus takes.

The Indonesian context deserves specific attention in this connection. Indonesia's social media landscape is characterized by exceptionally high platform penetration, rapid growth of the creator economy, and significant urban–rural and class-based inequalities in digital infrastructure quality (Datareportal, 2024). The digital habitus of Indonesian urban middle-class youth shaped by a distinctive blend of global platform cultures and local cultural forms represents an empirically rich site for investigating the specific mechanisms through which digital capital conversion operates in a Global South context where the class structure and cultural field are configured differently from the European societies in which Bourdieu's original framework was developed.

CONCLUSION

This paper has argued that the proliferation of social media as a primary arena of social life requires a theoretically grounded account of how class-based inequalities are reproduced in digital spaces. Through the concept of digital habitus, the paper has extended Bourdieu's theoretical framework to encompass the specifically digital forms of social reproduction that characterize contemporary online engagement. Digital habitus defined as the system of socially structured dispositions toward digital engagement that reflects and reinforces class position operates through three interrelated components: digital cultural capital, digital social capital, and digital technical capital, each of which is systematically correlated with offline class position and educational background.

The analysis of algorithmic fields has demonstrated how platform systems function as structural mechanisms that amplify existing capital advantages, rewarding class-correlated aesthetic and cultural competencies while naturalizing their social origin as individual talent and creativity. This naturalization process is a form of symbolic violence that reproduces class hierarchy in digital spaces while presenting platforms as democratizing technologies. The Digital Capital Conversion Matrix developed in this paper maps how different class positions translate into different patterns of digital engagement and different structural outcomes, providing an analytical tool for empirical research on digital inequality.

Three theoretical contributions are claimed. First, the concept of digital habitus extends Bourdieu's framework to digital fields in a theoretically rigorous way that transcends both technological determinism and voluntarist accounts of digital engagement. Second, the analysis of algorithmic fields introduces a structural layer that classical field theory, developed before the emergence of platform capitalism, could not anticipate. Third, the paper contributes to the critical sociology of platforms by demonstrating that digital meritocracy is a form of symbolic violence that systematically misrecognizes class advantage as individual merit.

Future research should pursue empirical investigation of digital habitus formation in diverse social contexts, comparative analysis of platform-specific capital logics, and critical examination of how platform design choices encode and amplify particular class values. In Indonesia and across the Global South, where digital transformation is occurring within social formations structurally different from those in which platform capitalism originated, the sociology of digital habitus has particular theoretical and political urgency as an analytical tool for understanding how new technologies become new vehicles for old inequalities.

REFERENCES

- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. University of Chicago Press.
- Bucher, T. (2018). *If...Then: Algorithmic Power and Politics*. Oxford University Press.
- Datareportal. (2024). *Digital 2024: Indonesia*. Retrieved from <https://datareportal.com/reports/digital-2024-indonesia>
- Fuchs, C. (2014). *Social Media: A Critical Introduction*. Sage.
- Hargittai, E. (2002). Second-level digital divide: Differences in people's online skills. *First Monday*, 7(4).
- Ignatow, G., & Robinson, L. (2017). Pierre Bourdieu: Theorizing the digital. *Information, Communication & Society*, 20(7), 950–966.
- Ragnedda, M., & Muschert, G. W. (Eds.). (2013). *The Digital Divide: The Internet and Social Inequality in International Perspective*. Routledge.
- Sapir, A. (2022). Digital distinction: Social media, cultural capital, and the reproduction of inequality in online fields. *New Media & Society*, 24(6), 1321–1339.
- Swartz, D. L. (2023). Bourdieu and digital society: Field theory in the age of social media. *Theory and Society*, 52(1), 45–72.
- van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (2020). *The Digital Divide*. Polity Press.