PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE (PRJSS)
ISSN Online : Open Access Scholarly Journal

Digital Inequality And The Post-Pandemic Digital Divide

Sinitha Xavier

Assistant Professor in Economics, Research Department of Economics,
P.M Govt. College, Chalakudy, Kerala, India.

Article information

Received: 4th March 2026
Received in revised form: 27th March 2026
Accepted: 9th April 2026
Available online: 19th April 2026

Volume: 1
Issue: 1
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19640464

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic exposed and amplified pre-existing digital inequalities across the globe. As governments, educational institutions, and employers shifted operations online, populations without reliable internet access, digital devices, or adequate digital literacy were systematically excluded from essential services. This article examines the structural dimensions of the post-pandemic digital divide through the lens of social stratification theory, analyzing how race, class, geography, and age intersect to produce differentiated digital outcomes. Drawing on quantitative data from the International Telecommunication Union, Pew Research Center, and national census surveys, alongside qualitative case studies from sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and rural North America, the paper argues that the digital divide is not merely a technological gap but a manifestation of deeper socioeconomic inequalities. The article concludes by evaluating policy interventions—including universal broadband initiatives, digital literacy programs, and public-private partnerships—and their effectiveness in bridging the divide.

Keywords: - Broadband Access, COVID-19, Digital Divide, Digital Inequality, Digital Literacy, Social Stratification

Introduction

The concept of the digital divide entered public discourse in the mid-1990s, initially describing the gap between those with and without access to computers and the internet (Norris 2001). Over the subsequent three decades, the divide has evolved from a binary access question into a multidimensional phenomenon encompassing quality of connection, digital skills, and the capacity to translate digital engagement into tangible social and economic benefits (Hargittai 2002; van Dijk 2020). The COVID-19 pandemic, which forced an unprecedented global shift to remote work, online education, and telehealth, served as a stress test for digital infrastructure and revealed the persistence and depth of these inequalities.

According to the International Telecommunication Union (ITU 2022), approximately 2.7 billion people remained offline as of 2022, with the vast majority concentrated in low-income countries and rural regions. In the United States, the Federal Communications Commission estimated that 21 million Americans lacked broadband access, though independent analyses suggested the true figure was considerably higher (Busby, Tanberk, and Cooper 2020). The pandemic made these statistics viscerally consequential: students without home internet connections fell behind academically, workers without digital skills faced unemployment, and elderly citizens without telehealth access experienced deteriorating health outcomes (Lai and Widmar 2021).

This article contributes to the growing body of post-pandemic digital divide scholarship by offering a comparative, multi-scalar analysis. It examines the digital divide at three levels: the macro level of global inequalities between nations, the meso level of within-country disparities along racial, geographic, and socioeconomic lines, and the micro level of individual digital competencies and usage patterns. In doing so, it moves beyond the first-level divide (access) to interrogate second-level (skills and usage) and third-level (tangible outcomes) divides as theorized by Wei and Hindman

(2011). The article draws on social stratification theory to argue that digital inequality is both a product of and a contributor to broader patterns of social inequality.

Theoretical Framework: Digital Inequality as Social Stratification

The theoretical foundation of this article rests on the intersection of digital divide scholarship and classical social stratification theory. DiMaggio and Hargittai (2001) were among the first to argue that as internet access expanded, the digital divide would not disappear but would transform into a more nuanced form of digital inequality. They identified five dimensions of digital inequality: technical apparatus (quality of hardware and connectivity), autonomy of use (location and freedom of access), skill (ability to navigate digital environments effectively), social support (availability of assistance from knowledgeable others), and purpose (the range and sophistication of activities undertaken online).

Van Dijk's (2005, 2020) sequential access model further refined this framework by proposing that digital access unfolds through four stages: motivational access (psychological engagement with technology), material access (physical availability of hardware and connectivity), skills access (operational, formal, informational, and strategic digital skills), and usage access (meaningful and diverse application of technology). This model is particularly useful for understanding post-pandemic dynamics, as the pandemic effectively removed motivational barriers—virtually everyone recognized the necessity of digital connectivity—while simultaneously exposing persistent material and skills gaps.

Robinson et al. (2015) integrated digital inequality into the broader sociological framework of social stratification, arguing that digital resources function as a form of capital analogous to Bourdieu's (1986) cultural capital. In this view, digital competence is not merely a technical skill but a socially distributed resource that reinforces existing hierarchies. Those who already possess economic, cultural, and social capital are better positioned to acquire digital capital, creating a feedback loop that deepens inequality over time. The pandemic accelerated this dynamic by making digital capital a prerequisite for participation in nearly every domain of social life.

The Global Digital Divide: Between and Within Nations

At the global level, the digital divide remains stark. The ITU (2022) reported that while 90 percent of the population in developed countries used the internet, the figure was only 57 percent in developing countries and 27 percent in the least developed countries. Sub-Saharan Africa had the lowest connectivity rate, with only 36 percent of the population online. These figures obscure further inequalities within regions: urban areas consistently outpace rural areas, and women in developing countries are 12 percent less likely than men to use the internet (ITU 2022).

The pandemic exacerbated these disparities. A UNESCO (2021) report found that 1.6 billion students were affected by school closures globally, and at least 463 million could not access remote learning due to a lack of internet or devices. In sub-Saharan Africa, where only 11 percent of households had internet access, the shift to online education effectively excluded the majority of students. Similar patterns emerged in South Asia, where the Indian government's push for digital education through platforms like DIKSHA and SWAYAM reached fewer than 25 percent of students in rural areas (Azim Premji Foundation 2021).

Within wealthy nations, the divide persisted along familiar fault lines. In the United States, the Pew Research Center (2021) found that 25 percent of adults with household incomes below $30,000 did not own a smartphone, compared to only 3 percent of those earning above $100,000. Rural Americans were nearly twice as likely as urban residents to report that access to high-speed internet was a major problem in their community. Racial disparities were also significant: Black and Hispanic adults were less likely than White adults to have home broadband and more likely to rely exclusively on smartphones for internet access (Vogels 2021).

The Educational Digital Divide: Remote Learning and Its Discontents

The shift to remote education during the pandemic provided the most visible illustration of how digital inequality translates into educational inequality. Research consistently demonstrated that students from lower-income households experienced greater learning loss during school closures than their wealthier peers (Engzell, Frey, and Verhagen 2021). A study by Dorn et al. (2020) for McKinsey & Company estimated that students in predominantly Black schools lost an average of six months of learning in mathematics, compared to four months for students in predominantly White schools.

These outcomes were driven by multiple intersecting factors. First, material access to devices and connectivity was unevenly distributed. A Common Sense Media (2020) report estimated that between 15 and 16 million K-12 students in the United States lacked adequate internet or devices for remote learning, a phenomenon termed the 'homework gap.' Second, even when devices were available, the quality of connectivity varied enormously: students relying on mobile hotspots or shared devices experienced frequent disruptions that undermined learning (Auxier and Anderson 2020). Third, parental digital literacy and capacity to support remote learning were themselves stratified by education and income, creating a compounding effect (Bonal and González 2020).

International evidence reinforced these findings. In the United Kingdom, Sutton Trust (2021) surveys revealed that private school students were twice as likely as state school students to have access to live online lessons. In Brazil, UNICEF (2021) reported that 4.8 million children and adolescents aged 9 to 17 had no internet access at home, with the figure disproportionately affecting Black, Indigenous, and rural populations. These educational disparities carry long-term consequences for human capital development, social mobility, and intergenerational inequality.

Employment, Economic Participation, and the Digital Economy

The pandemic accelerated the digitalization of labor markets, creating new forms of economic exclusion. Workers in knowledge-economy sectors transitioned relatively smoothly to remote work, while those in service, manufacturing, and informal employment—disproportionately women, racial minorities, and workers in developing countries—faced layoffs or continued in-person work under hazardous conditions (Adams-Prassl et al. 2020). Mongey, Pilossoph, and Weinberg (2021) demonstrated that the ability to work from home was strongly correlated with income, education, and occupational category, reinforcing pre-existing labor market stratification.

The gig economy and platform work, often presented as democratizing economic participation, have also reproduced digital inequalities. Algorithmic management systems, opaque rating mechanisms, and the absence of traditional labor protections create precarious conditions for platform workers (Rosenblat 2018; Wood et al. 2019). Workers without strong digital literacy or access to multiple platforms face disadvantages in navigating these systems, while the geographic concentration of high-quality gig work in urban centers further marginalizes rural populations.

Financial inclusion represents another critical dimension. The World Bank (2022) found that while the pandemic accelerated the adoption of digital financial services, an estimated 1.4 billion adults remained unbanked, predominantly in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa. Mobile money services, while transformative in some contexts, require basic digital literacy and network coverage that remain unavailable to many. The risk is that the digitalization of financial services, while expanding access for some, creates new forms of exclusion for those unable to participate.

Health Disparities and the Telehealth Divide

The rapid expansion of telehealth during the pandemic offered both promise and peril. While telehealth visits in the United States increased by over 150 percent in the early months of the pandemic (Koonin et al. 2020), access was stratified by age, race, geography, and digital literacy. Older adults, who were most vulnerable to COVID-19, were also least likely to have the digital skills or equipment for telehealth consultations (Lam et al. 2020). Rural communities faced the dual challenge of limited broadband infrastructure and fewer healthcare providers offering telehealth services.

Roberts and Mehrotra (2020) found that Black and Hispanic patients were significantly less likely than White patients to use video-based telehealth, relying instead on audio-only consultations that limited clinical assessment capabilities. This 'telehealth divide' threatened to reproduce and deepen existing health disparities, particularly for chronic disease management and mental health services. In low-income countries, telehealth remained largely aspirational, constrained by inadequate infrastructure, shortage of trained providers, and regulatory barriers (WHO 2020).

Policy Responses and Interventions

Governments worldwide have adopted a range of policy interventions to address the digital divide, with varying degrees of success. In the United States, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act of 2021 allocated $65 billion for broadband expansion, including the Broadband Equity, Access, and Deployment (BEAD) program and the Affordable Connectivity Program (ACP), which provided subsidies of up to $30 per month for low-income households (Whitacre and Gallardo 2020). While these initiatives represented the largest federal investment in broadband in American history, critics noted that funding alone was insufficient without complementary investments in digital literacy and device access (Tomer, Kneebone, and Shivaram 2017).

International efforts have similarly mixed track records. The European Union's Digital Decade initiative set targets of universal gigabit connectivity and basic digital skills for 80 percent of adults by 2030 (European Commission 2021). India's BharatNet project, aimed at connecting 250,000 village councils with fiber-optic broadband, has faced persistent delays and coverage gaps (Kathuria et al. 2018). In Africa, mobile network expansion has been the primary driver of connectivity growth, but affordability remains a major barrier: the Alliance for Affordable Internet (A4AI 2021) found that mobile data costs in many African countries exceeded 5 percent of average monthly income, far above the 2 percent affordability threshold.

Community-based interventions have shown promise as complements to large-scale infrastructure programs. Community networks, public library programs, and school-based device distribution initiatives can address the last-mile connectivity challenge while building local digital capacity (Birba and Diagne 2012; Real, Bertot, and Jaeger 2014). However, the sustainability of such programs depends on continued funding and institutional support, both of which have proven politically vulnerable.

Conclusion

The COVID-19 pandemic did not create the digital divide, but it rendered its consequences more severe and more visible than at any previous point in history. As this article has demonstrated, the divide operates across multiple dimensions access, skills, usage, and outcomes—and is deeply embedded in broader structures of social stratification. Addressing it requires more than technological solutions; it demands a comprehensive approach that integrates infrastructure investment with education, affordability measures, and institutional reform.

The post-pandemic moment presents both an opportunity and a risk. The opportunity lies in the heightened political awareness of digital inequality and the substantial public investments that have been mobilized in response. The risk is that as the acute phase of the pandemic recedes, so too will the political will to sustain these efforts. The evidence reviewed in this article suggests that without sustained, equity-focused intervention, the digital divide will continue to deepen, with

profound consequences for education, employment, health, and democratic participation. Ensuring that the benefits of digital transformation are broadly shared is not merely a technical challenge but a fundamental question of social justice.

References

Adams-Prassl, Abi, Teodora Boneva, Marta Golin, and Christopher Rauh. 2020. "Inequality in the Impact of the Coronavirus Shock: Evidence from Real Time Surveys." Journal of Public Economics 189: 104245.

Alliance for Affordable Internet (A4AI). 2021. Affordability Report 2021. Washington, DC: Web Foundation.

Auxier, Brooke, and Monica Anderson. 2020. "As Schools Close Due to the Coronavirus, Some U.S. Students Face a Digital Homework Gap." Pew Research Center, March 16.

Azim Premji Foundation. 2021. Loss of Learning during the Pandemic. Bangalore: Azim Premji Foundation.

Birba, Ousmane, and Abdoulaye Diagne. 2012. "Determinants of Adoption of Internet in Africa: Case of 17 Sub-Saharan Countries." Structural Change and Economic Dynamics 23 (4): 463–72.

Bonal, Xavier, and Sheila González. 2020. "The Impact of Lockdown on the Learning Gap: Family and School Divisions in Times of Crisis." International Review of Education 66 (5): 635–55.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. "The Forms of Capital." In Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education, edited by John Richardson, 241–58. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Busby, John, Julia Tanberk, and Tyler Cooper. 2020. "BroadbandNow Estimates Availability for All 50 States." BroadbandNow Research, February 3.

Common Sense Media. 2020. Closing the K–12 Digital Divide in the Age of Distance Learning. San Francisco: Common Sense Media.

DiMaggio, Paul, and Eszter Hargittai. 2001. "From the 'Digital Divide' to 'Digital Inequality': Studying Internet Use as Penetration Increases." Princeton University Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies Working Paper Series 15.

Dorn, Emma, Bryan Hancock, Jimmy Sarakatsannis, and Ellen Viruleg. 2020. "COVID-19 and Student Learning in the United States: The Hurt Could Last a Lifetime." McKinsey & Company, June 1.

Engzell, Per, Arun Frey, and Mark D. Verhagen. 2021. "Learning Loss Due to School Closures during the COVID-19 Pandemic." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 118 (17): e2022376118.

European Commission. 2021. 2030 Digital Compass: The European Way for the Digital Decade. Brussels: European Commission.

Hargittai, Eszter. 2002. "Second-Level Digital Divide: Differences in People's Online Skills." First Monday 7 (4).

International Telecommunication Union (ITU). 2022. Facts and Figures 2022: Internet Use. Geneva: ITU.

Kathuria, Rajat, Mansi Kedia, Gangesh Varma, Kaushambi Bagchi, and Saumitra Khullar. 2018. Estimating the Value of Connecting the Unconnected: An Economic Assessment of BharatNet. New Delhi: ICRIER.

Koonin, Lisa M., Brooke Hoots, Clarisse A. Tsang, Zanie Leroy, Kevin Farris, Tilicia Jolly, Peter Antall, et al. 2020. "Trends in the Use of Telehealth during the Emergence of the COVID-19 Pandemic—United States, January–March 2020." Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report 69 (43): 1595–99.

Lai, Jiawei, and Nicole Olynk Widmar. 2021. "Revisiting the Digital Divide in the COVID-19 Era." Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy 43 (1): 458–78.

Lam, Karen, Amy D. Lu, Ying Shi, and Kevin E. Covinsky. 2020. "Assessing Telemedicine Unreadiness among Older Adults in the United States during the COVID-19 Pandemic." JAMA Internal Medicine 180 (10): 1389–91.

Mongey, Simon, Laura Pilossoph, and Alex Weinberg. 2021. "Which Workers Bear the Burden of Social Distancing Policies?" Journal of Economic Inequality 19 (3): 509–26.

Norris, Pippa. 2001. Digital Divide: Civic Engagement, Information Poverty, and the Internet Worldwide. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pew Research Center. 2021. "Internet/Broadband Fact Sheet." April 7.

Real, Brian, John Carlo Bertot, and Paul T. Jaeger. 2014. "Rural Public Libraries and Digital Inclusion: Issues and Challenges." Information Technology and Libraries 33 (1): 6–24.

Roberts, Eric T., and Ateev Mehrotra. 2020. "Assessment of Disparities in Digital Access among Medicare Beneficiaries and Implications for Telemedicine." JAMA Internal Medicine 180 (10): 1386–89.

Robinson, Laura, Shelia R. Cotten, Hiroshi Ono, Anabel Quan-Haase, Gustavo Mesch, Wenhong Chen, Jeremy Schulz, Timothy M. Hale, and Michael J. Stern. 2015. "Digital Inequalities and Why They Matter." Information, Communication & Society 18 (5): 569–82.

Rosenblat, Alex. 2018. Uberland: How Algorithms Are Rewriting the Rules of Work. Oakland: University of California Press.

Sutton Trust. 2021. Remote Learning: The Digital Divide. London: Sutton Trust.

Tomer, Adie, Elizabeth Kneebone, and Rachel Shivaram. 2017. "Signs of Digital Distress: Mapping Broadband Availability and Subscription in American Neighborhoods." Brookings Institution, September 12.

UNESCO. 2021. Education: From Disruption to Recovery. Paris: UNESCO.

UNICEF. 2021. Reimagine Education: Summary Report. New York: UNICEF.

van Dijk, Jan A. G. M. 2005. The Deepening Divide: Inequality in the Information Society. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

van Dijk, Jan A. G. M. 2020. The Digital Divide. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Vogels, Emily A. 2021. "Digital Divide Persists Even as Americans with Lower Incomes Make Gains in Tech Adoption." Pew Research Center, June 22.

Wei, Lu, and Douglas Blanks Hindman. 2011. "Does the Digital Divide Matter More? Comparing the Effects of New Media and Old Media Use on the Education-Based Knowledge Gap." Mass Communication and Society 14 (2): 216–35.

Whitacre, Brian E., and Roberto Gallardo. 2020. "State Broadband Policy: Impacts on Availability." Telecommunications Policy 44 (9): 102025.

Wood, Alex J., Mark Graham, Vili Lehdonvirta, and Isis Hjorth. 2019. "Good Gig, Bad Gig: Autonomy and Algorithmic Control in the Global Gig Economy." Work, Employment and Society 33 (1): 56–75.

World Bank. 2022. The Global Findex Database 2021: Financial Inclusion, Digital Payments, and Resilience in the Age of COVID-19. Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Health Organization (WHO). 2020. Global Strategy on Digital Health 2020–2025. Geneva: WHO.