Kakati Trishna (2026). *Digital Inequality in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: Structural Exclusion, Governance Challenges, and Inclusive Development in India. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 5(1), 73-79.*

DIGITAL INEQUALITY IN THE ERA OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: STRUCTURAL EXCLUSION, GOVERNANCE CHALLENGES, AND INCLUSIVE DEVELOPMENT IN INDIA

Trishna Kakati

Research Scholar, Department of Sociology, Assam Down Town University, Assam, India.

Keywords	Abstract
Digital Divide, Artificial Intelligence, Social Inequality, Digital Governance, Inclusive Development, India.	Digital technologies and artificial intelligence (AI) have emerged as central components of contemporary development strategies, reshaping economic production, governance mechanisms, and social relations worldwide. In India, digital transformation is widely promoted as a pathway to inclusive growth, administrative efficiency, and technological leadership. However, the diffusion of digital and AI-driven technologies remains deeply uneven, producing new forms of inequality while simultaneously reinforcing long-standing social hierarchies. This paper critically examines the digital divide in India in the context of the expanding use of artificial intelligence. Moving beyond a narrow understanding of the digital divide as a problem of internet access, the study conceptualizes digital inequality as a multidimensional phenomenon encompassing infrastructure, skills, usage, and socio-economic outcomes. Drawing on secondary data from scholarly literature, government policy documents, and reports by international organizations, the paper analyses how disparities based on class, gender, caste, region, and education shape unequal access to AI-enabled opportunities. It further explores the implications of these inequalities for education, employment, and digital governance. The study argues that without a socially grounded and ethically informed policy framework, AI-driven development risks deepening exclusion rather than promoting equity. The paper concludes by emphasizing the need for inclusive digital governance, investment in digital capabilities, and human-centred AI policies to ensure that technological progress

Kakati Trishna (2026). *Digital Inequality in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: Structural Exclusion, Governance Challenges, and Inclusive Development in India. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 5(1), 73-79.*

	contributes to sustainable and equitable development in India.

1. INTRODUCTION

The rapid expansion of digital technologies has fundamentally transformed the organization of modern societies. Advances in information and communication technologies (ICTs), combined with the growing use of artificial intelligence (AI), have reshaped economic systems, governance structures, educational practices, and everyday social interactions. Across the globe, governments increasingly frame digitalization as a solution to persistent development challenges, including inefficiency, exclusion, and economic stagnation. In India, digital transformation occupies a central position within national development discourse, with initiatives such as Digital India, e-governance platforms, and AI-driven public service delivery receiving considerable policy attention.

Despite this optimistic narrative, the benefits of digital transformation are not distributed evenly across social groups. Access to digital infrastructure, devices, and technological skills remains stratified along lines of class, caste, gender, education, and region. Rather than functioning as an equalizing force, digital technologies often reproduce and intensify existing inequalities (Castells, 2010). The growing integration of artificial intelligence further complicates this landscape by introducing new forms of technological stratification related to data access, algorithmic decision-making, and advanced technical expertise.

In India, where socio-economic inequalities are historically entrenched, the digital divide cannot be reduced to a mere technological gap. Instead, it must be understood as a structural phenomenon embedded within broader systems of social power and governance. AI-driven systems increasingly influence access to education, employment, welfare benefits, and surveillance mechanisms. Individuals and communities lacking digital literacy or technological access risk systematic exclusion from these systems, raising serious concerns about equity, accountability, and social justice.

This paper examines digital inequality in India through the lens of artificial intelligence and social stratification. It argues that digital exclusion in the AI era is not simply a temporary development challenge but a structural issue requiring critical sociological and policy-oriented analysis. By situating AI-driven digitalization within India's socio-economic context, the study seeks to contribute to broader debates on inclusive development and ethical technology governance.

2. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON DIGITAL INEQUALITY

Technological change does not occur in a social vacuum. From a sociological perspective, technologies are shaped by existing power relations, institutional priorities, and economic structures (Winner, 1980). As a result, digital systems frequently reflect and reinforce prevailing social inequalities rather than dismantling them. Understanding digital inequality in the age of

artificial intelligence therefore requires engagement with broader theories of social stratification and power.

Pierre Bourdieu's concept of capital offers a useful analytical lens for examining digital inequality. Digital access and technological skills can be understood as forms of cultural and social capital that enhance individuals' capacity to participate in economic, educational, and civic life. Those lacking digital capital are disadvantaged in labour markets, educational institutions, and governance processes. AI-driven systems amplify this divide by privileging individuals and organizations with access to data, computational resources, and technical expertise.

Political economy perspectives further emphasize the role of market forces and corporate power in shaping digital landscapes. Zuboff (2019) argues that contemporary digital capitalism is characterized by large-scale data extraction and algorithmic control, concentrating power in the hands of technology corporations. In developing countries like India, where regulatory frameworks remain uneven, this concentration of power raises concerns about exploitation, surveillance, and exclusion.

These theoretical perspectives highlight that digital inequality is not merely a question of technological diffusion but a structural issue rooted in social relations and institutional arrangements. Addressing digital inequality in the AI era therefore requires policy interventions that prioritize equity, accountability, and democratic participation.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

Early discussions of the digital divide focused primarily on disparities in access to computers and internet connectivity (Norris, 2001). Over time, scholars expanded this concept to include differences in digital skills, usage patterns, and socio-economic outcomes (van Dijk, 2005). This multidimensional understanding of digital inequality is particularly relevant in the context of artificial intelligence, where meaningful participation requires advanced competencies and access to complex technological systems.

Empirical studies on digital inequality in India consistently identify persistent disparities across urban–rural, gender, and socio-economic lines (Desai et al., 2010). Rural areas often suffer from inadequate digital infrastructure, while women face cultural, educational, and institutional barriers to digital participation (GSMA, 2020). Caste-based inequalities further restrict access to education and digital resources, reinforcing historical patterns of marginalization (Thorat & Newman, 2010).

Recent scholarship on artificial intelligence emphasizes its capacity to reproduce social biases embedded in data and algorithms. O'Neil (2016) demonstrates how algorithmic systems can generate discriminatory outcomes when deployed without transparency and accountability. Similarly, Benjamin (2019) highlights how AI technologies can reinforce racial and social hierarchies, particularly when marginalized groups are underrepresented or misrepresented in training data.

Despite growing attention to AI ethics and governance, limited research has examined the intersection of AI and digital inequality in developing countries. Existing studies often focus on

innovation and efficiency while neglecting questions of access, exclusion, and social justice. This paper addresses this gap by integrating digital divide theory with critical perspectives on AI within the Indian context.

4. METHODOLOGY

The study adopts a qualitative, descriptive, and analytical research design based entirely on secondary data. Data sources include peer-reviewed journal articles, academic books, government policy documents, and reports published by international organizations such as the World Bank, UNESCO, OECD, and UNDP. A thematic content analysis approach was employed to identify recurring patterns related to digital inequality, artificial intelligence adoption, and social stratification in India.

Sources were selected based on their relevance, academic credibility, and recency to ensure analytical rigor. The study integrates insights from digital divide theory, political economy, and critical AI studies to develop a comprehensive analytical framework. Although the research does not involve primary data collection, triangulation across multiple sources enhances the validity and reliability of the findings.

5. DIGITAL DIVIDE IN EDUCATION AND KNOWLEDGE ACCESS

Education represents one of the most significant domains in which digital inequality manifests. The increasing use of online platforms, digital classrooms, and AI-based learning tools has transformed educational delivery, particularly in higher education and skill development. However, access to digital education remains highly uneven in India.

The COVID-19 pandemic exposed deep disparities in access to online learning. Students from rural and economically disadvantaged backgrounds faced barriers such as lack of digital devices, unreliable internet connectivity, and limited digital literacy (UNESCO, 2021). While AI-powered educational technologies offer opportunities for personalized learning, they often remain inaccessible to those most in need.

Digital exclusion in education has long-term implications for social mobility. Students lacking digital skills are less likely to access higher education and formal employment opportunities, reinforcing intergenerational cycles of inequality. Without targeted interventions, AI-driven education risks becoming a privilege for the socio-economically advantaged rather than a tool for inclusive development.

6. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE, EMPLOYMENT, AND ECONOMIC INEQUALITY

Artificial intelligence is reshaping labour markets by automating routine tasks and generating demand for high-skilled occupations. While AI-driven innovation creates new employment opportunities in sectors such as data analysis and software development, it simultaneously threatens low-skilled and routine jobs (Frey & Osborne, 2017).

In India, where informal employment accounts for a large proportion of the workforce, automation poses significant risks. Informal workers often lack access to social security and reskilling

opportunities, making them particularly vulnerable to technological displacement. The unequal distribution of digital and AI-related skills further exacerbates labour market inequality.

Addressing these challenges requires proactive labour policies, investment in reskilling and upskilling programs, and education systems that prioritize digital literacy. Without such measures, AI-driven economic growth may deepen socio-economic disparities rather than promoting inclusive prosperity.

7. DIGITAL GOVERNANCE, ALGORITHMIC BIAS, AND EXCLUSION

Digital governance initiatives in India aim to enhance efficiency, transparency, and service delivery. Platforms for digital identification, welfare distribution, and surveillance increasingly rely on algorithmic decision-making. While these systems offer administrative advantages, they also raise concerns about exclusion and accountability.

Individuals lacking digital literacy or formal documentation may be denied access to essential services (Khera, 2019). Moreover, algorithmic systems often operate with limited transparency, making it difficult to challenge erroneous or discriminatory decisions. Marginalized communities are particularly vulnerable to exclusion resulting from biased data and opaque algorithms.

Ensuring accountability in digital governance requires robust regulatory frameworks, transparency mechanisms, and avenues for redress. Without these safeguards, AI-driven governance risks undermining democratic inclusion and social justice.

8. POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND INCLUSIVE AI GOVERNANCE

Bridging the digital divide in the age of artificial intelligence requires comprehensive and inclusive policy interventions. Expanding digital infrastructure is necessary but insufficient. Policies must also address digital literacy, social inclusion, and ethical governance.

Gender-sensitive and community-based digital literacy programs are essential to address social barriers to digital participation. Investments in education and skill development must prioritize marginalized communities to prevent the reproduction of inequality. Inclusive AI governance frameworks should emphasize transparency, accountability, and public participation (Floridi et al., 2018).

Ethical guidelines for AI must be translated into enforceable regulations that protect vulnerable populations from discrimination and exclusion. Without a human-centred approach, AI-driven development risks reinforcing structural inequalities rather than fostering inclusive growth.

9. CONCLUSION

Digital inequality in India is a multidimensional and deeply structural phenomenon shaped by socio-economic hierarchies and institutional arrangements. The rise of artificial intelligence has intensified these inequalities by privileging those with access to digital resources, skills, and decision-making power. While AI holds transformative potential, its benefits remain unevenly distributed.

Kakati Trishna (2026). *Digital Inequality in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: Structural Exclusion, Governance Challenges, and Inclusive Development in India. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 5(1), 73-79.*

This paper has argued that inclusive digital development requires more than technological expansion. It demands a socially grounded approach that integrates equity, accountability, and democratic participation into AI governance. Future research should focus on empirical studies examining community-level impacts of AI and exploring participatory models of digital inclusion to ensure that technological progress contributes to sustainable and equitable development.

10. AUTHOR(S) CONTRIBUTION

The writers affirm that they have no connections to, or engagement with, any group or body that provides financial or non-financial assistance for the topics or resources covered in this manuscript.

11. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

12. PLAGIARISM POLICY

All authors declare that any kind of violation of plagiarism, copyright and ethical matters will take care by all authors. Journal and editors are not liable for aforesaid matters.

13. SOURCES OF FUNDING

The authors received no financial aid to support for the research.

REFERENCES

[1] Benjamin, R. (2019). Race after technology. Polity Press.

[2] Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education. Greenwood.

[3] Castells, M. (2010). The rise of the network society. Wiley-Blackwell.

[4] Desai, S., et al. (2010). Human development in India. Oxford University Press.

[5] Floridi, L., et al. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework. Minds and Machines, 28(4), 689–707.

[6] Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. (2017). The future of employment. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 114, 254–280.

[7] GSMA. (2020). The mobile gender gap report.

[8] Heeks, R. (2017). ICTs for development. Routledge.

[9] Khera, R. (2019). Dissent on Aadhaar. Economic and Political Weekly, 54(9), 38–43.

[10] Norris, P. (2001). Digital divide. Cambridge University Press.

[11] O'Neil, C. (2016). Weapons of math destruction. Crown.

Kakati Trishna (2026). *Digital Inequality in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: Structural Exclusion, Governance Challenges, and Inclusive Development in India. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews, 5(1), 73-79.*

[12] OECD. (2019). Artificial intelligence in society.

[13] Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. Oxford University Press.

[14] Thorat, S., & Newman, K. (2010). Blocked by caste. Oxford University Press.

[15] TRAI. (2022). Telecom subscription data.

[16] UNDP. (2021). Human development report.

[17] UNESCO. (2021). Education in a post-COVID world.

[18] Van Dijk, J. (2005). The deepening divide. Sage.

[19] Van Dijk, J. (2020). The digital divide. Polity Press.

[20] Winner, L. (1980). Do artifacts have politics? Daedalus, 109(1), 121–136.

[21] World Bank. (2016). World development report: Digital dividends.

[22] Zuboff, S. (2019). The age of surveillance capitalism. PublicAffairs.

[23] Castells, M. (2001). The Internet galaxy. Oxford University Press.

[24] Kumar, R. (2020). Digital governance in India. Journal of Asian Public Policy, 13(3), 345–360.