International Journal of Social Impact
ISSN: 2455-670X
Volume 11, Issue 1, DIP: 18.02.017/20261101
DOI: 10.25215/2455/1101017
www.ijsi.in |January-March, 2026

Research Paper

Digital Learning and Marginalized Communities in India: Access Without Inclusion?

Akash Ranjan Panda[1]*, Seeman Rani Panda[2]

ABSTRACT

This position paper investigates the multifaceted nature of digital inclusion within the Indian educational landscape through the lens of Amartya Sen's Capability Approach. While the National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 and the National Digital Education Architecture (NDEAR) have accelerated infrastructure deployment, this study argues that access does not inherently result in inclusion. By analyzing recent data from NAS (2021), ASER (2022), and NSSO (2019), the paper identifies critical personal, social, and institutional conversion factors, such as linguistic hegemony, gendered digital autonomy, and caste-based spatiality, that prevent marginalized learners from converting digital resources into substantive educational agency. The findings suggest that a one-size-fits-all technological approach risks exacerbating the Matthew Effect, where cumulative advantage further privileges the elite. The paper concludes by proposing a Capability Model for Digital Inclusion that prioritizes decentralized infrastructure and pedagogical mediation to ensure that the digital revolution serves as a tool for genuine social mobility rather than a mechanism for social reproduction.

Keywords: *Position Paper, Digital Divide, Capability Approach, Indian Education Policy, Intersectionality, Educational Equity*

Digital learning has transitioned from a supplementary pedagogical innovation to a structural pillar of educational governance in India. Over the past decade, and particularly following the COVID-19 pandemic, digital platforms have been institutionalized as central delivery mechanisms within the national education architecture. National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 formally codifies this transformation, positioning educational technology as a catalyst for equity, flexibility, multilingual access, and systemic modernization (Government of India, 2020). Complementary initiatives such as DIKSHA, SWAYAM, PM eVIDYA, and the National Digital Education Architecture (NDEAR) have significantly expanded digital repositories, virtual classrooms, and platform-based content delivery.

The Techno-Developmental Narrative vs. Empirical Reality

This expansion is situated within a broader techno-developmental state narrative in which digitalization is framed as both an economic accelerator and a democratizing force (MeitY, 2021). However, empirical evidence complicates this optimistic framing:

[1]Research Scholar, Department of Education, Guru Ghasidas Vishwavidyalaya, Bilaspur (C.G.)
[2]Research Scholar, Department of Education, Guru Ghasidas Vishwavidyalaya, Bilaspur (C.G.)
*Corresponding Author

Received: February 13, 2026; Revision Received: March 20, 2026; Accepted: March 26, 2026

- **Persistent Disparities:** National Sample Survey data indicate that substantial disparities persist in internet access across rural-urban divides and socio-economic strata (NSSO, 2019).
- **Marginalized Communities:** While internet penetration has grown rapidly, household-level access remains uneven, particularly among Scheduled Castes (SC), Scheduled Tribes (ST), rural households, and low-income families (Desai & Vanneman, 2015; IAMAI, 2023).
- **The Pandemic Proof-Point:** During pandemic-induced school closures, evidence from Azim Premji University (2021) revealed that a significant proportion of rural students lacked reliable access to devices, stable connectivity, or structured learning support, leading to measurable learning loss.

Beyond the Binary: Access vs. Meaningful Participation

The digital divide in India cannot be conceptualized as a simple binary between access and non-access. Rather, it operates as a multi-layered system of differential participation (Warschauer, 2003). Even where devices are available, patterns of shared usage, bandwidth instability, limited digital literacy, and constrained domestic learning environments reduce effective engagement (UNESCO, 2021). GSMA (2020) reports a persistent gender gap in mobile internet usage, with women significantly less likely to own smartphones independently. Such disparities suggest that access metrics alone are insufficient indicators of inclusion.

Social Reproduction and Digital Platforms

Digital education unfolds within an educational system historically structured by caste, class, gender, linguistic stratification, and regional inequalities (Nambissan, 2010; Thorat & Newman, 2010). Educational participation in India has long reflected social reproduction dynamics, where structural disadvantage translates into differential access to cultural and academic capital (Bourdieu, 1986; Jeffrey et al., 2008).

- **Platform Bias:** Digital platforms are not neutral; English-dominant interfaces and standardized pedagogical designs may privilege already advantaged learners (Selwyn, 2016; Williamson, 2017).
- **Linguistic Barriers:** Linguistic minorities and first-generation learners encounter cognitive and symbolic barriers that limit meaningful participation (Mohanty, 2019).

Theoretical Positioning: The Capabilities Approach

The core analytical problem is not whether digital infrastructure exists, but whether it translates into educational capability. Drawing upon Sen's (1999) Capabilities Approach, this paper conceptualizes digital devices and connectivity as resources rather than outcomes. A smartphone or data package does not inherently constitute educational inclusion. Digital resources become meaningful only when individuals possess the substantive freedom to convert them into valued functioning, encompassing sustained engagement, conceptual understanding, academic achievement, and the exercise of digital agency (Sen, 1999; Robeyns, 2005).

The Thesis: Access Without Inclusion

This manuscript argues that India's digital reform trajectory risks institutionalizing a condition of access without inclusion, where policy success is measured by device distribution while substantive participation remains stratified.

The conflation of infrastructure with equity is challenged by empirical data. While initiatives like DIKSHA target millions, UDISE+ (2021-22) data reveal that only 22% of government schools possess internet connectivity, compared to 59% of private institutions. Furthermore, Azim Premji University (2021) found that nearly 60% of rural students could not access online learning during school closures due to device shortages.

Intersectionality theory (Crenshaw, 1989) further highlights how caste and gender synthesize to form unique barriers. GSMA (2020) reports that Indian men are 1.5 times more likely to own a smartphone than women, severely limiting the digital autonomy of female learners. For students from marginalized castes, this time poverty is compounded by linguistic exclusion, as the majority of digital content is English-centric, alienating the 90% of students who study in regional languages (Mohanty, 2019).

Without addressing these conversion factors, including teacher preparedness, where only one-third of staff report ICT confidence (NCERT, 2022), digital reform may simply amplify the Matthew Effect of cumulative advantage (Merton, 1968). This paper proposes a capability-centred framework to ensure connectivity translates into meaningful educational inclusion.

DIGITAL EDUCATION IN THE INDIAN POLICY CONTEXT

National Reform Architecture

The current digital education landscape is governed by a techno-optimistic policy framework that views technology as a neutral tool for democratization. The National Education Policy 2020 positions digital tools as a primary solution for bridging the equity gap, advocating for a transition toward blended learning and open educational resources (Government of India, 2020b). This vision is operationalized through the National Digital Education Architecture (NDEAR), which aims to create a unified digital infrastructure for the nation (MeitY, 2021).
However, these policies primarily address the supply side of the digital divide. For instance, while the PM eVIDYA program successfully consolidated digital platforms, it measures success through reach, such as the number of hits or downloads, rather than substantive engagement or learning outcomes for marginalized learners.

Structural Inequalities and Policy Gaps

Despite these initiatives, the one-size-fits-all design of many platforms fails to address the deeply stratified nature of Indian education. The policy discourse frequently assumes that once infrastructure is provided, inclusion follows automatically. This ignores the socio-cultural realities of:

- **Caste-Based Spatiality:** Digital access points are often located in dominant-caste areas, making physical access difficult for SC/ST students due to historical and social segregation (Nambissan, 2010).
- **The Gendered Digital Gap:** Policy often overlooks the fact that household access does not equal individual access. GSMA (2020) indicates that women's internet usage remains 21% lower than men's in India, a factor rarely accounted for in digital-only homework assignments that assume a student has private, uninterrupted device time.
- **Language Hegemony:** While NEP 2020 promotes multilingualism, the technical infrastructure remains heavily skewed toward English and Sanskritized Hindi, marginalizing those in other linguistic groups (Mohanty, 2019).

The Quality vs. Quantity Dilemma

Current reform focuses on quantity, distributing hardware and increasing data speeds, over pedagogical quality. The National Achievement Survey (NAS) 2021, conducted by NCERT (2022), highlights a significant disconnect: while national policy emphasizes ICT integration, only 34% of teachers across India reported having received formal training in using technology for remote or digital instruction. Furthermore, the survey found that only 22% of schools had access to functioning computer labs.

This lack of preparation means that even when hardware is present, a majority of teachers use technology merely to replicate traditional lecture methods rather than fostering critical digital agency (Selwyn, 2016). This creates a scenario where technological adoption precedes pedagogical transformation, resulting in the oversold and underused phenomenon described by Cuban (2001).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

To move beyond a purely technical understanding of the digital divide, this paper employs a multi-dimensional framework that evaluates how technology interacts with existing social structures to either expand or restrict human potential.

The Capabilities Approach

Central to this framework is the distinction between resources and freedoms as established by Amartya Sen (1999) and Martha Nussbaum (2011). In this model, digital infrastructure is categorized as a resource, which is not an end in itself but a means to achieve valued outcomes. Educational inclusion is redefined as the realization of capabilities, the substantive freedom of a student to achieve learning goals they have reason to value.

The transition from a resource (a laptop or high-speed internet) to a capability is determined by conversion factors (Robeyns, 2005). These are categorised into:

- **Personal factors:** Such as digital literacy, linguistic competence, and cognitive readiness.
- **Social factors:** Including gender norms, caste hierarchies, and parental support.
- **Environmental factors:** Such as institutional infrastructure and stable electricity.

Without favorable conversion factors, the provision of technology remains a hollow gesture of access that fails to produce actual educational agency.

Social Reproduction and Cultural Capital

While the Capabilities Approach focuses on individual freedom, Social Reproduction Theory (Bourdieu, 1986) explains how digital systems often mirror and reinforce class-based hierarchies. Digital education requires a specific form of cultural capital, familiarity with English, technical self-efficacy, and a middle-class habitus, that is not distributed equally.

In the Indian context, digital platforms often function as mechanisms of social selection. Students from privileged backgrounds use technology to augment their existing advantages (cumulative advantage), while students from marginalized backgrounds face a hidden curriculum of digital navigation that they were never taught, leading to a widening of the learning gap (Jeffrey et al., 2008).

Intersectionality

To understand the specific nature of marginalization in India, this paper utilizes Intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989). Marginalization is not a singular experience but a layered one where caste, gender, and rurality intersect.

In the Indian context, a rural Dalit girl faces a synthesized exclusion rather than separate hurdles. Her lack of digital autonomy is rooted in gendered norms where men are 1.5 times more likely to own smartphones (GSMA, 2020). This is compounded by caste-based economic deprivation, as computer ownership among SC/ST households remains below 6% (NSSO, 2019). Furthermore, geographic neglect ensures that only 39% of rural households have internet access compared to 71% in urban areas (IAMAI, 2023). This intersectional lens explains why one-size-fits-all interventions fail; by assuming universal connectivity and private space, policy designs for the privileged while rendering the most marginalized invisible.

Policy Enactment Theory

Finally, Policy Enactment Theory (Ball et al., 2012) suggests that national policies are not simply implemented but are translated and contested at the institutional level. The success of digital reform is highly dependent on how teachers and school administrators, who are themselves part of the social fabric, interpret and mediate these tools. If the institutional conversion factor is weak or biased, the digital tool remains an inert object in the classroom (Biesta, 2010).

DIGITAL INFRASTRUCTURE: EXPANSION AND LIMITS

The expansion of digital infrastructure in India is characterized by a paradox of rapid aggregate growth alongside deepening relative disparities. While India possesses one of the world's largest bases of internet users, the quality and distribution of this infrastructure remain heavily concentrated among privileged demographics.

Geographic and Socio-Economic Disparities

Data from the IAMAI (2023) indicates a significant urban-rural divide, with internet penetration reaching 71% in urban centres compared to only 39% in rural areas. This geographic gap is further fractured by socio-economic status. According to the NSSO (2019), only about 4% of rural households possess a computer, compared to 23% in urban areas. For students in marginalized communities, the infrastructure often stops at the village boundary or the doorstep of the household.

The Device and Bandwidth Gap

Device ownership is frequently used as a proxy for access, yet this metric overlooks the nature of that access. In low-income households, learning often occurs on a single, shared mobile device with limited data caps and unstable 3G/4G connectivity. Research from Azim Premji University (2021) highlighted that even when a smartphone was present in the home, it was often unavailable to children during school hours because it was carried by an earning member of the family to work.

Technological Adoption vs. Pedagogical Transformation

The push for infrastructure assumes that hardware alone improves learning. However, as Cuban (2001) observed, technology is often oversold and underused when it is not integrated into a supportive ecosystem. In India, the lack of a reliable electricity grid in remote regions and the high cost of data for the bottom 20% of the population act as hard limits on the effectiveness of digital platforms (Srinivasan, 2019). Without addressing these structural constraints, the digital infrastructure remains a dormant resource rather than an active educational capability.

CONVERSION FACTORS IN THE INDIAN CONTEXT

The transition from digital infrastructure to educational capability is mediated by three primary conversion factors. In the Indian landscape, these factors often act as filters that disproportionately exclude marginalized learners.

Personal Conversion Factors

Personal conversion refers to the individual's internal capacity to utilize technology effectively. In India, this is primarily hindered by:

- **Linguistic Barriers:** With approximately 80% of high-quality digital content authored in English, the 90% of Indian students who study in regional languages face a symbolic barrier (Mohanty, 2019). Language acts as a cognitive gatekeeper, preventing the conversion of a digital resource into conceptual understanding.
- **Digital Literacy and Self-Regulation:** Students from privileged backgrounds often possess higher self-regulated learning capacity due to prior exposure. Conversely, first-generation learners often struggle with the cognitive load of navigating complex interfaces without pedagogical scaffolding (Zimmerman, 2002).

Social Conversion Factors

Social factors involve the external norms and household dynamics that regulate a student's freedom to use technology.

- **Gendered Digital Autonomy:** As noted by Chishti (2020), gender norms frequently dictate that girls' use of digital devices is highly monitored or restricted to domestic duties. Even when a device is available, a girl may lack the temporal freedom to engage with it compared to her male counterparts.
- **Caste and Parental Mediation:** Households with higher educational capital can provide the technical mediation necessary to navigate online platforms. In contrast, students from marginalized caste backgrounds often lack this domestic support system, relying entirely on overextended state infrastructure (Desai & Vanneman, 2015).

Institutional Conversion Factors

The school environment and teacher capacity are the final arbiters of digital inclusion.

- **Pedagogical Readiness:** The National Achievement Survey (NCERT, 2022) reveals that only 34% of teachers feel prepared to use ICT in instruction. Without trained educators, digital tools are often used for rote memorization rather than interactive learning.
- **Accessibility Standards:** Despite the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act (2016), most Indian educational apps remain non-compliant with universal design standards, effectively excluding students with visual or hearing impairments from the digital ecosystem (Singal, 2019).

CAPABILITIES: FROM ACCESS TO AGENCY

In the capability-centred framework, the ultimate goal of digital education is not the mastery of a device, but the expansion of a student's agency, the ability to act, choose, and participate meaningfully in the digital world. When conversion factors are unfavourable, digital engagement remains superficial, leading to passive consumption rather than active learning.

Passive Consumption vs. Dialogic Engagement

Meaningful participation requires what Freire (1970) termed dialogic engagement, where learners are co-creators of knowledge. In many marginalized contexts in India, digital

learning is reduced to watching pre-recorded videos on low-bandwidth connections. This lacks the critical feedback loops necessary for deep conceptual understanding. Without the freedom to question, interact, and manipulate digital tools, students remain recipients of information rather than agents of their own education (Selwyn, 2016).

The Development of Digital Agency

Digital agency involves the capacity to navigate the internet safely, evaluate information critically, and use technology to solve real-world problems. For a student from a marginalized community, agency might mean using a digital platform to access scholarship information or legal rights. However, when students are restricted by linguistic barriers or rigid pedagogical designs, they fail to develop this agency. As Warschauer (2003) argues, providing a resource without the social integration to use it effectively results in a loss of potential, where the technology exists but the capability does not.

Blended Learning and Mediated Agency

Research indicates that technology is most effective when it functions as a supplement to, rather than a replacement for, human instruction. Means et al. (2013) found that blended learning environments significantly outperform purely online models. In the Indian context, this suggests that digital agency cannot be built in a vacuum. It requires the mediation of teachers and peers who can translate digital content into local contexts, helping students bridge the gap between a remote screen and their lived reality. Without this institutional mediation, digital "access" remains an isolating and ineffective experience for the most vulnerable.

EDUCATIONAL INCLUSION OUTCOMES

The divergence between technological provision and realized capability manifests in stratified outcomes. When digital tools bypass critical conversion factors, the result is a reinforcement of cumulative advantage rather than a closing of the achievement gap.

Widening Learning Gaps

Empirical data confirms a widening learning divide. The World Bank (2022) reports that learning poverty in India surged post-pandemic, with 70% of children now unable to read a simple text by age 10. This is corroborated by ASER (2022), which found that basic reading levels in rural India dropped to 2012 levels. While students with high digital literacy and stable home environments progressed, those relying on fragmented access suffered acute learning loss, particularly in foundational numeracy and literacy.

Social Mobility and the Matthew Effect

The long-term impact is the stagnation of social mobility through the Matthew Effect (Merton, 1968). While digital platforms aim to democratize, Oxfam (2021) notes that only 15% of rural households have the reliable internet necessary for consistent schooling, compared to 42% of urban households. This creates a dual-track system: privileged students use digital tools as a ladder for mobility, while marginalized learners, often lacking the 21% gender-parity in device access (GSMA, 2020), face a digital ceiling that entrenches cycles of poverty.

Retention and Symbolic Exclusion

Inclusion requires both enrollment and a sense of belonging. When content remains skewed toward English, the language of only 10% of the population, it creates symbolic exclusion. UNESCO (2021) emphasizes that students not taught in their mother tongue are at higher risk

of dropout. In the digital architecture, this linguistic mismatch leads to a leaky pipeline, where marginalized students are statistically present but academically excluded, eventually withdrawing from a system that does not reflect their lived reality.

REFRAMING DIGITAL INCLUSION: A CAPABILITY MODEL

To transcend the failures of hardware-centric policy, this paper proposes a Capability Model for Digital Inclusion. This model rejects the notion that technological provision is synonymous with educational equity. Instead, it demands that policy be measured by the substantive freedom a student has to utilize digital tools for their own self-determined educational goals.

The Fallacy of Neutral Technology

The proposed model identifies that digital equity is only achieved when the path from resource to functioning is cleared of structural obstructions. We must move beyond the current obsession with hardware metrics:

- **The Resource Fallacy:** Counting devices distributed.
- **The Capability Metric:** Assessing individual autonomy and the power to convert digital content into actionable knowledge.

Evidence from Muralidharan (2023) proves that technology-aided instruction only yields gains when it is tailored to a student's specific learning level, a process that is currently obstructed by the standardized, rigid nature of national digital platforms.

Strategic Interventions for Agency

This position paper argues for three radical shifts in how digital education is implemented to ensure marginalized students are not merely recipients of data, but agents of learning:

1. **Pedagogical Scaffolding:** We must dismantle the linguistic hegemony of English-centric interfaces. Policy must mandate localized, AI-driven multilingual support to bridge the epistemic gap for the 90% of students studying in regional languages who are currently treated as secondary citizens in the digital world.
2. **Community-Owned Infrastructure:** We must abandon the household-centric model of device ownership, which inherently favours male and dominant-caste heads of households. Instead, investment must shift toward community-managed digital hubs. This directly counters the gendered digital gap, where men are 1.5 times more likely to own devices (GSMA, 2020), by providing safe, neutral spaces for learning.
3. **Teachers as Mediators of Freedom:** The teacher's role must be reframed from a technical proctor to a mediator of agency. NCERT (2022) findings show that while 66% of staff lack digital pedagogical training, the human element remains the only force capable of translating remote screens into local lived realities.

CONCLUSION: BEYOND SYMBOLIC INCLUSION

The central thesis of this paper is that India's digital education revolution risks becoming a mechanism for social reproduction rather than social mobility. While the National Education Policy 2020 promises to be a great equalizer, its current execution relies on a one-size-fits-all logic that renders the most vulnerable learners invisible.

The Failure of the Status Quo

The evidence presented, from UDISE+ to ASER 2022, confirms that the digital divide is a manifestation of historical caste and gender stratification. Without addressing the personal, social, and institutional conversion factors, the state is merely providing "symbolic

inclusion", where students are statistically enrolled in digital platforms but academically and psychologically excluded from the learning process.

A Call for Systemic Realignment

True inclusion requires a departure from techno-optimism toward a socio-pedagogical reality check. We recommend:

- **Decentralizing infrastructure** to community levels to bypass domestic power dynamics.
- **Linguistic democratization** to end the alienation of first-generation learners.
- **Pedagogical autonomy** for teachers to adapt digital tools to regional contexts.

The digital architecture of the future must be designed with the rural Dalit girl as the primary user. Only then can technology fulfil its potential as a tool for genuine educational freedom rather than a faster system for reinforcing old inequalities.

REFERENCES

ASER Centre. (2022). *Annual status of education report (Rural) 2022*. Pratham Education Foundation. https://www.asercentre.org

Azim Premji University. (2021). *Loss of learning during the pandemic*. Azim Premji University. https://azimpremjiuniversity.edu.in

Ball, S. J., Maguire, M., & Braun, A. (2012). *How schools do policy: Policy enactments in secondary schools*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203153185

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.

Chishti, S. (2020). The gendered dimension of the digital divide. *Economic and Political Weekly, 55*(XX), xx-xx.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989*(1), 139-167.

Cuban, L. (2001). *Oversold and underused: Computers in the classroom*. Harvard University Press.

Government of India. (2020). *National education policy 2020*. Ministry of Education. https://www.education.gov.in

GSMA. (2020). *The mobile gender gap report 2020*. GSMA. https://www.gsma.com

IAMAI & Kantar. (2023). *Internet in India 2022*. Internet and Mobile Association of India. https://www.iamai.in

Merton, R. K. (1968). The Matthew effect in science. *Science, 159*(3810), 56-63. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.159.3810.56

Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology. (2021). *National digital education architecture (NDEAR): Consultation paper*. Government of India. https://www.meity .gov.in

Mohanty, A. K. (2019). *The multilingual reality: Living with languages*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/MOHANT1468

Muralidharan, K. (2023). *Accelerating development: Evidence-based policy reform in India*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009320379

National Sample Survey Office. (2019). *Key indicators of household social consumption on education in India (NSS 75th round)*. Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation. http://mospi.nic.in

NCERT. (2022). *National achievement survey 2021: All India report*. Ministry of Education. https://ncert.nic.in

Oxfam India. (2021). *Inequality report 2021: India's unequal healthcare story*. Oxfam India. https://www.oxfamindia.org

Robeyns, I. (2005). The capability approach: A theoretical survey. *Journal of Human Development, 6*(1), 93-117. https://doi.org/10.1080/146498805200034266

Selwyn, N. (2016). *Is technology good for education?* Polity Press.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.

UNESCO. (2021). *World inequality database on education (WIDE)*. UNESCO Institute for Statistics. https://www.education-inequalities.org

World Bank. (2022). *The state of global learning poverty: 2022 update*. World Bank. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1905-0

Acknowledgment

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Panda, A.R. & Panda, S.R. (2026). Digital Learning and Marginalized Communities in India: Access Without Inclusion? *International Journal of Social Impact*, *11*(1), 147-156. DIP: 18.02.017/20261101, DOI: 10.25215/2455/1101017