

Digital Sociology – A Conceptual and Theoretical Approach **Djellala lwiza^{*}**

University 8 May 1945 Guelma (Algeria), djellala.lwiza@univ-guelma.dz

Received: 15/03/2025 ; **Accepted:** 12/11/2025; **publication:** 13/02/2026

Abstrac

This research provides a conceptual and theoretical approach to digital sociology by defining its concept, examining its emergence and development, and exploring key sociological approaches that explain it. The study addresses the gap in understanding how digital transformations reshape social structures and their societal implications, contributing to the development of more coherent social and cultural policies in the digital age. These approaches include the network society approach, which examines the structure of social relationships and the impact of networks on identity and social interaction; the digital capital approach, which highlights the economic and cultural dimensions of digital practices and their role in deepening social inequalities; the symbolic interactionist approach, which explains the construction of the digital self through interaction processes and the negotiation of meanings in digital spaces; and the critical approach which analyzes how digital data is employed to reinforce power relations and dominance through surveillance mechanisms and algorithms. Together, these approaches provide understanding of digital sociology, helping to develop more informed strategies that address digital transformations and their effects on individuals and societies.

Keywords: Digital Sociology, Theoretical Synthesis, Critical Analysis, Global South Perspectives, Digital Inequality

^{*}.Corresponding Author.

Introduction :

The rapid advancement of digital technologies has fundamentally transformed social life, necessitating new sociological approaches to understand these changes. Digital sociology has emerged as a field that examines how digital technologies reshape social structures, identities, and power relations. However, despite extensive research on digital phenomena, theoretical approaches to digital sociology often operate in isolation, creating gaps in our understanding of how different perspectives relate to and complement each other.

While scholars have developed valuable frameworks from Castells' network society to Bourdieu-inspired digital capital theories, there is limited systematic analysis of how these approaches address the complex and sometimes contradictory nature of digital society. This theoretical fragmentation prevents a comprehensive understanding of digital transformations.

How do various sociological approaches explain the transformations of identity, social structures, and power relations in digital society, and what are the strengths and limitations of each approach when critically examined?

This research provides a critical comparative analysis of four key sociological approaches to digital sociology. Rather than simply describing each approach, we analyze their theoretical assumptions, examine their limitations, and identify tensions between different perspectives. Our analysis reveals recurring challenges that current approaches face in explaining digital society's complexity.

Methodological Framework: This research employs a dialectical theoretical analysis that moves beyond traditional comparative methodology. Rather than treating different theoretical approaches as complementary perspectives that can be synthesized, we examine their fundamental contradictions as revelatory of deeper tensions within digital capitalism itself.

Our selection of four theoretical approaches network society theory, digital capital frameworks, symbolic interactionism, and critical theory is based on their dominance in the field, epistemological diversity (structural, cultural, interpretive, and critical orientations), and their ability to illuminate different dimensions of our three core paradoxes. This selection allows us to demonstrate how theoretical fragmentation reflects the contradictory nature of digital capitalism across multiple analytical levels.

We argue for moving beyond additive pluralism toward a critical synthesis that recognizes digital society as a contested terrain where emancipatory possibilities coexist with oppressive mechanisms. This

perspective is particularly relevant for understanding digital transformations in post-colonial contexts where global digital technologies intersect with local power structures.

I-Definition of digital sociology

Digital sociology is defined as the study of social interactions and societal processes within the digital environment. The world has undergone a radical transformation due to digital technology, which has reshaped daily life, social relationships, work methods, and interactions with institutions. Since the mid-20th century, rapid technological advancements have led to the emergence of the digital society, where the advent of the internet in the late 1980s, followed by the development of personal computers and smartphones, marked a significant leap toward comprehensive digitization.

With the rise of social media, individuals and businesses have become constantly connected, generating vast amounts of digital data that are collected and analyzed to identify behavioral patterns and inform decision-making at both individual and institutional levels.

While these technological developments are well-documented, current definitions of digital sociology often present these changes as neutral technological progress. However, this seemingly objective approach obscures important questions about power, control, and inequality in digital environments. Scholars such as Deborah Lupton argue that digital technologies are no longer mere tools for interaction but have become integral to shaping identities and social relationships. Yet critics argue that this perspective may overemphasize technology's transformative role while underestimating how existing power structures shape digital adoption and use.

The field faces ongoing debates about whether digital sociology represents a fundamental departure from traditional sociology or an extension of existing sociological concepts to new contexts. Some scholars argue that digital environments create entirely new forms of social relations that require new theoretical frameworks, while others contend that classical sociological theories remain adequate for understanding digital phenomena. This tension reflects broader disagreements about the nature of social change in the digital age.

Digital sociology also faces the challenge of distinguishing itself from related fields such as internet studies and media sociology. Unlike internet sociology, which primarily examines online spaces as separate from offline reality, digital sociology recognizes the interconnectedness of digital and physical social spaces and examines the blurring boundaries between them. This distinction is significant because it shapes how researchers

approach questions of identity, community, and social change in digital contexts.

Traditional definitions of digital sociology often reflect assumptions about universal digital access and literacy that do not apply to many Global South contexts. In Algeria, for example, digital technologies intersect with post-colonial state structures, economic dependency relationships, and cultural negotiations between traditional and modern values in ways that challenge universalist definitions of digital sociology. This context reveals how digital transformations cannot be understood without considering local power structures and historical contexts.

Based on this analysis, we can define digital sociology as the sociological field that critically examines social phenomena emerging in digital environments, analyzing how digital technologies both enable and constrain social interactions, and investigating the power relations embedded in digital systems. This definition emphasizes both the opportunities and limitations of digital technologies while recognizing that their social effects are shaped by existing inequalities and power structures.

This definition has important implications for how digital sociology research is conducted. Rather than treating digital technologies as neutral research tools or assuming that digital environments operate according to the same social rules as offline spaces, digital sociologists must examine how digital platforms, algorithms, and data collection practices shape the social phenomena they study. This requires methodological approaches that can account for both human agency and technological constraints in digital environments.

II- The emergence and evolution of digital sociology

Digital sociology has witnessed increasing development alongside modern technological changes, becoming increasingly concerned with studying how these advancements influence fundamental social processes within societies. Despite the relatively recent emergence of the term, interest in the relationship between technology and society dates back several decades. One of the earliest discussions on artificial intelligence and computing in sociology can be traced to the late 1980s, when an article adopted a social constructivist perspective to analyze the role of language in understanding and using computers, highlighting the dominance of English as the web's language and the gendered bias in computing terminology.

However, this conventional narrative obscures important theoretical struggles that shaped the field. Early scholarship was dominated by competing perspectives: technological optimists emphasized democracy and connection potential, while critical scholars warned of enhanced social control. This foundational tension remains evident in contemporary digital sociology debates.

Research continued exploring ICT impacts on identity, power relations, and inequality through the 2000s. As platforms like Facebook and Twitter spread, digital sociology gained academic attention in the late 2000s.

The 2010s witnessed intense methodological debates about whether digital sociology required new approaches or could rely on traditional methods applied to digital contexts. The emergence of big data analytics created additional controversies, with some scholars favoring computational approaches while others maintained that interpretive methods remained essential.

Moreover, the concept was officially introduced by Jonathan Wynn in 2009. Fundamental academic works emerged, including Neil's 2010 book "Expanding Sentience" and Lupton's 2012 "Digital Sociology: An Introduction." In 2013, "Digital Sociology: Critical Perspectives" marked the field's recognition as an independent discipline.

However, the field's institutionalization occurred primarily in Northern universities, creating frameworks that claim universality while reflecting particular regional experiences. In North Africa, digital technologies developed alongside political upheaval and cultural negotiations between traditional and modern values, challenging linear narratives of digital development.

With rapid advancements, individuals became constant data producers through smart devices and social networks, raising privacy and security concerns. Rather than viewing digital technologies as purely oppressive or liberating, digital sociology increasingly analyzes how they both enable and constrain social action, creating new possibilities while introducing new forms of control.

III- The most prominent sociological approaches explaining digital sociology

The digital society is interpreted through several key sociological approaches. The network society approach, introduced by Manuel Castells, emphasizes how digital transformations have reshaped social structures, leading to the emergence of dynamic networks that dominate the economy, culture, and politics. The digital capital approach focuses on digital assets as social and economic resources that create new opportunities for influence and dominance but also deepen the digital divide between individuals and communities. The symbolic interactionist approach highlights how interactions through digital media shape social identities and shared meanings. In contrast, the critical approach reveals the dimensions of control and exploitation in the digital space, warning against corporate data monopolies and the transformation of users into passive consumers subjected to the logic of digital capitalism.

III 1- The network society approach

From the perspective of social theory, the topic of digitization first gained significant attention in the context of the debate on "the rise of the network society," as introduced by Manuel Castells (1996). He observed a

correlation between technological innovation and social transformations. With the advancement of information and communication technology (ICT) and digitization, new social processes emerged, which he summarized through the concepts of globalization, deregulation, flexibility, and decentralization. The instantaneous connectivity enabled by digital networks has led to a temporal rupture between the industrial age and the information age, reshaping social, economic, and political structures on a global scale.

From this perspective, digitization is the driving force of the post-industrial society. Castells argues that the Internet is not merely a technical tool but a new social system that reconfigures relationships and institutions in unprecedented ways. While he acknowledges the social conditions that preceded technological developments, his analysis carries elements of technological determinism, similar to Marx's observation that technological advancements shape social structures, as seen in the role of the steam mill in industrial society.

According to Castells (2010), the network society is the result of developments in Information and Communication Technology (ICT), where the emergence of new technological paradigms since the 1970s has led to profound social and economic transformations. However, Castells emphasizes that technology does not determine society; rather, society shapes technology according to its values, norms, and needs.

Consequently, digital communication networks have become the backbone of this society, serving as the primary means of organizing social and economic relations on a global scale. The network society is a social structure based on global networks encompassing capital, goods, services, labor, information, science, and technology, making it a transnational society. However, it remains selective in its inclusivity. Despite the widespread expansion and influence of digital networks, they do not encompass all individuals but instead exclude certain groups, thereby reproducing new forms of social inequality.

However, critics argue that Castells' framework may overemphasize technology's role while underestimating how existing power structures shape network access and participation. In Algeria, digital networks reproduce patterns of center-periphery relations where urban elites access high-speed internet and global platforms while rural populations remain digitally marginalized, challenging assumptions about networks' inherently democratizing effects.

The network society approach differs significantly from other theoretical frameworks in its scope and optimism. While digital capital theory focuses on individual resource accumulation, Castells examines large-scale structural transformations. Unlike symbolic interactionism's emphasis on meaning-making, network theory prioritizes technological infrastructure and flows. Critical theory shares concerns about power relations but is more pessimistic about technology's democratizing potential. The strength of network theory lies in its comprehensive analysis of global digital transformations, but its weakness is the tendency toward

technological optimism that may underestimate persistent inequalities and power asymmetries that other approaches highlight more effectively.

III 2- The digital capital approach

The concept of digital capital is linked to the evolution of traditional forms of capital discussed by the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, as it is seen as an extension of cultural, social, and economic capital in the context of digital transformations. In this framework, digital cultural capital is understood as the product of cultural practices associated with interaction with digital services, social media platforms, and various applications, enabling individuals to acquire new digital skills and competencies.

The concept of digital capital is also linked to digital sociology as an analytical framework for understanding digital inequalities, based on the unequal distribution of a specific type of capital, drawing from Pierre Bourdieu's approach to forms of capital. The evolution of digital societies has led to the emergence of Bourdieu-inspired concepts such as technological capital, technical capital, electronic capital, and digital capital, which explain how individuals possess varying digital resources that influence their ability to participate in the digital sphere.

From this perspective, digital capital is not viewed as a replacement for the digital divide theory but rather as a concept that complements and extends it. It helps explain the social mechanisms that enable individuals to overcome digital barriers and enhance their integration into the digital space. Additionally, it highlights how digital capital can be transformed into other forms of capital, thereby enhancing individuals' social and economic opportunities while at the same time deepening existing gaps between different social groups.

According to Ragnedda and Royo, digital capital functions as a "bridging capital," serving as a fundamental component that connects offline experiences and resources with the digital environment. Since digital capital acts as a link between traditional offline capital and all potential domains in the digital space, it may contribute to reinforcing existing forms of capital. This can be particularly beneficial for individuals who lack traditional offline capital but possess the necessary digital capital to overcome barriers they could not have surpassed in the offline environment.

However, researchers argue that digital capital remains an individual resource that does not necessarily acquire the distinctive characteristics of cultural capital as defined by Pierre Bourdieu. While Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital is tied to notions such as social recognition and social closure, digital capital is seen as relatively independent of these dynamics.

Digital capital theory occupies a middle position between other approaches. Unlike network society theory's macro-level focus, it emphasizes individual and group-level resource distribution. It shares with symbolic interactionism an interest in individual agency but focuses on resources rather than meaning-making processes. Critical theory would argue that digital capital theory insufficiently addresses how digital platforms commodify these very "capitals." The strength of this approach

lies in its nuanced understanding of digital inequality beyond simple access issues, but its weakness is the conceptual confusion about whether digital resources truly function as capital in Bourdieu's theoretical sense, lacking the institutional recognition mechanisms that characterize traditional capital forms.

III3- The symbolic interactionist approach

The symbolic interactionist approach is a sociological theory that focuses on how meanings are formed through social interaction between individuals, where shared understanding relies on commonly agreed-upon symbols and meanings within society. According to Herbert Mead, this approach is based on the idea that meanings are not fixed but are continuously shaped and reshaped through daily interactions, contributing to individuals' perceptions of themselves, society, and the environment to which they belong.

In the digital context, the symbolic interactionist approach emphasizes how meanings are constructed and identities are shaped through interactions in virtual spaces. Communication on digital platforms relies on symbols such as text, emojis, and images, which enable users to express themselves and engage with others. This interaction goes beyond merely exchanging information; it actively shapes individuals' self-perception and digital identities, as reactions, comments, and engagements influence how they are perceived by the virtual community.

In this context, self-identity becomes dynamic and ever-changing, as individuals continuously adapt to interactions within digital environments. Social media platforms provide a space for reshaping the self based on the meanings exchanged within virtual communities, making social relationships influenced by digital representations as much as by direct interactions.

The symbolic interactionist approach in digital sociology explains how digital technology reshapes the performance and understanding of the self. With digital advancements, social interaction is no longer limited to face-to-face encounters but extends to "telecopresence," where individuals engage with a dispersed and unspecified audience through digital platforms. This leads to the formation of a "digital self," which may differ to varying degrees from the offline self, as individuals manage their impressions using strategies similar to those employed in traditional daily interactions.

However, critics argue that this approach may overemphasize individual agency while underestimating structural constraints that shape interaction possibilities. Digital platforms create "audience collapse" situations where multiple audiences receive the same content, challenging traditional assumptions about targeted self-presentation.

Symbolic interactionism offers a micro-level perspective that contrasts with other approaches. Unlike **network society theory's structural focus**, it emphasizes individual meaning-making and identity construction. It differs from **digital capital theory** by focusing on symbolic rather than resource-based processes. While **critical theory** emphasizes domination and control, symbolic interactionism highlights agency and creativity in digital spaces. Its strength lies in detailed analysis of identity formation and meaning construction, but its weakness is the potential underestimation of structural constraints and power relations that other approaches, particularly critical theory, highlight more effectively. The approach may also overstate the authenticity of digital interaction while underplaying how platform design shapes these interactions.

III 4-The critical approach

The critical approach in sociology, as proposed by Adorno and Horkheimer, contributes to transcending traditional models of social research by emphasizing the necessity of a comprehensive critique of capitalist structures and bourgeois society. Unlike approaches that rely on predictive theories derived from field research, critical theory employs dialectical thinking to understand social totality.

Technology has become an essential component of the social structure, necessitating a reevaluation of critical approaches to understanding it, especially in light of rapid digital transformations. In this context, the ideas of the Frankfurt School, which focused on instrumental rationality and technological domination, can be revisited to reinterpret their relevance in the digital space. Despite the shift in technology from industrial manufacturing to digital systems, modern technologies continue to reinforce the logic of technocratic power and reproduce patterns of domination in increasingly invisible ways.

The critical analysis of the digital society moves beyond the traditional Frankfurt School perspective on instrumental rationality. In this context, the analysis of "surveillance capitalism" reveals that technology is no longer merely a tool of production but has evolved into a mechanism for reshaping human behavior through data extraction and decision-making manipulation. This perspective extends Herbert Marcuse's critique of technocratic domination, wherein individuals are subjected to algorithmic logic and data-driven control.

Overall, the Frankfurt School focused on the impact of technology in shaping social structures and political frameworks. Adorno and Horkheimer argued that technological advancements since the 19th century have reinforced the dominance of cultural industries over individual

consciousness. When applying this analysis to the digital age, it becomes evident that modern technology, particularly the internet and social media, has become a powerful tool for reproducing cultural hegemony, reshaping social perception according to the logic of digital capitalism.

However, the Frankfurt School faced criticism for its inability to provide an accurate analysis of contemporary digital transformations. Gotham and Creer (2008) pointed out that its theories remained confined to traditional means, making them incapable of comprehending the nature of digital changes and their impact on social and political behavior.

Critical theory provides the most structurally pessimistic perspective among the four approaches. Unlike **network society theory's technological optimism**, it emphasizes domination and control mechanisms. It contrasts sharply with **symbolic interactionism's focus on individual agency** by highlighting structural constraints and manipulation. While **digital capital theory** examines resource distribution, critical theory analyzes how digital systems serve particular class interests. The strength of critical theory lies in its comprehensive analysis of power relations and its ability to reveal hidden mechanisms of digital domination. However, its weakness is the potential overemphasis on structural constraints at the expense of user agency and resistance practices, and a tendency toward pessimistic assessments that may overlook progressive possibilities that other approaches, particularly symbolic interactionism, identify in digital spaces.

IV. Implications and Future Directions

The theoretical discussion of digital sociology contributes to further research by providing comprehensive analytical frameworks for understanding how digital transformations simultaneously affect multiple dimensions of social life. These theoretical approaches offer valuable insights for policy development, particularly in areas of digital literacy, data governance, and addressing digital inequalities.

The analysis suggests several areas for policy intervention. Digital literacy programs should move beyond technical skills training to include critical understanding of digital power relations and algorithmic decision-making. Policies addressing digital capital distribution could help reduce digital inequalities by ensuring more equitable access to digital resources and opportunities. Additionally, privacy and data protection frameworks need to address the surveillance capitalism dynamics identified by critical theorists while recognizing the network effects described by Castells and the identity construction processes highlighted by symbolic interactionists.

This theoretical synthesis contributes to the field by demonstrating how different sociological approaches can be integrated to provide a more

comprehensive understanding of digital society. The analysis reveals both complementarities and tensions between approaches, suggesting that future research should explore these intersections more systematically. The framework developed here can guide empirical research by identifying key variables and relationships that warrant investigation.

Several areas require further empirical investigation. Comparative studies across different cultural and economic contexts, particularly in the Global South, could test the universality of these theoretical frameworks. Research examining the intersection of digital transformations with other forms of social inequality (race, gender, class) could provide more nuanced understanding of digital society's stratification processes. Additionally, longitudinal studies tracking changes in digital capital, network participation, identity construction, and power relations over time could illuminate the dynamic nature of digital social processes.

important questions remain for future exploration: How do these theoretical approaches apply to emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence, machine learning, and automated decision-making systems? What new theoretical frameworks might be needed as digital technologies continue to evolve rapidly? How can societies effectively balance digital innovation with social equity, individual privacy, and democratic participation? How do power relations in digital spaces intersect with traditional forms of social inequality? What forms of digital resistance and alternative organization emerge within dominant digital structures, and how can these be theorized?

Future research should examine the intersection of these approaches in specific empirical contexts, analyze how digital transformations affect different social groups differently, and explore resistance strategies and alternative digital practices that challenge dominant digital structures. Additionally, more work is needed on the global dimensions of digital sociology, particularly how digital technologies interact with local cultures, economies, and political systems in non-Western contexts. The development of new methodological approaches that can capture the complexity of digital social phenomena while remaining theoretically grounded also represents an important area for future development.

Conclusion:

Digital sociology reveals fundamental transformations in contemporary society, where digital technology is no longer merely a set of technical tools but a dynamic space that reshapes lifestyles, power relations, and forms of social interaction. The increasing expansion of digitization compels us to reconsider traditional sociological concepts and develop more

comprehensive approaches to understand the complex relationship between technology and society.

This comparative analysis of four prominent theoretical approaches demonstrates that each offers valuable insights while possessing distinct limitations. Network society theory provides a comprehensive framework for understanding global digital transformations but may underestimate persistent inequalities. Digital capital theory offers nuanced analysis of digital inequality but faces conceptual challenges about whether digital resources truly function as capital in Bourdieu's theoretical sense. Symbolic interactionism illuminates digital identity formation processes but may overemphasize individual agency while underestimating structural constraints. Critical theory reveals important mechanisms of digital domination but risks pessimistic determinism that obscures resistance possibilities.

Rather than viewing these approaches as mutually exclusive, our analysis reveals that they illuminate different dimensions of digital society's complexity. The tensions between them reflect the contradictory nature of digital transformations themselves, where technologies simultaneously enable new forms of social connection while creating new mechanisms of control and inequality.

This research contributes to digital sociology by demonstrating how different theoretical approaches can be integrated to provide more comprehensive understanding of digital phenomena. For contexts like Algeria and the broader Global South, this analysis reveals how digital technologies intersect with post-colonial power structures and cultural negotiations in ways that challenge universalist assumptions about digital development.

Future research should examine these theoretical insights through empirical studies in specific contexts, particularly in Global South societies where digital technologies may operate according to different logics. Additionally, comparative research across different cultural and political contexts could illuminate how digital transformations intersect with local power structures and forms of resistance.

As reliance on digital technologies continues to grow across all aspects of social life, understanding their complex effects becomes increasingly essential for developing policies and practices that can harness their benefits while mitigating their risks. This requires theoretical frameworks that recognize both the emancipatory potential and oppressive mechanisms embedded within digital systems, contributing to more

informed strategies for navigating digital transformations and their diverse effects on individuals and societies.

Referrals and references:

1. Castells, M. (2005). The Network Society: From Knowledge to Policy. Dans M. Castells, et al, M. Castells, & Gustavo Cardoso (Éds.), *The Network Society From Knowledge to Policy*. Washington: Center for Transatlantic Relations.
2. Day, C. (2025). Beyond Postpositivism: Dialectics, Epistemology, and Critical Sociology with Adorno and Horkheimer. *Sociological Theory*, Vol. 43(1).
3. Delanty, G., & Neal Harris. (2021). Critical theory and the question of technology: The Frankfurt School revisited. *Thesis Eleven*, Volume 166(Issue 1).
4. Dyczek, B. (2024). On the need for integrating social sciences and engineering – technical disciplines in studying contemporary social phenomena. New directions in digital sociology. *MEDIA I SPOŁECZEŃSTWO*(Nr 20(1/1)).
5. Fussey, P., & Silke Roth. (2020). Digitizing Sociology: Continuity and Change in the Internet Era. *Sociology*, Vol. 54(4).
6. Greyson, D., & et al. (2016). Digital Sociology and Information Science Research. *Conference: Association for Information Science and Technology Annual Meeting*At. 53(1). Denmark: Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology.
7. Hoang, N. H. (2023). Digital Sociology in the XXI Century: the Core Issues. *VNU Journal of Science: Policy and Management Studies*, Vol. 39(No. 4).
8. Houria, B., & Makhoulf Boumediene. (2024). Reshaping Educational Interactions: The Theory of Symbolic Interactionism in the Digital Education Era. *International Journal of Social Communication*, VOL: 11 (N°: 04).
9. Housley, W., & Robin James Smith. (2017). Interactionism and Digital Society. *Qualitative Research*, 17(2).
10. Husin, S. S., & et al. (2021). THE SYMBOLIC INTERACTIONISM THEORY: A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW OF CURRENT RESEARCH. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MODERN TRENDS IN SOCIAL SCIENCES (IJMTSS)*, Volume 4(Issue 17).

11. Laskar, M. H. (2023). Examining the emergence of digital society and the digital divide in India: A comparative evaluation between urban and rural areas. *Front. Sociol, Volume 8*.
12. Lybeck, R., & et al. (2024). From digital divide to digital capital: the role of education and digital skills in social media participation. *Universal Access in the Information Society, Volume 23*.
13. Musik, C., & Alexander Bogner. (2019). Book title: Digitalization & society A sociology of technology perspective on current trends in data, digital security and the internet. *Österreich Z Soziol, (Suppl 1) (44)*.
14. Nicola, A. D. (2022). Towards digital organized crime and digital sociology of organized crime. *Trends in Organized Crime, v. 2022(61)*.
15. Pa, H. (2022). Critical Thinking of Frankfurt School of Thought in Cultural Industry. *Advances in Educational Technology and Psychology, Vol. 6(Num. 11)*.
16. Pitzalis, M., & Mariano Porcu. (2024). Digital Capital and Cultural Capital in education: Unravelling intersections and distinctions that shape social differentiation. *Br Educ Res J, Volume 50 (Issue 6)*.
17. Skopek, J. (2023). Introduction and overview to the Research Handbook on Digital Sociology. Dans J. Skopek, et al, J. Skopek, & et al (Éds.), *Research Handbook on Digital Sociology*. USA: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
18. Verwiebe, R., & Steffen Hagemann. (2024). Bourdieu revisited: new forms of digital capital – emergence, reproduction, inequality of distribution. *INFORMATION, COMMUNICATION & SOCIETY, 27(16)*.
19. Zhao, Y., & Mingyu Wang. (2023). Digital sociology: origin, development, and prospects from a global perspective. *The Journal of Chinese Sociology, 10(1)*.
20. Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. Public Affairs.
21. Van Dijk, J. (2006). *The Network Society*. Sage
22. Savage & Burrows (2007) - "The Coming Crisis of Empirical Sociology" *Sociology, 41(5): 885-899*
23. Marres (2017) - "Digital Sociology: The Reinvention of Social Research ,Polity Press
24. Weiser, M. (1991). The Computer for the 21st Century. *Scientific American*.