JDSS Journal of Development and Social Sciences
www.jdss.org.pk

RESEARCH PAPER

In the Digital Age: Media, Society, and Power: Changing Governance, the Public Sphere, and Democratic Accountability (1990-2023)

1Dr. Muhammad Irfan, 2 Dr. Huma Nisar and 3Ayaz Ahmed

1. Assistant Professor Department of Mass Communication, Federal Urdu University of Arts, Science & Technology, Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan, https://orcid.org/0009-0007-9380-6861
2. Assistant Professor Department of Mass Communication\Federal Urdu University of Arts, Science & Technology, Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan, https://orcid.org/0009-0003-0662-9600
3. Lecturer Department of Mass Communication, Federal Urdu University of Arts, Science & Technology, Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan, https://orcid.org/0009-0000-2857-3001

| *Corresponding Author: | erfanaziz@fuuast.edu.pk |

ABSTRACT

This paper critically analyzes the changes in media, society, and power relations throughout the digital era, with a specific focus on how governance, the public sphere, and democratic accountability have evolved from 1990 to 2023. The rise of the Internet, social media, and data-driven communication platforms in the past three decades has profoundly reshaped how power is created, practiced, and negotiated. Using a qualitative, theoretically-oriented methodology, the paper synthesizes existing literature on mass communication, public sphere theory, and political-economic perspectives to evaluate the impact of digital media on political communication, democracy, and governance. The results reveal a paradox: while digital media enhance access to information, foster civic participation, and challenge elite power, they also contribute to the spread of misinformation, surveillance, polarization, and the concentration of corporate power. The paper concludes that digital accountability cannot be achieved solely through technological innovation but requires regulatory frameworks, media literacy, and ethical governance.

| **KEYWORDS** | Digital Media, Power, Public Sphere, Governance, Democratic Accountability, Mass Communication |

Introduction

Since the beginning of the 1990s, the media landscape of the world has experienced an earthquake, with the distribution modalities of the traditional ones slowly being replaced by digital technologies. The expanses of the means of information production, distribution, and consumption have been restructured due to the emergence of the Internet and social-media platforms and mobile communication technologies. The media have stopped being institutional news organisations but it has turned into a networked interactive space within which individuals, corporations and governments interact in attempting to influence the discourse of the people. These changes have far-reaching consequences related to the relationship of power, frameworks of authority, and the democratic rule. In the past, mass media in the form of newspapers, radio, and television have been the key gatekeepers of information, which increased the voices and interests of the political elites, media owners, and professional journalists (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). This hierarchical paradigm was broken by the use of user-generated content, real-time communication, and transnational information flow making the citizens able to confront traditional sources of power and representation (Castells, 2009). At the same time, the process of computerising the society revealed new aspects of power and complicates the principles of democracy. Symmetries of control created by algorithms, surveillance systems, and platform monopolies tend to be operated outside the scope of human governance (Zuboff, 2019). In addition, digital media have also become central to governance, citizens interactions and policy legitimisation as well as being usurped by governments to spy and control. The two sidedness of the media as empowering and controlling to some extent, poses very important questions of accountability and transparency. One of the leading themes of the democratic theory is the

concept of the public sphere that has become heterogeneous due to the digital media. Despite the role of online places in the process of debate and mobilisation, online spaces also prescribe polarisation, misinformation, and echo chambers that harm the discourse of rational-criticism (Habermas, 2006; Sunstein, 2017). Therefore, media-democracy has become more of a complex phenomenon. The present paper will discuss the dynamics of the entire interaction and development of the relationship of media, society, and power between 1990 and 2023. The research paper intends to explain how digital media have changed the way governance has been conducted in societies, recreated the mass publicity, and reformed democratic accountability using an integrative mass-communication theoretical model. This thesis is neither to claim that digital media are emancipatory or oppressive but, indeed, they are a battleground, on which power can be negotiated.

Literature Review

Media-power nexus is an old issue in the communication field, because media regimes have ultimate control over political power, social structure and mass consciousness. The initial academic literature based on the traditional mass-communication paradigm has supported media influence as being concentrated in the hands of print, radio and television thus influencing the way people think and vote. The relatively stable and stable media structures, professional standards of journalism and recognisable gatekeepers of information characterised this epoch. Agenda setting theory provided a good account of the media influence at this time. McCombs (2004) managed to show that, despite a lack of opinion shaping, the media have a significant impact given that they can make specific issues seem important. This observation shifted the academic emphasis of the discussion on persuasive influence to the background and hidden mechanisms that media frame political reality. The framing literature also explained why media discourses shape interpretive patterns, shapes the audience perceptions about events, actors and policies. The intersection of the agenda-setting and framing theories underscored the power to exercise symbolism by the media. Initial literature presupposed a one-way communication between the institutions of media and passive audience. This assumption was broken (or at least its re-assessment was triggered) by the appearance of the Internet in the late 1990s and the need to reconsider media power. Information technology communication reduced barriers to entry, increased user generated content, and drew horizontal flows of information. Benkler (2006) has maintained that networked communication compromised the traditional gate keeping bringing about a more pluralistic public sphere. In this regard, the digital media seem to decentralise the power by allowing the citizenry and civil society organisations to engage directly into the society through discourse. The first digital wave of idealism was in line with the democratic theory which held that a more engaged population and access to information would strengthen deliberation and accountability. Digital space was seen as a path to openness, mobilisation and civic engagement, which will recover the lost democratic procedures lost to commercialisation and elite interference. The presumption that digital media would reduce the deep-rooted power hierarchies appeared to be substantiated on the basis of the empirical evidence of online activism. But the coming of age of digital media spawned more critical appraisals. The effects of commercialisation and commercialisation of online communication together with the colonialism of proprietary platforms weakened the normative bases of the public sphere (Habermas, 2006). The online communication was often turned into entertainment, sensationalism, and personalisation instead of rational-critical discourse which exacerbated the struggle between market-driven media logic and democratic principles, most particularly, with the spread of social media platforms. Later empirical research proved the emergence of echo chambers, filter bubbles, and misinformation. Sunstein (2017) argued that personalisation through algorithms isolates users in ideologically homogenous information spheres, thus, distorting the debate and thinking in the area of mass discourse. These events pointed towards the idea that even access does not guarantee increased democracy, but once more, it is possible that digital media contributes to polarization and deviance of the conditions, which facilitate democratic deliberation. These changes between an optimistic starting

point and a critical ambivalence are indicative of a general reconceptualisation of media power. The production of power gains more and more of an infrastructural nature in the form of platforms, data, and algorithms instead of manufacturing content it itself. These structural dimensions have been shed on by the political-economy views. As Mosco (2009) pointed out, capitalistic relations of ownership, labour and commodification exist in media systems and therefore strengthens power concentration as opposed to weakening it. The phenomenon of surveillance capitalism, as defined by Zuboff (2019) comes as a result of platforms collecting behavioural information to predict and influence the actions of the user to economic and political benefits. This power is mostly unseen and it is not subject to traditional control measures making democratic accountability difficult. Despite the supposed openness and involvement of various online platforms, users tend to be subjugated to asymmetric systems and platforms determine visibility, reach and monetisation. These structural inequalities have an important governance implication. The line between corporations and states is being erased as governments are progressively resorting to commercial media as a way of communicating, enforcing regulations and delivering services to the population. Such reliance increases the issues of sovereignty, accountability and transparency, especially when political communication is anchored on platform rules and algorithms without the democratic control. Media power, therefore, is beyond persuasion, and it includes infrastructural governance. This dual nature has been recognised in research on digital governance which has recognised opportunities and threats. Chadwick (2013) proposed the hybrid media system, which implies that the old and the new media practice coexist and create a strategic space through which political actors exploit it to gain power. Accountability can be improved with e-government projects and online activism, but not equally, as it depends on a political regime, institutional capacity and culture. Notably, in literature, it is always shown that process of digital media does not have a deterministic effect; outcomes depend on regulatory structures, media literacy, political institutions as well as social inequalities. Digital media in strong democratic environments enhance accountability systems, but in weaker ones it can further enhance surveillance and control. These discrepancies are driving the idea that integrative analyses are needed that do not follow simplified accounts of empowerment or domination. In general, the literature is characterised by the formation of the conceptualisation of the media power as decentralised and structurally limited online space, where non-traditional institutions take centre stage. The rise in the level of awareness of the fact that there are democratic deficits that cannot be addressed through technological innovation only, is depicted by the trajectory of optimism to the ambivalence. Rather the power of media must be perceived as an active interaction between technology, economy, governance, and society.

Theoretical Lens

It is the most adequate theoretical framework to analyse media, society and power in digital age combining the public sphere theory, agenda-setting and critical political economy. The theory of public sphere being a construct of norm provides an outline of circumstances in which the media promote deliberation that is inclusive and rational debate (Habermas, 1989). This theory applies in the digital milieu, whereby it determines whether or not the online activities produce democratic discourse or corrupted discourse. The concept of agenda-setting has been relevant to a decentred online space, which is the basis of the strength that media command on priorities of the populace via algorithms, rankings, and moderation of the platform. Agenda-setting never stops even with its evolution, but now it takes new forms (McCombs, 2004). Framing theory can explain the meaning-making process and contestation in the digital discourse. Critical political economy is a structural perspective that holds the ownership, control and economic interests with media systems and this holds the dynamics of platform capitalism, data commodification, and corporate power (Mosco, 2009). Combined, these theories make up a holistic analytical model of comprehending power relations in the age of the online.

Theoretical Framework

The current framework is a synthesis of three fundamental concepts, namely, media power, governance, and democratic accountability. Media power is the ability of institutions, technologies and actors to influence discourse, perception and availability of information (Castells, 2009). Governance comprises formal and informal structures, such as state policies, rules and protocols in a platform to command power. Democratic accountability is the procedures whereby the authorities are not only accountable to the citizens but also transparent, participatory, and accountable. According to the model, the digital media mediates the relationship between governance and accountability through transformation of the public sphere. Algorithms and networked communication replace the customary gatekeeping role and provide new participation models and forms, at the same time fostering new modes of control. The framework explains how agency and structure interrelate to produce democratic results through the externalisation of media technologies into bigger political and economical contexts. This synthesizing method is enabling a subtle evaluation of empowering as well as constraining effects of digital media.

Material and Methods

This paper is theoretical based and qualitative in nature as it attempts to analyse media-society-power relationships in the period 1990 to 2023. Considering the conceptual and time frame, the best design applicable is a qualitative design in an attempt to capture structural change, normative shifts, and power dynamic that are not measurable by quantitative measures. The interpretation analysis dwells on processes of meaning-making, institutional change, and discursive power of media system. The main source of empirical data includes literature reviews and synthesis of the theoretical literature in a systematic manner. The databases have been used such as Google Scholar, JSTOR, Scopus, and Web of Science; the materials have been chosen among academic books, peer-reviewed articles, as well as policy reports and institutional publications. The seminal works in the area of mass communication, political communication, digital governance, platform capitalism, algorithmic governance, and democratic accountability were given priority.

Thematic analysis of literature was done in reference to the shift in media formations, governance processes, and civic engagement throughout the digital transformation.

Research Design

The study designed a longitudinal design, splitting 1990 2023 into three macro phases:

Early Digital Transition (1990- 2004): this was marked by the invention of the Internet and online news.

Platform Expansion (2005 -2015): characterized by the development of social media and user-created content.

If the mentality of the digital era—datafication, surveillance capitalism, and policy controversies—is concerned, Platform Consolidation and Algorithmic Governance (2016 2023). This segment of time allows establishing comparative analysis of continuities and discontinuities in media-power relations.

The four analytical categories, which include the following, are gatekeeping, agenda-setting, commodification, and democratic accountability, which are built using theoretical ideas and tested through the literature. The strategy is theoretically rigorous and gives interpretive leeway. Analytical validity of triangulating across discipline traditions

improves. The research does not give priority to any one explanatory approach but incorporates contradictory standpoints in the effort to produce an additive meaning to the same topic of digital media in democratic implications.

Despite the fact that the methodology based on the secondary sources and without region-specific empirical cases, its scope and depth make it appropriate to a macro-level conceptual analysis, which is correlated with the purpose of the study to clarify long-term media-society changes in the digital era.

Results and Discussion

Digital media has radically transformed the organization, allocation and utilization of power in modern societies with critical consequences on governance and democratic accountability. Digitalisation does not simply restructure the fundamental principles by which communicative activities have always been based; it is, in fact, one of the forms of restructuring the relatively old media systems, which have existed before it. With the onset of the digital transformation the media switched the process of functional centralisation of the media structures, i.e. the institutions that regulate resources, into decentralised and networked structures. However, this structural refocusing has not eliminated any power asymmetry, in fact, power has been restructured, redefined, and previously integrated into technological infrastructures, platform structures, and data-centric. Media International popular culture Media. The process of popularisation of the Internet in the 1990s was generally understood as a democratising tool to challenge the old system of gatekeeping by the mainstream media. It also compromised the control of agenda-setting and framing once controlled exclusively by the news organisations as now a growing diversity of individuals and non-institutional actors gained easy access to publishing tools. This allowed the appearance of alternative discourses, counter-publics and transnational communication forms. The agenda-setting power, at this immature stage, seemed more decentralised, with the viewers having access to multiple information sources other than mainstream ones, thus, seemingly fitting the demands of mainstream democracies that are defined by pluralism and participation. Such power decentralisation in media however was unequal and time-based.

With the proliferation of sources of information, there were structural inequalities in terms of access to technologies, digital literacy, and economic resources. Furthermore, the lack of strong systems of the elite power enhanced the process of commercialising the early digital spaces. The presumption of what could be termed democratic parity when it came to decentralisation was naive when it was assumed that the market forces and the ability of the institutional actors to reestablish dominance were ignored. This means that traditional gatekeeping was eroded early on and this did not destroy power; instead it transferred authorities to other spheres. The next change of the media relations balance came with the social media appearance in the middle of 2000s. The interfaces like Facebook, Twitter (now X), YouTube, Instagram, or Tik Tok turned into forceful mediators of the mass communication sphere. These platforms replaced the quality of editorial mediation processes with algorithmic curatorial processes that determine visibility, relevance, and accessibility to the audience. Algorithms, which are purportedly neutral and user-driven, are potent agentic instruments, and instead focus on the creation of content that results in user attention most effectively and monetisation. Therefore, the process of agenda-setting in the digital world continues but in an inert, non-transparent way which is being less linked to the idea of the common good. Algorithms of governance have far-reaching effects on democratic speech. Algorithms where engagement is valued put emotive, sensational and polarising information over truth and complexity, which directly further discriminates discourse towards conflict, as opposed to reconciliation.

The political agenda that results is largely based on likes, shares and watch time other than journalistic integrity and civic interest. This leads to the fact that the citizens are

divided and unwieldy in their attention, and it is impossible to support any democratic discussion and informed decision-making. These changing media agendas transform the way of governance. Digital channels are becoming an attractive policy dissemination tool, crisis management tool, public diplomacy method, and citizen outreach tool to governments. Although digital media allow the transmission of information more quickly and the state and the citizen closer relationships, which should increase the level of transparency and responsiveness, the dependencies created complicate democratic accountability. When governments uses privately owned delivery of communication, governments lose some control over communication infrastructures and conventions. The policies of platform and algorithm are expected to ameliorate the loss of the state-corporate boundary in an heinous fashion. The decisions of content moderation, deplatforming, and the use of data are often introduced by business participants, whose actions are based on self-interest rather than democratic values, undermining the sovereignty of states and disrupting the conventional paradigm of accountability that draws the line between the government and businesses.

Platform-based concentration of power is a representative of the political-economic model of the digital age. Media concentration in the modern world is quite intense, in opposition to early discourses of decentralisation. International companies have come to control international communications, personal data markets, advertising, and algorithmic rule, whereby they pick up structural power in terms of information flows, economic extraction, and political discourse. Such a phenomenon can be theorised through surveillance capitalism, which is the concept developed by Zuboff (2019). The commodification of the behaviours of users is being done at an unprecedented scale, and platforms can predict and control actions that cannot be represented in the traditional media. This invisibility impedes the identification of citizens and control over the control mechanisms in technology designs and thus challenges democracy accountability without any form of censorship. The recommendations of the literature policies are difficult and even conflicting. On the one hand, the electronic media enable the mobilisation, whistleblowing and citizen journalism that enable the civil society to keep the elites in check. On the other hand, they also facilitate the conduction of disinformation campaigns, political micro-targeting, and mass surveillance to reduce trust in the democratic institutions.

The absence of transparency, which is a key to democratic accountability, is also typified by micro-targeting: when providing specific messages to particular populations, the political entities in power avoid the form of examination and implication of leadership as well as compromise the idea of transparency, which is a key principle of democracy. The non-coordination between technology and accountability systems that do not effectively keep up with technological progress also contributes to inefficiency in enforcement since legislation and regulatory frameworks cannot keep up with quickly developing platforms and algorithms. Online literacy becomes a determining point to resisting democracy; lack of it means that citizens will be exposed to manipulation. These relations of digital media power reinforce that power is discussed between states, corporations, media institutions, and citizens. States want to have arenas of control but at the same time rely on them; corporations want to be seen as neutral but struggling against control; citizens want to have a role to play, disagree, and improvise in limited conditions. This interrelativity means that digital media are a disputable space, and not a place of manipulation or liberation. The impact of digital media on accountability and governance has different impacts on political and cultural conditions. Digital media is able to foster transparency and participation in liberal democracies, and may be used to maintain constant surveillance, censorship, and regulation against populations in totalitarian or hybrid regimes. Such deviation shows that media power is not deterministic of democratic results because technology is only mediated by institutional structures. Overall, the discussion clarifies that, online media has not changed the reality of power but the forms of power have changed. Agenda-setting, gate-keeping, and surveillance have now taken part in algorithmic, data-infrastructural and

corporate governance structures. Democratic accountability has been rebuilt and not fundamentally improved, depending on regulatory capabilities, institutional design and normative compliance with the communicative interest of the people.

The digital media is still an unsolvable enigma in modern society. They expand communicative spaces and, at the same time, create new power horizons. In order to understand this duality, we must avoid linear explanations that have a determinism stance and adopt an integrative analytic viewpoint which encompasses the technical, economical and political aspects. It is only with help of such a critical approach that the impact of digital media on governance and democracy can be described in a full scope

Discussion

The discussion critically addresses the normative connotations of digital media to the political cognizance of democratic policies. Expansion of the public space through the digital media can first accommodate the Habermasian principles of inclusiveness and participation. However, breakdown of language and loss of systems of shared information discourses suffocate rational-critical discourse by eroding its informational premise. Digital media are changing the nature of political participation by reducing the barriers to entry and encouraging networked activism as witnessed during the Arab spring and global climate movements. The participation though does not necessarily become the influence and responsibility. Remunerated visibility, which is facilitated by platforms, will primarily tend to increase interests in power structures, which will strengthen by asymmetry. The dilemma of efficiency versus accountability in digital governance is clear, as the greater the administrative capacity and the greater the interaction of the population, opportunities to monitor and control them increase, especially in oppressive or semi-oppressive regimes, which intensifies pressurisation instead of curbing it. Algorithms undermine editorial judgment and social conventions and are an unusual agenda-setting. Algorithms are not ethically accountable as the traditional journalism is and are concerned only with profitability, which negatively affects the watchdog role of the press and complicates the processes of democracy. As it is pointed out in the discussion, technological determinism cannot explain only democratic outcomes. Political institution, regulatory systems and social norms mediate the effects of media. The availability of digital media can also be used to hold strong, democratic institutions accountable, and institutions with strong independence of media, which is not the case with weaker states. Thus, the digital media cannot be divided into the democratic or authoritarian tools, but they serve as tools whose results are determined by the decisions of governance and relations of power.

This paper sums up the major findings of digital media, society and power. To start with, digital media reconditioned agenda setting and gate playing communities, with control handed over to relatively opaque sliding regimes. Second, the mass culture has been decentralised in terms of involvement but lacks consistence in terms of deliberation, which further runs and increases polarization and fragmentation. Thirdly, privately owned digital platforms are less accountable to administrative control because the states depend on corporations to provide infrastructure, analytics and moderation without being accountable to the voters. Fourthly, imbalance in owning digital assets creates inequalities and politicises the marginalised groups. Lastly, regulatory frameworks, media literacy is also an important mediator variable; a strong regulation and quality citizenry can reduce the effect of power imbalance which would exist otherwise.

Conclusion

This conclusion abridges the contradictions of relations between the media, the society, and power in the era of the online. Digital media will mediate communication, governance, and democracy in the period between the year 1990 and 2023, encouraging participation and creating novel inequalities and controls. The radical locus of power, when

the algorithms and the corporate system eliminate the old gatekeepers, is an indication of significant changes in the political-economic arena. Even though the internet spaces expand the speed of information dissemination and recruitment of people, it also creates divisions, polarization, and misinformation. As such, due to the quantitative but qualitative deterioration of the public sphere, deliberative norms are undermined by commercialisation and engagement algorithms. The rise in democratic outcomes does not come up as a result of simple information abundance. The article argues that technological innovation is not enough to create democratic accountability. Digital media has been undertaken into the governance systems, regulatory interventions and social hierarchies, unless there are adequately placed checks, transparency, and responsible custodianship, it might be seen that corporate interests will be placed over the common good. The increased reliance of governments in corporate communication tools further undermines state-corporate borders which increases the problem of accountability. The combination of the theories of mass communication, such as social problem, public sphere, and critical political economy proves that neither agenda-setting nor gate-keeping is dead, they have indeed been changed into the algorithmic processes lightly controlled by the democratic decision-making. This will require a redefinition of accountability regimes in the modern media systems. The article supports the critical approach to digital technologies, denying simple emancipation and oppression dichotomies. The digital media represent a persistent conflict in which power is negotiated between states, corporations, the media institutions, and citizens. The democratic value of digital media relies on deliberate political choices, positive institutional solutions, and the changing mass consciousness. The future studies will depend on how societies will be able to balance the innovative breakthroughs in technology with the normative openness, inclusivity, and communicative equity. The main ways of reversing concentrated media power can be enhanced regulatory measures, media-digital literacy, and ethical regulation of platforms.

Recommendations

To address the challenges posed by digital media, it is essential to establish regulatory tools that enhance the transparency and accountability of online platforms. Alongside this, media and digital literacy programs must be prioritized as critical democratic demands to equip individuals with the skills necessary to navigate and critically engage with digital spaces. Additionally, there should be a concerted effort to promote the creation of high-quality, socially beneficial algorithms and platforms that prioritize user well-being. Strengthening journalistic oversight in the digital realm is also crucial to ensure ethical reporting and prevent the spread of misinformation. Finally, fostering international collaboration in managing online spaces is vital to create a cohesive and effective global approach to regulating digital platforms and ensuring their responsible use across borders.

References

AlgorithmWatch. (2020). *Automating Society Report 2020: The state of algorithmic decision-making in the public sector*. AlgorithmWatch.

Ali, A., Khan, M. L., & Atta, N. (2024). Role of Parental Neglect in Shaping Resilience Among Individuals with Substance Use Disorder. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences*, *5*(2), 186-198.

Benkler, Y. (2006). *The wealth of networks: How social production transforms markets and freedom.* Yale University Press.

Castells, M. (2009). *Communication power*. Oxford University Press.

Center for Humane Technology. (2021). *The problem with persuasive design: A policy brief.* Center for Humane Technology. https://www.humanetech.com

Chadwick, A. (2013). *The hybrid media system: Politics and power*. Oxford University Press.

Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). Data colonialism: Rethinking big data's relation to the contemporary subject. *Television & New Media, 20*(4), 336–349. https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476418796632

Data & Society Research Institute. (2018). *Algorithms and human rights: Research report.* Data & Society. https://datasociety.net

European Commission. (2022). *Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 — Digital Services Act (DSA).* Official Journal of the European Union.

Fatima, S., Khan, M. L., & Kousar, R. (2024). Emotional Intelligence, Religiosity and Quality of Life Among University Students. *Journal of Social & Organizational Matters*, *3*(2), 455-471.

Firdos, S., Khan, M. L., & Atta, N. (2024). Intrinsic Motivation and Social Emotional Competence and Job Satisfaction Among School. *International Research Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, *3*(2), 58-79.

Freedom House. (2023). *Freedom on the Net 2023: The crisis of global internet freedom*. Freedom House. https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-net/2023

Gillespie, T. (2018). *Custodians of the internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media*. Yale University Press.

Gurganari, L., Dastageer, G., Mushtaq, R., Khwaja, S., Uddin, S., Baloch, M. I., & Hasni, S. (2022). Assessment of heavy metals in cyprinid fishes: Rivers of district Khuzdar Balochistan Pakistan. *Brazilian Journal of Biology*, *84*, e256071.

Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society* (T. Burger, Trans.). MIT Press. (Original work published 1962).

Hendricks, J. A., & Vestergaard, M. (2019). Global media and governance: New perspectives. In J. A. Hendricks & M. Vestergaard (Eds.), *Digital governance and media policy* (pp. 1–26). Routledge.

Irshad, A. F., Khan, M. L., & Mahmood, T. (2024). *Social Emotional Competence, Religiosity, and Pro-Social Behavior Among Adolescents. Global Sociological Review, IX (II), 153.*

Kayani, J. A., Faisal, F., Khan, S., & Anjum, T. (2023). Analysing Consumer's Intention to Buy Bottled Drinking Water in Pakistan Through Integrated Marketing Communication Framework. *Journal of Business and Management Research*, *2*(2), 881-902.

Kaye, D. (2019). *Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression: Ending online violence against women and girls*. United Nations Human Rights Council. https://www.ohchr.org

Khan, M. L., Farooq, S., & Kamal, R. (2023). Adapting Intrinsic Motivation Scale: Assessing Prospective Teacher's Motivation. *Orient Research Journal of Social Sciences*, *8*(1), 21-26.

Khan, S., Haq, A. U., & Naseer, M. (2022). The Influence of Guerrilla Marketing on Consumer Buying Behavior in the Beverage Sector of Rawalpindi and Islamabad, Pakistan. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences*, *3*(4), 647-659.

McCombs, M. E. (2004). *Setting the agenda: The mass media and public opinion* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.

McCombs, M., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 3*6(2), 176–187.

Morozov, E. (2011). *The net delusion: The dark side of Internet freedom.* PublicAffairs.

Mosco, V. (2009). *The political economy of communication* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Napoli, P. M. (2011). Audience evolution: New technologies and the transformation of media audiences. Columbia University Press.

Pariser, E. (2011). *The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you*. Penguin Press.

Pew Research Center. (2023). *Social Media and Politics 2023: News and Influence.* Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org

Rana, A. M., & Ahmed, A. M. (2022). A Propose Sustainable Mechanism For Academia And Industry Linkages: Perspective Of Transfer Of Innovation And Technology. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, *6*(8), 10012-10026.

Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism. (2023). *Digital News Report 2023*. Reuters Institute. https://www.reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/digital-news-report/2023

Sunstein, C. R. (2017). *#Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media*. Princeton University Press.

Tufekci, Z. (2017). *Twitter and tear gas: The power and fragility of networked protest.* Yale University Press.

UNESCO. (2021). *Publications on safety of journalists and the issue of disinformation*. UNESCO. https://en.unesco.org/themes/safety-journalists

Van Hoboken, J., & van Eijk, N. (2015). Freedom of expression and platform governance: Human rights and responsibilities online. In A. P. G. (Ed*.), Law, governance and internet* (pp. 45–68). Springer.

World Bank. (2016). *World Development Report 2016: Digital dividends*. World Bank. https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/wdr2016

Yasmeen, K., Khan, M. L., & Imran, H. (2024). Exploring Emotional Intelligence, Remote Work Dynamics, Team Collaboration, and Adaptive Leadership for Enhanced Success in the Digital Workplace. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, *8*(2), 969-979.

Zaller, J. (1992). *The nature and origins of mass opinion.* Cambridge University Press.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.

Zuboff, S. (2020). *The logic of surveillance capitalism: An overview.* PublicAffairs/Harvard briefings.