International Journal of Business and Management Invention (IJBMI)
ISSN (Online): 2319 – 8028, ISSN (Print): 2319 – 801X
www.ijbmi.org || Volume 15 Issue 6 || June, 2026 || PP—81-88

Algorithms of Caste: Platform Visibility, Identity Reinforcement, and Political Mobilization in Digital India

Abstract
This article examines how social media algorithms restructure caste-based political participation in India by shaping regimes of political visibility across digital platforms. Conceptualizing algorithms as mediating infrastructures rather than neutral tools, it argues that engagement-optimized recommendation systems translate historically embedded caste hierarchies into patterned forms of attention and influence. Through a comparative analysis of platform architectures across Facebook, Instagram, and WhatsApp, the article identifies a common mechanism whereby affectively charged, identity-aligned content is repeatedly amplified within caste-based networks, fostering echo chambers that enable mobilization while limiting cross-group reach. It advances two theoretical claims: first, that algorithmic polarization operates differently in contexts structured by ascriptive hierarchies such as caste; and second, that platform-specific visibility regimes condition how digital engagement converts into political influence. By foregrounding mechanism-oriented inference rather than descriptive accounts of online activism, the article contributes to debates on digital politics and social stratification.
Keywords: *Caste Identity; Social Media Algorithms; Echo Chambers; Political Mobilization; Digital Politics*

Date of Submission: 28-05-2026 Date of acceptance: 08-06-2026

I. Introduction

Caste remains one of the most durable and consequential structures shaping political participation, representation, and legitimacy in India (Piliavsky, 2013). Despite constitutional guarantees of equality and decades of democratic mobilization, caste continues to organize access to voice, visibility, and power within both formal political institutions and everyday political life (Dirks, 2001). While scholarship has examined caste politics through parties, electoral behavior, social movements, and state policy, the growing centrality of digital platforms introduces new mediating infrastructures that demand scrutiny (Udupa et al., 2021). As political discourse increasingly unfolds on social media, questions emerge not only about who speaks, but about how political visibility itself is produced, distributed, and constrained.

Caste-based political expression has expanded across various platforms, including Facebook, Instagram, and WhatsApp. Marginalised communities have used these spaces to articulate counter-narratives, challenge dominant representations, and mobilise politically, often bypassing traditional media gatekeeping (Tereza, 2024). At the same time, these platforms are governed by algorithmic systems that prioritize engagement, virality, and platform-specific affordances (Gillespie, 2018). These algorithms are not neutral: they shape which content circulates, which identities gain prominence, and which forms of political expression remain marginal or vulnerable (Noble, 2018). Yet much literature on caste and digital politics has focused on activism, misinformation, or inclusion, often treating platforms as passive arenas rather than active political actors (Udupa, 2019).

Parallel research on algorithms demonstrates how platform infrastructures influence discourse, polarization, and mobilization (Gillespie, 2018). However, much of this work centers on Western contexts and class- or ideology-based cleavages, with limited attention to caste as a historically entrenched system of stratification. The interaction between caste hierarchies and algorithmic visibility regimes thus remains under-theorized. This paper intervenes at this intersection, arguing that social media algorithms function as mediating infrastructures that reorganize caste politics rather than reproduce or erase them.

The central claim advanced here is that algorithmic systems produce uneven regimes of visibility, fostering caste-aligned echo chambers that enable expressive mobilization while limiting cross-caste reach and translating online attention into unequal political influence. These dynamics are platform-specific: Facebook's ranking and group-based circulation shape large-scale visibility, Instagram's influencer economies stabilize symbolic representation over time, and WhatsApp's closed-group circulation facilitates targeted, trust-based communication. Algorithmic mediation intersects with other axes of marginalization, particularly gender and religion, exposing marginalised actors to harassment, surveillance, and misrecognition while amplifying their visibility (Noble, 2018; Udupa, 2019).

Rather than adopting a technologically deterministic perspective, this study conceptualizes algorithms as political infrastructures embedded within broader social hierarchies. Platforms neither dissolve caste nor operate

independently of it; they actively structure how caste is articulated, performed, and mobilized (Udupa et al., 2021). By foregrounding algorithmic governance, the paper shifts analytical attention from content alone to the systems that structure circulation, attention, and legitimacy. By situating caste within debates on algorithms and digital democracy, this article contributes to scholarship on political participation, social stratification, and platform-mediated politics in India, demonstrating that platforms are not merely sites of expression but arenas where long-standing hierarchies are computationally reconfigured.

This study relies primarily on secondary sources, platform documentation, and mechanism-oriented synthesis rather than direct measurement of user activity. While this approach allows for comparative and conceptual insight, it does not provide fine-grained causal evidence of individual-level engagement or offline mobilization.

II. Algorithms, Visibility, and the Formation of Caste-Based Echo Chambers

In contemporary digital environments, political visibility is increasingly structured by algorithmic systems that rank, recommend, and circulate content based on predicted engagement (Gillespie, 2018). Social media platforms rely on computational mechanisms that prioritize likes, shares, comments, watch time, and forwarding behavior to manage attention and reduce information overload (Bucher, 2018). Often framed as neutral tools for efficiency, these systems function as infrastructural forms of power, shaping what becomes visible, legitimate, and politically salient in digital public spheres (Mittelstadt et al., 2016). Visibility is not evenly distributed; it is algorithmically produced, privileging content that resonates with users' prior interactions, social affiliations, and affective cues, thereby embedding social hierarchies into digital attention economies (Beer, 2017).

In the Indian context, algorithmic visibility regimes intersect with caste, a historically entrenched axis of social identity and political alignment (Madan, 2025). Caste identities permeate social, cultural, and political life, making them highly resonant within engagement-optimized digital environments (Padhy & Panbude, 2025). Content that affirms caste pride, articulates grievance, or mobilizes collective identity generates strong emotional engagement, which algorithms interpret as signals of relevance and amplify accordingly (Alatawi et al., 2021). Rather than disrupting entrenched hierarchies, these systems translate offline inequalities into patterned digital visibility, reproducing caste-based asymmetries while providing selective opportunities for counter-public formation (Ahmmad et al., 2025).

Algorithmic amplification functions as a recursive feedback loop: historical caste narratives generate digital content; user engagement signals prompt further recommendations; repeated exposure reinforces identity alignment (Ahmmad et al., 2025). Over time, this produces relatively homogeneous information environments where caste-consistent narratives circulate with minimal contestation (Hartmann et al., 2025). Studies on selective exposure and echo chambers suggest that such environments strengthen in-group cohesion, narrow informational horizons, and consolidate political attitudes, particularly where identity and politics are closely intertwined (DENNE et al., 2023). Within caste-aligned networks, algorithmic repetition normalizes specific political frames, reinforces collective identification, and consolidates caste-based political subjectivities.

The content most likely to be amplified within these echo chambers is rich in affective and symbolic cues (Kuiter & Saake, 2022). Narratives of caste pride, historical grievance, political exclusion, or victimhood generate strong emotional responses, which algorithms reward through repeated circulation and heightened visibility. As these narratives recirculate, they acquire increased legitimacy and a sense of common-sense validity, even in the absence of deliberation, verification, or cross-cutting engagement (Hartmann et al., 2025). Over time, algorithmically structured repetition shapes political perception, interpretive dispositions, and orientations toward collective identity, creating conditions under which digital narratives become socially entrenched and politically consequential.

Platform-specific architectures further mediate how algorithmic amplification organizes visibility regimes and identity consolidation (Ahmmad et al., 2025). Open-feed platforms such as Facebook enable rapid exposure to short-form content, stabilizing visibility through likes, shares, and comments. The platform's recommendation systems prioritize high-intensity engagement, producing bursts of attention that amplify emotionally resonant performances of caste identity while often constraining sustained deliberation or nuance (Alatawi et al., 2021). Instagram combines algorithmic recommendations with influencer hierarchies, curated imagery, and hashtag campaigns, generating slower but more sustained visibility. Repeated exposure within influencer-driven networks stabilizes symbolic representation, fosters identity consolidation, and allows political actors to coordinate messaging strategically over time (Cotter, 2018).

WhatsApp, in contrast, relies on trust-based, semi-private group structures that organize visibility through relational endorsement rather than public algorithmic ranking (Caetano et al., 2019). Circulation occurs primarily through repeated forwarding, contextual framing, and peer validation within tightly knit social networks (Kuru et al., 2023). This mode of distribution produces echo chambers that are highly insulated from external scrutiny, limiting cross-group contestation while intensifying in-group coherence (Kalogeropoulos, n.d.). Political

narratives gain credibility not through platform-wide virality but through their embedding within everyday social relationships, where trust functions as a key mediator of attention, legitimacy, and interpretive authority.

The consequences of algorithmically reinforced echo chambers are uneven across caste locations. Dominant caste narratives often benefit from larger networks, greater cultural legitimacy, and broader access to influencer nodes, allowing their content to circulate persistently and shape dominant frames of political relevance (Ahmmad et al., 2025). Marginalized communities, while using these platforms to form counter-publics and articulate grievances, frequently encounter harassment, algorithmic suppression, content moderation pressures, or strategic self-censorship that constrain the stability and reach of their visibility (Williams, 2025). Algorithmic amplification is thus simultaneously enabling and constraining: it creates opportunities for expression while reproducing hierarchical patterns of recognition and exclusion (Mitra & Das, 2025).

Taken together, these dynamics demonstrate that social media algorithms do more than host caste-based expression; they actively structure the conditions under which caste identities become visible, legitimate, and politically meaningful. By governing attention through engagement-driven logics, platforms determine which narratives circulate, which identities are normalized, and how collective alignments are reinforced over time. Algorithmic amplification thus functions as an intensifying mechanism that reshapes caste politics in digital environments while anchoring it in historically sedimented hierarchies. Understanding digital caste politics, therefore, requires analyzing algorithms not as neutral technologies, but as socio-technical infrastructures through which political inequality is reproduced, contested, and rendered durable.

III. Platform-Specific Pathways from Digital Visibility to Political Mobilization

While algorithmic amplification and echo chamber formation operate across social media, the pathways through which caste-based visibility is translated into political mobilization vary substantially across platforms (Gillespie, 2018). Differences in platform architecture, engagement logics, and visibility regimes shape not only what content circulates, but how digital attention is converted into coordinated political action, producing distinctive modalities of caste-based mobilization in contemporary India (Udupa, 2019). Examining Facebook, Instagram, and WhatsApp comparatively reveals how algorithmic systems intersect with historical hierarchies to generate unequal opportunities and risks for political participation.

On open-feed platforms such as Facebook, short-form and image- or text-based content facilitates rapid, high-intensity exposure to caste-coded material (Bucher, 2018). Recommendation systems prioritize early engagement metrics—likes, shares, comments, and immediate reactions—producing swift amplification of emotionally resonant performances of caste pride, grievance, or exclusion (Tufekci Z. , 2015). The algorithmic emphasis on affective intensity incentivizes simplified and polarized expressions of caste identity, enabling immediate political visibility but constraining sustained deliberation or nuanced discussion (Sunstein, 2018). These rapid visibility spikes function as a form of expressive mobilization: they alert audiences to salient caste narratives and signal political relevance, but, on their own, rarely produce long-term coordination or organizational consolidation (Gerbaudo, 2012). Facebook's design thus allows for expansive, short-term amplification while remaining vulnerable to ephemeral attention cycles.

Instagram exhibits a hybrid model of engagement, where algorithmic recommendation interacts with influencer hierarchies, follower networks, and curated content practices to produce more sustained visibility (Abidin, 2018). Hashtag campaigns, symbolic imagery, and repeated exposure to caste narratives consolidate in-group cohesion and stabilize identity-aligned frames over time (Bonilla & Rosa, 2015). Unlike the rapid virality favored on Facebook, Instagram's slow-burn amplification allows political actors to cultivate audiences, reinforce collective identity, and coordinate messaging strategically, particularly during electoral periods (Kruikemeier, 2018). Political visibility here is less about immediate exposure and more about deepening recognition, normalizing symbolic markers of social identity, and building relational trust between content producers and networked publics (Couldry, Media, society, world : social theory and digital media practice, 2012). In this sense, Instagram operates both as a site of symbolic representation and a medium for cumulative political agency.

WhatsApp exemplifies a trust-based, semi-private mobilization model, where circulation occurs primarily through closed and semi-closed groups (Banaji & Bhat, 2019). The absence of a public-facing feed means visibility is mediated by social trust and network density rather than algorithmic virality (Treré, 2019). Repeated forwarding, endorsement, and contextualization within caste-aligned groups generate strong in-group cohesion, allowing digital engagement to translate directly into offline action such as rally participation, coordinated voting, or grassroots organization (Udupa & Pohjonen, 2019). These networks are highly resilient, insulated from external scrutiny and cross-group contestation, and capable of producing strategic mobilization with high internal coherence (Sunstein, 2018). Unlike Facebook or Instagram, the key mechanism here is not algorithmic amplification but trust-mediated circulation that reinforces localized political influence.

For instance, during the 2019 Indian general election, WhatsApp was widely used as a central medium for political messaging that incorporated caste and community-oriented appeals (Basavaraj, 2022). Political organizations created expansive networks of WhatsApp groups, from national to booth-level structures, to

distribute targeted content such as campaign slogans, reminders, local updates, and potentially divisive narratives tailored to specific voter segments based on location, language, or social identifiers (e.g., caste or religion) (Srivastava & Singh, 2021; Banaji & Bhat, 2019). This strategy enabled rapid dissemination of tailored messages across thousands of groups and facilitated coordinated ground mobilization that blurred the lines between political coordination and everyday social communication (Joshi, 2024). Leveraging trusted social relationships within these networks made the campaigns especially potent in mobilizing users and shaping political conversations, even as forwarding restrictions were in place to limit unverified content.

Across all platforms, algorithmic logics interact with historical hierarchies to produce uneven outcomes for marginalized communities. Marginalized actors often leverage digital infrastructures to assert political voice and mobilize constituencies, but they also encounter heightened exposure to harassment, algorithmic suppression, and content moderation practices that constrain their capacity to convert visibility into durable influence (Noble, 2018). Dominant caste actors, by contrast, frequently enjoy structural visibility advantages, including broader network reach, cultural legitimacy, and access to influencer nodes, enabling their content to circulate more persistently and convert attention into concrete political outcomes (Noble, 2018). This intersection of algorithmic and social hierarchies produces a dual dynamic: while digital visibility enables expressive mobilization, it simultaneously amplifies vulnerability for politically marginalized groups (Fernández, 2017).

The translation of digital visibility into political mobilization is shaped by the temporal and relational dynamics specific to each platform (Dijck et al., 2018). On Facebook, rapid cycles of algorithmic amplification create high-intensity bursts of attention that can mobilize short-term expressive action or viral messaging (Tufekci Z. , 2017). Instagram's networked and influencer-mediated environment allows for cumulative recognition, supporting strategic and sustained coordination across time (Abidin, 2018). WhatsApp's trust-based semi-private networks enable direct translation of communication into organized, localized political participation (Banaji & Bhat, 2019). These differences illustrate that political mobilization is not an automatic outcome of algorithmic visibility; it is contingent on platform-specific architectures, engagement logics, and the relational density of social networks.

Pathways from digital visibility to mobilization are also unevenly distributed across caste locations (Deshpande, 2004). Marginalized communities face additional costs in translating visibility into action due to harassment, coordinated trolling, algorithmic marginalization, and self-censorship (Udupa, 2019). Digital attention can thus coexist with precarity: visibility alone does not guarantee political influence. Dominant caste actors, meanwhile, can convert attention more readily into strategic offline outcomes, demonstrating structural advantages embedded in social networks and platform logics (Noble, 2018). Platform-specific pathways, therefore, operate as mediating infrastructures that translate historical social hierarchies into digitally mediated forms of political influence.

Taken together, these dynamics highlight that caste-based mobilization in digital India is co-constituted by algorithmic architectures, platform-specific engagement logics, and historical social hierarchies. Digital platforms do not simply mirror offline inequalities; they actively participate in their reproduction and reconfiguration, producing distinct opportunities and constraints for political expression (Couldry & Mejias, 2019). Understanding these pathways is therefore essential for analyzing how online visibility translates into offline political influence and for assessing the infrastructural role of platforms in organizing caste-based politics. By foregrounding the interaction between algorithms, social trust, and network structures, this section theorizes the mechanisms through which digital platforms shape contemporary political mobilization in stratified societies.

IV. Intersectional Asymmetries in Algorithmic Caste Politics

Algorithmic amplification of caste identities does not operate uniformly across social groups; instead, it intersects with multiple axes of marginalization—caste, gender, religion, class, and sexuality—to produce complex asymmetries in visibility, vulnerability, and political influence (Crenshaw, 1989). Engagement-driven amplification can provide historically marginalized communities with platforms to document discrimination, voice counter-narratives, and mobilize solidarity networks on platforms such as Instagram, X, and Facebook (Udupa, 2019). Yet these same actors frequently encounter disproportionate harassment, coordinated trolling, shadow banning, and content suppression, limiting reach, compromising safety, and encouraging strategic self-censorship (Noble, 2018). These dynamics demonstrate that algorithmic affordances are not neutral; rather, they produce differentiated opportunities and constraints depending on intersecting social positions (Gillespie, 2018).

Religious identity further compounds these inequalities. Marginalized caste actors from religious minority communities face layered challenges in asserting visibility within digital public spheres (Udupa, 2017). While platforms theoretically allow nuanced intra-community expression, engagement-optimized systems tend to prioritize emotionally resonant or mainstream-majoritarian content, sidelining less sensational claims of historically marginalized groups (Ahmed, 2014). Similarly, marginalized activists may achieve heightened visibility during virality or outrage cycles yet remain structurally excluded from sustained discourse, influencer networks, or agenda-setting spaces (Abidin, 2018). This paradox—hyper-visibility in emotionally charged

contexts coupled with structural invisibility in deliberative arenas—highlights how algorithmic mediation simultaneously amplifies and constrains marginalized actors (Bucher, 2018).

These intersectional asymmetries carry concrete consequences for political mobilization. Uneven distributions of visibility and engagement translate into differential capacities for offline coordination, electoral participation, and social advocacy (Bail, 2021). Marginalized communities must navigate algorithmically produced risks alongside the affordances of platform circulation, carefully negotiating when, how, and in what form to express political identity (Udupa, 2019). Platforms operate as socio-technical systems that do more than reproduce historical hierarchies: they actively reconfigure them. By amplifying content aligned with dominant affective or cultural norms while constraining politically vulnerable voices across caste, gender, religious, and sexual identity lines, algorithms shape both the possibilities and limits of political participation (Kitchin, 2016).

Understanding digital caste politics, therefore, requires an intersectional lens that foregrounds how algorithmic infrastructures both reflect and reshape enduring social inequalities. These infrastructures produce differentiated opportunities for visibility, engagement, and collective action, enabling some actors to mobilize effectively while constraining others. In this sense, algorithmic systems operate not only as technical intermediaries but as active participants in the structuring of political power and social recognition, particularly in stratified societies like India.

V. Discussion: Algorithms as Infrastructures of Identity Politics

This study demonstrates that social media platforms function not merely as neutral channels for political or identity-based expression but as active infrastructures that shape visibility, circulation, and mobilization. Algorithmic systems govern what users see, what gains prominence, and how engagement translates into influence, producing uneven regimes of attention that systematically favor emotionally and identity-aligned content (Bucher, 2018). In doing so, platforms reorganize the politics of marginalized communities in ways deeply entangled with historical social hierarchies, translating entrenched offline inequalities into digitally mediated realities (Noble, 2018). Rather than fundamentally transforming hierarchies, algorithms amplify existing narratives, creating spaces where political claims, grievances, and expressions of pride or exclusion are repeatedly validated and circulated, generating both heightened visibility and persistent constraints.

A central mechanism through which these dynamics operate is the formation of algorithmically reinforced echo chambers (Sunstein, 2018). Repeated exposure to identity-consistent content strengthens in-group cohesion, stabilizes political frames, and narrows interpretive horizons, while simultaneously constraining cross-group dialogue (Iyengar & Hahn, 2009). These echo chambers are platform-specific: open-feed environments such as Facebook and Instagram enable sustained visibility through influencer networks, symbolic representation, curated aesthetics, and hashtag campaigns, whereas trust-based platforms like WhatsApp facilitate targeted mobilization within semi-private, networked communities (Dijck et al., 2018). This differentiation illustrates that algorithms do not merely reflect pre-existing political alignment; they actively restructure attention and participation, producing differentiated patterns of political visibility, engagement, and action.

Intersectional dimensions further complicate this landscape (Carbado et al., 2014). Algorithmic amplification interacts with gender, sexual orientation, religious identity, and other axes of marginalization to produce uneven opportunities and vulnerabilities. Marginalized activists, for instance, may achieve bursts of visibility through emotionally charged content, yet simultaneously face heightened exposure to harassment, trolling, shadow banning, or misrepresentation (Noble, 2018). Algorithmic logics that prioritize engagement and emotional resonance frequently amplify dominant or majoritarian narratives while rendering counter-narratives precarious, demonstrating that the political affordances of platforms are conditioned not only by design but by the social structures in which they operate. In this sense, algorithms possess a form of political agency: they co-constitute the expression, contestation, and mobilization of social identities, without fully determining outcomes, and mediate both opportunities and risks in digitally mediated political participation (Latour, 2013).

These dynamics have concrete implications for political mobilization and influence. By structuring visibility, platforms affect who can convert digital attention into offline political coordination, voter mobilization, or advocacy—and who remains marginalized despite online presence (Tufekci Z. , 2017). Dominant caste or religious actors often gain cumulative amplification, network legitimacy, and influencer access, allowing visibility to stabilize into durable political influence (Labigne, 2010). Marginalized communities, by contrast, navigate the dual burden of algorithmically generated opportunity and exposure to digital risk, producing contingent, defensive, and episodic forms of engagement. Platforms, therefore, function as sociotechnical systems in which historical hierarchies are not merely reproduced but actively reconfigured through the selective amplification and constraint of content across intersecting axes of identity. By theorizing algorithms as infrastructural mediators of caste-based mobilization across platform architectures, this study contributes to scholarship on digital politics in stratified societies.

Taken together, this analysis positions algorithms as infrastructural actors in contemporary identity politics. They do not operate as neutral intermediaries; rather, they shape what becomes visible, legitimate, and

resonant, translating historically embedded social hierarchies into digitally mediated patterns of influence. By amplifying certain voices, constraining others, and structuring attention according to engagement-driven logics, algorithms organize political participation, reinforce social identities, and produce stratified terrains of recognition and vulnerability. Understanding digital politics in stratified societies, therefore, requires examining platforms as active infrastructures that simultaneously enable and constrain the political expression and mobilization of marginalized communities across caste, gender, religion, and other intersecting social categories.

VI. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that social media algorithms are not neutral intermediaries but active infrastructures shaping the contours of political participation for marginalized communities in India. Algorithmic systems reorganize political visibility, prioritize engagement-driven content, and amplify identity-aligned narratives, producing uneven digital landscapes in which some voices gain prominence while others remain marginalized. By analyzing Facebook, Instagram, and WhatsApp, the study shows that platform-specific architectures generate distinct pathways of political mobilization: Facebook amplifies high-intensity content through rapid engagement cycles, Instagram sustains identity consolidation via influencer networks and curated engagement, and WhatsApp facilitates highly targeted circulation within trusted group networks. Collectively, these dynamics foster the formation of identity-based echo chambers, where repeated exposure strengthens in-group cohesion, shapes political attitudes, and constrains cross-group dialogue.

The study also highlights the intersectional dimensions of algorithmic politics. Gender, sexual orientation, religious identity, and other axes of marginalization intersect with caste and historical social hierarchies to produce complex asymmetries of visibility, vulnerability, and influence. Marginalized activists frequently experience heightened exposure to harassment, trolling, or misrepresentation, illustrating the paradoxical effect of algorithmic amplification: it simultaneously extends opportunities for political expression while reproducing entrenched inequalities. Platforms, therefore, do not merely host pre-existing hierarchies but actively reorganize them, producing differentiated opportunities and risks across intersecting social categories.

Theoretically, this paper contributes to scholarship on digital politics, social stratification, and algorithmic governance by framing algorithms as socio-technical infrastructures. Rather than erasing historical hierarchies, algorithms mediate attention, legitimacy, and political influence, shaping how marginalized identities are articulated, contested, and mobilized within digitally mediated public spheres. By linking platform-specific design, engagement logics, and social hierarchies, the study provides a mechanism-oriented understanding of how digital spaces structure both visibility and political action.

This analysis also points to broader implications for research and policy. Future work should examine the intersection of social marginalization with regional, linguistic, and socio-economic variation, as well as cross-national comparisons in platform-mediated politics. Longitudinal research could illuminate the sustained effects of algorithmically amplified visibility on offline political participation, representation, and the reproduction of social hierarchies. Scholars and policymakers alike must recognize platforms as active political actors whose design choices, recommendation systems, and amplification logics carry real consequences for democratic engagement and social equity.

In sum, understanding politics in the digital age requires sustained attention to algorithms not as neutral tools but as infrastructural agents that reorganize social hierarchies, amplify identity-based claims, and shape the possibilities for political participation. By foregrounding the political agency of algorithms, this study provides a framework for analyzing how digital technologies mediate inequality, structure collective action, and influence the evolving dynamics of contemporary democracy in India and beyond.

References

[1]. Abidin, C. (2018). *Internet Celebrity: Understanding Fame Online.* Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/9781787560765

[2]. Ahmed, S. (2014). *The Cultural Politics of Emotion.* Edinburgh University Press.

[3]. Ahmmad, M., Shahzad, K., Iqbal, A., & Latif, M. (2025). Trap of Social Media Algorithms: A Systematic Review of Research on Filter Bubbles, Echo Chambers, and Their Impact on Youth. *Societies, 15*(11). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15110301

[4]. Alatawi, F., Cheng, L., Tahir, A., Karami, M., Jiang, B., Black, T., & Liu, H. (2021). A Survey on Echo Chambers on Social Media: Description, Detection and Mitigation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.05084*. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2112.05084

[5]. Bail, C. (2021). Breaking the Social Media Prism: How to Make Our Platforms Less Polarizing. *Information, Communication & Society, 27*(11), 2212-2214. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2023.2258608

[6]. Banaji, S., & Bhat, R. (2019, November 11). *WhatsApp Vigilantes: An exploration of citizen reception and circulation of WhatsApp misinformation linked to mob violence in India*. Retrieved from LSE: https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/medialse/2019/11/11/whatsapp-vigilantes-an-exploration-of-citizen-reception-and-circulation-of-whatsapp-misinformation-linked-to-mob-violence-in-india/

[7]. Basavaraj, K. A. (2022). Misinformation in India's 2019 National Election. *Journal of Quantitative Description Digital Media, 2*. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.51685/jqd.2022.021

[8]. Beer, D. (2017). The social power of algorithms. *Information, Communication & Society, 20*(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2016.1216147

[9]. Bonilla, Y., & Rosa, J. (2015). #Ferguson: Digital protest, hashtag ethnography, and the racial politics of social media in the United States. *American Ethnologist, 42*(1), 4-17.

[10]. Bucher, T. (2018). *If...Then: Algorithmic Power and Politics.* Oxford Univerity Press. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190493028.001.0001

[11]. Caetano, J. A., Magno, G., Gonçalves, M., Almeida, J., Marques-Neto, H. T., & Almeida, V. (2019). Characterizing Attention Cascades in WhatsApp Groups. *In Proceedings of the 10th ACM conference on web science.*

[12]. Carbado, D. W., Crenshaw, K. W., Mays, V. M., & Tomlinson, B. (2014). INTERSECTIONALITY Mapping the Movements of a Theory. *Cambridge University Press, 10*(2), 303-312. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X13000349

[13]. Cotter, K. (2018). Playing the Visibility Game: How Digital Influencers and Algorithms Negotiate Influence on Instagram. *New Media & Society*. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818815684

[14]. Couldry, N. (2012). *Media, society, world : social theory and digital media practice.* Aarhus University Library. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.7146/MEDIEKULTUR.V29I54.8080

[15]. Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). *The Costs of Connection How Data Is Colonizing Human Life and Appropriating It for Capitalism.* Standford University Press.

[16]. Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989*(1).

[17]. DENNE, E., HADEN, J. C., LARSEN, T., & MEEHAN, E. (2023). RIBBONLENGTH OF FAMILIES OF FOLDED RIBBON KNOTS. *a Journal of Mathematics, 15*(4), 591-628. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2140/involve.2022.15.591

[18]. Deshpande, S. (2004). *Contemporary India: A Sociological View.* Cambridge University Press.

[19]. Dijck, J. v., Poell, T., & Waal, M. d. (2018). *The Platform Society.* Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190889760.001.0001

[20]. Dirks, N. (2001). *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India.* Princeton University Press.

[21]. Fernández, A. M. (2017). Platformed racism: the mediation and circulation of an Australian race-based controversy on Twitter, Facebook and YouTube. *Information, Communication & Society , 20*(6), 930-946. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1293130

[22]. Gerbaudo, P. (2012). *Tweets and the Streets: Social Media and Contemporary Activism.* Pluto Press. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt183pdzs

[23]. Gillespie, T. (2018). *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, Content Moderation, and the Hidden Decisions That Shape Social Media.* Yale University Press. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.12987/9780300235029

[24]. Hartmann, D., Wang, S. M., Pohlmann, L., & Berendt, B. (2025). A systematic review of echo chamber research: comparative analysis of conceptualizations, operationalizations, and varying outcomes. *Journal of Computational Social Science, 8*(52). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s42001-025-00381-z

[25]. Iyengar, S., & Hahn, K. S. (2009). Red Media, Blue Media: Evidence of Ideological Selectivity in Media Use. *Journal Of Communication, 59*(1), 19-39. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.01402.x

[26]. Joshi, D. (2024). *Party Politics and WhatsApp Pramukhs: Messaging Platforms and Electoral Integrity in India.* Mozilla Foundation. Retrieved from https://assets.mofoprod.net/network/documents/India-Case-Study_2019_Elections.pdf

[27]. Kalogeropoulos, A. (n.d.). *Groups and Private Networks – Time Well Spent?* Retrieved from Digital News Report: https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/digital-news-report/archive/survey/2019/groups-and-private-networks-time-well-spent/index.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com

[28]. Kitchin, R. (2016). Thinking critically about and researching algorithms. *Information, Communication & Society, 20*(1), 14-29. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2016.1154087

[29]. Kruikemeier, S. G. (2018). Understanding the dynamics of politicians' visibility in traditional and social media. *The Information Society, 34*(4), 215-228. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/01972243.2018.1463334

[30]. Kuiter, E., & Saake, G. (2022). A Survey and Comparison of Industrial and Academic Research on the Evolution of Software Product Lines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.05953*. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2212.05953

[31]. Kuru, O., Campbell, S. W., Bayer, J. B., Baruh, L., & Ling, R. S. (2023). Reconsidering Misinformation in WhatsApp Groups: Informational and Social Predictors of Risk Perceptions and Corrections. *International Journal of Communication, 17*.

[32]. Labigne, A. L. (2010). International Encyclopedia of Civil Society. *Springer, New York, NY*. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-93996-4_183

[33]. Latour, B. (2013). *Reassembling the Social An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory.* Oxford University Press.

[34]. Madan, T. N. (2025). Caste. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved from https://www.britannica.com/topic/caste-social-differentiation

[35]. Mitra, S., & Das, A. (2025). Echo Chambers and Polarization: The Role of Social Networks in Shaping Beliefs in India. *Indian Journal of Mass Communication and Journalism (IJMCJ), 4*(4). https://doi.org/10.54105/ijmcj.D1121.04040625

[36]. Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society, 3*(2). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679

[37]. Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism.* NYU Press. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1pwt9w5

[38]. Padhy, A., & Panbude, S. (2025, June 13). *The digital wall: How caste shapes access to technology in India*. Retrieved from idr: https://idronline.org/article/inequality/the-digital-wall-how-caste-shapes-access-to-technology-in-india

[39]. Piliavsky, A. (2013). Democracy against Development: Lower-Caste Politics and Political Modernity in Postcolonial India. American Ethnologist.

[40]. Srivastava, V., & Singh, M. (2021). PoliWAM: An Exploration of a Large Scale Corpus of Political Discussions on WhatsApp Messenger. *In Proceedings of the Seventh Workshop on Noisy User-generated Text (W-NUT 2021).* Retrieved from https://arxiv.org/pdf/2010.13263

[41]. Sunstein, C. R. (2018). *#Republic: Divided Democracy in the Age of Social Media.* Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv8xnhtd

[42]. Tereza, M. (2024). Digital Activism among Dalit-Bahujan Communities in India : Anti-Caste Discourses in Relations and Conflict. *In The 9th annual Global Digital Humanities Symposium*.

[43]. Treré, E. (2019). Hybrid Media Activism Ecologies, Imaginaries, Algorithms. *Information, Communication & Society*. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1631374

[44]. Tufekci, Z. (2015). Algorithmic Harms beyond Facebook and Google: Emergent Challenges of Computational Agency. *Colorado Technology Law Journal, 13*(203-218).

[45]. Tufekci, Z. (2017). *Twitter and Tear Gas.* Yale University Press.

[46]. Udupa, S. (2017). Gaali cultures: The politics of abusive exchange on social media. *New Media & Society, 20*(4). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/146144481769877

[47]. Udupa, S. (2019). Nationalism in the Digital Age: Fun as a Metapractice of Extreme Speech. *International Journal of Communication, 13*, 3143-3163. https://doi.org/10.5282/ubm/epub.69633

[48]. Udupa, S., & Pohjonen, M. (2019). Extreme Speech and Global Digital Cultures: Introduction. *International Journal of Communication*, 3049-3067.
[49]. Udupa, S., Venkatraman, S., & Khan, A. (2021). "Millennial India": Global Digital Politics in Context. *Television & New Media, 21*(4). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476419870
[50]. Williams, M. (2025). Social media democracy: How algorithms shape public discourse and marginalise voices. *Journal of Media and Rights, 3*(1).