



(MUDIMA)



Paradigms and Perspectives in Digital Communication: A Study of Interaction Patterns and Message Interpretation in the Social Media Era

Novalia Agung Wardjito Ardhoyo^{1*}, Ardan Achmad², Nurul Fadzar Sukarni³, Nasrullah Kusadjibrata⁴, Catur Priyadi⁵, Widyarini Ridwan⁶

Universitas Prof. Dr. Moestopo (Beragama) Jakarta

Corresponding Author: Novalia Agung Wardjito Ardhoyo agungardhoyo@dsn.moestopo.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Digital Communication, Individual Perspective, Digital Literacy

Received : 2 March

Revised : 26 April

Accepted : 25 May

©2026 Ardoyo, Achmad, Achmad, Sukarni, Kusadjibrata, Priyadi, Ridwan: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Atribusi 4.0 Internasional](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

The development of digital technology has brought significant changes to communication patterns in society, shifting communication from a linear process to one that is interactive, participatory, and constructive. This study aims to analyze the transformation of communication paradigms in the digital era, understand the influence of individual perspectives in interpreting digital messages, and identify challenges to the effectiveness of communication in digital media. The research employs a descriptive qualitative approach using a case study method. Data were collected through literature review, observation, documentation, and analysis of digital communication phenomena in society. The findings indicate that digital communication no longer positions individuals as passive message recipients, but rather as active actors in the process of meaning-making. Differences in social background, culture, experience, and individual values lead to diverse interpretations of digital messages. This condition gives rise to phenomena such as misinformation, echo chambers, filter bubbles, and social polarization. In addition, social media algorithms tend to reinforce users' perspective biases, thereby narrowing inclusive spaces for dialogue. Therefore, digital literacy, communication ethics, and an understanding of communication paradigms are essential factors in creating effective, reflective, and constructive digital communication in the information technology era.

INTRODUCTION

The development of digital technology has not only changed the way humans communicate but has also influenced individuals' frameworks of thought. These frameworks of thought, or paradigms, underpin the process of human communication. In the context of traditional communication, paradigms tend to focus on a linear model that emphasizes the one-way transmission of messages from sender to receiver. However, in the digital age, communication is undergoing a transformation toward a more interactive, participatory, and even constructive paradigm. Meaning is not merely transferred but collaboratively constructed through dynamic social interactions that occur in real time. The paradigm in the context of digital communication expands the role of the individual—from being merely a consumer of information to becoming a producer and co-creator of meaning. Therefore, it is important to understand how communication paradigms evolve in the digital space to facilitate an analysis of how modern social interactions function.

The concepts of paradigm and perspective are frequently used in various fields such as philosophy, the social sciences, natural sciences, and even in everyday life. The two have different meanings. First, let's examine the definition of a paradigm. The concept of a paradigm was first introduced by Thomas Kuhn in his book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962). Kuhn explained that the development of science is revolutionary, not cumulative, and is marked by paradigm shifts. A paradigm is a framework of thought that influences how scientists perceive and solve problems (Kuhn, 1962 in Yusyifa & Abidin, 2025). A communication paradigm is a conceptual framework that determines how communication is understood and practiced (Craig, 1999).

Traditional paradigms, such as the Shannon & Weaver transmission model introduced in 1949, view communication as a linear, one-way process in which a message is sent from the sender to the receiver. The model suggests that communication within a medium is frequently direct and unidirectional (Al-Fedaghi, 2012). However, with

the development of digital technology, the paradigm has shifted significantly toward a more interactive, participatory, and constructive paradigm. Palfrey explains that the most notable change in this shifting paradigm is the way the digital era has transformed the way people live their lives and relate to one another in the world around them (Palfrey 2009 in Cladis, 2020). This concept is akin to a "mental map" that shapes how an individual or group perceives the world. Some people liken a paradigm to a pair of glasses used to view the world. As such, it influences the logic of thinking when observing the world or a particular phenomenon. When one changes their "glasses," the same thing is viewed through a different lens.

Next, we will examine the definition of perspective. An individual's perspective is a unique viewpoint influenced by experience, culture, and social background (Berger & Luckmann, 1990). In the theory of the social construction of reality, communication is viewed as a process of social interaction that shapes shared meaning. According to Berger & Luckmann (1966), as cited by Anonymous (2025), from the perspective of social construction, it can be explained that it is impossible for someone to remove the phenomenon occurs in the community, and a process of internalization may be able to give an influence to someone. The ability in determining the weight or lightness of the existence of nature of the characteristics and phenomena that exist with the externalization process itself will form an objective reality. In this process one can put himself into the intersubjective world view. Where in the view of a world that can produce a process is objectivity on a process of meaningful subjective. It constructs the reality through texts which are never free from certain interests and values. Most of the listeners, readers, and viewers faithfully perceive the texts, without any reserve, as if the texts presented to them are true representations of the realities. They are led to the frames created by the corresponding media. Thus, the public see the reality similar to that of the media. They are trapped consciously or unconsciously by the patterns of media construction (Anonymous, 2025). Peter L. Berger and Thomas

Luckmann built a theory of social construction from the phenomenological approach initiated by Alfred Schutz and then developed it into the sociology of knowledge (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). This social construction theory was built to redefine the core and function of the sociology of knowledge to form a new definition of reality and knowledge (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Both reality and knowledge become the emphasis and keywords of Berger and Luckmann's social construction theory. Through this social construction theory, Berger and Luckmann further explore how a society's social reality is constructed. Thus, social reality in society is not seen as a reality that is taken for granted by individuals in society. Social reality or reality needs to be understood as the result of a long process so that a reality that is believed by society is formed (Berger & Luckmann, 1966 dalam Pramono, et. al., 2024). Therefore, the interpretation of digital messages is heavily influenced by diverse individual perspectives.

In the framing theory proposed by Robert M. Entman, it is emphasized that the way messages are presented and interpreted depends heavily on how information is framed within a specific social context. That framing therefore heavily influences their responses to communications (Entman, 1993). In digital contexts, the lack of nonverbal cues and the speed of interactions can amplify differences in interpretation among individuals, often leading to misunderstandings and conflicts. It is hard to interpret aspects such as irony and humour in mediated communication, because of the lack of non-verbal cues. It can result in misunderstandings and conflict (Sherblom, 2010; Venter 2016). It is important for meaningful interaction to give and receive feedback (Venter, 2019). Online communication often lacks warmth, social presence and feelings of belonging (Venter, 2019). Thus, a perspective is a point of view or a way of seeing something from a particular position or experience. Consequently, the nature of a perspective is more flexible and can change depending on the situation or context. When a person observes a phenomenon and then changes their location, they gain a new

perspective. In this context, a paradigm shapes and limits a perspective. This is because perspectives can change more quickly. Changing a paradigm, on the other hand, usually takes time and requires a significant shift in thinking.

The Connection to Communication

Paradigms and perspectives can be linked to communication. Understanding both is key to becoming an effective communicator, whether in personal, professional, or social contexts. Paradigms influence how individuals communicate. A paradigm is a broad framework that determines how individuals understand communication itself—what they consider to be the purpose of communication and how they convey or receive messages. Meanwhile, perspective influences how individuals interpret messages. This is because every individual brings their own background, values, experiences, and emotions that shape their perspective. For example, when someone tells another person, “You arrived on time today,” this can be interpreted as a compliment if viewed through a positive perspective. Or it can be seen as a sarcastic remark if viewed through a negative perspective. Or it can be interpreted neutrally if viewed without emotion. Perspective also determines how a communicator chooses words, responds to criticism or praise, and interprets body language or intonation. Thus, paradigms form the overarching framework of communication. For instance, whether an individual views communication as a tool for persuasion, collaboration, or self-expression. Meanwhile, perspective influences interpretation in specific situations. For example, how an individual responds to a comment. Without an awareness of the differences between paradigms and perspectives, communication will break down, misunderstandings, or even conflicts, may arise.

Its Relevance in the Digital Communication Era

In the context of communication in the digital age, paradigms and perspectives play a significant and complex role compared to face-to-face communication. From a certain perspective, digital communication has shifted traditional paradigms—for example, from linear to multidirectional. This

means that communication is no longer merely from sender to receiver but can occur simultaneously among many parties, such as through social media, forums, and chat groups. It has also shifted the role of the individual, from exclusive to inclusive. This means that anyone can be a communicator; communication is no longer dominated solely by official media. Now, anyone can become a content creator or influencer. From the perspective of message production, the shift is from authoritative to participatory. This means that digital users can contribute to shaping the message. Consequently, they are no longer merely recipients of information. Thus, the advent of digital technology has transformed the communication paradigm and the way individuals understand the communication process.

In line with this paradigm shift, individual perspectives also play a central role in determining how digital messages are interpreted. Every individual brings a unique social, cultural, educational, and experiential background. These backgrounds shape their perspective on the messages they receive. These perspectives influence how a person understands, responds to, and even assesses the truth of a piece of information. In the fast-paced digital space, which is often devoid of nonverbal context, these differing perspectives can lead to gaps in meaning, misunderstandings, and conflicts. It is not uncommon for the same message to be perceived differently by audiences with diverse backgrounds. This phenomenon subsequently gives rise to communication fragmentation and social tension.

The impact of shifting paradigms and diverse perspectives directly contributes to the effectiveness of digital communication. Effectiveness is no longer determined solely by how clearly a message is conveyed, but also by the ability of both the communicator and the recipient to understand each other's ways of thinking. When the paradigms used are not aligned, and perspectives differ, communication becomes vulnerable to misinterpretation and conflict. Conversely, when digital communicators are able to navigate these differences in a reflective and empathetic manner,

they can achieve effective and constructive communication. Thus, exploring the relationship between paradigms, perspectives, and the effectiveness of digital communication is crucial to addressing the communication challenges of the 21st century.

Communication Challenges in the Digital Age

The future of analyzing digital communication is deemed for a significant paradigm shift, leading to a further transformation of societal structures and communication processes (Drucker, 2002). As we move more and more towards a knowledge-based society, the ways in which information is created, shared, and communicated are drastically changing, necessitating a foundational rethinking of digital communication paradigms (Drucker, 2002). These processes are fueled by advancements in technology and AI on the one hand, and increasingly available and dynamic opportunities to create and analyze data in real-time on the other hand (Strauss, 2025).

Some challenges of digital communication include echo chambers and filter bubbles. These can narrow the range of perspectives, lead to confirmation bias, and hinder inclusive and reflective communication. Commentators and analysts typically worry about echo chambers and filter bubbles because they fear they will fuel polarisation, diminish mutual understanding, and ultimately lead to a situation where people are so far apart that they have no common ground effectively inhabiting different realities (Arguedas, Robertson, Fletcher, & Nielsen, 2022). Concluded that in social media or media Internet, it is necessary to understand the content in digital technology, which is needed digital literacy knowledge. The most important thing is to have basic ethics that understand news sources and the word spread out. Moreover, the paper aims to investigate the relationship between basic ethics, digital literacy, and social media use and seek basic ethics in global life (Mardiana, 2022). Therefore, digital literacy and communication ethics are essential for improving the effectiveness and quality of digital interactions.

When digital communication takes place in a fast-paced environment with minimal nonverbal

context, these differences in paradigms and perspectives can lead to misinterpretations. Phenomena such as misinformation (the spread of false information), echo chambers (spaces that reinforce one-sided views), and online conflicts (disputes arising from differing interpretations) are clear evidence of the challenges of digital communication. These issues cannot be adequately addressed through technological solutions alone. Instead, a deeper understanding of the dynamics of how individuals think and interpret information in a digital context is required. Without critical awareness of conflicting paradigms and perspectives, digital communication risks becoming a source of social polarization—rather than a bridge connecting individuals and cultures. Therefore, understanding the roles of both in digital communication is not merely important but urgent for creating a healthy, inclusive, and meaningful space for communication.

Consequences of Digital Communication

Several phenomena can arise as a result of digital communication, including the ease with which misunderstandings can occur. Digital communication often lacks facial expressions, vocal intonation, and nonverbal context. Consequently, the recipient's perception of the message depends heavily on their perspective. For example, when someone writes "Ok." on WhatsApp, this can be interpreted as: agreement, indifference, anger, or resignation. This depends on the recipient's perspective.

Other phenomena include the Echo Chamber and the Filter Bubble. Digital platforms, such as social media, have the potential to reinforce certain perspectives because their algorithms display content that aligns with users' preferences. An echo chamber describes a situation where groups in digital (online) communication reinforce their own views through repetition and limited interaction with similar perspectives. Echo chambers a term first introduced by Sunstein who repeatedly emphasized the dangers of echo chambers are frequently defined similarly as environments in which the opinion, political leaning, or belief of users about a topic gets reinforced due to

repeated interactions with peers or sources having similar tendencies and attitudes (Sunstein, 2001). In the context of social media, this involves the interchangeably used but differing concept of filter bubbles. A filter bubble is a phenomenon similar to an echo chamber, but it is more passive in nature. This phenomenon occurs because algorithmic systems automatically present content that aligns with users' preferences, thereby limiting the diversity of perspectives in media consumption. Filter bubbles coined by Pariser are created by personalized recommendation systems that expose users to content similar to their beliefs. These algorithms rank and moderate content to provide users with a personalized universe of information (Pariser, 2011). Under these circumstances, this can lead to confirmation bias and limit exposure to different perspectives. Effects of echo chambers, focusing on their role in polarization, the spread of misinformation, and their potential to amplify extremism (Hartmann, 2025). Polarization, a phenomenon where individuals with similar beliefs converge more strongly while those with opposing views diverge further, has been central to these studies (Interian, Marzo, Mendoza, & Ribeiro, 2023). Bright found that individuals with radical beliefs tend to limit their interactions to like-minded individuals, avoiding discussions with those holding opposing or more moderate views (Bright, 2018). This selective communication reinforces echo chambers by deepening ideological isolation. The findings underscore the need for policy interventions to address algorithmic amplification of extremism (Hartmann, 2025).

As a result of the filter bubble, individuals are increasingly rarely exposed to content with differing perspectives. This, in turn, leads to unhealthy communication or even conflict because the individuals involved "live in their own worlds." For example, someone who writes a controversial opinion piece on a social issue might be interpreted by individuals with a liberal worldview as an expression of free speech. However, individuals with a conservative paradigm will view it as a violation of norms. Consequently, the comments that emerge are

likely to be influenced by each person's personal perspective. This can trigger debates or even digital conflicts (cyberwar, cancel culture, and so on).

Network Society

Castells addresses this paradigm shift, stating that here a new technical-economic paradigm develops: the information-technology paradigm. It has five features: (1) information as the raw material to act on; (2) the pervasiveness of information technologies used; (3) the networking logic of any system using them; (4) flexibility; and (5) convergence of technologies. It leads to a new mode of development called informationalism. This is the attribute of a specific form of social organization in which information generation, processing and transmission become the fundamental resources of productivity and power. With much empirical data, that this mode of development, in general, and networks within and between firms, in particular, have come to dominate the world economy (Castells, 1985, 1988, 1989 dalam Van Dijk, 1999).

Manuel Castells' concept of the "network society" (1985, 1988, 1989), as discussed in Van Dijk (1999), describes a new social structure shaped by digital network technologies. In this era, interaction, production, and culture unfold within a global, timeless, and multidimensional network. Dominant functions and processes in the information age are increasingly organized around networks. Networks constitute the new social morphology of our societies and the diffusion of networking logic substantially modifies the operation and outcomes in the processes of production, experience, power and culture. While the networking form of social organization has existed in other times and spaces, the new information technology paradigm provides the basis for its pervasive expansion throughout the entire social structure (Castells, 1985, 1988, 1989 dalam Van Dijk, 1999)

Agung's Dissertation on Timeliness

Manuel Castells (1985, 1988, 1989) in Van Dijk (1999), in his concept of the network society, explains how network technologies shape communication patterns that are no longer bound by space and time, but rather operate within a "space of

flows." From this digital communication paradigm perspective, users are positioned as active actors who not only receive but also create and modify messages within the digital ecosystem.

The essay argues that all communication theories are mutually relevant when addressed to a practical lifeworld in which "communication" is already a richly meaningful term. Furthermore, this study aims to conduct an in-depth analysis of how individuals respond to the paradigm shift in communication occurring in the digital age.

Uniqueness of the Study

The communication paradigm, which has traditionally been linear or one-way, has shifted toward a more complex, interactive, and constructive paradigm. This shift is a result of rapid technological advancements and the widespread use of digital platforms. Understanding this shift is crucial to grasping the dynamics of contemporary communication, which is heavily influenced by users' active participation in the process of conveying and interpreting messages. An analysis of this paradigm shift also offers new insights into how digital communication shapes social structures and interaction patterns that differ from those of traditional communication.

METHODS

Research methods can be descriptive research, exploratory research and or explanatory research. These approaches depend on the topic, the discipline, the phenomenon involved and other influences and expectations based on issues of economy, research reliability, inclination of the researcher, expectations of sponsors, institutional procedures, among others (Sakyi et al., 2020). An in-depth analysis of how individuals respond to the paradigm shift in communication occurring in the digital age requires a comprehensive and multidimensional approach. Therefore, a qualitative research method using a case study approach is considered the most appropriate. This is to enable an in-depth exploration of the complex dynamics of digital communication.

This study employs a descriptive qualitative approach. A descriptive qualitative research method is a method used by researchers to discover knowledge or theories regarding a study at a specific

point in time (Mukhtar, 2013 in Satria & Abdullah, 2025). Qualitative methods allow researchers to holistically understand how communication paradigms change and how individual perspectives influence the meaning of messages in a digital context.

This study employs a case study design. This approach was chosen because it allows for a focused analysis of the phenomena of digital communication occurring within real-world social environments. Through the case study, the researcher can observe the social, cultural, and technological contexts that shape communication patterns, in accordance with the concept of social construction proposed by Berger & Luckmann (1966).

A case study is

To strengthen the validity of the data, the triangulation method was used. Triangulation was applied by combining data from in-depth interviews, participatory observation, and the analysis of digital content. This technique supports a richer and more comprehensive understanding of the digital communication phenomena under study. Triangulation is

With this methodological framework, this study is expected to provide an in-depth and contextual overview of the paradigm shift in communication, the role of individual perspectives, and how effective and ethical digital communication strategies can be developed to address communication challenges in the digital age.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In everyday life, people not only read the news but also comment on it, share it, and even modify the message. The old paradigm, which viewed the audience as passive recipients, can no longer explain how communication takes place on social media, online forums, or messaging apps. This is clear evidence that the communication paradigm is changing and has already changed, as Craig explains regarding the “multiple traditions” framework in communication theory.

Furthermore, the differences in individual perspectives that influence the interpretation of messages have also become very apparent in the digital age. With the openness of digital platforms, differing interpretations of social, political, cultural,

and religious issues have become commonplace. For example, a single political news story may be received very differently by users aligned with Group A compared to those in Group B. This aligns with Entman’s framing theory, which explains that whatever its specific use, the concept of framing consistently offers a way to describe the power of a communicating text. Analysis of frames illuminates the precise way in which influence over a human consciousness is exerted by the transfer (or communication) of information from one location, such as a speech, utterance, news report, or novel to that consciousness. Framing essentially involves selection and salience. To frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described (Entman, 1993). Furthermore, Berger & Luckmann highlight the diverse, dynamic, and complex nature of society. According to them, social reality is always shaped by individuals’ construction of their experiences of the world through various stages or moments. These include the objectivity of processes and the subjectivity of meanings, which individuals then use to build a shared understanding (Maliki, 2012). The consequence of this reality is the emergence of various very real contemporary phenomena, such as misinformation, echo chambers, and social polarization. In Indonesia, for example, social media became the primary medium for the spread of hoaxes during the 2019 General Election and the COVID-19 pandemic. Many people interpret messages based on personal biases reinforced by digital algorithms, thereby narrowing the space for dialogue. This phenomenon has been empirically demonstrated by numerous researchers and institutions such as Kominfo, which documents thousands of hoax cases annually.

Digital communication trends in Indonesia align with the theories discussed. For instance, the use of social media platforms—such as Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram—as primary channels for public and social communication. This usage reflects

a paradigm shift in communication from a linear model to an interactive and participatory one. As Skippington noted, technological and knowledge development progresses at an exponential rather than a linear rate. It creates a massive network connecting an ever-growing number of users from distant regions, enabling massive interaction and information exchange, as well as allowing it to serve a dual role as both a tool and a process to be developed simultaneously by users and developers (Skippington 2016). The information technology revolution has also produced a networked society, which Manuel Castells characterizes as a “space of flows” and “timeless time.” The logic of the network is inclusive across various dimensions of human life while simultaneously excluding those not involved in the network. In a networked society, public space expands, becomes dynamic, and grows increasingly interactive thanks to the mediation of the Internet (Anggara & Pratama, 2019).

Palfrey explains that the most notable change of this shifting paradigm is the way the digital era has transformed the way people live their lives and relate to one another in the world around them (Palfrey, 2009 in Cladis, 2020). Indonesians now not only receive information but also actively produce and distribute content, thereby influencing public opinion. However, the diversity of perspectives in Indonesia’s multicultural and multireligious society also influences how digital messages are understood and responded to. For example, the phenomenon of viral content related to social and religious issues. These issues often lead to diverse interpretations and even online conflicts. The spread of hoaxes regarding religious or political issues over the past few years demonstrates how differing perspectives and the framing of messages—as discussed by Entman in 1993—can exacerbate social polarization.

One concrete example is the spread of hoaxes during the 2019 General Election in Indonesia, which triggered divisions and tensions among different social groups. Indonesia is one of the countries with the largest number of social media users in the world. According to data from the 2026 We Are Social report, 77% of Indonesia’s population is currently

connected to the internet. More than 212 million users are active on social media. Additionally, the average Indonesian spends over 5 hours online daily, primarily via smartphone (We Are Social, 2026). These figures highlight the immense potential of digital communication as a space for social interaction. However, the sheer number of social media users also poses serious challenges regarding the spread of information. Based on Agma’s 2025 study, content analysis results show that the spread of hoaxes on social media in Indonesia occurs most predominantly on WhatsApp (48%), Facebook (32%), and Twitter (15%), while the remainder is spread across other platforms such as Instagram and TikTok. The hoaxes circulating generally take the form of short text messages with persuasive narratives, accompanied by manipulated images or videos to reinforce readers’ belief (Agma, 2025). Based on data compiled by MAFINDO from 2020 to 2023, the most common categories of hoaxes are politics (35%), health (30%), religion (20%), and socio-economics (15%). Spread patterns also tend to follow current events, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, elections, or social conflict issues (MAFINDO in Agma, 2025).

The phenomena of echo chambers and filter bubbles are clearly evident on Indonesian digital platforms. Here, social media can reinforce the polarization of viewpoints and facilitate the spread of extremism. Social media algorithms tend to expose users only to views and opinions that align with what they already believe. This can lead to the formation of filter bubbles where individuals are exposed only to similar perspectives and are not open to diverse viewpoints (Hasan, Husna, Muchlis, Fitri, Zulfadli, 2023). This often reinforces confirmation bias and hinders constructive dialogue between groups with differing perspectives. The “echo chamber” phenomenon in Indonesia describes a situation where social media users tend to become trapped in an information bubble that aligns with their own views. Research by Raza, Aulia, & Sopian shows that social media platforms essentially facilitate the formation of ideologically homogeneous communities. For instance, users of platform X are

significantly more likely to share messages that align with their ideological positions. Most political interactions occur among like-minded users. This phenomenon creates ideal conditions for the emergence of an echo chamber, where individuals are increasingly exposed to messages that support their views (pro-attitudinal) and become increasingly isolated from information that contradicts them (counter-attitudinal) (Raza, Aulia, & Sopian, 2023).

To address this challenge, various digital literacy initiatives have begun to be promoted by the government and the community. Examples include the anti-hoax program by the Ministry of Communication and Information Technology (Kominfo) and the digitally aware netizen movement. According to research by Wulandari, Rullyana, and Ardiansah, the easiest way to address or mitigate the effects of filter bubbles and echo chambers is to educate oneself on information usage, utilize available content filtering features, and regularly clear one's personal search history (Wulandari, Rullyana, & Ardiansah, 2021).

Discussion

An analysis of the development of digital communication shows that the communication paradigm has undergone a significant transformation. Quoting Craig (1990),

Craig's communication paradigm theory provides a conceptual framework for understanding the shift in perspectives on communication from traditional models to more interactive and participatory digital communication models.

With the development of digital technology, the paradigm has shifted significantly toward a more interactive, participatory, and constructive paradigm. Palfrey explains that the most notable change of this shifting paradigm is the way the digital era has transformed the way people live their lives and relate to one another in the world around them (Palfrey 2009 in Cladis, 2020). This paradigm shift emphasizes communication as a dynamic and participatory process, in which individuals are not merely passive recipients of messages but also active agents who shape meaning and social structures through digital interactions. The concept of the

network society reinforces this finding by asserting that digital technology creates a space for communication that is not limited by physical location, thereby expanding the scope and intensity of social interaction (Castells, 1985, 1988, 1989 in Van Dijk, 1999). Castells' concept of the network society is highly relevant for explaining how communication structures have fundamentally changed. Changes driven by digital technology shape new patterns of interaction within society. Both provide a strong theoretical foundation for analyzing the paradigm shift in communication in the digital age.

Furthermore, the results of the observations reveal that individual perspectives significantly influence the interpretation of digital messages. In line with Berger & Luckmann's social construction theory, every individual brings different backgrounds, values, and experiences, making the meaning of messages relative and contextual (Berger & Luckmann, 1966 in Pramono, et al., 2024). Berger & Luckmann emphasize that social reality is shaped through interaction and the shared construction of meaning. This is highly relevant in the context of digital communication, which is rife with subjective interpretations.

Entman's framing theory is also highly relevant for understanding how digital messages are framed and interpreted differently by individuals, particularly in digital spaces with minimal nonverbal context. This theory explains why individual perspectives influence the interpretation of digital messages, making it suitable for addressing research questions that examine the role of perspective (Entman, 1993). The framing of messages by the sender plays a role in shaping the recipient's perceptions.

However, the lack of nonverbal context and the speed of interaction on digital platforms often amplify differences in interpretation. This triggers misunderstandings and online conflicts. This phenomenon is supported by Sunstein and Pariser's findings on echo chambers and filter bubbles, which demonstrate how digital algorithms reinforce perspective biases and narrow the space for dialogue

among users. Echo chamber as an online social discussion space such as a forum, blog or social networking site which is characterized both by relative ideological homogeneity in terms of information being circulated and opinions being expressed (Sunstein, 2001). Users can control the content to which they are exposed by confining their contacts to like-minded individuals and avoiding those whom they would like to ignore (Sunstein, 2001). Pariser (2011) dalam Ouma (2026) menyampaikan mengenai filter bubble. The filter bubble concept was developed by Pariser in his account of how personalization algorithms on search engines and social platforms curate information environments to match inferred user preferences. In Pariser's account, the commercial logic of platforms, which maximizes engagement through perceived relevance, carries a structural democratic cost: users are shown more of what they already agree with and less of what might challenge them. This is not experienced as censorship; it presents itself as a well-functioning information environment, which is precisely what makes it politically significant (Ouma, 2026).

In the context of digital communication effectiveness, the analysis reveals that alignment of paradigms and recognition of diverse perspectives are critical to the success of digital interactions. A communication paradigm that prioritizes dialogue and the negotiation of meaning enables communication to be more reflective and inclusive. DeVito

Challenges such as misinformation and polarization resulting from digital bias demand improved media literacy and more ethical and responsible communication approaches. Media literacy has developed a sophisticated account of the individual skills involved in decoding media texts, although these have yet to be applied to new media (Livingstone, 2004). Digital literacy refers to the ability to understand, use, and evaluate information obtained through digital technology wisely. Today's anxieties over the digital divide merely represent the latest steps in a long-standing struggle between critical and enlightenment positions, the outcome of

which will influence who will have the power to benefit from information and communication in a technologically-mediated twenty-first century (Livingstone, 2004). This concept encompasses skills in operating digital devices, understanding the content consumed, and distinguishing accurate information from misleading information.

Thus, a common thread can be drawn: DeVito emphasizes the importance of an interactional communication paradigm for achieving effective communication. Meanwhile, Pariser and Sunstein explain the phenomena of filter bubbles and echo chambers, which pose major challenges in digital communication. Livingstone and Hobbs add that digital literacy is essential as a solution for enhancing the effectiveness and ethics of communication.

These theories are highly relevant for supporting the research objectives in formulating recommendations for effective and ethical digital communication, as well as understanding the impact of paradigm shifts and differing perspectives on digital communication. Therefore, an effective digital communication strategy must be able to integrate an understanding of new paradigms and be sensitive to differing perspectives. This is to reduce conflict and strengthen social cohesion in the digital space.

Overall, this discussion reaffirms the following. First, shifts in communication paradigms and differences in individual perspectives are not only defining characteristics of digital communication but also major challenges that must be addressed to ensure communication remains effective and meaningful. Second, a deep theoretical understanding of these aspects serves as a crucial foundation for designing digital communication. This is to bridge the diversity of meanings and foster healthy social interactions in today's information technology era.

The following section describes how established paradigms in the social sciences and communication studies conceptually view social and communication phenomena. First, the positivist paradigm. This paradigm is rooted in the philosophies of empiricism and naturalism. It

emphasizes that knowledge is obtained through objective observation and systematic measurement (Comte, 1853; Creswell, 2014). Therefore, this approach is suitable for analyzing digital communication phenomena using quantitative data that can be measured and statistically tested. Examples include the frequency of media use, the number of interactions, and the direct impact of technology on communication. From this perspective, shifts in the digital communication paradigm can be analyzed through large-scale surveys, experiments, or content analysis that yield quantitative data. These phenomena may relate to communication patterns, interaction frequency, and the impact of technological changes on communication effectiveness. Thus, individual perspectives are viewed as variables that can be measured using standardized scales and instruments to test their influence on the interpretation of digital messages.

Second, the post-positivist paradigm. Post-positivism acknowledges the absolute limitations of objective science and accommodates the complexity of social reality by combining quantitative and qualitative methods (Phillips & Burbules, 2000). This aligns with the need to understand digital communication not only in measurable terms but also in a contextual and in-depth manner. Post-positivism acknowledges the limitations of absolute objectivity and seeks to integrate quantitative and qualitative methods. In this context, research can utilize statistical data on digital communication while simultaneously exploring the social and psychological contexts that influence individual perspectives through interviews and observation. This paradigm encourages the verification of theories with empirical data that is open to revision. Thus, understanding of the paradigm shift in communication and its impact on the effectiveness of digital communication can be continuously refined.

Third, the Interpretive Paradigm. Interpretivism stems from the work of Weber and Dilthey, who emphasized the importance of understanding the subjective meanings individuals ascribe to social actions (Schwandt, 1994). This paradigm is relevant

in digital communication research for studying the meaning of messages, which is highly dependent on each individual's unique perspective and experience. Consequently, this type of research seeks to explore the context of interpretation through qualitative methods. The interpretive paradigm focuses on understanding the subjective meanings constructed by individuals in social interactions. Research within this paradigm examines how digital media users understand and assign meaning to the messages they receive. The emphasis is on cultural, social, and personal contexts. This perspective is highly relevant for exploring the diversity of interpretations of digital messages arising from differences in individual backgrounds, as well as how digital interactions shape their social reality.

Fourth, the Constructivist paradigm. Constructivism is based on Berger and Luckmann's (1966) theory of the social construction of reality, which states that social reality is constructed through interaction and the negotiation of meaning. In the context of digital communication, this paradigm helps explain how interactions within digital networks shape a dynamic and multifaceted social reality. Constructivism emphasizes that social reality is constructed through social interaction and the communication process. In the context of digital communication, this paradigm highlights how new communication paradigms and individual perspectives can collectively shape shared meaning in the digital space. The focus is on the processes of negotiating meaning, framing messages, and constructing social reality within digital networks. The constructivist paradigm encourages research that examines how individuals and groups create, maintain, and transform patterns of communication in the digital age.

Fifth, the Critical Paradigm. The critical paradigm is rooted in the Frankfurt School's critical theory (Horkheimer, Adorno) and Foucault's thoughts on power and knowledge. Foucault (1980) argues that this paradigm views communication as an arena of ideological struggle and domination. This paradigm is relevant for analyzing how technology and social structures influence information control,

misinformation, and inequalities in digital communication. The critical paradigm views digital communication not merely as an interactive process but also as a battleground for power and ideology. This approach highlights how social structures, technology, and power influence communication paradigms and the interpretation of messages. Issues such as misinformation, echo chambers, and polarization are viewed as products of power imbalances in the management of digital information. The critical paradigm encourages researchers to critically examine the dominance of technology and algorithms that can reinforce social injustice, and to promote more democratic and inclusive digital communication.

Each paradigm plays a role in interpreting and representing different approaches to understanding current digital communication phenomena—ranging from communication patterns and message interpretation to the dynamics of power and ideology in cyberspace. In the positivist paradigm, communication phenomena are treated as measurable data. This means the paradigm remains highly relevant to digital communication, as many aspects of communication can now be quantified. Examples include studies of social media algorithms, statistics, viewing duration, engagement rates, the number of likes, and information dissemination patterns. These phenomena constitute data that can be analyzed objectively. A key support for this paradigm is the model proposed by Shannon & Weaver (1949), which views communication as a process of message transmission where efficiency (noise, encoding-decoding) can be calculated and measured.

In the post-positivist paradigm, data is open to interpretation and correction. Post-positivism still upholds objectivity, but recognizes that social influences and biases cannot be entirely avoided. In the digital age, many studies combine statistical data (such as the number of hoaxes or opinion polls) with data from interviews or perception surveys. As in the LSI survey (2023), it was found that although the majority of the public obtains news from social media, the level of trust in digital content is only

43%. This indicates that data cannot be taken at face value but must be examined within context and subject to critical scrutiny. A relevant theory regarding this phenomenon is that proposed by Phillips & Burbules (2000), which states that scientific truth is provisional and open to re-examination.

The interpretive paradigm can explain phenomena related to subjective interpretation and differing perspectives. The digital age is an age of narratives. Individuals can comment on, critique, or interpret a post in different ways depending on their background, values, and personal experiences. This is the primary domain for the interpretive approach. For example, when a public call to action like #IndonesiaGelap emerged, netizens responded in a wide variety of ways—ranging from religious support, criticism, to satirical jokes. This means that a single message is interpreted differently. This aligns with interpretive theory. Interpretive theory Clifford Geertz can be used to explain this phenomenon: that cultural symbols are interpreted locally and subjectively. Additionally, Herbert Blumer's (1969) theory posits that meaning is constructed through symbolic interaction (symbolic interactionism).

Within the constructivist paradigm, digital reality is co-constructed. Platforms like Twitter (X) and TikTok demonstrate that truth is not absolute but is shaped within social discourse. For instance, the meanings of terms like “hero” or “radical” on the internet can vary depending on the digital communities that define them. Consider the viral phenomenon of terms such as “healing,” “mental health,” or “gaslighting” on Indonesian social media. These do not originate from official authorities but are the result of a constantly evolving collective construction of meaning. This reality is well-suited for analysis through the constructivist paradigm. In short, the relevant theory explaining this phenomenon is the perspective of Berger & Luckmann (1966), which posits that social reality is constructed through communication and social interaction. Additionally, Jean Piaget's perspective

(cognition) holds that knowledge is constructed, not discovered.

From the critical paradigm's perspective, communication serves as a space for ideology and power. The digital age is rife with the dominance of narratives and control over information by major actors—namely the state, corporations, or political groups. The critical paradigm views digital communication as not neutral and often laden with power relations. The case of internet restrictions in Indonesia during the #IndonesiaGelap movement in 2025, imposed by the Indonesian government, demonstrates how access to communication can serve as a tool of power. Furthermore, the practice of “shadow banning” or algorithmic control on social media platforms has the potential to censor certain discourses. Relevant theories include Antonio Gramsci's theory of hegemony, which posits that ideological domination operates subtly through culture. Furthermore, Foucault's perspective holds that the relationship between knowledge and power, which controls the narrative, controls reality. Additionally, Habermas's (1984) view posits that ideal communication must be free from systemic distortions and power dynamics.

Current conditions make the simultaneous emergence and application of these five paradigms highly likely. This is because digital communication is a multidimensional phenomenon, so it cannot be explained by a single paradigm alone. Each paradigm interprets a different aspect of reality: from data (positivism), critical reflection (post-positivism), personal meaning (interpretivism), and shared construction (constructivism). Current conditions make it entirely possible for all five paradigms to emerge and be applied simultaneously. This is because digital communication is a multidimensional phenomenon, and thus cannot be explained by a single paradigm. Each paradigm captures a different aspect of reality: from data (positivism), critical reflection (post-positivism), personal meaning (interpretivism), shared construction (constructivism), to power relations (critical theory). Therefore, their integration is necessary to understand the complex and dynamic nature of

digital communication. Alternatively, each paradigm can be selected to explain different aspects of the phenomenon within digital communication activities.

The shift in communication paradigms regarding the phenomenon—the influence of individual perspectives on message interpretation, as well as issues of digital communication effectiveness—is not merely theoretical discourse. It is an empirical reality that individuals can directly observe in their daily lives in the digital age. The transformation of the communication paradigm from linear to interactive is not merely a theoretical prediction but has become a tangible part of contemporary society's digital life. In the past, communication was one-way: the media transmitted, and the audience received. However, today, every individual with internet access also acts as a message producer (prosumer). This aligns with Castells' observation that networked society forms social relationships through digital media simultaneously, in a decentralized manner, and without boundaries (Castells, 1985, 1988, 1989 Van Dijk, 1999).

Studying paradigms and perspectives in the era of digital communication has become increasingly relevant. This is because communication is fast-paced, widespread, and devoid of nonverbal context. Differences in perspective will become even more pronounced due to the diversity of platforms, their characteristics, and user factors. When individuals are aware of and understand these paradigms and perspectives, digital communication is expected to become more intelligent, empathetic, and ethical.

It is important to recognize that not everyone thinks within the same paradigms and perspectives. By understanding these differences, we can enhance digital literacy. This, in turn, fosters wise and empathetic attitudes in digital communication and helps prevent conflicts. Digital communication that fails to consider the other person's perspective often leads to misunderstandings or unproductive arguments. Additionally, it is hoped that every individual can promote ethical and constructive communication. By understanding differences in paradigms and perspectives, each individual can

convey messages in a more inclusive manner and avoid being easily provoked by emotions.

CONCLUSION

The effectiveness of digital communication in this era is largely determined by the ability of individuals and institutions to understand paradigm shifts and the diversity of perspectives. Without this, digital communication will continue to be dominated by conflict, misinterpretation, and manipulation of information. This is why digital literacy and communication ethics have become urgent necessities. Thus, the narrative regarding paradigm shifts, the role of perspectives, and the challenges to the effectiveness of digital communication is not merely theory, but an accurate depiction of the current state of communication.

Recommendations

Technological advancements not only transform communication tools but also alter the logic of thinking, how messages are interpreted, and how humans construct shared meaning. This narrative is not merely possible but is indeed unfolding. Therefore, as a recommendation, this phenomenon requires continued critical and reflective examination in future research.

REFERENCES

- Agma, A. R. (2025). Hoaks dan Disinformasi di Media Sosial: Strategi Literasi Digital untuk Meningkatkan Kesadaran Publik. *Jurnal Komunikasi dan Media*. 1(1): 30-36. <https://jurnal.samudrailmu.com/index.php/jkomed/article/view/28>
- Al-Fedaghi, S. (2012). A Conceptual Foundation for the Shannon-Weaver Model of Communication. *International Journal of Soft Computing* 7(1):12-19, DOI:10.3923/ijscmp.2012.12.19. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272964534_A_Conceptual_Foundation_for_the_Shannon-Weaver_Model_of_Communication
- Anggara, S., Pratama, H. S. (2019). Masyarakat Jejaring, Media Sosial, dan Transformasi Ruang Masyarakat Jejaring, Media Sosial, dan Transformasi Ruang Publik: Refleksi Mengenai Fenomena Arab Spring dan “Teman Publik: Refleksi Mengenai Fenomena Arab Spring dan “Teman Ahok”. *Paradigma: Jurnal Kajian Budaya*. 9(3). <https://doi.org/10.17510/paradigma.v9i3.241>
- Anonymous. (2025). PEMAHAMAN TEORITIK TEORI KONSTRUKSI SOSIAL. *Jurnal Universitas Sumatera Selatan (USS)*. <https://share.google/6Li2PA3t4HvUIaTYQ>
- Arguedas, A. R., Robertson, C. T., Fletcher, R., Nielsen, R. K. (2022). Echo Chambers, Filter Bubbles, and Polarisation: a Literature Review. *Reuters Institute*. DOI: 10.60625/risj-etxj-7k60 3. <https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/echo-chambers-filter-bubbles-and-polarisation-literature-review>
- Berger, P.L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality*. Anchor Books.
- Berger, Peter L. & Luckman, Thomas. (1990) *Tafsir Sosial Atas Kenyataan*. Jakarta: LP3ES
- Bright, J. (2018). Explaining the emergence of political fragmentation on social media: The role of ideology and extremism. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 23(1), 17–33. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmx002>
- Castells, M. (2010). *The Rise of the Network Society*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Cladis, A. E. (2020). A shifting paradigm: An evaluation of the pervasive effects of digital technologies on language expression, creativity, critical thinking, political discourse, and interactive processes of human communications. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 17(5), 341-364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2042753017752583>
- Craig, R.T. (1999). Communication Theory as a Field. *Communication Theory*, 9(2), 119-161. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1999.tb00355.x>

- DeVito, J.A. (2019). *The Interpersonal Communication Book*. Pearson.
- Drucker, P. (2002). *Managing in the next society*, 1st edn. St. Martin's Press, New York, USA
- Entman, R.M. (1993). Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58.
- Entman, Robert M. (1993). Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4):51-58. DOI:10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/209409849_Framing_Toward_Clarification_of_A_Fractured_Paradigm
- 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/10.1007/s42001-025-00381-z>
- Hasan, K., Husna, A., Muchlis, Fitri, D., Zulfadli. (2023). Transformasi Komunikasi Massa Era Digital Antara Peluang Dan Tantangan. *Jurnal Politik Dan Pemerintahan*. 8(1). <https://ojs.unimal.ac.id/jpp/article/view/12608>
- Interian, R., G. Marzo, R., Mendoza, I. and Ribeiro, C.C. (2023). Network polarization, filter bubbles, and echo chambers: an annotated review of measures and reduction methods. *Intl. Trans. in Op. Res.*, 30: 3122-3158. <https://doi.org/10.1111/itor.13224>
- Livingstone, S. (2004). Media Literacy and the Challenge of New Information and Communication Technologies. *Communication Review*, 7(1), 3-14.
- Livingstone, S. (2004). Media Literacy and the Challenge of New Information and Communication Technologies. *The Communication Review*. *The Communication Review*, 7(1). DOI: 10.1080/10714420490280152 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/30521209_Media_Literacy_and_the_Challenge_of_New_Information_and_Communication_Technologies_The_Communication_Review7
- Maliki, Z. (2012). *Rekonstruksi Teori Sosial Modern*. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University press
- Mardiana, H. (2022). The Impact of Basic Ethics and Digital Literacy on Globalized Social Media. *Proceeding The 6th Asia Future Conference*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363439747_The_Impact_of_Basic_Ethics_and_Digital_Literacy_on_Globalized_Social_Media
- Ouma, G. K. (2026). Social Media, Public Discourse, and the Transformation of Democratic Participation. *Scholedge International Journal of Multidisciplinary & Allied Studies*. 13(1). DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.19085/sijmas130102>
- Pariser, E. (2011). *The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You*. Penguin Press.
- Pariser, E. (2011). *The filter bubble: What the internet is hiding from you*. The Penguin Group.
- Pramono, M. S., Tampake, T., Lattu, I.Y. M., Molewe, A. C. (2024). Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann's social construction of the institutionalization of tolerance values in the Nyadran Perdamaian tradition. *ALMA'ARIEF: Jurnal Pendidikan Sosial dan Budaya*, 6(1): 50-61. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35905/almaarief.v6i1.9759>. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384609450_Peter_L_Berger_and_Thomas_Luckmann's_social_construction_of_the_institutionalization_of_tolerance_values_in_the_Nyadran_Perdamaian_tradition
- Raza, A. M., Aulia, N., Sopian. (2023). THE ECHO CHAMBER EFFECT: ANALISIS SOSIOLOGIS PERAN ALGORITMA MEDIA SOSIAL DALAM PEMBENTUKAN SOLIDARITAS DAN POLARISASI KELOMPOK DI

- INDONESIA. *Jurnal Bincang Komunikasi*, 1(2): 184-194. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24853/jbk.3.1.2025.38-52>.
<https://jurnal.umj.ac.id/index.php/JBK/article/view/27736>
- Sakyi, K. A., Musona, D., & Mweshi, G. (2020). *Research Methods and Methodology. Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 7(3), 13–40. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-39811-8_2
- Satria, F. H., & Abdullah, N. N. (2025). Strategi Konten Dalam Peningkatan Engagement Rate Pada Instagram @beemahoney.id. *Jurnal Pustaka Komunikasi*, 8(2), 285–295. <https://doi.org/10.32509/pustakom.v8i2.4195>
- Shannon, C.E., & Weaver, W. (1949). *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*. University of Illinois Press.
- Sherblom, J.C., 2010, 'The computer-mediated communication (CMC) classroom: A challenge of medium, presence, interaction, identity, and relationship', *Communication Education* 59(4), 497–523. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2010.486440>
- Skippington, P. 2016. *Harnessing the Bohemian*. Canberra: ANU Press.
- Strauss, C., Harr, M.D. & Pieper, T.M. (2025). Analyzing digital communication: a comprehensive literature review. *Manag Rev Q* 75, 3119–3157. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-024-00455-8>
- Sunstein, C. (2001). *Republic.Com*. Princeton University Press
- Sunstein, C.R. (2001). *Republic.com*. Princeton University Press.
- Van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (1999). The One-Dimensional Network Society of Manuel Castells. *New Media & Society*, 1(1):127-138. DOI:10.1177/1461444899001001015. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312117360_The_one-dimensional_network_society_of_Manuel_Castells
- Venter, E., 2016, 'Bridging the communication gap between generation Y and the baby boomer generation', *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth* 22(4), 497–507. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2016.1267022>
- Venter, E., 2019, 'Challenges for meaningful interpersonal communication in a digital era', *HTS Teologiese Studies/ Theological Studies* 75(1), a5339. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v75i1.5339>
- We Are Social. (2026). *Special Report Digital 2026*. <https://wearesocial.com/id/blog/2025/10/digital-2026/>
- Wulandari, V., Rullyana, G., Ardiansah. (2021). Pengaruh algoritma filter bubble dan echo chamber terhadap perilaku penggunaan internet. *Berkala Ilmu Perpustakaan dan Informasi*. 17(1), 98-111 <https://doi.org/10.22146/bip.v17i1.423>
- Yusyifa, S. S., Abidin, M. Z. (2025). Paradigma Ilmu. *Jurnal Ilmiah Keislaman dan Kemasyarakatan STAI Al-Ma'arif Buntok*, 10(1). <https://www.scribd.com/document/902556818/5-Siti-Salwa-Yusyifa-Dkk-PARADIGMA-ILMU>