

---

## DIGITAL DIVIDE AMONG SENIOR CITIZENS

**Dr. Anjali Sharma**

Assistant Professor

Department of Sociology

University of Delhi, New Delhi, India

---

### Abstract

Digital technologies increasingly shape access to communication, health information, banking, public services, learning, and social participation. For many senior citizens, however, these opportunities remain unevenly available. The digital divide among older adults is not limited to internet connection or device ownership; it also includes affordability, digital literacy, confidence, accessibility, language, trust, and the availability of human support. When essential services move online without inclusive alternatives, older persons who are unable to use digital systems may face exclusion from everyday opportunities and reduced independence.

This study examines the digital divide among senior citizens through a qualitative review of scholarly literature, policy reports, digital-inclusion frameworks, and guidance on accessible technology. The analysis considers the barriers that influence technology adoption and meaningful use among older adults, including income constraints, low digital skills, disability-related access needs, fear of fraud, limited confidence, inadequate connectivity, and poorly designed online services. Particular attention is given to the difference between nominal access to a device and the ability to use digital tools safely, independently, and for personally valuable outcomes.

The findings indicate that effective digital inclusion requires a multi-dimensional response. Affordable devices and connectivity are necessary but insufficient when interfaces are complex, instructions are unclear, or older users lack trusted assistance. Skills training is most effective when it is practical, paced, repeated, and linked to everyday goals such as video calls, health appointments, digital payments, government services, and community engagement. Accessible design, strong consumer protection, and offline or assisted service options remain essential for people who cannot or do not wish to use digital channels.

The paper proposes an inclusion framework that combines access, affordability, skills, accessibility, trust, social support, service usability, and institutional accountability. It supports age-friendly digital policy and helps ensure that technological progress expands, rather than restricts, participation in later life.

**Keywords:** Digital Divide, Senior Citizens, Older Adults, Digital Inclusion, Digital Literacy, Accessibility, e-Governance, Online Safety, Social Support, Age-Friendly Technology

---

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Digital technologies have become an important part of contemporary life. Communication with family members, access to public information, medical appointments, financial transactions, entertainment, shopping, and government services are increasingly organised through websites, mobile applications, online platforms, and automated systems. These developments can improve convenience and independence, but they can also create new forms of exclusion when people lack the resources, skills, confidence, or support needed to participate. Senior citizens are among the groups most likely to experience these barriers, particularly where services are designed around assumptions of constant connectivity and advanced digital familiarity.

The digital divide among senior citizens should not be understood as a simple distinction between users and non-users. Older adults are diverse in income, education, health, language, living arrangement, work history, prior technology exposure, and personal interest. Some use smartphones, messaging applications, digital payments, and telehealth confidently, while others encounter difficulty with basic tasks such as creating a password, locating a reliable source, adjusting accessibility settings, or recognising a fraudulent message. The divide is therefore layered: differences in access lead to differences in skills, use, safety, and the benefits that people can obtain from technology.

Age-related changes can make digital interaction more demanding, but age itself

does not determine ability. Reduced vision, hearing loss, changes in memory, lower motor dexterity, and chronic health conditions may affect technology use when platforms are not designed accessibly. Complex menus, small text, rapid updates, unexplained icons, time-limited security checks, and dense legal language can turn ordinary online tasks into stressful experiences. These barriers are intensified when the person does not have an available family member, peer, trainer, or local service provider who can offer patient and trustworthy assistance.

The shift toward digital-first services has made this issue socially significant. Health systems, banks, transport providers, insurance companies, retailers, and public agencies often encourage or require online interaction. Digital channels may reduce administrative cost and expand reach, yet exclusive reliance on them can leave some older adults dependent on others, vulnerable to misinformation, or unable to complete important tasks. Inclusion therefore requires both accessible digital services and meaningful non-digital alternatives, including telephone support, in-person assistance, and clear paper-based information where necessary.

This paper investigates the digital divide among senior citizens and develops a practical framework for age-inclusive digital participation. It reviews key explanations of digital inequality, identifies barriers to access and meaningful use, and considers how governments, service providers, communities, families, and technology designers can reduce avoidable exclusion. The purpose is to show that digital inclusion in later life is not merely a technology issue; it is a matter of dignity, autonomy, social connection, and equal access to essential opportunities.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on the digital divide has moved beyond early measures of internet access to

examine differences in skills, patterns of use, and outcomes. The first-level divide concerns access to devices and connectivity, while later forms of inequality concern whether people can evaluate information, protect privacy, communicate effectively, and obtain practical benefits from online participation. This broader approach is especially relevant to senior citizens because device ownership does not necessarily produce confident, independent, or safe use (van Dijk, 2020; van Deursen & van Dijk, 2014).

Studies of older adults consistently identify education, income, prior work experience, health, social networks, and perceived usefulness as important factors in technology adoption. Older people are more likely to use digital tools when they see a clear personal benefit, such as staying in contact with family, managing health information, accessing services, or pursuing hobbies. Conversely, anxiety about mistakes, cost, complexity, privacy, and online fraud can discourage use even where devices and connections are available (Czaja et al., 2006; Mitzner et al., 2010; Lee & Coughlin, 2015).

The literature also emphasises that support and design are central to inclusion. Practical instruction, peer learning, intergenerational assistance, accessible interfaces, and dependable help channels can improve confidence and sustained use. During periods when physical contact or service access is restricted, digital exclusion can contribute to social isolation and unequal access to health, welfare, and civic information. Researchers therefore argue for policies that treat digital access as a social participation issue rather than a purely technical consumer choice (Hunsaker & Hargittai, 2018; Seifert, Cotton & Xie, 2021).

**TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF KEY LITERATURE ON DIGITAL DIVIDE AMONG SENIOR CITIZENS**

| S. No. | Author(s)    | Year | Methodology        | Key Focus           | Major Findings                                                              |
|--------|--------------|------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1      | Czaja et al. | 2006 | Longitudinal study | Technology adoption | Age, education, self-efficacy, and prior exposure influence technology use. |

| S. No. | Author(s)              | Year | Methodology          | Key Focus                  | Major Findings                                                                      |
|--------|------------------------|------|----------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2      | Mitzner et al.         | 2010 | Survey study         | Technology attitudes       | Older adults value useful technology but report usability and confidence barriers.  |
| 3      | van Deursen & van Dijk | 2014 | Theoretical analysis | Digital inequality         | The divide includes differences in usage patterns, skills, and outcomes.            |
| 4      | Friemel                | 2016 | Quantitative study   | Senior digital divide      | Access and use among seniors are shaped by social and personal resources.           |
| 5      | Hargittai & Dobransky  | 2017 | Survey research      | Digital skills             | Older adults show substantial inequality in online skills and types of use.         |
| 6      | Vaportzis et al.       | 2017 | Focus group study    | Tablet barriers            | Interface complexity, cost, and fear of errors discourage technology engagement.    |
| 7      | Hunsaker & Hargittai   | 2018 | Literature review    | Internet use in later life | Access, skills, support, and perceived relevance affect older adults participation. |
| 8      | Xie et al.             | 2020 | Policy analysis      | Digital necessity          | Digital inclusion became critical for information, services, and social connection. |
| 9      | Seifert et al.         | 2021 | Conceptual analysis  | Social exclusion           | Digital exclusion can deepen social isolation during service disruption.            |
| 10     | WHO                    | 2021 | Policy report        | Healthy ageing             | Age-friendly environments should support participation and functional ability.      |
| 11     | ITU                    | 2023 | Global data report   | Connectivity gaps          | Meaningful access requires attention to demographic and geographic inequalities.    |
| 12     | W3C                    | 2023 | Technical guidance   | Web accessibility          | Accessible content and interaction improve access for users with diverse abilities. |

### 3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The object of this study is the digital divide among senior citizens. The study examines the conditions that shape whether older adults can access, understand, trust, use, and benefit from digital technologies. It focuses on the quality of participation rather than device ownership alone. The central question is whether digital environments, services, and support systems enable senior citizens to perform meaningful tasks independently, safely, and with dignity.

The research considers smartphones, computers, tablets, internet connections, messaging platforms, online banking, e-health systems, digital government portals, social media, video communication, online shopping, and emergency information channels. These tools differ in purpose and complexity, but they share common inclusion requirements: affordable access, accessible design, clear instructions, appropriate security, practical support, and alternative pathways for users who cannot complete a task digitally.

The study also examines the relationship between individual capability and institutional responsibility. Digital inclusion is not achieved solely by asking senior citizens to learn more. Service providers and governments must design systems that are understandable, allow adequate time, minimise unnecessary steps, protect users from harm, and provide human assistance when digital interaction fails. The objective is to identify an age-inclusive framework that links individual confidence with accessible technology and accountable service delivery.

## KEY POINTS OF OBJECT OF STUDY

- To examine access to devices, affordable connectivity, and reliable technical infrastructure for senior citizens.
- To assess digital literacy, confidence, and the ability to complete everyday online tasks independently.
- To analyse how income, education, location, disability, health, and social support influence digital participation.

- To evaluate the accessibility of websites, mobile applications, e-health platforms, banking systems, and government portals.
- To study concerns related to privacy, misinformation, online fraud, and cyber-security among older users.
- To examine the role of families, peers, community centres, libraries, and trainers in building sustained confidence.
- To identify design barriers such as small text, complex navigation, poor language clarity, and time-limited verification steps.
- To consider the effects of digital exclusion on social connection, service access, health management, and civic participation.
- To evaluate the availability of assisted, telephone, and in-person alternatives for essential services.
- To develop a practical framework for inclusive digital participation in later life.

**TABLE 2: OBJECT OF STUDY FRAMEWORK**

| S. No. | Study Component             | Description                                                                              | Purpose                                                           |
|--------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1      | Access and connectivity     | Availability of suitable devices, reliable internet, electricity, and local support.     | Enable basic participation in digital communication and services. |
| 2      | Affordability               | Cost of devices, repairs, subscriptions, mobile data, and upgrades.                      | Reduce financial barriers to sustained use.                       |
| 3      | Digital skills              | Ability to use devices, search information, manage passwords, and complete online tasks. | Build independent and confident participation.                    |
| 4      | Accessibility and usability | Readable interfaces, simple navigation, adjustable settings, and clear language.         | Make systems usable for diverse functional abilities.             |
| 5      | Trust and safety            | Protection from scams, misinformation, privacy loss, and harmful online practices.       | Support safe and informed engagement.                             |
| 6      | Social support              | Family, peer, community, library, and trainer assistance.                                | Provide encouragement, practice, and problem-solving support.     |
| 7      | Service readiness           | Age-inclusive health, banking, public-service, and commercial platforms.                 | Prevent exclusion from essential digital services.                |

| S. No. | Study Component              | Description                                                            | Purpose                                               |
|--------|------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| 8      | Institutional accountability | Monitoring, accessible help, complaints, and non-digital alternatives. | Ensure that digital transformation remains equitable. |

#### 4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopts a qualitative, document-based research design. It combines a thematic review of peer-reviewed research with an examination of policy reports, digital-inclusion frameworks, accessibility guidance, and public information on ageing and digital participation. This approach is suitable because the research question concerns the interconnected social, technical, and institutional conditions that shape digital inclusion in later life. Rather than presenting a single local survey, the paper synthesises established evidence and practical principles that can guide age-friendly service design, community programmes, and public policy.

##### 4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

- Study Type: Qualitative and document-based analysis
- Approach: Thematic review supported by comparative analysis of barriers and inclusion practices
- Unit of Analysis: Technology access, digital skills, online services, support systems, and user outcomes among senior citizens
- Source Categories: Scholarly literature, public policy reports, accessibility guidance, digital-inclusion frameworks, and official data
- Core Inclusion Dimensions: Access, affordability, skills, accessibility, trust, social support, service usability, and accountability
- Analytical Goal: Develop a practical framework for age-inclusive digital participation and service delivery

##### 4.2 METHODOLOGICAL STEPS

- Step 1: Define the digital divide as differences in access, skills, use, safety, and outcomes.
- Step 2: Review literature on ageing, technology adoption, digital literacy, and digital inequality.

- Step 3: Examine policy reports and guidance on accessible technology, online safety, and digital inclusion.
- Step 4: Develop an analysis matrix covering access, affordability, confidence, accessibility, trust, support, and service alternatives.
- Step 5: Compare barriers associated with devices, connectivity, interfaces, authentication, information quality, and online transactions.
- Step 6: Identify high-risk situations such as fraud exposure, inaccessible health portals, digital-only service requirements, and misinformation.
- Step 7: Formulate inclusive design, training, support, and governance measures for organisations and communities.
- Step 8: Interpret findings in relation to autonomy, social participation, service equity, and quality of life in later life.

#### 5. DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis is based on a thematic comparison of barriers and enabling conditions identified in the literature and policy guidance. The analysis evaluates how access, affordability, skills, accessibility, trust, and support interact to shape real-world digital participation among senior citizens. These themes are closely connected: a person may own a smartphone but lack confidence, have internet access but face an inaccessible service, or possess basic skills yet avoid online activities because of fraud concerns. Meaningful inclusion therefore depends on the combined quality of technology, support, and service design.

##### 5.1 ACCESS, AFFORDABILITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS

Access remains the starting point of digital participation. A reliable device, stable internet connection, electricity, and affordable data are necessary for using communication platforms and online services. For some senior citizens, the cost of smartphones, repairs, mobile data,

broadband subscriptions, or replacement devices remains a significant barrier. Rural location, weak network coverage, shared devices, and limited access to local technical support can further reduce participation. Access should therefore be assessed in terms of reliability and practical usability, not only whether a household is nominally connected.

The analysis indicates that affordable access is most useful when it is linked to an appropriate device and adequate support. A low-cost smartphone may be insufficient when storage is limited, the screen is too small, security updates are unavailable, or the user cannot manage routine maintenance. Community-based internet points, public libraries, subsidised device programmes, and local repair support can help reduce these barriers. However, such measures must respect privacy and provide a safe setting for tasks involving personal, health, or financial information.

#### KEY OBSERVATION:

- Access should be measured by reliable device use, connectivity quality, affordability, and ability to maintain the technology over time.
- Subsidised devices and data plans are more effective when combined with setup assistance, accessible settings, and follow-up support.
- Digital-first services should retain alternative channels for people facing connectivity, cost, or device barriers.

#### 5.2 DIGITAL SKILLS, CONFIDENCE AND LEARNING ANALYSIS

Digital skills include more than knowing how to open an application. Older users may need to learn how to search for information, evaluate a source, manage passwords, update software, adjust accessibility features, recognise suspicious messages, use video calls, complete online forms, and recover from errors. Confidence is equally important because many people avoid digital tasks when they fear making an irreversible mistake, losing money, exposing personal data, or being judged for asking basic questions. Learning environments that move too quickly or use technical jargon can reinforce this reluctance. Practical and repeated learning is more likely to support sustained use than one-time instruction. Training should be paced, hands-on, and linked to meaningful tasks chosen by

the participant. Peer groups, intergenerational support, printed guides in clear language, practice devices, and patient troubleshooting help transform initial exposure into routine use. Programmes should also acknowledge that some senior citizens prefer limited or selective use of technology. Inclusion should expand informed choice and capability, not impose digital participation as the only acceptable way to access services.

#### KEY OBSERVATION:

- Skills programmes should focus on everyday tasks, safe decision-making, and confidence in recovering from common errors.
- Training is most effective when it is paced, repeated, locally available, and supported by trusted people.
- Digital literacy should include online safety, misinformation awareness, privacy, and fraud prevention.

#### 5.3 ACCESSIBILITY, INTERFACE DESIGN AND USABILITY ANALYSIS

Many digital services are difficult for senior citizens because their interfaces assume fast reading, precise tapping, strong vision, quick memory recall, and familiarity with changing conventions. Small text, low contrast, crowded screens, confusing icons, automatic logouts, multi-factor authentication, and inconsistent navigation can make essential tasks inaccessible. These problems are not inevitable consequences of ageing; they are often design failures that can be reduced through readable typography, plain language, predictable navigation, captions, screen-reader compatibility, voice support, and flexible authentication options.

Usability should be assessed through direct testing with diverse older users rather than assumptions made by designers. A service may meet a technical standard while remaining difficult to understand in practice. Organisations should test key journeys such as booking an appointment, making a payment, receiving a verification code, updating contact details, or seeking help after an error. Time limits, complex security checks, and hidden support options should be reviewed carefully because they can disproportionately affect people with slower processing speed, visual limitations, or intermittent connectivity.

## KEY OBSERVATION:

- Accessible design should be treated as a core service requirement rather than an optional feature added after launch.
- Plain language, readable text, predictable navigation, and adjustable settings improve usability for users of all ages.
- Older adults should be involved in testing real tasks, including error recovery, authentication, and help-seeking journeys.

**TABLE 3: DIGITAL INCLUSION EVALUATION MATRIX**

| Digital Inclusion Dimension       | Primary Barrier                                                | Inclusive Practice                                                                 | Evidence / Control                                                  |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Access and affordability          | No suitable device, costly data, unreliable connectivity       | Provide affordable devices, connectivity support, and local setup assistance.      | Access survey; subsidy records; device suitability review.          |
| Skills and confidence             | Fear of errors, low familiarity, technical jargon              | Offer paced, practical, repeated learning linked to everyday goals.                | Attendance record; skills practice checklist; participant feedback. |
| Accessibility and usability       | Small text, unclear navigation, complex authentication         | Use plain language, adjustable text, predictable flows, and flexible verification. | Accessibility audit; senior-user testing; task completion review.   |
| Trust and online safety           | Fraud, phishing, misinformation, privacy concerns              | Provide clear alerts, safety education, easy reporting, and rapid human support.   | Incident log; scam reporting pathway; safety awareness materials.   |
| Essential service equity          | Digital-only health, banking, welfare, or government processes | Maintain assisted, telephone, and in-person alternatives for high-impact tasks.    | Channel availability review; completion and complaint data.         |
| Social support and accountability | Isolation, lack of help, unclear responsibility                | Build community support networks and assign service owners for inclusion.          | Support directory; escalation process; periodic inclusion report.   |

## 5.4 SOCIAL SUPPORT, TRUST AND ONLINE SAFETY ANALYSIS

Social support strongly influences whether senior citizens begin and continue to use digital technologies. Family members, friends, neighbours, volunteers, community organisations, libraries, and health workers can provide encouragement, demonstrations, and reassurance. At the same time, dependence on others can create privacy concerns when a person must disclose passwords, banking details, or personal health information in order to complete a task. Support should therefore build the person's own capability and respect their autonomy rather than creating permanent reliance on an informal helper.

Trust is shaped by experience. Online fraud, phishing messages, impersonation calls,

misleading advertisements, and misinformation can cause older adults to avoid digital services altogether. Prevention requires more than warning users to be careful. Banks, platforms, telecom providers, and public agencies should use clear alerts, accessible reporting channels, quick account-protection measures, and human assistance following suspected fraud. Trusted intermediaries can also play an important role by explaining common scams without creating fear or embarrassment.

## KEY OBSERVATION:

- Social support should strengthen independent use while protecting privacy and personal decision-making.
- Online safety measures must be understandable, non-blaming, and linked

to rapid human assistance after a suspected scam.

- Trust grows when organisations provide clear communication, transparent processes, and accountable support channels.

## 5.5 ESSENTIAL SERVICES, HEALTH AND CIVIC PARTICIPATION ANALYSIS

Digital exclusion can have serious consequences when health, financial, welfare, transport, and government services are primarily available online. Older adults may miss appointment information, struggle to access test results, find it difficult to authenticate a payment, or be unable to submit an application within a digital deadline. The problem is particularly acute for individuals who live alone, have limited mobility, experience disability, or do not have a trusted support network. Digital service design must therefore consider the consequences of non-use rather than assuming that all users can transition at the same pace.

Inclusive service delivery requires a choice of channels. Telephone lines, in-person counters, assisted digital support, accessible paper information, and authorised help arrangements can prevent exclusion while digital skills develop. Health and public-service providers should clearly explain when online tools are optional, how privacy is protected, and where a person can obtain help. Digital systems can support autonomy and connection in later life, but only when they are embedded in a wider service model that recognises different capacities, preferences, and circumstances.

### KEY OBSERVATION:

- Essential services should not become inaccessible solely because an individual cannot use a website or mobile application.
- Assisted digital and non-digital alternatives are safeguards for equity, autonomy, and continuity of care.
- Service providers should monitor whether digital transformation creates unequal outcomes for older users.

## 6. DISCUSSION

The analysis shows that the digital divide among senior citizens is a multi-layered form of inequality. Providing an internet connection

or distributing a device may reduce one barrier, but it does not automatically create the skills, confidence, trust, accessibility, or service usability needed for meaningful participation. Digital inclusion should therefore be understood as a continuing process through which people gain the opportunity to use technology in ways that matter to them. This approach recognises that older adults are not a uniform group and that technology adoption depends on personal circumstances as well as institutional choices.

Accessibility is especially important because many digital barriers are created by avoidable design decisions. Clear content, adjustable text, visible help functions, flexible verification processes, and consistent navigation reduce unnecessary difficulty. Age-inclusive design benefits a wide range of users, including people with temporary injury, low literacy, disability, limited language proficiency, or unfamiliarity with a particular service. Designing for diverse abilities therefore strengthens the quality and reliability of digital systems for everyone.

Skills and confidence cannot be separated from trust. Senior citizens are often advised to use online services while simultaneously being warned about fraud, privacy loss, and misinformation. This can produce understandable caution. Effective inclusion programmes should provide realistic safety education, opportunities to practise, and a clear pathway to human help when problems occur. Organisations should also accept responsibility for secure design, simple reporting, and fair recovery processes rather than placing the entire burden of safety on individual users.

A responsible digital transformation strategy should assess the impact of service changes on older adults before removing in-person or telephone channels. At minimum, organisations should test services with senior users, provide plain-language guidance, offer accessible support, monitor completion and drop-off rates, and maintain alternatives for high-impact tasks. These measures are not only social safeguards; they can improve service quality, reduce avoidable errors, build trust, and prevent costly exclusion or complaint.

The responsibility for reducing the digital divide is shared. Governments can invest in

affordable connectivity, public access, digital literacy, and inclusive regulation; service providers can improve design and maintain human support; communities can create trusted learning spaces; families and peers can encourage safe use without taking control; and technology companies can build accessible products and transparent safety tools. Coordinated action matters because older adults experience the digital environment as a connected system rather than a series of separate platforms.

## 7. CONCLUSION

The digital divide among senior citizens is an important challenge for equitable participation in an increasingly digital society. The study finds that the most significant barriers involve access, affordability, skills, confidence, accessible design, online safety, social support, and the availability of non-digital alternatives. These dimensions influence whether older

adults can communicate with others, obtain information, manage health and finances, access public services, and participate in community life.

The research confirms that digital inclusion cannot be achieved through device distribution alone. Meaningful progress requires age-friendly service design, practical and repeated skills training, trustworthy support, strong fraud protection, and continued access to assisted and offline channels. When digital systems are designed around human diversity and accountability, they can support independence and connection in later life. When they are designed without these safeguards, they risk deepening social exclusion. Inclusive digital policy should therefore treat senior citizens as active participants with different needs, strengths, and preferences, not as passive recipients of technology.

## 8. REFERENCES

1. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2020). World population ageing 2020 highlights: Living arrangements of older persons. United Nations. <https://www.un.org/development/desa/pd/>
2. World Health Organization. (2021). Decade of healthy ageing: Baseline report. World Health Organization. <https://www.who.int/publications/>
3. International Telecommunication Union. (2023). Facts and figures 2023. ITU. <https://www.itu.int/itu-d/reports/statistics/facts-figures-2023/>
4. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). Going digital: Shaping policies, improving lives. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264312012-en>
5. European Commission. (2021). Green paper on ageing: Fostering solidarity and responsibility between generations. <https://commission.europa.eu/>
6. Czaja, S. J., Charness, N., Fisk, A. D., Hertzog, C., Nair, S. N., Rogers, W. A., & Sharit, J. (2006). Factors predicting the use of technology: Findings from the CREATE study. *Psychology and Aging*, 21(2), 333-352. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.21.2.333>
7. Mitzner, T. L., Boron, J. B., Fausset, C. B., Adams, A. E., Charness, N., Czaja, S. J., Dijkstra, K., Fisk, A. D., Rogers, W. A., & Sharit, J. (2010). Older adults talk technology: Technology usage and attitudes. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(6), 1710-1721. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2010.06.020>
8. Heart, T., & Kalderon, E. (2013). Older adults: Are they ready to adopt health-related ICT? *International Journal of Medical Informatics*, 82(11), e209-e231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2011.03.002>
9. Lee, C., & Coughlin, J. F. (2015). Perspective: Older adults adoption of technology: An integrated approach to identifying determinants and barriers. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 32(5), 747-759. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12176>
10. van Deursen, A. J. A. M., & van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (2014). The digital divide shifts to differences in usage. *New Media & Society*, 16(3), 507-526. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444813487959>
11. Friemel, T. N. (2016). The digital divide has grown old: Determinants of a digital divide among seniors. *New Media & Society*, 18(2), 313-331. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814538648>
12. Hargittai, E., & Dobransky, K. (2017). Old dogs, new clicks: Digital inequality in skills and uses among older adults. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 42(2), 195-212. <https://doi.org/10.22230/cjc.2017v42n2a3176>

13. Vaportzis, E., Clausen, M. G., & Gow, A. J. (2017). Older adults perceptions of technology and barriers to interacting with tablet computers: A focus group study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1687. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01687>
14. Hunsaker, A., & Hargittai, E. (2018). A review of internet use among older adults. *New Media & Society*, 20(10), 3937-3954. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818787348>
15. Scheerder, A., van Deursen, A., & van Dijk, J. (2017). Determinants of internet skills, uses and outcomes: A systematic review of the second- and third-level digital divide. *Telematics and Informatics*, 34(8), 1607-1624. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2017.07.007>
16. van Deursen, A. J. A. M., Helsper, E. J., Eynon, R., & van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (2017). The compoundness and sequentiality of digital inequality. *International Journal of Communication*, 11, 452-473.
17. Quan-Haase, A., Martin, K., & Schreurs, K. (2014). Not all on the same page: E-book adoption and technology exploration by seniors. *Information Research*, 19(2), paper 622. <https://informationr.net/ir/19-2/paper622.html>
18. Xie, B., Charness, N., Fingerman, K., Kaye, J., Kim, M. T., & Khurshid, A. (2020). When going digital becomes a necessity: Ensuring older adults needs for information, services, and social inclusion during COVID-19. *Journal of Aging & Social Policy*, 32(4-5), 460-470. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08959420.2020.1771237>
19. Seifert, A., Cotton, S. R., & Xie, B. (2021). A double burden of exclusion? Digital and social exclusion of older adults in times of COVID-19. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*, 76(3), e99-e103. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbaa098>
20. Beaunoyer, E., Dupere, S., & Guittou, M. J. (2020). COVID-19 and digital inequalities: Reciprocal impacts and mitigation strategies. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 111, 106424. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106424>
21. Chen, Y. R. R., & Schulz, P. J. (2016). The effect of information communication technology interventions on reducing social isolation in the elderly: A systematic review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 18(1), e18. <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.4596>
22. Khosravi, P., Rezvani, A., & Wiewiora, A. (2016). The impact of technology on older adults social isolation. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 63, 594-603. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.05.092>
23. Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
24. Selwyn, N. (2004). Reconsidering political and popular understandings of the digital divide. *New Media & Society*, 6(3), 341-362. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444804042519>
25. Helsper, E. J. (2012). A corresponding fields model for the links between social and digital exclusion. *Communication Theory*, 22(4), 403-426. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2012.01416.x>
26. van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (2020). *The digital divide*. Polity Press.
27. Anderson, M., & Perrin, A. (2017). Tech adoption climbs among older adults. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2017/05/17/tech-adoption-climbs-among-older-adults/>
28. National Institute on Aging. (2022). Online health information: Is it reliable? National Institutes of Health. <https://www.nia.nih.gov/health/online-health-information-it-reliable>
29. World Wide Web Consortium. (2023). Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.2. <https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG22/>
30. United Nations. (2021). United Nations principles for older persons. <https://www.un.org/development/desa/ageing/resources/international-year-of-older-persons-1999/united-nations-principles-for-older-persons.html>