Rethinking the Public Sphere in the Post-Truth Era

Diksha Vishwakarma

Research Scholar, Banaras Hindu University

Abstract

Ever since the Age of Enlightenment, individuals and social structures have strived to cultivate a discursive arena in which the unheard should not only be heard but also given the chance to advance the fundamental principles of solidarity and justice in a democracy. The public sphere paves the path for social interaction and intersubjective understanding of individuals based on civil exchange of reasons outside the confines of public institutions. By fostering communication and enabling collaborative co-creation, it facilitates everyone with equal liberty to speak their minds on any concern matter as the basis for mutual understanding, shared knowledge, trust, and interpersonal relationships. Keeping in mind the rich intellectual history of the concept, the purpose of this article would be to examine whether a vibrant public sphere helps people emancipate themselves from imposed authority or a spiral of silence and participate in peripheral awareness.

Keywords: public sphere, discourse, vigilance, Fake news, fact-checking, veracity, participation

Public Sphere and Democracy

Fundamentally, democracy and increasing complexity are at the heart of Habermas's theory of the public sphere. Growing complexity has a network form at its core, and given how important networks are to the world's economy, political system, civil society, and way of life, it is necessary to revise certain key theoretical presumptions about how the public sphere should be organized. We contend that to uphold Habermas's wider democratic aim, we must reevaluate the theoretical presumptions underlying its Neo-Parsonsian systems' theoretical underpinnings systematically.

The democratic potential of social networking sites may be realized through the ever larger amount of rational important discussion that may occur there compared to the restricted capability of traditional media that are confined. It would help in the formation of public opinion which is the soul of democracy, where one is supposed to leave their particularity behind like private interest or inner feelings and typical partiality, and rise to the occasion of participation using dialogues as the main medium of participation and thus forming an open and pluralistic description of society as a whole.

Locating Through Our Networked Self

The networked web can facilitate the unfolding of discussion and deliberation across several components of the population which will be spatially dispersed. There is no doubt that social media have ushered in a new era where the authority of traditional journalism and participation is subject to unprecedented challenge, what Boyd and Ellison called a "Social Network Site": its service is technically web-based. It allows individuals to construct a semi-public or a public profile that articulates lists of interested

participants who are eager to communicate and share their ideas and beliefs to be productive within that bounded system of intellectuals.

Social media plays a dynamic role in pulling people out of the spiral of silence and paves the path that leads them into the spiral of expression with a new perspective of explaining the mechanisms of society and thus informed public opinion in any exceptional circumstances when fear of isolation and conformity are no longer factors. The idea of electronic determinism that technology has important effects on our lives has contributed to discussions of the Internet, social media, and the public sphere often tend to stress new technologies that have transformative power to reorient them to transform our lives. Yochai Benkler talks about a networked public sphere "where straightforward possibility of human into the general public sphere has effectively permitted people to become active spectator and participants with their own point of view in any conversation" It has become an enticing notion that the Internet and the remarkable rise of public, private, and hybrid types of communication networks might help build a more equitable society given that currently approximately two-thirds of the world's population can connect to each other through the Internet. Sociocultural groups encourage one another to engage with the public realm. It frequently involves advocacy for any cause.

Horizons and Dimensions of Trust

The media is being questioned like never before, we see lots of phony news sites hoping for clicks and they are convincing people that they are true. The amount of trust people place in the media to provide accurate news is essential to the health of the public and democracy as well. The assertion that democracy has the potential to find the truth is presented at a high level of abstraction. To specify what this might mean for fake news, we need to look more closely at the role of the public in a truth-based democracy, and then at the role of social media within that public.

The rise of fake news and growing public recognition of the phenomenon creates epistemic uncertainty; Citizens are finding it harder to distinguish fact from fiction, and are alarmed and concerned by the amount of misleading information circulating online. This growing uncertainty about access to facts is exploited by strategic actors in a variety of ways, including what we call fake news. This is the rhetorical and partisan attack on "real" facts or fact-based participation. These and other strategic moves contribute to public confusion and doubts about the reliability of facts and information.

In short, social media seems to systematically reinforce untruth at the expense of truth. The major concern is whether will social networking sites act as a public sphere when important discourse can emerge and influence political action. Will these platforms recreate the conditions that have the potential for ideal speech and public interests a prospect throughout?

In this research, the researcher tried to look through the specific lens of transformations fueled by digitalization, particularly the development of social networking sites (SNSs), and demonstrate how this perspective is applicable to ongoing changes, with a focus on how audiences use it for interactive communication, discourse centered on a social graph and information dissemination purposes in the state of crisis.

The Post-truth Era Debate

How ordinary life ends up revolving around media has become a part of diet. They are the imitators who present false information as if it were true by reshaping it in their own ways by using words as tools to manipulate its semantic and expressive dimension. This situation is alarming, and it should be an

educational task to know the authenticity of news by all statistical means because lies are positioned as facts today. In today's era, objectives and facts are becoming less influenced, and subjective opinions are becoming more and more important.

Virtual Community as a Substitute

The use of social media accounts as a social center helps people keep in touch. Due to the daily exchange of messages between users, social media may be considered a virtual community. Social media is at the center of the modern world. Nearly everyone has access to social media platforms that help them interact with other people. The argument that online communication can actually strengthen civil society is contested by Fernback and Thompson in their 1995 critique of the democratic potential of virtual communities: "It seems most likely that the virtual public sphere brought about by [computer-mediated communication] will serve a cathartic role, allowing the public to feel involved rather than to advance actual participation."

Future communications technology can be seen in two distinct, compelling ways. The electronic agora is a futuristic idea made possible by new technology and implemented through decentralized networks. According to Rheingold (1994), "This technology does have democratizing potential in the same way that alphabets and printing presses had democratizing potential."

Literature Review

The argument between Dewey (1927) and Lippmann (1925), who disagreed on the significance of the public sphere at the start of the 20th century, made clear the concept's contentious character. Half a century later, Jürgen Habermas in his book 'The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere (1989b:1962) defined the öffentlichkeit as "a realm of our social life in which something approaching public opinion can be formed" and into which "access is guaranteed to all citizens," Habermas created a hypothetical ideal setting where all citizens would be able to congregate and discuss topics of common interest in an "unrestricted manner" (Habermas, 1974, p. 49). Habermas has pointed out that the success of the public sphere depends on the extent of access, the degree of autonomy, the rejection of the hierarchy and the rule of law, particularly the subordination of the state, and the quality of participation—the common commitment to the ways of logic (Rutherford, 2000, pp. 18–19). As Hjarvard explained, the three functions of media are constituting 'a realm of shared experiences', 'an interface in the relations within and between institutions', and institutionalizing a political public sphere (2013, p. 37).

Using Alexander's (2006) conceptualization of the civil sphere as a conceptual guide, we can examine changes in communication media and civic groups to study the social structure of the public sphere in the context of digitalization. SNSs usually provide a digital architecture for interactive communication along three types of integrated 'affordances' (Boyd, 2011): profiles, lists of friends, and communication tools. According to Poell (2014), activists frequently use social media, which influences the early stages of alternative communication. Facebook is utilized to disrupt the status quo, and mass communication channels are managed to influence narratives that direct mass behavior, as explained by Thomas Zeitzoff (2017), who also extends his claims that the concept of the public sphere retains significant influence over conceptualizations of public communication and the deliberation processes in online and offline contexts (Bruns, 2018).

Objectives

1. This study intends to determine how these social networks help to increase civic engagement and promote individual freedom and democracy.
2. In this study, individuals' willingness to participate in arguments and their level of initiative are measured.
3. This study also aims to find out to what extent we are aware of online vigilance and affective well-being.

Methodology

A total of 30 adults, both males and females, between the ages of 20 and 32 participated in the study for its purposes. A survey method was employed on a group of social media users who were chosen at random, and each participant was pre-screened to make sure they complied with the study's conditions before enrolling. Qualitative approaches are the best for examining how individuals comprehend intricate phenomena and challenging ideas, they were used in this study. This is the best strategy to achieve our research goals of thoroughly understanding what participants mean when they utilize social media, privacy, discussion forums, and mediation to speak their minds.

According to a large body of theoretical studies (Bennett 2012; Jenkins 2006; Salvatore 2013; Shirky 2011), social media is linked to civil discourse and the public sphere. The findings add an empirical dimension to the predominantly theoretical approach.

Whenever a vibrant public sphere is created, people emancipate themselves from imposed authority. It is in the public sphere that ideas are chosen and debated, which helps inform opinions and social actions so that they really take root. On the other hand, it is to be investigated whether social media re-emerges in Habermas's ([1989]1991) public sphere. This adds to the scholarly corpus of work related to the public sphere in the digital landscape. The following are the interpretations of responses from the research questions which were made keeping in mind the objectives of the study.

Table 1: General purpose of using social networking sites

The general purpose of using social networking sites includes all those possible activities that users perform in their everyday daily life using smartphones. Participants were asked about the different aspects of social media and networking sites that they indulged themselves in. Their responses are shown in Table 1.

SL No.	Usage of social networking sites	Responses	Percentage
1	Blogging	5	17.9%
2	Interact with friends or followers	14	50%
3	Communities	5	17.9%
4	Chatting	17	60.7%
5	Source of Information	21	75%
6	Discussions	6	21.4%
7	Entertainments	22	78.6%
8	Sharing opinions	5	17.9%

The majority of the participants stated that they use social networking sites for entertainment (78.6%), interact with friends or followers (50%), and use them as a source of information. Less than 25% of the

participants use these sites for connecting with different communities (17.9%), and sharing opinions (17.9%), and only 21.4% use these platforms as a discussion forum.

Table 2: Frequency of encountering false or tailored information online

The table below demonstrates how frequently misleading or tailored information is experienced online.

SL No.	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative	Percentage
Valid	Strongly agree	13	43.33	46.4	46.4
	Agree	8	26.66	28.6	75
	Neutral	4	13.33	14.3	89.3
	Disagree	3	10	10.7	100.0
	Strongly disagree				
	Total	28	93.33	100	
Missing	system	2	6.67		
Total	30				

Table 2 demonstrates that when participants were questioned if they had come across falsely curated material online, the majority of participants (43.33%) strongly agreed with the virality of personalized content online, and (26.66%) agreed with the repercussions of erroneous information spreadability. It is both shocking and terrifying that 10% of the participants disagree with it.

Table 3: Online vigilance and affective well-being

The table below indicates how careful and alert individuals are when engaging and networking in digital landscapes.

Sl. No.	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative	Percentage
Valid	Strongly agree	11	36.6	40.7	40.7
	Agree	8	26.6	29.6	70.3
	Neutral	5	16.6	18.5	88.8
	disagree	3	11.1	11.2	100
	Strongly disagree	-	-	-	
	Total	27	90		
Missing	system	3	10		
Total	30				

When asked about their level of awareness while browsing various social networking sites, 36.6% of the participants said they were aware of the significance of being vigilant to potential harm. While 16.6% are neutral about it and 26.6% agree with it, respectively.

Table 4: Social media platforms as potential arena for discussion

Through the civil exchange of viewpoints on various topics, social networking sites are helping to make sense of a new space as an arena for discussions that enables us to understand others on an intersubjective level.

Sl. No.	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative	Percentage
Valid	Strongly agree	8	26.66	27.6	27.6
	Agree	16	53.3	55.2	82.8
	Neutral	5	16.6	17.2	100.0
	Disagree	-	-	-	
	Strongly disagree	-	-	-	
	Total	29	96.66	100	
Missing	system	1	3.34		
Total	30				

Table 4 demonstrates that the premise that social networking sites can serve as a discussion platform is accepted by the majority of respondents (26.66%) express strong agreement. The majority of respondents—53.3%—agree, while 16.6%—are neutral about it.

Table 5: Paranoia of posting opinions online

Public and media spaces provide discursive environments where people can gather, converse, and share perspectives outside of the confines of a physical space. Often, we are reluctant to voice our ideas online due to the potential for backlash.

Table 5 reveals that only 20 percent of the participants are unafraid to share their thoughts online, while 46.6% concur that they are reluctant to do so because of the potential negative consequences. 30% of respondents are neutral about participating in debates online.

Sl. No.	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative	Percentage
Valid	Strongly agree	-	-	-	
	Agree	14	46.6	48.3	48.3
	Neutral	9	30	31	79.3
	Disagree	6	20	20.7	100.0
	Strongly disagree	-	-	-	
	Total	29	96.66	100	
Missing	System	1	3.34		
Total	30				

Table 6: Information veracity through fact-checking

The media is under greater scrutiny than ever. In order to separate fact from fiction, the degree of trust that individuals place in media material needs to be fact-checked. The table below shows the percentage of people agreeing with fact-checking.

Sl. No.	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative	Percentage
Valid	Strongly agree	10	33.3	34.5	34.5
	Agree	17	56.6	58.6	93.1
	Neutral	2	6.6	6.9	100.0
	Disagree	-	-	-	

	Strongly disagree	-	-	-	
	Total	29	96.66		
Missing	system	1	3.34		
Total	30				

Table 7: Influence in changing people's minds

Through various fabrication and projection tactics, our opinions and views can be influenced. Being skeptical of anything we read or find online is crucial.

Sl. No.	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative	Percentage
Valid	Strongly agree	-	-	-	
	Agree	15	50	51.7	51.7
	Neutral	8	26.6	27.6	79.3
	Disagree	5	16.6	17.3	96.6
	Strongly disagree	-	3.3	3.4	100.0
	Total	29	96.66		
Missing	system	1	3.34		
Total	30				

We may infer from the table above that (26.6%) of respondents are neutral about being influenced that readily while (50%) of respondents believe that they are easily persuaded by online content. Twenty percent of respondents disagree with being persuaded to change their minds without first evaluating the facts.

Conclusion

We argue that social media do support a re-emergence of Habermas's concept of the public sphere our participant's report suggests that (communicative action as represented civil discourse) rarely occurs on social media, our 26(86.7%) didn't bring up civil discourse at all, and only 9(13.3%) reported successfully engaging in civil discourse on social media.

While on the question of taking a stand for your beliefs in a contentious discussion online 17(58.6%) agreed to it and 7(24.1%) were neutral about standing up for their opinions because of the possible backlash they might experience online.

The study showed that in the post-truth era, people are aware of its spreadability and ubiquity but they lack the tendency to check sources of information. It is acceptable to believe but we must exercise great caution when we are encountering any piece of information.

References

1. Boyd, D. M., & Ellison, N. B. (2007). Social Network Sites: Definition, History, and Scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *13*(1), 210–230. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00393.x
2. Bruns, A. (2023). From "the" public sphere to a network of publics: towards an empirically founded model of contemporary public communication spaces. *Communication Theory*, *33*(2-3), 70–81. https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/qtad007

3. Enjolras, B., & Steen-Johnsen, K. (2017). The Digital Transformation of the Political Public Sphere: a Sociological Perspective (K. Steen-Johnsen, F. Engelstad, H. Larsen, J. Rogstad, D. Polkowska, A. S. Dauber-Griffin, & A. Leverton, Eds.). Retrieved from JSTOR website: https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvbkk05k.8

4. Goldberg, C. A. (2007). Reflections on Jeffrey C. Alexander's the Civil Sphere. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *48*(4), 629–639. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/40220045

5. Habermas, J. (1974). The Public Sphere: An Encyclopedia Article (1964). *New German Critique*, *3*(3), 49–55. https://doi.org/10.2307/487737

6. Jenkins, H., Ford, S., & Green, J. (2013). *Spreadable Media : Creating Value and Meaning in a Networked Culture*. New York: New York University Press.

7. Jurgen Habermas. (1999). *The structural transformation of the public sphere : an enquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. Oxford: Polity.

8. Koh, J., & Kim, Y.-G. (2003). Sense of Virtual Community: A Conceptual Framework and Empirical Validation. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, *8*(2), 75–93. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/27751097

9. Kruse, L. M., Norris, D. R., & Flinchum, J. R. (2018). Social Media as a Public Sphere? Politics on Social Media. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *59*(1), 62–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/00380253.2017.1383143

10. Rasmussen, T. (2016). Chapter 5 - The idea of a networked public sphere. *The Internet Soapbox*, 65–78. https://doi.org/10.18261/9788215027180-2016-05

11. Rauchfleisch, A. (2017). The public sphere as an essentially contested concept: A co-citation analysis of the last 20 years of public sphere research. *Communication and the Public*, *2*(1), 3–18. https://doi.org/10.1177/2057047317691054

12. Stig Hjarvard. (2013). *The Mediatization of Culture and Society*. Routledge.

13. van Dijck, J., & Poell, T. (2015). Social Media and the Transformation of Public Space. *Social Media + Society*, *1*(2), 205630511562248. https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305115622482

14. W. Lance Bennett, Freelon, D., Hussain, M., & Wells, C. L. (2012). Digital Media and Youth Engagement. *SAGE Publications Ltd EBooks*, 127–140. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446201015.n11

15. Zeitzoff, T. (2017). How Social Media Is Changing Conflict. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *61*(9), 1970–1991. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002717721392