

INNOVATION, WORK, SOCIETY**INTERNET AS AN IDEOLOGICAL STATE APPARATUS****Oleksandr Durniev**

Master's Student at the "Social Technologies" Program,
V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Ukraine
e-mail: alexdurnev22@gmail.com, orcid.org/0000-0003-0857-1011

Oksana Nekhaenko

Postgraduate Student at the Department of Political Sociology,
V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Ukraine
e-mail: O.V. Nekhaenko@karazin.ua, orcid.org/0000-0001-5201-8200

Summary

This article analyzes the role of the Internet in modern society as an ideological apparatus of the state. The emergence of modern means of communication and mass communication (the Internet, mobile phones, etc.) created the possibility of receiving, storing and transmitting information without the direct participation of various subjects (public associations, authorities, politicians, parties) that impose their perception of the world. The authors consider how the transformation of ideology takes place, how it adapts to the information society. The article proves that ideology, despite certain negative connotations and, as it seemed ten years ago, a partial loss of influence, is still not an anachronism and remains a powerful tool for influencing mass consciousness. The authors analyze the key aspects of the impact of internetization on the formation of social consciousness and values. The article contains the results of a study of the use of the Internet by political forces and powerful groups that use the Internet to spread ideological views and influence citizens. The authors address the issue of privacy policies as dictating the agenda for the perception of various kinds of minorities and inequalities, and at the same time creating conditions for limiting freedom of thought. The main theses of the article are illustrated by individual examples of Internet platforms, such as the social networks "Facebook", "Instagram", as well as the streaming platform "Twitch".

Key words: internetization, mass consciousness, ideology, ideological state apparatus, freedom of thought, political correctness, manipulation.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.23856/5920>

1. Introduction

Today, the Internet has become not just a technological achievement, but also a powerful tool that affects all spheres of social life. In recent decades, internetization has changed the way we perceive information, communicate, consume, and even the way we imagine the world around us.

The relevance of the article is determined by the active integration of the Internet into almost all aspects of social life. Humanity is steadily entering the digital era, which is revolutionizing methods of communication in general and ideological influence in particular. This digital transformation overturns the usual ideas about the spread of ideologies, creates new opportunities and challenges for their development and influence on society. Internetization today is a step in the formation of an information society, in which the exchange of ideas and the formation of ideologies take place in fundamentally new conditions and according to new mechanisms in the unique environment of virtual reality. In this article, we will determine the impact of Internetization and social networks on the development and transformation of ideology, analyze the key challenges and opportunities that it opens up for further scientific understanding of the phenomenon of ideology.

The purpose of this article is to characterize the Internet as an ideological apparatus of modern states. Let's try to find out how the Internet affects the formation of views, values and beliefs of society, as well as the way it is used by states to preserve relative social stability and legitimize the existing system.

The goal involves solving the following tasks:

- 1) analysis of the Internetization process, its consequences, as well as the impact of the Internet on mass consciousness;
- 2) formulation of the definition of ideological state apparatus;
- 3) analysis of individual cases of ideological influence that can be carried out through Internet platforms;
- 4) study of the potentially negative consequences of using the Internet as an ideological apparatus.

2. Internetization and popularization of the Internet

In order to better understand the modern direction of the development of ideologies, we need to describe and better understand the space of the Internet, as one of the main modern means of broadcasting norms and values, worldview models, etc. Let's consider how Internetization began and gained momentum – the spread of mass use of the Internet, equipping the masses with means of accessing the Internet. Internetization can be forced or voluntary. An example of violent Internetization can be considered the digitalization of bureaucratic structures, during interaction with which a person needs to use the Internet, and, accordingly, in this way, the number of users of the World Wide Web increases.

Another process that increases the spread of the Internet is the *popularization of the Internet* – the promotion of the Internet by people (both consciously and unconsciously) with the aim of making it not just known, but desirable. This process is aimed both at an individual person and an entire social group. His goal can be achieved in many ways, including manipulation.

It is important to note that Internetization and popularization of the Internet are not synonymous, as it may seem: while Internetization leads to the development of the possibility of mass use of the Internet (as a worldwide system of interconnected computer networks), popularization of the Internet leads to the fact that people learned about the Internet, and moreover, wanted it (that is, the popularization of the Internet only creates a demand for its availability).

The spread and influence of the Internet creates a false impression of the possibility of achieving maximum freedom of expression. Based on this, the Internet can be considered as a platform that is free from ideology, and each of its users is able to choose the content that he consumes. The most obvious answer is the fact that states can use and control the Internet and its individual platforms. States prohibit and block individual Internet platforms, dictate to

providers the conditions for providing Internet services to the population. However, this does not mean that there are no prerequisites for the realization of such an opportunity. There is every reason to believe that, under specific circumstances, the restriction of the Internet will take place in a fairly short period of time, as happened with the blocking of Russian sites in Ukraine and Ukrainian sites in Russia after February 24, 2022. However, we suggest focusing on less obvious examples, but on how the Internet can support ideologies or individual ideologues in the context of liberalism and a free Internet. Before proceeding to a detailed consideration, let's understand what is meant by ideological activity and ideological apparatus.

3. The Internet as an ideological apparatus of the state

Ideologies perform integrative, mobilizing and explanatory functions in a peculiar way. They unite people into a social whole and form an attitude towards certain events and phenomena. Louis Althusser noted, first of all, the materiality and objectivity of ideology, studied in detail its functional value in the context of reproduction of production relations and construction of the subject using the mechanism of interpellations (*Althusser, 2001*).

According to Louis Althusser, the ideological state apparatus is *a certain number of realities which present themselves to the immediate observer in the form of distinct and specialized institutions*" (*Althusser, 2001: 96*). The main goal of the ideological apparatus is the promotion and dissemination of panic ideology, although this may be at the same time as class struggle. Besides that, *"all Ideological State Apparatuses, whatever they are, contribute to the same result: the reproduction of the relations of production, i.e. of capitalist relations of exploitation"* (*Althusser, 2001: 104*). In this context, we can say that the Internet is one of the warehouses of the ideological apparatus of the state.

As has already been said, the Internet calls for a strong association with freedom of speech. The same idea is adopted by Manuel Castells, meaning that Internet culture defines the culture of freedom, and the freedom to express one's opinion and communicate it to many others has become one of the fundamental values of the Internet (*Castells, 2003*). On general, 59% of people in the world consider freedom of speech on the Internet in their country to be very important (*Pew Research Center, 2020*). Such an opinion could arise from the fact that the Internet, in their understanding, is its native autonomous island, a place with complete freedom of speech and should remain so. Such an opinion is dangerous because its "masks" from reflection such characteristics of the Internet as tendency and dependence on external factors. In addition, it is freedom of speech on the Internet that shows certain symbolic boundaries of space, which already show us the dependence and ideological orientation of the Internet.

The correlation of possible mechanisms of restriction of actions on the Internet with freedom of speech is increased by the fact that the concept of freedom of speech depends on social contexts. Absolute freedom of speech cannot exist in any civilized society due to socialization and structural-institutional restrictions.

What is the essence of "freeing" the word? In detaching it from all limiting things, which are morality, and legislation, and thought, and other norms, or even reality in general; it is invalid. It is impossible to have absolute (or "complete") freedom of speech, especially on the Internet, where anyone can both "cancel" and "ban", limiting not only opportunities for expression, but also general presence on certain internet platforms. One can come to the conclusion that absolute and complete freedom of speech cannot exist as E. Durkheim aptly knows, *« Liberty is the daughter of authority. For to be free is not to do as one pleases but rather to be master of oneself, to know how to act reasonably and to do one's duty »* (*Durkheim, 2018: 151*).

The myth of freedom of speech, which is widespread in the modern world and supported by various discourses, serves, on the contrary, to further limit or “fix” a person. That is why the “unrestricted” Internet, on the one hand, opens wide opportunities for the realization of freedom of speech, but, on the other hand, limits them with the help of self-censorship, which is implemented, for example, with the help of the so-called “cancellation culture”.

According to the results of a sociological survey conducted by the “Democratic Initiatives” foundation in 2018, for 86% of Ukrainians, freedom is the basis of human rights (*Ilko Kucheriv “Democratic Initiatives” foundation, 2018*). Accordingly, in the understanding of the absolute majority of Ukrainians, freedom is a connotation of the exercise of human rights. That is why the use of discourses about freedom is an effective cover and is implemented to “capture the audience”, as a result of adjusting to its values for further management.

In our context, the consideration of self-censorship is an interesting but not significant aspect; more important is the consideration of censorship, which is determined officially and comes from the state.

The author's positions are close to the constructivist point of view, we assume that to ensure social stability, it is necessary to create certain restraining mechanisms that enable “soft identification”, a certain leveling of worldviews. These mechanisms make it possible to avoid the appearance of opposition – from here, the most obvious feature appears, which determines our approach to this topic: the Internet allows you to reach almost all social groups, thereby allowing you to ensure social (and ideological) consensus, even in those cases where it seemed unattainable. Thus, the Internet certainly has the potential to construct models of social interaction at the macro level and plays a significant role in macro-ideological production. For example, consider individual services, platforms and social networks.

4. Mechanisms of functioning of individual Internet platforms as carriers of ideology

According to the results of a survey of OSCE participating states (conducted by the OSCE itself in 2011), among 66 participating states, 44 have specific legal norms and regulations prohibiting Internet piracy; in 36 there are specific legal norms and provisions prohibiting slander and insult (defamation) on the Internet; 20 have specific legal norms and provisions prohibiting the expression of views likely to incite extremism; 19 there are specific legal rules and regulations that prohibit the distribution of “harmful” content (that is considered “harmful” under the law) (*Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, 2011*).

Restrictions can also come from specific Internet platforms, which can be guided by both commercial success and act under the influence of the official policy of individual states. We can mention some cases that confirm this. The company Meta Platforms Inc.¹ (social networks “Facebook” and “Instagram”) is considered one of the most influential in the market of providing services on the Internet. In particular, Facebook is the most popular social network in the world today, and accordingly has a large number of users who can be influenced and shaped by their values, daily practices, etc. As of September 2023, Facebook is the 3rd most visited website in the world (*Top Websites Ranking, 2023*) and has 3.88 billion active users as of June 30, 2023 (*Meta Reports Second Quarter 2023 Results, 2023*).

Facebook's Community Guidelines specify the possibility of removing content that may contribute to the threat of violating people's physical safety. In addition, it is stated there that in certain cases Facebook allows the publication of content that in other situations would be

¹ Until October 28, 2021 – Facebook Inc.

considered as violating the norms of the community. For example, this happens when moderators consider the content worthy of publication or of public interest (immediately note the “blurring” of these comments and the possibility of creating double standards) (*Facebook Community Standards, n.d.*). The user agreement states that Facebook may remove content or restrict access to content that violates these terms and/or mute or disable a user's account for actions that violate these terms. The restrictions themselves are quite “blurry” there, and you can use them in different ways, for example: “*You may not use our Products to do or share anything: <...> that is unlawful, misleading, discriminatory or fraudulent (or assists someone else in using our Products in such a way)*” (*Terms of Service, 2022*).

Facebook usually blocks any messages that call for aggression, discrimination or contain offensive language and may be marked as politically incorrect. But in the pursuit of compliance with ethical principles, works of art and works of art can be “banned”. The algorithm perceived images of Renaissance sculptures as pornography (*Hughes, 2017*), did the moderators delete publications with quotes from Taras Shevchenko, because they clearly contain hate speech (*Abramovych, 2022*).

Instagram is also one of the most popular social networks in the world. As of September 2023, Instagram is the 4th most visited website in the world. Instagram's terms of use are similar to Facebook's user agreement, not only in its imprecise wording, but also in providing broad possibilities for Instagram itself: “*We can remove any content or information that you share on the Service if we believe that it violates these Terms of Use, our policies <...>, or we are permitted or required to do so by law. We can refuse to provide or stop providing all or part of the Service to you <...> immediately to protect our community or services, or if you create risk or legal exposure for us, violate these Terms of Use or our policies <...>, if you repeatedly infringe other people's intellectual property rights, or where we are permitted or required to do so by law*” (*Terms of Use, 2022*).

As an example of the fact that these rules work and are implemented, we can mention the case of blocking Donald Trump's Facebook and Instagram accounts. This incident occurred on January 7, 2021, after the US presidential election, which Donald Trump lost, and shortly after spoke at a rally of thousands in downtown Washington, again refusing to admit defeat and calling the election a fraud (*BBC, 2021*), at the same time, urging those present to go to the Capitol, where the results of the 2020 presidential election were approved. After that, the company “Meta” (then still Facebook) blocked Trump's accounts on its social networks (it is important to note that Trump was also blocked by Twitter, YouTube and many others). The blocking was explained by the fact that Trump encouraged, rather than condemned, the actions of his supporters near the Capitol building and used Meta platforms to “*incite violent insurrection against a democratically elected government*” (*Zuckerberg, 2021*).

It is difficult to say whether this case influenced the course of history or not, but it is important to take it not in the context of speculation, but as a fact. First, Internet platforms demonstrate that they can dictate who and how they will express themselves through their policies. Secondly, in this way there is a demonstration that various social networks and Internet platforms can influence the course of events in society. It is difficult to assess this influence on historical processes in full, but the fact that with the help of Internet resources the attitude of society to a specific fact is formed is undeniable. Of course, it was not only the actions of Internet corporations that influenced the acceptance of Joe Biden as president, but nevertheless, Internet corporations loudly and effectively expressed their own position on what was happening in the political and social space of the United States.

Another example is the online platform Twitch, owned by the company Twitch Interactive, which, in turn, is a subsidiary of Amazon. Twitch specializes in live broadcasts and gives its users not only the ability to watch live broadcasts, but also to host them. As of September 2023, Twitch is the 34th most visited website in the world and is the most popular online streaming platform (*Top Websites Ranking, 2023*). According to Twitch's own research, its global reach in 2023 is: average daily attendance – 35 million visitors; unique streamers who go on the air every month – 7 million. Also interesting is that nearly 70% of Twitch viewers are between the ages of 18 and 34 (*Over 2,500,000 are watching Twitch right now*).

An important component of streaming on Twitch is the communication between the streamer (the one who conducts the stream) and the viewers. Each streamer can be seen to have a position of power: they have the right to speak, while viewers can only write in chat or using another tool (and that the streamer can block them or limit them by putting limits on the use of certain words). During the streaming process, only the streamer has the right to speak, while his viewers become the audience. Statements of streamers can form views, values, and with systematic viewing of the same streamers – even worldview models in the audience. As mentioned, the users of this platform are mainly teenagers and young people, so the impact on the audience is more significant than, for example, on people of a more mature age. In turn, the activities and statements of the streamer are controlled by the Twitch Internet platform. So, for example, according to Twitch's Community Rules, it is forbidden to “spread harmful false information on or outside of Twitch.» It is important to note that even actions outside of the Twitch online platform can result in a ban on the Twitch online platform: “*In order to reduce harm to our community and the public without undermining our streamers' open dialogue with their communities, we prohibit harmful misinformation superspreaders who persistently share misinformation on or off of Twitch*” (*Community Guidelines*). That is, the platform also dictates what a person's behavior should be outside the Internet space.

A special role in the Twitch rules is played by the ban on inciting hatred and oppression, which directly affect the words of streamers. All this has led to the fact that streamers can lose their channels on the platform for one careless or thoughtless action or word. Yes, there were cases when a streamer was blocked for: putting black makeup on the face of a white character in the game (*Bankhurst, 2019*; uttering a “forbidden word” if the streamer has not condemned it; the statement that there are only two genders, etc (*Last Sports, 2022*). These rules, which exist on the Internet platform and limit streamers, affect their viewers, are institutionalized and routinized. The word “condemn” that should follow banned words is a prime example of this – in this way, Twitch proclaims political correctness as one of the platform's guiding principles. Twitch explains this policy as an active counteraction to aggression and incitement to hatred, and declares its goal to protect users from the most vulnerable social groups. The streaming service included women, people of color, representatives of LGBTQIA+ and indigenous peoples of different countries among them. The new rules are divided into three categories: harassment, hateful conduct and sexual harassment. In each section, Twitch has explained what is meant by certain bans. It is telling that there are currently discussions about increasing the number of “those who can be potentially oppressed” and the categories of discrimination. Thus, we see how political correctness actually acts as a tool capable of multiplying inequalities: each individual group can claim the need for special treatment, including at the level of expression, and the streaming platform must respond to such a request in order to stay on track (*Nekhaienko, 2018*).

Yes, we see how, with the help of normalization of the Internet environment, the opportunity to justify (legitimize) this or that social or political practice is realized. Political correctness here goes beyond the scope of politics, as it is primarily aimed at justifying (or condemning)

this or that social action, it works, if not as an ideology, then as a separate ideological construct that is broadcast using the Internet.

The normative function of ideology is implemented on the basis of Twitch, which sets a system of norms of social behavior for a social subject. In this way, the value parameters and evaluation criteria of certain social phenomena, events, processes are outlined, contributing to the suppression of dissent and ensuring ideological and value consensus, which is necessary for the harmonious functioning of the social system.

Within the framework of the given illustrations, we can see how social networks and other internet platforms can limit freedom of speech and dictate the agenda in society; it was important to demonstrate their potential. Often, those restrictions for users that come from the side of the Internet platforms themselves are aimed at facilitating the increase of capital (ultimately – making a profit) of the founders, shareholders or owners of the Internet platforms. Some restrictions help to attract advertisers (for advertisers, the content produced on the Internet platform is important, since it is this content that is the basis of their advertising). Other restrictions promote the spread of certain values or practices, which can also contribute to profit (as, for example, in the Meta scandal).

That is, social networks choose such restrictive strategies in order to attract the largest number of supporters and to be able to monetize the content produced on their platform.

5. Conclusions

Connecting to the Internet automatically immerses a person in a space that is moderated and functions according to certain rules and norms that limit human freedom. “Rules of using the Internet” can be different – depending on the Internet platform and its socio-political direction. But in all cases, there is a common feature – the rules are dictated by representatives of the ruling class, who in their actions are guided by commercial motives. The Internet acts as a platform where soft coercion takes place, and not by repressive methods, but mostly by ideological ones, while various means can be used, for example, linguistic (in the form of political correctness and so-called “hate speech”), visual (Internet memes, video – photo – content) etc.

Thus, it is they who have the opportunity to control and model people's practices, as well as influence their thoughts and ideas (“*The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class*” (Marx, Engels, 1955: 30)), supporting their power or certain trends, using in their various manipulations, the possibilities of which are represented by the Internet.

If we talk about the functioning of the Internet “in an ideological way”, then we can see a variety of discourses and ideologies, among which one dominant one always stands out. Online platforms provide opportunities for expression, but at the same time they control the selection of “those who express themselves”, for example, ignoring users with fewer followers and more tightly controlling users with a large number of followers. In addition, opinions may be stigmatized, labeled (primarily in discourses and rules) as “conspiracy theories,» “harmful,» or “disinformation.«

Internet platforms not only give users the opportunity to use them, but also teach them how to do it correctly. Starting from banal orientation in space (that is, forming the skills of use), which produces certain habits or stigmas in a person, and ending with the rules that the user must follow (that is, the system of values and worldview that the creators of these rules relied on, and which should be in a person in order for him to use this space). Moreover, Internet platforms do this in ways that ensure subordination to the dominant ideology.

Thus, we have reason to believe that the Internet is an ideological apparatus of the state, since, as Louis Althusser wrote, the ideological apparatus of the state can be not only the goal, but also the place of class struggle, and often even violent struggle. The ruling political class (or class union) does not so easily establish its laws in the ideological state apparatuses as it does in the (repressive) state apparatus (*Althusser, 2001*).

Social networks have become an integral part of modern society, and the Internet has become accessible to people (that's right, not the other way around) 24/7. Their influence on the formation of the mass consciousness of society is difficult to overestimate. The Internet has created an unprecedented opportunity for instant information dissemination. With platforms like Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube, etc., everyone can easily share news, facts, opinions, and more. This allows information to spread quickly and easily become available to millions of users. However, this becomes a prerequisite for the problem of filtering and verifying the authenticity of information that comes to us through social networks. The Internet can filter information according to individual user preferences. This can create echo chambers where people perceive and exchange information only within a certain worldview paradigm. Many social networks use algorithms to personalize content. This means that people receive information directly; and this, in turn, leads to the formation of “filter bubbles” in which people separate themselves from their own points of view and thoughts. Such features of the Internet make it possible to assert that society is becoming less protected from suggestion, and this is actively used, including for the formation and support of everyday ideologies.

References

1. Abramovych, O. (2022, October 30). *Facebook masovo blokuie odesyiv za virshi Shevchenka cherez slovo “moskal”*. Retrieved from *bessarabiainform.com*: <https://bessarabiainform.com/2022/10/facebook-masovo-blokue-odesitiv-za-virshi-shevchenka-cherez-slovo-moskal/>.
2. Althusser, L. (2001). *Ideology and Ideological State*. In L. Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* (pp. 85-126). New York: NYU Press.
3. Bankhurst, A. (2019, April 16). *Twitch Temporarily Bans White Streamer After Apex Legends Cosplay*. Retrieved from *ign.com*: <https://www.ign.com/articles/2019/04/15/twitch-temporarily-bans-white-streamer-after-apex-legends-cosplay>.
4. BBC. (2021, January 9). *Twitter 'permanently suspends' Trump's account*. Retrieved from *bbc.com*: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-55597840>.
5. Castells, M. (2003). *The Internet Galaxy Reflections on the Internet, Business, and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6. *Community Guidelines*. (n.d.). Retrieved from *twitch.tv*: https://safety.twitch.tv/s/article/Community-Guidelines?language=en_US#10CivilityandRespect.
7. Durkheim, E. (2018). *Education and Sociology (1922)*. In A. L. Hurst, *Classical Sociological Theory and Foundations of American Sociology* (pp. 147-153). Corvallis: Oregon State University. Retrieved from *Open Educational Resources*.
8. *Facebook Community Standards*. (n.d.). Retrieved from *transparency.fb.com*: <https://transparency.fb.com/en-gb/policies/community-standards/>.
9. Hughes, P. (2017, January 3). *Facebook blocked a photo of an Italian renaissance statue because it was 'sexually explicit'*. Retrieved from *businessinsider.com*: <https://www.businessinsider.com/facebook-blocks-photo-of-a-renaissance-statue-for-being-sexually-explicit-2017-1>.

10. Ilko Kucheriv "Democratic Initiatives" foundation. (2018, November 13). *Human Rights Observance in Ukraine: The Situation Analysis*. Retrieved from <https://www.undp.org/>: <https://www.undp.org/ukraine/publications/human-rights-observance-ukraine-situation-analysis>.
11. Karl, M., & Friedrich, E. (1955). *The Communist Manifesto*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.
12. Last Sports. (2022, June 7). *Why they can get banned on Twitch, forbidden words on Twitch, full list*. Retrieved from lostsports.com: <https://lostsports.com/why-they-can-get-banned-on-twitch-forbidden-words-on-twitch-full-list/>.
13. Mark Zuckerberg [@zuck] (2021, January 7). *The shocking events of the last 24 hours clearly demonstrate that President Donald Trump intends to use his remaining time in office to undermine the peaceful and lawful transition of power to his elected successor, Joe Biden*. Retrieved from [facebook.com](https://www.facebook.com/zuck/posts/10112681480907401?ref=embed_post): https://www.facebook.com/zuck/posts/10112681480907401?ref=embed_post.
14. Meta Reports Second Quarter 2023 Results. (2023, July 26). Retrieved from <https://investor.fb.com/>: <https://investor.fb.com/investor-news/press-release-details/2023/Meta-Reports-Second-Quarter-2023-Results/default.aspx>.
15. Nekhaienko O. V. (2018) *Sociological Comparison of the Phenomena of Political Correctness and Ideology. Science and Education a New Dimension. Humanities and Social Sciences, VI (29), I.:178, 2018 Sept. Budapest, p. 86-88.*
16. Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. (2011, December 15). *Freedom of Expression on the Internet*. Retrieved from [osce.org](https://www.osce.org/): <https://www.osce.org/fom/80723>.
17. *Over 2,500,000 are watching Twitch right now. (n.d.)*. Retrieved from twitchadvertising.tv: <https://twitchadvertising.tv/audience/>.
18. Pew Research Center. (2020, February 27). *Democratic Rights Popular Globally but Commitment to Them Not Always Strong*. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/>: <https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2020/02/27/attitudes-toward-democratic-rights-and-institutions/>.
19. *Terms of Service*. (2022, July 26). Retrieved from [facebook.com](https://www.facebook.com/legal/terms): <https://www.facebook.com/legal/terms>.
20. *Terms of Use*. (2022, July 26). Retrieved from help.instagram.com: https://help.instagram.com/581066165581870/?helpref=uf_share.
21. *Top Websites Ranking*. (2023, September). Retrieved from [similarweb.com](https://www.similarweb.com/top-websites/): <https://www.similarweb.com/top-websites/>.