



Social Life in the Digital Era: Transformations in Relationships, Identity, and Community

^{1*}P.J. Alby., ²J. O. Jeryda Gnanajane Eljo

^{1,2}, Department of Social Work, Bharathidasan University, Kijamalai Campus, Tiruchirappalli-620023, Tamil Nadu, India

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received: 16th Feb 2026

Revised: 4th April 2026

Published Online: 1st July 2026

Keywords:

Digital Society, Social Relationships, Identity Construction, Online Communities, Mental Health, Social Inequality, India

*Corresponding Author

Email: sralbypj@gmail.com

How to cite: Alby, P.J. and Gnanajane Eljo, J.O.J. (2026) 'Social Life in the Digital Era: Transformations in Relationships, Identity, and Community', *Journal of Eurasian Social Sciences*, 1(1), pp. 12–20.

ABSTRACT

This narrative review examines how digital technologies have transformed social life across four interrelated domains: interpersonal relationships, identity construction, virtual communities, and mental well-being. Drawing on sociological and psychological frameworks, including network society theory, symbolic interactionism, and social capital perspectives, the review synthesises peer-reviewed literature published between 2007 and 2024, retrieved from databases including Scopus, Web of Science, PsycINFO, and Google Scholar. Thematic synthesis reveals that digitalisation simultaneously expands opportunities for connectivity, belonging, and self-expression while amplifying risks of social fragmentation, algorithmic bias, psychological distress, and surveillance. Particular attention is paid to South Asian and Indian contexts, where digital expansion intersects with collectivist cultural values, linguistic diversity, and structural inequalities. The review identifies persistent gaps in longitudinal research, region-specific scholarship, and culturally grounded ethical frameworks. It calls for socially responsible digital governance that foregrounds fairness, inclusion, and human well-being.



1. Introduction

The rapid expansion of digital technologies over the past two decades has profoundly reshaped the fabric of social life. Social media platforms, mobile applications, and artificial intelligence-driven systems now mediate how individuals form relationships, construct identities, participate in communities, and engage with institutions. (Castells, 2010) argued that contemporary societies are increasingly organized around digital networks rather than physical proximity, a claim that has gained broad empirical support across disciplines. The digital era has blurred traditional boundaries between public and private life, local and global communities, and offline and online identities (Boyd, 2014).

These transformations are particularly visible in domains such as interpersonal relationships, mental health, workplace organization, civic participation, and cultural production. While digital platforms facilitate unprecedented connectivity and new forms of collective action, they also intensify concerns related to social fragmentation, misinformation, surveillance, and psychological distress (van Dijck, Poell, & de Waal, 2018; Noble, 2018). Scholars have emphasized the need to examine not only technological innovation but also its social consequences, particularly for vulnerable populations including children, women, and marginalized communities (Livingstone & Helsper, 2007; Helsper, 2021).

From a social science perspective, the digital era presents a complex paradox. Digital platforms simultaneously enable social inclusion and intensify structural inequalities through algorithmic bias, digital divides, and unequal access to digital literacy (Eubanks, 2018). These contradictions are especially pronounced in non-Western and developing contexts such as India and other South and Southeast Asian societies, where digitalization intersects with collectivist cultural norms, limited infrastructure, and historical inequalities.

1.1. Research Gap and Review Questions

Despite a growing body of literature on digital society, integrative reviews that synthesize findings across multiple social domains remain limited. Existing scholarship tends to be fragmented across disciplines, making it difficult to assess the cumulative social effects of digitalization. Most published reviews draw predominantly on Western samples, limiting their applicability to non-Western settings. This narrative review addresses these gaps by synthesizing cross-disciplinary evidence, with explicit attention to South Asian and Indian contexts. Specifically, the review addresses: (1) How do digital technologies reshape interpersonal relationships? (2) How do digital platforms influence identity formation and community belonging? (3) What does current evidence indicate about mental health outcomes? (4) What ethical and cultural challenges emerge from algorithmic systems?

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Review Design

This study adopts a narrative review design, appropriate for synthesizing diverse theoretical and empirical literature on a broad, interdisciplinary topic such as digital social transformation (Baumeister & Leary, 1997). A narrative approach allows for conceptual integration and critical interpretation of patterns, contradictions, and contextual variations across the literature corpus.

2.2. Search Strategy

Literature was identified through searches of four major databases: Scopus, Web of Science, PsycINFO, and Google Scholar. Key search terms and Boolean combinations included: "digital society" OR "digitalization"; "social media" AND "relationships"; "online identity"; "virtual communities"; "digital mental health"; and "algorithmic bias" AND "social sciences". The search covered publications from 2007 to 2024, with earlier seminal works included were theoretically significant.

2.3. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Studies were included if they: (a) were published in peer-reviewed journals or scholarly monographs; (b) addressed one or more focal domains (relationships, identity, community, mental health, ethics, workplace); (c) were available in English; and (d) engaged substantively with theoretical or empirical analysis of digital technologies and social life. Opinion pieces, editorials, and purely technical studies were excluded. Approximately 45 scholarly sources were ultimately included.

2.4. Analytical Approach

Thematic synthesis was employed to organize findings into coherent conceptual categories (Thomas & Harden, 2008). Key themes were identified inductively through iterative reading, and contradictory findings were noted and discussed. Sources addressing Indian and Asian contexts were flagged for specific attention.

3. Literature Review and Thematic Synthesis

Table 1 summarizes the seven major thematic domains identified through the review, along with key authors, core findings, and contexts of application. Subsequent sub-sections provide a critical analysis of each theme.

Table 1: Thematic Synthesis of Reviewed Literature on Digital Social Life

Theme	Key Authors	Core Finding	Context
Digital Relationships	Baym (2015); Turkle (2011); Arora (2019)	Digital platforms reduce spatial barriers but may weaken emotional depth; WhatsApp groups reinforce and strain family bonds.	Global; India
Identity Construction	boyd (2014); van Dijck et al. (2018); Mitra & Gajjala (2008)	Online identity is fluid and performative; algorithms reward conformity; Indian youth negotiate hybrid global-local identities.	Global; India/Asia
Virtual Communities	Ellison et al. (2007); Sunstein (2017); Udupa (2018)	Online communities support marginalized groups but foster echo chambers; hashtag activism amplifies causes in Global South.	Global; South Asia
Mental Health	Twenge et al. (2018); Keles et al. (2020); Naslund et al. (2016)	Heavy social media use correlates with depression/anxiety; platforms also expand mental health resources.	Global
Ethics & Algorithmic Bias	Noble (2018); Eubanks (2018); Floridi et al. (2018)	Algorithmic systems embed structural biases disadvantaging marginalised groups; ethical AI frameworks needed.	Global; India
Workplace & Gig Economy	De Stefano (2016); Mazmanian et al. (2013)	Digital work enables flexibility but blurs work-life boundaries; gig economy lacks labor protections.	Global; India
Cultural Sensitivity	Patel et al. (2018); Pink et al. (2016); Hofstede (2001)	Western digital tools misalign with collectivist values; participatory design and indigenous knowledge integration are critical.	South Asia

Source: Authors' synthesis from reviewed literature (2007–2024).

3.1. Digital Transformation in Social Sciences

Traditional models of social interaction, community, and identity were largely grounded in face-to-face relationships and geographically bounded structures. Castells's (2010) network society thesis argued that social organization is increasingly structured around digital networks. This shift has expanded methodological possibilities through big-data analytics, social-media mining, and computational social science (Lazer et al., 2009).

However, social media data represent primarily digitally active populations, potentially excluding marginalized groups and reinforcing existing inequalities (Hargittai, 2010). In the Indian context, digital government platforms such as Aadhaar create extensive policy-relevant datasets yet simultaneously raise concerns about surveillance and data misuse (Ramanathan, 2019). Digital ethnography and hybrid online-offline qualitative methods have gained prominence precisely because digital environments are not separable from material realities (Pink et al., 2016).

3.2. Digital Relationships

Social networking platforms reduce spatial and temporal barriers to communication, enabling constant connectivity (Baym, 2015). Romantic relationships increasingly begin through dating applications, while family ties are sustained through video calls and messaging services. However, a critical reading reveals important tensions: Turkle (2011) argued that digitally mediated relationships may produce “alone together” dynamics, where connectivity coexists with emotional shallowness. Baym (2015), by contrast, resists technological determinism, arguing that relationship quality depends on how people contextualize technologies rather than on the technologies themselves.

In collectivist cultures such as India, digital communication intersects with traditional kinship structures. Arora (2019) documented how WhatsApp family groups simultaneously reinforce familial bonds and create new sites of conflict and misinformation circulation, a finding that contradicts simplistic narratives of digital connectivity as uniformly positive.

3.3. Identity Construction in Digital Spaces

Identity in the digital era is increasingly fluid, performative, and multi-layered. Online platforms provide affordances for experimenting with self-presentation and exploring alternative identities (Boyd, 2014; Van Dijck et al., 2018) demonstrated that platform algorithms actively shape identity choices by rewarding visibility and conformity to idealized standards, contributing to anxiety and diminished self-esteem (Vogel et al., 2014).

In Asian contexts, identity construction is additionally shaped by cultural values related to family honor, collectivism, and respect for authority. Studies of Indian youth reveal a process

of negotiating hybrid self-concepts that balance global digital identities with local cultural expectations (Mitra & Gajjala, 2008), often experienced as tension rather than seamless synthesis.

3.4. Community and Belonging

Digital platforms enable the formation of virtual communities based on shared interests and experiences, providing social support for marginalized groups, including persons with disabilities, LGBTQ+ individuals, and rural populations (Ellison, Steinfeld, & Lampe, 2007). Simultaneously, Sunstein (2017) identified the risk that digital communities, through algorithmic personalization, foster political polarization and echo chambers. Empirical evidence on echo chambers is mixed, however: while algorithmic bubbles are measurable, their magnitude and causal effect on polarization remain debated (Guess, Nyhan, & Reifler, 2018).

In India, digital communities play a significant role in political mobilization and social activism. Udupa (2018) documented how hashtag movements amplify causes related to gender justice and mental health, while simultaneously becoming sites of harassment and ideological conflict, a duality of empowerment and vulnerability that recurs across thematic domains.

3.5. Mental Health in the Digital Era

The relationship between digital technology and mental health is empirically contested. Some studies report significant positive associations between heavy social media use and depression, anxiety, and loneliness among adolescents (Twenge et al., 2018; Keles et al., 2020), while meta-analytic reviews find effect sizes that are modest and contextually variable (Odgers & Jensen, 2020). Adolescents face vulnerabilities including cyberbullying, social comparison, and sleep disruption, yet digital platforms have also expanded access to mental health resources and peer support, particularly in underserved regions (Naslund et al., 2016).

In India, mental health stigma and limited professional infrastructure make digital interventions especially significant. Tele-counselling services and mental health awareness campaigns on social media have improved visibility of psychological issues (Patel et al., 2018), though quality control, cultural adaptation, and ethical regulation of online mental health tools remain insufficiently addressed.

3.6. Ethics, Fairness, and Algorithmic Bias

The increasing reliance on algorithmic systems for social measurement and governance has introduced fundamental ethical challenges. Noble (2018) and Eubanks (2018) provided compelling evidence that algorithmic decision-making systems in welfare, policing, and recruitment reflect and amplify biases embedded in historical data. The phenomenon of algorithmic bias is particularly consequential for marginalized groups

whose experiences are underrepresented in training datasets (Floridi et al., 2018).

In developing societies, including India, ethical concerns are heightened by uneven digital literacy, weak regulatory frameworks, and rapidly expanding data collection systems. Large-scale digital identification programs raise questions about surveillance, exclusion, and security (Ramanathan, 2019). Interdisciplinary frameworks such as ethical AI and responsible innovation offer productive pathways but require sustained political will and community participation.

3.7. Artificial Intelligence in Social Domains

Artificial intelligence has become a central driver of digital transformation across education, healthcare, social welfare, and public administration (Eubanks, 2018). While AI applications promise efficiency, they simultaneously risk reducing complex human experiences to numerical indicators (Beer, 2017). In education, AI-based platforms may reinforce inequalities if they rely on narrow indicators of achievement (Williamson, 2017). In social services, predictive analytics can enable early intervention but also risk stigmatization of vulnerable families.

In India, with its 22 official languages and significant regional variation, AI systems trained predominantly on English-language Western data face substantial cultural and linguistic challenges. Without participatory localization, AI applications risk replicating exclusionary assumptions and marginalizing indigenous knowledge systems.

3.8. Culturally Sensitive and Inclusive Digital Problem-Solving

Cultural sensitivity is essential in the design and implementation of digital interventions. Technologies developed in Western contexts may misalign with the values, communication styles, and social structures of other societies (Hofstede, 2001). In collectivist societies, digital solutions that prioritize individual autonomy without accounting for family and community networks may face resistance or produce unintended consequences.

Patel et al. (2018) demonstrated that digital mental health interventions must account for stigma, family involvement, and spiritual beliefs in Indian contexts. Participatory design approaches, which involve users as co-creators rather than passive recipients of technology, offer a promising framework for culturally grounded digital development (Pink et al., 2016).

3.9. Workplace and Organizational Transformation

The digital era has transformed workplace structures, communication patterns, and professional identities. Remote work technologies, online collaboration platforms, and AI-driven management systems have altered how organizations function, changes that accelerated substantially during the COVID-19 pandemic (De Stefano, 2016). Digital platforms

enable flexibility and global connectivity, but simultaneously blur boundaries between work and personal life, contributing to burnout and work-family conflict (Mazmanian, Orlikowski, & Yates, 2013).

In India, the rapid growth of the gig economy illustrates both economic opportunities and labor vulnerabilities created by digital platforms. Digital platforms have expanded income sources for women and young people, yet they lack formal labor protections, social insurance, and mechanisms for collective bargaining, a duality that underscores the need for socially responsible organizational policies.

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework of Digital Social Life



Source: Authors' conceptualization based on reviewed literature.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Hybridization of Social Experience

A central theme across the literature is the progressive hybridization of social experience: the intertwining of online and offline realities in ways that make it analytically difficult and practically misleading to treat them as separate spheres. This hybridization produces new forms of intimacy, self-expression, and collective action, while simultaneously importing and amplifying offline inequalities into digital environments. The continuity between old and new forms of inequality challenges technological utopian narratives and demands structural analyses of digital society.

4.2. Psychological Pressures and Individual Well-being

Digital platforms create new psychological pressures related to self-presentation, social comparison, and the demands of constant digital availability. These pressures are particularly significant for adolescents and young adults, who are both heavy digital users and at critical stages of identity development. The relationship between digital engagement and mental health is moderated by factors including platform type, the quality of online interactions, and individual vulnerability, a nuance that simple correlational studies frequently obscure.

4.3. Ethical Governance as a Priority

The review identifies ethical governance as the most critically underdeveloped dimension of digital social transformation. Algorithmic bias, data privacy violations, and corporate surveillance represent challenges that existing regulatory frameworks in most countries are ill-equipped to address. Social scientists must engage actively in debates on digital governance, contributing empirical evidence and normative perspectives. In India, this engagement must be attentive to the power asymmetries between large technology corporations and local communities.

4.4. Centrality of Cultural Context

Most foundational contributions and empirical studies reviewed here were produced in North American or European contexts. Their applicability to South and Southeast Asian societies is contingent. Indian research specifically documents complex negotiations that young people, women, and rural communities undertake between global digital cultures and local social norms. Region-specific research not merely the application of Western frameworks to Asian data, is urgently needed.

4.5. Limitations of this Review

As a narrative review, it does not employ the systematic exclusion criteria of a meta-analysis and may reflect selection biases. The restriction to English-language sources excludes significant scholarship in Indian regional languages and other Asian languages, potentially underrepresenting indigenous perspectives. The rapidly evolving nature of digital technologies means some findings may be outdated. Future reviews should consider systematic or scoping review designs and expand to multilingual literature databases.

5. Conclusion

This narrative review has synthesized cross-disciplinary evidence on how the digital era has reshaped social life across six thematic domains: interpersonal relationships, identity construction, virtual communities, mental health, algorithmic ethics, and workplace organization. The central scholarly contribution is threefold: (1) the review provides a structured thematic synthesis bridging disciplinary silos across sociology, psychology, media studies, and organizational research; (2) it explicitly foregrounds South Asian and Indian contexts underrepresented in existing integrative reviews; and (3) it advances a critical, theoretically reflexive account that identifies contradictions and gaps in the evidence base rather than presenting a consensual narrative.

For policymakers and practitioners, the findings emphasize the importance of culturally sensitive, inclusive digital strategies. Programs addressing mental health, education, and employment must be designed with attention to local values, structural inequalities, and digital literacy gaps. Ethical frameworks for

AI and digital measurement systems must be grounded in principles of fairness, transparency, accountability, and community participation.

Future research should priorities longitudinal and comparative designs capable of capturing how digitalization's effects unfold over time and across diverse social contexts. Particular attention should be given to marginalized groups, including women, children, rural populations, and persons with disabilities. Multilingual and participatory research methodologies are essential for generating evidence that is contextually valid and socially accountable. Digital transformation is a complex social process whose outcomes depend on the choice's scholars, policymakers, designers, and communities make about how technologies are built, governed, and used.

Acknowledgement

The author(s) gratefully acknowledge the scholarly contributions of researchers whose theoretical insights and empirical studies provided the foundation for this review paper. Appreciation is extended to colleagues for their constructive academic feedback during the development of this manuscript.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests: The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the narrated work, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Ethical Approval: The study complies with the current laws of the country in which it was performed.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies: During the preparation of this work, the author(s) used ChatGPT and Grammarly to assist with grammar correction and language improvement. The author(s) reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

References

- Arora, P. (2019) *The next billion users: Digital life beyond the West*. Harvard University Press.
- Baumeister, R.F. & Leary, M.R. (1997) 'Writing narrative literature reviews', *Review of General Psychology*, 1(3):311–320.
- Baym, N.K. (2015) *Personal connections in the digital age*, 2nd edn. Polity Press.
- Beer, D. (2017) 'The social power of algorithms', *Information, Communication & Society*, 20(1):1–13.
- Banaji, S., Bhat, R., Agarwal, A., Passanha, N. & Pravin, M.S. (2019) *WhatsApp vigilantes: An exploration of citizen reception and circulation of WhatsApp misinformation linked to mob violence in India*. London School of Economics and Political Science.
- boyd, d. (2014) *It's complicated: The social lives of networked teens*. Yale University Press.
- Castells, M. (2010) *The rise of the network society*, 2nd edn. Wiley-Blackwell.
- De Stefano, V. (2016) 'The rise of the just-in-time workforce: On-demand work, crowdwork, and labour protection in the gig-economy', *Comparative Labor Law & Policy Journal*, 37(3):471–504.
- Ellison, N.B., Steinfield, C. & Lampe, C. (2007) 'The benefits of Facebook "friends": Social capital and college students' use of online social network sites', *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(4):1143–1168.
- Eubanks, V. (2018) *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.
- Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., et al. (2018) 'AI4People — An ethical framework for a good AI society', *Minds and Machines*, 28(4):689–707.
- George, M.J. & Odgers, C.L. (2015) 'Seven fears and the science of how mobile technologies may be influencing adolescents in the digital age', *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 10(6):832–851.
- Guess, A., Nyhan, B. & Reifler, J. (2018) *Selective exposure to misinformation: Evidence from the consumption of fake news during the 2016 U.S. presidential campaign*. European Research Council.
- Hargittai, E. (2010) 'Digital na(t)ives? Variation in internet skills and uses among members of the "net generation"', *Sociological Inquiry*, 80(1):92–113.
- Helsper, E.J. (2021) *The digital disconnect: The social causes and consequences of digital inequalities*. SAGE.
- Hofstede, G. (2001) *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organisations across nations*, 2nd edn. SAGE.
- Keles, B., McCrae, N. & Grealish, A. (2020) 'A systematic review: The influence of social media on depression, anxiety and psychological distress in adolescents', *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 25(1):79–93.
- Lazer, D., Pentland, A., Adamic, L., et al. (2009) 'Computational social science', *Science*, 323(5915):721–723.
- Livingstone, S. & Helsper, E. (2007) 'Gradations in digital inclusion: Children, young people and the digital divide', *New Media & Society*, 9(4):671–696.

- Mazmanian, M., Orlikowski, W.J. & Yates, J. (2013) 'The autonomy paradox: The implications of mobile email devices for knowledge professionals', *Organization Science*, 24(5):1337–1357.
- Mitra, A. & Gajjala, R. (2008) 'Representing political subjectivity in the age of the internet', *National Communication Association*.
- Naslund, J.A., Grande, S.W., Aschbrenner, K.A. & Elwyn, G. (2016) 'Naturally occurring peer support through social media: The experiences of individuals with severe mental illness using YouTube', *PLOS ONE*, 9(10), e110171.
- Nesi, J. (2020) 'The impact of social media on youth mental health: Challenges and opportunities', *North Carolina Medical Journal*, 81(2):116–121.
- Noble, S.U. (2018) *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. NYU Press.
- Ogders, C.L. & Jensen, M.R. (2020) 'Annual research review: Adolescent mental health in the digital age — facts, fears, and future directions', *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 61(3):336–348.
- Patel, V., Saxena, S., Lund, C., et al. (2018) 'The Lancet Commission on global mental health and sustainable development', *The Lancet*, 392(10157):1553–1598.
- Pink, S., Horst, H., Postill, J., Hjorth, L., Lewis, T. & Tacchi, J. (2016) *Digital ethnography: Principles and practice*. SAGE.
- Ramanathan, U. (2019) 'A unique identity bill', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 45(14):10–14.
- Sunstein, C.R. (2017) *#Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media*. Princeton University Press.
- Thomas, J. & Harden, A. (2008) 'Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews', *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 8(1):45.
- Turkle, S. (2011) *Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other*. Basic Books.
- Twenge, J.M., Joiner, T.E., Rogers, M.L. & Martin, G.N. (2018) 'Increases in depressive symptoms, suicide-related outcomes, and suicide rates among U.S. adolescents after 2010 and links to increased new media screen time', *Clinical Psychological Science*, 6(1):3–17.
- Udupa, S. (2018) 'Enterprise Hindutva and social media in urban India', *Contemporary South Asia*, 26(4):453–467.
- van Dijck, J., Poell, T. & de Waal, M. (2018) *The platform society: Public values in a connective world*. Oxford University Press.
- Vogel, E.A., Rose, J.P., Roberts, L.R. & Eckles, K. (2014) 'Social comparison, social media, and self-evaluation', *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, 3(4):206–222.
- Williamson, B. (2017) *Big data in education: The digital future of learning, policy and practice*. SAGE