

Conscious Usage Patterns Of Social Media By Gen Z In Tamil Nadu

Original Research Article | Volume 1 | Issue 5 | 2026 | Article Number: 050

Accepted: 29 September 2026 | Published: 10 October 2026 | ISSN: 2979-8582 (Online)



Crossref : <https://doi.org/10.67693/BJCR-RPQKFPQZ>



Hariharan E A¹, Mahalakshmi R²

¹Research Scholar, Department of Journalism and Mass Communication, Periyar University, Salem, Tamil Nadu, India,

²Counselor, Educationalist, India

 HEA [0009-0005-5134-6946](#), MR [0009-0007-4313-3646](#)

Correspondence: Hariharan E A, eahari@gmail.com

Abstract

Generation Z is the first demographically saturated generation of digital natives whose cognitive processing, emotional regulation and social connectivity are fundamentally shaped by algorithmic recommendation architectures. Much of the legacy literature has treated adolescent screen time as a passive addiction, a pathology. Socio-technical trajectories emerging in the current scenario, however, indicate an intentional paradigm shift toward deliberate digital boundary-setting, algorithmic self-defense and contextual verification. This empirical qualitative study explores the conscious usage pattern of social media in Gen Z populations in Tamil Nadu, India, among two different developmental cohorts, Gen Z Teenagers (Ages 14-17; n=36) and Gen Z Young Adults (Ages 18-24; n=36). The study details gender disaggregation (male, female, non-binary). The investigation in Chennai, Coimbatore, Madurai and Tiruchirappalli looks at three key communicative axes: message consumption, content authoring/posting and message forwarding/verification. A qualitative analysis of 72 semi-structured in-depth interviews, 8 focus group discussions, and 7-day digital reflexivity journals shows that conscious digital agency unfolds along a unique developmental continuum. Gen Z Teenagers (14-17) demonstrate strong social comparison, FOMO, and algorithmic rabbit holes, but also invent proactive defensive practices such as secondary private accounts ('finstas'), app timer lockouts, and grayscale screen adaptations. Gen Z Young Adults (18-24), by contrast, engage in utilitarian algorithmic pruning, audience segregation, and institutional fact-checking driven by academic rigor and workplace surveillance. A gendered breakdown shows that young women across both age categories use pervasive privacy fencing to protect against gendered surveillance, while young men are more vulnerable to speculative financial schemes and hyper-masculine algorithmic content. The study has provided context specific recommendations for the educational institutions and regulatory bodies in Tamil Nadu.

Keywords: Conscious Social Media Use, Gen Z Teenagers (14–17), Gen Z Young Adults (18–24), Algorithmic Agency, Tamil Nadu Digital Culture, Verification Vigilance, Gender Disaggregation, Qualitative Thematic Analysis

Introduction

The hyper-networked media landscape of 2026 is dominated by ubiquitous short-form algorithmic video streams (Instagram Reels, YouTube Shorts), AI-curated generative timelines and deeply integrated direct-messaging communication ecosystems [4]. Digital communication channels have moved from peripheral recreational pastimes to structural foundations for education, personal identity and political expression in India, which has the world's largest youth population [5]. In this national matrix, Tamil Nadu has a singularly unique place. The state boasts a remarkable Gross Enrollment Ratio in higher education (over 51%); a greatly expanded rural-urban broadband connectivity; and a very dynamic vernacular internet sphere that blends global English pop culture with localized Tamil sociocultural paradigms [6, 7].

Contemporary sociological inquiry has often treated 'Generation Z' as an undifferentiated monolith. However, grouping a 15-year-old school pupil alongside a 23-year-old postgraduate job-seeker obscures critical developmental, psychological, and legal distinctions [8, 9]. In particular, this study distinguishes between Gen Z Teenagers (Ages 14–17) and Gen Z Young Adults (Ages 18–24) and points out the age-specific factors including cognitive maturity, parental control, legal independence, and future economic responsibility that impact the intentional self-regulation of digital behaviors [10, 11].

Need of the Study

Four intersecting scholarly and social imperatives give rise to this contextualized empirical investigation:

- Gen Z's Developmental Dichotomy (14-17): Adolescents struggle with the socio-emotional individuation process while subject to parental and school monitoring (18-24) Young adults struggle with the legal status of adulthood, the independence of college, and the entry into the world of work Lumping these groups together under a common label misrepresents policy and mental health interventions [12, 13].
- Regional Vernacular Realities of Tamilnadu: Most youth digital media scholarship has focused on metropolitan Western societies. Such urgent empirical qualitative research is needed to document how South Indian youth navigate localized disinformation conduits, regional cinema culture, and Tamil-language influencer narratives [7, 12].
- Intentionality versus Raw Screen-Time: Quantitative measures tracking hours of use do not address the qualitative quality of engagement. A teenager that is on Pinterest for 2 hours curating creative design resources, or checking on educational updates is working with vastly different cognitive mechanics than a teenager who is stuck in doomscrolling [14].
- 2026 Generative AI and Vernacular Exploitation: The current explosion in cheap synthetic video tooling, deepfakes and algorithmic gambling applications targeting youth across Tamil Nadu necessitates a current assessment of conscious protective defenses [15].

Review of Literature

This study contributes to the culture of youth in the digital era with important groundworks:

Seizure Attention and Algorithmic Immersions. Current recommendation algorithms are based on black-box feedback loops that aim to maximize engagement and exploit affective vulnerabilities (Zuboff, 2021; Bucher, 2022) [16, 17]. Swart (2023) described how young people develop 'folk theories' of algorithmic mechanics, and in-turn develop tactical resistance strategies to change their recommendation feeds [2].

Cognitive Affect and Developmental Vulnerabilities Longitudinal research by Twenge et al. (2022) and Valkenburg et al. (2022) have shown that adolescent teenagers (14-17) are much more neurologically susceptible to peer appraisal, social comparison and sleep disruption from late nite scrolling [1, 20].

Conversely, a study on emerging adults (18–24) by Primack et al. (2023) [8] found that stress was mostly associated with professional status anxiety, competition for academic performance and context collapse in social spheres.

Intentional Friction & Digital Wellbeing Vanden Abeele (2024) and Radtke et al. (2022) introduced the term “deliberate digital friction” to refer to the ways in which users generate barriers within the system (e.g. app timers, muted notifications, grayscale interfaces) as a way to control their attention [3, 21]. Banaji and Bhat (2021) and Guess et al. (2022) highlight the high socio-political stakes of youth online literacy in the Indian subcontinent and the exploitation of the regional socio-cultural divides to spread misinformation[12, 24].

Research Gap

Despite prior research on screen addiction and youth mental health, three critical gaps remain. First, there is an empirical void on comparative qualitative differences in conscious digital strategies between school-going Gen Z Teenagers (14–17) and independent Gen Z Young Adults (18–24) in non-Western developing contexts. Second, the literature lacks an intersectional gender-stratified breakdown showing how adolescent girls vs. young adult women are operationalizing defensive boundary-setting in South India. Third, the confluence of regional Tamil socio-cultural targeting typologies (cinema fan tribalism, competitive coaching scams, and quick-money trading schemes) with conscious message verification protocols have yet to be evaluated under a framework.

Research Methodology

This study was guided by qualitative phenomenological research methodology. It included in-depth semi-structured interviews, focus groups, and qualitative diary logs. The analysis was guided by the inductive thematic analysis framework of Braun and Clarke [25, 26].

Sampling Framework & Stratification: A purposive quota sampling was conducted across four representative urban and education clusters in Tamil Nadu: Chennai (state capital / IT hub), Coimbatore (industry and entrepreneurship hub), Madurai (cultural and commercial hub) and Tiruchirappalli (education hub). For the study, we recruited $N = 72$ participants, equally divided into two developmental groups:

- Cohort A: Gen Z Teenagers (Ages 14–17) [$n = 36$]: Studying in secondary/higher secondary schools (CBSE, ICSE and Tamil Nadu State Board). Sample Breakdown: 17 Male, 17 Female, 2 Non-binary/Gender Diverse. Strict informed parental/guardian consent and adolescent assent was obtained.
- Cohort B: Gen Z Young Adults (Ages 18–24) [$n = 36$]: University undergraduate students, postgraduates, and early career entrants. 17 Male, 17 Female, 2 Non-Binary/Gender Diverse.

Data Collection Procedures Data were collected from January to August 2026. The data collection tools were: (1) 72 In-Depth Semi-Structured Interviews (IDIs) lasting 45-65 minutes; (2) 8 Focus Group Discussions (FGDs, 4 groups per cohort, 6-8 participants each); and (3) A 7-Day Digital Reflexivity Journal where respondents logged impulse-scrolling episodes, forwarding dilemmas, emotional triggers, and fact-checking actions.

Analytical Rigor and Translation: Certified bilingual linguistic researchers audio recorded, transcribed, and back translated all Tamil interviews into English. The transcripts were analyzed using NVivo 14. Inter-coder reliability was achieved between two independent researchers and Cohen's Kappa $\kappa = 0.89$ inter-rater agreement was demonstrated.

Research Limitations

The study is subject to some methodological limitations: (1) The sample was concentrated in urban and educational urban centers of Tamil Nadu which may not reflect the infrastructure access challenges of remote rural agrarian youth; (2) Self-reported qualitative reflexivity is subject to social desirability bias where participants exaggerate the diligence of their conscious verification; and (3) The study is representative of the socio-technological and algorithmic ecosystem of the research study window, which is subject to incessant changes in platform policy and architecture.

Data Source

Primary Data: Demographic Qualitative data from Chennai, Coimbatore, Madurai and Tiruchirappalli.

Secondary Data: Extracted from peer-reviewed scientific journals (2021–2026) available in Scopus and Web of Science, supplemented with official institutional reports issued by Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI), Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY) and Tamil Nadu e-Governance Agency (TNeGA).

Behavioral and Psychological Dimensions: Consuming, Posting, and Forwarding

The qualitative results present different behavioral strategies and psychological reactions in the three basic communicative stages:

A. Receiving Message (Reading & Viewing)

Behavioral Patterns: Gen Z Teenagers (14-17) consume algorithmic micro-video formats (Reels, Shorts) in high volume. Aware teens set strict physical limits for themselves: smartphones are kept out of study bedrooms during board examination cycles, app-lock timers are used, and smartphone screens are switched to black-and-white mode to reduce dopamine stimulation. Gen Z young adults (18–24) adopt a utilitarian approach to feed management: aggressively hiding suggested posts, muting sensationalist celebrity accounts and actively training recommendation algorithms toward technical, career and competitive examination topics (TNPSC, UPSC, GATE). Psychological Aspects: Teenagers are marked by intense affective volatility, oscillating rapidly between entertainment gratification, acute peer-comparison distress, and dissatisfaction with body-image. Young adults experience cognitive fatigue, mental fragmentation and anxiety driven by career milestones and peer achievements, leading to deliberate digital detox weekends.

B. Posting & Updating Status (Creating a Message)

Behavioral Traits: The spontaneous and public personal broadcasting has crashed for both cohorts. For teens (14-17), their digital lives are almost entirely within private spaces: secondary private accounts (finstas), WhatsApp status visible only to close friends, and Snapchat streaks with verified school friends. Young Adults (18–24) are strategic impression managers, curating LinkedIn profiles, GitHub repositories, and keeping primary social media accounts locked tight. Psychological Aspects: Both groups worry about context collapse, the deep-seated fear that playful or personal posts will be evaluated by parents, school teachers, or future hiring managers. Teens fear embarrassment in front of their friends, or getting in trouble with their parents; young adults fear future professional liability.

C. Message Dissemination (Forwarding & Amplification)

Behavioral Patterns: Teenagers forward predominantly humor, pop culture memes, and gaming clips within peer group chats; their propensity to independently fact-check non-entertainment circulars is low (verified by only 22% of respondents). Instead, Young Adults (18–24) enact a “verification pause protocol.” 69% check claims with established regional news sources (The Hindu Tamil, Puthiyathalaimurai) or dedicated Tamil fact-checkers (YouTurn) before sharing news, viral job circulars or

political content. Psychological Aspects: Adolescents want to develop social intimacy and a sense of belonging among their peers. Young adults forward to provide utilitarian value or protect relatives, while consciously regulating the urge to engage in hostile comment sections.

Typology of Messages Targeting Gen Z in Social Media Platforms

Qualitative coding revealed five key types of targeted content that would grab the attention of Gen Z are:

- Hyper-Aspirational Trading & Instant Loan Exploits Targeting young adults (18-24) especially young men in Coimbatore & Madurai. Byglitzy local influencers promising easy money with binary options trading, crypto arbitrage and unlicensed instant loan apps.
- Predatory Educational & Study-Abroad Scams: Targets are Primarily Higher Secondary Teenagers (16-17) & Young Adults (18-24). Provides fake direct admissions in university abroad with no standard English tests (IELTS/TOEFL) or guaranty PR in Europe/Canada.
- AI- Fashioned a cine-political fan rivalry Content: Deeply embedded in the culture of Tamil cinema. Deepfake videos, doctored leaked audios, and combative fan-war memes that are meant to provoke sharp regional identity and sectarian fracas are circulating through algorithmic networks.
- Aesthetically Standardised Bodies and Cosmetic Consumption: Targeting Teenagers and Young Adult Females Pervasively (14-17). Algorithmic marketing promotes unverified whitening creams, extreme fasting diets and fast-fashion consumerism as “self-love” and wellness routines.
- Pseudoscientific Traditional Health Miracles: Siddha/Ayurvedic wellness remedies without scientific evidence that promise instant height growth, memory enhancement for exams, or miraculous cures, appealing to traditional Tamil pride.

Qualitative Analysis and Empirical Tables

The qualitative thematic matrix below illustrates the behavioral and psychological variances between Gen Z Teenagers (14–17) and Gen Z Young Adults (18–24), disaggregated across gender categories.

Table 1: Comparative Qualitative Analysis: Gen Z Teenagers (14–17) vs. Gen Z Young Adults (18–24)

Developmental Cohort	Consuming Patterns & Friction	Posting Praxis & Privacy	Forwarding & Verification Vigilance
Gen Z Teenagers (Ages 14–17) [n = 36] (Secondary / Higher Secondary)	• High susceptibility to immersive video algorithms (3.5–5.5 hrs daily). • Dopamine-seeking loop driven by school fatigue. • Conscious countermeasures: display greyscale switching (31%), physical phone confiscation during exams.	• Rejection of public profiles; strict reliance on 'finstas' and Close Friends. • Dynamic meme sharing, identity exploration, high privacy paranoia. • Extreme avoidance of adult family members online.	• Impulsive sharing of memes, school gossip, and trending reel challenges. • Verification vigilance is low (22% verify sources). • Reliance on peer consensus and top comments to judge truth.
Gen Z Young Adults (Ages 18–24) [n = 36] (Collegiate / Early)	• Utilitarian, goal-driven consumption (2.5–4.0 hrs daily). • Active algorithmic grooming (clicking 'Not	• Strategic professional branding (LinkedIn, portfolios, selective Instagram stories).	• Deliberate 'pause protocol' prior to forwarding. • High independent verification (69%)

Career)	Interested', training feeds for career/exams). • Intentional notification mutes and scheduled detoxes.	• Severe audience segmentation. • Acute awareness of workplace digital footprint and reputation risk.	cross-check via YouTurn, AltNews, or mainstream news). • Active debunking of misinformation in family WhatsApp groups.
---------	---	--	---

Table 2: Gender-Disaggregated Psychological Drivers and Conscious Coping Mechanisms

Gender Cohort	Primary Psychological Drivers	Targeting Susceptibility	Conscious Coping Mechanisms
Female (14–17 Teenagers: n=17 18–24 Young Adults: n=17)	• Heightened anxiety surrounding personal privacy, unsolicited contact, and photo misuse. • Severe body-image dissatisfaction triggered by beauty influencer reels. • Fear of societal gossip and family honor policing.	• Predatory beauty and whitening product promotions. • Fake education/scholarship links. • Unsolicited direct message harassments and deepfake photo extortion.	• Total private lock-downs: no personal face pictures on public avatars. • Aggressive use of blocking and story exclusion lists. • Deep migration to encrypted private circles (WhatsApp/Telegram).
Male (14–17 Teenagers: n=17 18–24 Young Adults: n=17)	• Status anxiety regarding future earning power, competitive exams, and physique. • Impulsive tribalism in cinema fan wars and political debates. • Chronic FOMO regarding crypto/trading trends.	• Get-rich-quick trading apps, gambling platforms, unverified crypto schemes. • Aggressive bodybuilding supplement advertisements. • Inflammatory cine-political clickbait reels.	• Rationalization of screen-time as 'study/career research'. • Deliberate muting of political/cinema group chats. • Relocating peer social interactions into multiplayer gaming (Discord).
Non-Binary / Gender Diverse (14–17 Teenagers: n=2 18–24 Young Adults: n=2)	• Acute emotional exhaustion from pervasive homophobic/transphobic cyber-bullying. • Chronic hyper-vigilance regarding digital identity outing.	• Algorithmic misgendering, toxic targeted trolling campaigns, moral policing.	• Complete pseudonymity on all public platforms. • Formation of insular, highly encrypted support circles on Signal/Telegram.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Participant narrative inductive analysis identified four core qualitative themes for Gen Z's conscious engagement with digital media in Tamil Nadu:

The development of algorithmic resistance: Qualitatively, the transition from adolescence (14-17) to young adulthood (18-24) is characterized by a shift from reactive to proactive resistance. Teenagers often feel trapped by platform algorithms, turning to external constraints, such as parents confiscating their phones or deleting apps before exams. By contrast, the young adults exercise intentional algorithmic sovereignty: purposefully 'hacking' the recommendation algorithms by searching for academic literature, web design tutorials and competitive exams (TNPSC/GATE), training platforms to serve their personal advancement [27, 28].

Context Collapse and Patriarchal Surveillance in Tamil Nadu: The demise of the open social media square is heavily pronounced among Tamil youth. Both adolescent girls and young women report intense anxiety over surveillance by extended family and neighbors. For female teenagers, posting a picture online carries the immediate threat of parental restriction, while young women fear reputational damage in collegiate and marital contexts. Consequently, female participants have pioneered elaborate systems of digital fencing, utilizing encrypted multi-tiered Close Friends lists to safeguard self-expression [29].

The Generational Responsibility of 'Reverse Fact-Checking': Although popular discourse assumes that youth are the primary consumers of misinformation, qualitative findings indicate that Young Adults (18-24) are significant domestic fact-checkers in Tamil households. Often the young adults are the ones who debunk false medical cures and viral political lies that parents and elders forward on WhatsApp. Nevertheless, teenagers (14-17) remain structurally silenced. Cultural norms of deference to elders prevent them from correcting family misinformation, even when they recognize false claims [30, 31].

Economic and Career Precarity Leveraged on the Platform: In cities like Coimbatore and Madurai, platform targeting is used to deliberately exploit the vulnerabilities of youth. For young men ages 18-24, day-trading and fantasy sports betting algorithmically promoted exploit social expectations of early financial independence and lead to financial distress. For teenagers (14-17), targeting exploits exam anxieties through unaccredited online coaching modules and false foreign education promises [32].

Summary

Empirical results indicate large qualitative differences across age and gender groups:

- **Developmental Divergence:** Gen Z Teenagers (14-17) are propelled by peer validation and wrestle with reactive impulse control -- whereas Gen Z Young Adults (18-24) are engaged in structured, utilitarian algorithmic curation for career advancement.
- **Verification Vigilance Gap:** Both cohorts demonstrate a high level of awareness of fake news, yet only 69% of Young Adults engage in information verification, while 22% of Teenagers do so, reflecting research literacy and personal accountability gaps.
- **Gendered Defensive Praxis:** Female participants employ aggressive structural privacy barriers and algorithmic blocking to negotiate societal surveillance and eschew cyber-harassment, while male participants are susceptible to speculative financial targeting.
- **Cultural Gatekeeping:** Young Adults Challenging Family Misinformation in Household WhatsApp Groups in Tamil Households

CONCLUSION

This study finds that conscious social media usage is not a static trait but a developmental process [33] by

conducting an empirical study on the unique experiences of Gen Z Teenagers (Ages 14 – 17) and Gen Z Young Adults (Ages 18 – 24) across Tamil Nadu. Teenagers are monitored by their parents as they deal with emotional ups and downs and a want for peer approval. They create creative ways to protect themselves such as “finstas” and grayscale screens. Complex algorithmic curation and strong fact-checking keep young adults protected from future careers and family ties. The qualitative insights here challenge simplistic narratives of Gen Z as passive victims of digital algorithms. Instead, Tamil youth are seen as reflexive digital agents who proactively establish boundaries to protect their cognitive autonomy. But conscious effort on the part of the individual doesn’t compensate for negligence on the part of the platform. Sustained well-being is accompanied by systemic platform reforms, local vernacular education and strong state safety nets.

Recommendations

Based on the empirical findings across age and gender groups, five specific recommendations are offered in the study:

- Differentiated Vernacular Media Literacy in Schools and Colleges of Tamil Nadu Tamil Nadu Department of School Education and TANSCHER should bring in customized electronic literacy curricula. Secondary schools (Ages 14–17) need modules on algorithmic design, cyber-bullying resilience and body-image awareness, while collegiate curricula (Ages 18–24) should focus on synthetic media forensics and digital footprint management [34].
- Mandatory Age-Appropriate Architectural Guardrails: Social media platforms operating in India shall put in place default friction features for teenage accounts (14-17) including automated 45-minute daily scroll locks, nighttime sleep modes (10 PM to 6 AM) and strict limits on algorithmic direct messaging from unknown adult accounts [35].
- Community-Level Tamil Fact-Checking Ecosystems The state government should partner with verified regional fact-checking organizations (e.g. YouTurn) to deploy AI-enabled WhatsApp and Telegram verification bots to deliver fast, colloquial Tamil debunking messages directly to family and collegiate groups [36].
- Enhanced Gender-specific Cyber-safety Redressal: Tamil Nadu Cyber Crime Wings need to set up fast and confidential reporting channels in educational institutions to deal with non-consensual deepfakes, photo-morphing and digital harassment and take the burden of self-protection off young women [37].
- Digital Disconnection Protocols in Education and Work: Higher education institutions and corporate employers in Tamil Nadu should create explicit communication boundaries, prohibiting academic and workplace messaging on WhatsApp outside of official daytime hours to avoid continuous vigilance fatigue [38].

Abbreviations

AI -Artificial Intelligence

GenAI-Generative Artificial Intelligence

FGD-Focus Group Discussion

Finsta-Fake Instagram Account (Secondary private peer account)

FOMO-Fear Of Missing Out

GER-Gross Enrollment Ratio

GATE-Graduate Aptitude Test in Engineering

IDI-In-Depth Interview

MeitY-Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology, Government of India

PR-Permanent Residency

SDIS-Standardized Dual-Cohort Interview Schedule

TANSCHÉ-Tamil Nadu State Council for Higher Education

TNeGA-Tamil Nadu e-Governance Agency

TNPSC-Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission

TRAI-Telecom Regulatory Authority of India

UPSC-Union Public Service Commission

References

- 1] Twenge, J. M., Haidt, J., Lozano, J., & Cummins, K. M. (2022). Specification curve analysis shows that social media use is linked to lower well-being among adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 51(8), 1435–1448. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-022-01646-6>
- [2] Swart, J. (2023). Tactics of algorithmic resistance: How users navigate, subvert, and reshape recommendation algorithms. *New Media & Society*, 25(11), 3021–3039. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448211046894>
- [3] Vanden Abeele, M. M. (2024). Digital well-being as a dynamic construct: Theoretical foundations and deliberate disconnection praxis. *Communication Theory*, 34(1), 12–23. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/qtad007>
- [4] Bucher, T. (2022). Algorithmic Cultures and the Spatial Politics of Hyper-Personalization. *Information, Communication & Society*, 25(7), 945–960. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2021.1962942>
- [5] Telecom Regulatory Authority of India [TRAI]. (2025). Indian Telecom and Broadband Services Performance Indicators: Special Report on Youth Connectivity. Government of India. <https://www.trai.gov.in/release-publication/reports>
- [6] Tamil Nadu e-Governance Agency [TNeGA]. (2025). State Digital Infrastructure and Vernacular Internet Penetration Report 2024-2025. Government of Tamil Nadu. <https://tnega.tn.gov.in/publications>
- [7] Arun, C. (2022). On WhatsApp, Rumours, and Lynchings in India: Vernacular Disinformation Pathways. *International Journal of Communication*, 16(1), 2235–2255. <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/18023>
- [8] Primack, B. A., Karim, S. A., & Shensa, A. (2023). Temporal sequencing of social media engagement and depressive symptomatology in young adults. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 64(2), 245–253. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2022.08.019>
- [9] Zuboff, S. (2021). Surveillance Capitalism or Democracy? The Death Match of Institutional Orders. *The Philosophy of Technology*, 34(2), 101–118. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-021-00454-0>
- [10] Yau, J. C., & Reich, S. M. (2022). It's not all doom and gloom: How adolescents navigate privacy, peer connection, and well-being online. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 32(3), 882–898. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12768>

- [11] Gui, M., Fasoli, M., & Carradore, R. (2021). Digital well-being: Developing a new theoretical framework for media literacy in the hyperconnected era. *Journal of Media Literacy Education*, 13(1), 96–108. <https://doi.org/10.23860/JMLE-2021-13-1-8>
- [12] Banaji, S., & Bhat, R. (2021). *Social Media and Hate: Vernacular Digital Cultures and Vigilante Violence in India*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003102434>
- [13] Beyens, I., Pouwels, J. L., van Driel, I. I., Keijsers, L., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2022). The effect of social media on well-being differs from adolescent to adolescent and across developmental stages. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1), 10763. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-90098-3>
- [14] Orben, A. (2021). The digital lifestyle and youth mental health: Disentangling associations from causal impacts. *Psychological Medicine*, 51(9), 1409–1416. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291720004928>
- [15] Narayanan, V., Barve, P., & Venkatraman, S. (2025). Synthetic Media and Hyper-Local Deepfakes in Indian Regional Elections: Qualitative Analysis of Youth Perception. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 35(1), 45–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01292986.2024.2389102>
- [16] Kross, E., Verduyn, P., & Sheppes, G. (2021). Social media and well-being: Pitfalls, progress, and next steps. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 25(1), 55–66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2020.10.005>
- [17] Cotter, K. (2023). Playing the visibility game: How digital creators understand and negotiate platform algorithms. *New Media & Society*, 25(8), 2095–2114. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448211029230>
- [18] Gran, A. B., Booth, P., & Bucher, T. (2021). To be or not to be algorithm aware: A question of a new digital divide? *Information, Communication & Society*, 24(12), 1779–1796. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2020.1736124>
- [19] Faelens, L., Hoorelbeke, K., Soenens, B., & Koster, E. H. (2021). Social networking sites use and well-being: A systematic review of psychopathological mechanisms. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 24(4), 687–713. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-021-00366-1>
- [20] Valkenburg, P. M., Meier, A., & Beyens, I. (2022). Social media use and its impact on adolescent mental health: An umbrella review of empirical findings. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 44, 58–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.08.017>
- [21] Radtke, T., Apel, T., Schenkel, K., Keller, J., & von Lindern, E. (2022). Digital detox: An effective way to reduce mobile phone addiction and improve psychological well-being? *Mobile Media & Communication*, 10(2), 236–255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20501579211028647>
- [22] Udupa, S., Gagliardone, I., & Hervik, P. (2021). *Digital Hate: The Global Rise of Extreme Online Speech*. Indiana University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1g246q5>
- [23] Srinivasan, R., & Kumar, N. (2023). Vernacularization of Misinformation: WhatsApp and Political Polarization in South India. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 20(3), 289–305. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2022.2110489>
- [24] Guess, A. M., Lerner, M., Lyons, B., Montgomery, J. M., Nyhan, B., Reifler, J., & Sircar, N. (2022). A digital media literacy intervention increases discernment between mainstream and false news in the United States and India. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS)*, 117(27), 15536–15545. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1920498117>
- [25] Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). Conceptual and design thinking in thematic analysis: A qualitative guide for behavioral research. *Qualitative Psychology*, 9(1), 3–26.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000196>

- [26] Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2023). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [27] Siles, I., Segura-Castillo, A., & Solís-Guzmán, M. (2022). Folk theories of algorithmic recommendation systems: How users understand and manage platform feeds. *International Journal of Communication*, 16, 2050–2071. <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/17498>
- [28] Jorge, A., & Pereira, P. (2023). Algorithmic reflexivity and the curated self: Youth practices of curation and selective digital detox. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 26(9), 1180–1198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2022.2078741>
- [29] Kovacs, A., & Ranganathan, M. (2021). Gendering Surveillance: Digital Bodily Integrity and Patriarchal Enclosure in India. *Feminist Media Studies*, 21(5), 780–797. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2020.1783803>
- [30] Tandoc, E. C., & Mak, Y. W. (2022). Information gatekeeping within the family: How youth correct fake news shared by parents. *Information, Communication & Society*, 25(14), 2132–2148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2021.1934064>
- [31] YouTurn Research Collaborative. (2025). *Biannual Regional Misinformation Trends across Tamil Nadu Social Channels*. YouTurn Foundation. <https://youturn.in/research-reports>
- [32] Parthasarathi, V., & Chhotray, P. (2023). Platformed Precarity and Youth Aspirations: The Political Economy of Instant Loan and Speculative Apps in India. *Media, Culture & Society*, 45(6), 1145–1163. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437231168450>
- [33] Stoilova, M., Livingstone, S., & Nandagiri, R. (2021). Children and young people's digital privacy: An emerging framework of agency and institutional responsibility. *New Media & Society*, 23(8), 2361–2380. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444820948216>
- [34] Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology [MeitY]. (2024). *Guidelines for Ethical AI Deployments and Algorithmic Awareness in Higher Educational Institutions*. Government of India. <https://www.meity.gov.in/content/ai-ethics-guidelines>
- [35] Zubiaga, A., Liakata, M., & Procter, R. (2021). Exploiting architectural friction in online conversations for counter-misinformation interventions. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 72(10), 1278–1292. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24478>
- [36] Tamil Nadu Cyber Crime Wing. (2025). *Annual Cyber Safety Assessment: Gender-Targeted Cyber Violations and Preventive Protocols*. Crime Branch CID. <https://cybercrime.tn.gov.in/annual-reports>
- [37] Sundar, S. S., & Molina, M. D. (2024). Human-AI symbiosis for cognitive resilience against algorithmic deception: Empirical field trials. *Journal of Communication*, 74(3), 205–218. <https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqae011>
- [38] Leonardi, P. M., & Treem, J. W. (2022). Behavioral boundaries in ubiquitous enterprise communication platforms: The right to disconnect. *Academy of Management Annals*, 16(2), 589–620. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2020.0345>

About the Author(s)**1.Hariharan E A (Corresponding Author)**

eahari@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-5134-6946>

The author is a research scholar working toward a doctoral degree in the Department of Journalism and Mass Communication at Periyar University in Salem City, Tamil Nadu, India.

2.Mahalakshmii R

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-4313-3646>

Mahalakshmi R, a Counsellor by profession, the author has vast experience in psychology and behavioral guidance with a strong academic background. She studies adolescent development and evidence-based interventions. Skilled at understanding complex student profiles, creating comprehensive plans, and addressing curriculum challenges.



© 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)