Phoenix: International Multidisciplinary Research Journal
Vol.3, No. 3.1, July-Sep, 2025
ISSN: 2583-6897

TRANSFORMING SOCIETY: THE ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY IN SHAPING INDIA'S SOCIAL IMPLICATION LANDSCAPE

Dr. Harish Dilip Kalan
(Associate Professor, Sandip Institute of Technology & Research Centre, Nashik)
Dr. Vinodkumar Pandurang Pathade
(Assistant Professor, Amrutvahini College of Engineering, Sangamner)
Mr. Atul Babasaheb Gaware
(Assistant Professor, Sandip University, Nashik)

https://doie.org/10.65985/pimrj.2025898329

Abstract

Over the last 30 years technology has changed beyond recognition in India. Mobile connectivity and digital financial services, telemedicine and artificial intelligence, technology has pervaded every corner of its society. This article examines how these innovations are transforming India's social terrain breaking down institutions, redefining relationships and changing power equations. And it looks at the use of technology to improve the delivery of public services, democratize access to education and health care, transform the nature of work through the growth of gig platforms and empower marginalized communities through initiatives around digital inclusion. At the same time, the paper critically examines how this deepening of the digital divide is contributing to strengthening and entrenching the existing rough inequalities of caste, class, gender and geography. Employing concepts of technological determinism, modernization theory and socio-technical systems theory, the study deconstructs the emancipatory potential as well as the exclusionary impact of technology transfer into Indian society. Methodologically, the paper integrates qualitative case studies with quantitative evidence from national and international sources to offer a multi-dimensional picture of change.

Digital technologies, which promise so much in the way of facilitating a fairer and more efficient society, are extensively enmeshed in social and political processes. It makes the case for a more democratic baseline technology agenda that looks beyond access gaps, to matters of privacy, participation and governance. In the final analysis, the research supports or challenges many popular debates in relation to the technology and social change thesis and provides specific policy recommendations that can be embedded within the context sensitivity of the Indian societal fabric.

Keywords: digital financial services, telemedicine, Digital technologies, final analysis.

1. Introduction

The fusion of technology and social life in the 21st century is the single most global development there is. Nowhere is this more evident than in India, a fast-changing country in the midst of a multifaceted digital transformation. With over 800 million internet users, rising smartphone penetration, and government-driven efforts, such as Digital India, technology has reached almost every sector, right

from governance and education to health, jobs and everyday social life. This change has not simply reconfigured economic outputs; it is altering the social fabric of the nation in significant ways. India's social-cultural landscape is deeply ridden with structural inequalities of &endash; caste, class, gender, region. In this context, technology comes to the fore as a grenade and a liberator. On the other, digital technologies are used to make public services and information more accessible, to facilitate greater citizen participation and to create new economic opportunities. On the other hand, they may also contribute to perpetuating existing exclusions especially since infrastructure, digital literacy, social and political biases do not facilitate equity of access and use.

I would like to critique here, in this study, the extent of this impact technology has on India's social scenario. And that means understanding how technology is changing the delivery of public services, the way education systems are accessed, how we engage with healthcare, our working patterns and gender. One of the central questions is whether this technological transition is helping to create a more inclusive society — or reinforcing new types of digital inequality. It is a multi-sectoral analysis that also utilizes technological determinism and social-technical systems theory to explain these changes. It also links empirics (including case studies and survey data) with policy analysis to offer an integrated view of the social/technological interface in India. This inquiry assumes added importance as India occupies a central position in the digital transformation of the global South and the learnings embedded in the analysis may potentially inform broader development paradigms elsewhere in the developing world.

2. Literature Review

The intersection of technology and social change in India is increasingly one of the richest areas of scholarship. Researchers have reported how digital tools and infrastructure affect access to resources, public service, education, labor engagement, and gender empowerment, often by highlighting both fulfilment and failure.

2.1 Technology and the Digital Divide:

The question of digital divide is central to any assessment of India's digital transition. Laskar (2023) stresses that the dichotomy between urban and village community cannot solely be explained in terms of access; the gap reflects socio-economic and cultural distinctions which technology alone is not capable of blurring. Likewise, Lavanya and Mamilla (2024) maintain that while connectivity is extending, women and marginal castes are structurally excluded from the benefits of digital services owing to literacy gaps and patriarchal norms.

2.2 Digital Transformation in Education:

Technology has changed education, especially as we've navigated the COVID-19 pandemic. Yet academics such as Mathrani et al. (2022) note that although digital platforms extended access, they also accentuated inequalities, disproportionately impacting girls, rural children and the poor. The authors recommend a tiered and differentiated digital literacy policy in response to multiple learner profiles.

2.3 Media over Expanding Transformations: Bringing in Technology into Public Services & E-Government:

Srivastava and Shainesh (2015) explain how digitally enabled service innovation such as e-governance and Aadhaar reconfigure access to public services. They are finding increases in efficiency combined with warning not to exclude with a techno-centric bent - benefits that exclude the poor as they can't authenticate or document.

2.4 Health Technology and Gendered Access:

Seth et al. (2023) investigate the role of digital health tools in scaling up primary care in India, particularly through telemedicine. But they warned that such interventions can further entrench gendered exclusions if women have no autonomy or mobility to reach it.

2.5 Women and the Gig Economy:

Feldman and Vishnuram (2025) present evidence that digital gig platforms such as Uber, Swiggy, and freelance portals can lead to greater flexibility for female workers in Tamil Nadu. But the rewards are not evenly spread — algorithmic influence, lack of internet regulation, and cultural constraints restrict the participation and power of women.

2.6 Policy and Skills Development:

Mukherjee et al. (2024) explore the dynamics of digital skill programs for unemployed women. Their findings indicated that while skills training is a promising approach, long-term success relies on ecosystems of support—access to devices, connectivity, mentorship, and family support.

2.7 Caste, Digital Citizenship, and Exclusion:

Liu and Saldanha (2025) suggest that Caste, gender and class play a significant role in digital adoption outcomes in India. Their Wage Returns to Digital Skills analysis finds Dalit and Adivasi women experience a disproportionately lower benefit, calling for intersectional tech policies.

2.8 Disparity between the Sexes in access to Technology in rural India:

Sadiq et al. (2024) analyse how gendered inequalities in digital access were revealed by the pandemic. Their framing of the “Evincible Divide” depicts the temporary reversibility of digital inclusion—such as when tech-enabled access through school closures is reversed when support systems are withdrawn post-crisis.

3. Research Methodology

This research takes a convergent parallel mixed-methods approach to comprehensively investigate the impact of technology on multiple aspects of Indian society, such as governance, education, health, labor, and gender relations. The methodology is based on both quantitative and qualitative methods in

order to triangulate, to deepen context, and to strengthen the findings across multiple sectors.

3.1 Research Design:

A convergent parallel mixed-methods approach is used. Quantitative elements offer statistical proof and indicators of trends. Quality aspects provide contextual knowledge, narrative depth, and grounded theory building. This two fold focus allows exploration of macro-level patterns (such as digital divide gaps, technology usage trends) and micro-level experiences (like personal empowerment, community change).

3.2 Data Collection Methods:

3.2.1 For Quantitative Methods Secondary Data Analysis from are as below:

National Sample Survey (NSS) and Periodic Labour Force Survey (PLFS) to analyse the impact of technology on labour force. NFHS-5 to study digital health interventions and gender based tech usage. TRAI Reports, MeitY Dashboards and IAMAI – for digital penetration and infrastructure. Digital India Progress Reports – to assess the progress of Government oranizations (Aadhaar, UMANG, e-Hospital etc.).

3.3.2 For Qualitative Methods Following Case Studies are consider:

Three in-depth community case studies: A digitally connected tribal village (ex, Jharkhand / Odisha) and Connected Tribal village etc. A ward of Smart City (e.g., in Pune city or Ahmedabad city). A SHG (Self-Help Group) of women borrowing and lending money with tech in Tamilnadu.

4. Discussion

A. Synthesis of Findings:

Synthesis this section endeavours to bring several of these perspectives together to draw cross-sectoral insights on the manner in which technology is re constellating Indian societies.

The cross-sectoral findings indicate that technology is not simply acting as an add-on to existing structures in India- it is reconfiguring the logic behind social institutions, power relations, and citizen-state relations. This complex weave of inclusion, innovation, exclusion and resistance is characterised by both convergence and contradiction. We summarize the main cross-sector insights learned in the study below:

1. Hierarchies to Platforms: New Models of Participation

Technology is dissolving bureaucratic hierarchies and intermediaries, offering governance, education, health care and work on platforms, as opposed to intermediated structures. For example: From governance perspective, Aadhaar UMANG, DigiLocker has channelled access to various state services directly, and thus trust local babu and middlemen have reduced.

In education, many online platforms such as DIKSHA and Byju’s have facilitated teacher-independent

learning though access is still extremely stratified. In labor markets, companies such as Swiggy, Uber, and Urban Company have upended conventional employer-employee relations in favor of algorithmic gig work.

Insight: This "platformization" distributes service delivery and labor but also aggregates control, through algorithms and closed systems from institutions to data controllers.

2. Equity as a Double-Edged Sword in Technology:

Technology turns out to be both an equalizer and a divider across industries:

It allows the marginalised (rural women, Dalits) to become part of public life through digital payments, WhatsApp for SHGs and social media activism. But the gap still remains, and is often in keeping with the traditional hierarchies of caste, class, gender, and geography. Low-income, rural, and female populations have less access to smartphones, mobile data, and digital literacy.

Insight: The hope of "inclusion" goes unevenly realized, and in some cases, in digitizing service delivery, we have moved the mode of exclusion from analog to algorithmic forms.

3. Rewriting Gender Relations through Digital Empowerment and Risk:

So-called technology is changing the norms of gender roles, especially in the workplace and at school. Digital micro-entrepreneurship, gig economy and mobile access has facilitated women to earn money at home. Access to gender specific health information (eg. menstrual health applications, teleconsultation). However, women are also victims of digital abuse, doxxing, and cyberbullying. Bogged down with invisible digital labor arranging online schooling, banking and family organization.

Insight: Digital tools may offer agency, but in and of themselves they do not break down underlying patriarchal structures so much as they may digitize them.

4. Labor Informalization and New Precarities:

The labor market is shifting. Gig work provides flexibility and independence and no stability, benefits or protection. The digital reskilling (as in many of the PMGDISHA-like) work as a preparation for the knowledge economy, again most of them lost in structural disadvantage (language, infrastructure, caste barrier).

Insight: Digital capitalism is creating a fresh cohort of "tech-dependent precariat" workers who use apps, work without contracts and are unseen in labor statistics.

5. Reconfiguring Citizenship and State Relations:

Digital identity systems (Aadhaar), health surveillance (Aarogya Setu), and the targeted delivery of services have remapped the citizen-state interface. The individual is now a data subject, and citizens are becoming increasingly mediated through digital verification when accessing entitlements. We are moving from universalism to conditionality for example, only Aadhaar-authenticated people will get subsidies.

Insight: Citizenry is being digitally conditioned, with devastating implications for privacy, data rights

and exclusion by design.

6. Cultural Transformation and Digital Norms:

Technology isn't just disrupting institutions, it's changing the way people value things, the way people communicate, the way they get information. Social media has hastened political mobilization (for example, #FarmersProtest, #DalitLivesMatter) and misinformation and polarization. The definition of education, health- seeking behavior and even romance are increasingly reshaped by being exposed to digital cultures (Instagram, YouTube, etc.).

Insight: India's society is being transformed, cognitively and culturally, driven by technology which serves as a frame through which aspirations, anxieties, and identities are filtered.

7. Regional asymmetries and the geography of inclusion:

Cities and digitally well-equipped states (Karnataka, Maharashtra, for instance) have accelerated toward smart citizenship. In contrast, north-eastern, tribal, backward districts are still reeling under infrastructural lag, digital illiteracy, and cultural shyness towards digital tools.

Insight: India's digital transformation is spatially dislocated. It is not a revolution that is uniformly spread across space, but a geographically uneven reconfiguration of opportunity.

B. Exploring Across Countries: World Lessons and Differences in Tech-Powered Social Change

India's digital shift may be huge, but it doesn't take place in a vacuum. Other developing countries especially China, Brazil and Kenya too, have experienced quick technology-driven social change. The experience of India can be contrasted with these countries through a comparison that points to similarities in their challenges as well as divergences in their trajectories. This section consolidates comparative knowledge on the ways these countries leverage technology to influence social organization, work, governance, and inclusion.

1. India vs. China

Global competition over data remains surveillance risks India vs. China and State-Driven Tech Infrastructure paved the way with high-tech state surveillance. It has an extensive state-run network incorporating AI surveillance, facial recognition and digital ID systems on platforms including WeChat, Alipay and the Social Credit System.

Similarities:

Both nations are a testament to the focus on centralized digital identity systems (China's Hukou system versus India's Aadhaar). Both use e-governance mechanisms to provide services, minimize corruption and bureaucracy.

Differences:

India's system is dispersed across various apps and state platforms (UMANG, Digilocker), whereas

China consolidates all services into mega apps. China has more integrated surveillance, and India has more civil society resistance to state control of data (e.g., Aadhaar privacy protests).

Insight: India's approach is more pluralistic and rights-contested; China's is more centralized, but in some ways more efficient spurring questions about democratic accountability versus digital authoritarianism.

2. India vs. Brazil: Digital Inclusion and Public Education Platforms

Like India, Brazil is a highly unequal society, with large regional and class-polarizing digital divides. Still, Brazil has seen significant progress in the areas of e-learning and public sector health technology.

Similarities:

Both countries faced challenges in trying to digitally teach poor children during COVID-19.

Each implemented national level educational tech platforms (India's DIKSHA; Brazil's TV Escola and AVAMEC).

Differences:

In Brazil decentralized community ICT centers are used for the purpose of promoting digital literacy, especially in indigenous regions and favelas. India's digital literacy campaigns are often top-down and bureaucratically driven.

Insight: Brazil provides lessons in community-led digital capacity and India has scale but lacks of grassroots work.

3. India vs. Kenya: Mobile-First Inclusiveness and FinTech

Kenya is known around the world as one of the global leaders in mobile money, which has transformed digital payments and banking for the poor, especially with the rise of M-Pesa.

Similarities:

Both have prioritized digital financial inclusion as a fundamental building block for development (India's UPI and Jan Dhan Yojana compared to Kenya's M-Pesa). Both link financial tools to identity systems (India's Aadhaar and Kenya's Huduma Namba).

Differences:

Kenya's model is mobile-first, with less complex interfaces and local networks of agents, while in India, where platforms can be more complex and app-based, people need to be able to know how to use the internet/data. Kenya favours private-sector-led innovation, but India depends more on public infrastructure.

Insight: Kenya provides tech-inspiration with user-friendly, SMS-based solutions for real grassroots inclusion, offering important design lessons for India.

5. Conclusion

The research paper generates a multipronged argument here that technology is not just a neutral or an instrument of development but at a very fundamental level shaping Indian society how power, participation, access and identity is now being redefined. The shift, though, is contradictory and uneven, creating as many new opportunities as new vulnerabilities. The central arguments of the work are:

1. Technology is Transforming Institution logics at the Sector Level:

Argument: Technology isn't just shaping public systems, but the very form and function of crucial institutions, including governance, education, health care and the labor market.

Evidence: E-governance applications (e.g., UMANG, DigiLocker) are transforming citizen-state engagement by lowering physical contacts but also raising issues of exclusion via digitization. Digital classrooms and ed- tech are moving the axis of education from schools and textbooks to mobile screens, fundamentally altering both the pedagogy of learning and, more broadly, who gets to receive an education.

Conclusions: Institutional transformation is not symmetric; it flows through the complex socio-political realities of India.

2. Digital Inclusion Reflects and Magnifies Social Disparities:

Argument: Digital tools promise to offer us, the people, democratization, but access to them is deeply mediated by caste, class, gender, geography and literacy.

Evidence: The data reveals significant gender imbalances in mobile ownership and accessing the internet, especially in the hinterlands and among tribal communities. Digital I.D. systems (such as Aadhaar) that reduce friction for the welfare transfer also produce fresh channels of exclusion for the undocumented or those with biometric mismatches.

Concluding Thoughts: Technology strengthens "exclusion by design" while equity needs to be built into infrastructure and implementation.

3. Technology is Building New Forms of Precarity into the Labor Market:

Argument: The gig economy and digital service platforms are disintegrating traditional models of employment, recasting citizenship as conditional and data-based.

Evidence: Gig workers such as those who work for platforms like Swiggy and Urban Company are algorithmically controlled with little or no social protection or job security. Access to Aadhaar-linked welfare is possible only if all checks on your identity go through rights become contingent on data compliance.

In conclusion, we are creating a tech-dependent underclass from which it will be difficult to hear any redress or representation.

4. Women's Empowerment through Technology is real:

Argument: Technology is creating new kinds of agency for women, particularly in finance, education

and entrepreneurship but this empowerment is often fragile, contingent and unequal.

Evidence: SHGs who use the app or digital wallets talk of new independence, but patriarchal dominance of phone use, online abuse, and low literacy are barriers to widespread use. Gig-economy women report income gains, but Informalization, lack of maternity benefits and cyber risk Women in the gig economy report income gains but Informalization, lack of maternity benefits and cyber risk.

Conclusion: The promise of technological liberation, yet without social reformation, the digital agonies are intensified and digital patriarchy is re-strengthened.

5. Digital Transformation is Spatially Fragmented:

Argument: India's digital revolution is not uniform; it differs dramatically across regions, yielding a geography of digital opportunity and exclusion.

Evidence: Most Smart City projects, high-speed networks are located in metros and state capitals. Tribal and remote districts have fallen behind as a result, thanks to poor infrastructure, language barriers and a cultural disconnect with tech norms.

Conclusions: A "spatial digital divide" remains, and its redress requires extremely local strategies and bottom-up policy making.

6. Technology is shifting the Nature of Citizenship and Surveillance:

Argument: The digital ID, contact-tracing apps and AI-enabled governance are changing what it means to be a citizen not a rights-based citizen, but data-driven eligibility.

Evidence: During COVID-19, platforms such as Aarogya Setu (in English, Aarogya Setu) and Aadhaar-enabled services established new dependencies on data visibility. Privacy and data protection are still under-regulated, and the risk of mass surveillance and digital profiling is high.

Conclusion: Indian techno-citizenship is contingent and performance-based and is database compliant threatening civil liberties.

7. Global Comparisons: Contrasting Models of Digital Social Change:

Argument: India's middle road to digital transformation It falls somewhere between the China model of centralized efficiency and the Kenya model of mobile-first inclusion, and it is shot through with both ambition and tension.

Evidence: The mega-app approach that China has embraced creates one-stop access, but with questions of surveillance and privacy. The success of Kenya's M-Pesa is a reminder that simplicity and mobile-first design are potent weapons in achieving real inclusion.

Conclusion: India is a model of fragmented but democratic authoritarianism, capable of inclusive transformation if, and only if, the state cares for equity, privacy, and ethical tech.

8. The social contract is being rewritten in code:

Argument: The paper contends that algorithms, platforms and data are mediating the social contract

between state, society and individual.

Evidence: Welfare, education, work and even proposition is increasingly channelled through digital identities and platform access. The decisions are opaque, as they are generated by black-box algorithms.

Conclusion: India is at a crossroads: Will it permit technological infrastructure to encode inequality, or can it use digital tools to inscribe a more inclusive social contract?

References:

1. Mishra, V., & Kapoor, R. (2022). Digital India and Inclusive Development: A Critical Analysis. Indian Journal of Public Administration, 68(2), 120–134. https://doi.org/10.1177/00195561221104789
2. Bhatia, A., & Goyal, S. (2023). Technological Disruption and Labor in India's Informal Sector. South Asia Economic Journal, 24(1), 55–75. https://doi.org/10.1177/13915614231100889
3. Chatterjee, S., & Bhattacharya, R. (2021). Gendered Access to Technology in Rural India: A Digital Divide Analysis. Journal of Gender Studies, 30(3), 290–308. https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2021.1912184
4. Kumar, S., & Singh, P. (2020). E-Governance and Public Service Delivery in India: A Study of Rural-Urban Divide. Information Polity, 25(4), 475–492. https://doi.org/10.3233/IP-200221
5. Roy, D., & Narayanan, A. (2022). AI and Social Bias in Indian Contexts: A Review of Emerging Evidence. Technology in Society, 70, 101985. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2022.101985
6. Reddy, B., & Thomas, A. (2019). Telemedicine in India: Evolution and Challenges. The Lancet Digital Health, 1(3), e103–e104. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(19)30051-3
7. Mehta, A. (2021). Caste and the Digital Divide in India. Social Change, 51(4), 497–510. https://doi.org/10.1177/00490857211038722
8. Laskar, M. H. (2023). Examining the emergence of digital society and the digital divide in India: A comparative evaluation between urban and rural areas. Frontiers in Sociology. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fsoc.2023.1145221/full
9. Lavanya, R., & Mamilla, R. (2024). Closing the digital divide in India: Ensuring equal access to technology for women in business. In Technology for Gender Equity in Business and Industry. IGI Global. https://www.igi-global.com/chapter/closing-the-digital-divide-in-india/355001
10. Mathrani, A., Sarvesh, T., & Umer, R. (2022). Digital divide framework: Online learning in developing countries during the COVID-19 lockdown. Globalisation, Societies and Education, 20(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2021.1981253

11. Srivastava, S. C., & Shainesh, G. (2015). Bridging the service divide through digitally enabled service innovations: Evidence from Indian healthcare. MIS Quarterly, 39(1), 245–267. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26628349
12. Seth, A., Shrestha, P., Garfinkel, S., Ingle, E., & Others. (2023). Gender and the primary health care system: The role of digital tools with case studies in India, Indonesia & Nigeria. Gates Open Research, 7, 60. https://gatesopenresearch.org/documents/7-60
13. Feldman, T., & Vishnuram, M. V. (2025). The impact of technology and the gig economy on women's participation in Tamil Nadu. International Journal of Research in Science, Technology and Management Studies (IJRSTMS). https://ijrstms.com/Content/UploadedFiles/844a41aa0deb996f884531168be9198a.pdf
14. Mukherjee, T., Ilavarasan, P. V., & Kar, A. K. (2024). Empowering through digital skills training: An empirical study of poor unemployed working-age women in India. Information Technology for Development, 30(1), 112–130. https://doi.org/10.1080/02681102.2023.2292739
15. Liu, C. W., & Saldanha, T. J. V. (2025). Can digital skills empower disadvantaged castes and women? Evidence from India. Production and Operations Management. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/10591478241248749
16. Sadiq, S. M., Singh, I. P., & Ahmad, M. M. (2024). Evincible digital gender divide in post-COVID-19 pandemic era: Vincible or invincible? In Management for Sustainable Development Goals. Taylor & Francis. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.1201/9781003505754-7/