

Transdigital[®]

journal



Volume 7, Issue 13: January-June 2026

ISSN: 2683-328X

Sociedad de Investigación sobre Estudios Digitales S. C.



Transdigital Scientific Journal is a biannual publication under a continuous publication model, edited by the Sociedad de Investigación sobre Estudios Digitales S.C. So far, the journal has been indexed in: *Latindex*, *Dialnet*, *ERIHPLUS*, *REDIB*, *EuroPub*, *LivRe*, *AURA*, *Academic Resource Index (ResearchBib)*, *MIAR*, *OpenAire-Explore*, *Refseek*, *Sherpa Romeo*, *Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek*, *ZDB Zeitschriften Datenbank*, *WorldCat*, *Dimensions*, *The University of Liverpool*, *Discovery*, *Erasmus University Rotterdam*, *Mir@bel*, *REBIUN*, *DARDO*, *UOCI*, *LatinRev*, *ROAD*, *Google Scholar*, *Crossref*, *Scite*, *Lens*, *Internet Archive*, *BASE*, *OpenAlex*, *Semantic Scholar*, and *ScienceOpen*. Official address: Circuito Altos Juriquilla 1132, C.P. 76230, Querétaro, Mexico. Tel. +52 (442) 301-3238. Official website: www.revista.transdigital.mx. Email: revista@transdigital.mx. Editor-in-Chief: Alexandro Escudero-Nahón (ORCID: 0000-0001-8245-0838). Exclusive Use Rights Registration No. 04-2022-020912091600-102. International Standard Serial Number (ISSN): 2683-328X — both granted by the Instituto Nacional del Derecho de Autor (Mexico). Responsible for the latest update: Editor-in-Chief Alexandro Escudero-Nahón. All articles in *Transdigital* are licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). You are free to: Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format. Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially. The licensor cannot revoke these freedoms as long as you follow the license terms. Under the following terms: Attribution — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use. No additional restrictions — You may not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits.

Trans

journal

TECHNOVIOLENCE AND SYMBOLIC VIOLENCE
IN DIGITAL ENVIRONMENTS

TECNOVIOLENCIAS Y VIOLENCIA SIMBÓLICA
EN ENTORNOS DIGITALES



Fernando Javier Araujo Pulido*
Autonomous University of Coahuila, Mexico
ORCID: 0000-0001-5413-941X



Diana Cristina Gámez Chávez
Autonomous University of Coahuila, Mexico
ORCID: 0009-0003-5376-8830



Jair de Jesús Morales Vargas
Autonomous University of Coahuila, Mexico
ORCID: 0009-0008-0484-5058

TECHNOVIOLENCE AND SYMBOLIC VIOLENCE IN DIGITAL ENVIRONMENTS TECNOVIOLENCIAS Y VIOLENCIA SIMBÓLICA EN ENTORNOS DIGITALES

ABSTRACT

This article examines the academic literature on technoviolence in digital environments, with the aim of analyzing how scholarly research has conceptualized these forms of violence and how they are articulated with processes of symbolic violence, power relations, and sociotechnical dynamics inherent to digital platforms, particularly in pandemic and post-pandemic contexts. Methodologically, the study is based on an analytical documentary review of scientific articles published in specialized social science journals, which were examined through a qualitative approach oriented toward the identification of recurring categories and interpretive patterns. The findings reveal a multilayered analytical architecture of technoviolence, composed of six interrelated dimensions: digital symbolic violence, cyberbullying and digital intimate partner violence, digitalized political violence, algorithmic violence, non-consensual dissemination and data vulnerability, and technopolitical resistance. Overall, the analysis indicates that processes of technoviolence do not operate in isolation, but rather complement and reinforce broader dynamics of violence, insecurity, and inequality in everyday life.

Keywords: technoviolence, symbolic violence, digital environments, digital violence

RESUMEN

El presente artículo analizó la producción académica sobre las tecnoviolencias en entornos digitales con el objetivo de examinar cómo la literatura científica ha conceptualizado estas formas de violencia y de qué manera se articulan con procesos de violencia simbólica, relaciones de poder y dinámicas sociotécnicas propias de las plataformas digitales, particularmente en el contexto pandémico y pospandémico. Metodológicamente, se desarrolló una revisión documental de carácter analítico basada en la selección de artículos científicos publicados en revistas especializadas de ciencias sociales, los cuales fueron examinados mediante un enfoque cualitativo orientado a la identificación de categorías recurrentes y patrones interpretativos. Los resultados permitieron identificar una arquitectura analítica multicapas de las tecnoviolencias, integrada por seis dimensiones: violencia simbólica digital, ciberacoso y violencia íntima digital, violencia política digitalizada, violencia algorítmica, difusión no consentida y vulneración de dato y resistencia tecnopolítica. En conjunto se identificó que los procesos de tecnoviolencias complementan los procesos de violencia, inseguridad y desigualdad de la vida cotidiana.

Palabras clave: tecnoviolencia, violencia simbólica, entorno digital, violencia digital

1. INTRODUCTION

The production of digital violence stems from the appropriation of social networks for interaction and the reproduction of everyday life. However, it is important to recognize that such action falls within what Bourdieu and Wacquant (1995) called Field Theory as symbolic violence, an action that corresponds to a form of power that operates without resorting to physical force. This is achieved through the imposition of categories of thought and perception that are accepted as legitimate and natural by the dominated and the dominant.

In the context of postmodernity, symbolic violence moves from physical to digital relationships (Bauman, 2013), as the mechanisms of interaction become blurred around the construction of ethics and values. In this sense, social networks, *apps*, and *websites* are established in a terrain that is relatively unknown to regulatory frameworks. Therefore, they guarantee access to justice. Likewise, as Baudrillard (2009) mentioned, in this type of digital practice, anonymity plays a key role in developing narratives and discourses around ideological positions that contravene various types of interests. In this context, we start from the idea that digital violence is part of a process of symmetry in which people and machines are part of a whole (Latour, 2008), rooted in everyday digital practices where power relations prevail and are exercised symbolically, but where what matters is not whether it is human or not, but the role it plays, in this case to exercise symbolic violence.

Given this scenario, it is imperative to recognize that Bauman (2013) pointed out that postmodernity, rather than a space-time category, should be recognized as a condition of life where the interest in the continuity of structural practices is concentrated. However, it is recognized as a space for the rupture of the civilizing process. This tension places it as two aspects that redefine the present social condition through the formation that precedes it, but also that originates it.

Postmodernity is a social and cultural condition characterized by fluidity, uncertainty, and the fragility of human bonds (Bauman, 2020). This contrasts with modernity, which aspired to the solidity of institutions, identities, and collective projects. In this sense, it is distinguished by the dissolution of these certainties and by the centrality of the transitory, the fragmentary, and the individual. To this end, Bauman (2013; 2020) used the metaphor of *liquid modernity* to point out how social, political, and cultural structures have ceased to offer stable frameworks of orientation, forcing individuals to constantly move in changing scenarios. Therefore, security is replaced by flexibility, and immediate consumption becomes the guiding principle of everyday life. This is where the exposure of symbolic violence takes advantage of the dizzying pace of social media to maintain and normalize discourses of hate, intolerance, and invisibility.

In the context of the first decades of the 21st century, symbolic violence continues to be expressed as a form of domination that is exercised invisibly and naturalized, where the dominated end up accepting social hierarchies as legitimate. It is a muffled, insensitive experience, invisible to its own victims, which is essentially exercised through the purely subjective channels of communication and knowledge (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1995).

This type of violence is anchored in people's *habitus* and incorporated dispositions, generating multiple contexts in which individuals act, showing how subjects experience and reproduce different forms of domination according to the social spaces in which they participate (Lahire, 2000). Thus, symbolic violence is defined as a culturally legitimized mechanism of domination, as it operates both in the internalization of dispositions and in the multiplicity of situated experiences of the actors.

In the realm of digital social networks, the relationship between postmodernity and symbolic violence appears transversally in microsocial spaces. On the one hand, postmodernity (2000), characterized by the fluidity and fragility of bonds, where interactions become instantaneous and disposable, impacts a scenario of identity and emotional instability, constituting a liquid space. In other words, symbolic violence takes on new forms, as hierarchies, stigmas, and exclusions are reproduced through seemingly natural mechanisms of communication. For example, memes, *hashtags*, comments, and algorithms. This legitimizes inequalities and normalizes practices of harassment with such subtlety that they incorporate the acceptance of these dynamics, which unfold in a pluralistic manner depending on the digital contexts in which the subjects participate.

This situation reproduces forms of violence on social media, which are spaces where society uses mechanisms of domination in digital contexts. This is expressed through direct coercion (hitting, pushing, shouting, among others) and through symbolic interactions that shape perceptions, dispositions, and forms of exclusion.

2. METHOD OF RESEARCH

The objective of this documentary review was to offer a comprehensive overview of the relationship between techno-violence, symbolic violence, and postmodernity. This was achieved based on the academic production generated after the pandemic around these themes. Through this analysis, the state of knowledge, the main lines of theoretical debate, and the research gaps that persist in the field were identified.

On the other hand, the methodological strategy consisted of a systematic process of searching, selecting, and analyzing scientific and academic literature in journals listed in the registry of the Secretariat of Humanities, Technologies, and Innovation (SECIHTI). Subsequently, the following keywords were defined: tech violence, digital violence, symbolic violence, social networks, and postmodernity.

The inclusion criteria were articles from the aforementioned list that took place during the pandemic and transitioned into the post-pandemic process, with an emphasis on studies linking the theoretical framework of postmodernity and symbolic violence (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1995; Bourdieu & Passeron, 2018; Lahire, 2000) with phenomena of digital interaction and social networks (Castells, 2010; Boyd, 2014; Van Dijck, 2019; Zuboff, 2021).

Likewise, works that addressed digital violence solely from a technical perspective (cybersecurity, programming) without considering its social and cultural dimensions were considered exclusion criteria. The analysis procedure included three phases:

- Descriptive systematization, in which an inventory of the selected sources was compiled, classified by year, authorship, country of origin, and disciplinary approach.
- Thematic analysis, in which the main categories of discussion were identified: a) symbolic violence in digital environments; b) transformations of social interaction in postmodernity; and c) expressions of violence and inequality mediated by Information and Communication Technologies (ICT).
- Critical synthesis, aimed at highlighting convergences, tensions, and gaps in the literature, in order to point the way for future research.

3. RESULTS

The analysis of the scientific literature allowed us to identify a recurring analytical structure around techno-violence, organized into three interrelated dimensions (Table 1). These dimensions operated as interpretive axes that facilitated the analysis of the different ways in which symbolic violence was incorporated, reproduced, and re-signified in contemporary digital environments.

Table 1

Categories of tech violence identified in research articles

Category of digital violence	Description
Digital symbolic violence	Reproduced in discourses, frameworks, and narratives on social media that stigmatize, invisibilize, or delegitimize social groups, normalizing symbolic hierarchies. Includes memes, comments, misinformation, and smear campaigns.
Cyberbullying and digital intimate violence	Practices of harassment and control through platforms, non-consensual dissemination of intimate images, digital surveillance, threats, or blackmail in intimate relationships and student contexts.
Digitalized political violence	Strategies of harassment, bullying, and delegitimization of women and political actors in digital spaces. This manifests itself in organized campaigns, hate speech, and media manipulation with an impact on democratic participation.

Table 1

Categories of tech violence identified in research articles

Category of digital violence	Description
Algorithmic/structural violence	Effects derived from the algorithmic logic of platforms, constituting biases in visibility and amplification of violent content.
Non-consensual dissemination and data breach	Misuse of images, information, and personal data without authorization. This exposes the legal and institutional dimension of techno-violence, as well as the inadequacy of regulatory frameworks in the pandemic and post-pandemic context.
Technopolitical resistance	Although not always recognized as violence, this category is linked to the use of platforms to denounce, highlight, and challenge narratives of domination. It appears as the flip side of technoviolence, showing that the same digital spaces enable practices of resistance and agency.

The research reviewed was conducted in spatiotemporal contexts characterized by the social transformations resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic and the subsequent transition to post-pandemic scenarios. This implies an analysis in which digitality was consistently incorporated into everyday life. Within this framework, the topics of interest focused on the ethical-political conditions of the situation, particularly the sustained increase in digital interaction as part of professional, academic, and personal dynamics. Likewise, the centrality of socio-digital platforms shaped new ways of reproducing social interactions, which implied the reconfiguration of power relations mediated by information and communication technologies.

For the analysis, 14 research articles were identified, published in specialized journals in the fields of communication, sociology, and sociocultural studies: *Comunicación y Sociedad*; *Paakat: revista de tecnología y sociedad*; *Convergencia*; *Desacatos*, *Cultura y representaciones sociales*; and *Estudios Sociológicos*. This distribution revealed a sustained but heterogeneous interest in the study of techno-violence, with a greater concentration in journals focused on the analysis of digital communication and sociopolitical processes, where digital violence was a topic of academic interest and was incorporated as a new line of research. Based on the thematic analysis, six analytical categories of techno-violence were identified, which articulated different expressions of symbolic violence in digital spaces.

Digital symbolic violence was incorporated as a cross-cutting category regardless of the articles analyzed. It is important to mention that this violence was expressed through discourses, narratives, and interpretive frameworks within the digital reality, which in turn contributed to the stigmatization, invisibilization, or delegitimization of specific social groups. The articles showed how digital interaction practices such as the circulation of memes, comments, disinformation campaigns, or cancellation dynamics favored the naturalization of symbolic hierarchies,

reproducing inequalities of gender, class, ethnicity, or political affiliation through discursive and cultural mechanisms from a digital perspective.

In the body of work reviewed, cyberbullying and digital intimate violence repeatedly appear as central expressions of techno-violence, especially in research focused on youth, educational spaces, and intimate relationships. Rather than exceptional episodes, the studies analyzed described a network of daily practices of harassment, control, and surveillance mediated by digital platforms, to which are added the non-consensual dissemination of intimate images, threats, and various forms of blackmail. From this perspective, digital mediation creates mechanisms that facilitate aggression by prolonging its duration, multiplying the scenarios in which it manifests itself, and deepening its symbolic, emotional, and relational effects on the lives of those affected.

For its part, digitalized political violence has become established as an analytical category in studies aimed at examining the political participation of women and public actors in the context of digital inequalities. The works reviewed documented the existence of coordinated harassment against women, as well as the persistent circulation of hate speech and the deployment of campaigns designed to erode the legitimacy of certain voices of vulnerable groups on social media. These types of practices affect public deliberation and the conditions of democratic life. Digital political violence was interpreted as a structured practice that is linked to ideological disputes and pre-existing power relations within the framework of dominant elites with an interest in controlling narratives, as well as restricting plurality and concentrating the capacity to influence institutions and spaces of political decision-making, as in the case of social movements and de facto powers.

A fourth line of discussion focused on algorithmic or structural violence, which was less prevalent in the literature reviewed. However, it is becoming increasingly relevant from an analytical point of view due to the effects associated with the algorithmic logic of digital platforms, in particular visibility biases, the differential amplification of content, and the prioritization of polarizing discourses, especially in media phenomena. In this sense, it is suggested that algorithms are socio-technical devices that influence the reproduction of symbolic inequalities and the normalization of certain forms of discursive violence based on the constant and massive consumption of certain types of content.

At the same time, the violation of personal data was identified as a category that articulates the symbolic dimension of techno-violence under a legal-institutional dimension, the limitations of current regulatory and normative frameworks to provide effective responses to these practices, especially in the pandemic and post-pandemic context; it suggests the constant construction of public policies around the protection of citizens. During this period, the accelerated digitization of broad areas of social life overwhelmed institutional regulatory capacity, revealing persistent mismatches between the speed of technological transformation and the legal and administrative instruments available to protect rights against the non-consensual dissemination of personal information.

Finally, technopolitical resistance emerged as a category that concentrates the forms of agency and contestation that arise in digital environments. Although these practices were not always explicitly conceptualized as expressions of violence, the studies reviewed showed that digital platforms are spaces for denunciation and are also tools used to highlight experiences of exclusion and narrative disputes of symbolic domination. This set of works allowed us to recognize the ambivalent nature of digital spaces, in which dynamics of aggression and exclusion are intertwined with practices of collective action to contain expressions of techno-violence.

4. DISCUSSION

The results of this documentary review were part of a field of research that, in the last two decades, has increasingly problematized the relationship between digital technologies, power, and violence. The identification of various categories of techno-violence confirmed that the expansion of digital environments has not meant a radical break with previously existing dynamics of social domination, but rather a reconfiguration of the ways in which these are legitimized. In this sense, the findings are in line with a broad tradition of sociological studies that have pointed out that technological changes tend to rearticulate, rather than replace, the social and symbolic structures that precede them (Castells, 2010; Van Dijck, 2019).

The centrality of digital symbolic violence identified by Bourdieu and Passeron (2018) conceptualized this form of violence as a mechanism of domination that develops through the internalization of socially legitimized and normalized patterns of perception and appreciation. In digital environments, this violence manifests itself through expressions that actively participate in the production of meaning, relying on everyday communicative practices and cultural formats specific to the platforms. For example, memes, *hashtags*, and viral narratives. These expressions have a high capacity for naturalization, given that they are presented under the logic of humor, irony, or spontaneous participation, which contributes to their social acceptance (Boyd, 2014; Van Dijck, 2019).

Following this logic, the *corpus* suggests that violence is expressed through narrative frameworks, forms of ridicule, discrediting, and stigmatization that reorder hierarchies, define who deserves to speak, and determine which identities are intelligible in the digital public space. Along these lines, the results of the survey with Andalusian youth showed that gender-based violence on social media is perceived and experienced as a continuum where aggression is trivialized, relativized, or becomes background *noise*, while its impact on participation and well-being is recognized (Sosa Valcarcel et al., 2024).

Complementarily, the impact of digital violence on university communities is largely established by the relationships between gender violence, public spaces, and digital media, where the agent executing the processes of exclusion is blurred. In other words, the management of violence begins in the classroom but is perpetuated in digital spaces (Acuña Kaldman & Peña Ramos, 2024). Along the same lines, the study on networked

sociodiscourses understood how psi, bio, and necropolitical discourses rearticulate legitimacies and hierarchies in the digital environment, producing cultural grammars that make certain exclusions or forms of violence acceptable (Guerrero Torrentera, 2022).

This symbolic dimension appears to be linked to cultural consumption that reorders moralities and representations of the social order. The phenomenon of narco-series points to a reversal of roles where the drug trafficker is constructed as a hero and the state as a villain, shifting the boundary between legality and illegality in the media imagination. As a result, it contributes to cultural climates of tolerance or fascination with violence (Muñoz, 2022). In this context, the boundaries of *legality* are blurred by the mediatization of crime.

A key effect is that digital symbolic violence tends to operate in a behavioral manner based on what is taught or sanctioned, as well as what is ridiculed and punished through public exposure. This becomes visible when the *corpus* analyzed collective actions and *hashtags* linked to protests. For example, the cyberactivism of *the journalists in the #paramos movement* shows how the digital environment, while enabling articulation and visibility, is also involved in disputes over the narrative and public legitimacy of feminism (Sosa Valcarcel et al., 2024).

From this perspective, the results of the review argue that digital platforms are transformed into specific social fields, where positions, symbolic capital, and differentiated forms of recognition among social actors come into play. In these spaces, both algorithms and visibility metrics enforce implicit norms of interaction that do not act neutrally. On the contrary, they are configured under unequal conditions of participation (García Canclini, 2004), favoring certain voices and restricting the presence of others. In response to this, Zuboff (2021) suggested that these practices are on the margins of surveillance capitalism, in which human experience is systematically translated into input for the generation of economic value and the exercise of new forms of social control.

The repeated presence of cyberbullying and digital intimate violence in the literature reviewed coincides with research that has documented the reconfiguration of interpersonal violence in contexts of technological hypermediation. In particular, various studies have shown that the intensive incorporation of digital technologies into emotional and social relationships has led to the emergence of specific forms of control, surveillance, and harassment, with a particular impact on intimate relationships and among young people (Boyd, 2014). Based on the evidence analyzed, these practices were represented as manifestations of power relations marked by gender, age, and class inequalities, which are updated and reproduced in digital environments.

In the relational dimension, the *corpus* converges on one point: techno-violence intensifies when platforms and devices are integrated into emotional, school, or community relationships, facilitating practices of control and monitoring that are presented as *normal* or *caring*. Findings on techno-interference in intimate relationships described how conflict arises in micro-interactions mediated by the telephone, *phubbing*, and the struggle for attention, revealing a reorganization of everyday power in intimacy (Rodríguez Salazar, 2024).

This pattern becomes clearer when surveillance is analyzed as a practice. The study on cell phones and surveillance in couples documents narratives of watching and being watched, showing that the device does not only mediate communication. In other words, it enables a repertoire of control that can be read as part of a culture of suspicion and permanent verification (Rodríguez Salazar, 2024).

From another perspective, the systematic review on cyberviolence intervention and prevention emphasizes that preventive strategies face institutional and methodological limits, in part because cyberviolence mutates rapidly. Therefore, its identification depends on cultural thresholds regarding what *is acceptable* in digital interaction (Lemus-Pool & Gómez Quinto, 2025). In terms of discussion, this suggests that the field needs to think about prevention not only as an individual response (literacy, self-care), but also as a socio-technical policy (regulation, design, reporting routes) and as cultural transformation.

For its part, digital ethnography is a resource for understanding Nazism in Mexico, as it functions as a borderline case for discussing how platforms enable the creation of extreme ideological communities that are sustained by repertoires of identity, propaganda, and digital socialization. These findings complicated the discussion, as they showed that techno-violence is not limited to individual interactions, but also includes infrastructures of belonging and enemy production, with the capacity for persistence and social reproduction (Yañez-Orozco, 2025).

At this point, the findings directly dialogue with contributions from feminist sociology and gender studies, which have pointed out that digital violence is an extension of the structural inequalities that shape offline social life. The temporary persistence of digital content and the difficulty of controlling its circulation create gaps in the origin and focus of the information. This means that responsibility for it does not fall on a visible figure. In this situation, groups or communities that share different moral fronts appropriate such digital narratives to legitimize their discourse.

On the other hand, permanent exposure to public scrutiny intensified the symbolic, emotional, and relational effects of this violence (Segato, 2016; Butler & Fraser, 2017). The documentary analysis confirmed this trend by showing that intimate digital violence does not remain in the initial phase of aggression; its damage is prolonged over time and unfolds in multiple social scenarios where it violates the person whose intimate information is exposed.

In relation to digitized political violence, the results are part of contemporary debates on the transformation of the public sphere in the digital age. Habermas (2006) pointed out that the fragmentation of spaces for deliberation and the growing mediatization of politics create conditions conducive to polarization and disinformation due to the lack of control over data, which translates into a weakening of democratic debate. In this context, some of the articles showed that social media are used as tools for the systematic harassment, delegitimization, and silencing of political actors, with particularly significant effects on women and historically excluded groups.

In the political-public sphere, techno-violence appears as a form of discipline that seeks to expel actors from the debate, undermine reputations, or reduce democratic participation through campaigns, hate speech, or lynching dynamics. The study of gender-based cyberviolence and 8M 2021 on *Facebook* allowed us to observe how comments and their reach shape arenas of confrontation where repertoires of discrediting and antagonism are deployed, affecting public conversation and the experience of those who participate (Domínguez Arteaga, 2023).

Convergently, the analysis of *YouTubers* during the pandemic showed that political dispute is reorganized around content creators, rhetorical strategies, and economies of visibility that intensify polarization and conflict. The digital space operates as a stage for the struggle for credibility and adherence, with effects on public trust and perceptions of legitimacy (Atilano, 2022). In the same vein of public arenas, work on religious politicization on *Twitter* showed how *hashtags* and interaction networks structure fields of debate where religious and political actors produce moral frameworks, dispute agendas, and construct adversaries. The conflict is not limited to content; it is inscribed in the very structure of the conversation and its dynamics of amplification (Argüello Pazmiño & Hurtado, 2024).

At a more structural level, studies on politics and the internet provided a backdrop for interpreting these findings. It was documented that political participation on platforms occurs in an ecosystem where media logic and digital infrastructure reconfigure incentives for exposure, attack, and response based on the exposure of violence such as the glorification of crime (Muñoz, 2022). Likewise, it was found that contributions to the reproduction of hate ideologies such as Nazism are found on digital platforms, as they are a space for building memory and community based on the violation of the rights of others. However, in the Latin American context, they subject their proposal to an emphasis pigeonholed in pre-Columbian history (Yañez-Orozco, 2025).

These findings coincided with research focused on gender-based political violence in digital environments, which emphasizes that online harassment does not seek only to discredit ideas or political positions. Rather, it is aimed at disciplining bodies, identities, and forms of participation, restricting effective access to the public sphere and limiting the possibilities for political intervention (Butler & Fraser, 2017; Segato, 2016). The review reinforced this interpretation by showing that digital political violence is linked to pre-existing power structures and algorithmic logics that favor the amplification of polarizing and emotionally intense content.

Likewise, the incorporation of algorithmic or structural violence as a dimension based on the approaches of Actor-Network Theory (Latour, 2008) indicated that algorithms are understood as non-human actors that actively intervene in the configuration of social interactions as effects that consolidate socialization processes in the contemporary context. From this perspective, algorithms affect the visibility of content based on the influence of hyperconsumption and the policies and interests of technology corporations, generating the production of symbolic hierarchies based on the narratives that are concentrated on social media.

The *corpus* suggests that a decisive part of techno-violence does not depend solely on individual intentions, but on the logic of visibility that orders what circulates and what remains hidden. In this discussion, the idea that algorithms are not neutral became relevant: they organize attention, encourage confrontation, and can amplify violent content due to their ability to generate interaction. In this regard, network and community analysis provides evidence of how conversation is structured by nodes, flows, and positions that influence the spread of messages and the formation of audiences.

At the cultural level, this dimension becomes visible when violence is aestheticized or turned into narrative merchandise. The article *Beyond Fiction* showed how digital media connect violence, politics, and vindication, so that the boundaries between denunciation, consumption, and spectacularization become porous. This produces conditions where certain violent content can circulate with legitimacy or appeal (Palazuelos Rojo, 2022).

In this regard, it is imperative to recognize that algorithmic systems make it difficult to assign responsibility and limit the ability to regulate their social effects (Zuboff, 2021; Van Dijck, 2019). The results of this review showed that this situation is addressed in the Latin American literature, albeit still in an incipient manner. Thus, algorithmic violence is emerging as a developing field of research that requires interdisciplinary approaches capable of articulating sociological, cultural, political, and technological analyses.

The category of non-consensual dissemination of information and violation of personal data also reinforces the debates surrounding the conflict between digitization processes and regulatory frameworks, as the acceleration of digitization during the pandemic highlighted existing legal loopholes and exposed new forms of violation in digital contexts (Castells, 2010). The works reviewed agreed that the inadequacy of regulatory frameworks limits access to justice and contributes to the normalization of practices that violate fundamental rights in digital environments.

Although not all articles in *the corpus* focused on legal issues, the discussion strongly emphasizes the idea that techno-violence involves informational dispossession: loss of control over images, data, and digital footprints. This dialogues with studies of cyberviolence and literature reviews that insist that institutional responses tend to lag behind the problem, especially given the speed with which aggressive practices and platforms change (Collado Campos, 2024; Lemus-Pool & Gómez Quinto, 2025).

In contrast to these dynamics of domination, technopolitical resistance emerges as an analytical category that complicates the understanding of technoviolence. In other words, digital environments also enable forms of collective action, public denunciation, and the articulation of social movements (Castells, 2010). The evidence reviewed confirmed that digital platforms are ambivalent spaces, in which practices of symbolic violence coexist with strategies of agency aimed at disputing hegemonic narratives and making social inequalities visible.

In macrosocial contexts, it was observed that the pandemic fostered strategies of inequality through the appropriation of technologies, and the introduction of security measures to contain the spread of the disease radically changed everyday life. In this sense, the lack of access to digital devices and the internet constituted a process of marginalization in different sectors of the population, especially among young people (Cerbino Arturi et al., 2023). Similarly, the study on technoferences discussed the processes of making intimate partner violence visible, which are not far removed from the forms of past decades. However, with the new generations, digital environments are reconfiguring expressions of control and misogyny (Rodríguez Salazar, 2024).

From a perspective focused on university experiences, the article "*The Digital is Political*" showed that digital violence against women is becoming normalized. Therefore, it is problematized by female university students who produce critical interpretations, coping strategies, and frameworks for reporting; resistance appears as a daily practice that challenges the idea that *this is how social media works* (Gómez Cruz, 2023).

From a broader perspective, the findings lie on the margins of liquid modernity (Bauman, 2013), where relationships cease to be stable due to the lack of control over publications. The fluidity of social ties and the centrality of symbolic consumption allow for scenarios in which digital violence takes subtle forms of appropriation. This effect suggests that techno-violence is embedded in this social condition marked by uncertainty, reinforcing the need for analytical frameworks that are attentive to the complexity of these processes.

The discussion as a whole revealed that techno-violence concentrates complex configurations of symbolic violence, inscribed in structural transformations associated with both postmodernity and digital capitalism. The literature reviewed indicated that these phenomena cannot be addressed from reductionist approaches focused exclusively on technical or legal dimensions, but rather require comprehensive perspectives that articulate social theory, critical analysis of digital technologies, and attention to the historical inequalities that permeate social life.

In this sense, technoviolence is organized around a multilayered analytical architecture that combines symbolic processes of meaning production, relational practices of control and aggression, and sociotechnical dynamics inherent to the functioning of digital platforms and devices. Together, these layers showed that digital violence does not operate as an isolated event, but as an everyday regime that disputes recognition, moral authority, public visibility, and conditions of security in intimate, political, and cultural life. This reading dialogues with research that, from different approaches, conceptualizes digital violence as a situated extension of preexisting inequalities and, at the same time, as a field with specific rules derived from platform design, the attention economy, and the accelerated circulation of narrative frameworks.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The analysis developed in this article allowed us to systematize a state-of-the-art analysis of recent academic production on techno-violence, a perspective that articulates symbolic violence and the postmodern condition of digital social interactions based on a documentary review focused on the pandemic and post-pandemic period. In this context, we identified that the expansion of digital platforms encourages the previously existing dynamics of domination, inequality, and violence. However, techno-violence reconfigures the ways in which these processes are generated, tracing new forms of social organization and, therefore, the constitution or adaptation of new institutions and social regulations.

Within this analytical framework, we identified the production of a systematic, multi-layered architecture of techno-violence, comprising symbolic dimensions of digital identity interpretation, as well as the construction of socio-technical devices that distribute violence in digital environments. This approach allowed us to understand that phenomena such as cyberbullying, digital intimate violence, digitized political violence, and personal data breaches are not isolated expressions of social structure and microcosms, but rather part of a network of power practices that are naturalized in everyday digital life. In this sense, symbolic violence is positioned as a cross-cutting axis that articulates seemingly trivial narratives such as memes, hashtags, or algorithmic dynamics, but with a high capacity to reproduce inequalities and systematic exclusions against vulnerable populations such as women, members of the LGBTQ+ community, indigenous peoples, among others.

Likewise, the results showed that techno-violence intensifies in spaces where fragile social ties are reproduced, while the acceleration of communication speeds up the dynamics of public scrutiny, characteristics typical of liquid modernity. In these scenarios, the temporary persistence of digital content amplifies the symbolic and relational effects of violence, constituting long-reaching processes between the initial stage of aggression and its impacts on different areas of social life.

For their part, algorithms play a key role in the construction of active components in the production and amplification of techno-violence, since, as mentioned above, they are presented as tools that are not neutral. This is because algorithmic systems configure symbolic hierarchies that favor discourses related to the interests that dominate algorithmic production, leading to the normalization of violent practices, while hindering the attribution of responsibility and institutional regulation.

At the same time, the study showed that digital environments are spaces of domination, but that mechanisms of technopolitical resistance are also developing around the generation of interactions that denounce specific cases, as well as the visibility of dynamics of inequality and injustice. This type of collective action demonstrates the capacity of various actors to challenge hegemonic narratives that reorient the formats in which technoviolence is carried out.

REFERENCES

- Acuña Kaldman, C., & Peña Ramos, M. O. (2024). Desentrañando la violencia de género en entornos universitarios y digitales: voces estudiantiles de Trabajo Social. *Cultura y Representaciones Sociales*, 19(37), 29. <https://www.culturayrs.unam.mx/index.php/CRS/article/view/12783>
- Argüello Pazmiño, S., & Hurtado, E. (2023). Arenas públicas virtuales en Twitter y politización religiosa en Ecuador. *Estudios Sociológicos de El Colegio de México*, 42, 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.24201/es.2024v42.e2329>
- Atilano, J. (2022). Disputas políticas y prácticas digitales de youtubers durante la pandemia de covid-19. *Estudios Sociológicos de El Colegio de México*, 40(120), 693–724. <https://doi.org/10.24201/es.2022v40n120.2163>
- Baudrillard, J. (2009). *La Sociedad de consumo*. Ediciones Akal.
- Bauman, Z. (2013). *Vida líquida*. Editorial Austral.
- Bauman, Z. (2020). *Modernidad líquida*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1995). *Respuestas: Por una antropología reflexiva*. Editorial Grijalbo.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (2018). *La reproducción: Elementos para una teoría del sistema educativo*. Siglo XXI Editores.
- Boyd, D. (2014). *It's complicated: The social lives of networked teens*. Yale University Press.
- Castells, M. (2010). *Comunicación y poder*. Alianza Editorial.
- Cerbino Arturi, M., Angulo, N., & Panchi, M. G. (2023). Las primeras víctimas: reflexiones sobre juventudes, pandemia, tiempo, espacio y tecnologías. *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales*, 68(249). <https://doi.org/10.22201/fcpys.2448492xe.2023.249.79953>
- Collado Campos, A. N. (2024). Revisión del tema de violencias digitales durante la pandemia por COVID en México. *PAAKAT: Revista de Tecnología y Sociedad*, 14(27), e856. <https://doi.org/10.32870/pk.a14n27.856>
- Domínguez Arteaga, R. A. (2023). Ciberviolencia de género y 8M 2021 en Tampico, Tamaulipas: comentarios y su alcance en Facebook. *PAAKAT: Revista de Tecnología y Sociedad*, 13(25), e796. <https://doi.org/10.32870/pk.a13n25.796>
- Butler, N., & Fraser, N. (2017). *¿Reconocimiento o redistribución? Un debate entre marxismo y feminismo*. Traficantes de Sueños.
- García Canclini, N. (2004). *Diferentes, desiguales y desconectados: Mapas de la interculturalidad*. Gedisa.
- Gómez Cruz, B. M. (2023). Lo digital es político: universitarias frente a la violencia digital hacia las mujeres. *Revista Pueblos y Fronteras Digital*, 18, 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.22201/cimsur.18704115e.2023.v18.640>
-
- Araujo Pulido, F. J., Gámez Chávez, D. C., & Morales Vargas, J. J. (2026). Technological violence and symbolic violence in digital environments. *Transdigital*, 7(13), e583. <https://doi.org/10.56162/transdigital583>

Guerrero Torrentera, C. A. (2022). Sociodiceas en red: psico, bio y necropolíticas, discursos culturales en la sociedad digital. *Cuicuilco. Revista de Ciencias Antropológicas*, 29(85).

Habermas, J. (2006). *Historia y crítica de la opinión pública*. Editorial Gustavo Gili.

Lahire, B. (2000). *El hombre plural: Los resortes de la acción*. Bellaterra Edicions.

Latour, B. (2008). *Reensamblar lo social: una introducción a la teoría del actor-red*. Manantial.

Lemus-Pool, M. C., & Gómez Quito, C. (2025). Intervención y prevención de la ciberviolencia: una revisión sistemática de literatura. *PAAKAT: Revista de Tecnología y Sociedad*, 15(28), e889. <https://doi.org/10.32870/pk.a15n28.889>

Muñoz, C. D. (2022). Narcoserries e inversión de roles: el narcotraficante como héroe frente al Estado como villano. *Cuicuilco. Revista de Ciencias Antropológicas*, 29(85), 99-136.

Palazuelos Rojo, I. de J. (2022). Más allá de la ficción: medios digitales, violencia, política y reivindicación. *PAAKAT: Revista de Tecnología y Sociedad*, 12(23), e747. <https://doi.org/10.32870/pk.a12n23.747>

Rodríguez Salazar, T. (2024). Las tecnoferencias en relaciones de pareja y el género: hallazgos cualitativos. *Comunicación y Sociedad*, 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.32870/cys.v2024.8661>

Segato, R. L. (2016). *La guerra contra las mujeres*. Traficantes de Sueños.

Sosa Valcarcel, A., Galarza Fernández, E., & Ranea-Triviño, B. (2024). Percepciones, experiencias y posicionamientos sobre la violencia de género en las redes sociales. Resultados de una encuesta a la juventud andaluza. *Comunicación y Sociedad*, 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.32870/cys.v2024.8676>

Van Dijck, J. (2019). *La cultura de la conectividad: Una historia crítica de las redes sociales*. Siglo XXI Editores.

Yañez-Orozco, H. (2025). Nazismo en el México del siglo XXI: ¿una contradicción? Una etnografía digital. *Estudios Sociológicos de El Colegio de México*, 43, 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.24201/es.2025v43.e2724>

Zuboff, S. (2021). *La era del capitalismo de la vigilancia*. Paidós.

