RESEARCH JOURNAL OF ENGLISH (RJOE)
www.rjoe.org.in | **Oray's Publications** | ISSN: **2456-2696**
An International Approved Peer-Reviewed and Refereed English Journal
Impact Factor: *8.373 (SJIF)* | **Vol. 11, Issue 1 (Jan/Feb/Mar;2026)**

Digital Narratives and the Algorithmic Gaze: Human Identity, Technology, and Storytelling in Contemporary Fiction

Deepak Kaushik
Independent Researcher

Paper Received on 23-02-2026, Accepted on 24-03-2026
Published on 2 5 -03-26; DOI:10.36993/RJOE.2026.11.01.729

Abstract:

There's something worth pausing on in how quickly fiction has moved into algorithmic territory. Not as scenery not as the blinking screens and notification pings that signal contemporaneity but as the actual problem the writing is trying to think through. This paper takes seriously a loose, not entirely coherent cluster of contemporary fiction digital fiction, tech noir, network narrative, whatever label fits that has made the experience of living inside systems you didn't design and can't quite see its central concern. Three things get real attention. One is identity: specifically, what happens to the realist novel's foundational assumption that there's a continuous, knowable self underneath the social performance when platforms are engineered around self-construction and your data is simultaneously being assembled, without you, into a shadow profile that hiring managers and insurance models consult instead. Another is surveillance, though not the Orwellian kind. The fiction I keep returning to is after something subtler the low-grade, intermittent awareness of being tracked that most people carry around now without quite naming it, the slight adjustment in what you search for or how you phrase a message. The third is formal, and frankly the most interesting: narrators whose unreliability isn't psychological but structural, whole novels assembled from Reddit threads and search histories, database architectures that make linear reading feel like the wrong tool.

Keywords: digital fiction; surveillance capitalism; algorithmic identity; posthumanism; narrative form

Introduction

Most of what happens in an ordinary day now passes through systems you didn't design and can't fully see. Who contacts you, what news surfaces, what jobs appear in your feed, what you end up buying all of it is sorted and ranked and shaped by algorithms running in the background. The shaping isn't announced. It just happens, and the effect on how people understand themselves what they think they want, who they think they are builds up quietly, without any obvious moment at which you could push back. Chun calls this the condition of habitual new media: not a rupture but a slow reorganisation of the terms of daily experience (8). The vocabulary for making sense of it is still, quite visibly, catching up.

What I find striking is how quickly fiction has moved into this territory not as backdrop, not as atmosphere, but as actual subject. The loose cluster of work sometimes labelled digital fiction, tech noir, or network narrative takes the algorithmic organisation of experience as its central concern. These texts aren't technophobic, and they're not celebratory either. What holds them together is an interest in what this situation actually feels like from inside: living in systems that monetise attention, having your identity partly constructed by processes you had no hand in, discovering that the reliability of information has become uncertain in ways that are hard to name or resist. The question they keep circling through structure more often than direct argument isn't whether any of this is good or bad. It's whether we have the conceptual equipment to understand what's happening to us at all. This paper works through three areas where I think the fiction is doing its most demanding work: digital selfhood and identity, the literature of surveillance and data capitalism, and the formal experiments that digital culture has pushed writers toward.

Digital Identity and the Fractured Self

The realist novel was built on a fairly stable assumption: that underneath the roles and performances of social life there is a real, continuous self, and that this self is what fiction is fundamentally about. Character development depends on it. So does psychological interiority, and the arc of a life across a narrative. Digital culture has made that assumption feel genuinely precarious not as an abstract philosophical matter, but in the concrete, practical sense that anyone who has maintained a social media presence for more than a few years will recognise immediately, even if they'd resist the theoretical framing.

Part of it is the self-presentation problem, which is stranger than it first looks. Platforms are engineered around the construction and management of a public self

the profile, the curated grid, the carefully timed post and the version of yourself you project there can diverge substantially from how you actually experience your life from the inside. That's not new in itself. Human beings have always performed versions of themselves in social contexts. What has changed is the scale, the permanence, and the feedback loop. You can watch in something close to real time how a given performance lands. You adjust. The record of those adjustments accumulates and stays searchable in ways that ordinary social performance doesn't. Turkle's observation about the psychological cost of the gap between the performed self and the experiencing self the sense of watching yourself from outside while trying to live from inside seems to me right in a way that you recognise before you can articulate (12).

Then there's the data double. Every click, search, pause, and purchase generates data, and that data gets assembled into what researchers call a shadow profile a parallel portrait of you, built without your participation, that carries material weight in contexts you may never directly encounter. Hiring decisions. Credit assessments. Ad targeting. Insurance models. In many cases this shadow version of you is more consequential than any self-portrait you've carefully constructed it's the one employers and platforms and state agencies actually consult. You have no real access to it and no clear right to dispute it.

Where fiction earns its place in this conversation is precisely here not by rehearsing the policy argument about data privacy, which has been done, but by putting you inside the specific phenomenology of living with a shadow self. The strange discomfort of presenting yourself online while sensing the presentation has already outrun you. The unsettling accuracy of a recommendation engine that has apparently inferred something true about you from traces you never consciously laid. These aren't abstractions. They're experiences with a distinct texture, and rendering that texture is something fiction can do that almost nothing else manages.

Surveillance, Data, and the Architecture of Control

Surveillance has become a persistent preoccupation in contemporary fiction, and I don't think this is primarily because writers are drawn to dystopian material. It's that the surveillance infrastructure is already operational, most people are already inside it, and the situation is genuinely hard to think about clearly. The data ordinary digital activity generates location, searches, purchases, social connections, the timing

and duration of various online behaviours is collected, stored, and deployed by governments and corporations in ways that most users haven't meaningfully consented to. This isn't paranoid speculation. It's documented and, in most jurisdictions, entirely legal. The regulations were written before anyone had accurately imagined the current scale.

Zuboff names the underlying logic with precision. Surveillance capitalism isn't really about collecting data it's about using behavioural data to predict and modify future behaviour, and selling that predictive capacity to whoever will pay for it (8). The data is instrumental; the product is what you will do next. The whole operation depends on opacity: proprietary algorithms, invisible data pipelines, terms of service designed to produce nominal consent without actual understanding. What fiction can do that economic analysis can't is give this opacity a human interior. What does it actually feel like, day to day, to be the raw material? How does behaviour shift when you know, or half-know, or vaguely suspect, that everything is being recorded and fed into systems whose goals have nothing to do with yours?

The surveillance fiction I find most interesting stays in the present rather than extrapolating into clearly coded futures. It's interested in what I'd call the ambient condition: the low-grade, barely-conscious awareness of being tracked that has settled into ordinary life. People adjust what they search for. They moderate what they write in messages. They think briefly about what a photo will look like posted before they take it. None of this rises to the level of deliberate self-censorship in most cases. It's something more diffuse — intermittent, partial self-monitoring that operates below the threshold of conscious decision-making. That quality resists the dramatic clarity that overtly dystopian fiction tends to impose, and the realist strand that gets it right has something the allegorical tradition doesn't.

There's a formal dimension here worth noting. The omniscient narrator has always had something surveillance-like in its structure positioned above the action, seeing everything, knowing things about characters that the characters don't know about themselves. Some contemporary writers are working that analogy deliberately, putting the reader structurally in the position of the data collector and then making that position uncomfortable — forcing the reader to notice what it actually means to be on the watching side. That's a more implicating move than straightforward critique.

Formal Innovations: Narrative Structure in the Digital Age

The formal changes digital culture has produced in fiction are, if anything, more significant than the thematic ones and less predictable, because they emerge from writers actually trying to solve the problem of how to render experiences that existing narrative structures weren't built for. What's happened isn't simply that fiction has added digital life to its range of subjects. Writers have started borrowing the actual structures of digital media the database, the feed, the search result, the notification thread, the hyperlink to build texts that feel, at the level of organisation, like what they're describing. The form becomes part of the argument.

Hypertext fiction in the 1990s was an early, programmatic version of this experiment. Breaking with linear narrative was a formal claim: meaning doesn't arrive sequentially; it gets navigated and assembled by a reader moving through a network of possibilities (Hayles, How We Think 3). Most of that early work feels dated now the mechanics are too visible, too pleased with their own novelty but the underlying insight has proven considerably more durable than the specific forms it first took. The sense that any text exists within a network of other texts, that reading is also navigation, has become a background assumption for contemporary writers even when they're not working in explicitly experimental modes.

The unreliable digital narrator seems to me the genuinely new development. Modernist unreliable narration worked with psychological distortion the way a particular consciousness selects, rationalises, misremembers. What digital conditions add is structural rather than psychological: a narrator whose perception is being actively shaped by systems curating what information reaches them. Filter bubbles presenting a narrow slice of reality as the whole picture. Recommendation engines reinforcing existing patterns rather than disrupting them. Misinformation calibrated to be difficult to distinguish from credible reporting. The narrator doesn't know what's not being shown to them. Neither does the reader, at least not at first. What results is a kind of epistemological vertigo that feels historically specific genuine uncertainty about what you know, and whether you know it because it's true or because something decided to surface it.

Some writers have pushed further, constructing entire narratives from platform forms: Twitter threads, Instagram grids, Reddit exchanges, search histories,

dating app messages. The interest isn't just formal novelty. These formats are deeply familiar, which means readers arrive with existing habits the speed, the compression, the particular rhythms of attention each platform has trained into them and a skilled writer can work with those habits or deliberately frustrate them. What inhabiting these forms also does is raise a question the platforms themselves are invested in never raising: what can and cannot actually be said within these structures, and what assumptions about human communication are built into their design? The character limit, the algorithmic feed, the like button these aren't neutral containers. They carry values, and fiction that moves into them critically can make those values visible from inside in a way external commentary usually can't.

Posthumanism and the Boundaries of the Human

Underneath all of these concerns is a question that digital technology has forced back into visibility: what exactly is the human, and is it stable enough to function as a reliable reference point? Hayles and Haraway have both made versions of the argument that it never was that the human has always been partly constituted through its tools, its prosthetics, the nonhuman systems it inhabits and depends on (Haraway 149). The line between the human and the technological has always been drawn rather than discovered. What AI and digital infrastructure have done is make the drawing of that line impossible to ignore.

This matters differently depending on where you look. When a system can generate plausible-sounding analysis, sustain a conversation, diagnose from an image, write in a recognisable style, the conceptual markers that once felt like reliable distinctions between human and machine start looking more like conventions under pressure than natural facts. I don't think this should automatically be alarming a great deal depends on how these capabilities are deployed, and by whom. But it demands thought that is still, largely, in arrears. Fiction has been engaging with it across a wide range: explicitly speculative work about artificial consciousness and uploaded minds at one end; at the other, quieter work interested in the unremarkable daily entanglements of people and their devices, the genuine emotional attachments that form to interfaces, the way algorithmic systems have quietly taken over categories of judgment once understood as distinctly human.

Braidotti's contribution is to resist both available narrative templates — posthumanism as triumphant story of technological transcendence, posthumanism as

lament for the erosion of the human (Braidotti 3). The human was never the coherent, self-sufficient entity classical humanism imagined, and the more interesting question isn't how to protect it from technological encroachment but how to navigate the new configurations of dependency, vulnerability, and agency that digital infrastructure has produced. Hayles frames this as the posthuman condition and insists on its irreducible doubleness: new capabilities and new vulnerabilities arriving together, not separately, with the ethical questions about how to distribute each still largely unresolved (How We Became Posthuman 287). Fiction that holds this ambiguity without resolving it that can put you inside what it feels like to grieve for a deleted chatbot companion, or to receive a hiring rejection issued by an algorithm with no appeal to human authority is doing something philosophical argument alone can't.

Conclusion

Algorithms can infer, predict, and optimise at scales that would have been unimaginable twenty years ago. What they can't do is render interiority the weight of a decision made under genuine uncertainty, the specific texture of embarrassment or grief or half-formed recognition, what it actually feels like from inside to be a self navigating conditions it didn't choose and can't fully see. Fiction can do that. It's one of the few things that can. And in a cultural moment saturated with algorithmic output generated text, curated feeds, recommendation-shaped preferences that capacity matters more than it did.

The formal experiments this writing has produced the unreliable digital narrator, narratives assembled from platform forms, database structures that resist linear reading aren't interesting primarily as experiments. They're attempts to find narrative shapes adequate to experiences that the inherited forms of fiction weren't designed to hold. Living inside systems that are simultaneously responsive to you and indifferent to you, that know what you're likely to click but have no idea who you are this requires different formal solutions than the nineteenth-century novel was built to provide. The writers doing the most serious work here have understood that the formal and the thematic problem are the same problem.

I want to resist the move the genre sometimes makes of positioning fiction as the thing that saves us from technology's depredations. That's too clean. What fiction can actually do is something more modest: it can slow the experience down enough to let you actually think about what's happening. The questions underneath all of this

about selfhood, about what it means to be known by a system that doesn't understand you, about whether the tools through which we think are transforming what we're capable of thinking predate the internet. The digital age has made them urgent in a way that touches ordinary daily life rather than remaining the property of specialists. Fiction that takes this seriously isn't doing something separable from what fiction has always done. It's doing exactly that, under conditions new enough that the forms are still being worked out.

Works Cited

Baym, Nancy K. Personal Connections in the Digital Age. 2nd ed., Polity Press, 2015.

Braidotti, Rosi. The Posthuman. Polity Press, 2013.

Carr, Nicholas. The Shallows: What the Internet Is Doing to Our Brains. W. W. Norton, 2010.

Chun, Wendy Hui Kyong. Updating to Remain the Same: Habitual New Media. MIT Press, 2016.

Haraway, Donna. Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature. Routledge, 1991.

Hayles, N. Katherine. How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics. U of Chicago P, 1999.

How We Think: Digital Media and Contemporary Technogenesis. U of Chicago P, 2012.

Raley, Rita. Tactical Media. U of Minnesota P, 2009.

Turkle, Sherry. Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other. Basic Books, 2011.

Zuboff, Shoshana. The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power. PublicAffairs, 2019.

How to Cite this article?
Kaushik, Deepak. "Digital Narratives and the Algorithmic Gaze: Human Identity, Technology, and Storytelling in Contemporary Fiction." *Research Journal of English (RJOE)*, vol. 11, no. 1, Jan.–Mar. 2026, Oray's Publications, doi:10.36993/RJOE.2026.11.01.729.