ResearchNext International Multidisciplinary Journal

Vol- 2, Issue- 1, January-March 2026 ISSN (O)- 3107-9725

Email id: editor@researchnextjournal.com Website- www.researchnextjournal.com

Artificial Intelligence, Digital Behaviour, and Mental Health: A Bio psychosocial Perspective on Human Adaptation in the Technological Era

Dr. Sanjay Kumar

Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Samastipur College, Samastipur, Lalit Narayan Mithila University, Darbhanga, Bihar

Dr. Manish Kant

Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, V.S.J. College, Rajnagar, Lalit Narayan Mithila University, Darbhanga, Bihar

Article Info: *(Recieved- 30/12/2025, Accept- 10/02/2026, Published- 20/03/2026)*

DOI- 10.64127/rnimj.2026v2i10012

Abstract

Artificial intelligence and digital technology are fundamentally reshaping how people think, feel, work, and relate to one another. This paper examines these transformations through a biopsychosocial framework that integrates biological, psychological, and social dimensions rather than addressing them in isolation.

At the biological level, prolonged exposure to AI-driven environments affects attentional capacity, sleep patterns, and neurological reward systems. Psychologically, increasing reliance on algorithms for decision-making, identity construction in virtual spaces, and social validation through digital platforms are associated with rising rates of anxiety, emotional dysregulation, and digital addiction. Socially, algorithmic systems are quietly restructuring interpersonal communication, the quality of human bonds, and shared norms often blurring the boundary between online and offline life.

This paper also identifies protective factors including digital literacy, emotional intelligence, and intentional technology use that support well-being. Drawing on psychology, neuroscience, and social science, it proposes a practical integrative framework to address a critical gap in understanding human adaptation to AI-mediated environments.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Digital Behavior, Mental Health, Biopsychosocial Model, Human Adaptation

1. Introduction

It is difficult to identify a moment in history when a single technological development penetrated every dimension of human life as rapidly or as completely as artificial

intelligence has done in the opening decades of the twenty-first century. Within what amounts to a single generation, systems that were once the exclusive domain of academic research laboratories have become the invisible infrastructure through which billions of people manage their daily existence. Recommendation algorithms curate what people read, watch, and listen to. Virtual assistants field questions, draft messages, and schedule appointments. Automated systems evaluate job applications, determine loan eligibility, flag potential medical diagnoses, and moderate what can be said in public online spaces. The transformation is so pervasive and so deeply embedded that it has become almost invisible which is precisely what makes it so important to examine carefully.

This transformation matters for psychology in a fundamental way. Human behavior is increasingly mediated by algorithmic systems that operate below the threshold of conscious awareness to shape attention, preference, and choice. These systems are not neutral instruments that respond passively to user intent; they are engineered to maximize engagement, and in doing so, they function as invisible regulators of cognition and conduct. Understanding what this means for human beings for their mental health, their relationships, their sense of self, and their capacity for autonomous thought requires more than a technological analysis. It requires an integrated psychological framework.

This paper adopts the biopsychosocial model (Engel, 1977) as its organizing framework, on the grounds that human adaptation to AI-mediated environments involves interactions among biological processes, psychological mechanisms, and social contexts that cannot be adequately understood by examining any single dimension in isolation. Additionally, drawing on concepts from administrative psychology, the paper treats AI systems as structures of behavioral governance — mechanisms that guide, constrain, and normalize human action in ways that parallel the authority structures of formal institutions. This framing makes it possible to ask not only what AI does to people, but how it exercises power, and whose interests that power serves.

The paper moves through several connected discussions: the theoretical frameworks that support the analysis; the biological, psychological, and social impacts of AI-mediated environments; the processes through which individuals adapt to these environments; the risk and protective factors that shape outcomes; and the ethical, educational, and policy implications that follow from the analysis as a whole.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 The Biopsychosocial Model

The biopsychosocial model conceptualizes biological, psychological, and social processes as dynamically interconnected systems rather than independent domains. In the context of artificial intelligence and digital environments, this interconnectedness becomes especially significant. Digital engagement does not produce isolated outcomes; instead, it simultaneously alters neural functioning, emotional experience, and patterns of social interaction. These dimensions operate in continuous feedback loops, where biological changes influence psychological states, and social environments further reinforce both. Understanding this integrated structure is essential for capturing the full complexity of human adaptation in AI-mediated contexts.

When this framework is applied to the question of artificial intelligence and digital behavior, its analytical power becomes immediately apparent. The effects of AI-mediated environments do not respect disciplinary boundaries. Consider a straightforward example: a young person who spends several hours each evening engaged with algorithmically optimized social media content experiences disrupted sleep as a result of blue-light exposure and emotional arousal (a biological effect), develops heightened anxiety from continuous social comparison (a psychological effect), and gradually

withdraws from face-to-face social interaction in favor of digital connection (a social effect). These are not three separate problems; they are three dimensions of a single, unfolding process. The biopsychosocial model provides the framework needed to hold all three in view simultaneously and to trace the feedback loops that connect them.

2.2 Cognitive Offloading and Digital Dependence

One of the most significant and far-reaching changes that AI tools have introduced into everyday cognitive life is the phenomenon that researchers describe as cognitive offloading the practice of transferring mental tasks that were formerly performed internally to external technological systems (Carr, 2010). Navigation, memory storage, arithmetic, language translation, information retrieval — tasks that once required active mental engagement are now routinely delegated to devices and algorithms.

The efficiency gains are genuine and substantial. But there are important reasons to consider the long-term consequences of this delegation carefully. When individuals consistently rely on external systems for cognitive tasks, internally driven processes such as critical reasoning, memory consolidation, and reflective judgment may gradually weaken due to reduced active engagement. When the brain consistently externalizes functions such as memory, calculation, and judgment, the neural pathways that support those functions receive less activation and may weaken over time. Carr (2010) has argued compellingly that the cumulative effect of widespread cognitive offloading is a gradual erosion of precisely the capacities — sustained attention, critical reasoning, independent judgment — that are most indispensable for navigating complex human situations. The efficiency of AI tools may be purchased, in part, at the cost of cognitive depth.

2.3 AI as a Structure of Behavioral Governance

From the perspective of administrative psychology, there is a striking structural parallel between AI-driven platforms and institutional authority systems. Like formal organizations, algorithmic platforms regulate behavior — through recommendations, personalized content delivery, and the design of interfaces that make certain actions easy and others difficult. They shape norms, by selectively amplifying particular types of content and suppressing others. And they exercise influence largely invisibly, through mechanisms that most users neither understand nor have any meaningful opportunity to contest. Bucher (2018) has analyzed this dynamic in detail, arguing that algorithmic systems exercise a form of power that is all the more effective for being imperceptible. Recognizing AI as a structure of behavioral governance is essential for understanding why its psychological effects are not accidental byproducts of neutral tools, but are, to a significant degree, designed outcomes that reflect the interests of the organizations that build and deploy them.

3. Biological Impacts of AI-Mediated Digital Environments

3.1 Attention, Cognitive Load, and Neural Functioning

Contemporary digital environments operate at a pace and intensity that differ significantly from the conditions under which human attentional systems developed. Information is delivered in rapid, continuous streams, requiring frequent shifts in focus and reducing opportunities for sustained and reflective attention. Content arrives in rapid, continuous streams, each item optimized for immediate emotional salience. The pace of switching between stimuli is extraordinarily high. And the architecture of these environments actively discourages the kind of sustained, focused attention that deep cognitive work requires.

Rosen and colleagues (2013) have documented how habitual engagement with such environments affects attentional systems, finding that frequent media multitasking is

associated with reduced capacity for sustained attention and greater susceptibility to distraction. The concern is not simply that people are distracted in the moment, but that sustained exposure to high-stimulation digital environments may gradually reconfigure the neural architecture of attention itself — training the brain to expect and require constant novelty, and undermining its capacity for the slower, more deliberate modes of processing on which complex reasoning, empathetic engagement, and creative thought depend.

3.2 Sleep Disruption and Circadian Rhythm

Among the best-documented biological consequences of intensive digital technology use is its impact on sleep. Twenge (2019) has demonstrated a strong and consistent correlation between rising rates of smartphone and social media use particularly among adolescents and declining sleep duration and quality. The mechanisms through which this occurs are multiple and mutually reinforcing. Screen-based engagement, particularly during late hours, disrupts natural sleep regulation by interfering with circadian rhythms and prolonging cognitive and emotional arousal, making it difficult for the mind to transition into restorative sleep. The algorithmically engineered compellingness of digital content creates what might be described as a gravitational pull that keeps users engaged past the point at which they would naturally withdraw for rest. And the emotional arousal generated by social media interactions the anticipatory anxiety of waiting for responses, the arousal of receiving notifications, the rumination triggered by social comparison can persist for hours after a device is set aside, making the mental deceleration that sleep requires genuinely difficult to achieve.

The consequences of chronic sleep disruption are comprehensive and severe: impaired consolidation of new memories, reduced capacity for emotional regulation, heightened susceptibility to anxiety and depressive states, degraded immune function, and diminished cognitive performance across virtually every domain of functioning. When AI-mediated digital environments systematically undermine sleep quality for large segments of the population, the effects reverberate through every dimension of individual and collective human life.

3.3 Dopamine, Reward Pathways, and Compulsive Engagement

Montag and Diefenbach (2018) have drawn attention to the neurophysiological mechanisms through which digital platforms secure and maintain behavioral engagement. AI-driven platforms are intentionally structured to reinforce user engagement by repeatedly activating reward-based neural responses. These responses involve the same neural circuitry associated with fundamental human rewards such as food, social interaction, and addictive behaviors, thereby creating powerful and self-reinforcing engagement loops. Positive social feedback, delivered through likes, shares, and comments, produces brief but meaningful dopamine responses that reward platform use and motivate its repetition. The intermittent and unpredictable nature of this feedback the uncertainty about whether any given post will elicit a satisfying response amplifies its reinforcing power considerably, exploiting the same variable-ratio reinforcement schedule that makes gambling behaviors so resistant to extinction.

Over time, these neurological patterns can solidify into habitual or compulsive use that operates independently of conscious intention. The person who reaches for their phone involuntarily dozens of times a day is not simply failing to exercise self-control; they are contending with behavioral mechanisms that have been deliberately designed to produce exactly that pattern of engagement. Understanding the neurobiological substrate of digital compulsion is important both for developing effective interventions and for situating moral responsibility appropriately.

4. Psychological Impacts

4.1 Algorithmic Decision-Making and the Erosion of Personal Autonomy

Artificial intelligence is increasingly positioned as a decision-making partner across virtually every domain of life from navigation and entertainment selection to career advice and health management. This positioning carries real benefits. AI decision-support tools extend human capability in meaningful ways, helping people process information at a scale and speed that unaided human cognition cannot match. But the relationship between AI-assisted decision-making and psychological autonomy is more complex than a straightforward story of empowerment.

Perceived control over one's own choices is a well-established contributor to psychological well-being, motivation, and self-efficacy. When individuals consistently delegate decision-making to external systems — and when those systems are opaque in their operations and difficult to interrogate or contest — the cumulative effect can be a subtle but pervasive sense of diminished agency. People may come to feel that the world they inhabit has been pre-arranged for them by forces they do not understand and cannot meaningfully influence. This diffuse sense of helplessness is psychologically corrosive and connects to broader questions about what it means to live an autonomous human life in an AI-mediated world. Over time, this gradual shift from self-directed to system-guided decision-making may reshape individuals' perception of personal agency, raising important psychological concerns about autonomy in digitally structured environments.

4.2 Anxiety, Emotional Dysregulation, and the Pace of Digital Life

The association between intensive social media use and elevated rates of anxiety and emotional instability is one of the most consistently replicated findings in contemporary psychological research (Keles et al., 2020). Multiple mechanisms contribute to this association. The sheer volume and velocity of information delivered by digital environments news, social updates, notifications, alerts places sustained demands on emotional processing systems that were calibrated for a much slower informational environment. The result, for many users, is a state of chronic low-grade hyperarousal that closely mimics the phenomenology of anxiety.

Beyond volume and pace, the specific content of algorithmically curated social media environments tends to be emotionally destabilizing by design. Emotionally provocative content material that makes people angry, fearful, or outraged generates substantially more engagement than neutral or affirming content, and is therefore systematically amplified by recommendation algorithms whose primary metric is engagement time. The person scrolling through a social media feed is not encountering a representative sample of human experience; they are immersed in an algorithmically selected collection of the most emotionally arousing stimuli available. Sustained exposure to such an environment predictably elevates anxiety, erodes emotional stability, and reduces the capacity for the kind of calm, deliberate self-regulation on which mental health depends.

4.3 Identity Formation, Social Comparison, and the Digital Self

In digital environments, self-evaluation increasingly occurs within a globally expanded and algorithmically curated field of comparison, extending the fundamental human tendency for social comparison (Festinger, 1954). Individuals are no longer limited to immediate social circles, but are continuously exposed to selectively presented and often idealized representations of others' lives. Social media environments amplify this process by creating persistent exposure to highly curated identities that function

as implicit standards for self-evaluation. Research by Fardouly and colleagues (2015) has documented the corrosive effects of social media social comparison on body image and self-esteem, particularly among adolescent girls and young women. But the phenomenon extends across virtually every domain of self-evaluation: professional achievement, social relationships, material lifestyle, intellectual ability, physical fitness.

What makes social media particularly damaging as a context for identity formation — a process that is already demanding under any circumstances (Marcia, 1980) — is that it creates structural incentives for performance over authenticity. Users present idealized versions of their lives, constructing a collective illusion in which everyone appears successful, happy, and fulfilled. Against this manufactured backdrop, ordinary human difficulty, self-doubt, and struggle appear as personal failures rather than universal experiences. The consequence, for many users, is a persistent and painful gap between the self they experience privately and the self that appears to measure up in public comparison.

4.4 Digital Addiction and Compulsive Platform Use

Andreassen (2015) has provided a systematic account of the behavioral patterns associated with digital addiction, encompassing compulsive use that persists despite awareness of its harmful consequences; progressive escalation in engagement required to achieve equivalent satisfaction; withdrawal-like symptoms of irritability, restlessness, and anxiety when access is restricted; and meaningful interference with educational, occupational, or relational functioning. These patterns are not uniformly distributed across the population. They cluster disproportionately among individuals with pre-existing psychological vulnerabilities elevated anxiety, depression, low self-esteem, impaired self-regulation suggesting that AI-driven platforms do not create fragility but are highly effective at identifying and exploiting it. Addressing digital addiction therefore requires attention both to platform design and to the psychological conditions that render individuals vulnerable.

5. Social Impacts of AI-Mediated Environments

5.1 Transformations in Human Communication

The conventions of AI-mediated digital communication differ from those of face-to-face interaction in ways that are subtle but cumulatively significant. Digital communication tends toward brevity and speed; emotion is compressed into icons and abbreviations; the physical presence, vocal tone, and facial expression of the conversational partner are absent. Valkenburg and Peter (2011) have examined how extensive habituation to these conventions may affect the development of social skills, particularly in younger users who are developing communicative competence primarily in digital contexts. The concern is not simply that digital communication is impoverished relative to face-to-face interaction, but that it cultivates different expectations — for immediacy, brevity, and emotional simplification — that may prove limiting when richer forms of communication are required.

5.2 Relationships, Intimacy, and the Paradox of Digital Connection

Turkle (2011) identified what she described as the central paradox of digital social life: technology that was designed to connect people more easily and more constantly has, for many, produced a form of connection that is simultaneously more extensive and less satisfying. The accessibility and convenience of digital communication can expand the reach of social networks and facilitate the maintenance of relationships across distance. But the depth, vulnerability, and mutual investment that characterize genuinely intimate relationships appear to be more difficult to sustain in environments

that privilege convenience and manage the discomfort of authentic encounter.

5.3 Algorithmic Norm Formation and Social Standards

Perhaps the most underexamined social consequence of AI-mediated environments is the role that algorithmic systems play in shaping social norms. By selectively amplifying certain kinds of content content that generates high engagement, that conforms to dominant aesthetic and behavioral conventions, that reflects the preferences of the most commercially valuable demographic groups recommendation algorithms quietly constitute a new kind of normative authority. What is amplified becomes visible; what is visible becomes normal; what becomes normal becomes aspirational. Chou and Edge (2012) have documented how social media use shapes perceptions of others' lives, with users systematically overestimating the happiness and success of their peers based on their curated digital self-presentations. Bandura's (1986) social learning theory provides a useful framework for understanding how algorithmically mediated observation of idealized social models can shape behavior and identity across large populations.

6. Human Adaptation to AI-Mediated Environments

One of the most important correctives to a purely deficit-focused account of AI's psychological effects is the recognition that human beings are active, resourceful adapters rather than passive recipients of environmental influence. The history of human development is, among other things, a history of adaptation to new informational environments writing, print, broadcasting each of which altered cognitive habits, social structures, and cultural norms in ways that were initially disorienting and ultimately transformative.

In the domain of cognitive adaptation, many individuals have developed effective strategies for managing information overload: selective attention, deliberate curation of digital inputs, and the compartmentalization of online and offline time. Emotionally, growing awareness of digital influence has enabled some individuals to develop greater metacognitive insight into their own platform-related vulnerabilities, and to cultivate coping strategies that reduce the emotional impact of social comparison and negative content exposure. Behaviorally, practices such as intentional digital minimalism, scheduled device-free time, and the deliberate cultivation of offline relationships and activities represent meaningful adaptations that protect well-being without requiring complete withdrawal from digital life. Recognizing and supporting these adaptive capacities is as important as identifying the risks.

7. Risk and Protective Factors

Not all individuals are equally affected by the psychological hazards of AI-mediated digital environments. Several factors appear to amplify vulnerability: excessive and unstructured screen time; low self-regulatory capacity; a strong orientation toward social comparison; limited awareness of algorithmic influence; and pre-existing psychological vulnerabilities including anxiety and depression. Adolescents are particularly at risk, given the developmental significance of identity formation, peer relationships, and social comparison during this life stage.

Against these risks, several protective factors have been identified. Digital literacy the capacity to understand how algorithmic systems function and to engage with them critically rather than passively substantially reduces susceptibility to manipulation and enables more intentional platform use. Emotional intelligence supports self-regulation in the face of emotionally provocative content. A strong, supportive offline social network provides an alternative source of validation and connection that reduces dependence on digital platforms for relational needs. And a disposition toward ethical, reflective technology use treating digital tools as means rather than ends appears to be

an important buffer against the most damaging psychological effects of AI-mediated environments.

8. Ethical and Administrative Implications

The analysis presented in this paper has significant implications for questions of ethics, governance, and institutional responsibility. If AI systems function as structures of behavioral governance shaping cognition, emotion, and social norms in systematic and largely invisible ways then their design and deployment are not merely technical matters but ethical ones. The choices made by platform designers and technology companies about what to optimize for, whose interests to prioritize, and what consequences to accept have direct and far-reaching implications for psychological well-being at a population scale.

The current landscape, in which engagement maximization is the primary metric driving algorithmic design, creates powerful structural incentives to exploit psychological vulnerabilities rather than protect against them. Bucher (2018) has argued that algorithmic power is most effective precisely because it is imperceptible users who do not understand how they are being influenced cannot meaningfully consent to or resist that influence. This analysis points toward the urgent need for transparency requirements that make algorithmic systems legible to the people they affect; independent oversight mechanisms capable of holding technology companies accountable for the psychological consequences of their design choices; and active mental health safeguards built into platform architecture rather than treated as afterthoughts. This raises critical questions about the ethical boundaries of algorithmic influence and the responsibility of institutions in safeguarding psychological well-being.

9. Implications for Practice

For individuals, the primary implication of this analysis is the importance of developing deliberate, reflective habits of technology use. This means cultivating awareness of one's own patterns of digital engagement the emotional triggers, the compulsive moments, the comparisons that consistently generate distress and developing practical strategies for managing them. Mindful use of technology, regular digital disengagement, and the intentional cultivation of offline relationships and activities are not merely lifestyle preferences; they are psychologically significant protective practices.

For educators, the challenge is to equip students with the critical capacities needed to navigate AI-mediated environments without being dominated by them. This requires integrating digital literacy genuine understanding of how algorithmic systems function and how they influence behavior into curricula at every level, alongside the development of critical thinking skills that enable students to evaluate digital content and algorithmic recommendations independently.

For policymakers, the challenge is to establish governance frameworks adequate to the scale and speed of AI development. This means developing regulatory standards for algorithmic transparency and accountability; creating mechanisms for independent review of the psychological impacts of platform design decisions; and ensuring that the interests of the most vulnerable users children, adolescents, individuals with mental health vulnerabilities receive explicit protections in AI governance frameworks.

For technology designers, the implication is straightforward in principle if demanding in practice: the optimization targets that drive algorithmic design need to be reoriented toward human well-being rather than engagement maximization. Designing for well-being means building systems that support autonomy, protect sleep, reduce compulsive use, and enable rather than exploit the natural human needs for connection, recognition,

and meaning.

10. Conclusion

Artificial intelligence is reshaping human experience in ways that are simultaneously profound and largely invisible. Its effects on cognition, emotion, identity, and social life are not incidental side effects of useful tools but are systematic consequences of systems designed to govern behavior at scale. The biopsychosocial framework applied in this paper reveals that these consequences are real, significant, and deeply interconnected that disrupted sleep, elevated anxiety, eroded autonomy, and fragmented identity are not separate problems but dimensions of a single complex process unfolding across biological, psychological, and social levels simultaneously.

At the same time, this analysis resists a deterministic or purely pessimistic reading of the human condition in the age of AI. Human beings are adaptive, resilient, and capable of developing the awareness and skills needed to navigate even radically changed informational environments. The goal of the framework proposed in this paper is not to counsel withdrawal from digital life but to support the kind of informed, intentional, and psychologically grounded engagement with AI-mediated environments that makes genuine flourishing possible.

The future of mental health in an AI-shaped world depends not on technology alone but on whether individuals, institutions, educators, and policymakers can develop the collective wisdom to guide technological development toward genuinely human ends. That is a challenge of the first order and one that the discipline of psychology is uniquely well positioned to help address. If left unexamined, these systems risk normalizing behavioral patterns that prioritize engagement over psychological well-being. A psychologically informed approach to AI design and governance is therefore essential for protecting human autonomy, mental health, and the integrity of social life in the digital age.

Author's Declaration:

I/We, the author(s)/co-author(s), declare that the entire content, views, analysis, and conclusions of this article are solely my/our own. I/We take full responsibility, individually and collectively, for any errors, omissions, ethical misconduct, copyright violations, plagiarism, defamation, misrepresentation, or any legal consequences arising now or in the future. The publisher, editors, and reviewers shall not be held responsible or liable in any way for any legal, ethical, financial, or reputational claims related to this article. All responsibility rests solely with the author(s)/co-author(s), jointly and severally. I/We further affirm that there is no conflict of interest financial, personal, academic, or professional regarding the subject, findings, or publication of this article.

References

1. Andreassen, C. S. (2015). Online social network site addiction: A comprehensive review. Current Addiction Reports, 2(2), 175–184.
2. Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Prentice-Hall.
3. Bucher, T. (2018). If...then: Algorithmic power and politics. Oxford University Press.
4. Carr, N. (2010). The shallows: What the Internet is doing to our brains. W. W. Norton & Company.
5. Chou, H. T. G., & Edge, N. (2012). "They are happier and having better lives than I am": The impact of using Facebook on perceptions of others' lives. Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, 15(2), 117–121.
6. Engel, G. L. (1977). The need for a new medical model: A challenge for biomedicine. Science, 196(4286), 129–136.
7. Fardouly, J., Diedrichs, P. C., Vartanian, L. R., & Halliwell, E. (2015). Social comparisons on social media: The impact of Facebook on young women's body image concerns and mood. Body Image, 13, 38–45.
8. Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. Human Relations, 7(2), 117–140.
9. Keles, B., McCrae, N., & Grealish, A. (2020). A systematic review: The influence of social media on depression, anxiety and psychological distress in adolescents. International Journal of Adolescence

and Youth, 25(1), 79–93.
10. Marcia, J. E. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), Handbook of adolescent psychology (pp. 159–187). Wiley.
11. Montag, C., & Diefenbach, S. (2018). Towards homo digitalis: Important research issues for psychology and the neurosciences at the dawn of the internet of things and the digital society. Sustainability, 10(2), 415.
12. Rosen, L. D., Carrier, L. M., & Cheever, N. A. (2013). Facebook and texting made me do it: Media-induced task-switching while studying. Computers in Human Behavior, 29(3), 948–958.
13. Turkle, S. (2011). Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other. Basic Books.
14. Twenge, J. M. (2019). iGen: Why today's super-connected kids are growing up less rebellious, more tolerant, less happy — and completely unprepared for adulthood. Atria Books.
15. Valkenburg, P. M., & Peter, J. (2011). Online communication among adolescents: An integrated model of its attraction, opportunities, and risks. Journal of Adolescent Health, 48(2), 121–127.

Cite this Article-

'Dr. Sanjay Kumar; Dr. Manish Kant', 'Artificial Intelligence, Digital Behaviour, and Mental Health: A Bio psychosocial Perspective on Human Adaptation in the Technological Era *ResearchNext International Multidisciplinary Journal, ISSN: 3107-9725 (Online), Volume:2, Issue:1, January-March 2026.*