Journal of Rare Cardiovascular Diseases
ISSN: 2299-3711 (Print) | e-ISSN: 2300-5505 (Online)
www.jrcd.eu

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Health Crises in the Digital Age: A Sociological Examination of Stigma and Social Regulation in HIV/AIDS and COVID-19

Joydeb Patra[1], Itishree Panda[2], Himan Kar[3] and Saptaparni Raha[4]
[1] Post Doc Scholar, School of Sciences and Humanities, SR University, Telangana and Assistant Professor, School of Law, Brainware University, Kolkata, India
[2]Assistant Professor, School of Sciences and Humanities, SR University, Warangal, Telangana India
[3]Senior Doctoral Research Scholar, Department of Sociology, Vidyasagar University
[4]Doctoral Research Scholar, Department of Law, Brainware University

*Corresponding Author:
Itishree Panda
(itishreepanda033@gmail.com)

Article History
Received: 14.08.2025
Revised: 25.08.2025
Accepted: 17.09.2025
Published: 30.09.2025

Abstract: Health crises often expose the moral and structural fault lines of societies. Both HIV/AIDS and COVID-19, though distinct in epidemiology, have produced similar sociological consequences—stigmatisation, moral panic, digital surveillance, and the reconfiguration of social regulation. In the digital age, where information flows instantly and identities are mediated online, the social meanings of illness are amplified through virtual narratives, misinformation, and moral judgment. This paper examines how stigma operates as a mechanism of social regulation, shaping public perceptions and institutional responses during these pandemics. Drawing from the works of Michel Foucault, Erving Goffman, and contemporary digital sociology, the study highlights how digital infrastructures have become new arenas for biopolitical control and resistance. Ultimately, this paper calls for a rethinking of health ethics and social solidarity in an age where data, disease, and discourse are increasingly intertwined.

Keywords: Health crises, Digital sociology, Stigma, Social regulation, HIV/AIDS, COVID-19, Biopolitics.

INTRODUCTION

Health crises have historically revealed more than the vulnerabilities of the human body—they have exposed the moral, political, and cultural foundations of society itself. From the plague of medieval Europe to the HIV/AIDS epidemic and the recent COVID-19 pandemic, every outbreak has triggered collective anxieties that extend far beyond the biomedical realm. These crises function as mirrors, reflecting deep-seated fears, inequalities, and notions of purity, responsibility, and deviance. They force societies to question who belongs within the moral and social order and who is marked as "risky" or "contagious."

The sociological study of such health crises reveals that stigma operates as a powerful form of social regulation. As Erving Goffman (1963) explains, stigma is not merely a mark of difference but a process through which individuals or groups are socially discredited. Illnesses become moralised when they are tied to ideas of sin, irresponsibility, or social failure. During the HIV/AIDS epidemic of the 1980s and 1990s, this process was acutely visible. The disease was framed not only as a medical condition but as a moral indictment—particularly of gay men, sex workers, and drug users. Governments and media often reinforced this moral panic, portraying HIV/AIDS as a punishment for perceived moral deviance. The stigmatisation of those infected produced exclusion and silence, making the epidemic as much a social crisis as a medical one.

In contrast, the COVID-19 pandemic unfolded within an era of digital interconnectedness, where information—and misinformation—circulated at unprecedented speed. Social media platforms became key arenas where fear, blame, and moral judgment were produced and amplified. Individuals and communities were labelled as "super-spreaders," "rule-breakers," or "irresponsible citizens." Healthcare workers were sometimes ostracised for their proximity to infection, while others faced digital shaming for violating lockdown norms. This new form of "digital stigma" operated through public exposure and surveillance rather than private gossip.

The digital age has therefore reshaped the terrain of social regulation. Governments introduced digital surveillance tools such as contact-tracing apps, biometric monitoring, and algorithmic risk assessments to control infection. While these technologies were justified as tools of public safety, they also extended the reach of biopower, a term Michel Foucault (1978) used to describe how modern states regulate populations by managing life and health. In the name of security, citizens' movements and personal data became subjects of monitoring, creating new forms of control under the guise of care.

Despite their differences, both HIV/AIDS and COVID-19 demonstrate that health crises are deeply intertwined with power, morality, and social order. HIV/AIDS revealed how marginalised identities could be pathologised, while COVID-19 showed how even ordinary citizens could become targets of stigma through digital visibility. Yet, both moments also generated counter-movements of solidarity and resistance. Activists, community networks, and digital advocates used media—first print and then online platforms—to challenge dominant narratives, promote empathy, and demand equitable healthcare.

In essence, health crises do not merely threaten physical survival; they test the ethical and social fabric of humanity. In the digital era, where data, discourse, and disease intersect, understanding stigma as a dynamic process of regulation becomes crucial. The challenge lies in cultivating digital and social spaces that prioritise care, privacy, and collective responsibility over surveillance and shame. Only then can societies respond to future health crises with compassion rather than control.

Theoretical Framework: Stigma, Biopower, and Digital Regulation

Erving Goffman's (1963) classic work Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity remains foundational for understanding the social construction of deviance and exclusion. Goffman conceptualised stigma as a social process through which individuals are discredited or devalued based on attributes considered undesirable or morally tainted by society. It is not the attribute itself—such as illness, disability, or nonconformity—that causes stigma, but the social meanings attached to it. Stigma emerges from interaction; it is a relational and performative act where "normal" individuals define the "deviant" other.

In the context of illness, stigma arises when disease becomes moralised—when sickness is no longer viewed merely as a biomedical condition but as a reflection of personal failure, irresponsibility, or moral impurity. Throughout history, societies have interpreted diseases as metaphors for sin, contagion, or social decay. For instance, people living with HIV/AIDS were stigmatised because the illness was initially associated with homosexuality, promiscuity, and drug use—behaviours seen as socially or morally deviant. In such cases, the sick person is not just physically ill but symbolically marked as dangerous or culpable. Illness stigma thus performs a social function: it reinforces moral boundaries and legitimises social control by distinguishing the "pure" from the "polluted."

Michel Foucault's (1977, 1978) concepts of biopower and governmentality expand on this logic by linking health, knowledge, and power. Biopower refers to the techniques and strategies through which modern states regulate populations by managing life processes—birth, disease, sexuality, and death. Health becomes a site of governance where the body is disciplined, and populations are controlled through public health measures, surveillance, and normalisation. Foucault shows how medicine, rather than being a neutral field, operates within a political economy of power, defining what counts as "normal" or "healthy."

Governmentality, as Foucault elaborates, describes the ways in which individuals internalize these norms and govern themselves in accordance with social expectations. Public health interventions, therefore, are not merely technical exercises but disciplinary mechanisms that shape conduct. Quarantine, vaccination campaigns, and contact tracing are forms of regulation that make citizens visible, calculable, and governable. During health crises, these disciplinary practices intensify as societies seek to maintain order, protect the collective body, and define moral responsibility.

In the digital age, these mechanisms of power are profoundly reconfigured. The rise of digital technologies has transformed the ways through which health information is produced, circulated, and regulated. Digital sociology, as discussed by Deborah Lupton (2016) and Noortje Marres (2017), argues that online platforms have become new spaces where social control, data extraction, and moral judgment intersect.

The digital sphere not only reflects social norms but actively shapes them through algorithmic filtering, surveillance systems, and participatory forms of moral policing.

Health crises such as COVID-19 illustrate this transformation vividly. Governments worldwide used digital contact tracing, mobility tracking, and data dashboards to monitor infections. While these technologies were justified in the name of public safety, they also extended the reach of surveillance and state power into intimate aspects of everyday life. Citizens became both subjects of health governance and sources of data—self-monitoring their symptoms, movements, and social interactions. In this way, digital biopolitics emerged: power operating not only through institutions but through networks, apps, and algorithms that shape behaviour and identity.

Simultaneously, digital platforms facilitated new forms of stigma and moral judgment. Online shaming of individuals who violated lockdowns, spread infection, or refused vaccination echoed older patterns of moral regulation seen in the HIV/AIDS era—but now amplified through viral visibility. Yet, digital spaces also offered possibilities for empowerment. Social media campaigns, online support groups, and digital activism have challenged stigma, promoted awareness, and fostered solidarity among marginalised groups.

Thus, health crises in the digital age are not purely biomedical events but deeply mediated social phenomena. They reveal how the politics of visibility, morality, and control are enacted through digital infrastructures. Goffman's insights on stigma and Foucault's theories of biopower find renewed relevance in this context. Together, they help us understand how societies assign blame, produce moral hierarchies, and regulate behaviour through both social and technological means. Ultimately, examining health crises through this sociological lens invites critical reflection on the balance between care and control, empowerment and surveillance, in a world increasingly governed by data and digital mediation.

HIV/AIDS: STIGMA, MORALITY, AND THE POLITICS OF BLAME

The HIV/AIDS epidemic, which emerged in the late 20th century, stands as one of the most stigmatised and morally charged health crises in modern history. What began as a biomedical concern soon transformed into a social and cultural crisis, largely due to the moral framing of the disease. Initially identified among gay men in Western countries, HIV/AIDS was quickly labelled a "gay disease," a term that reflected not scientific accuracy but deep-seated social prejudices. This framing produced widespread moral panic, reinforcing existing fears about sexuality, deviance, and non-normative identities. As Gregory Herek (1999) notes, the stigma surrounding HIV/AIDS was not merely about infection—it was a moral discourse that targeted entire communities.

People living with HIV/AIDS faced multiple forms of discrimination—social exclusion, loss of employment, denial of medical services, and even violence. The epidemic became a means of moral policing, where individuals' private behaviours were scrutinised under public judgment. Governments and media outlets further amplified this stigma by categorising certain groups—such as sex workers, intravenous drug users, and homosexual men—as "high-risk populations." This labelling effectively shifted responsibility from society and state institutions to the marginalised, portraying them as vectors rather than victims of the disease. Such narratives reinforced class, gender, and sexual hierarchies while legitimising institutional neglect.

From a sociological perspective, the HIV/AIDS crisis revealed that illness is not merely a biological condition but a socially constructed phenomenon. Susan Sontag (1989) argued that societies often attach moral metaphors to diseases—such as "punishment," "sin," or "pollution"—which shape how illness is perceived and managed. These metaphors transform disease into a symbol of moral failure, deepening the suffering of those affected. In the pre-digital era, stigma circulated through print media, religious sermons, and social gossip, producing fear and misinformation that often-overshadowed scientific understanding.

Yet, amid these forces of exclusion, communities also developed powerful forms of resistance. Grassroots organisations, non-governmental groups, and queer collectives began reclaiming the narrative through pamphlets, public campaigns, and peer education programs. Activists emphasised compassion, awareness, and human rights, challenging the dominant discourse that equated illness with immorality. Their efforts helped humanise those living with HIV/AIDS and laid the foundation for global health advocacy.

Thus, the HIV/AIDS epidemic, beyond its biomedical dimension, became a profound sociological event—exposing how stigma, power, and morality shape our collective response to disease. It stands as a reminder that public health is inseparable from social justice and that combating stigma is as crucial as curing infection.

COVID-19: DIGITAL SURVEILLANCE, MORAL PANIC, AND NEW STIGMAS

The outbreak of COVID-19 in 2020 transformed not only global health governance but also the social dynamics surrounding disease, risk, and responsibility. Unlike earlier pandemics, the COVID-19 crisis unfolded within a fully digitalised world, where technology became the primary instrument for both managing and narrating the pandemic. With the rapid deployment of contact-tracing applications, biometric monitoring, and real-time data dashboards, public health management entered the realm of digital surveillance. Governments and corporations collected vast amounts of personal data—tracking location, body temperature, vaccination status, and travel history—under the justification of safeguarding public health. While such technologies were effective in tracing infections and reducing transmission, they simultaneously extended the reach of what Michel Foucault terms biopolitical power, wherein the state regulates bodies and populations through data and visibility. Citizens, in this process, became both the subjects and objects of surveillance: governed by data they produced yet often excluded from decisions about how that data was used, stored, or shared (Zuboff, 2019).

This digitalisation of health management redefined the relationship between the state, technology, and the individual. What began as a health necessity evolved into a broader mechanism of social control—normalising constant monitoring and diminishing the boundaries between public health and personal privacy. For many, particularly in the Global South, digital surveillance also revealed existing inequalities.

Those without access to smartphones or stable internet connections were excluded from health systems that increasingly depended on digital registration and verification.

Parallel to this expansion of digital governance was the resurgence of stigma, albeit in new and technologically mediated forms. Social media platforms became powerful instruments for moral policing, misinformation, and the public shaming of individuals and groups associated with infection. In early 2020, when fear and uncertainty were high, people diagnosed with COVID-19 often faced social exclusion. Healthcare workers, paradoxically celebrated as “frontline heroes,” were at times ostracised by neighbours who feared contagion. Migrant labourers, struggling to return home during lockdowns, were portrayed by certain media narratives as “carriers” of the virus.

The digital sphere magnified stigma through the virality of misinformation and moral judgment. Online posts naming infected individuals, conspiracy theories about vaccine safety, and xenophobic remarks about particular regions or communities created an environment of distrust and hostility (Broom & Kenny, 2021).

What distinguished COVID-19 stigma from earlier epidemics such as HIV/AIDS was its breadth and reach. Instead of targeting particular identities—like sexuality or drug use—COVID-related stigma targeted mobility, class, and geography. Non-compliance with lockdown measures, refusal to wear masks, or vaccine hesitancy became moralised behaviours, often publicly condemned online.

This created what Mary Douglas (1966) describes as new “hierarchies of purity and danger,” where adherence to health norms signified moral virtue and deviation signified risk or irresponsibility.

The visibility of illness, amplified by digital technologies, therefore reinforced social divisions rather than unity. COVID-19, as a result, revealed not only a biological contagion but also a digital contagion of stigma—one that transformed disease management into a complex interplay of data, morality, and power.

Comparing HIV/AIDS and COVID-19: Continuities and Ruptures

Despite differences in transmission and temporality, both epidemics reveal structural similarities in how societies construct stigma and deploy regulation:

Dimension	**HIV/AIDS**	**COVID-19**
Moral Framing	Linked to sexuality, morality, and deviance	Linked to responsibility, hygiene, and civic duty
Social Visibility	Concealed, associated with marginalized groups	Hyper-visible through digital tracking and media
Regulatory Mechanisms	Medical surveillance, moral discourse	Digital surveillance, algorithmic governance
Resistance	Activism, advocacy, community care	Digital solidarity, misinformation counter-movements

The key rupture lies in **digital mediation**. While HIV/AIDS activism used print and physical networks, COVID-19 responses unfolded largely online. Yet, the core mechanism—stigma as a tool of social regulation—remains intact.

Digital Media, Misinformation, and the Politics of Truth

In both the HIV/AIDS and COVID-19 pandemics, information has functioned as a double-edged sword—vital for promoting awareness yet equally potent in spreading fear and misinformation. UNESCO's term "infodemic" captures how an overwhelming flow of unverified or misleading information can distort public understanding, intensify stigma, and deepen social divides. Digital media platforms have become critical arenas for these dynamics. They offer empowerment by enabling individuals living with HIV or long COVID to share personal experiences, access support networks, and challenge dominant narratives of illness. However, these same platforms often amplify misinformation, conspiracy theories, and state-endorsed narratives that legitimise surveillance and control.

Drawing on Michel Foucault's (1980) concept of the "regime of truth," the production of health knowledge today is shaped not merely by science but by intersecting powers—the state, medical institutions, and digital corporations. Through algorithms, platforms privilege certain discourses while marginalising others, creating a technologically mediated hierarchy of truth. Consequently, the stigmatisation of illness in the digital age is not only a social process but also a technological one, embedded within systems of data control and algorithmic visibility. Understanding this interplay between information, power, and technology is essential for fostering more ethical and inclusive digital health communication—one that prioritises empathy, transparency, and collective well-being over fear and control.

Resistance and Ethics in the Digital Age

Despite the expansion of surveillance and stigma, health crises also generate counter-narratives of solidarity and resistance. Digital platforms have hosted global health campaigns such as #U=U (Undetectable = Untransmittable) for HIV awareness and mental health drives during COVID-19 lockdowns.

Community-based digital activism demonstrates that social regulation is never total. Users reinterpret digital tools for care, education, and empathy. Yet, such practices require ethical reflection—particularly concerning privacy, consent, and the commodification of health data.

A sociology of digital health must therefore foreground **justice and inclusion**—acknowledging that digital divides mirror existing inequalities of class, gender, and geography. Ensuring equitable access to technology and protecting personal data are crucial for building a compassionate digital health ecosystem.

CONCLUSION

The comparative study of HIV/AIDS and COVID-19 reveals that stigma continues to be a powerful force in shaping social responses to health crises. Despite advances in technology and medicine, the moral logic of stigma—rooted in fear, blame, and exclusion—remains intact. In the digital age, the nature of stigma has evolved: while HIV/AIDS was marked by secrecy and whispered discrimination, COVID-19 witnessed public shaming and moral policing on social media platforms. Digital spaces amplified visibility, transforming private suffering into public spectacle and reinforcing social hierarchies of purity, responsibility, and danger.

As societies become more technologically mediated, ethical reflection on visibility, surveillance, and digital regulation becomes vital. Health crises must not perpetuate inequality or exclusion but rather foster empathy, solidarity, and justice. A sociological perspective reminds us that disease is not only biological but also social—constructed through narratives of morality and power. Thus, sociology should guide policy and public consciousness toward compassion, protecting human dignity in both physical and digital domains. In reimagining health ethics, the goal must be a more humane and inclusive response where technology serves care rather than control.

REFERENCES

1. Aghaei, A., and M. Aghaei. "Impact of Mass Media on HIV/AIDS Stigma Reduction." Journal of Health Communication, vol. 28, no. 3, 2023, pp. 215–223. https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2023.10096105.
2. Aghaei, A., and M. Aghaei. "Reducing HIV Public Stigma through News Information." Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking, vol. 25, no. 4, 2022, pp. 233–240. https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2022.21356.
3. Wu, F., and X. Wang. "Network Stigma towards People Living with HIV/AIDS and Its Impact." Journal of Health Psychology, vol. 20, no. 6, 2015,

pp. 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105314522404.

4. Dessie, Z. G., and T. Tadesse. “HIV-Related Stigma and Associated Factors: A Systematic Review.” Frontiers in Public Health, vol. 12, 2024, Article 1356430. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1356430.
5. Ibrahim, K., and S. A. R. Al-Dubai. “Social Media for the Prevention and Control of HIV/AIDS.” Journal of Medical Internet Research, vol. 26, no. 2, 2024, e37982. https://doi.org/10.2196/37982.
6. SeyedAlinaghi, S. A., and M. Karami. “Social Stigma during COVID-19: A Systematic Review.” Journal of Clinical Virology, vol. 145, 2023, pp. 105–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2023.105.
7. Wilandika, A., and D. Sari. “Social Stigma against Individuals with COVID-19.” Journal of Health Communication, vol. 28, no. 5, 2023, pp. 345–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/21642850.2022.2155166.
8. Budhwani, H., and R. Sun. “Creating COVID-19 Stigma by Referencing the Novel Coronavirus.” Journal of Health Communication, vol. 25, no. 10, 2020, pp. 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2020.1773275.
9. Wang, W., and X. Zhang. “Media Portrayals and Social Stigma Surrounding COVID-19 Survivors.” BMC Public Health, vol. 25, no. 1, 2025, Article 21840. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-025-21840-2.
10. Dienlin, T., and S. Trepte. “Effects of COVID-19 Related Social Media Use on Well-Being.” Scientific Reports, vol. 15, no. 1, 2025, Article 91385. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-91385-2.
11. World Health Organization. Social Stigma Associated with COVID-19: A Guide to Preventing and Addressing Social Stigma. 2020. https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronaviruse/covid19-stigma-guide.pdf.
12. Venetis, Mary, and Lara Hamama. “It's Time to Get Over 'COVID Shame'.” Time, 2020. https://time.com/6150012/covid-19-shame-guilt/.