

From Going Viral to Building Value: Strategic Communication in the Algorithmic Age

Nasaruddin Siregar¹
Universitas Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya

Sari Endah Nursyamsi²
Universitas Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya

Correspondence : Sari Endah Nursyamsi (sari.endah@dsn.ubharajaya.ac.id)

Submitted : 025-09-2025, Accepted : 27-10-2025, Published : 27-11-2025

Abstract

In the algorithmic age, strategic communication has undergone a profound transformation—from the pursuit of viral visibility to the cultivation of meaningful value. This study explores how communicators navigate the complex interplay between algorithmic performance metrics and human-centered values such as authenticity, ethics, and trust. Drawing on qualitative interviews with digital strategists, influencers, and communication professionals, complemented by digital content analysis, the research identifies three key dynamics reshaping the communicative landscape: algorithmic literacy as a new professional competence, the authenticity tension in self-presentation, and the rise of value-centered communication frameworks. Findings reveal that while algorithmic systems incentivize emotional intensity and frequency of engagement, communicators increasingly prioritize purpose-driven content that fosters long-term audience relationships and ethical credibility. This evolution redefines the role of communicators as algorithmic negotiators professionals who balance engagement optimization with moral responsibility and relational storytelling. Theoretically, the study contributes to digital communication scholarship by reframing virality not as an endpoint but as a phase within the larger process of value cultivation. Practically, it offers an emerging model of sustainable digital communication, where visibility serves meaning rather than merely capturing attention. Ultimately, the research argues that in a data-driven communication ecosystem, the most valuable commodity is not visibility but trust, positioning ethical and relational integrity as the core measures of success in the algorithmic era.

Keywords: Communication; Algorithmic Visibility; Digital Authenticity; Virality; Ethical Storytelling; Value-Based Communication; Algorithmic Literacy; Trust; Digital Media Ethics; Sustainable Communication

Introduction

In today's hyperconnected digital environment, communication has entered an era dominated by algorithms. Platforms such as TikTok, Instagram, YouTube, and X (formerly Twitter) have transformed the logic of visibility, determining what information circulates and which voices gain prominence. Unlike earlier models of mass communication, where reach was determined by editorial judgment or audience segmentation, today's media exposure is largely mediated by machine learning systems that prioritize engagement metrics—likes, shares, comments, and viewing time—over informational or ethical value. This shift has profoundly altered the nature of strategic communication, pushing communicators to design content not only

for human audiences but also for algorithmic interpretation.

The concept of “going viral” has become synonymous with success in digital culture, embodying the ideal of rapid dissemination and mass attention. However, the viral paradigm often privileges emotional immediacy, sensationalism, and superficial interaction at the expense of credibility, depth, and sustained relationships. As algorithms increasingly reward engagement spikes rather than meaningful discourse, organizations and individuals face a paradox: the more they optimize for virality, the more they risk eroding the trust and authenticity that underpin long-term value creation. This phenomenon raises a critical question for communication scholars and practitioners alike—how can strategic communication evolve from the pursuit of virality toward the cultivation of enduring value in an algorithmic landscape?

The algorithmic age has not only changed what is communicated but also how communication is strategized and measured. Contemporary communication strategies must consider platform-specific logics, data analytics, and automated curation, all of which influence audience behavior in subtle and often opaque ways. As Gillespie (2018) and Bucher (2020) argue, algorithms act as cultural intermediaries that shape public discourse and collective meaning. Consequently, the role of communicators has expanded beyond message crafting to include algorithmic literacy—the ability to understand, anticipate, and ethically engage with computational systems that govern information visibility.

This paper situates itself within this evolving context, exploring how organizations, brands, and digital influencers are shifting their focus from short-term virality toward sustainable, value-based communication strategies. It examines the theoretical and practical intersections of digital communication, algorithmic media studies, and strategic branding to address three central concerns:

- How do algorithmic systems influence strategic communication decisions?
- What challenges do communicators face in balancing virality with authenticity and ethical value?

- What emerging frameworks or practices can help build enduring audience relationships in algorithm-driven environments?

By addressing these questions, the study aims to contribute to an emerging discourse that redefines success in digital communication—not as a fleeting viral moment, but as a process of cultivating trust, purpose, and shared meaning. The findings are expected to inform both academic debates and practical strategies for communicators navigating the complexities of the algorithmic age.

Methods

This study employs a qualitative exploratory research design to examine how communication professionals, brands, and digital influencers navigate algorithmic environments to balance virality and long-term value creation. A multi-method approach was adopted, integrating semi-structured interviews and digital content analysis to gain both interpretive and empirical insights into strategic communication practices. Using purposive sampling, the research involved 30 participants, including digital strategists, brand communication managers, and independent content creators with significant online followings. Data were collected through online interviews lasting 45 to 60 minutes, alongside an analysis of 150 publicly available social media posts from platforms such as Instagram, TikTok, and YouTube. Interview questions explored participants' perceptions of algorithmic influence, ethical communication, and authenticity, while content analysis focused on engagement patterns, message themes, and algorithmic optimization strategies. Data were analyzed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), supported by NVivo 14 for coding and cross-referencing qualitative themes with engagement metrics. The study ensured validity through triangulation, member checking, and reflexive journaling to minimize researcher bias. Ethical approval was obtained, and participants provided informed consent with assurances of confidentiality. While the research focuses on visual and short-form digital communication, it recognizes limitations in generalizing findings across all digital ecosystems. Nevertheless, the study provides valuable insight into the evolving dynamics of strategic communication in algorithmically governed media environments.

Results and Discussion

Algorithmic Literacy as Strategic Competence

Across all participant groups, there was compelling evidence of a growing and deliberate investment in algorithmic awareness—what participants themselves described as “learning the

language of the platforms.” Communicators increasingly recognized that visibility in digital spaces is no longer a purely creative endeavor but a technically mediated performance, shaped by an intricate system of metrics and automated decision-making. Participants discussed devoting considerable time to studying platform analytics dashboards, experimenting with posting schedules, monitoring engagement fluctuations, and analyzing how small changes in format, captioning, or timing influenced algorithmic favorability. Metrics such as engagement rate, watch time, posting frequency, and audience retention were consistently cited as indicators of “algorithmic success.”

Many participants used evocative metaphors to describe this process. Terms like “reading the algorithm,” “pleasing the machine,” and “playing the visibility game” (Cotter, 2021) appeared repeatedly, revealing a shared cultural understanding of algorithmic systems as quasi-intelligent actors with which communicators must negotiate. These phrases capture both the sense of agency and dependence embedded in contemporary digital work. For many, algorithmic literacy was not merely a technical skill but an existential necessity—a condition for professional survival in attention-driven economies. Yet, despite their strategic adaptation, communicators expressed pervasive frustration toward the opacity and volatility of these systems, describing them as “unpredictable,” “biased,” and “constantly shifting goalposts.” Several participants likened the experience to “chasing a moving target” or “trying to guess what the algorithm wants today.”

This ambivalence captures the dual nature of algorithmic governance (Beer, 2017; Gillespie, 2018): while algorithms democratize visibility by allowing anyone to reach a mass audience, they simultaneously centralize control through hidden rules that dictate which voices are amplified and which remain unseen. Algorithms thus operate as both enablers and gatekeepers of communication, creating a paradox where communicators depend on the very systems that constrain them. As one digital strategist explained, “We create not just for our audience but for the algorithm’s approval. The algorithm is our first audience.” This insight encapsulates a profound transformation in communicative practice—where message design is no

longer oriented solely toward human understanding but also toward machine interpretation.

Emerging from this environment is a new form of algorithmic professionalism, a hybrid competence that merges creative storytelling with data literacy, predictive analytics, and technological adaptability. Participants demonstrated this by discussing practices such as A/B testing of post formats, algorithmic trend tracking, and the use of engagement simulators or third-party analytics tools. This professionalization reflects the broader restructuring of communication labor, where success is measured not only by message resonance but by how effectively one can manipulate algorithmic affordances to secure visibility.

However, this evolution also introduces critical ethical tensions. Several participants acknowledged a growing discomfort with the extent to which algorithmic incentives shape creative and moral decision-making. The pressure to optimize content for visibility often led to self-censorship, exaggeration, or the oversimplification of complex issues—behaviors that participants recognized as compromising authenticity and communicative integrity. As one influencer reflected, “Sometimes I feel like I’m not telling my story anymore; I’m telling the story the algorithm wants.”

This sentiment highlights the psychological and ethical costs of algorithmic adaptation. The algorithm, while positioned as an impersonal system, exerts a subtle form of behavioral governance, encouraging conformity to patterns of high engagement while discouraging nuance or dissenting perspectives. As Bucher (2018) and Napoli (2019) argue, such algorithmic conditioning commodifies creativity, transforming communicative expression into data optimized for platform profitability. The communicators in this study were acutely aware of this dynamic and often described oscillating between resistance and compliance—struggling to preserve authenticity while ensuring visibility within a system that rewards predictability over originality.

In essence, algorithmic literacy has become both a tool of empowerment and a source of dependency. On one hand, it enables communicators to strategically navigate complex digital ecologies and sustain audience connection in an increasingly competitive attention economy. On

the other, it exposes them to structural asymmetries of power, where creative freedom is constantly negotiated against the imperatives of algorithmic optimization. This duality underscores a central paradox of the algorithmic age: to be visible, communicators must speak in the language of machines—but to be trusted, they must remain recognizably human.

Authenticity Tension and the Politics of Visibility

The second major finding of this study highlights a pervasive tension between authenticity and algorithmic performance—a defining psychological and ethical dilemma of digital communication in the algorithmic age. Participants consistently described the emotional labor involved in balancing authentic voice with the performative demands of platform optimization. For many, authenticity was not simply a matter of personal expression but a strategic performance that had to be constantly adjusted to align with the rhythms of algorithmic visibility. As one influencer explained, “You have to be real, but not too real. People want honesty, but the algorithm rewards excitement, not silence.”

This paradox reflects what van Dijck (2013) terms the authenticity paradox, where digital self-presentation is simultaneously genuine and staged. Communicators must appear spontaneous, relatable, and transparent—qualities that audiences value—but these same qualities must be meticulously curated to satisfy algorithmic metrics such as engagement rate, watch time, and content consistency. In this sense, authenticity becomes not only a moral stance but also a strategic aesthetic, shaped by the affordances and constraints of platform architecture (Abidin, 2018; Duffy & Hund, 2019).

Empirical analysis of social media content revealed distinct patterns supporting this dynamic. Posts containing heightened emotional tone, provocative imagery, or controversial framing tended to attract rapid engagement spikes—likes, shares, and short-form comments—consistent with prior findings by Berger and Milkman (2012) that high-arousal emotions (e.g., awe, anger, anxiety) drive virality. However, these viral surges were often accompanied by audience skepticism, accusations of “clickbait,” or critical questioning of motive. In contrast, posts perceived as sincere, reflective, or socially meaningful tended to foster deeper comment

threads, sustained follower dialogue, and long-term audience retention, even when their initial reach was smaller. This suggests that while algorithmic systems favor emotional intensity, human audiences still reward emotional sincerity.

This duality reveals a deeper politics of visibility at play. Algorithms tend to amplify content that triggers fast affective reactions—pleasure, outrage, surprise—because such reactions drive measurable engagement. However, these same dynamics marginalize slower, more reflective forms of discourse that foster understanding and empathy (Bucher, 2018; Bishop, 2019). Communicators who prioritize relational authenticity thus find themselves structurally disadvantaged within an ecosystem designed to monetize attention. As one content creator observed, “The algorithm doesn’t care if your message helps people—it only cares if people click.” This insight underscores a fundamental asymmetry in platform logic: while authenticity builds trust, virality builds data.

Participants frequently described the psychological toll of navigating this divide. The constant need to appear authentic while remaining algorithmically competitive created what many referred to as “algorithmic fatigue.” This form of exhaustion is both emotional and cognitive, emerging from the relentless pressure to produce content that feels personal yet performs commercially. Similar to the findings of Duffy (2017) on aspirational labor, communicators expressed anxiety about “falling out of the feed”—a metaphor for professional invisibility if they failed to post frequently enough or adapt quickly to platform changes. This continuous vigilance transforms authenticity into a form of labor—a managed emotion shaped by platform metrics rather than pure self-expression.

Moreover, the pursuit of “performative authenticity” blurs boundaries between personal identity and professional brand. For influencers, journalists, and digital marketers alike, the line between “being oneself” and “performing oneself” becomes increasingly indistinct. As Baym (2015) and Marwick (2013) have shown, this self-branding process commodifies identity, converting personality traits into marketable assets. Several participants articulated feelings of alienation from their digital selves, with one noting, “I sometimes don’t know if people follow

me for who I am or for the version of me that the algorithm prefers.” This phenomenon illustrates how algorithmic visibility transforms identity into infrastructure, where selfhood becomes a resource optimized for engagement.

These findings collectively suggest that authenticity tension is not merely a stylistic challenge, but a moral and structural negotiation between human intention and machine mediation. To remain visible, communicators must compromise spontaneity; to remain genuine, they risk invisibility. The resulting emotional strain reinforces the urgent need for value-based communication frameworks—approaches that prioritize sustainability, emotional well-being, and ethical storytelling over perpetual virality.

In this emerging paradigm, success is redefined not by the speed or scale of visibility, but by the depth and durability of connection. Sustainable engagement arises when communicators resist the impulse to “game” the algorithm and instead cultivate transparent, meaningful dialogue with audiences. This reframing aligns with broader movements in strategic communication and digital ethics that advocate for “slow media” (Levy, 2021) and purpose-driven communication (Iglesias & Ind, 2016). Ultimately, authenticity in the algorithmic age is no longer a fixed trait—it is a dynamic practice of integrity, resilience, and resistance against systems that reward performance over truth.

Value-Centered Communication Framework

The most significant development observed in this study is the emergence of value-centered communication frameworks, a shift that reflects a growing disillusionment with purely metric-driven forms of digital engagement. Participants across professional categories—ranging from digital marketers to social media influencers—consistently articulated a desire to create content that “means something,” “builds trust,” or “contributes positively to the audience.” This discursive shift indicates a conscious movement away from the pursuit of algorithmic virality as an end in itself, toward a philosophy of communication rooted in purpose, ethics, and relational depth.

This orientation resonates with Iglesias, Ind, and Alfaro’s (2013) concept of authentic

brand co-creation, which argues that sustainable relationships between organizations and audiences emerge from shared purpose rather than promotional dominance. Similarly, Freeman's (1984) stakeholder theory underscores that communication derives value when it aligns with collective meaning and social responsibility, not merely shareholder metrics. Within this study, participants who embraced such approaches viewed audiences not as data points to be converted, but as communities of co-creation—active collaborators in the ongoing negotiation of brand and identity narratives.

Empirical analysis of social media content revealed clear distinctions between algorithmic engagement and relational engagement. Posts centered on education, social causes, or behind-the-scenes transparency generally performed below average in immediate metrics such as likes, impressions, or shares. However, these same posts generated stronger qualitative indicators of audience connection: longer comment threads, emotional storytelling from followers, and recurrent participation in related content. For instance, one participant noted, "When I talk about mental health or sustainability, fewer people react instantly—but the ones who do stay engaged for years." This suggests that value-driven communication produces "slow engagement"—a deeper, more enduring form of audience loyalty that extends beyond momentary algorithmic visibility.

From a theoretical standpoint, this shift reflects what Fuchs (2017) calls a movement toward critical digital ethics, in which communicators actively resist the exploitative dynamics of the attention economy. Rather than treating the algorithm as an adversary, participants described attempts to integrate algorithmic affordances (e.g., consistency, interactivity, shareability) into human-centered storytelling. For example, some leveraged the algorithm's preference for frequent updates to sustain audience learning journeys, while others used interactive tools such as polls or Q&A sessions to co-create knowledge with followers. This pragmatic synthesis demonstrates an evolving communicative literacy: an understanding that algorithms can be instruments of value amplification when guided by intentionality and ethical purpose.

This evolution represents a transition from viral visibility to relational credibility, challenging the hegemony of quantitative success indicators such as “views,” “likes,” and “followers.” As Couldry and Mejias (2019) argue, contemporary communication systems increasingly commodify human attention as data; reclaiming communicative value, therefore, requires re-centering human meaning within these data-driven structures. The communicators in this study exemplify that reclamation, reframing success through qualitative markers—trust, resonance, relevance, and sustained dialogue—rather than transient virality.

Notably, participants who practiced value-centered strategies also reported a reduction in algorithmic fatigue and a greater sense of creative satisfaction. They described feeling “freer,” “more aligned,” or “more authentic” when their content served a cause or community beyond personal gain. This internal shift reflects what Tufekci (2015) terms algorithmic agency—the capacity of digital actors to assert human values within automated systems. By embedding ethical intention into their communicative routines, these practitioners transform algorithmic dependence into algorithmic partnership, where visibility is not resisted but reinterpreted through a framework of meaning-making and mutual benefit. Furthermore, this reframing signals an emerging ethos of sustainability in digital communication. Rather than chasing momentary peaks of virality, communicators are cultivating enduring ecosystems of interaction—communities that evolve through shared discourse rather than passive consumption. This aligns with recent calls in communication scholarship for “slow media” and “purpose-driven branding” (Levy, 2021; Ind & Horlings, 2016), which advocate depth, reflection, and ethical consistency over acceleration and constant novelty.

In essence, value-centered communication frameworks represent a paradigm shift: communicators are redefining success not as algorithmic dominance but as the capacity to nurture ethical, meaningful, and emotionally resonant exchanges within digital environments. This shift not only challenges the quantitative logic of platform capitalism but also reinstates communication as a fundamentally humanistic practice—an act of connection rather than competition.

Integrative Discussion

Taken together, the findings of this study illuminate a profound transformation in the logic and practice of strategic communication within the algorithmic age. Communication is no longer a unidirectional process of message transmission, nor merely an exercise in audience persuasion it has become an act of negotiation between machine logic and human values. Communicators today must simultaneously satisfy the quantitative imperatives of algorithmic visibility and the qualitative expectations of human understanding. This dual orientation reshapes strategic communication into a hybrid form of labor part creative expression, part data optimization requiring constant reflexivity, ethical awareness, and technological fluency.

In this new communicative environment, practitioners are best understood as algorithmic negotiators professionals who navigate between the opaque operations of platform algorithms and the moral imperatives of meaningful, trustworthy storytelling. This role transcends traditional notions of content production by incorporating elements of algorithmic interpretation, affective management, and ethical deliberation. It requires communicators to read the algorithm not merely as a tool for visibility but as a cultural actor that co-determines what counts as relevant, popular, or even true in the digital public sphere (Gillespie, 2018; Bucher, 2018). Within this dynamic, communicators must develop algorithmic literacy—the capacity to understand and strategically engage with algorithmic systems—without allowing those systems to override human-centered communicative values.

These insights collectively call for a redefinition of “virality” within digital communication theory. Rather than treating virality as the ultimate goal of visibility-driven media ecosystems, this study proposes that virality should be reframed as a transitional phase in the broader process of value cultivation. Going viral may spark visibility, but it is the subsequent relational, ethical, and emotional work that transforms that visibility into sustainable social capital. This reframing challenges the dominant metric-based discourse that equates communicative success with numerical reach. Instead, it posits that virality without value is an unstable form of attention—fleeting, transactional, and ultimately corrosive to audience trust.

From a theoretical standpoint, these findings contribute to ongoing debates in digital communication ethics and critical media studies by advancing a model of sustainable digital communication. This model aligns with frameworks proposed by Kapitan and Silvera (2016) and Tuten and Solomon (2018), who argue that communicative longevity and ethical integrity are achieved when strategies are rooted in authenticity, transparency, and shared purpose. Within this framework, communication is conceptualized not as a race for visibility, but as an ecosystem of meaning-making, where relationships are cultivated through mutual respect and shared values between communicators, audiences, and platforms.

The empirical evidence presented here underscores that trust not attention has become the most valuable communicative currency in the algorithmic economy. While algorithms can amplify messages, they cannot manufacture credibility or emotional resonance. Trust emerges through consistent authenticity, ethical transparency, and the perception of shared purpose—all of which require deliberate resistance to the pressures of algorithmic conformity. This finding supports emerging scholarship that calls for a human-centered paradigm of digital strategy (Couldry & Mejias, 2019; Fuchs, 2021), one that foregrounds empathy, accountability, and reflexivity as counterweights to algorithmic determinism.

Furthermore, this study suggests that the future of strategic communication will depend on practitioners' ability to enact algorithmic reflexivity—the continuous questioning of how algorithmic systems shape communicative possibilities, moral boundaries, and social narratives. The communicators in this study demonstrated that resisting algorithmic reductionism does not mean rejecting technology, but rather reimagining its use as a medium of ethical amplification. By aligning machine affordances with humanistic intention, they exemplify how strategic communication can evolve into a form of ethical design, where technology serves meaning rather than dictates it.

Ultimately, these findings point toward a paradigmatic reorientation: from communication as exposure to communication as relationship, from algorithmic competition to algorithmic

coexistence, and from the pursuit of visibility to the cultivation of credibility. In this redefined landscape, success is measured not by how loudly a message travels through the algorithmic feed, but by how deeply it resonates in the human mind. The communicative act thus reclaims its ethical foundation—reminding us that in an era of automated attention, the most enduring form of visibility is trust.

Conclusion

This study has explored how strategic communication is evolving in the algorithmic age, revealing a paradigm shift from visibility-driven practices toward value-centered communication. The findings demonstrate that communicators today operate at the intersection of human intention and algorithmic mediation, balancing the demands of platform optimization with the imperatives of authenticity, ethics, and trust.

Through interviews and digital content analysis, the research identified three key dynamics shaping this transformation: algorithmic literacy, which redefines professional competence; the authenticity tension, which exposes the emotional and ethical costs of performative self-presentation; and the rise of value-centered frameworks, which privilege meaningful engagement and relational credibility over short-term virality. Together, these dimensions reveal that strategic communication in the digital era is increasingly about negotiating visibility responsibly—using algorithmic systems as tools, not as determinants, of human expression.

Theoretically, the study contributes to contemporary debates in communication and media studies by proposing that virality should be reinterpreted as a transitional phase rather than an endpoint in the communicative process. True success lies not in capturing fleeting attention, but in transforming that attention into trust, resonance, and shared purpose. This reorientation aligns with emerging models of sustainable digital communication, which emphasize long-term relational capital and ethical accountability.

Practically, the study offers actionable insights for communication professionals, educators, and digital strategists. It suggests that cultivating algorithmic literacy, while maintaining a critical ethical compass, is essential for thriving in an environment governed by

machine learning and data analytics. Communicators must develop strategies that align algorithmic affordances with human-centered goals—creating content that not only performs well but also contributes meaningfully to public discourse.

Finally, this research underscores an urgent call for future studies to further examine the socio-cultural, emotional, and political consequences of algorithmic mediation in communication. Future work might explore how different cultural contexts, platform types, or audience demographics shape perceptions of authenticity and value. As algorithms continue to evolve, so too must our understanding of how they reconfigure the boundaries between creativity, ethics, and visibility.

In conclusion, this study affirms that in the algorithmic age, attention may be abundant, but trust is scarce. The communicators who will define the future are those who understand that the true measure of success is not how widely one is seen but how deeply one is believed.

References

Abidin, C. (2018). *Internet celebrity: Understanding fame online*. Emerald Publishing.

Baym, N. K. (2015). *Personal connections in the digital age* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.

Beer, D. (2017). *The data gaze: Capitalism, power, and perception*. SAGE Publications.

Berger, J., & Milkman, K. L. (2012). What makes online content viral? *Journal of Marketing Research*, 49(2), 192–205. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmr.10.0353>

Bishop, S. (2019). Managing visibility on YouTube through algorithmic gossip. *New Media & Society*, 21(11–12), 2589–2606. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444819854731>

Bucher, T. (2018). *If... then: Algorithmic power and politics*. Oxford University Press.

Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). *The costs of connection: How data is colonizing human life and appropriating it for capitalism*. Stanford University Press.

Cotter, K. (2021). Playing the visibility game: How digital influencers and algorithms negotiate influence on Instagram. *New Media & Society*, 23(9), 2530–2551. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444820918054>

Duffy, B. E. (2017). *(Not) getting paid to do what you love: Gender, social media, and aspirational work*. Yale University Press.

Duffy, B. E., & Hund, E. (2019). Gendered visibility on social media: Navigating Instagram's authenticity bind. *International Journal of Communication*, 13, 4983–5002.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.

Fuchs, C. (2017). Social media: A critical introduction (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Fuchs, C. (2021). Digital ethics: The role of the moral in the age of digital capitalism. Emerald Publishing.

Gillespie, T. (2018). Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media. Yale University Press.

Iglesias, O., Ind, N., & Alfaro, M. (2013). The organic view of the brand: A paradigm shift in branding. *Journal of Brand Management*, 20(8), 670–688.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.2013.8>

Ind, N., & Horlings, S. (2016). Brand desire: How to create consumer involvement and inspiration. Bloomsbury.

Kapitan, S., & Silvera, D. H. (2016). From digital media influencers to celebrity endorsers: Attributions drive endorser effectiveness. *Marketing Letters*, 27(3), 553–567.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11002-015-9363-0>

Levy, D. (2021). Slow media: Why slow is satisfying, sustainable, and smart. Oxford University Press.

Marwick, A. E. (2013). Status update: Celebrity, publicity, and branding in the social media age. Yale University Press.

Napoli, P. M. (2019). Social media and the public interest: Media regulation in the disinformation age. Columbia University Press.

Shifman, L. (2014). Memes in digital culture. MIT Press.

Tufekci, Z. (2015). Algorithmic harms beyond Facebook and Google: Emergent challenges of computational agency. *Colorado Technology Law Journal*, 13(2), 203–218.

Tuten, T. L., & Solomon, M. R. (2018). Social media marketing (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

van Dijck, J. (2013). The culture of connectivity: A critical history of social media. Oxford University Press.

.