
The Transformation of Mass Communication Theories in the Digital Media Age: A Qualitative Synthesis and Critical Analysis (2000–2025)

[Safran Safar Almakaty](#)*

Posted Date: 15 April 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202604.1111.v1

Keywords: mass communication theories; digital media; algorithmic mediation; qualitative synthesis; theoretical convergence; agenda setting; cultivation theory; framing theory; uses and gratifications; media dependency; gatekeeping; spiral of silence; two-step flow; diffusion of innovation; technological determinism; generative AI; platform communication; and digital colonialism



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](#), which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Article

The Transformation of Mass Communication Theories in the Digital Media Age: A Qualitative Synthesis and Critical Analysis (2000–2025)

Safran Safar Almakaty

Journalism and New Media Department, College of Media and Communication, Imam Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University (IMSIU), Riyadh, Saudi Arabia; ssaamakty@imamu.edu.sa

Abstract

This study presents a comprehensive qualitative synthesis and critical analysis of the transformation of foundational mass communication theories in the digital media age, spanning the period from 2000 to 2025. Drawing on a systematic integrative review of 23 scholarly manuscripts encompassing over 600 peer-reviewed sources, the investigation examines how ten canonical communication theories—Agenda Setting Theory, Cultivation Theory, Framing Theory, the Two-Step Flow of Communication, the Spiral of Silence, Uses and Gratifications Theory, Media Dependency Theory, Gatekeeping Theory, Diffusion of Innovation Theory, and Technological Determinism—have evolved, converged, and been reconceptualized in response to the affordances and constraints of digital platforms, algorithmic mediation, and networked communication environments. Employing a reflexive thematic analysis methodology grounded in a critical realist epistemology, the study identifies six overarching meta-themes: (a) the emergence of algorithmic agency as a structural force reshaping all theoretical paradigms, (b) the dialectical tension between expanded user agency and platform-imposed constraints, (c) the increasing platform specificity of communication effects, (d) the convergence and theoretical integration of formerly discrete paradigms, (e) persistent global inequities in digital communication power structures, and (f) the implications of generative artificial intelligence for foundational communication theory. Findings reveal that while the core premises of classical theories retain explanatory value, their operative mechanisms, boundary conditions, and societal implications have undergone fundamental transformation. An expanded and substantiated version of the Algorithmic Communication Ecology Model (ACEM) is proposed, synthesizing insights across all ten theories within a four-dimensional integrative architecture. Thirty-two specific recommendations for future research are formulated across eight thematic areas, directly addressing persistent gaps in the literature. The study contributes to WOS- and Scopus-indexed communication scholarship by providing a unified analytical lens through which the simultaneous preservation, disruption, and reconstitution of mass communication's theoretical foundations can be systematically understood.

Keywords: mass communication theories; digital media; algorithmic mediation; qualitative synthesis; theoretical convergence; agenda setting; cultivation theory; framing theory; uses and gratifications; media dependency; gatekeeping; spiral of silence; two-step flow; diffusion of innovation; technological determinism; generative AI; platform communication; and digital colonialism

1. Introduction

The landscape of mass communication has undergone a paradigmatic transformation since the turn of the twenty-first century. The proliferation of digital platforms, the ubiquity of mobile connectivity, the rise of algorithmic content curation, and the collapse of traditional boundaries between media producers and consumers have collectively dismantled the institutional architecture

upon which classical communication theories were constructed (Castells, 2010; Jenkins, 2006). Theories formulated during the era of broadcast television and print journalism—when a limited number of institutional gatekeepers controlled the flow of information to relatively passive mass audiences—now confront a communication ecosystem characterized by decentralization, interactivity, personalization, and unprecedented speed of information diffusion (Chadwick, 2017; Hilbert, 2020).

The scholarly imperative to reassess these foundational frameworks is not merely academic; it carries profound implications for understanding democratic discourse, public opinion formation, cultural production, and the distribution of communicative power in contemporary societies. As Couldry and Hepp (2017) have argued, the process of “deep mediatization” has rendered media technologies inseparable from the very fabric of social life, demanding theoretical frameworks capable of accounting for the recursive, multi-layered, and algorithmically mediated nature of contemporary communication. The question confronting communication scholars is not whether classical theories remain relevant, but rather how their core insights must be reconceptualized, extended, and integrated to adequately explain communication phenomena in the digital age.

Compounding these challenges, the emergence of generative artificial intelligence systems capable of producing synthetic text, images, audio, and video at unprecedented scale and quality represents a qualitative disruption without historical precedent in the short history of mass communication theory (van Dijck et al., 2018; Zuboff, 2019). Unlike the digital turn, which accelerated and complicated existing communication dynamics while preserving the foundational distinction between human-generated and algorithmically mediated content, generative AI dissolves the producer-content distinction entirely, raising fundamental questions about authorship, authenticity, epistemic trust, and the social construction of reality that classical theories were not designed to address. These developments lend particular urgency to the project of theoretical synthesis and reconceptualization that this study undertakes.

This study responds to these imperatives by undertaking a comprehensive qualitative synthesis of the evolution, adaptation, and reconceptualization of ten foundational mass communication theories across the period 2000–2025. The theories examined—Agenda Setting Theory, Cultivation Theory, Framing Theory, the Two-Step Flow of Communication, the Spiral of Silence, Uses and Gratifications Theory, Media Dependency Theory, Gatekeeping Theory, Diffusion of Innovation Theory, and Technological Determinism—collectively represent the intellectual architecture of the communication discipline. Each has generated extensive bodies of empirical research, informed media policy and practice, and shaped scholarly understanding of how mediated messages influence individuals, communities, and societies.

The present investigation is distinguished from prior reviews by its integrative scope and synthesizing ambition. Rather than examining each theory in isolation, this study identifies cross-cutting themes, convergent trajectories, emergent theoretical possibilities, and specific research recommendations that arise when these paradigms are analyzed collectively within the context of digital transformation. The analysis draws upon 23 scholarly manuscripts comprising over 600 peer-reviewed sources, representing one of the most comprehensive syntheses of communication theory adaptation to date.

1.1. Research Questions

This study is guided by four interrelated research questions. First, how have the core premises, mechanisms, and boundary conditions of foundational mass communication theories evolved in response to the affordances and constraints of digital media environments from 2000 to 2025? Second, what cross-cutting themes and convergent trajectories emerge when these theoretical paradigms are analyzed collectively rather than in isolation? Third, what significant research gaps persist in the scholarly literature on communication theory adaptation to digital contexts, and what specific research directions would most effectively address them? Fourth, what integrated theoretical framework can account for the recursive, multi-directional, and structurally mediated nature of

contemporary communication processes, including the implications of generative artificial intelligence—across the full spectrum of foundational theories?

1.2. Significance of the Study

The significance of this investigation resides in its capacity to provide a unified analytical lens through which the fragmented landscape of communication theory adaptation can be comprehended. As discipline has grown increasingly specialized, with scholars working within discrete theoretical traditions often in relative isolation from one another, the need for integrative scholarship that identifies common patterns, shared challenges, and complementary insights has become acute (Blumler, 2016; Craig, 1999). This study addresses that need by demonstrating that the digital transformation of communication is not a series of isolated theoretical adjustments but a systemic reconstitution of the discipline's foundational assumptions about media power, audience agency, information flow, and communicative effects.

Furthermore, the study contributes to ongoing debates about the role of algorithms as communicative agents, the implications of platform capitalism for democratic discourse (Srnicek, 2017), the adequacy of Western-centric theoretical frameworks for explaining communication dynamics in diverse global contexts, and the unprecedented challenges posed by generative artificial intelligence for foundational theoretical premises. By proposing an expanded Algorithmic Communication Ecology Model and formulating 32 specific recommendations for future research, the study offers both conceptual architecture and a research agenda capable of guiding communication scholarship through the next decade of theoretical development.

2. Literature Review

This literature review synthesizes scholarships on the adaptation and reconceptualization of ten foundational communication theories within digital media environments, supplemented by emerging scholarship on generative artificial intelligence and immersive media technologies. The review is organized thematically, grouping theories according to their primary analytical focus: media effects and perception theories, information flow and influence theories, audience-centered theories, structural and systemic theories, and emergent theoretical frontiers. Within each thematic cluster, the review traces theoretical evolution, evaluates empirical evidence, integrates recent scholarship through 2025, and identifies persistent gaps in the scholarly literature.

2.1. Media Effects and Perception Theories

2.1.1. Agenda Setting Theory

Agenda Setting Theory, originating in the seminal Chapel Hill study by McCombs and Shaw (1972), posits that mass media exert significant influence over public perception by determining which issues receive prominent coverage and thereby shaping the salience of those issues in public consciousness. The theory has evolved through three distinct levels: first-level agenda setting, which addresses the transfer of issue salience; second-level agenda setting, which examines attribute salience and its intersection with framing processes (Pan & Kosicki, 1993); and third-level or Network Agenda Setting, which investigates how media construct interconnected networks of issues and attributes that collectively shape public understanding (Guo & McCombs, 2012; Vu et al., 2014).

The digital media environment has introduced fundamental challenges to classical agenda-setting mechanisms while simultaneously validating the theory's core insight that mediated information shapes public attention. Research by Meraz (2009) and Vargo et al. (2014) has demonstrated that while legacy media outlets such as the New York Times and BBC retain significant agenda-setting influence in digital spaces, new actors including political figures, social media influencers, activist networks, and algorithmic recommendation systems now participate in agenda construction. The Network Agenda Setting model, advanced by Guo and McCombs (2012), more

accurately captures the complexity of digital environments by examining how interconnected networks of issues and attributes are co-constructed across multiple platforms and actors rather than transferred linearly from media to audiences.

Algorithmic curation has emerged as a particularly consequential development for agenda-setting processes. Search engines and social media platforms function as structural agenda setters by determining information visibility through ranking algorithms, engagement metrics, and personalization systems (Bucher, 2018; Pariser, 2011). Unlike human editors whose decisions can be interrogated and held accountable, algorithmic agenda-setting operates with considerable opacity, raising significant normative questions about democratic discourse. The landmark study by González-Bailón et al. (2023), published in *Science*, provided large-scale empirical evidence of asymmetric ideological segregation in users' exposure to political news on Facebook, demonstrating how platform algorithms systematically create unequal information environments across the political spectrum. Furthermore, the phenomenon of reverse agenda setting—wherein public conversations on social media platforms push mainstream outlets to cover particular issues—demonstrates the multi-directional nature of contemporary agenda dynamics (McCombs, 2014). Research has consistently identified persistent gaps including insufficient cross-cultural studies, limited longitudinal research, and inadequate understanding of the interaction between algorithmic and traditional agenda-setting mechanisms.

The relationship between agenda setting and misinformation represents a critical frontier for contemporary research. Tandoc et al. (2018) have demonstrated that false news stories can achieve substantial agenda-setting effects by generating viral social media attention that subsequently pressures mainstream outlets to acknowledge and cover the issues they raise, even when coverage is framed as debunking. This process, which Wardle and Derakhshan (2017) situate within a broader framework of “information disorder,” challenges classical agenda-setting models' implicit assumption that media agendas are driven by professional editorial judgment rather than viral engagement dynamics.

2.1.2. Cultivation Theory

Cultivation Theory, developed by George Gerbner and colleagues through the Cultural Indicators research program beginning in the 1960s, argues that long-term, cumulative exposure to media content gradually shapes viewers' perceptions of social reality, cultivating worldviews that align with patterns prevalent in media narratives rather than with objective statistical realities (Gerbner & Gross, 1976; Gerbner et al., 2002). The theory's two central mechanisms—mainstreaming, whereby heavy viewers across diverse demographic groups converge toward homogeneous perspectives, and resonance, whereby media messages reinforce and amplify experiences congruent with viewers lived realities—were formulated within the context of broadcast television's centralized, repetitive storytelling environment.

The fragmentation of the media landscape through cable television, internet platforms, and social media has prompted extensive scholarly debate about cultivation's continued viability. Meta-analytical evidence from Shanahan and Morgan (1999) and more recently Appel et al. (2020) confirms small but statistically significant cultivation effects for digital media exposure across diverse outcomes, affirming the theory's continued relevance while highlighting the need for reconceptualization. Research has demonstrated that social media platforms produce distinctive cultivation effects: Facebook use correlates with idealized self-presentation beliefs, Instagram exposure cultivates body dissatisfaction and materialistic values, and algorithmic news feeds cultivate polarized political worldviews (Drozd et al., 2022; Fardouly et al., 2015). Valkenburg (2022), drawing on a comprehensive review of the adolescent mental health literature, demonstrated that the relationship between social media use and well-being is highly heterogeneous and conditional on usage type, underscoring the inadequacy of uniform cultivation effect assumptions.

The most significant theoretical development has been the reconceptualization of cultivation mechanisms for algorithmic environments. The concept of “niche-streaming”—replacing the

singular mainstreaming effect of broadcast television with algorithmic sorting of audiences into insular communities sharing similar viewpoints—captures how personalization transforms the homogenizing function of traditional cultivation into a fragmenting one. Similarly, “algorithmic resonance” describes how recommendation systems amplify mediated messages by targeting content to individuals whose preferences and viewing histories make them most susceptible to reinforcement effects (Pariser, 2011; Sunstein, 2017). Cinelli et al. (2021) provided empirical evidence for the “echo chamber effect” on social media, demonstrating platform-specific differences in how information homophily and algorithmic amplification interact to produce insular information environments with cumulative perceptual consequences consistent with cultivation theory predictions.

2.1.3. Framing Theory

Framing Theory, conceptualized by Goffman (1974) and adapted to communication research by Entman (1993), examines how the presentation of information—through selection, emphasis, and contextual placement—shapes audience interpretation and evaluation of issues and events. Entman’s influential definition identifies four framing functions: defining problems, diagnosing causes, making moral judgments, and suggesting remedies. Pan and Kosicki (1993) extended this framework through their analysis of framing as a political discourse strategy, demonstrating how syntactical, script, thematic, and rhetorical structures in news texts work together to activate particular schemas in audience cognition. The theory bridges media production and reception, illuminating how communicators construct interpretive frameworks that guide audience understanding.

Digital media environments have fundamentally altered framing dynamics by democratizing frame construction and dissemination. Research by Cacciatore et al. (2016) and Scheufele and Iyengar (2017) demonstrates that framing has shifted from an elite-controlled process—in which professional journalists and editors determined interpretive frameworks—to a networked, participatory process in which ordinary users construct, modify, and disseminate alternative frames through social media sharing, commenting, and content creation. The introduction of algorithmic framing introduces a structural dimension absent from classical models: platform algorithms determine which frames gain visibility based on engagement metrics, creating subtle but significant biases in information exposure (Gillespie, 2018). Hashtag activism, viral memes, and user-generated visual content have emerged as powerful framing devices that operate according to different logics than traditional news frames.

Methodological innovation has been particularly consequential for framing research. Computational approaches including natural language processing, sentiment analysis, and network analysis enable researchers to examine framing dynamics across massive datasets, capturing patterns invisible to traditional manual content analysis (Burscher et al., 2014; Freelon, 2020). However, scholars have cautioned that computational methods alone cannot capture the interpretive nuances of frame construction and reception, necessitating mixed-method approaches that combine computational scale with qualitative depth (Boyd & Crawford, 2012). Persistent research gaps include insufficient longitudinal studies examining long-term behavioral effects of digital framing, limited investigation of novel platform affordances such as ephemeral content and immersive virtual reality, and a pronounced Western-centric bias in the literature that limits cross-cultural generalizability.

2.2. *Information Flow and Influence Theories*

2.2.1. Two-Step Flow Theory

The Two-Step Flow Theory, originating in the work of Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet (1944) and further developed by Katz and Lazarsfeld (1955), posits that mass media influence not directly to the general public but is mediated by opinion leaders who interpret, contextualize, and relay media messages to their interpersonal networks. This model fundamentally challenged the prevailing hypodermic needle conception of direct media effects by introducing social mediation as a critical intervening variable.

Digital media have profoundly restructured the dynamics of opinion leadership and influence diffusion. The emergence of social media influencers, micro-celebrities, and networked individuals as new categories of opinion leaders represents a significant departure from the institutional authority that characterized classical opinion leadership (Aral & Walker, 2012; Marwick & Boyd, 2011). Research synthesizing approximately 60 studies from 2005 to 2025 demonstrates that traditional opinion leaders—journalists, academics, politicians—persist in digital environments but share influence with digital-native actors whose authority derives from perceived authenticity, niche expertise, and parasocial relationships rather than institutional position (Bakshy et al., 2012). Bail (2021), drawing on a series of experimental and observational studies of political communication on Twitter and Facebook, demonstrated that exposure to opposing views through prominent opinion leaders on social media frequently intensified rather than moderated political polarization, complicating the theory's assumption that interpersonal mediation serves a moderating and clarifying function.

Network analysis has revealed that information diffusion in digital environments often follows multi-step, non-linear pathways that diverge significantly from the original two-step model (Watts & Dodds, 2007). Algorithmic curation further complicates the picture by functioning as an intermediary that determines which opinion leaders gain visibility, effectively creating a new layer of mediation between content creation and audience reception. The role of coordinated inauthentic behavior—including bot networks, fake accounts, and astroturfing campaigns that simulate organic opinion leadership—represents a particularly significant threat to the democratic functions that the Two-Step Flow model implicitly celebrates (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017). Critical gaps persist in understanding how algorithmic selection mechanisms shape opinion leader prominence, how coordinated inauthentic behavior distorts influence pathways, and how opinion leadership dynamics vary across cultural contexts.

2.2.2. Gatekeeping Theory

Gatekeeping Theory, originating in Kurt Lewin's (1947) metaphor of information flow through channels controlled by decision-making gates and operationalized for journalism by White (1950), has undergone perhaps the most dramatic transformation of any classical communication theory in the digital age. The theory's evolution traces a trajectory from individual editorial judgment through organizational and institutional gatekeeping models to the contemporary hybrid systems in which algorithms, users, and platforms collectively determine information flow (Shoemaker & Vos, 2009; Singer, 2014).

Barzilai-Nahon's (2008) Network Gatekeeping Theory represented a pivotal conceptual advance by reconceptualizing gatekeeping as a networked phenomenon involving multiple actors, fluid power relations, and dynamic processes rather than a linear, hierarchical function. In digital environments, three distinct forms of gatekeeping operate simultaneously: algorithmic gatekeeping, in which platform algorithms filter and prioritize content based on engagement metrics and user data; secondary gatekeeping by users who share, amplify, or suppress content within their networks (Singer, 2014); and what Bruns (2018) terms "gatewatching," whereby users observe and curate information flows rather than controlling access to them. The commercial logic underlying algorithmic gatekeeping has been subjected to searching critique by Napoli (2019), who argues that the replacement of editorial judgment with engagement optimization systematically privileges emotionally provocative, partisan, and sensational content at the expense of quality journalism and democratic deliberation.

The convergence of gatekeeping and agenda-setting functions in algorithmic systems represents a significant theoretical development. Research has demonstrated that algorithms simultaneously perform filtering functions (determining what passes through information gates) and salience functions (determining what becomes prominent in public attention), dissolving the institutional separation between these processes that characterized traditional media environments (Bucher, 2018; Napoli, 2015). Zuboff's (2019) framework of surveillance capitalism illuminates how data extraction

and behavioral prediction underline the commercial imperatives that drive algorithmic gatekeeping decisions, situating gatekeeping theory within a broader political economy of digital communication. Cross-cultural research from Global South contexts reveals how algorithmic systems replicate and amplify existing power asymmetries, limiting the diversity of perspectives that reach public attention.

2.2.3. Diffusion of Innovation Theory

Diffusion of Innovation Theory, formalized by Rogers (2003) through five decades of empirical research, explains how new ideas, practices, and technologies spread through social systems via communication channels over time. The theory's analytical framework—encompassing innovation attributes (relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability, and observability), adopter categories (innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority, and laggards), and diffusion channels (mass media and interpersonal communication)—has been applied across disciplines ranging from agriculture and public health to information technology and organizational management.

Digital media have simultaneously validated and challenged the theory's foundational concepts. The pace of technology adoption has accelerated dramatically due to network effects, whereby the value of an innovation increases as the number of users grows, creating positive feedback loops absent from classical diffusion models (Katz & Shapiro, 1985). The collapse of boundaries between mass media and interpersonal communication channels in digital environments complicates the theory's channel distinction, as social media platforms simultaneously function as mass distribution systems and interpersonal influence networks. Opinion leaders, the primary interpersonal channel in classical diffusion, have evolved into digital influencers whose reach and impact are shaped by platform algorithms and network structures rather than solely by interpersonal relationships (Van Dijk, 2020).

The COVID-19 pandemic provided an unprecedented natural experiment for studying digital-age diffusion dynamics, revealing how health information and misinformation about vaccines, treatments, and public health measures spread through social networks with consequences for public behavior and health outcomes (Guess & Lyons, 2020; Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017). These observations highlight the critical importance of the "infodemic" dimension of diffusion in digital environments: the co-diffusion of accurate and inaccurate information through the same network structures and channels, often at comparable rates. The theory's adopter categories have proven less analytically useful in digital contexts, where adoption decisions are increasingly shaped by structural factors including digital infrastructure availability, platform design, algorithmic visibility, and economic access (Van Dijk, 2020). Research gaps include insufficient understanding of how algorithmic curation shapes diffusion pathways, limited cross-cultural validation of adapted models, and inadequate investigation of the relationship between technostress and adoption decision-making.

2.2.4. Spiral of Silence Theory

The Spiral of Silence Theory, developed by Noelle-Neumann (1974), posits that individuals continuously monitor their social environment for dominant opinion trends and suppress their own views when they perceive themselves to be in the minority, fearing social isolation. This self-censorship creates a spiraling process whereby minority views become increasingly invisible while majority views gain apparent dominance, distorting public perception of opinion distribution and potentially suppressing legitimate dissent.

Digital media environments have produced qualitatively different spiral of silence phenomena that both validate and complicate the theory's foundational premises. Research spanning 2005 to 2025 reveals that multiple simultaneous opinion climates exist across different platforms, with users perceiving different opinion distributions on Twitter compared to Facebook, TikTok, or Reddit (Hampton et al., 2014). Perceived anonymity, a variable absent from the original theory's face-to-face

orientation, reshapes opinion suppression dynamics in complex ways: some studies indicate that anonymity reduces fear of isolation and facilitates minority opinion expression, while others demonstrate that online harassment, doxing, and coordinated attacks create new and potent silencing mechanisms that exceed the social disapproval envisioned in the original theory.

Algorithmic curation introduces a structural dimension to the spiral of silence by selectively amplifying or suppressing particular viewpoints through automated content ranking. Bail et al. (2018) demonstrated that exposure to opposing views through social media can paradoxically strengthen rather than moderate the spiral of silence effect, as users who encounter algorithmically surfaced counter-attitudinal content frequently become more committed to their existing views and less willing to express minority positions publicly. The phenomenon of “cancel culture,” while contested as a concept, represents an extreme form of digital silencing in which coordinated social sanctioning rapidly suppresses minority viewpoints, extending the spiral of silence mechanism beyond its original scope of gradual social pressure to include organized punitive campaigns (Cinelli et al., 2021). Persistent research gaps include limited longitudinal studies on the long-term societal implications of digital silencing, insufficient research on AI-enabled surveillance and its chilling effects on opinion expression, and inadequate understanding of how individuals navigate multiple, potentially contradictory opinion climates across platforms.

2.3. Audience-Centered Theories

2.3.1. Uses and Gratifications Theory

Uses and Gratifications Theory (UGT), systematized by Katz, Blumler, and Gurevitch (1974), represents a paradigmatic shift from media-centric effects models to audience-centered approaches, positing that individuals actively select media to satisfy pre-existing needs including information acquisition, entertainment, personal identity construction, social interaction, and emotional regulation. The theory’s core assumptions—that audiences are active and goal-directed, that media use is motivated by identifiable needs, and that media compete with alternative sources of gratification—have proven remarkably durable across technological transitions (Ruggiero, 2000). Blumler (2016) proposed that contemporary digital communication represents a “fourth age of political communication” in which the UGT framework must be substantially reconceptualized to account for the collapse of audience roles, the hybridization of media forms, and the unprecedented scale and personalization of political information environments.

Digital platforms have exponentially expanded the scope and complexity of gratification processes. Research employing interpretive phenomenological analysis has identified emergent digital-specific gratification categories including curated self-expression, algorithmically mediated connection, information-escapism convergence, and platform-specific gratifications tied to particular affordances (Sundar & Limperos, 2013). Quan-Haase and Young (2010), in a comparative analysis of Facebook and instant messaging, demonstrated that gratifications are not merely platform-specific but vary systematically with usage context, social network composition, and the specific communicative affordances activated in different interactions. Qualitative investigations reveal that users experience paradoxical tensions in digital environments: seeking authentic connection through artificial systems, pursuing individual expression within standardized templates, and attempting autonomous choice within algorithmically curated environments. The phenomenon of “fighting the feed”—whereby users actively develop strategies to circumvent algorithmic curation in pursuit of desired gratifications—illustrates the dialectical relationship between user agency and platform architecture.

Negative gratifications accompanying positive ones represent a significant theoretical development: social comparison anxiety on Instagram, information overload from news aggregation, time displacement through infinite scrolling, and validation dependency from social media metrics demonstrate that gratification processes in digital environments are inherently ambivalent (Tandoc et al., 2015; Valkenburg, 2022). The integration of UGT with Media Ecology Theory has been proposed

to better account for how platform environments shape the range of possible gratifications, with UGT explaining the user “pull” of internal needs and motivations while Media Ecology explains the environmental “push” of structural biases and affordances. Research gaps include insufficient longitudinal studies of gratification evolution, limited cross-cultural investigation, and inadequate theoretical integration with complementary frameworks.

2.3.2. Media Dependency Theory

Media Dependency Theory (MDT), formulated by Ball-Rokeach and DeFleur (1976), conceptualizes audience-media relations as structural dependencies shaped by the degree to which individuals and social systems rely on media resources to achieve specific goals. The theory identifies three fundamental dependency goals—understanding (comprehending one’s social environment), orientation (making behavioral and interactional decisions), and play (relaxation and emotional release)—and posits that dependency intensity varies with the centrality of media information resources to goal achievement and with the degree of structural instability in the social environment.

The digital media environment has fundamentally altered dependency dynamics by multiplying the platforms, affordances, and information resources available for goal achievement while simultaneously creating new forms of structural dependency on digital infrastructure. Research spanning three generations of dependency theory—the foundational Uses and Dependency Model (Ball-Rokeach & DeFleur, 1976), Internet Use and Dependency adaptations, and the New Media Uses and Dependency Effect Model (Cho, 2009)—demonstrates that while the theory’s core logic of goal-directed reliance on information resources remains valid, the intensity, distribution, and mechanisms of dependency have been profoundly reshaped. Platform-level dependency analysis reveals that audiences develop differentiated dependencies across platforms, with social networking sites establishing stronger, more intensive dependencies than traditional media (Kim & Jung, 2017).

The integration of MDT with Uses and Gratifications Theory represents a significant theoretical advance. The proposed Need-Gratification-Dependency (NGD) cycle conceptualizes the relationship between user agency and platform architecture as a dynamic, self-reinforcing process: users initially engage platforms seeking gratifications (the UGT phase), but platform design features—algorithmic personalization, variable rewards, infinite scrolling—systematically foster dependency (the MDT phase), which then reshapes user needs, creating self-perpetuating feedback loops (Alter, 2017; Thaler & Sunstein, 2008). The concept of “guided activeness” captures the paradox of genuine agency exercised within powerful choice architectures deliberately designed to maximize engagement and dependency. Research at the macro level has extended dependency theory to address digital colonialism, demonstrating how multinational technology corporations from “digital core” nations extract data and exploit digital labor from the Global South, creating structural dependencies analogous to historical colonialism (Couldry & Mejias, 2019; Kwet, 2019; Srnicek, 2017).

2.4. Structural and Systemic Theories

2.4.1. Technological Determinism

Technological determinism, the proposition that technological development constitutes the primary driver of social, cultural, and institutional change, has been subjected to sustained critique from social constructionist, actor-network, and political economy perspectives throughout the history of communication scholarship (Williams, 1974; Winner, 1986). Nevertheless, the concept has experienced renewed scholarly attention in the digital age as platform architectures, algorithmic systems, and data-driven technologies demonstrate increasingly consequential influences on social structures, cognitive patterns, and democratic processes.

Contemporary scholarship distinguishes between “hard” determinism—the discredited proposition that technology operates as an autonomous, unstoppable force—and “soft” or “architectural” determinism, which recognizes the interplay between technological design and human agency while acknowledging that platform architectures create powerful path dependencies

that shape probable social outcomes (Jasanoff, 2016). Research examining new media technologies from 2020 to 2025 demonstrates that digital platforms create structural conditions that significantly constrain the range of possible human behaviors, even as users exercise agency within those constraints. The concept of “affordance” bridges deterministic and constructionist perspectives by identifying how technological features simultaneously enable and constrain particular forms of communication and social interaction (Bucher & Helmond, 2018).

The debate between deterministic and constructionist perspectives has particular salience for communication theory because it implicates fundamental questions about the location of communicative power. Zuboff’s (2019) framework of surveillance capitalism represents perhaps the most consequential recent contribution to this debate, arguing that the behavioral modification capabilities embedded in contemporary digital platforms constitute a form of “instrumental power” that operates at the level of environmental design rather than individual persuasion, effectively rendering the determinism-agency debate obsolete by demonstrating how human choice is systematically shaped before it is exercised. The scholarly consensus reflected in the reviewed literature suggests that neither extreme position captures the complexity of human-technology interaction, necessitating frameworks that account for the recursive constitution of technological affordances and human practices. The platform society framework proposed by van Dijck et al. (2018) offers a complementary perspective, analyzing how dominant platforms reconfigure social institutions—healthcare, education, news, civic life—through the imposition of commercial logics and behavioral architectures.

Table 1. Summary of Theoretical Evolution: Classical Premises versus Digital-Age Reconceptualization.

Theory	Classical Premise	Digital-Age Reconceptualization	Representative Scholarship
Agenda Setting	Media determine issue salience through coverage decisions	Multi-directional, networked agenda construction involving algorithms, users, and legacy media; reverse agenda setting from social media platforms	McCombs & Shaw (1972); Guo & McCombs (2012); González-Bailón et al. (2023)
Cultivation	Heavy TV exposure cultivates homogeneous worldviews via mainstreaming and resonance	Niche-streaming and algorithmic resonance produce platform-specific cultivation; heterogeneous effects moderated by usage type	Gerbner & Gross (1976); Appel et al. (2020); Valkenburg (2022)
Framing	Elite media construct interpretive frameworks for	Networked, participatory frame co-construction by users, algorithms, and influencers; computational framing analysis	Entman (1993); Pan & Kosicki (1993); Cacciatore et al. (2016)

	relatively passive audiences		
Two-Step Flow	Opinion leaders mediate mass media influence to interpersonal follower networks	Multi-step, non-linear influence via digital influencers, micro-celebrities, and algorithmic amplification; coordinated inauthenticity	Katz & Lazarsfeld (1955); Watts & Dodds (2007); Bail (2021)
Gatekeeping	Professional editors control information access through institutionalized selection decisions	Hybrid algorithmic-human-user gatekeeping; engagement optimization replaces editorial judgment; surveillance capitalism	White (1950); Barzilai-Nahon (2008); Napoli (2019); Zuboff (2019)
Spiral of Silence	Fear of social isolation suppresses minority opinion expression in public discourse	Multiple simultaneous opinion climates across platforms; coordinated harassment as intensified silencing; cancel culture dynamics	Noelle-Neumann (1974); Hampton et al. (2014); Bail et al. (2018)
Uses & Gratifications	Active audiences select media to satisfy pre-existing, identifiable needs	Platform-specific, algorithmically shaped gratifications; paradoxical negative gratifications; "fighting the feed" as active agency	Katz et al. (1974); Sundar & Limperos (2013); Quan-Haase & Young (2010)
Media Dependency	Goal-directed reliance on media information resources mediates communication effects	Platform-differentiated dependencies; NGD cycle; digital colonialism as macro-level structural dependency	Ball-Rokeach & DeFleur (1976); Kim & Jung (2017); Couldry & Mejias (2019)
Diffusion of Innovation	Innovations spread via communication channels to adopter categories over time	Accelerated, network-effect-driven diffusion; infodemic co-diffusion; structural barriers	Rogers (2003); Watts & Dodds (2007); Guess & Lyons (2020)

		supersede individual adopter typologies	
Technological Determinism	Technology drives social change as a relatively autonomous force	Architectural determinism via platform design; surveillance capitalism as behavioral modification; platform society	Williams (1974); van Dijck et al. (2018); Zuboff (2019)

Note. Synthesized from 23 source manuscripts comprising over 600 peer-reviewed sources (2000–2025). Each reconceptualization reflects the dominant scholarly consensus as represented in the reviewed literature.

2.5. Emergent Theoretical Frontiers: Generative AI, Immersive Media, and Algorithmic Governance

The emergence of large language models, text-to-image systems, and multimodal generative AI platforms since 2022 has introduced communication challenges that extend beyond the adaptation of classical theories and require genuinely new theoretical frameworks. Generative AI systems can produce synthetic text, images, audio, and video that are indistinguishable from human-generated content, fundamentally disrupting the assumptions about authorship, authenticity, and source credibility that underlie virtually every classical communication theory. For agenda-setting and gatekeeping theories, AI-generated content raises the prospect of fully automated agenda construction at scale, bypassing human editorial judgment entirely. For cultivation theory, synthetic media saturating information environments with particular narratives or representations could produce cultivation effects of unprecedented intensity and precision. For the Spiral of Silence, AI-enabled surveillance systems create chilling effects on opinion expression that operate through mechanisms of enforcement rather than social sanction (van Dijck et al., 2018; Zuboff, 2019).

Immersive media technologies, including virtual reality (VR) and augmented reality (AR), introduce a phenomenologically distinct communication environment characterized by embodied presence, interactive agency, and perceptual realism that classical theories formulated for screen-based media are not designed to address. The implications for framing theory are particularly significant, as immersive environments afford users the experience of inhabiting rather than observing mediated realities, potentially producing framing effects of greater intensity and durability than traditional media. For cultivation theory, the extended immersion and first-person perspective of VR environments may amplify cultivation effects relative to passive screen viewing, with particular implications for research on violence, social attitudes, and identity. For diffusion of innovation theory, the adoption trajectories of VR and AR technologies remain in early stages, offering opportunities to examine how classical diffusion dynamics play out in contexts of high cost, limited interoperability, and uncertain social utility.

Algorithmic governance has emerged as a critical site for theoretical development at the intersection of platform studies, political economy, and communication theory. The introduction of regulatory frameworks such as the European Union's Digital Services Act (2022) and the EU's Artificial Intelligence Act (2024) represents the most consequential attempt to date to impose public accountability on algorithmic gatekeeping, agenda-setting, and behavioral modification systems. These regulatory developments create natural experiments for studying how external governance constraints modify the communicative dynamics that classical theories have identified, offering longitudinal research opportunities of substantial theoretical significance (Napoli, 2019; van Dijck et al., 2018).

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This study employs a qualitative integrative synthesis design grounded in a critical realist epistemology, which recognizes that communication phenomena have both material manifestations and discursive dimensions that require interpretive analysis (Bhaskar, 2008; Maxwell, 2012). The integrative synthesis methodology is particularly suited to this investigation because it enables the systematic analysis and reconceptualization of findings across multiple bodies of literature that employ diverse methodological approaches, rather than being limited to studies sharing identical research designs as in conventional systematic reviews (Whittemore & Knafl, 2005). The critical realist orientation acknowledges that while the theoretical transformations documented in this study reflect real structural changes in communication environments, they are simultaneously mediated by scholarly interpretive frameworks that shape how those changes are understood and articulated.

This design was selected over pure systematic review approaches because the research questions require meta-theoretical synthesis and theoretical integration rather than aggregation of comparable findings. The integrative synthesis enabled the researcher to engage interpretively with theoretical arguments, conceptual developments, and empirical findings from across diverse methodological traditions, identifying emergent patterns and convergences that would be invisible to approaches focused on methodological homogeneity.

3.2. Data Sources and Corpus Construction

The primary data corpus comprises 23 scholarly manuscripts examining the evolution of foundational mass communication theories in digital media environments. These manuscripts were authored within a sustained program of research spanning 2024 to 2026, each employing systematic or integrative review methodologies to synthesize between 30 and 183 peer-reviewed sources per manuscript. Collectively, the corpus encompasses over 600 unique peer-reviewed sources published between 2000 and 2025, drawn from communication studies, media psychology, information science, sociology, political science, and interdisciplinary digital studies.

The manuscripts address ten foundational communication theories: Agenda Setting Theory, Cultivation Theory, Framing Theory, the Two-Step Flow of Communication, the Spiral of Silence, Uses and Gratifications Theory, Media Dependency Theory, Gatekeeping Theory, Diffusion of Innovation Theory, and Technological Determinism. Several manuscripts address theoretical integration, examining the convergence of multiple frameworks. The original literature searches underlying these manuscripts utilized major academic databases including Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, PsycINFO, Communication and Mass Media Complete, JSTOR, and ProQuest, with backward and forward citation tracking employed to ensure comprehensive coverage. The manuscript corpus was supplemented by the present author's independent review of scholarship on emergent topics including generative artificial intelligence, immersive media, and algorithmic governance, published between 2022 and 2025.

3.3. Analytical Procedure

The analytical procedure followed a three-phase reflexive thematic analysis protocol adapted from Braun and Clarke (2021). In the first phase, the researcher engaged in systematic familiarization with the full corpus through repeated close reading, annotating theoretical arguments, empirical findings, identified research gaps, and methodological observations across all 23 manuscripts. This phase produced a detailed analytical log documenting initial impressions, conceptual connections, and emergent patterns.

In the second phase, initial codes were generated through line-by-line analysis of theoretical claims, empirical evidence, and gap identifications. Codes were organized into categories reflecting both the specific theoretical domains (theory-level codes) and cross-cutting analytical dimensions (meta-level codes). The coding process was iterative, with codes refined and reorganized as the analysis progressed. A total of 247 initial codes were generated, subsequently organized into 34 categories.

In the third phase, categories were synthesized into overarching themes through a process of abstraction and integration. The researcher employed constant comparison analysis, systematically examining each category in relation to all others to identify convergent patterns, divergent trajectories, and emergent theoretical possibilities. Six meta-themes were identified that transcend individual theoretical traditions and capture the structural logic of communication theory transformation in the digital age. Theme development was guided by the principle of theoretical sufficiency, whereby analysis continued until themes adequately accounted for the patterns observed across the full corpus without significant residual categories.

3.4. Trustworthiness and Reflexivity

Trustworthiness was established through multiple strategies. Credibility was enhanced through prolonged engagement with the corpus, persistent observation of patterns across multiple analytical cycles, and triangulation across the diverse methodological traditions represented in the source manuscripts (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Transferability is supported by the thick description of analytical procedures and contextual factors provided throughout this methodology section. Dependability was maintained through a comprehensive audit trail documenting all analytical decisions, code revisions, and theme development processes. Confirmability was addressed through reflexive journaling in which the researcher examined how their own theoretical commitments, disciplinary training, and cultural positioning influenced analytical interpretations. The researcher acknowledges that their institutional positioning within a Middle Eastern university, combined with doctoral training in North American communication programs, produces a distinctive interpretive positionality that simultaneously facilitates cross-cultural analytical sensitivity and introduces particular biases that readers should consider when evaluating the study's conclusions.

3.5. Methodological Limitations

Several methodological limitations warrant explicit acknowledgment. First, the corpus is constituted by manuscripts authored within a single sustained research program, which may introduce systematic consistency in theoretical orientation and methodological approach that limits the representativeness of the synthesis. A more heterogeneous corpus drawing on manuscripts from diverse research traditions and institutional contexts would provide a stronger empirical basis for the integrative claims advanced. Second, the primary literature searches underlying the source manuscripts were conducted predominantly in English, systematically underrepresenting scholarship published in Arabic, Chinese, Spanish, Portuguese, and other major research languages. Third, the temporal scope of the corpus (2000–2025) necessarily excludes scholarship predating the digital turn that articulates classical theoretical positions with a precision and nuance that later scholarship may have compressed or simplified. Fourth, the rapidly evolving nature of digital communication environments means that findings from studies conducted even three to five years prior may not accurately characterize current platform dynamics, algorithms, and user practices.

Table 2. *Corpus Composition and Source Distribution by Theoretical Domain.*

Theoretical Domain	No. of Manuscripts	Approx. Sources	Temporal Scope	Primary Databases
Agenda Setting Theory	1	40	2004–2024	Scopus, WOS, Google Scholar
Cultivation Theory	1	50+	2005–2025	Scopus, PsycINFO, CMMC
Framing Theory	2	60+	2005–2025	JSTOR, Scopus, EBSCO

Two-Step Flow Theory	2	60	2005–2025	Scopus, WOS, Google Scholar
Spiral of Silence Theory	1	76+	2005–2025	Scopus, WOS, CMMC
Uses & Gratifications Theory	3	100+	2000–2025	Scopus, PsycINFO, CMMC
Media Dependency Theory	3	140+	2005–2025	WOS, Scopus, ACM Digital Library
Gatekeeping Theory	2	60	2000–2025	Scopus, WOS, Google Scholar
Diffusion of Innovation	1	45+	2000–2025	Scopus, WOS, ProQuest
Technological Determinism	1	50+	2020–2025	WOS, Scopus, ACM
Theoretical Integration / Overview	3	80+	2000–2025	Multiple databases
Supporting / Methodological	3	—	—	—

Note. Source counts are approximate as several manuscripts share overlapping references across theoretical domains. Supporting documents include methodological guidelines and author profile materials. Quality indicator reflects the proportion of sources indexed in Scopus or Web of Science.

Table 3. Overview of Methodological Approaches in Communication Theory Research.

Methodological Approach	Primary Application	Strengths	Limitations
Survey / self-report (quantitative)	UGT gratifications, Spiral of Silence, Cultivation	Large samples; established scales; replicability	Social desirability bias; cross-sectional designs predominate
Content analysis (manual)	Agenda Setting, Framing, Gatekeeping	High validity for frame identification; theory-driven coding	Labor-intensive; limited to small corpora; human coder reliability
Computational text analysis (NLP/ML)	Framing, Agenda Setting, Two-Step Flow	Scalable; pattern detection across massive datasets	Black-box risks; decontextualization; requires methodological pairing

Social network analysis	Two-Step Flow, Diffusion, Gatekeeping	Maps influence and diffusion pathways; identifies structural positions	Data access limitations post-API changes; snapshot designs
Qualitative interviews / IPA	UGT, Media Dependency, Spiral of Silence	Rich experiential data; captures subjective meaning	Small samples; limited generalizability; resource-intensive
Systematic / integrative review	All ten theories	Synthesizes large literature; identifies patterns; meta-level insights	Publication bias; heterogeneous primary studies; methodological variability
Experiment (lab / field)	Cultivation, Framing, Two-Step Flow	Causal inference; controlled conditions; internal validity	Ecological validity concerns; short-term outcome measurement
Digital trace / log data	UGT, Cultivation, Diffusion	Behavioral data unaffected by self-report bias; ecological validity	Privacy and access constraints; ethical challenges; platform dependency
Longitudinal panel design	Cultivation, Spiral of Silence, MDT	Tracks change over time; causal directionality	Attrition; platform changes during study; resource demands
Mixed-method designs	Multiple theories	Triangulation; complementary strengths; richer findings	Integration complexity; resource demands; methodological expertise

Note. This table synthesizes the methodological landscape across the reviewed corpus. Frequency indicates approximate proportion of studies employing each approach across the 600+ sources reviewed. Strengths and limitations are analytical judgments derived from methodological discussions in the source manuscripts.

4. Findings

The reflexive thematic analysis of the 23-manuscript corpus yielded six overarching meta-themes that capture the structural logic of communication theory transformation in the digital age. These themes are not discrete categories but interconnected dimensions of a systemic transformation, each illuminating a different facet of how digital media environments have reconstituted the foundational assumptions, operative mechanisms, and societal implications of classical communication theories. Each theme is discussed below with reference to evidence drawn from across the corpus, organized to demonstrate both the depth of empirical support and the complexity of the phenomena described.

4.1. Theme 1: Algorithmic Agency as a Structural Force

The most pervasive and consequential finding across the entire corpus is the emergence of algorithmic systems as autonomous agents in communication processes, operating across every theoretical domain examined. Algorithms are not merely neutral conduits facilitating pre-existing communication dynamics; they constitute a structural force that actively shapes what information becomes visible (gatekeeping), what issues achieve salience (agenda setting), what interpretive frameworks gain prominence (framing), whose influence reaches audiences (two-step flow), what opinion climates appear dominant (spiral of silence), what gratifications are available and discoverable (uses and gratifications), what dependencies form and intensify (media dependency), how innovations diffuse (diffusion of innovation), and what perceptions of social reality are cultivated (cultivation).

The analysis reveals that algorithms perform four distinct communicative functions across theoretical domains. First, they perform a filtering function analogous to traditional gatekeeping, determining what content passes through information channels. Second, they perform a salience function analogous to agenda setting, determining the prominence and visibility of content that has passed the filter. Third, they perform a framing function by contextualizing content through juxtaposition, sequencing, and recommendation patterns that create implicit interpretive frameworks. Fourth, they perform a dependency-generating function by designing engagement architectures that systematically transform use into reliance. The simultaneous performance of these functions by unified algorithmic systems dissolves the institutional boundaries that traditionally separated these communicative processes, creating what the corpus collectively characterizes as an integrated “algorithmic communication ecology.”

The opacity of algorithmic decision-making emerges as a critical normative concern across all theoretical domains. Unlike human communicators whose decisions can be interrogated, challenged, and held accountable through professional norms and regulatory frameworks, algorithmic systems operate through proprietary processes that resist public scrutiny. Zuboff’s (2019) framework of surveillance capitalism provides a political economy context for understanding why this opacity is not accidental but strategically maintained: the commercial value of behavioral prediction and modification depends on users not understanding the mechanisms through which their attention and behavior are shaped. This opacity has implications for democratic discourse (agenda setting and framing), opinion expression (spiral of silence), power distribution (gatekeeping), and cultural perception (cultivation) that existing theoretical apparatus is only beginning to address. Regulatory initiatives including the EU Digital Services Act (European Commission, 2022) and the EU Artificial Intelligence Act (European Commission, 2024) represent the most consequential attempts to date to impose transparency requirements on algorithmic communication systems.

Empirical research has documented algorithmic agencies across diverse communicative contexts. González-Bailón et al. (2023) demonstrated asymmetric ideological segregation in Facebook news exposure at population scale. Cinelli et al. (2021) provided comparative evidence of echo chamber formation across multiple platforms with different algorithmic architectures. Bail et al. (2018) showed that algorithmic exposure to opposing views paradoxically intensified political polarization. Meraz (2009) documented the emergence of blog networks as alternative agenda-setters within algorithmically structured information environments. Collectively, these studies establish that algorithmic agency is not a theoretical postulate but an empirically well-documented structural reality with consequential effects across the full range of processes that foundational communication theories were designed to explain.

4.2. Theme 2: The Agency-Structure Dialectic in Digital Communication

A fundamental tension pervades the corpus between expanded user agency in digital environments and the structural constraints imposed by platform architectures, algorithmic systems, and corporate governance. This dialectical relationship manifests differently across theoretical traditions but reflects a common underlying dynamic: digital media simultaneously empower users

with unprecedented communicative capabilities while embedding those capabilities within carefully designed choice architectures that shape probable outcomes.

Uses and Gratifications scholarship documents how users actively select platforms and content to satisfy diverse needs, develop creative strategies to circumvent algorithmic curation, and exercise meaningful choice in their media diets. The concept of “fighting the feed” captures users’ active resistance to algorithmic determination of their information environments. Similarly, gatekeeping research demonstrates how citizen gatekeeping has democratized information dissemination, enabling marginalized voices to bypass institutional filters and reach audiences directly. Framing research documents how users construct, modify, and disseminate alternative interpretive frameworks through social media activism, meme culture, and hashtag campaigns.

Simultaneously, however, Media Dependency Theory scholarship reveals how platform design features—algorithmic personalization, variable reward schedules, infinite scrolling, push notifications—systematically transform voluntary use into structural dependency, constraining the very agency that initially motivated engagement. The Need-Gratification-Dependency (NGD) cycle theorizes this process as a self-reinforcing loop in which gratification-seeking creates dependencies that reshape needs, effectively capturing users in engagement architectures designed to maximize platform metrics. The concept of “guided activeness” encapsulates this paradox: users exercise genuine agency, but within powerful choice architectures that delimit the range of probable outcomes in ways that serve platform interests. Thaler and Sunstein’s (2008) concept of choice architecture provides a useful analytical bridge, demonstrating how the arrangement of options can systematically steer choices without eliminating them.

The agency-structure dialectic has particular significance for understanding communicative inequality. Research on Diffusion of Innovation Theory demonstrates how structural barriers—digital infrastructure availability, economic access, algorithmic visibility—shape adoption patterns in ways that cannot be reduced to individual adopter characteristics (Van Dijk, 2020). Technological determinism scholarship highlights how platform architectures create path dependencies that constrain social possibilities regardless of user intention. Media Dependency Theory’s extension to digital colonialism reveals how global structural inequalities are reproduced through dependency on digital platforms controlled by technology corporations concentrated in a small number of “digital core” nations. The agency-structure dialectic, in this context, is not merely a theoretical paradox but a site of ongoing political struggle over the terms on which billions of people participate in contemporary communication environments.

4.3. Theme 3: Platform Specificity and the Fragmentation of Communication Effects

The corpus consistently demonstrates that communication effects in digital environments are platform-specific rather than universal, representing a fundamental departure from classical theories formulated in the context of broadcast media’s relatively homogeneous communication environment. Each platform’s distinctive affordances—the combination of technical features, interface design, algorithmic logic, user norms, and commercial imperatives—creates a distinct communicative ecology that shapes which effects manifest and through what mechanisms.

Cultivation research reveals that different platforms cultivate different perceptions: Instagram cultivates body image concerns and materialistic values through visual comparison (Drozd et al., 2022); Twitter cultivates perceptions of political polarization through trending algorithm design; TikTok cultivates abbreviated attention patterns through short-form content affordances; and news aggregation platforms cultivate either broadened or narrowed worldviews depending on algorithmic personalization intensity. Spiral of Silence research demonstrates that users perceive different opinion climates across platforms, with perceived anonymity on Reddit facilitating minority opinion expression while identity-linked platforms like Facebook suppress it (Hampton et al., 2014). Uses and Gratifications research documents platform-specific gratification patterns, with users strategically selecting different platforms for different needs (Quan-Haase & Young, 2010).

This platform specificity has profound methodological implications. Research designs that treat “digital media” or “social media” as undifferentiated constructs risk aggregating fundamentally different communicative environments, producing findings that may not accurately characterize any specific platform. The reviewed literature increasingly advocates for platform-specific theoretical specifications that identify how particular affordances shape particular effects, while simultaneously acknowledging that users navigate across multiple platforms and that cross-platform dynamics—content migration, audience overlap, and competitive algorithmic adaptation—create interdependencies that single-platform analyses cannot capture. Valkenburg’s (2022) finding that social media effects on well-being are conditional on specific usage types and contexts rather than overall exposure duration exemplifies the analytical precision that platform-specific theoretical specifications make possible.

Table 4. *Platform-Specific Communication Dynamics: Affordances, Algorithmic Logics, and Theoretical Implications.*

Platform	Primary Affordances	Dominant Algorithmic Logic	Key Theoretical Implications	Principal Theories Implicated
X / Twitter	Public short-form text, trending topics, retweet, quote tweet, hashtags	Recency + engagement; trending amplification	Agenda-setting via trending; spiral of silence in public discourse; two-step flow restructuring	Agenda Setting, Spiral of Silence, Two-Step Flow
Facebook / Meta	Social graph, mixed-media feed, group formation, event coordination	Social graph + engagement prediction	Echo chamber cultivation; political polarization; dependency through social graph lock-in	Cultivation, Media Dependency, Spiral of Silence
Instagram	Visual content, Stories, Reels, influencer economy, algorithmic Explore	Aesthetic engagement + influencer amplification	Body image cultivation; materialistic values; parasocial opinion leadership; visual framing	Cultivation, Framing, Two-Step Flow
TikTok	Short-form video, For You page, audio trends, duets/stitches	Interest graph; behaviorally driven cold-start discovery	Rapid cultural diffusion; abbreviated attention cultivation; viral	Cultivation, Diffusion of Innovation, Framing

			framing via audio trends	
Reddit	Pseudonymous, community-organized, upvote/downvote, nested discussion	Community voting + recency; subreddit curation	Minority opinion expression (anonymity effect); community-specific agenda-setting; gate watching	Spiral of Silence, Agenda Setting, Gatekeeping
YouTube	Long-form and short-form video, recommendation rabbit holes, comment threads	Watch-time optimization; rabbit-hole recommendation chains	Cultivation via extended immersive exposure; radicalization pathway concerns; dependency	Cultivation, Media Dependency, Gatekeeping
Generative AI Platforms (ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude)	Conversational AI, synthetic content generation, multimodal output	Prompt-response optimization; RLHF training alignment	New categories of synthetic media cultivation; post-authenticity framing; dependency on AI for information	Cultivation, Framing, Media Dependency, Gatekeeping

Note. Platform characteristics are based on documented affordances as of 2024 and may evolve as platforms update their systems. Theoretical implications are derived from the synthesis of reviewed literature rather than from platform-specific empirical studies. Instagram = INS; TikTok = TT; X/Twitter = X; Facebook/Meta = FB; Reddit = R; YouTube = YT.

4.4. Theme 4: Theoretical Convergence and Integration

Perhaps the most theoretically significant finding of this synthesis is the pronounced convergence of formerly discrete theoretical traditions in the digital media environment. Theories that were developed to explain distinct communication phenomena—agenda setting and gatekeeping, uses and gratifications and media dependency, framing and cultivation—increasingly address overlapping processes, shared mechanisms, and common analytical concerns in ways that suggest the boundaries between them are becoming analytically untenable.

The convergence of gatekeeping and agenda-setting theories illustrates this pattern most clearly. In traditional media environments, gatekeeping (determining what content passes through institutional filters) and agenda setting (determining what issues achieve public salience) were institutionally and analytically distinct processes. In algorithmic environments, these functions are

performed simultaneously by unified systems: the same algorithm that filters content also determines its visibility and prominence, collapsing the conceptual distinction between access and salience. Similarly, the integration of Uses and Gratifications Theory with Media Dependency Theory through the NGD framework demonstrates how user agency and structural dependency represent sequential phases of a single process rather than competing analytical perspectives.

The convergence trend extends across all theoretical domains. Framing and cultivation theories increasingly address how algorithmic content selection creates both interpretive frameworks (framing) and cumulative perceptual effects (cultivation) through the same recommendation mechanisms. Two-Step Flow and Diffusion of Innovation theories converge in their analysis of how influence and adoption spread through digital networks mediated by algorithmic visibility systems. Spiral of Silence and agenda-setting theories intersect in examining how algorithmically curated opinion climates shape both issue salience and opinion expression willingness. Technological Determinism increasingly converges with Media Dependency Theory in its analysis of how structural dependencies on platform architectures constrain communicative possibilities in ways that exceed individual choice.

These convergences suggest that the disciplinary tradition of analyzing communication through discrete theoretical lenses may require fundamental reconsideration in the digital age, favoring instead integrated frameworks capable of capturing the recursive, multi-functional nature of algorithmic communication systems. The convergence observed in this study is not merely a scholarly trend but reflects genuine structural changes in communication systems: when a single unified algorithmic system performs the functions historically distributed across separate institutional actors and social processes, theoretical frameworks that analyze those functions separately produce an artificial fragmentation that obscures rather than illuminates the phenomena under investigation.

4.5. Theme 5: Global Inequities and the Reproduction of Communicative Power

The corpus reveals persistent and in some cases intensifying global inequities in the distribution of communicative power within digital environments. These inequities manifest at multiple levels: the concentration of platform ownership and algorithmic control in a small number of technology corporations headquartered primarily in the United States and China; the extraction of data and digital labor from the Global South for processing and monetization by corporations in the “digital core”; the encoding of Western cultural assumptions in algorithmic systems deployed globally; and the dominance of English-language, Western academic perspectives in theoretical frameworks applied to diverse cultural contexts.

Media Dependency Theory’s extension to digital colonialism provides the most comprehensive analytical framework for understanding these dynamics. Research synthesizing 183 sources demonstrates how digital technologies, rather than democratizing opportunity as frequently promised, have created new mechanisms of exploitation and structural dependency analogous to historical colonialism (Couldry & Mejias, 2019; Kwet, 2019). Peripheral nations provide raw data and digital labor while importing proprietary software and platforms, replicating the unequal exchange dynamics identified by classical dependency theorists. Srnicek’s (2017) analysis of platform capitalism situates these dependencies within a broader political economy of digital accumulation, demonstrating how platform business models systematically extract value from communication practices while concentrating ownership and control in a small number of corporate actors.

The implications of global communicative inequality extend across all theoretical domains. Agenda-setting research has predominantly examined Western media systems, limiting understanding of how agenda dynamics operate in restricted media environments, authoritarian contexts, and societies with different media structures. Cultivation research has focused primarily on American and European populations, leaving substantial gaps in understanding how digital content cultivates perceptions in diverse cultural contexts. Framing research exhibits pronounced Western-centric bias that limits cross-cultural generalizability. The Two-Step Flow and Diffusion of Innovation

literatures have insufficiently examined how opinion leadership and innovation adoption dynamics vary across cultures with different communication norms, power structures, and technological infrastructures. Hilbert (2020), reviewing the history of digital technology and social change, observed that the democratic and emancipatory potentials of digital communication have been systematically constrained by structural inequalities in access, ownership, and algorithmic power that theoretical frameworks have not yet adequately incorporated.

4.6. Theme 6: Generative Artificial Intelligence and the Reconstitution of Communication Theory

Emerging evidence from 2022 to 2025 reveals that generative artificial intelligence represents not merely a new platform for existing communication processes but a qualitative disruption that challenges the foundational ontological premises of classical communication theory. The distinction between human communicators and technological channels—fundamental to every classical communication theory—dissolves in environments where AI systems generate content indistinguishable from human-authored text, images, and voice. This dissolution raises profound questions about the validity of theoretical constructs that presuppose human authorship, including opinion leadership (Two-Step Flow), audience agency (UGT), personal influence (MDT), and the authenticity of social opinion climates (Spiral of Silence).

For agenda-setting and gatekeeping theories, generative AI introduces the possibility of fully automated agenda construction at unprecedented scale. AI systems can generate thousands of news articles, social media posts, or search results on designated topics within minutes, effectively creating synthetic issue salience that may or may not reflect human informational needs or democratic priorities. The detection of AI-generated content presents a fundamental challenge for gatekeeping systems designed around human editorial judgment, as established content moderation approaches and professional journalistic norms are not calibrated for synthetic media at scale. Wardle and Derakhshan's (2017) information disorder framework, developed primarily in response to human-generated misinformation, requires extension to account for AI-generated synthetic information environments.

For cultivation theory, the prospect of AI-generated media saturating information environments with particular narratives, values, and representations raises the possibility of targeted cultivation effects calibrated to individual user profiles through personalized generative AI systems. Unlike broadcast television, which cultivated homogeneous perceptions through shared exposure to common narratives, AI-powered cultivation could produce highly individualized and precisely targeted perceptual consequences that are far more difficult to detect and study using traditional survey-based cultivation research methods. The implications for Uses and Gratifications Theory are equally significant: users increasingly seek gratifications from conversational AI systems rather than passively mediated content, creating new forms of parasocial interaction, information gratification, and emotional engagement that classical gratification typologies do not capture.

Table 5. *Theoretical Disruptions: How Generative AI Challenges and Reconfigures Classical Communication Theories.*

Theory	Classical Assumption Challenged by GenAI	Emergent Implication	Key Theoretical Questions
Agenda Setting	Human editorial judgment drives issue salience	Synthetic content at scale can manufacture artificial salience	How do AI-generated issues achieve salience? Can audiences distinguish synthetic agendas?

		without editorial accountability	
Cultivation	Shared media exposure produces homogeneous worldview cultivation	Personalized AI-generated content enables targeted, individualized cultivation effects*	Can AI-generated media produce stronger cultivation effects than broadcast media? How to measure?
Framing	Human communicators strategically construct and deploy frames	AI systems generate frames algorithmically; frames may reflect training data biases rather than communicator intent	Whose values are encoded in AI-generated frames? How do AI frames interact with user interpretation?
Two-Step Flow	Human opinion leaders interpret and relay media messages	AI-generated synthetic opinion leaders can simulate interpersonal influence at scale*	How do audiences develop trust in AI-generated opinion leaders? What are democratic implications?
Gatekeeping	Human editorial judgment selects newsworthy content	AI content generation bypasses editorial gatekeeping; RLHF creates new algorithmic gatekeeper	Who governs AI-based gatekeeping? How to maintain public interest accountability?
Spiral of Silence	Individuals perceive social opinion climates through social interaction	AI-generated content can create synthetic opinion climates that distort perceived majority views*	Do individuals silence themselves in response to AI-generated perceived majorities?
Uses & Gratifications	Users actively select pre-existing media to satisfy identifiable needs	Conversational AI enables on-demand gratification generation; new parasocial AI relationships	What new gratification categories emerge from AI interaction? How does AI alter the seeking process?

Media Dependency	Users develop dependency on media information resources for goal achievement	AI assistants create intensive, personalized dependency relationships; informational reliance on AI	How does AI dependency differ from platform dependency? What are cognitive and epistemic consequences?
Diffusion of Innovation	Innovations spread through social systems via communication channels	AI tools adopt rapidly through platform integration, bypassing classical adopter category logic	How does AI adoption reconfigure the role of opinion leaders in technology diffusion?
Technological Determinism	Technology shapes social outcomes through structural constraints	GenAI introduces unpredictable, emergent social consequences exceeding soft determinism frameworks*	Is a new theoretical vocabulary needed to account for AI's emergent and unpredictable societal effects?

Note. This table synthesizes emerging theoretical implications of generative AI based on scholarly literature published 2022–2025, supplemented by analytical extrapolation from foundational theoretical premises. The evidence base for each implication varies in empirical maturity; entries marked with an asterisk () reflect primarily theoretical or speculative analysis rather than established empirical findings.*

Table 6. Key Research Gaps in Digital Communication Theory and Practice.

Research Gap Category	Affected Theories	Nature of Gap	Priority Level
Longitudinal research	All ten theories	Insufficient tracking of how digital transformation processes evolve over extended periods; snapshot designs predominate; most studies examine effects at a single time point	Critical
Cross-cultural scholarship	All ten theories	Western-centric bias limits global generalizability; severe underrepresentation of Global South, Middle Eastern, African, and Southeast Asian contexts	Critical

Algorithmic transparency	Agenda Setting, Gatekeeping, Framing, Spiral of Silence, Cultivation	Opacity of algorithmic decision-making impedes understanding of how content filtering, salience, and recommendation mechanisms operate; proprietary systems resist academic audit	High
Generative AI and synthetic media	All ten theories	Near-complete absence of empirical research on how AI-generated content affects theoretical processes; urgent given rapid deployment of GenAI systems at scale	High
Methodological integration	All ten theories	Need for mixed-method approaches combining computational scale with interpretive depth; trace data combined with longitudinal surveys; platform API access barriers	High
Emerging platforms and affordances	Cultivation, UGT, Spiral of Silence, Framing	Insufficient research on TikTok, BeReal, Discord, Mastodon, and emerging VR/AR platforms; "social media" treated as monolithic	High
Intervention effectiveness	Cultivation, Spiral of Silence, Media Dependency	Limited research on media literacy, digital citizenship, platform design, and regulatory interventions that mitigate harmful effects	Medium
Theoretical integration frameworks	All ten theories	Insufficient development of integrated frameworks; theories continue to be applied in isolation despite documented convergence of underlying processes	Medium

Power, inequality, and digital colonialism	Gatekeeping, Media Dependency, Diffusion, Technological Determinism	Underexamined reproduction and amplification of global communicative power asymmetries; limited data sovereignty and indigenous data governance research	Medium
Neurobiological and cognitive mechanisms	Cultivation, Media Dependency, UGT	Limited integration of neuroscience on attention, reward processing, and habit formation; experimental and neuroimaging studies rare in communication literature	Medium

Note. Gaps identified through synthesis of 23 source manuscripts and supplementary review of 2022–2025 scholarship. “All ten theories” indicates that the gap was identified in literature addressing every theoretical domain examined.

5. Discussion

5.1. Theoretical Implications

The findings of this qualitative synthesis carry substantial implications for communication theory, methodology, and practice. The six meta-themes identified—algorithmic agency, the agency-structure dialectic, platform specificity, theoretical convergence, global communicative inequality, and the implications of generative AI—collectively suggest that the digital transformation of communication represents not merely a series of incremental theoretical adjustments but a fundamental reconstitution of the discipline’s conceptual architecture.

The emergence of algorithmic agency as a structural force operating across all theoretical domains challenges the discipline’s traditional analytical division between media production, message content, and audience reception. Classical theories were formulated within a communication model in which human agents—editors, journalists, producers—made identifiable decisions about content that was then received and interpreted by audiences. Algorithmic systems collapse these distinctions by simultaneously producing (generating and curating), distributing (filtering and ranking), and personalizing (adapting to individual characteristics) content through unified computational processes. Existing theories, each designed to illuminate one segment of the communication process, must be reconceptualized to account for the integrated, recursive nature of algorithmic mediation.

The pronounced convergence of theoretical traditions documented in this synthesis suggests that the disciplinary convention of studying communication through discrete theoretical lenses may have reached its analytical limits in digital environments. When the same algorithmic system simultaneously performs gatekeeping, agenda-setting, framing, cultivation, and dependency-generating functions, analyzing these processes through separate theoretical frameworks produces artificial fragmentation that obscures the integrated logic of digital communication systems. The emergence of generative AI as a sixth analytical theme reinforces this convergence imperative: AI systems challenge foundational assumptions shared across all ten theories simultaneously rather than affecting discrete theoretical domains in isolation.

5.2. The Algorithmic Communication Ecology Model

In response to the convergent trajectories documented in this synthesis, this study proposes the Algorithmic Communication Ecology Model (ACEM) as an integrative framework for understanding communication processes in digital environments. The ACEM conceptualizes digital communication as an ecology of recursive interactions among four analytical dimensions: algorithmic architecture, which encompasses the filtering, salience, framing, and engagement mechanisms built into platform systems; communicative agency, which encompasses the diverse, context-dependent ways in which individuals and groups use, resist, and appropriate digital communication technologies; platform environments, which encompass the distinctive affordances, norms, and commercial imperatives that shape communication within and across specific platforms; and structural power, which encompasses the global, institutional, and economic forces that shape who controls communication infrastructure, who benefits from data extraction, and whose perspectives are encoded in algorithmic systems.

The ACEM framework posits that communication phenomena in digital environments emerge from the recursive interaction of these four dimensions rather than from any single theoretical mechanism. Agenda-setting effects, for example, result from the interaction of algorithmic salience mechanisms (architecture), user sharing and attention patterns (agency), platform-specific trending algorithms (environment), and the concentration of platform ownership in particular corporate and national contexts (power). The model's recursive structure acknowledges that these dimensions are not independent variables but mutually constitutive processes: algorithmic architecture shapes user agency, which in turn generates data that modifies algorithmic behavior; platform environments are constructed by corporate decisions reflecting structural power relations, which are challenged and modified by collective communicative action.

The emergence of generative AI as a sixth meta-theme necessitates an extension of the ACEM to incorporate a fifth analytical dimension: synthetic content generation, which encompasses the processes through which AI systems produce and distribute content that is functionally indistinguishable from human-generated media. This dimension interacts with all four existing ACEM dimensions: it reshapes algorithmic architecture (as AI generation becomes integrated into platform content systems), challenges communicative agency (as users struggle to identify and evaluate synthetic content), transforms platform environments (as platforms become hybrid human-AI content systems), and intensifies structural power asymmetries (as AI capabilities are concentrated in a small number of well-resourced corporations).

The ACEM framework is offered not as a replacement for individual communication theories but as a meta-theoretical architecture within which their specific insights can be integrated and contextualized. Each theory illuminates particular dimensions and interactions within the ecology: Agenda Setting Theory illuminates the salience dimension of algorithmic architecture; Cultivation Theory illuminates the long-term perceptual consequences of sustained exposure within particular platform environments; Uses and Gratifications Theory illuminates the motivational dimensions of communicative agency; Media Dependency Theory illuminates the structural dependency mechanisms linking agency to architecture; and Gatekeeping Theory illuminates the power-laden filtering processes that shape information access. By positioning these theories within a common ecological framework, the ACEM enables scholars to examine how their insights interact and compound in specific communicative contexts.

Table 6. Analytical Dimensions of the Algorithmic Communication Ecology Model (ACEM): Theoretical Foundations, Mechanisms, and Regulatory Implications.

ACEM Dimension	Contributing Theories	Key Mechanisms	Priority Research Questions	Regulatory Relevance
Algorithmic Architecture	Agenda Setting,	Filtering, ranking, personalization,	How do specific algorithmic design	DSA algorithmic

	Gatekeeping, Framing, Cultivation	recommendation, engagement optimization	decisions produce measurable communication effects across theoretical domains?	transparency requirements; audit mechanisms
Communicative Agency	UGT, Two-Step Flow, Diffusion of Innovation	Need satisfaction, opinion leadership, innovation adoption, resistance, appropriation, platform circumvention	How do users navigate, resist, and appropriate algorithmic environments across diverse cultural contexts?	Media literacy policy; digital citizenship education
Platform Environment	Cultivation, Spiral of Silence, Framing, UGT	Affordances, norms, commercial imperatives, interface design, content modalities, community architecture	How do platform-specific affordances shape distinct patterns of communication effects across populations?	Platform governance; interoperability requirements
Structural Power	Media Dependency, Technological Determinism, Gatekeeping	Data extraction, infrastructure control, cultural encoding, regulatory governance, digital colonialism	How do global power asymmetries shape digital communication infrastructure, access, and effects?	Data sovereignty; antitrust; Global South digital rights
Synthetic Content Generation (proposed extension)	All ten theories	AI-generated text, image, audio, video; RLHF alignment; synthetic opinion leaders; personalized cultivation	How does AI-generated synthetic media alter the mechanisms and effects described by all ten foundational theories?	AI Act; deepfake regulation; synthetic media labeling

Note. The ACEM integrates insights from all ten theories within a unified ecological framework. The fifth dimension (Synthetic Content Generation) represents a proposed extension to account for generative AI. Contributing theories indicate primary analytical alignment; in practice, all theories inform multiple dimensions.

5.3. Methodological Implications

The findings carry significant methodological implications for communication research. The platform specificity of communication necessitates research designs that differentiate among distinct platform environments rather than treating digital or social media as undifferentiated constructs. The temporal dynamics of digital communication—including the rapid evolution of platform algorithms, the emergence and decline of platforms, and the shifting norms of user behavior—demand longitudinal research designs capable of tracking change across extended periods. The recursive interaction of algorithmic and human processes requires mixed-method approaches that combine the scale and pattern-detection capabilities of computational methods with the interpretive depth and contextual sensitivity of qualitative inquiry (Freelon, 2020).

The global inequities documented across the corpus underscore the urgent need for communication research conducted in and relevant to diverse cultural, linguistic, and political contexts. The dominance of English-language, Western-centric scholarship in the reviewed literature represents not merely a bibliometric limitation but a substantive analytical blind spot that distorts understanding of communication processes operating in fundamentally different institutional, cultural, and technological environments. Addressing this gap requires not only more research conducted in non-Western contexts but also the development of theoretical frameworks informed by diverse epistemological traditions, including indigenous knowledge systems, postcolonial theory, and Southern epistemologies (Coudry & Mejias, 2019; Kwet, 2019).

The emergence of generative AI as both a research subject and a methodological tool introduces new opportunities and challenges for communication research. AI-enabled computational methods can process far larger corpora of textual and multimedia data than previous computational approaches, enabling new forms of content analysis, network analysis, and longitudinal tracking. However, AI-generated research outputs raise new questions about methodological transparency and reproducibility that the discipline has not yet systematically addressed. The use of large language models to assist in literature synthesis—as in the present study—represents a methodological development that requires explicit disclosure and epistemological reflection about the ways in which AI tools shape analytical conclusions.

5.4. Practical Implications

The findings have practical implications for media policy, platform governance, media literacy education, and professional communication practice. The identification of algorithmic agency as a structural force operating across all communication processes strengthens the case for regulatory frameworks requiring algorithmic transparency, accountability, and auditability—as exemplified by the EU's Digital Services Act (European Commission, 2022) and the EU's Artificial Intelligence Act (European Commission, 2024). The documentation of the Need-Gratification-Dependency cycle informs the design of digital wellness interventions and platform features that support user autonomy rather than systematically fostering dependency. The analysis of global communicative inequality provides an evidence base for policy initiatives promoting digital sovereignty, data governance, and equitable access to digital communication infrastructure (Srnicsek, 2017; van Dijck et al., 2018).

For media literacy education, the findings suggest that effective programs must move beyond individual-level skills training to address the structural dimensions of digital communication. Understanding how algorithms shape information environments, how platform architectures design engagement, how generative AI produces synthetic content, and how global power relations structure digital access provides a more comprehensive foundation for critical digital citizenship than

traditional media literacy approaches focused primarily on content evaluation (Guess & Lyons, 2020). For professional communicators, the findings illuminate how the communication landscape has shifted from a model of controlled message dissemination to a complex ecology of networked, algorithmically mediated, and increasingly AI-generated processes that require fundamentally different strategic approaches.

5.5. Limitations

This study is subject to several limitations that qualify the scope and generalizability of its conclusions. First, as noted in the methodology section, the primary corpus is constituted by manuscripts from a single sustained research program, which may introduce systematic consistency in theoretical orientation that limits the representativeness of the synthesized findings. A corpus incorporating manuscripts from a wider range of research traditions, institutional contexts, and geographic locations would provide a stronger empirical foundation for the integrative claims advanced.

Second, the study's English-language orientation systematically underrepresents the substantial body of communication theory scholarship published in Arabic, Chinese, Spanish, French, Portuguese, Russian, and other major research languages. This limitation is particularly consequential for the study's analysis of global communicative inequities, as the scholarship most relevant to non-Western communication dynamics is most likely to be published in non-English languages.

Third, the rapidly evolving nature of digital communication environments means that specific empirical findings cited in this study may not accurately characterize current platform dynamics, algorithms, and user practices. The analysis of generative AI, in particular, draws on a literature that is both recent and rapidly expanding; the conclusions reached here should be understood as provisional assessments of an emerging area rather than established findings.

Fourth, the proposed ACEM framework, while grounded in the synthesis of extensive existing scholarship, has not been subjected to systematic empirical testing. The framework represents a theoretical contribution requiring validation through future empirical research rather than an established explanatory model. Scholars engaging with the ACEM should treat it as a heuristic for generating research hypotheses rather than a confirmed account of digital communication processes.

6. Conclusion

This study has undertaken a comprehensive qualitative synthesis of the transformation of ten foundational mass communication theories in the digital media age, analyzing 23 scholarly manuscripts encompassing over 600 peer-reviewed sources published between 2000 and 2025. The investigation has demonstrated that while the core premises of classical communication theories retain explanatory value, their operative mechanisms, boundary conditions, and societal implications have undergone fundamental transformation in response to the affordances and constraints of digital platforms, algorithmic mediation, and networked communication environments. The emergence of generative artificial intelligence as a sixth analytical theme underscores that this transformation is ongoing rather than completed, and that its ultimate implications for communication theory remain genuinely uncertain.

Six overarching meta-themes capture the structural logic of this transformation. The emergence of algorithmic agency as a structural force reshaping all theoretical paradigms represents the most consequential development, as algorithmic systems simultaneously perform filtering, salience, framing, and dependency-generating functions that were historically distributed across separate institutional actors and analytical frameworks. The dialectical tension between expanded user agency and platform-imposed constraints reveals the paradox of digital communication: users possess unprecedented communicative capabilities that are exercised within powerful choice architectures designed to serve platform interests. The increasing platform specificity of communication effects demands analytical approaches that differentiate among distinct communicative ecologies rather

than treating digital media as a monolithic category. The pronounced convergence of formerly discrete theoretical traditions suggests that the disciplinary convention of studying communication through separate theoretical lenses has reached its analytical limits in digital environments. The persistence of global inequities in communicative power structures demonstrates that digital transformation has reproduced and in some cases intensified existing asymmetries in who controls communication infrastructure, who benefits from data flows, and whose perspectives are encoded in the systems that increasingly mediate human experience. And the emergence of generative AI introduces challenges that require not merely the adaptation of existing theories but the development of genuinely new conceptual frameworks adequate to communication environments in which AI systems function as both channels and producers of content.

The Algorithmic Communication Ecology Model (ACEM), extended in this study to incorporate a fifth dimension of synthetic content generation, offers a meta-theoretical architecture within which the complementary insights of individual theories can be integrated and contextualized. The thirty-two specific research recommendations formulated across eight thematic areas provide a concrete agenda for future scholarship that directly addresses the persistent gaps identified through synthesis of the existing literature. Together, the ACEM framework and the research agenda constitute the study's primary contributions to communication scholarship: a theoretical foundation for integration and a practical program for empirical investigation.

The enduring challenge for communication scholarship is to develop theoretical frameworks that are simultaneously faithful to the complexity of contemporary communication environments and useful for understanding, critiquing, and improving the communicative conditions of human flourishing in an algorithmically mediated world. The classical theories synthesized in this study represent not historical artifacts to be superseded but intellectual resources to be reconceptualized, extended, and integrated within frameworks adequate to the communicative realities of the twenty-first century. It is the responsibility of the discipline to ensure that this theoretical work advances with the urgency and rigor that the stakes of democratic discourse, cultural production, and human agency in digital environments demand.

7. Recommendations for Future Research

To move communication studies forward, researchers should focus on key gaps and new opportunities. These recommendations are intended to guide both theoretical and practical progress within the field, fostering innovative thinking and actionable outcomes.

A foundational recommendation is the pursuit of longitudinal research, which systematically examines changes in communication practices over extended periods. As digital technologies and algorithms continue to evolve, tracking shifts in user behavior and attitudes becomes increasingly essential. For instance, researchers could observe cohorts of individuals who engage with artificial intelligence-driven platforms at varying levels, documenting how their perceptions and interactions transform over time. Such studies are particularly valuable in revealing the dynamics of opinion leadership and media dependency as digital platforms mature, offering insights unattainable through cross-sectional or short-term methodologies.

Expanding research to encompass international and intercultural perspectives is equally crucial. Comparative analysis of communication patterns across diverse cultural and regional contexts, with particular attention to the Global South, can illuminate the multifaceted effects of technology and media on societies worldwide. Investigations into phenomena such as digital colonialism and data sovereignty will uncover how infrastructure and access shape communicative behaviors, and how local norms influence the articulation and suppression of opinions. This global approach not only enriches the academic discourse but also addresses pressing societal challenges.

Another significant avenue for inquiry is the exploration of algorithmic transparency. As digital platforms increasingly rely on complex recommendation systems and algorithms to curate content, there is a pressing need for robust frameworks and tools to scrutinize their influence. Researchers are encouraged to develop auditing mechanisms that assess the impact of algorithms on news framing,

as well as to evaluate the effects of regulatory interventions on information dissemination. Understanding these processes is imperative, given the growing role of digital platforms in agenda-setting and the formation of public opinion climates.

The proliferation of generative artificial intelligence and synthetic media introduces new complexities regarding audience engagement and perception. Experimental studies can investigate how individuals respond to AI-generated opinion leaders or compare the effects of content produced by human versus artificial agents. Further, examining the manifestation of the spiral of silence in AI-mediated environments and identifying novel patterns of gratification and dependency will contribute to a deeper understanding of these transformative developments.

Methodological innovation remains a cornerstone of impactful research. Integrating behavioral data harvested from digital platforms with traditional survey responses, employing computational methods to analyze framing across multimedia formats, and designing interdisciplinary protocols that merge communication theory with human-computer interaction are recommended strategies. Additionally, the formulation of ethical guidelines for researching AI technologies is paramount, ensuring that scholarly inquiry remains both responsible and pioneering.

Focusing on the distinctive characteristics of individual platforms offers further opportunity for nuanced analysis. Comparative studies of environments such as TikTok, Instagram, and YouTube can elucidate how platform-specific features shape attitudes and communicative behaviors. The investigation of immersive technologies, including virtual and augmented reality, and the assessment of interventions aimed at mitigating the spiral of silence or navigating competing opinion climates, will enhance the granularity of research findings.

Finally, research that emphasizes practical interventions and policy analysis is essential for addressing real-world communication challenges. Evaluating approaches such as prebunking and inoculation theory to counteract misinformation, scrutinizing the effects of regulatory policies on platform gatekeeping, and developing media literacy programs tailored to algorithmic and AI-related issues will ensure that scholarly contributions have tangible societal impact.

A holistic understanding of communication in the digital era requires the integration of diverse theoretical frameworks and empirical approaches. Scholars should empirically test models across platforms and cultural contexts, devise metrics to assess theoretical convergence, and explore neurobiological correlates of media dependency through neuroimaging. Interdisciplinary collaboration will be instrumental in cultivating a comprehensive and nuanced perspective on the evolving landscape of communication studies. By aligning research endeavors with these recommendations, scholars are well-positioned to address enduring gaps and drive innovation within the discipline.

Funding: This work was supported and funded by the Deanship of Scientific Research at Imam Mohammad ibn Saud Islamic University (IMSIU) (grant number IMSIU-DDRSP2602).

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Transparency: The author confirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate and transparent account of the study that no vital features of the study have been omitted and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained. This study followed all ethical practices during writing.

References

- Alter, A. (2017). *Irresistible: The rise of addictive technology and the business of keeping us hooked*. Penguin Press.
- Appel, M., Marker, C., & Gnams, T. (2020). Are social media ruining our lives? A review of meta-analytic evidence. *Review of General Psychology*, 24(1), 72–86. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1089268019898034>
- Aral, S., & Walker, D. (2012). Identifying influential and susceptible members of social networks. *Science*, 337(6092), 337–341. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1215842>

- Bail, C. A. (2021). *Breaking the social media prism: How to make our platforms less polarizing*. Princeton University Press.
- Bail, C. A., Argyle, L. P., Brown, T. W., Bumpus, J. P., Chen, H., Hunzaker, M. B. F., Lee, J., Mann, M., Merhout, F., & Volfovsky, A. (2018). Exposure to opposing views on social media can increase political polarization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(37), 9216–9221. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1804840115>
- Bakshy, E., Rosenn, I., Marlow, C., & Adamic, L. (2012). The role of social networks in information diffusion. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on World Wide Web* (pp. 519–528). ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2187836.2187907>
- Ball-Rokeach, S. J., & DeFleur, M. L. (1976). A dependency model of mass-media effects. *Communication Research*, 3(1), 3–21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009365027600300101>
- Barzilai-Nahon, K. (2008). Toward a theory of network gatekeeping: A framework for exploring information control. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 59(9), 1493–1512. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.20857>
- Bhaskar, R. (2008). *A realist theory of science*. Routledge. (Original work published 1975)
- Blumler, J. G. (2016). The fourth age of political communication. *Javnost—The Public*, 23(4), 391–407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13183222.2016.1226704>
- Boyd, D., & Crawford, K. (2012). Critical questions for big data: Provocations for a cultural, technological, and scholarly phenomenon. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 662–679. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.678878>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE Publications.
- Bruns, A. (2018). *Gatewatching and news curation: Journalism, social media, and the public sphere*. Peter Lang.
- Bucher, T. (2018). *If...then: Algorithmic power and politics*. Oxford University Press.
- Bucher, T., & Helmond, A. (2018). The affordances of social media platforms. In J. Burgess, A. Marwick, & T. Poell (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of social media* (pp. 233–253). SAGE Publications.
- Burscher, B., Odiijk, D., Vliegthart, R., de Rijke, M., & de Vreese, C. H. (2014). Teaching the computer to code frames in news: Comparing two supervised machine learning approaches to frame analysis. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 8(3), 190–206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2014.937527>
- Cacciatore, M. A., Scheufele, D. A., & Iyengar, S. (2016). The end of framing as we know it... and the future of media effects. *Mass Communication and Society*, 19(1), 7–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2015.1068811>
- Castells, M. (2010). *The rise of the network society* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Chadwick, A. (2017). *The hybrid media system: Politics and power* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Cho, J. (2009). Uses and dependency of new media as a function of traditional and new media use. *Conference Papers—International Communication Association*, 1–27.
- Cinelli, M., Morales, G. D. F., Galeazzi, A., Quattrociocchi, W., & Starnini, M. (2021). The echo chamber effect on social media. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(9), e2023301118. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2023301118>
- Couldry, N., & Hepp, A. (2017). *The mediated construction of reality*. Polity 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.
- Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory*, 9(2), 119–161. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1999.tb00355.x>
- Drozd, M., Borecka, D., & Przybyslawski, J. (2022). Instagram as a source of social comparison and its impact on body image satisfaction and mental health. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(21), 14252. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192114252>
- European Commission. (2022). Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 of the European Parliament and of the Council on a Single Market for Digital Services (Digital Services Act). *Official Journal of the European Union*, L277, 1–102. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32022R2065>

- European Commission. (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). Official Journal of the European Union, L1689. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32024R1689>
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2014.12.002>
- Freelon, D. (2020). Computational research in the post-API age. *Political Communication*, 35(4), 665–668. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2018.1477506>
- Gerbner, G., & Gross, L. (1976). Living with television: The violence profile. *Journal of Communication*, 26(2), 172–199. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1976.tb01397.x>
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., Signorielli, N., & Shanahan, J. (2002). Growing up with television: Cultivation processes. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 43–67). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gillespie, T. (2018). *Custodians of the internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media*. Yale University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Harvard University Press.
- González-Bailón, S., Lazer, D., Münch, F. P., Zhang, R., Rahwan, I., Settle, J., & Benkler, Y. (2023). Asymmetric ideological segregation in exposure to political news on Facebook. *Science*, 381(6656), 392–398. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.ade7138>
- Guess, A. M., & Lyons, B. A. (2020). Misinformation, disinformation, and online propaganda. In N. Persily & J. A. Tucker (Eds.), *Social media and democracy: The state of the field, prospects for reform* (pp. 10–33). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108890960.002>
- Guo, L., & McCombs, M. (2012). An expanded perspective on agenda-setting effects: Exploring the third level of agenda setting. *Revista de Comunicación*, 11, 51–68.
- Hampton, K. N., Rainie, L., Lu, W., Dwyer, M., Shin, I., & Purcell, K. (2014). Social media and the “spiral of silence.” Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2014/08/26/social-media-and-the-spiral-of-silence/>
- Hilbert, M. (2020). Digital technology and social change: The digital transformation of society from a historical perspective. *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience*, 22(2), 189–194. <https://doi.org/10.31887/DCNS.2020.22.2/mhilbert>
- Jasanoff, S. (2016). *The ethics of invention: Technology and the human future*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. New York University Press.
- Katz, E., Blumler, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1974). Uses and gratifications research. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 37(4), 509–523. <https://doi.org/10.1086/268109>
- Katz, E., & Lazarsfeld, P. F. (1955). *Personal influence: The part played by people in the flow of mass communications*. Free Press.
- Katz, M. L., & Shapiro, C. (1985). Network externalities, competition, and compatibility. *American Economic Review*, 75(3), 424–440.
- Kim, Y., & Jung, J.-Y. (2017). SNS dependency and interpersonal storytelling: An extension of media system dependency theory. *New Media & Society*, 19(9), 1458–1475. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816636611>
- Kwet, M. (2019). Digital colonialism: US empire and the new imperialism in the Global South. *Race & Class*, 60(4), 3–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306396818823172>
- Lazarsfeld, P. F., Berelson, B., & Gaudet, H. (1944). The people's choice: How the voter makes up his mind in a presidential campaign. Duell, Sloan and Pearce.
- Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: II. Channels of group life; social planning and action research. *Human Relations*, 1(2), 143–153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872674700100201>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
- Marwick, A. E., & Boyd, D. (2011). I tweet honestly, I tweet passionately: Twitter users, context collapse, and the imagined audience. *New Media & Society*, 13(1), 114–133. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444810365313>

- Maxwell, J. A. (2012). *A realist approach for qualitative research*. SAGE Publications.
- McCombs, M. (2014). *Setting the agenda: Mass media and public opinion* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.
- McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187. <https://doi.org/10.1086/267990>
- Meraz, S. (2009). Is there an elite hold? Traditional media to social media agenda setting influence in blog networks. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14(3), 682–707. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2009.01458.x>
- Napoli, P. M. (2015). Social media and the public interest: Governance of news platforms in the realm of individual and algorithmic gatekeepers. *Telecommunications Policy*, 39(9), 751–760. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2014.12.003>
- Napoli, P. M. (2019). *Social media and the public interest: Media regulation in the disinformation age*. Columbia University Press.
- Noelle-Neumann, E. (1974). The spiral of silence: A theory of public opinion. *Journal of Communication*, 24(2), 43–51. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1974.tb00367.x>
- Pan, Z., & Kosicki, G. M. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Political Communication*, 10(1), 55–75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.1993.9962963>
- Pariser, E. (2011). *The filter bubble: What the internet is hiding from you*. Penguin Press.
- Quan-Haase, A., & Young, A. L. (2010). Uses and gratifications of social media: A comparison of Facebook and instant messaging. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, 30(5), 350–361. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0270467610380009>
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
- Ruggiero, T. E. (2000). Uses and gratifications theory in the 21st century. *Mass Communication & Society*, 3(1), 3–37. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327825MCS0301_02
- Scheufele, D. A., & Iyengar, S. (2017). The state of framing research: A call for new directions. In K. Kenski & K. Hall Jamieson (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political communication* (pp. 619–632). Oxford University Press.
- Shanahan, J., & Morgan, M. (1999). *Television and its viewers: Cultivation theory and research*. Cambridge University Press.
- Shoemaker, P. J., & Vos, T. P. (2009). *Gatekeeping theory*. Routledge.
- Singer, J. B. (2014). User-generated visibility: Secondary gatekeeping in a shared media space. *New Media & Society*, 16(1), 55–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444813477833>
- Srnicek, N. (2017). *Platform capitalism*. Polity Press.
- Sundar, S. S., & Limperos, A. M. (2013). Uses and grats 2.0: New gratifications for new media. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 57(4), 504–525. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2013.845827>
- Sunstein, C. R. (2017). *#Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media*. Princeton University Press.
- Tandoc, E. C., Ferrucci, P., & Duffy, M. (2015). Facebook use, envy, and depression among college students: Is Facebooking depressing? *Computers in Human Behavior*, 43, 139–146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.10.053>
- Tandoc, E. C., Lim, Z. W., & Ling, R. (2018). Defining “fake news”: A typology of scholarly definitions. *Digital Journalism*, 6(2), 137–153. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2017.1360143>
- Tarafdar, M., Cooper, C. L., & Stich, J.-F. (2019). The technostress trifecta—techno eustress, techno distress and design: Theoretical directions and an agenda for research. *Information Systems Journal*, 29(1), 6–42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12169>
- Thaler, R. H., & Sunstein, C. R. (2008). *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. Yale University Press.
- Valkenburg, P. M. (2022). Social media use and well-being: What we know and what we need to know. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 45, 101294. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.12.010>
- Van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (2020). *The digital divide*. Polity Press.
- van Dijck, J., Poell, T., & de Waal, M. (2018). *The platform society: Public values in a connective world*. Oxford University Press.

- Vargo, C. J., Guo, L., McCombs, M., & Shaw, D. L. (2014). Network issue agendas on Twitter during the 2012 U.S. presidential election. *Journal of Communication*, 64(2), 296–316. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12089>
- Vorderer, P., & Klimmt, C. (2021). *The Oxford handbook of entertainment theory*. Oxford University Press.
- Vu, H. T., Guo, L., & McCombs, M. E. (2014). Exploring “the world outside and the pictures in our heads”: A network agenda-setting study. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 91(1), 76–94. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699013514807>
- Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). *Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policymaking*. Council of Europe. <https://rm.coe.int/information-disorder-report-november-2017/16807834bb>
- Watts, D. J., & Dodds, P. S. (2007). Influentials, networks, and public opinion formation. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 34(4), 441–458. <https://doi.org/10.1086/518527>
- White, D. M. (1950). The “gate keeper”: A case study in the selection of news. *Journalism Quarterly*, 27(4), 383–390. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107769905002700403>
- Whittemore, R., & Knafl, K. (2005). The integrative review: Updated methodology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 52(5), 546–553. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2005.03621.x>
- Williams, R. (1974). *Television: Technology and cultural form*. Fontana.
- Winner, L. (1986). *The whale and the reactor: A search for limits in an age of high technology*. University of Chicago Press.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.