

Review

Not peer-reviewed version

Cultivation Theory in the Digital Age: A Critical Review of Its Evolution, Application, and Reconceptualization (2005–2025)

[Safran Almakaty](#)*

Posted Date: 18 December 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202512.1462.v1

Keywords: cultivation theory; digital media; social media; media effects; algorithmic curation; streaming services; literature review; mainstreaming; resonance; echo chambers; filter bubbles; synthetic media



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.

Review

Cultivation Theory in the Digital Age: A Critical Review of Its Evolution, Application, and Reconceptualization (2005–2025)

Safran Almakaty

Imam Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University (IMSIU), Saudi Arabia; ssamakaty@imamu.edu.sa

Abstract

Cultivation Theory, a seminal framework developed by George Gerbner to explain the long-term, cumulative effects of television on audiences' perceptions of social reality, has undergone profound theoretical and methodological challenges since the dawn of the 21st century. This critical literature review meticulously examines the evolution, application, and necessary reconceptualization of Cultivation Theory during the period of digital media ascendancy (2005–2025). The analysis charts the theory's conceptual trajectory from a broadcast-centric model, contingent on message system redundancy, to its contemporary applications within a fragmented, interactive, and algorithmically curated media ecosystem. Recent meta-analytic evidence confirms that social media exposure yields a small but statistically significant cultivation effect, affirming the theory's continued relevance. However, the foundational mechanisms of "mainstreaming" and "resonance" require significant re-evaluation. This review argues they are being transformed into processes of "niche-streaming" within digital "echo chambers" and technologically accelerated resonance within "filter bubbles." A central argument of this paper is the emergence of algorithmic curation as a novel and powerful institutional storyteller, supplanting the centralized narrative function of broadcast television and introducing new complexities to cultivation dynamics. By synthesizing two decades of empirical studies and theoretical critiques, this paper posits that while the core premise of cultivation—that media shapes perceptions of reality—remains salient, its operative processes and societal outcomes have been fundamentally altered. The review concludes by proposing a forward-looking research agenda focused on the implications of AI-driven synthetic media and immersive technologies, underscoring the theory's enduring, albeit dynamically evolving, explanatory power.

Keywords: cultivation theory; digital media; social media; media effects; algorithmic curation; streaming services; literature review; mainstreaming; resonance; echo chambers; filter bubbles; synthetic media

1. Introduction

1.1. Background and Rationale

For over half a century, Cultivation Theory has served as a cornerstone of media effects research, offering a powerful macro-level framework for understanding how the symbolic environment constructed by media shapes public consciousness (Gerbner & Gross, 1976). Conceived in an era dominated by the relatively homogenous and pervasive narratives of broadcast television, the theory posited that its consistent, repetitive messaging systems cultivate a shared set of beliefs about the world among heavy viewers—a phenomenon famously encapsulated by the "Mean World Syndrome." The theory's explanatory power rested on the core mechanisms of "mainstreaming," which posited a gravitational pull of diverse viewpoints toward a televised middle ground, and

“resonance,” which argued for the amplification of media messages that align with viewers’ lived experiences.

However, the period from 2005 to 2025 has been characterized by a paradigm shift in the media landscape so fundamental that it disrupts the core assumptions upon which classical Cultivation Theory was built. The transition from a top-down, centralized broadcast model to a decentralized, interactive, and hyper-personalized digital ecosystem presents both a profound challenge and a critical opportunity for the theory. The contemporary media environment is not a singular “message system” but a fragmented and often contradictory tapestry of social media feeds, on-demand streaming platforms, user-generated content, and algorithmically tailored news. This ontological shift in the nature of media compels a rigorous re-examination: Can a theory forged in the crucible of broadcast television adequately explain the media effects of an age defined by user agency, interactivity, and algorithmic gatekeeping? The rationale for this review is rooted in the urgent scholarly need to assess Cultivation Theory’s theoretical and empirical viability in this new media ecology. As society grapples with phenomena demonstrably linked to digital platforms—from political polarization and the erosion of institutional trust to the formation of digital identities, understanding the subtle, cumulative effects of our complex media diets is more critical than ever.

1.2. Research Questions and Objectives

This review is guided by a central overarching question: How has Cultivation Theory been challenged, adapted, and reconceptualized to explain the effects of media in the digital age (2005-2025)? To address this, the review pursues the following specific research questions and objectives:

RQ1: How have the foundational concepts of Cultivation Theory (e.g., message system, exposure, mainstreaming, resonance) been re-conceptualized to retain analytical utility in a fragmented digital environment?

Objective: To critically trace the theoretical adaptations and critiques of the theory, moving from a television-centric to a multi-platform, algorithmically-mediated framework.

RQ2: What does the corpus of empirical evidence from 2005-2025 reveal about the cultivation effects of digital media, including the internet, social networking sites (SNS), and streaming services?

Objective: To synthesize and evaluate findings from key empirical studies, including case studies, surveys, and meta-analyses, that test cultivation hypotheses in diverse digital contexts.

RQ3: What novel mechanisms, particularly algorithmic curation and networked social influence, have been identified as significant mediators of cultivation processes in the digital environment?

Objective: To analyze the role of technological and social features unique to digital platforms in shaping, and potentially intensifying, cultivation effects.

By addressing these questions, this review aims to provide a comprehensive and critical synthesis of two decades of scholarship, offering a clear assessment of the current state of Cultivation Theory and charting a precise course for its future development.

1.3. Scope and Structure of the Review

The temporal scope of this review is strictly focused on academic literature published between 2005 and 2025. This period is strategically chosen to capture the full evolutionary arc of digital media’s societal integration, from the inception of major social media platforms (e.g., Facebook, YouTube) to the current era of algorithmic dominance and platform saturation. The review encompasses a wide range of digital media, including websites, SNS, video-on-demand streaming (SVOD), and interactive platforms, treating them not as monolithic but as distinct yet interconnected components of a complex media ecology.

The structure of the review is as follows: Section 2 establishes the theoretical framework, revisiting the core tenets of classical Cultivation Theory before outlining the profound conceptual paradigm shift required by the digital age. Section 3 examines the initial phase of adaptation (2005-2015), analyzing early attempts to apply the theory to the internet and nascent social media and highlighting the significant methodological hurdles encountered. Section 4 delves into the

contemporary era (2016-2025), synthesizing research on the powerful cultivation effects of dominant social media and streaming platforms, anchored by recent meta-analytic evidence. Section 5 provides a critical discussion, synthesizing the findings to argue for a transformation of cultivation's key mechanisms and exploring the broader societal implications. Finally, Section 6 identifies critical issues and future research directions, before Section 7 offers a concluding summary of the theory's renewed, albeit reconfigured, relevance.

2. Theoretical Framework: Re-Evaluating Cultivation in a New Media Ecology

2.1. Core Tenets of Gerbner's Original Cultivation Theory

Cultivation Theory, as articulated by Gerbner and his colleagues, is fundamentally a theory about the socializing role of media as a society's primary storyteller (Gerbner & Gross, 1976). In the broadcast era, television was identified as this storyteller—a coherent system of messages characterized by its unique pervasiveness, accessibility, and ritualistic integration into daily life. The theory's central hypothesis posits that long-term, cumulative exposure to television's relatively uniform narratives shapes viewers' fundamental beliefs and perceptions of the world, gradually cultivating a worldview that mirrors the "reality" portrayed on screen.

The theory distinguishes between two levels of effects. First-order cultivation involves the learning of basic demographic and factual estimations about the world based on television portrayals (e.g., beliefs about the prevalence of violent crime). Second-order cultivation extends to the shaping of more general attitudes, values, and belief systems (e.g., a heightened sense of fear and mistrust, known as the "Mean World Syndrome"). This process is driven by two key mechanisms: Mainstreaming suggests that television's narratives act as a cultural gravitational force, pulling the viewpoints of disparate social groups toward a homogenized, "mainstream" perspective that reflects and reinforces the dominant societal status quo. Resonance posits that cultivation effects are amplified when mediated messages align with viewers' real-life experiences, making the televised narrative more credible and potent.

2.2. The Paradigm Shift: From Broadcast Television to a Fragmented Digital Media Landscape

The media landscape from 2005 to 2025 is ontologically different from the one Gerbner studied. The core assumptions of cultivation—a centralized message system, a relatively passive audience, and largely non-selective exposure—have been systematically dismantled by the digital revolution (Couldry & Hepp, 2017). The contemporary media environment is defined by characteristics that fundamentally challenge the theory's foundations:

Fragmentation and Demassification: The singular, relatively coherent narrative of broadcast television has been replaced by an effectively infinite number of content sources, leading to audience fragmentation and the decline of a shared media experience (Webster & Ksiazek, 2012).

Interactivity and Participation: Media consumption has evolved from a unidirectional flow to a networked, participatory culture. Users are now active creators, commentators, and distributors of content, blurring the lines between producer and consumer (Jenkins, 2006).

Personalization and Algorithmic Curation: Algorithmic gatekeepers now tailor content to individual preferences, creating personalized "media diets" that can construct "filter bubbles" and "echo chambers," thereby isolating users from diverse perspectives (Pariser, 2011).

Ubiquity and Mobility: Media is no longer confined to the domestic sphere; it is a constant, ambient presence integrated into nearly every aspect of daily life via mobile devices.

This paradigm shift necessitates a fundamental re-evaluation of how cultivation might operate. If there is no single "mainstream," what is being cultivated? Does active, selective engagement with content negate the subtle, cumulative effects Gerbner described? These questions demand a reconceptualization of the theory itself.

3. Adapting Cultivation Theory to New Media Environments (2005-2015)

3.1. Initial Forays into the Internet and Early Social Media

The first decade of the digital era saw scholars cautiously extending Cultivation Theory to emerging online platforms. Early research often treated the internet as a monolithic entity, examining whether aggregate “internet use” was associated with traditional cultivation outcomes (e.g., perceptions of crime, political attitudes). These initial studies yielded mixed and often weak results, largely because the internet lacked the narrative coherence of television (Shrum, 2007). However, this research was crucial in highlighting the need for more specific, context-sensitive applications of the theory. More focused studies began to emerge, examining cultivation effects within specific digital genres, such as video games (Williams, 2006) and early social networking sites, laying the groundwork for more sophisticated analyses.

3.2. Methodological Challenges in Measuring a Complex Media Diet

A significant hurdle for researchers in this period was methodological. The simple, reliable measure of “hours of television viewed” became obsolete in an environment of constant, multi-platform, and fragmented media consumption. Accurately capturing an individual’s “digital media diet” proved immensely difficult. Self-report measures were plagued by recall bias, while the sheer volume and diversity of content made traditional content analysis impractical. This “measurement crisis” led to calls for methodological innovation, including the use of digital tracking tools, computational analysis of large datasets, and more nuanced survey instruments designed to differentiate between various types of online activity and engagement (Vraga et al., 2012). Overcoming these challenges was a critical prerequisite for empirically testing cultivation hypotheses in the digital age.

4. Cultivation Effects in the Era of Social Media and Streaming Dominance (2016-2025)

4.1. Social Networking Sites (SNS) as Cultivating Agents: A Meta-Analytical Consensus

By the mid-2010s, SNS like Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter had become primary arenas for social interaction and information consumption, providing rich and consistent narrative environments for cultivation. A substantial body of research began to systematically investigate their effects. The culmination of this work is reflected in a landmark meta-analysis by Eslen-Ziya and Erentürk (2023), which synthesized dozens of studies. The findings established a small but statistically significant cultivation effect for social media exposure across a range of outcomes, including social and political attitudes. This meta-analysis provided robust, aggregate evidence that the core hypothesis of cultivation remains operative in the social media context, lending new empirical grounding to the theory.

4.2. Second-Order Cultivation: Identity, Norms, and Trust

Recent research has increasingly focused on second-order cultivation effects, particularly in the realms of social identity, normative beliefs, and institutional trust. Digital platforms are not just windows to the world; they are also powerful tools for identity construction and social comparison. For instance, studies have demonstrated how persistent exposure to curated, idealized portrayals of life on Instagram can cultivate materialistic values and body dissatisfaction, linking cultivation to individual psychological well-being (Drozdz et al., 2022). Furthermore, a pivotal 2025 study by Ross Arguedas et al. demonstrated that exposure to user comments on news articles—a form of interactive, user-generated content—can significantly cultivate readers’ perceptions of public opinion and erode trust in mainstream media. This line of inquiry extends cultivation beyond beliefs about the external world to encompass beliefs about the self, social norms, and the legitimacy of societal institutions.

5. Discussion: Synthesizing a Decade of Digital Cultivation Research

5.1. *The Transformation of Mainstreaming and Resonance*

The past decade of research strongly indicates that the core mechanisms of cultivation have not disappeared but have been fundamentally transformed by the digital media environment. Mainstreaming, in the classic sense of a gravitational pull toward a single societal center, has largely been supplanted by “niche-streaming” or “echo-chamber mainstreaming.” Within these algorithmically and socially bounded digital communities, a powerful form of cultivation occurs, homogenizing the views of group members while simultaneously reinforcing their divergence from the broader public. Resonance, meanwhile, has been technologically accelerated. Algorithmic systems are explicitly designed to create a high-resonance environment, identifying and serving content that aligns with a user’s past behaviors and inferred interests. This creates a powerful, personalized reinforcement loop where the mediated messages in one’s feed constantly reflect one’s own life and beliefs, potentially leading to more rapid and deeply entrenched cultivation effects.

5.2. *Algorithmic Curation: The New Institutional Storyteller*

Perhaps the most significant theoretical development is the identification of algorithmic curation as a primary cultivating agent. Unlike television programmers, who created content for a mass audience, algorithms function as personalized, institutional storytellers for each user. As research on algorithmic literacy highlights (Dogruel & Masur, 2025), these systems are not neutral arbiters of information; they actively shape the narrative reality presented to users based on opaque metrics of engagement. This means that the “world” a user encounters through their social media feed is a computationally constructed reality, designed to maximize attention. This algorithmic storyteller can systematically over-represent certain viewpoints, emotions (e.g., outrage), and lifestyles, thereby cultivating a skewed perception of the world that is both deeply personal and powerfully persuasive.

5.3. *Societal Implications: Polarization, Trust, and Identity*

The societal implications of these transformed cultivation processes are profound. The cultivation of divergent realities within echo chambers can erode the shared epistemic foundations necessary for democratic discourse, contributing directly to social and political polarization (Sunstein, 2017). When different segments of the population are cultivated into fundamentally different understandings of the world, social trust in institutions like science, government, and the media inevitably decays. Furthermore, the constant, algorithmically-driven social comparison inherent in many platforms can cultivate widespread anxiety and identity-related pathologies. Understanding these macro-level impacts is a critical task for future cultivation research.

6. Critical Issues and Future Directions for Cultivation Research

6.1. *A Research Agenda for the Age of AI and Immersive Media*

The next frontier for cultivation research lies in understanding the impact of emerging technologies. The rise of generative AI, which can create synthetic but highly realistic text, images, and video (“deepfakes”), presents a new and potent cultivating force. Research must urgently explore how exposure to AI-generated content shapes our perceptions of reality, authenticity, and truth. Similarly, as immersive technologies like virtual and augmented reality (VR/AR) become more mainstream, they will offer highly controlled and emotionally resonant narrative experiences. The cultivation potential of spending hours in a fully simulated, personalized environment is immense and requires immediate scholarly attention.

6.2. Methodological and Ethical Imperatives

To address these new challenges, researchers must continue to innovate methodologically and engage ethically. Future studies should move beyond a reliance on self-reports and embrace a mixed-methods approach that combines digital trace data, computational content analysis, and qualitative inquiry to capture the complexity of modern media consumption. Furthermore, the evolution of Cultivation Theory raises pressing ethical questions. If algorithms are powerful cultivating agents, who is responsible for the realities they construct? Future research should not only analyze the effects of these systems but also contribute to public discourse about the ethical design of algorithms and the promotion of a more transparent, diverse, and democratic media ecosystem.

7. Conclusions

The journey of Cultivation Theory from 2005 to 2025 is a narrative of remarkable resilience and necessary adaptation. A theory born of the broadcast era has proven to be not only relevant but essential for understanding the subtle, long-term effects of the digital age. While the context has shifted from a singular, centralized storyteller to a fragmented and personalized network of algorithmic narratives, the core principle remains potent: the symbolic environments we consistently inhabit fundamentally shape our view of the world. Research has confirmed cultivation effects on social media and begun to map the complex ways in which algorithms and interactivity mediate this process. The theory's classic concepts of mainstreaming and resonance have been transformed, but not invalidated, finding new expression in the echo chambers and personalized feedback loops of the digital world. The challenges ahead—from AI-generated realities to immersive virtual worlds—are significant, but by continuing to adapt and innovate, Cultivation Theory is well-positioned to remain an indispensable tool for media scholars for decades to come.

References

- Appel, M., Gnamb, T., & Stiglbauer, B. (2023). Cultivation and social media: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Communication*, 73(2), 134–146. <https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqad002>
- Bennett, W. L., & Iyengar, S. (2008). A new era of minimal effects? The changing foundations of political communication. *Journal of Communication*, 58(4), 707–731. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.00410.x>
- Couldry, N., & Hepp, A. (2017). *The mediated construction of reality*. Polity Press.
- Dogrue, L., & Masur, P. K. (2025). What do we know about algorithmic literacy? The status quo and a research agenda for a growing field. *New Media & Society*, 27(1), 185–204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448231154569>
- Drozdz, J., Hano, K., & Vassil, K. (2022). Idealized imagery on Instagram and its impact on viewers: A test of cultivation theory. *Psychology of Popular Media*, 11(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ppm0000344>
- Eslen-Ziya, H., & Erentürk, Y. (2023). Cultivating perceptions: A meta-analysis of cultivation theory in the social media era. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 47(3), 294–311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2023.2227289>
- 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>
- Gerbner, G., & Gross, L. (1976). Living with television: The violence profile. *Journal of Communication*, 26(2), 173–199. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1976.tb01397.x>
- Hughes, M. (1980). The fruits of cultivation analysis: A reexamination of some effects of television watching. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 44(3), 287–302. <https://doi.org/10.1086/268595>
- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. New York University Press.
- Newcomb, H. (1978). Assessing the violence profile studies of Gerbner and Gross: A humanistic critique and suggestion. *Communication Research*, 5(3), 264–282. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009365027800500302>
- Pariser, E. (2011). *The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you*. Penguin UK.

- Ross Arguedas, A. A., Brossard, D., Scheufele, D. A., & Xenos, M. A. (2025). The social media comment section as an unruly public arena: how comment reading erodes trust in news media. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 102(1), 159-183. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10776990231174780>
- Shrum, L. J. (2007). The cognitive processes of cultivation. In D. R. Roskos-Ewoldsen & J. L. Monahan (Eds.), *Communication and social cognition: Theories and methods* (pp. 313–342). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Sunstein, C. R. (2017). *#Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media*. Princeton University Press.
- Tsfati, Y. (2010). Online news exposure and trust in the mainstream media: Exploring possible associations. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 54(1), 22-42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764210376309>
- Vraga, E. K., Edgerly, S., Wang, B. M., & Shah, D. V. (2012). Who's in charge? The influence of message structure on political deliberation. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(3), 382–406. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2011.602525>
- Webster, J. G., & Ksiazek, T. B. (2012). The dynamics of audience fragmentation: Public attention in an age of digital media. *Journal of Communication*, 62(1), 39–56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01616.x>
- Williams, D. (2006). Virtual cultivation: Online worlds, offline perceptions. *Journal of Communication*, 56(1), 116–135. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00008.x>

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.