



(RESEARCH ARTICLE)



Digital Branding in the Post-Truth Era: How Online Perception Challenges Traditional Reputation Management

Uri Samet *

CEO, Buzz Dealer, Limassol, Cyprus.

International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 2023, 10(01), 1246-1259

Publication history: Received on 30 August 2023; revised on 18 October 2023; accepted on 29 October 2023

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30574/ijrsra.2023.10.1.0816>

Abstract

This article examines the profound impact of the post-truth era on digital branding and online reputation management. It defines the post-truth phenomenon, characterized by the diminished influence of objective facts in shaping public opinion, and analyzes how the increasing misinformation, algorithm-driven content exposure, social polarization, and declining public trust have fundamentally reshaped the digital landscape. The article explores the evolving principles of digital branding and the foundations of traditional reputation management, highlighting the new complexities introduced by digital forces. It critically analyzes the roles of search engines, social media platforms, and digital public relations in shaping public perception, drawing upon peer-reviewed studies and real-world examples. The conclusion proposes that digital branding is no longer purely controlled by organizations. Instead, public perception is increasingly shaped by external digital forces, affected by misinformation and platform dynamics. Consequently, traditional reputation management must evolve into a proactive, multi-platform set of strategies that account for fragmented information environments and declining institutional trust.

Keywords: Digital Branding; Post-Truth Era; Online Perception; Reputation Management; Media Trust

1. Introduction

1.1. The Digital Landscape and the Rise of Post-Truth

The 21st century has witnessed a dramatic transformation of the information environment, driven by rapid advances in information technology, wireless communications, and the pervasive adoption of social media.¹ This technological evolution has fundamentally altered how information is spread, leading to an increased speed and range of communication. Concurrently, it has diffused power over information, shifting socio-cultural norms and creating a complex, interconnected digital landscape.¹

Within this evolving environment, the term "post-truth" has gained significant prominence, particularly since the mid-2010s.² This concept refers to circumstances where objective facts exert less influence in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief.⁴ While some scholars argue that post-truth shares similarities with historical debates on relativism and postmodernity, others emphasize its distinct connection to 21st-century communication technologies and cultural practices.⁴ The phenomenon is less about questioning the nature of truth itself, and more about understanding why societal consensus on factual claims has eroded.⁴ This breakdown is often linked to a decline in the authority of traditional truth-telling institutions, such as government bodies and established news media.⁴

The current state of affairs is frequently described as the "Age of Disinformation," where the internet is full with falsehoods and half-truths presented as verifiable facts.³ This situation is exacerbated by the intentional weaponization of misinformation, which is deliberately spread to construct alternative narratives and gain credibility in public

* Corresponding author: Uri Samet

discussions.³ The digital landscape, with its inherent openness and the subjective nature of perceived truth, provides a fertile ground for such phenomena.³

1.2. Evolution of Digital Branding and Reputation Management

Digital branding is formally understood as the manner in which a company presents itself to its target market online, encompassing its online image, brand voice, tone, language, and overall customer perception.⁹ Effective digital branding involves the creation of a strong brand identity, achieved through consistent storytelling across various online channels, including websites, email marketing, and social media platforms.⁹ The ultimate aim is to foster brand recognition and cultivate a strong emotional connection with consumers.⁹ In an era characterized by information overload, brand awareness, the accessibility of brand associations, and clear brand positioning have become even more critical, as brands serve as essential "sorting mechanisms" to help consumers navigate the vast clutter of information.¹⁰

Conversely, traditional reputation management has been a cornerstone of organizational stability for centuries, with established procedures for building and maintaining a positive image.¹¹ Its foundational principles emphasized ethical conduct, transparent communication, and the consistent delivery of value to stakeholders.¹¹ This approach was largely unidirectional, conceptualized as a process managed "from company to stakeholder".¹³ Key inquiries in this traditional framework included understanding the basis of a company's reputation, methods for its measurement, and strategies for leveraging it to achieve specific advantages.¹³

The emergence of the digital age has fundamentally altered these long-established principles. Digitalization offers "innumerable possibilities for influencing reputation," but simultaneously introduces unprecedented challenges.¹¹ The immediate and pervasive nature of social media, for instance, means that negative information can go viral within seconds, demanding swift and strategic organizational responses to mitigate potential damage.¹⁴ This rapid spread of information challenges the slower, more controlled communication models of the past, where the durability of spoken defamations was short compared to written text.¹¹

1.3. Article Structure and Scope

This article addresses the critical challenge posed by the post-truth era to conventional digital branding and reputation management paradigms. It claims that the traditional organizational control over brand narratives is significantly decreasing, with public perception increasingly shaped by external digital forces. The subsequent sections will discuss the conceptual foundations of the post-truth era, analyze its impact on digital branding, explore how online perception reshapes reputation management, and examine the specific roles of misinformation, algorithms, social polarization, search engines, social media, and digital public relations. Finally, it will propose evolving strategies for navigating this complex environment.

2. The Post-Truth Era: Conceptual Foundations and Characteristics

2.1. Defining the Post-Truth Phenomenon

The post-truth era is characterized by circumstances where objective facts hold less influence in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief.⁴ This environment blurs the lines between truth and falsehood, honesty and dishonesty, and even nonfiction and fiction.⁵ From an academic perspective, post-truth refers to the widespread disputes over public truth claims that have become a defining feature of the 21st century, prompting research into their historical causes and contemporary effects.⁴ While some researches connect post-truth to older philosophical debates concerning relativism and postmodernity, a significant body of work emphasizes its unique manifestation in the context of 21st-century communication technologies and cultural practices.⁴

The contemporary understanding of post-truth shifts the inquiry from "what is truth?" or "is X true?" to "why don't we agree that this or that is true?".⁴ This reorientation highlights a pervasive breakdown in institutional authority for truth-telling, particularly concerning government and news media.⁴ This societal condition implies a profound shift in public discourse, where the very foundation of a shared reality is challenged. This extends beyond individuals simply being misinformed, it points to a fundamental change in how truth is perceived and valued. Consequently, the traditional reliance of branding and public relations on factual claims and demonstrable product benefits becomes inherently less effective. Brands must now navigate a landscape where their factual information might be readily dismissed in favor of emotionally resonant, yet potentially unfounded, narratives. This requires a strategic shifting from purely informative communication to emotionally intelligent and values-based engagement.

2.2. Key Characteristics: Emotion Over Fact, Ideological Bias, and Declining Trust

A central characteristic of the post-truth era is the elevation of individual opinion and feelings above objective facts.⁵ This prioritization fuels public and political campaigns that rely on emotional arguments rather than verifiable data or fact checks.⁵ The phenomenon is linked to heightened social polarization and pervasive ideological bias.⁶ Individuals are more inclined to accept arguments that align with their pre-existing beliefs and emotions, rather than those grounded in objective facts.⁵ This dynamic can lead to a situation where public policies are significantly influenced by emotionally charged public opinion, rather than rational deliberation.⁶

These shifts are accompanied with a documented decline in public trust, particularly in traditional institutions historically responsible for conveying truthful information, such as government institutions and established news media.⁴ This erosion of trust means that official information, even when accurate, may be rejected by a skeptical public if not communicated through an appropriate and empathetic approach.⁶ Conceptualization of "deliberate falsehood" provides a critical philosophical lens for understanding this characteristic. Claims that "factual truths are never compellingly true" and are vulnerable to being "perforated by single lies or torn to shreds by the organized lying of groups" underscores the inherent fragility of objective facts in this environment.⁴ This suggests that even verifiable truths about a brand's products or practices can be easily undermined or distorted by malicious actors or collective narratives. Such a scenario renders traditional fact-based defense mechanisms insufficient, requiring a proactive approach to narrative control and community building that goes beyond the distribution of merely factual information.

2.3. The Role of 21st-Century Communication Technologies

The emergence of 21st-century communication technologies, particularly social media, is a pivotal factor in the emergence and amplification of the post-truth culture.³ These platforms facilitate the rapid and massive diffusion of unverified rumors¹⁶ and have been widely criticized for providing a fertile ground for the spread of fake news campaigns and online hate speech.¹⁵ The sheer volume of user-provided content means that individuals often encounter misinformation daily, partly because they are generally neither trained nor used to validating information before consuming or sharing it.¹⁷

While Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Big Data analytics offer promising tools for verifying truth, they are also actively employed in scenarios where information attacks are intense due to the vast number of people involved.¹⁸ AI, in particular, can make fake news more sophisticated, generating texts and images that are nearly indistinguishable from credible sources.⁴⁹ Furthermore, personalized recommendation algorithms, a core feature of content-driven platforms, are designed to keep users engaged by presenting content that is highly interesting to them.³ This often leads to the creation of "tailored 'corners of the Internet'" where users are primarily exposed to information that reinforces their pre-existing beliefs.³ Consequently, users may accept information without critical thought, especially if it aligns with a perceived consensus within their specific online niche.³

The amplification of misinformation and disinformation by modern technologies represents a critical dynamic. While false information is not a new phenomenon, its scale and impact have been dramatically enhanced by digital platforms.³ This dynamic highlights how technology interacts with inherent human cognitive biases. Individuals exhibit a tendency to prefer information that is aligned with their existing beliefs (confirmation bias) and to avoid information that contradicts them (selective exposure, disconfirmation bias).²⁰ Algorithms, optimized for user engagement, are designed to promote extreme or emotionally charged content that resonates with specific audiences.²² This creates a self-reinforcing feedback loop: human biases drive engagement with particular content, algorithms learn these preferences and subsequently serve more of the same, which further encourages biases and contributes to social polarization.²² For digital branding, this implies that brand messages are not received in a neutral environment but are filtered and amplified through personalized, often biased, algorithmic pathways. This makes it increasingly challenging for brands to reach diverse audiences or effectively correct misperceptions outside of existing echo chambers.

Table 1 Key Characteristics of the Post-Truth Era

Characteristic	Description	Impact on Information Environment	Relevant Sources
Emotion Over Fact	Public opinion is shaped more by appeals to emotion and personal belief than objective facts.	Diminished value of factual accuracy; increased vulnerability to emotionally charged narratives.	⁴

Individual Opinion Valued Over Facts	An individual's subjective feelings and opinions are prioritized over verifiable data.	Subjectivity in truth claims; challenges to shared understanding of reality.	5
Ideological Bias & Social Polarization	Tendency to accept arguments aligning with pre-existing beliefs; societal fragmentation along ideological lines.	Reinforcement of existing viewpoints; reduced exposure to diverse perspectives.	6
Declining Institutional Trust	Erosion of public confidence in traditional truth-telling authorities (e.g., government, news media).	Increased skepticism towards official communications; reliance on alternative, often unverified, sources.	4
Sophisticated Misinformation	Propagation of intentionally false (disinformation) or unintentionally false (misinformation) content, often enhanced by AI.	Difficulty in discerning truth; rapid spread of misleading narratives.	3
Algorithmic Amplification	Algorithms prioritize engaging content, often reinforcing existing biases and accelerating the spread of polarizing information.	Creation of echo chambers and filter bubbles; exacerbation of societal divisions.	3

3. Digital Branding in a Fragmented Information Environment

3.1. Principles of Digital Branding and Identity Formation

Digital branding encompasses the comprehensive online presentation of a company, including its visual image, brand voice, tone, language, and the overall customer perception it cultivates.⁹ The foundation of a robust digital brand identity lies in clearly defining the brand's core values, mission, and unique selling propositions.⁹ This foundational clarity must then be consistently communicated through storytelling across all digital channels, such as corporate websites, email marketing campaigns, and various social media platforms.⁹ The strategic objective is to foster widespread brand recognition and establish a deep emotional connection with the target audience.⁹

In the current digital landscape, characterized by an overwhelming volume of information, the principles of brand awareness, the accessibility of brand associations, and precise brand positioning have become more critical than ever.¹⁰ Brands now serve a vital function as a "sorting mechanism," helping consumers navigate and make sense of the immense information clutter.¹⁰ However, this emphasis on a cohesive brand identity and consistent narrative creation, exists in a paradoxical tension with the inherent fragmentation and decentralization of information control within the digital environment. While brands meticulously craft their desired image, their ability to fully govern that image is significantly constrained by external digital forces. This fundamental tension between a brand's aspiration for control and the reality of its limited influence forms a central challenge in the post-truth era.

3.2. The Impact of User-Generated Content (UGC) on Brand Perception and Trust

User-Generated Content (UGC), which includes consumer-created reviews, ratings, photographs, and videos, has emerged as a pivotal element in modern marketing. This shift signifies a move from traditional brand-driven advertising to a model where consumers actively share their real-world experiences with products and services.³² This dynamic significantly influences brand perception and purchase intentions.³²

Consumers generally exhibit a higher degree of trust in reviews and feedback from their peers compared to traditional advertising messages.³² This peer influence can substantially enhance brand image and drive purchase intentions.³² The authenticity of UGC is a cornerstone for building trust, with studies indicating a high level of consumer trust in such content, reaching as high as 86% in some surveys.³³

However, the nature of UGC can also introduce negative effects. Negative user-generated content has an asymmetrically powerful effect on trust erosion, often requiring numerous positive pieces of content to counterbalance the damage inflicted by a single negative review.⁵² This highlights a fundamental shift in brand communication from a top-down, brand-controlled model to a peer-to-peer, consumer-driven one.³² This democratization of brand narrative means that consumers are no longer passive recipients of marketing messages but actively participate as co-creators of brand

perception and value.⁵³ This presents a dual challenge, in which while authentic UGC can generate immense trust and loyalty, negative or misleading UGC can rapidly stain a brand's reputation.¹⁴ This means that brands should actively foster positive UGC, engage proactively with their online communities, and develop robust mechanisms for monitoring and responding to negative content. The recognition that a brand's narrative is now a collective, co-created entity underscores the need for continuous vigilance and engagement.

3.3. Challenges to Brand Control in the Digital Sphere

In the post-truth era, organizations face unprecedented challenges to brand control, including new forms of exploitation, intimidation, and personal sabotage.¹⁸ The rapid and borderless spread of information, particularly negative content, through social media platforms means that companies must respond with exceptional speed and strategic precision during crises.⁴⁸ Online "firestorms," once ignited, are exceedingly difficult to contain, often spiraling beyond the organization's immediate influence.³⁹

The rapid increase of "fake news" specifically targeting corporations poses a significant threat, leading to tangible consequences such as a decrease in stock growth, an increase in negative sentiment within social media commentary, and heightened stress indicators among employee reviews.⁵¹ A critical aspect of this challenge is that even when individuals suspect the information is false, exposure to fake news can still influence their perception of a company and their subsequent relationship with it.⁴⁹

Traditionally, brand control centered on carefully crafting and spreading messages. However, in the post-truth digital sphere, the primary challenge is no longer solely *what the brand communicates*, but rather *what is communicated about the brand* by external actors, and crucially, *how* that information is generated and perceived within complex digital ecosystems.¹⁴ This paradigm shift implies that "control" in its conventional sense has become an illusion. Instead, the strategic focus must pivot towards managing the broader information environment itself. This includes a deep understanding of platform dynamics, nuanced consumer behavior, and the rapid virality of content, encompassing both positive and negative narratives.

4. Online Perception and the Reshaping of Reputation Management

4.1. Foundations of Traditional Reputation Management

Corporate reputation has long been recognized as an exceptionally valuable, yet intangible, asset for any organization.³⁹ It fundamentally represents the sum of stakeholders' expectations regarding a firm's future behavior and performance, expectations that are largely predicated on their observations and perceptions of the company's past conduct.³⁹ Historically, the process of cultivating a positive reputation was a well-established endeavor, refined over centuries through proven procedures and practices.¹¹ This traditional approach emphasized the critical importance of ethical conduct, transparent communication, and the consistent delivery of value to stakeholders.¹¹

Reputation management in this pre-digital era was often conceptualized as a unidirectional flow of information, primarily managed "from company to stakeholder".¹³ Key inquiries that guided practitioners included understanding the fundamental basis upon which a company's reputation was built, developing methods for its accurate measurement, and building strategies to leverage this reputation for specific organizational advantages.¹³ This framework assumed a relatively stable information environment where controlled communication and consistent, ethical behavior would reliably translate into public trust and a positive image.¹¹ However, the post-truth era fundamentally challenges these underlying assumptions. If objective facts are increasingly less influential than emotion and personal belief⁴, and if misinformation can spread with exceptional speed and reach¹⁶, then the direct causal link between "ethical conduct" and a "positive image" becomes fragile. This erosion of foundational assumptions necessitates a comprehensive re-evaluation of the core principles of reputation management in the digital age.

4.2. The Digital Transformation of Reputation Management: Opportunities and Challenges

The digital transformation has introduced a dual landscape of both novel challenges and significant opportunities for reputation risk management.³⁹ On the one hand, the boundary-free and perpetually available nature of digital communication channels facilitates the dynamic and potentially global distribution of news and opinions at a high speed.³⁹ Negative information, in particular, can go viral within seconds, leading to immediate and widespread reputational damage.¹⁴ Once unleashed, online "firestorms" are exceptionally difficult to contain, often escalating rapidly beyond an organization's control.³⁹

On the other hand, contemporary technological advancements offer powerful tools for dynamically tracking various aspects of reputation and conducting predictive analyses to anticipate how public sentiment might evolve.³⁹ Social media platforms, despite their inherent risks, provide mechanisms for fast and effective communication, enabling direct engagement with stakeholders during crises.⁴¹ This capability represents a significant opportunity to move beyond purely reactive damage control. While traditional reputation management often involved responding to crises after they had fully manifested⁴⁸, the speed and scale of digital information distribution now demand a fundamentally proactive attitude.¹⁴ The ability to monitor online sentiment in real-time and perform predictive analytics³⁹ allows organizations to anticipate and potentially prevent reputational risks before they escalate. This necessitates a strategic shift from merely mitigating damage to developing sophisticated "risk intelligence" and integrating continuous monitoring and data analytics into core reputation management practices.

4.3. The Erosion of Trust in Institutions and its Implications for Brands

A pervasive and critical development in the post-truth era is the significant global rise of digital trust.⁴² Digital trust is defined as the expectation individuals hold that digital technologies and services, along with the organizations providing them, will protect their interests and uphold societal values.⁴² Failures by technology developers and digital service providers, ranging from algorithmic predictions to data security breaches, have contributed to a significant decline in public confidence.⁴²

Misinformation actively undermines trust in credible experts and established organizations.⁴³ Once trust has been eroded, its restoration is a difficult and time-consuming process.⁴³ This decline in public trust in institutions creates a broader environment of skepticism that directly impacts brand trust. If the public generally distrusts "official" sources or traditional media outlets, then brand-generated content, even if factually accurate, may be viewed with suspicion. This means that brands are not merely contending with misinformation targeted at themselves, but are operating within a systemic decline in trust across all information sources. Consequently, brands must apply greater effort not only to establish their own trustworthiness but also to actively contribute to a more trustworthy information environment. This could involve promoting transparency, advocating for ethical AI use, promoting media literacy, or strategically leveraging trusted intermediaries such as influencers.⁴³

Table 2 Evolution of Reputation Management Challenges

Aspect	Traditional Era (Pre-Digital)	Digital Era (Post-Truth)
Information Flow	Controlled, Unidirectional (from company to stakeholder) ¹³	Decentralized, Multi-directional, User-generated ³²
Speed of Impact	Slower; spoken word fleeting, written text more durable ¹¹	Instant, viral, global; negative information spreads in seconds ⁴⁸
Primary Tools	Press releases, media relations, direct communication ⁴⁵	Content marketing, social media, SEO, real-time monitoring, analytics ⁴⁵
Crisis Management	Often reactive, focused on damage control and mitigation ⁴⁸	Proactive, rapid response, multi-platform strategies ⁴⁸
Trust Basis	Consistency, ethical conduct, personal relationships ¹¹	Authenticity, transparency, peer influence, consistent digital presence ³²

5. External Digital Forces and Their Impact on Public Perception

5.1. The Proliferation of Misinformation and Disinformation

5.1.1. Mechanisms of Spread and Influence on Public Opinion

Misinformation (unintentional false information) and disinformation (deliberate false information) are widespread features of the digital age.³ These forms of false content spread widely, often exhibiting greater virality than accurate news, particularly through social media platforms.¹⁶ The extensive availability of user-provided content on online social media enables the massive diffusion of unverified rumors.¹⁶ A significant contributing factor is that many non-experts routinely encounter fake news because they are generally not trained or used to validating information before consuming or sharing it.¹⁷

Fake news possesses the capacity to significantly influence public opinion and political decisions.⁴⁷ It frequently accumulates high levels of attention due to its sensational content and is often prioritized by algorithmic processes, leading to its rapid distribution before factual checks can be performed.⁴⁷ The rapid spread of misinformation and disinformation does not merely create confusion, instead it actively shapes public perceptions and influences behavior.⁴⁷ The sheer volume and velocity of false information contribute to a "truth deficit," where the public struggles to distinguish fact from fiction.⁴ This directly impacts brand perception, as consumers may act upon false information, potentially leading to financial losses for companies and a broader erosion of trust.⁴⁹ Consequently, brands must not only develop strategies to counter specific falsehoods but also contribute to broader media literacy initiatives and critical thinking among their audiences, alongside implementing robust monitoring systems to detect and address misinformation swiftly.

5.1.2. Case Examples of Misinformation Impact on Brands

Misinformation poses a growing threat to the corporate world, directly impacting corporations and capital markets.⁴⁹ Companies that become targets of fake news experience a range of negative outcomes, including heightened negativity in social media comments, a measurable decline in stock growth, and an increase in stress indicators reported in employee reviews.⁵⁰ Fake news is particularly harmful to companies that have built strong positive reputation, as its distribution creates cognitive dissonance for consumers, forcing them to reconcile their positive perceptions with the twisted information.⁵¹ A notable example of this occurred prior to the 2016 US presidential election, when a fake news story caused PepsiCo's stock to fall by approximately 4%.⁴⁶

Beyond direct corporate attacks, health and wellness influencers and brands have been observed leveraging social media to spread misinformation for economic gain, often weaponizing conspiracy theories to market and sell products.⁵⁵ This practice exposes consumers to significant risks, including financial losses and adverse health outcomes from purchasing ineffective products.⁵⁶ The data reveals that fake news has an asymmetric impact: it tends to cause more damage to organizations with strong, positive reputation, while its effect is less significant on those already viewed negatively.¹⁹ Furthermore, the effectiveness of fact-checking alerts in mitigating reputational damage is often limited.⁵¹ A deeper examination indicates that the perception of what *others believe* about a brand can be more damaging than an individual's direct belief in the fake news itself.⁵¹ If individuals perceive that others have been swayed by false information, their own opinion may gradually shift over time, even if they initially dismissed the misinformation.⁴⁹ This means that brands are engaged in a battle not just against false information, but also against a collectively perceived reality. Therefore, crisis management strategies must extend beyond simple debunking to focus on demonstrating sustained stakeholder confidence and proactively shaping the broader narrative.

5.2. Algorithm-Driven Content Exposure and Social Polarization

5.2.1. How Algorithms Shape Information Consumption

Recommendation algorithms fundamentally shape users' attention and information consumption patterns on social media platforms.⁴⁴ These algorithms are primarily designed to optimize for user engagement metrics, such as clicks, shares, and likes.²³ A key mechanism by which they achieve this is by prioritizing and presenting content that aligns with users' existing beliefs and interests.²⁴ This algorithmic curation results in personalized content feeds that reinforce pre-existing views, potentially leading to users becoming increasingly isolated within their own "echo chambers".²¹

Algorithms are not neutral channels of information, they are engineered to maximize engagement, which often translates into presenting users with more of what they already prefer or agree with.²⁴ This design inherently reinforces human cognitive biases such as confirmation bias and selective exposure.²⁰ The core understanding here is that algorithms primarily *amplify* existing human behavioral biases²³, rather than creating them from scratch. This dynamic leads to a narrowing of informational diversity, which can suppress nuanced public thinking and contribute to societal fragmentation.²² For brands, this means that reaching diverse audiences with nuanced messages becomes increasingly challenging, as their content may be filtered out of certain users' feeds or interpreted through a pre-existing, biased lens.

5.2.2. The Formation and Effects of Echo Chambers and Filter Bubbles

"Echo chambers" are defined as insulated online spaces, frequently found on social media platforms, where individuals are predominantly exposed to information, opinions, and ideas that reinforce their existing beliefs and perspectives.²¹ This environment intensifies confirmation bias, leading individuals to actively seek out and amplify information that aligns with their pre-existing beliefs while dismissing or ignoring contradictory information.²⁸

While some research suggests that algorithmic selection, particularly by search engines and social media, might paradoxically lead to slightly *more* diverse news consumption due to "automated serendipity" or "incidental exposure"³⁸, other studies claim that personalized algorithms contribute significantly to the formation of echo chambers and ideological segregation.²¹ The formation of these homogeneous clusters intensifies group polarization.²¹ Within these polarized environments, individuals become increasingly entrenched in their beliefs, as dissenting opinions are systematically filtered out or dismissed.²⁸

The prevalence of echo chambers and filter bubbles means that public discourse is increasingly fragmented, with different groups inhabiting distinct informational realities.²¹ For brands, this presents a significant challenge to maintaining a consistent, universally appealing image. If a brand takes a stance on a social issue, it risks distancing segments of its audience who are insulated within opposing echo chambers. It means that brands must carefully consider the political and social tendencies of their target audiences, and potentially tailor messages or even accept that strict neutrality may no longer be a viable option, thereby risking polarization in their own brand perception. This also underscores the necessity for developing strategies that can bridge these informational divides or operate effectively within fragmented publics.

5.3. The Role of Search Engines in Shaping Perception

Search engines play an increasingly critical role in shaping public access to information and influencing participation in public debates.³⁷ Their underlying algorithms determine which messages are displayed to users and in what order, effectively acting as powerful gatekeepers of online information.⁴⁷

5.3.1. Algorithmic Bias and Search Ranking Influence

Biased search rankings have been shown to significantly shift public opinion, including influencing voting preferences by as much as 20% or more.³⁶ This influence can be subtle and masked, meaning users often remain unaware that they are being manipulated.³⁶ Consumers tend to trust search engine companies to present results that are best suited to their needs, even though they generally have little understanding of how these ranking algorithms operate.³⁶

Algorithmic curation directly affects users' beliefs and decisions through feedback loops that reinforce existing cognitive biases, such as confirmation bias.³⁵ Studies have demonstrated that biased queries, particularly those targeting "benefits" or "risks," can yield search results that align with the query's inherent bias.³⁵ This "gatekeeping" power of search engines, with their capacity for biased search rankings to subtly shift opinions, presents a profound ethical dilemma.³⁶ For brands, this implies that their online visibility and the public's perception are not solely a function of their own digital marketing efforts but are heavily mediated by opaque algorithms. This requires caution in Search Engine Optimization (SEO) strategies that extend beyond mere keyword optimization to understanding and potentially advocating for fairness and transparency in search algorithms. It also underscores the importance of diversifying a brand's online presence to reduce over-reliance on a single search platform.

5.4. Social Media Platforms as Arenas for Perception Battle

5.4.1. Dynamics of Engagement and Crisis Communication

Social media platforms enable direct engagement with consumers, providing a powerful channel to influence their attitudes and behaviors concerning products and brands.³¹ Consequently, marketing expenditure on social media has experienced substantial growth.³¹ Social media has fundamentally transformed corporate crisis management by empowering consumers to engage in secondary crisis communication and altering the traditional dynamics of crisis response.⁴⁸ Negative posts and customer complaints can rapidly tarnish a company's reputation, necessitating immediate and strategic action.⁴⁸

Organizations that respond promptly and proactively to misinformation can significantly reduce its impact on brand reputation and stock price.⁴⁰ The role of the CEO is particularly crucial in social media crisis communication, as their direct engagement can foster connection and reassurance, thereby building trust in the institution's credibility during turbulent times.⁴⁸ Social media has shifted brand communication from a controlled monologue to an interactive dialogue.³² While this offers opportunities for deeper engagement and relationship building, it also exposes brands to immediate, widespread scrutiny and the rapid amplification of negative sentiment.⁴⁸ This means a brand's carefully crafted message can be instantly overwhelmed by user-generated content or adverse reactions. Effective social media engagement therefore requires not just content posting, but active listening, real-time monitoring, and a willingness to engage authentically and transparently, even in the face of criticism.

5.4.2. *The Amplification of Narratives and Sentiment*

Social media platforms carry a significant influence on public perception and support for various public issues.³⁰ They serve as dynamic mediums for sharing viewpoints and as arenas where diverse perspectives can meet, interact, and influence one another.²⁹ The opinions, reviews, and recommendations distributed by social media users holds considerable power to shape how consumers assess and respond to products or services.²⁹

Social media algorithms are designed to amplify emotionally charged and out-group hostile content.²³ Posts and tweets containing sensational or polarizing language are shared at a significantly higher rate compared to neutral or nuanced content.²² The amplification mechanisms inherent in social media mean that not only can negative sentiment spread rapidly⁴⁸, but even neutral or positive brand content can be recontextualized or weaponized to create misleading narratives.³⁷ The inherent "virality" of social media makes brands acutely vulnerable to narratives that originate and propagate entirely outside their direct control.³ This implies that brands must proactively maintain strong, positive digital assets and relationships that can serve as a buffer against negative virality. Furthermore, they must develop strategies to swiftly counter or reframe adverse narratives before they become deeply entrenched in public perception.

5.5. Digital Public Relations (PR) in a New Reality

5.5.1. *Evolution of PR Strategies in the Digital Age*

Digital Public Relations (PR) represents a significant evolution from traditional PR practices, integrating conventional tactics such as press releases and media inquiries with modern digital marketing components like content marketing, social media marketing, and search engine optimization (SEO).⁴⁵ A robust digital PR strategy aims to initiate and foster conversations, establish thought leadership, and strategically position brands as authoritative entities within their respective domains.⁴⁵ The benefits of this integrated approach include expanding brand awareness, enhancing thought leadership, driving organic web traffic, and building high-quality backlinks, which contribute to a brand's online authority.⁴⁵

Digital PR places a strong emphasis on cultivating relationships not only with traditional journalists and editors but also with a diverse array of digital content producers, including bloggers and social media influencers.⁴⁵ This expansion reflects a fundamental shift from relying solely on traditional media gatekeepers to engaging with a multitude of digital content creators and platforms.⁴⁵ The gatekeeping function has become distributed across a vast, interconnected network of influencers, algorithms, and user communities. This means that PR is no longer solely about pitching stories to a select few, but about cultivating relationships across a diverse ecosystem and understanding how content flows and is amplified by various digital actors.

5.5.2. *Proactive vs. Reactive Approaches to Online Reputation*

The digital media revolution has introduced unprecedented complexity into the public relations landscape, creating a "noisy information environment" characterized by numerous channels and actors.²⁷ In this dynamic context, effective crisis communication demands not only a consistent presence across various channels but also clarity and consistency in messaging.²⁷ Proactive crisis management, characterized by communicative and swift approaches, has been shown to significantly restore stakeholder trust and minimize reputational harm.⁴⁸

The continuous, real-time nature of digital communication³⁹ means that reputation management can no longer be a reactive, episodic function. The "always-on" nature of online conversations demands continuous monitoring and engagement.⁴⁸ This means that PR and reputation management are no longer restricted to crisis moments but must be integrated into daily organizational operations. This requires the implementation of proactive strategies for content creation, ongoing community engagement, and the development of rapid response mechanisms, demanding dedicated resources and a fundamental shift in organizational mindset.

6. Evolving Strategies for Digital Branding and Reputation Management

6.1. From Control to Influence: A Paradigm Shift

Organizations operating in the post-truth era must acknowledge a fundamental reorientation in their approach to digital branding: it is no longer purely controlled by the organization itself. Instead, public perception is increasingly shaped by a multitude of external digital forces. This requires a strategic shift from attempting to *control* the brand narrative to actively and strategically *influencing* it within a fragmented and dynamic information environment.⁸ The traditional model of absolute brand control has become outdated. Instead of striving for complete narrative governance, brands

must embrace a paradigm of co-creation with their audiences.⁵³ This involves actively inviting and leveraging user-generated content, fostering genuine community engagement, and understanding that influence is now distributed across complex networks rather than remain centralized within the organization. This reorientation implies a need for strategies that empower brand advocates and facilitate the development of resilient communities around the brand, thereby building a more robust and adaptable digital presence.

6.2. Proactive, Multi-Platform Engagement Strategies

To effectively navigate fragmented information environments and address declining institutional trust, developing and implementing proactive and multi-platform strategies becomes essential. This involves more than simply maintaining a presence on various social media sites, it requires a deep understanding of each platform's unique dynamics, algorithmic biases, and user behaviors. For instance, content that resonates strongly on a platform like TikTok may differ significantly from content that is effective on LinkedIn.⁴⁵ This creates the need for "platform fluency," where brands tailor their content and engagement strategies to maximize impact and mitigate risks specific to each digital ecosystem.³⁰

Such strategies should incorporate consistent storytelling across diverse digital channels⁹, ensuring that engaging content is intentionally paired with the most appropriate platforms to reach target audiences effectively.⁹ A data-driven approach is paramount for understanding audience perception and evaluating the effectiveness of content.²⁶ Key strategies include robust social listening, strategic influencer marketing, and user-generated content campaigns.²⁵ Social listening tools, for example, can provide valuable insights into a brand's visibility and market share relative to competitors, enabling agile adjustments to strategy.²⁶

6.3. Fostering Digital Trust and Transparency

Rebuilding public trust in the post-truth era necessitates strengthening evidence-based communication strategies and actively promoting media literacy among audiences.⁶ Ethical conduct and transparent communication remain foundational and paramount for effective reputation management.¹² Brands must actively demonstrate that key stakeholders, including industry experts and influential figures maintain confidence in their reputation.⁵⁰

Regarding user-generated content (UGC), enhancing its credibility through systematic content review processes is crucial for fostering consumer trust.⁵⁴ Transparency, such as clearly tagging sponsored posts, helps audiences differentiate between organic and paid content, thereby reinforcing credibility.³⁴ In an environment characterized by declining trust and sophisticated misinformation, transparency goes beyond compliance to become a core strategic imperative.¹² This is not simply about disclosing information, but about actively building trust through openness, particularly concerning the origins of content³⁷ and the underlying algorithmic processes that shape information distribution.⁴² This implies that brands should consider greater transparency in their digital operations, and even consider collaborating with fact-checkers or independent auditors, as means to differentiate themselves and actively rebuild public confidence.

6.4. Building Resilience Against Misinformation and Polarization

Building resilience against the pervasive challenges of misinformation and social polarization requires a multi-faceted approach. Proactive strategies must include continuous monitoring and active management of online reviews and brand related discussions across all relevant platforms.⁴⁸ Organizations are urged to adopt agile, transparent, and ethical communication strategies to strengthen stakeholder relationships in this volatile environment.⁷ Furthermore, the development and implementation of policies that support technology-based transparency, such as leveraging blockchain for data security or employing AI for fake news detection, hold significant potential for enhancing trust and combating misinformation.⁶

Simply debunking misinformation is often insufficient to fully mitigate its impact.⁴⁹ A more profound and sustainable strategy involves helping audiences develop "digital immunity" by actively fostering media literacy and critical thinking skills.⁶ This requires educating consumers about the mechanisms of algorithmic operation, the dynamics of misinformation spread, and effective methods for evaluating the credibility of information sources. For brands, it implies a role that extends beyond self-promotion: actively contributing to public education on digital literacy. By strengthening the public's ability to recognize truth and critically engage with online content, brands can indirectly protect their own narratives and build a more resilient digital environment for all stakeholders.

7. Conclusion

The digital landscape of the post-truth era has fundamentally reshaped the dynamics of branding and reputation management. Digital branding is no longer purely controlled by organizations, public perception is increasingly shaped by external digital forces, including the pervasive spread of misinformation and the complicated dynamics of platform algorithms. The traditional, largely unidirectional approaches to reputation management are insufficient in this complex environment. Instead, organizations must evolve towards proactive, multi-platform strategies that explicitly account for fragmented information environments, the pervasive influence of user-generated content, and a systemic decline in institutional trust. This evolution demands a shift from attempting to control narratives into strategically influencing them, embracing transparency as a core trust-building essential, and actively contributing to the development of media literacy among consumers. By adopting these adaptive strategies, brands can build resilience, foster genuine digital trust, and navigate the challenges of online perception in an increasingly complex and polarized world.

References

- [1] U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2022). Information environment: Opportunities and threats to DOD's national security mission (GAO-22-104714). U.S. Government Accountability Office. <https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-22-104714> gao.gov
- [2] Ševcenko, L. (2022). Public history for a post-truth era: Fighting denial through memory movements. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003185826>
- [3] Warrington-Arroyo, K. (2022, March 11). Post-truth: How did we get here? HEconomist. <https://heconomist.ch/2022/03/11/post-truth-how-did-we-get-here/>
- [4] Wikipedia contributors. (n.d.). Post-truth. In Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. Retrieved August 24, 2025, from <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Post-truth> en.wikipedia.org
- [5] Syofyan, D. (2019). Literary criticism in the post-truth era. *Andalas International Journal of Socio-Humanities*, 1(1), 25–36. <https://doi.org/10.25077/ajosh.v1i1.6>
- [6] Widmann, T. (2022). How emotional rhetoric affects public opinion. *Political Psychology*, 43(2), 233–252. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12761>
- [7] An, R. (2024). The role of digital media in shaping public relations: Developing successful online communication strategies for enterprises. *Journal of Advances in Humanities Research*, 3(3), 51–68. <https://doi.org/10.56868/jadhur.v3i3.246>
- [8] Navarro Fuentes, C. A. (2022). Post-truth, media and power: A problem for the humanities. *Comunicación y Hombre*. <https://comunicacionyhombre.com/en/article/post-truth-media-and-power-a-problem-for-the-humanities1-2/>
- [9] Hanna, R., Rohm, A., & Crittenden, V. L. (2011). We're all connected: The power of the social media ecosystem. *Business Horizons*, 54(3), 265–273. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2011.01.007>
- [10] Olsen, L. E. (2018). Future of branding in the digital age. In *At the forefront, looking ahead* (Chapter 5). Scandinavian University Press. <https://doi.org/10.18261/9788215031583-2018-06>
- [11] Pollak, F., Dorčák, P., & Markovič, P. (2019). Reputation management. In *Promotion and marketing communications* (pp. 73–94). IntechOpen. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.89282>
- [12] Mtengwa, E., & Muchenje, C. (2023). Reputation management: A cog for nurturing trust and building entrepreneurial success. In *Sustainable marketing, branding, and reputation management: Strategies for a greener future* (pp. 181–196). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-0019-0.ch011>
- [13] Money, K., Saraeva, A., Garnelo-Gómez, I., Pain, S., & Hillenbrand, C. (2017). Corporate reputation past and future: A review and integration of existing literature and a framework for future research. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 20(3–4), 193–211. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41299-017-0034-3>
- [14] Veil, S. R., Buehner, T., & Palenchar, M. J. (2011). A work-in-process literature review: Incorporating social media in risk and crisis communication. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 19(2), 110–122.
- [15] Vasist, P. N., Chatterjee, D., & Krishnan, S. (April 2023). The polarizing impact of political disinformation and hate speech: A cross-country configural narrative. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 26, 663–688. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-023-10390-w>

- [16] Del Vicario, M., Bessi, A., Zollo, F., Petroni, F., Scala, A., Caldarelli, G., Stanley, H. E., & Quattrociocchi, W. (2016). The spreading of misinformation online. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(3), 554–559. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1517441113>
- [17] Adeeb, R. A., & Mirhoseini, M. (October 2023). The impact of affect on the perception of fake news on social media: A systematic review. *Social Sciences*, 12(12), 674. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci12120674>
- [18] González Arencibia, M., & Hernández Velázquez, M. R. (2022). Post-truth thinking: A critical view. *IJRDO Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, 7(9), 129–137. <https://doi.org/10.53555/sshr.v7i9.5303>
- [19] Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 359(6380), 1146–1151. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559>
- [20] Hart, W., Albarracín, D., Eagly, A. H., Brechan, I., Lindberg, M. J., & Merrill, L. (2009). Feeling validated versus being correct: A meta-analysis of selective exposure to information. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135(4), 555–588. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015701>
- [21] Flaxman, S., Goel, S., & Rao, J. M. (2016). Filter bubbles, echo chambers, and online news consumption. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 80(S1), 298–320. <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfw006>
- [22] Brady, W. J., Wills, J. A., Jost, J. T., Tucker, J. A., & Van Bavel, J. J. (2017). Emotion shapes the diffusion of moralized content in social networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(28), 7313–7318. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1618923114>
- [23] Covington, P., Adams, J., & Sargin, E. (2016, September). Deep neural networks for YouTube recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems* (pp. 191–198). ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2959100.2959190>
- [24] Javed, U., & Javed, U. (2023). The influence of social media algorithms on political polarization and public opinion. *Online Media & Society*, 4(2), 44–52. <https://doi.org/10.71016/oms/2ffw9391>
- [25] De Veirman, M., Cauberghe, V., & Hudders, L. (2017). Marketing through Instagram influencers: The impact of number of followers and product divergence on brand attitude. *International Journal of Advertising*, 36(5), 798–828. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2017.1348035>
- [26] He, W., Zha, S., & Li, L. (2013). Social media competitive analysis and text mining: A case study in the pizza industry. *International Journal of Information Management*, 33(3), 464–472. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2013.01.001>
- [27] Reynolds, B., & Seeger, M. W. (2014). Crisis and emergency risk communication as an integrative model. *Journal of Health Communication*, 19(6), 733–744. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2014.935091>
- [28] Kim, L. (2023). The echo chamber-driven polarization on social media. *Journal of Student Research*, 12(4), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.47611/jsr.v12i4.2274>
- [29] Ausat, A. M. A. (2023). The role of social media in shaping public opinion and its influence on economic decisions. *Technology and Society Perspectives*, 1(1), 35–44. <https://doi.org/10.61100/tacit.v1i1.37>
- [30] Boulianne, S. (2015). Social media use and participation: A meta-analysis of current research. *Information, Communication & Society*, 18(5), 524–538. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1008542>
- [31] Moisescu, O.-I., Gică, O.-A., & Herle, F.-A. (2022). Boosting eWOM through social media brand page engagement: The mediating role of self-brand connection. *Behavioral Sciences*, 12(11), 411. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs12110411> pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
- [32] Erkan, I., & Evans, C. (2016). The influence of eWOM in social media on consumers' purchase intentions: An extended approach to information adoption. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 61, 47–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.03.003>
- [33] Nielsen. (2021). Trust in advertising 2021. Nielsen. <https://www.nielsen.com/insights/2021/trust-in-advertising/>
- [34] Federal Trade Commission. (2019). Disclosures 101 for social media influencers. FTC. <https://www.ftc.gov/business-guidance/resources/disclosures-101-social-media-influencers>
- [35] White, R. W., & Hassan, A. (2014). Content bias in online health search. *ACM Transactions on the Web*, 8(4), 25. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2656334>

- [36] Epstein, R., & Robertson, R. E. (2015). The search engine manipulation effect (SEME) and its possible impact on the outcomes of elections. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(33), E4512–E4521. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1419828112>
- [37] Royal Society. (2022). The online information environment: Understanding how the internet shapes people's engagement with scientific information. Royal Society. <https://royalsociety.org/news-resources/projects/online-information-environment/>
- [38] Arguedas, A. R., Robertson, C. T., Fletcher, R., & Nielsen, R. K. (2022). Echo chambers, filter bubbles, and polarisation: A literature review. *The Royal Society*
- [39] Maas, P., Bieler, M., Fischer, L., & Schumacher, C. (2020). Reputation: Opportunities and threats for corporations in the age of digital opinion making. University of St. Gallen, Institute of Insurance Economics. https://www.ivw.unisg.ch/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/20200831_Reputation-Report_ENG.pdf
- [40] Rosati, P., Cummins, M., Deeney, P., Gogolin, F., O'Brien, J., O'Reilly, P., ... & Lynn, T. (2019). The effect of data breaches on firm performance: A meta-analysis. *Business Research Quarterly*, 22(4), 282–297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brq.2019.01.002>
- [41] Austin, L., Liu, B. F., & Jin, Y. (2012). How audiences seek out crisis information: Exploring the social-mediated crisis communication model. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 40(2), 188–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2012.654498>
- [42] World Economic Forum. (2022, November 15). Earning Digital Trust: Decision-Making for Trustworthy Technologies [Insight report]. World Economic Forum. <https://www.weforum.org/reports/earning-digital-trust-decision-making-for-trustworthy-technologies>
- [43] Ecker, U. K. H., Lewandowsky, S., & Chadwick, M. (2020). Can corrections spread misinformation to new audiences? Testing for the elusive familiarity backfire effect. *Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications*, 5, Article 41. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-020-00241-6>
- [44] Bakshy, E., Messing, S., & Adamic, L. A. (2015). Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. *Science*, 348(6239), 1130–1132. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa1160>
- [45] Bradley, G. (2023, February 9). 2024 digital PR strategies, examples and functions. Archer Education. <https://www.archeredu.com/hemj/digital-public-relations/>
- [46] Fârte, G.-I., & Obadă, R. (2021). The effects of fake news on consumers' brand trust: An exploratory study in the food security context. *Romanian Journal of Communication and Public Relations*, 23(3), 47–60. <https://doi.org/10.21018/rjcpr.2021.3.333>
- [47] Oertel, B., Albrecht, S., Kluge, J., & Dametto, D. (2022). Algorithms in digital media and their influence on opinion formation (TAB-Fokus No. 42 / Working Report No. 204). Office of Technology Assessment at the German Bundestag
- [48] Austin, L., Liu, B. F., & Jin, Y. (2012). How audiences seek out crisis information: Exploring the social-mediated crisis communication model. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 40(2), 188–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00909882.2012.654498>
- [49] Ecker, U. K. H., Lewandowsky, S., Cook, J., Schmid, P., Fazio, L. K., Brashier, N. M., Kendeou, P., Vraga, E. K., & Amazeen, M. A. (2022). The psychological drivers of misinformation belief and its resistance to correction. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 1(1), 13–29. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-021-00006-y>
- [50] Bursztyn, L., Egorov, G., & Fiorin, S. (2022). From extreme to mainstream: How social norms unravel. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 137(4), 2063–2110. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjac020>
- [51] Arcuri, M. C., Gandolfi, G., & Russo, I. (2023). Does fake news impact stock returns? Evidence from US and EU stock markets. *Journal of Economics & Business*, 125–126, Article 106130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconbus.2023.106130>
- [52] Chevalier, J. A., & Mayzlin, D. (2006). The effect of word of mouth on sales: Online book reviews. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 43(3), 345–354. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.43.3.345>
- [53] Prahalad, C. K., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). *The future of competition: Co-creating unique value with customers*. Harvard Business School Press.

- [54] Forman, C., Ghose, A., & Wiesenfeld, B. (2008). Examining the relationship between reviews and sales: The role of reviewer identity disclosure in electronic markets. *Information Systems Research*, 19(3), 291–313. <https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1080.0193>
- [55] Center for Countering Digital Hate. (2021). The disinformation dozen: Why platforms must act on twelve leading online anti-vaxxers. CCDH. <https://counterhate.com/research/the-disinformation-dozen/>
Edelman. (2022). 2022 Edelman trust barometer. Edelman. <https://www.edelman.com/trust/2022-trust-barometer>