International Journal of Communication 18(2024), Feature 2149-2162 1932–8036/2024FEA0002

What Is the Value of Cultural Analytics? Discerning Value in Digital Environments

JONATHON HUTCHINSON
University of Sydney, Australia

How do we measure the contribution of online content creators toward our social fabric, particularly when platforms use bespoke measurement systems? Embedded in the value theory and social media visibility literature, this article provides an overview of the variety of metrics currently available within our everyday platformization experiences. In doing so, this article explores how metrics can move toward a system that engages cultural analytics to better understand our digital media environment. These insights have implications for online content creators, agencies who manage those creators, cultural institutions, and the digital intermediation processes that determine cultural production. With a better-informed measurement system for online content creation within digital media environments, policy makers are also better equipped to begin to answer emerging regulatory questions around generative AI practices to reflect important societal issues of our time, not just those that are "popular" or "visible."

Keywords: digital media, generative AI, online content creators, digital intermediation, cultural analytics, value systems, cultural production

In September 2022, the Australian newspaper *The Oz* released its Influencer Index, which ranks the Top 100 social media influencers in the country. *The Oz* says the list was developed from "the world-leading study of Australia's top 100 creators . . . [determined by] relatability, trustworthiness, expertise, attraction, content prominence, and content frequency" (Poppelwell, 2022, para. 1). However, several Sydney-based digital agencies reject the index by noting that these influencers may have high follower numbers but are not suitable for the social media campaigns they facilitate. The measures of these online content creators suggest they are popular, yet perhaps in ways that do not apply to all audiences. This scenario represents what Striphas (2015) highlighted as the transition of cultural production to automated processes, and what Manovich (2020) terms as a need for cultural analytics. That is, we can measure online content creation by platform-designed mechanisms (likes, followers, shares, etc.) but with little relevance to the value and its contribution to our cultural fabric.

Understanding automated media recommender systems and the impact they have on our society has been documented in the last five years (Bucher, 2018; Noble, 2018) and is embedded within the perspectives of online content producers (Bishop, 2019; Poell, Nieborg, & Duffy, 2021), platform governance (Flew, 2021; Popiel; 2022), audience reception studies (Stepnik, 2023), and the impact of algorithms and artificial intelligence (Crawford, 2021; Helberger & Zarouali, 2021). However, much of this research has focused on platformed media and on visible and popular content that researchers have accessed. In other

words, content that is made visible through measurable systems has been designed primarily by commercial media platforms to enable monetization and suitable reporting mechanisms for associated stakeholders.

Rogers (2018) notes that these measurable systems can be referred to as vanity metrics, "a term that captures the measurement and display of how well one is doing in the 'success theatre' of social media" (p. 1). In this statement, Rogers (2018) highlights the performance of the content, and thereby the creator, instead of content that encapsulates other forms of value beyond performance alone. Are there other measures we might employ to signify impact such as cultural relevance, social good, health and wellness, or positive citizenship? Could we design a set of engagement actions on digital media that signify to online content creators that their content makes us feel positive or that they might be lying or that their thoughts are different from a user based in a different country? News journalism (Bernstein, De Vreeses, & Helberger, 2021; Vrijenhoek et al., 2021) and public service media (Sørensen & Hutchinson, 2018) have done foundational work in understanding the impact of automation on societies from recommender systems. However, understanding how the content is valuable in the first instance—beyond the creator-imposed value—is yet to be explored. It is an opportunity to expand the value of cultural production into computationally calculated content creation.

Simultaneously, the Australian Cultural Policy, *Revive: A Place for Every Story, A Story for Every Place* (Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communication & the Arts, 2023), provides an opportunity to revisit the value of cultural production. While the focus of *Revive* is on First Nations–led storytelling and providing a voice for all stories within the Australian Cultural landscape, the emphasis on measuring stories through their visibility is a missed opportunity. Missing digital media visibility is emblematic of policy reform internationally. Understanding a content creator beyond their popularity measures can demonstrate their contribution to cohesive societies, healthy democracies, and positive experiences for users. Alternatively, commercial social media platforms skew how information is created, published, distributed, and consumed. Combining the successes of digital platforms with high cultural values will be a significant development for digital environments.

Given the global interest in the regulatory shifts in the platform space, this article uses Australian examples to demonstrate how digital media can be measured differently to recast what is understood as "popular content." That is, Australia is a test bed on how to measure digital content for its user relevance within a framework that also measures its cultural impact beyond existing engagement through likes, comments, and shares. The relationship between popular and visible content has been increasingly documented (Bishop, 2019; Hutchinson, 2019b) where "playing the visibility game" (Bishop, 2019, p. 2589) is essentially understanding and repurposing the existing measurement frameworks on our everyday media platforms. Content creators have been slowly directed to follow the emerging trends of platform media to appease the algorithms and attract larger audiences (Hutchinson, 2019a). Instead, it would be better to understand how we approach the concept of value, including that from a creator's perspective beyond visibility practices, identify the intermediation agents surrounding its use, and construct better frameworks that enable a variety of voices to be heard through diverse audiences.

A Theory of Basic Values: Locating Our Understanding of Cultural Value

When discussing how groups of individuals function, scholars often rely on psychological frames to explain why and how things function the way they do. Behavior characteristics such as attitudes, beliefs, norms, or traits have been employed by anthropologists, ethnographers, and media scholars to frame and discuss the fields they study. Each of these characteristics is a way in which to explain value—the things and processes that we engage to demonstrate how we value our existence. For Durkheim (1897) and Weber (1905), value was a social science approach to understanding how individuals organize themselves and how change in these organizations can be initiated and undertaken. For Allport (1961), values are intrinsically linked to personality: they build as we understand who we are in relation to others. Kluckhohn (1951) stated that values should be embedded in universalism to explain how one group's value can be translated across regions and cultural groups. Values, then, are a way for individuals to communicate around significance and importance, especially across disparate groups of individuals.

Kluckhohn (1951) says values are "a conception explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes" (p. 395). Schwartz (1999) builds on these psychological observations to construct a theory of basic human values that exists under three significant issues: (1) the differences between individuals and groups; (2) responsible behaviors that preserve the social fabric; and (3) the relationship between nature and the social world. As such, Schwartz (1999) uses the thinking of the theorists highlighted above and describes a matrix of features that comprise all value systems. Schwartz (1999) notes that values are:

- beliefs that are infused with feelings,
- desirable goals that motivate action,
- transcend specific actions and situations,
- serve as standards or criteria,
- ordered by importance relative to another,
- guide action motivated by relative importance. (p. 3)

For Schwartz (1999), these values are a baseline for how and why individuals function the way they do when operating within a larger group, for example, society. They represent how belief systems are important to and interpreted by individuals, how they activate motivations when the values are supported or challenged, how values become standards when placed within institutions, and how they become part of a hierarchy of importance based on everyday decisions. Values in a society help individuals function among other individuals and should contain universalism understanding.

Yet with any societal structure, there is a process through which information, meaning, value, or other measurements will pass. This prompts the question, Who or what is in control of transferring the value of these measurements? Value is represented through cultural production, which is consistently being mediated through humans and nonhumans, suggesting a deeper understanding of those intermediation processes. The following section outlines how the intermediation process takes place, specifically looking at how media and meaning are intrinsically connected to value. What is especially important is how human intermediaries facilitate value

translation and exchange, and within our ever-increasingly platformed and automated lives, the role that nonhuman intermediaries play in the translation of value—an intermediation culture.

Digital Media Metrics as a Cultural Production Value Signifier

One way to frame the value of digital media and the cultural production processes of content creation and distribution is to begin with understanding the negative aspects of social media. Zhang and Rau (2021) undertook a review of social media misuse (SMM) through a measurement, consequence, and predictor lens. What they observed from 131 articles categorized within the social media and problematic/ misuse/overuse/addiction space was a series of surveys that examined how users describe their SMM. In many cases it is through a series of predetermined terms such as mood (positive/negative), loss of control, dependency, conflicts in the social sphere, withdrawal, deception, and many other uses that can be determined as negative sorts of behaviors, or in other words, value representations. Through this capacity to quantify one's social media use, they were then able to apply these findings to a broader societal consequence, namely through mental disorders (anxiety, feeling of missing out, depression, etc.) and life problems (life dissatisfaction, decreased mood, regret, poor sleep quality, etc.). Their research demonstrates how social media use can be quantified beyond vanity metrics and with measurements that have tangible societal impact.

Content value demonstrates that we can measure digital media beyond the existing frameworks presented to us by platform providers to understand how they impact society. The process, however, involves sidestepping vanity metrics altogether and engaging in new forms of digital media metrics. This process destabilizes the current algorithmic culture (Striphas, 2015) that has been built around navigating the enormous amounts of digital media that surround our lives. While there has been much work that demonstrates the negative impact of automated decision making (see, e.g., Noble, 2018), there has also been support for these mathematically driven processes to assist us in making sense of our worlds (Wilson, 2017). It is worth reiterating here that these measurement systems inherently use vanity metrics designed and produced by commercial platform providers on which they operate.

There have, however, been attempts to integrate new forms of measurement systems for cultural production value beyond the obvious, such as vanity measures. The Centre for Cultural Value in the United Kingdom has been working in this space for several years with two main objectives—to understand cultural value and to include that understanding in policy-making decisions. Both objectives are useful for discerning value across a range of digital media production spaces. To understand the process of arts and culture and the impact of the engagement of individuals within the arts, this group provided a report to the UK Ministry of Arts in 2016 to highlight the importance of valuing the arts in the policy-making environment. They found that cultural production, through engagement, produces:

- reflective individuals
- engaged citizens
- peace building and healing after armed conflict
- productive cities and urban life
- economic benefits of arts and culture
- improved health and well-being, and

- education.

These categories have been used to place a value on the process of cultural production while also acknowledging the difficulty in accessing multiple sources of data to understand a tangible value. Traditional social science approaches of interviews and focus groups provide some insight but are not ideal when interfacing with digital spaces at scale. Similarly, relying on digital methods only provides a partial understanding of the connection between value and cultural artifacts. Returning to the work of Manovich, relying on the methodological approaches from the social sciences and digital humanities is complex and often overlooks the genuine contribution that cultural artifacts make beyond those that predetermined systems enable. How, then, do we acknowledge the value of cultural artifacts, enable that value to be recognized in policy-making environments, and move beyond the sorts of measures we currently have at our disposal?

Brown and Novak-Leonard (2007) attempted to answer this question through a combination of social science methodological approaches combined with consultation projects. They developed a series of "survey-based methodologies to measure the 'intrinsic' impacts of arts experiences," which led them to six constructs for the notion of impact: captivation, intellectual stimulation, emotional resonance, spiritual value, aesthetic growth, and social bonding (Brown & Novak-Leonard, 2007, p. 223). Approaching a measurement framework from this perspective fundamentally shifts our thinking away from populism and toward cultivating human relations while also acknowledging cultural value from different perspectives. But who or what is enabling the value to be seen and to be enacted on?

Intermediation as Value Exchange

French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1984) wrote about the importance of habitus, fields, and symbolic violence, and ultimately how social dynamics inherently embody power, especially through the cultural, social, and symbolic forms of capital. As the recognition of this capital emerged, the process of translation became a key focus through which Bourdieu focused on taste—how we value specific cultural objects and how those objects are afforded value by individuals in privileged positions. For Bourdieu, cultural intermediaries emerged as the key human capital exchange agents who translate value from one group of individuals to another. This was done through understanding the language of artifacts and critiquing the importance of that media to others. This was the key role of a critique: to observe cultural artifacts and describe the significance, and thereby value, of that object to others.

Building on that key theoretical frame, other scholars expanded the idea of human cultural intermediaries who translate social, human, and economic capital to others. They include Negus (1992), who examined artist and repertoire (A&R) agents in the music industry; Skov (2014), who examined fashion; Smith-Maguire and Matthews (2012), who understood food and cultural translation; and Hutchinson (2013, 2017), for his work on online community management and media organizations. In these fields, scholars mapped and articulated how individuals are responsible for identifying cultural value and transferring value to other groups or individuals, and how that process contributes to increasing the social, human, and economic capital of cultural artifacts and their creators. An example could be the opera, reality television, or visual cultures from fans to other non-fans of these cultural artifacts.

As culture became mechanized through what Striphas (2015) frames as cultural automation, humans who were once responsible for the cultural intermediation process now share that role with machines and automated systems. In a platform society, this emerges as automated decision-making processes, including recommender systems. Netflix recommends programs to us, Spotify suggests what we listen to, and now users report that the TikTok For You Page "gets us" (Stepnik, 2023). Users embody platform environments with varying skills to design and manage their recommended lives, where cultural intermediation value now more aligns with digital intermediation (Hutchinson, 2023).

Digital intermediation integrates cultural intermediation and highlights the nonhuman processes that enable, or inhibit, cultural production. Just as Deleuze and Guattari (1988) note in process relational theory, a series of results will emerge at process intersect points. For example, when online content interfaces with recommender systems, a series of results occur, including being seen by large audiences or being buried out of visibility. Digital intermediation is determined through technologies (databases, physical devices, sensors, etc.), institutions (cultural, regulatory, promotional, among others), and automation (recommender systems, artificial intelligence, machine learning, etc.). These processes determine not only what is produced but how those cultural artifacts are published, distributed, and consumed by audiences.

Moving beyond a digital intermediation framework that acknowledges the limitations of commercially oriented metric systems, such as vanity metrics and the like, a more useful framing of the exchange of cultural capital is value intermediation. Building on basic value theory by Schwartz (1999) and applying this to cultural production, it is possible to understand why creators make particular kinds of media. Discussing digital intermediation, Hutchinson (2023) notes that there is a relationship between platforms, audiences, and content creators and that this relationship is constantly in flux. As each entity within cultural production shifts focus, the other two will adjust accordingly. For example, if platforms promote content that is focused on a particular clothing brand or style, online content creators and audiences are likely to engage in this trend. This is the modus operandi within commercially driven spaces, which, as discussed previously, is driven by visibility toward popular content. How, then, do we think beyond commercially driven metrics and toward systems driven by value intermediation?

The gaming industry has been addressing this question in various ways to drive its business models and guide industry and markets to move beyond vanity metrics as aligned with social media. It is possible to then use a more political economy lens to understand the surrounding ecology, politics, and social markers that make up this market space. From a political economy perspective, it is possible to understand why content creators, in this case gamers, create the content they do and why that content has a specific value, derived from a self-enhancement yet universal approach, to borrow Schwartz's terms.

Clicks and Value: Gameplay Metrics

Value intermediation builds in cultural and digital intermediation, and, by approaching value from a Schwartz (1999) basic value theory, it is possible to understand how content becomes valuable for the individual and for the universal. This is important, as it shifts our contemporary understanding away from creating content that is popular for visibility purposes alone and toward content that is important for individuals and potentially groups of individuals—something that is human centered. It is a shift away from

the monotone of lifestyle, prank, beauty, and inspirational tween content of social media and toward content that is genuinely interesting for audiences again. It is a shift from vanity metrics, which is married to the performance of content for audiences yet starts to add detail to cultural analytics, which tends to embody everything about cultural production. As such, some of the techniques that have been employed in gaming genres are useful to understand how value intermediation is possible.

Brock (2021) uses a series of player metrics such as actions-per-minute, match-making-rank, and kills-deaths-assists, which are common in Defense of the Ancients 2, to understand how gamers remain relevant in their worlds through their metrics. Brock (2021) notes, "Ranking things requires the application of an 'economic methodology' to social practices that provide standard measures and tests against which to differentiate people and establish hierarchies of value" (p. 1). It is the action, but also the environment, that acts as a value generation, becoming important to measure and challenge the existing hierarchies of cultural value. What he does make explicit here is the environments and histories that require a fresh approach and not only the cultural artifact itself to holistically understand the value of cultural artifacts, and thereby, the political power of such items.

Brock's (2021) central argument is that "gameplay metrics create the characteristics of a competitive market and the need for a neoliberal subject" (p. 1). Placing human gameplay as a rankable process within the market draws on Beer's (2017) notion that neoliberalism is possible through the ranking and measurement of things. This idea is transferrable beyond the gaming environment and market alone and toward the broader digital media space, which includes platformed media of everyday users. In this space, Brock's approach could be understood through how social media is read and categorized by users if alternative engagement markers were made available to them. In this sense, the social media user moves from consumer to user to influencer to, as Hallinan (2023) suggests, a qualified user.

In their work on the qualified user, Trilò, Hallinan, and Shifman (2022) also attempt to understand how value can be attached to social media content and used as a reference for other users—the rituals. Their fieldwork examined YouTube content and comments over 12 months. Through this research, they observed how some commentary was engaged with in a more holistic way than others, which led them to develop the codebook for the qualified influencer. Their framework enables content to be aligned with the following measures of "good" (see Table 1).

Table 1. Trilò et al.'s (2022) "Measurement for Good" Framework.

Measure	Meaning
Aesthetics	beautiful or artistic
Distinctiveness	stands out
Economy	uses resources carefully
Functionality	fulfills its intended purpose
Morality	follows standards of right behavior or character
Pleasure	feels pleasant or satisfying
Popularity	liked or supported by many people
Resonance	emotionally moving
Tradition	classic or connected to the past

Truthfulness	real or authentic

The qualified influencer, then, is a way to incorporate the existing vanity-type metrics (popularity, pleasure, aesthetics) *alongside* the more analytical types of measurements (economy, morality, tradition, truthfulness).

While we now have yet another framework on how to measure digital media, the obvious and most important issue is the uptake by platform providers and their stakeholders. Recent attempts have been made to integrate this thinking into platforms, such as MeWe and BeReal*,* both of which acknowledge the negative side of social media and have attempted to increase trust and truth as an antidote to some of the negative experiences of social media. While the take-up of both platforms has been reasonably successful, it is significantly less than the more popular platforms such as TikTok, Instagram, and X, for example. This is reflective of the broader ecosystem of digital media: Policy, stakeholders, users, and creative industries rely on and maintain the existing vanity metric systems to ensure that the implemented value systems remain in place.

Cultural Policy's Persistence of Vanity Metrics: Revisiting Policy to Rethink Cultural Value

So far, this article has critically examined vanity metrics and the impact they have on broader societal systems. It has also demonstrated several frameworks that can be used to sharpen our thinking around value beyond popularity and aesthetics alone. This section returns to the Australian National Cultural Policy and its approach toward diversity within digital media. Despite claiming to prioritize diversity, the policy exhibits a reliance on conventional vanity metrics that inadvertently hinder the promotion of inclusive and representative cultural content. By analyzing the policy, this section highlights the challenges and limitations the policy poses in achieving meaningful diversity in the Australian digital media landscape.

The Australian National Cultural Policy aims to foster cultural diversity and inclusivity within the digital media landscape. While diversity is widely acknowledged as crucial for promoting cultural dialogue and societal cohesion, the policy's reliance on traditional vanity metrics presents a significant challenge. *Revive* (Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communication & the Arts, 2023) notes that the diversity of the Australian arts and cultural sector "strengthens social connectedness and wellbeing, helps to break down social stigmas, and offers a means of creative expression" (p. 44). However, while noting the importance of high-speed broadband to connect people, the policy stops short by repeating the rhetoric around the benefits of digital access, digital literacy skills, and digital divides. What the policy fails to acknowledge is that education and access are not enough to enable diversity alone—the affordances of platformization, as has been articulated in this article, have been intrinsically connected to visibility. Here, visibility through cultural measurement processes is the vital first step for diversity before one can consider digital access, literacy, and divides.

Revive explicitly acknowledges the importance of diversity in cultural expression and representation. It highlights the need for diverse voices, stories, and perspectives, and describes the importance that the digital media sector has within this pursuit. However, the policy's implementation strategies and metrics predominantly revolve around the quantifiable aspects of cultural production, such

as audience reach, engagement, and economic impact. This perspective of diversity, through reliance on these conventional metrics, limits the scope and authenticity of diverse content creation. Instead, *Revive* relies on vanity metrics, often associated with quantitative measures, used in digital media landscapes to gauge success and impact. These metrics include follower numbers, likes, shares, and views, which primarily emphasize surface-level indicators of popularity, especially noted in on-demand arts and cultural experiences. While they provide a quantifiable representation of reach and engagement, they inaccurately reflect the richness and complexity of cultural diversity. Relying on vanity metrics, the policy reinforces a culture that prioritizes popularity and mass appeal over authentic and inclusive cultural expression.

This presents the following problems for a cultural policy that incorporates the growing reliance on digital media that attempts to include diversity and inclusion as its core (see Table 2).

Table 2. Identified Problems With Current Metric Frameworks.

Identified Problem	Definition
Narrow Definition of Success	The focus on vanity metrics limits the recognition and promotion of alternative cultural forms, niche communities, and emerging voices. By measuring success through popularity metrics, the policy overlooks the potential of cultural expressions that do not conform to mainstream tastes or consumption patterns.
Representation and Underrepresentation	Vanity metrics often fail to capture the diversity of marginalized communities and their cultural contributions. By fixating on the most visible and commercially successful content, the policy may perpetuate existing power imbalances and exclude underrepresented voices from the cultural discourse.
Homogenization of Content	The reliance on vanity metrics can lead to the homogenization of cultural content. Creators may be driven to produce content that conforms to mainstream tastes rather than exploring diverse perspectives and narratives. Consequently, this approach risks reducing cultural diversity to a mere aesthetic variation within a narrow framework.

To achieve meaningful diversity in digital media, *Revive* should embrace a more inclusive measurable approach (see Table 3).

Table 3. Diversity Markers for Diversity in Digital Media.

Recommendations	Definition
Expanding metrics	Developing new metrics that capture qualitative aspects of diversity, such as cultural authenticity, representation, and social impact. Many of these measurements have been outlined in the previous sections and can be redesigned and aligned to support and encourage diverse content.
Supporting niche and emerging content	Recognizing and supporting cultural expressions that may not conform to conventional metrics of success. This includes providing funding, platforms, and opportunities for creators from diverse backgrounds and communities to share their stories and perspectives.

Emphasizing long-term impact	Shifting the focus from short-term popularity to long-term cultural impact. This involves evaluating the influence of cultural content in fostering dialogue, promoting social cohesion, and challenging dominant narratives.

While *Revive* highlights the importance of diversity in digital media, its implicit reliance on vanity metrics challenges cultural diversity. By broadening the metrics used to evaluate success, supporting niche and emerging content, and emphasizing long-term impact, the policy can overcome these limitations and foster a more inclusive and representative digital media landscape in Australia.

The Emerging Issues for the Cultural Sector: Generative AI and Insufficient Measurement

While this article argues that insufficient content creation measurement tools are the contemporary issue for the cultural sector, it is also the baseline for emerging issues surrounding this sector. The article has described the impact vanity metrics have had on society broadly—misinformation, hate speech, vitriol content, and the like—and how the affordances of platformization encourage, if not reward, this scenario. Yet, there is no cultural analytic in practice that could be adopted by users to make sense of their digital worlds. Instead, there are a plethora of attempts, frameworks, concepts, and ideas that have less real-world impact on how users navigate their recommended lives.

Issues have emerged in the last five years within broader chaotic societies—notwithstanding a global pandemic—through political agendas pushed through digital media to disrupt the status quo. While this cannot be tied to digital media alone, it has certainly been reinforced by popularity metrics described in this article. The pressing issue for humans is a distorted reality that will evolve and reinforce the impacts of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI). Crawford (2021) highlighted the concerns of AI on politics, power, and the environment by locating it within our everyday lives, yet the extent GenAI will have on the creative industries is less explored.

GenAI encompasses algorithms and models that possess the capability to autonomously produce novel and creative outputs such as text, images, and music. At its core, GenAI aims to mimic and replicate humanlike creativity and innovation, pushing the boundaries of what machines can generate independently. The underlying principle of GenAI revolves around learning patterns and structures from vast amounts of training data, enabling the models to generate new content that aligns with the learned patterns (Hageback & Hedblom, 2022). Through techniques such as deep learning and neural networks, GenAI models can capture the intricacies and nuances of the data, allowing them to generate outputs that exhibit coherence, contextuality, and arguably, originality. These models have demonstrated capacity in a range of applications, including natural language processing, computer vision, and creative arts. However, challenges persist, such as the potential for biases in generated content, the need for better evaluation methods, and ethical considerations regarding the impact of GenAI on society (Chesher & Albarrán-Torres, 2023). Nonetheless, GenAI holds immense potential in fields like content generation, data augmentation, and human-AI collaboration, offering new avenues for innovation and creativity in various domains. As research in GenAI progresses, there is growing emphasis on addressing these challenges and advancing the field toward more robust, ethical, and impactful applications, ultimately shaping the future landscape of AI and human–machine interaction.

It is here that the need for a research program around the impact of GenAI in the creative industries emerges. With a grounded understanding of the impact of cultural measurement, or lack thereof, the potential of this problem boosted through GenAI is unknown. Can GenAI overcome the issues demonstrated by the vanity metrics conundrum, or will it be escalated? How might creative practitioners engage GenAI to expand diversity and social cohesion, and thereby introduce their own value measures? What will be the impact of global policy reforms that are emerging in 2023 in this space? These are the questions for creative researchers in the next three to five years.

References

Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Beer, D. (2017). The social power of algorithms. *Information Communication & Society, 20*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2016.1216147

Bernstein, A., De Vreeses, C., & Helberger, N. (2021). Diversity in news recommenders. *Zurich Open Repository and Archive, 2021*, 43–61. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2005.09495

Bishop, S. (2019). Managing visibility on YouTube through algorithmic gossip. *New Media & Society, 21*(11), 2589–2606. https://doi.org/10.1177/146144481985

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *A social critique of the judgment of taste* (1st ed.). London, UK: Routledge.

Brock, T. (2021). *Counting clicks: Esports, neoliberalism and the affective power of gameplay metrics*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic.

Brown, A., & Novak-Leonard, J. (2007). Measuring the intrinsic impact of arts attendance. *Cultural Trends, 22*(3–4), 223–233.

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

Chesher, C., & Albarrán-Torres, C. (2023). The emergence of autolography: The "magical" invocation of images from text through AI. *Media International Australia*, *189*(1), 57–73. https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878X231193252

Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1988). *A thousand plateaus*. London, UK: Athlone.

Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communication & the Arts. (2023). *National Cultural Policy—Revive: A place for every story, a story for every place*. Canberra, Australia: Author. Retrieved from https://www.arts.gov.au/publications/national–cultural–policy–revive–place–every–story–story–every–place

Durkheim, E. (1897). *Suicide*. London, UK: Free.

Flew, T. (2021). *Regulating platforms*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Hageback, N., & Hedblom, D. (2022). *AI for Arts*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hallinan, B. (2023). No judgment: Value optimization and the reinvention of reviewing on YouTube. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 28*(5), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmad034

Helberger, N., & Zarouali, B. (2021). "Voetbal hoort niet bij robots": Attitudes regarding the use of artificial intelligence in refereeing. In M. Senftleben, J. Poort, M. van Eechoud, S. van Gompel, & N. Helberger (Eds.), *Intellectual property and sports: Essays in honour of P. Bernt Hugenholtz* (pp. 395–409). Brussels, Belgium: Wolters Kluwer.

Hutchinson, J. (2013). Communication models of institutional online communities: The role of the ABC cultural intermediary. *Platform Journal of Media and Communication, 5*(1), 16–38. Retrieved from http://journals.culture–communication.unimelb.edu.au/platform/v5i1_hutchinson.html

Hutchinson, J. (2017). *Cultural intermediation and audience participation in media organisations*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hutchinson, J. (2019a). Digital first personality: Automation and influence within evolving media ecologies. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies, 26*(5–6), 1284–1300. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856519858921

Hutchinson, J. (2019b). Microplatformization for digital activism on social media. *Information Communication & Society, 24*(1), 35–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1629612

Hutchinson, J. (2023). *Digital intermediation: Unseen infrastructures for cultural production*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kluckhohn, C. K. (1951). Values and value orientations in the theory of action. In T. Parsons & E. A. Shils (Eds.), *Toward a general theory of action* (pp. 530–554). Cambridge. MA: Harvard University Press.

Manovich, L. (2020). *Cultural analytics*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Negus, K. (1992). *Producing pop*. London, UK: Edward Arnold.

Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. New York: New York University Press.

Poell, T., Nieborg, D., & Duffy, B. E. (2021). *Platforms and cultural production*. London, UK: Polity.

Popiel, P. (2022). Regulating datafication and platformization: Policy silos and tradeoffs in international platform inquiries. *Policy & Internet, 14*(1), 28–46. https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.283

Popplewell, E. (2022). *The influencer index*. Retrieved from https://www.theaustralian.com.au/

Rogers, R. (2018). Otherwise engaged: Social media from vanity to critical analytics. *International Journal of Communication, 12*, 450–472.

Schwartz, S. H. (1999). A theory of cultural values and some implications for work. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 48*(1), 23–47. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.1999.tb00047.x

Skov, L. (2014). Cultural intermediaries and fashion. In J. Smith-Maguire & T. Miller (Eds.), *The cultural intermediaries reader* (pp. 113–124). London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Smith-Maguire, J., & Mathews, J. (2012). Are we all cultural intermediaries now? An introduction to cultural intermediaries in context. *European Journal of Cultural Studies, 15*(5), 551–562. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549412445762

Sørensen, J., & Hutchinson, J. (2018). Algorithms and public service media. In G. Lowe, H. V. d. Bulck, & K. Donders (Eds.), *RIPE@2017: Public service media in the networked society* (pp. 91–106). Göteborg, Norway: Nordicom.

Stepnik, A. (2023). *Active curation: Algorithmic awareness for cultural commentary on social media platforms* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Sydney, Australia.

Striphas, T. (2015). Algorithmic culture. *European Journal of Cultural Studies, 18*(4–5), 395–412. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549415577392

Trilò, T., Hallinan, B., & Shifman, L. (2022). A typology of social media rituals. *Journal of Computational Mediated Communication, 27*(4), 1–11.

Vrijenhoek, S., Kaya, M., Metoui, N., Möller, J., Odijk, D., & Helberger, N. (2021). Recommenders with a mission: Assessing diversity in news recommendations. In *Conference on Human Information Interaction and Retrieval, London, 2021* (pp. 173–183). London, UK: ACM. https://doi.org/10.1145/3406522.3446019

Weber, M. (1905). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. New York, NY: Scribner's.

Wilson, M. (2017). Algorithms (and the) everyday. *Information Communication & Society, 20*(1), 137–150. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2016.1200645

Zhang, A., & Rau, P. L. (2021). A review and reappraisal of social media misuse: Measurements, consequences, and predictors. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction, 37*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2020.1807281