



Influencer Credibility and Authenticity in the Fight Against Misinformation

Vi Thi Phuong^{1*}, Adamkolo Mohammed Ibrahim²

¹Thai Nguyen University of Science, Thai Nguyen City, 250000, Viet Nam

²Department of Mass Communication, University of Maiduguri, Borno State, 600004, Nigeria.

Abstract. The rise of social media influencers has reshaped how information is produced and consumed. While their perceived authenticity grants them persuasive power, questions persist about the credibility of their content and the risks of misinformation. Algorithms that prioritize engagement over accuracy further exacerbate this paradox. This paper employs a narrative literature review, synthesizing findings from studies on influencer authenticity, misinformation dynamics, and digital trust. Sources include peer-reviewed journals, policy reports, and case-based analyses, with an emphasis on cross-disciplinary perspectives from communication studies, marketing, and digital ethics. The findings indicate that influencer credibility depends on multiple factors beyond audience size, including transparency, expertise, consistency, and accountability. While fact-checking tools, regulations, and media literacy programs are common strategies, they remain fragmented and reactive. A significant gap exists in influencer accountability and the lack of co-created ethical standards, leaving misinformation unchecked in many cases. Current approaches are limited by scalability, regulatory inconsistencies, and algorithmic bias that favors sensationalism. Addressing misinformation requires systemic change: engaging influencers as partners in setting ethical norms, rethinking algorithms to reward accuracy, and expanding media literacy across demographics. Future research should investigate empirical cases of influencer responsibility, audience trust dynamics across cultures, and platform-level reforms to ensure long-term resilience against misinformation.

Keywords: Social Media Influencers; Information Authenticity; Credibility; Digital Communication

1. Introduction

The issue of information authenticity has become increasingly prominent. Authentic information is not only factually correct but also represents reality without manipulation, distortion, or fabrication (Ellis, 2021). Within the social media landscape, influencers have emerged as powerful actors shaping public discourse (Belanche et al., 2021; Pradhan et al., 2023; Rodrigo, 2023). With massive followings, they do more than share entertainment or lifestyle content, they construct narratives that influence social, political, economic, and even health-related conversations. Yet, a pressing challenge arises: how

*Corresponding author's email: phuong_vt@tnus.edu.vn, Telp. 0912716807/0392970732



can the public verify the authenticity of information disseminated by these influential figures?

Scholarly discussions on digital media dynamics highlight how technological advancements reshape communication practices. Gioltzidou et al. (2024) and Joseph (2022) underline how traditional media began adopting features such as interactivity, multimedia, and hypertext. Mero et al. (2023), Conde and Casais (2023) emphasize immediacy as another critical characteristic, while Hudders et al. (2021) and Koay et al. (2023) stress ubiquity and memory as defining traits. These features, as Rethemeyer (2007) and Jauhiainen et al. (2022) note, position the internet as a central communication tool that meets user needs in unprecedented ways. However, as Paul et al. (2024) observes, the abundance and speed of information do not necessarily guarantee authenticity and reliability, creating both opportunities and risks in the digital ecosystem.

The notion of authenticity itself has been debated across disciplines. In sociology, Nunes et al. (2021) defines authenticity as an unmediated experience that is sincere, genuine, and original, contrasting with strategic self-presentation. In anthropology, Handler (1988) frames authenticity as a cultural construct rooted in the modern Western pursuit of “pristine, original, genuine, unspoiled, and traditional” experiences. These perspectives demonstrate that authenticity is not merely a technical question of factual accuracy but also a socio-cultural phenomenon shaped by perception, values, and context.

Despite a growing body of research on digital media, interactivity, and authenticity, a research gap remains concerning social media influencers. While numerous studies examine traditional media or general patterns of digital communication, systematic investigations into the authenticity of influencer-generated content are relatively scarce. This is particularly critical given the role influencers play in amplifying misinformation and disinformation across platforms where they often serve as primary sources of information for their audiences.

This study, therefore, carries dual significance. Theoretically, it contributes to academic discourse by synthesizing diverse studies on authenticity, credibility, and influencers’ roles in digital communication. Practically, it offers insights for policymakers, researchers, and the general public in developing strategies to address challenges in verifying information authenticity in the social media era.

Accordingly, the aim of this study is to synthesize and analyze existing literature on the authenticity of information disseminated by social media influencers. It seeks to answer two central questions: what factors influence the authenticity of information shared by influencers, and what strategies can be employed to assess its veracity? By addressing these questions, the study provides critical insights into the dynamics of influence, credibility, and information accuracy in contemporary digital communication.

2. Method

This study adopts a systematic literature review approach to explore the authenticity of information disseminated by social media influencers (Pushparaj & Kushwaha, 2023; Sundermann & Raabe, 2019). Rather than generating new empirical data, the research relies on synthesizing existing scholarship across communication, media studies, sociology, and digital culture. This method is particularly suitable because the phenomenon of influencer-driven communication has been widely studied, yet findings remain fragmented across different disciplines and contexts. By consolidating these insights, the review seeks to identify recurring themes, conceptual debates, and research



gaps that shape current understandings of authenticity and credibility in the influencer economy.

The process of data collection involved a structured search of academic databases including Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, alongside selected industry reports and policy documents. Keywords such as social media influencers, information authenticity, credibility, misinformation, and digital communication guided the search strategy (Firdaniza et al., 2022; Pettersen-Sobczyk, 2023). Inclusion criteria emphasized peer-reviewed studies published in the last two decades, with particular focus on works that address authenticity, trust, and the communicative practices of influencers across various platforms. Studies that focused exclusively on unrelated aspects of social media, such as technical algorithms without reference to influencer communication, were excluded to maintain thematic relevance.

For analysis, a thematic synthesis approach was applied. The selected literature was reviewed to identify how authenticity is defined, the factors influencing perceptions of credibility, and the implications of influencer practices for public trust and misinformation. Key patterns were organized into categories such as sponsorship disclosure, self-presentation strategies, audience trust, and the role of fact-checking. By comparing theoretical perspectives with empirical findings, the review not only maps the state of knowledge but also highlights conceptual tensions and blind spots in existing scholarship. This approach provides a holistic understanding of the authenticity debate and offers a foundation for future research directions in communication studies.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. *The Challenge of Information Authenticity in the Age of Influencers*

Influencers have become powerful voices that shape not only consumer choices but also public debates. Their influence stems from a perceived sense of closeness and authenticity, qualities that make them appear more trustworthy than traditional media. Yet, as Audrezet, de Kerviler, and Moulard (2020) explain, authenticity in influencer culture is not always natural; it is often a strategic performance carefully crafted to balance personal narratives with commercial interests. This raises a fundamental question: when audiences perceive authenticity, are they responding to genuine truth or to a well-rehearsed illusion?

The challenge deepens when we consider how algorithms control visibility. Social media platforms prioritize engagement above accuracy, rewarding posts that evoke strong emotions rather than those grounded in verified facts. Vosoughi, Roy, and Aral (2018) found in their study of Twitter that false news travels “farther, faster, and deeper” than factual information precisely because it provokes stronger reactions. Hendrickx (2023), Ruth and Candraningrum (2020) observed the same trend on Instagram and TikTok, where wellness and nutrition misinformation flourished simply because it was entertaining and emotionally appealing. In this system, influencers willingly or not become key amplifiers of misinformation.

Evidence confirms that low-credibility content is not only circulating but often amplified by platform design. Pierri et al. (2023) analyzed millions of tweets and discovered that posts from unreliable sources consistently attracted more impressions than those from trustworthy outlets, even with similar engagement rates. This suggests a troubling paradox namely the greater an influencer’s reach, the greater the risk of amplifying misinformation, whether intentionally or accidentally. Algorithms thus act as



unseen editors, tilting the balance of public knowledge toward what is viral, not what is true.

Still, influencer credibility is not a monolithic concept. Research by Schouten, Janssen, and Verspaget (2020) highlights that authenticity involves dimensions such as expertise, connectedness, and originality. More recently, Lamberton, and Stephen (2016) emphasized transparency and integrity as critical components, especially in contexts where influencers blend personal branding with sponsored content. These findings suggest that while influencers can reinforce misinformation, they also hold the potential to foster more informed publics if authenticity is practiced with integrity rather than performance alone.

Yet the paradox remains, influence without responsibility undermines truth. Wardle and Wardle and Derakhshan (2017) describe this phenomenon as “information disorder,” where trust, algorithms, and virality collide in ways that destabilize knowledge. Some scholars and practitioners have suggested crowd-sourced accuracy signals as one way forward (Jha & Verma, 2024), offering platforms a tool to elevate fact-based content without silencing user engagement. But at the heart of this challenge lies a human dilemma: audiences long for voices that feel authentic, while platforms and influencers are tempted by what spreads fastest. Unless authenticity is redefined not as performance but as accountability, the digital public sphere risks becoming more emotional than rational, more viral than truthful.

Table 1 Research Insights on Influencers and Information Authenticity

Theme	Key Findings	Author(s) & Year	Implications
Influencer Authenticity	Authenticity is often a performance balancing self-expression and commercial motives.	Audrezet, de Kerviler & Moulard (2020)	Audiences may confuse curated authenticity with truth, making them vulnerable to persuasive but misleading content.
Spread of False Information	False news spreads faster, deeper, and more broadly than true news on social media.	Vosoughi, Roy & Aral (2018)	Algorithms reward emotional content, making influencers potential accelerators of misinformation.
Low-Credibility Amplification	Posts from unreliable sources receive more impressions than credible ones on Twitter.	Pierri et al. (2023)	Algorithms amplify visibility of misinformation regardless of accuracy.
Dimensions of Credibility	Expertise, connectedness, and originality shape influencer credibility.	Schouten, Janssen & Verspaget (2020)	Credibility depends on multiple factors, not just follower numbers.
Transparency & Integrity	Authenticity includes transparency and integrity, especially in sponsored content.	Becker, Lamberton & Stephen (2016)	Clear disclosure of partnerships strengthens trust and reduces manipulation.
Information	Virality, trust, and	Wardle & A	systemic challenge:



Disorder	algorithms intersect to destabilize truth online.	Derakhshan (2017)	misinformation becomes normalized in digital culture.
Crowd-Sourced Solutions	Accuracy signals from users could counterbalance algorithmic bias.	Overbye-Thompson and Rice (2025)	Platforms can integrate human judgment to enhance authenticity in information flows.
Misinformation in Wellness Content	Nutrition and health misinformation thrives on Instagram and TikTok due to emotional appeal.	Anderson (2011)	Illustrates how influencers in non-expert domains can easily spread misleading advice.

Table 1 shows that the challenge of authenticity in the age of influencers is shaped by both human behavior and platform design. Authenticity is not just about influencers themselves but also about the systems that amplify their voices.

3.2. Factors Shaping Credibility and Public Trust

Credibility has become a currency more valuable than mere popularity. While audience size can make an influencer visible, it does not automatically make them trustworthy. As Schouten, Janssen, and Verspaget (2020) point out, credibility is shaped by deeper qualities such as expertise, originality, and the ability to connect with followers on a personal level. This means that public trust is less about numbers and more about the perceived integrity of the person behind the content.

One of the strongest drivers of credibility is transparency. When influencers clearly disclose their sponsorships or paid partnerships, audiences are more inclined to view them as honest and authentic. Becker, Lamberton, and Stephen (2016) emphasize that openness about brand collaborations signals respect for followers, making them feel less manipulated. In contrast, hiding commercial interests often creates suspicion, even when the content itself may be informative or entertaining.

Consistency also plays a crucial role. Audiences are quick to notice when influencers contradict themselves or shift values for commercial gain. Studies on digital trust suggest that credibility is built over time through repeated alignment between words and actions (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017). For example, a fitness influencer who consistently shares evidence-based advice while maintaining personal integrity is far more likely to retain loyal followers than one who frequently jumps on sensational trends.

On the other hand, credibility can quickly collapse when influencers promote unverifiable claims or products with dubious benefits. Anderson (2011) highlights this in the case of wellness influencers on TikTok and Instagram, where misleading health advice spreads rapidly but often erodes trust once exposed. Such missteps remind us that public trust is fragile: it takes years to build but can be undone in a single misleading post.

Ultimately, credibility in the age of influencers rests on the delicate balance of transparency, trust, and consistency. Numbers may amplify a message, but without authenticity, transparency, and integrity, influence risks becoming hollow. As audiences become more media literate, they demand more honesty from the figures they follow. For influencers, this means that credibility is not just a strategy but a long-term responsibility to uphold the trust that gives them their power in the first place.



Table 2 Key Factors Influencing Influencer Credibility and Public Trust

Factor	Description	Key Authors	Implications
Transparency	Open disclosure of sponsorships and brand collaborations builds audience trust.	Becker, Lamberton & Stephen (2016)	Audiences feel respected when commercial ties are clear.
Consistency	Repeated alignment between values, actions, and content strengthens credibility.	Wardle & Derakhshan (2017)	Long-term reliability is more powerful than short-term virality.
Expertise	Demonstrating knowledge in a specific domain increases trustworthiness.	Schouten, Janssen & Verspaget (2020)	Followers prefer influencers who can back claims with competence.
Authenticity	Relatability, originality, and genuine communication foster emotional trust.	Audrezet, de Kerviler & Moulard (2020)	Authenticity creates loyalty, even in competitive digital spaces.
Accountability	Avoiding unverifiable claims and correcting mistakes publicly protects credibility.	Anderson (2011)	A single misleading post can damage years of trust-building.

Table 2 highlights that credibility is not a single attribute but a constellation of interconnected factors. Transparency emerges as the cornerstone, when influencers disclose sponsorships honestly, followers are more likely to interpret their recommendations as trustworthy rather than manipulative. This openness not only builds trust but also sustains long-term relationships with audiences.

Consistency, meanwhile, ensures that trust is reinforced over time. Wardle and Derakhshan (2017) stress that audiences judge influencers not only on individual posts but on patterns across weeks, months, and years. Repeated alignment between values and actions signals reliability, whereas frequent shifts or contradictions erode credibility quickly. Expertise provides another layer of trustworthiness. According to Janssen et al. (2022), followers value influencers who show knowledge in their niche, whether in fitness, beauty, or politics. Expertise reassures audiences that advice is not arbitrary but grounded in competence. Without it, popularity alone feels hollow.

Authenticity deepens this trust by adding an emotional dimension. As Audrezet et al. (2020) argue, audiences often connect with influencers not because they are flawless but because they appear relatable and genuine. This sense of “being real” encourages loyalty, even in oversaturated digital spaces where audiences can easily switch to other voices. Accountability protects and repairs credibility. Anderson (2011) illustrates how wellness influencers who spread health misinformation quickly lose trust once exposed. However, those who admit errors and correct misinformation publicly often preserve a degree of credibility. Thus, accountability is not only about avoiding harm but also about demonstrating ethical responsibility.

3.3. Strategies and Gaps in Combating Misinformation

Efforts to combat misinformation have multiplied in recent years, with fact-checking tools, regulatory frameworks, and media literacy programs emerging as the most common



responses. Fact-checking platforms such as Snopes and PolitiFact, for example, play an essential role in debunking viral claims, while governments and international organizations introduce policies aimed at curbing harmful disinformation campaigns. Media literacy education is equally vital, teaching audiences how to question sources, verify claims, and recognize manipulative content. Together, these tools form the backbone of contemporary strategies to resist misinformation.

Yet, despite their promise, these solutions often fall short in creating sustainable, long-term impact. Regulations, for instance, face criticism for being too slow to adapt to the fast-changing nature of digital platforms, while fact-checking tools are reactive rather than preventive, addressing falsehoods only after they have already spread widely. Media literacy programs, though effective in classrooms, struggle to scale across diverse populations and age groups. As Wardle and Derakhshan (2017) remind us, misinformation evolves continuously, exploiting the weaknesses of existing countermeasures.

A notable gap lies in the accountability of influencers themselves. While much attention has been given to platforms and audiences, influencers (who often act as amplifiers of viral content) remain underexamined in discussions of responsibility. Research highlights that when influencers participate in spreading misinformation, either deliberately or unknowingly, their credibility and the trust of their followers are directly at stake (Anderson, 2011). Yet the literature has offered limited exploration of how influencers could take a proactive role in preventing the spread of false information.

One promising direction is the co-creation of ethical standards, where influencers are not merely regulated from above but actively engaged in shaping guidelines for responsible communication. Lamberton, and Stephen (2016) suggest that influencers who openly adopt and advocate for transparent practices can help establish new cultural norms around credibility and integrity. This approach positions influencers not only as part of the problem but also as potential allies in the solution, capable of leveraging their trust-based relationships to promote verified information.

Still, the path forward is complex. Bridging these gaps requires collaboration among multiple stakeholders: governments, platforms, educators, and influencers themselves. Without stronger integration of influencer accountability and ethical self-regulation, existing strategies risk remaining fragmented and reactive. The challenge, then, is not just about building better tools or stricter rules, but about cultivating a digital culture where influencers share responsibility for truth, audiences are empowered to question, and platforms commit to systemic changes. Only then can misinformation be addressed at both its roots and its branches.

Fact-checking initiatives are often celebrated as the “first line of defense” against misinformation, yet their effectiveness is frequently constrained by scale and speed. Research by Vosoughi, Roy, and Aral (2018) shows that false information spreads faster and deeper than true information, meaning fact-checkers are often several steps behind. By the time a claim is corrected, it may already have embedded itself in the public imagination. This lag underscores the need for preventive rather than purely corrective strategies.

Regulatory approaches, such as the European Union’s Digital Services Act, represent another pillar of combating misinformation. While these measures compel platforms to take greater responsibility, critics argue that they risk overreach and may inadvertently infringe on free speech (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017). Moreover, enforcement remains inconsistent across jurisdictions, allowing harmful content to migrate from stricter



environments to more permissive ones. This illustrates how regulation alone cannot guarantee a safe and trustworthy information ecosystem.

Media literacy programs arguably hold the greatest promise for long-term resilience. Teaching audiences how to identify unreliable sources and critically assess information builds “immunity” against manipulation. However, research shows that literacy levels vary dramatically across demographic groups, and younger audiences on platforms like TikTok or Instagram often consume content without the critical skills needed to detect bias or falsehoods (Anderson, 2011). Without large-scale investment and integration into formal and informal education, media literacy remains unevenly distributed.

The accountability of influencers, however, remains the least developed frontier. Unlike journalists, who are bound by professional codes of ethics, influencers operate in a gray zone where commercial pressures often outweigh moral responsibility. Audrezet, de Kerviler, and Moulard (2020) argue that authenticity is often “performed” rather than lived, raising concerns about whether influencers can be trusted to self-regulate. The lack of industry-wide ethical standards for influencers creates a vacuum in which misinformation can spread unchecked, particularly when financial incentives are tied to virality.

A deeper, structural issue lies in the algorithms that underpin all digital communication. These systems amplify content based on engagement, not accuracy, which means misinformation enjoys a natural advantage in the attention economy (Pierri et al., 2023). Unless algorithms are re-engineered to integrate accuracy signals or prioritize trustworthy sources, even the best fact-checkers, regulators, and educators will remain in a reactive position. Bridging this technological gap requires innovation at the platform level, as well as collaboration with external researchers to ensure transparency and accountability in algorithmic design.

4. Conclusion

This study highlights that in the age of influencers, the challenge of information authenticity is deeply tied to the paradox of visibility. The findings reveal that while influencers hold immense power in shaping public opinion, their credibility is fragile, often undermined by the performative nature of authenticity, the amplification of emotionally charged content by algorithms, and the ease with which misinformation spreads across digital platforms. Credibility, therefore, is not defined by follower count but by transparency, expertise, consistency, and accountability.

The discussion further emphasizes that existing strategies namely fact-checking, regulations, and media literacy, provide important but partial solutions. Fact-checking tools are reactive, regulations struggle with overreach and jurisdictional limits, and literacy programs face challenges of scale. A critical gap lies in influencer accountability: unlike journalists bound by professional codes, influencers operate without clear ethical frameworks. Yet this also presents an opportunity: influencers could be engaged as co-creators of ethical standards, fostering trust through transparency and integrity while leveraging their close ties with audiences.

The limitations of this study stem from the reliance on secondary literature and conceptual analysis rather than empirical fieldwork. Future research should explore case studies of influencer-driven misinformation, cross-cultural differences in how audiences perceive authenticity, and experimental designs testing the effectiveness of new accountability frameworks. Exploring algorithmic reform, influencer self-regulation, and



audience co-creation of norms could offer deeper insight into building a more resilient digital information ecosystem.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interests.

References

- Anderson, C. W. (2011). Between creative and quantified audiences: Web metrics and changing patterns of newswork in local US newsrooms. *Journalism*, 12(5). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884911402451>
- Audrezet, A., de Kerviler, G., & Guidry Moulard, J. (2020). Authenticity under threat: When social media influencers need to go beyond self-presentation. *Journal of Business Research*, 117, 557–569. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.07.008>
- Belanche, D., Casaló, L. V., Flavián, M., & Ibáñez-Sánchez, S. (2021). Understanding influencer marketing: The role of congruence between influencers, products and consumers. *Journal of Business Research*, 132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.03.067>
- Conde, R., & Casais, B. (2023). Micro, macro and mega-influencers on instagram: The power of persuasion via the parasocial relationship. *Journal of Business Research*, 158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.113708>
- Ellis, J. (2021). How documentaries mark themselves out from fiction: a genre-based approach. *Studies in Documentary Film*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/17503280.2021.1923144>
- Firdaniza, F., Ruchjana, B. N., Chaerani, D., & Radianti, J. (2022). Information Diffusion Model in Twitter: A Systematic Literature Review. *Information (Switzerland)*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/info13010013>
- Gioltzidou, G., Mitka, D., Gioltzidou, F., Chrysafis, T., Mylona, I., & Amanatidis, D. (2024). Adapting Traditional Media to the Social Media Culture: A Case Study of Greece. *Journalism and Media*, 5(2), 485–499. <https://doi.org/10.3390/journalmedia5020032>
- Handler, R., & Saxton, W. (1988). Dyssimulation: Reflexivity, Narrative, and the Quest for Authenticity in “Living History.” *Cultural Anthropology*, 3(3). <https://doi.org/10.1525/can.1988.3.3.02a00020>
- Hendrickx, J. (2023). The Rise of Social Journalism: An Explorative Case Study of a Youth-oriented Instagram News Account. *Journalism Practice*, 17(8). <https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2021.2012500>
- Hudders, L., De Jans, S., & De Veirman, M. (2021). The commercialization of social media stars: a literature review and conceptual framework on the strategic use of social media influencers. *International Journal of Advertising*, 40(3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2020.1836925>
- Janssen, L., Schouten, A. P., & Croes, E. A. J. (2022). Influencer advertising on Instagram: product-influencer fit and number of followers affect advertising outcomes and influencer evaluations via credibility and identification. *International Journal of Advertising*, 41(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2021.1994205>
- Jauhiainen, J. S., Eyvazlu, D., Junnila, J., & Virnes, A. (2022). Digital divides, the Internet and social media uses among Afghans in Iran. *Technology in Society*, 70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2022.102057>



- Jha, A. K., & Verma, N. K. (2024). Social Media Platforms and User Engagement: A Multi-Platform Study on One-way Firm Sustainability Communication. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 26(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-023-10376-8>
- Joseph, T. (2022). MEDIA TODAY: MASS COMMUNICATION IN A CONVERGING WORLD, 8Th Edition. In *Media Today: Mass Communication In a Converging World, 8Th Edition*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003133933>
- Koay, K. Y., Tjiptono, F., Teoh, C. W., Memon, M. A., & Connolly, R. (2023). Social Media Influencer Marketing: Commentary on the Special Issue. In *Journal of Internet Commerce* (Vol. 22, Issue S1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332861.2022.2128277>
- Lamberton, C., & Stephen, A. T. (2016). A thematic exploration of digital, social media, and mobile marketing: Research evolution from 2000 to 2015 and an agenda for future inquiry. *Journal of Marketing*, 80(6). <https://doi.org/10.1509/jm.15.0415>
- Mero, J., Vanninen, H., & Keränen, J. (2023). B2B influencer marketing: Conceptualization and four managerial strategies. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2022.10.017>
- Nunes, J. C., Ordanini, A., & Giambastiani, G. (2021). The Concept of Authenticity: What It Means to Consumers. *Journal of Marketing*, 85(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242921997081>
- Overbye-Thompson, H., & Rice, R. E. (2025). Understanding how users may work around algorithmic bias. *AI & SOCIETY*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-025-02498-1>
- Paul, J., Ueno, A., Dennis, C., Alamanos, E., Curtis, L., Foroudi, P., Kacprzak, A., Kunz, W. H., Liu, J., Marvi, R., Nair, S. L. S., Ozdemir, O., Pantano, E., Papadopoulos, T., Petit, O., Tyagi, S., & Wirtz, J. (2024). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary perspective and future research agenda. *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 48(2). <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.13015>
- Pettersen-Sobczyk, M. (2023). Social Media Influencer Marketing in the Food Industry: A Spatial Distribution of Research. *EUROPEAN RESEARCH STUDIES JOURNAL*, XXVI(Issue 3). <https://doi.org/10.35808/ersj/3209>
- Pierri, F., DeVerna, M. R., Yang, K. C., Axelrod, D., Bryden, J., & Menczer, F. (2023). One Year of COVID-19 Vaccine Misinformation on Twitter: Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 25. <https://doi.org/10.2196/42227>
- Pradhan, D., Kuanr, A., Anupurba Pahi, S., & Akram, M. S. (2023). Influencer marketing: When and why gen Z consumers avoid influencers and endorsed brands. *Psychology and Marketing*, 40(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21749>
- Pushparaj, P., & Kushwaha, B. P. (2023). Communicate your audience through Virtual Influencer: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Content, Community and Communication*, 17(9). <https://doi.org/10.31620/JCCC.06.23/04>
- Rethemeyer, R. K. (2007). Policymaking in the age of internet: Is the internet tending to make policy networks more or less inclusive? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 17(2). <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mul001>
- Rodrigo, J. R. (2023). Influencer marketing. *Cuadernos de Derecho Transnacional*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.20318/cdt.2023.8080>
- Ruth, D., & Candraningrum, D. A. (2020). Pengaruh Motif Penggunaan Media Baru Tiktok terhadap Personal Branding Generasi Milenial di Instagram. *Koneksi*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.24912/kn.v4i2.8093>
- Schouten, A. P., Janssen, L., & Verspaget, M. (2020). Celebrity vs. Influencer endorsements in advertising: the role of identification, credibility, and Product-Endorser fit. *International Journal of Advertising*, 39(2).



<https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2019.1634898>

- Sundermann, G., & Raabe, T. (2019). Strategic Communication through Social Media Influencers: Current State of Research and Desiderata. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, 13(4). <https://doi.org/10.1080/1553118X.2019.1618306>
- Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 359(6380). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559>
- Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). Information Disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policy making. *Report to the Council of Europe, September 2017*.

