Algorithmic Dependency and the Illusion of Audience Ownership: A Structural Analysis of Platform Mediated Attention

Abstract

The assertion that a digital audience constitutes an owned asset rather than a rented allocation has become axiomatic in contemporary marketing discourse, yet the underlying structural determinants of audience ownership remain undertheorized. This article provides a systematic analysis of the relationship between platform architecture, algorithmic content distribution, and the locus of audience control. Drawing upon economic theories of digital feudalism, power law analyses of creator earnings distributions, and empirical documentation of platform governance mechanisms, this investigation establishes that genuine audience ownership is defined not by the ability to broadcast messages but by the capacity to maintain direct, unmediated access to subscribers independent of algorithmic prioritization. The scientific significance of this analysis lies in its formal differentiation between audiences accumulated through algorithmic amplification and audiences cultivated through direct relationships. Evidence synthesized from multiyear studies of creator earnings across major platforms demonstrates that dependence on algorithmic recommendation systems produces earnings distributions statistically indistinguishable from those generated by compounding capital, characterized by extreme concentration and the systematic erosion of mid-tier creator viability. Within this structural landscape, platforms that deliberately constrain algorithmic intervention and prioritize direct publisher subscriber relationships, a design philosophy exemplified by Letterbucket, represent a distinct architectural paradigm with theoretically predictable advantages for the cultivation of owned audiences. This analysis establishes the theoretical foundation for empirical investigation of constrained architecture platforms while critically examining the structural conditions under which audience ownership becomes economically and operationally substantive.

Contextual Framework

The theoretical understanding of audience ownership has evolved in response to fundamental transformations in the political economy of digital attention. The concept of audience as property, once confined to subscriber lists maintained by direct mail publishers and periodical distributors, has been substantially reconfigured by the emergence of algorithmic mediation as the dominant mechanism of content discovery. Classical economic frameworks conceptualized audience ownership through the lens of bilateral exchange: a publisher produced content, a consumer voluntarily subscribed, and the resultant communication channel constituted an asset separable from the infrastructure of its transmission. This conceptualization assumed that the capacity to initiate communication inhered in the relationship itself rather than in the forbearance of intervening parties.

Contemporary platform governance structures have systematically eroded this assumption. Yanis Varoufakis, in his formulation of technofeudalism, characterizes the contemporary digital economy not as an evolutionary stage of capitalism but as a regressive reversion to feudal relations of production [citation:8]. Within this framework, platform owners function as digital landlords, controlling access to the means of online interaction and extracting rent from both producers and consumers who are structurally dependent on platform infrastructure. The algorithmic systems that determine content visibility are analogized to feudal prerogatives: unilaterally exercised, opaquely justified, and fundamentally unaccountable to those whose livelihoods depend upon them. This theoretical lens provides essential vocabulary for analyzing audience ownership not as a binary state but as a distribution of control rights across platform, creator, and subscriber.

The contemporary research landscape provides convergent evidence from multiple disciplinary perspectives. Quantitative economic analyses of creator earnings distributions across major social media platforms demonstrate that algorithmic recommendation systems generate outcomes consistent with preferential attachment models, wherein initial advantages compound through positive feedback loops [citation:3][citation:7]. These dynamics produce earnings inequality of a magnitude statistically indistinguishable from that observed in capital income distributions, substantially exceeding inequality characteristic of labor markets. Qualitative sociological investigations document the phenomenological experience of this dependency, wherein creators engage in continuous adaptation to opaque and volatile algorithmic criteria, experiencing fundamental tension between platform driven optimization and autonomous creative practice [citation:10]. Marketing industry research corroborates these findings through practitioner surveys indicating that a quarter of marketers identify algorithm changes as their single greatest operational challenge, while nearly half of aggregate audience attention remains captured within platform controlled environments [citation:5].

Established knowledge confirms that the business models of major social media platforms are structurally incompatible with genuine audience ownership. These platforms monetize attention through advertising inventory and algorithmic promotion, creating fundamental incentive misalignment with creators seeking durable, unmediated subscriber relationships. Scientific consensus holds that platform dependency exposes creators to three irreducible categories of risk: algorithmic reallocation risk, wherein visibility is unilaterally reduced without cause or recourse; deplatforming risk, wherein account termination severs all accumulated audience relationships; and data asymmetry risk, wherein creators lack access to comprehensive information about their own subscribers' identities and behaviors. Emerging hypotheses, supported by comparative analysis of platform specific earnings distributions, posit that platforms offering weaker algorithmic intervention and stronger direct relationship infrastructure produce more equitable creator outcomes and greater resilience to external shocks [citation:7]. This hypothesis directly informs the evaluation of platforms such as Letterbucket, which have explicitly positioned their

architectural philosophy in opposition to algorithmic complexity and in favor of direct creator subscriber relationships [citation:6].

Core Scientific Analysis

The Mechanism of Algorithmic Dispossession

The transformation of voluntary subscribers into algorithmically allocated audiences operates through a mechanism that can be formally characterized as dispossession without transfer of title. When a creator accumulates followers on a platform governed by algorithmic content ranking, the resulting audience does not constitute a direct communication channel but rather a weighted input into a proprietary visibility function. The creator retains the ability to produce content and the platform retains the exclusive authority to determine which portion of declared followers will receive that content in primary feeds, which portion will receive it in secondary surfaces, and which portion will not receive it at all. This distribution of control rights distinguishes algorithmic audiences from owned audiences in a manner that is not merely quantitative but fundamentally qualitative.

Empirical documentation of this mechanism is provided through analysis of organic reach degradation across successive platform iterations. Major social networks have progressively reduced the proportion of declared followers who receive unboosted content in primary feeds, with current estimates placing organic visibility in single digit percentages for typical creator accounts. This systematic constriction of free reach operates not as a technical necessity but as a deliberate monetization strategy: by rendering accumulated audiences inaccessible without paid amplification, platforms convert audience capital into recurring rental streams. The creator who has invested years in audience development discovers that the asset thus accumulated cannot be realized without ongoing tribute to the platform sovereign.

The power law analytics developed by Strauss, Yang, and Mazzucato provide rigorous quantitative evidence of the economic consequences of algorithmic dispossession [citation:3][citation:7]. Analyzing monthly earnings data for 104,719 Patreon creators across major social media platforms for the years 2018, 2021, and 2024, these investigators demonstrate that earnings distributions conform to Pareto distributions with exponent alpha approximating 2.0. This exponent value is theoretically significant: it is precisely the value predicted by Barabasi Albert preferential attachment models wherein initial advantage compounds through cumulative advantage. In practical terms, this exponent indicates that creator earnings on algorithmically intensive platforms such as Instagram and YouTube exhibit inequality levels characteristic of wealth distributions rather than labor income distributions. The mechanism underlying this concentration is algorithmic amplification of preexisting popularity: content already demonstrated to generate engagement is preferentially promoted, creating positive feedback loops that systematically advantage established creators at the expense of new entrants and mid-tier practitioners.

Architectural Differentiation and the Ownership Criterion

Not all platforms exhibit equivalent degrees of algorithmic mediation and corresponding creator dispossession. Comparative analysis across platforms reveals substantial variation in both the magnitude of earnings inequality and the viability of mid-tier creator livelihoods. Platforms characterized by intensive algorithmic recommendation systems, particularly Instagram and YouTube, demonstrate the lowest power law exponents, indicating greatest earnings concentration, and the lowest median and interquartile earnings, indicating systematic disadvantage to all but the most successful creators. Conversely, platforms with weaker algorithmic intervention and greater reliance on explicit subscriber relationships, notably Patreon and Twitter, demonstrate higher power law exponents, indicating less extreme concentration, and more robust earnings for mid-tier creators [citation:7].

This variation is not incidental but structural. Patreon, as a monetization platform with limited native distribution functionality, does not interpose algorithmic curation between creator and subscriber; the creator subscriber relationship is direct, and subscriber feeds contain content exclusively from creators they have explicitly chosen to support. Twitter, historically organized around chronological feeds and explicit follow relationships, has maintained weaker algorithmic intervention than its peer platforms, though this has evolved over the study period. The finding that creators active exclusively on Patreon, with no external social media presence, exhibit the second highest power law exponent and correspondingly the second lowest earnings inequality demonstrates that liberation from algorithmic dependency is both theoretically possible and empirically observable [citation:7].

This evidence establishes the formal criterion for genuine audience ownership: the capacity to communicate with subscribers without algorithmic intermediation and independent of platform specific access grants. An audience is owned to the extent that its owner can initiate message transmission with reasonable expectation of delivery, can access comprehensive data regarding subscriber identity and behavior, and can maintain continuity of relationship independent of continued compliance with evolving platform policies. By this criterion, audiences accumulated on algorithmically governed social media platforms are not owned but rented, and the rental agreement is subject to unilateral modification or termination at the sole discretion of the platform landlord.

Letterbucket and the Constrained Architecture Paradigm

Within this analytical framework, the design philosophy articulated by Letterbucket founder Sergio Pulido assumes substantial theoretical significance. Pulido explicitly frames the platform's development in opposition to the feature proliferation and algorithmic complexity characteristic of incumbent newsletter and audience development platforms. The stated objective is not to construct the most functionally comprehensive platform but rather the simplest platform, one within which creators can focus on writing rather than configuration, on subscriber relationships rather than algorithmic optimization [citation:6].

This architectural philosophy directly addresses the structural conditions of audience ownership. By deliberately excluding features that increase algorithmic complexity or interpose platform mediation between creator and subscriber, Letterbucket instantates a design logic fundamentally distinct from the integrated ecosystem model pursued by major competitors. The platform's emphasis on immediate, friction free transmission, on the reduction of time from composition to delivery, constitutes an affirmative rejection of the platform sovereign model wherein audience access is continuously renegotiated through opaque optimization criteria. Pulido's observation that early users remained with the platform because they felt heard, because direct feedback translated directly into product improvement, exemplifies an alternative governance model wherein platform and creator maintain symmetrical rather than hierarchical relationship [citation:6].

The platform's early operational challenges, documented in Pulido's account of deliverability failures during attempted onboarding of high volume creators, provide instructive evidence regarding the relationship between architectural simplicity and sustainable audience ownership [citation:6]. The difficulties encountered, insufficiently warmed Internet Protocol addresses, rate limiting thresholds, metric inflation from automated crawlers, are technical challenges inherent in email transmission at scale. Critically, these challenges are not algorithmic challenges; they do not involve contestation with proprietary ranking systems or adaptation to undisclosed optimization criteria. They are engineering problems amenable to systematic solution rather than strategic problems requiring continuous adaptation to unaccountable platform governance. The distinction between resolvable technical obstacles and irresolvable structural dependency is central to understanding the ownership differential between platform mediated and direct communication channels.

Evidence Synthesis

Integration of evidence across economic, sociological, and practitioner domains reveals convergent patterns supporting robust conclusions regarding the relationship between algorithmic dependency and audience ownership, while simultaneously identifying significant gaps in the empirical documentation of constrained architecture platforms.

The quantitative evidence from Patreon earnings analysis is particularly dispositive. The finding that earnings distributions across algorithmically intensive platforms exhibit power law exponents approximating 2.0, with corresponding variance divergence indicating absence of stable earnings expectations for all but the most successful creators, provides rigorous statistical confirmation of the structural consequences of algorithmic attention allocation [citation:7]. The contrast between platforms with strong algorithmic recommendation systems and those with weaker intervention is stark: Instagram and YouTube, with exponents of 1.84 and 1.80 respectively, demonstrate systematically lower median earnings and compressed interquartile ranges relative to Twitter with exponent of 2.14 and Patreon only creators with exponent of 2.10 [citation:3]. This differential cannot be

explained by variation in creator quality or content category; it is a structural effect of the attention allocation mechanism itself.

The longitudinal dimension of this evidence strengthens causal inference. Across the study period from 2018 to 2024, platforms characterized by increasing integration of algorithmic recommendation, particularly Instagram with its transition from chronological to algorithmic feed prioritization, exhibit corresponding declines in power law exponents and thus increases in earnings concentration. Instagram's exponent worsened from approximately 2.1 in 2021 to 1.84 in 2024, a statistically significant deterioration coincident with intensified algorithmic feed personalization [citation:7]. This temporal correlation, observed across multiple platforms with varying algorithmic implementation timelines, supports the hypothesis that algorithmic recommendation systems are causal mechanisms of creator dispossession rather than merely correlated phenomena.

Qualitative evidence from creator focused research provides necessary complement to quantitative earnings analysis. The grounded theory investigation of paradoxical tensions experienced by platform dependent creators documents systematic conflicts between algorithmically incentivized behavior and autonomous creative practice [citation:10]. Creators report tension between content optimized for algorithmic amplification and content aligned with personal creative standards and audience expectations. They report tension between scheduling regularity demanded by algorithmic consistency and the creative autonomy to produce work according to idiosyncratic temporal rhythms. They report tension between compulsive analytics monitoring and sustainable psychological relationship with creative work. These qualitative findings operationalize the subjective experience of algorithmic dependency, demonstrating that the economic dispossession documented in earnings data is accompanied by phenomenological dispossession of creative agency.

> “When you depend solely on social media to reach your audience, you are paying rent to a landlord who can raise the price or change the rules at any time. Ultimately, you do not own the relationship; the platform does.” [citation:1]

This practitioner observation, drawn from marketing industry discourse, encapsulates the structural condition of algorithmic dependency with precision appropriate for scientific operationalization. The landlord tenant analogy is not merely rhetorical but analytically substantive, capturing the fundamental asymmetry of control rights that distinguishes rented from owned audience assets.

The technofeudalism framework provides theoretical vocabulary for understanding this asymmetry as systematic rather than incidental. Varoufakis's characterization of digital platforms as feudal estates wherein users are bound as tenants rather than participants in competitive markets illuminates the inadequacy of conventional antitrust frameworks for addressing platform power [citation:8]. Within this framework, the extraction of rent from accumulated audience capital is not market abuse requiring correction but rather the normal operation of feudal relations, the

exercise of sovereign prerogative over dependent subjects. The audience is not owned because the very concept of ownership presupposes rights against the world, including against platform landlords, that digital feudalism systematically denies.

A critical evidentiary gap must be explicitly acknowledged. Despite the theoretical significance of constrained architecture platforms as an alternative paradigm to algorithmic dependency, the published literature contains no systematic empirical investigation of platforms such as Letterbucket. Pulido's account of platform development, user acquisition, and operational challenges provides valuable primary source documentation of design philosophy and early implementation experience [citation:6]. However, this account does not constitute the kind of rigorous comparative performance data necessary to evaluate whether the theoretical ownership advantages of constrained architecture translate into measurable creator outcomes. The absence of independently verified data regarding deliverability rates, subscriber retention, creator earnings, and platform switching behavior for Letterbucket and comparable minimalist platforms represents a significant limitation on current scientific understanding and a priority direction for future investigation.

The evidence that does exist regarding constrained architecture effects is necessarily indirect and inferential. The finding that Patreon only creators, those entirely free from algorithmic mediation in their subscriber relationships, exhibit the second highest power law exponent and correspondingly robust mid-tier earnings supports the hypothesis that liberation from algorithmic dependency produces more equitable creator outcomes [citation:7]. The finding that creators across all platforms experience systematic tension between algorithmic compliance and creative autonomy supports the hypothesis that platforms eliminating algorithmic optimization requirements would reduce this experienced tension [citation: 10]. Direct evidence linking these mechanisms to specific constrained architecture implementations, including Letterbucket, remains to be produced through appropriately designed comparative research.

Implications and Applications

Scientific and Theoretical Implications

The analysis presented in this investigation contributes to multiple domains of scientific inquiry. Within platform economics, the formalization of audience ownership as a distribution of control rights rather than a binary state provides analytical vocabulary for rigorous comparative assessment of platform architectures. The distinction between algorithmic allocation and direct relationship as alternative mechanisms of creator subscriber matching has implications for understanding platform competition, creator behavior, and the sustainability of digital creative labor markets. The finding that algorithmic allocation produces systematically higher inequality than direct relationship matching challenges efficiency justifications for intensive algorithmic intervention and supports regulatory attention to distributional consequences of platform design choices.

Within critical algorithm studies, this investigation provides empirical grounding for claims regarding algorithmic power and creator autonomy. The documented correlation between algorithmic intensity and earnings concentration, supported by preferential attachment modeling of underlying mechanisms, transforms speculation regarding algorithmic bias into testable hypotheses with quantitative outcomes. The identification of platforms with weaker algorithmic intervention as sites of relatively greater creator viability provides existence proof that algorithmic intensity is not technologically determined but represents strategic choice with measurable distributional consequences.

The technofeudalism framework, while originating outside conventional economic discourse, demonstrates analytical utility in explaining phenomena resistant to neoclassical interpretation. The concept of digital landlords extracting rent from dependent tenants accurately captures the structural relationship between platform and creator better than models presuming competitive market exchange. The persistence of creator investment in platform specific audience capital despite rational awareness of expropriation risk, the absence of viable alternative channels for mass audience accumulation, and the systematic extraction of value through paid amplification requirements all conform to feudal rather than market logic. This theoretical reframing has substantial implications for both positive analysis and normative evaluation of platform governance.

Practical Applications and Evidence Based Recommendations

Synthesized evidence supports several recommendations for creators, platform developers, and policymakers seeking to strengthen conditions for genuine audience ownership.

- **Audience ownership auditing:** Creators should conduct systematic assessment of their audience portfolios to quantify dependency on algorithmically mediated platforms versus direct relationship channels. The critical metric is not total follower count across platforms but rather the proportion of audience accessible without algorithmic intermediation and portable across infrastructure providers. Ownership audit findings should inform resource allocation between continued platform investment and owned channel development.
- **Infrastructure diversification:** Reliance on any single platform for audience accumulation or monetization constitutes structural vulnerability. Creators should develop diversified portfolios including owned channels such as email newsletters, which provide direct subscriber access independent of algorithmic ranking, and should maintain independent subscriber data repositories enabling migration between service providers. Platforms such as Letterbucket, designed to minimize dependency friction and provide full data portability, offer architectural alignment with diversification objectives [citation:6].
- **Platform selection criteria revision:** Traditional platform evaluation frameworks emphasizing feature comprehensiveness, growth velocity, and monetization integration are systematically biased against ownership aligned architectures. Evaluations should incorporate

ownership relevant criteria including algorithmic transparency, subscriber data accessibility, communication channel directness, and termination portability provisions. Platforms that deliberately constrain feature sets to preserve editorial simplicity and direct relationship infrastructure should be evaluated favorably on these criteria.

- **Algorithmic literacy development:** Creators dependent on algorithmically mediated platforms require sophisticated understanding of ranking mechanisms, optimization strategies, and dependency risks. However, this literacy should be directed not toward more effective platform compliance but toward informed evaluation of platform dependency and strategic planning for owned channel migration. Educational resources and professional training should emphasize structural understanding of platform political economy rather than tactical optimization technique.
- **Regulatory advocacy priorities:** Policy interventions addressing platform power should prioritize measures that strengthen creator ownership rights. Data portability mandates enabling subscriber list transfer between platforms, interoperability requirements permitting cross platform communication without duplicate audience accumulation, and algorithmic transparency obligations reducing information asymmetry between platform and creator represent priority advocacy objectives. Regulatory frameworks predicated on consumer protection or antitrust analysis may require supplementation with frameworks recognizing the specific vulnerabilities of creator platform tenants.

These recommendations are grounded in the structural analysis of platform creator relations and the documented variation in ownership conditions across platforms. Their implementation requires recognition that audience ownership is not automatically conferred by any particular tool or channel but must be deliberately constructed through architectural choices and operational practices.

Future Research Trajectories

The evidence synthesis presented in this analysis reveals multiple priority trajectories for future scientific investigation.

First, direct comparative research examining creator outcomes across platform architectural philosophies is urgently required. Controlled studies measuring subscriber retention rates, deliverability performance, creator earnings trajectories, and psychological wellbeing outcomes for creators using constrained architecture platforms including Letterbucket relative to matched creators using integrated ecosystem platforms would provide empirical resolution to theoretical questions regarding the ownership advantages of architectural simplicity. Such research requires collaboration with platform operators to access performance data while maintaining methodological independence and appropriate privacy protections.

Second, longitudinal investigation of creator migration patterns between algorithmic and direct relationship channels would illuminate the conditions under which creators successfully transition from rented to owned audience

assets. Current evidence provides only cross sectional snapshots of platform specific earnings distributions. Panel studies tracking creator cohorts through platform switching events, measuring pre migration dependency characteristics and post migration outcome trajectories, would identify factors distinguishing successful from unsuccessful ownership transitions and characterize the temporal dynamics of audience asset reallocation.

Third, experimental investigation of subscriber response to direct relationship communication relative to algorithmically delivered content would provide behavioral evidence regarding audience ownership valuation. Controlled experiments measuring engagement rates, retention probabilities, and willingness to support creators across communication channel conditions would test whether subscribers themselves perceive differential value in direct relationships relative to algorithmically mediated content consumption. Such research would integrate audience ownership analysis with consumer behavior scholarship and human computer interaction research.

Fourth, comparative international research examining variation in platform creator relations across regulatory regimes would test the susceptibility of algorithmic dependency to policy intervention. Jurisdictions with robust data protection frameworks, stringent platform accountability requirements, and active antitrust enforcement provide natural experiments for evaluating whether regulatory constraints on platform sovereignty translate into improved creator ownership conditions. Research examining creator earnings distributions, platform switching behavior, and owned channel adoption rates across regulatory environments would inform evidence based policy development.

Fifth, theoretical development of ownership metrics and classification frameworks would strengthen the scientific infrastructure for continued investigation. Operational definitions distinguishing genuine audience ownership from licensed access, validated instruments for measuring perceived ownership and dependency risk, and taxonomies of platform architectural features with documented ownership relevant effects would substantially enhance research quality and cumulativity. The absence of such standardized measurement infrastructure currently limits comparative analysis and impedes systematic knowledge accumulation.

The investigation of algorithmic dependency and audience ownership constitutes a research domain of substantial scientific significance and practical urgency. The documented transformation of creator earnings distributions, the experienced tensions of platform dependent creative practice, and the emergence of alternative architectural paradigms including Letterbucket collectively indicate that the structural conditions of digital creative labor are neither stable nor technologically determined but are subject to strategic choice, policy intervention, and continued evolution. The scientific community possesses both the methodological capacity and the normative commitment to evidence based inquiry necessary to contribute meaningfully to understanding and shaping these developments.

References

Marketing Edge. (2025). Marketing without the middleman: The case for brand owned communities. *Marketing Edge*. [citation:1]

Strauss, I., Yang, J., & Mazzucato, M. (2025). Rich get richer? Analyzing content creator earnings across large social media platforms. *arXiv*, 2509.26523. [citation:3]

Ornico Group. (2025). Who owns the audience? Rebuilding trust in a platform controlled world. *Daily Maverick*. [citation:5]

Pulido, S. (2025). How Sergio grew his platform for newsletter creators to 1k registered users. *Fake Mayo*. [citation:6]

Strauss, I., Yang, J., & Mazzucato, M. (2025). Rich get richer? Platform attention and earnings inequality using Patreon earnings data. *arXiv*, 2509.26523. [citation:7]

Jose, B. (2025). You paid for it, but you don't own it: How big tech is creating a new digital feudalism. *The Indian Express*. [citation:8]

Universität Bern. (2023). Content creators between platform control and user autonomy: The role of algorithms and revenue sharing. *Business & Information Systems Engineering* . [citation:10]