The Voice of Creative Research

OPEN ACCESS

Research Article

Between Verses and Feeds: Literary Connection versus Algorithmic Disruption in Human Relationship

Dr. Sanket Kumar Jha[1]

[1]Assistant Professor of English
University Department of English
Lalit Narayan Mithila University Darbhanga (Bihar) India
Email: sanketjha007@gmail.com

Abstract

Literature has historically served as a connective medium, offering shared cultural texts through which individuals interpret love, intimacy, and identity. Poetry, in particular, mediates contradictions by holding multiple truths within a single frame. In contrast, twenty-first-century social media platforms, governed by algorithmic personalization, disrupt this shared interpretive space. Self-proclaimed psychologists and gendered content streams deliver contradictory relationship advice to male and female audiences, fragmenting relational norms. This article contrasts the permanence and universality of literary traditions with the volatility and segmentation of algorithmic feeds. Drawing on literary analysis, media theory, and cultural studies, it argues that literature's connective ethos can inform digital discourse reforms by embedding multiplicity, transparency, and cross-perspective exposure into relationship content delivery. By juxtaposing canonical texts with observed digital advice ecosystems, the study highlights how literature's enduring pluralism offers a model for mitigating algorithmic disruption. In doing so, it contributes to ongoing debates in literary studies, digital culture, and gendered media research.

Introduction

For centuries, literature has been one of humanity's most enduring tools for exploring relationships. Whether in the form of sonnets exchanged between lovers, epistolary novels mapping emotional landscapes, or epics embedding moral codes, the written word has provided a shared space for interpreting the complexities of intimacy. A Shakespearean sonnet could speak to both a young lover in Elizabethan England and a modern reader in Bihar, offering a continuity of language, symbol, and theme that bridges centuries (Greenblatt 92).

In the twenty-first century, however, a different medium has assumed the role of the everyday relationship guide: short-form social media content. Platforms like TikTok, Instagram Reels, and YouTube Shorts now flood users' feeds with advice on love, breakups, communication, and self-worth. Much of this guidance is delivered by self-proclaimed psychologists—individuals who often lack formal credentials but command large audiences by presenting themselves as authorities.

Unlike literary works, whose fixed texts invite prolonged engagement and cross-generational interpretation, social media advice exists in a state of algorithmically curated flux. The recommendation systems underpinning these platforms are designed to maximize engagement, not truth. They quickly sort users into gendered content silos: male-coded accounts are exposed to "manosphere" rhetoric emphasizing dominance, detachment, and suspicion; female-coded accounts encounter "tradwife" or "divine feminine" scripts promoting submission, self-blame, and hyper-femininity (Fisher 211). The result is a bifurcation of relational norms in which two partners may be following completely contradictory scripts without realizing their origins.

This divergence marks a fundamental shift in the way relational narratives circulate. Literature, even when contradictory within itself, does so deliberately, inviting reflection on multiple possibilities. Social media's contradictions, by contrast, are a byproduct of personalization algorithms, often exacerbating misunderstandings rather than deepening empathy.

The present study contrasts these two modes of relational narrative—literary and algorithmic—through three key lenses: permanence versus ephemerality, contradiction as device versus contradiction as byproduct, and shared interpretive space versus siloed feeds. It argues that the connective ethos of literature offers valuable insights for mitigating the disruptive tendencies of algorithmic relationship advice. By juxtaposing examples from canonical poetry with observed patterns in digital advice ecosystems, the paper seeks to reclaim the literary model as a template for building more inclusive, dialogic, and cross-perspectival online spaces.

Accordingly, this study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How does literature, through its permanence and multiplicity, create a shared interpretive space for relational narratives?
2. In what ways do social media algorithms, through personalization and ephemerality, disrupt this shared space by producing contradictory and gendered advice streams?

The Voice of Creative Research

Vol. 4 & Issue 4 (October 2022)

3. Can literary models of dialogue, contradiction, and universality inform more constructive approaches to digital relationship discourse?

To address these questions, the article adopts a comparative cultural approach that combines close reading of canonical literary texts (from Tirukkural and Kālidāsa to Shakespeare, Keats, Rossetti, and Das) with analysis of digital advice ecosystems as documented in media theory, communication studies, and algorithmic research. This dual methodology situates literary traditions alongside empirical studies of social media. To ground this comparison, the discussion first turns to the literary tradition, examining how poetry and narrative have historically provided connective frameworks for relational wisdom.

Literary Tradition as Connective Tissue

For much of recorded history, literature has been the principal archive of relational wisdom. The trajectory begins with ancient didactic verse, such as the *Tirukkural*, whose aphorisms on love and virtue present distilled guidance applicable across cultural and temporal boundaries. Thiruvalluvar's couplets speak of patience, mutual respect, and the enduring value of truth in companionship—principles that retain resonance regardless of the century or audience (Paramasivam 47).

Similarly, classical Sanskrit poetry, such as Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* (*The Cloud Messenger*), merges personal longing with universal imagery. The poem's lover, separated by distance, entrusts the monsoon cloud with messages for his beloved. In doing so, Kālidāsa encodes the emotional mechanics of absence, hope, and reunion into a symbolic form that is legible to readers across generations and geographies (Raghavan 112). This enduring communicability is the hallmark of literature's connective power: it offers a shared symbolic lexicon that transcends immediate context.

The Western canon, too, is replete with works that situate relational experience in a shared interpretive space. William Shakespeare's sonnets are perhaps the most concentrated example, offering meditations on beauty, time, loyalty, and betrayal. Sonnet 116, for instance, frames love as "an ever-fixed mark / That looks on tempests and is never shaken" (Shakespeare 14.5–6). These lines invite both historical and contemporary readers into a dialogue on the nature of constancy, allowing them to measure their own experiences against the text's ideal. Because the words remain unchanged, the conversation between text and reader can span centuries without loss of reference.

The Romantic movement extended this connective impulse through an emphasis on emotion and the natural world. John Keats's "Bright Star" envisions steadfast love through the metaphor of a celestial body, unblinking and eternal. Yet in the same breath, the speaker longs for the mortal intimacy of "pillow'd upon my fair love's ripening breast" (Keats 9). Here, the contradiction between immortality and embodied affection is not resolved but held in tension, mirroring the complexities of human attachment. In literature, such contradictions are intentional devices; they enrich rather than fracture the shared space of interpretation.

Poetry's openness to multiplicity is central to its function as connective tissue. T. S. Eliot observed that "genuine poetry can communicate before it is understood" (Eliot 3). This pre-

The Voice of Creative Research

cognitive communication arises from the capacity of poetic language to operate on multiple semantic levels simultaneously. In Pablo Neruda's "If You Forget Me," for instance, the oscillation between devotion and conditionality ("If you forget me / I want you to know one thing…") reflects the ambivalence inherent in human love, inviting identification from readers on both sides of the emotional equation (Neruda 72). The text becomes a common meeting ground where contradictions are acknowledged as part of the human condition.

Women poets have historically used this space to challenge and reframe relational norms. Christina Rossetti's "No, Thank You, John" rejects the suitor's advances with a directness that subverts Victorian gender expectations. By granting voice and agency to the female speaker, Rossetti constructs a relational script grounded in self-determination rather than acquiescence (Marsh 188). Modern feminist poets, such as Kamala Das, continue this tradition. In "An Introduction," Das exposes the gendered constraints on female identity and desire, writing, "I am every / Woman who seeks love" (Das 12–13). Her confession becomes both personal and collective, a line that resonates across contexts and cultures for women negotiating similar societal boundaries.

Importantly, the literary tradition not only offers these varied perspectives but situates them within a shared canon. A reader encountering Hardy's fatalistic love poems alongside Burns's romantic optimism is invited to inhabit and reconcile multiple emotional registers. The contradictions within the canon are productive: they suggest that relational truth is not singular but polyphonic. As Harold Bloom argues, the Western literary tradition sustains itself through "the dialectical interplay of voices" (Bloom 29).

In many cultural contexts, literature also functions as a communal experience. Oral poetry traditions in Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia fostered collective memory and shared moral frameworks. The recitation of ghazals in Urdu, for example, brought together audiences who could appreciate the double meanings and emotional subtleties embedded in the form. While individual interpretations might differ, the audience participated in a common textual moment, reinforcing social bonds through shared narrative and metaphor (Ali 54).

The permanence of literary works underpins their capacity to connect. A printed or memorized text resists the volatility of digital feeds; it can be revisited in moments of crisis, joy, or reflection. The reader might change, but the text remains a fixed point of reference, allowing for the tracing of personal growth against a stable narrative anchor. This is particularly significant in the realm of relationships, where shifting emotional states benefit from the grounding influence of enduring texts.

By presenting relational advice, reflections, and narratives within a durable, shared medium, literature fosters a collective interpretive space in which contradictions coexist productively. Whether through the structured paradoxes of metaphysical poetry, the sensual cadences of Neruda, or the self-assertive defiance of Rossetti, the literary tradition offers a connective framework. In this space, readers from different backgrounds can engage with the same text, bringing their own histories to bear while recognizing a common human thread.

The Voice of Creative Research

This universality stands in stark contrast to the personalized, often contradictory streams of advice produced by contemporary social media algorithms. Where literature invites many voices into a shared conversation, algorithmically segmented content assigns each user to an isolated room in which only certain voices are heard. Before turning to that digital environment, it is essential to understand that literature's connective power rests not only on its content but also on its mode of circulation: stable, public, and open to re-interpretation across time.

The Effect of Social Media Algorithms on Personal Relationships

The digital ecosystem that now shapes much of contemporary relationship discourse operates on principles fundamentally different from those governing literary circulation. Platforms such as TikTok, Instagram, and YouTube Shorts employ recommender algorithms designed to maximize user engagement — measured in clicks, watch time, and interactions — rather than to preserve a shared interpretive space. As Gillespie notes, algorithms "do not simply organize information; they produce relevance" (Gillespie 167). In doing so, they filter and rank content according to a user's behavioral patterns, inferred demographics, and network associations.

In the context of relationship advice, this algorithmic mediation has two significant consequences: the amplification of self-proclaimed experts and the segmentation of audiences along gendered lines. The first phenomenon arises from the platform's incentive structures. Creators who offer confident, emotionally charged, and easily consumable advice tend to capture more attention, irrespective of their professional credentials. Many of these "self-proclaimed psychologists" use the rhetorical markers of therapeutic authority — such as clinical vocabulary or diagnostic frameworks — without the training or ethical oversight associated with licensed practice (Luscombe 42). Their credibility is conferred not by peer-reviewed evidence but by the visibility algorithms grant them.

The second, and perhaps more consequential, phenomenon is gendered content funneling. In experimental studies of TikTok's "For You" page, newly created male-coded accounts have been shown to receive within minutes a preponderance of videos from the so-called "manosphere" — a loosely connected network of influencers advocating male dominance, emotional detachment, and skepticism toward women (Papadamou et al. 14). These streams often frame relationships as competitive arenas in which men must guard resources and avoid emotional vulnerability. The algorithm detects engagement with such themes and reinforces them by prioritizing similar content.

Parallel experiments with female-coded accounts produce a different stream: "tradwife" narratives promoting traditional domestic roles, "divine feminine" coaching that emphasizes passivity and receptiveness, and self-help content encouraging women to take disproportionate responsibility for relational harmony (Barker 205). While these messages appear benign or even supportive on the surface, they often reinscribe gender hierarchies under the guise of empowerment. By rewarding content that aligns with stereotypical expectations, the algorithm subtly normalizes divergent relational scripts for men and women.

The practical impact of this segmentation is the emergence of contradictory advice ecosystems. A man in one digital silo may be told never to initiate vulnerable conversation, lest it diminish his "value," while a woman in another silo is told to expect emotional openness as proof of commitment. Each partner's expectations are shaped by a feed optimized for individual engagement, not relational alignment. Unlike in the literary canon, where contradictory perspectives coexist in a shared public space, these contradictions are experienced in isolation, with little opportunity for cross-exposure.

This isolation is reinforced by what Pariser famously termed the "filter bubble" — the narrowing of a user's informational environment to content that confirms existing preferences (Pariser 9). In the realm of relationship advice, filter bubbles can lead to cognitive rigidity, where individuals interpret a partner's behavior solely through the lens endorsed by their algorithmic cohort. A perceived lack of compliance with that advice may be framed as evidence of incompatibility or bad faith, rather than as a difference in personal style or perspective.

Moreover, the velocity and ephemerality of social media content amplify this effect. Advice trends can rise and fall in a matter of days, each bringing a new set of "rules" for dating, texting, or boundary-setting. The advice that dominates a user's feed one week — for example, "go no-contact to increase attraction" — may be replaced the next by an opposite strategy, such as "constant communication to build trust." Because these shifts are algorithmically driven and not embedded in a stable textual tradition, they lack the reflective coherence of literary contradictions. The result is an unstable and often incoherent relational knowledge base.

It is important to note that the problem is not merely the presence of misinformation, though that is significant. Studies have found that health- and psychology-related TikTok videos often contain factual inaccuracies, with non-credentialed creators more likely to oversimplify or misrepresent complex concepts (Basch et al. 1331). More critical is the structural logic of personalization: by curating a reality in which only certain advice is visible, the algorithm actively fragments the shared relational lexicon that literature once reinforced.

This fragmentation has measurable social effects. In interviews with young adults navigating romantic relationships, respondents frequently cited "things I saw online" as justification for specific behaviors or expectations. These references often came without awareness that a partner's feed might offer entirely different guidance. What literature offers through shared allusions — the mutual recognition of a sonnet's imagery or a novel's moral — social media replaces with private, unverified scripts invisible to anyone outside the algorithmic loop.

The authority of self-proclaimed psychologists in this system mirrors, in a distorted way, the role of the poet or storyteller in traditional societies. Both serve as narrators of relational norms. But where the poet's work is situated in a communal archive, accessible to all and open to debate, the influencer's work is ephemeral, individualized, and insulated from challenge by the algorithmic architecture itself. This inversion of authority — from publicly accountable bard to privately curated influencer — marks a profound shift in the ecology of relationship discourse.

The Voice of Creative Research

In this sense, social media does not merely supplement literature's role; it supplants it with a structurally different mode of circulation. The connective tissue that literature weaves from shared symbols and stable texts is replaced by an ever-shifting patchwork of contradictory imperatives, each stitched to the individual by the invisible hand of personalization algorithms. The disruption is not simply in content but in the very conditions of relational storytelling: from permanence to impermanence, from openness to closure, from universality to segmentation.

Permanence vs. Ephemerality

One of the most fundamental differences between literature and social media lies in the temporal nature of their forms. Literature is anchored in permanence: a printed poem, a bound novel, or a digitized archive remains fixed in language, accessible in its original form for centuries. This stability allows for sustained engagement, rereading, and cross-generational dialogue. The words of John Donne's "The Sun Rising" will mean the same thing linguistically whether read in 1625 or 2025, even as readers bring new interpretations shaped by their own contexts (Donne 3). Permanence does not imply interpretive stagnation; rather, it provides a stable referent that invites evolving reflection.

Social media content, by contrast, exists in a state of radical ephemerality. Short-form videos on platforms like TikTok or Instagram are often consumed within seconds and replaced instantly by the next item in the feed. Even when a video goes "viral," its lifespan of cultural relevance is rarely more than a few days or weeks before being supplanted by the next trend (Leaver et al. 89). The temporality of the medium is not designed for contemplation but for continuous novelty. In an environment where the feed never ends, the half-life of any given piece of advice is vanishingly short.

This ephemerality has profound consequences for relationship discourse. In literature, contradictory perspectives coexist within a canon, enabling readers to explore them over time. A student can read Shakespeare's Sonnet 116 alongside Hardy's "Neutral Tones" across years, revisiting the texts at different stages of life and discovering new resonances. In social media, however, the algorithm's emphasis on freshness means that contradictory advice often arrives sequentially rather than simultaneously — one trend replacing the previous without acknowledgment. Users may adopt one behavioral "rule" one week ("Never text first") only to have it contradicted by another the following week ("Initiate daily to build trust"). There is no archival frame to reconcile these shifts, only the churn of content.

The permanence of literature also enables what Jan Assmann calls *cultural memory* — the preservation of shared narratives that define a community's identity over time (Assmann 129). Through repeated engagement with canonical texts, communities reinforce common reference points and moral vocabularies. Social media's ephemerality undermines such memory. While platforms do retain archives, their architecture privileges the new over the old, burying past content beneath the constant influx of fresh material. As a result, collective memory becomes attenuated, and relational norms are constructed in short-lived, unstable bursts.

The Voice of Creative Research

Vol. 4 & Issue 4 (October 2022)

Another distinction lies in the mode of consumption. Reading literature often requires deliberate engagement: selecting a book, dedicating uninterrupted time, and sustaining attention across pages. This process fosters a deeper cognitive and emotional investment. By contrast, the design of short-form social media encourages passive scrolling, where attention is captured fleetingly and then released. Even when content is "saved" or bookmarked, the abundance of new material competes for the user's focus, making return visits rare. As Shoshana Zuboff observes in her analysis of surveillance capitalism, the very architecture of these platforms is oriented toward "continuous behavioral modification" (Zuboff 249), which thrives on ephemerality.

Ephemerality also affects accountability. In literature, the permanence of the text allows readers and critics to scrutinize, challenge, and contextualize its claims. A problematic or contradictory passage can be analyzed in the light of the author's other works, historical context, or subsequent scholarship. In social media, advice that proves harmful or inaccurate can vanish without consequence, lost in the vast sea of new uploads. The creator is under little obligation to reconcile past contradictions, as the algorithm will continue to reward whatever captures engagement in the present moment.

Furthermore, permanence fosters a kind of temporal dialogue between the past and the present. Readers can compare their current relational experiences with those described in older works, noting shifts in cultural attitudes or constancies in human emotion. Social media's presentism — its fixation on the now — forecloses this dialogue. The absence of durable, widely recognized relational texts in the digital sphere means there is little continuity in the discourse, making it harder to track or challenge the evolution of relational norms.

For interpersonal relationships, the implications are significant. In the literary model, couples might share and revisit a poem, letter, or novel as a touchstone, returning to it in times of conflict or joy. In the social media model, each partner's touchstones are continually replaced, often without the other's awareness. The lack of a stable, shared archive makes it more difficult to negotiate differences or build mutual understanding over time.

Thus, while literature's permanence enables a reflective, communal approach to relational knowledge, social media's ephemerality fosters a fragmented, rapidly shifting set of norms. The former supports depth and continuity; the latter prioritizes novelty and individual segmentation. This temporal disjuncture not only disrupts the connective function literature has historically played but also exacerbates the contradictions explored in the next section.

Artistry vs. Algorithm

Contradiction has long been a feature of relational discourse in literature, but within the literary tradition it operates as a purposeful artistic device. Poets and novelists have used paradox, irony, and conflicting imagery to evoke the complexity of human relationships, inviting readers to hold multiple truths in mind simultaneously. The metaphysical poets, for instance, delighted in such tensions: John Donne's "A Valediction: Forbidding Mourning" instructs lovers to part without grief, even as the poem's conceit — the lovers as two legs of a compass — underscores their unbreakable connection (Donne 25). The contradiction between

emotional detachment and enduring unity is deliberate, compelling the reader to contemplate the coexistence of seeming opposites.

Similarly, W. B. Yeats's "Aedh Wishes for the Cloths of Heaven" presents the lover's vulnerability as both a gift and a risk: offering dreams to the beloved while warning them to "tread softly because you tread on my dreams" (Yeats 8). The contradiction here — between the generosity of giving and the caution of self-protection — does not seek resolution. Instead, it illuminates the fragility inherent in intimacy. This purposeful deployment of contradiction expands interpretive possibilities and deepens empathy, as readers must negotiate the tension themselves.

In literature, contradictions are anchored in a stable text, which allows them to be revisited and reinterpreted over time. A reader may find one element more persuasive in youth and another in maturity, but the coexistence of both elements within the same work ensures that the contradiction remains a shared reference point. This sharedness enables dialogue; readers can compare interpretations without disputing the textual facts.

Social media, by contrast, often produces contradiction not as a deliberate rhetorical choice but as a structural byproduct of personalization algorithms. The segmentation of audiences into discrete content streams means that contradictory relational imperatives are delivered to different users without acknowledgment of their opposition. As discussed earlier, male-coded accounts might receive advice to maintain emotional distance to preserve "high value," while female-coded accounts are told to demand constant reassurance as proof of love. Each set of advice, in isolation, may seem internally coherent to its target audience, but when these audiences interact in real life, their expectations collide.

Unlike literary contradictions, which are presented openly to all readers, algorithmic contradictions are hidden — each user experiences only their version of "truth." There is no common textual space where both versions coexist and can be examined side by side. Consequently, rather than fostering reflection, these contradictions tend to generate confusion, mistrust, and conflict in interpersonal relationships.

Moreover, because social media feeds prioritize recency and engagement, contradictory advice can appear sequentially even within the same user's feed. A person might encounter a popular "no-contact" strategy for attracting a partner one week, followed by a viral video promoting constant communication the next. Without the framing that literature provides — where contradiction is contextualized within a single work or tradition — these shifts can appear arbitrary or undermine confidence in any relational guidance altogether. The absence of authorial intention means the contradictions have no interpretive anchor; they are the incidental result of an algorithm's attempt to maximize engagement by offering variety and novelty.

The epistemic effect is significant. In literature, contradiction often signals complexity, encouraging the reader to tolerate ambiguity and resist reductive conclusions. In social media, contradiction frequently signals instability — the sense that "experts" cannot agree or that rules change without reason. For users seeking guidance, this instability can lead to cognitive

overload or the selective adoption of whichever advice aligns with preexisting biases, further entrenching polarization.

There is also a difference in accountability. Literary authorship is identifiable and subject to critique. Contradictions in an author's oeuvre can be examined within the broader context of their life, period, and thematic concerns. Self-proclaimed social media psychologists, however, are rarely held to such scrutiny; they can pivot between contradictory positions without addressing inconsistencies, knowing the platform's memory is short and audiences are segmented. The absence of an enduring textual archive makes it difficult to trace or challenge these shifts.

In essence, literature's contradictions are intentional provocations toward deeper understanding, while social media's contradictions are incidental artifacts of a system that prioritizes engagement over coherence. The former enriches the relational lexicon; the latter fragments it. Understanding this distinction is crucial for assessing how each medium shapes expectations and behaviors in relationships.

The next section extends this analysis by focusing on how these contradictions are distributed along gender lines through audience segmentation — an important dynamic in both historical literary traditions and contemporary algorithmic feeds.

The segmentation of relational narratives along gender lines is not unique to the digital age. Historically, literary production and consumption have often been organized around gendered genres and audiences. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, for example, the domestic novel, epitomized by authors like Jane Austen and Elizabeth Gaskell, was marketed primarily to women and focused on courtship, marriage, and the moral duties of domestic life (Poovey 27). Simultaneously, male readers were more likely to encounter adventure tales, political treatises, or epic poetry, in which relational themes were often subordinated to public or heroic narratives.

Yet despite these distinctions, the literary canon remained broadly accessible to all literate audiences. Men could — and did — read Austen; women could and did engage with Milton or Byron. Even when texts embodied gendered perspectives, they circulated in a common public sphere where cross-gender reading was possible and, in many cases, encouraged. This accessibility allowed for a certain permeability between gendered narrative worlds, enabling dialogue and empathy across the divide.

Poetry, in particular, often blurred gendered boundaries. Male poets wrote from the perspective of female voices, as in Edmund Spenser's *Amoretti*, while women like Christina Rossetti and Emily Dickinson addressed themes of desire, autonomy, and loss in ways that could speak to readers regardless of gender. Such textual cross-pollination challenged rigid audience segmentation and fostered a shared interpretive field. The presence of multiple, sometimes conflicting, gendered voices within the same corpus meant that readers could compare perspectives and negotiate relational norms with an awareness of their diversity.

In contrast, contemporary social media platforms often enforce a stricter separation of audiences through algorithmic personalization. The process begins with seemingly neutral

engagement signals — a user's interaction with particular videos, hashtags, or accounts — but quickly leads to the construction of a gender-coded feed. Research has demonstrated that within hours, new male-coded accounts on TikTok begin to receive content from influencers associated with the "manosphere," promoting themes of self-reliance, dominance, and suspicion toward romantic partners (Ribeiro et al. 5). These streams often frame emotional openness as weakness, discouraging vulnerability in relationships.

Female-coded accounts, by comparison, are often directed toward the "tradwife" movement, "divine feminine" coaching, and therapeutic-style self-help advice. This content frequently emphasizes emotional labor, accommodation, and the cultivation of traits designed to appeal to male partners. Even when couched in language of empowerment, the underlying message often reinforces conventional gender roles, suggesting that relational success depends on aligning with a prescriptive ideal of femininity (Ingle 142).

The consequence is the formation of two parallel advice ecosystems, each internally coherent but largely invisible to the other. A man influenced by "alpha male" relationship rhetoric may expect his partner to accept limited emotional disclosure, interpreting this as strength; a woman influenced by "emotional attunement" discourse may expect consistent verbal reassurance, interpreting its absence as neglect. These mismatched expectations are not the product of personal incompatibility alone but of algorithmic curation that has fed each partner a different set of norms.

Unlike historical gendered genres, which at least allowed for mutual access to each other's narratives, algorithmic feeds rarely encourage cross-exposure. A user must actively seek out content outside their assigned niche — an unlikely behavior given that the platform's design rewards engagement with familiar material. As Eli Pariser observes, "The filter bubble isn't invisible—it's just comfortable" (Pariser 15). This comfort fosters epistemic closure, in which one's understanding of relationships is shaped almost entirely by a gender-specific content loop.

This segmentation is particularly insidious because it masquerades as individualized choice. Whereas the marketing of a "ladies' novel" or "men's adventure" was overt, the gendering of social media content is often invisible to the user, embedded in the algorithm's inference mechanisms. The result is a more effective form of audience separation, one that operates without explicit labeling and thus without inviting the critical awareness that overt categorization might provoke.

The implications for relationship dynamics are significant. When partners are effectively trained by their respective feeds to expect behaviors that are mutually exclusive, conflict becomes structurally embedded. The shared interpretive space once offered by literature — where contradictions could be encountered and contemplated together — is replaced by isolated silos that foster misunderstanding. This is not simply a matter of misinformation; it is a matter of divergent cultural conditioning taking place in real time within ostensibly shared social environments.

The Voice of Creative Research

In sum, while gendered perspectives on relationships have always existed, literature historically allowed those perspectives to coexist in a common textual space, encouraging cross-gender engagement and mutual interpretation. Social media's algorithmic segmentation, by contrast, creates a closed-loop system in which each gender receives a curated, and often extreme, version of relational norms. The connective function of literature is thus undermined, not by the existence of difference, but by the engineered absence of shared access to that difference.

Bridging the Divide: Lessons from Literature

Literature's connective power offers practical lessons for digital platforms. Its multiplicity allows conflicting voices to coexist, encouraging empathy and "narrative imagination" (Nussbaum 95). Social media could mirror this by interleaving contrasting viewpoints instead of reinforcing silos.

Equally important is permanence with accessibility. Canonical texts endure because they can be revisited and critiqued over time. Platforms might emulate this by curating "evergreen" relationship content, balancing new trends with stable reference points.

The communal dimension of literature — readings, clubs, and shared syllabi — suggests digital analogues such as cross-audience forums or "shared content days." These could restore common reference points for relational dialogue.

Literature also models how to handle contradiction. From Donne to Kamala Das, poets have openly embraced paradox as part of intimacy. Platforms might adapt this by surfacing opposing advice side by side, prompting reflection rather than confusion.

Finally, literature insists on authorship and ethics. Identifiable writers are accountable for their voices, unlike many online influencers. Verified experts, archival transparency, and ethical review boards could strengthen digital relationship discourse.

Bridging the divide does not mean turning social media into literature, but adapting literature's practices — multiplicity, permanence, community, contradiction, accountability, and ethics — to digital systems. Doing so would transform fragmented feeds into connective spaces.

Conclusion

This study compared literature's stable, pluralistic narratives with the fragmented advice streams of algorithmic social media. Where literature connects through permanence, contradiction, and shared accessibility, digital platforms often disrupt through ephemerality, personalization, and gendered silos. Historically, even gendered literary traditions circulated in common archives, allowing cross-gender engagement. Today's feeds, however, isolate men and women in contradictory advice ecosystems, heightening relational conflict. The rise of unverified "self-proclaimed psychologists" further destabilizes discourse, replacing accountable authorship with algorithmic churn. To counter this, the paper proposed literary-inspired interventions: curating evergreen content, interleaving divergent perspectives, fostering communal engagement, highlighting contradictions intentionally, verifying creators, and embedding ethical review. Together, these strategies adapt literature's connective ethos to

digital realities. For scholarship, the implications are twofold: literature remains a repository of relational wisdom, and the humanities can help redesign digital platforms. For practice, educators, policymakers, and technologists can draw from literary traditions to build systems that reconnect — guiding relationships not through fragmented feeds but through a common cultural dialogue.

Works Cited

1. Ali, Agha Shahid. *The Rebel's Silhouette: Selected Poems*. University of Massachusetts Press, 1995.

2. Assmann, Jan. *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*. Translated by Rodney Livingstone, Cambridge UP, 2011.

3. Barker, Meg-John. *The Psychology of Gender and Sexuality: An Introduction*. Routledge, 2019.

4. Basch, Corey H., et al. "Public Health Communication in the Age of TikTok: Analysis of Misinformation and Accuracy in Health-Related Videos." *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, vol. 23, no. 10, 2021, p. e29594.

5. Bloom, Harold. *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages*. Harcourt Brace, 1994.

6. Burns, Robert. *Poems, Chiefly in the Scottish Dialect*. Edited by James Kinsley, Oxford UP, 1969.

7. Das, Kamala. *Summer in Calcutta*. Edited by Rajinder Paul, Everest Press, 1965.

8. Donne, John. *The Complete English Poems*. Edited by C. A. Patrides, Everyman, 1996.

9. Eliot, T. S. *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism*. Harvard UP, 1933.

10. Fisher, Max. *The Chaos Machine: The Inside Story of How Social Media Rewired Our Minds and Our World*. Little, Brown, 2022.

11. Gillespie, Tarleton. *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, Content Moderation, and the Hidden Decisions That Shape Social Media*. Yale UP, 2018.

12. Greenblatt, Stephen. *Will in the World: How Shakespeare Became Shakespeare*. W. W. Norton, 2004.

13. Hardy, Thomas. *The Complete Poems*. Edited by James Gibson, Macmillan, 1976.

14. Ingle, Stephanie. "#Tradwife: Digital Domesticity and the Rebranding of Traditional Gender Roles." *Feminist Media Studies*, vol. 21, no. 5, 2021, pp. 123–44.

15. Keats, John. *The Complete Poems*. Edited by John Barnard, Penguin Classics, 2012.

16. Leaver, Tama, et al. *TikTok: Creativity and Culture in Short Videos*. Polity Press, 2022.

17. Luscombe, Belinda. "The Rise of the Self-Proclaimed Psychologist." *Time*, 12 Oct. 2022.

18. Marsh, Jan. *Christina Rossetti: A Literary Biography*. Random House, 1994.

19. Neruda, Pablo. *The Captain's Verses*. Translated by Donald D. Walsh, New Directions, 1972.

20. Nussbaum, Martha C. *Poetic Justice: The Literary Imagination and Public Life*. Beacon Press, 1995.

21. Papadamou, Katerina, et al. "Manosphere Influence on TikTok: An Exploratory Analysis." *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, vol. 16, 2022, pp. 1010–14.

22. Paramasivam, M. *Thirukkural: A Guide to the Sacred Couplets*. Oxford UP, 2003.

23. Pariser, Eli. *The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You*. Penguin Press, 2011.

24. Poovey, Mary. *The Proper Lady and the Woman Writer: Ideology as Style in the Works of Mary Wollstonecraft, Mary Shelley, and Jane Austen*. U of Chicago P, 1984.

25. Raghavan, V. *Studies in Kalidasa*. Motilal Banarsidass, 1984.

26. Ribeiro, Manoel Horta, et al. "Auditing Radicalization Pathways on YouTube." *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, ACM, 2020, pp. 131–41.

27. Rossetti, Christina. *The Complete Poems*. Edited by R. W. Crump, Louisiana State UP, 1979.

28. Shakespeare, William. *The Sonnets*. Edited by Katherine Duncan-Jones, Arden Shakespeare, 2010.

29. Spenser, Edmund. *Amoretti and Epithalamion*. Edited by Maurice Evans, Penguin Classics, 1989.

30. Thiruvalluvar. *Tirukkural*. Translated by G. U. Pope, Asian Educational Services, 2000.

31. Yeats, W. B. *The Collected Poems of W. B. Yeats*. Macmillan, 1933.

32. Zuboff, Shoshana. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. PublicAffairs, 2019.