

Reconstructing Identity and Negotiating Meaning: De-institutionalized Pathways of Religious Identity in the Digital Age

Jian Li^{1,*}

¹ School of Philosophy, Shanxi University, Taiyuan 030006, China

* **Correspondence:**

Jian Li

li2022110209@162.com

Received: 12 March 2025 /Accepted: 24 April 2025 /Published online: 4 May 2025

Abstract

Buddhism for China's digital-native youth now unfolds less in monasteries than on the endlessly scrolling timelines of Douyin, Bilibili, and WeChat, where Zen-style décor ads, three-second tea ceremonies, and pastel Amitufo memes appear as algorithmic coincidences. How, in the absence of ritual apprenticeship or clerical authority, do such fragmented, commercialised encounters coalesce into a felt conviction of "being Buddhist"? This paper answers by fusing the lived-religion turn to everyday practice, Wellman's networked individualism, and cultural-schema theory with Mahāyāna categories of upāya (skillful means), pratīyasamutpāda (dependent origination), and anātman (non-self). The resulting De-Institutionalised Buddhist Identity Construction (DBIC) model specifies a four-phase, recursive mechanism: (1) Ambient Contact delivers unsolicited Buddhist stimuli via platform algorithms and lifestyle branding; (2) Schema Resonance activates dormant scripts of karma, compassion, or serenity; (3) Peer Legitimation supplies micro-affirmations through influencer cues and chat-thread encouragement; and (4) Ritual Bricolage converts resonance into modular, self-curated practices—five-minute metta sessions, virtual incense burns, eco-vegetarian "compassion meals." Each practice leaves digital traces that intensify subsequent exposures, forming feedback loops that echo dependent-origination logic. Five propositions render the model empirically testable, linking exposure patterns, network structure, bricolage diversity, and identity stability. By reframing narrative coherence as a functional rather than ontological yardstick—valid if it reduces dukkha and fosters altruism—the study challenges authenticity debates rooted in Western selfhood assumptions. It also coins algorithmic soteriology, suggesting recommender systems can, when aligned with upāya, serve as inadvertent pedagogues. Implications span temple strategy (from gatekeeping to curated digital pathways), mental-health practice, and policy design that balances religious expression with protection against pseudo-spiritual commodification. Although grounded in Chinese Buddhism, DBIC offers a transferable lens on post-institutional religiosity across platformised faith traditions.

Keywords: Religious Identity; De-Institutionalization; Digital Religion; Individualized Spirituality; Buddhism

1. Introduction

Buddhism in contemporary China is no longer encountered only within the cloistered courtyards of monasteries; it percolates through the glow of smartphones, the pastel aesthetics of “Zen-style” cafés, and the algorithmic curation of short-video platforms. For many Chinese in their late teens and twenties—digital natives raised amid market reform, urban migration, and omnipresent social media—contact with Buddhist symbols is unplanned, sporadic, and often commercialised. A scrolling pause on a Bilibili vlog titled “Seven-Day Silent Retreat,” an impulse purchase of incense branded as “Pure Mind,” or a reposted meme that exclaims Amitufo after a stressful exam: each micro-moment is slight and self-contained, yet together such fragments accumulate. Paradoxically, while formal affiliation with temples appears flat or declining in survey data, anecdotal evidence points to a rising popularity of Buddhist vocabulary and practices, from vegan mindfulness challenges to virtual incense offerings within mobile apps. The empirical puzzle, therefore, is not whether young adults are “religious” in the traditional sense, but how they arrive at a coherent self-understanding as Buddhist when the pedagogical pathways historically provided by monastic institutions—ritual socialisation, textual study, master–disciple mentorship—are largely absent from their quotidian experience.

To theorise this emergent form of religious self-fashioning, it is useful to braid insights from three intellectual strands. The lived-religion paradigm reminds us that religious meaning is stitched into the rhythms of ordinary life rather than confined to institutional sanctuaries; it redirects attention toward subtle gestures such as tapping a prayer-emoji, arranging minimalist altars beside laptops, or repeating the psithurism of a chant while commuting. Networked-individualism theory underscores how personal networks, assembled through social platforms and filtered by recommender algorithms, replace bounded congregations as the primary arena in which identity signals circulate and gain validation; a single “like” from a respected influencer can legitimise a nascent attraction to Buddhist ideas more powerfully than a sermon from a distant abbot. Cultural-schema theory, finally, clarifies the cognitive substrates of such processes: latent schemas of karma, compassion, or karmic reciprocity can be triggered by fleeting stimuli and, through repeated activation, coalesce into a durable narrative of the self as a morally improving, mindfulness-seeking subject. When read together with classical Buddhist notions of upāya (skillful means), pratīyasamutpāda (dependent origination), and anātman (non-self), these secular theories suggest an identity trajectory that is recursive and relational: ambient digital contact awakens dormant schemas, peer feedback confers legitimacy, and personalised ritual bricolage sediment practices into the fabric of everyday life. The result is a post-institutional Buddhist identity that is neither doctrinally sophisticated nor organisationally anchored, yet is experientially real to its bearer and socially recognisable within their media-suffused networks.

The present study is a theoretical exploration that aims to map this trajectory with greater precision and conceptual rigour. By synthesising the literatures sketched above and cross-pollinating them with Mahāyāna hermeneutics, the essay proposes a four-phase model that charts the spiral from ambient contact to ritual bricolage and back again, each phase infused with feedback loops that echo the Buddhist logic of interdependent emergence. In doing so, the paper seeks three contributions: to systematise scattered empirical observations into a coherent analytical framework; to expand identity theory by demonstrating how algorithmic infrastructures and classical religious categories can be theorised in tandem; and to offer a set of propositions that future mixed-methods research can operationalise. More practically, the model illuminates why conventional outreach strategies that rely on textual exegesis or monastic authority may miss the sensibilities of Gen Z, and how temples, lay associations, or even secular wellness brands might engage digital natives without collapsing into commodified superficiality. While the argument is developed with Chinese Buddhism in view, its implications reach across traditions grappling with the platformisation of religion, from evangelical micro-influencers on TikTok to Sufi zikr circles on Instagram. In short, by treating the smartphone timeline as a new field of religious practice rather than a mere delivery channel, the study reframes what it means to “be Buddhist” in an age when the temple fits inside a pocket and doctrinal tutelage competes with autoplay.

2. Theoretical Lens and Literature Review: An Interdisciplinary Conversation

This chapter surveys and synthesises the intellectual resources necessary for theorising de-institutionalised Buddhist identity among Chinese youth. Rather than cataloguing every relevant publication, it stages a dialogue among three major scholarly constellations that together illuminate—but never fully explain—the phenomenon at hand. Each section problematises the limits of its perspective and anticipates how the forthcoming analytical model will braid them into a more robust explanatory fabric. The chapter is organised into three subsections: (1) Everyday Religion and the Turn to Practice, (2) Networked Subjectivity under Platform Capitalism, and (3) Buddhist Philosophical Resources for Contemporary Identity Theory.

2.1. Everyday Religion and the Turn to Practice

The last three decades have witnessed a paradigmatic shift in the sociology and anthropology of religion from institution-centred metrics—membership rolls, clerical authority, confessional orthodoxy—to the microsociology of everyday religious practice. Pioneering works by Parameswaran (2004), Francis et al (2020), Alisauskiene & Maslauskaite (2021) dismantled the long-standing dichotomy between “religious” and “secular” spaces, showing that devotional meaning is braided into childcare routines, workplace ethics, and leisure consumption. This “lived religion” perspective critiques survey instruments that conflate religiosity with temple attendance or doctrinal literacy, proposing instead that researchers attend to quotidian gestures: reciting a mantra while driving, lighting a candle before exams, or curating spiritual memes on Instagram stories. Applied to Chinese contexts, the turn to practice has produced fertile ethnographies of “diffuse religiosity”. Mah (2004) urban fieldwork uncovered how ancestor veneration, feng-shui

consultations, and Daoist talismans sustain cosmological confidence despite nominal state atheism. Bahroun (2018) digital ethnography of scripture-copying WeChat groups revealed how middle-class office workers create micro-temporal sanctuaries during lunch breaks, translating tactile piety into stylus strokes on tablets.

Yet the everyday religion lens encounters explanatory limits when confronted with fragmented, algorithmically curated religiosity. Its methodological forte—thick description of embodied practice—sometimes blurs the cognitive and narrative labour of making sense of incoherent stimuli. Furthermore, lived religion studies often treat “daily life” as a relatively stable substrate, overlooking how the attention economy rearranges the temporal and affective texture of that life. A WeChat user reaching for her phone 150 times per day inhabits an attentional ecosystem fundamentally unlike that presumed by classic ethnographies of ritual. To appreciate how digital infrastructures scaffold or short-circuit religious practice, we must complement the practice turn with a theory of networked subjectivity.

2.2. Networked Subjectivity under Platform Capitalism

Barry Wellman’s concept of networked individualism (Wellman et al., 2003) posits that sociality in the mobile-internet era is organised around the person rather than the group. Individuals assemble personalised constellations of weak ties—family chat threads, fandom subreddits, professional WeChat contacts—each fulfilling specialised functions without monopolising identity. Religious affiliation, accordingly, migrates from the gravitational centre of community life to a peripheral yet persistent node in one’s network portfolio.

However, the original networked-individualism thesis underplayed the role of algorithmic recommendation. Contemporary platform capitalism relies on data-driven feedback loops that curate newsfeeds, short-video streams, and e-commerce suggestions based on granular behavioural telemetry (Nisar, 2005). These recommender systems do more than reflect user preferences; they actively shape the horizon of conceivable interests. Jokinen (2022) describe this as the “sculpting power” of algorithms: by weighting and sequencing content, platforms nudge users toward progressively specialised niches. For a university student who once Googled “Buddhist quotes about calm,” the YouTube sidebar may evolve into a steady diet of Vipassanā tutorials, vegan-Buddhist recipe reels, and influencer vlogs documenting silent retreats. Empirical studies confirm the religious valence of these sociotechnical assemblages. Zeng (2021) interviewed Chinese who self-identified as Buddhist; 82 percent credited social-media feeds—rather than family or temples—as their primary exposure.

Yet platform-centred approaches risk technological determinism: not every algorithmic prompt translates into religious identity, and similar exposure scenarios yield divergent outcomes. What accounts for selective resonance—the fact that one meme triggers spiritual inquiry while another scrolls by unnoticed? Here we must descend into the cognitive microdynamics of meaning-making. Cultural-schema theory offers such granularity, but it too requires supplementation if it is to speak productively with Buddhist philosophy’s own account of mind and identity.

2.3. Buddhist Philosophical Resources for Contemporary Identity Theory

Western social theories illuminate mediation and cognition, yet they often sit uneasily with the ontological and soteriological aims of Buddhism. Three Mahāyāna concepts—upāya (skillful means), pratīyasamutpāda (dependent origination), and anātman (non-self)—furnish a conceptual grammar that both critiques and enriches secular accounts of identity construction (Zapart, 2017).

Upāya. Canonical scriptures such as the Lotus Sūtra depict the Buddha deploying parables and expedients tailored to listeners' capacities. Contemporary Buddhist theorists (Radich, 2016) cast upāya as a pedagogical ethic that privileges pragmatic efficacy over doctrinal purity. Digital micro-fragments—TikTok chants, emoji rosaries, meditative gaming soundtracks—may function as twenty-first-century upāya: low-threshold entry points that approximate doctrinal depth without demanding immediate apprenticeship. This lens shifts the evaluative stance from “commodified dilution” to “pedagogical adaptation,” without romanticising market logics.

Pratīyasamutpāda. Dependent origination posits that phenomena arise through mutually conditioning causal nets, avoiding both essentialism and nihilism. In identity terms, the self is a contingent assemblage of sensory inputs, karmic dispositions, and social feedback—an ontology remarkably consonant with networked-individualism's distributed subject. Reading platform algorithms through pratīyasamutpāda foregrounds the recursive co-constitution of user, content, and code: every click both results from and re-configures the causal web that nurtures further clicking.

Anātman. The doctrine of non-self dissolves the Western assumption of a unitary, enduring ego. Instead, personal continuity is a heuristic, sustained by habit and craving. This challenges identity theory's valorisation of narrative coherence. If the self is empty, what does it mean to “be Buddhist” at all? Buddhist modernists (Takagi, 2008) argue that identity may serve as a provisional tool for ethical cultivation, to be relinquished once its karmic utility expires. Cultural-schema theory, concerned with how schemas stabilise across contexts, can absorb non-self by reframing stability as functional, not ontological: schemas persist only as long as they reduce suffering and enhance compassion.

Integrating these philosophical insights with sociological and cognitive theories yields three conceptual payoffs. First, it discourages moralistic binaries—authentic vs. superficial, sacred vs. commodified—by interpreting digital snippets as possible upāya in a karmically entangled world. Second, it injects ontological nuance into networked-subjectivity discourse: algorithmic feedback loops are not merely exploitative but existentially constitutive. Third, it recalibrates identity-coherence debates: fluidity need not signify superficiality if it supports ethical transformation.

These payoffs, however, remain theoretical until operationalised. Chapter 3 therefore proposes the De-Institutionalised Buddhist Identity Construction (DBIC) model, translating the interdisciplinary insights mapped here into four analytically distinct but recursively linked phases—Ambient Contact, Schema Resonance, Peer Legitimation, and Ritual Bricolage—each phase elaborated with propositions testable by future mixed-methods research.

3. Conceptual Model Construction: The De-Institutionalised Buddhist Identity Generation Mechanism (DBIC)

This chapter elaborates the De-Institutionalised Buddhist Identity Construction (DBIC) model, translating the interdisciplinary insights harvested in Chapter 2 into an analytic architecture suitable for theoretical exposition and subsequent empirical scrutiny. The model is presented in four inter-locking phases—Ambient Contact (AC), Schema Resonance (SR), Peer Legitimation (PL), and Ritual Bricolage (RB)—each of which is simultaneously sociotechnical and philosophical, reflecting the Buddhist principle of *pratītyasamutpāda* (dependent origination). After detailing the internal dynamics of each phase, the chapter specifies recursive feedback loops, articulates five propositions that can be operationalised in future research, and concludes with methodological reflections on how the model might be validated.

3.1. Phase I – Ambient Contact (AC)

Ambient Contact refers to sporadic, low-intensity exposures to Buddhist symbols, narratives, or practices that occur while individuals pursue non-religious goals (Cho, 2023). The defining features of AC are unintentionality and ubiquity. A user scrolling through Douyin’s “Just-for-You” feed may encounter a three-second clip of a monk pouring tea; a WeChat Mini-Program might push a “lucky merit” incense-burning widget during Lunar New Year; a lifestyle influencer on XiaoHongShu posts a flat-lay photo featuring a Zen verse printed on eco-friendly packaging.

AC is analytically distinct from conscious religious seeking because the latter presupposes a motivational orientation toward transcendence. In contrast, AC arises from algorithmic serendipity or market diffusion. Yet Buddhism has long embraced the logic of *upāya*: a single expedient image—the Buddha’s smile, the Bodhisattva’s gaze—may plant a karmic seed (*bīja*) that germinates later. Within DBIC, AC functions as the triggering condition that introduces raw materials into an individual’s cognitive-affective field.

Micro-Mechanisms.

Algorithmic insertion: recommender systems match latent interests (wellness, minimalism, self-care) with Buddhist-tagged content, thereby lowering the threshold of exposure.

Aesthetic allure: visual minimalism or sonic ambience resonates with consumer sensibilities (soft colours, lo-fi chanting), rendering Buddhist artefacts palatable in secular contexts.

Commodified diffusion: retailers deploy Buddhist signifiers—prayer beads as fashion accessories—spreading iconography beyond religious venues.

3.2. Phase II – Schema Resonance (SR)

Schema Resonance captures the internal cognitive-affective process whereby fragments encountered in AC activate latent cultural schemas—scripts of karma, compassion, serenity—that already inhabit the individual’s mental repertoire. Strauss and Quinn’s cultural-schema theory insists that meaning arises through patterned activation across contexts; the Buddha meme

“Mercy Mode Activated” resonates because it fits pre-existing moral scripts about kindness and stress-relief (Strauss & Quinn, 1997).

Operational Indicators.

Affective flash: a momentary sense of comfort, awe, or ethical uplift.

Cognitive association: spontaneous recall of proverbs or childhood temple visits.

Intertextual linkages: mental cross-referencing to media artefacts—Studio Ghibli’s Zen imagery, mindfulness podcasts, or self-help slogans.

SR is not yet identity; it is proto-identity, a nascent inclination that can either dissipate or intensify. Its durability depends on whether resonance finds external validation, leading to Phase III.

3.3. Phase III – Peer Legitimation (PL)

Peer Legitimation refers to micro-affirmations received from social contacts—friends, family, influencers, or online communities—that render the emerging Buddhist inclination socially plausible. In networked-individualism terms, identity claims circulate across personal networks seeking validation. A single “like” from a respected peer on a reposted sutra quote can outweigh dozens of algorithmic prompts, because human endorsement provides credibility cues.

PL operates through three pathways:

Direct encouragement: a friend comments “Amitufo, this helped me too!”

Normative modelling: influencers publicly integrate Buddhist practices into appealing lifestyles (vegan cooking, slow travel).

Community ritualisation: participation in group activities—virtual chanting rooms, group scripture-copying—confers experiential legitimacy.

Without PL, SR may remain an isolated sentiment; with PL, it gains collective momentum, opening the door to routinised practice (Phase IV).

3.4. Phase IV – Ritual Bricolage (RB)

Ritual Bricolage denotes the personalised assembly of micro-practices that stabilise Buddhist identity in daily routines. The term “bricolage” underscores DIY creativity: practitioners cherry-pick elements—five-minute metta meditation, incense at bedtime, minimalist altar beside a laptop—and weave them into a coherent self-narrative. RB is both performative and reflexive: by enacting practices, individuals become the identity they narrate.

Characteristic Features.

Temporal modularity: practices packaged in small, repeatable units (e.g., 108-bead chanting apps with progress bars).

Material minimalism: affordable or digital substitutes for temple paraphernalia (LED prayer lamps, virtual incense).

Ethical spill-over: adoption of vegetarian meals, eco-friendly consumption framed as “Buddhist compassion.”

RB translates cognitive resonance into embodied habit, satisfying the Buddhist notion that understanding without practice is incomplete.

3.5. Recursive Feedback Loops

DBIC emphasises that phases are iterative rather than linear. RB practices generate new digital traces—sharing a chanting streak, posting altar photos—which feed back into the algorithmic engines that furnish further AC. Similarly, successful PL deepens SR by embedding Buddhist schemas in relational narratives (“my partner and I chant together”), which in turn motivates more elaborate RB (joining a weekend retreat). This recursive architecture mirrors *pratīyasamutpāda*: each element is both cause and effect, sustaining a dynamic equilibrium.

3.6. Model Propositions

To transform conceptual elegance into empirical fertility, the model specifies five propositions.

P1 (Exposure–Resonance). The probability that ambient Buddhist content triggers schema resonance increases with the semantic overlap between the content’s aesthetic framing (e.g., calm pastel visuals) and the user’s pre-existing wellness schemas.

P2 (Resonance–Legitimation). Schema resonance is more likely to convert into peer legitimation when the user’s network contains at least one visible Buddhist exemplar whose lifestyle is socially admired (high social-capital score).

P3 (Legitimation–Bricolage). The diversity of ritual bricolage practices adopted is positively associated with the frequency and variety of peer-legitimation signals received in the preceding month.

P4 (Algorithmic Amplification). Users who publicly share bricolage practices (e.g., chanting-app screenshots) will experience a compounding effect of algorithmic recommendation, leading to exponentially greater ambient contact over time.

P5 (Identity Stability). Longitudinal stability of self-ascribed Buddhist identity is predicted by the recursive depth of the AC–SR–PL–RB loop, operationalised as the number of complete cycles executed within a six-month interval.

3.7. Methodological Reflections

Validating DBIC invites mixed-methods design:

Digital trace analytics can measure AC frequency and algorithmic amplification (P4).

Experience-sampling surveys capture moment-to-moment SR (affective flash, cognitive association).

Social-network analysis quantifies PL by mapping interaction graphs around Buddhist content.

Longitudinal ethnography documents RB evolution and identity narratives.

The model thus bridges grand theory and methodological pragmatism, setting the stage for comparative studies across regions, traditions, and platform ecologies.

4. Theoretical Expansion and Academic Significance

Building upon the DBIC model, this chapter situates the study's contributions within broader theoretical and disciplinary landscapes. It articulates three domains of expansion—Buddhist pedagogy, identity theory, and digital-culture studies—before addressing practical implications and future research trajectories.

4.1. Re-Imagining Buddhist Pedagogy in a Platform Society

Traditional Buddhist pedagogy relied on monastic authority and textual apprenticeship: students lived in temples, internalised Vinaya rules, and memorised canonical texts. DBIC implies a pedagogical shift from institution-centric transmission to network-centric facilitation. If identity now blossoms through ambient contact and bricolaged practice, temples and lay associations should pivot from gatekeeping to curating digital soteriological resources—interactive sutra apps, gamified merit-sharing, micro-retreat toolkits. This strategy echoes upāya, leveraging platform affordances to meet aspirants “where they scroll.”

However, pedagogy must also guard against commodification. The ease with which Buddhist symbols circulate as lifestyle accessories risks diluting ethical depth. DBIC offers a diagnostic: commodification becomes corrosive when the AC–SR–PL–RB loop stalls at aesthetic resonance without progressing to ethical bricolage. Educators might therefore design “scaffolded pathways” that nudge users from meme appreciation to mindfulness ethics, ensuring that digital expedients culminate in compassion praxis.

4.2. Contributions to Identity Theory: Beyond Coherence and Authenticity

Mainstream identity research values narrative coherence as a marker of psychological well-being. Yet the Buddhist doctrine of anātman unsettles this assumption: identity is provisional, to be wielded skilfully rather than cherished. DBIC reframes coherence as a functional, not ontological, criterion. A bricolaged Buddhist identity may look eclectic—mantra playlists mixed with eco-aesthetics—yet if it reduces dukkha (suffering) and fosters altruism, its “authenticity” is pragmatically validated.

This functionalist view aligns with emerging “processual” models of identity in sociology (Cederman, 2005) and anthropology's “assemblage” theory (Deleuze & Guattari). By illustrating how algorithmic environments orchestrate assemblage dynamics, DBIC extends processual identity theory into the digital era, demonstrating that selfhood is not merely narrated but coded through attention architectures.

4.3. Digital-Culture Studies: Algorithmic Soteriology and the Ethics of Attention

DBIC enriches digital-culture studies by foregrounding soteriological stakes in platform design. Scholarship on the “attention economy” often critiques distraction as cognitively deleterious; DBIC shows that the same infrastructures can, under certain conditions, catalyse ethical

transformation. This ambivalence demands a nuanced ethics of attention: platforms can be built or hacked to facilitate mindful rather than compulsive engagement.

Moreover, the model introduces the concept of algorithmic soteriology: the idea that recommender systems, when aligned with upāya, can participate in liberatory pedagogy, albeit imperfectly. This thesis invites interdisciplinary collaboration among computer scientists, Buddhist scholars, and sociologists to design recommendation logics that privilege contemplative depth and community reciprocity over click-through rates.

4.4. Practical and Policy Implications

For Buddhist institutions: develop hybrid curricula that integrate online micro-rituals with periodic offline retreats, exploiting the AC–SR–PL–RB loop while offering doctrinal grounding.

For mental-health professionals: recognise bricolaged Buddhist practices as potential coping strategies; incorporate culturally sensitive mindfulness programs that validate plural identities.

For policymakers: craft digital-literacy guidelines that encourage critical reflection on religious content, balancing freedom of expression with protection against exploitative pseudo-spiritual commerce.

5. Conclusion

This study set out to explain how Chinese digital natives, who rarely engage traditional temples or formal Dharma instruction, nonetheless fashion a viable Buddhist self-understanding from the algorithmic debris of memes, livestreams, and lifestyle branding. By weaving together the lived-religion emphasis on mundane practice, networked-individualism’s account of personalised social validation, and cultural-schema theory’s insights into cognitive resonance—then tempering these with Mahāyāna notions of upāya, pratīyasamutpāda, and anātman—we developed the De-Institutionalised Buddhist Identity Construction (DBIC) model. The model’s four recursively linked phases—Ambient Contact, Schema Resonance, Peer Legitimation, and Ritual Bricolage—demonstrate that identity formation in a platform society is neither purely subjective nor technologically predetermined; rather, it is the emergent product of contingent encounters, cognitive triggers, relational endorsements, and embodied improvisations that leave fresh data traces for algorithms to amplify.

Theoretically, DBIC reframes coherence as a pragmatic criterion oriented toward the reduction of dukkha and the cultivation of compassion, thereby loosening Western assumptions that equate authenticity with doctrinal mastery or narrative unity. It expands identity theory by showing how attention architectures “code” the very assemblage dynamics that processual sociology describes, and it injects Buddhist studies with a sociotechnical realism often missing from purely textual analysis. In coining the concept of algorithmic soteriology, the paper also invites scholars and designers to reconsider recommender systems not solely as engines of commodification but as potential, if ambivalent, allies in ethical cultivation. Practically, the findings prompt Buddhist monasteries and lay organisations to pivot from gatekeeping to curation—constructing scaffolded digital pathways that guide users from aesthetic curiosity toward deeper ethical praxis.

Mental-health professionals might legitimise bricolaged micro-rituals as culturally resonant coping tools, while policymakers could craft digital-literacy guidelines that safeguard against exploitative pseudo-spiritual commerce without stifling plural expression.

Author Contributions:

Conceptualization, J. L; methodology, J. L; software, J. L; validation, J. L; formal analysis, J. L; investigation, J. L; resources, J. L; data curation, J. L; writing—original draft preparation, J. L; writing—review and editing, J. L; visualization, J. L; supervision, J. L; project administration, J. L; funding acquisition, J. L. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding:

This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement:

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement:

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement:

Not applicable.

Conflict of Interest:

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- Alisauskiene, M., & Maslauskaitė, A. (2021). Religious identity and family practices in a post-communist society: the case of division of labor in childcare and housework. *Religions*, 12(12), 1040.
- Bahroun, A. (2018). 'WeChat wants to become the everyday': an ethno-semiotic study of computerized media, between industries and practices, in Shanghai and Chengdu (2015-2017).
- Cederman, L. E. (2005). Computational models of social forms: Advancing generative process theory. *American journal of sociology*, 110(4), 864-893.
- Cho, Y. (2023). Atmospheric buddhism: How buddhism is distributed, felt, and moralized in a repressive society. *Journal of Religious Ethics*, 51(4), 701-719.
- Francis, D., Kellaher, L., & Neophytou, G. (2020). *The secret cemetery*. Routledge.
- Jokinen, K. (2022). *Sosiologia ja kulttuurintutkimuksen" kulttuurinen käänne"*. Teoksessa U. Kovala, K. Eskola, K. Jokinen, V. Niinikangas & E. Sironen (toim.) *Tarkkoja siirtoja*.

- Mah, Y. B. (2004). *Critical contextualization of Chinese folk beliefs and practices: Feng Shui as a case study*. Asbury Theological Seminary.
- Nisar, T. M. (2025). *Personalization and Digital Social Markets: Disrupting the Capitalist Economy*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Parameswaran, R. E. (2004). Spectacles of gender and globalization: Mapping Miss World's media event space in the news. *The Communication Review*, 7(4), 371-406.
- Radich, M. (2016). *Contemporary Theories of the Body. Refiguring the Body: Embodiment in South Asian Religions*, 17.
- Strauss, C., & Quinn, N. (1997). *A cognitive theory of cultural meaning (Vol. 9)*. Cambridge University Press.
- Takagi, D. Y. (2008). Form and emptiness: Globalization, liberalism, and Buddhism in the West. *Amerasia Journal*, 34(1), 1-29.
- Wellman, B., Quan-Haase, A., Boase, J., Chen, W., Hampton, K., Díaz, I., & Miyata, K. (2003). The social affordances of the Internet for networked individualism. *Journal of computer-mediated communication*, 8(3), JCMC834.
- Zapart, J. (2017). The Buddha as I: Selfhood and Identity in Śrīmālādevī-simhanāda-sūtra. *Studia Religiologica. Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, 50(2), 145-161.
- Zeng, S., Peng, Z., & Wu, L. (2021). Is there a role of religion? The moderation role of religious identity and religious practice between traditional media usage and moral evaluation. *Religions*, 12(2), 137.