IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

A Study on the Influence of Social Media Algorithms on Public and Political Opinion

Dr. Joselin J[1], Apoor Vaishya R[2], Deeksha U[3], Poornima V[4]
Associate Professor[1]
BCA Students[2,3,4]
Sri Krishna Arts and Science College Coimbatore
joselinj @skasc.ac.in[1], apoorvaishyar23bca009@skasc.ac.in[2],
deekshau23bca014@skasc.ac.in[3], poornimav23bca038@skasc.ac.in[4]

Abstract: *From serving as a forum for personal communication, social media has developed into a major means of disseminating information and forming opinions. Sophisticated algorithms at the heart of these platforms select and tailor content according to user information, such as preferences, previous actions, and interaction history. Although the goal of this algorithmic curation is to improve user experience and engagement, it also has a big impact on political behaviour and public opinion[1]. This study looks at how social media algorithms affect users' perceptions, exposure to different ideologies, and political polarization. It explores the ways in which algorithms magnify and filter information, producing filter bubbles and echo chambers that support preexisting opinions.*

Keywords: *personal communication*

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The History of Social Media Use

The way people obtain information and make decisions has drastically changed over the past 20 years. Social media sites like Facebook, YouTube, Instagram, and X (formerly Twitter) have evolved into more than just networking tools; they are now significant news, opinion, and public discussion sources. Over 4.5 billion people use social media regularly worldwide, and a sizable percentage of them rely on these sites as their main information source, according to recent statistics. The media ecosystem has changed as a result of this pervasive dependence, making it harder to distinguish between activism, entertainment, journalism, and personal content.

1.2 Algorithm-Driven Content Delivery's Ascent

Social media mainly depends on automated algorithms to decide what content is displayed to users, in contrast to traditional media, where editorial control regulates content distribution. These algorithms examine user behavior, including likes, shares, watch time, and clicks, using sophisticated machine learning techniques to create a customized content feed. This results in the selective exposure of information even though it also increases relevance and engagement. Users may unintentionally filter out opposing viewpoints and consume content that supports their interests and beliefs, which could lead to a skewed reality and a limited worldview.

1.3 Importance of the Topic in Today's Digital Democracy

Access to accurate and varied information is essential to the public sphere's health in democracies. Algorithmic personalization, however, brings up issues with ideological segregation, disinformation, and manipulation. Because sensationalist or divisive content tends to garner more engagement, social media's algorithmic architecture can produce feedback loops that encourage it. In elections, policy discussions, and social movements, where inaccurate or biased information can distort public opinion and influence democratic outcomes, this is particularly troubling. This subject is crucial for both scholarly research and policy debates because algorithms have a subtle influence on political discourse.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Overview of Past Studies on Social Media and Political Behaviour

The influence of social media on political behaviour has been the subject of an increasing amount of research. According to research on Facebook users by Bakshy et al. (2015), algorithmic content curation lessens exposure to opposing political viewpoints. Similar to this, a study conducted during the 2016 U.S. election by Allcott and Gentzkow (2017) showed how voter behaviour could be greatly impacted by false information, which is frequently disseminated through algorithmic amplification. Other studies have demonstrated that the content users are algorithmically exposed to has a significant impact on their online political participation, including opinion sharing, group membership, and discussion participation.

2.2 Algorithmic Filtering and Echo Chambers

Echo chambers, or online spaces where users are only exposed to opinions and data that support their preexisting beliefs, are among the most alarming phenomena linked to social media algorithms. The phrase "filter bubble" was first used by Pariser (2011) to characterize how algorithmic personalization separates users from a range of viewpoints. In addition to decreasing ideological diversity, these filter bubbles exacerbate political polarization. According to Sunstein (2001), exposure to homogeneous content over time can cause "group polarization," in which people gradually take more extreme stances.

2.3 Role of Personalization and Recommendation Systems

On sites like YouTube, TikTok, and Instagram, recommendation systems are central to user interaction. Since emotionally charged or controversial content tends to garner more likes, shares, and time spent on the platform, these algorithms frequently give preference to it. This improves platform performance, but it also spreads partisan views, conspiracy theories, and false information[2]. For example, a study on YouTube's recommendation algorithm by Ribeiro et al. (2020) found that it has a propensity to gradually steer users toward more radical content. In political contexts, where contentious and emotional issues can skew democratic discourse, this pattern is especially concerning.

III. METHODOLOGY

The study's methodology is intended to methodically examine the ways in which algorithmic social media content delivery affects public and political opinion. It analyses user experiences, algorithmic influence, and behavioural patterns using both theoretical and empirical methods.

3.1 Type of Research: Mixed-Method Approach

A mixed-method research design that incorporates both qualitative and quantitative techniques is used in this study:

- Investigating user viewpoints, actions, and experiences with algorithm-driven content and political participation is made easier with the use of qualitative methods.
- Measurable patterns like sentiment shifts, engagement metrics, and exposure to particular kinds of content (like political bias or misinformation) are analysed using quantitative methods.
- A thorough grasp of the statistical patterns as well as the more profound contextual effects of social media algorithms is made possible by this dual approach.

3.2 Data Collection Methods

To gain a multi-dimensional perspective, the study employs the following data collection techniques:

a) Surveys and Questionnaires

- An online structured questionnaire was distributed to a sample group of social media users to collect data on:
  - Daily usage habits
  - Awareness of algorithms

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

- Perception of political bias in feeds
- Exposure to opposing viewpoints

b) Sentiment Analysis

A sentiment analysis was performed on public social media posts, particularly political comments and shared content, to assess emotional tone and political leanings over time.

c) Case Studies

Notable events (e.g., election cycles, viral misinformation incidents) were selected as case studies to analyze how algorithmic feeds may have influenced public opinion or political polarization during those periods.

d) Secondary Data Analysis

Reports from media watchdogs, analytics from prior research (e.g., Pew Research, Oxford Internet Institute), and platform transparency reports were referenced to support and validate findings.

3.3 Tools and Platforms Used

A number of digital tools and platforms were used to perform the analysis. Python with the following libraries:

- NLTK and TextBlob for sentiment analysis
- Matplotlib and Pandas for Data Visualization
- To create and distribute surveys, use Typeform or Google Forms.
- Reddit and Twitter APIs for social media data scraping
- Google Sheets and Microsoft Excel for organizing and cleaning survey responses
- For thematic analysis and qualitative data coding, use NVivo or ATLAS.ti, if available.

These tools made it possible to gather and analyze user-generated content as well as vast amounts of digital data.

3.4. Target Audience and Sample Size

a) Target Audience

The study focused on individuals aged 18–40, who actively use at least one major social media platform such as:

- Facebook
- Instagram
- Twitter/X
- YouTube
- TikTok

This age group represents the most active demographic in online political discussions and content consumption.

b) Sample Size

- A survey was conducted with a sample size of approximately 250 participants across different educational and professional backgrounds.
- For sentiment analysis, a dataset of over 5,000 social media posts/comments related to trending political topics was analyzed.
- Case studies involved content trends over a span of 2–3 weeks surrounding political events or controversies.

IV. WORKING OF SOCIAL MEDIA ALGORITHMS

Social media algorithms are sophisticated systems engineered to personalize and organize content for users, so that each individual views the posts most pertinent to them. Social media algorithms have revolutionized the way individuals communicate online, influencing everything from news consumption to entertainment preferences. Each big social

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025 Impact Factor: 7.67

media company uses its own iteration of an algorithm to sort through the torrential volume of content produced each second, employing varying factors to rank, filter, and suggest posts.

One of the first social media algorithms was Facebook's EdgeRank. Facebook originally utilized this algorithm to decide what posts showed up in a user's News Feed. EdgeRank took into account three primary factors: affinity (how well a user is connected to the content creator), weight (the content type, with photos and videos having more weight than text), and time decay (how fresh the content is). Over time, Facebook's algorithm has come to incorporate more advanced signals, but its purpose is the same to keep people on the site engaged by displaying to them what they are most likely to engage with. Likewise, TikTok's "For You" page functions from a recommendation system that examines user activity like watch time, likes, shares, and comments. The more someone engages with specific kinds of videos, the more of similar content the algorithm will bring to the surface[3]. TikTok's algorithm is very sensitive, so even new accounts can gain millions if the content they provide hits the spot. X (formerly Twitter) has a recommendation system that combines real-time trending topics, user interests, and engagement patterns to pop the timeline. Although it initially depended on the chronological order, X currently uses machine learning to bring tweets that are likely to engage discussion or generate interest to the front of the feed.

4.1 Engagement-based ranking vs chronological

There is a significant difference between engagement-based ranking and chronological feeds. Chronological feeds show posts strictly according to time, with the most recent posts at the top. This approach provides transparency but is likely to overwhelm users, particularly if they are following large numbers of accounts. Engagement-based ranking, on the other hand, gives prominence to content that is more likely to bring reactions likes, comments, shares regardless of when the post was made. This form of ranking can grow engagement on the platform but can also lead to filter bubbles where users are only exposed to the content that corresponds to their present preferences or biases.

4.2 AI and machine learning in content curation

At the heart of all these systems is Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning. These technologies enable platforms to process vast amounts of data in real-time and learn about each user's behavior. AI algorithms can pick up patterns, like what kind of content each individual hangs out on, trending hashtags, or what is viraling. This information is then utilized to forecast and deliver content that will hold users captive. Machine learning makes sure the algorithm gets better and better each like, swipe, or share fine-tunes the suggestions. Moreover, AI is used to moderate content, spam detection, hate speech, and disinformation, thus influencing the digital landscape in less obvious ways users are aware of.

V. ALGORITHMIC INFLUENCE ON PUBLIC OPINION

Social media algorithms in today's online world have a deep influence on public perception. By keeping the users engaged by presenting to them content relevant to their interest, the algorithms have the power to affect people profoundly in what they think, believe, and even do in reality. Though these systems provide ease and customization, they also give way to filter bubbles, the spread of false information, and public opinion changes on vital matters.

5.1 Filter bubbles and information silos

One of the most profound impacts of algorithmic content curation is the development of filter bubbles and silos of information. A filter bubble is formed when algorithms repeatedly present users with content that resonates with their current beliefs and do not expose them to contrasting views. The personalized content produces a culture where people do not encounter much information that goes against their views, resulting in more polarized and unidimensional opinions. Silos of information form when whole groups of individuals are given the same kind of content, all reinforcing a common set of beliefs while isolating other narratives. They reinforce and deepen divisions within society over time and decrease public discourse in a meaningful way, as individuals are less likely to see or even interact with opposing narratives.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025 Impact Factor: 7.67

5.2 Viral misinformation and confirmation bias

Yet another serious side effect of algorithmic curation is the swift propagation of viral disinformation and confirmation of confirmation bias. Social media sites favor postings that elicit intense emotional responses whether by causing outrage, fear, or amusement since emotionally charged posts attract more engagement. This creates an unintentional bias toward titillating or disinformation that is easily transmitted and can spread virally in a short time. Confirmation bias also worsens the situation since users are inclined to accept and pass on information that corroborates their current views, irrespective of its validity. Consequently, false stories disseminate extensively, driving public opinion and even policy decisions. This has been noticed in a lot of cases where conspiracy theories or disinformation have become popular on the internet, frequently with tangible repercussions.

5.3 Case studies of algorithm-driven opinion shifts (e.g., COVID-19 misinformation, elections)

Several case studies highlight how algorithms have driven shifts in public opinion. One notable example is the spread of COVID-19 misinformation. Throughout the pandemic, social media algorithms often amplified misleading posts about vaccines, treatments, and the virus itself. Some users were repeatedly shown false information because the algorithms detected their interest in similar content, contributing to vaccine hesitancy and distrust in public health guidance. Another critical case is the influence of social media during elections[4]. In countries like the United States, algorithms have been accused of amplifying divisive political content, fake news, and conspiracy theories, affecting voter behavior and undermining trust in democratic institutions. Reports have shown how coordinated disinformation campaigns, often automated by bots, have leveraged algorithmic systems to reach millions, sometimes swinging public sentiment in crucial moments

VI. ALGORITHMIC IMPACT ON POLITICAL OPINION

Algorithms have become tools of great influence in the shaping of political opinions, conduct, and even election results in the digital era. Social media platforms' use of algorithms to curate content has revolutionized the way political messages are communicated and received, frequently with serious implications for democracy. From explicitly targeted advertising to the deployment of bots and artificial engagement, algorithms are playing an ever-growing role in determining how citizens develop political opinion and cast their ballots.

6.1 Targeted political advertising (microtargeting)

The emergence of targeted political advertising, especially through microtargeting strategies, is one of the most noteworthy changes in the digital political landscape. These days, political parties and campaign teams use user data to target specific audience segments with highly tailored messages on delicate topics like immigration, taxes, and healthcare. By focusing on particular beliefs and feelings, this tactic enables campaigns to successfully rally supporters, influence unsure voters, or even reduce opposition turnout. Microtargeting presents significant ethical issues even though it can increase political engagement by making content seem more relevant to specific people. These include the possibility of information asymmetry, the strengthening of preexisting biases, and a lack of accountability and transparency because people frequently don't know how or why they are being singled out with specific messages.

6.2 Role of bots and fake engagement

Another major factor is the impact of bots and artificial engagement on online political discourse. Bots, which are automated accounts set to act like humans, have widespread use in amplifying political messages, promoting disinformation, or fabricating the perception of broad support for any given perspective. Algorithms that favor posting content based on such engagement markers as likes, shares, and comments can be manipulated by these bots to increase the popularity of controversial or disinformation posts. Artificial engagement artificially overinflates what appears to be the popularity or credibility of some stories and makes them seem more accepted or powerful than they actually are. This manipulation can mislead public perception and warp the political dialogue.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025 Impact Factor: 7.67

6.3 Influence on voter behaviour and polarization

The combined impact of such algorithmic forces is a profound influence on political polarization and voter behavior. By repeatedly presenting users with content that is harmonious with their emotions and preferences, algorithms can further splinter ideological divides and build echo chambers in which opposing viewpoints are seldom heard. This not only influences voting behavior but also makes people more entrenched in views, more intolerant of differing points of view, and more suspicious of democratic institutions[5]. The individualization of political material, as much as it increases involvement as a desirable commodity, also drives people toward more radical perspectives by continuously reinforcing the very same thoughts.

6.4 High-profile case studies (e.g., Cambridge Analytica, 2016/2020 elections)

A number of prominent case studies illustrate the actual impact of algorithmic influence on politics. The Cambridge Analytica case exposed how Facebook users' personal information was harvested en masse without their permission and used to build intimate psychological profiles to target micro in the 2016 U.S. presidential election and the Brexit vote. This case illustrated how data can be abused and manipulated on a grand scale. In addition, both the 2016 and 2020 U.S. elections saw the rampant deployment of algorithm-based political advertisements, disinformation operations, and botnets often produced by both foreign and domestic sources to sway voters and create dissent. These incidents highlighted the susceptibility of democratic processes to algorithmic manipulation and generated global discussions on how digital political advertising should be regulated, as well as on the responsibility of tech platforms.

VII. ETHICAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

The increasing use of algorithms to select information, inform opinion, and guide behavior has also created serious ethical and legal challenges. As they become increasingly integral to daily life especially in social media environments issues surrounding data privacy, transparency, accountability, and regulatory control have come to dominate public discourse. Ethical guidelines and legal frameworks are now necessary to make sure that algorithmic technologies benefit society in an equitable and responsible manner.

7.1 Data privacy concerns

Among the most prominent ethical issues is that of privacy of data. Social media's algorithms rely on massive amounts of individual data everything from individuals' location, browsing activity, and social profiles to their emotional responses and behavioral habits. This information is collected on a host of occasions without express or fully informed consent, causing surveillance and invasion-of-privacy concerns[6]. Most users are often not aware of the ways in which their personal data are being collected, analyzed, and utilized for purposes like political messaging or targeted advertising. Such instances of high-profile abuse, such as the use of Facebook data by Cambridge Analytica, have highlighted how violations of data privacy can cause not just individual harm but also mass-level manipulation at the social level.

7.2 Transparency and accountability of algorithms

Another urgent matter is the transparency and accountability of algorithmic decision-making. The majority of social media algorithms are "black boxes," meaning users possess minimal to no knowledge regarding how decisions regarding content ordering, recommendation, or suppression are implemented. This lack of transparency hinders challenging algorithmic results, especially when the algorithmic results contribute to deleterious outcomes such as misinformation diffusion, discrimination, or suppressing marginalized voices. Ethical requirements call for these systems to be transparent and subject to inspection, so users can know why they are seeing what they're seeing. Responsibility also falls on developers and firms that create such algorithms, taking responsibility for the effects of their systems on society, intended or otherwise.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025
Impact Factor: 7.67

7.3 Role of government and platform regulations (e.g., Digital Services Act, EU AI Act)

As a reaction to these ethical challenges, there is increasing appreciation for the necessity for government intervention and regulations by platforms. Several legal structures have been proposed to combat the unfettered might of social media sites and their algorithms. The Digital Services Act (DSA), which was passed by the European Union, is one legislation that seeks greater transparency in the way online platforms deal with content moderation and post recommendations. It needs big platforms to perform risk assessments of their algorithms and introduce measures to reduce harms like misinformation and online hate. Likewise, the EU Artificial Intelligence Act (AI Act) aims to oversee high-risk AI systems, including those applied in social media, by establishing requirements for transparency, security, and ethical application. These rules are a move towards legally holding tech firms responsible for the societal effects of their algorithmic technologies.

VIII. MITIGATION STRATEGIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

While the power of algorithms over society is increasing every day, there is a need for reflective mitigation measures and suggestions in order to minimize harm, safeguard democratic values, and facilitate responsible digital interaction. A number of strategies can be utilized to confront ethical, social, and political issues involved in algorithmic content curation.

8.1 Increasing algorithmic transparency

A top suggestion is to strive towards transparency through algorithms. Today, all major social media algorithms operate in a black box, so that users have no idea why particular content is displayed to them or how their data impacts recommendations. More transparency would mean that platforms disclose publicly how the algorithms operate, what information gets used, and what drives content visibility[7]. Open systems would make users able to make conscious decisions regarding their online activity and minimize the potential for manipulation. It would also enable researchers, regulators, and civil society groups to audit and evaluate the social effects of these algorithms to ensure that they are in line with ethical principles and public interest.

8.2 Media literacy and user awareness

The other key strategy is promoting media literacy and user awareness. As algorithms amplify what is shared based on engagement, users themselves contribute to what goes viral online. Informing users about how algorithms operate, how disinformation is propagated, and how to analyze online content critically is vital. Media literacy classes in schools, public campaigns, and readily available digital tools can contribute to users becoming wiser consumers of information[8]. An educated user community is less vulnerable to echo chambers, manipulation, or disinformation, thereby decreasing the overall societal harm from biased or harmful algorithms.

8.3 Designing more democratic and unbiased algorithms

Further, there is an urgent need for developing more democratic and impartial algorithms. Algorithmic bias usually reflects the values, assumptions, or data inputs of their designers, potentially resulting in discriminatory outcomes or amplifying polarizing content. As a counter to this, sites need to make an investment in ethical algorithm development that foregrounds fairness, diversity of perspective, and inclusiveness. This entails more than technical remedies like balanced training data and bias audits along with drawing in diverse populations to participate in designing and shaping algorithmic systems[9]. Algorithms need to be designed with democratic culture in mind, encouraging civil discourse over extremism or polarization.

8.4 Role of fact-checking and human moderation

The function of human moderation and fact-checking continues to play a crucial role in combating misinformation and algorithmic harms. While artificial intelligence might be used for flagging potentially false or dangerous content, human moderators and independent fact-checkers are necessary for making nuanced judgments and context-specific decisions. Partnerships between platforms and credible fact-checking entities can assist in making sure that falsehoods

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 5, Issue 1, August 2025 Impact Factor: 7.67

are quickly flagged and countered[10]. Additionally, sustaining equilibrium between programmed systems and human intervention can limit mistakes and prevent unwarranted censorship, while retaining safety and freedom of speech online.

IX. CONCLUSION

Through this examination of social media algorithms, a few important revelations are made. Algorithms are now the linchpin for how information is gathered, distributed, and consumed in today's digital world. They influence public opinion by tailoring content, boosting engagement-based posts, and often producing filter bubbles that restrict access to multiple viewpoints. The influence of algorithms is felt in sensitive areas of political opinion-making, the dissemination of disinformation, and the manipulation of voters through targeted ads and fabricated engagement. While algorithms provide efficiency and personalization, they also pose serious ethical and legal issues, most importantly around privacy, transparency, and accountability. A closer analysis of the societal and democratic ramifications uncovers that algorithms not only tailor personal preferences but also shape the collective awareness of entire societies. Personalization can contribute to more polarization, social stratification, and even challenges to democratic integrity. When citizens are presented with information primarily that validates their current beliefs, openings for constructive dialogue, empathy, and mutual understanding shrink. In addition, the transmission of viral disinformation erodes public confidence in institutions, media, and democratic processes. As algorithms silently shape what individuals view, think, and believe, the risks to governance, justice, and social cohesion grow greater by the day. The future of algorithmic governance predict that technology will certainly advance further, but it is how it will be managed and regulated that will shape its effect on society. Increasingly, there is a realization that self-regulation by technology firms is insufficient. Tougher legislation, ethical principles, and inclusive forms of oversight will be needed to guarantee that algorithmic systems are aligned with the public interest and not private interests only. Initiatives like the EU's Digital Services Act and AI rules are steps in the right direction but ongoing adaptation and watchfulness are needed as technology continues to evolve. In the end, it needs to be constructed on principles of transparency, fairness, and respect for human rights so that technology serves to strengthen democracy and not weaken it.

REFERENCES

[1]. Javed, U., & Javed, U. (2023). The influence of social media algorithms on political polarization and public opinion. Online Media and Society, 4(2), 44-52.

[2]. Shahzad, F. (2023). Investigating the Impact of Social Media Algorithms and Echo Chambers on Political Belief and behaviors. Journal of Peace, Development and Communication, 7(03).

[3]. Mondal, M. S., & Kumar, M. R. Chapter–8 Influence of Social Media Algorithm on News Consumption and Public Perception.

[4]. Bernstein, M., Christin, A., Hancock, J., Hashimoto, T., Jia, C., Lam, M., ... & Xu, C. (2023). Embedding societal values into social media algorithms. Journal of Online Trust and Safety, 2(1).

[5]. Alrached, S. (2024). The Impact of New Media on Foreign Policy: A Systematic Review of Social Media Algorithms. Available at SSRN 5151105.

[6]. Papakyriakopoulos, O., Serrano, J. C. M., & Hegelich, S. (2020). Political communication on social media: A tale of hyperactive users and bias in recommender systems. Online Social Networks and Media, 15, 100058.

[7]. Ahmed, S. (2020). THE IMPACT OF SOCIAL MEDIA ALGORITHMS ON POLITICAL POLARIZATION: A CROSS-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE. Global Media and Social Sciences Research Journal, 1(1), 1-7.

[8]. Gandini, A., Gerosa, A., Gobbo, B., Keeling, S., Leonini, L., Mosca, L., ... & Splendore, S. (2022). The algorithmic public opinion: a literature review.

[9]. Reisach, U. (2021). The responsibility of social media in times of societal and political manipulation. European journal of operational research, 291(3), 906-917.

[10]. Lim, M. (2020). Algorithmic enclaves: Affective politics and algorithms in the neoliberal social media landscape. In Affective politics of digital media (pp. 186-203). Routledge