International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Facebook's Machine Learning Algorithms and Voting Behavior: An Analytical Study

Vineet kumar[1], Dr. Manaswi Semwal[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Graphic Era deemed to be University, Dehradun
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Graphic Era deemed to be University, Dehradun

Abstract
In contemporary democratic societies, Facebook has evolved beyond being merely a social networking platform; it has emerged as a powerful medium influencing political information, opinion formation, and voter behavior. Through machine learning algorithms, Facebook analyzes users' interests, activities, and behavioral patterns, subsequently presenting political content tailored to these specific profiles. The objective of this research is to understand how processes such as algorithmic selection, personalized political advertising, and phenomena like "filter bubbles" and "echo chambers" impact voters' political perceptions and voting behavior. The study also highlights how machine learning-based algorithms can steer voters toward specific political ideologies, thereby exerting a profound influence on democratic decision-making processes. This research aims to elucidate the interrelationship between the role of Facebook algorithms, voter psychology, and digital political communication. In conclusion, this study demonstrates that machine learning-based algorithms are reshaping the flow of information and voting behavior within democracies, with significant socio-political ramifications.

Keywords: Facebook, Machine Learning, Voting Behavior

Introduction:

To comprehend 21st-century democracy, the role of digital communication media cannot be overlooked. Social media platforms—particularly Facebook—have challenged traditional models of political communication. Political parties, candidates, and voters can now engage in direct dialogue. Facebook's News Feed algorithm is predicated on machine learning models that rank content by predicting user preferences [1]. This process influences not only the flow of information but also the political agenda and the formation of public opinion.

According to McCombs and Shaw [2], the media determines which issues the public deems significant. In the digital era, this role is increasingly being assumed by algorithms. Pariser [3] introduced the concept of the "filter bubble," wherein users become confined to content that aligns with their existing views. The Cambridge Analytica scandal made it evident that Facebook data can be utilized for the psychological profiling of voters [4]. However, within the Indian context, systematic analysis regarding the relationship between Facebook's machine learning algorithms and voting behavior remains relatively limited. The present study endeavors to address this research gap.

Literature Review:

Traditional Theories of Voting Behavior and the Digital Transition:

The study of voting behavior has long been a central subject in the fields of political science and sociology. In early studies, Lazarsfeld et al. [5], in 'The People's Choice', posited that voting behavior is profoundly influenced by social groups—specifically family, class, and community. They introduced the "Two-Step Flow of Communication" model, which posits that opinion leaders play a pivotal role in the formation of voting preferences. Subsequently, Campbell et al. [6], in 'The American Voter', presented a psychological model in which party identification was identified as the primary determinant of voting decisions. According to this model, long-term party loyalty structures an individual's political behavior.

The "Rational Choice Model," propounded by Downs [7], views voting as a rational assessment of costs and benefits. From this perspective, a voter selects the candidate from whom they anticipate the maximum benefit. In these traditional theories, the role of the media was secondary; however, following the 1970s, the "Agenda-Setting Theory" accorded the media a central position. McCombs and Shaw [2] demonstrated that the media does not dictate the direction of public opinion, but rather determines the priority of the issues upon which the public reflects. In the digital era, a critical question has emerged: Do social media platforms-particularly Facebook-engage in agenda-setting in a manner similar to, or perhaps even more effectively than, traditional media? This research is situated within the broader scope of this very inquiry.

Social Media and Political Communication:

With the rise of social media, a fundamental shift has occurred in the structure of political communication. Castells [8], while introducing the concept of the "network society," argued that information technology-based networks redefine power structures. According to him, power is no longer confined to centralized institutions but is instead distributed across network structures. Chadwick [9] proposed the theory of the "hybrid media system," which highlights the interactive relationship between traditional media and digital media. In this model, platforms such as Facebook serve not merely as conduits for information dissemination but also influence the news agenda. Kreis [10], in a study of digital campaign strategies, demonstrated that political parties have now integrated data analytics and social media as integral components of their campaigns. These studies clarify that social media does not merely replace traditional models of political communication; rather, it restructures them.

Algorithmic Curation and the Digital Form of Agenda-Setting:

Facebook's News Feed algorithm is based on machine learning. Gillespie [1] has termed this algorithm a "public relevance algorithm," as it determines which content gains visibility. Bakshy et al. [11], analyzing data from Facebook users, found that algorithmic filtering can limit ideological diversity. This study is significant because it demonstrates that user preferences and algorithmic rankings collectively shape the information landscape. Pariser [3] introduced the concept of the "filter bubble," wherein a user becomes surrounded solely by information that aligns with their pre-existing beliefs. Sunstein [12] identified this as a challenge to democracy, given that a diversity of ideas constitutes the cornerstone of democratic discourse. However, some studies have also argued that social media actually offers opportunities for ideological diversity. Consequently, there is no complete consensus on this subject within the existing literature.

Micro-targeting, Data Analytics, and Psychological Profiling:
Micro-targeting plays a central role in digital campaign strategies. Kosinski et al. [13] demonstrated that personality traits can be inferred based on Facebook Likes. This study proved to be of immense significance for political campaigns. Allcott and Gentzkow [14] analyzed the impact of social media and fake news on the 2016 U.S. election. Howard and Woolley [15] introduced the concept of "computational propaganda," which encompasses bots, algorithmic amplification, and data-driven strategies. This body of literature suggests that machine learning-based micro-targeting possesses the potential to influence voting behavior, particularly among undecided voters.

Fake News, Disinformation, and Political Polarization:
Vosoughi et al. [16] found that false news spreads more rapidly on social media than the truth. Tucker et al. [17] analyzed the relationship between social media and political polarization. In the Indian context, Banaji and Bhat [18] studied the dissemination of fake news on WhatsApp and Facebook, analyzing the expansion of digital politics and communal discourse. This literature indicates that algorithmic architectures are predicated on engagement-based ranking, which can result in heightened visibility for emotionally charged and controversial content.

Digital Politics in the Indian Context:
The influence of social media in India intensified following the 2014 Lok Sabha elections. Mehta [19] termed 2014 as India's first "social media election." Yadav and Palshikar [20] examined the multi-layered factors influencing Indian voting behavior. According to reports by IAMAI and Pew Research [21], the number of social media users in India is continuously on the rise. Literature within the Indian context suggests that digital campaigns can reinforce identity-based politics while simultaneously enhancing political awareness.

Algorithmic Bias and Ethical Questions:
In ‘Algorithms of Oppression’ [22], Noble argued that algorithms can reproduce social inequalities. She emphasized the critical need for algorithmic transparency. In Europe, legislative measures such as the GDPR [23] and the Digital Services Act [10] represent significant strides toward ensuring algorithmic accountability. While data protection legislation has also been enacted in India, independent auditing and transparency remain limited. Although the existing literature offers numerous significant findings, several gaps are evident: a dearth of comprehensive, long-term studies on the interplay between machine learning and voting behavior in the Indian context; a lack of comparative analyses regarding algorithmic transparency; and limited research on the nexus between the digital divide and algorithmic influence. This research endeavors to address these specific gaps.
The literature review clearly indicates that Facebook's machine learning-based algorithmic architecture exerts a profound influence on voting behavior, political polarization, micro-targeting, and disinformation. This subject holds immense relevance in both global and Indian contexts. Divergent perspectives also exist within the literature: while some studies view social media as a force that strengthens democracy, others characterize it as a conduit for polarization and disinformation. Consequently, this subject necessitates continuous research and regulatory intervention.

Objectives:

1. To analyze the political role of Facebook's machine learning-based algorithms.
2. To explain the relationship between algorithmic content curation and voting behavior.
3. To study the impact of micro-targeting and data profiling on voter decision-making.

Research Questions:

1. How do Facebook's machine learning-based algorithms influence the flow of political information and agenda-setting?
2. How does algorithmic content curation affect voters' political perceptions, polarization, and voting behavior?
3. How do micro-targeting and data profiling influence voters' decision-making and political preferences?

Research Hypotheses:

1. Facebook's algorithmic curation significantly influences the political agenda and the prioritization of issues.
2. Algorithmic content curation (such as filter bubbles and echo chambers) fosters political polarization and influences the voting behavior of voters.
3. Micro-targeting and data profiling influence voters' decision-making at an individual level, particularly in the context of undecided voters.

Research Methodology:

This study is a qualitative-interpretive research project based entirely on secondary data, analyzing the relationship between Facebook's machine learning-based algorithmic mechanisms and voting behavior. The study utilizes theoretical frameworks drawn from media effects theory, agenda-setting theory, and digital platform governance. For this research, a systematic review was conducted of academic journals, peer-reviewed research papers, scholarly books, international reports, policy documents, and official digital advertising archives. Content analysis, comparative analysis, and critical analysis were employed as the primary methods of analysis. To ensure reliability and validity, only peer-reviewed sources and official reports were utilized.

Research Limitations:

This study lacks direct empirical testing, and access to algorithmic data is limited. Nevertheless, based on a comprehensive analysis of available literature, this study develops a theoretical and explanatory understanding of the interrelationship between Facebook's machine learning mechanisms and voting behavior.

Analysis and Discussion:

In the digital age, the nature of democracy is no longer confined solely to institutional structures; rather, it is being profoundly shaped by information technology, data architecture, and algorithmic mediation. Social media platforms such as Facebook-which initially emerged as tools for social interaction-have now evolved into powerful mediums influencing political discourse, public opinion formation, and voting behavior. In this context, the objective of the present analysis is to examine the interplay between

Facebook's machine learning-based algorithmic mechanisms and voting behavior from theoretical, critical, and philosophical perspectives.

Voting behavior constitutes a central element of the democratic process. It is not merely the outcome of a vote cast at a polling station; rather, it is constructed through the interplay of long-term socialization, political consciousness, ideological leanings, group identity, media exposure, and psychological factors. In traditional political science, key frameworks for understanding voting behavior have included the Columbia School's sociological model, the Michigan School's psychological model, and Anthony Downs' rational choice theory. However, the advent of digital communication and social media in the 21st century has introduced a new dimension-that of algorithmic structure-to these existing models[5].

Facebook's machine learning mechanism is not merely a technical tool; it serves as a structural controller of information flow. Algorithms determine precisely which political content is presented to a user, the sequence in which it appears, and the frequency with which it is displayed. In doing so, they indirectly become active participants in the shaping of political consciousness. To comprehend the relationship between Facebook's machine learning algorithms and voting behavior, it is essential to possess a clear understanding of the philosophical underpinnings of democracy, public opinion, and power. This is because voting behavior is not merely the product of technical influences; it is inextricably linked to broader processes of political legitimacy, moral autonomy, and social consensus. The philosophical foundation of modern democracy lies rooted in the social contract theory. According to John Locke, the legitimacy of the state rests upon the consent of the people. Rousseau introduced the concept of the "General Will," positing that public consent serves as the foundation for political decision-making. A fundamental premise underlying these theories is that citizens are free and rational beings who make decisions based on adequate information. Voting behavior constitutes an expression of this rational consent [26].

Public opinion is the soul of democracy. James Bryce characterized public opinion as the "ruler" of democracy; however, public opinion does not emerge spontaneously but is rather constructed through processes of social dialogue, media discourse, and political debate. In this context, Habermas introduced the concept of the "Public Sphere." According to Habermas, citizens shape public opinion through rational dialogue, and democracy is empowered only when the public sphere is free, inclusive, and pluralistic. A Foucauldian analysis of power views it not merely as a repressive force, but as a process of knowledge production. According to Foucault, power operates through invisible structures and determines which forms of knowledge are deemed legitimate. The traditional interrelationships among democracy, public opinion, and power are now being redefined due to digital mediation. Consequently, an analysis of the algorithmic influence of Facebook is no longer confined solely to the realm of communication-effects studies; rather, it becomes an integral part of a broader discourse encompassing democratic theory, moral autonomy, and political legitimacy.

Micro-targeting and Psychological Intervention

In the era of digital democracy, the nature of electoral politics has undergone a fundamental transformation. While traditional election campaigns relied on broad public outreach, rallies, and mass media channels to disseminate messages, machine learning-based micro-targeting has now emerged as the primary tool of political communication. Social media platforms such as Facebook segment voters at a granular level—utilizing vast data repositories, behavioral analytics, and predictive algorithmic models—to deliver personalized political messages[15]. This process constitutes not merely a technical innovation,

but possesses the capacity to intervene in the psychological architecture of voting behavior. Consequently, to comprehend micro-targeting, it is essential to adopt an integrated perspective that synthesizes political communication theory, behavioral psychology, and democratic ethics.

Micro-targeting entails segmenting voters into distinct groups based on their personal data, online behavior, social networks, and psychological profiles, and subsequently crafting tailored political messages for each specific group. Facebook's algorithmic infrastructure leverages demographic information (age, gender, location), behavioral data (likes, shares, clicks), network data (friend connections), and interest-based data. Machine learning models utilize these data points to infer a user's political leanings and serve them targeted content. As a result, election campaigns shift away from broad public discourse and evolve into personalized political communication [10]. The Cambridge Analytica scandal exposed the fact that Facebook data was utilized for the psychological profiling of voters. The OCEAN model was employed for personality analysis, enabling the inference of users' emotional predispositions. The Cambridge Analytica episode thus demonstrates that micro-targeting transcends mere information dissemination to become a vehicle for emotional and psychological intervention. Micro-targeting frequently targets immediate, intuitive, and emotional elements—such as fear, insecurity, identity, nationalism, and cultural pride. Consequently, political messages can activate a voter's emotional circuitry, thereby influencing their decision-making [4].

Micro-targeting does not merely prioritize specific issues; it can also influence a voter's cognitive framework. According to the theory of priming, if a particular issue is repeatedly given prominence, voters begin to base their political evaluations on that very issue [2]. When data-driven prediction and behavioral modification have the potential to compromise democratic autonomy, micro-targeting ceases to be merely a political strategy and instead emerges as a challenge to democratic ethics. As a result of micro-targeting, individual voters receive distinct political messages. This can undermine public accountability, as political parties may make disparate promises to different constituent groups. Howard and Woolley have termed this phenomenon "computational propaganda." [15] Fundamentally, micro-targeting serves primarily to facilitate voter mobilization rather than to induce widespread shifts in voting preferences; it functions not as a decisive factor, but rather as an auxiliary tool.

Algorithmic Amplification through Selective Exposure

While in the 20th century, selective exposure was primarily the result of individual psychological tendencies, in the 21st century, this tendency is being structurally reinforced by machine-learning-based algorithmic frameworks. Selective exposure has evolved from a voluntary cognitive process into a data-driven, structural, and technological process. This very transition adds a new dimension to the explanation of voting behavior. The theory of selective exposure emerged within the Columbia School and subsequent communication studies. Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet observed that voters typically absorb messages that align with their pre-existing political allegiances [5]. According to Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance, individuals attempt to avoid information that conflicts with their existing beliefs [26]. Thus, selective exposure functions as a psychological defense mechanism. In a digital context, Garrett argued that the Internet can amplify selective exposure, as users possess the freedom to select sources according to their own preferences [27].

In the traditional context, this process was based primarily on the individual's active choice. With the advent of the Internet and social media, the availability of information has increased exponentially. In the initial stages, it was assumed that greater informational diversity would reinforce democratic pluralism.

However, research has indicated that users frequently select sources that align with their ideological leanings [28]. Even when diverse sources are available, individuals voluntarily prioritize like-minded platforms. Consequently, selective exposure has become even more accessible in the digital age. Together, selective exposure and algorithmic amplification form a digital reinforcement cycle. A user's initial political inclination leads to higher engagement with similar content; this, in turn, prompts the algorithm to prioritize that same type of material. This cycle-characterized by increased ideological entrenchment and the subsequent consumption of similar content-can, over time, rigidify a voter's political identity[29]. The transition from selective exposure to algorithmic amplification signifies a subtle shift in the balance of power within a democracy. This process gives structural form to individual cognitive biases; while it may limit ideological diversity and restructure political consciousness, it is not entirely deterministic. Therefore, for the future of democracy, it is imperative that algorithmic transparency and digital literacy be strengthened.

Filter Bubbles and Echo Chambers

In a digital democracy, the rise of social media platforms like Facebook has fundamentally altered the structure of information flow. Machine learning-based algorithms prioritize content based on a user's past activities, preferences, and network structure. The result of this process manifests in conditions such as filter bubbles and echo chambers. Both of these concepts pose a serious challenge to democratic discourse, as they can limit pluralistic dialogue and exacerbate ideological fragmentation.

The concept of the filter bubble was popularized by Eli Pariser [3]; according to him, digital platforms select content based on a user's past interests, thereby confining the user within a limited and personalized information environment. Facebook's algorithm prioritizes engagement. If a user interacts frequently with posts related to a specific political ideology, the algorithm displays more content of that same nature [11]. This process can gradually narrow the user's informational world. Filter bubbles possess structural characteristics such as personalization, prediction, prioritization, and data-driven customization. Consequently, a filter bubble is not merely the result of individual choice, but rather the outcome of an algorithmic structure.

The concept of the echo chamber was introduced by Sunstein; according to him, when an individual is exposed solely to ideas similar to their own, their ideological stance becomes more rigid [12]. On Facebook, groups, pages, and friend networks are often composed of individuals sharing similar ideological leanings. When the algorithm prioritizes content from these groups, the user is repeatedly exposed to similar viewpoints. This repetition gives rise to ideological reinforcement. According to Habermas, the foundation of democracy lies in rational public discourse [30]. If dialogue on digital platforms becomes confined to a single ideology, the potential for rational debate diminishes. Filter bubbles and echo chambers can fragment the democratic public sphere into isolated discursive realms. In such a scenario, a shared political reality may be undermined.

Echo chambers can reinforce identity-based politics. When users are exposed solely to content relevant to their own identities-such as caste, religion, nationality, or ideology-an "us versus them" mentality may emerge. According to Sunstein, this tendency gives rise to group polarization [12]. This can impact voting behavior, as voters begin to prioritize identity-based preferences over substantive issues. Filter bubbles can also facilitate the dissemination of disinformation. If a user is active within a specific ideological group, unverified information shared within that group may appear more credible [15]. According to Hannah Arendt, politics is grounded in plurality [31]. If the public sphere loses this plurality, democracy

may be weakened. Filter bubbles and echo chambers can challenge the very concept of public truth, as each group inhabits its own distinct informational world. This situation can render the formation of democratic consensus more difficult.

Micro-targeting and Free Will

In the context of digital democracy, micro-targeting is not merely a technical electoral strategy; rather, it constitutes a profound philosophical inquiry intertwined with a citizen's free will, moral autonomy, and democratic legitimacy. If voting is to be regarded as the expression of democratic sovereignty, it is imperative that the voter's decision be free, informed, and autonomous. However, when political campaigns employ machine learning-based algorithmic systems to psychologically profile voters and deliver targeted messages, the question arises: is the voter's decision truly free, or is it structurally influenced?

The concept of free will occupies a central position within the Western philosophical tradition. According to Kant, the foundation of morality is autonomy-an individual is morally responsible only when they make decisions based on their own conscience [32]. In a democracy, voting serves as the public expression of this very moral autonomy. John Stuart Mill regarded freedom of expression as the bedrock of democracy, arguing that a plurality of ideas empowers the individual to make rational decisions [33]. Micro-targeting is a data-driven strategy wherein voters are categorized based on their behavioral and psychological profiles[10]. Platforms such as Facebook utilize machine learning models to infer a user's potential political leanings—drawing upon their online activities, social networks, interests, preferences, and demographic data—and subsequently serve them personalized political advertisements [01]. The Cambridge Analytica scandal exposed how Facebook data was leveraged to influence voters through psychological profiling[04].

From a philosophical perspective, free will is not entirely absolute; it is subject to the influence of social and structural factors. While the voter is formally free, their access to information and their emotional activation are algorithmically structured. If the voter's decision is structurally influenced, can democratic consent truly be considered legitimate? If political messages are private, personalized, and opaque, public discourse may be undermined[34]. Thus, micro-targeting can pose a challenge to democratic transparency. According to Hersh and Schaffner, targeted campaigns typically mobilize voters to cast their ballots rather than altering their fundamental political views [35]. It can be argued that free will is not entirely eradicated, but rather is structurally influenced. In a diverse society like India, micro-targeting can reinforce identity-based politics. If messages are targeted based on caste, religion, or regional identity, a voter's decision may be swayed by an identity-based emotional response rather than by rational policy deliberation. This situation can present a challenge to democratic pluralism.

Algorithmic Governance and Democratic Accountability

In the digital age, the traditional concept of governance has undergone a fundamental transformation. While policies, decisions, and the flow of information were previously controlled primarily through state institutions and traditional media, algorithmic systems—particularly the machine learning models of social media platforms—have now begun to structure public discourse, information visibility, and political dialogue. This phenomenon is understood as "algorithmic governance" [36]. In the context of Facebook, algorithmic governance implies that processes such as News Feed ranking, content prioritization, ad

targeting, and compliance with community standards are controlled through automation. This structure redefines questions regarding democratic accountability, transparency, and legitimacy.

Algorithmic governance refers to the process wherein decision-making and social coordination are driven by algorithmic systems [37]. According to Gillespie, algorithms have become the custodians of public knowledge, as they determine which content remains visible and which remains invisible [01]. Bucher introduced the concept of the "algorithmic imaginary," wherein users assume algorithms to be neutral and impartial, even though they are structurally based on specific criteria [38]. Thus, algorithmic governance represents not merely technical efficiency, but an integral part of the socio-political power structure.

Liberal democracies are founded upon the principles of transparency and accountability. John Stuart Mill regarded public deliberation as the bedrock of democracy [33]. According to Habermas, democratic legitimacy stems from rational public discourse [30]. If the process by which information is prioritized remains opaque, citizens are unable to discern what content is being presented to them—or why. Algorithms often function as "black boxes"; their decision-making criteria are not made public. This lack of transparency poses a significant challenge to democratic legitimacy. In the digital age, data analysis and algorithmic prioritization influence the structure of knowledge. Facebook's algorithms analyze user behavioral data to determine the visibility of political content. Consequently, the nature of power shifts from direct political control to data-driven mediation. This constitutes the digital form of "soft power." Facebook's advertising-based model transforms user data into an economic resource. When political advertisements become an integral part of this very model, democratic discourse risks becoming subservient to the "attention economy." In such a scenario, the objective of algorithmic prioritization may not be the public interest, but rather the maximization of user engagement and revenue. [39]

In the context of algorithmic governance, accountability becomes multi-layered; it is essential to clearly define where responsibility lies-whether with the platform, the programmers, the users, or in instances where a political party derives indirect benefits. However, questions regarding algorithmic transparency remain complex. Furthermore, democracy is not merely a procedural arrangement but fundamentally a moral project. In the context of algorithmic governance, three normative principles are of paramount importance: first, Autonomy-citizens' decision-making must be independent; second, Transparency—the decision-making process must be lucid; and third, Justice—the flow of information must be impartial. Should algorithmic structures violate these principles, democratic accountability could face a crisis.

Conclusion:

The challenges and possibilities of digital democracy are not confined to a single dimension; rather, they emerge from the intricate interrelationships among technological, social, and political structures. In the digital age, public discourse has become structured under the mediation of algorithms. Facebook's machine-learning-based algorithms neither exercise absolute control over democracy nor are they entirely inconsequential; instead, they function as a potent mediating force within the democratic framework. The findings of the study indicate that algorithmic content curation, micro-targeting, and data profiling significantly influence voters' political perceptions, preferences, and decision-making. Thus, algorithmic processes not only control the flow of information but also structure the decision-making environment for voting behavior. At the policy level, it is essential to strengthen algorithmic transparency, data security, and platform accountability. Furthermore, it is necessary to promote digital literacy so that citizens can comprehend algorithmic influences and make informed decisions. Future research should empirically

examine these effects-particularly within the Indian context-to gain a clearer understanding of the nature of digital democracy.

References-

1. T. Gillespie, "The relevance of algorithms," Media Technologies: Essays on Communication, Materiality, and Society, Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 2014, 167–194.
2. M. E. McCombs and D. L. Shaw, "The agenda-setting function of mass media," Public Opinion Quarterly, 1972, 36(2), 176–187.
3. E. Pariser, "The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You", New York, USA: Penguin Press, 2011.
4. C. Cadwalladr and E. Graham-Harrison, "Revealed: 50 million Facebook profiles harvested for Cambridge Analytica in major data breach," The Guardian, Mar. 17, 2018.
5. P. F. Lazarsfeld, B. Berelson, and H. Gaudet, "The People's Choice: How the Voter Makes Up His Mind in a Presidential Campaign", New York, USA: Columbia University Press, 1944.
6. A. Campbell, P. E. Converse, W. E. Miller, and D. E. Stokes, "The American Voter", New York, USA: Wiley, 1960.
7. A. Downs, "An Economic Theory of Democracy", New York, USA: Harper & Row, 1957.
8. M. Castells, "The Rise of the Network Society", 2nd ed. Oxford, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
9. A. Chadwick, "The Hybrid Media System: Politics and Power", 2nd ed. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 2017.
10. S. Kreiss, "Prototype Politics: Technology-Intensive Campaigning and the Data of Democracy", Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 2016.
11. E. Bakshy, S. Messing, and L. A. Adamic, "Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook," Science, 2015, 348(6239), 1130–1132,.
12. C. R. Sunstein, "Republic.com 2.0", Princeton, NJ, USA: Princeton University Press, 2007.
13. M. Kosinski, D. Stillwell, and T. Graepel, "Private traits and attributes are predictable from digital records of human behavior," Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS), 2013, 110(15), 5802–5805.
14. H. Allcott and M. Gentzkow, "Social media and fake news in the 2016 election," Journal of Economic Perspectives, 2017, 31(2), 211–236.
15. P. N. Howard and S. Woolley, "Computational propaganda worldwide," International Journal of Communication, 2018, (12), 4882–4890.
16. S. Vosoughi, D. Roy, and S. Aral, "The spread of true and false news online," Science, 2018, 359(6380), 1146–1151.
17. J. A. Tucker et al., "Social media, political polarization, and political disinformation: A review of the scientific literature," Political Science Quarterly, 2020, 135(1), 1–33.
18. S. Banaji and R. Bhat, "WhatsApp vigilantes: An exploration of citizen reception and circulation of WhatsApp misinformation linked to mob violence in India," London School of Economics Report, 2019.
19. N. Mehta, "India's 2014 election: The first social media election?" Economic & Political Weekly, 2014, 49(39), 11–14.
20. Y. Yadav and S. Palshikar, "Ten theses on state politics in India," Seminar, 2009, 591, 14–24.

21. Pew Research Center, Social Media Use in Emerging Economies. Washington, DC, USA: Pew Research Center, 2018.
22. S. U. Noble, *"*Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism*",* New York, USA: NYU Press, 2018.
23. European Union, General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)*,* Regulation (EU) 2016/679, 2018.
24. European Union, Digital Services Act*,* Regulation (EU) 2022/2065, 2022.
25. Government of India, Digital Personal Data Protection Act, No. 22 of 2023, New Delhi, India, 2023.
26. L. Festinger, "A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance",. Stanford, CA, USA: Stanford Univ. Press, 1957.
27. R. K. Garrett, "Echo chambers online?," Journal of Communication, 2009, 59(2), 265–285.
28. N. Stroud, Niche News. New York, NY, USA: Oxford Univ. Press, 2011.
29. S. Flaxman, S. Goel, and J. Rao, "Filter bubbles and echo chambers," Public Opinion Quarterly, 2016, 80(1), 298–320.
30. J. Habermas, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 1989.
31. H. Arendt, The Human Condition. Chicago, IL, USA: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1958.
32. I. Kant, Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. Riga, Latvia: Hartknoch, 1785.
33. J. S. Mill, On Liberty. London, U.K.: John W. Parker and Son, 1859.
34. M. Foucault, Power/Knowledge. New York, NY, USA: Pantheon, 1980.
35. E. Hersh and B. Schaffner, "Targeted campaign appeals and voting behavior," Political Behavior, 2013, 35(3), 489–515.
36. K. Yeung, "Algorithmic regulation," Regulation & Governance, 2018, 12(4), 505–523.
37. D. Beer, "The social power of algorithms," Information, Communication & Society, 2017, 20(1), 1–13.
38. T. Bucher, "The algorithmic imaginary," Information, Communication & Society, 2017, 20(1), 30–44.
39. N. Persily, "The 2016 U.S. election and the media," Journal of Democracy, 2017, 28(2), 63–76.