P-ISSN: 2790-6795	Annals of Human and Social Sciences	Apr-June 2024,Vol. 5, No. 2 (S)
O-ISSN:2790-6809	http://doi.org/10.35484/ahss.2024(5-II-S)22	[219-232]

Annals of Human and Social Sciences
www.ahss.org.pk

RESEARCH PAPER

Algorithmic Curation in Facebook: An Investigation into the role of AI in Forming Political Polarization and Misinformation in Pakistan

[1]Ali Raza, * and [2]Malik Waqar Aslam

1. Student, BS International Relations, Department of Political Science and International Relations, University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Lecturer Department of Political Science and International Relations, University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

Corresponding Author alirzkhn@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research paper investigates the impact of AI Algorithmic curation and filter bubbles on the spread of misinformation and political polarization in Pakistan. It also highlights the recommendation system of Facebook and its role in exposing users to content based on selective exposure. The role of AI and recommendation algorithm curation in spreading misinformation, and deepening polarized political views have raised concerns. The AI Social Media Algorithmic Curation crafts a system based on personalization that improves user experience on the platform and maximizes engagement. However, this technique is also deepening polarization in the society by reinforcing pre-existing beliefs and limiting dissenting viewpoints. This multidisciplinary study applies quantitative techniques by employing Contingency Tables on the available and collected data to comprehend and reveal the underlying complex dynamics at play. The method systematically analyzes the data set of posts and the public's view via a survey. The findings highlight the bias patterns in FB's algorithm, user engagement data, and the role of AI in deepening polarization. There needs to be more transparency in the working of algorithmic curation and Meta should introduce features where users have more control over their feeds allowing diverse viewpoints.

Keywords: Cyberpolitics, Deep Fake, Generative AI, Polarization, Social Media

Introduction

Humanity has arrived at a point of progress where it is about to witness a societal revolution bound to change the fundamental dynamics of life i.e. AI. AI brings with it innumerable opportunities and deepening ethical dilemmas in equal parts. The massive interest and investment in AI are increasing enthusiasm and fear in the masses. At this point, this phenomenon is still not holistically understood nor debated in academic and policy circles. This research paper aims to shed light on this overlooked yet new phenomenon by understanding the complex AI working in Social Media especially Facebook in Pakistan's context.

Today the world is facing a new phenomenon which is Big Data. It allows humanity to analyse a large set of data to identify patterns, associations, and trends (Tiao, 2024). Artificial Intelligence of social media platforms is continuously making the patterns of datasets for the hot and cold interests of users. Facebook labels the content as hot interest in which the user actively engages. On the contrary, the cold interest is the one where the user seldom engages with the content. The AI records and memorizes the hot and cold interests of users and brings forth such content that keeps the user engaged and happy. This learning process is continuous and in reaction, the consumer is encored with **Algorithmic Curation.** Scholars defined Algorithmic Curation as it is the organized collection of digital content using personalized searches and recommendation algorithms and keeping data up-to-date using continuous real-time reading of user interests (oxford, 2022).

Meta has explained how its algorithm works. Every time a user opens Facebook, the algorithm goes through a four-step process to determine what content most likely matters to the user.

Inventory: The inventory includes posts shared by the user's friends and the pages a user follows on News Feed, Watch, Shorts, etc.

Signals: For this stage, we consider hundreds of thousands of signals, including:

When and who uploaded this story? The viewing environment focuses such as the:

What time of the day is it? How quick is the internet connection?

Prediction: How likely is a user to interact with this post? The algorithm then utilizes all those signals to forecast your likelihood of engaging with a post. We make predictions that:

How likely are you to leave a comment on a story? How likely are you to spend time reading that story? Would you watch the video through to the end? How likely are you to say this story is informative?

Score: The score indicates how interested people will be in this post. Then we combine all of the collected signals to create a relevancy score, which shows how interested the user will be in that content. Meta forecasts the probability of spending time with that post. Probability to enjoy, remark, and share. You'll likely find this informative. (Zote, 2022)

From the above-mentioned mechanism, we learned how a feed is constituted in the Meta products specifically Facebook. We have thoroughly discussed the role of artificial intelligence in network distribution. This algorithmic curation raises the ethical dilemma of polarization between the users on Facebook as well as in society. In Pakistan's context, according to recent demographic information about Social Media users in Pakistan, there are more than 46.44 million Pakistanis on Facebook (oosga, 2023). Each user is catered to by the AI algorithmic curation which is likely causing polarization in society.

Political scientists argue that disagreements on social issues, as well as in government policies, often lead a society to destructive polarization (Kelly, 2021). The far extremes on both ends adhere to and reiterate their viewpoints, resulting in the systemic barrier to harmony, peacebuilding, and progress. As for political polarization, it is the shift of political parties as well as their followers towards ideological extremes. In the case of Pakistan, Ali stated that the fundamental changes in the society, including media liberalization, information technology, and globalization which have linked groups and civilizations, are the primary causes of polarization in Pakistan. Furthermore, polarized political opinions have been established in Pakistan due to extreme radicalization, socio-economic degradation, and tremendous population growth. (Ali, 2014)

The Impact of social media is now moving from the arenas of media and economics towards the arena of politics. Political party affiliations now determine social identity. This social identity throws the supporters of political parties in the fire of "Us vs Them". Blaming each other on every topic and disgrace by linking with scandals are new strategies employed by politicians to gain popularity. (Lodhi, 2022)

As for the misinformation aspect in social media, generative AI is a tool that offers a lot to content creators. With the advent of artificial intelligence now it is easy to make deep fake videos and AI-generated audio and images. The most attention-seeking and attention-grabbing content is videos, so we are mostly focusing on the deep fake videos or AI-generated videos in this paper. Deepfakes are falsified media, typically videos, produced by artificial intelligence (AI) systems. By replacing a person's voice or appearance with

another, these techniques create the illusion that the person in the video is speaking or acting in ways they never would have. (Times, 2023)

Literature Review

The strength of human intelligence is additivity. Humans can adjust according to environmental conditions and change their behavior according to continuous learning (Ertel, 2018). This is where Algorithms come in, Algorithms can be simple, depending on the task at hand, but they are all deterministic and rely on established principles to solve problems. On the other hand, Artificial Intelligence is built to learn and adopt new situations and make machines simulate human intelligence to work on their own. Algorithms are definite, every stage is well-defined and unambiguous. It is a creation of intelligent machines capable of learning from data, identifying patterns, and predicting results. (Ashutosh, 2024)

According to the recent studies conducted in American settings show that AI-driven devices tend to escalate societal inequality and deepen social divisions, especially among traditionally marginalized populations (Alexa Hagerty, Igor Rubinov, 2019). It is anticipated that AI technologies will emerge in various forms and locations. Tremendous ideas and technology always transform everyone and everything when they come into contact with local cultures. (Hagerty, june 2018)

Social effects won't be "one size fits all," not even in the same nation or locality (Alexa Hagerty, Igor Rubinov, 2019). From an ethical perspective, autonomous weapons systems that are operated by robots and artificial intelligence (AI), such as lethal autonomous weapons systems (also known as LAWS), may be controversial. (B. Mikhail, 682-684). A human operator may easily control the machine and is rightfully in charge of making decisions if the decision-making algorithm is sufficiently straightforward and there are no ethical concerns. By enabling robots to decide who to kill, laws may go against basic human rights. For instance, machines may be ordered to exterminate anyone displaying "threatening behavior" (S. Russel, 2015).

Artificial intelligence on social networks is employing predictive analytics. Utilizing machine learning and statistics, predictive analysis examines behavior and generates forecasts. Humans have predictable habits and patterns, such as waking up, brushing teeth, showering, dressing, and eating breakfast. Predictive marketing helps marketers anticipate future events and tailor tactics accordingly (STELZNER, 2018). Social networks use Artificial Intelligence to keep people “on the platform”, that is to keep them “hooked (Stein, 2021).

In his study on the impact of tweets on individuals, Mr. Yakoov Stein found that the difference between the two groups grows over time. The cumulative effect of tweets is unstoppable; regardless of how little each tweet affects the people, who see it. There is no chance for anyone to move camps if enough time has passed, as the camps become completely isolated from one another (Stein, 2021).

Eli Pariser's "filter bubble" theory links algorithmic filtering to user polarisation, which explains this paradoxical phenomenon. According to Pariser, social media companies explicitly encourage people to pay more attention to viewpoints that are similar to their own. Recommendation systems link users to content that aligns with their current beliefs in order to boost metrics like engagement and ad revenue (Samuels, 2012).

Increased polarisation in society has also been widely linked to social networks (Seth Flaxman, 2016), affecting a variety of topics including politics (Glance, 2005), (Baer, 2016), (Michael D Conover, 2011).

According to traditional psychological theory, people become polarised due to "selective exposure" (Eytan Bakshy, 2015) (Kiran Garimella, 2018) (Stroud, 2010), which means they are more inclined to believe information that supports their pre-existing beliefs. The inclusion of Artificial intelligence into content production poses a bigger challenge. Prior, the digital manipulation of visuals as well as audio make the content indistinguishable from the real material. Initially, this so-called Deep fake was only in the movie industry but now it is advancing its foot in the Political arena, international affairs, and consumer deception. (Chesney, 2018)

There have been several instances of AI-generated videos depicting politicians making statements they never declared. In 2017, a video of Barack Obama released by the University of the. The program was capable enough of turning audio clips into realistic video (Seitz, 2017).

Obama's video was to demonstrate how deep fake technology works and to show a possible threat in the cyber sphere, in May 2019, a video of US House Speaker Nancy Pelosi went viral in which she appeared to drunkenly slur her words. Although the video was a deceptive one but did not classify as a deep fake. (O'Sullivan, 2019)

In the context of South Asian domestic politics, the fake news can be assessed through the closure of Facebook fake accounts as well as bots on the platform. For instance, in Bangladesh before the elections, Facebook shut down many leading news outlets and fake personal accounts on December 20, 2018. According to the head of Facebook's cybersecurity policy Nathaniel Gleicher, the investigation proved that individuals from the Bangladesh government were involved in the activity. (Devnath, 2018)

After analyzing the diverse literature, we have concluded that there is a need to investigate the role of AI in spreading misinformation and deepening polarization in Pakistani society. Also, how fake news and misinformation through AI-generated content lead to political polarization. Similarly, how does exposure to AI-generated content affect individuals' attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors toward political issues and ideologies?

Material and Methods

The quantitative method's Contingency Tables are used to investigate and analyze the influence of AI algorithmic curation on Facebook and its impact on society. By gathering the primary data and coming up with the frequency counts for each category, the Chi-Square tool is used to check the p-value. Primary data was collected via a survey questionnaire with a sample population of 118 subjects. The sample population was derived from the Convenience sampling technique. The findings via the response alternatives of the survey are summarized using pie charts.

Results and Discussion

During analysis, we considered that strongly agree and agree as one entity and strongly disagree and disagree as the other entity to establish a concrete result.

Social media usage in Pakistan: The survey revealed that 64.8% of Pakistanis spend an average of 4 hours using Facebook and Instagram. While 9.8% population spends more than 6 hours on Facebook and Instagram. While only 25.4% sample population use Facebook and Instagram for less than 1 hour.

Table 1
Daily Meta Usage

Time Spent on Facebook and Instagram	Sample Population %

Less than 1 hour	25.4%
1 to 4 hours	45.9%
4 to 6 hours	18.9%
More than 6 hours	9.8%

Facebook as a source of video Content: Our survey expressed that 28.4% don't watch videos on Facebook. 57% of people are sure that their prominent behavior while using Facebook is watching videos. 14.6%people are confused about their behavior of using social media

Table 2
Video Consumption on Meta

Behavior on Video Content Exposure on Facebool	Sample Population %
No Watch Time	28.4%
High Watch Time	57%
Unsure	14.6%

Facebook as a source of news: 75.6% of people regard Facebook as a source of news. 10.6% of people disagreed with the opinion that Facebook is a source of news. 13.8% of people give a response as neutral means that they are confused over it.

Table 3
Facebook as source of news

Facebook as a source of news	Sample Population %
Highly Agree	15.4%
Agree	60.2%
Neutral	13.8%
Disagree	4.9%
Strongly Disagree	5.7%

Posts on feed: 36.6% of people said that they only get posts from followed ones. While on the other hand, 37.4% of people simply rejected the statement. While 26% do not notice the source of content.

Table 4
Posts from followed ones only

Posts on Feed from followed ones only	Sample Population %
Highly Agree	4.9%
Agree	31.7%
Neutral	26%
Disagree	27.6%
Strongly Disagree	9.8%

Content liked by friends: 73.7% **of** people agreed that they get the content on their feed that is liked by their friends. 10.7% only denied this statement. 15.6% population doesn't have any idea.

Table 5
Friend-liked content

Friend-liked content	Sample Population %
Highly Agree	59.8%

Agree	13.9%
Neutral	15.6%
Disagree	7.4%
Strongly Disagree	3.3%

Content on feed which we are thinking: 69.9% population agreed that they get the content they are thinking and even they see the same things, the same content, and the same advertisements, which they are vocal about. 12.2% of people only disagreed with it. 17.9% population responded as neutral which means they do not notice.

Table 6
Thought-content sync

Content on FB Feed Based on Thoughts and Vocals	Sample Population %
Highly Agree	25.2%
Agree	44.7%
Neutral	17.9%
Disagree	8.1%
Strongly Disagree	4.1%

Recognition of fake images: 57.9% of people claimed that they can recognize the fake images. Only 8.3% of people agreed that they can't recognize on Facebook which picture is fake and which is real. While 33.9% showed a Neutral response.

Table 7
Fake image recognition

Fake images recognition	Sample Population %
Highly Agree	11.6%
Agree	46.3%
Neutral	33.9%
Disagree	5%
Strongly Disagree	3.3%

Recognition of misinformative video: 68.6% even agreed that they can recognize which video is fact-based and which video is misinformative. Only 9.9% disagreed that they can't recognize while 21.5% person responded neutral which means they are confused they have no idea about misinformative videos on Facebook.

Table 8
Misinformative Video Recognition

Misinformative video recognition	Sample Population %
Highly Agree	11.6%
Agree	57%
Neutral	21.5%
Disagree	7.34%
Strongly Disagree	2.5%

Recognition of deep fake videos: There is 55.3% population in society claimed that they have encountered deep fake videos, which means they can distinguish between genuine content and deep fake videos. Only 20.7% accepted that they couldn't recognize the deep fake video. 24% population responded neutral which means they are confused.

Table 9
Recognition of Deepfake Video

Deep fake video recognition	Sample Population %
Highly Agree	13.2%
Agree	42.1%
Neutral	24%
Disagree	17.4%
Strongly Disagree	3.3%

Responding behavior to the AI-generated content: 47.1% population agreed that they share the AI-generated content after verifying its authenticity. 29.9% disagreed that they share the AI-generated content without verifying. 24% population responded Neutral which means that either they don't know about Ai AI-generated content or they have no idea about their behavior.

Table 10
Response to AI-Generated content

Response to AI-Generated content	Sample Population %
Highly Agree	5.8%
Agree	41.3%
Neutral	24%
Disagree	19%
Strongly Disagree	10.9%

Political affiliations and Ai Generated Data: 40.5% population agreed that their political affiliations make them believe in Ai-generated content whether it is authentic or not. 31.4% disagreed with the statement. 28.1% of people responded neutral which means they are unable to link their ability to believe content shown on Facebook with their political affiliations.

Table 11
Effect of Political Affiliation on content validity

Political Affiliation and believe on the validity of AI-generated content	Sample Population %
Highly Agree	5%
Agree	35.5%
Neutral	28.1%
Disagree	23.1%
Strongly Disagree	8.3%

Role of Peer Endorsements in believing content on Facebook: 53.8% population in Pakistani society agreed that the Peer's recommendation or endorsements on Facebook influence their belief in the accuracy of content in the context of politics. Only 11.1% of people disagreed that Peer endorsements do not affect their belief in the accuracy of political content. While 35% of people responded neutral.

Table 12
Effect of Peer Endorsement on content validity

Effect of Peer endorsement on the perceptive validity of AI-generated content	Sample Population %
Highly Agree	8.5%
Agree	43.5%
Neutral	35%
Disagree	9.4%

Strongly Disagree	1.7%

Relationship between level of engagement and credibility: 48.7% population agreed that a higher level of engagement such as more likes, more comments, and more shares influences the user to believe in the credibility of content. Just 20.2% population disagreed with the statement. While 31.1% population has responded Neutral which reflects that they do not notice the credibility of the content they are consuming.

Table 13
Effect of Engagement on content validity

Effect of engagement on the perceptive validity of AI-generated content	Sample Population %
Highly Agree	4.2%
Agree	44.5%
Neutral	31.1%
Disagree	14.3%
Strongly Disagree	5.9%

Personal Bias and accuracy of political content: 55.1% of people agreed that their personal biases affect their perception of the accuracy of political content. While 19.8% of people disagreed with the statement and 25% of people responded neutral.

Table 14
Effect of personal biases on content validity

Effect of Personal biases on the perceptive validity of AI-generated content	Sample Population %
Highly Agree	6%
Agree	49.1%
Neutral	25%
Disagree	17.2%
Strongly Disagree	2.6%

Liked content and Facebook feed: 71.9% population agreed that when they like any content then Facebook shows more content of that type. 10.7% people disagreed with this statement while 17.4% responded neutral which means they do not notice or have no idea of the Facebook feed behavior.

Table 15
Effect of liking content on feed

High frequency of the same content on liking content	Sample Population %
Highly Agree	9.9%
Agree	62%
Neutral	17.4%
Disagree	7.4%
Strongly Disagree	3.3%

Adverse leadership vs my leadership: 65.3% of people in Pakistan agreed that when they experience watching videos of adverse political group leadership then their feed shows them a more positive video of their leadership. 10% population disagreed with it. Around 24.8% of people responded neutral which means they have no idea about it.

Table 16
Adverse Leadership vs My Leadership

Adverse leadership vs my leadership	Sample Population %
Highly Agree	6.6%
Agree	58.7%
Neutral	24.8%
Disagree	8.3%
Strongly Disagree	1.7%

Political views and content sharing: 50% population agreed that they share content when it's aligned with their political views irrespective that it is AI-generated or original content. 22% population disagreed. While 28% of people are confused about whether their political views are acting as a supportive variable in sharing content or not.

Table 17
Political views and Content sharing

Sharing content on the basis of its alignment with our political beliefs	Sample Population %
Highly Agree	5.1%
Agree	44.9%
Neutral	28%
Disagree	18.6%
Strongly Disagree	3.4%

Reinforcement of political beliefs: our survey revealed that 50.8% population is agreed and convinced that their Facebook feed has reinforced their political ideas and beliefs. Only 22.8% population said that their Facebook feed did not reinforce their political ideas. 26.3% of people responded neutral.

Table 18
Reinforcement of Political Beliefs

Role of Facebook Feed on reinforcement of Political Beliefs	Sample Population %
Highly Agree	4.2%
Agree	46.6%
Neutral	26.3%
Disagree	16.9%
Strongly Disagree	5.9%

To apply the quantitative technique of the Contingency Table, we came up with a null hypothesis and an alternate hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis: There is no influence of algorithmic curation on polarization.

It indicates there is no relationship between the two categorical variables.

Alternate Hypothesis: The AI algorithmic curation deepens polarization in the society

The Alternative Hypothesis indicates that there exists a strong relationship between the two variables.

Table 18
Contingency Table

	Increased	Decreased	Neutral	Total
Strong Influence	20	5	10	35
Mild Influence	15	10	20	45
Weak Influence	5	20	13	38
Total	40	35	43	118

The Contingency Table frequencies are in place for each category. By applying the Contingency Table technique, the following results came up where the Chi-Square statistic is **22.23**, and the P-value calculates to **0.00018** which is less than the standard significance level of **0.05**. This means that our null hypothesis is rejected. The rejection of the null hypothesis indicates that there is a statistically significant relationship between AI algorithmic curation and its impact on polarization in society.

Moreover, according to our survey data, almost 28.4% population is consuming content like pictures and written posts. As Thompson argued in his research paper politicians are a risk that their actions may be disclosed in a way that conflicts with the image they want to project. So according to him, it became more difficult to propagate symbolic content only (Thompson, 2005).

At the same time 89.4% population in our analysis consider Facebook as a source of news. People think that traditional media is influenced by power structures while social media is a valid source of news as it does not influence news based on the interests of political elites. However, society is unaware of the influence of the algorithm. The collective opinion on Facebook being an uncontrolled news platform is deceptive. The fact is that a user's hobbies and interests control what the feed is showing, and this control lies with the AI. Society is trapped in a bubble that scholars referred as a filter bubble.

To understand the impact of algorithmic curation and misinformation, we need to understand what our feed is showing us. We find that 89.3% Pakistani population who use Facebook also get the content their friends and family like. The principles of the Facebook feed algorithm also support the findings. While 36.6% of people claimed that they only get news from their followed pages, groups, and friends. The response of 26% population reflected that they even don't care who the author of the content is. This is the very basic concern for evaluating the credibility and authenticity of content.

Here at this stage, another important thing is to understand the content. Milly Smith expressed his concerns on the Generative Artificial intelligence content. She declared the misinformation and fake news as a challenge on social media. She asserted that Generative algorithms have the potential to produce and propagate misleading information if they are not properly trained and supervised. (smith, 2024).

According to our survey, 57.9% of people claimed that they could recognize fake images and 68.6% population of our sample claimed that they could recognize fake images. Now here an important concern that arises with this claim is what type of fake content they can recognize. The objective validation of content can only be proved through forensics while the subject validation is the one they are talking about. They are just subjectively validating the content which is based on their feelings, emotions, or opinions.

The data also showed that 55.3% population also agreed that they encountered deep fake content (videos, audio, and pictures). Now this claim needs an investigation into what content they are categorizing in the deep fake content. It's a controversial claim because the validation of content can only be done through forensics and if the mass population is saying they encountered deep fake videos then there can be two scenarios either the content goes through the judicial evaluation and the judiciary gives the decision that the content is proved

to be fake. The second probability is that the stakeholders of videos specifically victims come on social media and start propagating that the video is deep fake.

When we asked people about their response behavior to artificially generated content then the response was that only 47.1% of people are sharing Ai generated content after validation. While 29.8% of people said that they share the content without validating. When the question asked about the avoidance of Ai generated content then 49.5% said that they tend to ignore that content.

Table 19
Tendency of Avoiding content

Tendency to ignore Ai-Generated content	Sample Population %
Highly Agree	42.1%
Agree	7.4%
Neutral	33.9%
Disagree	12.4%
Strongly Disagree	3.3%

Now here analysis is drawn that people are contradicting in their stance but they are in a pool of confusion. Even 33.9% are accepting that they are confused. They are unable to analyze their behavior. There can be various factors either their beliefs are still evolving or there is uncertainty or there is a lack of knowledge. Another important factor can be bias.

Another aspect of understanding this complex relationship is what is authentic according to people. When we asked people about their political affiliation and their tendency to believe in content then 40.5% were convinced that their political affiliations pursue their tendency to believe in the political content irrespective of its validity while 28.1 % reflected that they have no idea about it that either their political views are influencing their assessing power or not. The cherry on top is that 50% population accepted that they even share the content when it's aligned with their existing political beliefs. 48.7% population also agreed that the level of engagement with the post also gives them the satisfaction that the content the factually accurate. While only 20.2% of people rejected the statement.

41.1% of people also accepted that the higher frequency of posts on the feed made them believe that the content on this post was right. Only 25.2% give surety that the frequency of a singular content does not influence them to believe it right. People also showed an important behavior that only 11.1% denied from the fact that the peer recommendations and endorsements on Facebook force users to believe in the authenticity of the content. So the above five indicators show that on what basis people are authenticating the data.

Another variable is that if you engage with any content on Facebook then it will show the same type of content. 71.9% of people agreed that when they like the content related to their political leadership then their feed shows them more videos of the leader. While Facebook does not show the positive content of leadership of any other political leader. The exceptional case is when the leaders of other political parties are trending then Facebook shows them that trending content.

Conclusion

The analysis shows that Facebook is dividing society into schemas and these schemas exist in their cognitive thinking as well. The user only thinks what he sees and listens, which in turn is damaging the collective ideas. The creativity and innovation of new ideas are stuck as society is stuck in the schemas. So new ideas are prevailing from that 0.1% group that is controlling the means of communication. This is how a spider knits its web

around a person, every layer shows a specific interest and over time this spider web will get dense and it will be harder for the person to get out from the cognitive schemas of that web. This will eventually result in the death of versatility of interest as well as tolerance for dissenting viewpoints. The case will be different when a person gives time to exchanging ideas with different people in his daily life or reading books of diverse knowledge. If the input will be just through Facebook then our prediction will be proved valid.

In the end, when the survey enquired from the population about the role of Facebook feeds in the reinforcement of their existing political beliefs then 50.8% population agreed that yes social media reinforcing their political beliefs while 26.3% responded neutral. There are multiple reasons maybe those persons are less exposed to the political content or they have uncertainty or evolving beliefs so they were not able to assess any change or reinforcement of political ideas.

The paper concluded that selective exposure and eco chambers are at the roots of societal divisions. The AI-driven feed is proven in the survey. The nexus of political polarization and artificial intelligence is directly relation. The more people are in the hands of AI, the more the chances are that it will enhance societal divisions.

Recommendations

Policymakers, academic circles, and civil society need to highlight the issue of polarization in society caused by Facebook's algorithmic curation. There are several remedies to the issue, first and foremost, there should be more transparency in the algorithm's working. This could be done by Meta by providing users with the option to alter their feeds. Secondly, the algorithmic curation should adhere to neutral exposure rather than selective exposure. This would diversify the content feed and expose users to a variety of viewpoints rather than a single one. Otherwise, there should be an Algorithm free feed. Meta should also introduce a feature of fact-checking which should moderate the flow of misinformation and deepfakes. This moderation mechanism should help reduce the spread of misinformation that deepens polarization. In Pakistan's context, the policymakers should raise the issue with Meta and urge them to take measures to regulate their algorithmic curation.

References

Alexa Hagerty, Igor Rubinov. (2019). Global AI Ethics: A Review of the Social Impacts and Ethical Implications of Artificial Intelligence. *Cornell University* .

Ali, M. (2014, jan 15). *Blogs*. Retrieved from aaj tv : http://blogs.aaj.tv/2010/12/pakistan%E2%80%99s-polarized-politics

Allcott, H. &. (2017). Social media and fake news in the 2016 Elections. *The Journal of Economic* , 211-235.

Ashutosh. (2024, March 5). *How Do AI and Algorithms Different From Each Other*. Retrieved from *SDLC CORP*: https://sdlccorp.com/post/how-do-ai-and-algorithms-different-from-each-other/

B. Mikhail, M. A. (682-684). On the way to legal framework for AI in public sector. *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Theory and Practice of Electronic Governance, 2018.*

Devnath, A. (2018, December 22). *Bangladesh's fight against fake news*. Retrieved from *The Hindu*,: https://www.thehindu.com/news/

Ertel, W. (2018). *Introduction to Artificial Intelligence (2 ed.)*. (N. T. Black, Trans.) Springer.

faecbook. (n.d.). *Privacy*. Retrieved from *META*: https://www.facebook.com/privacy/dialog/is-facebook-listening-to-my-conversation/

Glance, L. A. (2005). The political blogosphere and the 2004 US election: divided they blog. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Link Discovery*, (pp. 36–43).

Hagerty, A. (june 2018). *A Lovely Grave for Learning": Exhuming the Dead of Guatemala's Genocide.* Los Angeles : Los Angeles Review of Books.

Kelly, M. (2021, december 9). *Political polarization and its echo chambers: Surprising new, cross-disciplinary perspectives from Princeton*. princeton university:

Kevin Ponniah. (2019, April 6). WhatsApp: The 'black hole' of fake news in India's. *BBC News*

Lodhi, M. (2022). *A crisis of trust? Dawn*. Retrieved from Dawn.com.

Michael D Conover, J. R. (2011). Political polarization on Twitter. *Fifth International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media.*

oosga. (2023). *Social Media in Pakistan - 2023 Stats & Platform Trends.* Singapore: oosga.

O'Sullivan, D. (2019, May 24). *Doctored videos shared to make Pelosi sound drunk viewed millions of times on social media*. *CNN*:

oxford, U. o. (2022, december 8). *New exhibit highlights differences between algorithmic and human curation*. university of oxford:

Robert Chesney, D. C. (2018, December 11). *Deepfakes and the New Disinformation War; The Coming Age of Post-Truth Geopolitics.* Foreign affairs

S. Russel, S. H. (2015). Ethics of artificial intelligence. *Nature*, 415-416.

Samuels, M. G. (2012). The Filter Bubble: What the Internet is Hiding from You by Eli Pariser. *UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*. doi:10.5070/D482011835

Seth Flaxman, S. G. (2016). Filter bubbles, echo chambers, and online news consumption. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 80*(S1), 298-320.

smith, M. (2024, Jan 10). *The Rise of Generative AI in Social Media and Its Impact on the Future of Gen AI*. All things work

Stein, Y. (2021, August). Artificial Intelligence in Social Networks Produces Polarization. *Academia Letters*.

STELZNER, M. (2018, APRIL 13). *Predictive Analytics: How Marketers Can Improve Future Activities*. *social media examiner*

Steven M. Seitz, S. S.-S. (2017, july 20). Synthesizing Obama: learning lip sync from audio. *ACM Transactions on Graphics, 36*(4), 1–13. doi:10.1145/3072959.3073640

Stroud, N. J. (2010). Polarization and Partisan Selective Exposure. *Journal of Communication, 60*(3), 556–576.

Thompson, J. B. (2005). The New Visibility. *Theory, Culture and Society, 22*(6), 31-51. doi:10.1177/0263276405059413

Times, T. E. (2023, nov 7). What are deepfake videos, how they are made, and how to spot fake ones? Here is all you should know. *The Economic Times*

Zote, J. (2022, november 9). *How the Facebook algorithm works and ways your brand can outsmart it*. sprout social