Vol. 24 (2026): Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Linguistics, Psychology and Creative Education (ICLPCE 2026)
E-ISSN: 3105-0522 P-ISSN：3105-0514
DOI: https://doi.org/10.70267/iclpce.2026184189

The Impact of Information Silos on Individual Psychology in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

Aixin Song*

Huo Yingdong Jianxi College, University of Macau, Macau 999078, China

**Corresponding author: Aixin Song.*

Abstract

In today's digital age, artificial intelligence and big data technologies are widely applied, leading to the development of personalized recommendation systems. While these systems enhance user experience, they have also contributed to the creation of information silos. An information silo refers to a narrow information environment in which individuals are exposed primarily to content that aligns with their existing views due to algorithmic recommendations. Consequently, users typically encounter only information that reinforces their perspectives, thereby influencing their cognition. This study aims to explore the mechanisms through which artificial intelligence drives the formation of information silos and to examine the impact of this phenomenon on individual psychology. To achieve this objective, the paper employs a combined approach of literature review and case analysis to investigate existing recommendation algorithms and their influence on user behavior. Furthermore, psychological theories are introduced to analyze how information silos contribute to cognitive biases in individuals. By integrating perspectives from both artificial intelligence and psychology, the study provides an in-depth analysis of how algorithm-driven personalized recommendations affect user psychology and social fragmentation. Through this research, it is hoped that the potential impact of information silos on individual mental health and society as a whole will be revealed, offering theoretical support for future solutions and fostering a more diverse digital information environment.

Keywords

information echo chambers, big data, artificial intelligence, personalized recommendations, psychology

1. Introduction

With the rapid proliferation of artificial intelligence technology, algorithm-driven personalized recommendation systems have become deeply embedded in users' daily information-seeking behaviors. The content individuals receive daily is increasingly determined by platform algorithms rather than by active choice. While this technological transformation has enhanced the efficiency of information matching, it has also drawn widespread academic attention to the phenomenon of the "information bubble." Existing research indicates that, although algorithmic recommendations reinforce users' interests and preferences, they systematically limit individuals' exposure to diverse viewpoints, thereby profoundly influencing their cognitive structures and psychological states [1,2]. However, current research remains insufficient in providing a comprehensive analysis of the formation mechanisms, psychological effects, and cross-cultural variations of the information bubble. This paper aims to systematically examine the technical pathways of information filter bubbles and their psychological impact mechanisms from an interdisciplinary perspective that combines algorithmic logic and cognitive psychology. By drawing on case studies across multiple platforms, it seeks to offer insights into understanding cognitive health issues in the digital age. Reason: The revision improves clarity and readability by correcting grammar, punctuation, and spelling errors (e.g., “personalised” to “personalized,” “whilst” to “while,” “heterogeneous viewpoints” to “diverse viewpoints,” “information-seeking behaviours” to “information-seeking behaviors”). It also enhances sentence flow and coherence by breaking up long sentences and refining word choice. Additionally, the revision standardizes terminology and formatting for a more professional and polished academic tone.

2. Mechanisms of Information Bubble Formation

2.1 Algorithm-Driven Personalized Recommendations

Every time we open our mobile phones and interact with a platform—such as liking, saving, or following specific types of content (e.g., political news, entertainment videos, or technical tutorials); spending more than 30 seconds on a particular article; or swiping past certain content on a short-video platform while repeatedly watching another category of clips—this behavioral data is collected, processed, and analyzed by sophisticated recommendation system algorithms behind the scenes. These algorithms determine what content you will see and what information you will miss.

Recommendation systems match content based on user behavior data, utilizing collaborative filtering, content-based recommendations, and deep learning models to continuously optimize platform engagement metrics such as click-through rates and dwell time[1]. These algorithms tend to promote content, systematically reinforcing users’ existing interests and thereby reducing their exposure to diverse viewpoints [2].

2.2 User Behavior and the Positive Feedback Loop

User behavior data serves as the fuel for algorithm training, driving the continuous evolution of recommendation models such as collaborative filtering, content-based recommendation, and deep learning models. Crucially, the primary optimization objective of these algorithms is typically to increase user dwell time and platform engagement rates, rather than to ensure information diversity [3]. This design orientation gives rise to a closed positive feedback loop:

clicks → Algorithm records preferences → Model parameters are adjusted → Probability of displaying similar content increases → User receives more similar content → A new round of click behavior is captured…

This positive feedback loop causes recommendation systems to gradually shift from to user needs to user needs. As the loop repeats, the algorithm’s understanding of user preferences becomes increasingly precise and entrenched—it focuses exclusively on interests the user has already demonstrated while consistently overlooking areas the user has never encountered. This process lays the structural foundation for the formation of a homogenized information environment at a technical level.

3. The Psychological Impact of the Information Bubble

3.1 Reinforcement of Confirmation Bias and Cognitive Rigidity

Confirmation bias is a cognitive bias in which individuals, during information processing, tend to select, interpret, and retain information that supports their existing beliefs [4]. The information bubble, through the algorithmic positive feedback loop described above, further amplifies this bias systematically.

Prolonged exposure to a homogenized information environment, constructed by algorithms, leads to the continuous reinforcement of an individual’s confirmation bias. Classic psychological experiments have demonstrated [5] that when faced with ambiguous evidence, people’s inherent positions distort the filtering and interpretation of information. Algorithm-driven information silos transform this individual-level cognitive bias into a technology-supported, systematic “institution.” Under this system, the information ecosystem gradually becomes homogenized due to the absence of cognitive stimulation from heterogeneous perspectives. Research indicates that prolonged exposure to such an environment not only results in a sustained decline in the acceptance of contradictory information but also causes individuals' cognitive schemas to become increasingly rigid, with the capacities for "self-doubt" and "perspective-taking"—essential for critical thinking—gradually atrophying [6].

3.2 Cognitive Dissonance and Emotional Fluctuations

When a small amount of heterogeneous information (such as fact-checking reports that contradict one's own political stance) unexpectedly enters an echo chamber, individuals experience cognitive dissonance [7]. This psychological discomfort is intensified within the context of the information echo chamber and is challenging to regulate effectively, manifesting specifically across the following three dimensions:

3.2.1 Abnormal Increase in the Intensity of Dissonance

Traditional cognitive dissonance theory posits that the degree of dissonance depends on the importance of the conflicting beliefs. However, in the social media era, algorithms' "dilution" of conflicting information—such as burying it amidst a vast amount of homogeneous content—artificially intensifies the sense of dissonance. For example, when a user, after continuous exposure to a large volume of content supporting a particular political stance, suddenly encounters a contradictory report, the resulting sense of dissonance is significantly stronger than if they had encountered the same content within a diverse information environment.

3.2.2 Defensive Avoidance and Emotional Reactions

To alleviate the psychological discomfort caused by cognitive dissonance, users typically employ the following three defensive avoidance strategies:

1) Information blocking: the act of obstructing or blacklisting sources of dissenting information.
2) Cognitive Distortion: Interpreting contradictory information as by hostile forces, as labeling scientific consensus as news from the mainstream media.
3) Emotional venting: attacking individuals with differing views in comment sections, which can lead to cyberbullying.

The aforementioned processes are likely to induce negative emotional states such as anxiety, hostility, and even paranoia. If sustained over the long term, these may develop into adjustment disorders [8].

4. Case Study: Multi-Platform Comparison

4.1 Case Study 1: Facebook and the 2016 and 2020 U.S. Presidential Elections

Bakshy et al. [2], after analyzing data from 870,000 Facebook users, found that content representing opposing viewpoints accounted for only 9.6% of users' news feeds—far below the 23.4% observed in a randomized allocation scenario. Even when such content did appear, the algorithm systematically reduced its exposure frequency, with an average exposure rate of only one-third that of like-minded content.

Research by Guess et al. [13] further revealed that voters exposed to diverse information correctly identified candidates' policy stances with an accuracy rate of 78%, whereas voters confined to information silos for extended periods achieved an accuracy rate of only 41%. This disparity clearly highlights the significant harm that information silos inflict on voters' cognitive understanding and the quality of democratic decision-making.

During the 2020 election, Facebook's internal researchers—later revealed by the leaked 'Facebook Files'—acknowledged that the platform's recommendation algorithms played a significant role in amplifying emotional and polarizing content. However, due to commercial considerations, proposed improvements were not implemented. This indicates that the issue of information silos is not merely a technical problem but reflects a fundamental conflict between the platform's commercial interests and its public responsibility.

4.2 Case Study 2: YouTube and the Path to Radicalization (German Research)

Research by Flaxman et al. [11] on online news consumption patterns indicates that users on algorithm-driven platforms are exposed to ideological content with significantly more extreme stances than those who visit news websites directly. For example, YouTube's recommendation algorithm has been widely criticized for "continuously directing users toward more inflammatory content." Researchers found that users who start with mainstream political commentary often reach extremist nationalist or conspiracy theory content after just a few clicks through the algorithmic recommendation chain. This 'radicalization funnel' phenomenon has been documented in many European and American countries and is considered to be correlated with the online mobilization of right-wing extremism.

4.3 Case Study 3: Chinese Social Media Platforms and the Health Information Echo Chamber

The echo chamber effect is also prevalent on domestic platforms, though it manifests through distinct content dimensions. For example, on platforms such as Weibo and WeChat, when users are repeatedly exposed to specific health concepts—such as traditional Chinese medicine wellness practices or particular dietary therapies—algorithms continuously promote health content that aligns with their existing beliefs while filtering out evidence-based counterarguments. This health information echo chamber became especially pronounced during the COVID-19 pandemic. Some users, having been immersed in a particular information ecosystem for an extended period, developed cognitive resistance to official public health guidelines, resulting in significant fragmentation in the dissemination of epidemic prevention information. These phenomena demonstrate that the echo chamber effect is not confined to the political sphere but also has profound practical implications in fields such as public health and science communication.

4.4 Summary: Cross-Case Comparison

A synthesis of the three cases reveals that, regardless of platform type (Western commercial platforms or domestic social media ecosystems) or content domain (politics, health, culture), algorithm-driven filter bubbles operate with highly similar logic: they use user interaction data as feedback signals to continuously reduce information diversity and reinforce existing cognitive biases. Differences arise primarily in content orientation and regulatory environments, rather than in the underlying mechanisms. This consistency across platforms and cultures further confirms the structural and universal nature of the information bubble problem.

5. Countermeasures

5.1 Algorithmic Transparency and Diversity in Design

Under the EU's Digital Services Act (DSA), platforms are required to provide users with detailed explanations of why specific content is recommended. Research indicates that transparency-focused design can effectively increase users' willingness to actively break out of their echo chambers.

Introducing an information entropy metric into recommendation models and requiring that a certain proportion of recommended content originates from cognitively opposing domains is one of the technical intervention strategies currently under active discussion in academia. A review by Zhao et al. [14] systematically summarizes the latest developments in fairness and diversity design within recommendation systems, providing a technical foundation for relevant policy formulation. TikTok also highlighted the goal of optimizing recommendation diversity in its 2023 Transparency Report [15]; however, the quantitative effectiveness of specific mechanisms has yet to be validated by peer-reviewed research.

5.2 Targeted Psychological Interventions

At the application level, AI mental health tools could incorporate an diversity reminder module. When a user is detected to be persistently focused on a single topic, the system would provide suggestions for cognitive expansion (e.g., reading perspectives from different standpoints; this can help alleviate cognitive strain The core logic of such interventions lies in activating users' metacognitive awareness through external prompts, thereby partially offsetting the narrowing effect on cognitive horizons caused by algorithmic positive feedback loops.

5.3 Introducing Relevant Courses

The Civic Online Reasoning course, developed by the Stanford History Education Group (SHEG) in the United States, incorporates media critical thinking training into simulated social media feeds, systematically enhancing students' ability to recognize algorithmic bias. Research shows that within three months of completing the training, participants' susceptibility to false information decreased by 40%[16]. This finding demonstrates that media literacy education, as a long-term strategy for addressing information silos, holds significant practical value.

6. Conclusion

In summary, this study demonstrates that in the era of artificial intelligence, personalized recommendation systems—primarily driven by user dwell time and interaction data—utilize technical mechanisms such as collaborative filtering, content recommendation, and deep learning to construct a closed-loop system that continuously reinforces users' existing preferences. At a technical level, this mechanism establishes the structural foundation for the formation of information silos and filter bubbles, generating a series of far-reaching psychological effects on individuals. It systematically reinforces confirmation bias, leading to cognitive rigidity; amplifies the intensity of cognitive dissonance, prompting individuals to resolve psychological discomfort through defensive avoidance, thereby exacerbating emotional volatility and social polarization; and, at the group level, catalyzes more extreme polarization of positions, eroding the foundations of social dialogue and cooperation.

Through a comparative analysis of multiple cases—including Facebook's election ecosystem, YouTube's radicalization pathways, and the dissemination of health information on Chinese platforms—this study further confirms the structural consistency of the information filter bubble effect across platforms and cultures. It reveals that the phenomenon is fundamentally a systemic product arising from the combined influence of platform business logic and algorithmic optimization objectives.

This study has certain limitations. The current analysis relies primarily on published empirical data and case materials, lacking first-hand survey data from specific populations. Additionally, the specific manifestations of the information bubble effect may vary significantly across groups with different cultural backgrounds, age groups, and levels of digital literacy. This variability requires verification through subsequent cross-cultural and stratified research.

Breaking down information echo chambers is not merely a matter of technological ethics; it is a systemic endeavor involving individual mental well-being and social cohesion. It requires collaboration among algorithm engineers, policymakers, psychologists, and educators to strike a balance between technological innovation, institutional regulation, and individual empowerment, thereby jointly fostering a digital information ecosystem that is both efficient and healthy.

References

[1] Jannach, D., Zanker, M., Felfernig, A., & Friedrich, G. (2010). *Recommender systems: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

[2] Bakshy, E., Messing, S., & Adamic, L. A. (2015). Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. *Science, 348*(6239), 1130–1132.

[3] Zhou, K., Zhou, J., Zeng, Y., & Gao, M. (2020). Improving conversational recommender systems via knowledge graph-based semantic fusion. *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, 1006–1014. https://doi.org/10.1145/3394486.3403143

[4] Nickerson, R. S. (1998). Confirmation bias: A ubiquitous phenomenon in many guises. *Review of General Psychology*, *2*(2), 175–220.

[5] Lord, C. G., Ross, L., & Lepper, M. R. (1979). Biased assimilation and attitude polarisation: The effects of prior theories on subsequently considered evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*(11), 2098–2109.

[6] Bail, C. A., Argyle, L. P., Brown, T. W., Bumpus, J. P., Chen, H., Hunzaker, M. B. F., Lee, J., Mann, M., Merhout, F., & Volfovsky, A. (2018). Exposure to opposing views on social media can increase political polarisation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 115*(37), 9216–9221. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1804840115

[7] Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance* (Vol. 2). Stanford University Press.

[8] Tsfati, Y., Cohen, J., Dvir-Gvirsman, S., Tsuriel, K., Waismel-Manor, I., & Holbert, R. L. (2021). Political para-social relationship as a predictor of voting preferences in the Israeli 2019 elections. *Communication Research*, 49(8), 1118–1147. https://doi.org/10.1177/00936502211032822

[9] Moscovici, S., & Zavalloni, M. (1969). The group as a polariser of attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 12*(2), 125–135.

[10] Sunstein, C. R. (2002). The law of group polarisation. *Journal of Political Philosophy, 10*(2), 175–195

[11] Flaxman, S., Goel, S., & Rao, J. M. (2016). Filter bubbles, echo chambers, and online news consumption. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 80*(S1), 298–320.

[12] Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Addison-Wesley.

[13] Guess, A., Nagler, J., & Tucker, J. (2019). Less than you think: Prevalence and predictors of fake news dissemination on Facebook. *Science Advances, 5*(1), eaau4586.

[14] Zhao, Y., Wang, Y., Liu, Y., Cheng, X., Aggarwal, C. C., & Derr, T. (2025). Fairness and diversity in recommender systems: A survey. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology, 16*(1), 1–28.

[15] TikTok. (2023). *Community guidelines enforcement report* (Q3). https://www.tiktok.com/transparency/

[16] Breakstone, J., Smith, M., Wineburg, S., Rapaport, A., Carle, J., Garland, M., & Saavedra, A. (2021). Students' civic online reasoning: A national portrait. *Educational Researcher, 50*(8), 505–515.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgment

This paper is an output of the science project.