Proceeding of ICGPSH 2025 Symposium: International Relations and Global Governance
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BO26146

Research on the Impact of Social Media on Political Multipolarity in the 21st Century

Zihang Dou

Suzhou North America High School, Suzhou, China
17751970217@163.com

Abstract. In the digital age, social media platforms have reshaped political discourse, yet their structural mechanisms increasingly contribute to political polarization and ideological fragmentation. This paper examines how social media fosters divisive political dynamics through three interrelated frameworks: filter bubbles and echo chambers, group polarization and online tribalism, and misinformation and political manipulation. Using a qualitative analysis of theoretical frameworks and case studies, the study reveals how algorithmic personalization creates insulated information environments, reinforcing homogeneous beliefs and limiting exposure to diverse viewpoints. Online interactions within like-minded groups amplify extreme attitudes, while coordinated disinformation campaigns exploit psychological biases and viral dissemination to distort public perceptions and erode institutional trust. These mechanisms collectively weaken bipartisan dialogue, escalate intergroup antagonism, and threaten democratic stability by accelerating ideological polarization rather than facilitating constructive debate. The research highlights the need for multi-faceted solutions, including algorithmic transparency, misinformation regulation, and enhanced media literacy, to transform social media from a driver of division into a platform for inclusive, fact-based political discourse.

Keywords: political polarization, Filter Bubble & Echo Chamber, Group Polarization & Online Tribalism, Fake News, Misinformation & Political Manipulation

1. Introduction

In the twenty-first century, the world has seen the emergence of a wide variety of social software, such as Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, etc., which provide a platform for users to share their lives and interests, while also increasing the opportunities and possibilities for users to access and discuss world information and news, especially politically relevant content.. With the help of social software, people's ideological stances continue to collide and merge , which has led to many complex political issues and has had an impact on political multipolarity.

Political multipolarity refers to the increasing polarisation of political positions within a society or country, leading to extreme opposition between different groups in terms of ideology, policy stances and social values, and reducing the likelihood of compromise and consensus [1]. This phenomenon usually manifests itself in the form of intense partisan competition, polarisation of public opinion and increased social divisions. Among other things, in the context of political

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BO26146

multipolarity, the echo chamber effect is also on the rise, whereby groups of people with similar ideas are amplified and reinforced by constant communication and mutual identification with each other in the news media and social media [2]. Simultaneously, the information cocoon problem triggered by data and algorithms, whereby people only focus on information they choose or that they like, thus forming a closed ‘cocoon’, also influences the evolution of people's ideologies and their access to information [3]. In addition, artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning systems exhibit systematic unfairness in data processing, decision-making or recommendation processes, leading to further algorithmic bias as certain groups or perspectives are treated unfairly [4]. All of the above issues demonstrate the negative impact of social media on political multipolarity.

Whereas current social medias based on their algorithmic technology can filter information to users, that is, selecting specific information from a large amount of information and recommending it to a specific group of people, which can lead to group polarisation. This can lead to polarisation of a group of people, which can lead to that group making decisions and taking actions that are more radical than their initial beliefs and stances. In addition, on social software, the massive spread of fake news containing false political information can further influence the positions and perceptions of a wide range of users. These online platforms play a very important role in shaping political discourse under the current new media communication. Therefore, this paper examines the mechanisms by which platforms shape political discourse through a literature review and qualitative analysis, thus demonstrating how social media can lead to the weakening of bipartisan dialogue and increase antagonism between opposing groups. The analysis allows users to create awareness of information screening and discrimination so as to avoid the influence of online media platforms on them.

2. Filter bubble & echo chamber

2.1. Related theory

Filter Bubble refers to the fact that social media platforms collect users' interests, behaviors, and histories, and use algorithms to create a closed information environment for useds, so that they can exposed to information that matches their preferences for a long period of time, and unable to access different content. This mechanism is formed solely on the personalized recommendation systems of social media platforms, which automatically analyze a user's likes, shares, comments, and browsing history, and then automatically pushes out information, news and content that is more in line with user's personal preferences. While such personalized recommendations can improve the user experience on social media, the problem of information homogenisation can lead to serious information bias, particularly in the area of political news.

In addition, the echo chamber effect can further exacerbate this phenomenon, as as users on social media are more inclined to follow, trust, and interact with people who have similar views to their own, while holding negative attitudes such as scepticism, contempt and other negative attitudes towards groups with different positions. These phenomena can lead to a tendency for discussions on social platforms to be one-way reinforcing rather than pluralistic dialogues, especially on political topics. Meanwhile, the unique social network of social media also contribute to this closure, with users of platforms more inclined to follow like-minded people or join groups with similar stances rather than people with different political views. As a result, the political information these users are exposed to on the net becomes highly homogenized, and this trend becomes more pronounced over time. In such a social environment, people become more entrenched in their political positions, and less tolerant of dissidents users.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BO26146

2.2. Case study

In the 2016 U.S.A election, Facebook's algorithms enable users to see almost exclusively news that matched their political leanings [5]. Moreover, Daily Kos, Free Republic, and Fox News, which belong to different political parties, all displayed a clear and strong information preferences for news that benefit the party most closely associated with their own ideological orientations [6].

Facebook's algorithm had a significant impact on the nature of political information users saw during the election. the platform prioritized engagement-driven content, which allowed users of the platform to be exposed to news stories that catered to their political beliefs only. This selective exposure further entrenched ideological biases and limited the range of perspectives to which users were exposed. Thereby enhancing the dominance of affiliated parties in political debate became and exacerbating partisan divides.

In addition, during the election period, there was a significant increase in the reading and sharing of fake news, which spread much fast than the news on factual reporting, thus making it distort public perception. The Echo chamber phenomenon occurs as algorithimic curation manipulate users so that they are only exposed to information that conforms to their beliefs, and causes them to neglect to discern and judge the information they access.

Both the filter bubble and the echo chamber effect render the user struggling to be exposed to alternative viewpoints, and the public's beliefs are manipulated throughout social media, thus creating an environments that encouraged political polarization. It also reduces the likelihood of discussion and debate between different political parties or members of the public with different beliefs. This unsustainable political landscape makes it increasingly harder to engage in any sort of meaningful political conversation.

Both of these examples ddemonstrate that digital media ecosystem shapes public perceptions and ideologies , as well as narrows opportunities for balanced discussion, ultimately leading to a more polarized political landscape.

3. Group polarization & online tribalism

3.1. Related theory

It refers to the phenomenon where individuals, when interacting within like-minded groups—especially in online spaces—tend to adopt more extreme versions of their initial beliefs and attitudes. This occurs because group discussions reinforce shared perspectives, validate existing opinions, and marginalize dissenting voices. In online environments, social media platforms amplify this effect by enabling users to form highly homogeneous communities based on ideological alignment, known as online tribalism. These digital "tribes" foster a strong sense of in-group identity while increasing hostility toward opposing groups. As users continuously engage in politically or ideologically charged discussions within these closed networks, their views become more rigid and extreme over time. The ease of blocking, muting, or dismissing alternative perspectives further entrenches these divisions, making political compromise and open dialogue increasingly difficult in polarized societies.

3.2. Case study

Garry et al tracked changes in the number of followers of 32 Telegram channels over a 39-day period. Over a period of just over five weeks (19 October - 26 November 2020), the total number of

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BO26146

followers of QAnon-related channels increased from 292,272 to 340,761, a total increase of 17% [7]. This increase in numbers is indicative of the global traction gained by US-based conspiracies and the fact that QAnon followers began to engage in a range of mobilisation activities and acts of violence offline as their numbers increased. In addition, by examining Trump supporters and opponents pitted against each other on Twitter, it is possible to see the distinctive features of group polarisation and online tribalism. Trump's crazy statements on social daily also largely triggered endless arguments between supporters and opponents, leading to more serious social problems [8].

The divisions on Twitter about the differences between Trump supporters and Trump opponents, and the rise and activity of the QAnon conspiracy theory community are cases in point of GP/OT at work in the online world. Political conversation on Twitter is often driven by how the content is segregated by; algorithm, in which individuals are likely to interact with parts of the world with people that think similarly, but also to be fed partisan terms that align with their preconceived ideas. Hashtags like #MAGA and #Resist united opposing political groups around a common banner, feeding isolated digital echo chambers in which dialogue became the source of division, rather than resolution. QAnon, likewise, sucked users towards more extreme narratives through the radicalisation is brought by social media, a phenomenon in which users repeatedly encountering mildly conspiratorial ideas would be funnelled, by algorithmic amplification and community dynamics, towards increasingly extreme narrative strands. In such close-networked online communities, not only did confirmation bias and ingroup favoritism get reinforced, but they also made people more insulated against external counterarguments and predisposed to extreme ideological adoption. Political and conspiratorial online communities thus operate as digital “tribes” by promoting the cohesion of internal groups to the detriment of external groups, further entrenching social rifts and setting the path towards an ever-minoritarian future in increasingly polarized political environments.

It is important to note how the division of both Trump supporters and Trump opponents, and expansion of the QAnon community, on Twitter demonstrates how Group Polarization & Online Tribalism deepens the ideological divide of people in digital spaces. Social media algorithms that magnify partisan echo chambers both deepen bonds between groups and create enmity toward others’ points of view. In these insular online communities, confirmation bias and algorithm-driven content amplification nudge people toward more extreme views, making substantive conversation and political compromise all the harder. Thus, social media both reflects existing political divides and acts decidedly to fast-track them — a slicing of society further down into its component parts.

4. Misinformation & political manipulation

4.1. Related theory

Fake News, Misinformation & Political Manipulation encompasses the intentional or accidental dissemination of inaccurate, misleading, or deceptive information, typically intending to sway public opinion, construct political narratives, or influence electoral results. Fake news are completely made-up stories whose sole aim is to deceive, while misinformation is wrong or false information disseminated without malice. Disinformation is a type of misinformation that is intentionally defamatory and harmful. Social media algorithms and digital platforms are used by political actors, extremist groups, and even foreign governments to permeate such content, capitalizing on emotional appeals, confirmation bias, and viral sharing mechanisms to magnify its dissemination. But false information spreads quickly, bred by mistrust in traditional media and

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BO26146

contributing to ideological polarization, skewing the view of political developments and undermining democratic processes and decision making.

4.2. Case study

During the 2016 US election, Russia used social media tools to coordinate a disinformation campaign on platforms such as Facebook and Twitter, using troll farms and bots to disseminate politically charged fake news aimed at dividing and influencing voter campaigns [9]. Many of these misleading narratives went viral, solely to exploit confirmation bias and ideological echo-chamberpragmatic frameworks in which misinformation proliferates, destabilizing public trust in democratic processes and democratic representatives.

The same thing happened with misinformation about vaccines that spread to social media during the COVID-19 pandemic and facilitated vaccine hesitancy via fear, distrust of institutions, and algorithmic amplification. These conspiracy theories have thwarted attempts to formulate public health policy and also driven a wedge between communities over the question of whether vaccines are safe and government authorization of them was appropriate. In addition to traditional media, the Internet has provided a means for anti-vaccine voices and opinions to spread to the general public through social media platforms, influencing the development and implementation of relevant policies through the proliferation of misinformation or negativity [10].

Both cases show how social media algorithms, digital propaganda, and coordinated deception warp public discourse, influence political and health-related behaviors, and ultimately undermine trust in institutions. It also reveal how fake news, misinformation, and political manipulation leverage social media to shape public opinion and deepen societal divisions. By exploiting algorithm-driven content dissemination and psychological biases, disinformation campaigns distort reality, weaken trust in institutions, and influence critical decision-making. These cases highlight the broader impact of digital misinformation, demonstrating its ability to manipulate elections, disrupt public health efforts, and fuel polarization on a massive scale.

5. Disscussion

Social media in the 21st century has played a crucial role in shaping political discourse, but its structural mechanisms have greatly contributed to political polarization and ideological fragmentation. Filter bubbles and echo chamber effects limit people's exposure to different points of view and create isolated information environments that reinforce pre-existing beliefs. Group polarization and online tribalism further exacerbate these divisions, as like-minded people congregate in the digital space, leading to the amplification of extreme views and the marginalization of dissenting opinions. Moreover, the spread of fake news, misinformation, and political manipulation exploits the viral nature of social media, distorting public perceptions and undermining trust in institutions. Together, these factors erode bipartisan dialogue, increase political hostility, and threaten democratic stability, as social media platforms not only reflect the ideological polarization of modern society, but actively accelerate it.

Ultimately, the structure of social media leads to polarisation, ideological isolation and even misinformation, which conflicts with the very stability and social nature of democracy. The more divisive the discourse of governance, the harder it is to attract constructive debate about shared goals and hopes. Prevention of such issues in the future necessitates a multi-faceted strategy, such as improved algorithm transparency, more robust misinformation regulations, and enhanced media

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2025.BO26146

literacy among users. Social media can transform from a weapon undermining democratic dialogue and social solidarity into an instrument enhancing open, balanced and fact-based discussions.

6. Conclusion

Social media have profoundly changed the way of political participation, but their intrinsic mechanisms often reinforce social divisions, leading to the fragmentation of perceptions and the proliferation of false information, posing significant challenges to democratic consultation and social integration. To address these phenomena, a comprehensive governance strategy is needed, including promoting openness and transparency in the referral system, improving the regulatory framework for inaccurate information, and raising the level of media literacy among the public. Only through systematic reform can social platforms be transformed from a field that exacerbates antagonism to a public space that promotes rational, inclusive and constructive political dialog. Realizing this transformation is decisive for maintaining the healthy development of democracy and reshaping public confidence in the governance system.

There are some shortcomings in this article. Firstly, the article's election cases are mainly based on the US general election, and the cases lack richness and generalisation. Secondly, the number of readings and citations in related literature is small, and the perspective of discussion is relatively narrow. Meanwhile, the text also lacks the analysis of relevant social experiments and data. In the future, with the accumulation of relevant expertise, the study will be researched and analysed at a deeper level.

References

[1] Badawy, A., Ferrara, E., & Lerman, K. (2018). Analyzing the Digital Traces of Political Manipulation: The 2016 Russian Interference Twitter Campaign. 2018 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining (ASONAM). https: //doi.org/10.1109/asonam.2018.8508646

[2] Bakshy, E., Messing, S., & Adamic, L. (2015). Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. Science, 348(6239), 1130–1132. https: //doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa1160

[3] Baum, M. A., & Groeling, T. (2008). New Media and the Polarization of American Political Discourse. Political Communication, 25(4), 345–365. https: //doi.org/10.1080/10584600802426965

[4] Garry, A., Walther, S., Mohamed, R., & Mohammed, A. (2021). QAnon Conspiracy Theory: Examining its Evolution and Mechanisms of Radicalization. https: //www.cve-kenya.org/media/library/QANON_EXTREMISM_POLICY.pdf

[5] Gross, J. H., & Johnson, K. T. (2016). Twitter Taunts and Tirades: Negative Campaigning in the Age of Trump. PS: Political Science & Politics, 49(04), 748–754. https: //doi.org/10.1017/s1049096516001700

[6] McCoy, J., Rahman, T., & Somer, M. (2018). Polarization and the Global Crisis of Democracy: Common Patterns, Dynamics, and Pernicious Consequences for Democratic Polities. American Behavioral Scientist, 62(1), 16–42.

[7] Mehrabi, N., Morstatter, F., Saxena, N., Lerman, K., & Galstyan, A. (2021). A Survey on Bias and Fairness in Machine Learning. ACM Computing Surveys, 54(6), 1–35. https: //doi.org/10.1145/3457607

[8] The Filter Bubble. (2025). Google Books. https: //books.google.co.jp/books?hl=zh-CN& lr=& id=-FWO0puw3nYC& oi=fnd& pg=PT24& dq=Pariser

[9] Tucker, J., Guess, A., Barbera, P., Vaccari, C., Siegel, A., Sanovich, S., Stukal, D., & Nyhan, B. (2018). Social Media, Political Polarization, and Political Disinformation: A Review of the Scientific Literature. SSRN Electronic Journal. https: //doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3144139

[10] Ullah, I., Khan, K. S., Tahir, M. J., Ahmed, A., & Harapan, H. (2021). Myths and conspiracy theories on vaccines and COVID-19: Potential effect on global vaccine refusals. Vacunas, 22(2). https: //doi.org/10.1016/j.vacun.2021.01.001