A Broken Algorithm’s World (Recommendations Gone Wrong: What It “Looks” Like)

Name

Institution Name

Course Name

Instructor Name

Date

A Broken Algorithm's World (Recommendations Gone Wrong: What It "Looks" Like)

In the current digital space, recommendation algorithms are supposed to provide value to personal users by personalizing the content; however, the algorithms are mostly prone to similar structural biases that predispose the user to certain elements and restrict the amount of information that can be accessed. Recent studies demonstrate that algorithmic systems broadly, and collaborative filtering systems employed by social networks and streaming applications, serve to promote popular content over genuine diversity, not to mention that they amplify the historical tendencies in users' behaviour (Carnovalini et al., 2025). This unequal attention is created by biases in data distributions and models and results in what scholars refer to as the popularity bias, with popular content prevailing at the top of recommendation lists to the detriment of niche or underrepresented content. This bias has been reported to be a major research issue in recommender systems and has an impact on the users and content providers. In this respect, a busted algorithm is a system that reduces coverage instead of increasing exposure, reducing serendipity and discrimination in online discovery.

This popularity bias is a direct cause of the formation of filter bubbles, where users get exposed to a limited perspective of the available content influenced by feedback loops between previous behavior and algorithmic selection. Several in-depth studies of the recommender system recognize filter bubble as an explicit impact of the adaptive algorithms, reinforcing the previous preferences, restricting users to homogenized streams of content (Kidwai et al., 2023). The formation of these bubbles ensures that the user experiences fewer counter-pointed opinions or multiplicity of items in their informational diet, resulting in a skewed informational diet instead of the breadth of potential content that the algorithms are currently predicting. The learning processes in the algorithm themselves are not malicious, but thereby unintentionally divide the informational environment of users and turn the digital world into a smaller and narrower content space than it is. Practically, it is expressed in the trends of feeding the users into repeated cycles of similar videos, articles, or products, and creates experiential silos that distort the way people use the digital platform.

In addition to the problem of informational diversity, fragmented recommendation systems can enhance the toxic or negative content, with the influence on user experiences measured in both psychological and social terms. Regehr et al. (2025) research on social media recommendation systems discovered that because of its constant reinforcement in user feeds, particularly amongst young users on services such as TikTok and Instagram, algorithmic curation tends to radicalize or even propagate harmful ideology. The reason such a normalization effect exists is that the algorithms are optimized to produce engagement over the quality or safety of the content; this is to say that the provocative or emotionally evoking material can get traction even when it is harmful to the mental health of users. As the accumulation of harmful content in the recommendations of the user transforms the online experience, it changes the priorities of the user in the long term and shapes temperaments, attitudes, and social attitudes.

Such biased personalization also applies to views on trust and fairness, where incorrect recommendations diminish users' determination of users about the responsibility of digital systems to protect their interests. According to Hilbert et al. (2024) research on the effects of algorithms, it is common to experience a bad recommendation - a recommendation that does not respond to needs or which can produce distress, in proportions that are unacceptable in other consumer systems. Although these poor proposals are in the minority, they are made very clear because of a high user engagement, and users get to doubt whether personalization offers any advantages to them or is just using their information as a performance indicator.

Finally, a fractured algorithmic world appears as a place where digital customization undermines diversity, strengthens bad tendencies, and lowers trust. The lessons of recent research highlight the fact that these shortcomings will be treated by a more open, unbiased, and ethically driven design that considers the interests of users and information richness more than local predictive accuracy.

References

Carnovalini, F., Rodà, A., & Wiggins, G. A. (2025). Popularity Bias in Recommender Systems: The Search for Fairness in the Long Tail. *Information*, *16*(2). https://doi.org/10.3390/info16020151

Hilbert, M., Thakur, A., Flores, P. M., Zhang, X., Bhan, J. Y., Bernhard, P., & Ji, F. (2024). 8–10% of algorithmic recommendations are 'bad', but… an exploratory risk-utility meta-analysis and its regulatory implications. *International Journal of Information Management*, *75*, 102743. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102743

Kidwai, U. T., Akhtar, N., & Nadeem, M. (2023). Unravelling Filter Bubbles in Recommender Systems: A Comprehensive Review. *International Journal*, *10*(2), 1650–1680.

Regehr, K., Shaughnessy, C., Zhao, M., Cambazoglu, I., Turner, A., & Shaughnessy, N. (2025). Normalizing toxicity: The role of recommender algorithms for young people's mental health and social wellbeing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *16*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1523649