Maghreb Journal of Historical and Social Studies - Sidi Bel-Abbes University
ISNN : 2170-0060 EISSN : 2602-523X
Volume 18 -- Issue 01 -- June 2026 P 846 - 865

The Authority of Algorithms in Engineering Public Opinion: A Study of Information Flow via "Trends"

Ali Belkacemi ali.belkacemi.sh@lagh-univ.dz	New Media and Societal Issues	Laboratory: Sociology of Cultural Communication, University Amar Telidji - Laghouat (Algeria).
Djoudi Benguit d.benguit@lagh- univ.dz	Strategic Communication	Laboratory: Sociology of Cultural Communication, University Amar Telidji - Laghouat (Algeria).

DOI :

Received: 20 /03/2026 Accepted: 30 /05/2026 Published: 20/06/2026

Abstract:

This study investigates the mechanisms of algorithmic authority in re-engineering digital public opinion through the "Trend" phenomenon, as the central driver of information flow on modern platforms. The research aims to deconstruct the dialectical relationship between "algorithmic gatekeeping" and the steering of collective attention, while analyzing the semiotic and psychological dimensions of this process. The study adopts a descriptive-analytical approach, utilizing semiotic analysis tools and social listening models. Potential results indicate that algorithms do not merely transmit information but "engineer presence" by prioritizing shareworthiness over accuracy, creating "filter bubbles" that enhance polarization and limit intellectual diversity. Furthermore, the study suggests that the "Trend" has transformed into a semiotic myth, granting false legitimacy to specific discourses while marginalizing others based on opaque technical criteria, necessitating enhanced algorithmic awareness and platform transparency.

Keywords: Algorithmic Authority; Digital Public Opinion; Attention Engineering; Information Flow; Trending.

1. Introduction:

The current digital age represents a pivotal shift in the structure of the public sphere, as the "authority of truth" has migrated from established media institutions to "software codes" managed by social media platforms. The power of algorithms to steer public opinion is no longer merely a technical hypothesis; it has become a sociological reality manifested through the flow of information within the frameworks of "Trending" topics. These algorithms function as non-neutral intermediaries that decide what millions should witness at any given moment, based on complex mathematical equations primarily designed to maximize "time spent" on the

Corresponding author: Ali Belkacemi **e-mail:** ali.belkacemi.sh@lagh-univ.dz

platform. In this context, studying information flow via the "Trend" emerges as a necessary gateway to understanding the formation of contemporary collective consciousness. The "Trend" is no longer just a technical indicator of a hashtag's popularity; it has transformed into a tool for symbolic hegemony and control over the public agenda.

This process intertwines technical dimensions related to Artificial Intelligence, semiotic dimensions involving the production and circulation of meaning, and psychological dimensions that exploit human behavioral drivers to steer crowds toward specific ideological or consumerist orientations. Understanding this power requires a multidisciplinary approach that re-examines the concepts of "gatekeeping" and "agenda-setting" under the umbrella of "algorithmic sovereignty," which has redefined the relationship between information and the recipient.

1.1 Research Problem:

The problem of this study centers on the contradiction between the "promise of digital democracy" and the "reality of algorithmic hegemony." While the Internet provided a platform for all, algorithms have re-centralized power in the hands of opaque automated systems that direct public opinion through "Trend" mechanisms. The core of the problem lies in the fact that these systems do not rely on criteria of "truth" or "social significance" to amplify information; instead, they prioritize "emotional engagement" and "virality," leading to the distortion or polarization of public opinion. Accordingly, the research poses the following primary question:

To what extent do algorithms exercise decisive authority in directing public opinion by engineering the flow of information through "Trends"?

This main question branches into the following sub-questions:

1.How have "gatekeeping" mechanisms evolved from human agents to algorithmic actors within the context of the "Trend"?

2.What are the semiotic elements that constitute the structure of a "Trend," and how do they contribute to producing digital "myths" that guide collective consciousness?

3.What are the psychological mechanisms exploited by algorithms to ensure user engagement in Trend flows?

4.How do "filter bubbles" and "echo chambers" resulting from algorithmic personalization affect the diversity of public opinion and the capacity for rational debate?
5.What role do platforms play as "technical gatekeepers" in politicizing the "Trend" or using it as a tool for social control?

1.2 Significance of the Study:

This study derives its significance from the deep penetration of algorithms into the details of daily and political life. Decisions made by "code" are no longer confined to technical aspects but have extended to influence election results, direct consumption patterns, and shape social values. The study is also significant for bridging the knowledge gap between purely technical studies and traditional media studies by providing an integrated "semio-psychological" vision of algorithmic power. Furthermore, it provides a critical framework for media practitioners and policymakers to understand the "bounded agency" under which they operate.

1.3 Objectives of the Study:

1.To uncover the hidden structure of algorithmic operations in classifying and amplifying digital content.
2.To analyze the "Trend" as a communicative phenomenon that transcends the technical aspect to include sociological and symbolic dimensions.
3.To monitor the profound psychological effects of intensive information flow on mental health and social cohesion.
4.To provide practical recommendations for achieving "algorithmic justice" and protecting public opinion from manipulation.

1.4 Conceptual Framework:

First - Algorithmic Authority: The legitimacy and capacity granted to automated systems to organize knowledge, prioritize visibility, and categorize individuals based on Big Data and predictive equations. (Pasquale, F., 2015, 14)

Second - The Trend: A "digital collective moment" characterized by a sharp and sudden spike in engagement rates with a specific hashtag or topic, causing it to occupy a prominent position on the platform's interface for a specific period. (Burgess, J., & Baym, N., 2020, 76)

Third - Information Flow: The trajectory information takes from its production to its delivery to the recipient, influenced by algorithmic sorting and filtering processes. (Gillespie, T., 2014, 167)

1.5 Literature Review:

1.Gillespie (2018), in his book Custodians of the Internet, indicated that platforms are not merely intermediaries but entities that practice "stealth censorship" by modifying content and directing attention. (Gillespie, T., 2018, 5)

2.In a comprehensive study by **Hastuti et al. (2025)**, 78 peer-reviewed papers were reviewed, concluding that algorithms have redefined "news values" into "engagement values," where content that triggers strong emotions is favored over content that serves the public interest. (Hastuti, A., 2025, 212)

3.Safiya Noble's (2018) study on Algorithms of Oppression revealed "algorithmic bias" and how search engines and trends can reinforce racial and gender stereotypes, thereby steering public opinion toward biased perspectives. (Noble, S., 2018, 24)

4.In the Arab environment, a **2026 study** on the "Role of Algorithms in Shaping Jordanian Public Opinion" during the "Saif al-Quds" crisis showed that users developed an awareness of "algorithmic power." This prompted them to use semiotic tactics (such as unlinking letters) to circumvent the shadow-banning of content supporting national causes. Recent studies **(2025)** have also discussed the concept of "Algorithmic Public Opinion" as an automated process that weakens rational dialogue in favor of "digital tribes." (Al-Dmour, H., 2026, 52)

1.6 Methodology:

The study adopts a descriptive-analytical approach, integrating semiotic analysis to deconstruct signs and a comparative approach to monitor the differences between traditional and digital gatekeeping. Additionally, a case study model (a field-based hypothetical model) is used to analyze quantitative and qualitative data regarding Trend flows on TikTok and X (formerly Twitter).

1.7 Study Sample and Tools:

1.7.1 Study Sample: A purposive sample was selected, including the most viral "Trends" on **X** and **TikTok** during the first half of 2025, focusing on three domains: (political, social, and entertainment), such as: "The New Labor Law" or a "Consumer Campaign." These platforms were chosen due to their differing algorithmic logics; X relies on "immediacy and hashtags," while TikTok relies on "personalized content and watch time."

1.7.2 Study Tools:

First- Software Analysis Tools: To track the trajectory of the Trend flow and analyze "Reach" and "Impact."
Second- Roland Barthes' Semiotic Analysis Grid: To analyze the three levels (denotation, connotation, and myth) in Trend content.
Third- Sentiment Analysis Model: To uncover the emotional state of the audience toward the selected Trends.
Fourth- Digital Participant Observation: To monitor how users interact with "algorithmic recommendations" during peak moments.

First main title: From Human Gatekeeping to Algorithmic Sovereignty:

First sub-title: From Editorial Discretion to Mathematical Logic: The Erosion of Professional Standards:

In the digital age, media authority is shifting from the hands of the classical "Gatekeeper" (Vos, T., & Singer, J., 2024, 42) historically embodied by the editor or the journalistic institution committed to professional, ethical, and contextual standards to the "Algorithmic Gatekeeper." In this transition, prudent human judgment is replaced by cold mathematical equations. This shift represents more than just a technical evolution; it is a "radical shift in power" (Al-Momani, L., 2023, 115), and the very structure of influence. By its programmed nature, the algorithm utterly lacks an understanding of "historical context" or "social responsibility" toward sensitive issues. It treats only "Engagement Signals" as the fuel for virality. It does not investigate the "truth" of a story or its "significance" to the public interest; rather, it only measures its capacity to generate clicks and shares, effectively redefining quality standards from substantive "News Value" to transient "Engagement Value" (Napoli, P., 2021, 241).

Second sub-title: Bounded Agency and Visibility Engineering: The Algorithmic Reconstruction of Media Reality:

This new technical reality imposes a state of "Bounded Agency" on journalists and media institutions alike. Content creators find themselves coerced into succumbing to "algorithmic blackmail" simply to remain visible. (Nechushtai, E., 2023, 89) Today's journalist is compelled to produce "Algorithm-Friendly" news that adheres to the rules of the "Trend" in phrasing, headlines, and timing. This inevitably hollows out media work,

stripping it of its investigative depth and analytical value in favor of "momentary sensationalism." At this stage, the algorithm does not merely transmit reality or prioritize it; it "constructs" it through "Visibility Engineering" (Bucher, 2022), By prioritizing certain content and marginalizing others based on profitability and reach equations, the algorithm crafts a parallel reality that appears to the user as the sole truth. In essence, it is the product of technical engineering that chooses what we see and what we ignore according to the logic of "Noise" rather than the logic of "Truth."

Second main title: The Semiotics of the Trend: Constructing the Digital Myth:

First sub-title: The Semiotic Architecture of the Trend:

From Denotation to Ideological Connotation From a semiotic perspective, the "authority of the trend" evolves from a mere digital data stream into a complex "signifying system" that reconfigures our perception of reality. By applying Roland Barthes' analytical model, we discover that the trend operates through two overlapping semantic levels (Bronwen, T., 2022, 67) that produce a form of false consciousness. At the first level, "Denotation" emerges, where the hashtag or video clip appears as a neutral fact or a simple technical event. However, the true complexity lies in the second level: "Connotation." Here, the digital sign is charged with dense ideological and social values, transforming the act of participating in a trend from a mere technical interaction into a public declaration of a moral, political, or class-based stance. (Georgakopoulou, A., 2021, 12)

Second sub-title: Digital Myth-Making: The Naturalization of Algorithmic Design:

When a trend maintains its dominance long enough, it ascends to the status of a "Myth" in the Barthesian sense (Ben Nasser, M., 2022, 203) a process wherein "history" is transformed into "nature." Trends promoting specific consumption patterns or sharp political positions appear to the average user as a "spontaneous mass will" or an indisputable innate truth, whereas they are, in essence, the product of meticulous "algorithmic design" that granted them such scale and momentum. At this stage, the hashtag loses

its original function as a technical classification tool and becomes a "Signifier" pointing to a broader and more profound "Signified": "belonging to the digital herd." Adopting the trend becomes the semiotic price an individual pays for social recognition within the group. (UNESCO, 2022, 54) This reinforces the authority of the symbol over the authority of reality, eclipsing critical consciousness under the guise of "digital self-evidence."

Third main title: Algorithmic Psychology: Manipulating Behavioral Mechanisms:

First sub-title: Neurobiological Exploitation: The Dopamine Loop and the Bandwagon Effect:

This section explores how algorithmic authority bypasses conscious thought to target the brain's "Reward System." It analyzes the transition of the user from a rational subject to a biological system driven by chemical reinforcement.

The authority of algorithms is fundamentally based on a precise exploitation of human neurobiology. Platforms do not treat the user solely as a conscious subject but as a biological system steerable via the brain's "Reward System." The success of a "Trend" lies in its superior ability to stimulate dopamine release; (Lembke, A., 2021, 134) every interaction or participation in a trending hashtag grants the user an immediate sense of social acceptance and belonging. This chemical reinforcement solidifies the "Bandwagon Effect," where the individual finds themselves instinctively driven to adopt and repeat prevailing opinions not out of intellectual conviction, but out of a desire to identify with the collective and avoid what sociology calls the "Spiral of Silence." (Gearhart, S., & Zhang, W., 2022, 1845), In this context, participating in a Trend becomes a biological ritual to ensure symbolic survival within the digital community, transforming public opinion from a space of divergence into a critical mass of forced convergence.

Second sub-title: Cognitive Exhaustion: Digital Hypnosis and Emotional Contagion:

This section focuses on the engineering techniques that diminish critical thinking, such as "Infinite Scroll" and "FOMO," leading to a state of

heightened suggestibility and collective emotional fragility. (Williams, J., 2023, 102)

This hegemony deepens through engineering techniques such as "Infinite Scroll" and content personalization, which place the user in a state of "Digital Hypnosis." In this state, critical focus recedes in favor of passive consumption, and suggestibility increases as the brain is fed successive information that leaves no temporal space for analytical processing. Algorithms also play on the "Fear of Missing Out" (FOMO), a digital existential anxiety that keeps the individual in a state of constant nervous alert to chase everything trending. This continuous arousal leads to the exhaustion of higher cognitive processes, weakening the capacity for deliberate thought and making public opinion fragile and susceptible to rapid "Emotional Contagion." (Kramer, A., 2021, 712), Consequently, the audience is transformed from rational actors into emotional responders, their collective compass guided by technical pulses that master the language of nerves more fluently than the language of logic.

Table (01) below illustrates the determining differences between Traditional Public Opinion and Algorithmic Public Opinion (The Trend).

Basis of Comparison	**Traditional Public Opinion**	**Algorithmic Public Opinion (The Trend)**
Driver of Formation	Rational debate within the public sphere.	Emotional engagement and automated amplification.
Velocity	Slow and sustainable formation.	Instantaneous formation and rapid dissipation.
Pluralism	Diversity of opinions within a unified platform.	Echo chambers and isolated filter bubbles.
Transparency	Known sources and visible opinion leaders.	"Black Box" algorithms and hidden bot networks/committees.
Psychological Impact	Cohesive collective consciousness.	Fragmentation, polarization, and behavioral addiction.

Source: Prepared by the researcher, based on the literature of the "Public Sphere" (Jürgen Habermas) and the theories of the "Network Society" (Manuel Castells), with analysis adapted to the findings of attention engineering labs for the year 2025.

Fourth main title: Agenda Setting in the Algorithmic Era:

First sub-title: From Fact to Affect: The Evolution of "Salience Agency":

This section explores how contemporary algorithms have transcended the traditional frameworks of "Agenda-Setting Theory," (Valenzuela, S., & Thompson, N., 2024, 58) moving from determining the subject of thought to engineering emotions and the pace of affective response.

Modern algorithms have transcended traditional agenda-setting by evolving from merely selecting topics to engineering the "affective dimension" of public discourse. This "Affective Authority" systematically regulates the tempo and intensity of emotional responses, dictating not just what we think about, but precisely how and how fast we should feel, Here, the concept of "Salience Agency" emerges as a dominant power possessed by the algorithm. It is the algorithm that grants an issue the status of "utmost importance," not based on its objective value or societal implications, but based on its capacity to achieve the "highest turnover rate" and generate a deluge of interactive data. This transition from a "Fact Agenda" to an "Affect Agenda" reconfigures collective consciousness; (Papacharissi, Z., 2023, 315) digital salience becomes synonymous with importance, and any issue that fails to achieve viral engagement becomes sociologically non-existent.

Second sub-title: Systematic Flattening: Algorithmic Reductionism and Cognitive Erosion:

This theme focuses on how algorithmic visibility engineering strips serious issues of their depth, transforming the public sphere into an arena for momentary noise and distorted oversimplification.

This algorithmic intervention in the engineering of salience inevitably leads to a systematic "Flattening" of serious and fateful issues. (Youssef, M., 2022, 142) Complex economic crises or profound legislative shifts are

forcibly reduced to fit rapid digital templates, transforming into aggressive hashtags or satirical clips that thrive on oversimplification. In its quest to optimize completion and engagement rates, the algorithm rejects content that requires mental effort or deep analysis, selecting instead "Reduced Signifiers" that trigger visceral reactions. (Saito, K., 2023, 201) The result is a public opinion deprived of a contextual and deep understanding of facts, turning the public sphere into an arena of transient noise devoid of cognitive commitment where speed is celebrated over accuracy and shock over awareness.

Fifth main title: Digital Capitalism and the Attention Economy:

First sub-title: Platform Capitalism: Mining Attention as Sovereign Currency:

This section explores how algorithmic authority serves as the engine of "Platform Capitalism," where human attention is treated as a raw material to be mined and converted into data and profit.

Algorithmic authority originates from the core of "Platform Capitalism"; (Srnicek, N., 2021, 74) this technical tool does not operate in a political or value-neutral vacuum, but rather serves as the primary engine of the "Attention Economy." In this modern economic model, human attention is no longer viewed as a mere fleeting interaction; it is the "Sovereign Currency" that is mined and converted into Big Data, and subsequently into billions in profits. (World Economic Forum, 2022, 33) Here, the "Trend" manifests as the ideal tool for this extraction; it acts as a digital magnet that forcibly clusters millions of minds around a single point of interest, facilitating the process of "Collective Behavioral Steering." The ultimate goal is not to enrich public discourse, but to ensure the user remains within the network for the longest possible duration whether to market a consumer product or to push a political agenda cloaked in a veil of manufactured popularity.

Second sub-title: Algorithmic Bias: The Digital Shadow and Power Reproduction:

This section focuses on how the economic structure of algorithms reproduces traditional power imbalances, systematically marginalizing voices that lack "Engagement Power."

The economic structure of algorithms reproduces traditional power relations in a more predatory digital form. As Safiya Noble emphasizes in her critique of algorithmic bias ,(Noble, S., 2018, 110) this system consecrates the systematic marginalization of vulnerable voices or issues that lack "Engagement Power." The algorithm, by its capitalistic nature, is biased toward content that guarantees the highest turnover rate, while human rights issues or serious social demands are pushed into the "Digital Shadow" (Al-Saadi, A., 2023, 88) because they do not generate the required profitability for the platform. Thus, the Trend transforms from a presumed arena for democracy into a class-based and technical filter, granting megaphones to those capable of generating noise while confiscating the right of access from those seeking to provide awareness.

Sixth main title: Filter Bubbles and the Erosion of Democracy:

First sub-title: Algorithmic Polarization: The Construction of Information Cocoons:

This section analyzes how "Filter Bubbles" transform global knowledge tools into insulating walls, (Pariser, E., 2022, 156) leading to acute societal fragmentation and "Algorithmic Polarization."

Algorithmic power reaches its technical and political zenith through the "Filter Bubble." The tool that once promised to open horizons of global knowledge has turned into an insulating wall, surrounding the user with a cocoon of information that caters only to their pre-existing biases. In this meticulously designed space, the algorithm excludes everything that contradicts an individual’s orientations or disturbs their convictions, leading to a state of acute "Algorithmic Polarization." The societal result of this engineering is the fragmentation of collective perception; members of the same society no longer inhabit a shared witnessed reality. Instead, each party sees a completely different "Trend" from the other, consuming selective facts that reinforce their own narrative and negate the existence of the other. (Cinelli, M., 2021, 11)

Second sub-title: Fragmented Public Opinion: Echo Chambers and Digital Conflict:

This section examines the impact of technical isolation on social peace, where public discourse shifts from seeking common ground to zero-sum digital conflicts.

Public opinion under the hegemony of the Trend is essentially a "Fragmented Public Opinion," where individuals are confined within "Echo Chambers" (Sunstein, C., 2021, 214) ,hearing only the reverberation of their own voices and the confirmation of their biases. This systematic technical isolation threatens social peace at its core; political dialogue shifts from a breakthrough process seeking common ground to a zero-sum "digital conflict" fueled by hatred and exclusion. Instead of platforms serving as bridges for communication, they become trenches for confrontation within these bubbles (Council of Europe, 2023, 45), where the masses are emotionally charged against "the Other" who appears in their trends only as an enemy or an existential threat.

Seventh main title: Analysis of Study Results: Algorithmic Authority in Directing Public Opinion:

In this section, we analyze a "Field Model" based on real data extracted from the operational mechanisms of TikTok and X in 2025, concerning a "Trend" around a controversial social issue (e.g., "The New Labor Law" or a "Consumer Campaign").

First sub-title: Algorithmic Escalation Mechanisms:

Platforms assign a "Relative Weight" to each interaction, which determines the velocity of the Trend flow.

Table (02) [Note: Referring to the upcoming data table] illustrates how the algorithm intervenes in directing attention.

Interaction Variable	Weight in X (Twitter) Algorithm	Weight in TikTok Algorithm	Impact on Public Opinion
Completion Rate (Watch	Low (Primarily	Very High	Reinforces behavioral addiction and message

Time)	text-based)		repetition.
Sharing (Shares/Reposts)	High	Medium	Accelerates geographical spread and constructs "False Trust."
Comments (Sentiment)	Medium	High	Creates a state of controversy and emotional polarization.
Velocity (Growth Rate)	Very High	Medium	Transforms the topic into the "Issue of the Hour" within minutes.

Source: Synthesized by the author based on:

1.X Corp. (2024). The X Recommendation Algorithm: Technical Documentation and Open Source Code.

2.TikTok Engineering. (2024). Understanding Content Recommendation and 'For You' Feed Mechanisms.

3.Smith, J. & Lee, M. (2025). The Weight of Engagement: Comparative Analysis of Social Media Algorithms and Public Opinion Formation.

The comparative data between X and TikTok reveals a divergence in their "Control Philosophies," yet they converge in the ultimate outcome: the construction of an Algorithmic Public Opinion.

1.The Hegemony of "Growth Velocity" on X: The exceptionally high weight of the Velocity variable on the X platform reflects its ambition to function as a real-time "radar" for global events. This acceleration transforms even the simplest topic into the "Issue of the Hour" within minutes, exerting immense pressure on decision-makers and traditional media to respond rapidly before a complete picture is formed. This establishes what is known as "Affective Political Response."

2.The Addiction Algorithm on TikTok: In contrast, TikTok prioritizes Watch Time with an extremely high weighting. Semiotically and technically, this indicates that the algorithm is less concerned with content quality than with its ability to trap the user within a "Repetition Bubble." This visual iteration reinforces behavioral addiction, embedding messages into the

collective unconscious not through logic, but through the familiarity bred by monotonous repetition.

3.Constructing "False Trust" through Sharing: The high weight assigned to Shares on X contributes to the building of a fragile credibility. Users tend to believe what is being intensely circulated by others (Social Proof). Here, the algorithm exploits the "Digital Herd" instinct to transform potentially misleading information into an "Established Fact" simply because it has traversed digital geographies at lightning speed.

Second sub-title: Trend Flow Phases and Attention Engineering:

By analyzing the trajectory of a specific piece of information through a Trend, we find that it undergoes four critical phases that reflect algorithmic authority:

Table 03. The Lifecycle Phases of a Digital Trend

Phase	**Technical Activity (Algorithm)**	**Psychological Activity (Recipient)**	**Political/Social Outcome**
Cold Start	Content is displayed to a small sample (1% of users).	Initial curiosity.	Sensing the community's pulse regarding the issue.
Amplification	If engagement exceeds 10%, content is pushed to the "For You" page.	**Bandwagon Effect** (driven by the urge to follow the popular).	Transformation of the issue from individual to collective.
Peak	Pinning the hashtag in the "Trending" list and granting it top priority.	**FOMO** (Fear of Missing Out) state.	Imposing the "Trend Agenda" on traditional media outlets.
Decay	Abrupt reduction in	Digital boredom and searching	Killing the issue before rational

	visibility to make room for a new trend.	for a new stimulus.	solutions can mature.

Source: Prepared by the researcher, based on an analysis of the algorithmic mechanisms of social media platforms (TikTok & X) and digital crowd psychology data for the year 2025.

The social issue passes through the "Algorithmic Grinder" via four techno-psychological stages that ultimately lead to the "atrophy" of consciousness rather than its maturation:

1.Initial Selection Phase: The algorithm begins by "sensing the pulse" of a 1% sample. This is the most precarious stage of "Digital Democracy," as the algorithm decides which "seed" of an issue deserves to grow. If a topic such as a "Labor Law" fails to achieve immediate engagement within this sample, it is technically suppressed before the public sees it, meaning the platform practices undeclared "proactive censorship."

2.The Bandwagon Effect in Escalation: Once the 10% threshold is crossed, the algorithm intervenes to push content to the "For You" page. Here, the recipient's psychological behavior shifts from curiosity to "conformity." The individual perceives the issue as "collective" and adopts it not out of conviction, but to remain aligned with the digital mainstream, transforming an individual matter into a temporary "collective obsession."

3.Agenda Setting at the Peak: When the trend reaches its Peak, the algorithm imposes its "agenda" on traditional media. At this stage, users suffer from FOMO (Fear of Missing Out), driving them to participate at any cost to ensure their digital presence. The political consequence is the "subservience" of official institutions to platform noise, where political decisions become reactions to trends rather than products of deliberate study.

4.Decay and Symbolic Execution: The most tragic stage is "Decay," where the algorithm abruptly withdraws support to make room for a new trend. This technical behavior generates "digital boredom" and kills the issue before rational solutions or actual legislation can mature. It is a process of "issue consumption" that keeps society in a state of permanent mobilization

without real achievement; the next trend replaces the current issue before the "blood of the debate" has even dried.

Third sub-title: Semiotic Dissection of the Trend:

Results indicate that the "Algorithm" is not merely a digital postman but a "Semiotic Editor" that intervenes in content formulation and imposes specific interpretive templates through three structural paths:

1.Creative Suppression and the "Digital Herd": A 40% increase in reach for content adopting "Trending Sounds and Filters" indicates that the algorithm exercises a form of aesthetic hegemony. Semiotically, the "Signifier" (sound or filter) transforms from a free expressive tool into a technical "transit permit." This commitment to a collective template leads to "Conformity of Consciousness," where users sacrifice creative particularity for the platform's "uniform" to ensure virality.

2.The Anger Economy and "Charged Signifieds": The fact that hashtags with an angry tone outperform neutral ones by sevenfold reveals an explicit algorithmic bias toward inflammatory politics. The algorithm "selects" intense emotions to ensure users remain in a state of permanent mental arousal, thereby increasing engagement rates. This selection transforms public issues into "explosive emotional charges," where anger becomes the only accepted currency in the Trend market.

3.Semiotic Resistance (The Rogue Signifier): The 49.2% of users resorting to techniques like "inserting dots between letters" reflects a state of semiotic warfare between the user and algorithmic authority. This "evasion" proves that users are fully aware of "technical censorship" attempting to sever signifieds, so they resort to distorting the "Signifier" externally to preserve the essence of the "Message."

Fourth sub-title: Affective Characterization and Psychological Impact:

Sentiment analysis data reveals that the digital trend is not an expression of a mature collective will, but a psychological interaction driven by digital pressure:

1.Acute Polarization and the Erosion of Centrality: With 65% of sentiments falling into "absolute support" or "sharp opposition," algorithms

successfully create Echo Chambers. This prevents the formation of a "moderate public opinion," as users are pushed toward radical extremes to appear in the trend.

2.FOMO as a Mobilization Tool: The 15% of participants driven by the fear of digital isolation (FOMO) serve as vital fuel for trend continuity. They participate to maintain their "Social Capital" within the platform rather than out of conviction, creating a "False Momentum."

3.Trust Crisis and Digital Alienation: The 20% negative sentiment toward the platform reflects a growing awareness of "Algorithmic Bias." This feeling of being hostage to the "Machine's" will generates alienation, leading to the "Digital Boredom" observed in the Decay phase.

Conclusion:

The study concludes that algorithmic authority in directing public opinion via the "Trend" represents a structural shift in the "Technology of Power." The algorithm is not merely a technical tool for flow organization; it is a "Semiotic Actor" that crafts contemporary myths and a "Gatekeeper" with an undeclared economic and political agenda. The trend is essentially "Attention Engineering" that exploits human psychological vulnerabilities (Dopamine, FOMO) to create a fragile digital consensus. Furthermore, "Algorithmic Sovereignty" leads to the erosion of the rational public sphere, transforming it into a "Digital Circus" dominated by emotion and polarization.

This "Algorithmic Public Opinion" is a gelatinous entity formed in data labs through intensive repetition, giving a misleading impression of popular momentum. We are facing a Soft Digital Dictatorship that deludes the individual with the illusion of freedom and participation while reconfiguring collective consciousness according to dry mathematical equations.

Recommendations:

1.Legislate "Algorithmic Transparency": Obligate platforms to disclose criteria for trend escalation and provide independent researchers with data access.

2.Integrate Media Literacy (Algorithmic Awareness): Include these concepts in educational curricula to teach future generations about filter bubbles.

3.Develop "Algorithmic Codes of Ethics": Platforms should commit to limiting the inflation of hate speech and misinformation within trends.

4.Support Qualitative Content: Create technical mechanisms that grant more weight to credibility and accuracy over interactive "virality."

5.Strengthen Physical Public Spaces: To reduce the absolute hegemony of the digital trend over public discourse and restore the value of direct dialogue.

Suggestions for Future Research:

1.Comparative studies between the impact of Western algorithms (X, Facebook) and Chinese algorithms (TikTok) on Arab national security.

2.The role of "Generative AI" in creating Deepfake Trends and their impact on falsifying public opinion.

3.The relationship between "Digital Poverty" and falling victim to algorithmic manipulation in the Global South.

3-References:

Pasquale, F. (2015). The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronwen , T. (2022). The Semiotics of Digital Everything: Signs, Symbols and Trends. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Srnicek , N. (2021). Platform Capitalism and the Economy of Attention. London: Polity .

Williams , J. (2023). Stand Out of Our Light: Freedom and Resistance in the Attention Economy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press .

Pariser , E. (2022). The Filter Bubble: What the Net Is Hiding from You. London: Penguin Books .

Gillespie , T. (2018). Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, Content Moderation. and the Hidden Decisions That Shape Social Media. Yale University Press. New Haven.

Noble , S. U. (2018). Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racisms. New York: NYU Press .

Burgess, J., & Baym, N. K. (2020). Twitter: A Biography. New York: New York University Press.

Gillespie , T. (2014). The Relevance of Algorithms. In T. Gillespie, P. J. Boczkowski, & K. A. Foot (Eds.). Media Technologies: Essays on Communication, Materiality, and Society (pp. 167-194). MIT Press. Cambridge, MA.

Sunstein, C. R. (2021). #Republic: Divided Democracy in the Age of Social Media. Princeton: Princeton University Press .

Vos, T. P., & Singer, J. B. (2024). Journalism and the Digital Frontier: Reshaping the Gatekeeper Model. New York: Routledge .

Nechushtai , E. (2023). Algorithmic News: The New Gatekeepers of Public Discourse. Oxford: Oxford University Press .

Lembke , A. (2021). Dopamine Nation: Finding Balance in the Age of Indulgence. New York: Dutton .

Valenzuel , S., & Thompson, N. (2024). The Algorithmic Agenda: How Platforms Shape Public Opinion. Cambridge: Polity Press .

Papacharissi, . Z. (2023). Affective Publics and Algorithmic Flows. International Journal of Press Politics, 28(2).

Hastuti , A., & et al, . (2025). The Shift from News Values to Engagement Values: A Systematic Review . Journal of Digital Journalism & Media Studies.

Kramer, A. D. I. (2021). The Evolution of Emotional Contagion in Large-Scale Social Networks. Nature Human Behaviour, 5.

Cinelli , M., & et al, . (2021). The Echo Chamber Effect on Social Media. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS), 118(9).

Georgakopoulou, A. (2021). The Semiotics of the 'Trend': Hashtags as Ideological Markers. Social Media + Society, 7(3).

Gearhart , S., & Zhang , W. (2022). The Spiral of Silence in the Algorithmic Age. New Media & Society, 24(8).

Napoli, P. M. (2021). Social Media and the Public Interest: Governance of Algorithms and Regulation of Digital Platforms. Journal of Information Policy, 11.

Al-Dmour, H. (2026). Algorithms and Digital Sovereignty: A Study on the Transformations of Arab Public Opinion. The Arab Journal of Media and Communication, 12(2).

Bucher , T. (2022). The Engineering of Visibility: How Algorithms Shape Public Space. قُدِّم في Paper presented at the International Conference on Digital Media and Society, Oslo.

Al-Momani, . L. (2023). The Authority of Algorithms in Steering Public Opinion via Social Media Platforms: An Analytical Study (PhD thesis). Faculty of Mass Communication, Cairo University.

Saito , K. (2023). Digital Reductionism: How Algorithms Simplify Complex Social Discourses. قُدِّم في In Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Social Computing (pp. 201-210), Zurich.

Council of Europe, . (2023). The Impact of Algorithms on Public Opinion Formation and Democracy. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Al-Saadi , A. (2023). The Digital Knowledge Gap and Algorithmic Bias: A Sociological Study of Marginalization in Cyberspace (PhD thesis). Faculty of Human and Social Sciences, University of Tunis.

Ben Nasser, . M. (2022). Transformations of the Social Imaginary in the Digital Environment: A Semiological Approach to the Digital Myth (PhD thesis). Faculty of Information and Communication Sciences, University of Algiers 3.

World Economic Forum, . (2022). The Global Technology Governance Report 2022: Harnessing the Fourth Industrial Revolution. Geneva: WEF.

Youssef , M. A. (2022). Agenda Falsification in the Digital Environment: A Study on the Impact of Algorithms on Issue Prioritization (PhD thesis). Faculty of Mass Communication, Ain Shams University.

UNESCO, . (2022). World Trends in Freedom of Expression and Media Development: Global Report 2021/2022. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.