American Journal of Social and Humanitarian Research
Vol. 7 Issue 6 | **pp.** 176-186 | **ISSN:** 2690-9626
Available online @ https://globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/ajshr

Article

Algorithmic Behavioral Influence Among Young Adults In Central Asia: A Simulation-Based Mixed-Methods Study of Decision-Making, Habit Formation, and Awareness

Oybek Eraliyev*[1], Madinaxon Karimova[2]

1. Professor of Capstone Design and Artificial Intelligence Courses, Inha University in Tashkent, Uzbekistan
2. Bachelor's Candidate, School of Computer and Information Engineering, Inha University in Tashkent, Uzbekistan

* Correspondence: o.eraliyev@inha.uz

Abstract: This study aims to examine the extent to which Algorithmic Decision-Making (ADM) systems shape long-term decision-making and behavioral patterns among young adults in Central Asian digital environments. The study employed a simulation-based mixed-method research design, including both quantitative survey data and qualitative interview data analysis. The quantitative sample consisted of 285 young adults aged between 18 and 30 across three Central Asian countries (Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan), along with qualitative semi-structured interviews (n = 24). Quantitative data were collected using the Algorithmic Behavioral Influence Scale (ABIS), a 22-item instrument measuring habitual platform behavior, algorithmic awareness, and decision-making delegation. All three subscales scored significantly above the scale midpoint, with habitual platform behavior recording the highest mean of 3.88. Qualitative aspects observed three major experiential frames: a large unconscious process of personalized content, reduced capacity to engage in cognitively demanding tasks, and a gradual, increasing reliance on algorithmic-driven systems. Altogether, these findings describe how young adults' functioning is becoming deeply embedded in algorithmically curated environments. This study contributes to understanding ADM systems and behavioral formation in algorithmic societies in the Central Asian region and carries practical implications for educators, policymakers, and platform designers. However, limitations include reliance on simulated self-reported data, suggesting the need for longitudinal research across various cultures.

Keywords: Algorithmic decision-making; behavioral influence; habit formation; decision-making delegation; algorithmic awareness; digital literacy; Central Asia; young adults; mixed methods; simulation-based research.

Citation: Oybek E & Madinaxon K. Algorithmic Behavioral Influence Among Young Adults In Central Asia: A Simulation-Based Mixed-Methods Study of Decision-Making, Habit Formation, and Awareness. American Journal of Social and Humanitarian Research 2026, 7(6), 176-186.

Received: 23rd Mar 2026
Revised: 20th Apr 2026
Accepted: 18th May 2026
Published: 19th Jun 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

3-167.

1. Introduction

Algorithmic systems increasingly mediate young adults' experiences, ranging from simple social interactions to information consumption and economic participation. Within recent years, it has become so integrated into aspects of life that people might not even notice how much of their lives are influenced by algorithms. Social media platforms like TikTok and Instagram learn to prioritize and personalize people's needs with just a few clicks. Beyond

personalization, these systems actively shape the informational and social environments in which users operate. Algorithmic Decision-Making (ADM) systems do not simply recommend information; they actively structure visibility, analyze opportunities, and create environments. While ADM systems provide strong analytical capabilities, human decision-makers need to identify the limits of current systems to better integrate comprehension of human behavior with social desires and expectations (Erlei, Nekdem, Meub, Anand, & Gadiraju, 2020). That is to say, algorithms are no longer understood as part of embedded organizational practices, but instead they play a key role in new forms of governing society [1].

This paper will focus on the role that algorithmic patterns play in shaping societies' behavior in a digital setting. While the social power of algorithms and their impact on human behavior have been examined multiple times across regions, little research has been conducted on long-term behavioral patterns that negatively affect focus and attention span, specifically across Central Asia. Young adults in this region navigate a rapidly expanding digital environment, yet the influence of algorithmic patterns on their interests remains unexplored. Uncertainty about the algorithm may lead us to miscalculate its power and importance, which in turn may sabotage our understanding of algorithmic governance. This paper, therefore, asks: To what extent do ADM systems shape long-term decision-making and behavioral patterns among young adults in Central Asian digital environments? By explaining algorithmic influence within a regional context, this study aims to contribute to ongoing debates about behavioral formation in algorithmic societies from the unique perspective of Central Asia [2].

As digital infrastructure continues to expand across Central Asia, the long-term implications for decision-making systems remain insufficiently examined in the region. This gap is particularly significant given the rise of digital information agencies and a growing reliance on social media usage among younger generations. The purpose of this paper is to explain the connection between algorithms and their users whilst considering their application specifically to the region of Central Asia. Thus, the sections below outline a series of concepts, such as personalization and recommendation logic; habit formation and decision-making patterns; and the Central Asian platform landscape and governance, that are associated with algorithmic functionality and can be seen within a broader context [3].

2. Literature Review

ADM systems have become a major, increasingly important aspect of internet infrastructure, where social media platforms use algorithms to organize people's preferences and online behavior. They often work as "black boxes", meaning their impact can be observed, but the reasoning behind them is rarely visible or explainable. In one such study, where black-box decision support systems (DSS) help users to turn their decision-making ability into higher levels of cooperation through a series of ultimatum bargaining games, researchers aim to understand how that affects the behavior of those who are using the system and those who are affected by it. However, it fails to explain the logic behind users' behavior. This is why interpretability, described simply as the ability to explain or present in understandable terms to a human, has become such a key concern. Without it, it is hard for users, or even institutions, to know what these systems are actually doing and why [4].

Most users become completely unaware of the personalization processes they encounter when engaging with these platforms, underscoring the need for digital media literacy in this context argue that personalization creates a tailored information environment based on previous interactions with a system, which later leads users to be trapped in their filter bubbles and echo chambers. Filter bubbles are understood here as an effect of various processes of information search being tailored down to a selection that fits users' attitudes and pre-existing preferences, and echo chambers are a phenomenon where filter bubbles intersect, creating communities of individuals that share a common social media bubble with their like-minded friends[5].

Understanding recommendation systems is critically needed. Although people often refer to them as too complicated to understand, Narayanan (2023) provides a clear, simple

explanation of such systems, also stating that various groups, ranging from content creators to journalists and policymakers, would benefit from understanding them. Nonetheless, Swart (2021) states that users' sense-making strategies of algorithms may not always encourage users to intervene in their predictive algorithmic behavior, examining how users perceive and engage with algorithmic curation and attempting to understand algorithmic culture from the users' perspective.

Schuilenburg and Peeters (2021) describe algorithms as potential solutions to major challenges of our time, including security, public services, health care, and environmental protection. In contrast, Gran et al. (2020) state that not merely the algorithms themselves, but also a deep and solid understanding of their mechanisms, bolsters information security and resilience against misinformation and manipulation. Nevertheless, Beer (2017) highlights the potential power of algorithms in a social scientific context. While that work outlines a good basis for what an algorithm is and how different types of them work, it offers limited observation on how they shape human behavior and lacks investigation into how power might actually be deployed through such algorithmic technologies.

As noted above, many scholars, such as Beer (2017), agree on the need for greater insight into algorithmic governance, given its contextual impact on what people encounter online. However, Gran et al. (2020) argue that not much is yet examined about the extent to which people are aware of their functionality or the potentially disruptive changes imposed by ADM systems. Thus, algorithmic anticipation stresses behavioral structure and users' profiles by reducing people to a set of variables (e.g., age, gender, educational level, income), so that individuals become dividuals (Deleuze, 1990), those who are defined by data sets that predict potential behavior (Schuilenburg & Peeters, 2021).

In Western societies, users' awareness of ADM systems does not simply mean the access level to the Internet; it concerns such aspects as skill and usage, and is not the same as practical to-do skills and concrete usage. Algorithmic skills refer more to creative understanding and the way algorithms influence the visibility of people's content (Klawitter & Hargittai, 2018). Being aware of and consciously navigating the social media infrastructure could therefore be seen as part of a broader level of algorithmic literacy.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This study adopts a simulated mixed-method research design that includes quantitative survey data with qualitative interview analysis. The reason both methods are used is that this research question has two sides: quantifying how much and in what specific ways ADM systems affect behaviour, and understanding how young adults themselves experience and interpret their influence [6].

3.2. Setting and Context

The research was conducted across three different Central Asian countries: Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan. These regions were selected due to their rapidly expanding digital infrastructure, high rates of social media use, and absence of research on algorithmic influence across these regions. Replicated data collection was conducted online to match the natural digital environment where algorithms operate [7].

3.3. Participants

The quantitative sample consisted of N = 285 young adults aged between 18 and 30, and stratified random sampling was used to balance proportionally divided representation across countries, gender, and age. Participants were mostly recruited through university emails, social media platforms like Instagram and Telegram, and student organizations. For the qualitative interviews, 24 participants were selected from the survey respondents who represented a range of platform use frequency, algorithmic awareness, and country of residence [8].

Table 1 presents the demographic profile and platform usage patterns of the 285 survey participants. The sample was predominantly female (58.2%) with a mean age of 22.4 years (SD = 3.1). The majority were enrolled in higher education (74.7%). TikTok was the most frequently used platform (61.4%), followed by Instagram (54.0%) and YouTube (48.6%). Participants reported an average daily screen time of 4.3 hours (SD = 1.9) across all

platforms [9].

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics and Platform Usage of Respondents

Variable	Category	% / M (SD)
Gender	Female	58.2
	Male	41.8
Age (years)	Mean (SD)	22.4 (3.1)
Education Status	Enrolled in higher education	74.7
Most Frequently Used Platforms	TikTok	61.4
	Instagram	54.0
	YouTube	48.6
Daily Screen Time (hours)	Mean (SD)	4.3 (1.9)

The final sample included 58.2% female, 41.8% male. Mean age was 22.4 years (SD = 3.1). The majority were enrolled in higher education (74.7%). TikTok was the most frequently used platform (61.4%), followed by Instagram (54.0%) and YouTube (48.6%). Average daily screen time across platforms was 4.3 hours (SD = 1.9).

3.4. Instruments

The major quantitative instrument was the Algorithmic Behavioral Influence Scale (ABIS), a 22-item self-report scale developed for this study to measure the perceived influence of algorithms on behaviour. Participants rated statements on a scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The scale comprises three subscales: Algorithmic Awareness, Habitual Digital Behavior, and Decision-Making Delegation. Internal reliability for the full scale was $\alpha = .87$, with subscale alphas ranging from .79 to .84. As ABIS was developed specifically for this study, it should be considered an exploratory instrument. Formal validation procedures such as confirmatory factor analysis and pilot testing were beyond the scope of this research and are recommended before the scale is used in future studies [10].

3.5. Procedure

Simulated recruitment began in March 2025 through targeted social media posts and institutional email lists. Interested participants were directed to the online survey platform (Qualtrics), where they reviewed questions. Participation was voluntary, and no financial reward was offered. Data collection took place from February 4 to April 14, 2025, encompassing survey distribution, response collection, and qualitative interviews.

Interview data were analyzed through thematic analysis following Braun & Clarke's (2019) six-phase framework. Coding was conducted in NVivo (v.14). Initial coding was obtained through reading the transcripts, then grouping them into themes, and finally reporting the findings. Intercoder reliability was assessed on 20% of the data ($\kappa = .82$) [11].

3.6. Ethical Considerations

All participation was voluntary and anonymous. Participants signed an informed digital consent and were informed of their right to withdraw at any stage without any consequence. No personal information was collected in the quantitative strand. Interview audio files were stored on a password-protected institutional server and were deleted upon study completion. Participants were provided with a debrief sheet and contact information for the research team.

3.7. Simulation Disclosure

The methodology, participant data, and all statistical outputs presented in this study were purposefully simulated using Claude (Anthropic, 2025), a large language model, for academic purposes as a part of a university research methods course. The simulation prompt specified a mixed-methods design targeting a small group of N = 285 young adults across three countries (Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan), using stratified random sampling, a 22-item self-report instrument (ABIS) with three subscales, and semi-structured interviews with 24 participants. The model was instructed to generate internal statistics, one-sample t-tests. ANOVA results, hierarchical regression outputs, and thematic

analysis findings aligned with the stated research question. However, the research question, theoretical framework, literature review, and discussion sections are the authors' original intellectual work. This paper should therefore be read as a simulation-based methodological exercise rather than an empirical study, and its findings should not be cited as evidence in other research.

4. Results

This section primarily reports the study's findings. The former quantitative sample comprised 285 young adults (58.2% female, 41.8% male) from Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan. The latter sample comprised 24 participants selected from the survey respondents. All tests were evaluated, with alphas ranging from .79 to .84.

Table 2 presents means, standard deviations (SDs), and ranges for all scale measures and daily screen time among participants. The ABIS total score ranged from 1.36 (min) to 5.00 (max) with a mean of 3.64 and a standard deviation of 0.65. Among those ABIS subscales, Habitual Platform Behavior returned the highest Mean = 3.88 and SD = 0.69, followed by Algorithmic Awareness, Mean = 3.61 and SD = 0.74, and Decision-Making Delegation, with Mean = 3.44 and SD = 0.81. Mean daily screen time across the platforms was 4.30 hours (SD = 1.90). Table 3 presents platform use frequencies: Telegram (71.2%), TikTok (61.4%), and Instagram (54.0%), which are the most used social media platforms.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Primary Measures (N = 285)

Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Algorithmic Awareness (8 items)	3.61	0.74	1.00	5.00
Decision-Making Delegation (7 items)	3.44	0.81	1.00	5.00
Habitual Platform Behavior (7 items)	3.88	0.69	1.25	5.00
ABIS Total Score (22 items)	3.64	0.65	1.36	5.00
Daily Screen Time (hrs/day)	4.30	1.90	0.50	12.00

Note. All ABIS items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree). ABIS = Algorithmic Behavioral Influence Scale.

Table 3 displays the frequency and average daily usage for each social media platform in the sample. Telegram was the most widely used platform (71.2%), followed by TikTok (61.4%) and Instagram (54.0%). TikTok also recorded the highest mean daily use among its users (2.1 hrs/day). Percentages sum to more than 100% because participants reported using multiple platforms simultaneously.

Table 3

Platform Use Frequencies and Mean Daily Use (N = 285)

Platform	n	%	Mean Daily Use (hrs)
TikTok	175	61.4	2.1
Instagram	154	54.0	1.4
YouTube	138	48.6	1.8
VK	61	21.4	0.8
Telegram	203	71.2	1.1

Note. Percentages exceed 100% because participants reported using multiple platforms. Mean daily use is calculated only among users of each platform.

The following assumptions were examined. Normality was tested using Kolmogorov-

Smirnov tests and visual inspection of Q-Q plots. ABIS total scores ($D(285) = 0.041$, $p = .200$) did not deviate significantly from normality. Homogeneity of variance across country groups was assessed using Levene's test.

One-sample tests were conducted to determine whether the mean ABIS score differed substantially from the scale midpoint of 3.0. ABIS total scores were significantly above the given midpoint ($t(284) = 16.57$, $p < .001$, $d = .98$). All three subscores were also above the midpoint: Algorithmic Awareness ($t(284) = 13.93$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.82$), Decision-Making Delegation ($t(284) = 9.17$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.54$), and Habitual Platform Behavior ($t(284) = 22.81$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.35$).

One-way ANOVAs were used to compare ABIS total scores and screen time across different countries. Total scores did not show any major differences for ABIS ($F(2, 282) = 1.84$, $p = .160$, $\eta^2 = .013$) or daily screen time ($F(2, 282) = 2.11$, $p = .122$, $\eta^2 = .015$). All η^2 values fell below the .06 threshold for a small effect [12].

Table 4 presents the results of one-way ANOVAs comparing ABIS total scores and daily screen time across the three countries. Uzbekistan recorded a slightly higher ABIS mean ($M = 3.71$) compared to Kazakhstan ($M = 3.60$) and Kyrgyzstan ($M = 3.58$), while Uzbekistani participants also reported the highest average daily screen time ($M = 4.6$ hrs). However, neither ABIS scores ($F(2, 282) = 1.84$, $p = .160$, $\eta^2 = .013$) nor screen time ($F(2, 282) = 2.11$, $p = .122$, $\eta^2 = .015$) differed significantly across countries, indicating that algorithmic behavioral patterns were largely uniform across the region.

Table 4

Country-Level Comparisons of ABIS and Daily Screen Time

Measure	Uzbekistan (n=98) M (SD)	Kazakhstan (n=102) M (SD)	Kyrgyzstan (n=85) M (SD)	F(2,282) / p / η^2
ABIS Total Score	3.71 (0.63)	3.60 (0.66)	3.58 (0.67)	1.84 / .160 / .013
Daily Screen Time (hrs)	4.6 (1.8)	4.2 (1.9)	4.0 (2.0)	2.11 / .122 / .015

Note. η^2 = eta-squared. All p-values are two-tailed. ns = non-significant at $\alpha = .05$.

Thematic analysis of the 24 semi-structured interviews was conducted. Intercoder reliability was $\kappa = .82$, tested on 20% of the transcripts. The three themes are presented in Table 5 with specific representative quotes from the participants.

Theme 1, Invisible Personalization, was identified in 22 of 24 interviews. Theme 2, Eroded Tolerance for Depth, was identified in all of them and was most frequently associated with TikTok use. Theme 3, Delegated Discovery, was identified in 19 of 24 interviews, with the strongest relevance to participants who reported daily screen time above 5 hours [13].

Table 5 summarizes the three themes that emerged from thematic analysis of the 24 semi-structured interviews. Each theme is accompanied by a brief description and a representative participant quote. Theme 1, Invisible Personalization, was present in 22 of 24 interviews and captures participants' unawareness of gradual content shaping. Theme 2, Eroded Tolerance for Depth, appeared in all 24 interviews and was most strongly linked to TikTok use. Theme 3, Delegated Discovery, was identified in 19 interviews and was most pronounced among participants with daily screen time exceeding five hours [14].

Table 5
Qualitative Themes, Descriptions, and Representative Quotes (n = 24)

Theme	Description	Representative Quote
Invisible Personalization	Participants described gradual, unnoticed shaping of content preferences by platform algorithms.	"I realized I had not actually chosen anything for months - it just kept giving me more of the same thing."
Eroded Tolerance for Depth	Participants reported reduced ability to engage with long-form or academically demanding content.	"I cannot read for more than five minutes anymore."
Delegated Discovery	Participants described outsourcing information-seeking and product/topic selection to algorithmic feeds.	"I stopped searching for things myself. The feed just tells me what exists."

Note. Quotes are translated from Russian/Uzbek, where applicable. Participant identifiers withheld to preserve anonymity.

The findings suggest that participants experienced invisible content shaping, along with the inability to stay focused for long periods of time, and stopped seeking out information themselves, letting the algorithm choose for them.

5. Discussion

5.1. Summary of Key Findings

These findings indicate that ADM systems significantly shape behavior above the scale midpoint across three different countries, suggesting a considerable level of algorithmic shaping in people's digital lives [15]. Habitual social media platform behavior was the most affected dimension, followed by attention decline, and, although the lowest of the three, decision-making delegation still exceeded the midpoint significantly. In this study, country differences were somewhat negligible due to the platform-driven aim, which was not culturally specific. Qualitative aspects, however, confirmed and deepened the quantitative picture, which together observed three major experiential frames: a large unconscious process of personalized content, reduced capacity to engage in cognitively demanding tasks, and a gradual, increasing reliance on algorithmic-driven systems. Taken together, these findings paint a picture of young adults whose functioning is becoming deeply embedded in algorithmically curated environments, not always consciously, and whose behavioral habits appear to be shaped in patterned ways as a result [16].

5.2. Theoretical Interpretation

Habitual Platform Behavior interprets itself through habit formation theory. The idea is that variable rewards create compulsive behavior. People never know if the next scroll will be interesting, so they keep scrolling. They do not do it because the content is always good, but because it might be. Moreover, habits are not deliberate choices, but rather automatic responses triggered by contextual cues. When interview respondents realized that they were scrolling and consuming without actively deciding to do so, it appeared to have been automated, in which goal-directed behavior gave way to stimulus-driven repetition. Algorithmic recommendation systems may act just as environmental cues that reinforce this automaticity, and the algorithm removes what is known as cognitive friction — the pause of thinking — by instantly showing the next piece of content [17].

Uses and Gratifications Theory suggests that algorithms define users' needs, instead of letting them choose themselves. This explains Delegated Discovery. Cognitive offloading theory explains that people tend to redistribute cognitively demanding tasks to external tools. What makes these findings notable is that normal cognitive offloading is deliberate, meaning people can choose to use certain tools to make life easier, but the participants in this study did not choose to let the algorithm decide what they should discover. It happened invisibly. When users are unaware that they have transferred their epistemic agency to the algorithm, they quietly hand control over without ever agreeing to it. The algorithm is not neutral — it is built by a company with specific goals, usually keeping users on the platform as long as possible [18].

The qualitative side of Eroded Tolerance for Depth introduces a more troubling theoretical extent. Dual-process theories of cognition distinguish between effortless thinking and effortful reasoning. Short-form video content platforms such as TikTok, which participants frequently mentioned, are designed to optimize the former. If constant engagement with algorithmically curated content has accustomed users to rapid information processing, the cost may be reduced capacity to sustain deep attention to analytically demanding tasks for extended periods. Participants' self-reports suggest that it is not merely a preference but an experienced change in attentional capacity [19].

The concept of Invisible Personalization, identified in most interviews, is connected to the foundational notion of the filter bubble. The idea is that algorithmic personalization processes gradually narrow information down in ways that are not understandable for an ordinary person. Data show that participants could not merely understand the algorithms; they genuinely did not feel it happening. It was not a knowledge issue — it was a perception problem. Only after analyzing their own content did they realize how constrained their environment had become.

5.3. Comparison with Prior Studies

Previous researchers documented that people tend to think they are choosing their own content when actually the platform is choosing for them — a bias that this study's Invisible Personalization aspect verifies. The current data provides an additional dimension that survey-based studies cannot easily capture. Conducting interviews allowed examination of how that feeling of ignorance develops over time, gradually building into a completely distorted sense of being in control [20].

The key finding of screen time above 4 hours per day, with dominant platform usage on Telegram, TikTok, and Instagram, shows how distinct the regional digital ecology of Central Asia is from most Western samples. Telegram, a messaging and channel-based platform, operates very differently from a simple recommendation feed. This matters because not all theories and frameworks researchers have studied may be fully applicable to this platform type, suggesting a future algorithmic model to account for a much wider range of platforms.

Regarding the theme of Eroded Tolerance for Depth, researchers found a distinct relationship between heavy social media use and shortened attention span (Braghieri et al., n.d.). The current study contributes a qualitative account of how this erosion of attention span is experienced subjectively — not by a sudden change, but a gradual transformation that participants only realized when required to concentrate on a real cognitively demanding task.

5.4. Unexpected Findings

One of the most theoretically significant findings in this study is the absence of country-level differences in ABIS scores and daily screen time across Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan. Given that these three countries differ in language, digital infrastructure, governance, and internet regulation, one might expect meaningfully different patterns of algorithmic influence to emerge.

Several explanations may account for this null finding. First, the global standardization of platform architecture is a likely driver: TikTok, Instagram, and YouTube deploy identical recommendation logic across every region. Second, all three countries share a post-Soviet socio-cultural legacy, including overlapping patterns of media consumption and similar educational systems. Third, the sample was restricted to young adults aged 18-30 who are active social media users. Finally, the dominance of Telegram across all three countries (71.2%) may further flatten regional differences, since users are navigating the same channel-based platform logic[21].

These findings suggest that, at least for algorithmically mediated behavior among young adults, platform-level effects may outweigh national cultural differences within this region. Future research should explore whether this pattern holds among older age groups or non-social-media users, and whether more culturally sensitive instruments would reveal subtler distinctions.

5.5. Practical Implications

These findings have several implications for educators, policymakers, and platform designers. Educators in Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan should introduce

structured digital literacy modules in which students actively audit their own platform feeds, identify personalization patterns, and reflect on how their information environment has changed over time. This should be embedded into university curricula, particularly in departments where deep reading and independent research are core competencies.

Policymakers should consider a coordinated regional policy approach given that findings were consistent across all three countries. A single Central Asian transparency regulation could require platforms operating in the region to disclose their content-ranking criteria in Russian and local languages, making algorithmic logic legible to users. Policymakers should also consider mandating user-facing controls that allow individuals to adjust or opt out of personalization.

Platform designers bear an ethical responsibility for the long-term cognitive effects of their design choices. Platforms could implement opt-in depth mode features — such as suppressing autoplay after a set duration, surfacing longer-form content, or providing weekly algorithmic transparency reports — that allow users to consciously shift between fast and slow content consumption modes [22].

5.6. Limitations

First, because ABIS is self-reported, the data reflect participants' perceptions of how algorithms influence them rather than objective behavioral evidence. This introduces social desirability bias and retrospective distortion. Second, qualitative participants were recruited exclusively from those who completed the survey first and then agreed to participate in an interview. This self-selection bias is a meaningful limitation: participants willing to discuss algorithms in an interview likely hold stronger or more critical views than the broader population, which may have amplified themes such as Eroded Tolerance for Depth and Delegated Discovery. Third, the study could not conduct experiments over a long period of time, which means direct causation cannot be established. Lastly, restricting the sample to young adults in Central Asian digital environments limits generalizability to wider populations.

5.7. Future Research Directions

Future research should address these limitations using longitudinal or experimental methods that capture behavioral changes over time. Passive behavioral data, such as screen time and app usage analytics, could strengthen the self-reported measurements and give an additional dimension to the ABIS. Including non-Central Asian regions would help distinguish between cultural and platform-level aspects of the findings. Finally, the role of specific platform designs, such as Telegram, would require further investigation to determine how interaction models differ from those of recommendation-feed platforms.

6. Conclusion

This study set out to examine the extent to which Algorithmic Decision-Making systems shape long-term decision-making and behavioral patterns among young adults in Central Asian digital environments. Drawing on a simulation-based mixed-methods design with 285 survey participants and 24 qualitative interviewees from Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan, the findings consistently indicate that algorithmic influence is both measurable and meaningful in this understudied regional context.

All three dimensions of the ABIS — Habitual Platform Behavior, Algorithmic Awareness, and Decision-Making Delegation — scored significantly above the scale midpoint, with Habitual Platform Behavior yielding the strongest effect ($d = 1.35$). Qualitative analysis deepened these findings by revealing three interconnected experiential patterns: participants described an invisible, gradual shaping of their content preferences; a reduced tolerance for cognitively demanding tasks; and an increasing tendency to delegate discovery to algorithmic feeds rather than actively seeking information. Taken together, these quantitative and qualitative results suggest that young adults in the region are becoming deeply embedded in algorithmically curated environments, often without conscious awareness.

One of the most theoretically notable results was the absence of significant country-level differences across all three nations. Despite meaningful variation in digital infrastructure, governance, and language, ABIS scores and screen time were strikingly uniform, pointing to the homogenizing force of globally standardized platform architectures. This finding

implies that platform-level design decisions may override national cultural differences, at least within this demographic.

This study carries practical implications for educators, policymakers, and platform designers operating in Central Asia. Structured digital literacy education, regional transparency regulations, and platform-level design features that support slower, more deliberate content consumption are among the interventions most clearly supported by the data. At the same time, the study's reliance on simulated self-reported data, a restricted age range, and a cross-sectional design limit causal inference. Future research should prioritize longitudinal methods, passive behavioral data, and broader cross-regional samples to build on these preliminary findings.

In sum, this study provides an early empirical and experiential account of algorithmic behavioral influence in Central Asia, a region whose digital landscape is expanding rapidly but remains largely absent from the scholarly literature. As ADM systems continue to shape information environments worldwide, understanding their effects on diverse populations is not merely an academic concern but a matter of civic and educational importance.

REFERENCES

[1] B. J. Fogg, "A behavior model for persuasive design," in *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Persuasive Technology*, 2009, pp. 1–7. doi: 10.1145/1541948.1541999.

[2] V. Moravec, N. Hynek, M. Skare, B. Gavurova, and V. Polishchuk, "Algorithmic personalization: A study of knowledge gaps and digital media literacy," *Humanit. Soc. Sci. Commun.*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 341, 2025, doi: 10.1057/s41599-025-04593-6.

[3] D. Kahneman, D. Lovallo, and O. Sibony, "Before You Make That Big Decision," *Harv. Bus. Rev.*, 2011, [Online]. Available: https://economy4humanity.org/commons/library/biases.pdf

[4] E. Bozdag, "Bias in algorithmic filtering and personalization," *Ethics Inf. Technol.*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 209–227, 2013, doi: 10.1007/s10676-013-9321-6.

[5] E. F. Risko and S. J. Gilbert, "Cognitive Offloading," *Trends Cogn. Sci.*, vol. 20, no. 9, pp. 676–688, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2016.07.002.

[6] A. Anand *et al.*, "Effects of Algorithmic Decision-Making and Interpretability on Human Behavior: Experiments using Crowdsourcing," in *Unpublished manuscript*,

[7] J. Swart, "Experiencing Algorithms: How Young People Understand, Feel About, and Engage With Algorithmic News Selection on Social Media," *Soc. Media Soc.*, vol. 7, no. 2, 2021, doi: 10.1177/20563051211008828.

[8] A. Erlei, F. Nekdem, L. Meub, A. Anand, and U. Gadiraju, "Impact of Algorithmic Decision Making on Human Behavior: Evidence from Ultimatum Bargaining," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Human Computation and Crowdsourcing*, 2020, pp. 43–52. doi: 10.1609/hcomp.v8i1.7462.

[9] G. Deleuze, *Logique Du Sens*. Columbia University Press, 1990.

[10] V. Braun and V. Clarke, "Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis," *Qual. Res. Sport Exerc. Health*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 589–597, 2019, doi: 10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806.

[11] B. Verplanken and S. Orbell, "Reflections on Past Behavior: A Self-Report Index of Habit Strength," *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 1313–1330, 2003, doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb01951.x.

[12] L. Braghieri, R. Levy, and A. Makarin, "Social Media and Mental Health," *Unpubl. Manuscr.*.

[13] M. Schuilenburg and R. Peeters, Eds., *The Algorithmic Society: Technology, Power, and Knowledge*. Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group, 2021.

[14] E. Pariser, *The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You*. Penguin Press, 2011. [Online]. Available: https://balka-book.com/files/2022/10_17/18_42/u_files_store_48_45027.pdf

[15] E. Klawitter and E. Hargittai, "The Role of Algorithmic Skills in the Curation of Creative Goods," *Int. J. Commun.*, vol. 12, 2018.

[16] D. Beer, "The social power of algorithms," *Inf. Commun. Soc.*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2017, doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2016.1216147.

[17] D. Geschke, J. Lorenz, and P. Holtz, "The triple-filter bubble," *Br. J. Soc. Psychol.*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 129–149, 2019, doi: 10.1111/bjso.12286.

[18] J. Burrell and M. Fourcade, "The Society of Algorithms," *Annu. Rev. Sociol.*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 213–237, 2021, doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-090820-020800.

[19] A.-B. Gran, P. Booth, and T. Bucher, "To be or not to be algorithm aware: A question of a new digital divide?," *Inf. Commun. Soc.*, vol. 24, pp. 1–18, 2020, doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2020.1736124.

[20] F. Doshi-Velez and B. Kim, "Towards A Rigorous Science of Interpretable Machine Learning." 2017. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.1702.08608.

[21] A. Narayanan, "Understanding Social Media Recommendation Algorithms."

[22] E. Katz, J. G. Blumler, and M. Gurevitch, "Uses and Gratifications Research," *Public Opin. Q.*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 509–523, 1973.