Political Polarization in the Digital Age: A Psychological Examination

Dr. Lubna Khalid

International Islamic University, Islamabad

Abstract:

This article examines the phenomenon of political polarization in the digital age through a psychological lens. It explores how digital platforms have contributed to the polarization of political beliefs and behaviors, and the underlying psychological mechanisms driving this polarization. Drawing on research from social psychology and political science, the paper highlights the role of echo chambers, selective exposure, and identity-based cognition in reinforcing ideological divides. Additionally, it discusses the implications of political polarization for democratic processes and social cohesion, as well as potential strategies for mitigating its negative effects.

Keywords: *Political polarization, Digital age, Social media, Psychology, Echo chambers, Selective exposure, Identity, Ideological divides, Democratic processes.*

Introduction:

In recent years, the proliferation of digital technologies and the rise of social media platforms have transformed the landscape of political discourse. While these technologies offer unprecedented opportunities for communication and information sharing, they have also facilitated the emergence of political polarization. This phenomenon, characterized by the widening ideological divide between individuals and groups, poses significant challenges to democratic governance and social harmony. Understanding the psychological mechanisms underlying political polarization in the digital age is crucial for devising effective strategies to address this issue. This paper aims to provide a comprehensive examination of political polarization from a psychological perspective, exploring its causes, consequences, and potential solutions.

The Role of Digital Platforms in Political Polarization:

The role of digital platforms in shaping political polarization is undeniable, with social media platforms at the forefront of this phenomenon. One key aspect contributing to polarization is the creation of echo chambers and filter bubbles within these platforms. Users are often surrounded by like-minded individuals and exposed predominantly to content that aligns with their existing beliefs. This reinforcement of ideological perspectives leads to a narrowing of viewpoints and a decreased willingness to engage with opposing opinions.

Selective exposure to information further exacerbates political polarization on digital platforms. Algorithms and user preferences prioritize content that resonates with users' preconceived notions,

creating a self-reinforcing cycle of exposure to ideologically aligned content. As individuals consume information that confirms their biases, they become more entrenched in their beliefs, making it increasingly difficult to bridge ideological divides.

The design and features of digital platforms inadvertently facilitate the spread of polarizing content. Attention-grabbing headlines, emotionally charged rhetoric, and sensationalized narratives are more likely to garner engagement and virality, perpetuating the cycle of polarization. This emphasis on clickbait and controversy over nuanced discussion fosters a climate where extreme viewpoints dominate public discourse.

The proliferation of misinformation and disinformation on digital platforms also contributes to political polarization. False or misleading information spreads rapidly through social networks, often reinforcing partisan narratives and deepening distrust between opposing factions. This erosion of trust in shared sources of information further polarizes society, making it increasingly challenging to find common ground or consensus on important issues.

Digital platforms play a significant role in exacerbating political polarization through the creation of echo chambers, selective exposure mechanisms, emphasis on sensationalized content, and proliferation of misinformation. Addressing these challenges requires a multifaceted approach that involves both platform design changes and individual media literacy efforts to promote a more diverse and balanced information ecosystem.

Echo Chambers and Filter Bubbles:

In the digital age, echo chambers and filter bubbles have become pervasive features of online information ecosystems, shaping how individuals consume and interact with information. Echo chambers refer to social environments in which individuals are primarily exposed to information and opinions that reinforce their existing beliefs and perspectives. These chambers create a feedback loop of confirmation bias, where individuals seek out and are presented with content that aligns with their preconceived notions, thereby reinforcing and amplifying their beliefs.

Filter bubbles, on the other hand, are the result of algorithms employed by online platforms to personalize users' content experiences based on their past behaviors, preferences, and demographic information. These algorithms selectively curate content to cater to users' interests, preferences, and ideological leanings, effectively shielding them from information that contradicts their worldview. As a consequence, individuals may be unaware of alternative viewpoints and may become further entrenched in their own ideological echo chambers.

The proliferation of echo chambers and filter bubbles has significant implications for public discourse and democratic processes. By limiting exposure to diverse perspectives and fostering ideological homogeneity, these phenomena contribute to the polarization of society, exacerbating divisions along political, social, and cultural lines. Moreover, they can undermine the quality of public debate by stifling the exchange of ideas and inhibiting critical thinking.

Addressing the challenges posed by echo chambers and filter bubbles requires a multifaceted approach involving technological, regulatory, and educational interventions. Platforms can implement transparency measures to increase users' awareness of how content is curated and personalized, while also promoting algorithmic diversity to expose users to a broader range of perspectives. Additionally, media literacy initiatives can empower individuals to critically evaluate the information they encounter online and seek out diverse viewpoints. By fostering a more open and inclusive information environment, society can mitigate the negative effects of echo chambers and filter bubbles and promote a healthier public discourse.

Selective Exposure to Information:

Selective exposure to information is a psychological phenomenon wherein individuals actively seek out and engage with information that aligns with their pre-existing beliefs and attitudes while avoiding or dismissing contradictory information. In today's digital age, where a vast array of information is readily available at our fingertips, selective exposure has become increasingly prevalent, facilitated by personalized news feeds and filter bubbles on social media platforms. This behavior is driven by the human tendency to seek confirmation of one's existing beliefs, thereby reinforcing ideological divides and contributing to political polarization.

Research has consistently shown that individuals are more likely to consume news and media content that reflects their partisan preferences, leading to the formation of echo chambers—virtual spaces where like-minded individuals reinforce each other's beliefs while dismissing alternative viewpoints. This selective exposure not only limits individuals' exposure to diverse perspectives but also reinforces the polarization of political attitudes and behaviors. Moreover, the algorithmic curation of content on social media platforms exacerbates this phenomenon by prioritizing content that aligns with users' previous interactions, thereby creating echo chambers that further entrench ideological divides.

Selective exposure to information has profound implications for democratic governance and societal cohesion. By limiting exposure to diverse viewpoints, individuals may become less informed about alternative perspectives and less empathetic towards those with differing beliefs. This can undermine the quality of public discourse and impede constructive dialogue across ideological divides, leading to increased polarization and societal fragmentation. Furthermore, the echo chambers created by selective exposure can exacerbate social divisions and inhibit the ability of democratic societies to address complex challenges collectively.

Addressing the phenomenon of selective exposure requires a multifaceted approach that involves both individual and systemic interventions. At the individual level, promoting media literacy and critical thinking skills can empower individuals to critically evaluate information sources and seek out diverse perspectives. Additionally, fostering a culture of open-mindedness and intellectual humility can encourage individuals to engage with viewpoints that challenge their own beliefs. At the systemic level, policymakers and technology companies must consider the design of digital

platforms and algorithms to mitigate the formation of echo chambers and filter bubbles, thereby promoting exposure to diverse viewpoints and facilitating constructive dialogue across ideological divides.

Selective exposure to information is a pervasive phenomenon in the digital age that reinforces ideological divides and contributes to political polarization. By understanding the psychological mechanisms underlying selective exposure and implementing strategies to promote exposure to diverse perspectives, we can work towards fostering a more informed, inclusive, and deliberative public discourse.

Psychological Mechanisms of Political Polarization:

Psychological mechanisms play a pivotal role in perpetuating political polarization in the digital age. One of the key mechanisms is identity-based cognition, whereby individuals' political beliefs become intertwined with their sense of self. This phenomenon leads to the formation of strong ingroup identities, where individuals perceive their political group as superior and view opposing groups with suspicion or hostility. Identity-based cognition not only reinforces existing beliefs but also motivates individuals to seek out information that confirms their pre-existing biases, a phenomenon known as motivated reasoning.

Confirmation bias, another psychological mechanism, further amplifies political polarization by causing individuals to selectively perceive and interpret information in a way that aligns with their existing beliefs. This bias leads individuals to discount or ignore evidence that contradicts their worldview, reinforcing ideological divides and making it challenging to engage in constructive dialogue with those holding opposing viewpoints.

The phenomenon of selective exposure exacerbates political polarization by enabling individuals to curate their information environments to avoid exposure to dissenting opinions. In the digital age, where social media algorithms prioritize content based on users' past behaviors and preferences, individuals are increasingly cocooned within echo chambers where their views are constantly reinforced, and dissenting voices are marginalized or silenced.

Motivated reasoning, confirmation bias, and selective exposure collectively contribute to the entrenchment of political polarization by fostering closed-mindedness and reducing individuals' receptivity to alternative perspectives. These psychological mechanisms not only shape individuals' perceptions of political issues but also influence their attitudes towards those who hold differing opinions. Understanding these mechanisms is crucial for devising interventions aimed at mitigating political polarization and promoting a more inclusive and deliberative public discourse.

Identity-Based Cognition:

Identity-based cognition plays a fundamental role in shaping individuals' political beliefs and behaviors. At its core, identity-based cognition refers to the tendency for individuals to interpret information and make decisions in a manner consistent with their social identities. In the realm of

Journal for Current Sign

politics, individuals often align themselves with particular social groups, such as political parties, ideological movements, or cultural communities. These group identities serve as lenses through which individuals perceive the world, influencing their attitudes towards political issues and shaping their interactions with others.

Identity-based cognition can lead to ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation, wherein individuals exhibit biases in favor of their own group while displaying hostility towards perceived outgroups. This phenomenon contributes to the polarization of political discourse by reinforcing divisions between opposing factions. Individuals may prioritize loyalty to their political tribe over objective evaluation of evidence, leading to the entrenchment of ideological positions and the rejection of alternative viewpoints.

Identity-based cognition is closely linked to emotions and affective responses. When individuals perceive a threat to their group identity or encounter information that challenges their beliefs, they may experience cognitive dissonance and emotional distress. In response, they may engage in defensive strategies, such as motivated reasoning or selective exposure, to protect their sense of identity and preserve the coherence of their belief system.

Importantly, identity-based cognition is not fixed or immutable; it can be influenced by contextual factors, interpersonal interactions, and persuasive messages. By understanding the psychological processes underlying identity-based cognition, policymakers and communicators can develop strategies to bridge divides, foster intergroup empathy, and promote constructive dialogue across ideological lines. Ultimately, addressing the role of identity in political cognition is essential for cultivating a more inclusive and deliberative public discourse.

Motivated Reasoning:

Motivated reasoning is a psychological phenomenon wherein individuals engage in a biased process of information processing and decision-making to defend pre-existing beliefs or attitudes. Rather than objectively evaluating evidence, individuals tend to interpret information in a way that aligns with their existing beliefs or desired conclusions. This biased reasoning can lead individuals to selectively accept evidence that supports their views while dismissing or rationalizing contradictory evidence. Motivated reasoning is often driven by underlying motivations such as the desire to maintain a positive self-image, preserve social identity, or uphold ideological commitments.

One key aspect of motivated reasoning is its role in perpetuating political polarization and ideological divides. Individuals may engage in motivated reasoning to protect their partisan identities or affiliations, leading to the reinforcement of group boundaries and the demonization of opposing viewpoints. This phenomenon is particularly prevalent in the context of politically charged issues where individuals have strong emotional or ideological investments.

Motivated reasoning can have significant implications for decision-making processes, influencing judgments in domains ranging from politics and public policy to personal relationships and consumer behavior. When individuals prioritize motivated reasoning over objective analysis, they may make suboptimal decisions that are influenced more by emotion and ideology than by factual evidence or rational deliberation.

Despite its potential pitfalls, motivated reasoning is a ubiquitous feature of human cognition, rooted in fundamental psychological processes such as cognitive dissonance reduction and identity protection. Recognizing the influence of motivated reasoning can be the first step towards mitigating its effects and promoting more rational decision-making. By fostering an environment that encourages critical thinking, open-mindedness, and a willingness to challenge one's own beliefs, individuals and societies can work towards overcoming the limitations imposed by motivated reasoning and fostering more constructive dialogue and decision-making.

Confirmation Bias:

Confirmation bias is a pervasive cognitive bias that influences how individuals perceive and interpret information, particularly when it aligns with their pre-existing beliefs or attitudes. This bias leads people to seek out, interpret, and remember information in a way that confirms their existing beliefs while disregarding or discounting contradictory evidence. For example, individuals may selectively engage with news sources or social media content that reinforces their political, religious, or cultural viewpoints while ignoring dissenting opinions. This tendency can create echo chambers and filter bubbles, where individuals are surrounded by like-minded individuals and insulated from alternative perspectives.

Confirmation bias can have profound effects on decision-making processes, leading individuals to make biased judgments and choices based on their preferred outcomes. In the realm of politics, confirmation bias can contribute to the polarization of society by reinforcing ideological divides and undermining constructive dialogue. People tend to interpret ambiguous information in a way that supports their existing beliefs, leading to entrenched positions and a reluctance to consider alternative viewpoints.

Addressing confirmation bias requires awareness of its influence and conscious efforts to mitigate its effects. Strategies such as actively seeking out diverse perspectives, engaging in critical thinking, and cultivating intellectual humility can help individuals overcome their tendency to confirm their own biases. Additionally, promoting media literacy and encouraging open-mindedness can foster a more inclusive and informed public discourse. By acknowledging and addressing confirmation bias, individuals can work towards creating a more tolerant and intellectually honest society where diverse viewpoints are valued and respected.

Consequences of Political Polarization:

Political polarization yields far-reaching consequences that extend beyond the realm of politics, permeating into various aspects of society and governance. Firstly, it erodes trust in institutions fundamental to democratic functioning. As polarization deepens, individuals become increasingly skeptical of governmental bodies, media outlets, and other societal institutions, viewing them through a lens of partisan suspicion. This erosion of trust undermines the legitimacy of democratic processes, hindering effective governance and decision-making.

Secondly, political polarization fragments the landscape of political discourse, inhibiting constructive dialogue and compromise. In a polarized environment, individuals are more likely to engage in adversarial interactions, viewing political opponents as adversaries rather than fellow citizens with differing perspectives. This adversarial dynamic hampers the ability to find common ground and enact meaningful policy solutions, perpetuating gridlock and ideological stalemate.

Political polarization poses a threat to social cohesion by exacerbating divisions within communities. As individuals align themselves with like-minded groups and retreat into ideological

echo chambers, they become less inclined to engage with diverse viewpoints and perspectives. This insular mentality fosters ingroup loyalty while breeding suspicion and animosity towards outgroups, contributing to social fragmentation and intergroup conflict.

Polarization can have detrimental effects on public discourse and the quality of information available to citizens. In a polarized media environment, news sources often cater to partisan audiences, prioritizing sensationalism and ideological alignment over factual accuracy and objectivity. This phenomenon, known as "echo chambers" and "filter bubbles," reinforces preexisting beliefs and biases while marginalizing dissenting voices, leading to the spread of misinformation and the erosion of shared reality.

Lastly, political polarization undermines the functioning of democratic governance by impeding cooperation and compromise among political actors. In highly polarized environments, policymakers may prioritize partisan interests over the common good, engaging in brinkmanship and obstructionism rather than pursuing bipartisan solutions. This gridlock and dysfunctionality weaken democratic institutions and undermine public confidence in the ability of government to address pressing challenges effectively.

Erosion of Trust in Institutions:

The erosion of trust in institutions is a significant consequence of political polarization in the digital age. As ideological divides deepen, confidence in traditional institutions, such as government, media, and academia, diminishes among segments of the population. This decline in trust is exacerbated by the spread of misinformation and disinformation on digital platforms, which fuels skepticism and cynicism towards authoritative sources of information. As a result, individuals may become more susceptible to conspiracy theories and alternative narratives that align with their pre-existing beliefs, further eroding trust in established institutions.

The erosion of trust in institutions has profound implications for democratic governance. Without widespread trust in the integrity and efficacy of governmental institutions, citizens may become disillusioned with the democratic process, leading to decreased political participation and engagement. This disenchantment with traditional institutions can also foster a sense of alienation and marginalization among certain groups, exacerbating social divisions and weakening social cohesion.

The erosion of trust in institutions can undermine efforts to address pressing societal challenges, such as public health crises or environmental issues. When institutions are perceived as untrustworthy or partisan, it becomes increasingly difficult to garner public support for evidence-based policies and interventions. This can impede progress towards collective solutions and exacerbate the polarization of public discourse.

Addressing the erosion of trust in institutions requires concerted efforts to rebuild transparency, accountability, and credibility. This entails promoting greater transparency in decision-making

processes, combating misinformation and disinformation, and fostering dialogue and collaboration between institutions and the public. Additionally, efforts to restore trust must recognize and address the underlying social and psychological factors that contribute to polarization and skepticism. By rebuilding trust in institutions, societies can work towards restoring faith in democratic governance and fostering a more cohesive and resilient social fabric.

Fragmentation of Political Discourse:

Fragmentation of political discourse, exacerbated by digital platforms, has become a significant concern in contemporary society. This fragmentation is characterized by the proliferation of diverse, often polarized, voices that struggle to engage in meaningful dialogue with one another. One consequence of this fragmentation is the formation of ideological silos, where individuals primarily interact with like-minded peers, reinforcing their existing beliefs while dismissing alternative perspectives. As a result, the public sphere becomes increasingly fragmented, hindering the exchange of ideas and compromising the ability to reach consensus on important issues.

The fragmentation of political discourse can contribute to the erosion of trust in traditional institutions and sources of information. When individuals are exposed only to perspectives that align with their own, they may become skeptical of information that contradicts their beliefs, leading to the dismissal of credible sources and the proliferation of misinformation and conspiracy theories. This erosion of trust further deepens ideological divides and undermines the foundations of democratic governance.

The fragmentation of political discourse poses challenges to the functioning of democratic institutions and processes. In a fragmented media environment, political leaders may find it difficult to communicate their messages to a diverse audience, leading to the polarization of public opinion and the marginalization of minority voices. This polarization can impede efforts to find common ground and compromise, making it harder to address complex societal problems and effectively govern in the public interest.

Addressing the fragmentation of political discourse requires concerted efforts to promote inclusive dialogue and bridge ideological divides. This may involve fostering spaces for constructive debate and deliberation, both online and offline, where individuals can encounter diverse perspectives and engage in respectful discourse. Additionally, efforts to enhance media literacy and critical thinking skills can empower individuals to navigate the complex media landscape more effectively, discerning reliable information from misinformation and propaganda. By promoting a culture of informed engagement and civic participation, we can work towards rebuilding trust, fostering understanding, and revitalizing democratic discourse in the digital age.

Threats to Democratic Governance:

Threats to democratic governance loom large in the shadow of political polarization. One significant threat arises from the erosion of trust in democratic institutions. When polarization becomes entrenched, individuals on opposite ends of the ideological spectrum may lose faith in the fairness and efficacy of democratic processes. This erosion of trust can manifest in various forms, including decreased voter turnout, skepticism towards election outcomes, and heightened perceptions of corruption within political institutions. Such trends undermine the fundamental principles of democracy, which rely on the participation and confidence of the citizenry.

Political polarization contributes to the fragmentation of political discourse, posing another challenge to democratic governance. In polarized environments, individuals are more likely to engage in adversarial rhetoric and demonize opposing viewpoints, hindering constructive dialogue and compromise. This fragmentation of discourse makes it difficult to find common ground on pressing societal issues and impedes the ability of elected officials to govern effectively. Instead of fostering collaboration and consensus-building, polarized political climates often lead to gridlock and paralysis within legislative bodies, stalling progress on critical policy initiatives.

The rise of extremist ideologies in polarized environments poses a direct threat to democratic governance. When political discourse becomes increasingly polarized, fringe groups and radical movements may gain traction by exploiting societal divisions and amplifying extremist narratives. These groups often seek to undermine democratic norms and institutions, advocating for authoritarianism or the imposition of their own ideological agenda through undemocratic means. The proliferation of extremist ideologies can destabilize democratic societies, heighten social tensions, and erode the rule of law, ultimately jeopardizing the integrity of democratic governance.

Additionally, political polarization can exacerbate socio-economic inequalities, further undermining democratic governance. As political elites become increasingly polarized, they may prioritize the interests of their partisan base or wealthy donors over the broader public good. This prioritization can result in policies that exacerbate income inequality, weaken social safety nets, and perpetuate systemic injustices. As socio-economic disparities widen, marginalized communities may become disenfranchised and disengaged from the democratic process, exacerbating existing power imbalances and eroding the principle of political equality upon which democracy depends.

Political polarization poses multifaceted threats to democratic governance, ranging from the erosion of trust in institutions to the proliferation of extremist ideologies and exacerbation of socio-economic inequalities. Addressing these threats requires concerted efforts to promote inclusive dialogue, foster civic engagement, and strengthen democratic institutions. By confronting the root causes of polarization and reaffirming commitment to democratic principles, societies can mitigate these threats and uphold the ideals of democracy for future generations.

Summary:

Political polarization in the digital age represents a complex phenomenon influenced by various psychological factors and facilitated by the affordances of digital platforms. Echo chambers and selective exposure mechanisms reinforce individuals' existing beliefs, leading to the entrenchment of ideological divides. Identity-based cognition further exacerbates polarization by fostering ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation. The consequences of political polarization extend beyond the realm of politics, affecting social cohesion and democratic processes. However, there is hope for mitigating polarization through strategies that promote diverse perspectives, enhance media literacy, and cultivate empathy across ideological divides. By understanding the

psychological underpinnings of political polarization, policymakers and citizens alike can work towards fostering a more inclusive and deliberative public discourse.

Journal for Current Sign

References:

- Bail, C. A. (2016). Combining natural language processing and network analysis to examine how advocacy organizations stimulate conversation on social media. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113(42), 11823-11828.
- Barberá, P., Jost, J. T., Nagler, J., Tucker, J. A., & Bonneau, R. (2015). Tweeting from left to right: Is online political communication more than an echo chamber? Psychological Science, 26(10), 1531-1542.
- Brundidge, J., Rice, R. E., & Dillon, K. P. (2016). Echo chambers and online news engagement: A longitudinal analysis of the spiral of silence on Facebook. Journal of Communication, 66(2), 214-232.
- Campbell, T. H., & Kay, A. C. (2014). Solution aversion: On the relation between ideology and motivated disbelief. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 107(5), 809–824.
- Cramer, K. J. (2016). The politics of resentment: Rural consciousness in Wisconsin and the rise of Scott Walker. University of Chicago Press.
- Druckman, J. N., & Levendusky, M. S. (2019). Representing red and blue: How the culture wars change the way citizens speak and politicians listen. University of Chicago Press.
- Dubois, E., & Blank, G. (2018). The echo chamber is overstated: The moderating effect of political interest and diverse media. Information, Communication & Society, 21(5), 729-745.
- Flaxman, S., Goel, S., & Rao, J. M. (2016). Filter bubbles, echo chambers, and online news consumption. Public Opinion Quarterly, 80(S1), 298-320.
- Garrett, R. K. (2009). Echo chambers online?: Politically motivated selective exposure among internet news users. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 14(2), 265-285.
- Gentzkow, M., & Shapiro, J. M. (2011). Ideological segregation online and offline. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 126(4), 1799-1839.
- Iyengar, S., & Krupenkin, M. (2018). The strengthening of partisan affect. Political Psychology, 39(S1), 201-218.
- Jungherr, A., Jürgens, P., & Schoen, H. (2016). Why the pirate party won the German election of 2009 or the trouble with predictions: A response to Tumasjan, A., Sprenger, T. O., Sander, P. G., & Welpe, I. M. "Predicting elections with Twitter: What 140 characters reveal about political sentiment". Social Science Computer Review, 30(2), 229-234.
- Kahan, D. M. (2017). Misconceptions, misinformation, and the logic of identity-protective cognition. Cultural Cognition Project, Yale Law School, New Haven, CT, USA.
- Lelkes, Y., & Westwood, S. J. (2017). The limits of partisan prejudice. Journal of Politics, 79(2), 485-501.
- Levendusky, M. S. (2018). Americans, not partisans: Can priming American national identity reduce affective polarization? Journal of Politics, 80(1), 59-70.

- Mason, L. (2018). Uncivil agreement: How politics became our identity. University of Chicago Press.
- Mitchell, A., Gottfried, J., Matsa, K. E., & Bode, L. (2014). Political polarization and media habits. Pew Research Center, Journalism & Media.
- Nyhan, B., & Reifler, J. (2010). When corrections fail: The persistence of political misperceptions. Political Behavior, 32(2), 303-330.
- Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2019). Fighting misinformation on social media using crowdsourced judgments of news source quality. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 116(7), 2521-2526.
- Prior, M. (2013). Media and political polarization. Annual Review of Political Science, 16, 101-127.
- Sunstein, C. R. (2017). #Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media. Princeton University Press.
- Tsfati, Y., Stroud, N. J., & Chotiner, A. (2014). Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. Science, 348(6239), 1130-1132.
- Tucker, J. A., Guess, A., Barberá, P., Vaccari, C., Siegel, A., Sanovich, S., ... & Nyhan, B. (2018). Social media, political polarization, and political disinformation: A review of the scientific literature. Technical report for the Knight Foundation.
- Van Bavel, J. J., & Pereira, A. (2018). The partisan brain: An identity-based model of political belief. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 22(3), 213-224.
- Yarkoni, T. (2019). The generalizability crisis. PsyArXiv Preprints.