

A Systematic Review of Worldwide Causal and Correlational Evidence on Digital Media and Democracy

now published at:

<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41562-022-01460-1>

Philipp Lorenz-Spreen^{1,*;†} Lisa Oswald^{2;†} Stephan Lewandowsky^{3,4}
Ralph Hertwig¹

¹Center for Adaptive Rationality, Max Planck Institute for Human Development, Berlin, Germany

²Hertie School, Berlin, Germany

³School of Psychological Science and Cabot Institute, University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

⁴School of Psychological Science, University of Western Australia, Perth, Australia

[†]these authors contributed equally; *lorenz-spreen@mpib-berlin.mpg.de

November 7, 2022

ABSTRACT

One of today's most controversial and consequential issues is whether the global uptake of digital media is causally related to a decline in democracy. We conducted a systematic review of causal and correlational evidence ($N = 496$ articles) on the link between digital media use and different political variables. Some associations, such as increasing political participation and information consumption, are likely to be beneficial for democracy and were often observed in autocracies and emerging democracies. Other associations, such as declining political trust, increasing populism, and growing polarization, are likely to be detrimental to democracy and were more pronounced in established democracies. While the impact of digital media on political systems depends on the specific variable and system in question, several variables show clear directions of associations. The evidence calls for research efforts and vigilance by governments and civil societies to better understand, design and regulate the interplay of digital media and democracy.

Introduction

The ongoing heated debate on the opportunities and dangers that digital media pose to democracy has been hampered by disjointed and conflicting results (for recent overviews see [1, 2, 3, 4]). Disagreement about the role of new media is not a novel phenomenon; throughout history, evolving communication technologies have provoked concerns and debates. One likely source of concern is the dual-use dilemma, that is, the inescapable fact that technologies can be used for both noble and malicious aims. For instance, during the Second World War, radio was used as a propaganda tool by Nazi Germany [5], whereas allied radio, such as the BBC, supported resistance against the Nazi regime, for example, by providing tactical information on allied military activities [6, 7]. In the context of the Rwandan genocide, radio was used to incite Rwandan Hutus to massacre the country's Tutsi minority [8]. In the aftermath of the genocide, using the same means to cause different ends, the radio soap opera *Musekeweya* successfully reduced intergroup prejudice in a yearlong field experiment [9, 10].

Digital media appears to be another double-edged sword. On the one hand, it can empower citizens, as demonstrated in movements such as the Arab Spring [11], Fridays for Future, and #MeToo [12]. On the other hand, digital media can also be instrumental in inciting destructive behaviours and tendencies such as polarization and populism [13], as well as fatal events such as the attack on the United States Capitol in January 2021. Relatedly, the way political leaders use or avoid digital media can vary greatly depending on the political context. U.S. President Trump used it to spread numerous lies ranging from claims about systematic voter fraud in the 2020 presidential election to claims about the harmlessness of Covid-19. In spring 2022, Russian President Putin has most social media platforms banned, probably to prevent access to information about his army's attack on Ukraine, that would bypass the state-controlled classical media [14]. At the same time, Ukrainian President Zelensky has skilfully used social media to boost Ukrainian morale and win the information war with Russia. Examples of the dual-use dilemma of digital media abound.

Clearly, digital media can foster liberation, democratization, and participation, but can also play an important role in eroding democracy. The role of digital media is further complicated because unlike other communication technologies, it enables individuals to easily produce and disseminate content themselves and offers largely frictionless interaction between users. These properties have not only moved the self-organised political behaviour of citizens into the spotlight [15], they have also shifted power to large digital media platforms. Unlike broadcasters, digital media platforms typically do not create content; instead, their power lies in providing and governing a digital infrastructure. Although that infrastructure could serve as an online public sphere [16], it is the platforms, that exert much control over the dynamics of information flow.

Our goal is to advance the scientific and public debate on the relationship between digital media and democracy by providing an evidence-based picture of this complex constellation. To this end, we comprehensively reviewed and synthesized the available scientific knowledge [17] on the link between digital media and various politically significant variables such as participation, trust and polarization.

We aimed to answer the preregistered question *If, to what degree and in which contexts, do digital media have detrimental effects on democracy?* (preregistered protocol, including research question and search strategy, at <https://osf.io/7ry4a/>). This two staged question encompasses, first, the assessment of the direction of effects, and, second, how these effects play out as a function of political contexts.

A major difficulty facing researchers and policy makers is that most studies relating digital media use to political attitudes and behaviours are correlational. Because it is nearly impossible to simulate democracy in the laboratory, researchers are forced to rely on observational data that typically only provide correlational evidence. We therefore pursued two approaches: First, we collected and synthesized a broad set of articles that examine associations between digital media use and different political variables. We then conducted an in-depth analysis of the small subset of articles reporting causal evidence. This two-step approach permitted us to focus on causal effects while still taking the full spectrum of correlational evidence into account.

For the present purpose, we adopted a broad understanding of digital media, ranging from general internet access to the use of specific social media platforms, including exposure to certain types of content on these platforms. To be considered as valid digital media variable in our review, information or discussion forums have to be hosted via the internet or need to describe specific features of online communication. For example, we considered the online outlets of traditional newspapers or TV channels as digital source of political information but not the original traditional media themselves. We provide an overview of digital media variables present in our review sample in Fig. 1d and discern in our analyses between the two overarching types of digital media: internet, broadly defined, on the one hand and social media in particular on the other hand.

We further aimed to synthesize evidence on a broad spectrum of political attitudes and behaviours that are relevant to basic democratic principles [18]. We therefore grounded our assessment of political variables in the literature that examines elements of modern democracies that are considered essential to their functioning, such as citizens' basic trust in media and institutions [19], a well-informed public [20], an active civil society [21, 22], and exposure to a variety of opinions [23, 24]. We also included phenomena that are considered detrimental to the functioning of democracies, including open discrimination against people [25], political polarization to the advantage of political extremists and populists [26], and social segregation in homogeneous networks [23, 27].

The political variables in focus are themselves multi-dimensional and may be heterogeneous and conflicting. For example, polarization encompasses partisan sorting [28], affective polarization [29], issue alignment [30, 31], and a number of other phenomena (see [32] for an excellent literature review on media effects on variations of ideological and affective polarization). For our purpose, however, we take a broader perspective, examining and comparing across different political variables the directions—beneficial or detrimental to democracy—in which digital media effects play out.

Notwithstanding the nuances within each dimension of political behavior, wherever possible we explicitly interpret each change in a political variable as tending to be either beneficial or detrimental to democracy. Even though we try to

refrain from normative judgements, the nature of our research question required us to interpret the reported evidence with regard to its relation with democracy. For example, an increase in political knowledge is generally considered to be beneficial under the democratic ideal of an informed citizenry [20]. Similarly, a certain level of trust in democratic institutions is crucial for a functioning democracy [33]. By contrast, various forms of polarization (particularly affective polarization) tend to split societies into opposing camps and threaten democratic decision making [34, 35]. Likewise, populist politics, that are often coupled with right-wing nationalist ideologies, artificially divide society into a corrupt “elite” that is opposed by “the people”, which runs counter to the ideals of a pluralistic democracy and undermines citizens’ trust in politics and the media [36, 37]. We therefore consider polarization and populism, for example, to be detrimental for democracy.

There are already some systematic reviews of subsets of associations between political behaviour and media use that fall within the scope of our analysis, including reviews of the association between media and radicalization [38, 39], polarization [32], hate speech [40], participation [41, 42, 43, 44, 45], echo chambers [46], and campaigning on Twitter [47]. These extant reviews did, however, not contrast and integrate the wide range of politically relevant variables into one comprehensive analysis—an objective that we pursue here. For the most relevant review articles, we matched the references provided in them with our reference list (see Materials and Methods section for details). Importantly, and unlike some extant reviews, our focus is not on institutions, the political behaviour of political elites (e.g., their strategic use of social media; see [47, 48]), or higher-level outcomes (e.g., policy innovation in governments [49]). We also do not consider the effects of traditional media (e.g., television or radio) or consumption behaviours that are not specific to digital media (e.g., selective exposure [50]). Furthermore, we do not focus on the microscopic psychological mechanisms that could shape polarization on social media (for a review see [51]). For reasons of external validity, we omitted small scale laboratory-only experiments (e.g., [52]), but included field experiments in our review. We included studies using a variety of methods—from surveys to large-scale analyses of social media data—and across different disciplines, that are relevant to our research question. Details on the inclusion and exclusion criteria are provided in the Materials and Methods section. Our goal with this knowledge synthesis is to provide a nuanced foundation of shared facts for a constructive stage in the academic but also societal debate about the future of digital media and their role in democracy. In our view, this debate and the future design of digital media for democracy requires a comprehensive assessment of its impact. We therefore not only focus on individual dimensions of political behaviour but, thus going beyond the extant reviews, compare these dimensions and the methods by which they have been researched so far. This approach aims to stimulate research that fills evidence gaps and establishes missing links that only become apparent when comparing the dimensions.

Results

After conducting a preregistered search (most recent update September 15, 2021) and selection process, we arrived at a final sample of $N = 496$ articles. For further analysis, we classified them by the set of variables between which they report associations: type of digital media (e.g., social media, online news), political variables (e.g., trust, participation),

and characteristics of the information ecology (e.g., misinformation, selective exposure), as depicted in Fig. 1a. Each article was coded according to the combination of these variables as well as method, specific outcome variable, and, if applicable, the direction of association and potential moderator variables (see Materials and Methods for details). The resulting table of the fully coded set of studies is at <https://osf.io/7ry4a/>, alongside the code for the analyses and visualizations offered here.

Fig. 1 reports the composition of the set of included articles. Fig. 1a confirms that the search query mainly returned articles concerned with the most relevant associations between digital media and political outcomes (A–B, $N = 299$). Most of the articles were published in the last five years, highlighting the fast growth of interest in the link between digital media and democracy. Articles span a range of disciplines, including political science, psychology, computational science, and communication science. Although a preponderance of articles focused on the United States, there was still a large geographical variation overall (see Fig. 1b).

Fig. 1c shows the distribution of measurements (counted separately when one article reported several outcomes) across methods and political variables. Our search query was designed to capture a broad range of politically relevant variables, which meant that we had to group them into broader categories. The ten most frequently reported categories of variables were trust in institutions, different variants of political participation (e.g., voter turnout or protest participation), exposure to diverse viewpoints in the news, political knowledge, political expression, measures of populism (e.g., support for far-right parties or anti-minority rhetoric), prevalence and spread of misinformation, measures of polarization (e.g., negative attitudes towards political opponents or fragmented and adversarial discourse), homophily in social networks (i.e., social connections between like-minded individuals) and online hate (i.e., hate speech or hate crime). Similarly, the distribution of outcomes and associated digital media variables in Fig. 1d shows that many studies focused on political information online, and specifically political information on social media, in combination with political polarization and participation, while other digital media variables, such as messenger platforms are less explored. The full table, including the reported political variables within each category, can be found at <https://osf.io/7ry4a/>. Fig. 1 also reveals gaps in the literature, such as rarely explored geographical regions (e.g., Africa) and under-studied methods–variable combinations (e.g., involving the combination of data sources such as social media data with survey or secondary data).

Direction of Associations

In the first part of our research question, we ask whether the available evidence suggest that the effects of digital media are predominantly beneficial or detrimental to democracy. To find an answer, we first selected subsets of articles that addressed the ten most frequently studied categories of political variables (from here on simply referred to as political variables). We did not test specific hypotheses in our review. A total of $N = 355$ associations were reported for these variables (when an article examined two relevant outcome variables, two associations were counted). The independent variable across these articles was always a measure of the usage of some type of digital media, such as online news consumption or social media uptake. Statistically speaking, the independent variables can be positively or negatively associated with the political outcome variable. For instance, more digital media use could be associated with more

expression of hate (positive association) or less expression of hate (negative association), or they could be not associated at all. We decided to present relationships not at a statistical level but at a conceptual level. We therefore classified each observed statistical association as beneficial or detrimental depending on whether its direction was aligned or misaligned with democracy. For example, a positive statistical association between digital media use and hate speech was coded as a detrimental association; by contrast, a positive statistical association between digital media use and participation was coded as beneficial. Throughout, we represent beneficial associations in turquoise and detrimental associations in orange, irrespective of the underlying statistical polarity.

Fig. 2 provides an overview of the 10 most frequently studied political variables and the reported directions—color-coded in terms of whether they are beneficial or detrimental to democracy—of each of their associations with digital media use. This overview encompasses both correlational and causal evidence. Some findings in Fig. 2 suggest that digital media can foster democratic objectives. First, the associations reported for participation point mostly in beneficial directions for democracy (aligned with previous results [45]), including a wide range of political and civic behaviour (see Fig. 1d), from low-effort participation such as liking/sharing political messages on social media to high-cost activities such as protesting in oppressive regimes. Second, measures of political knowledge and diversity of news exposure appeared to be associated with digital media in beneficial ways, but the overall picture was slightly less clear. Third, the literature was also split on how political expression is associated with digital media. Articles reporting beneficial associations between digital media and citizens' political expression were opposed by a number of articles describing detrimental associations. These detrimental associations relate to the “spiral of silence” idea, that is, the notion that people's willingness to express their political opinions online depends on the perceived popularity of their opinions (see relevant overview articles [53, 54]).

Fourth, we observed consistent detrimental associations for a number of variables. Specifically, the associations with trust in institutions were overwhelmingly pointing in directions detrimental to a functioning democracy. Measures of hate, polarization, and populism were also widely reported to have detrimental associations with digital media use in the clear majority of articles. Likewise, increased digital media use was often associated with a greater exposure to misinformation. Finally, we also found that digital media were associated with homophily in social networks in detrimental ways (mostly measured on social media, and here especially Twitter), but the pattern of evidence was a little less consistent. Differences in the consistency of results were also reflected when broken down along associated digital media variables (see the insets in Fig. 2): For instance, both trust and polarization measures were consistently associated with media use across types of digital media, ranging from social media to political information online; in contrast, results for homophily were concentrated on social media and especially Twitter, while measurements of news exposure were mostly concentrated on political information online. This points not only to different operationalizations of related outcome measures, such as diverse information exposure and homophilic network structures, but also to differences between the distinct domains of digital media in which these very related phenomena are measured. Similar observations can be made when separating associations between general types of digital media: social media vs. internet more broadly in Supplementary Figure 1.

Next, we distinguished between articles reporting correlational versus causal evidence and focused on the small subset of articles reporting the latter ($N = 24$). We excluded causal evidence on the effects of voting advice applications from our summary as a very specific form of digital media, explicitly constructed to inform vote choices, and already extensively discussed in a meta analysis [55].

Causal inference

Usually, the absence of randomized treatment assignment, an inescapable feature of observational data (e.g., survey data), precludes the identification of causal effects because individuals differ systematically on variables other than the treatment (or independent) variable. However, under certain conditions it is possible to rule out non-causal explanations for associations, even in studies without random assignment that are based on observational data (see [56, 57, 58]). For a more detailed explanation of the fundamental principles of causal inference, see the Supplementary Material page 5 and, for example, the work of 2021 laureates of the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economics [56, 57, 58].

Common causal inference techniques that were used in our sample include instrumental variable designs that introduce exogenous variation in the treatment variable [59, 60, 61, 62, 63], matching approaches to explicitly balance treatment and control groups [64, 65, 66], and panel designs that account for unobserved confounders with unit and/or time fixed effects [67, 68]. We also found multiple large-scale field experiments conducted on social media platforms [69, 70, 71, 72] as well as various natural experiments [61, 73, 62, 59].

Fig. 3 summarizes the findings and primary causal inference techniques of these articles. Again, causal effects were coded as beneficial for or detrimental to democracy. This figure is structured according to whether evidence stemmed from established democracies or from emerging democracies and authoritarian regimes, adopting classifications from the Liberal Democracy Index provided by the Varieties of Democracy project [18]. In some autocratic regimes (e.g., China), it is particularly difficult to interpret certain effects. For example, a loss of trust in government suggests a precarious development for an established democracy; in authoritarian regimes, however, it may indicate a necessary step toward overcoming an oppressive regime and, eventually, progressing toward a more liberal and democratic system. Instead of simply adopting the authors' interpretation of the effects or imposing our own interpretation of effects in authoritarian contexts, we leave this interpretation to the reader (denoted in purple in the figure). The overall picture converges closely with the one drawn in Fig. 2. We found general trends of digital media use increasing participation and knowledge but also increasing political polarization and decreasing trust that mostly aligned with correlational evidence.

Effects on key political variables

In the following, we provide a short synopsis of the results, point to conflicting trends, and highlight some examples of the full set of correlational and causal evidence, reported in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3, for six variables that we found to be

particularly crucial for democracy: participation, trust, political knowledge, polarisation, populism, network structures and news exposure. The chosen examples are stand-ins and illustrations of the general trends.

Participation. Consistent with past meta-analyses [42, 43, 45], the body of correlational evidence supported a beneficial association between digital media use and political participation and mobilization.

Causal analyses of the effects of digital media on political participation in established democracies mostly studied voting and voter turnout [74, 67, 75, 71, 76, 64]; articles concerned with other regions of the world focused rather on political protest behavior [66, 61, 59]. Other articles considered online political participation [71, 65]. One study, applying causal mediation analysis to assess a causal mechanism [77], found that information-oriented social media use affects political participation, mediated or enabled through the user's online political efficacy [65]. Overall, our evidence synthesis found largely beneficial mobilizing effects for political participation across this set of articles. Our search did not identify any studies that examined causal effects of digital media on political participation in authoritarian regimes in Africa or the Middle East.

Trust. Many articles in our sample found detrimental associations between digital media and various dimensions of trust (Fig. 2). For example, detrimental associations were found for trust in governments and politics [78, 60, 79, 80, 59, 81, 66, 82], trust in media [83], and social and institutional trust [84]. During the COVID-19 pandemic, digital media use was reported to be negatively associated with trust in vaccines [85, 86]. Yet the results about associations with trust are not entirely homogeneous. One multinational survey found beneficial associations with trust in science [87]; others found increasing trust in democracy with digital media use in Eastern and Central European samples [88, 89]. Nevertheless, the large majority of reported associations between digital media use and trust appear to be detrimental for democracy. While the evidence stems mostly from surveys, results gathered with other methods underpin these findings (see Fig. 2 inset).

The majority of articles identifying causal effects also find predominantly detrimental effects of digital media on trust. A field experiment in the United States that set browser defaults to partisan media outlets [37] found a long-term loss of trust in mainstream media. Studies examining social trust as a central component of social capital find consistent detrimental effects of social media use [84]; in contrast, they find no effects of broadband internet in general on social trust [90]. In authoritarian regimes in Asia, increasing unrestricted internet access decreased levels of trust in the political system [91, 73, 59]. This finding confirms the predominant association observed in most other countries. Yet it also illustrates how digital media is a double-edged sword, depending on the political context: By reducing trust in institutions, digital media can threaten existing democracies as well as foster emerging democratic developments in authoritarian regimes.

Political knowledge. The picture was less clear for associations between the consumption of digital media and political knowledge. Still, the majority of associations point in beneficial directions and were found in both cross-sectional surveys [92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99] and panel surveys [100, 101, 102]. Studies linking web-tracking

and survey data showed increased learning about politics [103], but also a turning away from important topics [104], whereas other experiments demonstrated an overall beneficial effect of digital media on issue salience [105]. These findings, however, stand in contrast to other studies that find a detrimental association between political knowledge and digital media use [106, 107, 108, 109, 110].

The body of causal evidence on political knowledge also tends to paint a relatively promising picture. Multiple articles found that engagement with digital media increased political knowledge [67, 74, 70, 72] and that engagement with political content on social media increased political interest among adolescents [111]. In line with these findings, it has been reported that political messages on social media, as well as faster download speed, can increase information-seeking in the political domain [71, 67]. By contrast, there is evidence for a decrease in political knowledge [112], which is mediated through the news-finds-me effect: Social media users' believe that actively seeking out news is no longer required to stay informed, as they expect to be presented with important information.

It is important to note that most of these effects are accompanied by considerable heterogeneity in the population that benefits and the type of digital media. For example, politically interested individuals showed higher knowledge acquisition when engaging with Twitter, whereas the opposite effects emerged for engagement with Facebook [113]. Furthermore, there is evidence that the news-finds-me effect on social media can be mitigated when users consult alternative news sources [112].

Polarization. Most articles found detrimental associations between digital media and different forms of political polarization [114, 115, 116, 117, 118]. Our review obtained evidence for increasing out-group polarization on social media in a range of political contexts and on various platforms [119, 120, 121, 122]. Increasing polarization was also linked to exposure to viewpoints opposed to one's own on social media feed [123, 69]. Articles comparing several political systems found associations that were country-dependent [124], again highlighting the importance of political context [125]. Nevertheless, high digital media use was for the most part linked to higher levels of polarization, although there was some evidence for balanced online discourse without pronounced patterns of polarization [126, 127, 128], as well as evidence for potentially depolarizing tendencies [129].

The body of causal articles largely supported the detrimental associations of digital media that emerged, by and large, in the correlational articles. Among established democracies, both social media use and overall internet use increased political polarization [63, 70]. This was also the case for an experimental treatment that exposed users to opposing views on Twitter [69]. However, some findings run counter to the latter result [130]: in a 2-month field experiment, exposure to counterattitudinal news on Facebook reduced affective polarization (the authors used opposing news outlets as treatment instead of opinions on social media). Furthermore, one other field experiment did not find evidence that exposure to partisan online news substantively shifted political opinions, but found a long-term loss of trust in mainstream media [37]. Still, taking all evidence into account, the overall picture remains largely consistent on the detrimental association between digital media and political polarization, including some but not all causal evidence.

Populism. Articles on populism in our review examined either vote share and other popularity indicators for populist parties or the prevalence of populist messages and communication styles on digital media. Overall, articles using panel surveys, tracking data, and methods linking surveys to social media data consistently found that digital media use was associated with higher levels of populism. For example, digital platforms were observed to benefit populist parties more than they benefit established politicians [131, 132, 133, 134]. In a panel survey in Germany, a decline in trust that accompanied increasing digital media consumption was also linked to a turn towards the hard-right populist AfD party [80]. This relationship might be connected to AfD's greater online presence, relative to other German political parties, [132], even though these activities might be partly driven by automated accounts. There is also evidence for an association between increased social media use and online right-wing radicalization in Austria, Sweden, and Australia [135, 136, 137]. Only a minority of articles found no relationship or the reverse relationship between digital media and populism [138, 139, 140]. For instance, in Japan, internet exposure was associated with increased tolerance towards foreigners [141].

Similarly, most causal inference studies linked increased populism to digital media use. For instance, digital media use in Europe led to increased far-right populist support [142, 63], and there was causal evidence that digital media can propagate ethnic hate crimes in both democratic and authoritarian countries [68, 62]. Leaving the US and European political context, in Malaysia, internet exposure was found to cause decreasing support for the authoritarian, populist government [60].

Echo chambers and news exposure. The evidence on echo chambers points in different directions depending on the outcome measure. On the one hand, when looking at news consumption, several articles showed that social media and search engines diversify people's news diets [143, 144, 145, 67, 146]. On the other hand, when considering social networks and the impact of digital media on homophilic structures, the literature contains consistent reports of ideologically homogeneous social clusters [147, 148, 149, 150, 151]. This underscores an important point: Some seemingly paradoxical results can potentially be resolved by looking more closely at context and specific outcome measurement (see also Supplementary Figure 2). The former observation of diverse news exposure might fit with the beneficial relationship between digital media and knowledge reported in [74, 67, 94, 102, 95], and the homophilic social structures could be connected to the prevalence of hate speech and anti-outgroup sentiments [152, 153, 120, 154, 155].

Heterogeneity

We now turn to the second part of our research question and analyse the effects of digital media use in light of different political contexts. Fig. 4 shows the geographical distribution of effect directions around the globe. Notably, most beneficial effects on democracy were found in emerging democracies in South America, Africa, and South Asia. Mixed effects, by contrast, were distributed across Europe, the United States, Russia, and China. Similarly, detrimental outcomes were mainly found in Europe, the United States and partly Russia, although this may reflect a lack of studies undertaken in authoritarian contexts. These patterns are also shown in Fig. 4c and d, where countries are listed according

to the Liberal Democracy Index. Moderators—variables such as partisanship and news consumption that are sources of effect heterogeneity—displayed in Supplementary Figure 3 also show slight differences between outcomes. Beneficial outcomes seemed to be more often moderated by political interest and news consumption, whereas detrimental outcomes tended to be moderated by political position and partisanship.

Furthermore, many causal articles acknowledge that effects differ between subgroups of their sample by including interaction terms in their statistical models. For example, the polarizing effects of digital media differ between Northern and Southern European media systems [142]: While consumption of right-leaning digital media increased far-right votes, especially in Southern Europe, the consumption of news media and public broadcasting in Northern European media systems with high journalistic standards appears to mitigate these effects. Another example of differential effects between subgroups was found in Russia, where the effects of social media on xenophobic violence were only present in areas with pre-existing nationalist sentiment. This effect was especially pronounced for hate crimes with a larger number of perpetrators, indicating that digital media was serving a coordinating function. In summary, a range of articles found heterogeneity in effects for varying levels of political interest [67, 113], political orientation [63, 70, 69], and different characteristics of online content [111].

Most authors, particularly those of the causal inference articles in our body of evidence, explicitly emphasized the national, cultural, temporal and political boundary conditions for interpreting and generalising their results (see, e.g., [111]). By contrast, especially in articles conducted on US samples, the national context and results' potential conditionality was often not highlighted. We strongly caution against a generalization of findings that are necessarily bound to a specific political setting (e.g. the US) to other contexts.

Sampling methods and risk of bias

In order to assess study quality and risk of bias, we additionally coded important methodological aspects of the studies, specifically, the sampling method, sample size and transparency indicators, such as competing interest, open data practices and pre-registrations. In Fig. 5, we show an excerpt from that analysis. Different sampling methods naturally result in different sample sizes as shown in Fig. 5a and b. Furthermore, behavioural data is much more prevalent for studies that look at detrimental outcomes, such as polarization and echo chambers. Classic surveys with probability samples or quota samples, in contrast, are often used to examine beneficial outcome measures like trust and participation (see Fig. 5c and d). Overall, however, no very clear pattern emerges in terms of the reported directions of associations. If anything, large probabilistic samples report relatively less beneficial associations for both types of outcomes (see Fig. 5). Generally, different types of data have different advantages, such as probability and quota samples approximating more closely the ideal of representativeness, whereas the observation of actual behavior on social media escaping the potential downsides of self-report. A potential blind spot in studies working with behavioural data from social media, inaccessible to both us and the original authors of the studies, is the selection of data provided by platforms. Therefore, it is tremendously important for researchers to get unrestricted access or, at least, transparent provision of random samples of data by platforms. The selection of users into the platforms, however, remains an open issue for

behavioural data as it is often unclear who the active users are and why they are active online. We find that political outcome measures studied with behavioral data appear to show quite distinct results compared to when studied with large-scale survey data. Combining both data types would likely maximize the chances for reliable conclusions about the impact of digital media on democracy.

We found relatively few null effects for some variables. This could be accurate, but it could also be driven by the file-drawer problem—the failure to publish null results. In an attempt to examine the extent of a potential file-drawer problem, we contacted authors via large mailing lists but did not receive any unpublished work that fitted our study selection criteria. With regard to possible risk of bias, we found that only in 143 out of 355 measurements, authors clearly communicated that no conflict of interest was present (beyond the usual funding statement). However, we did not find a striking imbalance in the distribution of reported associations between those articles in which no competing interest was and was not explicitly stated. The few associations for which a conflict of interests was stated, four pointed in beneficial, three in detrimental and two reported lack of directionality. In only 79 of 355 measurements the researchers did use open data practices. Considering articles that reported detrimental associations, we did not find a clear difference in the directions between those with and without open data. However, considering articles that report beneficial outcomes, the numbers of positive findings in the studies without open data are relatively much larger than for the open science studies. Namely, 103 beneficial and 33 detrimental associations were reported in those without open data, while 19 beneficial versus 14 detrimental were reported in studies with open data practices. This observation might be due to the large number of survey-based studies about participation, which often do not follow open data practices. Even fewer of the studies in our sample were pre-registered, namely, 13 of the 355, where nine of those reported detrimental associations and only three beneficial and one found no direction of association. To shed light on other potential biases, we additionally examined temporal variations in the directions of reported associations and found, besides the general explosive growth of studies in this domain, a slight trend toward an increasing number of both detrimental directions and null effects over time (see Supplementary Figure 4). On the author-level, there was no clear pattern in the associations reported by those authors who published the greatest number of articles in our sample; several authors variously reported detrimental and beneficial effects as well as null effects, with a few exceptions (see Supplementary Figure 5). Their co-authorship network in Supplementary Figure 6, split for the two types of outcomes measures, some communities of co-authors can be seen, however, no clear pattern of preferred direction of reported association can be spotted. Overall, we did not find evidence of a systematic bias in either direction driven by temporal trends or particular authors.

Discussion

Regardless of whether they are authoritarian, illiberal, or democratic, governments around the world are concerned with how digital media affects governance and their citizenry's political beliefs and behaviors. A flurry of recent interdisciplinary research, stimulated in part by new methodological possibilities and data sources, has shed light on this potential interplay.

Although classical survey methods are still predominant, novel ways of linking data types, for example linking URL tracking data or social media data with surveys, permit more complex empirical designs and analyses. Furthermore, digital trace data allow an expansion in sample size. The articles we reviewed included surveys with a few hundred, up to a few thousand participants, but also large-scale social media analyses that included behavioral traces of millions. Yet with computational social science in its early days, the amount of evidence supporting and justifying causal conclusions is still limited. Causal effects of digital media on political variables are also hard to pin down empirically due to a plethora of complexities and context factors, as well as the highly dynamic technological developments that make predicting the future difficult. While emergent political phenomena are hard to simulate in the lab, the value of estimation and data collection strategies to draw causal inferences from real-life data is enormous. However, the long established trade-off between internal and external validity still applies which also highlights the value of high quality descriptive work.

Taking into account both, correlational and causal evidence, our review suggests that digital media use is clearly associated with variables such as trust, participation, and polarization. They are critical for the functioning of any political system, in particular democracies. Extant research reports relatively few null effects. However, the trends on each factor mostly converge, both across research methods and across correlative and causal evidence.

Our results also highlight that digital media are a double-edged sword, with both beneficial and detrimental effects on democracy. What is considered beneficial or detrimental will, at least partly, hinge on the political system in question: Intensifying populism and network homophily may benefit a populist regime or a populist politician but undermine a pluralistic democracy. For democratic countries, evidence clearly indicates that digital media increases political participation. Less clear but still suggestive are the findings that digital media has positive effects on political knowledge and exposure to diverse viewpoints in news. On the negative side, however, digital media use is associated with eroding the “glue that keeps democracies together” [33]: trust in political institutions. The results indicating this danger converge across methods. Furthermore, our results also suggest that digital media use is associated with increases in hate, populism, and polarisation. Again, the findings converge across causal and correlational articles.

Alongside the need for more causal evidence, we found several research gaps, including the relationship between trust and digital media and the seeming contradiction between network homophily and diverse news exposure. Methods that link tracking data for measuring news exposure with behavioural data from social media (e.g., sharing activities or the sentiment of commenting) are crucial to a better understanding of this apparent contradiction.

Limitations

The articles in our sample incorporate a plethora of methods and measures. As a result, it was necessary to classify variables and effects into broad categories. This is a trade-off we had to make in exchange for the breadth of our overview of the landscape of evidence across disciplines. For the same reason, we could not provide a quantitative comparison across the diverse sample of articles. We believe that digital media research would benefit from more

unified measures (e.g., for polarization), methods across disciplines to allow for better comparability in the future, and a systematic comparison of different types digital media (i.e., Facebook and Twitter are not of one kind nor, in all likelihood, are their effects), and the extensions of outcome measurements beyond certain types of digital media. This follows other recent calls for commensurate measures of political and affective polarization [156]. The breadth of our review and the large number of political outcome measures in particular, made it necessary to be quite restrictive on other ends (see Fig. 6 for our exclusion process and Table S1 for the detailed criteria). We explicitly decided to prioritize the selection of causal evidence (see Fig. 7 for an overview of the causal inference techniques that we considered) and other large-sample, quantitative, published evidence. However, following this preregistered search strategy led to the selection of unequal numbers of studies for different outcome variables. For example, our search query selected considerably more studies examining political participation than political expression or trust, while at the same time, it did not include all studies that are included in other systematic reviews [45] due to stricter exclusion criteria.

The interpretation of our results was in several cases hampered by a lack of appropriate baseline measures. There is no clear measure of what constitutes a reasonable benchmark of desirable political behaviour in a healthy democracy. In addition, there were no means of quantification of some of these behaviours in the past, outside of digital media. This problem is particularly pronounced for factors such as exposure to diverse news, social network homophily, misinformation, and hate speech. Measuring these phenomena at scale is possible through digital media (e.g., by analysing social network structure); much less is known about their prevalence and dynamics in offline settings. Many articles therefore lacked a baseline. For instance, it is not clear what level of homophily in social networks is desirable or undesirable in a democratic society. Nor is it clear how to interpret the results of certain studies on polarization [69, 130], whose findings depend on whether one assumes that social media has increased or decreased the exposure to opposing views relative to some offline benchmark. For example, if exposure to opposing views is increased on social media, the conclusion of one study [130] would be that it reduces polarization, but if exposure is decreased one would come to the opposite conclusion. Notably, in this study, counter attitudinal exposure was found to be down-ranked by Facebook's news feed—hence supporting a process that fosters polarization instead of counteracting it. Furthermore, results about populism might be skewed: Descriptive evidence on the relative activity and popularity of right-wing populist parties in Europe suggests their over-representation, as in the case of Germany's AfD, on social media, relative to established democratic parties (see e.g., [132]). Therefore, it is difficult to interpret even causal effects of digital media use on populist support in isolation from the relative preponderance of right-wing content online.

Conclusion

Our results provide grounds for concern. Alongside the positive effects of digital media for democracy, there is clear evidence of serious threats to democracy. In light of the importance of these corrosive and potentially difficult-to-reverse effects for democracy, a better understanding of the diverging effects of digital media in different political contexts (e.g., authoritarian vs. democratic) is urgently needed. To this end, methodological innovation is required. This includes, for instance, more research using causal inference methodologies, as well as research that examines digital media

use across multiple and interdependent measures of political behaviour. More research and better study designs will, however, also depend on access to data collected by the platforms. This access has been restricted or foreclosed. Yet without independent research that has unhampered access to all relevant data, the effects of digital media can hardly be understood in time. This is concerning even more so because digital media can implement architectural changes that, even if seemingly small, can scale up to widespread behavioral effects. Regulation may be required to facilitate this access [157]. Most importantly, we suggest that the bulk of empirical findings summarized here can be attributed to the current status quo of an information ecosystem produced and curated by large, commercial platforms. They have succeeded in attracting a vast global audience of users. The sheer size of their audience as well as their power over what content and how content gets the most attention has led, in the words of the philosopher Jürgen Habermas, to a new structural transformation of the public sphere [16]. In this new public sphere, everybody can be a potential author spontaneously producing content, both right-wing radical networks as well as the courageous Belarusian women standing up for human rights and against a repressive regime. One need not share Habermas' conception of "deliberate democracy" to see that current platforms fail to produce an information ecosystem that empowers citizens to make political choices that are as rationally motivated as possible. Our results show how this ecosystem plays out to have important consequences for political behaviours and attitudes. They further underscore that finding out which aspects of this relationship are detrimental to democracy and how they can be contained while actively preserving and fostering the emancipatory potential of digital media is, perhaps, one of the most important global tasks of the present. Our analysis hopes to contribute to the empirical basis of this endeavour.

Materials and Methods

This systematic review follows the MOOSE Guidelines for Meta-Analyses and Systematic Reviews of Observational Studies [158]. The detailed protocol of the review process was preregistered on OSF at <https://osf.io/7ry4a/>. The repository also contains the completed MOOSE checklist showing where each guideline is addressed in the text.

Fig. 6 summarizes the search query that we used on two established academic databases, Scopus and Web of Science (both highly recommended search tools [159]), the resulting number of articles from the query and the subsequent exclusion steps, leading to the final sample size of $N = 496$ articles under consideration.

Study selection criteria. We included only original, empirical work. Conceptual or theoretical work, simulation studies, and evidence synthesizing studies were excluded. Articles had to be published in academic journals in English. Unpublished studies for which only the abstract or a preprinted version was available were excluded from the review. We excluded small- N laboratory experiments and small- N student surveys ($N < 100$) from our body of original work due to validity concerns. Although correlational evidence cannot establish a causal direction, we focused on articles that examined effects of digital media on democracy but not the opposite. We therefore excluded, for example, articles that examined ways to digitize democratic procedures. To be included, articles had to include at least two distinct variables, a digital media variable and a political outcome. Articles measuring a single variable were only included if this variable was a feature of digital media (e.g., hate speech prevalence, homophily in online social networks, prevalence of misinformation in digital media).

Search strategy, study selection, coding and data extraction. Articles eligible for our study had to be published before September 15, 2021. We sourced our review database from Scopus and Web of Science, as suggested by [159]. The search query (see Fig. 6) was constructed in consultation with professional librarians and was designed to be as broad as possible in order to pick up any articles containing original empirical evidence of direct or indirect effects of digital media on democracy (including correlational evidence). We further consulted recent, existing review articles in the field [39, 32, 40] to check for important articles that did not appear in the review body. Articles that were included manually are referenced separately in the flow chart (see Fig. 6). In addition, we contacted authors via large mailing lists of researchers working on computational social science and misinformation, but did not receive any unpublished work that fitted our study selection criteria. The query retrieved $N = 3,512$ articles. Of these, 1,352 were retained after screening the titles for irrelevant topics. This first coding round, whether an article, based on the title, fits the review frame or not was split between two coders. Coders could flag articles that are subject to discussion to let the other coder double check the decision. In this round, only clearly not fitting articles were excluded from the sample. A list of exclusion criteria can be found in the SI.

The next coding round, whether an article, based on the abstract, fits the review frame was conducted in parallel by two coders. The inter-coder reliability, after this round of article selection, was Krippendorff's alpha of 0.66 (87% agreement). After calculating this value, disagreement between coders was solved through discussion. At this stage,

we excluded all studies that were not original empirical work such as other reviews or conceptual articles, simulation studies and purely methodological articles (e.g., hate speech or misinformation detection approaches). This coding round was followed by a more in-depth coding round. Here we refined our exclusion decisions (e.g. excluded studies that examined the digitisation of government, preprints, small-scale lab experiments, small-scale convenience or student samples and studies that only included one variable (e.g. description of online forums), see Supplementary Table 1 for a detailed list of criteria. A full-text screen was performed in cases where the relevant information could not be retrieved from the abstract and for all articles implying causal evidence.

After both rounds of abstract screening, 475 articles remained in our sample. After cross-checking the results of our literature search against the references from existing reviews, we found and included further $N = 24$ articles that met our thematic criteria but were not identified by our search string. Ultimately, a total of 496 articles were selected into the final review sample. Fig. 6b summarizes the selection procedure.

The following information was extracted from each article using a standardized data extraction form: variable groups under research (digital media, features of media and/or political outcome variables), the concrete digital media under research, the explicit political outcome variable, the methods used, the country of origin, causal claims, possible effect heterogeneity (moderation) as well as various potential sources of bias. In order to assess various quality criteria of the studies, the coders had to visit the full text of the articles (e.g. to find the declaration of competing interests, preregistration or data availability statements, or to consider the methods section). Therefore, and facing the large number of articles under consideration, blinding could not be established during this procedure.

When conducting a systematic review with a broad scope, categories of the variables cannot be exhaustively defined prior to coding. Therefore, variable categories, especially for the digital media variables and the political outcome variables, were chosen inductively. In the first extraction step, coders stuck closely to the phrasing of the authors of the respective study. To reduce redundancy and refine the clustering of the variables, we iteratively generated frequency tables and manually sorted single variables to the best fitting categories until a small number of clearly distinct categories was selected. After the categories were defined, both coders re-coded 10% of the sample to calculate inter coder reliabilities for all key variables. We provide a table of inter coder reliabilities (percentage agreements and Krippendorff's Alphas), see Supplementary Table 2.

Data synthesis and analysis. Due to considerable heterogeneity in methods in the articles—including self-report surveys through network analysis of social media data, URL tracking data, and field experiments—no calculation of meta-analytic effect sizes was possible. The final table of selected articles with coded variables will be published alongside this article as a major result of this review project. The effect directions of 10 important political outcome variables (four consistent with liberal democracy, four opposing democratic values) are summarized in Fig. 2. For articles dealing with these political variables, we also assessed the country in which the study was conducted, explicit sources of effect heterogeneity such as demographic characteristics of study participants or characteristics of the digital media platform (Fig. 4).

For the overview analysis, which includes both correlational and causal evidence, we mainly restricted ourselves to the evaluation effects reported in the abstracts. Articles making explicit causal claims and/or using causal inference methods (Fig. 7) were examined in-depth and summarized as simplified path diagrams with information on mediators, moderators, country of origin, and method used (Fig. 3).

1 Deviations from the protocol

The volume of papers our query returned prevented an in-depth analysis of confounding variables. Instead, our assessment of quality relied on the sampling strategy and sampling strategy and sample size, the method used, sources of heterogeneity and transparency criteria, like open data practices and pre-registration. Furthermore, we were able to construct the co-author network by matching the author's names, but unable to produce a meaningful co-citation network due to the incompleteness and ambiguity of references in the export format that we used.

Data availability: The dataset including all originally collected studies with decision stages (N = 3531, "full_data.xlsx"), the table including all papers within our review sample (N = 496, "data_review.xlsx"), and the table including all effects reported within papers dealing with the top ten outcome measures (N = 355, "data_effects.xlsx") are available at <https://osf.io/7ry4a/>.

Code availability: R scripts for all analyses and figures are available at <https://osf.io/7ry4a/>.

Acknowledgements: We thank Simon Munzert for providing his perspective on causal inference and issues specific to political science. We thank Deborah Ain for editing the manuscript and Friederike Stock for help in the literature comparison. PLS, SL and RH acknowledge financial support from the Volkswagen Foundation (grant "Reclaiming individual autonomy and democratic discourse online: How to rebalance human and algorithmic decision making"). SL acknowledges support from the Humboldt Foundation through a research award. SL was also in part supported by an ERC Advanced Grant (PRODEMINFO) during completion of this paper. LO acknowledges financial support by the German National Academic Foundation in the form of a PhD scholarship. The authors received no specific funding for this work. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish or preparation of the manuscript.

Author Contributions: All authors designed the study. PLS and LO selected and coded the literature. PLS and LO evaluated the coded tables. All authors analyzed the results and wrote the manuscript. PLS and LO contributed equally to this work.

Competing Interests Statement: The authors report no competing interests.

Figure Captions

List of Figures

- 1 Summary of the reviewed articles. **a** Combinations of variables in the sample: digital media (A), political variables (B) and content features such as selective exposure or misinformation (C). Numbers in brackets count articles in our sample that measure an association between variables. **b** Geographic distribution of articles that reported site of data collection. **c** Distribution of measurements (counted separately whenever one article reported several variables) over combinations of outcome variables and methods and **d** over combinations of outcome variables and digital media variables. 70

- 2 Distribution of directions of associations from the full sample, reported for various political variables (see Fig. 1d for a breakdown). Insets show exemplary the distribution of associations with trust, news exposure, polarization, and network homophily over the different digital media variables with which they were associated. 71

- 3 Summary of causal evidence for digital media effects on political variables. Each box represents one article. Treatments are in white boxes on the left, political outcome variables in coloured boxes on the right; M denotes mediators; H represents sources of effect heterogeneity or moderators. Positive (+) and negative (–) signs at paths indicate reported direction of effects. Location of sample indicated in top right corner of boxes, primary causal inference strategy in bottom left. Strategies include statistical estimation strategies such as instrumental variables (IV), matching, and panel designs (PD) that use, for example, fixed effects (FE) or difference in difference (DiD) for causal estimation, as well as lab or field experiments (e.g., field experiments rolled out on various platforms that are often supplemented with IV estimation to account for imperfect compliance). Detrimental effects on liberal democracy are shown in orange, beneficial effects in turquoise, effects open to interpretation in purple, and null effects in grey. Solid arrows represent pathways for which authors provide causal identification strategies, dashed arrows represent descriptive (mediation) pathways. 72

- 4 Geographical distribution of associations, columns showing beneficial and detrimental outcomes. **a** Geographical distribution of reported associations for the variables trust, knowledge, participation, exposure, and expression. Pie charts show the composition of directions for each country studied. **b** Geographic representation of reported associations for the variables hate, polarization, populism, homophily, and misinformation. **c** Data and variables in **a**, in absolute numbers of reported associations and sorted along the Liberal Democracy Index [18]. **d** Data and variables in **b**, in absolute numbers of reported associations and sorted along the Liberal Democracy Index. 73

- 5 Sample size and sampling strategy for reported associations, columns are split between beneficial and detrimental outcomes. **a** and **b** show sample size vs. sampling methods, each dot represents one measurement, as well as color coded the direction of the reported association. **c** and **d** break down sampling methods in more detail and count the number of reported associations including their direction. 74

6	Strategy for curating the sample of relevant articles. a Keywords included in our search query, run on Web of Science and Scopus, with logical connectors. Focus on causal inference methods (method column), but also inclusion of descriptive quantitative evidence. Relationships between digital media (cause column) and political outcomes (direct effect box) or content features (indirect effect box). b Flow-chart representing the step wise exclusion process, starting with title based exclusion, followed by abstract based exclusion. c Exemplary illustration of the outcome variable extraction from the abstracts. d Breakdown of the most frequently reported political variables into top 10 categories. Numbers in brackets are counts of measurements in the set.	75
7	Summary of causal inference techniques used in our sample of causal evidence (excluding field experiments).	76

References

- [1] Persily, N. & Tucker, J. A. *Social Media and Democracy: The State of the Field, Prospects for Reform* (Cambridge University Press, 2020).
- [2] Tucker, J. A. *et al.* Social media, political polarization, and political disinformation: A review of the scientific literature. *Political polarization, and political disinformation: a review of the scientific literature (March 19, 2018)* (2018).
- [3] Rau, J. P. & Stier, S. Die echokammer-hypothese: Fragmentierung der öffentlichkeit und politische polarisierung durch digitale medien? *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Politikwissenschaft* **13**, 399–417 (2019).
- [4] Lewandowsky, S. *et al.* Technology and democracy: Understanding the influence of online technologies on political behaviour and decision-making (2020).
- [5] Adena, M., Enikolopov, R., Petrova, M., Santarosa, V. & Zhuravskaya, E. Radio and the Rise of the Nazis in Prewar Germany. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **130**, 1885–1939 (2015). Publisher: MIT Press.
- [6] Adena, M., Enikolopov, R., Petrova, M. & Voth, H.-J. Bombs, broadcasts and resistance: Allied intervention and domestic opposition to the Nazi regime during World War II. *Available at SSRN 3661643* (2021).
- [7] Gagliarducci, S., Onorato, M. G., Sobbrío, F. & Tabellini, G. War of the waves: Radio and resistance during World War II. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **12**, 1–38 (2020).
- [8] Li, D. Echoes of violence: Considerations on radio and genocide in Rwanda. *Journal of Genocide Research* **6**, 9–27 (2004). Publisher: Taylor & Francis.
- [9] Paluck, E. L. Reducing intergroup prejudice and conflict using the media: a field experiment in Rwanda. *Journal of personality and social psychology* **96**, 574 (2009). Publisher: American Psychological Association.
- [10] Staub, E. & Pearlman, L. A. Reducing intergroup prejudice and conflict: A commentary. (2009). Publisher: American Psychological Association.
- [11] Howard, P. N. & Hussain, M. M. *Democracy's fourth wave?: digital media and the Arab Spring* (Oxford University Press, 2013).
- [12] Jackson, S. J., Bailey, M. & Welles, B. F. *#HashtagActivism: Networks of race and gender justice* (MIT Press, 2020).
- [13] Engesser, S., Ernst, N., Esser, F. & Büchel, F. Populism and social media: How politicians spread a fragmented ideology. *Information, communication & society* **20**, 1109–1126 (2017).
- [14] Warzel, C. The Information War Isnt Over Yet (2022). URL <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2022/03/russia-ukraine-war-propaganda/626975/>.
- [15] Bak-Coleman, J. B. *et al.* Stewardship of global collective behavior. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118** (2021).

- [16] Habermas, J. Überlegungen und hypothesen zu einem erneuten strukturwandel der politischen öffentlichkeit. *LEVIATHAN* 470 (2021).
- [17] The value of evidence synthesis. *Nature Human Behaviour* **5**, 539–539 (2021).
- [18] Coppedge, M. *et al.* *Varieties of Democracy: Measuring Two Centuries of Political Change* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2020).
- [19] Warren, M. E. What kinds of trust does a democracy need? Trust from the perspective of democratic theory. In *Handbook on political trust* (Edward Elgar Publishing, 2017).
- [20] Milner, H. *Civic literacy: How informed citizens make democracy work* (UPNE, 2002).
- [21] Kohler-Koch, B. & Quittkat, C. *De-mystification of participatory democracy: EU-governance and civil society* (OUP Oxford, 2013).
- [22] O'connell, B. & Gardner, J. W. *Civil society: The underpinnings of American democracy* (UPNE, 1999).
- [23] Sunstein, C. R. The law of group polarization. *Journal of political philosophy* **10**, 175–195 (2002). Publisher: Wiley Online Library.
- [24] Habermas, J., Lennox, S. & Lennox, F. The public sphere: An encyclopedia article (1964). *New German Critique* 49–55 (1974). Publisher: JSTOR.
- [25] Howard, J. W. Free speech and hate speech. *Annual Review of Political Science* **22**, 93–109 (2019). Publisher: Annual Reviews.
- [26] Müller, J.-W. *What is populism?* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016).
- [27] Pariser, E. *The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you* (Penguin UK, 2011).
- [28] Davis, N. T. & Dunaway, J. L. Party polarization, media choice, and mass partisan-ideological sorting. *Public Opinion Quarterly* **80**, 272–297 (2016).
- [29] Iyengar, S., Lelkes, Y., Levendusky, M., Malhotra, N. & Westwood, S. J. The origins and consequences of affective polarization in the united states. *Annual Review of Political Science* **22**, 129–146 (2019).
- [30] Kozlowski, A. C. & Murphy, J. P. Issue alignment and partisanship in the american public: Revisiting the partisans without constraint thesis. *Social Science Research* **94**, 102498 (2021).
- [31] Baldassarri, D. & Gelman, A. Partisans without constraint: Political polarization and trends in american public opinion. *American Journal of Sociology* **114**, 408–446 (2008).
- [32] Kubin, E. & von Sikorski, C. The role of (social) media in political polarization: a systematic review. *Annals of the International Communication Association* 1–19 (2021).
- [33] Dodsworth, S. & Cheeseman, N. Political trust: The glue that keeps democracies together. *London: Westminster Foundation for Democracy* (2020).

- [34] McCoy, J. & Somer, M. Toward a theory of pernicious polarization and how it harms democracies: Comparative evidence and possible remedies. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* **681**, 234–271 (2019).
- [35] Danescu, E. Varieties of democracy (v-dem) annual report 2019-" democracy facing global challenges. Tech. Rep., V-Dem Institute, the Department of Political Science at the University of Gothenburg (2019).
- [36] Bächtiger, A., Dryzek, J. S., Mansbridge, J. & Warren, M. Deliberative democracy. *The Oxford handbook of deliberative democracy* 1 (2018).
- [37] Guess, A. M., Barberá, P., Munzert, S. & Yang, J. The consequences of online partisan media. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118** (2021). Publisher: National Acad Sciences.
- [38] OdaÄŸ, Ä., Leiser, A. & Boehnke, K. Reviewing the role of the internet in radicalization processes1. *Journal for Deradicalization* 261–300 (2019).
- [39] Hassan, G. *et al.* Exposure to Extremist Online Content Could Lead to Violent Radicalization: A Systematic Review of Empirical Evidence. *International Journal of Developmental Sciences* **12**, 71–88 (2018).
- [40] Castano-Pulgarín, S. A., Suárez-Betancur, N., Vega, L. M. T. & López, H. M. H. Internet, social media and online hate speech. systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 101608 (2021).
- [41] Angyal, E. & Fellner, Z. How are online and offline political activities connected? A comparison of studies. *Intersections East European Journal of Society and Politics* **6**, 81–98 (2020).
- [42] Chae, Y., Lee, S. & Kim, Y. Meta-analysis of the relationship between Internet use and political participation: examining main and moderating effects. *Asian Journal of Communication* **29**, 35–54 (2019).
- [43] Oser, J. & Boulianne, S. Reinforcement effects between digital media use and political participation : a meta-analysis of repeated-wave panel data. *Public Opinion Quarterly* **84**, 355–365 (2020).
- [44] Boulianne, S. Social media use and participation: A meta-analysis of current research. *Information, communication & society* **18**, 524–538 (2015).
- [45] Boulianne, S. Twenty Years of Digital Media Effects on Civic and Political Participation. *Communication Research* **47**, 947–966 (2020).
- [46] Terren, L. & Borge-Bravo, R. Echo chambers on social media: A systematic review of the literature. *Review of Communication Research* **9**, 99–118 (2021).
- [47] Jungherr, A. Twitter use in election campaigns: A systematic literature review. *Journal of information technology & politics* **13**, 72–91 (2016). Publisher: Taylor & Francis.
- [48] Lewandowsky, S., Jetter, M. & Ecker, U. K. Using the presidents tweets to understand political diversion in the age of social media. *Nature communications* **11**, 1–12 (2020).
- [49] LaCombe, S. J., Tolbert, C. & Mossberger, K. Information and policy innovation in us states. *Political Research Quarterly* 10659129211006783 (2021).

- [50] Stroud, N. J. Polarization and partisan selective exposure. *Journal of communication* **60**, 556–576 (2010).
- [51] Van Bavel, J. J., Rathje, S., Harris, E., Robertson, C. & Sternisko, A. How social media shapes polarization. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* (2021).
- [52] Banks, A., Calvo, E., Karol, D. & Telhami, S. # polarizedfeeds: Three experiments on polarization, framing, and social media. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* **26**, 609–634 (2021).
- [53] Scheufle, D. A. & Moy, P. Twenty-five years of the spiral of silence: A conceptual review and empirical outlook. *International journal of public opinion research* **12**, 3–28 (2000).
- [54] Matthes, J., Knoll, J. & von Sikorski, C. The spiral of silence revisited: A meta-analysis on the relationship between perceptions of opinion support and political opinion expression. *Communication Research* **45**, 3–33 (2018).
- [55] Munzert, S. & Ramirez-Ruiz, S. Meta-Analysis of the effects of voting advice applications. *Political Communication* 1–16 (2021). Publisher: Taylor & Francis.
- [56] of Sciences, T. R. S. A. The Sveriges Riksbank Prize in Economic Sciences in Memory of Alfred Nobel 2021 (2021).
- [57] Angrist, J. D. & Pischke, J.-S. *Mostly harmless econometrics* (Princeton university press, 2008).
- [58] Angrist, J. D. & Pischke, J.-S. The credibility revolution in empirical economics: How better research design is taking the con out of econometrics. *Journal of economic perspectives* **24**, 3–30 (2010).
- [59] Zhou, D., Deng, W. & Wu, X. Impacts of Internet Use on Political Trust: New Evidence from China. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade* **56**, 3235–3251 (2020).
- [60] Miner, L. The unintended consequences of internet diffusion: Evidence from Malaysia. *Journal of Public Economics* **132**, 66–78 (2015).
- [61] Enikolopov, R., Makarin, A. & Petrova, M. Social Media and Protest Participation: Evidence From Russia. *Econometrica* **88**, 1479–1514 (2020).
- [62] Petrova, M., Bursztyn, L., Egorov, G. & Enikolopov, R. Social Media and Xenophobia: Evidence from Russia (2020).
- [63] Schaub, M. & Morisi, D. Voter mobilisation in the echo chamber: Broadband internet and the rise of populism in Europe. *European Journal of Political Research* **59**, 752–773 (2020). Publisher: Wiley Online Library.
- [64] Mousavi, R. & Gu, B. The impact of twitter adoption on lawmakers’ voting orientations. *Information Systems Research* **30**, 133–153 (2019).
- [65] Chen, C., Bai, Y. & Wang, R. Online political efficacy and political participation: A mediation analysis based on the evidence from Taiwan. *New Media and Society* **21**, 1667–1696 (2019).
- [66] Bekmagambetov, A. *et al.* Critical social media information flows: political trust and protest behaviour among Kazakhstani college students. *Central Asian Survey* **37**, 526–545 (2018).

- [67] Lelkes, Y. A Bigger Pie: The Effects of High-Speed Internet on Political Behavior. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* **25**, 199–216 (2020).
- [68] Müller, K. & Schwarz, C. Fanning the flames of hate: Social media and hate crime. *Journal of the European Economic Association* (2018).
- [69] Bail, C. A. *et al.* Exposure to opposing views on social media can increase political polarization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **115**, 9216–9221 (2018). Publisher: National Acad Sciences.
- [70] Allcott, H., Braghieri, L., Eichmeyer, S. & Gentzkow, M. The welfare effects of social media. *American Economic Review* **110**, 629–76 (2020).
- [71] Bond, R. M. *et al.* A 61-million-person experiment in social influence and political mobilization. *Nature* **489**, 295–298 (2012).
- [72] Asimovic, N., Nagler, J., Bonneau, R. & Tucker, J. A. Testing the effects of Facebook usage in an ethnically polarized setting. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118** (2021). Publisher: National Academy of Sciences Section: Social Sciences.
- [73] Wong, S. H.-W. & Wong, M. Y. H. "Distant Participation" and Youth Political Attitudes: Evidence from a Natural Experiment. *Social Science Quarterly* **101**, 1489–1512 (2020).
- [74] Kleinberg, M. & Lau, R. Googling Politics: How Offloading Affects Voting and Political Knowledge. *Political Psychology* **42**, 93–110 (2021).
- [75] Poy, S. & Schüller, S. Internet and voting in the social media era: Evidence from a local broadband policy. *Research Policy* **49** (2020).
- [76] Lee, S. & Xenos, M. Incidental news exposure via social media and political participation: Evidence of reciprocal effects. *New Media and Society* (2020).
- [77] Imai, K., Keele, L. & Tingley, D. A general approach to causal mediation analysis. *Psychological methods* **15**, 309 (2010). Publisher: American Psychological Association.
- [78] Porumbescu, G. Not All Bad News After All? Exploring the Relationship Between Citizens' Use of Online Mass Media for Government Information and Trust in Government. *International Public Management Journal* **20**, 409–441 (2017).
- [79] Zhu, Z., Liu, Y., Kapucu, N. & Peng, Z. Online media and trust in government during crisis: The moderating role of sense of security. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* **50** (2020).
- [80] Zimmermann, F. & Kohring, M. Mistrust, Disinforming News, and Vote Choice: A Panel Survey on the Origins and Consequences of Believing Disinformation in the 2017 German Parliamentary Election. *Political Communication* **37**, 215–237 (2020).
- [81] Bucy, E. P. & Groshek, J. Empirical support for the media participation hypothesis: Trends across presidential elections, 1992-2012. *New Media & Society* **20**, 1889–1909 (2018).

- [82] Arlt, D. Who trusts the news media? Exploring the factors shaping trust in the news media in German-speaking Switzerland. *Studies in Communication Sciences* **18**, 231–245 (2019).
- [83] Park, S., Fisher, C., Flew, T. & Dulleck, U. Global Mistrust in News: The Impact of Social Media on Trust. *Jmm-International Journal on Media Management* **22**, 83–96 (2020).
- [84] Sabatini, F. & Sarracino, F. Online Social Networks and Trust. *Social Indicators Research* **142**, 229–260 (2019). URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-018-1887-2>.
- [85] Carrieri, V., Madio, L. & Principe, F. Vaccine hesitancy and (fake) news: Quasi-experimental evidence from Italy. *Health Economics (United Kingdom)* **28**, 1377–1382 (2019).
- [86] Casara, B., Suitner, C. & Bettinsoli, M. Viral suspicions: Vaccine hesitancy in the web 2.0. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied* **25**, 354–371 (2019).
- [87] Huber, B., Barnidge, M., Gil de Zuniga, H. & Liu, J. Fostering public trust in science: The role of social media. *Public Understanding of Science* **28**, 759–777 (2019).
- [88] Placek, M. A. #Democracy: social media use and democratic legitimacy in Central and Eastern Europe. *Democratization* **24**, 632–650 (2017).
- [89] Placek, M. Can the Internet Aid Democratic Consolidation?: Online News and Legitimacy in Central and Eastern Europe. *Placek, M.(2018). Can the Internet Aid Democratic Consolidation* (2018).
- [90] Geraci, A., Nardotto, M., Reggiani, T. & Sabatini, F. Broadband Internet and social capital. *Journal of Public Economics* **206**, 104578 (2022). URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0047272721002140>.
- [91] Min, G., Yu, Z. & Li, F. *Analysis of Moral Deviation in Netnews Post-Bumping* (2015).
- [92] Di, C. & Fang, W. New channels, new ways of becoming informed? Examining the acquisition of public affairs knowledge by young people in China. *Information Development* **35**, 688–702 (2019).
- [93] Wei, K., Lin, Y.-R. & Yan, M. Examining Protest as An Intervention to Reduce Online Prejudice: A Case Study of Prejudice Against Immigrants. 2443–2454 (2020).
- [94] Alam, A., Adnan, H. M. & Kotamjani, S. S. Examining the Impact of Using Social Networks on Political Knowledge and Political Attitude by Iranian University Students. *Jurnal Komunikasi-Malaysian Journal of Communication* **35**, 125–140 (2019).
- [95] Beaudoin, C. E. The internet’s impact on international knowledge. *New Media & Society* **10**, 455–474 (2008).
- [96] Ida, R., Saud, M. & Mashud, M. An empirical analysis of social media usage, political learning and participation among youth: a comparative study of Indonesia and Pakistan. *Quality and Quantity* **54**, 1285–1297 (2020).
- [97] Salaudeen, M. & Onyechi, N. Digital media vs mainstream media: Exploring the influences of media exposure and information preference as correlates of media credibility. *Cogent Arts and Humanities* **7** (2020).

- [98] Imran, M. & Fatima, M. Connectivism: E-learning of democratic values on social media public spheres. vol. 2017-December, 82–89 (2018).
- [99] Park, C. & Kaye, B. News Engagement on Social Media and Democratic Citizenship: Direct and Moderating Roles of Curatorial News Use in Political Involvement. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* **95**, 1103–1127 (2018).
- [100] Gottfried, J. A., Hardy, B. W., Holbert, R. L., Winneg, K. M. & Jamieson, K. H. The Changing Nature of Political Debate Consumption: Social Media, Multitasking, and Knowledge Acquisition. *Political Communication* **34**, 172–199 (2017).
- [101] Kim, D. H. & Kwak, N. Media Diversity Policies for the Public: Empirical Evidence Examining Exposure Diversity and Democratic Citizenship. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* **61**, 682–702 (2017).
- [102] Beam, M. A., Hutchens, M. J. & Hmielowski, J. D. Clicking vs. sharing: The relationship between online news behaviors and political knowledge. *Computers in Human Behavior* **59**, 215–220 (2016).
- [103] Edgerly, S., Thorson, K. & Wells, C. Young Citizens, Social Media, and the Dynamics of Political Learning in the U.S. Presidential Primary Election. *American Behavioral Scientist* **62**, 1042–1060 (2018).
- [104] Cardenal, A., Galais, C. & Majó-Vázquez, S. Is Facebook Eroding the Public Agenda? Evidence from Survey and Web-Tracking Data. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* **31**, 589–608 (2019).
- [105] Feezell, J. T. Agenda Setting through Social Media: The Importance of Incidental News Exposure and Social Filtering in the Digital Era. *Political Research Quarterly* **71**, 482–494 (2018).
- [106] Kelly Garrett, R. Social medias contribution to political misperceptions in U.S. Presidential elections. *PLoS ONE* **14** (2019).
- [107] Lee, S. & Xenos, M. Social distraction? Social media use and political knowledge in two U.S. Presidential elections. *Computers in Human Behavior* **90**, 18–25 (2019).
- [108] van Erkel, P. & Van Aelst, P. Why Dont We Learn from Social Media? Studying Effects of and Mechanisms behind Social Media News Use on General Surveillance Political Knowledge. *Political Communication* 1–19 (2020).
- [109] Lee, S. Connecting social media use with gaps in knowledge and participation in a protest context: the case of candle light vigil in South Korea. *Asian Journal of Communication* **29**, 111–127 (2019).
- [110] Cacciatore, M. A. *et al.* Is Facebook Making Us Dumber? Exploring Social Media Use as a Predictor of Political Knowledge. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* **95**, 404–424 (2018).
- [111] Moeller, J., Shehata, A. & Kruikemeier, S. Internet use and political interest: Growth curves, reinforcing spirals, and causal effects during adolescence. *Journal of Communication* **68**, 1052–1078 (2018).
- [112] Lee, S. Probing the Mechanisms Through Which Social Media Erodes Political Knowledge: The Role of the News-Finds-Me Perception. *Mass Communication and Society* **23**, 810–832 (2020).

- [113] Boukes, M. Social network sites and acquiring current affairs knowledge: The impact of Twitter and Facebook usage on learning about the news. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* **16**, 36–51 (2019).
- [114] Adam, S., Haussler, T., Schmid-Petri, H. & Reber, U. Coalitions and counter-coalitions in online contestation: An analysis of the German and British climate change debate. *New Media & Society* **21**, 2671–2690 (2019).
- [115] North, S., Piwek, L. & Joinson, A. Battle for Britain: Analyzing Events as Drivers of Political Tribalism in Twitter Discussions of Brexit. *Policy and Internet* (2020).
- [116] Bryson, B. Polarizing the middle: internet exposure and public opinion. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* **40**, 99–113 (2019).
- [117] Lee, C., Shin, J. & Hong, A. Does social media use really make people politically polarized? Direct and indirect effects of social media use on political polarization in South Korea. *Telematics and Informatics* **35**, 245–254 (2018). Publisher: Elsevier.
- [118] Cho, J., Ahmed, S., Keum, H., Choi, Y. & Lee, J. Influencing Myself: Self-Reinforcement Through Online Political Expression. *Communication Research* **45**, 83–111 (2018).
- [119] Yarchi, M., Baden, C. & Kligler-Vilenchik, N. Political polarization on the digital sphere: A cross-platform, over-time analysis of interactional, positional, and affective polarization on social media. *Political Communication* 1–42 (2020). Publisher: Taylor & Francis.
- [120] Workneh, T. Social media, protest, & outrage communication in Ethiopia: toward fractured publics or pluralistic polity? *Information Communication and Society* **24**, 309–328 (2021).
- [121] Hawdon, J., Ranganathan, S., Leman, S., Bookhultz, S. & Mitra, T. *Social media use, political polarization, and social capital: is social media tearing the u.s. apart?*, vol. 12194 LNCS of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)* (2020).
- [122] Urman, A. News Consumption of Russian Vkontakte Users: Polarization and News Avoidance. *International Journal of Communication* **13**, 5158–5182 (2019).
- [123] Kibet, A. & Ward, S. Socially Networked Heterogeneity: The Influence of WhatsApp as a Social Networking Site on Polarisation in Kenya. *African Journalism Studies* **39**, 42–66 (2018).
- [124] Fletcher, R., Cornia, A. & Nielsen, R. How Polarized Are Online and Offline News Audiences? A Comparative Analysis of Twelve Countries. *International Journal of Press/Politics* **25**, 169–195 (2020).
- [125] Lu, J. & Luo, C. Development consensus in the Internet context: penetration, freedom, and participation in 38 countries. *Information Development* **36**, 288–300 (2020).
- [126] Lai, M., Tambuscio, M., Patti, V., Ruffo, G. & Rosso, P. Stance polarity in political debates: A diachronic perspective of network homophily and conversations on Twitter. *Data and Knowledge Engineering* **124** (2019).
- [127] Kobayashi, T., Ogawa, Y., Suzuki, T. & Yamamoto, H. News audience fragmentation in the Japanese Twitter-sphere. *Asian Journal of Communication* **29**, 274–290 (2019).

- [128] Nguyen, A. & Vu, H. Testing popular news discourse on the echo chamber effect: Does political polarisation occur among those relying on social media as their primary politics news source? *First Monday* **24** (2019).
- [129] Beam, M., Hutchens, M. & Hmielowski, J. Facebook news and (de)polarization: reinforcing spirals in the 2016 US election. *Information Communication and Society* **21**, 940–958 (2018).
- [130] Levy, R. Social media, news consumption, and polarization: Evidence from a field experiment. *American economic review* **111**, 831–70 (2021).
- [131] Carrella, F. #Populism on twitter: Statistical analysis of the correlation between tweet popularity and populist discursive features. *Brno Studies in English* **46**, 5–23 (2020).
- [132] Serrano, J., Shahrezaye, M., Papakyriakopoulos, O. & Hegelich, S. The rise of Germany’s AfD: A social media analysis. 214–223 (2019).
- [133] Schumann, S., Boer, D., Hanke, K. & Liu, J. Social media use and support for populist radical right parties: assessing exposure and selection effects in a two-wave panel study. *Information Communication and Society* (2019).
- [134] Schumann, S., Thomas, F., Ehrke, F., Bertlich, T. & Dupont, J. C. Maintenance or change? Examining the reinforcing spiral between social media news use and populist attitudes. *Information, Communication & Society* 1–18 (2021).
- [135] Heiss, R. & Matthes, J. Stuck in a Nativist Spiral: Content, Selection, and Effects of Right-Wing Populists Communication on Facebook. *Political Communication* **37**, 303–328 (2020).
- [136] Bliuc, A.-M. *et al.* The effects of local socio-political events on group cohesion in online far-right communities. *PLoS ONE* **15** (2020).
- [137] Schulze, H. Who uses right-wing alternative online media? An exploration of audience characteristics. *Politics and Governance* **8**, 6–18 (2020).
- [138] Boulianne, S., Koc-Michalska, K. & Bimber, B. Right-wing populism, social media and echo chambers in Western democracies. *New Media and Society* **22**, 683–699 (2020).
- [139] Jeroense, T., Luimers, J., Jacobs, K. & Spierings, N. Political social media use and its linkage to populist and postmaterialist attitudes and vote intention in the Netherlands. *European Political Science* (2021).
- [140] Bosilkov, I. Media populism in Macedonia: Right-wing populist style in the coverage of the migrant crisis. *Central European Journal of Communication* **12**, 206–223 (2019).
- [141] Seebruck, R. Technology and Tolerance in Japan: Internet Use and Positive Attitudes and Behaviors Toward Foreigners. *Social Science Japan Journal* **16**, 279–300 (2013).
- [142] DOROSHENKO, L. Far-Right Parties in the European Union and Media Populism: A Comparative Analysis of 10 Countries During European Parliament Elections. *International Journal of Communication* **12**, 3186–3206 (2018).

- [143] Fletcher, R. & Nielsen, R. Are people incidentally exposed to news on social media? A comparative analysis. *New Media and Society* **20**, 2450–2468 (2018).
- [144] Guess, A. M. (Almost) Everything in Moderation: New Evidence on Americans' Online Media Diets. *American Journal of Political Science* (2021).
- [145] Strauss, N., Huber, B. & Gil de Zuniga, H. "Yes, I Saw It - But Didn't Read It ..." A Cross-Country Study, Exploring Relationships between Incidental News Exposure and News Use across Platforms. *Digital Journalism* **8**, 1181–1205 (2020).
- [146] Yang, T., Majó-Vázquez, S., Nielsen, R. & González-Bailón, S. Exposure to news grows less fragmented with an increase in mobile access. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **117**, 28678–28683 (2020).
- [147] Rivero, G. Preaching to the choir: ideology and following behaviour in social media. *Contemporary Social Science* **14**, 54–70 (2019).
- [148] Cinelli, M., de Francisci Morales, G., Galeazzi, A., Quattrociocchi, W. & Starnini, M. The echo chamber effect on social media. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **118** (2021).
- [149] Cota, W., Ferreira, S., Pastor-Satorras, R. & Starnini, M. Quantifying echo chamber effects in information spreading over political communication networks. *EPJ Data Science* **8** (2019).
- [150] Guerrero-Solá, F. & Lopez-Gonzalez, H. Government Formation and Political Discussions in Twitter: An Extended Model for Quantifying Political Distances in Multiparty Democracies. *Social Science Computer Review* **37**, 3–21 (2019).
- [151] Koironen, I., Koivula, A., Keipi, T. & Saarinen, A. Shared contexts, shared background, shared values - Homophily in Finnish parliament members social networks on Twitter. *Telematics and Informatics* **36**, 117–131 (2019).
- [152] Barnidge, M., Macafee, T., Alvarez, G. & Rojas, H. Citizenship and Political Participation in Colombia: How Orientations Toward Citizenship Associate with Political and Civic Behaviors. *International Journal of Communication* **8**, 1831–1850 (2014).
- [153] Soral, W., Liu, J. & Bilewicz, M. Media of contempt: Social media consumption predicts normative acceptance of anti-muslim hate speech and islamoprejudice. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* **14**, 1–13 (2020).
- [154] Tornberg, A. & Wahlstrom, M. Unveiling the radical right online: Exploring framing and identity in an online anti-immigrant discussion group. *Sociologisk Forskning* **55**, 267–292 (2018).
- [155] Rathje, S., Van Bavel, J. J. & van der Linden, S. Out-group animosity drives engagement on social media. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **118** (2021). Publisher: National Acad Sciences.
- [156] Kubin, E. & von Sikorski, C. The role of (social) media in political polarization: a systematic review. *Annals of the International Communication Association* **45**, 188–206 (2021).

- [157] Pasquetto, I. V. *et al.* Tackling misinformation: What researchers could do with social media data. *The Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review* (2020).
- [158] Moher, D. *et al.* Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS medicine* **6**, e1000097 (2009). Publisher: Public Library of Science.
- [159] Gusenbauer, M. & Haddaway, N. R. Which academic search systems are suitable for systematic reviews or meta-analyses? evaluating retrieval qualities of google scholar, pubmed, and 26 other resources. *Research synthesis methods* **11**, 181–217 (2020).
- [160] Park, I. & Lee, D. Understanding news-sharing across different platforms: the effects of newsworthiness and gratifications from news-sharing. *Information Research-an International Electronic Journal* **25**, 882 (2020). WOS:000611778100045.
- [161] Machackova, H. & Tkaczyk, M. THE EFFECT OF MEDIA AND POLITICAL BELIEFS AND ATTITUDES ON TRUST IN POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS: A MULTILEVEL ANALYSIS ON DATA FROM 21 EUROPEAN COUNTRIES. *Communication Today* **11**, 64–82 (2020). WOS:000593125500006.
- [162] Magalhaes, P. C., Aldrich, J. H. & Gibson, R. K. New forms of mobilization, new people mobilized? Evidence from the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems. *Party Politics* **26**, 605–618 (2020). WOS:000556264500007.
- [163] Kwak, N., Lane, D. S., Zhu, Q., Lee, S. S. & Weeks, B. E. Political Rumor Communication on Instant Messaging Platforms: Relationships With Political Participation and Knowledge. *International Journal of Communication* **14**, 5663–5685 (2020). WOS:000616658300200.
- [164] Powers, E., Koliska, M. & Guha, P. "Shouting Matches and Echo Chambers": Perceived Identity Threats and Political Self-Censorship on Social Media. *International Journal of Communication* **13**, 3630–3649 (2019). WOS:000483935600005.
- [165] Adegbola, O. & Gearhart, S. Examining the Relationship Between Media Use and Political Engagement: A Comparative Study Among the United States, Kenya, and Nigeria. *International Journal of Communication* **13**, 1231–1251 (2019). WOS:000475772800037.
- [166] Liu, Y.-I. Online and Offline Communication and Political Knowledge and Participation in Presidential Campaigns: Effects of Geographical Context. *International Journal of Communication* **13**, 1438–1461 (2019). WOS:000475772800051.
- [167] Taneja, H. & Yaeger, K. *Do People Consume the News they Trust? Incidental News Usage and the High-Choice Media Environment* (2019). Publication Title: Chi 2019: Proceedings of the 2019 Chi Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems WOS:000474467906076.
- [168] Goebel, S. & Munzert, S. Political Advertising on the Wikipedia Marketplace of Information. *Social Science Computer Review* **36**, 157–175 (2018). WOS:000429943900002.

- [169] Wen, N. & Wei, R. Examining Effects of Informational Use of Social Media Platforms and Social Capital on Civic Engagement Regarding Genetically Modified Foods in China. *International Journal of Communication* **12**, 3729–3750 (2018). WOS:000457602100111.
- [170] Quenette, A. M. & Velasquez, A. Shifting Demographics: Understanding How Ethnically Diverse Networks Influence Latinos' Political Uses of Social Media and Offline Political Engagement. *International Journal of Communication* **12**, 4839–4859 (2018). WOS:000457602100175.
- [171] Zhang, N. & Skoric, M. M. Media Use and Environmental Engagement: Examining Differential Gains from News Media and Social Media. *International Journal of Communication* **12**, 380–403 (2018). WOS:000431821400025.
- [172] Mustapha, L. K., Gbonegun, V. O. & Mustapha, M. L. Social Media Use, Social Capital, and Political Participation among Nigerian University Students. *Tripodos* 127–143 (2016). WOS:000395301500008.
- [173] Barredo Ibanez, D., Arcila Calderon, C., Arroyave, J. & Silva, R. Influence of Social Networks in the Decision to Vote: An Exploratory Survey on the Ecuadorian Electorate. *International Journal of E-Politics* **6**, 15–34 (2015). WOS:000446494000003.
- [174] Kim, Y. & Chen, H.-T. Discussion Network Heterogeneity Matters: Examining a Moderated Mediation Model of Social Media Use and Civic Engagement. *International Journal of Communication* **9**, 2344–2365 (2015). WOS:000361977300104.
- [175] Krolo, K. & Puzek, I. Usage of Internet Social Networks and Participatory Dimensions of Social Capital of Youth - The Example of Facebook. *Drustvena Istrazivanja* **23**, 383–405 (2014). WOS:000345812600001.
- [176] de Zuniga, H. G. & Valenzuela, S. The Mediating Path to a Stronger Citizenship: Online and Offline Networks, Weak Ties, and Civic Engagement. *Communication Research* **38**, 397–421 (2011). WOS:000290301400005.
- [177] Popova, O. & Negrov, E. Political communication of youth in the internet space: Effects on influence on political consciousness and behavior. vol. 2813, 181–195 (2021). URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85101631373&partnerID=40&md5=dfe78af08271e9b58aece5019ee35f28>.
- [178] Panizo-LLedot, A., Torregrosa, J., Bello-Orgaz, G., Thorburn, J. & Camacho, D. *Describing Alt-Right Communities and Their Discourse on Twitter During the 2018 US Mid-term Elections*, vol. 882 *SCI of Studies in Computational Intelligence* (2020). URL https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85086570383&doi=10.1007%2f978-3-030-36683-4_35&partnerID=40&md5=d669494d971cbd00c64cec8aaebd021c. Pages: 439.
- [179] Serhan, F. & Elareshi, M. New media and hate speech: A study of university students in Jordan. *Opcion* **36**, 166–184 (2020). URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85084997399&partnerID=40&md5=f09e3d9075f29f1ac39eee7a3adea979>.
- [180] Riikonen, R., Huhtinen, A.-M. & Norri-Sederholm, T. Not a problem for me: Young mens conceptions of their social media use and false information. 240–245 (2020). URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85084997399&partnerID=40&md5=f09e3d9075f29f1ac39eee7a3adea979>.

//www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85097756848&doi=10.34190%2fESM.20.031&partnerID=40&md5=debc7038da814e1795cf153561edf5a3.

- [181] Ida, R., Saud, M. & Mashud, M. Persistence of social media on political activism and engagement among Indonesian and Pakistani youths. *International Journal of Web Based Communities* **16**, 321–342 (2020). URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85083581686&doi=10.1504%2fijwbc.2020.111377&partnerID=40&md5=d9c679273d1558fc67107d1dd0406c81>.
- [182] KIM, H., KIM, Y. & LEE, D. Understanding the Role of Social Media in Political Participation: Integrating Political Knowledge and Bridging Social Capital From the Social Cognitive Approach. *International Journal of Communication* **14**, 4803–4824 (2020). URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85099605102&partnerID=40&md5=ff61266c2ac800c3c940006d98359a9d>.
- [183] Steffan, D. Visual Self-Presentation Strategies of Political Candidates on Social Media Platforms: A Comparative Study. *International Journal of Communication* **14**, 3096–3118 (2020). URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85099439857&partnerID=40&md5=08a0c64300c9b63ab205da0d41adc44d>.
- [184] Supovitz, J., Kolouch, C. & Daly, A. The social psychology of homophily: The collective sentiments of education advocacy groups. *Teachers College Record* **122**, 49–66 (2020). URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85091826465&partnerID=40&md5=8911eeb637fcd2b7e198fba0a9faa7eb>.
- [185] Zannettou, S., Finkelstein, J., Bradlyn, B. & Blackburn, J. A quantitative approach to understanding online antisemitism. 786–797 (2020). URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85088394577&partnerID=40&md5=745a787180358f6f711088e19aa12181>.
- [186] Halpern, D., Valenzuela, S., Katz, J. & Miranda, J. *From Belief in Conspiracy Theories to Trust in Others: Which Factors Influence Exposure, Believing and Sharing Fake News*, vol. 11578 LNCS of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)* (2019). URL https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85069833064&doi=10.1007%2f978-3-030-21902-4_16&partnerID=40&md5=3bf3b8bc0fcff702ce77fb07fea63db6. Pages: 232.
- [187] Jones, M. Propaganda, fake news, and fake trends: The weaponization of Twitter bots in the Gulf crisis. *International Journal of Communication* **13**, 1389–1415 (2019). URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85068128178&partnerID=40&md5=b6736e5c213f839d390d50131fa03cf4>.
- [188] Jiang, S., Robertson, R. & Wilson, C. Bias misperceived: The role of partisanship and misinformation in YouTube comment moderation. 278–289 (2019). URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85070399362&partnerID=40&md5=2d70fd6bbdf3f70d6f91743032db1880>.
- [189] Quintanilha, T., Da Silva, M. & Lapa, T. Fake news and its impact on trust in the news. Using the portuguese case to establish lines of differentiation. *Communication and Society* **32**, 17–

- 33 (2019). URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85069803365&doi=10.15581%2f003.32.3.17-33&partnerID=40&md5=1e3f6959b3cb64e2353a5d570bd0b0f9>.
- [190] Emamjomehzadeh, S., Masoudnia, H. & Rahbarqazi, M. The role of online social media in peoples political orientations and tendency to participate in presidential elections. *Teorija in Praksa* **55**, 666–683 (2018). URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85055971280&partnerID=40&md5=86333c6dd745e8560bbcd26ce70355e4>.
- [191] Bodrunova, S., Blekanov, I. & Kukarkin, M. *Multi-dimensional echo chambers: Language and sentiment structure of Twitter discussions on the Charlie Hebdo case*, vol. 850 of *Communications in Computer and Information Science* (2018). URL https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85055822021&doi=10.1007%2f978-3-319-92270-6_56&partnerID=40&md5=a3951716f2d40f1ef2270ca6713385ee. Pages: 400.
- [192] Mohamad, B., Dauda, S. & Halim, H. Youth offline political participation: Trends and role of social media. *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication* **34**, 172–192 (2018). URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85056571382&doi=10.17576%2fJKMJC-2018-3403-11&partnerID=40&md5=2fc3b41313a00c22cf48b0ee980329b4>.
- [193] Lee, S. The Role of Social Media in Protest Participation: The Case of Candlelight Vigils in South Korea. *International Journal of Communication* **12**, 1523–1540 (2018). URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85061390066&partnerID=40&md5=0909eee742426af3d5e14ade58330961>.
- [194] Herrero-Jiménez, B., Carratalá, A. & Berganza, R. Violent conflicts and the new mediatization: The impact of social media on the European parliamentary agenda regarding the Syrian war. *Communication and Society* **31**, 141–157 (2018). URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85050497356&doi=10.15581%2f003.31.3.141-157&partnerID=40&md5=cbc8363444ea0ccbd3bdf5e5df6791>.
- [195] Xenos, M. *et al.* News media use and the informed public in the digital age. *International Journal of Communication* **12**, 706–724 (2018). URL <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85041596617&partnerID=40&md5=cb45b2bb28d5937be8998211847e6b09>.
- [196] Garimella, K., Smith, T., Weiss, R. & West, R. Political Polarization in Online News Consumption. *arXiv:2104.06481 [cs]* (2021). URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2104.06481>. ArXiv: 2104.06481.
- [197] Pagoto, L. & Longhi, R. Platformization, techno populism and disintermediation of sources in attacks on journalism on Instagram. *CHASQUI-REVISTA LATINOAMERICANA DE COMUNICACION* 181–200 (2021).
- [198] de Zuniga, H., Borah, P. & Goyanes, M. How do people learn about politics when inadvertently exposed to news? Incidental news paradoxical Direct and indirect effects on political knowledge. *COMPUTERS IN HUMAN BEHAVIOR* **121** (2021).
- [199] Olise, F. Level of Acceptance of News Stories on Social Media Platforms Among Youth in Nigeria. *JURNAL KOMUNIKASI-MALAYSIAN JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION* **37**, 210–225 (2021).

- [200] Santini, R., Salles, D. & Tucci, G. When Machine Behavior Targets Future Voters: The Use of Social Bots to Test Narratives for Political Campaigns in Brazil. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION* **15**, 1220–1243 (2021).
- [201] Choi, J. Cross-Cutting Scanning, Integrating, and Interacting: Dimensions of Cross-Cutting Exposure on Social Media and Political Participation. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION* **15**, 1595–1616 (2021).
- [202] Gerosa, T., Gui, M., Hargittai, E. & Nguyen, M. (Mis)informed During COVID-19: How Education Level and Information Sources Contribute to Knowledge Gaps. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION* **15**, 2196–2217 (2021).
- [203] Villanueva, C. & Toscano, G. Legitimation of hate and political violence through memetic images: the Bolsonaro campaign. *COMMUNICATION & SOCIETY-SPAIN* **34**, 449–468 (2021).
- [204] Ahmed, M., Riaz, M., Qamar, M. & Asghar, R. Fake News Shared on WhatsApp During Covid-19: An Analysis of Groups and Statuses in Pakistan. *MEDIA EDUCATION-MEDIAOBRAZOVANIE* 4–17 (2021).
- [205] Gorski, L. C. & Thomas, F. Staying Tuned or Tuning Out? A Longitudinal Analysis of News-Avoiders on the Micro and Macro-Level. *Communication Research* 009365022110259 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00936502211025907>.
- [206] Enders, A. M. *et al.* The Relationship Between Social Media Use and Beliefs in Conspiracy Theories and Misinformation. *Political Behavior* (2021). URL <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11109-021-09734-6>.
- [207] Müller, P. & Bach, R. L. Populist alternative news use and its role for elections: Web-tracking and survey evidence from two campaign periods. *New Media & Society* 146144482110329 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/14614448211032969>.
- [208] Ozeren, S., Cubukcu, S. & Cash, G. Exposure to Extremist Content and Public Sympathy for ISIS. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 1–21 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1057610X.2021.1965728>.
- [209] Hashemi, M. Discovering social media topics and patterns in the coronavirus and election era. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society* **20**, 1–17 (2022). URL <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JICES-04-2021-0039/full/html>.
- [210] Wolfowicz, M., Weisburd, D. & Hasisi, B. Examining the interactive effects of the filter bubble and the echo chamber on radicalization. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* (2021). URL <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11292-021-09471-0>.
- [211] Yamamoto, M. & Yang, F. Does news help us become knowledgeable or think we are knowledgeable? Examining a linkage of traditional and social media use with political knowledge. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* **19**, 269–283 (2022). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19331681.2021.1969611>.

- [212] Goyanes, M., Borah, P. & Gil de Zúñiga, H. Social media filtering and democracy: Effects of social media news use and uncivil political discussions on social media unfriending. *Computers in Human Behavior* **120**, 106759 (2021). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0747563221000819>.
- [213] Choli, M. & Kuss, D. J. Perceptions of blame on social media during the coronavirus pandemic. *Computers in Human Behavior* **124**, 106895 (2021). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0747563221002181>.
- [214] Cano-Orón, L., Calvo, D., Llorca-Abad, G. & Mestre-Páez, R. Media crisis and disinformation: the participation of digital newspapers in the dissemination of a denialist hoax. *El Profesional de la información* e300412 (2021). URL <https://revista.profesionaldelainformacion.com/index.php/EPI/article/view/86394/version/4386>.
- [215] Kim, B., Cooks, E. & Kim, S.-K. Exploring incivility and moral foundations toward Asians in English-speaking tweets in hate crime-reporting cities during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Internet Research* **32**, 362–378 (2022). URL <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/INTR-11-2020-0678/full/html>.
- [216] Melki, J. *et al.* Mitigating infodemics: The relationship between news exposure and trust and belief in COVID-19 fake news and social media spreading. *PLOS ONE* **16**, e0252830 (2021). URL <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0252830>.
- [217] Martin, J. D. & Hassan, F. Testing Classical Predictors of Public Willingness to Censor on the Desire to Block Fake News Online. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* **28**, 867–887 (2022). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/13548565211012552>.
- [218] Bermes, A. Information overload and fake news sharing: A transactional stress perspective exploring the mitigating role of consumers resilience during COVID-19. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* **61**, 102555 (2021). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0969698921001211>.
- [219] Shin, S. H., Ji, H. & Lim, H. Heterogeneity in preventive behaviors during COVID-19: Health risk, economic insecurity, and slanted information. *Social Science & Medicine* **278**, 113944 (2021). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0277953621002768>.
- [220] Nah, S., Lee, S. & Liu, W. Community Storytelling Network, Expressive Digital Media Use, and Civic Engagement. *Communication Research* **49**, 327–352 (2022). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00936502211019677>.
- [221] Dias, T., von Bülow, M. & Gobbi, D. Populist Framing Mechanisms and the Rise of Right-wing Activism in Brazil. *Latin American Politics and Society* **63**, 69–92 (2021). URL https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S1531426X21000224/type/journal_article.
- [222] SIHOMBING, S. O. & PRAMONO, R. The Integration of Social Media to the Theory of Planned Behavior: A Case Study in Indonesia. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business* **8**, 445–454 (2021). URL <https://doi.org/10.13106/JAFEB.2021.VOL8.NO5.0445>.

- [223] Rao, A. *et al.* Political Partisanship and Antiscience Attitudes in Online Discussions About COVID-19: Twitter Content Analysis. *Journal of Medical Internet Research* **23**, e26692 (2021). URL <https://www.jmir.org/2021/6/e26692>.
- [224] Visentin, M., Tuan, A. & Di Domenico, G. Words matter: How privacy concerns and conspiracy theories spread on twitter. *Psychology & Marketing* **38**, 1828–1846 (2021). URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/mar.21542>.
- [225] Osmundsen, M., Bor, A., Vahlstrup, P. B., Bechmann, A. & Petersen, M. B. Partisan Polarization Is the Primary Psychological Motivation behind Political Fake News Sharing on Twitter. *American Political Science Review* **115**, 999–1015 (2021). URL https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0003055421000290/type/journal_article.
- [226] Herrera-Peco, I. *et al.* Antivaccine Movement and COVID-19 Negationism: A Content Analysis of Spanish-Written Messages on Twitter. *Vaccines* **9**, 656 (2021). URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-393X/9/6/656>.
- [227] Nazar, S. & Pieters, T. Plandemic Revisited: A Product of Planned Disinformation Amplifying the COVID-19 infodemic. *Frontiers in Public Health* **9**, 649930 (2021). URL <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2021.649930/full>.
- [228] Hollewell, G. F. & Longpré, N. Radicalization in the Social Media Era: Understanding the Relationship between Self-Radicalization and the Internet. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* **66**, 896–913 (2022). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0306624X211028771>.
- [229] Tal-Or, N., Cohen, J., Tsfaty, Y. & Gunther, A. C. Testing Causal Direction in the Influence of Presumed Media Influence. *Communication Research* **37**, 801–824 (2010). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0093650210362684>.
- [230] Weeks, B. E., Menchen-Trevino, E., Calabrese, C., Casas, A. & Wojcieszak, M. Partisan media, untrustworthy news sites, and political misperceptions. *New Media & Society* 146144482110333 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/14614448211033300>.
- [231] Gil de Zúñiga, H., Barnidge, M. & Diehl, T. Political persuasion on social media: A moderated moderation model of political discussion disagreement and civil reasoning. *The Information Society* **34**, 302–315 (2018). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01972243.2018.1497743>.
- [232] Chayinska, M., Miranda, D. & González, R. A longitudinal study of the bidirectional causal relationships between online political participation and offline collective action. *Computers in Human Behavior* **121**, 106810 (2021). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0747563221001333>.
- [233] Criss, S. *et al.* Advocacy, Hesitancy, and Equity: Exploring U.S. Race-Related Discussions of the COVID-19 Vaccine on Twitter. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **18**, 5693 (2021). URL <https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/18/11/5693>.

- [234] Onat, I., Guler, A., Kula, S. & Bastug, M. F. Fear of Terrorism and Fear of Violent Crimes in the United States: A Comparative Analysis. *Crime & Delinquency* 001112872110361 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00111287211036130>.
- [235] Chen, H.-T. Second Screening and the Engaged Public: The Role of Second Screening for News and Political Expression in an O-S-R-O-R Model. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* **98**, 526–546 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1077699019866432>.
- [236] Lin, W.-Y., Hope Cheong, P., Kim, Y.-C. & Jung, J.-Y. Becoming Citizens: Youths Civic Uses of New Media in Five Digital Cities in East Asia. *Journal of Adolescent Research* **25**, 839–857 (2010). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0743558410371125>.
- [237] Young, L. E. Mobilization Under Threat: Emotional Appeals and Pro-Opposition Political Participation Online. *Political Behavior* (2021). URL <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11109-021-09711-z>.
- [238] Wang, D. & Qian, Y. Echo Chamber Effect in Rumor Rebuttal Discussions About COVID-19 in China: Social Media Content and Network Analysis Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research* **23**, e27009 (2021). URL <https://www.jmir.org/2021/3/e27009>.
- [239] Diehl, T., Huber, B., Gil de Zúñiga, H. & Liu, J. Social Media and Beliefs about Climate Change: A Cross-National Analysis of News Use, Political Ideology, and Trust in Science. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* **33**, 197–213 (2021). URL <https://academic.oup.com/ijpor/article/33/2/197/5628296>.
- [240] Biancovilli, P., Makszin, L. & Jurberg, C. Misinformation on social networks during the novel coronavirus pandemic: a quali-quantitative case study of Brazil. *BMC Public Health* **21**, 1200 (2021). URL <https://bmcpublihealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-021-11165-1>.
- [241] Apuke, O. D. & Omar, B. Social media affordances and information abundance: Enabling fake news sharing during the COVID-19 health crisis. *Health Informatics Journal* **27**, 146045822110214 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/14604582211021470>.
- [242] Párez-Curiel, C., Rivas-de Roca, R. & García-Gordillo, M. Impact of Trumps Digital Rhetoric on the US Elections: A View from Worldwide Far-Right Populism. *Social Sciences* **10**, 152 (2021). URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-0760/10/5/152>.
- [243] Elliott, T. & Earl, J. Online protest participation and the digital divide: Modeling the effect of the digital divide on online petition-signing. *New Media & Society* **20**, 698–719 (2018). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444816669159>.
- [244] Hawkins, I. & Saleem, M. Rise UP!: A content analytic study of how collective action is discussed within White nationalist videos on YouTube. *New Media & Society* 146144482110405 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/14614448211040520>.

- [245] Gorodnichenko, Y., Pham, T. & Talavera, O. Social media, sentiment and public opinions: Evidence from #Brexit and #USElection. *European Economic Review* **136**, 103772 (2021). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0014292121001252>.
- [246] Chan, M., Chen, H.-T. & Lee, F. L. F. Cross-Cutting Discussion on Social Media and Online Political Participation: A Cross-National Examination of Information Seeking and Social Accountability Explanations. *Social Media + Society* **7**, 205630512110356 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/20563051211035697>.
- [247] Mari, S. *et al.* Conspiracy Theories and Institutional Trust: Examining the Role of Uncertainty Avoidance and Active Social Media Use. *Political Psychology* **43**, 277–296 (2022). URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/pops.12754>.
- [248] Kopacheva, E. How the Internet has changed participation: Exploring distinctive preconditions of online activism. *Communication & Society* 67–85 (2021). URL <https://revistas.unav.edu/index.php/communication-and-society/article/view/40019>.
- [249] Gavazza, A., Nardotto, M. & Valletti, T. Internet and Politics: Evidence from U.K. Local Elections and Local Government Policies. *The Review of Economic Studies* **86**, 2092–2135 (2019). URL <https://academic.oup.com/restud/article/86/5/2092/5035337>.
- [250] De Coninck, D. *et al.* Beliefs in Conspiracy Theories and Misinformation About COVID-19: Comparative Perspectives on the Role of Anxiety, Depression and Exposure to and Trust in Information Sources. *Frontiers in Psychology* **12**, 646394 (2021). URL <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.646394/full>.
- [251] Wang, L. Race, social media news use, and political participation. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* **19**, 83–97 (2022). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19331681.2021.1923497>.
- [252] Basch, C. E., Basch, C. H., Hillyer, G. C., Meleo-Erwin, Z. C. & Zagnit, E. A. YouTube Videos and Informed Decision-Making About COVID-19 Vaccination: Successive Sampling Study. *JMIR Public Health and Surveillance* **7**, e28352 (2021). URL <https://publichealth.jmir.org/2021/5/e28352>.
- [253] Weeks, B. E., Lane, D. S. & Hahn, L. B. Online Incidental Exposure to News Can Minimize Interest-Based Political Knowledge Gaps: Evidence from Two U.S. Elections. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* **27**, 243–262 (2022). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1940161221991550>.
- [254] Valenzuela, S., Halpern, D., Katz, J. E. & Miranda, J. P. The Paradox of Participation Versus Misinformation: Social Media, Political Engagement, and the Spread of Misinformation. *Digital Journalism* **7**, 802–823 (2019). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2019.1623701>.
- [255] Onuch, O., Mateo, E. & Waller, J. G. Mobilization, Mass Perceptions, and (Dis)information: New and Old Media Consumption Patterns and Protest. *Social Media + Society* **7**, 205630512199965 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2056305121999656>.

- [256] Hernandez, R. G., Hagen, L., Walker, K., OLeary, H. & Lengacher, C. The COVID-19 vaccine social media *infodemic* : healthcare providers missed dose in addressing misinformation and vaccine hesitancy. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics* **17**, 2962–2964 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21645515.2021.1912551>.
- [257] Ruijgrok, K. Illusion of control: how internet use generates anti-regime sentiment in authoritarian regimes. *Contemporary Politics* **27**, 247–270 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13569775.2020.1851931>.
- [258] Brandtzaeg, P. B. Facebook is no Great equalizer: A big data approach to gender differences in civic engagement across countries. *Social Science Computer Review* **35**, 103–125 (2017). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0894439315605806>.
- [259] Rodr iguez-Virgili, J., Serrano-Puche, J. & Fern andez, C. B. Digital Disinformation and Preventive Actions: Perceptions of Users from Argentina, Chile, and Spain. *Media and Communication* **9**, 323–337 (2021). URL <https://www.cogitatiopress.com/mediaandcommunication/article/view/3521>.
- [260] Suhay, E., Blackwell, A., Roche, C. & Bruggeman, L. Forging Bonds and Burning Bridges: Polarization and Incivility in Blog Discussions About Occupy Wall Street. *American Politics Research* **43**, 643–679 (2015). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1532673X14553834>.
- [261] Lilleker, D., Koc-Michalska, K. & Bimber, B. Women learn while men talk?: revisiting gender differences in political engagement in online environments. *Information, Communication & Society* **24**, 2037–2053 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369118X.2021.1961005>.
- [262] Schulz, W. Spiraleffekte in der neuen Medienwelt: W ahlermobilisierung und die Nutzung politischer Online- und Offline-Information im Bundestagswahlkampf 2013. *Studies in Communication | Media* **8**, 77–114 (2019). URL <https://www.nomos-elibrary.de/index.php?doi=10.5771/2192-4007-2019-1-77>.
- [263] Tolbert, C. J. & McNeal, R. S. Unraveling the Effects of the Internet on Political Participation? *Political Research Quarterly* **56**, 175 (2003). URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3219896?origin=crossref>.
- [264] Valenzuela, S., Halpern, D. & Araneda, F. A Downward Spiral? A Panel Study of Misinformation and Media Trust in Chile. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* **27**, 353–373 (2022). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/19401612211025238>.
- [265] Choi, J. & Lee, J. Enthusiasm toward the other side matters: Emotion and willingness to express disagreement in social media political conversation. *The Social Science Journal* 1–17 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03623319.2021.1949548>.
- [266] Jennings, W. *et al.* Lack of Trust, Conspiracy Beliefs, and Social Media Use Predict COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy. *Vaccines* **9**, 593 (2021). URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-393X/9/6/593>.
- [267] Nagayoshi, K. The Political Orientation of Japanese Online Right-wingers. *Pacific Affairs* **94**, 5–32 (2021). URL <https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/10.5509/20219415>.

- [268] Kahne, J. & Bowyer, B. The Political Significance of Social Media Activity and Social Networks. *Political Communication* **35**, 470–493 (2018). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10584609.2018.1426662>.
- [269] Liu, W., Chen, N.-T. N., Ognyanova, K., Nah, S. & Ball-Rokeach, S. Connecting With Hyperlocal News Website: Cause or Effect of Civic Participation? *American Behavioral Scientist* **62**, 1022–1041 (2018). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0002764218764243>.
- [270] Housholder, E., Watson, B. R. & LoRusso, S. Does Political Advertising Lead to Online Information Seeking? A Real-World Test Using Google Search Data. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* **62**, 337–353 (2018). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/08838151.2018.1451854>.
- [271] Shahin, S., Saldaña, M. & Gil de Zúñiga, H. Peripheral elaboration model: The impact of incidental news exposure on political participation. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* **18**, 148–163 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19331681.2020.1832012>.
- [272] Haenschen, K. & Jennings, J. Mobilizing Millennial Voters with Targeted Internet Advertisements: A Field Experiment. *Political Communication* **36**, 357–375 (2019). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10584609.2018.1548530>.
- [273] Sakya, S. M. *et al.* The impact of COVID-19-related changes in media consumption on public knowledge: results of a cross-sectional survey of Pennsylvania adults. *Current Medical Research and Opinion* **37**, 911–915 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03007995.2021.1901679>.
- [274] Sridhar, D. & Getoor, L. Estimating Causal Effects of Tone in Online Debates. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 1872–1878* (International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, Macao, China, 2019). URL <https://www.ijcai.org/proceedings/2019/259>.
- [275] Patra, R. K. & Pandey, N. Disinformation on Novel Coronavirus (COVID 19) A Content Analysis of News Published on Fact Checking Sites in India. *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology* **41**, 275–283 (2021). URL <https://publications.drdo.gov.in/ojs/index.php/djlit/article/view/16556>.
- [276] Shin, J. How Do Partisans Consume News on Social Media? A Comparison of Self-Reports With Digital Trace Measures Among Twitter Users. *Social Media + Society* **6**, 205630512098103 (2020). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2056305120981039>.
- [277] Praprotnik, K., Perlot, F., Ingruber, D. & Filzmaier, P. Soziale Medien als politischer Informationskanal (2019). URL <https://webapp.uibk.ac.at/ojs/index.php/OEZP/article/viewFile/2726/2291>. Publisher: Universitaet Innsbruck - Innsbruck University Press.
- [278] Bail, C. A. *et al.* Assessing the Russian Internet Research Agency's impact on the political attitudes and behaviors of American Twitter users in late 2017. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117**, 243–250 (2020). URL <https://pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.1906420116>.

- [279] Batool, S. H., Ahmed, W., Mahmood, K. & Saeed, H. Twitter dialogue: an analysis of Pakistani politicians information sharing. *Information Discovery and Delivery* **50**, 64–74 (2022). URL <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IDD-03-2020-0031/full/html>.
- [280] Siongers, J., Keppens, G., Spruyt, B. & Van Droogenbroeck, F. On the Digital Lane to Citizenship? Patterns of Internet Use and Civic Engagement Amongst Flemish Adolescents and Young Adults. *JSSE - Journal of Social Science Education* Vol 18 No 2 (2019) (2019). URL <https://www.jsse.org/index.php/jsse/article/view/901>. Publisher: JSSE - Journal of Social Science Education.
- [281] Linvill, D. L., Boatwright, B. C., Grant, W. J. & Warren, P. L. THE RUSSIANS ARE HACKING MY BRAIN! investigating Russia's internet research agency twitter tactics during the 2016 United States presidential campaign. *Computers in Human Behavior* **99**, 292–300 (2019). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S074756321930202X>.
- [282] Chan, M.-p. S. *et al.* Legacy and social media respectively influence risk perceptions and protective behaviors during emerging health threats: A multi-wave analysis of communications on Zika virus cases. *Social Science & Medicine* **212**, 50–59 (2018). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0277953618303630>.
- [283] Koivula, A., Kaakinen, M., Oksanen, A. & Räsänen, P. The Role of Political Activity in the Formation of Online Identity Bubbles. *Policy & Internet* **11**, 396–417 (2019). URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/poi3.211>.
- [284] Kleinnijenhuis, J., van Hoof, A. M. J. & van Atteveldt, W. The Combined Effects of Mass Media and Social Media on Political Perceptions and Preferences. *Journal of Communication* **69**, 650–673 (2019). URL <https://academic.oup.com/joc/article/69/6/650/5681988>.
- [285] Bowman, W. M. & Bowman, J. D. Censorship or self-control? Hate speech, the state and the voter in the Kenyan election of 2013. *The Journal of Modern African Studies* **54**, 495–531 (2016). URL https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0022278X16000380/type/journal_article.
- [286] Kim, H. H.-s. & Lim, C. From virtual space to public space: The role of online political activism in protest participation during the Arab Spring. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* **60**, 409–434 (2019). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0020715219894724>.
- [287] Matuszewski, P. & Szabó, G. Are Echo Chambers Based on Partisanship? Twitter and Political Polarity in Poland and Hungary. *Social Media + Society* **5**, 205630511983767 (2019). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2056305119837671>.
- [288] Lee, F. L. F., Lee, P. S. N., So, C. Y., Leung, L. & Chan, M. C. Conditional impact of facebook as an information source on political opinions: the case of political reform in Hong Kong. *Asian Journal of Political Science* **25**, 365–382 (2017). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02185377.2017.1352523>.

- [289] Casas, A. & Williams, N. W. Images that Matter: Online Protests and the Mobilizing Role of Pictures. *Political Research Quarterly* **72**, 360–375 (2019). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1065912918786805>.
- [290] Xiong, J., Feng, X. & Tang, Z. Understanding user-to-User interaction on government microblogs: An exponential random graph model with the homophily and emotional effect. *Information Processing & Management* **57**, 102229 (2020). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0306457319310672>.
- [291] Nguyen, T. T. *et al.* Evaluating associations between area-level Twitter-expressed negative racial sentiment, hate crimes, and residents' racial prejudice in the United States. *SSM - Population Health* **13**, 100750 (2021). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2352827321000252>.
- [292] Gondal, M. T., Munir, A., Shabir, G. & Naz, A. Facebook and Propaganda: Following Politics on Facebook and its Impact on Political Behaviors of Youth. *Clinical Social Work and Health Intervention* **10**, 27–33 (2019). URL <https://clinicalsocialwork.eu/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/04-Gondal-1.pdf>.
- [293] Zang, L., Xiong, F. & Gao, Y. Reversing the U: New Evidence on the Internet and Democracy Relationship. *Social Science Computer Review* **37**, 295–314 (2019). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0894439318767957>.
- [294] Ohme, J. Updating citizenship? The effects of digital media use on citizenship understanding and political participation. *Information, Communication & Society* **22**, 1903–1928 (2019). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369118X.2018.1469657>.
- [295] Corbu, N., Oprea, D.-A., Negrea-Busuioc, E. & Radu, L. They cant fool me, but they can fool the others! Third person effect and fake news detection. *European Journal of Communication* **35**, 165–180 (2020). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0267323120903686>.
- [296] Germann, M. & Gemenis, K. Getting Out the Vote With Voting Advice Applications. *Political Communication* **36**, 149–170 (2019). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10584609.2018.1526237>.
- [297] Neely, S., Eldredge, C. & Sanders, R. Health Information Seeking Behaviors on Social Media During the COVID-19 Pandemic Among American Social Networking Site Users: Survey Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research* **23**, e29802 (2021). URL <https://www.jmir.org/2021/6/e29802>.
- [298] Inguanzo, I., Zhang, B. & Gil de Zúñiga, H. Online cultural backlash? sexism and political user-generated content. *Information, Communication & Society* **24**, 2133–2152 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369118X.2021.1962940>.
- [299] Chekol, M. A., Moges, M. A. & Nigatu, B. A. Social media hate speech in the walk of Ethiopian political reform: analysis of hate speech prevalence, severity, and natures. *Information, Communication & Society* 1–20 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369118X.2021.1942955>.

- [300] Valenzuela, S., Bachmann, I. & Bargsted, M. The Personal Is the Political? What Do WhatsApp Users Share and How It Matters for News Knowledge, Polarization and Participation in Chile. *Digital Journalism* **9**, 155–175 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2019.1693904>.
- [301] Van Duyn, E., Peacock, C. & Stroud, N. J. The Gender Gap in Online News Comment Sections. *Social Science Computer Review* **39**, 181–196 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0894439319864876>.
- [302] Wiedlitzka, S., Prati, G., Brown, R., Smith, J. & Walters, M. A. Hate in Word and Deed: The Temporal Association Between Online and Offline Islamophobia. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* (2021). URL <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10940-021-09530-9>.
- [303] Oh, H. J., Lor, Z. & Choi, J. News Repertoires and Political Information Efficacy: Focusing on the Mediating Role of Perceived News Overload. *SAGE Open* **11**, 215824402098868 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2158244020988685>.
- [304] Siegel, A. A. *et al.* Trumping Hate on Twitter? Online Hate Speech in the 2016 U.S. Election Campaign and its Aftermath. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* **16**, 71–104 (2021). URL <http://www.nowpublishers.com/article/Details/QJPS-19045>.
- [305] Kruike-meier, S. How political candidates use Twitter and the impact on votes. *Computers in Human Behavior* **34**, 131–139 (2014). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0747563214000302>.
- [306] van Erkel, P. F. A. & Van Aelst, P. Why Dont We Learn from Social Media? Studying Effects of and Mechanisms behind Social Media News Use on General Surveillance Political Knowledge. *Political Communication* **38**, 407–425 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10584609.2020.1784328>.
- [307] Chan, N. K. Political Inequality in the Digital World: The Puzzle of Asian American Political Participation Online. *Political Research Quarterly* **74**, 882–898 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1065912920945391>.
- [308] Wang, X. & Kobayashi, T. Nationalism and political system justification in China: differential effects of traditional and new media. *Chinese Journal of Communication* **14**, 139–156 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17544750.2020.1807372>.
- [309] Freudenthaler, R. & Wessler, H. Mapping Emerging and Legacy Outlets Online by Their Democratic Functions—Agonistic, Deliberative, or Corrosive? *The International Journal of Press/Politics* **27**, 417–438 (2022). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/19401612211015077>.
- [310] Cardenal, A. S., Galais, C. & Majó-Vázquez, S. Is Facebook Eroding the Public Agenda? Evidence From Survey and Web-Tracking Data. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* (2018). URL <https://academic.oup.com/ijpor/advance-article/doi/10.1093/ijpor/edy025/5250416>.

- [311] Zhou, C., Xiu, H., Wang, Y. & Yu, X. Characterizing the dissemination of misinformation on social media in health emergencies: An empirical study based on COVID-19. *Information Processing & Management* **58**, 102554 (2021). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0306457321000583>.
- [312] Hajj, N., McEwan, P. J. & Turkington, R. Women, information ecology, and political protest in the Middle East. *Mediterranean Politics* **24**, 62–83 (2019). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13629395.2017.1380116>.
- [313] Zhu, A. Y. F., Chan, A. L. S. & Chou, K. L. Creative social media use and political participation in young people: The moderation and mediation role of online political expression. *Journal of Adolescence* **77**, 108–117 (2019). URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1016/j.adolescence.2019.10.010>.
- [314] Towner, T. L. & Muñoz, C. L. Baby Boom or Bust? the New Media Effect on Political Participation. *Journal of Political Marketing* **17**, 32–61 (2018). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15377857.2016.1153561>.
- [315] Licari, P. R. Sharp as a Fox: Are foxnews.com Visitors Less Politically Knowledgeable? *American Politics Research* **48**, 792–806 (2020). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1532673X20915222>.
- [316] Krueger, B. S. A Comparison of Conventional and Internet Political Mobilization. *American Politics Research* **34**, 759–776 (2006). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1532673X06290911>.
- [317] Makhortykh, M., de Vreese, C., Helberger, N., Harambam, J. & Bountouridis, D. We are what we click: Understanding time and content-based habits of online news readers. *New Media & Society* **23**, 2773–2800 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444820933221>.
- [318] Sydnor, E. Platforms for Incivility: Examining Perceptions Across Different Media Formats. *Political Communication* **35**, 97–116 (2018). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10584609.2017.1355857>.
- [319] Piazza, J. A. & Guler, A. The Online Caliphate: Internet Usage and ISIS Support in the Arab World. *Terrorism and Political Violence* **33**, 1256–1275 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09546553.2019.1606801>.
- [320] Dahlgren, P. M., Shehata, A. & Strömback, J. Reinforcing spirals at work? Mutual influences between selective news exposure and ideological leaning. *European Journal of Communication* **34**, 159–174 (2019). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0267323119830056>.
- [321] Garrett, R. K. Politically Motivated Reinforcement Seeking: Reframing the Selective Exposure Debate. *Journal of Communication* **59**, 676–699 (2009). URL <https://academic.oup.com/joc/article/59/4/676-699/4098408>.
- [322] Milani, E., Weitkamp, E. & Webb, P. The Visual Vaccine Debate on Twitter: A Social Network Analysis. *Media and Communication* **8**, 364–375 (2020). URL <https://www.cogitatiopress.com/mediaandcommunication/article/view/2847>.

- [323] Nguyen, A. & Western, M. Socio-structural correlates of online news and information adoption/use: Implications for the digital divide. *Journal of Sociology* **43**, 167–185 (2007). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1440783307076894>.
- [324] Kane, B. & Luo, J. Do the Communities We Choose Shape our Political Beliefs? A Study of the Politicization of Topics in Online Social Groups. In *2018 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*, 3665–3671 (IEEE, Seattle, WA, USA, 2018). URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8622535/>.
- [325] Wollebæk, D., Karlsen, R., Steen-Johnsen, K. & Enjolras, B. Anger, Fear, and Echo Chambers: The Emotional Basis for Online Behavior. *Social Media + Society* **5**, 205630511982985 (2019). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2056305119829859>.
- [326] Scheffauer, R., Goyanes, M. & Gil de Zúñiga, H. Beyond social media news use algorithms: how political discussion and network heterogeneity clarify incidental news exposure. *Online Information Review* **45**, 633–650 (2021). URL <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/OIR-04-2020-0133/full/html>.
- [327] Chan, M., Chen, H.-T. & Lee, F. L. F. Examining the Roles of Political Social Network and Internal Efficacy on Social Media News Engagement: A Comparative Study of Six Asian Countries. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* **24**, 127–145 (2019). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1940161218814480>.
- [328] Miao, H. Media Use and Political Participation in China: Taking Three National Large-N Surveys as Examples. *Asian Journal for Public Opinion Research* **7**, 1–22 (2019). URL <https://doi.org/10.15206/AJPOR.2019.7.1.1>.
- [329] Peterson, E., Goel, S. & Iyengar, S. Partisan selective exposure in online news consumption: evidence from the 2016 presidential campaign. *Political Science Research and Methods* **9**, 242–258 (2021). URL https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S2049847019000554/type/journal_article.
- [330] Hjorth, F. & Adler-Nissen, R. Ideological Asymmetry in the Reach of Pro-Russian Digital Disinformation to United States Audiences. *Journal of Communication* **69**, 168–192 (2019). URL <https://academic.oup.com/joc/article/69/2/168/5425470>.
- [331] Dozier, D. M., Shen, H., Sweetser, K. D. & Barker, V. Demographics and Internet behaviors as predictors of active publics. *Public Relations Review* **42**, 82–90 (2016). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0363811115001435>.
- [332] Asker, D. & Dinas, E. Thinking Fast and Furious: Emotional Intensity and Opinion Polarization in Online Media. *Public Opinion Quarterly* **83**, 487–509 (2019). URL <https://academic.oup.com/poq/article/83/3/487/5566253>.
- [333] Sugihartati, R., Suyanto, B. & Sirry, M. The Shift from Consumers to Prosumers: Susceptibility of Young Adults to Radicalization. *Social Sciences* **9**, 40 (2020). URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-0760/9/4/40>.

- [334] Johnson, T. J., Kaye, B. K. & Lee, A. M. Blinded by the Spite? Path Model of Political Attitudes, Selectivity, and Social Media. *Atlantic Journal of Communication* **25**, 181–196 (2017). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15456870.2017.1324454>.
- [335] Yang, J. & Grabe, M. E. Knowledge acquisition gaps: A comparison of print versus online news sources. *New Media & Society* **13**, 1211–1227 (2011). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444811401708>.
- [336] Bode, L., Vraga, E. K., Borah, P. & Shah, D. V. A New Space for Political Behavior: Political Social Networking and its Democratic Consequences. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* **19**, 414–429 (2014). URL <https://academic.oup.com/jcmc/article/19/3/414-429/4067544>.
- [337] Shim, K. & Oh, S.-K. K. Who creates the bandwagon? The dynamics of fear of isolation, opinion congruency and anonymity-preference on social media in the 2017 South Korean presidential election. *Computers in Human Behavior* **86**, 181–189 (2018). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0747563218301766>.
- [338] Rosenbusch, H., Evans, A. M. & Zeelenberg, M. Multilevel Emotion Transfer on YouTube: Disentangling the Effects of Emotional Contagion and Homophily on Video Audiences. *Social Psychological and Personality Science* **10**, 1028–1035 (2019). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1948550618820309>.
- [339] Munger, K., Luca, M., Nagler, J. & Tucker, J. The (Null) Effects of Clickbait Headlines on Polarization, Trust, and Learning. *Public Opinion Quarterly* **84**, 49–73 (2020). URL <https://academic.oup.com/poq/article/84/1/49/5827235>.
- [340] Eady, G., Nagler, J., Guess, A., Zilinsky, J. & Tucker, J. A. How Many People Live in Political Bubbles on Social Media? Evidence From Linked Survey and Twitter Data. *SAGE Open* **9**, 215824401983270 (2019). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2158244019832705>.
- [341] Guerrero-Solá, F. Interactive Behavior in Political Discussions on Twitter: Politicians, Media, and Citizens Patterns of Interaction in the 2015 and 2016 Electoral Campaigns in Spain. *Social Media + Society* **4**, 205630511880877 (2018). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2056305118808776>.
- [342] Theocharis, Y., Moor, J. & Deth, J. W. Digitally Networked Participation and Lifestyle Politics as New Modes of Political Participation. *Policy & Internet* **13**, 30–53 (2021). URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/poi3.231>.
- [343] Robles, J. M., Velez, D., De Marco, S., Rodríguez, J. T. & Gomez, D. Affective homogeneity in the Spanish general election debate. A comparative analysis of social networks political agents. *Information, Communication & Society* **23**, 216–233 (2020). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369118X.2018.1499792>.

- [344] Costello, M. & Hawdon, J. Who Are the Online Extremists Among Us? Sociodemographic Characteristics, Social Networking, and Online Experiences of Those Who Produce Online Hate Materials. *Violence and Gender* **5**, 55–60 (2018). URL <https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/10.1089/vio.2017.0048>.
- [345] Vaccari, C. & Valeriani, A. Digital Political Talk and Political Participation: Comparing Established and Third Wave Democracies. *SAGE Open* **8**, 215824401878498 (2018). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2158244018784986>.
- [346] Park, C. S. & Karan, K. Unraveling the relationships between smartphone use, exposure to heterogeneity, political efficacy, and political participation: a mediation model approach. *Asian Journal of Communication* **24**, 370–389 (2014). URL <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01292986.2014.892146>.
- [347] David, C. C., San Pascual, M. R. S. & Torres, M. E. S. Reliance on Facebook for news and its influence on political engagement. *PLOS ONE* **14**, e0212263 (2019). URL <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0212263>.
- [348] Arshad, S. & Khurram, S. Can governments presence on social media stimulate citizens online political participation? Investigating the influence of transparency, trust, and responsiveness. *Government Information Quarterly* **37**, 101486 (2020). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0740624X1930574X>.
- [349] Machackova, H. & Á erek, J. Does clicking matter? The role of online participation in adolescents civic development. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace* **11** (2017). URL <https://cyberpsychology.eu/article/view/8741>.
- [350] Jeroense, T., Luimers, J., Jacobs, K. & Spierings, N. Political social media use and its linkage to populist and postmaterialist attitudes and vote intention in the Netherlands. *European Political Science* **21**, 193–215 (2022). URL <https://link.springer.com/10.1057/s41304-020-00306-6>.
- [351] Bosi, L., Lavizzari, A. & Portos, M. The impact of intolerance on young peoples online political participation. *Politics* **42**, 95–127 (2022). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/02633957211014453>.
- [352] Sommariva, S., Vamos, C., Mantzarlis, A., Uyên-Loan Đào, L. U.-L. & Martinez Tyson, D. Spreading the (Fake) News: Exploring Health Messages on Social Media and the Implications for Health Professionals Using a Case Study. *American Journal of Health Education* **49**, 246–255 (2018). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19325037.2018.1473178>.
- [353] Kim, D. H., Jones-Jang, S. M. & Kenski, K. Why Do People Share Political Information on Social Media? *Digital Journalism* **9**, 1123–1140 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2020.1827966>.
- [354] Kulshrestha, J. *et al.* Search bias quantification: investigating political bias in social media and web search. *Information Retrieval Journal* **22**, 188–227 (2019). URL <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10791-018-9341-2>.

- [355] Eddington, S. M. The Communicative Constitution of Hate Organizations Online: A Semantic Network Analysis of Make America Great Again. *Social Media + Society* **4**, 205630511879076 (2018). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2056305118790763>.
- [356] Feezell, J. T. & Ortiz, B. I saw it on Facebook: an experimental analysis of political learning through social media. *Information, Communication & Society* **24**, 1283–1302 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1697340>.
- [357] Ejaz, W., Ittefaq, M., Seo, H. & Naz, F. Factors associated with the belief in COVID-19 related conspiracy theories in Pakistan. *Health, Risk & Society* **23**, 162–178 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13698575.2021.1929865>.
- [358] Omotayo, F. & Folorunso, M. B. Use of Social Media for Political Participation by Youths. *JeDEM - eJournal of eDemocracy and Open Government* **12**, 132–157 (2020). URL <https://jedem.org/index.php/jedem/article/view/585>.
- [359] Hasangani, S. Religious Identification on Facebook Visuals and (Online) Out-group Intolerance: Experimenting the Sri Lankan Case. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* **57**, 247–268 (2022). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00219096211008466>.
- [360] Mueller-Herbst, J. M., Xenos, M. A., Scheufele, D. A. & Brossard, D. Saw It on Facebook: The Role of Social Media in Facilitating Science Issue Awareness. *Social Media + Society* **6**, 205630512093041 (2020). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2056305120930412>.
- [361] Lu, Y., Lee, J. K. & Kim, E. Network characteristics matter in politics on Facebook: evidence from a US national survey. *Online Information Review* **42**, 372–386 (2018). URL <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/OIR-09-2016-0262/full/html>.
- [362] Forati, A. M. & Ghose, R. Geospatial analysis of misinformation in COVID-19 related tweets. *Applied Geography* **133**, 102473 (2021). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0143622821000898>.
- [363] Hong, S. & Kim, S. H. Political polarization on twitter: Implications for the use of social media in digital governments. *Government Information Quarterly* **33**, 777–782 (2016). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0740624X16300375>.
- [364] Westerwick, A., Sude, D., Robinson, M. & Knobloch-Westerwick, S. Peers Versus Pros: Confirmation Bias in Selective Exposure to User-Generated Versus Professional Media Messages and Its Consequences. *Mass Communication and Society* **23**, 510–536 (2020). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15205436.2020.1721542>.
- [365] Stoica, A.-A., Riederer, C. & Chaintreau, A. Algorithmic Glass Ceiling in Social Networks: The effects of social recommendations on network diversity. In *Proceedings of the 2018 World Wide Web Conference on World Wide Web - WWW '18*, 923–932 (ACM Press, Lyon, France, 2018). URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=3178876.3186140>.

- [366] Vissenberg, J., Coninck, D. D. & dHaenens, L. Relating adolescents exposure to legacy and digital news media and intergroup contact to their attitudes towards immigrants. *Communications* **46**, 373–393 (2021). URL <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/commun-2021-0047/html>.
- [367] Yu, R. P. & Oh, Y. W. Social media and expressive citizenship: Understanding the relationships between social and entertainment expression on Facebook and political participation. *Telematics and Informatics* **35**, 2299–2311 (2018). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S073658531830460X>.
- [368] Lake, J. S., Alston, A. T. & Kahn, K. B. How Social Networking Use and Beliefs About Inequality Affect Engagement With Racial Justice Movements. *Race and Justice* **11**, 500–519 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2153368718809833>.
- [369] Barnidge, M., Huber, B., de Zúñiga, H. G. & Liu, J. H. Social Media as a Sphere for Risky Political Expression: A Twenty-Country Multilevel Comparative Analysis. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* **23**, 161–182 (2018). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1940161218773838>.
- [370] Mustapha, L. K. & Omar, B. Do social media matter? Examining social media use and youths political participation during the 2019 Nigerian general elections. *The Round Table* **109**, 441–457 (2020). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00358533.2020.1788766>.
- [371] Qin, A. Y. Judging Them by My Media Use: Exploring the Cause and Consequences of Perceived Selective Exposure. *Mass Communication and Society* **25**, 237–259 (2022). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15205436.2021.1977327>.
- [372] Blank, G. & Lutz, C. Benefits and harms from Internet use: A differentiated analysis of Great Britain. *New Media & Society* **20**, 618–640 (2018). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444816667135>.
- [373] Bail, C. A., Merhout, F. & Ding, P. Using Internet search data to examine the relationship between anti-Muslim and pro-ISIS sentiment in U.S. counties. *Science Advances* **4**, eaao5948 (2018). URL <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.aao5948>.
- [374] Hendriks Vettehen, P., Troost, J., Boerboom, L., Steijaert, M. & Scheepers, P. The Relationship Between Media Content Preferences and Political Participation in 25 European Countries: The Moderating Role of Broadband Penetration and Broadband Access. *Communication Research* **47**, 967–987 (2020). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0093650217701033>.
- [375] Arlt, D. & Wolling, J. Bias wanted! Examining peoples information exposure, quality expectations and bias perceptions in the context of the refugees debate among different segments of the German population. *Communications* **43**, 75–99 (2018). URL <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/commun-2017-0045/html>.
- [376] Cardenal, A. S., Aguilar-Paredes, C., Cristancho, C. & Majó-Vázquez, S. Echo-chambers in online news consumption: Evidence from survey and navigation data in Spain. *European Journal of Communication* **34**, 360–376 (2019). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0267323119844409>.

- [377] Gallego, J., Martnez, J. D., Munger, K. & Vsquez-Corts, M. Tweeting for peace: Experimental evidence from the 2016 Colombian Plebiscite. *Electoral Studies* **62**, 102072 (2019). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S026137941930006X>.
- [378] Allington, D., McAndrew, S., Moxham-Hall, V. L. & Duffy, B. Media usage predicts intention to be vaccinated against SARS-CoV-2 in the US and the UK. *Vaccine* **39**, 2595–2603 (2021). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0264410X21002346>.
- [379] Wagner, K. M., Gainous, J. & Abbott, J. P. Gender Differences in Critical Digital Political Engagement in China: The Consequences for Protest Attitudes. *Social Science Computer Review* **39**, 211–225 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0894439319865907>.
- [380] Foos, F., Kostadinov, L., Marinov, N. & Schimmelfennig, F. Does Social Media Promote Civic Activism? A Field Experiment with a Civic Campaign. *Political Science Research and Methods* **9**, 500–518 (2021). URL https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S2049847020000138/type/journal_article.
- [381] Erdem, R. & Ozejder, I. Use of Social Media for Political Purposes: The Case of Diyarbakir. *Revista de Cercetare si Interventie Sociala* **72**, 187–209 (2021). URL https://www.rcis.ro/images/documente/rcis72_13.pdf.
- [382] Bimber, B. Information and Political Engagement in America: The Search for Effects of Information Technology at the Individual Level. *Political Research Quarterly* **54**, 53 (2001). URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/449207?origin=crossref>.
- [383] Sindermann, C., Elhai, J. D., Moshagen, M. & Montag, C. Age, gender, personality, ideological attitudes and individual differences in a person’s news spectrum: how many and who might be prone to filter bubbles and echo chambers online? *Heliyon* **6**, e03214 (2020). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2405844020300591>.
- [384] Guntuku, S. C., Bottenheim, A. M., Sherman, G. & Merchant, R. M. Twitter discourse reveals geographical and temporal variation in concerns about COVID-19 vaccines in the United States. *Vaccine* **39**, 4034–4038 (2021). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0264410X21007386>.
- [385] Kim, H. & Joshanloo, M. Internet Access and Voicing Opinions: The Moderating Roles of Age and the National Economy. *Social Indicators Research* **150**, 121–141 (2020). URL <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11205-020-02298-8>.
- [386] Heinsohn, T., Fatke, M., Israel, J., Marschall, S. & Schultze, M. Effects of voting advice applications during election campaigns. Evidence from a panel study at the 2014 European elections. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* **16**, 250–264 (2019). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19331681.2019.1644265>.

- [387] Shmargad, Y. & Klar, S. Sorting the News: How Ranking by Popularity Polarizes Our Politics. *Political Communication* **37**, 423–446 (2020). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10584609.2020.1713267>.
- [388] Chen, H.-T. Spiral of silence on social media and the moderating role of disagreement and publicness in the network: Analyzing expressive and withdrawal behaviors. *New Media & Society* **20**, 3917–3936 (2018). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444818763384>.
- [389] Romer, D. & Jamieson, K. H. Patterns of Media Use, Strength of Belief in COVID-19 Conspiracy Theories, and the Prevention of COVID-19 From March to July 2020 in the United States: Survey Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research* **23**, e25215 (2021). URL <https://www.jmir.org/2021/4/e25215>.
- [390] Klein, E. & Robison, J. Like, Post, and Distrust? How Social Media Use Affects Trust in Government. *Political Communication* **37**, 46–64 (2020). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10584609.2019.1661891>.
- [391] Kim, C. & Lee, S. Does social media type matter to politics? Investigating the difference in political participation depending on preferred social media sites. *Social Science Quarterly* **102**, 2942–2954 (2021). URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ssqu.13055>.
- [392] Garrett, R. K. & Bond, R. M. Conservatives susceptibility to political misperceptions. *Science Advances* **7**, eabf1234 (2021). URL <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.abf1234>.
- [393] van Tubergen, F., Cinjee, T., Menshikova, A. & Veldkamp, J. Online activity of mosques and Muslims in the Netherlands: A study of Facebook, Instagram, YouTube and Twitter. *PLOS ONE* **16**, e0254881 (2021). URL <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0254881>.
- [394] Gherghina, S. & Rusu, E. Begin Again: Election Campaign and Own Opinions Among First-Time Voters in Romania. *Social Science Quarterly* **102**, 1311–1329 (2021). URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ssqu.12979>.
- [395] Karakaya, S. & Glazier, R. A. Media, information, and political participation: The importance of online news sources in the absence of a free press. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* **16**, 290–306 (2019). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19331681.2019.1645784>.
- [396] Heatherly, K. A., Lu, Y. & Lee, J. K. Filtering out the other side? Cross-cutting and like-minded discussions on social networking sites. *New Media & Society* **19**, 1271–1289 (2017). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444816634677>.
- [397] Kaakinen, M., Oksanen, A. & Räsänen, P. Did the risk of exposure to online hate increase after the November 2015 Paris attacks? A group relations approach. *Computers in Human Behavior* **78**, 90–97 (2018). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0747563217305484>.

- [398] Kurfi, M. Y., Msughter, M. E. & Mohamed, I. Digital Images on Social Media and Proliferation of Fake News on Covid-19 in Kano, Nigeria. *Galactica Media: Journal of Media Studies* **3**, 103–124 (2021). URL <https://galacticamedia.com/index.php/gmd/article/view/111>.
- [399] Zhang, X. & Lin, W.-Y. Stoking the Fires of Participation: Extending the Gamson Hypothesis on Social Media Use and Elite-challenging Political Engagement. *Computers in Human Behavior* **79**, 217–226 (2018). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S074756321730609X>.
- [400] Costello, M., Barrett-Fox, R., Bernatzky, C., Hawdon, J. & Mendes, K. Predictors of Viewing Online Extremism Among Americas Youth. *Youth & Society* **52**, 710–727 (2020). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0044118X18768115>.
- [401] Dvir-Gvirsman, S., Tsfati, Y. & Menchen-Trevino, E. The extent and nature of ideological selective exposure online: Combining survey responses with actual web log data from the 2013 Israeli Elections. *New Media & Society* **18**, 857–877 (2016). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444814549041>.
- [402] Chang, K. & Park, J. Social Media Use and Participation in Dueling Protests: The Case of the 2016-2017 Presidential Corruption Scandal in South Korea. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* **26**, 547–567 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1940161220940962>.
- [403] Lee, H. & Hahn, K. S. Partisan selective following on twitter over time: polarization or depolarization? *Asian Journal of Communication* **28**, 227–246 (2018). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01292986.2017.1384845>.
- [404] Boxell, L., Gentzkow, M. & Shapiro, J. M. Greater Internet use is not associated with faster growth in political polarization among US demographic groups. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **114**, 10612–10617 (2017). URL <https://pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.1706588114>.
- [405] Stier, S., Kirkizh, N., Froio, C. & Schroeder, R. Populist Attitudes and Selective Exposure to Online News: A Cross-Country Analysis Combining Web Tracking and Surveys. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* **25**, 426–446 (2020). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1940161220907018>.
- [406] Garrett, R. K. *et al.* Implications of Pro- and Counterattitudinal Information Exposure for Affective Polarization: Partisan Media Exposure and Affective Polarization. *Human Communication Research* **40**, 309–332 (2014). URL <https://academic.oup.com/hcr/article/40/3/309-332/4093810>.
- [407] Sharma, I., Jain, K. & Singh, G. Effect of online political incivility on partisan attitude: role of issue involvement, moral identity and incivility accountability. *Online Information Review* **44**, 1421–1441 (2020). URL <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/OIR-03-2020-0084/full/html>.
- [408] Stella, M., Ferrara, E. & De Domenico, M. Bots increase exposure to negative and inflammatory content in online social systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **115**, 12435–12440 (2018). URL <https://pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.1803470115>.

- [409] Ackland, R., O'Neil, M. & Park, S. Engagement with news on Twitter: insights from Australia and Korea. *Asian Journal of Communication* **29**, 235–251 (2019). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01292986.2018.1462393>.
- [410] Mothes, C. & Ohme, J. Partisan Selective Exposure in Times of Political and Technological Upheaval: A Social Media Field Experiment. *Media and Communication* **7**, 42–53 (2019). URL <https://www.cogitatiopress.com/mediaandcommunication/article/view/2183>.
- [411] Popa, S. A., Theocharis, Y. & Schnaudt, C. From seeing the writing on the wall, to getting together for a bowl: Direct and compensating effects of Facebook use on offline associational membership. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* **13**, 222–238 (2016). URL <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19331681.2016.1194241>.
- [412] Karlsen, R., Beyer, A. & Steen-Johnsen, K. Do High-Choice Media Environments Facilitate News Avoidance? A Longitudinal Study 1997-2016. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* **64**, 794–814 (2020). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/08838151.2020.1835428>.
- [413] Goyanes, M. Antecedents of Incidental News Exposure: The Role of Media Preference, Use and Trust. *Journalism Practice* **14**, 714–729 (2020). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17512786.2019.1631710>.
- [414] Siegel, A. A., Nagler, J., Bonneau, R. & Tucker, J. A. Tweeting Beyond Tahrir: Ideological Diversity and Political Intolerance in Egyptian Twitter Networks. *World Politics* **73**, 243–274 (2021). URL https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0043887120000295/type/journal_article.
- [415] Mashuri, A. *et al.* The socio-psychological predictors of support for post-truth collective action. *The Journal of Social Psychology* **162**, 504–522 (2022). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00224545.2021.1935678>.
- [416] Alshareef, M. & Alotiby, A. Prevalence and Perception Among Saudi Arabian Population About Resharing of Information on Social Media Regarding Natural Remedies as Protective Measures Against COVID-19. *International Journal of General Medicine* **Volume 14**, 5127–5137 (2021). URL <https://www.dovepress.com/prevalence-and-perception-among-saudi-arabian-population-about-reshari-peer-reviewed-fulltext-art>.
- [417] North, S., Piwek, L. & Joinson, A. Battle for Britain: Analyzing Events as Drivers of Political Tribalism in Twitter Discussions of Brexit. *Policy & Internet* **13**, 185–208 (2021). URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/poi3.247>.
- [418] Florio, K., Basile, V., Lai, M. & Patti, V. Leveraging Hate Speech Detection to Investigate Immigration-related Phenomena in Italy. In *2019 8th International Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction Workshops and Demos (ACIIW)*, 1–7 (IEEE, Cambridge, United Kingdom, 2019). URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8925079/>.

- [419] Dilliplane, S. All the News You Want to Hear: The Impact of Partisan News Exposure on Political Participation. *Public Opinion Quarterly* **75**, 287–316 (2011). URL <https://academic.oup.com/poq/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/poq/nfr006>.
- [420] Wasisto, A. Electoral volatility of the 2019 presidential election: A study in Jakarta and Depok, Indonesia. *Masyarakat, Kebudayaan dan Politik* **34**, 281 (2021). URL <https://e-journal.unair.ac.id/MKP/article/view/18842>.
- [421] Sturm Wilkerson, H., Riedl, M. J. & Whipple, K. N. Affective Affordances: Exploring Facebook Reactions as Emotional Responses to Hyperpartisan Political News. *Digital Journalism* **9**, 1040–1061 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2021.1899011>.
- [422] Zunino, E. Medios digitales y COVID-19: sobreinformación, polarización y desinformación. *Universitas* 133–154 (2021). URL <https://universitas.ups.edu.ec/index.php/universitas/article/view/34.2021.06>.
- [423] Strauß, N., Huber, B. & Gil de Zúñiga, H. Structural Influences on the News Finds Me Perception: Why People Believe They Dont Have to Actively Seek News Anymore. *Social Media + Society* **7**, 205630512110249 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/20563051211024966>.
- [424] Tai, K.-T., Porumbescu, G. & Shon, J. Can e-participation stimulate offline citizen participation: an empirical test with practical implications. *Public Management Review* **22**, 278–296 (2020). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14719037.2019.1584233>.
- [425] Kim, H. The mere exposure effect of tweets on vote choice. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* **18**, 455–465 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19331681.2021.1900979>.
- [426] Marozzo, F. & Bessi, A. Analyzing polarization of social media users and news sites during political campaigns. *Social Network Analysis and Mining* **8**, 1 (2018). URL <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s13278-017-0479-5>.
- [427] Granberg-Rademacker, J. S. & Parsneau, K. Lets Get Ready to Tweet! An Analysis of Twitter Use by 2018 Senate Candidates. *Congress & the Presidency* **48**, 78–100 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2020.1728425>.
- [428] Chan, M. Media Use and the Social Identity Model of Collective Action: Examining the Roles of Online Alternative News and Social Media News. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* **94**, 663–681 (2017). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1077699016638837>.
- [429] Kitchens, B., Johnson, S. L. & Gray, P. Understanding Echo Chambers and Filter Bubbles: The Impact of Social Media on Diversification and Partisan Shifts in News Consumption. *MIS Quarterly* **44**, 1619–1649 (2020). URL <https://misq.org/understanding-echo-chambers-and-filter-bubbles-the-impact-of-social-media-on-diversification-and> html.

- [430] Amit, S., Mannan, S. & Islam, A. BANGLADESH: TIME SPENT ONLINE, CONFLICT AND RADICALIZATION. *Conflict Studies Quarterly* 3–21 (2020). URL <http://www.csq.ro/wp-content/uploads/Sajid-AMIT-et-al.pdf>.
- [431] Casero-RipollÃ©s, A. Influencia de los medios de comunicaci3n en la conversaci3n polÃ©tica en Twitter. *Revista ICONO14 Revista cientÃ©fica de Comunicaci3n y TecnologÃ©as emergentes* **18**, 33–57 (2020). URL <https://icono14.net/ojs/index.php/icono14/article/view/1527>.
- [432] Saud, M., El Hariri, D. B. & Ashfaq, A. The role of social media in promoting political participation: The Lebanon experience. *Masyarakat, Kebudayaan dan Politik* **33**, 248 (2020). URL <https://e-journal.unair.ac.id/MKP/article/view/19054>.
- [433] Sismeiro, C. & Mahmood, A. Competitive vs. Complementary Effects in Online Social Networks and News Consumption: A Natural Experiment. *Management Science* **64**, 5014–5037 (2018). URL <http://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/10.1287/mnsc.2017.2896>.
- [434] Johannesson, M. P. & Knudsen, E. Disentangling the Influence of Recommender Attributes and News-Story Attributes: A Conjoint Experiment on Exposure and Sharing Decisions on Social Networking Sites. *Digital Journalism* **9**, 1141–1161 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2020.1805780>.
- [435] Yamamoto, M. & Nah, S. Mobile information seeking and political participation: A differential gains approach with offline and online discussion attributes. *New Media & Society* **20**, 2070–2090 (2018). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444817712722>.
- [436] Lee, J. M., Park, Y. & Kim, G. D. Social Media and Regionalism in South Korean Voting Behavior: The Case of the 19th South Korean Presidential Election. *Issues & Studies* **54**, 1840006 (2018). URL <https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/S1013251118400064>.
- [437] Allcott, H. & Gentzkow, M. Social Media and Fake News in the 2016 Election. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **31**, 211–236 (2017). URL <https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/10.1257/jep.31.2.211>.
- [438] Theocharis, Y., Barberá, P., Fazekas, Z. & Poppa, S. A. The Dynamics of Political Incivility on Twitter. *SAGE Open* **10**, 215824402091944 (2020). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2158244020919447>.
- [439] Nah, S. & Yamamoto, M. The Integrated Media Effect: Rethinking the Effect of Media Use on Civic Participation in the Networked Digital Media Environment. *American Behavioral Scientist* **62**, 1061–1078 (2018). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0002764218764240>.
- [440] Pang, H. Can microblogs motivate involvement in civic and political life? Examining uses, gratifications and social outcomes among Chinese youth. *Online Information Review* **42**, 663–680 (2018). URL <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/OIR-04-2017-0136/full/html>.

- [441] Moeller, J., Kühne, R. & De Vreese, C. Mobilizing Youth in the 21st Century: How Digital Media Use Fosters Civic Duty, Information Efficacy, and Political Participation. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* **62**, 445–460 (2018). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/08838151.2018.1451866>.
- [442] Cinelli, M. *et al.* Selective exposure shapes the Facebook news diet. *PLOS ONE* **15**, e0229129 (2020). URL <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0229129>.
- [443] Yamamoto, M. & Morey, A. C. Incidental News Exposure on Social Media: A Campaign Communication Mediation Approach. *Social Media + Society* **5**, 205630511984361 (2019). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2056305119843619>.
- [444] Levy, R. Social Media, News Consumption, and Polarization: Evidence from a Field Experiment. *American Economic Review* **111**, 831–870 (2021). URL <https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/10.1257/aer.20191777>.
- [445] Vozab, D. Generational Patterns of Digital News Consumption: From Traditionalists to Millennial Minimalists. *Medijske studije* **10**, 107–126 (2020). URL https://hrcak.srce.hr/index.php?show=clanak&id_clanak_jezik=343064.
- [446] Jamal, A., Kizgin, H., Rana, N. P., Laroche, M. & Dwivedi, Y. K. Impact of acculturation, online participation and involvement on voting intentions. *Government Information Quarterly* **36**, 510–519 (2019). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0740624X1830488X>.
- [447] Shen, F., Xia, C. & Skoric, M. Examining the roles of social media and alternative media in social movement participation: A study of Hong Kongs Umbrella Movement. *Telematics and Informatics* **47**, 101303 (2020). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0736585319307956>.
- [448] Dohle, M., Bernhard, U. & Kelm, O. Presumed Media Influences and Demands for Restrictions: Using Panel Data to Examine the Causal Direction. *Mass Communication and Society* **20**, 595–613 (2017). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15205436.2017.1303072>.
- [449] Marquart, F., Goldberg, A. C. & de Vreese, C. H. This time Im (not) voting: A comprehensive overview of campaign factors influencing turnout at European Parliament elections. *European Union Politics* **21**, 680–705 (2020). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1465116520943670>.
- [450] Hoffmann, C. P. & Lutz, C. Digital Divides in Political Participation: The Mediating Role of Social Media Self-Efficacy and Privacy Concerns. *Policy & Internet* **13**, 6–29 (2021). URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/poi3.225>.
- [451] Mitts, T. From Isolation to Radicalization: Anti-Muslim Hostility and Support for ISIS in the West. *American Political Science Review* **113**, 173–194 (2019). URL https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0003055418000618/type/journal_article.
- [452] Lukito, J. Coordinating a Multi-Platform Disinformation Campaign: Internet Research Agency Activity on Three U.S. Social Media Platforms, 2015 to 2017. *Political Communication* **37**, 238–255 (2020). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10584609.2019.1661889>.

- [453] Hong, S., Choi, H. & Kim, T. K. Why Do Politicians Tweet? Extremists, Underdogs, and Opposing Parties as Political Tweeters. *Policy & Internet* **11**, 305–323 (2019). URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/poi3.201>.
- [454] Chadwick, A. *et al.* Online Social Endorsement and Covid-19 Vaccine Hesitancy in the United Kingdom. *Social Media + Society* **7**, 205630512110088 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/20563051211008817>.
- [455] Zumárraga-Espinosa, M. Redes sociales y protesta política: Un análisis del rol moderador del estatus socioeconómico y la pertenencia a grupos políticos. *Doxa Comunicación. Revista interdisciplinaria de estudios de comunicación y ciencias sociales* 55–77 (2020). URL <https://revistascientificas.uspceu.com/doxacomunicacion/article/view/500>.
- [456] Fletcher, R. & Nielsen, R. K. Automated Serendipity: The effect of using search engines on news repertoire balance and diversity. *Digital Journalism* **6**, 976–989 (2018). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2018.1502045>.
- [457] Sell, T. K., Hosangadi, D. & Trotochaud, M. Misinformation and the US Ebola communication crisis: analyzing the veracity and content of social media messages related to a fear-inducing infectious disease outbreak. *BMC Public Health* **20**, 550 (2020). URL <https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-08697-3>.
- [458] Brugnoli, E., Cinelli, M., Quattrociocchi, W. & Scala, A. Recursive patterns in online echo chambers. *Scientific Reports* **9**, 20118 (2019). URL <http://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-019-56191-7>.
- [459] Barnidge, M., Kim, B., Sherrill, L. A., Luknar, A. & Zhang, J. Perceived exposure to and avoidance of hate speech in various communication settings. *Telematics and Informatics* **44**, 101263 (2019). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0736585319307555>.
- [460] Kim, B. & Hoewe, J. Developing contemporary factors of political participation. *The Social Science Journal* 1–15 (2020). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03623319.2020.1782641>.
- [461] Barnidge, M., Sayre, B. & Rojas, H. Perceptions of the Media and the Public and their Effects on Political Participation in Colombia. *Mass Communication and Society* **18**, 259–280 (2015). URL <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15205436.2014.923463>.
- [462] Petrova, M., Sen, A. & Yildirim, P. Social Media and Political Contributions: The Impact of New Technology on Political Competition. *Management Science* **67**, 2997–3021 (2021). URL <http://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/10.1287/mnsc.2020.3740>.
- [463] Bryson, B. P. Polarizing the middle: internet exposure and public opinion. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* **40**, 99–113 (2020). URL <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJSSP-09-2019-0181/full/html>.

- [464] Bovet, A. & Makse, H. A. Influence of fake news in Twitter during the 2016 US presidential election. *Nature Communications* **10**, 7 (2019). URL <http://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-018-07761-2>.
- [465] Germani, F. & Biller-Andorno, N. The anti-vaccination infodemic on social media: A behavioral analysis. *PLOS ONE* **16**, e0247642 (2021). URL <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0247642>.
- [466] Wei, R. & Lo, V.-h. News Media Use and Knowledge about the 2006 U.S. Midterm Elections: Why Exposure Matters in Voter Learning. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* **20**, 347–362 (2008). URL <https://academic.oup.com/ijpor/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/ijpor/edn032>.
- [467] Zhu, A. Y. F., Chan, A. L. S. & Chou, K. L. The Pathway Toward Radical Political Participation Among Young People in Hong Kong: A Communication Mediation Approach. *East Asia* **37**, 45–62 (2020). URL <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s12140-019-09326-6>.
- [468] Balcells, J. & Padró-Solanet, A. Crossing Lines in the Twitter Debate on Catalonias Independence. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* **25**, 28–52 (2020). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1940161219858687>.
- [469] Grover, P., Kar, A. K., Dwivedi, Y. K. & Janssen, M. Polarization and acculturation in US Election 2016 outcomes - Can twitter analytics predict changes in voting preferences. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* **145**, 438–460 (2019). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S004016251731421X>.
- [470] Choi, D.-H. & Shin, D.-H. A dialectic perspective on the interactive relationship between social media and civic participation: the moderating role of social capital. *Information, Communication & Society* **20**, 151–166 (2017). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369118X.2016.1154586>.
- [471] Thorson, K., Cotter, K., Medeiros, M. & Pak, C. Algorithmic inference, political interest, and exposure to news and politics on Facebook. *Information, Communication & Society* **24**, 183–200 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1642934>.
- [472] Kim, Y., Hsu, S.-H. & de Zúñiga, H. G. Influence of Social Media Use on Discussion Network Heterogeneity and Civic Engagement: The Moderating Role of Personality Traits: Social Media & Personality Traits. *Journal of Communication* **63**, 498–516 (2013). URL <https://academic.oup.com/joc/article/63/3/498-516/4085989>.
- [473] Guess, A. M., Nyhan, B. & Reifler, J. Exposure to untrustworthy websites in the 2016 US election. *Nature Human Behaviour* **4**, 472–480 (2020). URL <http://www.nature.com/articles/s41562-020-0833-x>.
- [474] Hokka, J. & Nelimarkka, M. Affective economy of national-populist images: Investigating national and transnational online networks through visual big data. *New Media & Society* **22**, 770–792 (2020). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444819868686>.
- [475] Schumann, S., Boer, D., Hanke, K. & Liu, J. Social media use and support for populist radical right parties: assessing exposure and selection effects in a two-wave panel study. *Information, Communication & Society* **24**, 921–940 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1668455>.

- [476] Kim, M. How does Facebook news use lead to actions in South Korea? The role of Facebook discussion network heterogeneity, political interest, and conflict avoidance in predicting political participation. *Telematics and Informatics* **35**, 1373–1381 (2018). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0736585317308407>.
- [477] Mosca, L. & Quaranta, M. Are digital platforms potential drivers of the populist vote? A comparative analysis of France, Germany and Italy. *Information, Communication & Society* **24**, 1441–1459 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369118X.2021.1894211>.
- [478] Justwan, F., Baumgaertner, B., Carlisle, J. E., Clark, A. K. & Clark, M. Social media echo chambers and satisfaction with democracy among Democrats and Republicans in the aftermath of the 2016 US elections. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* **28**, 424–442 (2018). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17457289.2018.1434784>.
- [479] Smith, S. T., Kao, E. K., Shah, D. C., Simek, O. & Rubin, D. B. Influence Estimation on Social Media Networks Using Causal Inference. In *2018 IEEE Statistical Signal Processing Workshop (SSP)*, 328–332 (IEEE, Freiburg, 2018). URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8450823/>.
- [480] Bode, L. *et al.* Participation in Contentious Politics: Rethinking the Roles of News, Social Media, and Conversation Amid Divisiveness. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* **15**, 215–229 (2018). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19331681.2018.1485607>.
- [481] Cinelli, M., Cresci, S., Galeazzi, A., Quattrociochi, W. & Tesconi, M. The limited reach of fake news on Twitter during 2019 European elections. *PLOS ONE* **15**, e0234689 (2020). URL <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234689>.
- [482] Guenther, L., Ruhrmann, G., Bischoff, J., Penzel, T. & Weber, A. Strategic Framing and Social Media Engagement: Analyzing Memes Posted by the German Identitarian Movement on Facebook. *Social Media + Society* **6**, 205630511989877 (2020). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2056305119898777>.
- [483] Song, H., Cho, J. & Benefield, G. A. The Dynamics of Message Selection in Online Political Discussion Forums: Self-Segregation or Diverse Exposure? *Communication Research* **47**, 125–152 (2020). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0093650218790144>.
- [484] Rice, L. L. & Moffett, K. W. Snapchat and civic engagement among college students. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* **16**, 87–104 (2019). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19331681.2019.1574249>.
- [485] Beam, M. A., Hmielowski, J. D. & Hutchens, M. J. Democratic Digital Inequalities: Threat and Opportunity in Online Citizenship From Motivation and Ability. *American Behavioral Scientist* **62**, 1079–1096 (2018). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0002764218764253>.

- [486] Hermann, E., Eisend, M. & Bayón, T. Facebook and the cultivation of ethnic diversity perceptions and attitudes. *Internet Research* **30**, 1123–1141 (2020). URL <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/INTR-10-2019-0423/full/html>.
- [487] Powell, A., Scott, A. J. & Henry, N. Digital harassment and abuse: Experiences of sexuality and gender minority adults. *European Journal of Criminology* **17**, 199–223 (2020). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1477370818788006>.
- [488] Li, L., Chen, J. & Raghunathan, S. Informative Role of Recommender Systems in Electronic Marketplaces: A Boon or a Bane for Competing Sellers. *MIS Quarterly* **44**, 1957–1985 (2020). URL <https://misq.org/informative-role-of-recommender-systems-in-electronic-marketplaces-a-boon-or-a-bane-for-competing.html>.
- [489] Choi, D.-H., Yoo, W., Noh, G.-Y. & Park, K. The impact of social media on risk perceptions during the MERS outbreak in South Korea. *Computers in Human Behavior* **72**, 422–431 (2017). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S074756321730153X>.
- [490] Samuel-Azran, T. & Hayat, T. Online news recommendations credibility: The tie is mightier than the source. *Comunicar* **27**, 71–80 (2019). URL <https://www.revistacomunicar.com/index.php?contenido=detalles&numero=60&articulo=60-2019-07>.
- [491] Kushin, M. J., Yamamoto, M. & Dalisay, F. Societal Majority, Facebook, and the Spiral of Silence in the 2016 US Presidential Election. *Social Media + Society* **5**, 205630511985513 (2019). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2056305119855139>.
- [492] Ardi, R. Partisan Selective Exposure to Fake News Content. *Makara Human Behavior Studies in Asia* **23**, 6 (2019). URL <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/hubsasia/vol23/iss1/3/>.
- [493] Feld, S. L. & McGail, A. Egonets as systematically biased windows on society. *Network Science* **8**, 399–417 (2020). URL https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S2050124220000053/type/journal_article.
- [494] Hedayatifar, L., Rigg, R. A., Bar-Yam, Y. & Morales, A. J. US social fragmentation at multiple scales. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* **16**, 20190509 (2019). URL <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rsif.2019.0509>.
- [495] Bale, T., Webb, P. & Poletti, M. Participating Locally and Nationally: Explaining the Offline and Online Activism of British Party Members. *Political Studies* **67**, 658–675 (2019). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0032321718794740>.
- [496] Celik, S. Experiences of internet users regarding cyberhate. *Information Technology & People* **32**, 1446–1471 (2019). URL <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/ITP-01-2018-0009/full/html>.

- [497] Sainudiin, R., Yogeeswaran, K., Nash, K. & Sahioun, R. Characterizing the Twitter network of prominent politicians and SPLC-defined hate groups in the 2016 US presidential election. *Social Network Analysis and Mining* **9**, 34 (2019). URL <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s13278-019-0567-9>.
- [498] Lee, S. & Xenos, M. Incidental news exposure via social media and political participation: Evidence of reciprocal effects. *New Media & Society* **24**, 178–201 (2022). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444820962121>.
- [499] Casero-RipollÃ©s, A., Micó-Sanz, J.-L. & DÃ©ez-Bosch, M. Digital Public Sphere and Geography: The Influence of Physical Location on Twitters Political Conversation. *Media and Communication* **8**, 96–106 (2020). URL <https://www.cogitatiopress.com/mediaandcommunication/article/view/3145>.
- [500] Kim, Y., Chen, H.-T. & Wang, Y. Living in the Smartphone Age: Examining the Conditional Indirect Effects of Mobile Phone Use on Political Participation. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* **60**, 694–713 (2016). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/08838151.2016.1203318>.
- [501] Elvestad, E., Phillips, A. & Feuerstein, M. Can Trust in Traditional News Media Explain Cross-National Differences in News Exposure of Young People Online?: A comparative study of Israel, Norway and the United Kingdom. *Digital Journalism* **6**, 216–235 (2018). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2017.1332484>.
- [502] Steffan, D. & Venema, N. New medium, old strategies? Comparing online and traditional campaign posters for German Bundestag elections, 2013-2017. *European Journal of Communication* **35**, 370–388 (2020). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0267323120903681>.
- [503] Vraga, E. K. & Tully, M. News literacy, social media behaviors, and skepticism toward information on social media. *Information, Communication & Society* **24**, 150–166 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1637445>.
- [504] Kofi Frimpong, A. N., Li, P., Nyame, G. & Hossin, M. A. The Impact of Social Media Political Activists on Voting Patterns. *Political Behavior* **44**, 599–652 (2022). URL <https://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11109-020-09632-3>.
- [505] Ribeiro, M. H., Ottoni, R., West, R., Almeida, V. A. F. & Meira, W. Auditing radicalization pathways on YouTube. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 131–141 (ACM, Barcelona Spain, 2020). URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3351095.3372879>.
- [506] L3pez-Rabad3n, P. & Dom3nech-Fabregat, H. Nuevas funciones de Instagram en el avance de la pol3tica espect3culo. Claves profesionales y estrategia visual de Vox en su despegue electoral. *El profesional de la informaci3n* e300220 (2021). URL <https://revista.profesionaldelainformacion.com/index.php/EPI/article/view/85530>.

- [507] Gainous, J., Abbott, J. P. & Wagner, K. M. Active vs. Passive Social Media Engagement with Critical Information: Protest Behavior in Two Asian Countries. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* **26**, 464–483 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1940161220963606>.
- [508] Skoric, M. M., Zhu, Q. & Lin, J.-H. T. What Predicts Selective Avoidance on Social Media? A Study of Political Unfriending in Hong Kong and Taiwan. *American Behavioral Scientist* **62**, 1097–1115 (2018). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0002764218764251>.
- [509] Zannettou, S. *et al.* Disinformation Warfare: Understanding State-Sponsored Trolls on Twitter and Their Influence on the Web. In *Companion Proceedings of The 2019 World Wide Web Conference*, 218–226 (ACM, San Francisco USA, 2019). URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3308560.3316495>.
- [510] Alsaad, A., Taamneh, A. & Al-Jedaiah, M. N. Does social media increase racist behavior? An examination of confirmation bias theory. *Technology in Society* **55**, 41–46 (2018). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0160791X18300630>.
- [511] Nanz, A., Heiss, R. & Matthes, J. Antecedents of intentional and incidental exposure modes on social media and consequences for political participation: a panel study. *Acta Politica* **57**, 235–253 (2022). URL <https://link.springer.com/10.1057/s41269-020-00182-4>.
- [512] Ardèvol-Abreu, A., Hooker, C. M. & Gil de Zúñiga, H. Online news creation, trust in the media, and political participation: Direct and moderating effects over time. *Journalism* **19**, 611–631 (2018). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1464884917700447>.
- [513] Lu, Y. & Pan, J. Capturing Clicks: How the Chinese Government Uses Clickbait to Compete for Visibility. *Political Communication* **38**, 23–54 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10584609.2020.1765914>.
- [514] Davidson, B. I., Jones, S. L., Joinson, A. N. & Hinds, J. The evolution of online ideological communities. *PLOS ONE* **14**, e0216932 (2019). URL <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0216932>.
- [515] Mahmood, Q. K., Bhutta, M. H. & Haq, M. A. u. Effects of sociodemographic variables and Facebook group membership on students political participation. *Education and Information Technologies* **23**, 2235–2247 (2018). URL <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10639-018-9715-5>.
- [516] Kyung Hee University, Min, H., Yun, S. & Kyung Hee University. Selective Exposure and Political Polarization of Public Opinion on the Presidential Impeachment in South Korea : Facebook vs. KakaoTalk. *Korea Observer - Institute of Korean Studies* **49**, 137–159 (2018). URL http://dcontent.dkyobobook.co.kr/genomad_gift/001/article/1/03/81/10381508.pdf.
- [517] Yamamoto, M., Kushin, M. J. & Dalisay, F. How informed are messaging app users about politics? A linkage of messaging app use and political knowledge and participation. *Telematics and Informatics* **35**, 2376–2386 (2018). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S073658531830412X>.

- [518] MartÃ¡nez-Torres, H. & GÃ¡mez, C. Is internet access bad news for media-capturing incumbents? *Journal of Applied Economics* **22**, 527–553 (2019). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15140326.2019.1673082>.
- [519] Imran, M. S., Fatima, M. & Kosar, G. Connectivism: E-learning of democratic values on social media public spheres. In *2017 International Conference on Information and Communication Technologies (ICICT)*, 82–89 (IEEE, Karachi, 2017). URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8320169/>.
- [520] Scharkow, M., Mangold, F., Stier, S. & Breuer, J. How social network sites and other online intermediaries increase exposure to news. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117**, 2761–2763 (2020). URL <https://pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.1918279117>.
- [521] Kwak, N. *et al.* Perceptions of Social Media for Politics: Testing the Slacktivism Hypothesis. *Human Communication Research* **44**, 197–221 (2018). URL <https://academic.oup.com/hcr/article/44/2/197/4957051>.
- [522] Schmidt, A. L., Zollo, F., Scala, A., Betsch, C. & Quattrociocchi, W. Polarization of the vaccination debate on Facebook. *Vaccine* **36**, 3606–3612 (2018). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0264410X18306601>.
- [523] Vaccari, C. & Valeriani, A. Dual Screening, Public Service Broadcasting, and Political Participation in Eight Western Democracies. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* **23**, 367–388 (2018). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1940161218779170>.
- [524] Sharar, B. & Abd-El-Barr, M. Citizens' Perspective on the Impact of Social Media on Politics in Kuwait. In *2018 International Conference on Computing Sciences and Engineering (ICCSE)*, 1–6 (IEEE, Kuwait City, 2018). URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8374207/>.
- [525] Lee, S. H. & Fu, K.-w. INTERNET USE AND PROTEST POLITICS IN SOUTH KOREA AND TAIWAN. *Journal of East Asian Studies* **19**, 89–109 (2019). URL https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S1598240818000255/type/journal_article.
- [526] Piatak, J. & Mikkelsen, I. Does Social Media Engagement Translate to Civic Engagement Offline? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* **50**, 1079–1101 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0899764021999444>.
- [527] Baek, Y. M. Political mobilization through social network sites: The mobilizing power of political messages received from SNS friends. *Computers in Human Behavior* **44**, 12–19 (2015). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0747563214006190>.
- [528] Ferrucci, P., Hopp, T. & Vargo, C. J. Civic engagement, social capital, and ideological extremity: Exploring online political engagement and political expression on Facebook. *New Media & Society* **22**, 1095–1115 (2020). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444819873110>.

- [529] Corrigan-Brown, C. & Wilkes, R. Media exposure and the engaged citizen: How the media shape political participation. *The Social Science Journal* **51**, 408–421 (2014). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1016/j.sosci.2014.03.009>.
- [530] Valenzuela, S., Correa, T. & Gil de Zúñiga, H. Ties, Likes, and Tweets: Using Strong and Weak Ties to Explain Differences in Protest Participation Across Facebook and Twitter Use. *Political Communication* **35**, 117–134 (2018). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10584609.2017.1334726>.
- [531] Popan, J. R., Coursey, L., Acosta, J. & Kenworthy, J. Testing the effects of incivility during internet political discussion on perceptions of rational argument and evaluations of a political outgroup. *Computers in Human Behavior* **96**, 123–132 (2019). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S074756321930069X>.
- [532] Ā tÄ>tkva, V., Mazák, J. & Vochocová, L. Nobody Tells us what to Write about: The Disinformation Media Ecosystem and its Consumers in the Czech Republic. *Javnost - The Public* **28**, 90–109 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13183222.2020.1841381>.
- [533] Kobayashi, T. Depolarization through social media use: Evidence from dual identifiers in Hong Kong. *New Media & Society* **22**, 1339–1358 (2020). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444820910124>.
- [534] Talwar, S., Dhir, A., Kaur, P., Zafar, N. & Alrasheedy, M. Why do people share fake news? Associations between the dark side of social media use and fake news sharing behavior. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* **51**, 72–82 (2019). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0969698919301407>.
- [535] Yarchi, M., Baden, C. & Kligler-Vilenchik, N. Political Polarization on the Digital Sphere: A Cross-platform, Over-time Analysis of Interactional, Positional, and Affective Polarization on Social Media. *Political Communication* **38**, 98–139 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10584609.2020.1785067>.
- [536] Bobba, G. Social media populism: features and likeability of Lega Nord communication on Facebook. *European Political Science* **18**, 11–23 (2019). URL <http://link.springer.com/10.1057/s41304-017-0141-8>.
- [537] Tewksbury, D. & Riles, J. M. Polarization as a Function of Citizen Predispositions and Exposure to News on the Internet. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* **59**, 381–398 (2015). URL <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/08838151.2015.1054996>.
- [538] Giglietto, F., Righetti, N., Rossi, L. & Marino, G. It takes a village to manipulate the media: coordinated link sharing behavior during 2018 and 2019 Italian elections. *Information, Communication & Society* **23**, 867–891 (2020). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369118X.2020.1739732>.
- [539] Marcinkowski, F. & DoÄ;enoviÄ; P. From incidental exposure to intentional avoidance: Psychological reactance to political communication during the 2017 German national election campaign. *New Media & Society* **23**, 457–478 (2021). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444820902104>.

- [540] Bastien, F., Koop, R., Small, T. A., Giasson, T. & Jansen, H. The role of online technologies and digital skills in the political participation of citizens with disabilities. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* **17**, 218–231 (2020). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/19331681.2020.1742264>.
- [541] Nelson, J. L. & Taneja, H. The small, disloyal fake news audience: The role of audience availability in fake news consumption. *New Media & Society* **20**, 3720–3737 (2018). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444818758715>.
- [542] Lelkes, Y., Sood, G. & Iyengar, S. The Hostile Audience: The Effect of Access to Broadband Internet on Partisan Affect: EFFECT OF BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS ON PARTISAN AFFECT. *American Journal of Political Science* **61**, 5–20 (2017). URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ajps.12237>.
- [543] Hunter, L. Y., Griffith, C. E. & Warren, T. Internet connectivity and domestic terrorism in democracies. *International Journal of Sociology* **50**, 201–219 (2020). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00207659.2020.1757297>.
- [544] Heiss, R. & Matthes, J. Does incidental exposure on social media equalize or reinforce participatory gaps? Evidence from a panel study. *New Media & Society* **21**, 2463–2482 (2019). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444819850755>.
- [545] Bobba, G., Cremonesi, C., Mancosu, M. & Seddone, A. Populism and the Gender Gap: Comparing Digital Engagement with Populist and Non-populist Facebook Pages in France, Italy, and Spain. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* **23**, 458–475 (2018). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1940161218787046>.
- [546] Troian, J., Arciszewski, T. & Apostolidis, T. The dynamics of public opinion following terror attacks: Evidence for a decrease in equalitarian values from Internet Search Volume Indices. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace* **13** (2019). URL <https://cyberpsychology.eu/article/view/12015>.
- [547] Frissen, T. Internet, the great radicalizer? Exploring relationships between seeking for online extremist materials and cognitive radicalization in young adults. *Computers in Human Behavior* **114**, 106549 (2021). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0747563220302995>.
- [548] Park, B., Kang, M. Y. & Lee, J. Sustainable Political Social Media Marketing: Effects of Structural Features in Plain Text Messages. *Sustainability* **12**, 5997 (2020). URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/12/15/5997>.
- [549] Yun, G. W., Park, S.-Y., Holody, K., Yoon, K. S. & Xie, S. Selective Moderation, Selective Responding, and Balkanization of the Blogosphere: A Field Experiment. *Media Psychology* **16**, 295–317 (2013). URL <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15213269.2012.759462>.

- [550] Allen, J., Howland, B., Mobius, M., Rothschild, D. & Watts, D. J. Evaluating the fake news problem at the scale of the information ecosystem. *Science Advances* **6**, eaay3539 (2020). URL <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.aay3539>.
- [551] Gainous, J., Abbott, J. P. & Wagner, K. M. Traditional Versus Internet Media in a Restricted Information Environment: How Trust in the Medium Matters. *Political Behavior* **41**, 401–422 (2019). URL <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11109-018-9456-6>.
- [552] Boulianne, S., Koc-Michalska, K. & Bimber, B. Mobilizing media: comparing TV and social media effects on protest mobilization. *Information, Communication & Society* **23**, 642–664 (2020). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369118X.2020.1713847>.
- [553] Waechter, N. The participative role of social media for the disadvantaged young generation in the Arab Spring. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Soziologie* **44**, 217–236 (2019). URL <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11614-019-00356-1>.
- [554] Wang, T. & Shen, F. Perceived party polarization, news attentiveness, and political participation: a mediated moderation model. *Asian Journal of Communication* **28**, 620–637 (2018). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01292986.2018.1494204>.
- [555] Guess, A., Nagler, J. & Tucker, J. Less than you think: Prevalence and predictors of fake news dissemination on Facebook. *Science Advances* **5**, eaau4586 (2019). URL <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.aau4586>.
- [556] Kaur, M. & Verma, R. Demographics, Social Media Usage, and Political Engagement in Punjab. *Indian Journal of Marketing* **48**, 43 (2018). URL <http://www.indianjournalofmarketing.com/index.php/ijom/article/view/137984>.
- [557] Castillo-DÃaz, A. & Castillo-Esparcia, A. Relación entre la participación en foros y blogs de debate político en internet y el seguimiento de información política en medios profesionales: análisis evolutivo 2011-2016. *El Profesional de la Información* **27**, 1248 (2018). URL <https://revista.profesionaldelainformacion.com/index.php/EPI/article/view/epi.2018.nov.08>.
- [558] Heiss, R., Knoll, J. & Matthes, J. Pathways to political (dis-)engagement: motivations behind social media use and the role of incidental and intentional exposure modes in adolescents political engagement. *Communications* **45**, 671–693 (2020). URL <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/commun-2019-2054/html>.
- [559] Enjolras, B., Steen-Johnsen, K. & Wollebæk, D. Social media and mobilization to offline demonstrations: Transcending participatory divides? *New Media & Society* **15**, 890–908 (2013). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444812462844>.

- [560] Bhat, S. I., Arif, T., Malik, M. B. & Sheikh, A. A. Browser simulation-based crawler for online social network profile extraction. *International Journal of Web Based Communities* **16**, 321 (2020). URL <http://www.inderscience.com/link.php?id=111377>.
- [561] Aruguete, N., Calvo, E. & Ventura, T. News Sharing, Gatekeeping, and Polarization: A Study of the #Bolsonaro Election. *Digital Journalism* **9**, 1–23 (2021). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2020.1852094>.
- [562] Bae, S. Y. The social mediation of political rumors: Examining the dynamics in social media and belief in political rumors. *Journalism* **21**, 1522–1538 (2020). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1464884917722657>.
- [563] Nikolov, D., Lalmas, M., Flammini, A. & Menczer, F. Quantifying Biases in Online Information Exposure. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology* **70**, 218–229 (2019). URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/asi.24121>.
- [564] Akpan, I. J. *et al.* Association Between What People Learned About COVID-19 Using Web Searches and Their Behavior Toward Public Health Guidelines: Empirical Infodemiology Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research* **23**, e28975 (2021). URL <https://www.jmir.org/2021/9/e28975>.
- [565] Yamamoto, M., Nah, S. & Bae, S. Y. Social media prosumption and online political participation: An examination of online communication processes. *New Media & Society* **22**, 1885–1902 (2020). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444819886295>.
- [566] Song, T., Tang, Q. & Huang, J. Triadic Closure, Homophily, and Reciprocation: An Empirical Investigation of Social Ties Between Content Providers. *Information Systems Research* **30**, 912–926 (2019). URL <http://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/10.1287/isre.2019.0838>.
- [567] Strauß, N., Huber, B. & Gil de Zúñiga, H. Yes, I Saw It - But Didnt Read It... A Cross-Country Study, Exploring Relationships between Incidental News Exposure and News Use across Platforms. *Digital Journalism* **8**, 1181–1205 (2020). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21670811.2020.1832130>.
- [568] Ahmad, S. Political behavior in virtual environment: Role of social media intensity, internet connectivity, and political affiliation in online political persuasion among university students. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment* **30**, 457–473 (2020). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10911359.2019.1698485>.
- [569] Lee, H. Voters involvement, attitude, and confidence in the era of new media. *Palgrave Communications* **6**, 1 (2020). URL <http://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0368-9>.
- [570] Čábelková, I., Smutka, L. & Strielkowski, W. Public support for sustainable development and environmental policy: A case of the Czech Republic. *Sustainable Development* **30**, 110–126 (2022). URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/sd.2232>.

- [571] Lu, J. & Yu, X. Does The internet make us more intolerant? A contextual analysis in 33 countries. *Information, Communication & Society* **23**, 252–266 (2020). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1369118X.2018.1499794>.
- [572] David, Y. Public opinion, media and activism: the differentiating role of media use and perceptions of public opinion on political behaviour. *Social Movement Studies* **21**, 334–354 (2022). URL <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14742837.2021.1875321>.
- [573] Back, E. A., Back, H., FredÃ©n, A. & Gustafsson, N. A social safety net? Rejection sensitivity and political opinion sharing among young people in social media. *New Media & Society* **21**, 298–316 (2019). URL <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444818795487>.
- [574] Ye, Y., Xu, P. & Zhang, M. Social media, public discourse and civic engagement in modern China. *Telematics and Informatics* **34**, 705–714 (2017). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0736585316302908>.
- [575] Salman, A., Yusoff, M. A., Mohamad Salleh, M. A. & Hj Abdullah, M. Y. PENGUNAAN MEDIA SOSIAL UNTUK SOKONGAN POLITIK DI MALAYSIA [THE USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA FOR POLITICAL SUPPORT IN MALAYSIA]. *Journal of Nusantara Studies (JONUS)* **3**, 51 (2018). URL <https://journal.unisza.edu.my/jonus/index.php/jonus/article/view/222>.
- [576] Mueller, K. & Schwarz, C. Fanning the Flames of Hate: Social Media and Hate Crime. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **19**, 2131–2167 (2021). URL <https://academic.oup.com/jeea/article/19/4/2131/5917396>.
- [577] Bursztyn, L., Egorov, G., Enikolopov, R. & Petrova, M. Social Media and Xenophobia: Evidence from Russia. Tech. Rep. w26567, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA (2019). URL <http://www.nber.org/papers/w26567.pdf>.
- [578] Lee, C., Shin, J. & Hong, A. Does social media use really make people politically polarized? Direct and indirect effects of social media use on political polarization in South Korea. *Telematics and Informatics* **35**, 245–254 (2018). URL <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0736585317305208>.

Figure 1: Summary of the reviewed articles. **a** Combinations of variables in the sample: digital media (A), political variables (B) and content features such as selective exposure or misinformation (C). Numbers in brackets count articles in our sample that measure an association between variables. **b** Geographic distribution of articles that reported site of data collection. **c** Distribution of measurements (counted separately whenever one article reported several variables) over combinations of outcome variables and methods and **d** over combinations of outcome variables and digital media variables.

Figure 2: Distribution of directions of associations from the full sample, reported for various political variables (see Fig. 1d for a breakdown). Insets show exemplary the distribution of associations with trust, news exposure, polarization, and network homophily over the different digital media variables with which they were associated.

Figure 3: Summary of causal evidence for digital media effects on political variables. Each box represents one article. Treatments are in white boxes on the left, political outcome variables in coloured boxes on the right; M denotes mediators; H represents sources of effect heterogeneity or moderators. Positive (+) and negative (−) signs at paths indicate reported direction of effects. Location of sample indicated in top right corner of boxes, primary causal inference strategy in bottom left. Strategies include statistical estimation strategies such as instrumental variables (IV), matching, and panel designs (PD) that use, for example, fixed effects (FE) or difference in difference (DiD) for causal estimation, as well as lab or field experiments (e.g., field experiments rolled out on various platforms that are often supplemented with IV estimation to account for imperfect compliance). Detrimental effects on liberal democracy are shown in orange, beneficial effects in turquoise, effects open to interpretation in purple, and null effects in grey. Solid arrows represent pathways for which authors provide causal identification strategies, dashed arrows represent descriptive (mediation) pathways.

Figure 4: Geographical distribution of associations, columns showing beneficial and detrimental outcomes. **a** Geographical distribution of reported associations for the variables trust, knowledge, participation, exposure, and expression. Pie charts show the composition of directions for each country studied. **b** Geographic representation of reported associations for the variables hate, polarization, populism, homophily, and misinformation. **c** Data and variables in **a**, in absolute numbers of reported associations and sorted along the Liberal Democracy Index [18]. **d** Data and variables in **b**, in absolute numbers of reported associations and sorted along the Liberal Democracy Index.

Figure 5: Sample size and sampling strategy for reported associations, columns are split between beneficial and detrimental outcomes. **a** and **b** show sample size vs. sampling methods, each dot represents one measurement, as well as color coded the direction of the reported association. **c** and **d** break down sampling methods in more detail and count the number of reported associations including their direction.

Figure 6: Strategy for curating the sample of relevant articles. **a** Keywords included in our search query, run on Web of Science and Scopus, with logical connectors. Focus on causal inference methods (method column), but also inclusion of descriptive quantitative evidence. Relationships between digital media (cause column) and political outcomes (direct effect box) or content features (indirect effect box). **b** Flow-chart representing the step wise exclusion process, starting with title based exclusion, followed by abstract based exclusion. **c** Exemplary illustration of the outcome variable extraction from the abstracts. **d** Breakdown of the most frequently reported political variables into top 10 categories. Numbers in brackets are counts of measurements in the set.

Figure 7: Summary of causal inference techniques used in our sample of causal evidence (excluding field experiments).