



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Two sides to every story

Brenes Peralta, C.M.

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Brenes Peralta, C. M. (2017). Two sides to every story: Causes and consequences of selective exposure to balanced political information.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <http://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

References

A

- Albarracín, D., & Mitchell, A. L. (2004). The role of defensive confidence in preference for proattitudinal information: How believing that one is strong can sometimes be a defensive weakness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(12), 1565-1584.
- Abramowitz, A. (2010). *The disappearing center*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Allen, M., & Preiss, R. W. (1997). Comparing the persuasiveness of narrative and statistical evidence using meta-analysis. *Communication Research Reports*, 14, 125-131.
- Arceneaux, K., & Johnson, M. (2013). *Changing Minds Or Changing Channels?: Partisan News in an Age of Choice*. University of Chicago Press.
- Arceneaux, K., & Johnson, M. (2015, April 16-19). *How Mainstream News Can Polarize America, Too*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Ill, USA.
- Arceneaux, K., Johnson, M., & Cryderman, J. (2013). Communication, persuasion, and the conditioning value of selective exposure: Like minds may unite and divide but they mostly tune out. *Political communication*, 30(2), 213-231.

B

- Babbie, E. R. (2012). *The practice of social research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. Calhoun.
- Bakshy, E., Messing, S., & Adamic, L. (2015). Exposure to Ideologically Diverse News and Opinion on Facebook. *Science*, 348(6239), 1130-1132.
- Bartlett, D. L., Drew, P. B., Fahle, E. G., & Watts, W. A. (1974). Selective exposure to a presidential campaign appeal. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 38(2), 264-270.
- Baum, M. A. (2011). *Red, blue, and the flu: Media self-selection and partisan gaps in swine flu vaccinations* (HKS Faculty Research Working Paper Series RWP11-010). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Kennedy School.
- Beam, M. A., & Kosicki, G. M. (2014). Personalized news portals: Filtering systems and increased news exposure. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 91(1), 59-77.
- Behrend, T. S., Sharek, D. J., Meade, A. W., & Wiebe, E. N. (2011). The viability of crowdsourcing for survey research. *Behavior Research Methods*, 43(3), 800-813.
- Bennett, W. L., & Iyengar, S. (2008). A new era of minimal effects? The changing foundations of political communication. *Journal of Communication*, 58(4), 707-731.
- Bennett, W. L., & Manheim, J. B. (2006). The one-step flow of communication. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 608(1), 213-232.
- Berinsky, A. J., Huber, G. A., & Lenz, G. S. (2012). Evaluating online labor markets for experimental research: Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk. *Political Analysis*, 20(3), 351-368.

- Bolsen, T., Druckman, J. N., & Cook, F. L. (2014). The influence of partisan motivated reasoning on public opinion. *Political Behavior*, 36(2), 235-262.
- Brannon, L. A., Tagler, M. J., & Eagly, A. E. (2007). The moderating role of attitude strength on selective exposure to information. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43(4), 611-617.
- Brenes Peralta, C., Wojcieszak, M., Lelkes, Y., & de Vreese, C. (2016). Selective Exposure to Balanced Content and Evidence Type The Case of Issue and Non-Issue Publics About Climate Change and Health Care. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*. doi: 1077699016654681.
- Brosius, H. B., & Bathelt, A. (1994). The utility of exemplars in persuasive communications. *Communication Research*, 21(1), 48-78.

C

- Carmines, E. G., & Stimson, J. A. (1980). The two faces of issue voting. *American Political Science Review*, 74(1), 78-91.
- Carmines, E. G., & Stimson, J. A. (1986). On the structure and sequence of issue evolution. *American Political Science Review*, 80(3), 901-920.
- Casler, K., Bickel, L., & Hackett, E. (2013). Separate but equal? A comparison of participants and data gathered via Amazon's MTurk, social media, and face-to-face behavioral testing. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(6), 2156-2160.
- Chaiken, S., Giner-Sorolla, R., & Chen, S. (1996). Beyond accuracy: Defense and impression motives in heuristic and systematic information processing. In P. M.
- Gollwitzer & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *The psychology of action: Linking cognition and motivation to behavior* (pp. 553-578). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Chaiken, S., Liberman, A., & Eagly, A. H. (1989). Heuristic and systematic information processing within and beyond the persuasion context. In J. S. Uleman & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *Unintended thought* (pp. 212-252). New York: Guilford Press.
- Clay, R., Barber, J. M., & Shook, N. J. (2013). Techniques for measuring selective exposure: A critical review. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 7(3-4), 147-171.
- Converse, P. E. (1964). The nature of belief systems in mass publics. In D. A. Apter (Ed.), *Ideology and discontent* (pp. 206-261). New York: Free Press.

D

- D'Alessio, D., & Allen, M. (2000) Media bias in presidential elections: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Communication, 50*(4), 133-156.
- de Wit, J. B. F., Das, E., & Vet, R. (2008). What works best: Objective statistics or a personal testimonial? An assessment of the persuasive effects of different types of message evidence on risk perception. *Health Psychology, 27*(1), 110-115.
- Dilliplane, S. (2011). All the news you want to hear: The impact of partisan news exposure on political participation. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 75*(2), 287-316.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Sato, K. (2003, August). *Does the Internet balkanize political attention? A test of the Sunstein thesis*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Atlanta, GA, USA.
- Ditto, P. H., & Lopez, D. F. (1992). Motivated skepticism: Use of differential decision criteria for preferred and nonpreferred conclusions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*(4), 568-584.
- Druckman, J. N. (2012). The politics of motivation. *Critical Review, 24*(2), 199-216.
- Druckman, J. N., & Bolsen, T. (2011). Framing, motivated reasoning, and opinions about emergent technologies. *Journal of Communication, 61*(4), 659-688.
- Durrheim, K. (2007). Research design. In M. T. Blanche, K. Durrheim & D. Painter (Eds.), *Research in practice: Applied methods for the social sciences* (pp. 33-59). Cape Town, South Africa: University of Cape Town Press.
- Dvir-Gvirzman, S. (2016). Media audience homophily: Partisan websites, audience identity and polarization processes. *New media & society*. doi: 1461444815625945.
- Dvir-Gvirzman, S., Tsfati, Y., & Menchen-Trevino, E. (2014). 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*(5), 857-877.

F

- Feather, N. T. (1962). Cigarette smoking and lung cancer: A study of cognitive dissonance. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 14*(1), 55-64.
- Feather, N. T. (1963). Cognitive dissonance, sensitivity, and evaluation. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66*(2), 157-163.
- Feldman, L. (2011). The opinion factor: The effects of opinionated news on information processing and attitude change. *Political Communication, 28*(2), 163-181.
- Feldman, L., Stroud, N. J., Bimber, B., & Wojcieszak, M. (2013). Assessing selective exposure in experiments: The implications of different methodological choices. *Communication Methods and Measures, 7*(3), 198-220.

- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Fiorina, M. P., Abrams, S. J., & Pope, J. C. (2005). *Culture war? The myth of a polarized America*. New York: Pearson Longman.
- Fischer, P., & Greitemeyer, T. (2010). A New Look at Selective-Exposure Effects An Integrative Model. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 19(6), 384-389.
- Fischer, P., Greitemeyer, T., & Frey, D. (2008). Self-regulation and selective exposure: The impact of depleted self-regulation resources on confirmatory information processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(3), 382-395.
- Fischer, P., Jonas, E., Frey, D., & Kastenmüller, A. (2008). Selective exposure and decision framing: The impact of gain and loss framing on confirmatory information search after decisions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44(2), 312-320.
- Fischer, P., Kastenmüller, A., Greitemeyer, T., Fischer, J., Frey, D., & Crelley, D. (2011). Threat and selective exposure: The moderating role of threat and decision context on confirmatory information search after decisions. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 140(1), 51-62.
- Fischer, P., Schulz-Hardt, S., & Frey, D. (2008). Selective exposure and information quantity: How different information quantities moderate decision makers' preference for consistent and inconsistent information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(2), 231-244.
- Flaxman, S., Goel, S., & Rao, J. (2016). Filter bubbles, echo chambers, and online news consumption. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 80(1), 298-320.
- Freedman, J. L. (1965). Confidence, utility, and selective exposure: A partial replication. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2(5), 778-780.

G

- Gallup. (2014). "Jobs, Government, and Economy Remain Top U.S. Problems." May 8-11, 2014, [Survey report]. Retrieved November 5th, 2014, from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/169289/jobs-government-economy-remain-top-problems.aspx>
- Garrett, R. K. (2009). Echo chambers online?: Politically motivated selective exposure among Internet news users. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14(2), 265-285.
- Garrett, R. K. (2009). Politically motivated reinforcement seeking: Reframing the selective exposure debate. *Journal of Communication*, 59(4), 676-699.
- Garrett, R. K. (2013). Selective exposure: New methods and new directions. *Communication Methods and Measures*, 7(3-4), 247-256.
- Garrett, R. K., Carnahan, D., & Lynch, E. K. (2013). A turn toward avoidance? Selective exposure to online political information, 2004–2008. *Political Behavior*, 35(1), 113-134.

References

- Garrett, R. K., Gvirsman, S. D., Johnson, B. K., Tsfati, Y., Neo, R., & Dal, A. (2014). Implications of Pro-and Counterattitudinal Information Exposure for Affective Polarization. *Human Communication Research, 40*(3), 309-332.
- Garrett, R.K., Johnson, B.K., Neo, R., et al. (2013, June 17-21) *Implications of Pro- and Counter-Attitudinal Information Exposure for Affective Polarization*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association: Challenging Communication Research, London..
- Garrett, R. K., & Stroud, N. J. (2014). Partisan Paths to Exposure Diversity: Differences in Pro and Counter attitudinal News Consumption. *Journal of Communication, 64*(4), 680-701.
- Gentzkow, M., & Shapiro, J. M. (2011). Ideological segregation online and offline. *Quarterly Journal of Economics, 126*(4), 1799-1839.
- George, A. (2016, November 7). The Hyper-Polarization of America. *Scientific American*. Retrieved from <https://blogs.scientificamerican.com>.
- Glaeser, E. L., & Sunstein, C. R. (2013). *Why does balanced news produce unbalanced views?* National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series. Retrieved from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w18975.pdf>
- Goldman, S., & Mutz, D. (2011). The Friendly Media Phenomenon: A Cross- National Analysis of Cross-Cutting Exposure. *Political Communication, 28*(1), 42-66.
- Goodman, J. K., Cryder, C. E., & Cheema, A. (2013). Data collection in a flat world: The strengths and weaknesses of Mechanical Turk samples. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 26*(3), 213-224.
- Guess, A. *Media Choice and Moderation: Evidence from an Experiment With Digital Trace Data*. Paper presented at American Political Science Association 2016: Political Communication Preconference, Philadelphia, U.S.A.
- Gunther, A. C., & Schmitt, K. (2004). Mapping boundaries of the hostile media effect. *Journal of Communication, 54*(1), 55-70.

H

- Hallin, D. C., & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing media systems: Three models of media and politics*. Cambridge university press.
- Hameleers, M., Bos, L., & de Vreese, C. H. (2017). Selective Exposure to Populist Communication: How Attitudinal Congruence Drives the Effects of Populist Attributions of Blame. Manuscript in preparation.
- Hansen, G. J., & Kim, H. (2011). Is the media biased against me? A meta-analysis of the hostile media effect research. *Communication Research Reports, 28*(2), 169-179.
- Hart, W., Albarracín, D., Eagly, A. H., Brechan, I., Lindberg, M. J., & Merrill, L. (2009). Feeling validated versus being correct: A meta-analysis of selective exposure to information. *Psychological Bulletin, 135*(4), 555-588.

- Hastall, M. R., & Knobloch-Westerwick, S. (2013). Severity, efficacy, and evidence type as determinants of health message exposure. *Health communication, 28*(4), 378-388.
- Hauser, D. J., & Schwarz, N. (2015). Attentive Turkers: MTurk participants perform better on online attention checks than do subject pool participants. *Behavior research methods, 48*(1), 400-407.
- Hoeken, H. (2001). Anecdotal, statistical, and causal evidence: Their perceived and actual persuasiveness. *Argumentation, 15*(4), 425-437.
- Holbrook, A. L., Berent, M. K., Krosnick, J. A., Visser, P. S., & Boninger, D. S. (2005). "Attitude Importance and the Accumulation of Attitude-Relevant Information in Memory." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 88*(5), 749-769.
- Hopmann, D. N., Van Aelst, P., & Legnante, G. (2012). Political balance in the news: A review of concepts, operationalizations and key findings. *Journalism, 13*(2), 240-257.
- Hutchings, V. L. (2003). *Public opinion and democratic accountability: How citizens learn about politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Iyengar, S. (1990). "Shortcuts to Political Knowledge: The Role of Selective Attention and Accessibility." In J.A. Ferejon & J.H. Kuklinski (Eds.), *Information and Democratic Processes* (pp. 160-85). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

I

- Iyengar, S., & Hahn, K.S. (2008). Red media, blue media: Evidence of ideological selectivity in media use. *Journal of Communication, 59*(1), 19-39.
- Iyengar, S., Hahn, K. S., Krosnick, J. A., & Walker, J. (2008). Selective exposure to campaign communication: The role of anticipated agreement and issue public membership. *Journal of Politics, 70*(1), 186-200.

J

- Jacobson, G. C. (2006). *A divider, not a uniter: George W. Bush and the American people*. New York: Pearson.
- Jang, S. M. (2014). Seeking congruency or incongruency online? Examining selective exposure to four controversial science issues. *Science Communication, 36*(2), 143- 167.
- Johnson, T. J., Bichard, S. L., & Zhang, W. (2009). Communication communities or "cyberghettos?": A path analysis model examining factors that explain selective exposure to blogs. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 15*(1), 60-82.
- Johnson, B. T., & Eagly, A. H. (1989). Effects of involvement on persuasion: A meta- analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 106*(2), 290-314.

- Johnson, T. J., Zhang, W., & Bichard, S. L. (2011). Voices of convergence or conflict? A path analysis investigation of selective exposure to political websites. *Social Science Computer Review*, 29(4), 449-469.

K

- Kahan, D. M., Braman, D., Slovic, P., Gastil, J., Cohen, G. L., & Kysar, D. (2008). *Cultural cognition and nanotechnology risk perceptions*. Unpublished paper, Yale University.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1984). Choices, values, and frames. *American Psychologist*, 39(4), 341-350.
- Kastenmüller, A., Greitemeyer, T., Jonas, E., Fischer, P., & Frey, D. (2010). Selective exposure: The impact of collectivism and individualism. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 49(4), 745-763.
- Kim, Y. M. (2007). How intrinsic and extrinsic motivations interact in selectivity: Investigating the moderating effects of situational information processing goals in issue publics' Web behavior. *Communication Research*, 34(2), 185-211.
- Kim, Y. M. (2009). Issue Publics in the New Information Environment: Selectivity, Domain Specificity, and Extremity. *Communication Research*, 36(2), 254-84.
- Kleinberg, M., & Lau, R. (2016). Candidate Extremity, Information Environments, and Political Polarization: Three Experiments. In A. Blais, J.F. Laslier & K. Van der Straeten (Eds.), *Voting Experiments* (pp. 67-87). Springer International Publishing.
- Knobloch-Westerwick, S., Johnson, B. K., Silver, N. A., & Westerwick, A. (2015). Science Exemplars in the Eye of the Beholder How Exposure to Online Science Information Affects Attitudes. *Science Communication*, 37(5), 575-601.
- Knobloch-Westerwick, S. & Kleinman, S. (2012). Pre-election selective exposure: Confirmation bias versus informational utility. *Communication Research*, 39(2), 170-193.
- Knobloch-Westerwick, S., & Meng, J. (2009). Looking the Other Way Selective Exposure to Attitude-Consistent and Counterattitudinal Political Information. *Communication Research*, 36(3), 426-448.
- Knobloch-Westerwick, S., & Sarge, M. A. (2015). Impacts of exemplification and efficacy as characteristics of an online weight-loss message on selective exposure and subsequent weight-loss behavior. *Communication Research*, 42(4), 547-568.
- Kohut, A., Doherty, C., Dimock, M., & Keeter, S. (2010). *Americans spending more time following the news—Ideological news sources: Who watches and why*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center for the People & the Press. Retrieved from <http://people-press.org/files/legacy-pdf/652.pdf>
- Kohut, A., Doherty, C., Dimock, M., & Keeter, S. (2012). *Cable leads the pack as campaign news source*. Retrieved from <http://www.people-press.org/files/legacy-pdf/201220Communicating20Release.pdf>

- Kopfman, J. E., Smith, S. W., Ah Yun, J. K., & Hodges, A. (1998). Affective and cognitive reactions to narrative versus statistical evidence organ donation messages. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 26(3), 279-300.
- Kreuter, M. W., Green, M. C., Cappella, J. N., Slater, M. D., Wise, M. E., Storey, D., Clark, E. M., et al. (2007). Narrative communication in cancer prevention and control: A framework to guide research and application. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, 33(3), 221-235.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1988). The role of attitude importance in social evaluation: a study of policy preferences, presidential candidate evaluations, and voting behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(2), 196-210.
- Krosnick, J. A. (1990). Government policy and citizen passion: A study of issue publics in contemporary America. *Political Behavior*, 12(1), 59-92.
- Krosnick, J., & Berent, M. (1993). Comparisons of Party Identification and Policy Preferences: The Impact of Survey Question Format. *American Journal of Political Science*, 37(3), 941-64.
- Krosnick, J. A., Boninger, D. S., Chuang, Y. C., Berent, M. K., & Carnot, C. G. (1993). Attitude strength: One construct or many related constructs?. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 65(6), 1132-1151.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Schuman, H. (1988). Attitude intensity, importance, and certainty and susceptibility to response effects. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 54(6), 940-952.
- Krosnick, J. A., & Telhami, S. (1995). Public attitudes toward Israel: A study of the attentive and issue publics. *International Studies Quarterly*, 39(4), 535-554.
- Kruglanski, A. W. (1989). *Lay Epistemics and Human Knowledge: Cognitive and Motivational Bases*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Kruglanski, A. W., & Boyatzis, L. M. (2012). The psychology of closed and open mindedness, rationality, and democracy. *Critical Review*, 24(2), 217-232.
- Kruglanski, A. W., & Klar, Y. (1987). A view from the bridge: Synthesizing the consistency and attribution paradigms from a lay epistemic perspective. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 17(2), 211-241.
- Kull, S., Ramsay, C., & Lewis, E. (2003). Misperceptions, the media, and the Iraq war. *Political Science Quarterly*, 118(4), 569-598.
- Kunda, Z. (1990). The case for motivated reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(3), 480-498.

L

- Lazarsfeld, P. F., Berelson, B. R., & Gaudet, H. (1948). *The people's choice*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Leeper, T. J. (2014). The informational basis for mass polarization. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 78(1), 27-46.

References

- Leeper, T. J., & Mullinix, K. J. (2014). What If you had done things differently? Testing the generalizability of framing effects with parallel experiments. Working paper.
- Leeper, T. J., & Slothuus, R. (2014). Political parties, motivated reasoning, and public opinion formation. *Political Psychology*, 35(1), 129-156.
- Leiserowitz, A. (2005). American Risk Perceptions: Is Climate Change Dangerous? *Risk Analysis*, 25(6), 1433-1442.
- Levendusky, M. S. (2013). Why do partisan media polarize viewers?. *American Journal of Political Science*, 57(3), 611-623.
- Lindsey, L. L. M., & Yun, K. A. (2003). Examining the persuasive effect of statistical messages: A test of mediating relationships. *Communication Studies*, 54(3), 306-321.
- Lodge, M., & Taber, C. (2000). Three steps toward a theory of motivated political reasoning. In A. Lupia, M.D. McCubbins & S.L. Popkin (Eds.), *Elements of reason: Cognition, choice, and the bounds of rationality* (pp. 183-213). New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Lodge, M., & Taber, C. S. (2005). The automaticity of affect for political leaders, groups, and issues: An experimental test of the hot cognition hypothesis. *Political Psychology*, 26(3), 455-482.
- Lord, C. G., Lepper, M. R., & Preston, E. (1984). Considering the opposite: a corrective strategy for social judgment. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 47(6), 1231-1243.
- Lord, C. G., Ross, L., & Lepper, M. R. (1979). Biased assimilation and attitude polarization: The effects of prior theories on subsequently considered evidence. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 37(11), 2098-2109.
- Lundgren, S. R., & Prislun, R. (1998). Motivated cognitive processing and attitude change. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24(7), 715-726.

M

- Manjoo, F. (2008). *True Enough: Learning to Live in a Post-Fact Society*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Matthes, J., & Valenzuela, S. (2012, May). Who learns from cross-cutting exposure? Motivated reasoning, counterattitudinal news coverage, and awareness of oppositional views. In *Manuscript presented at the annual conference of International Communication Association*. Phoenix, USA.
- Messing, S., & Westwood, S. J. (2012). Selective exposure in the age of social media: Endorsements trump partisan source affiliation when selecting news online. *Communication Research*, 41(8), 1042-1063.
- Metzger, M. J., Hartsell, E. H., & Flanagin, A. J. (2015). Cognitive Dissonance or Credibility? A Comparison of Two Theoretical Explanations for Selective Exposure to Partisan News. *Communication Research*. doi: 10.1177/0093650215613136.
- Mill, J. S. (1860). *La liberté*. Guillaumin.

- Mitchell, A., Jurkowitz, M., & Olmstead, K. (2014, March 13). Audience routes: Direct, search & Facebook. *Pew Research Journalism Project*. Retrieved October 21th, 2014, from <http://www.journalism.org/2014/03/13/audience-routes-direct-search-facebook/>
- Mullen, M. (2003). *The rise of cable programming in the United States: revolution or evolution?*. University of Texas Press.
- Mullinix, K. J., Leeper, T. J., Druckman, J. N., & Freese, J. (2015). The generalizability of survey experiments. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 2(2), 109-138.
- Mutz, D. C. (2002). The consequences of cross-cutting networks for political participation. *American Journal of Political Science*, 46(4), 838-855.
- Mutz, D. C. (2006). How the mass media divide us. In P. S. Nivola & D. W. Brady (Eds.), *Red and blue nation? Characteristics and causes of America's polarized politics* (Vol. 1, pp. 223-242). Stanford: Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, and Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Mutz, D. C., & Martin, P. S. (2001). Facilitating communication across lines of political difference: The role of mass media. *American Political Science Review*, 95(1), 97-114.

N

- Nienhuis, A. E., Manstead, A. S., & Spears, R. (2001). Multiple motives and persuasive communication: Creative elaboration as a result of impression motivation and accuracy motivation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(1), 118-132.
- Nir, L. (2011). Motivated reasoning and public opinion perception. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 75(3), 504-532.

P

- Page, B., & Shapiro, R. (1992). *The rational public: Fifty years of trends in Americans' policy preferences*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Paolacci, G., Chandler, J., & Ipeirotis, P. G. (2010). Running experiments on Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Judgment and Decision making*, 5(5), 411-419.
- Parsons, B. M. (2010). Social networks and the affective impact of political disagreement. *Political Behavior*, 32(2), 181-204.
- Pelham, B. W., & Neter, E. (1995). The effect of motivation of judgment depends on the difficulty of the judgment. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 68(4), 581-594.
- Perloff, R. M. (2003). *The dynamics of persuasion* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Petersen, M. B., Skov, M., Serritzlew, S., & Ramsøy, T. (2013). Motivated reasoning and political parties: Evidence for increased processing in the face of party cues. *Political Behavior*, 35(4), 831-854.

References

- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 19, pp. 123-205). New York: Academic Press.
- Petty, R. E., & Krosnick, J. A. (1995). *Attitude strength: Antecedents and consequences*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. (2014). "Deficit Reduction Declines as Policy Priority." January 15-19, [Survey report]. Retrieved October 21st, 2014, from <http://www.people-press.org/2014/01/27/deficit-reduction-declines-as-policy-priority/>
- Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. (2014). *Political polarization and media habits* (Survey report). Retrieved from <http://www.journalism.org/2014/10/21/political-polarization-media-habits/>
- Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. (2015). "State of the News Media 2015." [Annual report]. Retrieved May 15th, 2015, from <http://www.journalism.org/2015/04/29/state-of-the-news-media-2015/>
- Price, V., Cappella, J. N., & Nir, L. (2002). Does disagreement contribute to more deliberative opinion? *Political Communication*, 19(1), 95-112.
- Prior, M. (2007). *Post-Broadcast Democracy: How Media Choice Increases Inequality in Political Involvement and Polarizes Elections*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Prior, M. (2013). Media and political polarization. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 16(1), 101-127.
- Prior, M., Sood, G., & Khanna, K. (2013). You Cannot be Serious: Do Partisans Believe What They Say?. *Princeton University. Typescript*.
- Pyszczynski, T., & Greenberg, J. (1987). Toward an integration of cognitive and motivational perspectives on social inference: A biased hypothesis-testing model. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 20, pp. 297-340). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

R

- Redlawsk, D. P. (2002). Cognition or cool consideration? Testing the effects of motivated reasoning on political decision making. *Journal of Politics*, 64(4), 1021-1044.
- Redlawsk, D. P., Civettini, A. J., & Emmerson, K. M. (2010). The affective tipping point: do motivated reasoners ever "get it"? *Political Psychology*, 31(4), 563-593.
- Reinhart, A. M. (2006). *Comparing the persuasive effects of narrative versus statistical messages: A meta-analytic review* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3213634)

S

- Sears, D. O. (1965). Biased indoctrination and selectivity of exposure to new information. *Sociometry*, 28(4), 363-376.
- Sears, D. O., & Freedman, J. L. (1967). Selective exposure to information: A critical review. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 31(2), 194-213.
- Slater, M.D. (2007). Reinforcing Spirals: The Mutual Influence of Media Selectivity and Media Effects and Their Impact on Individual Behavior and Social Identity." *Communication Theory*, 17(3), 281-303.
- Smith, S. M., Fabrigar, L. R., Powell, D. M., & Estrada, M. (2007). The role of information processing capacity and goals in attitude-congruent selective exposure effects. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33(7), 948-960.
- Stitt, C. R. & Nabi, R. L. (2005). The Persuasive Impact of Narratives: A Comparison Across Message Types and Modalities. Paper contributed to the International Communication Association Conference (55th). New York, New York.
- Stroud, N.J. (2006). *Selective exposure to partisan information*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Stroud, N. J. (2008). Media use and political predispositions: Revisiting the concept of selective exposure. *Political Behavior*, 30(3), 341-366.
- Stroud, N. J. (2010). Polarization and partisan selective exposure. *Journal of Communication*, 60(3), 556-576.
- Stroud, N. J. (2011). *Niche news: The politics of news choice*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Sunstein, C. R. (2001). *Republic.com*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sunstein, C. R. (2009). *Republic.com 2.0*. Princeton University Press.
- Sunstein, C. (2009). *Going to Extremes: How Like Minds Unite and Divide*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sunstein, C. (2012). Breaking up the echo. *NYTimes*, A25.

T

- Taber, C. S., Cann, D., & Kucsova, S. (2009). The motivated processing of political arguments. *Political Behavior*, 31(2), 137-155.
- Taber, C. S., & Lodge, M. (2006). Motivated skepticism in the evaluation of political beliefs. *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(3), 755-769.
- Taber, C., & Lodge, M. (2012). The scope and generality of automatic affective biases in political thinking: Reply to the symposium. *Critical Review*, 24(2), 247-268.
- Taylor, S. E., & Thompson, S. C. (1982). Stalking the elusive "vividness" effect. *Psychological Review*, 89(2), 155-181.

References

- Tormala, Z. L., & Petty, R. E. (2004). Source credibility and attitude certainty: A metacognitive analysis of resistance to persuasion. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 14*(4), 427-442.
- Trilling, D., & Schoenbach, K. (2015). Investigating people's news diets: How online news users use offline news. *Communications: The European Journal of Communication Research, 40*(1), 67-91.

U

- Umbricht, A., & Esser, F. (2014). Changing Political News? Long-Term Trends in American, British, French, Italian, German, and Swiss Print Media Reporting. *Political Journalism in Transition: Western Europe in a Comparative Perspective, 195-217*.
- U. S. Census Bureau. (2010a). *Age and Composition: 2010*. Retrieved November 25, 2014, from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-03.pdf>
- U. S. Census Bureau. (2010b). *Educational Attainment in the United States: 2010*. Retrieved November 25, 2014, from <https://www.census.gov/hhes/socdemo/education/data/cps/2010/tables.html>

V

- Valentino, N. A., Banks, A. J., Hutchings, V. L., & Davis, A. K. (2009). Selective exposure in the Internet age: The interaction between anxiety and information utility. *Political Psychology, 30*(4), 591-613.
- Van Aelst, P., Strömbäck, J., Aelberg, T., Esser, F., de Vreese, C., Matthes, J., Hopmann, D., Salgado, S., Hubé, N., Stepinska, A., Papatthanassopoulos, S., Berganza, R., Legnante, G., Reinemann, C., Sheaffer, T., & Stanyer, J. (2017). Political communication in a high-choice media environment: a challenge for democracy? *Annals of the International Communication Association, 41*(1), 3-27.
- Visser, P. S., Bizer, G. Y., & Krosnick, J. A. (2006). Exploring the Latent Structure of Strength-related Attitude Attributes. *Advances in experimental social psychology, 38*, 1-67.

W

- Webster, J. G. & Ksiazek, T. B. (2012). The dynamics of audience fragmentation: Public attention in an age of digital media. *Journal of Communication, 62*(1), 39-56.
- Weldon, M. (2008). *Everyman news: The changing American front page*. University of Missouri Press.
- Westen, D., Blagov, P. S., Harenski, K., Kilts, C., & Hamann, S. (2006). Neural bases of motivated reasoning: An fMRI study of emotional constraints on partisan political judgment in the 2004 US presidential election. *Journal of cognitive neuroscience, 18*(11), 1947-1958.

- Westerwick, A., Kleinman, S. B., & Knobloch-Westerwick, S. (2013). Turn a Blind Eye If You Care: Impacts of Attitude Consistency, Importance, and Credibility on Seeking of Political Information and Implications for Attitudes. *Journal of Communication*, 63(3), 432-453.
- Winter, S., Metzger, M. J., & Flanagin, A. J. (2016). Selective Use of News Cues: A Multiple-Motive Perspective on Information Selection in Social Media Environments. *Journal of Communication*, 66(4), 669-693.
- Wojcieszak, M. (2011). Deliberation and attitude polarization. *Journal of Communication*, 61(4), 596-617.
- Wojcieszak, M. (2014). Preferences for Political Decision-Making Processes and Issue Publics. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 78(4), 917-939.
- Wojcieszak, M., & Kim, N. (2016). How to Improve Attitudes Toward Disliked Groups The Effects of Narrative Versus Numerical Evidence on Political Persuasion. *Communication Research*, 43(6), 785-809.

Z

- Zaller, J. (1996). "The Myth of Massive Media Impact Revived." In D. Mutz., P. Sniderman., & R. Brody (Eds.), *Political Persuasion and Attitude Change* (pp. 17-79). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Zaller, J., & Feldman, S. (1992). A simple theory of the survey response: Answering questions versus revealing preferences. *American Journal of Political Science*, 36(3), 579-616.
- Zillmann, D., & Brosius, H.B. (2000). *Exemplification in communication: The influence of case reports on the perception of issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Zuiderveen Borgesius, F. & Trilling, D. & Möller, J. & Bodó, B. & de Vreese, C. & Helberger, N. (2016). Should we worry about filter bubbles?. *Internet Policy Review*, 5(1). doi: 10.14763/2016.1.401

Appendices

A

Appendix A

Example of Numerical and Narrative Texts by Types of Arguments

Numerical Texts	Narrative Texts
<p>Pro-Text</p> <p>Headline: Numbers Show Clear Benefits of the Affordable Care Act for Americans</p> <p><i>Lead:</i> I support the Affordable Care Act (ACA), and a substantial body of statistical data shows the ACA is a good thing.</p> <p><i>Example Paragraph:</i> American businesses also benefit from the ACA. Because they are required to offer health insurance, they receive tax credits to help employees pay insurance premiums. In 2015, the tax credit will increase to 50%. To compensate, the top 2% of businesses and individuals pay some extra taxes, contributing more without being hurt.</p>	<p>Pro-Text</p> <p>Headline: Drew’s Story: How I Personally Benefitted from the Affordable Care Act</p> <p><i>Lead:</i> I support the Affordable Care Act (ACA), and my personal story shows the ACA is a good thing.</p> <p><i>Example Paragraph:</i> And my boss offered me health insurance! His business got a tax credit from the ACA to help me pay for my premium. To compensate, the richer companies will pay more taxes. After all, they can give more without being hurt. I feel safe now, I can sleep. All thanks to the ACA!</p>
<p>Con-Text</p> <p>Headline: Statistics Reveal the Outrageous Costs of the Affordable Care Act for Americans</p> <p><i>Lead:</i> I am against the Affordable Care Act (ACA), and a substantial body of statistical data shows the ACA is a hurtful policy.</p> <p><i>Example Paragraph:</i> Over 30.1 million Americans bought their own private health insurance before the ACA was implemented. Many have had their plans cancelled by insurance companies because the plan didn’t meet the 10 health requirements stipulated in the ACA. And replacement insurance is substantially more expensive because it provides services that many people don’t need.</p>	<p>Con-Text</p> <p>Headline: Quinn’s Story: My Personal Losses from the Affordable Care Act</p> <p><i>Lead:</i> I am against the Affordable Care Act (ACA), and my personal story shows the ACA is a hurtful policy.</p> <p><i>Example Paragraph:</i> I am a hard-working American. Throughout the years I always worked long hours to afford private insurance. Then the ACA came and my insurance was taken away because it didn’t fit with ACA standards. This is not fair! Now I am really struggling to buy a more expensive insurance with services I don’t even need!</p>
<p>Balanced Text</p> <p>Headline: Statistics Unveil Pros and Cons of the Affordable Care Act for Americans</p> <p><i>Lead:</i> I am uncertain as to whether the Affordable Care Act (ACA) is beneficial or hurtful, and a substantial body of statistical data shows the ACA has both its pros and cons.</p> <p><i>Example Paragraph:</i> Uninsured workers also benefit from the ACA. Because businesses are required to offer health insurance, they receive tax credits to help employees pay premiums. In 2015, the tax credit will increase to 50%.</p> <p>However, the ACA also hurts uninsured Americans. Those who didn’t purchase insurance by the deadline of March 31, 2014 have to pay a tax of \$95 in 2014. This means about 4 million people, or 1.2% of the population, end up paying the tax rather than purchasing health insurance.</p>	<p>Balanced Text</p> <p>Headline: Pat’s Story: My Personal Gains and Losses from the Affordable Care Act</p> <p><i>Lead:</i> I am uncertain as to whether the Affordable Care Act (ACA) is beneficial or hurtful, and my personal story shows the ACA has both its pros and cons.</p> <p><i>Example Paragraph:</i> Luckily, the ACA gave me a tax credit that makes it easier to get insurance. And my boss just offered me health insurance! His business got a tax credit from the ACA to help me pay for my premium. Finally, for once in my life health services become affordable! I thought all my worries would be solved...</p> <p>But sadly, my experience with the ACA hasn’t been all that good. I couldn’t buy insurance before the deadline, so I’m forced to pay a high penalty. And I am still uninsured!</p>

Appendix B

Tables showing results of hypothesis 3 testing

Table 4. Repeated Logit Model of Article Selection by Evidence Type, Selective Exposure among Issue Publics (Attitude Importance)

	Climate Change		Health Care	
	(N = 321)		(N = 220)	
	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)
Intercept	-1.50(.16)***	.22	-2.28(.34)***	.10
Gender	-.09(.06)	.92	-.20(.07)*	.86
Age	-.01(.0)*	.99	.0(.0)	1.0
Education	.05(.03)*	1.05	.11(.03)***	1.12
Numerical	.15(.08)	1.16	.07(.10)	1.08
Pro-attitudinal	.03(.08)	1.03	.08(.10)	1.09
Balanced	.68(.19)***	1.98	.87(.18)***	2.38
High importance	.29(.16)	1.33	.17(.17)	1.19
Numerical X pro	-.06(.11)	.95	.17(.13)	1.18
Numerical X balanced	.24(.23)	1.27	.37(.23)	1.46
Numerical X high importance	-.14(.13)	.87	-.18(.12)	.84
Pro X high importance	-.001(.12)	.99	.04(.13)	1.04
Narrative X balanced X low importance	.15(.20)	1.16	.03(.19)	1.03
Narrative X counter X high importance	-.17(.17)	.84	-.05(.17)	.95
Numerical X balanced X high importance	.31(.14)*	1.36	-.13(.14)	.88

Note. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$. The reference categories for the main effects were: narrative evidence, counter-attitudinal information, low attitude importance. For the two-way interaction evidence type X information type, results show the coefficients for numerical X pro and numerical X balanced. All other combinations served as reference categories. For the two-way interaction evidence type X attitude importance, results show the coefficient for numerical X high importance. All other combinations were the reference categories. For the two-interaction information type X attitude importance, results show the coefficient for pro-attitudinal X high importance. All other combinations served as reference categories. Finally, for the three-way interactions evidence type X information type X attitude importance, results show the coefficients for narrative X balanced X low importance, narrative X counter-attitudinal X high importance, and numerical X balanced X high importance. All other combinations served as reference categories.

Table 5. Repeated Logit Model of Article Selection by Evidence Type, Selective Exposure among Issue Publics (Attitude Strength)

	Climate Change		Health Care	
	(N = 321)		(N = 220)	
	B	Exp(B)	B	Exp(B)
Intercept	-1.43(.22)***	.24	-2.01(.19)***	.13
Gender	-.08(.06)	.93	-.15(.07)*	.86
Age	-.01(.0)*	.99	.0(.0)	1.0
Education	.05(.03)	1.05	.11(.03)***	1.12
Numerical	.16(.09)	1.17	.09(.10)	1.10
Pro-attitudinal	.05(.08)	1.06	.14(.10)	1.14
Balanced	.90(.19)***	2.46	1.03(.18)***	2.80
High strength	.08(.16)	1.08	.09(.16)	1.09
Numerical X pro	-.16(.12)	.85	.04(.14)	1.04
Numerical X balanced	-.01(.23)	.99	.06(.23)	1.06
Numerical X high strength	.08(.13)	1.08	-.019(.12)	.99
Pro X high strength	.15(.12)	1.16	.18(.12)	1.19
Narrative X balanced X low strength	-.08(.20)	.92	-.06(.19)	.94
Narrative X counter X high strength	.05(.17)	1.05	.17(.17)	1.18
Numerical X balanced X high strength	.32(.14)*	1.37	.13(.14)	1.13

Note. *** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05

The reference categories for the main effects were: narrative evidence, counter-attitudinal information, low attitude strength. For the two-way interaction evidence type X information type, results show the coefficients for numerical X pro and numerical X balanced. All other combinations served as reference categories. For the two-way interaction evidence type X attitude strength, results show the coefficient for numerical X high strength. All other combinations were the reference categories. For the two-interaction information type X attitude strength, results show the coefficient for pro-attitudinal X high strength. All other combinations served as reference categories. Finally, for the three-way interactions evidence type X information type X attitude strength, results show the coefficients for narrative X balanced X low strength, narrative X counter-attitudinal X high strength, and numerical X balanced X high strength. All other combinations served as reference categories.

Appendix C

Results of information selection about health care across explicit and accountability manipulations.

Predicted probabilities of selecting information type about health care by accountability manipulations (N = 324)

	Pro-Attitudinal			Balanced			Counter-Attitudinal		
	Margin	z	90% C.I.	Margin	z	90% C.I.	Margin	z	90% C.I.
Control	.27(.07)***	6.00	.14 - .40	.61(.07)***	8.36	.47 - .76	.11(.05)*	2.38	.02 - .21
Defensive Explicit	.52(.07)***	7.36	.38 - .66	.44(.07)***	6.27	.30 - .57	.04(.03)	1.44	.01 - .09
Accuracy Explicit	.19(.06)***	3.35	.08 - .31	.78(.06)***	12.9	.66 - .90	.02(.02)	1.01	.02 - .06
Defensive incentive	.40(.07)***	5.48	.26 - .54	.53(.07)***	7.17	.39 - .68	.07(.04)	1.79	.0 - .14
Accuracy incentive	.19(.06)***	3.34	.08 - .30	.70(.07)***	10.53	.57 - .83	.10(.05)*	2.37	.02 - .19
Defensive no-incentive	.30(.07)***	4.49	.17 - .43	.63(.07)***	8.86	.49 - .76	.06(.04)	1.79	.0 - .14
Accuracy no-incentive	.34(.07)***	4.95	.21 - .48	.55(.07)***	7.40	.40 - .69	.11(.05)*	2.37	.02 - .20

Note. *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$. Entries on the left column are predicted probabilities of selecting an information type, with the standard errors in parenthesis. P values indicate whether predicted probabilities are significantly different from zero.

Appendix D


Pretest results of stimulus material

On a scale from 1 to 5, participants rated headlines and texts about the extent they contained counter-issue arguments (values of 1 and 2), balanced arguments (value of 3), or pro-issue arguments (values of 4 and 5). The ANOVA results were significant for climate change headlines, $F_{(6, 704)} = 1126.80, p < .001$ and texts, $F_{(6, 704)} = 2114.40, p < .001$. Pro-issue headlines and texts were rated more as having supporting arguments, compared to balanced and counter-issue messages (all $p < .001$). Similarly, counter-issue headlines and texts were perceived more as having opposing arguments, and balanced headlines (all $p < .001$), and texts were perceived more as containing both pro- and counter-issue arguments (all $p < .001$). Also, the ANOVA results were significant for health care headlines, $F_{(6, 704)} = 1586.45, p < .001$, and texts, $F_{(6, 704)} = 2111.45, p < .001$. Pro-issue headlines and texts were rated more as having supporting arguments, compared to balanced and counter-issue messages (all $p < .001$). Counter-issue headlines and texts were perceived more as having opposing arguments, and balanced headlines (all $p < .001$), and texts were perceived more as containing both pro- and counter-issue arguments (all $p < .001$). All texts were perceived equally understandable (all $p > .2$), convincing (all $p > .2$), coherent (all $p > .2$), interesting (all $p > .2$), and believable (all $p > .2$).

Appendix E

Results of hypothesis 4 and research questions 1 and 2 of motivated selection, using a single index of attitude strength (Study 2)

Figure 3. Predicted probabilities of selecting information type by motivation and attitude strength as a single index (Study 2) ($N = 258$)



Note. The three graphs show predicted probabilities of selecting pro-attitudinal, balanced and counter-attitudinal numerical content by motivated reasoning manipulations and attitude strength. Confidence intervals set at 90%.

Appendix F

Example of Messages by Types of Arguments

	Climate change	Refugees
Pro-issue	Climate change is a serious threat for American food security. Many scientists believe global average temperatures have increased by over 1.4°F over the last century. This is bound to have serious consequences for agriculture. These include decreases in stream flow in river basins, which would cost nearly \$200 million annually because of lack of sufficient water for irrigation. Moreover, these impacts of climate change on agricultural regions may cause yield decreases of 30% by the end of the century.	Americans should not worry about giving asylum to Syrian refugees because the fear that terrorists could infiltrate is misguided. The 21-step screening process for Syrians takes up to 24 months, and is far more rigid than the immigration process is for other refugees. Since 1980, the U.S. has invited millions of refugees, and since 2011, over 2034 Syrian refugees have been admitted. Until now, zero of these refugees have been arrested or removed on terrorism charges.
Con-issue	The U.S. plan to mitigate carbon emissions will be costly for the American economy. For example, it will significantly affect the production of coal in the United States. With enough coal existing in the country to provide electricity for 500 years, coal is bound to be an important energy resource for Americans long into the future. However, the Plan's war on coal threatens existing coal plants that generate 40% of America's affordable, reliable energy.	America should not welcome Syrian refugees as they pose a serious threat to national security. About 77% of Syrian refugees are men of military age. With the U.S. government planning to accept up to 250 000 refugees coming from Syria, the federal government will not be able to conduct thorough background checks. This will make it easier for ISIS to infiltrate terrorists by coaching them how to pass the screening process.
Balanced	The U.S. plan to mitigate carbon emissions has pros and cons. On the pro side, promoting energy efficiency would save American households an average of \$900 annually by 2030 in electricity costs, while businesses would save \$126 billion annually. On the downside, in order to garner those savings, the nation will need to make up-front investments of up to 1.3% of the GDP from 2012 to 2030. This means that Americans will have to pay 20% more for electricity.	Some reject welcoming Syrian refugees into America, believing the threat of terrorism will increase. However, others disagree. Those against admitting refugees argue that 60% of terrorism experts believe that at least one terrorist will infiltrate as a refugee, and successfully carry out an attack on the country. However, refugee supporters claim that refugees coming to the U.S. are actually victims of terrorism, which include 50% children, and 30% above the age of 65.

English summary

ES

Scholars, political observers, and media pundits have worried that citizens prefer mostly pro-attitudinal information about politics and public affairs, which in turn may influence the public to make uninformed decisions, develop extreme political opinions, and be less tolerant towards opposing perspectives. Although the current information environment offers citizens an unprecedented opportunity to see mostly pro-attitudinal information, the debate about the prevalence and consequences of selective exposure in a high-choice media environment is largely inconclusive. Moreover, the majority of the scholarship has focused on studying the selection and effects of one-sided political content (i.e., pro- or counter-attitudinal), and has paid little attention to balanced content, even though it is available in the media environment and consumed by citizens.

This dissertation shifts this dominant attention from one-sided information towards balanced exposure, and contributes to the selective exposure literature by studying 1) whether the selection of balanced, in addition to pro- and counter-attitudinal information depends on whether an individual is personally invested and has strong opinions about a certain issue (issue public membership), and on the type of evidence for a message claim – numerical vs. narrative; 2) how psychological factors, such as individual motivation and attributes of issue attitudes, influence balanced information selection; and 3) how balanced exposure affects information processing and attitude polarization. These questions were answered using a series of online experiments. Information selection was studied using self-selection protocols, in which participants select the stimuli from a limited set of choices. The consequences of balanced exposure were studied using randomized exposure to fixed treatment stimuli. Collectively, the experiments presented in the dissertation uncover the psychological underpinnings of balanced exposure and its attitudinal outcomes about contested and highly relevant socio-political issues, such as climate change, health care reform and refugees.

Results of the dissertation show that:

1. The prevalence of selective exposure is overestimated

Selective exposure is not a prevalent phenomenon among citizens. Most individuals do not want messages that only contain pro-attitudinal information, but instead, they prefer balanced messages that present arguments confirming their opinions, alongside arguments that run counter to their priors.

2. Most citizens prefer balanced political content over one-sided content

Exposure to balanced media content is the preferred choice for different groups of citizens. This includes people who have strong opinions and care about climate change and health

care (issue publics), as well as those less invested in those issues. Also, balanced content is selected by individuals motivated to reach accurate conclusions (accuracy motivation), as well as those seeking to defend their prior opinions (defensive motivation).

3. The type of evidence for a message claim also influences information selection

Although this dissertation studied mostly individual factors that drive balanced exposure, another conclusion is that the type of evidence for a message claim also shapes the type of political information that different citizens seek. Specifically, issue publics and average citizens prefer political messages which contain numerical over narrative evidence. In addition, the preferred form of political information for issue publics is that which uses numbers and statistics to argue two sides of a story.

4. Balanced exposure reduces the influence of motivated reasoning on information processing

Exposure to balanced content plays a crucial role in shaping how people process political information. Balanced exposure encourages more unbiased processing, relative to one-sided messages. More importantly, we learn that whether individuals are motivated to reinforce their opinions or to reach accurate conclusions, they interpret balanced content in a similar unbiased manner. Specifically, when exposed to balanced messages, defensive and accuracy motivated citizens are less likely to accept pro-attitudinal arguments and to refute counter-attitudinal ones, compared to when they are confronted with one-sided messages.

5. Balanced exposure encourages unbiased thinking but does not reduce political polarization

The availability, selection and unbiased processing of balanced political information is not enough to promote moderate political views on contested socio-political issues. Results refute the hope by some that exposure to balanced or counter-attitudinal information can depolarize political opinions. On the bright side, exposure to balanced political content reduces the risk that people's attitudes become more extreme.

This dissertation has important implications for political communications scholars, journalists and citizens. First, most citizens prefer balanced information about politics and public affairs. In addition, some citizens seek balanced content that is backed up by factual and truthful evidence. This in itself is a good reminder for media institutions and journalists advocating the notion that political media coverage should be balanced, objective and fair. Second, this dissertation suggests that the media environment can encourage more

unbiased thinking by offering balanced and neutral reporting. If journalists cover political issues in a balanced manner, different citizens would attend these messages, which in turn could encourage them to interpret contested issues more open-mindedly. Third, even though we cannot hope that coming in contact with balanced information is a solution to correct attitude polarization, the availability and exposure to such an information environment may benefit democracy in other ways. To explore these possibilities, future scholarship on selective exposure should shift its traditional focus on studying mostly one-sided political messages, and instead, extend our understanding of the causes and consequences of balanced information exposure.

Nederlandse samenvatting

NS

Academici, politieke waarnemers en media-experts zijn bezorgd dat burgers meestal een voorkeur hebben voor pro-attitudinale informatie over politieke en publieke zaken. Deze voorkeur kan het publiek beïnvloeden om niet-geïnformeerde beslissingen te nemen, om extreme politieke opvattingen te ontwikkelen, en om minder tolerant tegenover tegengestelde perspectieven te zijn. Alhoewel de huidige informatie-omgeving burgers een ongekeerde kans biedt om voornamelijk pro-attitudinale informatie te consumeren, is de discussie over de prevalentie en de gevolgen van selectieve blootstelling in een hoge-keuze mediaomgeving grotendeels inconsistent. Bovendien heeft de meerderheid van voorgaand onderzoek zich gericht op het bestuderen van de selectie en de gevolgen van eenzijdige politieke inhoud (dat wil zeggen pro- of contra-attitude), en is er weinig aandacht besteed aan een evenwichtige inhoud, ook al is dergelijke inhoud aanwezig in de media omgeving.

Dit proefschrift verschuift deze dominante aandacht voor eenzijdige informatie richting gebalanceerde blootstelling, en draagt hiermee bij aan de selectieve blootstellingliteratuur door het bestuderen van 1) of de selectie van een evenwichtige, in aanvulling op de pro- en contra-attitudinale informatie afhankelijk is van of een individu persoonlijk betrokken is en een uitgesproken mening heeft over een bepaald onderwerp (lid van een issue public) en het soort bewijs voor een bericht claim - numerieke vs. verhaal; 2) hoe psychologische factoren, zoals individuele motivatie en kenmerken van attitudes ten opzichte van een onderwerp evenwichtige selectie van informatie beïnvloeden; en 3) hoe evenwichtige blootstelling tot informatieverwerking en attitude polarisatie beïnvloed. Deze vragen werden beantwoord met behulp van een serie online experimenten. Informatie selectie werd bestudeerd met behulp van zelfselectie protocollen, waarin de deelnemers stimuli selecteren uit een beperkt aantal keuzes. De gevolgen van evenwichtige blootstelling werden bestudeerd met behulp van gerandomiseerde blootstelling aan vaste stimuli. Tezamen, onderzoeken de experimenten in dit proefschrift de psychologische wortels van evenwichtige blootstelling en de uitkomsten hiervan ten opzichte van omstrede en zeer relevante politieke kwesties, zoals klimaatverandering, hervorming van de gezondheidszorg en vluchtelingen.

De resultaten van het proefschrift tonen aan dat:

1. De dominantie van selectieve blootstelling wordt overschat

Selectieve blootstelling is niet een gangbaar fenomeen onder burgers. De meeste mensen willen geen berichten die enkel pro-attitudinale informatie bevatten, en zien in plaats daarvan liever evenwichtige berichten waarin argumenten die hun mening bevestigen worden gepresenteerd, naast de argumenten die tegen hun bestaande mening ingaan.

2. De meeste burgers geven de voorkeur aan evenwichtige politieke inhoud ten opzichte van eenzijdig inhoud

Blootstelling aan gebalanceerde media-inhoud heeft de voorkeur onder verschillende groepen burgers. Dit geldt ook voor mensen die een uitgesproken mening hebben over de klimaatverandering en de gezondheidszorg (*issue publics*), evenals voor mensen die minder betrokken zijn bij deze kwesties. Ook wordt een evenwichtige inhoud geselecteerd door individuen die gemotiveerd zijn om tot juiste conclusies te komen (nauwkeurigheid motivatie), evenals door diegenen die hun bestaande meningen willen verdedigen (defensieve motivatie).

3. Het soort bewijs voor een standpunt in een bericht beïnvloedt ook de informatieselectie

Hoewel dit proefschrift voornamelijk individuele factoren die aan de grondslag van uitgebalanceerde blootstelling liggen bestudeerde, kan er ook een andere conclusie getrokken worden: het soort bewijs dat gezocht wordt voor een standpunt, vormt ook het soort politieke informatie die verschillende burgers zoeken. Specifieker, *issue publics* en gewone burgers geven de voorkeur aan politieke boodschappen die numeriek in plaats van narratief bewijs bevatten. Daarnaast prefereren *issue publics* politieke informatie die getallen en statistieken gebruikt om twee kanten van een verhaal te belichten.

4. Evenwichtige blootstelling vermindert de invloed van gemotiveerde beredenering op informatieverwerking

Blootstelling aan evenwichtige inhoud speelt een cruciale rol voor de manier waarop mensen politieke informatie te verwerken. Evenwichtige blootstelling moedigt onpartijdige verwerking aan, ten opzichte van eenzijdige berichten. Wat nog belangrijker is, het geeft ons inzichten in de vraag of als mensen gemotiveerd zijn om hun mening te versterken of om nauwkeurige conclusies te komen, ze dan ook evenwichtige inhoud in een onpartijdige manier te interpreteren. In het bijzonder, wanneer iemand wordt blootgesteld aan evenwichtige berichten, dan zijn defensief en nauwkeurigheid gemotiveerde burgers minder geneigd om pro-attitudinale argumenten te accepteren en tegenstelde argumenten te weerleggen, in vergelijking met wanneer ze worden geconfronteerd met eenzijdige berichten.

5. Evenwichtige blootstelling stimuleert onpartijdig denken, maar is niet in staat om politieke polarisatie verminderen

De beschikbaarheid, selectie en onpartijdige verwerking van evenwichtige politieke informatie is niet voldoende om gematigde politieke standpunten over omstreden sociaal-politieke kwesties te bevorderen. Deze resultaten weerleggen de hoop dat de

blootstelling aan gebalanceerde of contra-attitudinale informatie politieke opvattingen kan depolariseren. Aan de andere kant, de blootstelling aan evenwichtige politieke inhoud vermindert het risico dat de houding van mensen extremer wordt.

Dit proefschrift heeft belangrijke gevolgen voor politieke communicatie wetenschappers, journalisten en burgers. Ten eerste, de meeste burgers geven de voorkeur aan evenwichtige informatie over politiek en publieke zaken. Bovendien zoeken sommige burgers naar evenwichtige inhoud die wordt ondersteund door feitelijke en waarheidsgetrouw bewijs. Dit is op zich een goede uitkomst voor de media-instellingen en journalisten die pleiten voor het idee dat politieke berichtgeving in de media moet worden afgewogen, en objectief en eerlijk moet zijn. Ten tweede, dit proefschrift suggereert dat de media omgeving meer onpartijdig denken kan stimuleren door het aanbieden van een evenwichtige en neutrale rapportage. Als journalisten politieke kwesties op een evenwichtige manier verslaan, zouden verschillende burgers aandacht aan deze berichten schenken, wat hen zou kunnen aanmoedigen om omstreden kwesties meer onbevagen te interpreteren. Ten derde, hoewel we er niet vanuit kunnen gaan dat blootstelling aan evenwichtige informatie een oplossing is voor attitude polarisatie, de beschikbaarheid en de blootstelling aan dergelijke informatie-omgeving kunnen de democratie op andere manieren bevorderen. Om deze mogelijkheden te verkennen, moet toekomstig onderzoek over selectieve blootstelling zijn traditionele focus verleggen van het bestuderen van veelal eenzijdige politieke boodschappen naar het uitbreiden van inzichten over de oorzaken en gevolgen van evenwichtige informatie blootstelling.

Acknowledgements on authorship

AA

Chapter 2: Selective Exposure to Balanced Content and Evidence Type: The Case of Issue and Non-Issue Publics about Climate Change and Health Care

Carlos Brenes Peralta, Magdalena Wojcieszak, Yphtach Lelkes & Claes de Vreese

Study design: all authors. Acquisition of data: CB. Analyses and Interpretation of data: CB, YL. Drafting of the manuscript: CB. Critical revision of the manuscript: all authors.

Chapter 3: Desired vs. Correct Conclusions: The Motivated Selection of Balanced Content

Carlos Brenes Peralta, Magdalena Wojcieszak, Yphtach Lelkes & Claes de Vreese

Study design: all authors. Acquisition of data: CB. Analyses and Interpretation of data: all authors. Drafting of the manuscript: CB. Critical revision of the manuscript: all authors.

Chapter 4: I Stick to My Guns: Motivated Reasoning and Biased Processing of Balanced Political Information

Carlos Brenes Peralta, Magdalena Wojcieszak, Yphtach Lelkes & Claes de Vreese

Study design: all authors. Acquisition of data: CB. Analyses and Interpretation of data: CB, YL, and MW. Drafting of the manuscript: CB. Critical revision of the manuscript: all authors.

Acknowledgements
Dankwoord
Agradecimientos

A

“Little do you know your own blessedness; for to travel hopefully is a better thing than to arrive, and the true success is to labour.” (Robert Louis Stevenson)

Before I began writing these words, I reflected on what it meant for me to complete my journey as a PhD candidate. But, as I was about to start writing, I experienced a flashback of seemingly infinite memories. A movie played in my mind that spanned not only the last three years creating my dissertation, but also took me way back to what I can remember as the beginning of my journey. After the movie ended, I thought to myself: what a journey it has been! Perhaps, if I ever become a good writer, I will write some sort of fiction book someday. Until then I will keep these memories to myself... dear memories that I share complicitly with the wonderful people I wish to acknowledge here.

I have cause to celebrate the conclusion of this dissertation as a personal achievement. But the truth is that anything worth doing takes a village. And you build that village by investing love and time in your relationships. As the movie keeps playing in my head, I visit that village again and remember all those people around me who made this dissertation possible. I realize how lucky I am to have a global village spanning two continents.

The beginning of my journey reminded me of my father and who is the first person I wish to thank. As a boy I remember looking up at him because he was a great man, who also happened to have a PhD. This was my first memory of thinking I also want to obtain a PhD, believing that if I can do so, perhaps I can become a bit like him. He received his PhD back in 1977 and hopefully I will receive mine 40 years later in 2017. Have I achieved becoming a bit like him now? I don't think so, but knowing he is proud of me... well there is no better feeling. I also wish to address my mother, and my apologies to some readers, I wish to do it in Spanish. *Mama, siempre ha sido usted la luz de mi vida y la fuente de mi espiritualidad. Es un hecho que quien soy y lo que he logrado no hubiese pasado sin mi mama. Con todo lo que hemos enfrentado estos años, merecemos este logro juntos. Gracias hoy y eternamente.* I also wish to thank the rest of my family. *Fernando, eres mi modelo a seguir . Laura and Andres: gracias por ser unos hermanos maravillosos. Salito: vos has sido mi angel de la guardia, mi mayor e incondicional apoyo cada segundo aqui, sos mi familia y mi motor. Mi eterno agradecimiento y amor es tuyo.* I also express my deep gratitude and love to my extended family in Costa Rica and to my grandparents looking after me from heaven.

I wish now to thank all those people in my Dutch village and who I am blessed to call my second family. All of you have been my life and world in the past years. First, I wish to thank all my lecturers and friends at the VU University Amsterdam. They offered me the

necessary academic preparation to continue towards my PhD at the UvA. Second, I wish to thank my three great supervisors: Claes, Yph and Magdalena. Thank you for betting on me! You gave me the opportunity to work at ASCoR, and in doing so also offered me the opportunity to meet and learn from a village of wonderful people. I also thank you for your support during the past three years. You guys were great supervisors in many ways. You were deeply involved and effective, and you did so in a way I always felt challenged, but supported and confident that everything would work out fine. I also learned substantially from each of you individually, which I am thankful for because I can take these lessons with me. Claes, you helped me become a more effective thinker and doer. Yph, you helped me become a better scientist. Magdalena, you helped me become a better writer and also pushed me to nurture my inner potential. From a Buddhist perspective, you were the best teacher I could have hoped for.

There is a host of amazing people I wish to acknowledge next. Not only have they been indirectly involved with my project in different capacities, but also on a personal level, you have been my daily family. There are so many of you, and for each I can write pages of love and appreciation. For the sake of space here, I will only mention your names in a random order. But it is my wish that before my time here is done, I will convey to each of you personally my deep appreciation. I first want to thank Guus, because he is one of my favorites, but also because I am afraid I could forget to mention him. Now, in a random order, I thank my brothers Tommy - my Robobuddy and Mrs. Robobuddy Yara too, my bestie Jappie, my role-model Stuart – and who has lived a more interesting life than Forest Gump - my favorite populist and real-estate mogul Michael, Toni the Tiger, my idol Mark, the caring and warm-hearted Jelle, Damian the future of science, the chosen one Bjorn, Jeroen son of Harrison Ford, Alex the engineer, Andreas the restaurant connoisseur, Jedi Martijn and Ivar the great. I also wish to thank my very dear friends and excellent scholars Alyt, Sifra, Annemarie, Nadine, Fam, Sanne, Sabine, Rena, Anna, Hao, Anne, Nadine, Franzi, Carmina, Keren, Sarah, Hande, Verena, Nina, Alma, Nhu, SJ, Rosa.

I wish to express my admiration and gratitude to the great people who have been part of our political communication group. Special thanks to Penny, Bert, Andreas, Franzi, Katjana, Joost, Linda, Judith, Erika, Marcel, Wouter, Sophie, Knut, Jonas, Rashid, Rens and Ruud. I also want to thank Anke for all your support as a Phd Club convener. Next, my gratitude to Danny van der Pol, Ardy, Miriam, Jeanette, Kathleen and Margrit for all your daily support. Also I want to share my appreciation and gratitude to Hans and everyone working at the Communication Science Department. Furthermore, I want to thank the excellent international scholars who gave me valuable advise at different stages of my project. My gratitude to Markus Prior, James Druckman, Dustin Carnahan, Kelly Garret,

Acknowledgements

Kevin Arceneaux, Shanto Iyengar, Yariv Tsfati, Rolando Perez, Kim Andersen, Jakob Ohme, Erik Knudsen, Liliach Nir, Nick Valentino, Natalie Stroud and Tilo Hartmann. I also wish to thank Jochen, Barbara, Natali, Peter and Damian for evaluating my dissertation. It also must be said that I could not have written this dissertation without my daily food intake of veggie-free *broodjes*, supplied by De Brug, the UvA Cantine and the Roeterseiland Albert Heijn. Also, I wish to thank the personnel at Crea, Kriterion, Burgermeister and Koosje for nurturing the social and networking segment of my PhD life. Finally, my gratitude to the wonderful city of Amsterdam and to the Netherlands. Thank you for always making me feel at home even though I never learned your language. And last but not least, special thanks to the Immigratie en Naturalisatiedienst for not deporting me before my journey here comes to its intended end.

Carlos Brenes Peralta
Amsterdam, 2017