

*Article*

# Religion, Cognition, and Political Behavior : An Interdisciplinary Exploration of Faith-Based Polarization Mechanisms

**Syahirul Alim**

Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia;  
email : syahirul@ub.ac.id

PERADABAN JOURNAL OF  
RELIGION AND SOCIETY  
*Vol. 3, Issue 2, Januari 2024*

ISSN 2962-7958

Page : 113-129

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.59001/pjrs.v3i2.181>

**Copyright**

© The Author(s) 2024



This work is licensed under a  
[Creative Commons Attribution  
4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

## **Abstract:**

Political polarization is a complex phenomenon with significant implications for democratic processes worldwide. This study investigates the cognitive mechanisms underlying political reinforcement learning and examines how environmental information influences political decision-making, resulting in diverse political behaviors and beliefs. The methodology employed encompasses descriptive analysis, systematic literature review, and content analysis. Data were sourced from various democratic countries to ensure a comprehensive and diverse perspective. Key findings indicate that both traditional and social media significantly shape political opinions, while cognitive biases and political motivations can lead to divergent interpretations of identical facts, culminating in polarized beliefs. Interventions that enhance cognitive flexibility and metacognitive insight, as well as those promoting civil discourse and reducing intergroup anxiety, were found to be effective in mitigating political polarization. This research provides valuable insights into the cognitive and social dynamics underlying political polarization and proposes strategies to reduce polarization and strengthen democratic institutions. Future research should prioritize the empirical validation of these models and the testing of interventions across diverse cultural and political contexts.

## **Keyword:**

Political polarization, cognitive mechanisms, reinforcement learning, political decision-making, information influence

## **Introduction**

Political polarization represents a multifaceted issue influenced by an array of factors, including cognitive processes, psychological traits, genetic predispositions, contextual elements, and social dynamics. Recent scholarship has explored the roots of political polarization through an interdisciplinary lens (Baar & FeldmanHall, 2022). Cognitive processes play a pivotal role in individuals' susceptibility to polarized beliefs concerning political and social issues (Rollwage et al., 2019). Empirical studies have demonstrated correlations between cognitive ability, openness to experience, and political engagement, with common genetic factors explaining a substantial proportion of these relationships (Weinschenk et al., 2019). Cognitive intelligence emerges as a crucial factor in shaping political attitudes, influencing politically motivated reasoning and susceptibility to conspiracy theories (Vitriol et al., 2022).

Cognitive metaphors and heuristics serve as guiding principles in political decision-making and reasoning processes (Bougher, 2012). The polarization of factual beliefs is posited to originate from a confluence of institutional and psychological factors, wherein the politicization of factual claims interacts with individuals' partisan and ideological identities (Rekker, 2021). The application of cognitive psychology to political elites has underscored the significance of information processing in political representation (Miler, 2009).

Psychological engagement in politics exhibits associations with educational attainment and affective polarization, which in turn mediates the effects of authoritarian attitudes (Han, 2022). Furthermore, cognitive rigidity has been shown to influence the resolution of perceptual ambiguity, thereby impacting political attitudes and biases (Caparos et al., 2015). Social polarization is intrinsically linked to factors such as wealth inequality, social identity differentiation, and governmental influence. Income disparity has been correlated with global political polarization, affecting both elite/party and mass polarization dynamics (Gu & Wang, 2021).

A comprehensive understanding of the cognitive mechanisms underlying political decision-making is essential for elucidating the complexities of individual choice in the political domain. Political decision-making encompasses a synthesis of cognitive processes, emotional responses, personality traits, and contextual factors that collectively shape individual choices (Krastev et al., 2016). The utilization of heuristics and cognitive shortcuts plays a significant role in political decision-making, highlighting the influence of cognitive processes over deliberative choices (Spezio et al., 2012). Moreover, conscious self-regulation systems integrate cognitive and personality factors in decision-making, emphasizing the importance of understanding how these elements interact in political voting situations (Indina & Morosanova, 2009).

Empirical evidence suggests that optimal decision-making results from a synergy of external factors, such as physical and social contexts, and internal factors, including cognitive and emotional processes (McCarrey et al., 2010). The interplay between cognition and emotion is crucial in shaping voting behavior and decision-making processes (Viteková & Václavíková, 2022). Additionally, the development of cognitive control, particularly in the prefrontal cortex, is essential for effective decision-making across various developmental stages (Steinbeis & Crone, 2016).

It is imperative to recognize that political decision-making transcends pure rationality, encompassing elements of empathy, intuition, compassion, morality, and justice, thus highlighting the diverse cognitive processes at play (Noël et al., 2019). Neuropsychological research has made significant contributions to our understanding of the fundamental mechanisms of decision-making and the factors that can influence decision-making abilities (Brand & Markowitsch, 2009). Furthermore, decision-making theories often emphasize rationality and coherence as means to enhance decision-making processes (Bijma et al., 2005).

In conclusion, a nuanced understanding of the cognitive mechanisms underlying political decision-making is essential for unraveling the intricate processes that shape individual choices in the political sphere, encompassing cognitive, emotional, and contextual influences.

## **Method**

This study employs a systematic literature review methodology to explore the cognitive mechanisms in religious reinforcement learning and factors influencing faith-based political polarization. This approach was chosen to integrate and analyze findings from various existing studies, providing a comprehensive understanding of this topic.

### *Literature Review Process*

A systematic literature review was conducted to explore existing research on cognitive processes, environmental information, religious political behavior, and interventions to reduce faith-based polarization. The primary databases used for this review included Scopus, Web of Science, and PsycINFO, given their extensive repositories of peer-reviewed articles. Search terms included combinations of keywords such as “religious polarization,” “cognitive process,” “reinforcement learning,” “faith-based decision-making,” “religious information impact,” and “depolarization intervention.”

### *Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria*

Inclusion criteria:

- a.) Peer-reviewed articles in English
- b.) Studies focusing on cognitive mechanisms in religious-political contexts

- c.) Research on reinforcement learning in faith-based political decision-making
  - d.) Studies addressing the impact of religious information on political behavior
  - e.) Articles proposing or evaluating interventions to reduce religious-political polarization
- Exclusion criteria:
- a.) Opinion pieces or editorials
  - b.) Studies not focusing on cognitive or learning aspects in religious-political contexts
  - c.) Research irrelevant to religious polarization or faith-based political decision-making

### *Study Selection and Data Extraction*

Two independent researchers screened titles and abstracts to assess study eligibility based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Full texts of eligible articles were then retrieved for further review. Extracted data included information on research design, methodology, key findings, and theoretical and practical implications.

### *Data Synthesis and Analysis*

Thematic analysis was conducted to identify, analyze, and report patterns (themes) within the collected data. Emerging themes were organized into broader categories aligned with the research questions. A narrative synthesis was used to integrate findings from various studies, considering the context and quality of evidence from each study.

### *Ethical Considerations*

Although this research did not involve direct human participants, ethical considerations were maintained in terms of research integrity and accurate reporting. Efforts were made to avoid selection and reporting biases, and to properly acknowledge all sources used.

### *Limitations*

The limitations of this study include the potential for language bias due to the inclusion of only English-language articles, and the possibility of publication bias favoring significant results. Additionally, the heterogeneity of studies in this field may limit the generalizability of some findings.

This methodological approach provides a robust framework for examining cognitive mechanisms in religious reinforcement learning and understanding the roots of faith-based political polarization. It combines quantitative and qualitative methods to offer a comprehensive analysis of the factors influencing religious-political beliefs and behaviors, as well as the effectiveness of interventions to reduce faith-based polarization

### **Cognitive Processes in Political Reinforcement Learning**

Reinforcement learning (RL) has emerged as a fundamental framework for understanding variability in political cognition. Sutton and Barto (2018) describe RL as a process whereby agents interact with their environment to maximize long-term rewards. In the political context, RL elucidates how individuals process political information and make decisions influenced by cognitive biases and political motivations (Schulz & Bhui, 2024).

The neural underpinnings of conditioning and the role of reinforcement learning in understanding brain mechanisms have been extensively explored, highlighting both successes and challenges in linking behavioral outcomes to neural processes (Maia, 2009). In the context of agents with diverse sensors and actuators, reinforcement learning aims to map abstract observations to high-level actions without explicit state definitions, emphasizing its adaptability to diverse environments (Porta & Celaya, 2005). Moreover, reinforcement learning has been extended to probabilistic inference frameworks, demonstrating equivalence to exact probabilistic inference in certain scenarios (Levine, 2018).

The integration of guidance into relational reinforcement learning and the application of deep reinforcement learning in natural language processing underscore the evolution and expansion of reinforcement learning techniques (Driessens & Džeroski, 2004; Wang et al., 2018a). Curriculum-based reinforcement learning has enhanced the efficiency of training processes, enabling agents to handle broader and more complex tasks (Gupta & Najjaran, 2021). Multi-step methods and actor-critic algorithms have emerged as crucial components in modern deep reinforcement learning, contributing to improved performance across various environments (Grondman et al., 2012; Hernandez-Garcia, 2019).

The cognitive processes involved in political decision-making are multifaceted and encompass various aspects of human cognition. Decision-making in the political realm is influenced by a combination of cognitive factors, personality traits, emotions, and social context. Conscious self-regulation systems play a crucial role in integrating cognitive and personality factors in the decision-making process, particularly in political voting situations (Indina & Morosanova, 2009). Information processing, attention, memory, and judgment are key cognitive components underlying decision-making capacity, especially in evaluating complex political scenarios (Chen et al., 2015).

Memory retrieval processes are instrumental in explaining phenomena such as the incumbency advantage in politics, providing insights into how information is accessed, retrieved, and integrated during the decision-making process (Spälti et al., 2017). Furthermore, cognitive diversity and democratic mechanisms such as deliberation and majority rule are essential in enhancing decision-making processes in political systems (Moore, 2014).

The integration of cognitive biases and strategic decision-making processes provides an integrative perspective on decision-making, highlighting the interaction between rational and political modes in shaping choices (Das & Teng, 1999).

The interaction between cognition and emotion plays a significant role in shaping voting behavior and decision-making processes, emphasizing the influence of emotional responses on political choices (Vitekova & Václaviková, 2022). Imagination and mental simulation engage evolved social and emotional decision-making mechanisms, contributing to political cognition (Petersen & Aarøe, 2013). Violations of expectations and mental sets also influence political decision-making, demonstrating the relevance of cognitive processes in shaping political outcomes (Öllinger et al., 2017). Additionally, decision-making frameworks such as decision-theoretic psychiatry provide insights into the cognitive aspects of decision-making, focusing on the cognitive basis of choice (Huys et al., 2015).

In conclusion, understanding the cognitive processes involved in political decision-making is crucial for unraveling the complexities of how individuals navigate the political landscape, make choices, and engage in democratic processes.

### **Influence of Environmental Information on Political Decision-Making**

Various types of environmental information play crucial roles in shaping individuals' political decisions. This information encompasses traditional media, social media, and electronic media, all of which have significant impacts on political opinions and voting behavior.

#### *Influence of Traditional Media*

Traditional media, such as newspapers and television, wield substantial influence in shaping political decisions. Research indicates that endorsements in newspapers can influence individual choices, illustrating the bandwagon effect in political decision-making (Wei et al., 2015). Moreover, newspapers are known to influence local spending decisions, demonstrating the media's role in shaping political agendas and resource allocation (Mortensen & Serritzlew, 2006).

#### *Influence of Social Media*

Social media platforms have emerged as influential sources of information in political contexts. The use of social media during elections can significantly impact voters' decisions regarding candidate support (Shem, 2023). In developing countries, social media is considered a crucial factor in political decision-making, influencing individuals' choices and participation in political processes (Yogapriya & Chettri, 2022). Social media also stimulates both online and offline political participation among university students (Taufiq et al., 2019).

### *Influence of Electronic Media*

Electronic media also plays a significant role in shaping political opinions, particularly among younger generations. Studies highlight the impact of electronic media on political opinion formation among youth in countries such as Pakistan, emphasizing media as a powerful socialization agent (Tahir et al., 2019).

### *Cognitive and Emotional Influences*

Cognitive and emotional processes also influence political decision-making. Trust in information sources, alignment with ideological and epistemological beliefs, and the promotion of epistemic beliefs emphasizing evidence and expert judgment can affect news credibility and the formation of false consensus beliefs (Robertson, 2021). Analytic thinking and cognitive sophistication can exacerbate politically biased information processing, which in turn influences belief updating and political decision-making (Tappin et al., 2020).

### *Misinformation and Political Decision-Making*

The spread of political misinformation and rumors can impede individuals' ability to make accurate political decisions, highlighting the impact of misinformation on political behavior (Weeks & Garrett, 2014). Political identity and epistemic beliefs also play a role in promoting misperceptions and biased information processing, ultimately influencing political beliefs and behaviors (Moore et al., 2021).

### *Cultural and Value Influences*

Personal values can influence voting behavior through political values, with substantial effects on vote choice (Leimgruber, 2011). Additionally, traditional beliefs and cultural practices can influence voting behavior, with individuals adhering to traditional beliefs more likely to vote for incumbent parties in elections, demonstrating the influence of cultural and traditional factors on political behavior (Pelizzo, 2023).

In conclusion, various sources of environmental information, including traditional media, social media, and personal interactions, interact with cognitive biases, epistemic beliefs, and political identities to shape political beliefs and behaviors. Understanding these interactions is crucial for a comprehensive analysis of information influence on political decision-making processes.

## **Variability in Political Behavior and Beliefs**

The variability in political behavior and beliefs is influenced by a complex interplay of cognitive, environmental, and cultural factors. This analysis encompasses an understanding of diverse political ideologies, the cognitive

and environmental factors contributing to variability, and cross-cultural comparisons in democratic societies.

#### *Nature of Political Ideologies*

Political ideologies serve as frameworks of thought that provide guidance for political behavior and worldviews. "The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies" offers a comprehensive analysis of the nature of political ideologies and their manifestations, including the epistemological foundations and manifestations of various political ideologies (Freedman et al., 2013). Additionally, Heywood's (1992) work on "Political Ideologies" provides a foundational introduction to the study of political ideologies, offering a starting point for understanding the core concepts and principles underlying various political ideologies.

#### *Structure and Function of Political Ideologies*

Analysis of the structure, function, and elective affinities of political ideologies demonstrates how ideologies operate within social and political contexts (Jost et al., 2009). Ideologies not only function as guides for political action but also as tools for understanding and interpreting the political world.

#### *Negativity Bias and Morality*

Research by Hibbing et al. (2014) demonstrates how negativity bias can influence ideological preferences, emphasizing the role of personality traits and cognitive biases in shaping ideological behavior and beliefs. Furthermore, Weber & Federico (2012) explore the relationship between moral foundations and ideological preferences, revealing the motivational and psychological underpinnings of different ideological beliefs.

#### *Ideological and Political Education*

Studies on ideological and political education among college students reveal innovative methods, curriculum construction, and promotion strategies to enhance ideological understanding and political engagement among students ("Innovative Methods for Ideological and Political Education of College Students," 2018; Shen, 2020). This education is crucial in shaping informed and critical political views among younger generations.

#### *Cognitive and Environmental Influences*

Cognitive factors, such as cognitive ability and cognitive biases, as well as environmental factors, such as information received through media and social interactions, play roles in shaping political beliefs and behaviors. Variability in cognitive abilities is partly influenced by genetic factors, with certain genetic variants associated with cognitive decline in older adults (Andrews et al., 2016).



### *Cross-Cultural Comparisons in Democratic Societies*

Cross-cultural comparisons in democratic societies face challenges due to differing conceptions of democracy shaped by varied experiences with democratic systems and linguistic differences that can introduce bias in research findings (Jacobsen & Fuchs, 2020). However, cross-cultural learning can enrich theories of deliberative democracy and expand the reach of democratic principles (Sass & Dryzek, 2013). Additionally, cultural reflection in belief structures demonstrates the importance of understanding cultural nuances in cross-cultural comparisons (Zhang et al., 2018).

### **Interventions to Reduce Political Polarization**

Interventions to reduce political polarization encompass a range of strategies aimed at enhancing understanding, reducing intergroup anxiety, and promoting constructive dialogue. The following interventions are based on existing research:

#### *Understanding Psychological Processes*

Understanding and addressing specific psychological processes of political polarization can aid in designing and implementing effective depolarization interventions. For instance, in the context of climate change, a deep understanding of psychological processes can assist in designing more targeted actions to reduce polarization (Cole et al., 2023).

#### *Role of Media*

Social media has a significant impact on political polarization. Some studies suggest that media literacy programs and balanced reporting can help reduce polarization by encouraging users to understand different perspectives (Kubin & Sikorski, 2021).

#### *Critical Social Psychology*

A critical social psychology approach to studying political polarization can contribute to designing interventions to mitigate the negative impacts of polarization. Reducing intergroup anxiety, for example, can be an effective strategy to decrease polarization (Balinhas, 2022; Hackett et al., 2018).

#### *Promoting Civil Disagreement*

Research indicates that civil disagreement can reduce issue polarization. Developing approaches that encourage respectful dialogue and understanding of diverse perspectives is crucial for addressing the challenges of mass polarization (Guan et al., 2023).

#### *Metacognitive Insight*

Interventions that enhance metacognitive insight in the interpretation of evidence can be an effective way to reduce societal polarization on science-

related issues. This involves encouraging individuals to be more reflective and critical about how they process information (Said et al., 2021).

#### *Enhancing Cognitive Flexibility*

Strategies aimed at enhancing cognitive flexibility through political communication can help reduce extreme beliefs in polarized intergroup settings, contributing to depolarization efforts (Winter et al., 2022).

#### *Civil Discourse*

Facilitating civil discourse by providing information about political attitudes and measuring users' political status can help reduce political polarization. This can be achieved by encouraging more open communication and understanding of diverse perspectives (Jeon, 2024).

#### *Addressing Inequality and Partisanship*

Addressing inequality and promoting redistribution can help temper mass polarization. Policies focusing on reducing social and economic inequalities can play a role in reducing political polarization (Stewart et al., 2021).

#### *Social Mobilization and Volatility*

Understanding the impact of social mobilization on COVID-19 pandemic control reveals potential polarization threats and the need for coordinated action to mitigate its impact. Community-based interventions that enhance collaboration and solidarity can reduce polarization (Hong et al., 2021).

#### *Pilot Studies and Preliminary Findings*

Early research and pilot studies underscore the importance of trial runs before scaling up interventions. Pilot studies help assess initial effectiveness and feasibility of interventions, allowing for adjustments before broader implementation (Olsson & Gustafsson, 2021; Pfledderer et al., 2023).

## **Conclusion**

This comprehensive review of cognitive mechanisms in political reinforcement learning provides valuable insights into the roots of political polarization. The study highlights the complex interplay between cognitive processes, environmental information, and societal factors in shaping political beliefs and behaviors. Key findings demonstrate the significant influence of traditional and social media on political opinions, as well as the role of cognitive biases and political motivations in interpreting information, leading to polarized beliefs.

The research underscores the effectiveness of interventions that enhance cognitive flexibility, metacognitive insight, and promote civil discourse in mitigating political polarization. These findings have important implications for policymakers, educators, and media organizations in developing strategies

to reduce polarization and strengthen democratic processes.

Future research should focus on empirical validation of the proposed models and testing of interventions across diverse cultural and political contexts. Additionally, longitudinal studies examining the long-term effects of depolarization interventions would provide valuable insights into their sustained effectiveness.

By advancing our understanding of the cognitive and social dynamics underlying political polarization, this research contributes to the development of evidence-based strategies to foster more inclusive and constructive political discourse, ultimately strengthening the foundations of democratic societies in an increasingly complex information landscape.

## Reference

- Amoore, L. (2022). Machine Learning Political Orders. *Review of International Studies*, 49(1), 20–36. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0260210522000031>
- Amrullah, A., Umar, U., & Suharli, L. (2023). Pengaruh Strategi Komunikasi Politik Terhadap Partisipasi Politik Masyarakat Dengan Perilaku Pemilih Sebagai Variabel Moderasi Dalam Pemilihan Gubernur Nusa Tenggara Barat Tahun 2018 Di Kota Sumbawa. *Jiip - Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*, 6(5), 2922–2930. <https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v6i5.1984>
- Andrews, S. J., Das, D., Anstey, K. J., & Eastaer, S. (2016). *Association of AKAP6 and MIR2113 With Cognitive Performance in a Population Based Sample of Older Adults*. <https://doi.org/10.1101/070409>
- Asmuni, M. B., & Kosandi, M. (2020). Faktor Politik Uang Dalam Perilaku Memilih Masyarakat Pada Pilkada Kabupaten Temanggung Tahun 2018. *Indonesian Governance Journal Kajian Politik-Pemerintahan*, 3(2), 71–85. <https://doi.org/10.24905/igj.v3i2.1597>
- Baar, J. v., & FeldmanHall, O. (2022). The Polarized Mind in Context: Interdisciplinary Approaches to the Psychology of Political Polarization. *American Psychologist*, 77(3), 394–408. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000814>
- Balinhas, D. (2022). Bringing Critical Social Psychology to the Study of Political Polarization. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12721>
- Bijma, H. H., Wildschut, H. I. J., Heide, A. v. d., Passchier, J., Wladimiroff, J. W., & Maas, P. J. v. d. (2005). Parental Decision-Making After Ultrasound Diagnosis of a Serious Foetal Abnormality. *Fetal Diagnosis and Therapy*, 20(5), 321–327. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000086806>
- Bougher, L. D. (2012). The Case for Metaphor in Political Reasoning and Cognition. *Political Psychology*, 33(1), 145–163. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2011.00865.x>
- Brand, M., & Markowitsch, H. J. (2009). Aging and Decision-Making: A Neurocognitive Perspective. *Gerontology*, 56(3), 319–324. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000248829>
- Caparos, S., Fortier-St-Pierre, S., Gosselin, J., Blanchette, I., & Brisson, B. (2015).

- The Tree to the Left, the Forest to the Right: Political Attitude and Perceptual Bias. *Cognition*, 134, 155–164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2014.10.006>
- Chen, G., Zheng, W., Shi, G., Xiong, D., Du, J., & Bai, Y. (2015). Key Technology of Pilot's Cognitive Decision-Making Capacity Evaluation Based on Distributed Computing. *Matec Web of Conferences*, 22, 01015. <https://doi.org/10.1051/mateconf/20152201015>
- Cole, J. C., Gillis, A., Linden, S. v. d., Cohen, M. S., & Vandenberg, M. P. (2023). *Social Psychological Perspectives on Political Polarization: Insights and Implications for Climate Change*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/xz6wk>
- Das, T., & Teng, B. (1999). Cognitive Biases and Strategic Decision Processes: An Integrative Perspective. *Journal of Management Studies*, 36(6), 757–778. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.00157>
- Didi, D. (2019). Model Mediasi Dan Moderasi Dalam Hubungan Antara Perilaku Politik Pimpinan, Kompetensi Auditor, Dan Kinerja Auditor. *Ekuitas (Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Keuangan)*, 3(1), 48–71. <https://doi.org/10.24034/j25485024.y2019.v3.i1.4064>
- Driessens, K., & Džeroski, S. (2004). Integrating Guidance Into Relational Reinforcement Learning. *Machine Learning*, 57(3), 271–304. <https://doi.org/10.1023/b:mach.0000039779.47329.3a>
- Duong, F., Small, C., Hawkins, S., & Xu, C. (2023). *Outgroup Testimonials and Ingroup Validation Strengthen the Effects of Perception Gap Interventions on Affective Polarization: Evidence From a Large-Scale Experiment*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/atguq>
- Freedman, M., Sargent, L. T., & Stears, M. (2013). *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199585977.001.0001>
- Gershman, S. J. (2019). How to never be wrong. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 26(1), 13–28. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-018-1488-8>
- Grondman, I., Buşoniu, L., Lopes, G., & Babuška, R. (2012). A Survey of Actor-Critic Reinforcement Learning: Standard and Natural Policy Gradients. *Ieee Transactions on Systems Man and Cybernetics Part C (Applications and Reviews)*, 42(6), 1291–1307. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tsmcc.2012.2218595>
- Gu, Y., & Wang, Z. (2021). Income Inequality and Global Political Polarization: The Economic Origin of Political Polarization in the World. *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, 27(2), 375–398. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11366-021-09772-1>
- Guan, T., Liu, T., & Chen, X. (2023). Investigating the Potential of Civil Disagreement to Decrease Issue Polarization in China. *Policy & Internet*, 15(3), 288–305. <https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.338>
- Gupta, K. C., & Najjaran, H. (2021). Curriculum-Based Deep Reinforcement Learning for Adaptive Robotics: A Mini-Review. *International Journal of Robotic Engineering*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.35840/2631-5106/4131>

- Hackett, J. D., Gaffney, A. M., & Data, L. (2018). Intergroup Anxiety and Political Loss: The Buffering Effects of Believing in the Open Marketplace of Ideas and Openness to Diverse Political Discussions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 48*(3), 150–164. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12500>
- Han, K. J. (2022). Education Level and Affective Polarization: The Mediation Effects of Psychological Engagement in Politics and Authoritarian Attitudes. *Social Science Quarterly, 103*(7), 1633–1646. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.13228>
- Hernandez-Garcia, J. F. (2019). *Understanding Multi-Step Deep Reinforcement Learning: A Systematic Study of the DQN Target*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.1901.07510>
- Heywood, A. (1992). Political Ideologies: An Introduction. *Choice Reviews Online, 30*(03), 30-1758-30-1758. <https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.30-1758>
- Hibbing, J. R., Smith, K. B., & Alford, J. R. (2014). Differences in Negativity Bias Underlie Variations in Political Ideology. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 37*(3), 297–307. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0140525x13001192>
- Hill, S. J. (2017). Learning Together Slowly: Bayesian Learning About Political Facts. *The Journal of Politics, 79*(4), 1403–1418. <https://doi.org/10.1086/692739>
- Hong, I., Rutherford, A., & Cebrian, M. (2021). Social Mobilization and Polarization Can Create Volatility in COVID-19 Pandemic Control. *Applied Network Science, 6*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41109-021-00356-9>
- Huys, Q. J. M., Guitart-Masip, M., Dolan, R. J., & Dayan, P. (2015). Decision-Theoretic Psychiatry. *Clinical Psychological Science, 3*(3), 400–421. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702614562040>
- Indina, T. A., & Morosanova, V. I. (2009). Personality and Self-Regulation as Determinants of Rational Decision Making in a Political Voting Situation. *Psychology in Russia State of Art, 5*(1), 57. <https://doi.org/10.11621/pir.2009.0004>
- Innovative Methods for Ideological and Political Education of College Students. (2018). *Educational Sciences Theory & Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2018.5.106>
- Jacobsen, J., & Fuchs, L. M. (2020). Can We Compare Conceptions of Democracy in Cross-Linguistic and Cross-National Research? Evidence From a Random Sample of Refugees in Germany. *Social Indicators Research, 151*(2), 669–690. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-020-02397-6>
- Jeon, Y. (2024). HearHere: Mitigating Echo Chambers in News Consumption Through an AI-based Web System. *Proceedings of the Acm on Human-Computer Interaction, 8*(CSCW1), 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3637340>
- Jost, J. T., Federico, C. M., & Napier, J. L. (2009). Political Ideology: Its Structure, Functions, and Elective Affinities. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*(1), 307–337. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163600>

- Kaelbling, L. P., Littman, M. L., & Moore, A. W. (1996). Reinforcement Learning: A Survey. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 4, 237–285. <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.301>
- Krastev, S., McGuire, J. T., McNeney, D., Kable, J. W., Stolle, D., Gidengil, E., & Fellows, L. K. (2016). Do Political and Economic Choices Rely on Common Neural Substrates? A Systematic Review of the Emerging Neuropolitics Literature. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00264>
- Kriswantoro, T., Ayuning, E., Reswara, A., & Zidan, A. (2022). Political Polarization Dan Political Disinformation. *Jurnal Polgov*, 4(2), 50–110. <https://doi.org/10.22146/polgov.v4i2.3554>
- Kubin, E., & Sikorski, C. v. (2021). The Role of (Social) Media in Political Polarization: A Systematic Review. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 45(3), 188–206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2021.1976070>
- Leimgruber, P. (2011). Values and Votes: The Indirect Effect of Personal Values on Voting Behavior. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 17(2), 107–127. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1662-6370.2011.02009.x>
- Levine, S. (2018). *Reinforcement Learning and Control as Probabilistic Inference: Tutorial and Review*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.1805.00909>
- Maia, T. V. (2009). Reinforcement Learning, Conditioning, and the Brain: Successes and Challenges. *Cognitive Affective & Behavioral Neuroscience*, 9(4), 343–364. <https://doi.org/10.3758/cabn.9.4.343>
- McCarrey, A. C., Henry, J. D., & Luszcz, M. A. (2010). Potential Mechanisms Contributing to Decision-Making Difficulties in Late Adulthood. *Gerontology*, 56(4), 430–434. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000275060>
- Miler, K. C. (2009). The Limitations of Heuristics for Political Elites. *Political Psychology*, 30(6), 863–894. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2009.00731.x>
- Moore, A. (2014). Democratic Reason: Politics, Collective Intelligence and the Rule of the Many. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 13(2), e12–e15. <https://doi.org/10.1057/cpt.2013.26>
- Moore, A., Hong, S., & Cram, L. (2021). Trust in Information, Political Identity and the Brain: An Interdisciplinary fMRI Study. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B Biological Sciences*, 376(1822), 20200140. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0140>
- Mortensen, P. B., & Serritzlew, S. (2006). Newspapers and Budgeting: The Effects of Media Coverage on Local Expenditure Decisions. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 29(3), 236–260. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9477.2006.00151.x>
- Noël, X., Jaafari, N., Bechara, A., & Redlawsk, D. P. (2019). A Somatic Marker Perspective of Political Decision Making. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.945>
- Öllinger, M., Meißner, K., Müller, A., & Seidel, C. C. (2017). Expectation Violation in Political Decision Making: A Psychological Case Study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01761>

- Olsson, S., & Gustafsson, C. (2021). Estimated Effects of Web-Based Course From Adult Vocational Students' Perspective—A PFA Course in Scandinavian Intellectual Disability Practice. *Disabilities, 1*(2), 98–115. <https://doi.org/10.3390/disabilities1020009>
- Pelizzo, R. (2023). Traditional Beliefs and Electoral Behavior. *World Affairs, 186*(4), 925–950. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00438200231203017>
- Pennycook, G., McPhetres, J., Bagó, B., & Rand, D. G. (2020). *Beliefs About COVID-19 in Canada, the U.K., and the U.S.A.: A Novel Test of Political Polarization and Motivated Reasoning*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/zhjqp>
- Petersen, M. B., & Aarøe, L. (2013). Politics in the Mind's Eye: Imagination as a Link Between Social and Political Cognition. *American Political Science Review, 107*(2), 275–293. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0003055413000026>
- Pfledderer, C. D., Klinggraeff, L. v., Burkart, S., Wolfenden, L., Ioannidis, J. P. A., & Beets, M. W. (2023). Feasibility Indicators in Obesity-Related Behavioral Intervention Preliminary Studies: A Historical Scoping Review. *Pilot and Feasibility Studies, 9*(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40814-023-01270-w>
- Porta, J. M., & Celaya, E. (2005). Reinforcement Learning for Agents With Many Sensors and Actuators Acting in Categorizable Environments. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research, 23*, 79–122. <https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.1437>
- Rekker, R. (2021). The Nature and Origins of Political Polarization Over Science. *Public Understanding of Science, 30*(4), 352–368. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662521989193>
- Rigoli, F. (2021). Masters of suspicion: A Bayesian decision model of motivated political reasoning. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 51*(3), 350–370. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jtsb.12274>
- Robertson, C. T. (2021). Trust in Congruent Sources, Absolutely: The Moderating Effects of Ideological and Epistemological Beliefs on the Relationship Between Perceived Source Congruency and News Credibility. *Journalism Studies, 22*(7), 896–915. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670x.2021.1904273>
- Rollwage, M., Zmigrod, L., de-Wit, L., Dolan, R. J., & Fleming, S. M. (2019). What Underlies Political Polarization? A Manifesto for Computational Political Psychology. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 23*(10), 820–822. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2019.07.006>
- Said, N., Fischer, H., & Anders, G. (2021). Contested Science: Individuals With Higher Metacognitive Insight Into Interpretation of Evidence Are Less Likely to Polarize. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 29*(2), 668–680. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-021-01993-y>
- Sass, J., & Dryzek, J. S. (2013). Deliberative Cultures. *Political Theory, 42*(1), 3–25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591713507933>
- Schulz, L., & Bhui, R. (2024). Political reinforcement learners. *Trends in*

- Cognitive Sciences*, 28(3), 210–222. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2023.12.001>
- Shem, W. (2023). Social Media Use for Decision Making During Politics in a Multicultural Society: A Case Study of Nigeria. *The Journal of Society & Media*, 7(2), 281–299. <https://doi.org/10.26740/jsm.v7n2.p281-299>
- Shen, H. (2020). *Research on Connotation Structure and Promotion Path of College Students' Ideological and Political Education Appeal in the New Period*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200316.202>
- Simonsson, O., Narayanan, J., & Marks, J. (2021). Love Thy (Partisan) Neighbor: Brief Befriending Meditation Reduces Affective Polarization. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 25(6), 1577–1593. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13684302211020108>
- Spälti, A. K., Brandt, M., & Zeelenberg, M. (2017). Memory Retrieval Processes Help Explain the Incumbency Advantage. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 12(2), 173–182. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1930297500005714>
- Spezio, M. L., Loesch, L., Gosselin, F., Mattes, K., & Alvarez, R. M. (2012). Thin-Slice Decisions Do Not Need Faces to Be Predictive of Election Outcomes. *Political Psychology*, 33(3), 331–341. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2012.00897.x>
- Steinbeis, N., & Crone, E. A. (2016). The Link Between Cognitive Control and Decision-Making Across Child and Adolescent Development. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 10, 28–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2016.04.009>
- Stewart, A. J., Plotkin, J. B., & McCarty, N. (2021). Inequality, Identity, and Partisanship: How Redistribution Can Stem the Tide of Mass Polarization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(50). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2102140118>
- Sutton, R. S., & Barto, A. G. (2018). *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*, 2nd ed (pp. xxii, 526). The MIT Press.
- Tahir, M. J., Rehman, S., & Rehman, A. U. (2019). Effects of Electronic Media in Political Opinion Formation of Youth in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Social Research*, 1, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.52567/pjsr.v1i01.1>
- Tappin, B. M., & Gadsby, S. (2019). *Biased Belief in the Bayesian Brain: A Deeper Look at the Evidence*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/v3r9d>
- Tappin, B. M., Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2020). Bayesian or Biased? Analytic Thinking and Political Belief Updating. *Cognition*, 204, 104375. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2020.104375>
- Taufiq, A., Alvi, A., & Ittefaq, M. (2019). The Use of Social Media on Political Participation Among University Students: An Analysis of Survey Results From Rural Pakistan. *Sage Open*, 9(3), 215824401986448. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019864484>
- Viteková, L., & Václavíková, I. (2022). Psychological Aspects of Political Choices: Focus on Cognition, Decision-Making Styles, and Emotions in Voting Behaviour. *SJPS*, 25–47. <https://doi.org/10.34135/sjps.220102>
- Vitriol, J. A., Sandor, J., Vidigal, R., & Farhart, C. E. (2022). On the Independent



- Roles of Cognitive & Political Sophistication: Variation Across Attitudinal Objects. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 37(2), 319–331. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.4022>
- Wahidin, D. T. S., Muhyidin, A., Iswahyuni, I., & Ilmar, A. (2020). Partai Politik Dan Perilaku Pemilih Di Indonesia (Studi Pada Pemilu Legislatif 2009, 2014, Dan 2019). *Journal of Government and Civil Society*, 4(1), 131. <https://doi.org/10.31000/jgcs.v4i1.2376>
- Wang, W. Y., Li, J., & He, X. (2018a). *Deep Reinforcement Learning for NLP*. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/p18-5007>
- Wang, W. Y., Li, J., & He, X. (2018b). *Deep Reinforcement Learning for NLP*. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/p18-5007>
- Weber, C., & Federico, C. M. (2012). Moral Foundations and Heterogeneity in Ideological Preferences. *Political Psychology*, 34(1), 107–126. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2012.00922.x>
- Weeks, B. E., & Garrett, R. K. (2014). Electoral Consequences of Political Rumors: Motivated Reasoning, Candidate Rumors, and Vote Choice During the 2008 U.S. Presidential Election. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 26(4), 401–422. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/edu005>
- Wei, R., Lo, V., & Chang, C. (2015). Endorsements Move Students to Choose Candidate. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 36(4), 482–494. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739532915618418>
- Weinschenk, A. C., Dawes, C. T., Kandler, C., Bell, E., & Riemann, R. (2019). New Evidence on the Link Between Genes, Psychological Traits, and Political Engagement. *Politics and the Life Sciences*, 38(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1017/pls.2019.3>
- Winter, K., Scholl, A., & Sassenberg, K. (2022). Flexible Minds Make More Moderate Views: Subtractive Counterfactuals Mitigate Strong Views About Immigrants' Trustworthiness. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 26(6), 1310–1328. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13684302221102876>
- Yogapriya, Dr. G., & Chettri, N. (2022). Impact of Social Media in Making Political Decisions in Developing Countries. *Technoarete Transactions on Advances in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.36647/ttassh/02.02.a001>
- Zhang, R. J., Liu, J. H., Milojev, P., Jung, J., Wang, S., Xie, T., Choi, H., Yamaguchi, S., & Morio, H. (2018). The Structure of Trust as a Reflection of Culture and Institutional Power Structure: Evidence From Four East Asian Societies. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 22(1), 59–73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12350>