The Influence of Media Coverage on Public Opinion and Electoral Outcomes: A Comprehensive Analysis

Report Issued: 2025-07-15

Executive Summary

This report provides a comprehensive analysis of the multifaceted influence of media coverage on public opinion and voter behavior during election campaigns. It examines the core theoretical mechanisms through which media exerts its influence, namely agenda-setting, priming, and framing. The analysis traces the evolution of the media landscape, contrasting the enduring role of traditional outlets like television and newspapers with the transformative impact of digital and social media. Drawing on extensive academic research, empirical data, and quantitative studies, the report presents evidence-based conclusions on how media can shape electoral outcomes. Case studies of the 2016 Brexit referendum and the 2016 and 2020 U.S. presidential elections illustrate these dynamics in practice. Furthermore, the report addresses the pervasive challenges of media bias, the proliferation of misinformation, and the role of fact-checking as a countermeasure. By analyzing longitudinal changes in media's role, this document offers critical insights for academic and policy audiences seeking to understand and navigate the complexities of the modern information environment and its profound implications for democratic processes.

Theoretical Foundations: Mechanisms of Media Influence

The academic understanding of media's influence on public opinion, particularly within the context of elections, has evolved significantly over the past century. Initial theories in the early 20th century, often termed "hypodermic needle" or "magic bullet" models, posited that mass media had direct, powerful, and uniform effects on a passive audience. This view gave way in the mid-20th century to a "minimal effects" paradigm, which argued that media primarily reinforced pre-existing beliefs, its influence being heavily mediated by social networks and selective exposure. However, by the 1970s, a return to the concept of a powerful media emerged, driven by theories that focused on long-term cognitive effects rather than immediate behavioral changes. The contemporary view acknowledges that media can have strong effects, but these are contingent upon audience characteristics, the political context, and the nature of the media message itself. This modern understanding is primarily articulated through three interconnected theoretical models: agenda-setting, priming, and framing.

Agenda-setting theory describes the media's ability to influence the salience of issues in the public mind. First articulated by Maxwell McCombs and Donald Shaw in their 1972 study of the 1968 U.S. presidential election, the theory is famously summarized as the media not telling people what to think, but rather "what to think about." It operates on a cognitive level, suggesting that by giving prominence to certain topics through sustained and extensive coverage, the media makes those topics more accessible in people's memories. This increased accessibility leads the public to perceive these issues as more important. The theory encompasses multiple levels: the media agenda (the issues news outlets cover), the public agenda (the issues the public deems important), and the policy agenda (the issues that capture the attention of policymakers). The process is often circular, as political actors and

interest groups engage in "agenda building" to influence media coverage, which in turn shapes public and policy priorities. The power of agenda-setting has been observed in numerous real-world events, from raising public concern about climate change and the COVID-19 pandemic to shaping the discourse around the Black Lives Matter and #MeToo movements. Despite its explanatory power, the theory has been criticized for sometimes assuming a passive audience that does not actively filter or reject media messages based on personal experience and values.

Priming is a closely related concept, often considered an extension of agenda-setting. It refers to the process by which news content suggests to audiences the specific criteria they should use when evaluating political leaders, parties, or policies. Both priming and agenda-setting are based on memory accessibility models; by making certain issues more salient (agenda-setting), the media also influences the considerations that come to mind when citizens make political judgments (priming). For example, if media coverage relentlessly focuses on the economy, voters are primed to evaluate incumbent performance based on economic indicators, potentially overlooking other areas like foreign policy or social issues. Political campaigns strategically employ priming to highlight their strengths and their opponents' weaknesses. A campaign might emphasize national security after a crisis to prime voters to favor a candidate perceived as a strong leader. This mechanism works by activating cognitive schemas, or mental frameworks, that guide information processing. Repeated emphasis on certain attributes makes them more accessible, shaping the evaluative benchmarks voters use and potentially reinforcing partisan biases by resonating with specific ideological leanings.

Framing theory moves beyond the salience of issues to address how they are characterized and presented. Rooted in both psychology and sociology, framing is concerned with "how to make sense of the issue." It posits that the way a story is told—the specific words, images, and context used—influences how the audience understands and interprets it. Unlike the accessibility-based models of agenda-setting and priming, framing is about the applicability of certain considerations. For instance, a protest can be framed as a legitimate expression of civil dissent or as a dangerous threat to public order; each frame encourages a different interpretation and emotional response. Framing is a necessary tool for journalists to simplify complex issues for public consumption, but it is also a powerful persuasive instrument for political actors. The strategic use of language to frame policies, such as referring to an "estate tax" versus a "death tax," can significantly shift public opinion by resonating with different underlying values and schemas within the audience. The challenge in studying framing lies in distinguishing it from simple content differences, ensuring that the focus remains on the mode of presentation rather than just the substance of the message. Together, these three theories provide a robust framework for understanding the subtle yet powerful cognitive effects of media on public opinion during elections.

The Evolving Media Landscape: Traditional vs. Digital Platforms

The ecosystem of political information has undergone a dramatic transformation, shifting from a landscape dominated by a few traditional mass media outlets to a fragmented, interactive, and ceaselessly active digital environment. This evolution has not rendered traditional media obsolete but has altered its function and forced a synergistic, and sometimes competitive, relationship with new digital platforms. Understanding the distinct and overlapping impacts of both traditional and digital media is crucial to comprehending modern electoral dynamics.

Traditional media, encompassing television, newspapers, and radio, continues to play a pivotal role in election campaigns, retaining significant influence due to its broad reach, established credibility, and unique functions. Television, in particular, remains a primary source of news for a vast cross-section of society, including older demographics who are less active online. Major newspapers and broadcast

networks often carry a legacy of journalistic integrity and authority, making them trusted sources for in-depth analysis and fact-checking in an era rife with misinformation. These outlets perform several core democratic functions: they inform voters about candidate platforms and backgrounds, facilitate public debate through televised events and interviews, vet candidates through investigative journalism, and serve a critical watchdog role by holding political actors accountable. Furthermore, local newspapers and broadcast affiliates provide a crucial connection to community-level issues, allowing candidates to engage with constituents on a more personal level. However, traditional media faces significant challenges, including economic pressures from declining ad revenue, which can lead to a focus on sensationalism and profitable "horse race" coverage over substantive policy analysis. They also grapple with declining public trust, exacerbated by perceptions of partisan bias and the pressures of a 24-hour news cycle that can prioritize speed over accuracy.

The ascendancy of digital and social media has revolutionized political communication, offering unprecedented tools for campaigns and fundamentally altering how voters engage with the electoral process. Platforms like Facebook, X (formerly Twitter), Instagram, and TikTok allow political candidates to bypass traditional media gatekeepers and communicate directly with the electorate in real-time. This direct channel can foster a more personal connection and mobilize supporters with greater efficiency. A key feature of digital campaigning is **microtargeting**, where data analytics and artificial intelligence are used to deliver tailored messages to specific voter demographics based on their online behavior, interests, and personal data. This allows for highly personalized and potentially more persuasive communication. The digital realm also thrives on viral content and hashtag movements, which can amplify a political message or social cause with incredible speed and reach. Campaigns increasingly leverage online influencers and podcasters to reach new audiences, and use social media as a powerful tool for fundraising and gathering real-time data on public sentiment.

The impact of digital media on voter behavior is profound. It has democratized access to information, allowing citizens to engage with political content instantaneously. It has also proven to be a powerful tool for voter mobilization, with "get out the vote" campaigns and online registration drives contributing to increased turnout, especially among younger voters. However, this digital transformation is fraught with peril. The same platforms that enable direct engagement are also fertile ground for the rapid spread of **misinformation** and **disinformation**. The algorithmic nature of social media feeds can create "echo chambers" and "filter bubbles," where users are primarily exposed to content that reinforces their existing beliefs, thereby deepening political polarization and societal divisions. The use of personal data for microtargeting raises serious ethical concerns about voter manipulation and privacy, as exemplified by the Cambridge Analytica scandal. The digital age has thus created a dual-edged sword: it empowers citizens and campaigns with new tools for democratic participation while simultaneously posing significant threats to the integrity of the information ecosystem and the health of public discourse. The future of political communication lies in the complex interplay between the established authority of traditional media and the dynamic, participatory nature of the digital sphere.

Empirical Evidence and Case Studies of Electoral Influence

Theoretical models of media influence are powerfully substantiated by a growing body of empirical research and real-world case studies that demonstrate a tangible impact on election outcomes. Quantitative studies, employing sophisticated methodologies, have moved beyond correlation to establish causal links between media exposure and voter behavior, while analyses of recent elections in the United States and Europe reveal the potent effects of media strategies, bias, and disinformation in practice.

Recent quantitative research has provided compelling evidence of social media's influence. A notable study by Fujiwara, Müller, and Schwarz utilized a quasi-experimental design to assess the effect of Twitter on the 2016 and 2020 U.S. presidential elections. By exploiting variation in Twitter adoption linked to the 2007 South by Southwest festival—an event that created a surge in early adopters in certain geographic areas for reasons unrelated to pre-existing political trends—the researchers isolated a causal effect. Their findings indicated that a 10% increase in a county's Twitter users lowered the Republican vote share for Donald Trump by approximately 0.2 percentage points in both elections. This effect was not observed for other Republican candidates in congressional races, suggesting it was specific to Trump. The mechanism appeared to be persuasion, primarily among independent and moderate voters who shifted towards the Democratic candidate, potentially as a "backlash" to Trump's unique and high-volume presence on the platform, which was amplified by a pro-Democratic slant in overall political content on Twitter. Similarly, a study by Heike Klüver on the 2019 European Parliament election in Germany used a differences-in-differences design to show that a viral video by a social influencer named Rezo, which strongly criticized the ruling Christian Democratic Union (CDU), caused a significant vote loss of 4.7 percentage points for the party among those who voted in person after the video's release compared to those who had already voted by mail. These studies highlight that both broad platform effects and specific influential content can measurably alter electoral results.

The 2016 Brexit referendum in the United Kingdom serves as a stark case study of how media narratives and misinformation can shape a nation-defining vote. The "Leave" campaign effectively utilized simplified, emotionally resonant slogans and disputed figures, most famously the claim that the UK sent £350 million per week to the EU that could instead fund the National Health Service. This narrative, though widely debunked, dominated discourse. The media landscape was highly polarized and acrimonious, with coverage focusing intensely on immigration, often framing it in negative terms that stoked fears about national identity and security. Research revealed the aggressive use of automated social media accounts, or bots, to artificially amplify these messages and create a false sense of consensus, contributing to a climate of division and confusion that influenced the narrow outcome of the referendum.

The 2016 U.S. presidential election further illustrated the power of a fragmented and partisan media ecosystem. Analysis revealed an asymmetric media landscape where a more insular and hyperpartisan right-wing media, centered around outlets like Breitbart, successfully set the agenda. While mainstream media coverage was negative for both candidates, it disproportionately focused on Hillary Clinton's alleged scandals, often driven by narratives originating in and amplified by the right-wing media sphere through strategic leaks and coordinated campaigns. This was coupled with foreign interference, particularly from Russian-operated troll farms and bots that spread disinformation and used targeted advertising on platforms like Facebook to inflame divisive issues among specific voter segments. The right-wing media ecosystem proved highly effective at manipulating the standards of traditional journalism to inject its narratives into the mainstream, while being largely impervious to traditional accountability mechanisms itself.

The 2020 U.S. election saw these trends intensify, with an unprecedented volume of disinformation centered on the integrity of the election itself, particularly concerning mail-in voting. This period was marked by a dramatic increase in social media activity from lawmakers and a rise in "link polarization," where political actors and their followers increasingly shared content exclusively from ideologically aligned sources, deepening the echo chamber effect. Following the election, a significant portion of Republican lawmakers' social media language shifted to cast doubt on the results, using terms like "fraud" and "recount." This sustained campaign of disinformation, amplified across partisan media, eroded trust in the democratic process and had severe real-world consequences. These cases collectively demonstrate that the modern media environment, when leveraged strategically, can profoundly influence public perception, behavior, and the ultimate outcomes of elections.

The Pervasive Challenge of Media Bias and Misinformation

The democratic ideal of a well-informed citizenry making rational choices is profoundly challenged by two intertwined phenomena in the modern media environment: pervasive media bias and the rampant proliferation of misinformation. While media outlets are expected to act as neutral arbiters of information, they are often influenced by political leanings, economic incentives, and narrative conventions that can skew coverage and shape voter perceptions in subtle but powerful ways. This challenge is magnified by the spread of deliberately false or misleading content, which erodes public trust and undermines the factual basis required for healthy political discourse.

Media bias manifests in various forms beyond overt partisan cheerleading. One subtle form is **issue bias**, related to the concept of "issue ownership," where media coverage that disproportionately focuses on topics seen as the strength of one party (e.g., national security for Republicans, social welfare for Democrats) can inadvertently favor that party. A more common and criticized form is the reliance on **narrative framing**, particularly "horse race" coverage, which presents elections as a strategic game of polls and personalities rather than a substantive debate on policy. This frame, while engaging for audiences, can foster cynicism and distract from the real-world stakes of an election. Bias is also evident in the **tone and volume of coverage**. Studies have documented stark disparities in the positive versus negative coverage candidates receive, with a disproportionate focus on one candidate's controversies over another's. Even **visual bias**, through the selection and presentation of photographs, can convey powerful emotional cues that influence voter impressions. These biases are amplified by the audience's tendency toward **selective exposure**, where individuals seek out news sources that confirm their existing beliefs, creating ideological echo chambers that reinforce partisan divides and make voters less receptive to alternative viewpoints.

The problem of bias is compounded by the deluge of **misinformation** (unintentionally false information) and **disinformation** (deliberately fabricated information intended to deceive). The architecture of digital platforms, designed to maximize engagement, often rewards sensational, emotionally charged, and polarizing content, allowing falsehoods to spread faster and wider than factual corrections. This digital wildfire is fueled by various actors, from domestic political operatives to foreign state-sponsored campaigns aiming to sow discord and manipulate electoral outcomes. The use of sophisticated tools, including AI-generated "deepfakes" and coordinated bot networks, makes it increasingly difficult for the average citizen to distinguish fact from fiction. The consequences are severe: the erosion of trust in democratic institutions, the distortion of public debate, and the potential for electoral manipulation.

In response to this "infodemic," **fact-checking** has emerged as a critical journalistic countermeasure. A substantial body of research confirms that fact-checking is generally effective at correcting specific misperceptions; when people are exposed to a correction, their belief in the false claim is reduced. The feared "backfire effect," where a correction paradoxically strengthens a false belief, has been found to be rare. However, the effectiveness of fact-checking is not absolute and is subject to several limitations. A significant challenge is **motivated reasoning**, as strong partisans are often resistant to corrections that challenge their worldview. Furthermore, even when a correction is accepted, a "continued influence effect" can persist, where the original misinformation continues to shape a person's broader attitudes. The impact of a fact-check also depends on various factors, including the credibility of the fact-checking source, the clarity and tone of the correction, and whether it provides a compelling alternative narrative to replace the falsehood. While fact-checking is an essential tool for promoting accuracy, it is not a panacea for the broader problems of bias and misinformation that permeate the contemporary media landscape.

Longitudinal Changes and Future Outlook

The influence of media on elections is not a static phenomenon but a dynamic process that has evolved in lockstep with technological advancements and societal shifts. A longitudinal perspective reveals a clear trajectory from a relatively centralized media environment to the decentralized, interactive, and often chaotic digital ecosystem of the 21st century. This historical evolution has reshaped campaign strategies, voter behavior, and the very nature of democratic discourse, presenting both new opportunities for engagement and significant challenges to political stability.

In the early American republic, the press was overtly partisan, often serving as a direct mouthpiece for political factions. The 20th century ushered in the era of mass media, with radio and later television becoming dominant forces. The televised presidential debates of 1960, for instance, famously demonstrated the power of visual media to shape public perception. Throughout this period, a model of professional, objective journalism gained prominence, with major newspapers and broadcast networks acting as powerful gatekeepers of political information. While these outlets wielded significant agenda-setting power, the information landscape was relatively contained. The advent of the internet and digital media in the late 20th century began to fracture this model, offering consumers an explosion of choice. This led to the emergence of the "Media Participation Hypothesis," which posited that interactive media use could foster greater civic engagement and political efficacy, a finding supported by longitudinal data showing that engagement with participatory media correlated with more positive assessments of democratic processes.

The last fifteen years can be characterized as the "Decade of Social Media Elections." Platforms like Facebook and X (formerly Twitter) have become central arenas for political combat, enabling direct candidate-to-voter communication, micro-targeted advertising, and grassroots mobilization on an unprecedented scale. However, this era is also defined by its pathologies: the viral spread of misinformation, the algorithmic creation of polarizing echo chambers, and the amplification of extreme views. Alongside social media, researchers have identified the growing importance of "search media," recognizing that the ranking of search engine results is a powerful and ephemeral form of media influence that can shape opinions and potentially sway close elections. Studying these dynamic and personalized media effects requires new methodologies, such as the "algorithm audits" used to track changes in search results over time.

Looking forward, the profound influence of media on democratic processes necessitates a multi-pronged response from policymakers, technology companies, and civil society. The dual nature of modern media—its capacity to both inform and engage, as well as to mislead and polarize—presents a formidable governance challenge. Potential avenues for intervention include the development of more robust regulatory frameworks to enhance transparency in political advertising and curb the worst excesses of data harvesting. There is a critical need for widespread media literacy education to equip citizens with the skills to critically evaluate information sources, identify bias, and recognize manipulative content. Media organizations themselves face a call to reinforce journalistic standards, prioritize substantive reporting over sensationalism, and innovate in ways that foster informed and civil public discourse. The integrity of future elections will depend on the ability of democratic societies to adapt to this ever-changing media environment, harnessing its potential for positive engagement while mitigating its capacity to erode trust and distort the political process.

Conclusion

The relationship between media coverage and public opinion during election campaigns is a complex, powerful, and continuously evolving dynamic that lies at the heart of modern democratic practice. As this report has detailed, media influence is not a simple, monolithic force but operates through soph-

isticated cognitive mechanisms of agenda-setting, priming, and framing, which collectively shape what citizens think about, the criteria they use for judgment, and how they interpret political issues. The transition from a traditional mass media landscape to a fragmented and interactive digital sphere has fundamentally altered the channels of this influence, creating a dual reality of unprecedented access to information alongside unparalleled challenges of misinformation, polarization, and media bias.

Empirical evidence and case studies from recent, high-stakes elections confirm that these are not merely theoretical concerns. The strategic use of media narratives, the weaponization of disinformation, and the inherent biases of both legacy and new media platforms have a measurable impact on voter behavior and can alter electoral outcomes. The challenges are profound, threatening to erode the shared factual basis necessary for reasoned public debate and to deepen the societal divisions that strain democratic institutions.

Yet, the media remains an indispensable pillar of democracy. It provides the essential functions of informing the public, holding power to account, and providing a platform for political discourse. The path forward does not lie in rejecting the media's role but in fostering a more resilient and responsible information ecosystem. This requires a concerted, multi-stakeholder effort that includes promoting robust journalistic ethics, implementing thoughtful policy and regulation to ensure transparency and fairness, and, most critically, cultivating a media-literate citizenry capable of navigating the complexities of the modern world. The health of democracy in the digital age will ultimately depend on our collective ability to manage this delicate balance, ensuring that the media serves to enlighten rather than obscure, and to unite rather than divide.

References

A Breakdown of the Negatives and Positives of Media in the Political Sphere. (https://theobserver-qiaa.org/a-breakdown-of-the-negatives-and-positives-of-media-in-the-political-sphere)

A DECADE OF SOCIAL MEDIA ELECTIONS – A CROSS-NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE (https://spir.aoir.org/ojs/index.php/spir/article/download/10976/9644/)

Agenda Setting Theory | Media's Role in Shaping Public Opinion (https://mediatheory.net/agenda-setting-theory/)

Agenda Setting Theory: How Media Shapes Public Opinion and Priorities (https://masscommunication-theories.com/agenda-setting-theory-how-media-shapes-public-opinion-and-priorities/)

Agenda-Setting, Framing and Priming (https://methods.sagepub.com/hnbk/edvol/sage-hdbk-public-opinion-research/chpt/agendasetting-framing-priming)

Agenda-Setting, Priming, and Framing (https://experts.illinois.edu/en/publications/agenda-setting-priming-and-framing)

Agenda-Setting, Priming, and Framing (https://www.academia.edu/95693581/Agenda_Setting_Priming_and_Framing)

American Bar Association. (n.d.). "Six ways the media influence elections" (https://www.americanbar.org/groups/public_interest/election_law/american-democracy/our-work/democracy-database/six-ways-media-influence-elections/)

Analysing the role of digital platforms in shaping voter behaviour and election outcome (https://www.multisubjectjournal.com/article/611/7-2-13-537.pdf)

Baum, M. A., & Gussin, P. (2005). "Issue Bias: How Issue Coverage and Media Bias Affect Voter Perceptions of Elections". Harvard University. (https://mbaum.scholars.harvard.edu/publications/issue-bias-how-issue-coverage-and-media-bias-affect-voter-perceptions-elections)

Brichacek, A. (2016, November 8). "Six ways the media influence elections". University of Oregon. (https://journalism.uoregon.edu/news/six-ways-media-influences-elections)

Carlow University. (n.d.). Case Studies - Election Disinformation and Misinformation: A Critical ... (ht-

tps://ctrl.carlow.edu/c.php?g=1417763&p=10507977)

Ch. 7 - 3. Media Influence Flashcards (https://quizlet.com/633786271/ch-7-3-media-influence-flash-cards/)

Charting Congress on Social Media in the 2016 and 2020 Elections (https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2021/09/30/charting-congress-on-social-media-in-the-2016-and-2020-elections/)

City, University of London. (n.d.). Social media 'bots' used to boost political messages during Brexit ... (https://www.citystgeorges.ac.uk/research/impact/case-studies/social-media-bots-used-to-boost-political-messages-during-brexit-referendum)

Content Analysis in the Research Field of Election (Campaign ... - Springer (https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/978-3-658-36179-2_10.pdf)

Effect of Social Media on Elections: Evidence from The United States (https://academic.oup.com/jeea/article-abstract/22/3/1495/7308471)

Effects of Fact-Checking Political Misinformation on Perceptual Accuracy and Epistemic Political Efficacy (https://www.researchgate.net/publication/338023950_Effects_of_Fact-Checking_Political_Misinformation_on_Perceptual_Accuracy_and_Epistemic_Political_Efficacy)

Empirical Support for the Media Participation Hypothesis: Longitudinal ... (https://www.academia.edu/72812278/Empirical_Support_for_the_Media_Participation_Hypothesis_Longitudinal_Trends_Across_Presidential_Elections)

Empirical Support for the Media Participation Hypothesis: Longitudinal Trends Across Presidential Elections (https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444817709281)

Evolving role of media in elections (https://www.ifes.org/news/evolving-role-media-elections)

Fact checking in the 2019 election: research recommendations (https://fullfact.org/media/uploads/election-factcheck-briefing.pdf)

Fact-checking election-campaign misinformation: Impacts on noncommitted... (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/pops.13059)

facts.net/culture-and-the-arts/mass-media/25-facts-about-the-role-of-media-in-us-elections/ (https://facts.net/culture-and-the-arts/mass-media/25-facts-about-the-role-of-media-in-us-elections/)

Framing, Agenda Setting, and Priming: The Evolution of Three Media ... (https://academic.oup.com/joc/article/57/1/9/4102624)

Framing, Agenda Setting, and Priming: The Evolution of Three Media Effects Models (https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00326.x)

Fujiwara, T., Müller, K., & Schwarz, C. (2021). THE EFFECT OF SOCIAL MEDIA ON ELECTIONS: NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH (https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w28849/w28849.pdf)

Fujiwara, T., Müller, K., & Schwarz, C. (2023). The Effect of Social Media on Elections: Evidence from the United States (https://www.karstenmueller.com/uploads/1/3/3/9/133963673/socialmediaandelections.pdf)

Harvard Berkman Klein Center. (2017, August 16). Partisanship, Propaganda, and Disinformation: Online Media and the 2016 U.S. Presidential Election (https://cyber.harvard.edu/publications/2017/08/mediacloud)

Headlines win elections: Mere exposure to fictitious news media alters voting behavior (https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10393126/)

How Media – Namely News, Ads and Social Posts – Can Shape an Election (https://www.rutgers.edu/news/how-media-namely-news-ads-and-social-posts-can-shape-election)

How Media Coverage Influences Voter Behavior (https://demstore.com/how-media-coverage-influences-voter-behavior/)

How media coverage of presidential primaries fails voters and has helped Trump (https://theconversation.com/how-media-coverage-of-presidential-primaries-fails-voters-and-has-helped-trump-222133)

Impact of Information and Communication Technologies on Democratic Processes and Citizen Participation (https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4698/15/2/40)

Impact of Media on Politics: Analysis and Challenges (https://socialstudieshelp.com/impact-of-media-on-politics-analysis-and-challenges/)

Increased Media Choice and Political Knowledge Gaps: A Comparative … (https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10584609.2020.1868633)

Introduction: A Decade of Social Media Elections (https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/20563051211063461)

JSTOR. (n.d.). Brexit, Tweeted: Polarization and Social Media Manipulation on … (https://www.jstor.org/stable/jj.9692580)

Klüver, H. (2024). Social Influencers and Election Outcomes. Comparative Political Studies. (https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/00104140241306955)

lawslearned.com/media-coverage-of-elections/ (https://lawslearned.com/media-coverage-of-elections/)

Media Effects: How Media Influence Voters (https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/spsr.12263)

Media Influence in Politics: Agenda Setting, Framing and Priming (https://www.ukessays.com/essays/media/media-influence-in-politics-9928.php)

Media's Impact on Democratic Processes (https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/media-impact-on-democracy)

Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Voting Advice Applications (https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10584609.2020.1843572)

Misinformation Dashboard: Election 2024 (https://misinfodashboard.newslit.org/)

Moore, M., & Ramsay, G. (2017). UK media coverage of the 2016 EU Referendum campaign. (https://www.kcl.ac.uk/policy-institute/assets/cmcp/uk-media-coverage-of-the-2016-eu-referendum-campaign.pdf)

Partisanship, Propaganda, and Disinformation: Online Media and the 2016 U.S. Presidential Election (https://cyber.harvard.edu/publications/2017/08/mediacloud)

PNAS. The global effectiveness of fact-checking: Evidence from… (https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2104235118)

Political polarization and the electoral effects of media bias (https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0047272708000236)

Political polarization of news media and influencers on Twitter in the 2016 and 2020 US presidential elections (https://www.nature.com/articles/s41562-023-01598-z)

Positive and Negative Impacts of Social Media on Politics (https://hubvela.com/hub/technology/positive-negative-social-media/politics/)

Reinforcement Effects between Digital Media Use and Political … (https://academic.oup.com/poq/article/84/S1/355/5855290)

Review of Media Influence on Political Decision-Making Processes (https://www.ijfans.org/uploads/paper/ca304113c2bf03fdfe581e3260f01106.pdf)

Role of News Media in Enhancing Voters' Engagement: A Literature Review based Study (https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358929138_Role_of_News_Media_in_Enhancing_Voters'_Engagement_A_Literature_Review_based_Study)

SAGE Journals. Changes in perceptions of media bias (https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/2053168020987441)

schoolofpoliticalscience.com/social-media-and-politics/ (https://schoolofpoliticalscience.com/social-media-and-politics/)

Search Media and Elections: A Longitudinal Investigation of Political … (https://socialmedialab.sites.stanford.edu/sites/g/files/sbiybj22976/files/media/file/metaxa-cscw-search.pdf)

Social Influencers and Election Outcomes (https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/00104140241306955)

Social media and electoral dynamics: A dataset of X and facebook … (https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352340925001398)

Social media discourse and voting decisions influence: sentiment analysis in tweets during an

electoral period (https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13278-023-01048-1)

Social Media Effects: Hijacking Democracy and Civility in Civic Engagement (https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7343248/)

Social Media Use and Political Efficacy: Structural Effect of the Voting Decision of New Voters (https://hrmars.com/papers_submitted/10205/social-media-use-and-political-efficacy-structural-effect-of-the-voting-decision-of-new-voters.pdf)

Social media, sentiment and public opinions: Evidence from #Brexit and #USElection (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2021.103772)

socialstudieshelp.com/ap-government-and-politics/the-impact-of-political-campaigns-on-voter-behavior/ (https://socialstudieshelp.com/ap-government-and-politics/the-impact-of-political-campaigns-on-voter-behavior/)

South Slope News. What Is Priming in Politics? Examples and Impacts Explained. (https://southslope-news.com/what-is-priming-in-politics/)

Tandfonline.com. (n.d.). Full article: Brexit as 'politics of division': social media … (https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14742837.2021.1928484)

Taylor & Francis Online. When are Fact-Checks Effective? An Experimental Study on the Inclusion… (https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/15205436.2024.2321542)

The Delicate Balance: Navigating Media Influence, Public Opinion, and Democracy (https://www.aceye.org/the-delicate-balance-navigating-media-influence-public-opinion-and-democracy-mariama-salifu/)

The Effect of Social Media on Elections: Evidence from the United States (https://www.researchgate.net/publication/347600253_The_Effect_of_Social_Media_on_Elections_Evidence_from_the_United_States)

The Growing Divide: Media Bias in the 2024 Election Coverage (https://overseernews.com/2024/10/29/the-growing-divide-media-bias-in-the-2024-election-coverage/)

The Impact of Media Bias: How Editorial Slant Affects Voters (https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1111/j.1468-2508.2005.00349.x)

The Impact of Social Media on Voters Behavior In Recent Elections (https://ijhssm.org/issue_dcp/The%20Impact%20of%20Social%20Media%20on%20Voters%20Behavior%20In%20Recent%20Elections.pdf)

The performance of truth: politicians, fact-checking journalism, and… (https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7520375/)

THE ROLE OF THE MEDIA IN DEMOCRACIES: WHAT IS IT, AND WHY DOES IT MATTER? (https://www.ucl.ac.uk/constitution-unit/sites/constitution_unit/files/the_role_of_the_media_in_democracies.pdf)

The role of traditional media in modern political campaigns (https://theschoolofpolitics.com/blog/the-role-of-traditional-media-in-modern-political-campaigns/)

The role of traditional media in the 2025 election cycle: is it evolving? (https://virtualowl.com/the-role-of-traditional-media-in-the-2025-election-cycle-is-it-evolving/)

The University of Chicago Journals. (n.d.). "The Impact of Media Bias: How Editorial Slant Affects Voters" (https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1111/j.1468-2508.2005.00349.x)

toxigon.com/the-role-of-media-in-elections (https://toxigon.com/the-role-of-media-in-elections)

ultimate-guide-to-social-medias-political-impact/ (https://www.politicalmarketingstrategies.com/ultimate-guide-to-social-medias-political-impact/)

Universiteit Leiden. (n.d.). Influencing the debate in the run-up to the 2016 Brexit referendum: a … (https://studenttheses.universiteitleiden.nl/access/item%3A2701607/view)

Voters' involvement, attitude, and confidence in the era of new media (https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0368-9)

What Hundreds of Studies Say About the Impact of Digital Media on Democracy (https://www.konsyse.com/articles/what-hundreds-of-studies-say-about-the-impact-of-digital-media-on-democracy/)

What is the role of traditional media in a presidential election? (https://baker.utk.edu/podcast-season-4/

what-is-the-role-of-traditional-media-in-a-presidential-election/)

research.umd.edu/articles/social-medias-impact-2020-presidential-election-good-bad-and-ugly (https://research.umd.edu/articles/social-medias-impact-2020-presidential-election-good-bad-and-ugly)

saisreview.sais.jhu.edu/social-media-disinformation-and-ai-transforming-the-landscape-of-the-2024-u-s-presidential-political-campaigns/ (https://saisreview.sais.jhu.edu/social-media-disinformation-and-ai-transforming-the-landscape-of-the-2024-u-s-presidential-political-campaigns/)