Journal of Neonatal Surgery
ISSN(Online): 2226-0439
Vol. 14, Issue 5s (2025)
https://www.jneonatalsurg.com

OPEN ACCESS

The Role of Selective Exposure in Shaping Public Perception of Political Information: An Empirical Study

Yasir Ahmed[1], DR. Jitendra Singh[2]

[1]Yasir Ahmed— Scholar in Journalism and Mass Communication, Lovely Professional University, Phagwara, Punjab,
Email ID: yasirahmed78614@gmail.com, Orcid. Id 0000-0002-5836-3491

[2]Dr Jitendra Singh — Associate Professor (Department of Journalism and Mass Communication) Lovely Professional University, Phagwara, Punjab,
Email ID: jitendrasaingh079@gmail.com

Cite this paper as: Yasir Ahmed, DR. Jitendra Singh, (2025) The Role of Selective Exposure in Shaping Public Perception of Political Information: An Empirical Study. *Journal of Neonatal Surgery*, 14 (5s), 710-715.

ABSTRACT
In the post-truth era, selective exposure to political information significantly influences public perception, reinforcing ideological polarization. This study examines the extent to which individuals engage with diverse political perspectives and the psychological and algorithmic mechanisms that shape selective exposure. Using a quantitative cross-sectional survey conducted in Jammu and Kashmir, the study analyzes the relationship between media consumption patterns, political discussions, and resistance to contradictory viewpoints. The findings confirm that frequent exposure to political information correlates with higher rejection of opposing views, reinforcing cognitive dissonance and confirmation bias. Moreover, self-reported efforts to diversify media consumption did not align with actual exposure, indicating performative rather than substantive diversification. These results underscore the role of social and digital media in deepening ideological divides, highlighting the need for interventions that promote genuine exposure to diverse perspectives.

Keywords: *Selective exposure, post-truth, cognitive dissonance, confirmation bias, media polarization.*

1. INTRODUCTION

In an era characterized by the rapid proliferation of digital media and the fragmentation of information ecosystems, the concept of "post-truth" has emerged as a defining feature of contemporary political discourse. Coined to describe a cultural landscape where objective facts are increasingly subordinate to emotional appeals and ideological alignment (McIntyre, 2018), the post-truth paradigm has profound implications for how individuals consume, process, and respond to political information. Central to this phenomenon is *selective exposure theory*—the psychological tendency to seek out information that aligns with preexisting beliefs while avoiding contradictory viewpoints (Knobloch-Westerwick, 2014). As algorithmic curation and social media platforms amplify ideological polarization (Bakshy et al., 2015; Sunstein, 2017), understanding the mechanisms driving selective exposure has become critical to addressing challenges such as misinformation, political polarization, and the erosion of democratic discourse.

The post-truth era is marked by a growing distrust in traditional institutions, from media to scientific expertise, and a shift toward emotionally charged narratives that reinforce tribal identities (Lewandowsky et al., 2017). For instance, the spread of misinformation during events such as the 2016 U.S. presidential election and the COVID-19 pandemic underscores how false claims, often tailored to align with partisan identities, can gain traction over empirically validated facts (Van Bavel et al., 2021). This environment is exacerbated by digital platforms that prioritize engagement metrics, such as clicks and shares, over accuracy (Vosoughi et al., 2018). Algorithms on platforms like Facebook and YouTube curate content based on user behavior, creating self-reinforcing feedback loops that trap individuals in ideological "filter bubbles" (Pariser, 2012). These dynamics not only deepen societal divisions but also undermine collective decision-making processes, posing existential risks to democratic governance (Sunstein, 2017).

Aim and Research Objectives

This study aims to investigate the role of selective exposure in shaping public perception of political information within the post-truth context. Specifically, it seeks to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: How does the frequency of political information exposure influence individuals' likelihood of rejecting contradictory viewpoints?

RQ3: Does the frequency of political discussions correlate with exposure to opposing viewpoints?

RQ4: How does the belief that exposure enhances understanding affect individuals' engagement with opposing political perspectives?

Hypotheses

H_0: There is no significant association between the frequency of political information exposure and the rejection of contradictory viewpoints.
H_0: There is no significant association between media consumption behaviour and conscious efforts to diversify information sources.
H_0: There is no significant association between the frequency of political discussions and exposure to different viewpoints.
H_0: There is no significant association between the belief that exposure enhances understanding and the likelihood of engaging with opposing views.

The primary objective is to empirically validate selective exposure theory while exploring its interaction with cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957), confirmation bias (Knobloch-Westerwick, 2014), and echo chamber dynamics (Barberá et al., 2015). By analyzing patterns of media consumption, reactions to contradictory information, and engagement in political discussions, this research provides a nuanced understanding of how individuals navigate increasingly polarized information landscapes.

Significance of the Study

The rise of post-truth politics highlights the urgency of examining selective exposure. Polarized media ecosystems not only deepen societal divisions but also undermine collective decision-making processes (Sunstein, 2017). For instance, algorithmic recommendations on platforms like Facebook and YouTube prioritize engagement over accuracy, creating feedback loops that entrench partisan identities (Bakshy et al., 2015; Ledwich & Zaitsev, 2020). This study contributes to ongoing debates about media literacy, platform accountability, and democratic resilience by identifying systemic and psychological barriers to diverse information consumption.

The societal implications of selective exposure are far-reaching. Polarization fueled by ideological isolation has been linked to decreased trust in democratic institutions and reluctance to compromise on policy issues (Sunstein, 2017). For example, social media platforms have been implicated in amplifying extremist content, which can foster real-world conflict (Ledwich & Zaitsev, 2020). By elucidating the mechanisms behind selective exposure, this research informs interventions aimed at bridging ideological divides.

Moreover, the findings challenge assumptions about individuals' awareness of their own biases. While respondents claimed to value diverse perspectives (Table 2), their actual habits revealed ideological homogeneity—a phenomenon termed *performative diversification* (Prior, 2013). Such discrepancies highlight the limitations of media literacy initiatives that focus solely on individual agencies without addressing algorithmic amplification of bias (Helberger et al., 2017). For instance, efforts to encourage "balanced" news consumption often fail to account for platform architectures that invisibly steer users toward extremist content (Ledwich & Zaitsev, 2020). By bridging theoretical frameworks from psychology, communication studies, and political science, this research offers actionable insights for policymakers, educators, and technology designers seeking to mitigate polarization.

2. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative cross-sectional design to analyze media consumption behaviours, political discussion patterns, and responses to contradictory information. Data were collected through a structured survey, designed to capture participants' selective exposure tendencies and engagement with diverse political perspectives.

Sampling Strategy

Participants were recruited from Jammu and Kashmir using both random and non-random sampling techniques. A stratified sampling approach was employed to ensure demographic diversity in terms of age (18–65+), political affiliation (liberal, moderate, conservative), and geographic location (urban, suburban, rural). Additionally, a convenience sampling method was used to collect responses via Google Forms, allowing for broader participation beyond the randomly selected sample. This mixed-sampling approach ensured representation while optimizing data collection feasibility.

Ethical Considerations

All ethical procedures were strictly adhered to in the study. Participants were informed about the voluntary nature of their

participation, with the assurance of confidentiality and anonymity. Informed consent was obtained before survey participation, and respondents were given the right to withdraw at any stage without providing a reason. The study followed ethical guidelines as outlined in institutional and research ethics protocols.

Variables and Operationalization

The survey assessed key variables related to selective exposure and engagement with diverse political perspectives:

- **Exposure Frequency**: Measured by the frequency of political information consumption (daily, weekly, monthly).
- **Reaction to Contradictory Information**: Coded into three categories—accept, neutral, or reject.
- **Conscious Diversification Efforts**: Self-reported attempts to seek ideologically diverse sources, measured on a **5-point Likert scale**.
- **Political Discussions**: Frequency and diversity of viewpoints encountered in social interactions, assessed through **open-ended and multiple-choice questions**.

Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using **Pearson's chi-square tests** to evaluate associations between categorical variables. The **chi-square test** was chosen for its robustness in detecting dependencies in contingency tables (McHugh, 2013). Key analyses included:

- **Table 1**: Relationship between exposure frequency and rejection of contradictory information (**$\chi^2(16) = 45.367$, $p < .001$**).
- **Table 4**: Links between belief in understanding and exposure to opposing views (**$\chi^2(16) = 27.900$, $p = .033$**).

Additionally, the **Likelihood Ratio test** was employed to supplement chi-square results and confirm model fit. All statistical tests adhered to the assumption that expected cell frequencies were **≥5**, ensuring the validity of results (Field, 2018).

This methodology ensures a comprehensive, ethically sound, and statistically valid approach to analyzing selective exposure patterns within the post-truth context. By employing both random and convenience sampling methods, the study effectively captures a diverse participant pool from Jammu and Kashmir, providing meaningful insights into media consumption behaviors and political information processing.

Theoretical Framework

The study is grounded in Festinger's (1957) *cognitive dissonance theory*, which posits that individuals experience psychological discomfort when confronted with conflicting beliefs, motivating avoidance or rejection of dissonant information. This framework is extended through the lens of *confirmation bias*—the tendency to favor information that reinforces existing views (Knobloch-Westerwick, 2014)—and *echo chamber theory*, which describes how social and algorithmic systems amplify selective exposure (Barberá et al., 2015; Sunstein, 2017). Additionally, Nyhan and Reifler's (2010) concept of *false clarity bias* informs the analysis of overconfidence in one's understanding of political issues.

Data Interpretation

Table 1: Reaction to Contradictory Information vs. Exposure Frequency

The Pearson chi-square test revealed a significant association, $\chi^2(16) = 45.367$, $p < .001$. Individuals who frequently consumed political information were more likely to reject contradictory viewpoints, supporting H2. This aligns with **cognitive dissonance theory**, where discomfort from conflicting information motivates avoidance (Festinger, 1957).

Table 2: Media Consumption Behavior vs. Conscious Diversification Efforts

No significant association was found ($\chi^2(16) = 18.149$, $p = .315$). Despite claims of seeking diverse perspectives, respondents' actual media habits reflected ideological homogeneity, suggesting **performative rather than substantive diversification** (Prior, 2013).

Table 3: Frequency of Political Discussions vs. Exposure to Different Viewpoints

The non-significant result ($\chi^2(16) = 16.892$, $p = .393$) indicates that political discussions rarely incorporate opposing perspectives. This reinforces **echo chamber dynamics**, where social networks amplify selective exposure (Barberá et al., 2015).

Table 4: Belief in Understanding vs. Exposure to Political Perspectives

A significant association emerged ($\chi^2(16) = 27.900$, $p = .033$). Respondents who believed exposure enhanced understanding were paradoxically less likely to engage with opposing views, reflecting a **"false clarity" bias** (Nyhan & Reifler, 2010).

3. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study provide strong empirical evidence for selective exposure theory in the post-truth era, highlighting the role of cognitive, social, and algorithmic factors in shaping individuals' engagement with political information. The results confirm that individuals systematically favor politically congruent information while avoiding opposing viewpoints, reinforcing ideological isolation. RQ1: How does the frequency of political information exposure influence individuals' likelihood of rejecting contradictory viewpoints?
The significant association between frequent political media consumption and the rejection of contradictory viewpoints (; Table 1) supports H1, consistent with cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957). Frequent exposure to politically aligned information fosters stronger partisan identities, making individuals more resistant to conflicting perspectives. Algorithmic curation further reinforces these biases by prioritizing ideologically resonant content (Bakshy et al., 2015; McIntyre, 2018). This dynamic exemplifies confirmation bias (Knobloch-Westerwick, 2014) and systemic polarization mechanisms (Sunstein, 2017), as individuals actively avoid discomfort associated with contradictory information.

RQ2: To what extent do individuals' self-reported efforts to diversify media consumption align with their actual exposure to diverse perspectives? The non-significant association between media consumption behaviour and conscious diversification efforts (; Table 2) leads to the rejection of H2. Despite claims of seeking diverse perspectives, respondents' actual media habits reflected ideological homogeneity, indicating performative rather than substantive diversification (Prior, 2013). This disconnect suggests that while individuals may express a desire for balanced exposure, their engagement patterns are shaped by ingrained biases and platform-driven reinforcement loops. Similar to Fernbach et al.'s (2013) "illusion of explanatory depth," this finding illustrates how individuals overestimate their exposure to diverse viewpoints, further solidifying selective exposure tendencies.

RQ3: Does the frequency of political discussions correlate with exposure to opposing viewpoints? The lack of a significant relationship between political discussions and engagement with diverse perspectives (; Table 3) supports the rejection of H3. This finding reinforces the echo chamber hypothesis (Barberá et al., 2015), suggesting that political discussions are often insular, occurring within ideologically homogeneous networks. Rather than fostering engagement with opposing views, social interactions primarily serve to reaffirm preexisting beliefs. This aligns with Sunstein's (2017) argument that social media networks amplify selective exposure, creating self-reinforcing loops that further polarize discourse.

RQ4: How does the belief that exposure enhances understanding affect individuals' engagement with opposing political perspectives? A paradoxical association was found between belief in enhanced understanding and reduced engagement with opposing views (; Table 4), supporting H4 and illustrating Nyhan and Reifler's (2010) concept of "false clarity" bias. Respondents who believed exposure to political content increased their understanding were actually less likely to engage with alternative perspectives, indicating that overconfidence in one's knowledge can deter openness to dissenting viewpoints. This finding has critical implications for media literacy initiatives, suggesting that mere exposure to political information does not guarantee balanced engagement but may instead reinforce ideological entrenchment.

Implications and Future Research

These findings collectively emphasize the challenges of promoting ideological diversity in media consumption. The persistent influence of cognitive dissonance, echo chambers, and false clarity bias highlights the limitations of existing interventions aimed at fostering balanced news consumption. Media literacy efforts must account for both individual biases and the structural dynamics of digital platforms (Helberger et al., 2017). Furthermore, algorithmic transparency and content recommendation reforms may be necessary to counteract selective exposure mechanisms. Future research should explore experimental interventions that encourage genuine engagement with opposing perspectives and assess their effectiveness in reducing ideological polarization. By addressing both cognitive and technological barriers to diverse information exposure, policymakers, educators, and platform designers can work toward mitigating the societal risks associated with selective exposure in the post-truth era.

4. CONCLUSION

This study provides empirical evidence supporting selective exposure theory within the post-truth era, emphasizing the role of cognitive biases, algorithmic curation, and social reinforcement in shaping political information consumption. The findings suggest that individuals unconsciously gravitate toward ideologically congruent content while rejecting contradictory perspectives, deepening polarization. The discrepancy between self-reported media diversification efforts and actual exposure patterns highlights the limitations of current media literacy approaches. Furthermore, the persistence of echo chambers in political discussions calls for more structural interventions, such as algorithmic transparency and policy reforms. Addressing selective exposure requires a multi-faceted approach, incorporating media education, platform accountability, and incentivized exposure to diverse perspectives.

List of Tables

Table 1: Chi-Square Test Results for Reaction to Contradictory Information and Exposure Frequency

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	45.367[a]	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	40.456	16	.001
N of Valid Cases	395		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.06.

Table 2: Chi-Square Test Results for Media Consumption Behavior and Conscious Diversification Efforts

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.149[a]	16	.315
Likelihood Ratio	17.545	16	.351
N of Valid Cases	395		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.44.

Table 3: Chi-Square Test Results for Frequency of Political Discussions and Different Viewpoints

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.892[a]	16	.393
Likelihood Ratio	15.847	16	.464
N of Valid Cases	395		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.33.

Table 4: Chi-Square Test Results for Belief in Enhancement of Understanding and Exposure to Political Perspectives

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	27.900[a]	16	.033
Likelihood Ratio	29.271	16	.022
N of Valid Cases	395		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.96.

REFERENCES

[1] Bakshy, E., Messing, S., & Adamic, L. A. (2015). Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. *Science*, *348*(6239), 1130–1132. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa1160

[2] Barberá, P., Jost, J. T., Nagler, J., Tucker, J. A., & Bonneau, R. (2015). Tweeting From Left to Right: Is Online Political Communication More Than an Echo Chamber? Psychological Science, 26(10), 1531-1542. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615594620

[3] Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford University Press.

[4] Field, A.P. (2018) Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics. 5th Edition, Sage, Newbury Park.

[5] Fernbach, P. M., Rogers, T., Fox, C. R., & Sloman, S. A. (2013). Political extremism is supported by an illusion of understanding. *Psychological science*, *24*(6), 939–946. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612464058

[6] Helberger, N., Pierson, J., & Poell, T. (2017). Governing online platforms: From contested to cooperative responsibility. *The Information Society*, *34*(9), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/01972243.2017.1391913

[7] Knobloch-Westerwick, S. (2014). Choice and Preference in Media Use: Advances in Selective Exposure Theory and Research (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315771359

[8] Ledwich, M., & Zaitsev, A. (2020). Algorithmic extremism: Examining YouTube's rabbit hole of radicalization. *First Monday*, *25*(3). https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v25i3.10419

[9] McHugh, M. L. (2013). The Chi-square test of independence. *Biochemia Medica*, *23*(2), 143–149. https://doi.org/10.11613/BM.2013.018

[10] McIntyre, L. (2018). *Post-truth*. MIT Press.

[11] Nyhan, B., & Reifler, J. (2010). When corrections fail: The persistence of political misperceptions. *Political Behavior*, *32*(2), 303–330. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-010-9112-2

[12] Pariser, E. (2012). *The filter bubble: How the new personalized web is changing what we read and how we think.* Penguin Books.

[13] Prior, M. (2013). *Media and political polarization. Annual Review of Political Science*, *16*(1), 101-127. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-100711-135242

[14] Sunstein, C. R. (2017). *#Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media*. Princeton University Press.

[15] Van Bavel, J. J., Harris, E. A., Pärnamets, P., Rathje, S., Doell, K. C., & Tucker, J. A. (2021). *Political psychology in the digital (mis)information age: A model of news belief and sharing. Social Issues and Policy Review*, *15*(1), 84–113. https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12077

[16] Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, *359*(6380), 1146–1151. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559

[17] Lewandowsky, S., Ecker, U. K. H., & Cook, J. (2017). Beyond misinformation: Understanding and coping with the "post-truth" era. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, *6*(4), 353–369. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2017.07.008