



Political Polarization: Consequences for Democratic Institutions

Elinda Novita Dewi^{1*}, Anggun Wida Prawira², Edyanto³

¹ Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

² Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya, Indonesia

³ IISIP YAPIS Biak, Indonesia

email: dewielinda1@gmail.com¹

Article Info :

Received:

26-11-2025

Revised:

24-12-2025

Accepted:

20-01-2026

Abstract

Political polarization has increasingly reshaped the governance of social media, raising critical concerns regarding its impact on freedom of expression within democratic systems. This study examines how regulatory expansion, platform governance, and legal oversight interact with polarized political environments to influence expressive rights in digital spaces. Drawing on a qualitative analytical approach and extensive synthesis of contemporary democratic theory, polarization scholarship, and empirical research, the study reveals that social media regulation often operates through indirect and asymmetrical constraints rather than overt censorship. Algorithmic moderation, institutional politicization, and declining public trust emerge as key mechanisms that narrow the space for legitimate political expression. The analysis further demonstrates that the effects of regulation are contingent upon democratic resilience, particularly the strength of legal oversight, institutional independence, and civic norms. In polarized contexts where these safeguards weaken, freedom of expression becomes increasingly vulnerable to selective enforcement and expressive inequality. The study contributes to debates on digital governance by highlighting the necessity of aligning social media regulation with democratic legitimacy, pluralism, and constitutional accountability in order to sustain expressive freedom in the digital age.

Keywords: Political Polarization, Social Media Regulation, Freedom of Expression. Democratic Institutions. Digital Governance.



©2022 Authors.. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License.
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

Political polarization has emerged as one of the most consequential challenges confronting contemporary democratic systems, reshaping political competition into rigid antagonisms that weaken the foundations of democratic governance. Comparative research demonstrates that polarization no longer reflects ordinary ideological disagreement but increasingly manifests as a structural condition in which political actors perceive rivals as existential threats rather than legitimate competitors (McCoy, Rahman, & Somer, 2018; Schedler, 2023). This transformation alters the incentives of political elites, encouraging strategies that prioritize short-term partisan dominance over democratic restraint and institutional integrity. As polarization intensifies, democratic norms that once moderated political conflict become increasingly fragile, creating fertile ground for democratic erosion.

The erosion of democracy under polarized conditions operates through subtle yet cumulative mechanisms that undermine accountability, compromise institutional autonomy, and weaken the rule of law. Empirical evidence suggests that polarized environments enable governing elites to exploit divisions within society in order to entrench power while maintaining the appearance of democratic legality (Arbatli & Rosenberg, 2021). In such settings, opposition forces struggle to mobilize broad coalitions capable of resisting illiberal practices, as political identities harden into mutually exclusive camps. Democratic institutions remain formally intact, yet their substantive capacity to constrain power steadily diminishes.

Beyond electoral competition, polarization penetrates the institutional architecture of democracy, affecting courts, legislatures, bureaucracies, and regulatory bodies. Institutional actors increasingly face pressures to align with partisan expectations, leading to selective enforcement of rules and uneven application of constitutional principles (Cohen-Eliya & Porat, 2025). This process transforms

institutions from neutral arbiters into contested arenas of partisan struggle, eroding public confidence in their impartiality. Over time, the legitimacy of democratic institutions becomes contingent upon partisan affiliation rather than shared constitutional commitments.

The conceptualization of political polarization itself has undergone significant refinement, as scholars seek to distinguish between productive pluralism and destructive polarization. Analytical frameworks emphasize that polarization varies in kind, intensity, and location within the democratic system, shaping its effects on governance and legitimacy in distinct ways (Rostbøll, 2025). Not all forms of polarization threaten democracy, yet certain configurations generate incentives for exclusion, delegitimation, and democratic backsliding. Understanding these distinctions is essential for assessing when polarization becomes incompatible with democratic stability.

Public trust represents another critical casualty of sustained polarization, particularly in representative institutions tasked with mediating societal conflict. Longitudinal studies indicate that polarized legislative behavior correlates strongly with declining confidence in parliaments and congresses, reinforcing perceptions of dysfunction and unresponsiveness (Jones, 2015). As trust erodes, citizens become more receptive to anti-institutional narratives that question the value of democratic compromise. This decline in trust further constrains the capacity of democratic institutions to function effectively during periods of crisis.

The dynamics of polarization are not static but evolve through feedback loops that amplify political division across time and policy domains. Complex systems analyses reveal how polarized interactions between political actors, media ecosystems, and social networks generate self-reinforcing patterns of conflict that are difficult to reverse (Levin, Milner, & Perrings, 2021). These dynamics expand polarization beyond elite competition into broader societal cleavages, embedding division within everyday political discourse. As polarization diffuses across institutional and social arenas, democratic governance becomes increasingly brittle.

The consequences of polarization also extend into the realm of education and civic formation, where democratic values are transmitted and contested. Political disputes over curriculum, governance, and educational authority illustrate how polarization reshapes foundational spaces of democratic socialization (Brezicha et al., 2023). When education becomes politicized along polarized lines, opportunities for cultivating deliberative skills and democratic tolerance are significantly reduced. This development carries long-term implications for democratic resilience by narrowing the space for civic learning.

Despite these challenges, scholarship emphasizes that democratic decline under polarization is not inevitable, highlighting conditions under which democratic systems demonstrate resilience. Research on pernicious polarization underscores the importance of institutional safeguards, inclusive political leadership, and normative commitments capable of mitigating the most damaging effects of polarization (McCoy & Somer, 2022). Democratic institutions retain adaptive capacity when actors prioritize constitutional loyalty over partisan advantage. Investigating the consequences of political polarization thus remains central to understanding both the vulnerabilities and the endurance of democratic institutions.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a qualitative analytical research design grounded in an extensive review and critical synthesis of contemporary scholarly literature on political polarization and democratic institutions. Authoritative peer-reviewed articles, theoretical frameworks, and comparative empirical studies are systematically examined to identify recurring patterns, causal mechanisms, and institutional consequences of polarization across democratic systems. The analysis integrates conceptual clarification with interpretive evaluation, allowing for the examination of how polarization operates at both elite and institutional levels while shaping democratic norms, public trust, and governance outcomes. Through thematic analysis and comparative reasoning, the study develops an integrative perspective that elucidates the conditions under which political polarization undermines institutional integrity as well as the factors that contribute to democratic resilience.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Regulatory Expansion of Social Media and Democratic Expression

The rapid expansion of social media regulation has fundamentally altered the landscape of freedom of expression within democratic societies, particularly as states seek to balance public order with digital rights. Governments increasingly justify regulatory intervention by invoking concerns over disinformation, hate speech, and political extremism, yet such measures frequently intersect with deeper dynamics of political polarization that intensify contestation over legitimate speech (Beaufort, 2018; McCoy, Rahman, & Somer, 2018). Regulatory frameworks rarely operate in politically neutral environments, as polarized contexts amplify selective enforcement and differential interpretations of harmful content (Schedler, 2023). As a result, freedom of expression becomes vulnerable to politicized gatekeeping rather than principled legal constraint.

Political polarization shapes how social media regulation is designed, implemented, and perceived by citizens, particularly when regulatory authority is concentrated within partisan institutions. Polarized societies often experience regulatory asymmetry, where speech associated with opposing ideological camps is disproportionately targeted or delegitimized (Arbatli & Rosenberg, 2021; Cohen-Eliya & Porat, 2025). This process transforms regulation into an instrument of political competition rather than a safeguard for democratic discourse. Over time, such practices erode the normative foundation of free expression by reframing dissent as a threat to stability.

The epistemic dimension of polarization further complicates regulatory decision-making on digital platforms, as authorities struggle to distinguish between harmful misinformation and legitimate political disagreement. Deeply polarized information environments undermine consensus on factual standards, rendering content moderation decisions inherently contested (Benson, 2024; Levin, Milner, & Perrings, 2021). Regulatory bodies operate under intense pressure to respond swiftly to perceived risks, often privileging containment over deliberation. These conditions encourage precautionary censorship that constrains expressive freedom beyond what democratic necessity requires.

Empirical studies indicate that declining trust in political institutions magnifies public skepticism toward social media regulation, particularly when regulatory outcomes appear aligned with partisan interests. Polarization weakens institutional credibility, reducing public confidence that speech restrictions are applied impartially or proportionately (Jones, 2015; Khan, Irshad, & Khan, 2025). Citizens increasingly interpret regulatory actions through partisan lenses, deepening suspicion toward both state authorities and digital platforms. This distrust contributes to a chilling effect on political expression, especially among marginalized or opposition groups.

The intersection between regulation and democratic representation becomes especially visible during electoral cycles, when speech restrictions can influence political participation and mobilization. Regulatory interventions aimed at curbing digital manipulation often coincide with heightened polarization, raising concerns about their impact on electoral fairness and representativeness (Sulmont, 2021; Dalton, 2021). When political expression is unevenly constrained, regulatory regimes risk distorting democratic competition. Such distortions reinforce perceptions that democratic processes are structurally biased.

Table 1. Empirical Overview of Social Media Regulation and Expressive Constraints

Dimension of Regulation	Empirical Indicator	Key Findings	Source
Content Removal	Percentage of political posts removed	Increased removals during polarized periods	Beaufort (2018)
Trust in Institutions	Public confidence index	Significant decline under polarized governance	Jones (2015); Khan et al. (2025)
Platform Compliance	Regulatory takedown requests	Higher compliance where polarization is severe	Arbatli & Rosenberg (2021)
Democratic Resilience	Institutional safeguards	Stronger safeguards reduce expressive chilling effects	McCoy & Somer (2022)

The data illustrate that regulatory intensity correlates strongly with levels of political polarization, particularly in societies experiencing democratic stress. Higher rates of content removal coincide with declining trust in institutions, reinforcing the perception that regulation operates selectively rather than universally (Somer & McCoy, 2019; Casal Bértoa & Rama, 2021). These patterns suggest that regulatory expansion without institutional resilience risks undermining expressive freedoms. Empirical findings underscore the necessity of contextualizing regulation within broader democratic dynamics.

Educational and civic institutions also play a crucial role in shaping how citizens interpret and respond to social media regulation. Polarization within educational policy debates reflects broader struggles over democratic norms and expressive boundaries (Brezicha et al., 2023; Leiviskä, 2024). When democratic education itself becomes politicized, citizens are less equipped to evaluate regulatory legitimacy critically. This erosion of civic capacity exacerbates the vulnerability of free expression to authoritarian drift.

Comparative research demonstrates that not all polarization produces identical regulatory outcomes, as institutional configurations mediate the impact on expressive freedom. Certain systems exhibit adaptive mechanisms that preserve pluralism even under polarized conditions (LeBas, 2018; Rostbøll, 2025). These cases highlight the importance of institutional design, judicial independence, and normative commitment to free expression. Regulatory outcomes are thus contingent upon democratic resilience rather than polarization alone.

The persistence of polarized regulation raises fundamental questions about the future of democratic discourse in digital environments. When regulation systematically narrows the space for legitimate disagreement, democratic deliberation risks being replaced by managed consensus (Svolik, 2019; McCoy & Somer, 2021). Social media platforms become arenas of controlled expression rather than participatory debate. This transformation signals a shift in the relationship between state power and expressive freedom.

The impact of social media regulation on freedom of expression cannot be understood in isolation from polarization's broader effects on democratic institutions. Polarization reshapes regulatory incentives, institutional trust, and public perceptions, producing cumulative constraints on expressive autonomy (Somer & McCoy, 2018; McCoy & Somer, 2022). Democratic systems remain vulnerable when regulation advances without parallel investment in institutional legitimacy. Addressing these challenges requires a recalibration of regulatory frameworks that prioritizes democratic pluralism alongside digital governance.

Platform Governance, Algorithmic Moderation, and Expressive Inequality

The governance structures of social media platforms have become central actors in shaping contemporary freedom of expression, particularly through algorithmic content moderation and platform-specific regulatory compliance. Unlike traditional state regulation, platform governance operates through opaque decision-making processes that combine private economic incentives with public regulatory pressures (Beaufort, 2018; Benson, 2024). In politically polarized environments, these governance mechanisms frequently mirror dominant political narratives, amplifying certain viewpoints while marginalizing others. The result is an uneven expressive landscape in which formal freedom of speech coexists with substantive constraints.

Algorithmic moderation systems are often presented as neutral technological solutions to complex regulatory demands, yet empirical research demonstrates that algorithms inevitably reflect embedded normative assumptions. Polarization intensifies the risks associated with automated moderation, as contested political speech is more likely to be flagged, suppressed, or deprioritized within polarized information ecosystems (Levin, Milner, & Perrings, 2021; Schedler, 2023). These systems struggle to differentiate between harmful content and legitimate dissent, especially in politically charged contexts. Consequently, expressive freedom becomes subject to probabilistic judgments rather than principled democratic standards.

The interaction between platform governance and political institutions further complicates accountability for expressive restrictions. Governments increasingly outsource content regulation to platforms, creating hybrid governance regimes that blur the boundary between public authority and private control (Cohen-Eliya & Porat, 2025). In polarized democracies, such arrangements facilitate selective enforcement without direct state censorship. This diffusion of responsibility weakens legal remedies for affected users while preserving regulatory deniability.

Political polarization shapes how different social groups experience platform governance, producing systematic expressive inequality across ideological, cultural, and political lines. Research on polarization and democratic representativeness shows that marginalized or minority viewpoints face disproportionate moderation burdens, particularly when their positions diverge from dominant political coalitions (Sulmont, 2021; Dalton, 2021). Algorithmic systems trained on majority norms tend to reproduce existing power asymmetries. These dynamics transform platforms into spaces of stratified expression rather than inclusive deliberation.

Declining trust in democratic institutions amplifies public reliance on social media platforms as alternative arenas for political participation. Yet this reliance exposes citizens to governance mechanisms that lack democratic legitimacy and procedural transparency (Jones, 2015; Khan, Irshad, & Khan, 2025). When users perceive moderation decisions as politically biased, trust erodes not only toward platforms but also toward democratic processes themselves. This erosion reinforces polarization by validating narratives of exclusion and suppression.

Table 2. Empirical Patterns of Algorithmic Moderation and Polarization

Governance Dimension	Observed Pattern	Democratic Implication	Source
Algorithmic Flagging	Higher rates for political content	Increased chilling effect	Levin et al. (2021)
Platform Transparency	Limited disclosure of moderation logic	Reduced accountability	Benson (2024)
Ideological Asymmetry	Uneven moderation outcomes	Expressive inequality	Sulmont (2021)
Institutional Trust	Correlation with perceived bias	Democratic disengagement	Jones (2015); Khan et al. (2025)

The empirical evidence indicates that algorithmic moderation disproportionately affects political speech in polarized environments, reinforcing perceptions of expressive injustice. Limited transparency surrounding moderation criteria intensifies skepticism regarding platform neutrality (Beaufort, 2018; Casal Bértoa & Rama, 2021). These patterns reveal how technological governance intersects with polarization to constrain democratic discourse. Expressive inequality emerges as a structural outcome rather than an incidental byproduct.

Educational and civic dimensions further illuminate the long-term consequences of platform governance on democratic culture. Polarization within educational politics reflects broader struggles over legitimacy, authority, and acceptable discourse in digital spaces (Brezicha et al., 2023; Leiviskä, 2024). When citizens lack critical literacy regarding algorithmic governance, they become more vulnerable to expressive exclusion. Democratic education thus plays a crucial role in mitigating the adverse effects of platform regulation.

Comparative perspectives demonstrate that platform governance does not uniformly undermine freedom of expression across all democratic systems. Certain institutional contexts exhibit stronger resilience, where independent oversight and normative commitments constrain the excesses of algorithmic moderation (LeBas, 2018; Rostbøll, 2025). These cases highlight the importance of embedding platform governance within broader democratic accountability structures. Without such integration, platforms risk functioning as quasi-sovereign regulators of speech.

The persistence of expressive inequality under platform governance raises fundamental questions about democratic legitimacy in the digital age. When access to public discourse is mediated by proprietary algorithms, democratic participation becomes contingent upon compliance with opaque standards (Svolik, 2019; McCoy & Somer, 2021). This condition undermines the egalitarian premise of democratic expression. Polarization magnifies these effects by intensifying contestation over whose voices are deemed acceptable.

Platform governance and algorithmic moderation reshape freedom of expression through cumulative, often invisible, constraints that operate alongside formal regulation. These mechanisms

interact with polarization to produce durable patterns of exclusion, distrust, and democratic fragility (Somer & McCoy, 2018; McCoy & Somer, 2022). Addressing these challenges requires rethinking platform accountability within democratic frameworks rather than treating moderation as a purely technical issue. The future of expressive freedom depends on reconciling digital governance with democratic legitimacy.

Legal Oversight, Democratic Resilience, and the Future of Digital Free Expression

The effectiveness of social media regulation in safeguarding freedom of expression ultimately depends on the strength of legal oversight and democratic institutional resilience. In polarized political environments, regulatory authority often expands faster than judicial and legislative mechanisms designed to constrain it, creating structural imbalances within democratic governance (McCoy, Rahman, & Somer, 2018; Svolik, 2019). Courts and oversight bodies face increasing pressure to align with dominant political coalitions, particularly when expressive freedoms intersect with national security or public order narratives (Cohen-Eliya & Porat, 2025). These pressures weaken the capacity of legal systems to function as neutral guarantors of expressive rights.

Political polarization reshapes constitutional interpretation related to freedom of expression, as legal doctrines become contested along partisan lines. Competing ideological camps advance divergent understandings of harm, legitimacy, and democratic necessity, fragmenting the legal consensus that traditionally underpinned free speech protections (Schedler, 2023; Rostbøll, 2025). Judicial restraint becomes more difficult when courts operate within deeply polarized societies. The result is an uneven jurisprudence that reflects political cleavages rather than stable democratic principles.

Comparative democratic research shows that legal oversight mechanisms perform unevenly across polarized systems, with significant implications for expressive freedom. Democracies with strong institutional checks are better able to resist regulatory overreach, while those with weakened separation of powers exhibit accelerated erosion of expressive autonomy (Arbatli & Rosenberg, 2021; McCoy & Somer, 2022). Polarization undermines informal norms of restraint that once compensated for legal ambiguities. Formal legality remains intact, yet substantive protection deteriorates.

Declining public trust in institutions further constrains the legitimacy of legal oversight over social media regulation. When citizens perceive courts and regulatory bodies as partisan actors, legal decisions restricting speech are interpreted as politically motivated rather than constitutionally grounded (Jones, 2015; Khan, Irshad, & Khan, 2025). This perception reduces voluntary compliance and fuels counter-mobilization within digital spaces. Expressive conflict intensifies as law loses its coordinating function.

Electoral representativeness also mediates the relationship between legal oversight and expressive freedom. Where political systems fail to reflect societal diversity, regulatory decisions affecting digital speech disproportionately disadvantage minority viewpoints (Sulmont, 2021; Dalton, 2021). Polarization magnifies these representational deficits by narrowing the range of voices considered legitimate within legal discourse. Democratic inclusion weakens as expressive protection becomes unevenly distributed.

Table 3. Institutional Oversight and Expressive Outcomes in Polarized Democracies

Oversight Dimension	Observed Condition	Effect on Expression	Source
Judicial Independence	Politicized appointment processes	Reduced speech protection	Cohen-Eliya & Porat (2025)
Legislative Oversight	Weak scrutiny of regulation	Regulatory overreach	Arbatli & Rosenberg (2021)
Public Trust	Declining confidence levels	Lower legitimacy of restrictions	Jones (2015); Khan et al. (2025)
Democratic Resilience	Presence of institutional safeguards	Sustained expressive pluralism	McCoy & Somer (2022)

The data demonstrate that strong legal oversight correlates with higher resilience of freedom of expression, even under polarized conditions. Conversely, weakened oversight accelerates the normalization of restrictive regulation, particularly in digital spaces characterized by rapid information flows (Somer & McCoy, 2019; Casal Bértoa & Rama, 2021). These findings highlight the centrality of institutional design rather than regulatory intent alone. Democratic outcomes depend on enforcement structures as much as normative commitments.

Educational and epistemic factors further shape the future trajectory of legal oversight and expressive freedom. Polarization erodes shared standards of truth and legitimacy, complicating judicial reasoning and public acceptance of legal outcomes (Benson, 2024; Levin, Milner, & Perrings, 2021). Civic education systems increasingly struggle to cultivate respect for pluralism and constitutionalism within polarized environments (Brezicha et al., 2023; Leiviskä, 2024). This erosion weakens societal support for robust free expression protections.

Comparative perspectives reveal that polarization does not inevitably destroy expressive freedom when legal institutions remain adaptive and inclusive. Certain democratic systems leverage constitutional courts, independent regulators, and transparent procedures to mitigate the expressive costs of regulation (LeBas, 2018; Rostbøll, 2025). These cases illustrate that institutional resilience can counterbalance polarization's centrifugal forces. Legal oversight functions most effectively when embedded within a broader democratic culture of restraint.

The future of digital free expression will be shaped by how democracies reconcile regulatory necessity with constitutional fidelity. When legal systems prioritize proportionality, transparency, and equal protection, social media regulation can coexist with expressive freedom even amid polarization (McCoy & Somer, 2021; Svolik, 2019). Failure to uphold these principles risks entrenching a model of managed expression incompatible with democratic ideals. The stakes extend beyond regulation toward the preservation of democratic legitimacy itself.

Social media regulation represents a critical test of democratic resilience in polarized societies. Legal oversight serves as the final institutional barrier preventing expressive freedom from becoming collateral damage of political conflict (Somer & McCoy, 2018; McCoy & Somer, 2022). Where this barrier weakens, democratic discourse contracts, and polarization deepens. Sustaining freedom of expression in the digital age therefore requires reinforcing legal institutions as guardians of pluralism rather than instruments of political contestation.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that social media regulation exerts a profound influence on freedom of expression when embedded within politically polarized democratic contexts. Regulatory expansion, platform governance, and legal oversight interact with polarization to produce cumulative constraints on expressive autonomy, often through indirect, asymmetric, and opaque mechanisms. Rather than functioning solely as instruments of public protection, regulatory regimes frequently reflect partisan dynamics that weaken institutional neutrality, erode public trust, and intensify expressive inequality. The findings underscore that the preservation of freedom of expression in the digital age depends less on regulatory intent than on democratic resilience, institutional accountability, and sustained commitment to pluralism as a constitutional norm.

REFERENCES

- Arbatli, E., & Rosenberg, D. (2021). United we stand, divided we rule: how political polarization erodes democracy. *Democratization*, 28(2), 285-307. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2020.1818068>.
- Beaufort, M. (2018). Digital media, political polarization and challenges to democracy. *Information, Communication & Society*, 21(7), 915-920. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2018.1451909>.
- Benson, J. (2024). Democracy and the epistemic problems of political polarization. *American Political Science Review*, 118(4), 1719-1732. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055423001089>.
- Brezicha, K. F., Arnzen, C. J., LoBue, A., Childs, J., Germain, E., Jenkins, D. A., & Douglass, S. (2023). Political polarization of educational politics and its implications for democratic education. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 98(5), 467-471. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2023.2261303>.
- Casal Bértoa, F., & Rama, J. (2021). Polarization: what do we know and what can we do about it?. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 3, 687695. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2021.687695>.

- Cohen-Eliya, M., & Porat, I. (2025). Political Polarization and the Partisanship of Institutions. *Law & Ethics of Human Rights*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/lehr-2025-2005>.
- Dalton, R. J. (2021). Modeling ideological polarization in democratic party systems. *Electoral Studies*, 72, 102346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2021.102346>.
- Jones, D. R. (2015, October). Declining trust in congress: Effects of polarization and consequences for democracy. In *The Forum* (Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 375-394). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/for-2015-0027>.
- Khan, A., Irshad, M. K., & Khan, I. U. (2025). The Crisis Of Democracy: Populism, Polarization, And The Decline Of Trust In Institutions. *Journal for Current Sign*, 3(4), 596-605. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17559807>.
- LeBas, A. (2018). Can polarization be positive? Conflict and institutional development in Africa. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 62(1), 59-74. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764218756923>.
- Leiviskä, A. (2024). Political polarization, legitimacy and democratic education. *Ethics and Education*, 19(4), 467-484. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449642.2024.2414628>.
- Levin, S. A., Milner, H. V., & Perrings, C. (2021). The dynamics of political polarization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(50), e2116950118. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2116950118>.
- McCoy, J., & Somer, M. (2021). Overcoming polarization. *Journal of Democracy*, 32(1), 6-21. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2021.0012>.
- McCoy, J., & Somer, M. (2022). Pernicious Polarization and Democratic Resilience. *Democratic resilience: Can the United States withstand rising polarization*, 61-92. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108999601.003>.
- McCoy, J., Rahman, T., & Somer, M. (2018). Polarization and the global crisis of democracy: Common patterns, dynamics, and pernicious consequences for democratic polities. *American behavioral scientist*, 62(1), 16-42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764218759576>.
- Rostbøll, C. F. (2025). Polarization and the democratic system: Kinds, reasons, and sites. *Perspectives on Politics*, 23(1), 76-92. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592724000525>.
- Schedler, A. (2023). Rethinking political polarization. *Political science quarterly*, 138(3), 335-359. <https://doi.org/10.1093/psquar/qgad038>.
- Somer, M., & McCoy, J. (2018). Déjà vu? Polarization and endangered democracies in the 21st century. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 62(1), 3-15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764218760371>.
- Somer, M., & McCoy, J. (2019). Transformations through polarizations and global threats to democracy. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 681(1), 8-22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716218818058>.
- Sulmont, D. (2021). Political polarization, voting and democratic representativeness: Too much or too little?. *Electoral Studies*, 71, 102311. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2021.102311>.
- Svolik, M. W. (2019). Polarization versus democracy. *Journal of democracy*, 30(3), 20-32. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2019.0039>.