HOW COGNITIVE DISTORTIONS
AFFECT POLITICIANS, SOCIAL MEDIA, AND RADIO TALK SHOW HOSTS
William F. Doverspike, PhD

drwilliamdoverspike.com
770-913-0506

Retitled from the original article ("How to Be a Radio Talk Show Host"), this piece was expanded to include anyone who strives for political power using social media. This simple formula outlines how to become an effective talk-show host, defined as a politician who avoids the scrutiny of cross-examination that has become inherent in running for a political office.

1. First, start with yourself, because it is all about you. In a culture in which many want to be heard but few want to listen, make sure you are heard. Take one of your most cherished attitudes, beliefs, or opinions and equate it with reality by using—consciously or otherwise—the cognitive error of *absolutistic thinking* (i.e., equating one's beliefs with reality). In the world of social media, which includes news narrowcasters that have replaced traditional news broadcasters, a subject matter expert needs only an opinion and a microphone.

2. Next, use *binary thinking* to adopt a world view, because being a talk-show host is all about the lens or filter through which you see the world. Two-factor thinking allows the complexity of the world to be reduced into only two categories that are bipolar, dichotomous, or opposite. Binary thinking is less about the content of thought (i.e., what one thinks about) and more about the process of thought (i.e., how one thinks about a topic). Yet content of thought is also important, because the effective talk-show host chooses trigger topics based on the host's own unresolved, unrecognized, and unconscious emotional conflicts about a particular topic. Speaking of emotions, be sure to use the defense mechanisms of *intellectualization* and *rationalization*, so that it will seem like your arguments are logical rather than emotional. Be sure to use the word "logical" frequently, because it may help cover your reliance on emotional reasoning.

3. Using a binary approach, divide your concerns, topics, and political positions into an "us vs. them" mentality. It is tribal, primitive—and it works. Use *othering*, which involves the reductionist labelling of a political party, particular person, or a group of people as belonging to the intrinsically inferior category of "the Other." When referring to the debased "the Other," be sure to use the unspecified pronoun "they." If you are a talk show host, "they" is definitely your preferred pronoun.

4. Employ the *strawman argument*, which involves distorting and exaggerating your opponent's position in an attempt to gain an advantage in an argument. Use a quote from someone on the other side, because in tribal politics there are only two sides, and interpret it out of context so that almost anyone will agree with your interpretation. As always, compare only the best of your party to the worst of their party. When criticizing the media, be sure to ignore that you are a big part of the media.

5. Use an angry tone, loud voice, and a pressured pace of speech. The content of what you say may not be as important as how you say it. Speech involves *content* (what you say) and *process* (how you say it). Although content can provide information (or at least opinions), process provides influence and impact.

In summary, pick any example of a political opinion or societal practice with which you agree, equate your thoughts with reality (absolutism), use the proverbial "they" (othering) to characterize anyone who does not agree with you, characterize "their" position by using only the most extreme examples (strawman argument), focus on what's wrong with "their" position (externalization of blame), and ignore any shortcomings of your position (disavowal of personal responsibility).

Counterpoint

For those who are not interested in becoming talk show hosts or politicians, the antidotes to talk show toxicity include the following: First, learn the perspectives of political parties based on their most respected proponents rather than from their most hated political enemies. Second, do not compare the best of your party to the worst of their party.

Glossary of Terms

Absolutistic thinking occurs when a person's beliefs, feelings, or opinions are equated with reality. The underlying belief is, "If I think it's so, then it's so." This process involves an egocentric assumption (largely "unconscious" or outside of awareness) that one's thoughts are in fact reality, often accompanied by the claim that others' beliefs are not reality. Absolutistic thinking involves a sense of certainty, which is why absolutistic thinkers equate their certainty with absolute truth—which can give rise to *absolute truth claims*. For those with no interest in becoming self-proclaimed experts, one antidote to absolutism is simple: "Don't believe everything I think."

One of the most pathological consequences of absolutism is when it occurs within a political party or a religious cult. In his book *When Religion Becomes Evil*, Charles Kimball (2002) makes this observation: "In every religion, truth claims constitute the foundation on which the entire structure rests. However, when particular interpretations of these claims become propositions requiring uniform assent and are treated as rigid doctrines, the likelihood of corruption in that tradition rises exponentially" (p. 41).

Absolutist thinking can lead to *disavowal of personal responsibility*. Disavowal of personal responsibility is more likely to occur when people attribute their beliefs to an absolutistic source, and the source becomes more authoritative when it is capitalized (e.g., "The Truth" in contrast to "My Truth"). This type of thinking is associated with cognitive inflexibility and rigidity. In this context, no political party has a monopoly on truth.

Absolutism is associated with *arrogance*, which involves absolutistic certainty. A related but broader concept is *particularism*, which refers to an exclusive attachment to one's own group, religion, nation, or political party. *Political particularism* refers to the belief that one's own brand of politics is the only path to truth and justice. A related concept is *exceptionalism*, which is the perception or belief that a country, society, institution, individual, or political party "exceptional" (i.e., unusual or extraordinary). Exceptionalism carries with it the implication, whether specified or not, that the

referent is superior in some way. Political absolutism often involves both exceptionalism and particularism.

All-or-nothing thinking, which is less often termed "all-or-none" thinking, is a form of absolutistic thinking that occurs when a person thinks in terms of "always," "every," or "never." We are all prone to slipping into reductionist type of thinking from time to time, partly because it simplifies information. At the same time, all-or-none thinking reduces our choices when we ignore exceptions, gradations, and the middle ground. All-or-none thinking is a *binary, bifurcated,* or *dualistic* type of thinking, often described as "black and white" thinking. In contrast, as most people have experienced, the wide array of colors in the real world are much more complex than simply shades of gray. To the binary thinker, the various shades of gray may feel too "fuzzy" for comfort. From a psychological perspective, all-or-none thinking is often associated with personality traits such as inability or difficulty tolerating ambiguity, ambivalence, or uncertainty. Conversely, people who can tolerate ambiguity and uncertainty are less like to engage in all-or-none thinking.

Arbitrary inference involves drawing a conclusion when evidence is lacking or contrary to the conclusion. It can also involve taking a single sentence or statement out of context while attributing a highly personalized meaning to it. In exegesis, this process is known *proof texting*, which refers to the practice of taking a verse out-of-context and then using it to support one's own presuppositions, beliefs, or biases. Taken literally, a proof text (also known as a "proof-text") refers to "a Scriptural passage adduced as proof for a theological doctrine, belief, or principle" (Merriam-Webster, n.d.). As a form of arbitrary inference, political proof texting involves ignoring the cultural, historical, or semantic context of a statement while giving an idiosyncratic or highly personalized interpretation to the statement. It is sometimes referred to as reading one's own ideas into the Scripture, which is a type of confirmation bias.

In describing some of the ways the Evangelical church in America is breaking apart, media commentator and conservative Christian writer Peter Wehner observes: "They might insist that they are interpreting their politics through the prism of

scripture, with the former subordinate to the latter, but in fact scripture and biblical ethics are often distorted to fit their politics" (Wehner, 2021, para. 23).

To guard against making arbitrary inferences, scholars strive to interpret texts by using context, including cultural, historical, and linguistic contexts. They avoid taking a statement out of context or, in the world of politics, arguing against a position based on extraction of a single sentence taken from an eight hour transcript.

Attribution theory is a conceptual model based on the idea that we attempt to understand the behavior of others by attributing feelings, beliefs, and intentions to some other source (i.e., usually to ourselves or to another person). Attributions can be *internal* (attributed to self) or *external* (attributed to others). In an external (or situational) attribution, a person infers that another person's behavior is due to situational factors. By contrast, in an internal attribution, we attribute some behavior or event to internal factors within the other person (or within ourselves). In politics, we have a tendency to attribute positive events to internal characteristics within ourselves or our own political party, and we are more likely to attribute negative events to external factors of to the other political party. In other words, we attribute positive societal outcomes to the own actions of our political party, whereas we a attribute negative outcomes to political party of our opponent.

Binary thinking is another term for *dichotomous reasoning*, which refers to *all-or-none* thinking. It is also known as *dualistic* thinking, in contrast to *holistic* thinking (which some writers term non-dualistic thinking, which itself reflects dualistic categories). A binary thinker may use categories such as right-wrong, saved-unsaved, saint-sinner, us-them, normal-abnormal, and so forth. Political truths usually involve paradox—not one polar extreme or the other, but rather a blend of both dimensions and even others. Optimal functioning requires going beyond binary thinking.

Binary thinking is also expressed in the logical fallacy known as the *false dilemma*, also known as the *fallacy of false choices*, in which something is falsely claimed to be an "either/or" situation, when in fact there is at least one additional option. This type of bifurcated thinking usually takes the form of acknowledging only two options—one of which is usually extreme—from a continuum of possibilities. For example, "Either we accept the belief in _____, or we must no longer call ourselves religious." The fallacy of the false dilemma is sometimes the result of a habitual tendency, whatever the cause, to view the world with limited set of options. One antidote for mutually exclusive "either-or" thinking is a more inclusive "both-and" thinking.

To some extent, binary thinking is involved in the cultural or sociological process of *othering*, which refers to a reductionist labelling of a person, culture, or religion as belonging to the subordinate and intrinsically inferior category of the Other. To *otherize* (in British *otherisation*) involves making a person or group of people seem different or to consider them to be different. The practice of "othering" excludes people who do not fit the norm of the majority or prevailing social or religious group, which is some version of the Self.

The binary thinking style of othering is not only a form of judging and prejudice, but it can also be the foundation for anger, aggression, and even violence. On both an individual psychological level as well as a communal group level, the internal emotions of anxiety and fear may underlie the more external actions ranging from religious indignation to religious persecution and violence. According to spiritual director Deborah Midkiff, MS, NCC, SD, "The problem of othering is inherent in the process of excluding based on differences rather than including based on similarities. Thus fear exists on both sides of the equation" (D. Midkiff, personal communication, June 22, 2021).

At its worst, the process of othering can lead to *demonization*, which involves the portrayal of some activity or group as immoral, wicked, or threatening. Collective rationalizations are regularly constructed for acts of aggression (Smith & Mackie, 2007, p. 513), based on exaltation of the in-group and demonization of the opposite side or out-group. As the Gestalt psychotherapist Fritz Perls (1971, p. 9) expressed the idea, "My political conviction is sacred; the other political conviction is bad. If a state is at war, its own soldiers are angels, and the enemy

are all devils. Our own soldiers take care of the poor families; the enemy rapes them." In politics, this tendency to exalt ourselves and demonize the other can be similarly expressed. For example, "Our political party takes care of the poor; the other party exploits them." Conversely, "Our political party protects hard-working people who pay taxes; the other political party exploits hard-working people who pay taxes."

In his book *The Colonial Present*, Derek Gregory (2004), British academic and Professor of Geography at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, offers his critique of the so-called "war on terror" in Afghanistan and its extensions into Palestine and Iraq. Gregory traces the long history of British and American involvements in the Middle East and shows how colonial power continues to cast long shadows that reach into the present. Gregory provides a quote from cultural critic and Columbia University Professor of Literature, Edward Wadie (1935-2003):

> To build a conceptual framework around a notion of Us-versus-Them is, in effect, to pretend that the principal consideration is epistemological and natural—our civilization is known and accepted, theirs is different and strange—whereas, in fact, the framework separating us from them is belligerent, constructed, and situational. (Gregory, 2004, p. 24)

In some ways, binary thinking is similar to the mathematical concept of a *bounded-set* (i.e., one is either inside or outside of a boundary or set), as opposed to a *centered-set* (i.e., in which one is moving closer to the center of a set). Bounded-set thinkers can draw a circle that keeps others out, whereas centered-set thinkers can draw a larger circle that lets others in. Whereas bounded-set thinking can involve an "us-them" dichotomy, centered-set thinking can involve a "we" mentality. Unless one is an absolutistic thinker, it is not a matter of whether one type of thinking is right and another type is wrong (which is by definition a binary distinction), but rather it is that bounded-set type of thinking is more *exclusive* and centered-set thinking is more *inclusive*.

The principles of inclusiveness and exclusiveness also have implications in moral psychology. One principle of moral psychology is that "morality binds and blinds." As First Amendment attorney Greg Lukianoff and social psychologist Jonathan Haidt, Ph.D. (2015, para. 12) point out, "Part of what we do when we make moral judgments is express allegiance to a team. But that can interfere with our ability to think critically. Acknowledging that the other side's viewpoint has any merit is risky—your teammates may see you as a traitor." In the case of religious fundamentalism, traitors are often viewed as heretics—and punished accordingly.

With specific reference to academic settings such as college campuses, Lukianoff and Haidt (2015, para. 5) use the term "protective vindictiveness" to refer to a movement to that punishes anyone who interferes with the goal of turning college campuses into "safe spaces" in which "young adults are shielded from words and ideas that make some uncomfortable." According to Lukianoff and Haidt vindictive protectiveness creates "a culture in which everyone must think twice before speaking up, lest they face charges of insensitivity, aggression, or worse" (2015, para. 5). Whether in universities or in congress, protective vindictiveness operates on both sides of the political aisle.

Cognitive deficiency occurs when an important aspect of one's life situation is disregarded, dismissed, or ignored. The term does not refer to a mental defect or intellectual disability, but rather it comes closer to the psychodynamic concepts of denial, repression, or lack of awareness. While judging others harshly, a cognitively deficient person might ignore his or her own self-righteous hypocrisy. It is easier to be a movie critic than a movie direction, just as it is easier to be a literary critic than an author. It is easier to criticize the faults of the other political party than it is to engage in examination of the faults of one's own political party.

Confirmation bias, also called "myself" bias, refers to the tendency to interpret new data or evidence as confirmation of one's own pre-existing beliefs or theory. In other words, it is the tendency to favor information that confirms one's beliefs—regardless of the actual facts. Even the most objective scientific researchers must be continually on guard against

seeing what they expect to see in the data. *Perspective-taking*, which involves striving to understand a subject matter from the perspective of the other person or an alternative hypothesis, is one way to guard against confirmation bias.

Dichotomous reasoning is another term for *binary thinking* or *all-or-none-thinking*. It involves viewing situations as binary rather than multidimensional. Rather than seeing in color or even in shades of gray, dichotomous thinking involves seeing in black and white.

Illusion of Explanatory Depth (IOED) is a term that refers to the phenomenon that we believe that we understand more about the world than we actually do. It is often not until we are asked to actually explain a concept that we come face to face with our limited understanding of it. The illusion of explanatory depth can cause use to make important but sometimes faulty decisions based on limited information. In a nationally representative sample of adults in the US, Fernbach and colleagues found that as extremity of opposition to and concern about genetically modified foods increases, objective knowledge about science and genetics decreases, but perceived understanding of genetically modified foods increases. In other words, extreme opponents know the least, but think they know the most.

Intellectualization is an ego defense mechanism that involves excessive use of intellectual processes to avoid the expression or experience of emotions. In intellectualization, attention is focused on external reality to avoid the expression of inner feelings, emphasis is focused on the inanimate in order to avoid intimacy with people, and emphasis is placed on irrelevant details to avoid perceiving the whole. Intellectualization is closely related to rationalization.

Literalism is a term used by various writers concerning textual interpretation. Because it serves as one of the foundational pillars of political and religious fundamentalism, literalism deserves special consideration. Literalism generally refers to an adherence to the exact letter or the literal meaning of a word or words, as opposed to a contextual meaning.

Literalism refers to adherence to the exact letter or the literal sense of laws, scripture, or text. Literalism stands in contrast to historical-critical or cultural methods of interpretation, which investigate the origins of texts in order to understand "the world behind the text" (Soulen & Soulen, 2001, p. 78). Somewhat paradoxically, literalism does not necessarily lead to complete agreement among literalists with regard to one single interpretation of any given passage or verse in sacred writings.

Magnification occurs when the meaning of some event or thing is exaggerated. *Minor* events are misconstrued to be *major* problems, such as "making a mountain out of a molehill." As it relates to politics, magnification is a part of how we may emphasize the negative aspects of other political parties, whereas minimization refers to how downplay the negative aspects of our own party.

Mind reading occurs when a person believes that he or she knows the feelings, thoughts, or beliefs of another person without asking the other person. This type of cognitive distortion can reach political significance when a person claims to be able to read the mind of a candidate or elected official of the other party.

Minimization occurs when *major* problems are misconstrued as *minor* concerns. This type of thinking occurs when one "doesn't care" or when important issues "don't matter," or "aren't important." This error in thinking may occur when a person focuses only on the negative and minimizes the positive aspects of an interaction or situation. As it relates to politics, minimization is a part of how we may devalue or minimize the positive aspects of other political positions different than our own, and minimization is also how we may view the negative aspects of our own party's positions.

Othering refers to a reductionist labelling of a person, culture, or political party as belonging to the subordinate and intrinsically inferior category of the Other. To *otherize* (in British, *otherisation*) involves making a person or group of constituents seem different or to consider them to be different. The practice of *othering* excludes people who do not fit the norm of the majority or prevailing social or religious group, which is some version of the Self.

For more details, see the discussion of this topic listed under Binary Thinking.

Overgeneralization occurs when a single instance such as failure is viewed as a sign that similar incidents will recur. This type of thinking includes the use of words such as "everybody," "always," or "never." Overgeneralizations such as "you always" or "you never" can create also conflicts in relationships. In religion, overgeneralizing can lead to stereotyping others, which can lead to us paying more attention to how we are different rather than how we are similar to others.

Projection refers to the process by which we attribute our impulses, feelings, or motives to others. In this sense, projection is related to *attribution theory*, although the concept of projection originated in psychoanalytic theory as an ego defense mechanism in which we unconsciously attribute our unacceptable impulses onto others. The "unconscious" refers to that which is outside of our awareness.

In a broad sense, projections can be negative or positive. Our political opponents become enemies onto whom we project our own unacceptable impulses that we are unable or unwilling to recognize within ourselves. On the other hand, our political allies become friends onto whom we project our idealized images of ourselves.

Proof-texting, which is also called prooftexting, refers to the process of using selective quotes from a document in order to "prove" one's own attitudes or beliefs. It similar what William Shakespeare observed in *The Merchant of Venice* (i.e., "The devil can cite Scripture for his purpose"). A *proof text* is a passage of scripture presented as proof for a theological belief, doctrine, practice, or principle. *Proof-texting* is the practice of using isolated, out-of-context quotations from a document to establish a proposition in *eisegesis*. In contrast to exegesis (i.e., the discipline of extracting what the text says by using grammatical, historical, and textual analysis), eisegesis refers to the process of interpreting a text in such a way as to "prove" one's own agenda, bias, or presupposition. It is a type of *confirmation bias* commonly referred to as "reading into the text."

Prophesizing, which has also been described as "fortune telling," occurs when a person "tells the future," and then consequently acts in a fashion that makes the prediction come true. This type of thinking is also called a "self-fulfilling prophesy." Confirmation bias can aid the process by allowing us to look back and selectively recall the facts and fictions that fit best with our prophecy—a process known as *prophetic history*.

Rationalization is an ego defense mechanism that involves offering logical or rational explanations in an attempt to justify attitudes, beliefs, or behavior that may otherwise be unacceptable. Such underlying motives are usually instinctual and unconscious, which means they are outside of conscious awareness.

Reductive reasoning refers the use of the strawman argument, which is a strategy that intentionally presents a much weaker, exaggerated, and falsified version of the opponent's position. The false (i.e., "straw") version of the opponent' position is then attacked. The purpose of this method is for the proponent to appear victorious in front of an audience (e.g., usually media such as radio or internet. The strawman argument is termed *reductionist* because it reduces an opponent's position and then misrepresents the reduced form as if it is the original argument of the opponent. With audiences that are uneducated in logical fallacies, this simplification is easier to explain and it also seems more intuitive to an audience, making the response to it appear brilliant or even logical.

Selective abstraction occurs when we take a bit of information out of context and then generalize it into some global truth. For example, we might take a single event (such as an elected official's unproductive day) and interpret it in a more generalized manner (saying that the elected official is an unproductive person). Similarly, a person might take a particular verse from a sacred text and then literalize the verse in some generalized way without taking into consideration the original cultural context, the intended audience, or even the original languages from which the verse has been translated. This practice is often referred to as *weaponizing* a candid comment or a statement taken from a transcript.

Self-Other rating occurs when a person rates global *worth*, rather than *traits*, of oneself or others. It can also involve "comparing one's insides to others' outsides." A self-other rating is a form of overgeneralization, which can be a risk factor in the etiology of feelings of envy, greed, jealousy, hostility, or feelings of inadequacy. With respect to politics, it is easier to compare the best of one's own party with the worst of another's party. Seeing only the worst in other the other party perpetuates stereotyped perceptions. The antidote, of course, I simple: When striving to understand another point of view, ask the proponents—rather than the opponents—for an explanation of their perspective.

Solution Aversion refers to denial of an actual problem when solutions to the problem appear to be more aversive than the problem. Based on four research studies conducted by Duke University researchers Campbell and Kay (2014), the concept helps explain why some people deny a scientific hypothesis even when there is overwhelming evidence to support the hypothesis. From a scientific perspective, solution denial does not make logical sense, because determining whether or not a problem exists would seem to be based solely on evidence for or against the existence of that problem. For example, just because we believe it will be very expensive to replace faulty wiring in a home should not our belief in the electrical short circuit any less likely. From a political perspective, people often decide what they want the solutions to be, and then they believe whatever facts will support their beliefs. This cognitive error is related to *selective abstraction*, abstracting some global or universal truth on the basis of some small bit of data or information.

Straw Man argument is comprised of elements of cognitive distortion, over-generalization, selective abstraction, reductive reasoning, and self-other rating. Straw man argument, also known as the *straw man fallacy*, involves deliberately distorting or reducing an opponent's position in an attempt to gain an advantage in an argument. It occurs whenever someone substitutes an opposing argument with a distorted, exaggerated, misrepresented, or oversimplified version of it in order to make the opposing position (i.e., the straw man) easier to defeat in a debate. In some political circles, this logical fallacy should be referred to as a straw person argument.

According to the Paul Elsher (2020), this logical fallacy of the strawman argument is that it gives the impression of refuting the other person's actual position. In reality, however, Person A attacks an opinion, position, or view that their opponent does not really hold. The distorted version of Person B's claim may be taken out of context, focus only on a single aspect of the original argument, or be only remotely related to it. The distortions of the straw man fallacy can be applied to groups and constituencies as well as individuals. As clinical psychologist Rian E. McMullin, Ph.D. has observed, "Whatever their origins, fallacies can take on a special life of their own when they are popularized in the media and become part of a national credo (2000, p. 194). Unfortunately, straw man arguments have become almost the norm in contemporary political debates, particularly as they may involve controversial topics and societal concerns.

References

Campbell, T. H., & Kay, A. C. (2014). Solution aversion: On the relation between ideology and motivated disbelief. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 107*(5), 809–824. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037963

Elsher, P. (2022). *Straw man argument (logical fallacy): Definition and examples*. https://fallacyinlogic.com/straw-man-fallacy-definition-and-examples/#Category This reference was originally titled as follows: Beginner's guide to the straw man fallacy (with examples). (2020). *Fallacy in Logic*. https://fallacyinlogic.com/straw-man-fallacy-definition-and-examples/#Category

Fernbach, P. M., Light, N., Scott, S. E., Inbar, Y., & Rozin. P. (2019, March). Extreme opponents of genetically modified foods know the least but think they know the most. *Nature Human Behaviour, 3*(3), 251–256.

Gregory, D. (2004). *The colonial present: Afghanistan, Palestine, Iraq*. Carlton, Victoria, Australia: Blackwell Publishing.

Kimball, C. (2002). *When religion becomes evil*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Lukianoff, G., & Haidt, J. (2015, September). The coddling of the American mind. *The Atlantic*. https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/09/the-coddling-of-the-american-mind/399356/

Lukianoff, G., & Haidt, J. (2018). *The coddling of the American mind: How good intentions and bad ideas are setting up a generation for failure*. New York, NY: Penguin Press.

Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Proof text. In Merriam-Webster.com dictionary. Retrieved January 1, 2020, from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/proof%20text

McMullin, R. E. (2000). *The new handbook of cognitive therapy techniques*. (2nd ed.). New York, NY: W. W. Norton. See section on logical fallacies (pp. 194–202).

Perls, F. (1971). *Gestalt theory verbatim*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.

Smith, E R., & Mackie, D. (2007). *Social psychology* (3rd ed.). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.

Soulen, R. N., & Soulen, R. K. (2001). *Handbook of biblical criticism* (3rd ed., rev. and expanded ed.). Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

Wehner, P. (2021, October 24). The Evangelical church is breaking apart: Christians must reclaim Jesus from his church. *The Atlantic*. https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2021/10/evangelical-trump-christians-politics/620469/

Correct Citation for Reference Entry

The reference entry correct citation styles for this document are illustrated below. Students should defer to the style preferences of their individual course instructors to determine whether the course instructor has preferences that are more specific than those shown below:

American Psychological Association

Doverspike, W. F. (2022). How cognitive distortions affect politicians.
http://drwilliamdoverspike.com/

Chicago Manual of Style / Kate Turabian

Doverspike, William, "How cognitive distortions affect politicians," April 15, 2022.
http://drwilliamdoverspike.com/

Note: According to the Chicago Manual of Style, blog posts are typically not included in bibliographies, but can be cited in the running text and/or notes. However, if a blog is cited frequently, you may include it in the bibliography.

Modern Language Association

Doverspike, William F. "How cognitive distortions affect politicians." 15 Sept. 2022 [Date accessed]

Note: MLA guidelines assume that readers can track down most online sources by entering the author, title, or other identifying information in a search engine or a database. Consequently, MLA does not require a URL in citations for online sources such as websites. However, because some instructors still ask for it, check with them to determine whether they require it.

Documentation

This document is cross-referenced to a portable document file (PDF) published from this Word document file: How Cognitive Distortions Affect Politicians.doc

Server path:
http://drwilliamdoverspike.com/files/how_cognitive_distortions_affect_politicians.pdf

Server file name:
how_cognitive_distortions_affect_politicians.pdf

Website tab: Practice [Popular Articles]
Link name: How Thoughts Control Politics

Published Sept. 15, 2022 | Last updated Jan. 01, 2024