

# How User Language Affects Conflict Fatality Estimates in ChatGPT

Daniel Kazenwadel<sup>†,1</sup> & Christoph V. Steinert<sup>†,2</sup>

August 2, 2023

OpenAI’s ChatGPT language model has gained popularity as a powerful tool for complex problem-solving and information retrieval. However, concerns arise about the reproduction of biases present in the language-specific training data. In this study, we address this issue in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian and Turkish-Kurdish conflicts. Using GPT-3.5, we employed an automated query procedure to inquire about casualties in specific airstrikes, in both Hebrew and Arabic for the former conflict and Turkish and Kurdish for the latter. Our analysis reveals that GPT-3.5 provides  $27 \pm 11$  percent lower fatality estimates when queried in the language of the attacker than in the language of the targeted group. Evasive answers denying the existence of such attacks further increase the discrepancy, creating a novel bias mechanism not present in regular search engines. This language bias has the potential to amplify existing media biases and contribute to information bubbles, ultimately reinforcing conflicts.

<sup>†</sup> both authors contributed equally

<sup>1</sup>University of Konstanz, [daniel.kazenwadel@uni-konstanz.de](mailto:daniel.kazenwadel@uni-konstanz.de)

<sup>2</sup>University of St. Gallen, [christoph.steinert@unisg.ch](mailto:christoph.steinert@unisg.ch)

# 1 Introduction

Scholars have long recognized that information discrepancies play a profound role in armed conflicts (Fearon, 1995; Slantchev and Tarar, 2011). Discrepancies in information have affected armed conflicts throughout history, but what distinguishes today’s conflicts is the availability of an unprecedented amount of information sources. Nowadays, individuals can draw on abundant online information about conflict-related events and even employ artificial intelligence (AI) to obtain targeted answers to specific questions.<sup>1</sup> To the extent that these new sources of information mitigate information discrepancies and contribute to a convergence of beliefs, they may have a pacifying effect on conflict-prone regions.

However, quite to the contrary, it has been argued that these novel technologies facilitate the spread of misinformation and reinforce radical beliefs (Koehler, 2014; Zhuravskaya, Petrova, and Enikolopov, 2020). As people tend to search for belief-congruent information, targeted algorithms can create ‘information bubbles’ that reproduce prior beliefs (Kaakinen et al., 2020; Rhodes, 2022). Being confronted with fake news and deepfakes, it may be harder than ever before to identify the correct information. This is especially true when the novel information sources themselves have built-in biases that affect the content of the information obtained. While AI provides an appearance of objectivity, the information obtained may differ between people who speak different languages. For instance, the popular chatbot ChatGPT relies on the logic of prompting, meaning that the answers obtained are a function of the information provided in the question prompt. In multilingual contexts, individuals are likely to provide question prompts in different languages which may shape the content produced by the language-based model. How this affects information discrepancies in the context of multilingual armed conflict has not yet been investigated.

Against this backdrop, this study investigates how language affects information about conflict-related violence obtained by GPT-3.5, the language model underlying ChatGPT. We analyze airstrikes that occurred during the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the Turkish-Kurdish conflict as recorded by the UCDP Georeferenced Events Dataset (Davies, Pettersson, and Öberg, 2022; Sundberg and Melander, 2013). For each airstrike, we ask GPT-3.5 for the number of people killed in both Hebrew and Arabic, and in Turkish and Kurdish respectively.<sup>2</sup> By automating this process and repeatedly asking the same question about each airstrike, we obtain varying fatality

---

<sup>1</sup>This may not apply to citizens of states where the Internet is completely censored. However, there are only a small number of states where internet censorship is comprehensive, and individuals tend to be savvy in circumventing these restrictions (e.g., King, Pan, and Roberts, 2013, p. 328).

<sup>2</sup>We use Northern Kurdish, also known as Kurmanji, which is the most widely spoken form of Kurdish. Kurmanji is predominantly used in south-eastern Turkey and northern Iraq, which are the regions covered in our paper.

numbers, which allow us to generate uncertainty estimates. Drawing on this quantitative information, we analyze how the language provided to GPT-3.5 affects the information obtained on airstrike fatalities.

Our findings show for the first time that there is a substantial language bias in the information on conflict-related violence provided by GPT-3.5. The evidence suggests that GPT-3.5 reports higher casualty figures when asked about airstrikes in the language of the targeted group than in the language of the perpetrator.<sup>3</sup> More specifically, in the context of Turkish airstrikes against alleged PKK members, we find that GPT-3.5 reports higher fatality numbers when it is asked about these airstrikes on Kurdish compared to Turkish. Similarly, we find that GPT-3.5 reports higher fatality numbers on Arabic compared to Hebrew in response to question prompts about Israeli airstrikes. Further we identify a new, previously unreported bias mechanism that exists only in chatbot responses and has no equivalent in traditional search engines. When asked in the language of the attacker, the chatbot not only provides a lower number of casualties but is also more likely to deny the existence of the queried event or reports an attack by the opposing side. Overall, GPT-3.5 is more likely to provide information about airstrikes and tends to produce higher casualty estimates in the language of the targeted group.

This evidence contributes to our understanding of political biases in AI (Hartmann, Schwenzow, and Witte, 2023; McGee, 2023) with a specific focus on fatality estimates in armed conflicts. While previous research demonstrates that AI is prone to gender biases (Leavy, 2018; Marinucci, Mazzuca, and Gangemi, 2022; Nadeem, Abedin, and Marjanovic, 2020) and racial biases (Cheng, Durmus, and Jurafsky, 2023; Intahchomphoo and Gundersen, 2020; Noseworthy et al., 2020; Obermeyer and Topol, 2021; Lee, 2018), we identify a novel language bias that shapes information discrepancies in multilingual conflicts. This speaks to previous research suggesting that intrastate conflicts occur more frequently within linguistic dyads than religious dyads (Borrmann, Cederman, and Vogt, 2017). By demonstrating that individuals are exposed to different information environments depending on their spoken language, we identify one mechanism linking multilingual contexts to conflict. More broadly, the evidence contributes to research on misinformation and propaganda during armed conflicts (Greenhill and Oppenheim, 2017; Honig and Reichard, 2018; Lewandowsky et al., 2013; Silverman, Kaltenthaler, and Dagher, 2021; Schon, 2021). We show that new information technologies do not solve these problems, but reproduce biases that are widespread in media coverage of conflict-related violence.

---

<sup>3</sup>We do not take a political stance on the question of who is the aggressor in the overall conflicts but use the terms ‘perpetrator’ and ‘attacker’ only in relation to specific airstrikes carried out by one side.

As a major methodological contribution, we provide a novel tool for analyzing such language biases in large language models. We use the inherent translation capabilities of ChatGPT to translate and back-translate our prompts in a fully automated query scheme. This approach allows for good scalability and applicability to diverse topics and languages. Our focus on numerical estimates allows for statistical analysis and is not dependent on the subtleties of the exact translation and wording that affect more classical approaches such as sentiment analysis (e.g., Mohammad, 2017).

Our study proceeds as follows: First, we review previous research on deliberate misinformation campaigns and reporting biases during armed conflicts. Building on this body of research, we develop our theoretical expectations about the impact of language on conflict-related information obtained through AI. Subsequently, we introduce our research design that enables us to test our hypothesis using an automated procedure employed in GPT-3.5. Next, we present our results on estimates of airstrike fatalities in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and in the Turkish-Kurdish conflict obtained through repeated multilingual searches in GPT-3.5. In the final section, we review these findings and draw broader implications on the nexus of AI and armed conflicts.

## **2 Conflict fatality estimates, reporting biases, and novel sources of information**

Information on conflict-related violence is a highly contested good. Belligerents have incentives to deny or inflate information about conflict-related violence given that battlefield objectives must be balanced against other concerns such as legitimacy (Malthaner, 2015; Podder, 2017; Schlichte and Schneckener, 2015), audience costs (Kurizaki and Whang, 2015; Slantchev, 2006), or combat morale (Fennell, 2014; Nilsson, 2018). Perpetrators of violence might want to downplay the extent of violent attacks to avoid negative repercussions such as domestic opposition or international sanctions. Evidence suggests that violence can trigger a backlash and incite opposition against the perpetrator (Carey, 2006; Curtice and Behlendorf, 2021; Rozenas and Zhukov, 2019; Steinert and Dworschak, 2022). This is especially likely when violence is clearly attributable to one side (Thomson, 2017) and when it is indiscriminate and causes civilian casualties—such as in the case of airstrikes (Pechenkina, Bausch, and Skinner, 2019; Rozenas and Zhukov, 2019; Schutte, Ruhe, and Linke, 2022). In anticipation of possible adverse consequences, perpetrators of violence may

seek to deny acts of violence or downplay their scale and intensity.<sup>4</sup> All else equal, governments are in a privileged position to distort information about conflict-related violence because they can use state-controlled media and their own propaganda apparatus to whitewash their public image (Guriev and Treisman, 2019). However, evidence suggests that non-state actors also go to great lengths to portray themselves as norm-abiding actors, seeking to attract legitimacy and international support (Huang, 2016; Salehyan, K. S. Gleditsch, and Cunningham, 2011; Stanton, 2020).

On the other hand, victimized groups have incentives to inflate information on the scale of violence perpetrated by their opponent. By reporting (exaggerated) numbers of deaths caused by their opponent's attacks, they may seek to attract international solidarity and damage their opponent's reputation (Honig and Reichard, 2018; Noor et al., 2012; Silverman, Kaltenthaler, and Dagher, 2021). In particular, reports of civilian casualties including allegations of attacks on vulnerable groups such as children, can be used strategically to portray the opponent as cruel and inhumane. Evidence further suggests that reports of female casualties attract stronger opposition than reports of male casualties (Kreft and Agerberg, 2023). In order to appeal to international norms and reduce support for the perpetrators of violence, victimized groups tend to emphasize the indiscriminate and disproportionate nature of the violence perpetrated by their adversaries. In sum, belligerents are engaged in an information war for "the hearts and minds" of domestic and international audiences, resulting in strategic attempts to manipulate information about conflict-related violence.

While belligerents deliberately manipulate information, even independent sources may not be able to provide accurate information on conflict-related violence. Verifying information in war contexts is inherently difficult, given the imminent risk of violence and a disrupted information infrastructure (Nohrstedt and Ottosen, 2014; Saul, 2008). Physical obstacles such as blocked roads, destroyed bridges, and damaged power grids hamper the work of journalists and human rights organizations (Pfeifle, 2022). Fact-finding needs to be constantly adapted to local security concerns, as a significant number of journalists are killed while reporting in conflict societies (see Gohdes and Carey, 2017, p. 163). Because information is chronically difficult to verify, media reports of conflict-related violence tend to under-report the true incidence of violent events (Price and Ball, 2015; Price, Gohdes, and Ball, 2014). This underreporting bias follows systematic

---

<sup>4</sup>In some contexts, perpetrators of violence may wish to exaggerate the scale of their attacks in order to spread fear and signal their resolve. Such exaggeration of violence is particularly common in the case of terrorist groups that seek to maximise fear and attention (Blankenship, 2018; Braithwaite, 2013; Pape, 2003).

patterns, as for example conflict-related violence in rural areas is less likely to be reported (Kalyvas, 2004).

Overall, citizens in conflict-affected countries find themselves in a complex information environment where it is difficult to obtain accurate evidence. Novel information technologies facilitate access to information about conflict-related events but they can also reinforce political biases. Substantial evidence suggests that social media is prone to creating ‘information bubbles’, fostering ideological polarization and radicalized identities (Dobransky and Hargittai, 2021; Eady et al., 2019; Kaakinen et al., 2020; Spohr, 2017). Chatbots such as ChatGPT offer a new source of information that can provide concise answers to specific questions. Being already used in diverse fields such as content creation (Lawrence, 2023), programming (Surameery and Shakor, 2023), education (Lo, 2023), research (Zhu et al., 2023), tourism (Carvalho and Ivanov, 2023), and marketing (Rivas and Zhao, 2023), it is plausible to extrapolate that large language models will increasingly be used for information purposes among larger audiences. In particular, they could be used to obtain information on complex and controversial issues—such as conflict-related violence—where it is difficult to find clear-cut information elsewhere.<sup>5</sup>

In light of this ongoing development, it is important to understand how AI responds to questions about conflict-related violence. To date, we lack systematic empirical evidence on AI in this specific context. While AI may increasingly reach global audiences, we expect that individuals’ engagement with AI will vary systematically across cultural contexts. In particular, we argue that language competence is a fundamental constraint on individuals’ engagement with AI. Despite the fact that chatbots such as ChatGPT can be used as translators, for mere convenience purposes, it is plausible that individuals will primarily engage with AI through their own spoken and written language. It is well known that the quality of ChatGPT’s answers depends strongly on the language used, since it relies mostly on the subset of the training data that is in the same language as the question (Blevins and Zettlemoyer, 2022). The training data—a mixture of different sources, including a copy of open access internet data (Common Crawl), an overview of open source books, and Wikipedia—is heavily biased towards the English language (over 50%) (Artetxe et al., 2022; Crawl Archives, 2023; Dodge et al., 2021). Since the performance of language models depends on the amount of training data, this results in a significantly worse performance for languages with less training data (Fang et al., 2023; Kreutzer et al., 2022; Lai et al., 2023). This means that even if people ask exactly the same question in different languages, the language model is expected to

---

<sup>5</sup>The responses from ChatGPT do not reflect the level of uncertainty associated with the information. They therefore suggest a level of confidence that other sources may not offer.

produce different answers.

We argue that this has implications for queries on conflict-related violence. We expect that the information available in the training data on events of conflict-related violence will differ systematically across languages. In light of the incentives for information distortion discussed above, we hypothesize that ChatGPT responses differ depending on the language of the query. In particular, in the context of airstrikes during armed conflicts, we expect fewer reported deaths in the language of the attacker than in the language of the targeted group.

### 3 Research Design

We investigate the hypothesis in the context of airstrikes during armed conflicts where the parties to the conflict are linguistically divided.<sup>6</sup> We select the two cases of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (Hebrew/Arabic dyad) and the Turkish-Kurdish conflict (Turkish/Kurdish dyad), which are both classified as intra-state armed conflicts by the UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset (N. P. Gleditsch et al., 2002; Davies, Pettersson, and Öberg, 2022). These conflicts are comparable in the sense that professional armies are pitted against weaker non-state insurgents, representing typical cases of irregular warfare (Kalyvas and Balcells, 2010). While holding the type of conflict constant, the analyzed conflicts differ substantially in historical, political, and cultural dimensions, allowing us to analyze whether our hypothesis holds in different multilingual contexts. We focus on airstrikes in these conflicts because this type of conflict-related violence tends to result in fatalities, but the numbers are often disputed and difficult to verify.<sup>7</sup> The large number of conflicts in which English-speaking countries were involved (Vietnam, Afghanistan, Iraq, etc.) are excluded due to the significantly better performance of AI in this language (see Dodge et al., 2021).

To identify airstrikes during the two conflicts under scrutiny, we use information from the UCDP Georeferenced Event Dataset (GED), which contains fine-grained information on individual events of organized violence that are geo-coded to the level of individual villages (Davies, Pettersson, and Öberg, 2022; Sundberg and Melander, 2013). The major advantage of this dataset is that it provides us with rich contextual information about individual airstrikes, such as the exact day and location, which allows us to pinpoint these airstrikes through specific questions in GPT-3.5. While GED covers different types of organized violent events, we filter the subset of

---

<sup>6</sup>This excludes, among others, Russia’s ongoing war of aggression in Ukraine as Russian is spoken in both countries.

<sup>7</sup>As only the Israeli and the Turkish governments have air forces, airstrikes can easily be attributed to the respective conflict parties.

airstrikes by searching for this term via string detection in the ‘source article’ column provided by GED. Subsequently, we randomly select 10 airstrikes for both the Turkish-Kurdish conflict and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, identified by the ‘conflict name’ column in GED. All analyzed airstrikes were carried out by the Turkish government against Kurdish individuals or by the Israeli government against Palestinian individuals. We present the exact locations of these airstrikes on the map in panel (a) of the figures 2 and 3, based on the geolocation coordinates provided by GED.

Drawing on the information provided by GED, we then developed 10 short question prompts for each conflict to ask GPT-3.5 about the number of fatalities in each of these airstrikes. The questions include information about the perpetrator of an airstrike, the exact date of the airstrike, and the location where the airstrike took place. As an example of an Israeli airstrike, we used the question *“In the Israeli airstrike on August 21, 2014 in the Nuseirat refugee camp how many were killed?”*<sup>8</sup> In the same vein, we asked questions about the Turkish airstrikes such as *“In the Turkish airstrike on August 8, 2015 in Midyat how many were killed?”*.

To get a significant amount of data while keeping the coding effort acceptable our query procedure is fully automated. A short scheme of our approach is shown in figure 1. We use OpenAI’s Python API and the GPT-3.5-turbo algorithm, which is currently the cheapest and most widely used instance. For each query language, we follow the procedure described in in the figure and below, with each element consisting of a new instance to reduce memory effects and bias.

Each of these instances consists of a system message (primer) defining the role of the instance, followed by the query itself. The number of maximum response tokens (each token is about one syllable, see Open AI, 2023b) is always set to 1,000 in order to avoid unnecessarily verbose responses. The exact procedure for each language goes as follows:

1. The primer is translated using the role: *“You are a professional translator.”* and a temperature of zero to allow for reproducible translations. As a primer we use the phrase: *“You are an expert of quantitative military history.”* This role provides fairly reproducible responses that involve exact numbers and are easy to code later on. We have tried standard phrases such as *“You are a helpful assistant.”* or similar, but the amount of unusable answers involving non-exact quantities is too large and language-dependent. We assume that our assigned role gives similar results than longer chats with the API where someone just asks for exact numbers.

---

<sup>8</sup>We had tried different question wordings and chose this question based on the highest propensity to provide numerical estimates of fatalities in GPT-3.5.






Figure 1: **Query scheme:** The depicted scheme is used for all 4 languages. The square boxes denote GPT-3.5 requests. The blue boxes and lines denote communication being conducted completely in the target language.

2. We take a question and translate it using the same procedure as applied for the primer before.
3. This is the main prompt. In an instance that only communicates in the query language we use the translated role and question to get a “typical” response in the user language. We do this 10 times in order to allow for statistical analysis. Setting the response ‘temperature’ to 0.6 allows for a certain amount of randomness in the answers (for more detail see Open AI, 2023a).
4. We automatically translate the answers back into English and save the whole conversation to allow for easy coding of the answers.
5. We proceed with the next question.
6. When all questions are completed, all queries and prompts are saved to a logfile.
7. The coding and statistical analysis of the recorded responses is done manually in order to detect outliers, technical problems, etc. A random sample of questions and answers in each language were double-checked by native speakers to further detect any undesirable behavior/translation issues.

All logfiles used for our analysis as well as a code sample of our query script are available online on Zenodo (Kazenwadel, 2023).<sup>9</sup>

## 4 Evidence on numeric fatality estimates

Our main results are presented in figure 2 for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and in figure 3 for the Turkish-Kurdish conflict. For each case, we provide the geolocated positions of the airstrikes in chronological order (panel a), GPT-3.5’s quantitative estimates of the number of fatalities in each airstrike (panel b), and the fatality estimates averaged across all airstrikes (panel c).




Figure 2: **Quantitative results on the Arabic/Hebrew dyad:** a) Geographic distribution of airstrikes b) Number of recorded fatalities (military plus civilians) for each event. Blue are the fatalities recorded when asking in Hebrew, yellow the recorded fatalities when asking in Arabic. The errorbars denote the standard deviation of the mean, evasive answers were excluded. c) Number of total fatalities (fat.), injured (inj.), number of killed civilians averaged over all events (civ.). Evasive answers (ev.) are only observed when the answer says the event did not exist or it does not know of it. When the answer only says that GPT-3.5 does not know the exact fatalities the event is not coded as evasive, but still excluded from the statistical analysis.

Beginning with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the evidence shows that the fatality estimates provided by GPT-3.5 are higher in Arabic than in Hebrew for 8 out of 10 airstrikes, while the pattern is reversed for one airstrike (case #8). The error bars indicate the standard deviation and therefore the spread of the non-zero results in each case. This correlates with the temperature setting mentioned above and should therefore be interpreted with caution. On average, fatality estimates tend to be higher in GPT-3.5 responses in Arabic than in Hebrew, both for total fatalities and for civilian casualties.<sup>10</sup> For one airstrike (case #4), quantitative information on fatalities was only provided in Arabic. This discrepancy in the propensity to provide information about airstrikes is borne out in the aggregated analysis of evasive answers (ev.), which refer to cases where GPT-

<sup>9</sup>See: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8181226>.

<sup>10</sup>Somewhat surprisingly, the average number of reported injured individuals is slightly higher in Hebrew compared to Arabic. This may reflect a tendency for Hebrew sources to report targeted individuals as injured rather than killed, resulting in a substitution process.

3.5 denied the airstrike in question or described another event. As shown in Figure 2 panel c), GPT-3.5 is more likely to respond that the respective airstrike did not occur when asked in Hebrew compared to questions in Arabic.




Figure 3: **Quantitative results on the Kurdish/Turkish dyad:** a) Geographic distribution of airstrikes b) Number of recorded fatalities (military plus civilians) for each airstrike. Red are the fatalities recorded when asking in Turkish, green the recorded fatalities when asking in Kurdish. The errorbars denote the standard deviation of the mean. Evasive answers were excluded. c) Number of total fatalities (fat.), injured (inj.), number of killed civilians averaged over all events (civ.). Evasive answers are only observed when the answer says the event did not exist or it does not know of it (ev.). When the answer only says that GPT-3.5 does not know the exact fatalities the event is not coded as evasive.

Moving to the evidence for the Turkish-Kurdish conflict presented in figure 3, we find that queries to GPT-3.5 on Kurdish tend to result in higher fatality estimates compared to queries on Turkish. For 7 out of 10 airstrikes, the fatality numbers are higher when the information is searched in Kurdish compared to Turkish. Two airstrikes (cases #3 & #4) deviate from this pattern, and for one airstrike fatality estimates are only provided in Kurdish (case #6). Overall, the responses to GPT-3.5 queries on Kurdish, compared to Turkish, suggest that the airstrikes caused a higher human toll. On average, GPT-3.5 reports higher numbers of deaths, more civilians killed, and more people injured in Kurdish. Furthermore, GPT-3.5 is more likely to report that the airstrikes in question did not take place or that it is not aware of them when asked in Turkish. For example, there was a surprisingly high number of responses in the Turkish output reporting 13 dead Turkish soldiers in a cave. This is due to the abduction into a cave and subsequent execution of 13 Turkish citizens by the PKK in February 2021 (Reuters, 2021). Notably, this case is frequently described in Turkish responses when GPT-3.5 is asked about Turkish airstrikes.

The discrepancy in evasive answers is especially striking for both conflicts. In the language of the attacker, we get a significant number of responses where GPT-3.5 states that it does not know of such an event (29 in Hebrew, 38 in Turkish). In the language of the targeted group, this behavior is less common (5 in Arabic, 0 in Kurdish). This is probably due to the fact that

such events have a different news impact in the respective languages. When the number of media mentions of an event falls below a certain threshold (typically in the attacker’s language), GPT-3.5 starts to mention other events or simply denies its existence. This could be even more problematic than the bias in the training data. Imagine a user that uses a typical search engine such as Google to search for the fatalities of an airstrike, she will get a small number of results, but the event will still be present at the top because the search engine cannot evade. When using Chat-GPT or similar language based models, the user will get an evasive answer resulting in an impression of zero fatalities.

To sum up our quantitative results we calculated the percentage by which the estimate in the language of the attacker differs from the estimate in the language of the targeted group in each case. Cases where no casualties are reported or where all responses are evasive are excluded from the analysis. On average, reported casualties are 26 percent lower in Hebrew than in Arabic, with a standard deviation of nine percent. In the Turkish/Kurdish dyad we get a bias of  $28 \pm 12$  percent. Taking into account the evasive answers, this deviation would increase to more than 50 percent. This means that the reported numbers of casualties are significantly lower when asked in the language of the attacker.

## 5 Evidence on word frequencies

ChatGPT’s tendency to characterize airstrikes as deadlier and bloodier in the language of the targeted group is reflected not only in the numerical estimates of fatalities, but also in the substantive information provided. To analyze the content of ChatGPT responses, we measured word frequencies in the logfiles of the GPT-3.5 output. Since we are not looking for precise death counts in this analysis, but for broader contextual information, we asked ChatGPT more broadly “*what happened in the Israeli airstrike on date X in location Y?*” using the primer “*You are a helpful advisor.*”.




Figure 4: **Word frequency analysis:** Top 15 word stems in each language after removal of stopwords, with their respective word frequencies. The uncertainties are based on the shot noise limit a) Hebrew/Arabic dyad. b) Turkish/Kurdish dyad.

Figure 4 presents the most common, non-trivial words in the GPT-3.5 responses of each language.<sup>11</sup> Some notable patterns emerge that support our claims of a language bias in GPT-3.5. The word frequency plot indicates that the stem “hamas” is the 4th most common word in Hebrew, while it is not among the top 15 terms in Arabic. In contrast, the terms “civilian” and “children” appear more frequently in Arabic. Similarly, the term “pkk” appears more frequently in the Turkish GPT-3.5 output. Tellingly, the stem “kurdistan” is the 4th most common term in Kurdish but does not appear among the top 15 terms in Turkish. Further, the terms “civilians” and “guerilla” have a greater relative frequency in Kurdish compared to Turkish.

To further explore the biases in the substantive information provided by GPT-3.5, we manually coded the relative frequency of claims of indiscriminate violence. Conflict research differentiates between selective and indiscriminate violence by asking whether the attacker uses force against the intended individuals while avoiding the use of force against those who were not targeted (Gohdes, 2020; Greitens, 2016; Kalyvas, 2006). Violence is characterized as indiscriminate when it lacks precision, implying that ‘false positives’ are among the victims. We conceptualize this important

<sup>11</sup>We applied stemming and removed stopwords.

dimension of violence by manually coding statements about killed civilians and non-combatants such as children. As indiscriminate violence violates international humanitarian law, we further searched for references to the United Nations and human rights in the responses.

Civilian casualties are mentioned more than twice as often in the Arabic responses as in the Hebrew responses. Killed children are mentioned 6 times more often and female victims 3 times more often in the Arabic version. GPT-3.5’s responses in Arabic are also more likely to emphasize that these airstrikes violated international law. The United Nations is mentioned 13 times in the Arabic responses, while it is never mentioned in the Hebrew output. Moreover, the propensity differs by factor 11 that it was highlighted that these airstrikes were condemned by the international community. In contrast, the term “terrorist” is mentioned more than 6 times more frequently in the Hebrew responses compared to the Arabic responses.

With regard to the Turkish-Kurdish conflict, we find that civilian casualties are mentioned about 50% more often in Kurdish than in Turkish. Killed children appear 10 times more often in the Kurdish responses compared to the Turkish ones. Notably, the term “innocent” appears only in the GPT-3.5 output in Kurdish. Furthermore, the term “human rights” is mentioned 33% more often in Kurdish than in Turkish. Overall, terms related to indiscriminate victimization or international condemnation appear more frequently in GPT-3.5 responses in Kurdish. In contrast, the term “terrorist” is mentioned 8% more often in the Turkish text compared to the Kurdish output.

## 6 Discussion

This study demonstrates that information on conflict-related violence generated by ChatGPT is affected by a substantial language bias. Using GPT-3.5, we show that the language model tends to produce higher fatality estimates when queried in the language of the targeted group compared to the language of the attacker. In the context of Turkish airstrikes against Kurdish targets, we find that GPT-3.5 produces higher fatality estimates if it is enquired in Kurdish compared to Turkish. In the same vein, GPT-3.5 reports higher fatality estimates in Arabic compared to Hebrew when asked about Israeli airstrikes in the Gaza Strip. Moreover, we show that airstrikes are described as more indiscriminate in the language of the targeted group, which is reflected in discrepancies in information about civilian casualties, killed children, and female victims. While it is well-established that language models can generate misinformation (Buchanan et al., 2021; Solaiman et al., 2019) and that they are linked to ethical and social risks (Bahrini et al., 2023;

Weidinger et al., 2021), our study provides the first evidence of language bias in the context of conflict-related violence.

It is important to consider these findings in light of the underlying data generation process. By generating responses based on a multilingual corpus of online sources, ChatGPT’s multilingual queries approximate large-scale language-specific media content analyses. Hence, although we specifically identify biases in the responses produced by the language model, they reproduce broader biases that are present in the training data. This suggests that to the extent that individuals consume online news in different languages, they tend to obtain different information about the extent and intensity of conflict-related violence.<sup>12</sup> While this media bias is problematic in itself, ChatGPT makes it especially difficult for citizens to identify this bias. Critical consumers may be able to distinguish between high-quality and low-quality news sources, but they are less likely to understand the origins of the biases produced by the language model. Thus, by reproducing media biases under the guise of ostensible objectivity and ‘superhuman’ intelligence, AI may exacerbate information discrepancies in armed conflicts. Furthermore, we find a novel source of bias that does not exist in classical search engines. By providing evasive answers in the language of the attacker, ChatGPT gives the impression that the airstrikes in question did not even occur. This amplifies the bias already present in the training data.

This has far-reaching implications for multilingual armed conflicts. Public opinion plays a crucial role in armed conflicts as governments tend to rely on loyal troops and public support to wage war (Feinstein, 2022; Tomz and Weeks, 2013; Voeten and Brewer, 2006). Misinformation may stir the public opinion against the opposing side and can even become a deadly self-fulfilling prophecy (Horowitz, 2001). Our findings suggest that citizens of states that have conducted airstrikes may underestimate the human toll of these attacks based on the information obtained through ChatGPT. In contrast, citizens of attacked groups may perceive these airstrikes as especially brutal and indiscriminate based on the information available in their language. These antithetical perceptions may contribute to radicalized identities and intensify dynamics of mutual blaming (Hameleers and Brosius, 2022). In so doing, information discrepancies may nurture grievances and ultimately reinforce conflicts within linguistic dyads.

Our findings have important implications beyond the specific context of armed conflict. It is plausible that similar language biases affect information generated by GPT-3.5 in other topic areas, especially where the training data is likewise heterogeneous and differs across languages. This is

---

<sup>12</sup>Note that GPT-3.5 produces the modal response in the available online information. Of course, there is variation around this modal response.

likely to be the case for other areas of contested information such as sensitive political issues, religious beliefs, or cultural identities. Future research could explore to what extent language biases in GPT-3.5 responses are present in other topic areas, which languages are particularly susceptible to these biases, and if the same effects apply to other multilingual large language models as well. As the use of chatbots becomes more widespread, studies of their impact on public opinion are crucial. To conclude, our study provides a method for quantitatively analysing bias in large language models, offering a more robust quantitative alternative to classical sentiment analysis approaches. Using this new method, we show a significant bias between different user languages that could promote conflicts and information bubbles in the near future.



## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank J. Holder and J. Weisser for many helpful comments and discussions. We acknowledge funding from evangelisches Studienwerk e.V. and from the International Postdoctoral Fellowship of the University of St. Gallen. We thank the ‘Konstanzer WG’, especially P. Gebauer, S. Fonseca, L. Heyden, F. Böhringer, and H. Zentner for providing a highly conducive and stimulating environment for this research project.

## References

- Artetxe, Mikel, Itziar Aldabe, Rodrigo Agerri, Olatz Perez-de-Viñaspre, and Aitor Soroa (2022). “Does Corpus Quality Really Matter for Low-Resource Languages?” In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.08111*.
- Bahrini, Aram, Mohammadsadra Khamoshifar, Hossein Abbasimehr, Robert J. Riggs, Maryam Esmaeili, Rastin Mastali Majdabadkohne, and Morteza Pasehvar (2023). “ChatGPT: Applications, opportunities, and threats”. In: *2023 Systems and Information Engineering Design Symposium (SIEDS)*. IEEE, pp. 274–279.
- Blankenship, Brian (2018). “When do states take the bait? State capacity and the provocation logic of terrorism”. In: *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 62.2, pp. 381–409.
- Blevins, Terra and Luke Zettlemoyer (2022). “Language contamination helps explain the cross-lingual capabilities of English pretrained models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.08110*.
- Bormann, Nils-Christian, Lars-Erik Cederman, and Manuel Vogt (2017). “Language, religion, and ethnic civil war”. In: *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 61.4, pp. 744–771.
- Braithwaite, Alex (2013). “The logic of public fear in terrorism and counter-terrorism”. In: *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology* 28, pp. 95–101.
- Buchanan, Ben, Andrew Lohn, Micah Musser, and Katerina Sedova (2021). “Truth, lies, and automation”. In: *Center for Security and Emerging Technology* 1.1, p. 2.
- Carey, Sabine (2006). “The dynamic relationship between protest and repression”. In: *Political Research Quarterly* 59.1, pp. 1–11.
- Carvalho, Inês and Stanislav Ivanov (2023). “ChatGPT for tourism: applications, benefits and risks”. In: *Tourism Review*.
- Cheng, Myra, Esin Durmus, and Dan Jurafsky (2023). “Marked Personas: Using Natural Language Prompts to Measure Stereotypes in Language Models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18189*.
- Crawl Archives (2023). *Statistics of Common Crawl Monthly Archives*. URL: <https://commoncrawl.github.io/cc-crawl-statistics/plots/languages>.
- Curtice, Travis B. and Brandon Behlendorf (2021). “Street-level repression: Protest, policing, and dissent in Uganda”. In: *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 65.1, pp. 166–194.
- Davies, Shawn, Therese Pettersson, and Magnus Öberg (2022). “Organized violence 1989–2021 and drone warfare”. In: *Journal of Peace Research* 59.4, pp. 593–610.

- Dobransky, Kerry and Eszter Hargittai (2021). “Piercing the pandemic social bubble: Disability and social media use about COVID-19”. In: *American Behavioral Scientist* 65.12, pp. 1698–1720.
- Dodge, Jesse, Maarten Sap, Ana Marasović, William Agnew, Gabriel Ilharco, Dirk Groeneveld, Margaret Mitchell, and Matt Gardner (2021). “Documenting large webtext corpora: A case study on the colossal clean crawled corpus”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08758*.
- Eady, Gregory, Jonathan Nagler, Andy Guess, Jan Zilinsky, and Joshua A. Tucker (2019). “How many people live in political bubbles on social media? Evidence from linked survey and Twitter data”. In: *Sage Open* 9.1, pp. 1–21.
- Fang, Changchang, Jitao Ling, Jing Zhou, Yue Wang, Xiaolin Liu, Yuan Jiang, Yifan Wu, Yixuan Chen, Zhichen Zhu, and Jianyong Ma (2023). “How does ChatGPT4 preform on Non-English National Medical Licensing Examination? An Evaluation in Chinese Language”. In: *medRxiv*. Publisher: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, p. 2023.05. 03.23289443.
- Fearon, James D. (1995). “Rationalist explanations for war”. In: *International Organization* 49.3, pp. 379–414.
- Feinstein, Yuval (2022). *Rally’round the flag: The search for National Honor and respect in times of crisis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fennell, Jonathan (2014). “Morale and combat performance: An introduction”. In: *Journal of Strategic Studies* 37.7, pp. 796–798.
- Gleditsch, Nils Petter, Peter Wallensteen, Mikael Eriksson, Margareta Sollenberg, and Håvard Strand (2002). “Armed conflict 1946-2001: A new dataset”. In: *Journal of Peace Research* 39.5, pp. 615–637.
- Gohdes, Anita (2020). “Repression technology: Internet accessibility and state violence”. In: *American Journal of Political Science* 64.3, pp. 488–503.
- Gohdes, Anita and Sabine Carey (2017). “Canaries in a coal-mine? What the killings of journalists tell us about future repression”. In: *Journal of Peace Research* 54.2, pp. 157–174.
- Greenhill, Kelly M. and Ben Oppenheim (2017). “Rumor has it: The adoption of unverified information in conflict zones”. In: *International Studies Quarterly* 61.3, pp. 660–676.
- Greitens, Sheena Chestnut (2016). *Dictators and their secret police: Coercive institutions and state violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guriey, Sergei and Daniel Treisman (2019). “Informational autocrats”. In: *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 33.4, pp. 100–127.

- Hameleers, Michael and Anna Brosius (2022). “You are wrong because I am right! The perceived causes and ideological biases of misinformation beliefs”. In: *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 34.1.
- Hartmann, Jochen, Jasper Schwenzow, and Maximilian Witte (2023). “The political ideology of conversational AI: Converging evidence on ChatGPT’s pro-environmental, left-libertarian orientation”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.01768*.
- Honig, Or and Ariel Reichard (2018). “Evidence-fabricating in asymmetric conflicts: How weak actors prove false propaganda narratives”. In: *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 41.4, pp. 297–318.
- Horowitz, Donald L. (2001). *The deadly ethnic riot*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Huang, Reyko (2016). “Rebel diplomacy in civil war”. In: *International Security* 40.4, pp. 89–126.
- Intahchomphoo, Channarong and Odd Erik Gundersen (2020). “Artificial intelligence and race: A systematic review”. In: *Legal Information Management* 20.2, pp. 74–84.
- Kaakinen, Markus, Anu Sirola, Iina Savolainen, and Atte Oksanen (2020). “Shared identity and shared information in social media: Development and validation of the identity bubble reinforcement scale”. In: *Media Psychology* 23.1, pp. 25–51.
- Kalyvas, Stathis (2004). “The urban bias in research on civil wars”. In: *Security Studies* 13.3, pp. 160–190.
- (2006). *The logic of violence in civil war*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kalyvas, Stathis and Laia Balcells (2010). “International system and technologies of rebellion: How the end of the Cold War shaped internal conflict”. In: *American Political Science Review* 104.3, pp. 415–429.
- Kazenwadel, Daniel (July 25, 2023). *Replication Data: How User Language Affects Conflict Fatality Estimates in ChatGPT*. URL: [10.5281/zenodo.8181226](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8181226).
- King, Gary, Jennifer Pan, and Margaret E. Roberts (2013). “How censorship in China allows government criticism but silences collective expression”. In: *American Political Science Review* 107.2, pp. 326–343.
- Koehler, Daniel (2014). “The radical online: Individual radicalization processes and the role of the Internet”. In: *Journal for Deradicalization* 1, pp. 116–134.
- Kreft, Anne-Kathrin and Mattias Agerberg (2023). “Imperfect Victims? Civilian Men, Vulnerability, and Policy Preferences”. In: *American Political Science Review*, pp. 1–17.

- Kreutzer, Julia, Isaac Caswell, Lisa Wang, Ahsan Wahab, Daan van Esch, Nasanbayar Ulzii-Orshikh, Allahsera Tapo, Nishant Subramani, Artem Sokolov, and Claytone Sikasote (2022). “Quality at a glance: An audit of web-crawled multilingual datasets”. In: *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 10, pp. 50–72.
- Kurizaki, Shuhei and Taehee Whang (2015). “Detecting audience costs in international disputes”. In: *International Organization* 69.4, pp. 949–980.
- Lai, Viet Duc, Nghia Trung Ngo, Amir Pouran Ben Veyseh, Hieu Man, Franck Dernoncourt, Trung Bui, and Thien Huu Nguyen (2023). “Chatgpt beyond english: Towards a comprehensive evaluation of large language models in multilingual learning”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05613*.
- Lawrence, Kelsey (2023). *Can AI Bots be Content Creators?* London: SAGE Publications: SAGE Business Cases Originals.
- Leavy, Susan (2018). “Gender bias in artificial intelligence: The need for diversity and gender theory in machine learning”. In: *Proceedings of the 1st international workshop on gender equality in software engineering*, pp. 14–16.
- Lee, Nicol Turner (2018). “Detecting racial bias in algorithms and machine learning”. In: *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society* 16.3, pp. 252–260.
- Lewandowsky, Stephan, Werner GK Stritzke, Alexandra M. Freund, Klaus Oberauer, and Joachim I. Krueger (2013). “Misinformation, disinformation, and violent conflict: From Iraq and the “War on Terror” to future threats to peace.” In: *American Psychologist* 68.7, p. 487.
- Lo, Chung Kwan (2023). “What is the impact of ChatGPT on education? A rapid review of the literature”. In: *Education Sciences* 13.4, p. 410.
- Malthaner, Stefan (2015). “Violence, legitimacy, and control: the microdynamics of support relationships between militant groups and their social environment”. In: *Civil Wars* 17.4, pp. 425–445.
- Marinucci, Ludovica, Claudia Mazzuca, and Aldo Gangemi (2022). “Exposing implicit biases and stereotypes in human and artificial intelligence: state of the art and challenges with a focus on gender”. In: *AI & Society*, pp. 1–15.
- McGee, Robert W. (2023). “Is chat gpt biased against conservatives? an empirical study”. In: *An Empirical Study (February 15, 2023)*.
- Mohammad, Saif M. (2017). “Challenges in sentiment analysis”. In: *A practical guide to sentiment analysis*, pp. 61–83.

- Nadeem, Ayesha, Babak Abedin, and Olivera Marjanovic (2020). “Gender Bias in AI: A review of contributing factors and mitigating strategies”. In: *ACIS 2020 Proceedings*. URL: <https://aisel.aisnet.org/acis2020/27/>.
- Nilsson, Marco (2018). “Primary unit cohesion among the Peshmerga and Hezbollah”. In: *Armed Forces & Society* 44.4, pp. 647–665.
- Nohrstedt, Stig A. and Rune Ottosen (2014). *New wars, new media and new war journalism: professional and legal challenges in conflict reporting*. University of Gothenburg: Nordicom.
- Noor, Masi, Nurit Shnabel, Samer Halabi, and Arie Nadler (2012). “When suffering begets suffering: The psychology of competitive victimhood between adversarial groups in violent conflicts”. In: *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 16.4, pp. 351–374.
- Noseworthy, Peter A., Zachi I. Attia, LaPrincess C. Brewer, Sharonne N. Hayes, Xiaoxi Yao, Suraj Kapa, Paul A. Friedman, and Francisco Lopez-Jimenez (2020). “Assessing and mitigating bias in medical artificial intelligence: the effects of race and ethnicity on a deep learning model for ECG analysis”. In: *Circulation: Arrhythmia and Electrophysiology* 13.3.
- Obermeyer, Ziad and Eric J. Topol (2021). “Artificial intelligence, bias, and patients’ perspectives”. In: *The Lancet* 397.
- Open AI (2023a). *Chat completions*. URL: <https://platform.openai.com/docs/guides/chat> (visited on 05/23/2023).
- (2023b). *What are tokens and how to count them?* URL: <https://help.openai.com/en/articles/4936856-what-are-tokens-and-how-to-count-them> (visited on 05/23/2023).
- Pape, Robert A. (2003). “The strategic logic of suicide terrorism”. In: *American Political Science Review* 97.3, pp. 343–361.
- Pechenkina, Anna O., Andrew W. Bausch, and Kiron K. Skinner (2019). “How do civilians attribute blame for state indiscriminate violence?” In: *Journal of Peace Research* 56.4, pp. 545–558.
- Pfeifle, Birke (2022). “Detecting Armed Conflict Damages in Satellite Imagery Using Deep Learning”. PhD thesis. Universität Konstanz.
- Podder, Sukanya (2017). “Understanding the legitimacy of armed groups: A relational perspective”. In: *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 28.4, pp. 686–708.
- Price, Megan and Patrick Ball (2015). “Selection bias and the statistical patterns of mortality in conflict”. In: *Statistical Journal of the IAOS* 31.2, pp. 263–272.

- Price, Megan, Anita Gohdes, and Patrick Ball (2014). “Updated statistical analysis of documentation of killings in the Syrian Arab Republic”. In: *Human Rights Data Analysis Group, Geneva*, pp. 14–15.
- Reuters (Feb. 14, 2021). *Turkey says militants executed 13, including soldiers, police, in Iraq*. URL: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-turkey-iraq-security-idUSKBN2AE050>.
- Rhodes, Samuel C. (2022). “Filter bubbles, echo chambers, and fake news: how social media conditions individuals to be less critical of political misinformation”. In: *Political Communication* 39.1, pp. 1–22.
- Rivas, Pablo and Liang Zhao (2023). “Marketing with chatgpt: Navigating the ethical terrain of gpt-based chatbot technology”. In: *AI 4.2*. ISBN: 2673-2688 Publisher: MDPI, pp. 375–384.
- Rozenas, Arturas and Yuri M. Zhukov (2019). “Mass repression and political loyalty: Evidence from Stalin’s ‘terror by hunger’”. In: *American Political Science Review* 113.2, pp. 569–583.
- Salehyan, Idean, Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, and David E. Cunningham (2011). “Explaining external support for insurgent groups”. In: *International Organization* 65.4, pp. 709–744.
- Saul, Ben (2008). “The international protection of journalists in armed conflict and other violent situations”. In: *Australian Journal of Human Rights* 14.1, pp. 99–140.
- Schlichte, Klaus and Ulrich Schneckener (2015). “Armed groups and the politics of legitimacy”. In: *Civil Wars* 17.4, pp. 409–424.
- Schon, Justin (2021). “How narratives and evidence influence rumor belief in conflict zones: Evidence from Syria”. In: *Perspectives on Politics* 19.2, pp. 539–552.
- Schutte, Sebastian, Constantin Ruhe, and Andrew M. Linke (2022). “How indiscriminate violence fuels conflicts between groups: Evidence from Kenya”. In: *Social Science Research* 103, p. 102653.
- Silverman, Daniel, Karl Kaltenthaler, and Munqith Dagher (2021). “Seeing is disbelieving: the depths and limits of factual misinformation in war”. In: *International Studies Quarterly* 65.3, pp. 798–810.
- Slantchev, Branislav L. (2006). “Politicians, the media, and domestic audience costs”. In: *International Studies Quarterly* 50.2, pp. 445–477.
- Slantchev, Branislav L. and Ahmer Tarar (2011). “Mutual optimism as a rationalist explanation of war”. In: *American Journal of Political Science* 55.1, pp. 135–148.

- Solaiman, Irene, Miles Brundage, Jack Clark, Amanda Askill, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Jeff Wu, Alec Radford, Gretchen Krueger, Jong Wook Kim, and Sarah Kreps (2019). “Release strategies and the social impacts of language models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.09203*.
- Spohr, Dominic (2017). “Fake news and ideological polarization: Filter bubbles and selective exposure on social media”. In: *Business Information Review* 34.3, pp. 150–160.
- Stanton, Jessica A. (2020). “Rebel groups, international humanitarian law, and civil war outcomes in the post-Cold War era”. In: *International Organization* 74.3, pp. 523–559.
- Steinert, Christoph V. and Christoph Dworschak (2022). “Political imprisonment and protest mobilization: Evidence from the GDR”. In: *Journal of Conflict Resolution*.
- Sundberg, Ralph and Erik Melander (2013). “Introducing the UCDP georeferenced event dataset”. In: *Journal of Peace Research* 50.4, pp. 523–532.
- Surameery, Nigar M. Shafiq and Mohammed Y. Shakor (2023). “Use chat gpt to solve programming bugs”. In: *International Journal of Information Technology & Computer Engineering (IJITC) ISSN: 2455-5290* 3.1, pp. 17–22.
- Thomson, Henry (2017). “Grievance attribution, Mobilization and Mass Opposition to authoritarian Regimes: Evidence from June 1953 in the GDR”. In: *Comparative Political Studies* 51.12, pp. 1594–1627.
- Tomz, Michael R. and Jessica LP Weeks (2013). “Public opinion and the democratic peace”. In: *American Political Science Review* 107.4, pp. 849–865.
- Voeten, Erik and Paul R. Brewer (2006). “Public opinion, the war in Iraq, and presidential accountability”. In: *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50.6, pp. 809–830.
- Weidinger, Laura, John Mellor, Maribeth Rauh, Conor Griffin, Jonathan Uesato, Po-Sen Huang, Myra Cheng, Mia Glaese, Borja Balle, and Atoosa Kasirzadeh (2021). “Ethical and social risks of harm from language models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.04359*.
- Zhu, Jun-Jie, Jinyue Jiang, Meiqi Yang, and Zhiyong Jason Ren (2023). “ChatGPT and environmental research”. In: *Environmental Science & Technology*.
- Zhuravskaya, Ekaterina, Maria Petrova, and Ruben Enikolopov (2020). “Political effects of the internet and social media”. In: *Annual Review of Economics* 12, pp. 415–438.