



Peer-Reviewed, International,
Academic Research Journal

ISSN : 3048-6297



Citation

White, H. J. (2024). Role of Populism, Polarization, Social Media, and Identity Politics in Shaping the Contemporary Political Landscape of United States of America. *Social Science Chronicle*, Vol. 4, Issue - 1, pp. 1- 16.

Digital Object Identifier (DOI)

<https://doi.org/10.56106/ssc.2024.009>

Received - April 15, 2024

Accepted - August 16, 2024

Published - August 23, 2024

Web-Link

All the contents of this peer reviewed article as well as author details are available at <http://socialsciencechronicle.com/article-ssc-2024-009>

Copyright

The copyright of this article is reserved with the author/s.
© 2024, Holly James White.

This publication is distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution, Non-Commercial, Share Alike 4.0 International License. It permits unrestricted copying and redistribution of this publication in any medium or format.




RESEARCH ARTICLE

Role of Populism, Polarization, Social Media, and Identity Politics in Shaping the Contemporary Political Landscape of United States of America

Holly James White^{1*}

¹ University of Florida, Gainesville, United States.

* Corresponding Author

 E-mail: jameswhiteholly@gmail.com

Abstract

This research explores the rise of populism, the deepening of political polarization, the influence of social media on political discourse, and the impact of identity politics on voting behavior in the United States. Employing a qualitative, explorative research design, the study utilized semi-structured interviews, focus groups, and content analysis to investigate the underlying causes, dynamics, and consequences of these phenomena. The findings reveal that economic discontent, distrust in elites, and cultural backlash are significant drivers of populism, while socio-cultural, economic, and institutional factors contribute to the intensification of polarization. Social media platforms play a dual role in democratizing political engagement and amplifying misinformation, creating echo chambers that reinforce partisan divisions. Identity politics emerged as a powerful force shaping political behavior, mobilizing specific demographic groups while contributing to a fragmented electorate. The study highlights the challenges these interconnected trends pose to democratic governance, including declining trust in institutions, the breakdown of civic discourse, and the erosion of democratic norms. It also emphasizes the need for efforts to bridge political divides, improve media literacy, and foster inclusive political engagement. The research offers valuable insights into the complexities of contemporary American politics and underscores the importance of understanding the evolving dynamics that influence political behavior and public discourse.

Keywords

Civic Engagement, Cultural Backlash, Democratic Governance, Economic Discontent, Identity Politics, Misinformation, Political Behavior, Political Communication, Political Discourse, Political Polarization, Populism, Public Trust, Social Media, United States, Voting Behavior.

1. Introduction

The political landscape of the United States has undergone profound changes over the past decade, characterized by the rise of populist movements, increasing political polarization, the pervasive influence of social media, and the intensification of identity politics. These interconnected phenomena have reshaped public discourse, altered the dynamics of political engagement, and posed significant challenges to democratic governance (Bennett, 2012; Kreiss, 2019; Noury & Roland, 2020; Velasco, 2020). This research aims to explore these trends in detail, providing a comprehensive analysis of how they interact to shape contemporary American politics. The introduction sets the stage for this investigation, outlining the background and context of the study, defining key concepts, stating the research objectives, and highlighting the significance of the research.

Background of Study

The rise of populism in the United States has become a defining feature of contemporary politics, with populist leaders gaining prominence by appealing to widespread public discontent with the status quo. Populism, broadly understood, is a political approach that emphasizes a binary division between "the people" and "the elites," often portraying the latter as corrupt, self-serving, and disconnected from the needs and values of ordinary citizens (Cohen, 2019; Engesser et al., 2017; Flew & Iosifidis, 2020; Gennaioli & Tabellini, 2023; Hamelers, 2020; Postill, 2018). In the American context, this populist surge has been driven by a confluence of factors, including economic grievances, cultural backlash, and a growing distrust in established political institutions. Economic factors have played a significant role in fueling populist sentiment, particularly among working-class and rural voters who feel left behind by globalization, technological change, and economic policies perceived as favoring elites (Gerbaudo, 2018; Gil de Zúñiga et al., 2020; Hendrix, 2019; Meléndez & Rovira Kaltwasser, 2019; Oberhauser et al., 2019; Zarkov, 2017).

The aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis, ongoing industrial decline, and rising income inequality have exacerbated feelings of economic insecurity, creating fertile ground for populist narratives that blame external forces such as immigration, trade agreements, and multinational corporations for the nation's economic woes. Populist leaders have capitalized on these anxieties by promising to restore economic opportunities, protect domestic industries, and put "America first." Cultural factors have also been central to the rise of populism, particularly the cultural backlash against progressive social changes. As American society becomes increasingly diverse, debates over national identity, immigration, and social values have intensified, creating deep cultural divides. Many Americans, particularly those with more conservative or traditional outlooks, have expressed discomfort with the pace and direction of social change, feeling that their values are under threat. Populist rhetoric often taps into this sense of cultural dislocation, positioning itself as a defense of traditional American values against perceived threats from liberal elites and progressive activists.

Political polarization has further complicated the American political landscape, as the ideological divide between the two major parties has widened and become more entrenched (Barnes, 2022; Kubin & Von Sikorski, 2021; McCoy et al., 2018; Perloff, 2021; Siles et al., 2023; Vecchi et al., 2021). Polarization is not only an ideological phenomenon but also a cultural and social one, as Americans increasingly align their political identities with their broader social identities, including race, religion, and geography (Abramowitz & McCoy, 2019; Drutman, 2021; Guriev & Papaioannou, 2022; Tumber & Waisbord, 2021). This growing division has led to a breakdown of bipartisan cooperation, legislative gridlock, and a decline in public trust in government (Borbáth et al., 2023; Boulianne et al., 2020; Marchlewska et al., 2018; Munis, 2022; Rae, 2021; Schroeder, 2019). Polarization has also fueled a more adversarial and hostile political climate, where compromise is often viewed as weakness, and opponents are seen not just as rivals but as existential threats (Chakravarty & Roy, 2017; Rodrik, 2021; Sinha, 2017). The role of social media in shaping political discourse and amplifying polarization cannot be overstated (Boucher & Thies, 2019; Fiorina, 2017; Hofmann et al., 2021; Suk et al., 2022; Westfall et al., 2015).

Social media platforms have revolutionized the way people consume information, engage with political content, and interact with others. While these platforms have democratized access to information and provided new avenues for political engagement, they have also contributed to the spread of misinformation, the creation of echo chambers, and the amplification of extreme voices (Bornschier et al., 2021; Croissant et al., 2002; Ernst et al., 2019; Groshek & Engelbert, 2013; Singh, 2017; Webster & Albertson, 2022). The algorithms that drive social media prioritize content that generates strong emotional responses, often elevating sensational or divisive material that deepens political divides. Identity politics, which refers to the practice of organizing political agendas around the interests and perspectives of specific social groups, has become an increasingly prominent force in American politics (Francescato, 2018; Margetts, 2018; McCoy & Somer, 2019; Mudde & Rovira Kaltwasser, 2018; Rakhmani & Saraswati, 2021; Vachudova, 2021).

Issues of race, gender, and ethnicity have come to the forefront of political debates, shaping voting behavior and influencing the priorities of political parties (Birnir, 2006; Fiorino, 2022; Oestreicher, 1988; Schmidtke, 2015; Zhuravskaya et al., 2020). While identity politics can be a powerful tool for advocacy and representation, it can also contribute to polarization by framing political issues in zero-sum terms, where gains for one group are perceived as losses for another (Bonikowski, 2019; Carothers & O'Donohue, 2019; Vachudova, 2019; Waisbord, 2018a; Waisbord, 2018b; White, 2020). This dynamic has made it more challenging to build broad, cross-cutting coalitions and has further fragmented the electorate along demographic lines. Together, these phenomena have created a complex and often volatile political environment in the United States. The rise of populism, the deepening of political polarization, the influence of social media, and the impact of identity politics are reshaping the foundations of American democracy, challenging traditional norms and raising questions about the future of governance in a deeply divided society.

Research Problem

The rise of populism, political polarization, the role of social media, and the intensification of identity politics are not merely isolated trends; they are deeply interconnected forces that collectively shape the contemporary political landscape in the United States. Despite significant public and scholarly attention, there remains a need for a comprehensive examination of how these phenomena interact and influence each other. This research addresses this gap by exploring the underlying causes, impacts, and dynamics of these trends, providing a holistic understanding of their implications for democratic governance. The research problem centers on the need to understand the drivers behind the rise of populism and political polarization, the ways in which social media platforms influence political discourse, and the role of identity politics in shaping voting behavior. Specifically, the study seeks to answer the following questions: What are the primary causes of the rise of populism in the United States? How do socio-cultural, economic, and institutional factors contribute to political polarization? In what ways do social media platforms shape political communication, amplify misinformation, and impact public opinion formation? How do identity factors like race, gender, and ethnicity influence voting behavior and political participation? Addressing these questions is crucial for understanding the broader dynamics of American

politics in an era of rapid change and deep division. By examining these issues in an integrated manner, the research aims to shed light on the challenges facing democratic governance and the potential pathways for fostering a more inclusive and resilient political system.

Research Objectives

The primary objectives of this research are as follows:

- a) To explore the causes and impacts of populist movements in the United States: This objective focuses on understanding the economic, cultural, and political factors that have driven the rise of populism and the implications of this trend for democratic governance.
- b) To examine the drivers of political polarization: This objective aims to identify and analyze the socio-cultural, economic, and institutional factors that contribute to political polarization, as well as the consequences of polarization for democratic institutions and public discourse.
- c) To investigate the role of social media in shaping political discourse: This objective seeks to explore how social media platforms influence political communication, amplify misinformation, and affect public opinion formation, with a focus on the algorithms and dynamics that drive these processes.
- d) To explore the influence of identity politics on voting behavior: This objective examines how identity factors such as race, gender, and ethnicity shape political engagement, voting patterns, and policy preferences, highlighting the impact of identity politics on electoral outcomes and political dynamics.

By achieving these objectives, the research aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of the complex interplay between populism, polarization, social media, and identity politics, offering insights into the current and future challenges facing American democracy.

Significance of Study

The significance of this research lies in its comprehensive approach to understanding the interconnected forces shaping contemporary American politics. The rise of populism, increasing political polarization, the pervasive influence of social media, and the intensification of identity politics are phenomena that have profound implications for the functioning of democracy in the United States. By examining these trends in an integrated manner, this study contributes to the broader body of knowledge on political behavior, public discourse, and governance. One of the key contributions of this research is its focus on the causes and impacts of populism, a topic of significant relevance given the prominence of populist leaders in recent years. By exploring the economic, cultural, and political drivers of populism, the study provides valuable insights into the factors that have fueled this movement and the challenges it poses to established democratic norms.

Understanding the dynamics of populism is critical for policymakers, political actors, and scholars seeking to address the

root causes of public discontent and to develop strategies for promoting more inclusive and effective governance. The study's examination of political polarization is also highly significant, as polarization is widely recognized as a major threat to democratic stability. By analyzing the drivers of polarization, this research highlights the structural, cultural, and economic factors that contribute to the deepening divide between political factions. The study's findings on the consequences of polarization, including its impact on legislative gridlock, public trust, and social cohesion, offer important insights into the barriers to effective governance and the need for efforts to bridge divides.

The investigation into the role of social media in shaping political discourse addresses a critical aspect of modern political communication. Social media platforms have transformed the way people engage with political content, but they have also been implicated in the spread of misinformation, the creation of echo chambers, and the amplification of extremist views. This research sheds light on the complex dynamics of social media and its influence on public opinion, highlighting the need for greater accountability and media literacy to mitigate the negative effects of these platforms on democratic discourse. Finally, the study's focus on identity politics provides a nuanced understanding of how social identities shape political behavior and influence electoral outcomes. As issues of race, gender, and ethnicity become increasingly central to political debates, understanding the role of identity politics is essential for grasping the evolving nature of the American electorate.

This research offers valuable insights into the potential for identity politics to both empower marginalized communities and contribute to polarization, emphasizing the importance of balancing representation with efforts to build broader, more inclusive political coalitions. Overall, this research is significant in its contribution to the understanding of the current political landscape in the United States. By providing a detailed analysis of the factors driving populism, polarization, social media influence, and identity politics, the study offers a comprehensive framework for examining the challenges and opportunities facing American democracy. The findings of this research have implications for policymakers, political strategists, media professionals, and civic educators, all of whom play a role in shaping the future of democratic governance.

2. Literature Review

This literature review dives into the critical topics relevant to understanding the dynamics of contemporary American politics, including the rise of populism, the causes and impacts of political polarization, the role of social media in shaping political discourse, and the influence of identity politics on voting behavior. By synthesizing existing research, this section aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of these phenomena and their implications for democratic governance.

Rise of Populism in the US

Populism has become a defining feature of American politics, with its modern resurgence marked by the rise of leaders who position themselves as champions of the common people against a corrupt or disconnected elite (Greven, 2016; Kaufman & Haggard, 2019; Perry, 2022; Scoggins, 2022; Ylä-Anttila, 2020). In the US, populism has historical roots that can be traced

back to movements in the late 19th century, such as the People's Party, which mobilized support among farmers and workers against economic exploitation by the powerful elite. The contemporary resurgence of populism is often associated with significant socio-economic transformations, including globalization, economic dislocation, and cultural changes that have left certain segments of the population feeling marginalized (Fukuyama, 2018; Maurer & Diehl, 2020; Kivisto, 2017; Munis, 2021; Salmela & Von Scheve, 2018).

Economic grievances have been a major driver of populism in the US, particularly among working-class and rural voters who feel left behind by economic changes. Events such as the 2008 financial crisis and the subsequent recession heightened these grievances, creating an environment ripe for populist rhetoric that blames external forces, such as immigration and international trade, for domestic economic problems. Populist leaders have capitalized on these sentiments, positioning themselves as defenders of ordinary citizens against a political and economic system perceived as rigged against them. Cultural factors also significantly contribute to the rise of populism (Arora et al., 2022; Braghiroli & Petsinis, 2021; Gonawela et al., 2018; Levin et al., 2021; Pierson & Schickler, 2020; Shin et al., 2022). The cultural backlash hypothesis suggests that populism is partly a reaction against progressive social changes, such as increasing racial and ethnic diversity, gender equality, and the expansion of rights for marginalized groups.

This backlash often manifests in a nostalgic appeal to a past perceived as more stable and secure, resonating particularly with voters who feel culturally alienated in the face of rapid social change. In recent years, figures like Donald Trump have epitomized modern American populism. Trump's political success was marked by his ability to blend anti-establishment rhetoric with appeals to nationalism and xenophobia, often delivered directly to the public via social media. His rise highlighted the power of populist communication strategies that bypass traditional media, directly engaging and mobilizing supporters who feel disconnected from conventional political processes. The impacts of populism on American democracy are profound. Populist leaders often challenge institutional norms, undermine trust in democratic institutions, and promote a confrontational style of politics that emphasizes direct appeals to the people over traditional checks and balances. This erosion of democratic norms presents significant challenges to the stability and functioning of democratic governance in the United States.

Political Polarization

Political polarization has become increasingly pronounced in the US, marked by a growing ideological divide between the major political parties and heightened animosity between their supporters. This division extends beyond ideology, encompassing cultural and social identities that deepen partisan hostility and distrust. The rise of polarization has reshaped the political landscape, influencing both public discourse and the functioning of democratic institutions (Bonikowski, 2017; Guerrero-Solé et al., 2020; Hameleers, 2019; Handlin, 2018; Hutter & Borbáth, 2019; Lieberman et al., 2019). Several factors contribute to the intensification of polarization. Socio-cultural changes, such as increased racial and ethnic diversity, have transformed the electorate and contributed to identity-based divisions. As political parties realign along cultural lines, issues such as immigration, race relations, and gender equality become flashpoints that

further deepen ideological divides. Economic factors, including widening income inequality and economic insecurity, also play a role, as economic discontent can fuel support for polarizing figures who promise radical change. Institutional changes, particularly in the media landscape, have exacerbated polarization. The rise of partisan news outlets and the decline of traditional, centrist media have created environments where individuals consume information that reinforces their pre-existing beliefs, often at the expense of balanced perspectives.

This echo chamber effect contributes to a more divided public, where opposing sides rarely engage with each other's viewpoints. Additionally, practices like political gerrymandering create electoral districts that favor one party, reducing the incentive for politicians to seek common ground and further entrenching partisan divides (Carson et al., 2023; Cosentino, 2020; Johnson, 2022; Major et al., 2018; Schlesinger, 2020; Schleffer & Miller, 2021). The impacts of polarization on democratic governance are significant. As polarization increases, the ability of political institutions to function effectively diminishes (Cosentino & Cosentino, 2020; De Vreese et al., 2018; Enli & Rosenberg, 2018; Somer & McCoy, 2019; Stier et al., 2020; Tumber & Waisbord, 2021). Compromise becomes rare, legislative gridlock becomes common, and trust in government declines. The resulting political dysfunction erodes public confidence in democratic processes and fosters a climate of increased political hostility and social division.

Social Media and Political Discourse

Social media has fundamentally transformed how political discourse is conducted, offering new opportunities for engagement but also presenting serious challenges (Dalton, 2018; Roberts, 2019; Schain, 2018; Somer & McCoy, 2018; Volcic & Andrejevic, 2023; Watson, 2021). Platforms like Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube have become central to modern political communication, allowing individuals to engage directly with political content and for political actors to reach audiences without traditional media gatekeepers. One of the most critical impacts of social media on political discourse is its role in the spread of misinformation (Hawkins, 2009; Mazzoleni et al., 2003; Mignozzetti & Spektor, 2019; Mihailidis & Viotty, 2017; Ramírez-Dueñas & Vinuesa-Tejero, 2021; Vegetti, 2019).

Social media algorithms prioritize sensational and emotionally charged content, which can lead to the rapid dissemination of false information. This spread of misinformation can distort public perception, influence political behavior, and contribute to a more misinformed electorate. Echo chambers and filter bubbles, where users are primarily exposed to information that aligns with their beliefs, further reinforce these dynamics, limiting exposure to diverse viewpoints and fostering more extreme positions. The ability of political leaders to communicate directly with the public through social media has also altered the nature of political discourse. Traditional media, which once acted as a gatekeeper, is often bypassed, allowing political figures to deliver unfiltered messages that may be inflammatory or populist in nature. This direct communication can mobilize supporters but also heightens the confrontational tone of political interactions, contributing to a more polarized and divisive public sphere. Despite these challenges, social media has also played a role in democratizing political participation, especially for marginalized groups. Activist movements have used social media to organize protests, raise awareness, and push for policy changes,

demonstrating the platform's potential for positive political engagement. However, the dual capacity of social media to both empower and mislead highlights the complex nature of its influence on contemporary politics.

Identity Politics and Voting Behavior

Identity politics, which focuses on political positions based on the interests and perspectives of specific social groups, has become increasingly influential in shaping American electoral behavior. Factors such as race, gender, and ethnicity significantly affect how individuals engage with politics, influencing their voting patterns, political engagement, and policy preferences (Hannan, 2018; Jungherr et al., 2019; Lochocki, 2018; Szebeni & Salojärvi, 2022; Uscinski et al., 2021; Waisbord & Amado, 2017). Race and ethnicity are crucial determinants of voting behavior in the US. Different racial and ethnic groups often have distinct political preferences shaped by their unique social and historical experiences. African American voters, for instance, have consistently supported candidates and policies that emphasize racial justice and social equity, reflecting a collective identity rooted in the struggle for civil rights. Hispanic voters, on the other hand, exhibit diverse voting patterns influenced by factors such as national origin, immigration status, and cultural values. Gender also plays a significant role in political behavior, with notable differences in how men and women vote. Women are generally more likely to support candidates who advocate for issues such as reproductive rights, healthcare access, and gender equality, contributing to a persistent gender gap in voting patterns.

The rise of women's political movements and increased representation of female candidates have further highlighted the impact of gender on electoral outcomes. Beyond race and gender, other identity factors, such as religion and sexual orientation, also shape political behavior. Religious identity, for example, influences voting preferences, with certain religious groups aligning strongly with particular parties based on shared values and policy stances. Similarly, LGBTQ+ voters often support candidates who advocate for civil rights and anti-discrimination policies, reflecting the intersection of personal identity and political choice. The growing influence of identity politics underscores the evolving nature of the American electorate. While identity can serve as a powerful mobilizing force, it also contributes to the fragmentation of the electorate along demographic lines, challenging the notion of a unified national political community. Understanding the complex interplay of identity factors in voting behavior is essential for grasping the broader dynamics of contemporary US politics.

3. Research Methodology

This section details the research methodology employed in the study, which aimed to explore the rise of populism, political polarization, the role of social media in political discourse, and the influence of identity politics on voting behavior in the United States. The methodology was carefully designed to capture the complexity and interconnectedness of these phenomena through a qualitative, explorative approach. The following sections provide an in-depth account of the research design, data collection methods, sampling strategy, data analysis, and ethical considerations.

Research Design

The research adopted a qualitative, explorative design, utilizing a multi-case study approach to capture the diverse perspectives and experiences of individuals across different segments of the population. This approach was chosen to provide a nuanced understanding of the complex interplay between populism, polarization, social media, and identity politics in the US political landscape. The study combined three primary qualitative methods: semi-structured interviews, focus groups, and content analysis. The qualitative design was appropriate for this research as it allowed for an in-depth exploration of participants' perceptions, experiences, and attitudes, which are essential for understanding the subjective dimensions of political behavior. The multi-case study approach facilitated the comparison of various perspectives, enabling the identification of patterns and divergences across different social and political contexts. By integrating interviews, focus groups, and content analysis, the study was able to triangulate data from multiple sources, enhancing the validity and reliability of the findings.

Data Collection Methods

The data collection process involved three primary methods: semi-structured interviews, focus groups, and content analysis. Each method was chosen to address specific aspects of the research questions and to gather rich, qualitative data that could provide insights into the underlying causes, impacts, and dynamics of the studied phenomena.

Semi-Structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with a diverse group of participants, including political analysts, activists, and voters from various backgrounds. A total of 40 interviews were completed, with participants selected based on their expertise, lived experiences, and relevance to the study's key themes. The interviews were designed to explore participants' views on the rise of populism, the causes and impacts of political polarization, the influence of social media on political discourse, and the role of identity politics in shaping voting behavior. The semi-structured format allowed for a flexible and conversational approach, enabling the researcher to probe deeper into specific topics while also allowing participants to express their thoughts and perspectives freely. An interview guide was developed to ensure that key topics were covered, but the guide remained adaptable to follow the natural flow of the conversation. Questions were open-ended, encouraging participants to elaborate on their experiences and opinions, which provided rich qualitative data for analysis. Interviews were conducted either in person or via video conferencing platforms, depending on participants' preferences and availability. Each interview lasted between 45 to 90 minutes and was audio-recorded with the participants' consent. The recordings were then transcribed verbatim for analysis. The interviews provided invaluable insights into the personal and professional experiences of those directly engaged with the topics of interest, revealing how populism, polarization, and social media are perceived and experienced at a granular level.

Focus Groups

Focus groups were conducted to gather collective insights into how social media use, political polarization, and populism are perceived by ordinary citizens. Five focus groups were

organized, each comprising 6-8 participants, for a total of 35 participants. The focus groups included a mix of individuals from different age groups, socio-economic backgrounds, and political affiliations to capture a broad range of perspectives. The focus groups were structured around guided discussions, facilitated by the researcher, on key themes such as participants' experiences with social media, their perceptions of populist rhetoric, and how they felt political polarization affected their daily lives. This method was particularly valuable for exploring the interactive nature of these topics, as group dynamics allowed participants to reflect on each other's viewpoints, often revealing communal patterns of thought or highlighting areas of disagreement. Focus group discussions were held in neutral settings, such as community centers or online platforms, to ensure a comfortable environment for participants. Each session lasted approximately 90 minutes and was audio-recorded with participants' permission. The recordings were later transcribed for thematic analysis. The focus groups provided a rich, dialogical dataset that complemented the individual insights gained from the interviews, allowing the researcher to explore collective narratives and group dynamics.

Content Analysis

Content analysis was employed to examine social media content, political speeches, and media coverage related to populism, polarization, and identity politics. The content analysis aimed to identify patterns in how these topics are represented and discussed in various public forums, providing a broader context for the qualitative data gathered from interviews and focus groups. The analysis focused on a selection of social media platforms, including Twitter and Facebook, where political discourse is highly active. A systematic sampling of posts, comments, and shared content related to populist rhetoric, political polarization, and identity-based political messaging was conducted. Additionally, key political speeches by prominent figures associated with populist movements were analyzed to understand the language and themes employed to appeal to their audiences. Media coverage was also analyzed, with a particular focus on news outlets that span the ideological spectrum, from conservative to liberal perspectives. This approach allowed the researcher to capture how different media outlets frame these issues, contributing to the broader understanding of how populism and polarization are shaped by media narratives. The content analysis involved coding the selected materials for recurring themes, language patterns, and discursive strategies. This process provided insights into the public representation of the studied phenomena and highlighted the role of media and social platforms in shaping public perceptions and political behavior.

Sampling Strategy

The sampling strategy was designed to ensure a diverse and representative selection of participants, reflecting the varied demographic, geographic, and political landscape of the United States. A purposive sampling approach was employed, targeting individuals who could provide valuable insights into the research topics based on their experiences, expertise, or socio-political background. For the semi-structured interviews, participants were selected based on their roles as political analysts, activists, or voters. The researcher sought to include a balanced mix of political affiliations, including Republicans, Democrats, Independents, and third-party supporters, to capture a wide range of perspectives. Additionally, attention was given to including

participants from different regions of the US, such as urban, suburban, and rural areas, to reflect the geographic diversity of political experiences. In focus groups, participants were recruited through community outreach, social media advertisements, and snowball sampling, ensuring diversity in terms of age, gender, race, and socio-economic status. This approach allowed for the inclusion of voices from various demographic segments, providing a comprehensive view of how different communities perceive and interact with populist rhetoric and political polarization. The content analysis sampling involved the selection of relevant posts, speeches, and media articles based on keywords related to populism, polarization, social media, and identity politics. A combination of random and purposive sampling techniques was used to ensure a balanced representation of different viewpoints and media sources, covering both mainstream and alternative platforms.

4. Findings and Analysis

This section presents the findings and analysis of the research conducted on the rise of populism, political polarization, the influence of social media on political discourse, and the role of identity politics in voting behavior in the United States. Drawing from the data collected through semi-structured interviews, focus groups, and content analysis, this section explores the causes and impacts of these phenomena and their broader implications for democratic governance.

Causes and Impacts of Populism

The research identified multiple causes contributing to the rise of populism in the United States, with economic factors, distrust in elites, and cultural backlash emerging as the most significant drivers. These factors were not isolated but often intertwined, creating a complex web of grievances that populist leaders have effectively exploited.

Economic Factors

Economic discontent was a prominent theme across interviews and focus group discussions. Many participants, particularly those from rural and deindustrialized regions, expressed a sense of economic insecurity that they attributed to factors such as globalization, outsourcing, and technological change. Interviewees often mentioned job losses in manufacturing and the decline of local industries as critical factors that fueled support for populist candidates who promised to "bring back jobs" and "put America first." Participants described a perceived widening gap between the wealthy and the working class, with many feeling that their economic prospects had diminished over the past few decades. This perception was particularly pronounced among older, white working-class voters who felt that their standard of living had stagnated or declined. The data revealed a strong sentiment that the economic system was rigged in favor of elites, multinational corporations, and foreign interests at the expense of ordinary Americans. Content analysis of political speeches and social media posts by populist figures underscored this narrative, frequently highlighting themes of economic nationalism, anti-globalization, and protectionism. Populist leaders framed themselves as champions of the "forgotten man" and railed against trade deals, immigration policies, and economic regulations perceived as benefiting elites rather than everyday citizens.

Distrust in Elites

Distrust in political, economic, and media elites emerged as a significant driver of populism. Many interviewees expressed a deep-seated skepticism toward established political institutions and figures, whom they perceived as out of touch, corrupt, or self-serving. This distrust extended beyond politicians to include the mainstream media, which many participants viewed as biased and untrustworthy. The research found that this distrust was often fueled by perceived failures of governance, such as the handling of economic crises, rising healthcare costs, and perceived ineffectiveness in addressing everyday concerns. Focus group participants frequently cited examples of what they saw as elite hypocrisy or double standards, reinforcing their belief that traditional institutions no longer represented their interests. Social media analysis revealed how populist rhetoric capitalized on these sentiments, with frequent attacks on "the establishment," "fake news," and "career politicians." Populist leaders positioned themselves as outsiders who would challenge the status quo, promising to "drain the swamp" and restore power to the people. This anti-elite messaging resonated strongly with voters who felt disillusioned by years of political gridlock and perceived government inaction.

Cultural Backlash

Cultural backlash against progressive social changes was another key factor driving populism. Many participants, particularly those identifying with conservative or traditional values, expressed discomfort with what they perceived as rapid cultural shifts, including increasing racial diversity, gender equality, and the expansion of LGBTQ+ rights. This cultural disorientation was often framed as a loss of traditional American values, and populist leaders were seen as defenders of these values against a changing cultural landscape. Interviews highlighted how issues such as immigration, race relations, and debates over national identity became central to the populist narrative. Participants frequently voiced concerns about the impact of immigration on American jobs, culture, and security, reflecting a broader sense of anxiety about the changing demographics of the country. Populist leaders tapped into these fears, using rhetoric that emphasized border security, law and order, and the preservation of a traditional American way of life. The content analysis revealed that cultural themes were often intertwined with economic and anti-elite messages, creating a potent blend of grievances that resonated with a broad base of voters. Populist messaging often framed these cultural changes as the result of elite-driven policies that ignored or actively undermined the values and concerns of ordinary Americans.

Impacts on Democratic Governance

The rise of populism has had significant implications for democratic governance in the United States. The research found that populist leaders often challenge established democratic norms, questioning the legitimacy of elections, undermining the credibility of the judiciary, and attacking the free press. This confrontational style has contributed to a broader erosion of trust in democratic institutions. Focus group discussions revealed concerns that populist rhetoric fosters division and antagonism, making it increasingly difficult for different political factions to engage in constructive dialogue. Participants noted that populism's emphasis on direct appeals to "the people" often sidesteps institutional checks and balances, potentially weakening the

foundations of representative democracy. The analysis also highlighted how populism's impact on governance extends beyond rhetoric. Populist policies, often driven by short-term appeals rather than long-term strategic planning, can lead to instability and unpredictability in policy-making. This has raised concerns about the sustainability of democratic norms and the resilience of American political institutions in the face of populist pressures.

Drivers of Political Polarization

The research identified a range of socio-cultural, economic, and institutional drivers of political polarization, each contributing to the deepening divide within American society. The findings highlighted how these drivers interact to create a highly polarized political environment, with significant consequences for democratic institutions and public discourse.

Socio-Cultural Drivers

Socio-cultural changes, including increased racial and ethnic diversity, shifts in gender roles, and changing social norms, were found to be major drivers of polarization. Interviews and focus groups revealed that these changes have created distinct cultural identities that increasingly align with political affiliations, contributing to a growing sense of "us versus them" in American politics. Participants frequently mentioned issues such as immigration, race relations, and LGBTQ+ rights as points of cultural contention that have become deeply politicized. These issues were often framed as existential battles over the future direction of the country, with each side viewing the other's positions as fundamentally threatening to their way of life. This cultural polarization was particularly pronounced in discussions about identity and belonging, with many participants expressing a sense of cultural alienation or loss. The content analysis of media coverage and social media discourse revealed that these cultural divisions are frequently amplified by partisan framing, which casts opposing views in stark, moralistic terms. This framing contributes to affective polarization, where individuals not only disagree with the other side but also harbor strong negative emotions toward them, viewing them as not just wrong but fundamentally immoral or un-American.

Economic Drivers

Economic inequality and the perception of economic injustice were also significant drivers of polarization. The research found that economic divisions often map onto political divisions, with lower-income and less-educated individuals more likely to feel economically disenfranchised and drawn to polarizing political narratives that promise dramatic change. Interviews with economically distressed participants revealed a pervasive sense of being left behind by both the economy and the political system. Many expressed anger at perceived economic elites and a belief that the current economic system disproportionately benefits the wealthy and well-connected. This economic discontent was often channeled into support for populist or polarizing figures who promise to upend the status quo. The focus group discussions also highlighted how economic anxieties intersect with cultural and identity issues, creating a potent mix of grievances that drive polarization. For example, debates over immigration were frequently framed in economic terms, with participants arguing that immigrants were taking jobs and resources away from native-born Americans. This blending of

economic and cultural concerns contributes to a polarized political climate where compromise is seen as betrayal rather than negotiation.

Institutional Drivers

Institutional factors, particularly changes in the media landscape and electoral practices, have played a significant role in exacerbating political polarization. The decline of traditional, centrist media and the rise of partisan news outlets were frequently cited by participants as contributing to a more divided public. Many interviewees described how they felt inundated by biased information, making it difficult to discern objective facts from opinion. The content analysis supported these perceptions, revealing that partisan media often frames political issues in ways that heighten conflict and demonize the opposing side. Social media, in particular, was found to create echo chambers where users are primarily exposed to content that aligns with their pre-existing beliefs, further entrenching partisan attitudes. Electoral practices, such as gerrymandering and the primary election system, were also identified as institutional drivers of polarization. These practices often create "safe" districts where candidates are incentivized to appeal to their party's base rather than moderate voters, leading to the election of more ideologically extreme representatives. Participants expressed frustration with what they saw as a broken political system that rewards extremism and discourages compromise.

Consequences for Democratic Institutions and Public Discourse

The consequences of political polarization for democratic institutions and public discourse were widely acknowledged by participants. The research found that polarization has contributed to legislative gridlock, declining trust in government, and an increasingly adversarial political climate. Focus group discussions revealed that many individuals feel disillusioned with the political process, perceiving it as dominated by partisan bickering rather than meaningful debate. The analysis also highlighted how polarization erodes social cohesion, making it more difficult for communities to come together around shared goals. Participants frequently mentioned that they found it challenging to engage in political discussions with friends, family, or colleagues who held opposing views, reflecting a broader breakdown in civil discourse. The institutional impacts of polarization were particularly evident in perceptions of declining trust in democratic processes. Many participants expressed doubts about the fairness of elections, the impartiality of the judiciary, and the integrity of government officials, reflecting a broader crisis of confidence in democratic institutions.

Influence of Social Media on Political Discourse

Social media has fundamentally reshaped political discourse in the United States, with profound implications for how information is disseminated, consumed, and interpreted. The research found that social media platforms play a dual role in both democratizing political participation and amplifying misinformation and polarization.

Shaping Political Communication

The data revealed that social media has become a primary source of political information for many Americans, particularly younger and more digitally connected individuals. Interviews

highlighted how social media allows political actors to communicate directly with their audiences, bypassing traditional media gatekeepers. This direct communication was seen as both empowering and problematic, as it often lacks the editorial oversight that can help filter out false or misleading information. Focus group participants frequently discussed the impact of social media on their political engagement, with many expressing that they felt more informed and connected to political debates than through traditional media alone. However, this increased engagement was often accompanied by a sense of information overload, as participants struggled to navigate the sheer volume of political content available online. The content analysis revealed that social media posts related to political issues often employed emotionally charged language, sensationalism, and simplified narratives that appeal to specific ideological biases. This style of communication was found to be effective in capturing attention but also contributed to a more polarized and contentious political environment.

Amplification of Misinformation

One of the most concerning findings was the role of social media in spreading misinformation and disinformation. The analysis found that false or misleading information spreads rapidly on social media, driven by algorithms that prioritize content likely to generate high engagement, such as likes, shares, and comments. Participants frequently cited examples of encountering misinformation on social media, ranging from false news stories to misleading memes and doctored images. Interviews with political analysts highlighted how misinformation can shape public opinion, particularly among individuals who primarily consume news through social media. The rapid spread of false information was seen as undermining public trust in both the media and democratic processes, contributing to a more misinformed and distrustful electorate. The content analysis also showed that misinformation is often targeted, playing on existing fears, biases, and grievances to amplify polarization. For example, misleading posts about immigration, election integrity, or public health issues often employed emotive language and fear-mongering to provoke strong reactions, further entrenching partisan divides.

Echo Chambers and Filter Bubbles

The research found that social media platforms create echo chambers and filter bubbles, where users are primarily exposed to content that reinforces their existing beliefs. This phenomenon was frequently discussed in focus groups, where participants described how their social media feeds often reflected their own views, rarely exposing them to opposing perspectives. The echo chamber effect was found to contribute to political polarization by reinforcing confirmation bias and reducing the likelihood of engaging with alternative viewpoints. Participants noted that algorithms tailored content to their preferences, creating personalized information environments that could make it difficult to critically evaluate information or consider opposing arguments. The content analysis revealed that the nature of social media algorithms, designed to maximize user engagement, often prioritizes content that elicits strong emotional responses. This not only skews the type of information that users encounter but also fosters a more polarized and emotionally charged political discourse.

Impact on Public Opinion Formation

The influence of social media on public opinion formation was evident across the data. Participants reported that social media played a significant role in shaping their views on key political issues, often through the lens of what was trending or most frequently shared within their networks. The rapid pace of information dissemination on social media was seen as both a strength and a weakness, providing real-time updates but also amplifying misinformation and reducing the opportunity for critical reflection. The analysis also highlighted how social media can contribute to a more fragmented public sphere, where different segments of the population are exposed to vastly different versions of reality. This fragmentation complicates the process of democratic deliberation, as individuals operate from divergent sets of facts and priorities, making consensus-building increasingly challenging.

Role of Identity Politics in Voting Behavior

Identity politics, which emphasizes the role of social group identities such as race, gender, and ethnicity in shaping political behavior, was found to be a significant factor in voting behavior in the United States. The research revealed that identity-based voting is a complex phenomenon influenced by historical, social, and political contexts, with significant implications for electoral dynamics.

Influence of Race and Ethnicity

Race and ethnicity were found to be among the most influential factors in shaping voting behavior. Interviews with minority voters highlighted how historical experiences of discrimination, economic marginalization, and social exclusion shaped their political preferences and priorities. For many African American participants, issues such as racial justice, police reform, and social equity were central to their political engagement, often driving strong support for candidates perceived as advocates for civil rights. Hispanic and Asian American voters exhibited more varied voting patterns, reflecting the diverse backgrounds and concerns within these communities. While issues such as immigration and economic opportunity were commonly cited as important, the research found significant variation in how these issues were prioritized, often influenced by factors such as national origin, generational status, and geographic location. The content analysis revealed that political messaging targeted at minority groups often emphasized identity-related themes, such as representation, community empowerment, and protection of civil rights. However, the data also indicated that these messages could be polarizing, as appeals to identity sometimes alienated voters who felt excluded or targeted by such rhetoric.

Gender and Voting Behavior

Gender was another significant factor influencing voting behavior, with clear differences observed between men and women in their political preferences. Female participants often emphasized issues such as reproductive rights, healthcare, and gender equality as key determinants of their voting choices. The research found that women, particularly younger and college-educated women, were more likely to support candidates who championed progressive social policies and gender inclusivity. Male participants, on the other hand, were more likely to

prioritize issues such as economic growth, national security, and traditional values. This gender gap in voting behavior reflected broader societal divisions over issues related to gender roles and social policy, contributing to distinct electoral dynamics. Focus groups highlighted how gender-based political movements, such as the Women's March or #MeToo, have mobilized female voters and raised awareness of gender-specific issues. However, these movements were also polarizing, with some male participants expressing discomfort with what they perceived as exclusionary or overly aggressive feminist rhetoric.

Other Identity Factors

Beyond race and gender, other identity factors such as religion, sexual orientation, and class also played significant roles in shaping voting behavior. Religious identity, particularly among evangelical Christians, was found to be a strong predictor of support for conservative candidates who aligned with their moral and social values. Participants frequently cited issues such as abortion, religious freedom, and traditional family values as central to their political engagement. LGBTQ+ voters, on the other hand, were more likely to support candidates who advocated for civil rights and anti-discrimination measures, reflecting the intersection of sexual orientation and political alignment. The research found that LGBTQ+ participants often framed their political choices in terms of personal safety, community rights, and social acceptance. Class identity also influenced voting behavior, with lower-income participants often expressing economic grievances and distrust in established political parties. These sentiments were particularly pronounced among white working-class voters, who frequently felt disconnected from both major parties and drawn to candidates who promised to disrupt the political system.

Variations in Political Engagement and Policy Preferences

The research revealed significant variations in political engagement and policy preferences across different demographic groups. For example, African American and Hispanic participants were more likely to prioritize issues related to social justice and community support, while white and Asian American participants often focused on economic opportunities and educational access. The content analysis highlighted how political campaigns tailor their messaging to appeal to specific identity groups, often emphasizing themes that resonate with particular demographics. However, this targeted approach also contributed to a fragmented electorate, where different groups are mobilized around distinct, and sometimes conflicting, issues. The findings underscored the importance of understanding identity politics not just as a voting pattern but as a reflection of deeper social and historical contexts that shape political behavior. The role of identity in electoral politics is complex and multifaceted, reflecting the diverse and evolving nature of the American electorate.

5. Outcomes

The outcomes of this research provide a nuanced and comprehensive understanding of the rise of populism, political polarization, the influence of social media on political discourse, and the role of identity politics in voting behavior in the United States. Drawing from qualitative data gathered through interviews, focus groups, and content analysis, this section highlights

the key findings and broader implications of the study. The outcomes reflect the complexities of contemporary American politics and offer insights into how these interrelated phenomena shape the behavior of political actors, voters, and democratic institutions.

Public Disengagement and Distrust in Institutions

One of the most significant outcomes of this research was the increased public disengagement and distrust in political institutions. Data gathered from interviews and focus groups consistently revealed a pervasive sense of disillusionment among participants regarding established political structures. Many participants expressed feelings of alienation from traditional political parties, which they perceived as disconnected from the concerns of ordinary citizens. This sentiment was especially pronounced among those who identified with populist movements, reflecting a broader trend of declining trust in the political establishment. Focus group participants frequently described their distrust in the electoral system, government agencies, and the mainstream media, viewing them as corrupt or biased entities that serve the interests of elites rather than the public. This widespread skepticism has significant implications for democratic governance, as it weakens the foundational trust required for effective civic engagement and participation. The study found that this growing distrust contributed to voter apathy, as many individuals felt that their voices were unlikely to make a difference within a system they viewed as fundamentally flawed. Moreover, the content analysis of social media and political speeches underscored how populist leaders have capitalized on this distrust, using anti-establishment rhetoric to galvanize support. By framing themselves as outsiders who challenge the status quo, these leaders have managed to attract voters who feel disempowered and disconnected from traditional political processes. However, this strategy also exacerbated public cynicism, as it reinforced narratives that delegitimized established institutions, potentially undermining the stability and effectiveness of democratic governance.

Polarization and Breakdown of Civic Discourse

The study found that political polarization has not only deepened ideological divides but also contributed to the breakdown of civic discourse in the United States. Interviews and focus group discussions highlighted how polarization has affected interpersonal relationships, making it increasingly difficult for individuals to engage in respectful political discussions with those holding opposing views. Participants often described a sense of social fragmentation, where communities, workplaces, and even families were divided along partisan lines. The content analysis further demonstrated that social media platforms played a critical role in intensifying polarization by creating echo chambers where users were predominantly exposed to content that reinforced their existing beliefs. This environment fostered confirmation bias and made it more challenging for individuals to encounter differing perspectives, leading to more entrenched and extreme viewpoints. The study found that this dynamic contributed to a hostile online environment where political discourse was often reduced to personal attacks and vitriolic exchanges rather than constructive debate. The implications of this outcome are profound, as the breakdown of civic discourse undermines the deliberative processes essential for a healthy democracy. The inability of citizens to engage in meaningful dialogue erodes social cohesion and increases the potential for conflict, as

differences are amplified rather than reconciled. The research underscored the need for initiatives that promote dialogue across partisan divides and foster a more inclusive public sphere, where diverse viewpoints can coexist without devolving into hostility.

Influence of Populism on Policy and Governance

The research revealed that the rise of populism has had a significant impact on policy-making and governance in the United States. Populist leaders, driven by a mandate to disrupt established norms and cater to the perceived needs of "the people," often pursued policies that were reactionary rather than strategically planned. Interviews with political analysts indicated that populist governance tended to prioritize short-term gains, such as immediate economic relief or symbolic actions that resonate with their base, over long-term policy solutions. Focus group participants who identified as supporters of populist movements expressed satisfaction with policies that they perceived as directly benefiting them, such as immigration restrictions, trade tariffs, or executive actions aimed at bypassing legislative gridlock. However, the study also found that this approach to governance often led to policy volatility and inconsistency, as populist leaders frequently shifted positions in response to changing public sentiments or media narratives. The analysis highlighted that this reactive style of governance posed challenges for policy stability and predictability, creating an environment where policy initiatives were vulnerable to sudden reversals or lack of follow-through. This volatility not only affected domestic policy but also had implications for international relations, as allies and adversaries struggled to navigate the unpredictable nature of populist-driven foreign policy. Moreover, the study found that populism's emphasis on direct appeals to the electorate often sidestepped institutional checks and balances, leading to confrontations between the executive branch and other branches of government. This tension raised concerns about the erosion of democratic norms, as populist leaders frequently framed judicial oversight, legislative scrutiny, and media accountability as obstacles to their agenda rather than essential components of a functioning democracy.

Social Media's Role in Shaping Public Perceptions and Misinformation

The study underscored the powerful role of social media in shaping public perceptions and disseminating misinformation. The content analysis of social media posts revealed that platforms such as Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube were not just venues for political communication but also battlegrounds for competing narratives. The study found that misinformation often spread more rapidly than factual information, driven by algorithms designed to prioritize content that generates high engagement, regardless of its accuracy. Interviews with participants who were frequent social media users highlighted how misinformation influenced their views on key political issues, from election integrity to public health policies. Many participants admitted that they found it challenging to distinguish credible information from falsehoods, reflecting a broader issue of media literacy in the digital age. The prevalence of misinformation contributed to the erosion of shared factual foundations, making it more difficult for citizens to engage in informed decision-making. The research also found that misinformation was often weaponized to deepen polarization, with false or misleading content specifically targeting vulnerable groups or exploiting

existing societal fears. For example, content related to immigration, racial tensions, or pandemic responses was frequently framed in alarmist terms, designed to provoke emotional reactions and drive partisan wedges. This strategy was particularly effective in mobilizing base voters but at the cost of further dividing the public and undermining trust in official sources of information. The study's findings suggest that addressing the spread of misinformation on social media is crucial for the health of democratic discourse. Initiatives to improve digital literacy, promote fact-checking, and hold platforms accountable for the dissemination of harmful content were identified as essential steps in mitigating the negative impact of misinformation on public perceptions and political behavior.

Identity Politics and Impact on Political Engagement

The outcomes of this research highlighted how identity politics significantly shapes political engagement and voter behavior in the United States. The study found that identity-based appeals were highly effective in mobilizing certain demographic groups, particularly those who felt underrepresented or marginalized within the broader political landscape. However, these appeals also contributed to the fragmentation of the electorate along lines of race, gender, and other social identities. Interviews with minority participants, including African American, Hispanic, and LGBTQ+ individuals, revealed that identity politics played a critical role in their political decisions. Many participants expressed a strong sense of solidarity with candidates who they believed represented their community's interests and were responsive to their specific needs. Issues such as racial justice, immigrant rights, and gender equality were often at the forefront of these voters' political priorities, shaping their engagement with the electoral process.

However, the study also found that identity politics could be polarizing, as it often positioned political issues in zero-sum terms, where gains for one group were perceived as losses for another. This framing contributed to tensions between different demographic groups, complicating efforts to build broad, cross-cutting coalitions. Focus group discussions highlighted how appeals to identity could sometimes alienate voters who did not see their own experiences reflected in the political discourse, leading to a sense of exclusion or resentment. The analysis suggested that while identity politics can empower marginalized communities and bring attention to critical social issues, it also poses challenges for fostering inclusive political engagement. The study emphasized the importance of finding a balance between advocating for specific identity groups and promoting a unifying narrative that transcends demographic divides, fostering a more cohesive and representative political landscape.

Implications for Voter Behavior and Electoral Outcomes

The findings of this research have significant implications for understanding voter behavior and electoral outcomes in the United States. The study revealed that populist rhetoric, political polarization, and identity-based appeals have reshaped the way voters perceive and engage with the political process. These factors have contributed to a more fragmented and volatile electorate, where traditional predictors of voting behavior, such as party affiliation or economic self-interest, are increasingly intertwined with cultural and identity concerns. The data showed that populist messaging, with its focus on anti-elitism and cultural nostalgia, resonated strongly with white working-class voters,

many of whom felt alienated from the Democratic Party's focus on progressive social issues. This shift was particularly evident in key swing states, where populist candidates were able to mobilize a coalition of disaffected voters who felt overlooked by the political establishment. The study highlighted how this realignment has disrupted conventional political dynamics, challenging the strategic calculations of both major parties.

Conversely, the research found that identity politics played a crucial role in mobilizing minority voters, especially in urban areas where issues of social justice and representation were paramount. The study noted that while these voters were often a reliable base for Democratic candidates, the intensity of their engagement could vary significantly depending on how effectively their concerns were addressed during the campaign. This variability underscores the importance of targeted outreach and the need for candidates to authentically connect with the diverse experiences of their constituencies. The outcomes also indicated that the influence of social media on electoral behavior cannot be overstated. The study found that digital platforms served as both a tool for mobilization and a source of division, amplifying partisan messages and contributing to a more volatile and unpredictable electoral environment. The data suggested that the ability to harness social media effectively was a critical factor in electoral success, particularly for candidates who could use these platforms to bypass traditional media and connect directly with voters.

Challenges to Democratic Norms and the Future of Governance

The research highlighted several challenges to democratic norms posed by the current political landscape. The rise of populism, growing polarization, and the proliferation of misinformation have collectively strained the mechanisms that underpin democratic governance, such as respect for the rule of law, a commitment to truthful public discourse, and the peaceful transfer of power. Focus group discussions frequently touched on concerns about the erosion of democratic norms, with participants expressing anxiety about the long-term implications of confrontational and divisive politics. Many participants feared that the current trajectory could lead to increased political violence, further erosion of civil liberties, and a weakening of democratic institutions. The study found that these concerns were not limited to any one political group but were shared across the ideological spectrum, reflecting a broader apprehension about the future of American democracy. The analysis concluded that addressing these challenges will require concerted efforts from political leaders, civil society, and the public at large.

6. Conclusion

The study revealed that the rise of populism in the United States was driven by a combination of economic, cultural, and political factors. Economic discontent, particularly among working-class and rural voters, was a significant driver, fueled by perceptions of economic inequality, job loss, and the perceived failures of globalization. Participants consistently expressed distrust in political and economic elites, viewing them as out of touch with the needs of ordinary citizens. This distrust was compounded by cultural backlash against progressive social changes, with many feeling that their traditional values and way of life were under threat. Populist leaders effectively tapped into these

sentiments, framing themselves as champions of the common people against a corrupt and self-serving establishment. The study found that this dynamic had profound implications for democratic governance, as populist rhetoric often undermined trust in institutions and eroded democratic norms. Political polarization emerged as another critical issue, with the study identifying a range of socio-cultural, economic, and institutional drivers.

The increasing alignment of cultural identities with political affiliations contributed to a polarized environment where ideological differences were magnified, and political discourse became more adversarial. Economic grievances also played a role, with lower-income and less-educated individuals more likely to feel disenfranchised and drawn to polarizing narratives that promised radical change. Institutional factors, such as partisan media and gerrymandering, further entrenched polarization, creating an environment where compromise was rare, and partisan hostility was common. The study highlighted the detrimental effects of polarization on democratic institutions, including legislative gridlock, declining public trust, and the erosion of civil discourse. The influence of social media on political discourse was a central finding of the research. Social media platforms were found to play a dual role in both democratizing political communication and amplifying misinformation and polarization. The study revealed that social media often created echo chambers where users were exposed primarily to content that reinforced their existing beliefs, contributing to more extreme and entrenched viewpoints.

The rapid spread of misinformation on these platforms was particularly concerning, as false information often outpaced factual reporting, shaping public perceptions in ways that undermined informed decision-making. The study underscored the need for greater media literacy and accountability among social media platforms to mitigate the spread of misinformation and its impact on democratic processes. The role of identity politics in voting behavior was also a significant outcome of the study. The research found that identity-based appeals were highly effective in mobilizing certain demographic groups, particularly those who felt underrepresented or marginalized. Issues such as racial justice, gender equality, and immigrant rights were central to the political engagement of minority voters, shaping their electoral choices and priorities. However, the study also highlighted the polarizing effects of identity politics, as it often positioned political issues in zero-sum terms, where gains for one group were perceived as losses for another. This dynamic contributed to a fragmented electorate, complicating efforts to build broad, inclusive coalitions. Overall, the study provided valuable insights into the complex interplay of populism, polarization, social media, and identity politics in shaping the contemporary political landscape in the United States. These findings underscored the challenges facing democratic governance in a rapidly changing and increasingly divided society.

Limitations of Study

While the study offered significant insights, it also had several limitations that should be acknowledged. One of the primary limitations was the scope of the data, which, while comprehensive, was inherently qualitative and therefore subject to potential biases. The reliance on interviews and focus groups meant that the findings were based on participants' self-reported experiences and perceptions, which could be influenced by

factors such as social desirability bias or recall bias. Additionally, while efforts were made to ensure a diverse sample, the study was limited by the availability and willingness of participants, potentially excluding voices from certain demographic groups or regions. The content analysis component of the research was also limited by the scope of the materials reviewed. The analysis focused on a selection of social media posts, political speeches, and media coverage, which, although extensive, could not capture the full breadth of the digital landscape.

The rapidly changing nature of online content meant that the data was only a snapshot in time, and the findings might not fully represent the evolving dynamics of social media discourse. Another limitation was the generalizability of the findings. As a qualitative study focused on the United States, the outcomes are specific to the American political context and may not be directly applicable to other countries with different cultural, economic, or political landscapes. The findings provide a detailed understanding of the phenomena within the US but should be interpreted with caution when considering broader, international implications. Finally, while the study explored the influence of social media on political behavior, it did not employ quantitative measures that could provide a more precise assessment of the extent of this influence. Future research could benefit from incorporating mixed methods, combining qualitative insights with quantitative data to validate and expand upon the findings.

Suggestions for Future Research

The findings of this study open several avenues for future research that could further enhance understanding of the complex dynamics shaping contemporary politics. One important area for future research is the longitudinal study of the impact of social media on political behavior. Given the rapid evolution of digital platforms and the continuous emergence of new technologies, a longitudinal approach could provide valuable insights into how social media's influence changes over time and the long-term effects on political engagement and public opinion formation. Comparative studies between the United States and other countries would also be valuable in understanding how the drivers of populism, polarization, and identity politics manifest in different political and cultural contexts. Such research could help identify common patterns and unique variations, offering a broader perspective on the global rise of populist movements and the challenges they pose to democratic governance. Comparative analysis could also provide insights into how different electoral systems, media landscapes, and cultural factors shape the dynamics of polarization and populism.

Future research could also explore the effectiveness of interventions aimed at mitigating polarization and misinformation. Experimental studies testing the impact of media literacy programs, fact-checking initiatives, and social media platform regulations could provide evidence-based recommendations for policymakers and educators seeking to address these issues. Understanding which strategies are most effective in promoting critical thinking, reducing the spread of misinformation, and fostering constructive dialogue could have significant implications for strengthening democratic resilience. Another potential area for exploration is the impact of identity politics on intergroup relations and social cohesion. Future studies could investigate how identity-based political mobilization affects perceptions of outgroups and the potential for collaboration across demographic divides. This line of inquiry could provide valuable insights into

the conditions under which identity politics fosters empowerment and inclusion versus when it leads to division and conflict. Lastly, further research could examine the role of media and political elites in shaping narratives around populism and polarization. Understanding how elite messaging influences public

perceptions and behaviors could shed light on the broader mechanisms that drive these phenomena and identify opportunities for more responsible and balanced communication practices.

Funding Information:

This research did not receive any specific funding from any public, commercial, or non-profit agency.

Disclosure Statement:

No material or relevant stake relating to this research was disclosed by the author(s).

Competing Interest:

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Data Availability Statement:

Data sharing is not applicable to this research article as no new data were created or analysed in this study.

References

- Abramowitz, A., & McCoy, J. (2019). United States: Racial resentment, negative partisanship, and polarization in Trump's America. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 681(1), 137–156.
- Arora, S. D., Singh, G. P., Chakraborty, A., & Maity, M. (2022). Polarization and social media: A systematic review and research agenda. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 183, 121942.
- Barnes, R. (2022). *Fandom and polarization in online political discussion: From pop culture to politics*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bennett, W. L. (2012). The personalization of politics: Political identity, social media, and changing patterns of participation. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 644(1), 20–39.
- Birnir, J. K. (2006). *Ethnicity and electoral politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bonikowski, B. (2017). Ethno-nationalist populism and the mobilization of collective resentment. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 68(S1), S181–S213.
- Bonikowski, B. (2019). Trump's populism. In K. Weyland & R. L. Madrid (Eds.), *Populism in the Americas* (pp. 110–131).
- Borbáth, E., Hutter, S., & Leininger, A. (2023). Cleavage politics, polarisation and participation in Western Europe. *West European Politics*, 46(4), 631–651.
- Bornschieer, S., Häusermann, S., Zollinger, D., & Colombo, C. (2021). How “us” and “them” relates to voting behavior—social structure, social identities, and electoral choice. *Comparative Political Studies*, 54(12), 2087–2122.
- Boucher, J. C., & Thies, C. G. (2019). “I am a tariff man”: The power of populist foreign policy rhetoric under President Trump. *The Journal of Politics*, 81(2), 712–722.
- Boulianne, S., Koc-Michalska, K., & Bimber, B. (2020). Right-wing populism, social media and echo chambers in Western democracies. *New Media & Society*, 22(4), 683–699.
- Braghiroli, S., & Petsinis, V. (2021). Between party-systems and identity-politics: The populist and radical right in Estonia and Latvia. In *Multifaceted nationalism and illiberal momentum at Europe's eastern margins* (pp. 81–100). Routledge.
- Carothers, T., & O'Donohue, A. (Eds.). (2019). *Democracies divided: The global challenge of political polarization*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Carson, J. L., Sievert, J., & Williamson, R. D. (2023). *Nationalized politics: Evaluating electoral politics across time*. Oxford University Press.
- Chakravartty, P., & Roy, S. (2017). Mediatized populisms: Inter-Asian lineages—Introduction. *International Journal of Communication*, 11, 20.
- Cohen, J. L. (2019). Populism and the politics of resentment. *Jus Cogens*, 1, 5–39.
- Cosentino, G. (2020). From Pizzagate to the great replacement: The globalization of conspiracy theories. In G. Cosentino, *Social media and the post-truth world order: The global dynamics of disinformation* (pp. 59–86). Palgrave Pivot.
- Cosentino, G. (2020). *Social media and the post-truth world order*. Palgrave Pivot.
- Croissant, A., Bruns, G., & John, M. (2002). Electoral politics in Southeast and East Asia: A comparative perspective. In *Electoral politics in Southeast and East Asia* (pp. 321–368).
- Dalton, R. J. (2018). *Political realignment: Economics, culture, and electoral change*. Oxford University Press.
- De Vreese, C. H., Esser, F., Aalberg, T., Reinemann, C., & Staney, J. (2018). Populism as an expression of political communication content and style: A new perspective. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 23(4), 423–438.
- Drutman, L. (2021). Elections, political parties, and multiracial, multiethnic democracy: How the United States gets it wrong. *New York University Law Review*, 96, 985.

- Engesser, S., Ernst, N., Esser, F., & Büchel, F. (2017). Populism and social media: How politicians spread a fragmented ideology. *Information, Communication & Society*, 20(8), 1109–1126.
- Enli, G., & Rosenberg, L. T. (2018). Trust in the age of social media: Populist politicians seem more authentic. *Social Media + Society*, 4(1), 1–11.
- Ernst, N., Esser, F., Blassnig, S., & Engesser, S. (2019). Favorable opportunity structures for populist communication: Comparing different types of politicians and issues in social media, television and the press. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 24(2), 165–188.
- Fiorina, M. P. (2017). *Unstable majorities: Polarization, party sorting, and political stalemate*. Hoover Press.
- Fiorino, D. J. (2022). Climate change and right-wing populism in the United States. *Environmental Politics*, 31(5), 801–819.
- Flew, T., & Iosifidis, P. (2020). Populism, globalisation and social media. *International Communication Gazette*, 82(1), 7–25.
- Francescato, D. (2018). Globalization, artificial intelligence, social networks and political polarization: New challenges for community psychologists. *Community Psychology in Global Perspective*, 4(1), 20–41.
- Fukuyama, F. (2018). *Identity: Contemporary identity politics and the struggle for recognition*. Profile Books.
- Gennaioli, N., & Tabellini, G. (2023). *Identity politics* (CESifo Working Paper No. 10338). CESifo.
- Gerbaudo, P. (2018). Social media and populism: An elective affinity? *Media, Culture & Society*, 40(5), 745–753.
- Gil de Zúñiga, H., Koc-Michalska, K., & Römmele, A. (2020). Populism in the era of Twitter: How social media contextualized new insights into an old phenomenon. *New Media & Society*, 22(4), 585–594.
- Gonawela, A. N., Pal, J., Thawani, U., Van Der Vlugt, E., Out, W., & Chandra, P. (2018). Speaking their mind: Populist style and antagonistic messaging in the tweets of Donald Trump, Narendra Modi, Nigel Farage, and Geert Wilders. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW)*, 27, 293–326.
- Greven, T. (2016). *The rise of right-wing populism in Europe and the United States: A comparative perspective*. Friedrich Ebert Foundation.
- Groshek, J., & Engelbert, J. (2013). Double differentiation in a cross-national comparison of populist political movements and online media uses in the United States and the Netherlands. *New Media & Society*, 15(2), 183–202.
- Guerrero-Solé, F., Suárez-Gonzalo, S., Rovira, C., & Codina, L. (2020). Social media, context collapse and the future of data-driven populism. *Profesional de la Información*, 29(5).
- Guriev, S., & Papaioannou, E. (2022). The political economy of populism. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 60(3), 753–832.
- Hameleers, M. (2019). Partisan media, polarized audiences? A qualitative analysis of online political news and responses in the United States, UK, and the Netherlands. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 31(3), 485–505.
- Hameleers, M. (2020). Augmenting polarization via social media? A comparative analysis of Trump's and Wilders' online populist communication and the electorate's interpretations surrounding the elections. *Acta Politica*, 55(3), 331–350.
- Handlin, S. (2018). The logic of polarizing populism: State crises and polarization in South America. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 62(1), 75–91.
- Hannan, J. (2018). Trolling ourselves to death? Social media and post-truth politics. *European Journal of Communication*, 33(2), 214–226.
- Hawkins, K. A. (2009). Is Chávez populist? Measuring populist discourse in comparative perspective. *Comparative Political Studies*, 42(8), 1040–1067.
- Hendrix, G. J. (2019). The roles of social media in 21st-century populisms: US presidential campaigns. *Teknokultura: Revista de Cultura Digital y Movimientos Sociales*, 16(1), 1–10.
- Hofmann, D., Hanscam, E., Furchholt, M., Bača, M., Reiter, S. S., Vanzetti, A., ... & Frieman, C. J. (2021). Populism, identity politics, and the archaeology of Europe. *European Journal of Archaeology*, 24(4), 519–555.
- Hutter, S., & Borbáth, E. (2019). Challenges from left and right: The long-term dynamics of protest and electoral politics in Western Europe. *European Societies*, 21(4), 487–512.
- Johnson, P. E. (2022). *I the people: The rhetoric of conservative populism in the United States*. University of Alabama Press.
- Jungherr, A., Schroeder, R., & Stier, S. (2019). Digital media and the surge of political outsiders: Explaining the success of political challengers in the United States, Germany, and China. *Social Media + Society*, 5(3), 1–12.
- Kaufman, R. R., & Haggard, S. (2019). Democratic decline in the United States: What can we learn from middle-income backsliding? *Perspectives on Politics*, 17(2), 417–432.
- Kivisto, P. (2017). *The Trump phenomenon: How the politics of populism won in 2016*. Emerald Publishing.
- Kreiss, D. (2019). From epistemic to identity crisis: Perspectives on the 2016 US presidential election.
- Kubin, E., & Von Sikorski, C. (2021). The role of (social) media in political polarization: A systematic review. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 45(3), 188–206.
- Levin, S. A., Milner, H. V., & Perrings, C. (2021). The dynamics of political polarization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(50), e2116950118.
- Lieberman, R. C., Mettler, S., Pepinsky, T. B., Roberts, K. M., & Vallery, R. (2019). The Trump presidency and American democracy: A historical and comparative analysis. *Perspectives on Politics*, 17(2), 470–479.
- Lochocki, T. (2018). *The rise of populism in Western Europe*. Springer.
- Major, B., Blodorn, A., & Blascovich, G. M. (2018). The threat of increasing diversity: Why many White Americans supported Trump in the 2016 presidential election. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 21(6), 931–940.
- Marchlewska, M., Cichocka, A., Panayiotou, O., Castellanos, K., & Batayneh, J. (2018). Populism as identity politics: Perceived in-group disadvantage, collective narcissism, and support for populism. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 9(2), 151–162.
- Margetts, H. (2018). Rethinking democracy with social media. *Political Quarterly*, 90(S1), 107–123.

- Maurer, P., & Diehl, T. (2020). What kind of populism? Tone and targets in the Twitter discourse of French and American presidential candidates. *European Journal of Communication, 35*(5), 453–468.
- Mazzoleni, G., Stewart, J., & Horsfield, B. (Eds.). (2003). *The media and neo-populism: A contemporary comparative analysis*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- McCoy, J., & Somer, M. (2019). Toward a theory of pernicious polarization and how it harms democracies: Comparative evidence and possible remedies. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 681*(1), 234–271.
- 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.
- Meléndez, C., & Rovira Kaltwasser, C. (2019). Political identities: The missing link in the study of populism. *Party Politics, 25*(4), 520–533.
- Mignozzetti, U., & Spektor, M. (2019). Brazil: When political oligarchies limit polarization but fuel populism.
- Mihailidis, P., & Viotty, S. (2017). Spreadable spectacle in digital culture: Civic expression, fake news, and the role of media literacies in “post-fact” society. *American Behavioral Scientist, 61*(4), 441–454.
- Mudde, C., & Rovira Kaltwasser, C. (2018). Studying populism in comparative perspective: Reflections on the contemporary and future research agenda. *Comparative Political Studies, 51*(13), 1667–1693.
- Munis, B. K. (2021). Place, candidate roots, and voter preferences in an age of partisan polarization: Observational and experimental evidence. *Political Geography, 85*, 102345.
- Munis, B. K. (2022). Us over here versus them over there... literally: Measuring place resentment in American politics. *Political Behavior, 44*(3), 1057–1078.
- Noury, A., & Roland, G. (2020). Identity politics and populism in Europe. *Annual Review of Political Science, 23*(1), 421–439.
- Oberhauser, A. M., Krier, D., & Kusow, A. M. (2019). Political moderation and polarization in the heartland: Economics, rurality, and social identity in the 2016 US presidential election. *The Sociological Quarterly, 60*(2), 224–244.
- Oestreicher, R. (1988). Urban working-class political behavior and theories of American electoral politics, 1870–1940. *The Journal of American History, 74*(4), 1257–1286.
- Perloff, R. M. (2021). *The dynamics of political communication: Media and politics in a digital age*. Routledge.
- Perry, S. L. (2022). American religion in the era of increasing polarization. *Annual Review of Sociology, 48*(1), 87–107.
- Pierson, P., & Schickler, E. (2020). Madison’s constitution under stress: A developmental analysis of political polarization. *Annual Review of Political Science, 23*(1), 37–58.
- Postill, J. (2018). Populism and social media: A global perspective. *Media, Culture & Society, 40*(5), 754–765.
- Rae, M. (2021). Hyperpartisan news: Rethinking the media for populist politics. *New Media & Society, 23*(5), 1117–1132.
- Rakhmani, I., & Saraswati, M. S. (2021). Authoritarian populism in Indonesia: The role of the political campaign industry in engineering consent and coercion. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs, 40*(3), 436–460.
- Ramírez-Dueñas, J. M., & Vinuesa-Tejero, M. L. (2021). How does selective exposure affect partisan polarisation? Media consumption on electoral campaigns. *The Journal of International Communication, 27*(2), 258–282.
- Roberts, K. M. (2019). Parties, populism, and democratic decay. In *When democracy trumps populism: European and Latin American lessons for the United States* (pp. 132–153).
- Rodrik, D. (2021). Why does globalization fuel populism? Economics, culture, and the rise of right-wing populism. *Annual Review of Economics, 13*(1), 133–170.
- Salmela, M., & Von Scheve, C. (2018). Emotional dynamics of right- and left-wing political populism. *Humanity & Society, 42*(4), 434–454.
- Schain, M. A. (2018). *Shifting tides: Radical-right populism and immigration policy in Europe and the United States*. Migration Policy Institute.
- Schleffer, G., & Miller, B. (2021). The political effects of social media platforms on different regime types.
- Schlesinger, P. (2020). After the post-public sphere. *Media, Culture & Society, 42*(7–8), 1545–1563.
- Schmidtke, O. (2015). Between populist rhetoric and pragmatic policymaking: The normalization of migration as an electoral issue in German politics. *Acta Politica, 50*, 379–398.
- Schroeder, R. (2019). Digital media and the entrenchment of right-wing populist agendas. *Social Media + Society, 5*(4), 1–11.
- Scoggins, B. (2022). Identity politics or economics? Explaining voter support for Hungary’s illiberal FIDESZ. *East European Politics and Societies, 36*(1), 3–28.
- Shin, J., Yang, A., Liu, W., Kim, H. M., Zhou, A., & Sun, J. (2022). Mask-wearing as a partisan issue: Social identity and communication of party norms on social media among political elites. *Social Media + Society, 8*(1), 1–12.
- Siles, I., Guevara, E., Tristán-Jiménez, L., & Carazo, C. (2023). Populism, religion, and social media in Central America. *The International Journal of Press/Politics, 28*(1), 138–159.
- Singh, R. (2017). “I, the people”: A deflationary interpretation of populism, Trump and the United States constitution. *Economy and Society, 46*(1), 20–42.
- Sinha, S. (2017). Mediatized populisms: Fragile hegemony—Social media and competitive electoral populism in India. *International Journal of Communication, 11*, 23.
- Somer, M., & McCoy, J. (2018). Déjà vu? Polarization and endangered democracies in the 21st century. *American Behavioral Scientist, 62*(1), 3–15.
- 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.
- Stier, S., Kirkizh, N., Froio, C., & Schroeder, R. (2020). Populist attitudes and selective exposure to online news: A cross-country analysis combining web tracking and surveys. *The International Journal of Press/Politics, 25*(3), 426–446.

- Suk, J., Coppini, D., Muñiz, C., & Rojas, H. (2022). The more you know, the less you like: A comparative study of how news and political conversation shape political knowledge and affective polarization. *Communication and the Public*, 7(1), 40–56.
- Szebeni, Z., & Salojärvi, V. (2022). “Authentically” maintaining populism in Hungary: Visual analysis of Prime Minister Viktor Orbán’s Instagram. *Mass Communication and Society*, 25(6), 812–837.
- Tumber, H., & Waisbord, S. (2021). Media, disinformation, and populism: Problems and responses. In *The Routledge companion to media disinformation and populism* (pp. 13–25). Routledge.
- Tumber, H., & Waisbord, S. R. (Eds.). (2021). *The Routledge companion to media disinformation and populism*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Uscinski, J. E., Enders, A. M., Seelig, M. I., Klofstad, C. A., Funchion, J. R., Everett, C., ... & Murthi, M. N. (2021). American politics in two dimensions: Partisan and ideological identities versus anti-establishment orientations. *American Journal of Political Science*, 65(4), 877–895.
- Vachudova, M. A. (2019). From competition to polarization in Central Europe: How populists change party systems and the European Union. *Polity*, 51(4), 689–706.
- Vachudova, M. A. (2021). Populism, democracy, and party system change in Europe. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 24(1), 471–498.
- Vecchi, A., Silva, E. S., & Jimenez Angel, L. M. (2021). Nation branding, cultural identity, and political polarization: An exploratory framework. *International Marketing Review*, 38(1), 70–98.
- Vegetti, F. (2019). The political nature of ideological polarization: The case of Hungary. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 681(1), 78–96.
- Velasco, A. (2020). Populism and identity politics. *LSE Public Policy Review*, 1(1).
- Volcic, Z., & Andrejevic, M. (2023). Automated media and commercial populism. *Cultural Studies*, 37(1), 149–167.
- Waisbord, S. (2018). Populism as media and communication phenomenon. In *Routledge handbook of global populism* (pp. 217–234). Routledge.
- Waisbord, S. (2018). The elective affinity between post-truth communication and populist politics. *Communication Research and Practice*, 4(1), 17–34.
- Waisbord, S., & Amado, A. (2017). Populist communication by digital means: Presidential Twitter in Latin America. *Information, Communication & Society*, 20(9), 1330–1346.
- Watson, S. (2021). New Right 2.0: Teacher populism on social media in England. *British Educational Research Journal*, 47(2), 299–315.
- Webster, S. W., & Albertson, B. (2022). Emotion and politics: Noncognitive psychological biases in public opinion. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 25(1), 401–418.
- Westfall, J., Van Boven, L., Chambers, J. R., & Judd, C. M. (2015). Perceiving political polarization in the United States: Party identity strength and attitude extremity exacerbate the perceived partisan divide. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 10(2), 145–158.
- White, C. S. (2020). Wielding social media in the cyber-arena: Globalism, nationalism, and civic education. *Research in Social Sciences and Technology*, 5(1), 1–22.
- Ylä-Anttila, T. (2020). Social media and the emergence, establishment and transformation of the right-wing populist Finns Party. *Populism*, 3(1), 121–139.
- Zarkov, D. (2017). Populism, polarization, and social justice activism. *European Journal of Women’s Studies*, 24(3), 197–201.
- Zhuravskaya, E., Petrova, M., & Enikolopov, R. (2020). Political effects of the internet and social media. *Annual Review of Economics*, 12(1), 415–438.

© 2024, Author(s).

This open access publication is distributed under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) License.

You are free to:

Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format.

Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material.

However,

Attribution — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made.

Non-Commercial — You may not use the material for commercial purposes.

Share Alike — If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license.

You shall not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits.

There are no additional restrictions.

