EXPORTING POPULISM IN THE DIGITAL ERA: CHALLENGES FOR POLITICAL PROCESSES AND INSTITUTIONS

Garaschuk D. V.
*Ph.D student at the Department of International Relations
and Political Management
Zhytomyr State Technological University
Zhytomyr, Ukraine*

Serhieiev V. S.
*Doctor Habilitated in Political Science,
Associate Professor at the Department of International Relations
and Political Management
Zhytomyr State Technological University
Zhytomyr, Ukraine*

Populism, a thin-centered ideology, thrives on its ability to attach itself to broader ideological frameworks, such as conservatism, socialism, or liberalism, adapting to diverse sociopolitical contexts. This ideological flexibility has allowed populism to become a resilient and transformative force in global politics, evolving to align with local and international narratives. The digital era has further magnified this adaptability, enabling populist actors to expand their influence, disrupt traditional political processes, and challenge institutional authority on an unprecedented scale [1, 2].

The advent of digital populism has transformed the nature of political communication. Social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram have created new pathways for direct interaction between populist leaders and their audiences, bypassing traditional media gatekeepers. This direct engagement fosters a perception of authenticity, immediacy, and responsiveness, reinforcing the populist narrative of "the people versus the elite." Populist leaders utilize these platforms to craft emotionally resonant messages, employing slogans, hashtags, and provocative content to mobilize support and dominate the digital landscape [3].

Algorithmic populism encapsulates the digital strategies used by populist leaders to amplify their rhetoric and consolidate their power. Datafication enables them to gather detailed information about audiences, allowing for highly targeted messaging. Gamification, meanwhile, transforms political engagement into participatory experiences that deepen emotional bonds with supporters. These strategies exploit platform algorithms that prioritize engagement, ensuring that

sensational and emotionally charged content achieves greater visibility. This dynamic sidelines fact-based discussions, leading to the erosion of public discourse and reinforcing populist narratives [4, 5].

Social media algorithms contribute to the creation of digital echo chambers, isolating users within ideologically homogeneous groups where populist messages are continually amplified. These environments limit exposure to opposing viewpoints and insulate populist rhetoric from critical scrutiny. As a result, populist leaders can strengthen their narratives while fostering polarization and fragmentation within societies [6]. The hybrid media system, characterized by the interplay of traditional and digital media, further intensifies this polarization, complicating efforts to rebuild cohesive political discourse.

The consequences of digital populism are profound, particularly for democratic governance and institutional integrity. One of the most significant challenges is the erosion of trust in democratic institutions, driven by the delegitimization campaigns of populist leaders. By framing institutions as corrupt, elitist, or disconnected from ordinary citizens, populists undermine their authority and weaken their capacity to mediate political conflicts. This rhetoric is particularly effective during societal crises, such as economic downturns or public health emergencies, where populists exploit public fears to amplify their narratives and consolidate support [7].

Digital populism also intensifies political polarization, fostering an "us versus them" mentality that deepens divisions and undermines collaborative governance. The emotionally charged and divisive content spread by populist leaders exacerbates societal fragmentation, creating fertile ground for extremism and weakening democratic resilience. This polarization not only disrupts political processes but also creates significant barriers to achieving consensus on critical issues, further destabilizing political systems [8].

The phenomenon of "truth decay" adds another layer of complexity to these challenges. Populist leaders exploit the public's diminishing reliance on factual information and rational discourse, leveraging misinformation to shape narratives and reinforce their agendas. Social media algorithms, designed to maximize engagement, prioritize emotionally provocative content, allowing misinformation to spread rapidly and outpace corrective measures. Fact-checking efforts often fail to mitigate the impact of misinformation, as the temporal gap between its dissemination and correction allows falsehoods to solidify within public consciousness. Cognitive biases, such as confirmation bias and motivated reasoning, further entrench these narratives, making them resistant to counteraction [5].

Religious symbolism in populist rhetoric adds another dimension to these dynamics, particularly in regions with strong cultural and religious traditions. In Eastern Europe, populist movements in countries like Poland and Hungary have employed religious imagery to construct narratives of moral superiority and national defense against external threats. By framing political conflicts as moral or existential struggles rooted in religious identity, these leaders evoke powerful emotional responses that resonate deeply with their audiences. While effective in mobilizing support, this strategy risks exacerbating societal divisions and undermining democratic norms [8].

Addressing the challenges posed by digital populism requires a multifaceted and proactive approach. Enhancing media literacy is a foundational step, empowering citizens to critically evaluate the information they consume. Educational initiatives must focus on developing the skills needed to identify manipulative narratives and resist their influence, fostering a more informed and resilient public. Policymakers must also strengthen regulatory frameworks for digital platforms, ensuring transparency in algorithmic operations and accountability for the dissemination of content. These measures should aim to reduce the spread of misinformation while preserving the democratic value of free speech [9].

Restoring public trust in democratic institutions is equally critical. Addressing the root causes of populist discontent, including economic inequality, political exclusion, and cultural anxieties, can reduce the appeal of populist rhetoric. Inclusive governance and participatory decision-making processes are essential in bridging the gap between citizens and institutions. Moreover, fostering dialogue across ideological divides is vital to counteract polarization and rebuild a sense of shared purpose and national cohesion. Efforts to promote social equity and justice will further weaken the foundations of populist narratives and support democratic resilience.

In conclusion, the export of populism in the digital era exemplifies the transformative power of technology in reshaping global politics. By exploiting the affordances of digital platforms, populist leaders have not only amplified their reach but also redefined the dynamics of political communication, challenging the integrity of traditional processes and institutions. Mitigating the adverse effects of digital populism requires a coordinated effort encompassing education, regulation, and inclusive governance. As this phenomenon continues to evolve, understanding its mechanisms and implications is critical to preserving democratic values and fostering political systems capable of adapting to the digital age.

Bibliography:

1. C. Mudde, "The Populist Zeitgeist," *Gov. Oppos.*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 541–563, Sep. 2004, doi: 10.1111/j.1477-7053.2004.00135.x.

2. I. Maly, "Populism as a mediatized communicative relation: The birth of algorithmic populism," 2018, doi: 10.13140/RG.2.2.14077.20960.

3. D. V. Garaschuk and V. S. Serhieiev, "FACT-CHECKING CHALLENGES OF DIGITAL POPULISM IN THE 'TRUTH DECAY' ERA," in *ФІЛОСОФІЯ ТА ПУБЛІЧНІ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ: ІНФОРМАЦІЙНИЙ ПРОСТІР СУЧАСНОЇ КУЛЬТУРИ*, Liha-Pres, 2024, pp. 22–26. doi: 10.36059/978-966-397-443-9-5.

4. I. Maly, "ALGORITHMIC POPULISM AND THE DATAFICATION AND GAMIFICATION OF THE PEOPLE BY FLEMISH INTEREST IN BELGIUM," *Trab. Em Linguística Apl.*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 444–468, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1590/01031813685881620200409.

5. D. V. Garaschuk, "Digital echo chambers: amplifying populist rhetoric in the age of social media," *Актуальні проблеми філософії та соціології* №46, pp. 152–157, 2024, doi: 10.32782/apfs.v046.2024.26.

6. P. Hong and J. Bhuiyan, "Populism and Public Opinion in a Digital World," 2023, pp. 1–6. doi: 10.1007/978-981-16-9859-0_298-1.

7. A. Spilimbergo and N. Magud, "Economic and Institutional Consequences of Populism," C.E.P.R. Discussion Papers, CEPR Discussion Papers 15824, Feb. 2021. [Online]. Available: https://ideas.repec.org/p/cpr/ceprdp/15824.html

8. S. Kostiuchkov, D. Garaschuk, V. Serhieiev, and K. Volkova, "Religious Symbolism in Rhetoric of Right Populist Parties," *Occas. Pap. Relig. East. Eur.*, vol. 44, no. 6, Aug. 2024, doi: 10.55221/2693-2229.2538.

9. Y. Stavrakakis and G. Katsambekis, Eds., *Research Handbook on Populism*. Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2024.