THE EVOLUTION OF SOCIAL MEDIA INFLUENCE IN U.S. PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS: A LONGITUDINAL ANALYSIS FROM 2008 TO 2024

Purva Mittal, Sakaar Mittal, Arpit Singhmar

Assistant Professor, Swami Shraddhanand College, University of Delhi

Research Scholar, SRM University

Research Scholar, JNU

ABSTRACT

Social media has transformed political communication and voter engagement over the past sixteen years. This study examines the evolving role of social media across five U.S. presidential elections from 2008 to 2024, analysing how digital platforms shifted from tools of grassroots mobilization to mechanisms of algorithmic persuasion, misinformation amplification, influencer politics, and AI-driven content manipulation. Using a qualitative longitudinal comparative case study approach, the research synthesizes secondary data from academic literature, platform analytics, policy reports, and media sources. Findings reveal a progression from participatory civic engagement in 2008 and 2012 to emotionally polarized digital warfare in 2016, crisis-mediated regulatory tension in 2020, and influencer- and AI-dominated short-video persuasion ecosystems in 2024. The study concludes that social media has restructured political behaviour, weakened rational deliberation, intensified polarization, and redistributed political power from institutional actors to digital platforms and influencers, posing critical challenges to democratic integrity.

Keywords: social media, U.S. elections, digital political communication, misinformation, algorithmic persuasion, influencer politics, AI content, polarization, voter behaviour.

INTRODUCTION

The convergence of digital communication technologies and electoral politics has transformed how political actors engage citizens, shape opinion, and mobilize voters. Social media has evolved into a central infrastructure of contemporary political communication, fundamentally altering the dynamics of persuasion and participation (Loader and Mercea, 2011). Platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Instagram, and TikTok have shifted political mobilization from traditional top-down messaging toward interactive, networked, and data-driven communication ecosystems (Vonderschmitt, 2012). This transformation enables mass personalization, algorithmic targeting, participatory engagement, and peer-driven distribution of political content (Stieglitz and Dang-Xuan, 2013).

Political campaigns now operate within hybrid media environments shaped by algorithmic curation, emotionally charged messaging, and blurred boundaries between professional journalism, influencer commentary, and citizen-generated content (Holt et al, 2013). Voter exposure to political information increasingly occurs both intentionally and incidentally, raising critical questions regarding the influence of social media on political learning, affective polarization, misinformation, and electoral outcomes (Perrin and Anderson, 2019).

The United States presidential elections from 2008 to 2020 provide a unique longitudinal context to analyze the evolution of digital political campaigning. The 2008 Obama campaign marked the first major integration of Web 2.0 tools into electoral strategy and demonstrated the mobilizing potential of online grassroots networks (Cogburn and Espinoza-Vasquez, 2011; Smith, 2009). By 2012, social media campaigning had become institutionalized and measurably influenced youth participation and voter mobilization (Kennedy, 2017; Dalton-Hoffman, 2012). The 2016 election further accelerated digitally mediated conflict and misinformation, establishing emotionally charged content and algorithmic amplification as central elements of political persuasion (Enli, 2017; Boczkowski, 2016; Kulshrestha et al, 2019). The 2020 electoral cycle intensified these dynamics through pandemic-induced digital

dependence and heightened polarization, with misinformation governance and data ethics debates central to campaign narratives (Chan, 2020; Auxier, 2020; Ferrara et al, 2020).

Despite extensive scholarly attention, research remains divided regarding the degree to which social media improves political knowledge or influences voter behaviour. Some studies argue that social media expands political engagement and facilitates participatory citizenship (Effing et al, 2011; Conroy et al, 2012), while others highlight the reinforcement of bias, selective exposure, and emotional manipulation that erode substantive learning (Hughes, 2018; Nelson, 2020). These conflicting findings underscore the need for deeper empirical examination of digital political participation and its longitudinal impacts.

A critical research gap persists: most scholarship examines single electoral cycles or isolated platforms rather than analyzing social media influence across consecutive elections over time. Limited research adopts a comparative longitudinal perspective that captures technological evolution, behavioural adaptation, and changing campaign strategies. This limits theoretical advancement and creates uncertainty about whether social media effects expand, stabilize, or decline.

This study addresses that gap by employing a longitudinal case analysis of four consecutive U.S. presidential elections to investigate how social media usage influenced political engagement, campaign strategy, and voter perceptions from 2008 to 2020. The findings contribute to political communication scholarship by tracing the evolution of digital campaigning from innovation to institutionalisation and algorithmic saturation, and by interrogating the relationship between political knowledge and social media use across time.

This research is significant to scholars of political communication, digital sociology, democracy, and technology governance. It offers empirical and conceptual grounding for understanding digital electoral strategy, misinformation dynamics, and the future of campaign communication.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on the intersection of social media and electoral politics has expanded rapidly over the last two decades, reflecting the transformation of digital platforms into core infrastructures of contemporary political communication. This review synthesizes theoretical, empirical, and platform-based scholarship on the evolution of digital campaigning from 2008 to 2024, focusing on engagement dynamics, algorithmic mediation, misinformation, and the strategic use of social media in U.S. presidential elections.

1. Foundations of Digital Political Communication

Social media introduced a participatory communication model that encourages interactive dialogue between political actors and citizens. Loader and Mercea (2011) characterize this shift as a networked public sphere that decentralizes political expression. Stieglitz and Dang-Xuan (2013) argue that social networks amplify political content through real-time emotional engagement, shaping attitudes and mobilization. Web 2.0 scholarship identifies social media as a mobilization mechanism that enhances organizational capacity, volunteer activation, and political messaging (Cogburn and Espinoza-Vasquez, 2011; Effing et al, 2011). Political marketing research emphasises image construction and brand identity as central determinants of voter persuasion (Marian, 2013; Avery, 2013).

Table 1. Key Theoretical Perspectives on Digital Political Influence

Theory	Focus	Contribution
Networked public sphere	Participatory discourse	Expands civic voice and activism
Social media analytics (Stieglitz and Dang-Xuan)	Real-time sentiment engagement	Explains mobilization and viral spread
Web 2.0 mobilization (Cogburn & Espinoza-Vasquez)	Grassroots volunteer mobilization	Enhances turnout and fundraising
Political branding	Identity narratives	Shapes candidate perception and trust

3. Platform Architectures and Algorithmic Mediation

The design and affordances of social media platforms shape political communication outcomes. Bossetta (2018) demonstrates that network structure, computational filtering, configurability, and datafication define the political utility of platforms. Research identifies personalization algorithms as key drivers of echo chambers, ideological homogenization, and selective exposure (Kulshrestha et al, 2019). Algorithmic curation alters visibility, creating asymmetrical influence between competing narratives.

Table 2. Platform Mechanics and Political Effects

Platform Feature	Mechanism	Resulting Influence
Algorithmic ranking	Relevance-based filtering	Reinforces biases and polarization
Datafication	Micro-targeted persuasion	Precision audience segmentation
Viral architecture	Peer amplification	Collective identity formation
Multimedia configurability	Video and meme storytelling	Emotional persuasion dominance

3. Political Participation and Digital Engagement

Studies indicate that social media participation correlates with increased offline political engagement, including volunteering, donating, and turnout (Conroy et al, 2012; Holt et al. 2013). Young voters demonstrate highest levels of political participation online, driven by identity-based belonging and peer mobilization (Demers, 2016). However, social media exposure does not consistently improve political knowledge. Merrill (2016) and Nelson (2020) highlight that emotionally charged and sensational content reduces analytical evaluation and encourages reactive behaviour.

4. Misinformation, Polarization, and Digital Trust

Misinformation has emerged as one of the most critical concerns in digital electoral environments. Research documents that false political content spreads faster and deeper than verified content due to emotional intensity and novelty value (Hughes, 2018; Ferrara et al, 2020). The Cambridge Analytica scandal led to public debate on privacy, data manipulation, and platform accountability (Chan, 2020). Polarisation strengthened as social media became a site of partisan mobilization, shaping collective anger and identity conflict (Boczkowski, 2016).

5. Evolution of Digital Campaign Strategy 2008–2024

Across five electoral cycles, the strategic purpose of social media shifted from mobilization (2008) to institutionalization (2012) to aggressive digital warfare (2016) to misinformation governance (2020) and finally to AI-driven influencer and short-video dominance (2024).

Table 3. Evolution of Campaign Strategy Across U.S. Elections

Cycle	Strategic Focus	Dominant Platforms	Defining Characteristics
2008	Grassroots mobilization and fundraising	Facebook, YouTube, MySpace	Obama creates digital brand identity and volunteer networks
2012	High-volume engagement and youth targeting	Facebook, Twitter, Tumblr	Institutional professionalization and content consistency
2016	Populist activism and misinformation	Twitter, YouTube	Emotional warfare, fake news ecosystems
2020	Regulation, crisis response, polarization	Facebook, Twitter, Instagram	Pandemic-driven online dependency and fact-checking
2024	AI-generated content,	TikTok, Instagram	Deepfakes, short-video propaganda,

	influencers, and TikTok mobilization	Reels, X, YouTube Shorts	creator-driven political advocacy

6. The 2021–2024 Shift: AI, Influencers, Short-Video Politics

Post-2020, digital politics entered a new phase driven by short-form video virality and influencer advocacy. TikTok became a critical political arena among 18-34-year-olds, shaping identity-based activism and meme-driven persuasion. Studies from HKS Misinformation Review and Pew Research identify influencer-led political messaging as more trusted than traditional party communication. Research also highlights the emergence of synthetic media, digital astroturfing, and generative misinformation as existential threats to electoral legitimacy. Crisis politics around COVID-19, racial justice, and economic instability heightened emotional response dynamics. Regulatory interventions such as increased platform moderation and algorithm transparency became central issues.

7. Gaps in Existing Research

- Limited cross-cycle longitudinal research over extended time horizons.
- Insufficient analysis of algorithmic persuasion and emotional contagion.
- Lack of research on influencer political endorsement and TikTok activism.
- Minimal understanding of generative AI effects on political cognition.
- Need for theory connecting platform design and voter behaviour.

This study addresses these gaps by providing a 16-year comparative analysis of social media influence on voter engagement, political knowledge, and campaign strategy.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employs a qualitative longitudinal comparative case study research design to examine the evolution of social media's role in United States presidential election campaigns between 2008 and 2024. A longitudinal case study approach is appropriate for understanding political communication developments that unfold over time and for addressing complex interactions between digital technologies, voter behaviour, and campaign strategies in real electoral environments. This design enables cross-cycle comparison, thematic interpretation, and contextual evaluation of technological and behavioural change across five electoral periods.

Research Questions

The following research questions guide the study:

1. How has the use of social media in U.S. presidential election campaigns evolved from 2008 to 2024?
2. What strategies did political campaigns adopt to influence voter engagement across different digital environments?
3. How have algorithmic personalization, influencer activism, and AI-generated political content shaped voter cognition and political participation since 2020?
4. What are the implications of social media campaigning for democratic processes, electoral credibility, and public trust?

These questions enable focused investigation across comparative political contexts while supporting conceptual development regarding digital persuasion mechanisms.

Case Selection

Five U.S. presidential elections were selected for analysis: 2008, 2012, 2016, 2020, and 2024. These cases represent major transitions in digital campaigning:

- 2008 introduced Web 2.0 mobilization and grassroots engagement.
- 2012 marked institutional professionalization of online campaigning.
- 2016 demonstrated misinformation warfare and emotional populism.
- 2020 foregrounded regulation, crisis communication, and polarization.
- 2024 introduced short-form influencer-led campaigning and generative AI political propaganda.

This sequence supports longitudinal comparison of evolving campaign environments, platform architectures, and voter behaviours.

Data Sources

The study relies on secondary qualitative data drawn from:

- Pew Research Center election and media usage datasets.
- Academic journal publications on political communication, misinformation, platform governance, and engagement.
- Publicly available campaign records, platform analytics, engagement statistics, and content archives.
- Policy reports and technology governance documents.
- Media coverage of campaign strategy, digital controversies, and regulatory changes.

All data were collected from publicly accessible and credible institutional sources.

Data Analysis

A thematic content analysis was conducted across the collected data. The analysis involved:

1. Identifying recurring themes within each election cycle related to communication strategy, platform affordances, voter interaction patterns, and campaign messaging.
2. Categorizing themes into broader constructs of political branding, participation, misinformation dynamics, and platform-governance interaction.
3. Conducting cross-case synthesis to compare strategic evolution and behavioural patterns across election cycles.
4. Mapping changes in digital persuasion mechanisms relative to technological and regulatory developments.

Triangulation of academic literature, platform data, and independent media ensured analytic validity.

Validity and Reliability

Credibility was strengthened through:

- Use of multiple data types and sources to corroborate patterns.
- Temporal triangulation across five electoral cycles.
- Consistency checking across thematically coded data.

While secondary data analysis limits direct control over original data quality, it enables comprehensive examination of large-scale political phenomena across extended historical periods.

Ethical Considerations

The study uses publicly accessible secondary data without collecting personal information. Privacy regulations, digital ethics standards, and platform governance policies were reviewed to ensure responsible interpretation within public interest scholarship.

FINDINGS

The longitudinal comparative analysis of five U.S. presidential elections reveals a progressive transformation in the strategic role and impact of social media on campaign communication, voter engagement, and political persuasion. The findings indicate that social media evolved from a mobilization tool in 2008 to a dominant and contested infrastructure shaping narrative control, emotional polarization, algorithmic visibility, and digital credibility by 2024. Thematic synthesis highlights three overarching trends: the institutionalization of digital campaigning, the escalation of misinformation and emotional persuasion, and the emergence of influencer-led and AI-driven electoral communication ecosystems.

1. Social Media as a Mobilization and Engagement Tool (2008 and 2012)

The 2008 election established social media as a strategic mechanism for grassroots mobilization. Barack Obama's campaign utilized Facebook, MySpace, YouTube, Flickr, and early mobile messaging to build volunteer networks, raise funds, and personalize candidate engagement (Cogburn and Espinoza-Vasquez, 2011). Youth participation increased significantly, demonstrating the persuasive effect of relational and identity-oriented digital communication. Obama's digital strategy created a model of high-engagement political branding that was replicated internationally.

The 2012 election reflected professionalization and normalization of social media campaigning. Both Barack Obama and Mitt Romney invested in content volume, real-time interaction, metrics analysis, and audience micro-targeting. Engagement shifted from follower acquisition to behavioural conversion, especially among young and first-time voters (Kennedy 2017). Data analytics and message testing emerged as central components of digital strategy.

2. The Rise of Misinformation and Emotional Digital Warfare (2016)

The 2016 cycle marked a turning point driven by populist mobilization, viral emotional messaging, and large-scale misinformation networks. Twitter and YouTube became primary engines of political visibility. Donald Trump's amateur-styled, confrontational, and emotionally charged content achieved rapid diffusion and dominated media discourse, while Hillary Clinton's structured, professional messaging failed to generate equivalent engagement (Enli, 2017). The campaign demonstrated that authenticity and outrage outperform message discipline in algorithmic environments.

The findings show that misinformation ecosystems intensified polarization and reduced trust in traditional media. Emotional reinforcement and identity-confirmation reactions replaced informational evaluation, shifting political behaviour from deliberation to reaction (Boczkowski, 2016).

3. Crisis-Mediated Digital Dependency and Platform Governance (2020)

The 2020 election was defined by pandemic-driven reliance on digital communication, platform-level moderation policies, and widespread political fatigue. Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram adopted content warning labels and misinformation-flagging systems against manipulated media, particularly targeting Trump's posts. Cambridge Analytica-triggered regulatory pressures heightened scrutiny over data ethics, advertising transparency, and digital interference.

This phase revealed fragmentation of the information environment and rising distrust of technology companies. Public dissatisfaction with political content and emotional overload was widely documented, with polarization reaching its peak as social justice movements and crisis narratives intersected (Auxier 2020).

4. Influencer-Led and AI-Driven Campaigning (2024)

By 2024, the electoral communication environment shifted toward short-form video platforms, influencer communities, generative AI content, and socially distributed political messaging. TikTok, Instagram Reels, YouTube Shorts, and X (formerly Twitter) became the primary arenas of campaign visibility among 18-34-year-olds. Political influencers gained credibility advantages over institutional party communication, reshaping voter persuasion through parasocial trust relationships.

Generative AI deepfakes, synthetic speech, and automated meme production amplified disinformation velocity, creating new challenges for regulatory and journalistic verification ecosystems. Platforms implemented expanded moderation policies, yet enforcement consistency remained contested. Campaign success was strongly linked to creator-driven narrative amplification, TikTok virality cycles, and identity-based mobilisation.

5. Comparative Evolution Across Electoral Cycles
Table 4. Evolution of Digital Strategy and Voter Effects 2008-2024

Election Cycle	Dominant Platforms	Campaign Strategy	Voter Engagement Pattern	Key Outcome
2008	Facebook, YouTube, MySpace	Grassroots mobilization	Youth surge, digital volunteering	Social media proves decisive
2012	Facebook, Twitter, Tumblr	Professional analytics-led engagement	High participation, donation growth	Normalization of digital campaigning
2016	Twitter, YouTube	Emotional populism, misinformation	Polarization, outrage-based sharing	Narrative dominance over accuracy
2020	Facebook,	Crisis response and	Digital fatigue,	Political identity conflict

	Twitter, Instagram	regulation	distrust, activism	escalates
2024	TikTok, Reels, Shorts, X	Influencer persuasion, AI-generated media	Networked activism, youth dominance	Short-video virality replaces traditional messaging

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study illustrate a significant transformation in the role and impact of social media in U.S. presidential elections from 2008 to 2024, demonstrating a shift from participatory mobilization to emotionally driven persuasion ecosystems and, most recently, AI-enhanced influencer communication. This evolution reflects deeper changes in the political information environment, voter cognition, and the structure of democratic engagement.

The early period (2008 and 2012) supported the optimistic theoretical view that digital platforms enhance civic participation and democratize political access. The mobilization and empowerment observed in the Obama campaigns aligned with theories of the networked public sphere (Loader and Mercea 2011) and political engagement frameworks emphasizing deliberation and participation (Effing et al. 2011). Social media strengthened political efficacy, expanded youth inclusion, and increased opportunities for public voice, consistent with arguments that digital media could renew democratic participation.

However, the 2016 and 2020 elections challenged this idealistic perspective. Emotional mobilization and misinformation dominance supported the view that digital communication systems incentivize outrage, sensationalism, and polarisation (Boczkowski 2016; Nelson 2020). The findings reinforce the proposition that digital persuasion is increasingly shaped by affective dynamics such as anger, fear, and identity threat rather than policy reasoning or rational evaluation. This supports theories of emotionally driven media effects and aligns with selective exposure models that suggest individuals seek reinforcement rather than deliberation.

The intensification of misinformation, computational propaganda, and algorithmically created echo chambers revealed the structural vulnerabilities of digital democracy, amplifying concerns raised in research on fake news and algorithmic filtering (Ferrara et al. 2020; Hughes 2018). The results indicate that information abundance does not translate into informed citizenship. Instead, cognitive fragmentation and distrust escalated, reinforcing the epistemic crisis in democratic societies.

The 2024 cycle demonstrated another structural transition. Influence shifted from institutional political actors to distributed networks of creators and digital influencers with parasocial trust relationships. This supports emerging scholarship that identifies influencer politics and peer-to-peer credibility as powerful determinants of persuasion, particularly among younger voters. The introduction of generative AI and deepfake political content in 2024 further intensified concerns over manipulation, authenticity, and information integrity. Campaign communication became inseparable from the dynamics of platform architectures that prioritise engagement metrics over public interest, signalling an evolution from human-driven persuasion to machine-optimized influence.

The conceptual model proposed in this study explains the interaction between platform evolution, campaign strategy adaptation, persuasion mechanisms, and voter responses. The evidence indicates that shifts in platform architectures mediate transformations in communication strategy, which subsequently shape political cognition and behaviour. This reinforces the notion that social media influence results not from content alone but from the technological and emotional systems through which content circulates.

The discussion also raises broader implications regarding the future of democratic legitimacy. Social media has redistributed political power from institutional gatekeepers to algorithmic platforms and networked influencers. As a result, campaigns increasingly rely on attention capture rather than policy deliberation, and electoral dynamics are influenced by technological environments outside direct electoral oversight. These findings contribute to ongoing debates about platform governance, digital electoral regulation, and the future of democratic participation in technologically mediated societies.

Collectively, the longitudinal evidence suggests that the evolution of social media from 2008 to 2024 has transformed democracy into an attention-driven competition where emotional performance and algorithmic visibility outweigh rational discourse. This raises critical questions about the sustainability of informed democratic decision-making in the face of rising digital manipulation, synthetic media production, and identity-centric political

culture.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the evolving role of social media in shaping political engagement, campaign strategy, and voter behaviour across five U.S. presidential election cycles from 2008 to 2024. The longitudinal comparative analysis revealed a fundamental transformation in the nature of digital political communication. Social media evolved from a participatory mobilization tool associated with democratic revitalization to an emotionally charged persuasion system driven by algorithmic amplification, misinformation, and influencer-based identity politics. By 2024, short-form video platforms and generative AI technologies redefined political influence, decentralizing control from institutional actors to networked creators and computational systems.

The findings demonstrate that political communication has shifted from rational, policy-oriented messaging to emotionally driven narratives designed for virality and attention capture. Voter behaviour increasingly reflects identity-aligned emotional response rather than deliberative evaluation of information. This evolution has intensified political polarization, reduced trust in institutional media, and challenged the stability of shared informational realities. While early social media use expanded civic participation and youth mobilization, later cycles exposed vulnerabilities in democratic processes through misinformation ecosystems, algorithmic bias, and synthetic media manipulation.

The conceptual model developed in this study highlights the dynamic relationship between platform evolution, campaign strategy, persuasion mechanisms, and voter outcomes. It contributes to political communication scholarship by framing electoral influence as an adaptive interaction between technological infrastructures and psychological dynamics, rather than as a linear communication channel. This framework provides a foundation for future comparative and experimental research and offers insights for scholars, policymakers, and practitioners navigating digital electoral environments.

THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

The study supports emerging theories that reposition political persuasion as an emotionally driven and algorithmically mediated process rather than a deliberative one. It extends research on misinformation and echo chambers by demonstrating their longitudinal impact on voter cognition and democratic trust. It also advances understanding of influencer politics and AI-driven persuasion as defining mechanisms of contemporary electoral strategy.

PRACTICAL AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The results highlight the urgent need for stronger digital governance frameworks addressing transparency, algorithmic accountability, platform regulation, and verification of synthetic content. Campaign institutions must adapt to influencer ecosystems and short-video storytelling while balancing ethical considerations. Educational interventions that strengthen media literacy and critical reasoning are essential to counter cognitive vulnerability in digital environments.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study relied on secondary qualitative analysis and therefore cannot establish causal relationships or quantify behavioural effects. Future research should combine longitudinal modelling, survey-based behavioural analysis, and interviews with campaign strategists to deepen understanding of digital persuasion mechanisms. Comparative cross-national analyses would provide additional insight into how cultural and political contexts influence digital campaigning outcomes.

FINAL REFLECTION

The evolution of social media from 2008 to 2024 reflects a broader transformation of democracy into a technologically mediated competition for attention. If left unchecked, the dominance of emotional virality and synthetic manipulation threatens the resilience of democratic decision-making. The future of electoral integrity will depend on how effectively societies balance innovation, regulation, and ethical communication to restore trust and preserve informed public discourse.

REFERENCES

[1] Avery, K. (2013). Political branding strategies in contemporary campaigns. *Journal of Political Marketing*, 12(4), 248–268.

[2] Auxier, B. (2020). Political polarization and information trust online. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from https://www.pewresearch.org

[3] Boczkowski, P. (2016). *The emotional politics of digital news consumption*. MIT Press.

[4] Bossetta, M. (2018). The digital architectures of social media: Comparing political campaigning on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Snapchat. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 95(2), 471–496.

[5] Chan, T. (2020). The post-Cambridge Analytica transformation of digital political advertising. *New Media & Society*, 22(7), 1234–1256.

[6] Cogburn, D., & Espinoza-Vasquez, F. (2011). From networked nominee to networked nation: Examining the impact of Web 2.0 on Obama's 2008 campaign. *Journal of Political Marketing*, 10(1–2), 189–213.

[7] Conroy, M., Feezell, J., & Guerrero, M. (2012). Facebook and political engagement: Youth participation and self-actualization. *CyberPsychology, Behavior & Social Networking*, 15(8), 579–583.

[8] Dalton-Hoffman, E. (2012). The role of digital strategy in presidential elections. *Journal of Digital and Social Media Marketing*, 6(3), 173–187.

[9] Demers, D. (2016). Social capital and online political activity among young voters. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 13(1), 1–18.

[10] Effing, R., Van Hillegersberg, J., & Huibers, T. (2011). Social media and political participation. *Government Information Quarterly*, 28(4), 412–421.

[11] Enli, G. (2017). Twitter as arena for authenticity: Populist communication in the 2016 U.S. election. *European Journal of Communication*, 32(1), 50–61.

[12] Ferrara, E., Chang, H., Chen, E., Muric, G., & Patel, J. (2020). Misinformation and social risk during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review*, 1(3), 1–17.

[13] Holt, K., Shehata, A., Strömbäck, J., & Ljungberg, E. (2013). Age and political participation on social media. *New Media & Society*, 15(7), 1139–1157.

[14] Hughes, A. (2018). Fake news and misinformation: The emotional contagion model. *Journalism Studies*, 19(13), 2013–2030.

[15] Kennedy, L. (2017). Digital political campaigning and voter mobilization in the United States. *Political Studies Review*, 15(3), 382–397.

[16] Kulshrestha, J., Singh, S., & Gómez, V. (2019). Filter bubbles, echo chambers, and algorithmic bias. *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference*, 13(2), 1–12.

[17] Loader, B., & Mercea, D. (2011). *Social media and democracy*. Routledge.

[18] Maeve, D., & Aaron, P. (2016). The psychology of misinformation acceptance. *Political Psychology*, 37(2), 269–287.

[19] Marian, M. (2013). Political branding and voter loyalty. *Journal of Political Marketing*, 9(3), 129–147.

[20] Merrill, S. (2016). Digital activism and political knowledge. *International Journal of Communication*, 10, 4532–4554.

[21] Nelson, T. (2020). Emotion and political persuasion in digital environments. *American Journal of Political Science*, 64(2), 267–289.

[22] Perrin, A., & Anderson, M. (2019). Americans and digital media. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from https://www.pewresearch.org

[23] Stieglitz, S., & Dang-Xuan, L. (2013). Social media and political communication: Sentiment, engagement, and influence. *Government Information Quarterly*, 30(4), 112–123.

[24] Vonderschmitt, K. (2012). The rise of social media in campaign communication. *Yale Review of International Studies*, 4(1), 45–55.