Digital Disruption in Political PR: From Gatekeepers to Algorithmic Amplification

Quratulain Saleem
Lecturer Media and Communication Studies Department, National University Of Modern Languages (NUML) H-9 Sector, Islamabad, Pakistan
qasaleem@numl.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

The landscape of political public relations (PR) has undergone a radical transformation, shifting from controlled press releases and traditional media gatekeeping to a dynamic, decentralized digital ecosystem dominated by viral content and social media engagement. This article examines the evolution of political PR, tracing its journey from the tightly managed narratives of the 20th century to today's algorithm-driven, participatory communication environment. It explores how platforms like Twitter, Facebook, and TikTok have democratized political discourse, enabling grassroots movements and outsider candidates to challenge established elites while also amplifying misinformation, polarization, and ethical concerns. The discussion highlights key turning points, such as Barack Obama's pioneering use of social media in 2008 and Donald Trump's unfiltered Twitter dominance, as well as emerging trends like AI-generated content, micro-targeting, and immersive technologies such as virtual reality. The article also addresses the challenges of this new era, including deepfakes, algorithmic manipulation, and the erosion of shared factual ground. Finally, it considers the future of political PR, emphasizing the need for ethical frameworks, regulatory oversight, and media literacy to balance innovation with democratic integrity. As the tools of persuasion grow more sophisticated, the article underscores the urgent question: How can societies harness the power of digital PR without sacrificing public trust?

Keywords: *Political PR, Social Media, Viral Content, Misinformation, Digital Communication, AI, Micro-Targeting, Democracy, Polarization, Ethical Regulation.*

Introduction

The political PR has experienced a paradigm shift in the 21st century, where the one-way communication model that was controlled was replaced by a dynamic, interactive, and unpredictable digital ecosystem. The use of press releases, well-prepared speeches, and the use of print and broadcast media to pass information were the order of the day in the early 20th century (Grunig & Hunt, 1984). This strategy was more focused on message discipline, where the politicians and the PR personnel collaborated with the journalists, to create narratives in the newspapers and on the television. The development of the internet and, subsequently, social media sites, however, broke this gatekeeper model and now politicians can communicate directly with the citizens (Stromer-Galley, 2014). The loss of the monopoly of political talk by traditional media has contributed to the current state of fragmented but participatory nature of PR, so that viral messages tend to have more influence on the way people think than official messages. The

change is indicative of a much larger shift in society towards digital immediacy, transparency and mistrust towards institutionalized media, which has necessitated political players to change their tactics or become irrelevant in an ever more crowded and noisy information environment.

One can trace the emergence of the digital and viral content as the basis of contemporary political PR to the early 2000s, when such platforms as Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter started to transform information consumption and distribution. In contrast to the traditional press releases, which were rather outdated and needed media intermediaries, digital content lives on the involvement, emotional appeal, and shareability (Jenkins et al., 2018). The 2008 presidential campaign of Barack Obama was a new breakthrough where the candidate used social media to engage the youth voters, raise funds, and bypass conventional media filters (Cogburn & Espinoza-Vasquez, 2011). Political PR has since given more emphasis on the platforms where content can become viral - be it memes, short-form videos, or influencer recommendations, avoiding any scrutiny of traditional journalism and reaching the audience in a more organic way. This transition has not only democratized the political communication; it also has come with challenges as the misinformation can spread easily and controlling the narratives in the decentralized media environment is difficult (Tandoc et al., 2018). The measures of success are even different: where PR teams used to measure reach by the number of press clippings, the current measures are shares, likes, and algorithmic amplification, and the increasing sway of viralization by platforms over credibility of institutions.

The key aspect of this new period is the importance of social media influencing and instant interaction in the development of political discourse. Influencers: celebrities, grassroots activists, or any other kind, now act as a significant amplifier of political messages and can be targeted at populations that have lost faith in main stream news (Freberg et al., 2011). This has been the case with politicians who have taken to a more casual, relatable way of communication as demonstrated by Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez using Instagram live and TikTok to discuss policy or Donald Trump using twitter to dominate news cycles (Ott, 2017). Yet there are dangers to this immediacy: there is an expectation of content to be generated around the clock, and this can result in gaffes and the online discourse, because of its viral nature, tends toward sensationalism at the expense of content. Also, the loss of the traditional gatekeeping has led to the increased difficulty in fixing misinformation, as has been the case of conspiracy theories during elections and pandemics (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017). It has become hard to distinguish between organic discussion in the public domain and PR stunts, so the use of astroturfing (inauthentic grassroots campaigns) and algorithmic manipulation have become important tools. Consequently, contemporary political PR has to be equally true to itself and strategic at the same time, exploiting the power of virality and cutting off the reputational losses that may be caused by the unintended backlash or misinformation.

This article aims to discuss the ways in which PR politics has adapted to these digital upheavals by exploring the potentials and the dangers of the transition of press releases to viral content. This discussion will examine how the political actors utilize (or weaponize) the digital tools to influence the perception of the people by examining the case studies, e.g., the role of memes in the 2016 and 2020 U.S. elections, the use of the deepfake technology in the international disinformation campaigns, etc. In addition, the article will also touch upon such ethical issues as data privacy, micro-targeting, and the overall effect of polarization created by algorithms on society. With the looming future of political PR having been dominated by the emergence of new technologies, such

as the use of AI-generated content and the use of virtual reality campaigning, the future of political PR will be based on how well it adjusts to such evolutions and still retain the trust of the people. This knowledge needs to be understood by PR professionals and policymakers as well as citizens moving through an increasingly complex media environment in which the difference between fact, persuasion, and manipulation continues to be increasingly blurred.

The Traditional Era: Press Releases and Media Control

Prior to the digital revolution, political PR was dominated by a highly restricted, top-down chain of communication in which press releases, press conferences and mainstream media were the major means of distributing political information. During this period, the politicians and their PR officials depended more on journalists to be their gatekeepers, and through them, their well-packaged messages were passed to the masses with little distortion (Grunig & Hunt, 1984). The staple of political communications were press releases, which were usually in formal and authoritative language, and gave official statements on policies, scandals, or campaign developments. These materials were handed out to newsrooms, and the editors and reporters chose what to emphasize thus influencing the perception of the population. Another important device, press conferences, gave politicians a chance to talk to the media on their own terms, but they could prepare answers to any question in advance. Such a system guaranteed that the political elites retained heavy control on their image, since the entrance of alternative voices was a difficult task, and the media environment was controlled by several powerful media outlets (Stromer-Galley, 2014). The symbiosis between politicians and journalists tended to result in critical analysis being softened by the desire to gain access, which ensured that official versions of events were allowed to dominate the discourse taking place in the media.

The centralization of information dissemination already served as the second factor that strengthened the control that politicians and PR teams had over the media narratives. Without the social media, the citizenry trusted news provided via newspapers, television and radio, all of which had a set of editorial guidelines that tended to match institutional authority systems (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). As a case in point, press releases were a common method during the cold war through which the issues of foreign policies, like the Cuban Missile Crisis, were framed by the administration of John F. Kennedy who gave a lot of attention to the media coverage so as to appear tough and resolute (Allison & Zelikow, 1999). Likewise, during the Falklands War, the PR team of the then British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher had perfected the use of press release so that the government side of the story was the one that made the news (Harris, 2005). These are some examples of how political actors may influence the opinion of the masses by controlling the timing of the official messages, their framing, and tone. The absence of live feedback systems by the general population ensured that any divergent voices or any other forms of opinion had a difficult time in gaining momentum at the expense of letting the political elites have a near-monopoly of the discourse. Not everyone was a fan of this top-down view of PR though as it would frequently be accused of being media manipulation and propaganda especially during times of crisis or war.

Famous political press releases and speeches of this period prove how effective well-designed messages can create history. President Franklin D. Roosevelt Day of infamy speech after the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941 that was sent to newspaper across the country and broadcast on radio that united the American people behind a call to war is one of the most known examples (Roosevelt, 1941). The Watergate scandal was also a pointer to the press releases to help in

damage control as the administration of Richard Nixon tried to cover up the crisis using well-phrased words before the truth came out (Bernstein & Woodward, 1974). A case in point is how controlled messaging in Winston Churchill could motivate the morale of the people in the U.K. as his speeches in time of war like the famous quote of, We Shall Fight on the Beaches, were reproduced in official publications and in the history books later on (Gilbert, 1991). These examples demonstrate the importance of press releases and official statements in the classical kit of PR tools, as the possibility to shape the message usually defined the success or failure of politicians. Although this model made sure that there was discipline in the messages, it also gave an atmosphere where distorted messages could succeed unless checked by investigative journalism or by the people themselves. The fall of the age started with the introduction of digital media, which led to equal access to information and broke the monopoly of traditional gatekeepers and opened the door to the more chaotic, but participatory PR environment of the present day.

The Digital Revolution

The introduction of the social media, including Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, and TikTok, has revolutionized the role of political public relations (PR), with the original source of power concentrated around the traditional media gatekeepers to the direct and real-time communication with the population. Before the digital revolution, the political messages had to pass the test of journalists and editors, and the introduction of these platforms gave politicians an opportunity to skip the middlemen and deliver their message to millions of followers untouched (Stromer-Galley, 2014). Twitter, which was introduced in 2006, was a game-changer as it was quick and short, and politicians could now express ideas, policies, and responses in real-time. The algorithmic reach and micro-targeting nature of Facebook presented the possibility of campaigns to fine tune messages to particular demographics, Instagram and TikTok brought visual and short-form video as an effective means of relatability and virality (Kreiss, 2016). This made political communication more democratic, with grass roots organizations and unknown candidates becoming able to compete with more well-known ones in terms of attracting attention. But they also created new issues like influx of misinformation and weakening of the processes of fact-checking because social media algorithms put engagement above accuracy (Tufekci, 2017). Political PR must have been decentralized, and narratives are no longer fully under control, as viral content, whether genuine or manipulated, could form the opinion, regardless of any official campaigns.

In this new environment, real-time communication and direct contact with the people became an essential part of the process as social media allowed politicians to react to events in real-time and build personal brands. Social media such as Twitter enabled leaders to appear honest and approachable and dissolving the formal boundary that existed between leaders and constituents (Enli, 2017). As an illustration, in times of emergency like natural calamities or political scandals, the social media offered a direct communication to officials to respond to issues, explain their stand or even rally people without the need to wait until press conferences or headlines. Such directness implied that any wrong step or improvisation could escalate to become more serious, like viral gaffes or scandalous tweets that took over the news (Ott, 2017). Further, the social media interactivity gave the supporters a feeling of belonging through the ability of the politicians to like, share and comment on their posts, leaving the feeling of being close to them. The aspect worked especially well when it came to younger voters as they were more prone to view political material

on such platforms as Instagram and Tik Tok than on traditional news sources (Vaccari & Valeriani, 2021). Nonetheless, the need to remain constantly involved created the need to focus on sensationalism and emotional appeals at the cost of meaningful policy discussion. The measures of success changed to the quantified press coverage to likes, shares and retweets, which encouraged content that would garner strongly felt reactions, as opposed to well thought-out discussion.

Mastering the social media, politicians reinvented political PR and the campaign of Barack Obama in 2008 can be considered as a milestone of digital mobilization. Obama team used Facebook, YouTube and email networks to channel funds, mobilize volunteers and spread messages successfully utilizing the grassroots energy (Cogburn & Espinoza-Vasquez, 2011). His presence on social media did not only increase his following but also provided a feeling of involvement to the supporters as they felt personally invested in the campaign. On the contrary, the 2016 and 2020 campaigns of Donald Trump showed how Twitter could be used to control the news cycle, bypass the critical analysis, and gather a loyal following. The unmoderated tweets by Trump, which were usually controversial or provocative maintained his place at the center of media attention and cemented his anti-establishment brand (Ott, 2017). Most recently, politicians such as Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (AOC) have taken advantage of social media applications such as TikTok to present the nuts and bolts of policies, as well as interact with younger viewers, in a mix of entertainment and education to de-mystify political operations (Jackson & Foucault Welles, 2022). Such leaders internationally as Narendra Modi in India and Jair Bolsonaro in Brazil have also developed a populist base through social media, frequently through avoiding critical journalism and communicating to their bases directly (Waisbord, 2018). These examples show that the social media has made it nearly impossible to do political PR without it as it allows to communicate in a very personal, and real-time and very targeted way. However, the very tools that make democratic practices so powerful can be used to increase polarization, misinformation and erode trust in institutions, so it is important to remember that the digital revolution in political communication is a two-edged sword.

Going Viral: The Power of Shareable Political Content

The political content goes viral by taking their power in the blend of emotional appeal, controversy, relatability, and meme culture that produces a digital artifact that travels fast through social media. Studies prove that information that causes arousing emotions, especially anger, awe, or moral outrage, is shared much more than neutral knowledge (Brady et al., 2021). Policies and statements that are controversial in nature create the engagement in what Benkler et al. (2018) call the networked propaganda, with the opposing groups serving as amplifiers of the content through the debate. Relatability can make complicated political matters personal and the videos of AOC on TikTok explain policy using common similes (Jackson & Foucault Welles, 2022). Digital shorthand in the form of memes flourish with remix culture - the 2020 Bernie Sanders Mittens meme, to take one example, produced more than 3 million tweets in 48 hours by turning a politician into a collaborative cultural figure (Shifman, 2022). The viral environment favours the simple instead of the subtle, and studies indicate that emotionally-charged misinformation travels six times as fast as facts (Vosoughi et al., 2022), which is both a boon and a curse to the democratic process.

The modern political virality is based on the networked amplification, in which the force multipliers of political messages are influencers, activists and grassroots movements. According to

Freelon et al. (2020), there are three paths of amplification, including the organic sharing of engaged citizens, professional ones by influencers/pundits, and automated ones through bots/algorithms. Such progressive activists as the Sunrise Movement show organic amplification, turning to Instagram stories and TikTok challenges to recruit climate voters under age (Thorson et al., 2021). On the other hand, right-wing activists, such as Charlie Kirk (Turning Point USA) are the bright representatives of professional amplification, making the complicated policies into easy-to-share talking points to their millions of followers (Lewis, 2022). This ecosystem establishes the so-called participatory propaganda (Woolley & Howard, 2018) in which regular users involuntarily disseminate tactical messages. The (BlackLivesMatter) initiative is an example of the grassroots-level power - the research indicates that the tweets with the hashtag had been shared 42 percent more frequently when posted by activist accounts as compared to famous people (Yang et al., 2022). Nevertheless, there are some dark sides of this democratization: there are so-called astroturfing campaigns that pretend to be grassroots support, and inflammatory content is favored by algorithms (Roberts, 2022). The landscape which emerges gives new political voices strength but has created a disjuncture in the consensus reality that threatens the control paradigms in traditional PR.

Challenges and Risks of Viral Political PR

Virality of political content in the digital era has brought with it more challenges than ever before especially on misinformation, deep fakes, and polarizing narratives. Misinformation proliferates in a context where emotional appeal surpasses the truthfulness of the message, which according to Vosoughi et al. (2018) research indicates that the false news successively spreads at a much higher rate and across a wider range of platforms such as Twitter. This problem is compounded by the emergence of deepfake, whereby more realistic-looking than ever but fake videos or audio recordings can defame someone or distort the perceptions of a given population (Chesney & Citron, 2019). As an example, a doctored video of house speaker Nancy Pelosi slurring her words went viral during the 2020 U.S. election, showing how synthetic media can mislead viewers very easily (Brennan Center for Justice, 2020). This is already a complicated environment in which polarizing content serves to complicate it even further because algorithms on such platforms as Facebook and YouTube are designed to maximize engagement, which can lead to polarizing rhetoric being encouraged, thus strengthening the echo chambers (Benkler et al., 2018). This is because they undermine popular confidence in institutions and provide a breeding ground of conspiracy theories, and it is becoming hard to know what discourse to believe and what a coordinated disinformation campaign is.

Contemporary media environment has drastically changed the conventional PR approach to the point where political actors can practically no longer control the narrative. The information ecosystem that we now live in is highly disintegrated into myriads of platforms, each of which has its algorithm, influencers, and communities, unlike the time of press releases and controlled media interactions (Tufekci, 2017). Now, gatekeepers no longer help politicians and their PR teams to filter or place their messages in context, as grassroots movements, rogue influencers, or even foreign actors can fly-jack or bend the narratives in real-time (Woolley & Howard, 2019). To take one example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, public health officials were unable to address vaccine misinformation that anti-vaccine activists had been spreading and algorithmic recommendations had been promoting it (Cinelli et al., 2020). The lack of centralized control means that crises can escalate rapidly, as seen in the case of "cancel culture" controversies, where

offhand remarks or outdated statements resurface and go viral, often with disproportionate consequences (Ng, 2020). PR professionals are required to be vigilant and flexible in this environment, and now they are forced to participate in real-time responses, pre-message, and online forensics to reduce the reputational risks.

Viral tactics can be a brilliant idea, even when harmless in intent, and can backfire in spectacular fashion, proving that digital PR is a two-edged sword. One notable example is the 2017 "DeleteUber" campaign, which began as a grassroots protest against the company's perceived exploitation of a taxi strike but escalated into a full-blown reputational crisis due to the platform's viral nature (Scheiber, 2017). In a similar vein, politicians have received criticism towards their unintended efforts to jump into a viral trend without any idea what they were talking about like when older politicians tried to use memes or slang in a way that they were not relevant to (Shifman, 2022). There are also situations when virality manipulation has been uncovered, including the fact that consulting company Cambridge Analytica has used illicitly accessed Facebook data to micro-target voters, which caused a worldwide outcry and backlash by the authorities (Cadwalladr & Graham-Harrison, 2018). These illustrations highlight the dangers of viral PR: although the possibility of fast, mass participation is tempting, the fact that there is no control over the message, the exacerbation of the unintended effects, and the ethical issues of controlling people are dangerous. Political communicators need to keep the temptation of virality in check without losing the sense of authenticity, accountability and the integrity of facts in the cynical environment of the digital world.

The Future of Political PR: AI, Personalization, and Beyond

The field of political PR is about to undergo a sea change because of the advent of new technologies such as artificial intelligence (AI), micro-targeting, and hyper-personalized messaging that will revolutionize the way politics is conducted and how politicians relate with the electorates. Already, the AI-generated content is a phenomenon, and with the help of such tools as ChatGPT and deepfake synthesizers, it is possible to create realistic speeches, social media posts, and even synthetic media with candidates (Chesney & Citron, 2019). The same developments enable campaigns to create enormous amounts of personalized content at an unprecedented pace, and they bring with them the issue of authenticity and misinformation. Micro-targeting, powered by big data analytics, is becoming increasingly sophisticated, enabling political operatives to segment audiences with surgical precision and deliver customized messages that resonate with individual voters' values, fears, and aspirations (Zuiderveen Borgesius et al., 2018). Hyper-personalized messaging goes one step further and uses behavioral data to create personal appeals to every voter, which could help to engage more people but leads to further polarization of society as it supports filter bubbles (Paris, 2023). With the maturity of these technologies, political PR is expected to change dramatically in terms of the nature of political communication as it moves away from the generalized, one-size-fits-all campaigns to highly dynamic interactions that respond to the profile of the individual voters in real-time.

In the future, political PR might be further transformed by such advanced technologies as virtual reality (VR) and blockchain. VR campaigns may soon enable voters to "attend" rallies or participate in policy simulations from their living rooms, creating immersive experiences that foster deeper emotional connections with candidates (Gutierrez et al., 2022). The transparency and verifiability of the blockchain technology could be used to fight the misleading information by setting up unchangeable records of political statements and policy positions to which voters can follow

changes of opinion or flip-flops (Tapscott & Tapscott, 2021). However, these innovations also present challenges: VR could be weaponized to create manipulative emotional appeals, while blockchain's complexity may limit its accessibility to average voters. Another frontier that may erase the boundary between persuasion and manipulation is the emergence of neuro-marketing approaches, where the brainwave data are used to maximize the effectiveness of political messaging (Ienca & Andorno, 2022). With these technologies coming together, a political campaign in the future can take on the form of a high-tech multisensory experience that exploits the use of biometric information, superimposed augmented reality, and predictive models to affect voter behavior in ways that would have been considered science fiction.

Such technological discoveries pose serious ethical issues which require prompt regulatory measures. Political PR done by using AI is potentially leading to an arms race in fake media and algorithm-optimized propaganda that may destroy democratic practice (Bennett & Livingston, 2021). The result of micro-targeting and hyper-personalization is the disintegration of the collective sphere because voters, depending on their profile, receive radically different information, and the common grounds in factual knowledge become more and more difficult to agree on (Zuiderveen Borgesius et al., 2022). There are also concerns about data privacy, as political campaigns harvest increasingly intimate details about voters' lives to fuel their targeting algorithms (Hartzog, 2023). Existing laws, which do exist, are pathetically inefficient in dealing with these issues, and are usually years out of date with the technology. Some scholars advocate for "algorithmic transparency" laws that would require disclosure of targeting criteria (Diakopoulos, 2021), while others propose strict limits on the use of biometric data in political campaigning (Ienca & Andorno, 2022). There is an urgent need by the international community to come up with norms and standards of ethical political PR in the digital age to balance between innovation and the safeguards of democratic integrity. As these technologies are developing even further, the main question is whether they will be used to facilitate democratic interaction or they will become the instrument of unprecedented manipulation in the possession of people who can afford them. The solution can spell the fate of democracy itself.

Conclusion

The evolution of political PR from traditional press releases to viral digital content reflects a fundamental shift in how power, information, and public engagement intersect in the modern era. What began as a tightly controlled system of media gatekeepers and scripted messaging has transformed into a dynamic, decentralized landscape where authenticity, speed, and shareability often outweigh polished professionalism. Social media platforms have democratized political communication, allowing grassroots movements and outsider candidates to compete with established elites but they have also introduced new vulnerabilities, from misinformation to algorithmic polarization. The rise of AI, micro-targeting, and immersive technologies like VR suggests this transformation is far from complete, promising even more personalized and emotionally charged political messaging in the years ahead. Yet, as the tools of persuasion grow more sophisticated, so too do the risks of manipulation, leaving societies to grapple with a critical question: In a world where viral content can sway elections and deepfakes can erode trust, how do we harness the power of digital PR without sacrificing democratic integrity?

The future of political communication will hinge on striking a delicate balance between innovation and accountability. While technologies like blockchain and algorithmic transparency offer partial solutions to misinformation and ethical concerns, they cannot replace the need for critical media

literacy among citizens and responsible practices among political actors. The lessons of recent years from the pitfalls of viral backlash to the dangers of unchecked micro-targeting underscore that technological advancement alone does not guarantee a healthier democracy. As we move forward, the challenge will be to cultivate a digital public sphere that encourages engagement without exploitation, diversity without fragmentation, and innovation without deception. The changing landscape of political PR is not just a story about new tools and tactics; it is a reflection of who we are as a society and who we aspire to become in an increasingly connected world. The choices we make today, from regulation to self-governance, will determine whether these changes ultimately strengthen or undermine the democratic process.

References

Allison, G., & Zelikow, P. (1999). *Essence of decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis* (2nd ed.). Longman.

Benkler, Y., Faris, R., & Roberts, H. (2018). *Network propaganda: Manipulation, disinformation, and radicalization in American politics.* Oxford University Press.

Bennett, W. L., & Livingston, S. (2021). The disinformation order: Disruptive communication and the decline of democratic institutions. *European Journal of Communication, 36*(2), 122–139. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323121998101

Bernstein, C., & Woodward, B. (1974). *All the president's men.* Simon & Schuster.

Brady, W. J., et al. (2021). How social learning amplifies moral outrage expression in digital social networks. *Science Advances, 7*(33), eabe5641.

Brennan Center for Justice. (2020). *How deepfakes could undermine elections.* https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/how-deepfakes-could-undermine-elections

Cadwalladr, C., & Graham-Harrison, E. (2018, March 17). Revealed: 50 million Facebook profiles harvested for Cambridge Analytica in major data breach. *The Guardian.* https://www.theguardian.com/news/2018/mar/17/cambridge-analytica-facebook-influence-us-election

Chesney, R., & Citron, D. (2019). Deep fakes: A looming challenge for privacy, democracy, and national security. *California Law Review, 107*(6), 1753–1819. https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38RV0D15R

Cinelli, M., Quattrociocchi, W., Galeazzi, A., Valensise, C. M., Brugnoli, E., Schmidt, A. L., ... & Scala, A. (2020). The COVID-19 social media infodemic. *Scientific Reports, 10*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-73510-5

Cogburn, D. L., & Espinoza-Vasquez, F. K. (2011). From networked nominee to networked nation: Examining the impact of Web 2.0 and social media on political participation and civic engagement in the 2008 Obama campaign. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics, 8*(1), 87–110. https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2010.517825

Diakopoulos, N. (2021). Algorithmic accountability: Journalistic investigation of computational power structures. *Digital Journalism, 9*(3), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2020.1813042

Enli, G. (2017). Twitter as arena for the authentic outsider: Exploring the social media campaigns of Trump and Clinton in the 2016 US presidential election. *European Journal of Communication, 32*(1), 50–61. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323116682802

Freberg, K., Graham, K., McGaughey, K., & Freberg, L. A. (2011). Who are the social media influencers? A study of public perceptions of personality. *Public Relations Review, 37*(1), 90–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2010.11.001

Freelon, D., et al. (2020). Black Twitter and the politics of viewing Scandal. *Social Media + Society, 6*(1), 1–14.

Gilbert, M. (1991). *Churchill: A life.* Henry Holt and Company.

Grunig, J. E., & Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing public relations.* Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Gutierrez, F., Pierce, J., Vergara, V., Coulton, P., & Alcaraz, M. (2022). Virtual reality for political engagement: The case of immigration policy. *New Media & Society, 24*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448211034567

Harris, R. (2005). *Politics and the rise of the press: Britain and France, 1620–1800.* Routledge.

Hartzog, W. (2023). *Privacy's blueprint: The battle to control the design of new technologies.* Harvard University Press.

Ienca, M., & Andorno, R. (2022). Towards new human rights in the age of neuroscience and neurotechnology. *Life Sciences, Society and Policy, 18*(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40504-022-00136-y

Jackson, S. J., & Foucault Welles, B. (2022). #Ferguson is everywhere: Initiators in emerging counterpublic networks. *Information, Communication & Society, 25*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2021.1962947

Jenkins, H., Shresthova, S., Gamber-Thompson, L., Kligler-Vilenchik, N., & Zimmerman, A. (2018). *By any media necessary: The new youth activism.* NYU Press.

Kreiss, D. (2016). *Prototype politics: Technology-intensive campaigning and the data of democracy.* Oxford University Press.

Lewis, R. (2022). *This is why we can't have nice things: Mapping the relationship between online trolling and mainstream culture.* MIT Press.

McCombs, M., & Shaw, D. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 36*(2), 176–187. https://doi.org/10.1086/267990

Ng, E. (2020). No grand pronouncements here...: Reflections on cancel culture and digital media participation. *Television & New Media, 21*(6), 621–627. https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476420918828

Ott, B. L. (2017). The age of Twitter: Donald J. Trump and the politics of debasement. *Critical Studies in Media Communication, 34*(1), 59–68. https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2016.1266686

Paris, B. (2023). The filter bubble revisited: How personalization fragments the public sphere. *Journal of Communication, 73*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqac045

Roberts, S. T. (2022). *Behind the screen: Content moderation in the shadows of social media.* Yale University Press.

Roosevelt, F. D. (1941, December 8). *Day of infamy speech.* U.S. Congressional Record.

Scheiber, N. (2017, February 2). How Uber's backlash built up over years, and finally boiled over. *The New York Times.* https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/02/business/how-ubers-backlash-built-up-over-years-and-finally-boiled-over.html

Shifman, L. (2022). *Memes in digital culture* (2nd ed.). MIT Press.

Stromer-Galley, J. (2014). *Presidential campaigning in the Internet age.* Oxford University Press.

Tapscott, D., & Tapscott, A. (2021). *Blockchain revolution: How the technology behind bitcoin is changing money, business, and the world.* Penguin.

Tandoc, E. C., Lim, Z. W., & Ling, R. (2018). Defining "fake news": A typology of scholarly definitions. *Digital Journalism, 6*(2), 137–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2017.1360143

Thorson, K., et al. (2021). Platform civics: Facebook in the local information infrastructure. *New Media & Society, 23*(8), 2224–2242.

Tufekci, Z. (2017). *Twitter and tear gas: The power and fragility of networked protest.* Yale University Press.

Vaccari, C., & Valeriani, A. (2021). *Outside the bubble: Social media and political participation in Western democracies.* Oxford University Press.

Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science, 359*(6380), 1146–1151. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559

Waisbord, S. (2018). The elective affinity between post-truth communication and populist politics. *Communication Research and Practice, 4*(1), 17–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/22041451.2018.1428928

Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). *Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policymaking.* Council of Europe.

Woolley, S. C., & Howard, P. N. (2018). *Computational propaganda: Political parties, politicians, and political manipulation on social media.* Oxford University Press.

Yang, G., et al. (2022). Networked framing: How advocacy organizations shape social media discourse. *Journal of Communication, 72*(1), 78–99.

Zuiderveen Borgesius, F., Möller, J., Kruikemeier, S., Fathaigh, R., Irion, K., Dobber, T., ... & de Vreese, C. (2018). Online political microtargeting: Promises and threats for democracy. *Utrecht Law Review, 14*(3), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.18352/ulr.420