

Hate on the Screen: Dynamics, Causes, and Consequences of Aggressive Online Communication

Daniele Battista, PhD
University of Salerno, Italy

Abstract

This study focuses on how language used online, especially in politics, is closely linked to violence. Often, what people write or say online not only spreads hatred and creates divisions but can also lead to actual episodes of physical violence. First and foremost, it is essential to understand which linguistic strategies push public debates to become increasingly extreme and which ways of speaking justify aggressive attitudes. To this end, we analysed both online content and scientific studies to see how digital platforms promote the spread of extreme ideas and fuel social conflict. What clearly emerges is that political leaders are increasingly using technology to influence public opinion, often with messages that increase divisions in society. In essence, the language that circulates online not only influences people's opinions but can also make hatred in various forms seem normal. Understanding how these dynamics work is important if we want to promote a healthier, more balanced and respectful public debate.

Keywords: digital violence; public discourse; hate speech; political communication; digital platforms

Introduction

Political communication has evolved drastically in the digital era of today. New rules, strategies, and dynamics brought by social media have mixed with, and occasionally challenge, the conventional ways the media used to shape political messaging¹. The latter is defined as a form of communication in which mass media play a central role in setting the collective agendas of a political system, transmitting information according to codified formats and influencing events and social activities². The hybridization between traditional media and new media has led to a redefinition of democracy in relation to communication, with a new configuration of the relationship between politics and digital platforms³. In this scenario, a hybrid media ecosystem has emerged in which, although digital innovation has fostered disintermediation and provided space for citizens' demands, mass media still play a significant role in shaping the political agenda⁴. From this perspective, significant changes stand out, such as the

¹ Van Dijck et al., 2018, p. 113.

² Mendonça et al., 2024, p. 76.

³ Cioffi et al., 2022.

⁴ Gilardi et al., 2022.

use of marketing techniques to influence political opinions, an increasingly unstable electorate, and a new way of understanding the relationship between politicians and citizens based on direct sharing and the removal of intermediaries. Digitalization has deeply transformed political communication, bringing important challenges: polarization and partisanship have grown stronger on social networks, and there is often a difficult coexistence between traditional media and social platforms⁵. In this context, new communication strategies have emerged that rely on digital logic and the influence of algorithms, but also on the ongoing interaction between traditional media and social media. This complicated coexistence has encouraged the development of a populist communication style that starts from the bottom up and emphasizes immediacy and disintermediation—that is, the ability to overcome the gap between what really happens in politics and how it is perceived or presented⁶. The use of social media has acquired a central role in the communicative strategies of political leaders, providing them with tools to interact directly with an active electorate, thereby consolidating their political agenda. Digital presence is mainly articulated in two directions: on the one hand, the construction of a direct and personalized relationship with the electoral base through the monitoring of online reactions and consensus; on the other, the management of credibility and reputation, also on digital platforms⁷. Public opinion is controlled through “agenda trending” practices, where cognitive communities quickly cluster around polarizing issues, significantly influencing public debate⁸. In line with this trend, interactive political leadership emerges as a key strategy for managing communicative dynamics on digital platforms. Social media allow leaders to horizontally insert themselves into the everyday lives of users who are less involved in political polarization, offering new forms of interaction that redefine the relationship between citizens and politics, both online and offline. In this highly digitalized era, previously unseen dynamics and challenges have emerged, driven by the evolution of new information technologies and the growing global connectivity. Digital platforms, especially social networks, redraw traditional paradigms of the public sphere, promoting new forms of interaction between political actors, the media, and citizens. In this sense, the flow of political messages is faster and more omnipresent, significantly influencing the formation of public opinion and the creation of dominant narratives. However, the virtual environment renders political discourse vulnerable to phenomena such as misinformation, polarization, and manipulation, with considerable implications for the stability of democratic debate. The absence of editorial filters and the algorithmic logic of platforms prioritize the visibility of sensationalist and emotional content, contributing to the radicalization of positions and the normalization of hostile language. Moreover, the increasingly close connection

⁵ Perloff 2021, p. 189.

⁶ Kritzinger et al., 2021.

⁷ Heavey et al., 2020.

⁸ Brown et al., 2023.

between political communication and digital participation strategies has strengthened the persuasive power of political leaders, giving them tools to influence public debate through targeted—and sometimes even manipulative—communication practices. For this reason, it becomes ever more important to explore the relationship between language, politics, and technology, in order to understand how public discourse is evolving and what risks may arise from the growing blurring of lines between symbolic expression and actual forms of violence, both online and offline. In any case, behind this democratization of access to information lies the widespread online presence of highly controversial elements, including aggressive and violent rhetoric. In fact, this type of content tends to go viral because social media algorithms favour materials that provoke intense emotional reactions, including those of a violent nature⁹. This refers to all forms of communication that fuel hatred, discrimination, and violence toward individuals or groups based on characteristics such as race, ethnicity, religion, gender, or sexual orientation. This issue has increasingly drawn the attention of scholars and institutions because it represents a real threat to social cohesion and the proper functioning of democracy¹⁰. The article aims to explore how political communication can influence the spread of violent discourse and promote online polarization. Through a critical review of existing studies, it will seek to understand how changes in political communication contribute to the spread of harmful messages and to what extent these phenomena can worsen social and political conditions.

Theoretical background and digital implications

Political communication represents a crucial field in shaping social dynamics and constructing the collective imagination, as it deeply influences the public perception of political phenomena and the formation of consensus¹¹. Through the interaction between institutional actors, media, and citizens, it not only transmits information and strategic messages but also actively contributes to structuring public debate and developing dominant narratives within a society. Today, with digital technology everywhere and media more interconnected than ever, political communication has become much more complex. Emotions, symbols, and ways of persuading mix with the algorithms of social platforms¹². This has changed how politicians and institutions relate to voters, opening new possibilities for participation, mobilization, and being heard. But political communication isn't just about spreading information: it also plays an important role in creating a collective identity and legitimizing certain powers. It acts as a device of meaning-making, guiding how citizens interpret political and social reality, thereby influencing not only individual opinions but also collective decision-

⁹ Westwood et al., 2022.

¹⁰ Battista, & Uva, 2024.

¹¹ de Arruda et al., 2022.

¹² Battista, & Salzano, 2022.

making processes. In light of these considerations, the study of political communication is essential for understanding the transformations of the public sphere, the dynamics of influence between media and politics, and the consequences of digitalization on democratic governance. The analysis of its strategies, tools, and effects therefore constitutes a central research area for developing interpretive models capable of deciphering the complexity of the contemporary communication ecosystem. It is important to underline here that, through language, political leaders transmit messages that can potentially shape public opinion, direct electoral preferences, and meld the perception of institutions and general demands. However, the use of political jargon is not always aimed at neutrality or constructiveness; it can become a screen for channelling divisive and violent impulses. This mechanism raises significant reflections on the consequences that verbal violence exerts on the social fabric, democratic institutions, and civil coexistence. Considering the degree of violence and aggressiveness present in elements of political communication, this can manifest in many different forms. It is not only openly vehement or offensive expressions but also more subtle forms of linguistic aggression, such as delegitimizing political opponents, using stereotypes and prejudices, or hate rhetoric¹³. The objective of such stylistic approaches is often to dehumanize or criminalize a group of people, an ethnic group, a social class, or a particular political identity, fostering a sense of threat or danger. On the other hand, a central component of verbal insults in the political arena consists of combining and spreading the notion of an “enemy.” Identifying a particular group or person as the main cause of social or economic problems is a common rhetorical practice and can lead to the creation of a narrative intended to incite contempt and hostility¹⁴. This enemy can be internal, such as a rival political party, or external, such as an ethnic or religious minority often used as a scapegoat¹⁵. Undoubtedly, one of the main consequences of resorting to violence in political communications is the process of social polarization. This manifests when political and social opinions shift toward exaggerated distances, restricting the space for dialogue and the search for balance. In this sense, the presence of interventions that tend to exacerbate existing conflicts induces citizens to firmly identify with one of two factions and to perceive anyone with divergent beliefs as an enemy. Moreover, such radicalization of positions is not limited to the ideological realm but can affect interpersonal relationships, pushing toward increasing social fragmentation. A relevant example of this occurred in the United States during and after the 2016 presidential election campaign, where aggressive and divisive language, widely spread by the media and social networks, caused growing episodes of tension among different communities (Heltzel & Laurin, 2020). Data indicate that verbal and physical attacks directed at certain ethnic, religious, and

¹³ Bentivegna, & Rega, 2022.

¹⁴ De Blasio, & Sorice, 2023.

¹⁵ Cohen-Almagor 2011.

political groups increased considerably during that period¹⁶. In reality, this phase began even earlier in the United States. Susan Herbst¹⁷ already pointed this out in 2010 in her book *Rude Democracy*, where she analysed with concern the dynamics of political confrontation during Obama's rise to the presidency. The American scholar observed how deliberately incorrect and aggressive practices were emerging that, despite undermining the quality of public debate, gained legitimacy and appeal. These forms of political interaction, based on the ostentation of incivility, attracted attention and fuelled tensions, laying the groundwork for an increasingly polarized climate. It should be added that the verbal component of communication can negatively affect trust in democratic institutions. Indeed, the delegitimization of the opponent, characteristic of this type of language, deteriorates the perception of the validity of the electoral process and the involved institutions¹⁸. In fact, if a political leader uses a message that questions the regularity of the election or accuses opponents of corruption or anti-democratic behaviour without concrete evidence, this can lead to a decline in trust toward the democratic process itself, opening the door to forms of authoritarianism or political instability. Furthermore, social networks have only intensified the problem of linguistic violence in politics. Platforms like Facebook, X, and Instagram facilitate the rapid and widespread circulation of political content, favouring the spread of hate speech, fake news, and polarizing propaganda. Although community guidelines and moderation algorithms are applied to limit the visibility of such content, on platforms like TikTok many videos of this nature manage to gain popularity¹⁹. The content dissemination dynamics on TikTok present peculiar characteristics compared to other social platforms like Facebook, X, and Instagram, especially regarding political communication and the circulation of polarizing content. Unlike traditional social networks, TikTok uses a very sophisticated algorithm that focuses on making content go viral based on how quickly it engages users and the interactions it generates, rather than relying on personal friendship or contact networks. This system allows political videos, even those with aggressive or manipulative tones, to quickly reach a wide audience, going beyond the usual ideological "bubbles." Another important aspect is that the content is short and audiovisual, which makes TikTok especially effective at delivering simple, emotionally engaging, and easily shareable political messages. The short format highlights the spectacle of politics, favouring populist and polarizing messages²⁰. Moreover, users can remix videos, create "duets," or respond, creating a highly interactive environment where political narratives can be amplified, distorted, or used for propaganda purposes in ways that traditional moderators struggle to control. Despite TikTok's efforts to limit the spread of false information, hate speech,

¹⁶ Piazza 2023.

¹⁷ Herbst 2010, p. 110.

¹⁸ Battista 2024a, p.179.

¹⁹ Battista 2023; Battista 2024b.

²⁰ Bastos, & Farkas, 2019.

and violent content through rules and moderation tools, the platform often struggles to stop them. Users manage to bypass these restrictions using creative strategies such as alternative codes, symbols, or text overlays on videos to evade automatic filters. Worldwide, TikTok has become a key tool in political communication strategies, both for institutions and unofficial groups, because it reaches mainly young people who are less likely to follow traditional channels. That's why it's important not only for politicians and parties but also for activists, influencers, and those involved in organized disinformation. TikTok's impact on public life and political discourse is significant, posing new challenges for regulating digital communication. The platform, with its rapid content circulation model, has deeply changed how political debate unfolds online, transforming propaganda and digital mobilization strategies²¹. Overall, all platforms tend to reward content that sparks strong emotions, even when it comes to violent or divisive messages, because they attract more attention than calmer ones. In short, this trend tends to reward content that hits people's emotions hard, often sidelining more balanced and thoughtful messages. Because sensational and polarizing stories grab more attention and spark more reactions, they tend to spread more easily—even when they're sometimes violent. As a result, the space for public conversation can suffer, with debates becoming more heated and opinions more extreme, making it harder to have calm, constructive discussions.

Violent connotations and amplification of the phenomenon

Even if it is used in order to impose an ideological vision that claims to be the only "true interpretation" of political reality, extremism can be defined as the inclination to drastically change the current political and social order even using violence. But in recent years, as political communication evolved and digital platforms became more widely used, the ways in which radicalism is expressed and disseminated have changed dramatically. The emergence of the new digital media ecosystem has clearly changed the character of extremism. Originally a phenomena limited to physically violent acts, it has progressively become rhetorical and psychological radicalized thanks to digital dynamics including anonymity and the absence of direct confrontation²². Historically, often with an eye toward anarchy and instability, extremism was expressed by planned demonstrations, riots, or physical confrontations with authorities. States have, however, improved their legislative and social control mechanisms over time, allowing them to stifle quite public demonstrations with great violence. New kinds of violence—less obvious but equally potent—symbolic, psychological, and progressively mediated through digital environments have emerged as a result²³. In the political sphere, indeed, a change has taken place redefining the very idea of "violence".

²¹ Zeng, & Abidin, 2023, pp. 93-115.

²² Sunstein 2018, p. 106.

²³ Benkler et al., 2018, p. 34.

Originally mostly expressed physically, violence today frequently takes psychological and verbal forms, enhanced by the logic of digital communication. Hate speech, trolling, and the proliferation of false news have become main weapons through which violent language permeates online public conversation, so radicalizing opinions and escalating political polarizing. One of the main elements allowing online extremism to proliferate is anonymity. Many sites let users express themselves without disclosing their identity, usually by means of pseudonyms or profiles devoid of personal reference. Originally meant to defend freedom of expression, this has sometimes had the opposite effect: allowing the unbridled dissemination of hate speech and extreme rhetoric free from repercussions for those spreading them. Lack of direct confrontation eliminates many of the restraints that typically control social interaction, hence online communication becomes more aggressive and polarized²⁴. Today, divisive and aggressive language finds rich ground in public conversation, frequently supported by political leaders themselves. One prominent example is Donald Trump, who extensively attacked journalists, political rival, and minority groups on Twitter even during his first term. By doing this, he helped to normalize a harsh, negative attitude once thought unacceptable. Along with inflammatory remarks about immigrants—sometimes labeled as “criminals” or “rapists”—his regular use of the term fake news to discredit critical media highlights this change²⁵. Driven by Trump’s own story of a stolen election, this kind of rhetoric not only heightened political polarization but also stoked growing radicalism, which resulted in the Capitol insurrection on January 6, 2021. The phenomena of disinformation and false news is another important element promoting the dissemination of extreme opinions online. False or altered knowledge is a useful weapon for supporting extreme narratives and denigration of rivals. False information is reportedly far more likely than confirmed news to go viral²⁶. One obvious example is the 2016 American presidential contest, in which false news meant to sway public opinion was spread using Facebook and Twitter—now X. The *Pizzagate* conspiracy theory, which claimed Democratic Party members were running a paedophiles ring, is one infamous example. Real-world fallout from this included an armed attack on a Washington pizzeria by a man convinced the narrative was accurate. Fake news is real “media hallucinations”—narrative constructions with no factual basis that, once disseminated, start to seem rather true. These stories can set off a self-fulfilling prophecy whereby their broad dissemination overcomes their initial lack of factual grounding, so having actual influence on political and social dynamics. In this framework, we can describe an explanatory model of digital radicalization organized in phases ranging from first exposure to possible active mobilization. Fundamentally, these are enabling conditions like anonymity and disintermediation, which lessen personal responsibility in digital environments, and platform algorithms

²⁴ Citron 2014, p. 90.

²⁵ Ott 2017.

²⁶ Vosoughi et al., 2018.

that support selective exposure and produce informational echo chambers. Here amplification dynamics are quite important: hate speech, trolling, and fake news help create alternative narratives that normalize aggressive language and discredit rivals. Further driving this process is support from political elites and influencers. Mechanisms like digital tribalism and echo chambers help to consolidate ideological identity and encourage the competitive dissemination of radical content, so turning political conflict into a kind of game—a phenomena known as gamification. Factors like the Overton window effect—where fringe ideas become accepted—and the greater virality of extreme content relative to moderate speech help to feed this vicious cycle. The outcomes might be rhetorical escalation, acceptance of verbal violence, and in extreme circumstances, actual mobilization via demonstrations or forceful action. Several scholarly studies indicate that the influence of even low percentage of violent content on internet is far from minimal. Given the enormous volume of material flying around social media, a 22% rise in interaction with hate content over neutral content is noteworthy. Multiplying this modest increase across millions of daily contacts results in astonishing absolute numbers. The logic of social media, which prizes speed and emotional intensity regardless of truth or quality, accentuates the virality of violent material. Consequently, even a little quantity of extreme content can have a significant impact since it fuels social conflict and division. Such material often finds an already receptive audience, so supporting current opinions and eliciting strong emotions like anger and fear that motivate more sharing. This helps violent language to become accepted in public conversation, so lowering the social acceptability threshold and validating actions that would have been disapproved of past times. For vulnerable groups—ethnic, religious, or political minorities—who experience discrimination, isolation, and growing sense of anxiety, the repercussions are especially negative. In essence, even if hate messages account for a small portion of all the content available online, their constant presence compromises public debate, strengthens polarization, and reduces the forum for honest, productive communication. In essence, even a little bit of violent material can have a disproportionate influence, so compromising democratic procedures and the standard of political communication.

Prospects and solutions for informed dialogue

These phenomena should not be viewed in a vacuum, but rather as closely related to normative action. This is situated within a theoretical framework that is inextricably linked to the disorder of information and the decline of public discourse, which is also causing the lines between truth and falsity to blur. The stability and standard of democratic discourse are undermined by this circumstance, which creates an atmosphere where violent and offensive content frequently escalates into personal threats. A vicious cycle results from this situation: in addition to warping reality, misinformation also serves as a stage for verbal abuse and assaults. Furthermore,

by influencing the consistency of narrative frameworks, the problem of fake news drastically changes the phenomenon²⁷. Given this, it is imperative to create a comprehensive regulatory framework that recognizes the connections between these aspects and fosters an environment based on mutual respect and productive discourse. Therefore, the development of a critical-thinking and informed society becomes essential to upholding the standard of democratic discourse and guaranteeing a safe and welcoming communication environment. Furthermore, the social sciences are at a significant epistemological crossroads in the complex world of today, where the internet has a significant impact on all facets of social life. One risk is that it will only describe the disruptive effects of new communicative dynamics, like the polarization of public discourse and the spread of harmful content. However, instead of just reclassifying them using analogical reasoning, there is a chance to conduct a more thorough analysis that aims to comprehend the essence of such phenomena. This method necessitates a critical analysis of interactions and a keen awareness of the moral and societal ramifications of digital technology use. Effective counterstrategies must be reinforced and put into practice in order to address the complex issues related to verbal violence and aggression in online political language. In order to detect and eliminate violent or hateful content, this involves advocating for stronger moderation guidelines on digital platforms. While collaboration between governmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, and tech companies can help develop tools for reporting and tracking extremist expressions, awareness campaigns can play a big part by promoting the use of inclusive and respectful language. The development of a type of counter speech—a communication tactic intended to counteract hate and misinformation by providing alternate narratives rather than censoring them—becomes especially pertinent in this light. This strategy is predicated on addressing hate speech with compassion, refuting its claims, and encouraging a productive discussion as opposed to escalating polarizations. Counter speech proponents contend that by encouraging deradicalization and amicable dispute resolution, this strategy can stop verbal violence from getting worse. Eight counter speech tactics have been identified by Susan Benesch, a researcher with the Dangerous Speech Project: presenting facts to dispel myths or incorrect impressions, offering substantiated data to refute divisive discourse. A warning about the negative effects hate speech can have on society, both online and offline. Identifying with the original speaker or the intended audience in order to promote empathy and create a more productive dialogue channel. Instead of confronting someone directly, try to communicate in a more humane and understanding manner by using an empathic tone. In the digital world, where communication speeds and viral content necessitate prompt and efficient responses, counter speech is especially pertinent. In this sense, programs like the Online Civil Courage Initiative (OCCI), which was created by Facebook and the

²⁷ Olan et al., 2024.

Institute for Strategic Dialogue, aim to stop hate speech by using active engagement techniques. By providing resources to specifically address extremist narratives on social media, OCCI assists groups and activists working to advance counter speech. Three distinct counter speech tactics—humor, consequences warnings, and empathy—were investigated in a Swiss study²⁸ to combat xenophobic posts on Twitter. Only the sympathetic approach among these demonstrated a reduction in hate speech, albeit a slight one. This implies that over time, focused and repeated interventions might prove more successful. Facebook’s Counter speech Hub is one example of an initiative that highlights the significance of implementing coordinated strategies to address the growing prevalence of hate speech online. Counter speech seeks to change public discourse and promote a more responsible and inclusive communication environment in addition to eliminating harmful content. In this way, encouraging user engagement and productive discussion can help to create safer online spaces that are less likely to be violent and more supportive of openness and respect for one another. In this regard, we also need to take into account the work of two distinguished Belgian academics, Chaïm Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca²⁹, who over the past few decades have developed the idea of a “new rhetoric.” The goal of their work is to develop a number of discursive strategies that can combat rhetorical contamination and lexical manipulation. In addition to addressing the necessity of avoiding argumentative distortions, their strategy promotes the establishment of a rational discussion forum that is characterized by moral and intellectual norms. As a result, the new rhetoric is promoted as a way to improve discourse quality by encouraging interactions between interlocutors that are as knowledgeable, logical, and courteous as possible. The goal of this theoretical framework is to provide a strong foundation for reconsidering modern communication dynamics and promoting a critical, respectful, and constructive dialogue. In fact, language would be viewed as a tool for mutual understanding and exchange rather than just a way to persuade. Thus, the Treatise on Argumentation becomes a crucial resource for tackling the contemporary issue of violent political language, highlighting the necessity of truthful and productive communication in the divisive environment of today. In the end, the demand for an argumentative style that fosters consensus and respect for one another becomes crucial in an environment where combative rhetoric and discursive manipulation appear to predominate. The authors emphasize the need to tailor any discourse to the audience and the situation, which may lessen the divisive impact of today’s political rhetoric. Furthermore, their focus on persuasion as a key component of polite conversation highlights the urgent need for communication techniques that not only steer clear of verbal abuse but also foster mutual respect and shared values. The framework of the new rhetoric could be a useful theoretical lens through which to reimagine current discursive dynamics, encouraging a use of language that builds bridges rather than erecting barriers. This is

²⁸ Hangartner et al. 2022.

²⁹ Perelman, & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1958, p. 56.

because political leaders need to use political communication to build consensus and shape public opinion, and political communication has a profound impact on society.

Conclusion

A climate of tension and conflict has been exacerbated by the increasingly divisive and inflammatory language used, which makes it more difficult to have productive and healthy conversations. Political language today actively shapes attitudes, widens rifts, and promotes intolerance rather than merely reflecting societal trends. Given this, it is imperative to reconsider political discourse in a way that encourages mutual respect and communication as opposed to outright conflict. This phenomenon is not limited to TV talk shows or institutional debates. It has a significant impact on public opinion, influencing how people view social interactions and politics. More radical viewpoints have resulted from the increase in verbal and symbolic violence in public life, which has limited opportunities for productive interaction and fueled the ideological division of society. Social media platforms have also accelerated this trend. However, the significance of verbal abuse and its detrimental impacts are frequently understated in the larger discussion surrounding this matter. It is a fact, though, that public messages have become more aggressive and harsh. Although the causes of this trend are numerous and intricate, the political class bears a large portion of the blame as it becomes more and more involved in the depoliticization process³⁰. Politicians frequently come across as disconnected from the needs and realities of the people, which exacerbates mistrust of institutions in a world where the divide between citizens and political leaders has widened³¹. Propaganda has surpassed genuine communication, and political language has become noticeably more combative. Parties and programs have become less important, and public confidence in political parties has drastically decreased. Today, identification with a leader has supplanted party affiliation, this slow change has resulted in a loss of communication, transparency, and the ability to resolve conflicts through mutual understanding. Instead of promoting public awareness, digital platforms that could have gotten people more involved in politics have frequently been used to cultivate and strengthen devoted voter bases. Rigid moralism, which is frequently exhibited by movements and parties that portray digital dynamics as indicators of advancement, has served more as a showpiece than as an actual reform tool. Reestablishing a connection between politics and the social dimension becomes crucial if political language has such a powerful impact on citizens. Only by using language carefully and responsibly can this reconciliation be achieved. A major threat to democracy, aggressive political speech is more than just a fashion statement. It degrades political discourse, erodes institutional trust, and feeds a disinformation

³⁰ De Beinst 2017, p. 176.

³¹ Laclau 1977, p. 89.

culture where it is harder to distinguish between fact and fiction. The very cornerstones of a robust, participatory democracy are undermined by verbal aggression, which also stifles pluralistic discourse and the exchange of ideas. Accordingly, contemporary political communication should be viewed as an active force influencing a country's political culture, with tangible consequences for social cohesion and voting behavior, rather than just a reflection of the times. In addition to reflecting the crisis of political representation, the increasing polarization of language runs the risk of exacerbating it and reducing the opportunities for inclusive and democratic discourse. With major ramifications for social cohesion and democratic stability, the rise of violent rhetoric in digital political communication is a difficult problem. The dissemination of hate speech and extremist rhetoric is facilitated by anonymity and the absence of face-to-face interaction. Political polarization is also exacerbated by the divisive communication tactics employed by political leaders. To stop digital extremism and promote more responsible and inclusive political discourse, it is imperative to regulate social media platforms and implement policies to combat misinformation.

Bibliography

1. Alakali, Terfa T., Faga, Hemen Philip. and Mbursa, Jinatu. "Audience Perception of Hate Speech and Foul Language in the Social Media in Nigeria: Implications for Morality and Law." *Academicus International Scientific Journal*, vol. 15, 2017, pp. 166-183., <https://doi.org/10.7336/academicus.2017.15.11>.
2. Bastos, M., & Farkas, J. (2019). "Donald Trump is my President!": The internet research agency propaganda machine. *Social Media+ Society*, 5(3), 2056305119865466.
3. Battista, D. (2024a). *TikTok Politics: Influenze e interazioni sociali*. Milano: Meltemi.
4. Battista, D. (2024b). Political communication in the age of artificial intelligence: an overview of deepfakes and their implications. *Society Register*, 8(2), 7-24.
5. Battista, D. (2023). For better or for worse: politics marries pop culture (TikTok and the 2022 Italian elections). *Society Register*, 7(1), 117-142.
6. Battista, D., & Uva, G. (2024). Navigating the virtual realm of hate: Analysis of policies combating online hate speech in the Italian-European context. *Law, Technology and Humans*, 6(1), 48-58.
7. Battista, D., & Salzano, D. (2022). Political storytelling and the "Giorgia's Meloni case". *Central European Political Science Review*, 23, 73-91.
8. Benkler, Y., Faris, R., & Roberts, H. (2018). *Network Propaganda: Manipulation, Disinformation, and Radicalization in American Politics*. UK: Oxford University Press.

9. Bentivegna, S., & Rega, R. (2022). *La politica dell'inciviltà*. Roma-Bari: Laterza
10. Brown, K., Mondon, A., & Winter, A. (2023). The far right, the mainstream and mainstreaming: Towards a heuristic framework. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 28(2), 162-179.
11. Cioffi, J. W., Kenney, M. F., & Zysman, J. (2022). Platform power and regulatory politics: Polanyi for the twenty-first century. *New Political Economy*, 27(5), 820-836.
12. Citron, D. (2014). *Hate Crimes in Cyberspace*. Usa: Harvard University Press
13. Cohen-Almagor, R. (2011). Fighting hate and bigotry on the Internet. *Policy & Internet*, 3(3), 1-26.
14. de Arruda, H. F., Cardoso, F. M., de Arruda, G. F., Hernández, A. R., da Fontoura Costa, L., & Moreno, Y. (2022). Modelling how social network algorithms can influence opinion polarization. *Information Sciences*, 588, 265-278.
15. De Benoist, A. (2017). *Populismo: La fine della destra e della sinistra*. Bologna: Arianna Editrice.
16. De Blasio, E., & Sorice, M. (2023). Il disordine informativo e l'odio in rete. Democrazia a rischio= Information disorder and online hatred. Democracy at risk. *H-ermes. Journal of Communication*, 2023(23), 217-243.
17. Gilardi, F., Gessler, T., Kubli, M., & Müller, S. (2022). Social media and political agenda setting. *Political communication*, 39(1), 39-60.
18. Hangartner, D., Gennaro, G., Alasiri, S., Bahrich, N., Bornhoft, A., Boucher, J.,... & Donnay, K. (2021). Empathy-based counterspeech can reduce racist hate speech in a social media field experiment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 118(50), e2116310118.
19. Heavey, C., Simsek, Z., Kyprianou, C., & Risius, M. (2020). How do strategic leaders engage with social media? A theoretical framework for research and practice. *Strategic Management Journal*, 41(8), 1490-1527.
20. Herbst, S. (2010). *Rude democracy: Civility and incivility in American politics*. USA: Temple University Press.
21. Kritzinger, S., Foucault, M., Lachat, R., Partheymüller, J., Plescia, C., & Brouard, S. (2021). 'Rally round the flag': the COVID-19 crisis and trust in the national government. *West European Politics*, 44(5-6), 1205-1231.
22. Laclau, E. (1977). *Politics and ideology in Marxist theory*. New York: New Left Books.
23. Mendonça, R. F., Almeida, V., & Filgueiras, F. (2024). *Algorithmic Institutionalism: the changing rules of social and political life*. UK: Oxford University Press.

24. Olan, F., Jayawickrama, U., Arakpogun, E. O., Suklan, J., & Liu, S. (2024). Fake news on social media: the impact on society. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 26(2), 443-458.
25. 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.
26. Papa Gusho, Leticja. and Mitrushi, Marsela. "The manifestation of disturbing behavior on adolescents as a result of using violent video-games." *Academicus International Scientific Journal*, vol. 16, 2017, pp. 113-121., <https://doi.org/10.7336/academicus.2017.16.08>.
27. Perelman, C. & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1958). *Traité de l'argumentation*. Vol. 1. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
28. Perloff, R. M. (2021). *The dynamics of political communication: Media and politics in a digital age*. London: Routledge.
29. Piazza, J. A. (2023). Political polarization and political violence. *Security Studies*, 32(3), 476-504.
30. Sorice, M. (2020). La «piattaformizzazione» della sfera pubblica. *Comunicazione politica*, 21(3), 371-388.
31. Sunstein, C. R. (2018). *#Republic: Divided Democracy in the Age of Social Media*. Usa: Princeton University Press.
32. Van Dijck, J.; Poell, T.; De Waal, M. (2018). *The Platform Society: Public Values in a Connective World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
33. Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). "The spread of true and false news online." *Science*, 359(6380), 1146-1151.
34. Westwood, S. J., Grimmer, J., Tyler, M., & Nall, C. (2022). Current research overstates American support for political violence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(12), e2116870119.
35. Zeng, J., & Abidin, C. (2023). '# OkBoomer, time to meet the Zoomers': Studying the memefication of intergenerational politics on TikTok. In *The playful politics of memes* (pp. 93-115). London: Routledge.

© Academicus™

DP13193-DP13194 28-2010 Academicus International Scientific Journal
International Trademark Classification under the Nice Agreement

 Creative Commons License CC-BY-NC

Hate on the Screen: Dynamics, Causes, and Consequences of Aggressive Online Communication
by Daniele Battista
is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

Presented: May 2025

Included for Publishing: June 2025

Published: July 2025, Volume 16, Issue 32 Academicus International Scientific Journal