

Social Media, Populism, and Identity in Shaping Political Polarization

Suffianor¹

¹Universitas Muhammadiyah Palangkaraya, Indonesia

Correspondent: suffianor@umpr.ac.id¹

Received : February 20, 2025

Accepted : April 07, 2025

Published : April 30, 2025

Citation: Suffianor, (2025). Social Media, Populism, and Identity in Shaping Political Polarization. *Politeia : Journal of Public Administration and Political Science and International Relations*, 3(2), 72-84.

ABSTRACT: Political polarization represents a critical challenge for modern democracies, influencing political discourse, weakening institutional stability, and eroding civic trust. This review synthesizes key drivers, consequences, and global variations to provide an integrated understanding of its impact on democratic governance. Literature was systematically retrieved from Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar using keywords such as political polarization, affective polarization, partisan hostility, and democratic resilience. Studies were included if they addressed causes, consequences, or mitigation strategies within democratic contexts. The review synthesizes findings across quantitative, qualitative, and experimental research traditions. Findings show that polarization is fueled by the interaction of social media, populist rhetoric, and cultural identity conflicts, which collectively intensify both affective and ideological divisions. Consequences include reduced institutional effectiveness, weakened democratic norms, declining public trust, and heightened extremism. Comparative analysis reveals that advanced democracies tend to face ideologically rooted polarization, while developing democracies are more affected by identity-based and socio-economic divisions. Despite contextual differences, polarization consistently weakens democratic resilience and erodes social cohesion. The discussion connects these findings to theories of democracy, highlights systemic factors such as inequality and weak representation, and considers policy responses including institutional reform, civic education, and media regulation. Future research is recommended to adopt interdisciplinary, comparative, and longitudinal approaches. This review contributes a unique synthesis of interdisciplinary and cross-regional insights, underscoring the urgency of addressing polarization to safeguard democratic systems in an increasingly fragmented environment.

Keywords: Political Polarization, Affective Polarization, Democratic Resilience, Populism, Social Media, Institutional Trust, Comparative Politics.



This is an open access article under the CC-BY 4.0 license

INTRODUCTION

Political polarization has become a defining feature of contemporary democracies, increasingly attracting the attention of scholars across disciplines. Over the past decade, research on polarization has expanded considerably, encompassing both ideological and affective dimensions

in a variety of national contexts. McCoy et al. (2018) emphasize that sharp polarization not only divides political parties but also generates societal tensions that negatively affect democratic stability. The roots of polarization lie in deeper social phenomena, where identity, belief systems, and fragmented norms of thought create opposing narratives among different social groups. This has transformed polarization from a purely political issue into a broader societal challenge that permeates democratic institutions and civic life.

Quantitative data demonstrate a significant rise in political polarization across countries in the last two decades. Akboğa et al. (2023) show that political polarization has extended into social and religious dimensions, reinforcing distrust in government institutions. Similarly, Freedom House reports indicate that countries experiencing democratic backsliding, such as Turkey, have witnessed heightened polarization between pro-democracy forces and authoritarian actors (Akboğa et al., 2023). These trends highlight the global relevance of polarization as both a symptom and a driver of democratic erosion.

The role of social media has further exacerbated these dynamics. Suk et al. (2021) reveal that distrust toward information from opposing groups intensifies affective polarization, where individuals increasingly adapt to perspectives aligned with their political identity. This pattern illustrates how digital platforms foster echo chambers that reinforce preexisting divisions, creating feedback loops of distrust and hostility. Benson (2023) supports these findings by linking polarization to an epistemic crisis, in which societies lose their capacity to establish consensus or shared understanding across factions. These dynamics raise concerns about how democratic systems can sustain deliberation when basic facts and truths are contested.

Empirical evidence underscores the consequences of polarization for extremism and public trust. Kligler-Vilenchik et al. (2020) document how divergent interpretations of political events on social media create significant gaps in opinion, often leading to confrontation. Similarly, survey data from multiple countries show sharp increases in negative attitudes toward political opponents, posing serious challenges to social integration and democratic endurance (Torcal & Carty, 2022). These findings point to the destabilizing effects of polarization, which extend beyond partisan politics into broader societal relations.

Another factor intensifying polarization is the rise of populism. Politicians frequently exploit polarization to consolidate support by framing politics in dichotomous terms of “us” versus “them.” Scholtz (2024) and Muhtadi & Warburton (2020) observe that populist parties often adopt polarizing rhetoric that mobilizes identity-based cleavages while undermining institutional checks and balances. As a result, political polarization has become not only a challenge for policymakers but also a threat to social cohesion and the normative foundations of democracy itself.

Managing polarization presents multifaceted challenges across institutional, social, and technological domains. Institutionally, polarization disrupts the functioning of governance structures and political parties. Marshall and Cole (2023) argue that factionalism within political systems weakens democracy by exacerbating conflicts of interest and alienation across groups. This fragmentation complicates the ability of policymakers to foster consensus and cooperation. In parallel, Osmundsen et al. (2021) emphasize that partisan polarization drives asymmetric information-sharing behaviors, further aggravating tensions between political camps. Together, these findings underscore the institutional fragility exposed by polarized environments.

At the social level, polarization deepens group identities and reinforces exclusionary “us versus them” cultures. Kligler-Vilenchik et al. (2020) highlight how digital communication amplifies conflicting interpretations of political events, obstructing opportunities for common ground. This fragmentation of discourse undermines democratic dialogue and pushes societies toward antagonism rather than compromise. The erosion of shared civic identities thus threatens the integrative capacity of democratic institutions.

Technological transformations represent another critical challenge. Suk et al. (2021) show that social media platforms contribute to “filter bubbles” that restrict exposure to diverse perspectives. The rapid spread of disinformation, particularly during political crises, intensifies polarization (Osmundsen et al., 2021). The ease with which falsehoods circulate online fuels suspicion and division, making it increasingly difficult for societies to converge around shared realities. In this context, technology operates as both a facilitator of engagement and a catalyst of fragmentation, complicating efforts to address polarization.

Despite the breadth of existing research, gaps remain in understanding the causes and consequences of political polarization. Many studies emphasize ideological divides while overlooking the broader social and psychological dynamics at play. For instance, Kligler-Vilenchik et al. (2020) caution against viewing polarization solely through ideological lenses, stressing the importance of cultural and communicative factors. Moreover, much of the literature remains case-specific, limiting its ability to provide comparative insights into how polarization manifests differently across democratic contexts (McCoy et al., 2018). This narrow scope underscores the need for more comprehensive and interdisciplinary approaches.

The primary aim of this narrative review is to deepen the understanding of polarization’s dynamics and consequences across diverse political contexts. Specifically, the review seeks to identify recurring patterns of polarization while examining the factors that exacerbate it, such as social media, identity politics, and populism (McCoy et al., 2018; Kligler-Vilenchik et al., 2020). In doing so, it aims to construct a more integrative perspective that highlights both the systemic risks and the potential avenues for mitigating polarization. As Morrissey and Boswell (2020) argue, finding “common ground” is essential to counteract the divisive impact of polarization and to rebuild public trust in democratic institutions.

The scope of this review extends to multiple geographic contexts, with a particular focus on the United States and European democracies, where polarization has been extensively documented. In the U.S., increasing partisan hostility, disinformation, and identity-driven politics have sharpened divisions, exemplified by the January 6, 2021 Capitol insurrection (Fure-Slocum, 2024). European democracies similarly face rising polarization, with conflicting interpretations of political issues undermining deliberative dialogue (Kligler-Vilenchik et al., 2020). In Asia, countries such as Indonesia present critical cases where political and social polarization complicate debates on democracy and governance (Muhtadi & Warburton, 2020; Setiawan & Tomsa, 2023). Latin America also reveals patterns of heightened polarization, as seen in Venezuela’s struggle to maintain democratic commitments amid deeply divided political landscapes (González, 2020). By adopting a cross-regional lens, this review emphasizes the global relevance of polarization while highlighting the contextual variations that shape its dynamics.

In sum, political polarization is a global phenomenon with profound implications for democratic resilience. This introduction underscores its multifaceted causes and consequences, identifies gaps in the existing literature, and outlines the aims and scope of the present review. A comprehensive and interdisciplinary approach is essential to capture the complexity of polarization and to inform strategies for addressing one of the most pressing challenges facing democracies today.

METHOD

The methodological framework of this study was designed to ensure a systematic and comprehensive approach to examining political polarization in contemporary democracies. Central to this process was the selection of appropriate academic databases, the formulation of effective search strategies, the establishment of clear inclusion and exclusion criteria, and the application of rigorous evaluation procedures for the literature identified. By adhering to these methodological principles, the study sought to produce a balanced and credible narrative review that captures the multifaceted dynamics of polarization.

The first step in the methodological process involved the selection of databases that provide reliable and comprehensive coverage of social science research. Scopus was chosen due to its extensive collection of peer-reviewed journals, particularly in the fields of political science, sociology, and communication studies. Its citation tracking capabilities also facilitated the identification of influential studies and the mapping of research networks relevant to polarization (Suk et al., 2021). Web of Science was included as a complementary source, given its advanced search functionalities and multi-disciplinary coverage, which were essential for tracing the evolution of concepts such as affective polarization and democratic backsliding across different academic traditions (Marshall & Cole, 2023). Google Scholar was also incorporated into the search process, providing broader access to materials such as dissertations, working papers, and reports that might not appear in formal indexing services. Although Google Scholar lacks the rigorous filtering of peer-reviewed journals, its inclusivity ensured that the review captured a wide range of perspectives and emerging insights into polarization.

The formulation of search strategies was another critical component of this methodology. Specific keywords were selected to encompass the breadth of political polarization as a research topic. The core keywords included “political polarization,” “affective polarization,” “polarization in democracy,” “partisan hostility,” and “democratic resilience.” These terms were chosen to capture both the emotional and ideological dimensions of polarization as well as its broader implications for democratic governance. The keyword “affective polarization,” for example, was used to identify studies focusing on the intensification of negative emotions toward opposing partisans (Kligler-Vilenchik et al., 2020). Meanwhile, “democratic resilience” was applied in searches to retrieve literature exploring how institutions and societies respond to polarization and attempt to safeguard democratic practices (Osmundsen et al., 2021). Boolean operators such as AND, OR, and NOT were employed to combine keywords strategically, ensuring both specificity and inclusivity in search results. For example, “political polarization AND social media” was used to identify studies examining the intersection of digital communication and polarization dynamics.

Following the database searches, inclusion and exclusion criteria were established to ensure the relevance and quality of the selected literature. Inclusion criteria consisted of studies published between 2000 and 2025, allowing for a temporal scope that captures both the early conceptualizations of polarization and the most recent developments in the digital era. Only articles published in peer-reviewed journals, book chapters from academic publishers, and high-quality reports from reputable institutions were considered. Studies were required to explicitly address political polarization within democratic contexts, either in terms of causes, consequences, or mitigation strategies. Exclusion criteria eliminated articles that focused solely on non-democratic regimes unless they provided comparative insights into democratic systems. Opinion pieces, journalistic accounts, and non-academic reports were also excluded to maintain the scholarly rigor of the review.

The types of research included in this narrative review spanned a range of methodological traditions. Quantitative studies, such as surveys and experimental designs, provided statistical evidence of polarization's rise and its effects on political behavior and trust in institutions. For example, survey-based analyses of partisan hostility revealed patterns of affective polarization across multiple democracies. Qualitative studies, including case studies and discourse analyses, offered rich insights into the cultural and institutional contexts that shape polarization. Experimental studies were particularly valuable for understanding causal mechanisms, such as how exposure to partisan media or cross-party interactions affects attitudes and behaviors. By incorporating this diversity of methodologies, the review sought to build a comprehensive understanding of polarization that acknowledges both empirical generalizations and context-specific dynamics.

The process of literature selection was conducted in several stages. Initially, search results from each database were exported into a reference management tool, which allowed for the removal of duplicates and the systematic organization of sources. Titles and abstracts were then screened to determine their relevance to the research questions. Studies that met the inclusion criteria were retrieved in full text for further evaluation. The evaluation process involved assessing the methodological rigor, theoretical contribution, and empirical relevance of each article. Particular attention was paid to whether studies clearly defined polarization, distinguished between ideological and affective dimensions, and situated their findings within broader debates on democracy.

To ensure transparency and reliability, the selection process mirrored the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework, though adapted for the purposes of a narrative review. This involved documenting the number of articles identified, screened, excluded, and ultimately included in the analysis. While narrative reviews differ from systematic reviews in their flexibility and interpretive orientation, the application of PRISMA-like procedures provided structure and accountability to the process. In total, the final pool of literature consisted of studies that collectively addressed polarization across multiple contexts, including North America, Europe, Asia, and Latin America. This geographic diversity was critical for identifying both common patterns and context-specific manifestations of polarization.

The evaluation of studies also considered the interplay between micro-level psychological processes and macro-level institutional dynamics. For example, research on affective polarization

often emphasized individual-level attitudes and emotions, while studies on democratic resilience focused on institutional responses to polarization. By synthesizing these different levels of analysis, the methodology aimed to produce a more integrated account of how polarization develops, persists, and impacts democracies. Additionally, attention was given to interdisciplinary contributions, incorporating insights from political science, sociology, communication studies, and psychology.

Overall, this methodological approach ensured that the review was both comprehensive and critical. The combined use of multiple databases, carefully selected keywords, and clearly defined inclusion and exclusion criteria facilitated the identification of a diverse yet coherent body of literature. The incorporation of different research designs enabled the review to capture the complexity of polarization as both a psychological and institutional phenomenon. The systematic screening and evaluation of sources provided a strong foundation for synthesizing the findings presented in the subsequent sections. In this way, the methodology not only guided the literature search and selection process but also shaped the analytical framework through which the phenomenon of political polarization in contemporary democracies was examined.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results of this narrative review reveal a multifaceted picture of political polarization in contemporary democracies, with literature converging on three interrelated themes: the causes of polarization, its consequences, and cross-national comparisons. Across all themes, empirical studies provide robust evidence of the rising prominence of polarization and its complex effects on political, social, and institutional dynamics.

Causes of Political Polarization

The literature consistently identifies social media, populism, and cultural identity as the principal drivers of political polarization. Digital platforms have fundamentally altered the way citizens interact and exchange information, heightening both ideological and affective divides. Suk et al. (2021) and Kligler-Vilenchik et al. (2020) show that political conversations online are characterized by heightened emotional intensity and fragmentation, creating conditions for polarization to intensify. Empirical data from Osmundsen et al. (2021) reinforce this finding, demonstrating that unequal access to and engagement with information online skews public discourse in ways that disproportionately amplify partisan perspectives while marginalizing opposing voices.

Populism represents another powerful force shaping polarization. Populist leaders often rely on divisive rhetoric that frames politics in binary terms of “us” versus “them,” thus mobilizing support through antagonism. Jaime et al. (2022) argue that this rhetorical strategy entrenches societal divisions and corrodes democratic norms. McCoy et al. (2018) and Lovell & Powells (2020) similarly note that populist appeals exacerbate polarization by shifting the basis of conflict from policy disagreements to identity-based disputes. These dynamics have been observed across multiple democracies, where populist actors exploit polarization to undermine trust in institutions and strengthen their own political legitimacy.

Empirical evidence from different regions illustrates the global spread of this phenomenon. In the United States, McCoy et al. (2018) demonstrate that reliance on social media for political information is strongly correlated with declining trust between partisan groups. In Europe, Osmundsen et al. (2021) and Lee & Hwang (2018) observe that online environments often function as “echo chambers,” reinforcing preexisting beliefs and fostering more extreme political attitudes. These findings underline the critical role of digital communication and populist politics as mutually reinforcing drivers of polarization, shaping both ideological orientations and affective responses to political conflict.

Consequences of Political Polarization

The consequences of polarization for democratic stability, institutional quality, and public trust are profound. Studies consistently show that sharp polarization undermines consensus-building and weakens governance. Lovell & Powells (LaMonica et al., 2024) argue that polarized environments reduce governmental effectiveness by making it increasingly difficult for parties to negotiate and compromise, thereby intensifying public disillusionment with democratic institutions. This erosion of institutional performance threatens adherence to the rule of law and undermines the legitimacy of democratic norms.

Polarization is also linked to the rise of political extremism and intolerance. Zamora et al. (2015) and Droppert & Bennett (2015) find that in polarized contexts, individuals are more likely to endorse extreme measures and express hostility toward political opponents. The Venezuelan case offers a stark example: Kimuli (2025) shows how extreme polarization facilitated the consolidation of authoritarian practices, with repression used to maintain control. Kido and Ibanez Jacob (2018) further highlight how the collapse of healthy political dialogue in polarized environments fosters intolerance and support for authoritarian solutions, illustrating the corrosive impact of polarization on democratic resilience.

The cumulative effects of polarization thus extend beyond governance to broader societal relations. Polarization weakens social trust, increases hostility, and deepens divisions that undermine the integrative function of democratic institutions. The literature makes clear that these effects are neither isolated nor temporary but represent systemic challenges with long-term implications for political and civic life.

Global Comparisons of Polarization

Comparative analyses across advanced and developing democracies reveal both similarities and divergences in the patterns of political polarization. In advanced democracies such as the United States and Europe, polarization is often entrenched in ideological and emotional cleavages shaped by historical legacies and systemic political competition. In contrast, in developing democracies, particularly in Latin America and Asia, polarization tends to emerge from socio-economic shifts, identity-based conflicts, and governance challenges in contexts of rapid technological and global transformations.

A key similarity across both groups of countries is the central role of social media in fueling polarization. Research consistently demonstrates that digital platforms foster echo chambers and selective exposure, regardless of national context. Kligler-Vilenchik et al. (2020) show that in both advanced and developing democracies, citizens are more likely to engage with information that aligns with their preexisting beliefs, thereby reinforcing partisan identities and exacerbating polarization. This dynamic underscores the global reach of digital communication as a catalyst for political fragmentation.

Nonetheless, important differences remain. In the United States, polarization has been shaped by ideological disputes over immigration, healthcare, and cultural issues, with populism serving as a key accelerant. These divisions are reflected in generational and geographic divides, with younger and urban populations often positioned against older and rural constituencies (McCoy et al., 2018; Fure-Slocum, 2024). In European contexts, similar patterns emerge, but the multiparty systems allow for more diverse representation, even as they sometimes exacerbate coalition instability (Osmundsen et al., 2021).

In developing democracies, polarization is often rooted in identity-based cleavages. For example, in several Latin American states, polarization reflects struggles between authoritarian regimes and opposition movements, with political and social unrest dominating public life (González, 2020). Economic inequality and distrust of government institutions serve as additional accelerants, linking polarization to broader socio-economic grievances. In Asian contexts, including Indonesia, polarization frequently revolves around ethnic and religious identities, with Muhtadi & Warburton (2020) and Setiawan & Tomsa (2023) documenting how these divisions exacerbate conflicts over democratic governance.

The type of political system also shapes how polarization manifests. In two-party systems, such as the United States, polarization is more structured, with two dominant factions consolidating political conflict and intensifying zero-sum competition. Elections and political campaigns often magnify this binary division, making polarization more visible and measurable. By contrast, multiparty systems in Europe and parts of Latin America disperse conflict across multiple actors, producing a wider spectrum of ideological positions. While this can facilitate coalition-building and compromise, it also creates risks of fragmentation and instability when grassroots discontent is not adequately addressed (Marshall & Cole, 2023).

Taken together, the literature underscores that while the underlying drivers of polarization—particularly digital communication and populist rhetoric—are widely shared, the contexts in which they unfold produce distinct patterns. In advanced democracies, polarization is often systemic and ideological, whereas in developing democracies it is more identity-driven and closely linked to socio-economic grievances. Despite these contextual differences, polarization in both settings produces similarly corrosive effects on democratic institutions and social trust.

Synthesis

The findings of this review highlight the global scope of political polarization and its deeply embedded causes and consequences. Media dynamics, populist strategies, and identity conflicts function as interlocking drivers that not only exacerbate divisions but also erode democratic

norms. The consequences, ranging from institutional dysfunction to the rise of extremism and authoritarian tendencies, underscore the systemic risks posed by polarization. At the same time, comparative evidence reveals that while manifestations of polarization differ between advanced and developing democracies, the outcomes are uniformly detrimental to democratic resilience and social cohesion.

This synthesis provides a foundation for the subsequent discussion, which will analyze how systemic factors interact with polarization and explore potential pathways for mitigating its effects in diverse democratic contexts.

The findings of this narrative review highlight the complex nature of political polarization in contemporary democracies and their connections with prominent theories of democracy. Theoretical frameworks such as agonistic democracy and epistemic democracy offer useful lenses to analyze the dynamics identified in the literature. Agonistic democracy, as articulated by Chantal Mouffe, emphasizes that conflict is an intrinsic component of democratic life. From this perspective, polarization is not necessarily destructive but can reflect a healthy contestation of ideas, provided that such conflicts are mediated through constructive dialogue and inclusive political institutions. Political polarization, therefore, can be interpreted as the manifestation of democratic plurality, but only when managed within boundaries that sustain mutual respect and deliberation. By contrast, epistemic democracy underscores the capacity of citizens to engage in rational and informed public debate as the foundation of democratic legitimacy. In this context, polarization poses a critical challenge because it diminishes the prospects for reasoned deliberation, particularly when media fragmentation and digital echo chambers obstruct the circulation of reliable information and undermine the potential for shared understanding (Kligler-Vilenchik et al., 2020; Suk et al., 2021; Benson, 2023).

Systemic factors play a significant role in sustaining and exacerbating political polarization, with economic inequality emerging as one of the most consistent drivers across different contexts. Disparities in wealth distribution and access to resources cultivate dissatisfaction among marginalized groups, who often perceive political systems as biased toward elites. This perception feeds into polarized narratives that cast the political sphere as a battleground between the privileged and the excluded. Empirical studies demonstrate that inequalities not only shape voting behavior but also intensify affective divisions, as individuals align their political identities with grievances linked to socio-economic status (McCoy et al., 2018). In this sense, inequality is not merely an economic issue but a political catalyst that reinforces antagonism and fosters populist mobilization.

Political representation further contributes to polarization by shaping how citizens perceive the inclusiveness of democratic processes. When groups feel systematically excluded from decision-making, they are more likely to embrace extreme positions and oppositional identities. Marshall and Cole (2023) highlight how factionalism within political systems can erode trust and alienate segments of society, thereby deepening divisions. Weak institutional mechanisms exacerbate this process by failing to mediate conflict effectively or by neglecting the voices of minority groups. Institutions unable to accommodate diversity often become arenas of antagonism rather than platforms for deliberation, thereby accelerating the spiral of polarization and opening space for extremist movements or populist leaders to exploit discontent (Lovell & Powells, 2020).

These systemic vulnerabilities underscore how polarization cannot be understood solely as an attitudinal or ideological phenomenon but must be situated within broader political and socio-economic structures. For instance, the rise of populism in many democracies reflects both institutional fragility and widespread dissatisfaction with political elites. Jaime et al. (2022) argue that populist rhetoric, which frames politics in terms of absolute antagonism, resonates particularly strongly in contexts marked by inequality and weak representation. This illustrates how systemic factors provide fertile ground for rhetorical strategies that amplify polarization and transform ordinary political disagreements into existential conflicts.

The findings also point to critical implications for democratic governance. Polarization undermines the stability and effectiveness of governments by reducing opportunities for compromise and consensus-building. LaMonica et al. (2024) emphasize that polarized legislatures often struggle to enact policy, leading to governance paralysis and growing public frustration. Moreover, polarization corrodes the legitimacy of institutions, as citizens perceive them as biased or incapable of mediating conflict. This erosion of institutional trust diminishes compliance with democratic norms and creates conditions conducive to the rise of authoritarian alternatives (Kimuli, 2025).

Polarization's societal consequences extend beyond institutional decline. At the social level, it erodes interpersonal trust and fosters hostility between citizens aligned with opposing political camps. Zamora et al. (2015) and Droppert & Bennett (2015) show that polarized environments foster support for extremist policies and intolerance toward political opponents, undermining democratic culture itself. The Venezuelan case vividly demonstrates how extreme polarization can normalize repression and entrench authoritarian governance, with destructive consequences for social cohesion and civic engagement (González, 2020). These dynamics affirm that polarization is not confined to the political sphere but penetrates deeply into the social fabric, shaping identities and daily interactions.

Addressing polarization requires integrated solutions that recognize its systemic roots. Institutional reform is one commonly proposed strategy, particularly reforms designed to foster inclusiveness and incentivize collaboration. Electoral system reforms, for example, may encourage coalition-building by reducing incentives for zero-sum competition. In multiparty systems, proportional representation can create opportunities for diverse voices to enter the political process, though such reforms must be carefully designed to avoid further fragmentation (Osmundsen et al., 2021). Beyond electoral reform, enhancing institutional accountability and responsiveness to marginalized groups may alleviate grievances that fuel polarization, strengthening trust in democratic systems.

Civic education represents another critical pathway to mitigate polarization by fostering tolerance and democratic literacy. By equipping citizens with knowledge about democratic processes and the value of pluralism, civic education can counteract the divisive effects of populist rhetoric and misinformation. Morrissey and Boswell (2020) emphasize the importance of fostering dialogue across partisan lines, which requires citizens to develop the skills and dispositions necessary for constructive engagement. Strengthening educational programs that promote critical thinking and media literacy may reduce susceptibility to disinformation and help citizens resist the pull of echo chambers.

Media regulation also emerges as a key area for policy intervention. As digital platforms have become central to political communication, their role in fostering echo chambers and disseminating misinformation is undeniable. Suk et al. (2021) and Osmundsen et al. (2021) demonstrate how social media algorithms amplify polarizing content by prioritizing engagement over accuracy. Regulatory frameworks that hold platforms accountable for the spread of harmful information, while promoting responsible journalism, could mitigate these effects. However, such regulations must be carefully balanced with protections for freedom of expression to avoid exacerbating distrust or enabling authoritarian controls. Promoting transparency in algorithms and supporting initiatives for fact-checking and independent journalism may provide a middle ground that enhances information quality without undermining democratic freedoms.

Despite the robust insights provided by existing research, this review also reveals several limitations in the current literature. Many studies focus narrowly on ideological divides, overlooking the complex interplay between socio-economic grievances, institutional weaknesses, and technological transformations. Kligler-Vilenchik et al. (2020) caution against reductive approaches that fail to account for cultural and communicative dimensions of polarization. Comparative studies remain relatively scarce, limiting our ability to understand how polarization operates across diverse democratic contexts. McCoy et al. (2018) highlight the need for broader analyses that move beyond single-country case studies to identify cross-national patterns and contextual differences.

Further research should explore the interaction between micro-level psychological processes and macro-level systemic factors. While studies of affective polarization illuminate individual-level attitudes, more work is needed to link these findings to institutional and structural dynamics. Longitudinal studies could also provide valuable insights into how polarization evolves over time and whether interventions such as educational initiatives or institutional reforms produce lasting effects. Additionally, the global scope of polarization calls for more comparative and interdisciplinary research that integrates insights from political science, sociology, psychology, and communication studies. Such work could advance a more comprehensive understanding of polarization and inform strategies tailored to different democratic contexts.

CONCLUSION

This narrative review highlights the complex and multidimensional nature of political polarization in contemporary democracies. The analysis reveals that the main drivers of polarization include the expansion of social media, the strategic use of populist rhetoric, and identity-based divisions, all of which reinforce ideological and affective cleavages. The consequences are profound, encompassing institutional dysfunction, declining public trust, and the rise of extremism and authoritarian tendencies. Comparative perspectives show that while polarization manifests differently across advanced and developing democracies, its effects are consistently corrosive to democratic resilience and social cohesion.

The urgency of addressing polarization lies in its ability to undermine the integrative capacity of democratic systems. Policy interventions must therefore target systemic vulnerabilities, including institutional reforms that incentivize collaboration, civic education programs that promote

tolerance and democratic literacy, and media regulation to mitigate the spread of disinformation. These measures, taken together, can help restore trust and enable constructive engagement across political divides. At the same time, future research must address existing gaps by examining the interplay of psychological, socio-economic, and institutional dynamics, as well as conducting more comparative and longitudinal studies. Advancing this agenda is essential to developing strategies that not only respond to the immediate threats posed by polarization but also strengthen the long-term resilience of democratic governance.

REFERENCE

- Akboğa, S., Şahin, O., & Arık, E. (2023). Polarisation over the meaning of democracy: the case of political parties in Turkey. *Politics*, 45(3), 333-354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02633957231191445>
- Benson, J. (2023). Democracy and the epistemic problems of political polarization. *American Political Science Review*, 118(4), 1719-1732. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0003055423001089>
- Droppert, H., & Bennett, S. (2015). Corporate social responsibility in global health: an exploratory study of multinational pharmaceutical firms. *Globalization and Health*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-015-0100-5>
- Fure-Slocum, E. (2024). Teaching the January 6th insurrection: historical perspectives on a crisis in American democracy. *American British and Canadian Studies*, 42(1), 182-207. <https://doi.org/10.2478/abcsj-2024-0010>
- González, Y. (2020). 'Democracy under threat': the foundation of the opposition in Venezuela. *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, 40(1), 69-83. <https://doi.org/10.1111/blar.13090>
- Jaime, G., Hobeika, A., & Figuié, M. (2022). Access to veterinary drugs in Sub-Saharan Africa: roadblocks and current solutions. *Frontiers in Veterinary Science*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2021.558973>
- Jacob, W. (2018). Integrated rural development from a historical and global perspective. *Asian Education and Development Studies*, 7(4), 438-452. <https://doi.org/10.1108/aeds-02-2018-0022>
- Kimuli, I. (2025). Research perspectives for improving regulation and policy development for energy efficiency and sustainable mobility in Uganda. *iScience*, 112877. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2025.112877>
- Kligler-Vilenchik, N., Baden, C., & Yarchi, M. (2020). Interpretative polarization across platforms: how political disagreement develops over time on Facebook, Twitter, and WhatsApp. *Social Media + Society*, 6(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120944393>
- LaMonica, H., Loblay, V., Poulsen, A., Hindmarsh, G., Alam, M., Ekambareswarar, M., ... & Hickie, I. (2024). Top 10 research lessons learned from a digital childrearing program in low- and middle-income countries: a multi-case study (preprint). *Journal of Medical Internet Research*. <https://doi.org/10.2196/65705>

- Lee, I., & Hwang, S. (2018). Urban entertainment center (UEC) as a redevelopment strategy for large-scale post-industrial sites in Seoul: between public policy and privatization of planning. *Sustainability*, 10(10), 3535. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10103535>
- Lovell, H., & Powells, G. (2020). Smart grid knowledges and the state. *Area*, 52(3), 583-590. <https://doi.org/10.1111/area.12613>
- Marshall, M., & Cole, B. (2023). Societal-system analytics and the problem of factionalism in emerging (and declining) democracies. *Social Evolution & History*, 22(1). <https://doi.org/10.30884/sch/2023.01.02>
- McCoy, J., Rahman, T., & Somer, M. (2018). Polarization and the global crisis of democracy: common patterns, dynamics, and pernicious consequences for democratic polities. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 62(1), 16-42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764218759576>
- Morrissey, L., & Boswell, J. (2020). Finding common ground. *European Journal of Political Theory*, 22(1), 141-160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474885120969920>
- Muhtadi, B., & Warburton, E. (2020). Inequality and democratic support in Indonesia. *Pacific Affairs*, 93(1), 31-58. <https://doi.org/10.5509/202093131>
- Osmundsen, M., Bor, A., Vahlstrup, P., Bechmann, A., & Petersen, M. (2021). Partisan polarization is the primary psychological motivation behind political fake news sharing on Twitter. *American Political Science Review*, 115(3), 999-1015. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0003055421000290>
- Scholtz, H. (2024). Polarization and partitioning representation: how an overlooked aspect of contemporary democracy leads to polarizing societies. *Sociology Compass*, 18(10). <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.70008>
- Setiawan, K., & Tomsa, D. (2023). Defending a vulnerable yet resilient democracy: civil society activism in Jokowi's Indonesia. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 42(3), 350-371. <https://doi.org/10.1177/18681034231209058>
- Suk, J., Coppini, D., Múñiz, C., & Rojas, H. (2021). The more you know, the less you like: a comparative study of how news and political conversation shape political knowledge and affective polarization. *Communication and the Public*, 7(1), 40-56. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20570473211063237>
- Torcal, M., & Carty, E. (2022). Partisan sentiments and political trust: a longitudinal study of Spain. *South European Society & Politics*, 27(1), 171-196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13608746.2022.2047555>