



The Role of Social Media and Its Implication for Democracy in 2020 U.S. Elections

Andika Drajat Murdani¹, Halifa Haqqi², Satria Rizaldi Alchatib³

¹²³Universitas Slamet Riyadi, Indonesia

Correspondent : andika.drajat.m@unisri.ac.id¹

Received : May 20, 2022

Accepted : July 18, 2022

Published : July 31, 2022

Citation: Murdani, A, D., Haqqi, H., Alchatib, A, R.(2022). The Role of Social Media and Its Implication for Democracy in 2020 U.S. Elections. *Ilomata International Journal of Social Science*, 3(3), 325-336.

<https://doi.org/10.52728/ijss.v3i3.499>

ABSTRACT: We can see the growing use of social media for politics through 2020 U.S. elections. This social media presence has the potential to shift the perspective of democracy. This paper is a reflection to explore the use of social media in the United States democracy, especially in the 2020 election. This paper explained that social media has a significant role in the United States democracy, including those of the 2020 U.S. presidential election. Social media, with its shortcomings and advantages, contributed greatly to the election results, increasing public engagement, and increasing political participation. On the other hand, social media also gave rise to public polarization in the U.S. and opened up foreign intervention opportunities. However, by the 2020 U.S. election, the foreign intervention was relatively low, so that it did not have enough effect on the election results. Trump and Biden became two candidates who understood this social media potential and sought to attract voters in their respective ways. With the right and structured strategy, Biden was able to achieve deeper engagement through numerous interactions on social media. As the result, Biden emerged as the winner of the election, one of which with social media support.

Keywords: U.S., democracy, social media, 2020 election



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

INTRODUCTION

The world is faced with the emergence of social media in world politics ([Mechkova & Wilson, 2021](#)). Public communication and how the public captures and responds to information is an important part of democracy ([Lee & Xenos, 2019](#)). The importance of this groove made the delivery of messages to the public need to get important positions and considerations for the political elite. These considerations include ways of conveying messages to the public, other elites, and the press to influence constituent opinion, volunteer recruitment, supporters to mobilize voters ([Owen, 2017](#)).

Post 2000 the world of information and communication technology experienced rapid development. The evolution of social media technologies such as Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and other platforms makes social media potentially a powerful political tool. In the United States, ever-increasing users of social

media are also growing to talk about politics. Social media influence gained momentum in the US presidential election in 2008. Presidential candidate Barack Obama then had a strategy in utilizing social media and organizing political support at the grassroots level ([Bimber, 2014](#); [Karami et al., 2022](#)).

The popularity of social media use is increasing in Barack Obama's 2008 video campaign, on BarelyPolitical.com's "Obama Girl" and will. i.am's "Yes, We Can,". The slogan managed to attract millions of spectators ([Wallsten, 2010](#)). Since that momentum, social media has become increasingly popular in government, campaigns, and political movements. Social media became a new force in line with the news media ecosystem on other conventional television sites or news media. If it refers to the opinion of political observer Bruce Bimber, the development of democracy is closely related to technological development ([Bimber, 2014: 130](#)).

In this regard, social media emerged as an important intermediary in politics to potentially produce a new feel in democracy in the United States. On the other hand, there are opportunities for political actors to increasingly work to shape, even limiting the influence of the digital public in the political sphere. For example, on November 19, 2016, the New York Times published criticism of Facebook's social media failure in stopping lies spread ahead of the 2016 US Presidential Election ([Garrett, 2019](#)).

In addition, Twitter and other social media are also called having a stake in distributing misinformation, alternative facts, and false news ([Karami et al., 2022](#)). The smash of information so rapidly spread through social media even reduced the existence of local news to a low point. This compromises the institutional media's ability to examine false facts produce by social media or the propaganda through computing ([Garrett, 2019](#)). Many sprung up evidence of false news circulation in the 2016 U.S. presidential election period, part of Russia's propaganda efforts. This suggests that social media opens up opportunities for the power of other countries to insert propaganda and shift information to potentially damage a country's democratic and political order ([Isaac & Wakabayashi, 2017](#)).

This new American reality also provides a new landscape in the US democracy, in the elections of 2020. Social media exerts a diverse impact on the ideology, the terma-suk for the democratic pattern of a nation. The rapid development of the internet can present a new perspective on politics and democracy. How the impact of social media in the United States democracy is an interesting issue that can be seen by analyzing social media as an intermediary in establishing political engagement between the political elite with the public. The role of social media in improving political knowledge and political participation thereby affecting United States democracy. This reflection paper describe the phenomenon of social media in a world politic. We can see this reflection with social media and democratic concepts, in the form of political engagement, political knowledge, and political participation.

METHOD

The type of research used is descriptive qualitative. This study attempts to describe social phenomena in society without being standardized on numbers and numerical data. The final results of the research are presented in the form of a comprehensive descriptive narrative accompanied by an interpretation of all aspects in order to answer the research questions that have been formulated, in the form of the impact of social media on democracy in the United States. This research was conducted through a library research approach by raising the subject of research in the form of social media and democratic concepts, in the form of political engagement, political knowledge and political participation. The research analysis was carried out by descriptive analysis by considering data reduction and data validity

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Power of Social Media

Social media is a networked communicative practice, whose meaning is negotiated by various offenders, including service providers, developers, community figures, and users, while in the manufacturing process ([Lomborg, 2014](#)). The term “social media” refers to the use of the web- and mobile-based technologies to convert communications into interactive dialogues ([Lomborg, 2015](#)). Social media allows people to be able to interact more easily with anyone around the world, including to listen to his voice to the government. Social media users are a very diverse society in terms of their understanding, character, profession, and political preferences. That is, there is an ideological diversity of social media users, with its various interests ([Lee & Xenos, 2019](#)).

Social media is essentially a product of communicative capitalism, with the initial goal not to encourage political action ([Gayo-Avello, 2015](#)). However, the messages delivering that occurred through the networking of these social media was able to build public opinion. Social media became an attractive tool for politics to be able to reach a wide audience quickly. In its development, social media produced political discourse and polarization so that it could pose widespread political consequences ([Van Dijck, 2013](#)).

The rise of social media and the production of information that can be disseminated by anyone causes trusted local news to disappear from the media landscape. In contrast to local news media, on social media there is no response to filtered information. Misinformation is often perceived as fact and goes viral through social networks without being controlled ([Bucay et al., 2017](#)). Many researchers have stated that false information spreads faster on social media platforms such as Twitter than the truth ([Vosoughi et al., 2018](#)). Many people don't realize they are sharing fake news through their social media feeds.

MIT studies also found that people are more likely to forward false stories through their networks because they are considered more capable of producing readers' emotional responses ([Vosoughi et al., 2018](#)). Even on Twitter, its users can be entirely anonymous. There are also millions of automated bots and fake accounts that can easily overwhelm the network with tweets and retweets. The bot quickly surpassed Twitter-mounted spam detectors ([Manjoo, 2017](#)).

In the case of news, social media can strengthen the existence of online news. Social media can be accepted by a wider readership than print media. However, another power of social media is as an alternative to users to acquire entertainment. In this case, social media also replaced more traditional Internet and Web usage. More and more people are looking for online news through social media, rather than over the internet or conventional web ([Baer, 2022](#)).

Under these conditions, the power of social media in influencing public opinion is enormous. Under Montesquieu's tripartite system, the power is divided over the separation of powers on legislative, executive, and judicial government. However, since the conception of mass media strengthened, mass media emerged as an influential independent force in liberal and pluralist democracy. In the same way, the use of the internet, information technology, and digital communications could potentially be another new force in democracy ([Dutton, 2009](#)).

These conditions also arise as a phenomenon in the United States, especially in the 2020 United States presidential election. Political campaigns utilizing social media began to spread. This condition gave rise to political advertisements as a method of campaigning political candidates. Political campaigns with social media content allowed candidates to communicate with the prospective voters and directly build political discourses according to desire. The promotions undertaken were even able to hook up the prospectors, who had not previously had the direction of choice. The broad range of social media also

allowed candidates to raise publicity, confirming criticism, even accentuate the weaknesses of their competitors (Knoester & Gichiru, 2021).

The phenomenon of using social media as a tool of political campaigns still reaps much controversy. Social media may potentially be a bridge in political communication. On the other hand, social media also competes to bring about the polarization and emergence of populist politics. The U.S. Federal Election Commissioner itself states that social media such as Facebook for example pretty much hurts democracy. In election activities, the political agenda of each candidate leads to efforts to attract public sympathy during the processing period before the election. During this time, the candidates had the opportunity to interact through political campaigns by utilizing the social platforms of the media ([Costa-Font & Ljunge, 2022](#)).

Moreover, social media users in the United States show an increase in the number year after year. By 2020, the number of social media users reached 80% of the population, an increase of 1% from the previous year's 79% ([Tankovska, 2021](#)). It became potential for political candidates to campaign through social media, ranging from Instagram, Facebook, Twitter to Snapchat. Social media became an important tool for candidates to reach the wider public. Social media can connect and spread information to millions of people within seconds. This makes social media very efficient to do a campaigns.

In 2020, social media also has a large role in the presidential election between candidate Joe Biden and candidate Donald Trump. Social media became a tool of information dissemination to the supporters of both sides of the candidate. Moreover, the pandemic conditions also resulted in physical limitations of political campaigns. That is, social media was increasingly instrumental in the process before this election. Nevertheless, social media also gave its dilemmas. The spread of information from the two camps made the people of the United States divided into two camps. One camp supported the Democrats and the other side supported the Republics ([Karami et al., 2022](#)).

It can be assumed that social media has great power in influencing the political and democratic activities of a country. It's just that these powers have both positive and negative sides. In the United States, social media becomes an effective and efficient tool in reaching the public in the 2020 political campaign, especially as a campaign medium in pandemic times. It's just that, on the negative side, social media is as if dividing the United States into two opposing camps between the two parties.

Social Media and Democracy

Democracy as a concept refers to shared ideals, welfare, and electoral institutions. Whereas in practice, democracy refers to a network of solidarity and accompanying relationships with voting behavior ([Marsden, 2020](#)). The democratic government has three principles that build up its communication environment.

First, citizens must be faced with the material they did not choose before. Second, many or most citizens must have various experiences in common so that they can become social adhesives. Without sharing experience, heterogeneous societies will be much more difficult in dealing with social issues. Third, citizens must be in a position of being able to distinguish between truth and lies and to know when the democratic process is manipulated. In a democracy, everyone has a right to access the truth, although not everyone has to approve of it ([Sunstein, 2018](#)).

It is these three principles, democratic communication is capable of creating a system of self-government or governance democratic that itself produces democracy. In this regard, democratic communication became a significant aspect in the relation of society to government. Accurate assessment of political information is essential to citizens' capacity to vote for their interests, as well as to create a healthy democratic environment. Good democratic communication can be a strong political strategy ([Gastil et al.,](#)

[2017](#)). In the context of the election, the participation of the public in this communication can have important consequences for the choice of the subsequent citizen vote ([Oreskes & Conway, 2010](#)).

The level of political knowledge affects the acceptance of democratic principles, attitudes to certain issues, and political participation. Political engagement is one form of reinforcement in democratic buildings. It is proportionally built by the level of political knowledge and political participation. Competent democratic citizens need not be policy experts but have a basic level of knowledge to make various reasoned public assessments ([Galston, 2001](#)).

It is just that politicians need to make an extra approach to capture this vastly numbered social media user. In the case of the US election, social media does have great potential. Social media is widely accessed by the majority of United States societies daily. However, the survey showed that the social user appeal of the media to political issues was very low. Not many active social media users share political issues on the homepage of their accounts. The survey data from the Pew Research Center against social media active users in August 2020, shows only 9% of adult social users who state often post or share sociopolitical related issues in social media. Several 70% of social media users even stated never posted or shared sociopolitical issues ([Mcclain, 2021](#)).

This condition becomes contradictory. Ones social media became an important and influential tool in supporting democracy through political engagement. On the other hand, the US public is still less interested in political issues. Nevertheless, in the case of the 2020 U.S. election, social media remains the candidates' preference as well as its supporting parties to increase political engagement and attract public attention. The efforts of the two parties in establishing public opinion increased the number of discussions of political issues. During the campaign period, both parties sought to attract the attention of voters, especially beginner voters or young voters. The novice voters still learn about the election and its various dynamics from its teachers at the school. However, Forbes shows that 20% of novice voters views were shaped by social media. It is influenced by the habitual patterns of young men who spend their time tracking social media ([Suciu, 2020](#)).

In US democracy, social media is still the choice of politicians to build political engagement, thus, it co-drives political knowledge and political participation, as builders of democratic structures. As social media progressed and the growing crowd of social media users, researchers conducted various research related to how the relations between social media with politics. Many discoveries suggest that social media and the various news within have transformed the political landscape. Very active media social users provide great opportunities for populist actors to deliver their agendas and political messages ([Topîrceanu, 2021](#)).

In 2020, social media is also widely used by candidates to win this presidential race. The candidates saw great potential to conduct political engagement to the number of U.S. citizens who were at the voting age, 72% of whom were active media social users, 69% of whom were Facebook users. For Donald Trump, this social use of media became a follow-up step of campaign activities that had been undertaken at later elections. In the 2016 election, he has proven that social media is effective for winning elections. Trump confidently advanced into the hammer fight by relying on his social media ([Sioh, 2018](#)). At the start of the campaign, he was already excelling at social media Twitter by having 87 million followers, while Biden had only 11 million followers. In the next round of elections, the two candidates both seek to massively and sustainably increase engagements to the public ([Suciu, 2020](#)).

Some US publics themselves have had an ideological trend or political party. However, surveys conducted in the run-up to the 2020 campaign show that even the public with the party's inclination is not much involved in sharing sociopolitical information. Of the supporters of the republican party, 74% stated they never or rarely posted and shared sociopolitical issues. Proponents of the Democratic party also stated

the same, with a 66% ratio ([Mcclain, 2021](#)). This means efforts to increase the political engagement of the candidates to the public should be pursued in ways preferred by social users.

Increasing engagement through social media is a thing that many world politicians already do. Social media can be a message sender to the public quickly and cheaply. Social media is also able to mobilize followers for online and offline political action. In the times of the election, although many publics claimed to be unhappy about posting and sharing political issues, talks about these two presidential candidates have been on the rise. The number of tweets, responses, and social media followers from both candidates is experiencing up and down. In fact, in the days of debate, the public in social media was crowded with talks surrounding the content of the debate. Data from Hootsuite led that in the period of debate on October 21–23, 2020, as many as 6.6 million social media users were talking Trump and Biden, with a dominance of Biden as much as 72% ([Suciu, 2020](#)).

This dynamic suggests that even though many publics are not interested in political issues, but presidential races are different things and still attract attention. The social media public heavily talks about candidates during the campaign times. Public attention suggests a public awareness in political participation, recognizing the candidates. The public seeks to recognize presidential candidates through the social media activity of both candidates and their support parties. But, the public is trying to see widely from the full character of the presidential candidates, not just in the action of political campaigns ([Amlani & Algara, 2021](#)).

The social influence of media in US democracy is indeed very complex. In the 2020 elections, the public has much to talk about both candidates. On the other hand, the public feels tired of political postings on social media. Studies found that only a small percentage of users produced most tweets more generally on social media. In a separate study conducted during the election season, data was obtained that 55% of Americans said they were tired of political postings on social media, especially political posts from Republicans who carried out Donald Trump ([Mcclain, 2021](#)).

For democracy, social media became a unique tool. There is a positive and negative side hidden behind social media. In real-life settings, public discourse is built in more visible and measurable ways and actions. On the other hand, the social media environment is not self-governable. Social media is under the control of the oligarchy of a monetary-oriented technology company. Social media companies use algorithms that prove capable of effectively defeating the power of professional media. Social media spread information by relying on robotic algorithms, leaving it insensitive to valid data and facts. This potentially eliminates the distinction between fact and fiction and is even able to cause political turmoil ([Niederdeppe et al., 2021](#)).

Algorithms on social media decide what we use on social media and what information comes before us. The algorithm generates a view by learning its user preferences and repeatedly reminding us of the results of the algorithm's analysis. The more we engage with content, the better they know us. In such a situation, the greater the power that social media has over what users think, say and do.

If associated with democracy, social media can produce "The Social Dilemma". The term was delivered by Tristan Harris, in the 2020 Netflix documentary emphasizing that "fake news spreads six times faster than real news." The spread of information without sarin-gan facts and validity is what constitutes a threat in itself in social media. Disappointment and easy sharing of information without content validation can cause misinformation or misperception. In fact, in the concept of democracy, the public should be well-informed and have critical thinking ability towards policy and politicians before they cast their votes. If algorithms continue to influence people's way of thinking and include improper feeds or information, it poses a serious threat to democracy.

Feeds spread in social media without confirmation can result in information bias. It is also what prompts the occurrence of political polarization. U.S. politicians are increasingly happy to communicate with the public through social media. Paw Research Center in its study in the 2020 election mentioned that the large gap continues to grow between liberals and conservatives, Republicans and Democrats. This gap was also a hallmark of US politics ([Gluzman, 2021](#)). Distrust in the news poses a serious threat to democracy. It also hurts traditional media. Traditional media are commonly worked out with caution, mediating politics and the public by confirming the biases that occur on the news. But, when politicians choose social media lines like tweets rather than holding press conferences, there will be no press asking questions and confirming the facts shared. At press conferences, some journalists play a role to bridge thought critically and uncover facts. But on social media, there are only politicians who spread information in the absence of checks and balances.

At the time of the U.S. election campaign, conditions were what occurred. Trump for example, according to CNN, ahead of the presidential election, spent 300 days without holding a press briefing. Meanwhile, he did an average of 18 tweets per day. Approaching election day, Twitter marks about 200 of Trump's posts as posts containing errors, misleading or disputed information ([Gluzman, 2021](#)). Social media firms practice by checking user facts and marking posts as disinformation becomes a problem that needs to be analyzed in itself. At least, simply these conditions suggest that social media companies have considerable power to influence public perception.

Social media has a complex relation to democracy. It opens up public opportunities to speak up while having the opportunity to close information, select information, and determine "facts" ([Tucker, 2021](#)). Therefore, social media cannot be classed as a legacy of democracy nor non-democracy. Social media can be proponents of democracy, as well as against democracy itself. Social media is a new political arena that shows for politicians to show their power and form public opinion. Social media can bring up a new regime in democracy for those who can make good use of it. In the US, Trump once proved his grandeur in the 2016 presidential election through social media power, defeating Hillary Clinton. However, by 2020, with stronger patterns of structure, Joe Biden is opening a new regime of U.S. democracy, also by utilizing social media.

Social Media in 2020 U.S. Election

After 2010, other countries began to pay attention to the increased influence of social media to impact the result of a general election. In the US, the influence of social media on election results also results in much debate ([McKinney, 2021](#)). The increased social media activity carried out by politicians to increase popularity became supporting evidence of election travel in the US. Since the 2016 election, the public has been heavily influenced by the development of digital technology in democracy in the United States and around the world. There is an alleged intervention of foreign powers in the US campaign through social media and other digital media. Numerous "fake news" and programmed propaganda through technology became a much-present threat in the previous U.S. election ([Persily & Stewart III, 2021](#)). The condition also became a concern in itself at the 2020 election. The covid-19 pandemic conditions made limitations on offline campaign activities. This makes campaigning, voter mobilization, and other electoral activities to be implemented using digital technology. That is, social media and digital media play a more important role in the 2020 presidential race.

For Trump, social media was still an important tool for gathering voters. But, a research found a decrease in response to the Twitter Republican Party in the 2020 election compared to the 2016 election ([Fujiwara et al., 2020](#)). The public responded less or gave "like" to Trump's tweets ([Fujiwara et al., 2020](#)). Still, in the same study, it also acquired Twitter user demographic data on the identity preferences of its party. There are 25% more users who are happier to identify as Democrats than as Republicans. In addition, democrat politicians are also more popular on Twitter than Republican politicians ([Fujiwara et al., 2020](#)). The

party's preference and popularity were the ones who affected voter decisions, especially for the public with more moderate views.

Further analysis was made of changes in voter preference, especially in the Republican Party. It is known that there was deconstruction against populist messages delivered by Trump. The public decided not to believe in Trump, and at the common time, the public expressed its distrust of ballot management at the election ([McKinney, 2021](#)). This process before the election already showed that Trump began to lose his popularity to the public on social media. The election results confirmed this low in popularity of Trump with Joe Biden's exit as the winner. Poling conducted after the completion of the election on November 3, 2020, showed that 60% of the public stated that Biden had legitimized it as winning the election. On the other hand, the same polls showed that 70% of Republican participants stated that Democratic candidates were not elected on a legitimate basis ([Persily & Stewart III, 2021](#)). This data suggests a polarization of public opinion and distrust that occurs among voters, politicians, and institutions.

In addition to misinformation, social media can be designed in such a way as to be able to increase the popularity and sympathy of the public. It was also realized by Joe Biden's winning team. Days before the 2020 Presidential election, Biden's team reported that Joe Biden outperformed Donald Trump on social media using certain metric molesters. On Twitter, Trump's Twitter feed volume was indeed more than Biden. But, Biden produced more interactions per tweet and far more interactions per user. Biden didn't just win on Twitter. The campaign he conducted also received a major response on other social media, such as YouTube and even Twitch ([Davis, 2021](#)).

The campaign conducted on social media in the 2020 U.S. elections brought about its dynamics. The candidates came up with various approaches. On the other hand, the public who supported Trump or Biden also share his own opinions, including celebrities. Numerous informants on social media are often impressed as controversial. Nevertheless, this crowd of public talks regarding candidates and politics increased public engagements in the elections. The public is involved in conveying its political opinion through social media, which boils down to political participation.

Looking at his pattern of social media usage, Biden's victory looks like it's already set. There is a carefully prepared setting by relying on social media. Biden's social campaign was deliberated in a structured manner under the foundation of social analysis. It is this expressed by Biden's camphor team, Sarah Galvez, Director of Social Media Development, and Biden Audience for President. Biden's team was able to capture the preferences of the voters. They understand that the public is not interested in much of a raw political issue. Therefore, they answer the public's wishes, especially the novice voters by carrying new concepts of ideas, innovative and creative thinking ([Davis, 2021](#)).

Various pieces of information shared on social media ahead of the 2020 elections were also able to open the thoughts of young voters, especially those who had never voted before. These beginner voters can explore social media to gather information related to new things in politics or presidential. Research from PBS shows that younger generations claim to be more deduced to political issues and presidential election phenomena through social media. The survey, held by PBS NewsHour Student Reporting Labs in January 2020, shows that novice voters have hopes of major changes from the 2020 election. They want a new government that can bring about change to the political climate and various other things. The views of the youth at this time elections have had a greater influence as the number of young voters at the 2020 elections is higher compared to the last 2016 elections ([McKinney, 2021](#)). Therefore, they seek to be more deduced to determine the choices appropriately.

Social media is particularly beneficial to be a place to find information for anyone and to be a place to show political participation. This means social media is already a new land for conveying one's political thoughts. One can voice approval or rejection of a particular thought. The debate and the differences in

thought spread in social media are already new normal. Supporters of Biden as well as Trump can post everything to attract public attention. On the other hand, they can also engage in hot debate. Debates between Biden and Trump supporters themselves have already been frequent in the social arena of the media. However, what is worrisome is the potential for intervention in the debate on social media, especially those from abroad.

In the 2016 election, there were several pieces of evidence of foreign state intervention in the U.S. elections, through social media. However, on the search the National Intelligence Council conducted, the U.S. stated in its post-election report, that it believed the threat of states outside the U.S. against U.S. elections did not sufficiently affect the election results of 2020, as did the 2016 election. Nevertheless, the NIC admitted to efforts from several countries such as Russia, China, Cuba, Venezuela, Ukraine, and Iran for intervention. The growing crowd of internet and social media use opened up opportunities for the interference of foreign countries to influence voters in the US. However, the US believes that public awareness of the media in the US is already getting bigger so it is capable of countering the foreign threat through social media ([NIC, 2021](#)).

Deviant information deployment does still happen a lot. The majority of the US public admitted that they were getting the most misinformation from social media and cable TV news. They also confess that this abundance of scattered misinformation has the potential to affect the voter's views. In a survey conducted by the Knight Foundation, it was found that 81% of the United States public were convinced that the misinformation they received affected the election results. Around 62% of the public believe that the election results were affected by misinformation shared through social media ([Brenan, 2020](#)). Other opinions also state that the majority of the U.S. public stating that misinformation affected election results, thinking that the spread of this misinformation stemmed most from individual posts by the U.S. public itself ([Jones, 2020](#)).

However, given that large internet companies handled the fake news differently ahead of the election, the dynamics are complex. Internet companies at the 2020 U.S. elections used several measures to label false information. The long drive in the 2020 U.S. elections does have a unique circumstance. The election battle ended with Biden's victory, with Biden's declaration as president-elect. This declaration was also disseminated using social media. Through social media, too, such as Tik Tok, Instagram, and others, the public celebrated Biden's victory. The use of media to celebrate this election victory also became a means considered appropriate given the global conditions that are still stricken by the covid pandemic. This condition suggests that social media, with its lack of power and merit, became an influential element in the 2020 U.S. elections from the preparation period to the period of protest against the election result. The ability of social media to connect the masses, whatever his political beliefs, was a monumental experience for all involved, including the candidates, their teams, and the electorate.

CONCLUSION

Social media has a large role in United States democracy, including during the 2020 U.S. presidential election period. Social media platforms co-created history with their power of increasing public engagement and increasing political participation. On the other hand, social media gave rise to public polarization in the US also opening up opportunities for foreign country intervention. However, by the 2020 U.S. election, the foreign intervention that occurred was minimal so that it did not have enough effect on the election results.

The ability of social media to connect the masses, whatever his political beliefs, was a monumental experience for all those involved, including the candidates, their teams, and the electorate. Trump and

Biden became two candidates who understood the potential of this social media. Each has its way of hooking publicity and increasing the appeal of the voters. Trump was confident in having more followers on social media. However, with structured measures and paying attention to social media preferences, Biden was able to achieve deeper engagement through a large number of interactions on social media. As the result, Biden emerged as the winner of the election, one of which with social media support.

Then, how to respond to the power of social media? In the world of politics, social media can be a double-edged sword. For democracy, social media can also be viewed in the same way. One positive and one negative side. Social media can be used to campaign for democratic values as well as a medium to support the democracy itself. But on the other hand, social media can be used by certain power to garner support and build public opinion, which may only be for the benefit of a small group of people. A good society must be able to capture social media signals correctly. So, the results can be beneficial to strengthen democratic values.

REFERENCES

- Amlani, S., & Algara, C. (2021). Partisanship & nationalization in American elections: Evidence from presidential, senatorial, & gubernatorial elections in the U.S. counties, 1872–2020. *Electoral Studies*, 73, 102387. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2021.102387>
- Baer, J. (2022). *Social Media Usage Statistics for 2021 Reveal Surprising Shifts*. Statista. <https://www.convinceandconvert.com/social-media/social-media-usage-statistics/>
- Bimber, B. (2014). Digital Media in the Obama Campaigns of 2008 and 2012: Adaptation to the Personalized Political Communication Environment. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 11(2), 130–150. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2014.895691>
- Brenan, M. (2020). *Four in five Americans concerned misinformation will influence election*. Knight Foundation. <https://knightfoundation.org/articles/four-in-five-americans-concerned-misinformation-will-influence-election/>
- Bucay, Y., Elliott, V., Kamin, J., & Park, A. (2017). *America's growing news deserts*. Columbia Journalism Review. https://www.cjr.org/local_news/american-news-deserts-donuts-local.php
- Costa-Font, J., & Ljunge, M. (2022). Ideological spillovers across the Atlantic? Evidence from Trump's presidential election. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 102231. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2022.102231>
- Davis, K. (2021). *Breaking down President Biden's data-driven social media strategy*. Martech. <https://martech.org/breaking-down-president-bidens-data-driven-social-media-strategy/>
- Dutton, W. H. (2009). The Fifth Estate Emerging through the Network of Networks. *Prometheus*, 27(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08109020802657453>
- Fujiwara, T., Müller, K., & Schwarz, C. (2020). The Effect of Social Media on Elections: Evidence from the United States. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3719998>
- Galston, W. A. (2001). Political Knowledge, Political Engagement, and Civic Education. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4(1), 217–234. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.4.1.217>
- Garrett, R. K. (2019). Social media's contribution to political misperceptions in U.S. Presidential elections. *PLOS ONE*, 14(3), e0213500. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0213500>
- Gastil, Reedy, & Wells. (2017). Knowledge distortion in direct democracy: A longitudinal study of biased empirical beliefs on statewide ballot measures. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 12(1).
- Gayo-Avello, D. (2015). Social Media, Democracy, and Democratization. *IEEE MultiMedia*, 22(2), 10–16. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MMUL.2015.47>

- Gluzman, R. (2021). *Social media and democracy: The hard questions*. The Weekender The Daily Californian. <https://www.dailycal.org/2021/02/26/social-media-and-democracy/>
- Isaac, M., & Wakabayashi, D. (2017). *Russian Influence Reached 126 Million Through Facebook Alone*. The New York Times Company. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/30/technology/facebook-google-russia.html>
- Jones, J. (2020). *In Election 2020, how did the media, electoral process fare? Republicans, Democrats disagree*. Knight Foundation. <https://knightfoundation.org/articles/in-election-2020-how-did-the-media-electoral-process-fare-republicans-democrats-disagree/>
- Karami, A., Clark, S. B., Mackenzie, A., Lee, D., Zhu, M., Boyajieff, H. R., & Goldschmidt, B. (2022). 2020 U.S. presidential election in swing states: Gender differences in Twitter conversations. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights*, 2(2), 100097. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijime.2022.100097>
- Knoester, M., & Gichiru, W. P. (2021). Inquiry into the educational implications of voting practices of young adults in U.S. mid-term elections. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 45(4), 267–276. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2021.05.003>
- Lee, S., & Xenos, M. (2019). Social distraction? Social media use and political knowledge in two U.S. Presidential elections. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 90, 18–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.08.006>
- Lomborg, S. (2014). Social Media, Social Genres: Making Sense of the Ordinary. *European Journal of Communication*, 29(5), 641–642. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323114539432>
- Lomborg, S. (2015). “Meaning” in Social Media. *Social Media + Society*, 1(1), 205630511557867. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305115578673>
- Manjoo, F. (2017). *How Twitter is being gamed to feed misinformation*. He New York Times. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/31/technology/how-twitter-is-being-gamed-to-feed-misinformation.html>
- Marsden, L. (2020). International Religious Freedom Promotion and US Foreign Policy. *Religions*, 11(5), 260. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel11050260>
- Mcclain, C. (2021). *70% of U.S. social media users never or rarely post or share about political, social issues*. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2021/05/04/70-of-u-s-social-media-users-never-or-rarely-post-or-share-about-political-social-issues/>
- McKinney, M. S. (2021). Presidential campaign debates in the 2020 elections: debate scholarship and the future of presidential debates. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 57(3–4), 149–156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511431.2021.1963526>
- Mechkova, V., & Wilson, S. L. (2021). Norms and rage: Gender and social media in the 2018 U.S. mid-term elections. *Electoral Studies*, 69, 102268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2020.102268>
- NIC. (2021). *Foreign Threats to the 2020 US Federal Elections*. National Intelligence Council Report Paper.
- Niederdeppe, J., Avery, R. J., Liu, J., Gollust, S. E., Baum, L., Barry, C. L., Welch, B., Tabor, E., Lee, N. W., & Fowler, E. F. (2021). Exposure to televised political campaign advertisements aired in the United States 2015–2016 election cycle and psychological distress. *Social Science & Medicine*, 277, 113898. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.113898>
- Oreskes, N., & Conway, E. M. (2010). *Merchants of Doubt: How a Handful of Scientists Obscured the Truth on Issues from Tobacco Smoke to Global Warming* (1st ed.). Bloomsbury Press. <https://www.bloomsbury.com/us/merchants-of-doubt-9781608193943/>
- Owen, D. (2017). *“The new media’s role in politics.”* In *The Age of Perplexity: Rethink-ing the World We Know*. Penguin Random House. <https://www.bbvaopenmind.com/en/articles/the-new-media-s-role-in-politics/>

- Persily, N., & Stewart III, C. (2021). The Miracle and Tragedy of the 2020 Election. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3790904>
- Sioh, M. (2018). The wound of whiteness: Conceptualizing economic convergence as Trauma in the 2016 United States Presidential Election. *Geoforum*, 95, 112–121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.06.020>
- Suciu, P. (2020). *Social Media Could Determine The Outcome Of The 2020 Election*. Forbes. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/petersuciu/2020/10/26/social-media-could-determine-the-outcome-of-the-2020-election/?sh=5389b4ff26f6>
- Sunstein, C. (2018). Is Social Media Good Or Bad For Democracy? International. *Journal on Human Rights*, 27(27). <https://www.proquest.com/docview/2161600268>
- Tankovska. (2021). *Share of U.S. population who use social media 2008-2021*. Statista. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/273476/percentage-of-us-population-with-a-social-network-profile/>
- Topîrceanu, A. (2021). Electoral forecasting using a novel temporal attenuation model: Predicting the US presidential elections. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 182, 115289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2021.115289>
- Tucker, J. (2021). *This explains how social media can both weaken — and strengthen — democracy*. The Washington Post. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2017/12/06/this-explains-how-social-media-can-both-weaken-and-strengthen-democracy/>
- Van Dijck, J. (2013). *The Culture of Connectivity: A Critical History of Social Media*. Oxford University Press.
- Vosoughi, S., Roy, D., & Aral, S. (2018). The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, 35(9), 1146–1151. <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.aap9559>
- Wallsten, K. (2010). ‘Yes We Can’: How online viewership, blog discussion, campaign statements, and mainstream media coverage produced a viral video phenomenon. *Journal of Information Technology and Politics*, 2(3), 163–181.