

FROM JOKE TO BACKLASH: PLATFORMED AFFECT AND COMMUNITY RESPONSE ON TRUTH SOCIAL

JOE Sarah Chidiebere

Department of Development Communication
Faculty of Communication and Media Studies
Rivers State University
sarah.joe@ust.edu.ng

Abstract

This study examines how users on Truth Social responded to Donald Trump's reaction to Trevor Noah's satirical joke at the 2026 Grammy Awards. It analyses users' interpretations of Trump's response, identifies dominant affective frames, investigates the transformation of satire from humour into a perceived cultural threat, and assesses what these reactions reveal about the communicative culture of Truth Social. The research is grounded in the concept of affective publics, drawing on the works of Papacharissi and Lünenborg, which describe how digital political communities are organised through emotional expression and collective meaning-making. A qualitative research design was employed, utilising thematic analysis of purposively selected replies to Trump's post on Truth Social. The findings indicate that users' responses were shaped more by emotional expression and identity performance than by deliberative engagement. Five dominant themes were identified: satire as an affective trigger, defensive alignment with Trump, moralised outrage, strategic dismissal and symbolic amplification, and counter-discursive critique. The results further demonstrate that within ideologically homogeneous digital spaces, satire is reconstructed less as humour and critique and more as symbolic aggression that prompts emotional mobilisation and collective defense. The study concludes that backlash operates as a form of political communication that reinforces group solidarity and cohesion. It recommends increased scholarly attention to audience reception practices and comparative research across alternative social media platforms. This research contributes to scholarship on affective publics, Alt Tech, and the reception of political satire.

Keywords: Affective publics | Alt Tech | Audience reception | Political satire | Truth Social

Objectives of the Study

In line with the foregoing discussions, this study seeks to examine how Truth social users interpret Trump's reaction to Noah's Grammy joke, identify and analyse the dominant affective frames expressed in user responses to Donald Trump's post, investigate how satire is transformed from a form of humour into a perceived cultural threat within discussions on Truth social, and explore what user responses reveal about the communicative culture of Truth Social.

Research Questions

This study address the following questions: How do Truth Social users interpret Donald Trump's reaction to Trevor Noah's Grammy joke? What affective frames dominate user responses? How is satire transformed from humour into perceived cultural threat? What do these responses reveal about the communicative culture of Truth Social?

Literature Review

Following Papacharissi (2015), networked publics coalesce over emotional expressions rather than rational deliberation. Within these spaces, outrage, solidarity, pride, and indignation circulate to influence how political issues are read and interpreted. Similarly, Lunenborg (2019) argued that publics should be conceptualised as dynamic and performative formulations that come into being through communicative acts of articulation and reception. Under this view, emotional expression is not just an individual reaction but also part of the process by which publics are constituted and sustained.

In tandem with this, this affective orientation of publics needs to be situated vis-à-vis more extensive issues of power, exclusion and contestation. Fraser (1990) develops the notion of multiple counter-publics by arguing against a unitary public sphere in which spaces exist outside dominant discourses for subordinate groups to fashion alternative discursive

Introduction

Over the last two decades, political communication on digital platforms has experienced major changes. Social media has not only redefined how political messages are produced, distributed and consumed, it has also influenced how publics form. In these spaces, for instance, communication is not subject to gatekeeping or other traditional media logic (Joe, 2020). Instead, political discourse derives from emotionally charged exchanges by a vast network of users, and is shaped by platform-specific logic and affordances (Treem & Leonardi, 2012, 2013; van Dijck & Poell, 2013). For Lunenborg (2019) and Papacharissi (2015), contemporary digital publics are not mere information-sharing communities, but affective assemblages, in which users, platform affordances, and circulating discourses interact to organise emotive expressions of solidarity and hostility.

Affective publics, a notion introduced by Zizi Papacharissi, explain the nature of political communication in networked environments. Papacharissi (2015) conceptualised affective publics as “networked public formations that are mobilised and connected or disconnected through expressions of sentiment” (p. 125). In this formulation, emotions such as humour, resentment, solidarity or indignation serve as connective forces that organise participation and collective meaning-making within digital spaces. In parallel, Lunenborg (2019) noted the mutable, volatile, and performative character of these publics in networked settings, noting that publics are brought into being through affective flows of communication such as posting, commenting, sharing, and tagging. Thus, affective publics are not just audiences rallying around events; rather, they are contingent communicative formations sustained through the traversal of affect across networked media infrastructures. Taken together, Papacharissi and Lunenborg highlight emotion as a key organising principle of contemporary digital publics while also giving a conceptual template for how platform users perceive and reply to political events communally.

The intentional deployment of emotion in political conversations has been normalised in digital media environments. According to Boler and Davis (2021), contemporary political communication is now more reliant than ever on the affective weaponisation of information (pp. 15-18), where emotional reactions like resentment, anger, or fear are evoked to shape identity and retain attention. This is particularly the case in the polarised media environment, where communication is more of a mechanism for reinforcing shared ideological beliefs.

Within this evolving environment, alternative social media, also referred to as Alt Tech have emerged as critical platforms for political discourse, partly in response to censorship and moderation practices on established sites like X and Facebook. However, the literature indicates that Alt Techs are not necessarily alternate spaces for free speech. Instead, they foster visibility, participation and ideological consensus, while their design and user base often encourage ideological consolidation over pluralistic debate (Siapera, 2023).

Truth Social is an example of an Alt Tech. The platform which launched in 2022 is owned by Trump Media & Technology Group, and as such is structurally linked to US President Donald Trump. Truth Social operates within a politically symbiotic environment, where Trump's posts functions as a central node of information and mobilisation. Although its audience is smaller when compared to legacy social media applications, Trump's posts attract substantial engagement and generates wider media attention in the hybrid media ecosystem (Zhang et al., 2024). Network analyses of the platform reveal cluster-based communication and ideological homophily with minimal cross-cutting interaction across political orientations (Hughes & Weninger, 2025). These dynamics, therefore, dictate how political discussions are perceived and understood. Rather than facilitating heterogeneous deliberations, ideologically aligned technology may promote communicative patterns that prioritise emotional reassurance,

identity signalling, and affirmation. Thus, media events originating outside the platform can acquire transformed meanings when reconstructed within the platform's unique environment.

A notably instructive instance is the interaction between platform-based expressions of political identity and political satire. Scholars characterise political satire a multifarious form of political expression that combines humour, ambiguity, and critique. As theorised by Jones and Baym (2010), satire could question power, flag hypocrisy, and trigger political reflection. Additionally, satire is by its very nature, interpretatively unstable, due to its dependence on hyperbole and irony, which enables a propensity for multiple interpretations regarding the intended point of the satire or the target of its mockery (Landreville, 2015). This equivocality means satire can trigger dissimilar reactions from its target audience. For some, the satire may be humorous, while for others, it may be judged disrespectful or an ideological assault. Thus, in politically charged environments, satire may provoke emotional backlash rather than laughter.

This study considers such a case. Trevor Noah, the South African comedian and talk show host, delivered a satirical remark about Donald Trump during the 2026 Grammy Awards. The US President later responded to the joke on Truth Social, prompting numerous replies from users, with many outraged and others defending Trump or rebuking perceived cultural elites. The joke itself is not the focus of this study, but how users responded to Trump's post. In doing this, the research examines how humour becomes politically offensive, how users express emotional responses, and the reinforcement of community identity within a platform characterised by strong homophily. The qualitative thematic analysis of user responses explores how emotional expressions serve as political messaging on politically polarised Internet platforms, and by this, the study adds to knowledge on affective publics, Alt Tech and reception of political satire.

Statement of the Problem

Historically, political satire has been understood as a form of media content that can inform audiences, critique power, or foster political deliberation (Jones & Baym, 2010; Landreville, 2015). However, much of existing scholarship treats satire as text or the conditions of its production within mainstream media environments, with considerable emphasis in its rhetorical composition and its cognitive implications (Baunmgartner & Morris, 2006; Day, 2011; Young, 2013; 2017). Lesser emphasis has been placed on how satire is consumed or reconstructed in ideologically aligned online environments. Furthermore, research on Alt Tech platforms such as Truth Social centre elite political communication, network structures and platform governance (Hughes & Weninger, 2025; Zhang et al., 2024). Although these works provide insight into the layout and configuration of these emergent platforms, they fail to reveal how ordinary users interpret communicative events, express their emotion, or facilitate in-group cohesion. These gaps are critical because making sense of political communication is not restricted to the original content. Meaning is also made through user responses and collective interpretation. In ideologically aligned platforms, for instance, user responses may transform external events like satire into symbolic threats that provoke emotional mobilisation and reinforce political identity.

This study addressed these gaps by examining the Trump-Trevoh case from the perspective of users' response, by unpacking how humour is reconstructed as offence, how affective reactions structure political discourse, and how backlash serves as an instrument of community reinforcement. Specifically, the study explores: how users constructed meaning around Trump's reaction, what types of affective patterns dominated the replies, in what ways the responses performed political identity and community cohesion, and how the Truth Social platform environment influenced the metamorphosis of satire into backlash.

formations that frame oppositional understandings of hegemonic narratives. While digital platforms have enabled the emergence of different kinds of counter-publics, they have also allowed ideologically homogeneous spaces to flourish, in which discourse is more a matter of reaffirmation than contestation (Colleoni et al., 2014).

This affective lens is therefore important for understanding political communication in online spaces and holds special importance when examining communication on ideologically sympathetic platforms. In such contexts, emotional expression rarely serves as deliberative engagement; much more commonly, it operates as a tool for identity affirmation and group solidarity (Papacharissi, 2015).

Building on the argument of the previous authors, Boler and Davis (2021) extended the argument by emphasising how digital media environments exacerbate emotional mobilisation through technological and economic frameworks that privilege content designed to arrest attention. According to these scholars, current-era political communication is marked by the affective weaponisation of information, where content is not just distributed for consumption but instead feeds into the attention machine to evoke emotionally-laced responses that engineer partisan alignment and groupthink. Taken together, these perspectives indicate that analysing emotional expressions is critical for understanding how political discourse takes place in digitally mediated spaces.

Scholars have demonstrated how emotions go beyond individuals and circulate through digital architectures, bodies, and texts. Sara Ahmed (2004) explains that emotions are relational and accumulative, “sticking” to objects, figures, and narratives over time, determining how they are understood and interpreted. This process leaves some figures affectively endowed — attracting attachment, loyalty or hostility; others labelled threats or objects of contempt. Within digital political environments, these affective

economies are critical for determining how users read events, allocate meaning, and position themselves within the community. This insight is particularly relevant for reviewing rhetoric on platforms that are ideologically compatible, in which emotional intensities are expressed and exacerbated through algorithmic visibility and repetition (Gillespie, 2014).

Along with these developments, Alt Tech research is an expanding domain of scholarship in digital political communication studies. Although these platforms emerged as a result of moderation, governance practices, and perceived ideological bent on legacy social media applications, scholars have contended that their relevance extends beyond the mere provision of alternative venues for engagement. Alt techs shape distinctive communicative ecosystems (Rogers, 2020). Siapera (2023), for instance, conceptualised these platforms as political media infrastructures that enable ideological entrepreneurship and audience consolidation. According to the author, these platforms may be oriented toward creators with whom they remain beholden to foster loyal audiences or sustain movements.

For example, Truth Social exists within a politically aligned ecosystem built around Donald Trump. Zhang et al. (2024) show that Trump's posts on Truth Social generates engagement capable of inspiring broader media attention. This signals how Alt Tech platforms remain enmeshed within the hybrid media system. Hughes and Weninger's (2025) network analysis of Truth Social revealed that the platform is predominantly ideologically clustered, meaning it is based on hypercommunication around dominant figures and communities rather than the diffusion of voices across the ideological spectrum. This indicates that discussions on the platform may tend toward entrenching rather than facilitating deliberative exchange around political identity.

Within broader digital political communications, while satire has an established history in political discourse, it occupies an important, yet

complex position. On the one hand, satire can reveal hypocrisy in political rhetoric, disrupt authority, and inspire audiences to critically engage with political ideas (Jones and Baym, 2010). On the other hand, satire is inherently ambivalent because its messages rely on irony and hyperbole (Landreville, 2015). The tendency for misinterpretation could result in audiences evaluating certain satire as offensive rather than humorous. In politically fractured contexts, then, satire may elicit other emotional reactions beyond laughter (Ekman & Widholm, 2025).

Although much scholarly literature addresses satire, political news, and digital media more generally, far less attention has been given to how satirical material is interpreted in ideologically homogeneous online spaces. Given this state of affairs, much scholarship to date either addresses satire produced in the mainstream media environment or focuses on its impact on large and heterogeneous audiences. Baumgartner and Morris (2006), for example, examine *The Daily Show* from an effects perspective, demonstrating that exposure to political satire can simultaneously increase political efficacy while stimulating cynicism towards political institutions. Day (2011) views satire as a performative mode of political critique, investigating the role that parodic news, satirical documentaries, and ironic activism play in politics by intervening within political discourse to disrupt dominant narratives within the mainstream media environment. Following this line of thought, Young (2013; 2017) examines the psychological and emotional aspects of satire consumption, showing how satire appeals to certain audience groups and moulds political attitudes through mechanisms of humour, irony, and selective exposure within an increasingly polarised media environment.

These studies engage satire as a textual or mediated product and audiences as inactive recipients or measurable respondents, giving little consideration to how users increasingly reinterpret and create satirical

meaning in digitally aligned political platforms. But the interpretive ecology of satire is highly context-dependent and can differ substantially between more politically cohesive online communities. Satire aimed at political leaders in such spaces may be seen as a sign-based aggression on the community itself. Understanding these realities, therefore, necessitates a shift from the analysis of satirical texts to audiences' responses. Replies, comments, and other forms of user interaction offer valuable insights into how audiences understand and reconstruct communicative events. By examining responses on Truth Social, this study adds to this emerging vein of inquiry and details how satire can function as an affective stimulus that strengthens political identity and in-group solidarity.

Methodology

This study uses a qualitative research design highlighting the discursive and affective features of users comments on how Truth Social users reacted when Trump responded to Noah's satirical joke at the 2026 Grammy Awards. The responses in this instance are considered as communicative acts through which users manifested political identity, performed group affiliation, and solidified their shared affective leanings.

Thematic analysis, a qualitative data analytic method allowing researchers to identify patterns of meaning across textual data, is used to analyse the data extracted from Truth Social. Thematic analysis is appropriate for analysing digital discourse, as it enables the researcher to identify recurring themes related to emotion and narrative while remaining sensitive to variations in context. The interpretive orientation is rooted in Papacharissi's (2015), Lunnenborb and Maier (2018), and Lunenborg's (2019) notion of affective publics, which characterises digital political communication as structured around emotional expression rather than deliberative reasoning. Within this framework, replies on Alt Tech platforms are understood as performative expressions through which users participate

in the construction of a politically aligned public.

The research setting is Truth Social, a platform scholars indicate acts like a web of ideologically aligned digital community, featuring high levels of political homogeneity and concentrated interactions with dominant accounts (Hughes & Weninger, 2025; Zhang et al., 2024). These structural traits make Truth Social well-suited to studying how politically aligned communities make sense of and respond to contentious political events.

The dataset comprises users' responses to Trump's reaction to Noah's Grammy joke, with the unit of analysis being individual replies to the post. Replies were purposively determined and were included if they had substantive textual commentary pertaining to the joke, Trump's response, or the broader political context. Posts comprising only emojis, unrelated links, or spam were excluded, except if they sufficiently aided affective expression.

Due to the absence of a widely available public Application Programming Interface (API) on the platform for research purposes, the responses analysed were manually extracted from the Truth Social platform, while adhering to ethically compliant digital archiving methods. Each reply was captured along with relevant contextual information, including timestamps and, when possible, visible engagement metrics.

Analytic procedures for the dataset followed the thematic analysis as proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006). It was initiated by re-reading the replies to become familiar with the data and detect patterns in language use, tone, and emotion. This process was followed by initial open coding to extract the most salient discursive and affective elements from the dataset. The outcome revealed recurring patterns, including expressions of political fealty, anger toward perceived elites, dismissal of satire, and broader narratives of media hostility. Related codes were organised into broader analytical categories through an iterative comparison across the dataset. Those clusters were then further condensed into broader themes that

accounted for the prevailing affective patterns driving user response.

Although the data reported and analysed in this study are publicly available, ethical considerations apply. Usernames and identifying information were stripped from the dataset, and all quoted replies are presented in an anonymised form. The study analyses only the text of replies and does not collect personal information from users.

Discussion of Findings

RQ1: How do Truth Social users interpret Donald Trump's reaction to Trevor Noah's Grammy joke?

The results indicate that Truth Social users primarily interpreted Donald Trump's response to Trevor Noah's satirical Grammy remark through affective and identity-oriented frameworks, rather than through humour appreciation or critical engagement. Throughout the dataset, users seldom regarded Noah's comments as satire or symbolic critique. Instead, they reimagined the joke as an ideological attack, a form of cultural provocation, or as evidence of ongoing hostility from media and entertainment elites. This reinterpretation elicited emotionally charged responses, such as indignation, moral condemnation, and calls for retaliation.

A dominant theme within this pattern is the role of satire as an affective trigger. Rather than being perceived as humour, Noah's satirical statement was often interpreted as hostile, defamatory, or deliberately inflammatory. User comments such as “*disgraceful ingrate*,” “*assclown*,” and “*Lying Liberal Loser*” demonstrate that satire lost its comedic ambiguity and was reframed as verbal aggression. Even less overtly hostile remarks referencing “*false and reckless claims*” and “*defamation*” indicate that users regarded satire as factual distortion rather than symbolic commentary.

This finding aligns with Ahmed's (2004) concept of affective economies, where emotions become attached to figures and events, thereby

Truth Social, satire did not function as an interpretive invitation; instead, it became a symbolic event that necessitated emotional defence and collective response.

However, this finding diverges from existing scholarship on political humour. Studies by Landreville (2015) and Young (2013) suggest that satire can stimulate learning and political engagement among audiences. The present results indicate that within ideologically aligned spaces, humour may instead intensify polarisation and activate defensive identity processes.

RQ4: What do these responses reveal about the communicative culture of Truth Social?

The findings demonstrate that Truth Social functions as an affectively organised communicative environment characterised by emotional intensification, identity performance, and the maintenance of moral boundaries. Rather than fostering deliberative exchange, participation is structured to reinforce collective identity and sustain ideological coherence.

This finding is consistent with emerging Alt-Tech scholarship, which argues that alternative platforms constitute distinctive communicative ecosystems rather than merely serving as substitute spaces for engagement (Rogers, 2020). Within these environments, platform affordances and ideological consensus interact to establish specific communicative norms.

However, the presence of counter-discursive responses complicates assumptions of complete ideological closure. Alternative interpretations grounded in democratic beliefs and ironic critique persisted, despite their limited visibility. These findings indicate that ideological homogeneity is never absolute and partially support Fraser's (1990) argument regarding the persistence of competing publics.

Collectively, the evidence advances scholarship by demonstrating that within ideologically homogeneous environments, satire may cease to

shaping their social meaning. Trevor Noah's comments became emotionally charged objects that users employed to mobilise anger and antagonism. Similarly, Papacharissi (2015) contends that networked publics increasingly organise around affective intensities rather than deliberative reasoning. The data indicate that, within Truth Social, satire operates as a catalyst for emotional alignment and political meaning-making.

This finding is also consistent with Boler and Davis (2021), who argue that digital political environments prioritise emotional mobilisation and identity affirmation over rational discourse. However, this interpretation diverges from traditional scholarship on satire. Scholars such as Day (2011), Jones and Baym (2010), and Young (2017) maintain that satire functions as a democratic resource that fosters reflection and critique. In this context, however, satire prompted emotional reactions and political defensiveness rather than reflexive engagement.

RQ2: What affective frames dominate user responses?

The analysis revealed four primary affective frames: defensive alignment with Trump, moralised outrage and ideological othering, strategic dismissal and symbolic amplification, and counter-discursive critique.

The first and most prominent affective frame was defensive alignment with Trump. Users often depicted Trump as a victim of unjust attacks and cast themselves as defenders of a politically embattled figure. Statements such as “*We love you President Trump,*” “*We have President Trump's back,*” and “*Go get him sir*” illustrate strong affective identification and collective loyalty. Calls for retaliation, including “*SUE SUE SUE*” and “*TAKE HIM DOWN,*” further reinforced this orientation.

This finding supports Lünenborg and Maier's (2018) argument that publics are constituted through communicative performances of emotion. Participation in these spaces is oriented less toward information exchange

and more toward the display of affiliation and solidarity. Defending Trump thus operates not just as opinion expression but as a form of identity performance.

The second affective frame was characterised by moralised outrage and ideological othering. Trevor Noah, liberal media figures, and perceived cultural elites were frequently depicted as morally corrupt and politically illegitimate. Terms such as “*lying scum bags*,” “*commie globalists*,” and “*no morals and no integrity*” exemplify a process of moral boundary construction that ethically delegitimises out-groups. Comments questioning Noah's identity, such as “*another loser from South Africa*” and “*wonder what his immigration status is*,” further illustrate symbolic exclusion.

These outcomes support Boler and Davis (2021), who argue that digital environments intensify antagonistic political emotions and reinforce affective polarisation. The findings also align with van Dijk's (1998) theory of ideological polarisation, in which positive in-group representation is reinforced through negative portrayals of outsiders.

Another significant affective frame involved strategic dismissal combined with symbolic amplification. Users simultaneously minimised the significance of Trevor Noah and the Grammy event while intensifying their reactions. Comments such as “*The Grammys are unwatchable trash*” and “*another elite lecture gone wrong*” dismissed Noah's importance, whereas calls such as “*destroy him in court*” and “*sue him for everything he has*” amplified collective mobilisation.

This dual process supports platform studies scholarship, which suggests that digitally networked environments promote visibility through emotional intensity (van Dijck & Poell, 2013). Satire was thus constructed as both trivial and threatening; trivial enough to dismiss, yet sufficiently dangerous to warrant retaliation.

Finally, a smaller but analytically significant frame involved counter-discursive critique. Some users challenged dominant interpretations by invoking legal reasoning, democratic values, and counter-satire. Comments such as “*Defamation claims are decided in courts—not press releases*” and “*threatening comedians is inconsistent with a free press*” attempted to reframe the event through alternative interpretive logics.

This finding partially supports Fraser's (1990) theory of subaltern counter-publics, which emphasises the emergence of competing discourses within dominant communicative spaces. However, unlike Fraser's optimistic formulation, these dissenting interventions remained marginal and comparatively muted, suggesting structural asymmetries within Truth Social's affective environment.

RQ3: How is satire transformed from humour into a perceived cultural threat?

The evidence indicates that satire experienced an affective transformation, wherein humour was reframed as symbolic aggression and a perceived cultural threat. Instead of being regarded as political commentary, Trevor Noah's joke was incorporated into broader narratives of elite hostility, ideological persecution, and moral decline.

This process exemplifies Ahmed's (2004) argument that emotions circulate within society and accumulate around specific objects and narratives over time. Through repeated emotional reinforcement, satire was re-signified as evidence of broader cultural conflict. Users interpreted the joke not as an isolated humorous statement but as confirmation of a more extensive antagonistic relationship between media elites and Trump supporters.

This finding further supports Papacharissi's (2015) proposition that emotional intensity shapes meaning-making in digital environments. On

function as a vehicle for deliberation or critique. Instead, it serves as an affective mechanism for identity performance, symbolic boundary construction, and community reinforcement. The transformation of humour into backlash, therefore, appears structurally embedded within platform dynamics of affect, visibility, and political alignment.

Conclusion

This study examined Truth Social users' responses to Donald Trump's reaction to Trevor Noah's satirical Grammy remarks and found that, within ideologically aligned digital environments, satire extends beyond humour or political critique. Instead of functioning as a site for reflection, satire operated as an affective catalyst, prompting users to express outrage, affirm political loyalties, defend group identities, and reinforce symbolic community boundaries. User responses consistently prioritised emotional performance over deliberative engagement, demonstrating that political meaning in contemporary digital spaces is collectively produced through affective participation.

The findings further indicate that Truth Social's communicative culture is structured around emotional intensification and ideological coherence. Platform affordances and political alignment together establish conditions in which external communicative events are mediated through pre-existing affective and identity frameworks. As a result, satire is transformed from symbolic critique into a perceived cultural threat that prompts defence, resistance, and collective mobilisation.

Ultimately, this study contends that the significance of political satire in fragmented digital environments resides not only in the satirical text itself but also in the ways audiences emotionally receive, circulate, and reconstruct it within specific platform contexts. As digital publics become increasingly polarised and platform-dependent, conceptualising audience reception as an affective process becomes central to understanding contemporary political communication.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are proposed based on the findings of this study:

1. Researchers examining political satire in digital environments should move beyond textual and effects-based approaches by prioritising audience reception practices. User responses, comment cultures, and affective engagements represent significant sites of political meaning-making, particularly within ideologically aligned platforms.
2. Scholars of digital political communication should examine how platform architectures and affordances influence emotional expression and collective interpretation. Future research should investigate the interplay among technological design, political congruence, and affective mobilisation across various alternative social media environments.
3. Media literacy initiatives should promote critical engagement with emotionally charged political content by enabling users to recognise how humour, satire, and political messaging are transformed through affective and partisan dynamics within online communities.
4. Future studies should conduct comparative analyses across multiple platforms to determine whether the affective transformation of satire observed on Truth Social also occurs in other digital environments with differing levels of ideological diversity and moderation structures.

References

Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion*. Edinburgh University Press.

Baumgartner, J. & Morris, J. S. (2006). The Daily Show effect: Candidate

- evaluations, efficacy, and American youth. *American Politics Research*, 34(3), 341-367.
- Boler, M., & Davis, E. (2021). *Affective politics of digital media: Propaganda by other means*. Routledge.
- Colleoni, E., Rozza, A., & Arvidsson, A. (2014). Echo chamber or public sphere? Predicting political orientation and measuring political homophily in twitter using big data. *Journal of Communication*, 64(2), 317-332.
- Day, A. (2011). *Satire and dissent: Interventions in contemporary political debate*. Indiana University Press.
- Ekman, M. & Widholm, A. (2025). Entertaining the electorate” Strategic satire and evolving formats of negative political campaigning. *Comedy Studies*, DOI: 10.1080/2040610X.2025.2607879
- Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. *Social Text*, (25/26), 56–80.
- Gillespie, T. (2014). The relevance of algorithms. In T. Gillespie, P. J. Boczkowski, P. J., & K. A. Foot (Eds.), *Media technologies: Essays on communication, materiality & society* (pp. 167–194). MIT Press.
- Hughes, A., & Weninger, T. (2025). Echo chambers and information brokers on Truth Social: A study of network dynamics and political discourse. *CSCW Companion '25: Companion of the Computer-Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, doi.org/10.1145/3715070.3749241
- Jones, J. P., & Baym, G. (2010). A dialogue on satire news and the crisis of truth in postmodern political television. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 34(3), 278–294.
- Landreville, K. D. (2015). Satire as uncertain territory: Uncertainty expression in discussion about political satire, opinion, and news. *Humour*, 28(4), 559-582

- Lunenborg, M. (2019). Affective publics. In J. Slaby & C. V. Scheve (Eds.), *Affective societies: Key concepts* (pp. 319-329). Routledge.
- Lünenborg, M., & Maier, T. (2018). The turn to affect and emotion in media studies. *Media and Communication*, 6(3), 1–4.
- Papacharissi, Z. (2015). *Affective publics: Sentiment, technology, and politics*. Oxford University Press.
- Rogers, R. (2020). Deplatforming: Following extreme Internet celebrities to Telegram and alternative social media. *European Journal of Communication*, 35(3), 213-229.
- Siapera, E. (2023). Alt tech and the public sphere: Exploring Bitchute as a political media infrastructure. *European Journal of Communication*, 38(5), 446-465.
- Treem, J. W. & Leonardi, P. M. (2013). Social media use in organisations: Exploring the affordances of visibility, editability, persistence, and association. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 36(1), 143-189
- Treem, J. W., & Leonardi, P. M. (2012). Social media use in organisations: Exploring the affordances of visibility, editability, persistence, and association. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 36, 143–189.
- van Dijck, T. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage Publications.
- van Dijck, J., & Poell, T. (2013). Understanding social media logic. *Media and Communication*, 1(1), 2-14.
- Van Dijck, J., Poell, T., & de Waal, M. (2018). *The platform society: Public values in a connective world*. Oxford University Press.
- Young, D. G. (2013). Laughter, learning, or enlightenment? Viewing and avoidance motivations behind the *Daily Show* and *The Colbert Report*. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 57(2), 153-169

- Young, D.G. (2017). *Irony and outrage: The polarised landscape of rage, fear, and laughter in the United States*. Oxford University Press.
- Zhang, Y., Lukito, J., Suk, J. & McGrady, R. (2024). Trump, Twitter, and Truth Social: How Trump used both mainstream and alt-tech social media to drive news media attention. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, DOI: 10.1080/19331681.2024.2328156