# Twitter Thread by GET A GRIP ■



**GET A GRIP ■**
@docrussjackson

**New research into anti-immigration rhetoric, which I'll try to summarise in this THREAD.**

**It basically suggests that the emotive use of metaphor & hyperbole in anti-immigration rhetoric drives base support & INCREASES their likelihood of political**

Typical anti-immigration rhetoric used by right-wing populist nationalist parties presents immigrants as outsiders, who are framed as a threat to the populist nationalists idealized nation.




In their anti-immigration rhetoric, politicians typically use strong, vivid, & negative metaphors & hyperboles to frame their political statements.

There is agreement that, at least for parts of the electorate, such populist anti-immigration rhetoric can be highly persuasive.




Metaphor & hyperbole can spark emotions by eliciting a vivid image & can increase perceived message intensity.

Metaphors can activate connotations attached to intense & negative concepts, like war & other threats, & hyperboles can exaggerate danger & emphasize threats.




When metaphor &/or hyperbole are used to frame a political issue, they not only add a rhetorical flourish, but they transfer conceptual content as well: they can promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, problem evaluation, &/or a possible problem solution.

Anti-immigration rhetoric is often associated with the occurrence of frames that combine metaphor and hyperbole.

For example, Dutch right-wing politician Geert Wilders hyperbolically extended the metaphor a wave of immigrants into "a tsunami" of 'Islamization'.




It's widely accepted that figurative language can increase a message's persuasiveness, but this research tests the persuasiveness of these tropes in the context of anti-immigration rhetoric, & allows for effects of figurative frames to be moderated by voters' prior positions.

Some metaphor scholars propose that effects of figuration can outweigh effects of prior opinion.

The results showed that voters of right-wing populist nationalist parties responded differently to figuratively framed anti-immigration statements than other voters.

Although the typically intense and emotive anti-immigration rhetoric used by right-wing populist leaders is often seen as an important factor for their success, the research findings do NOT directly support this idea, as populist nationalist voters may already be desensitized.

For voters as a whole, figuratively framed intense & emotive statements resulted in a 'boomerang effect' - increasing opposition to those with anti-immigrant sentiment, thus supporting 'Social Judgment Theory' (messages going against one's beliefs are unlikely to be persuasive).

Results support the idea that when such messages are perceived as intense, the chance increases that it backfires on its sender: within the context of anti-immigration rhetoric, metaphors & hyperboles can steer opinion AWAY from the position advocated in the political message.

At first sight, the findings suggest that the typically intense and emotive rhetoric used by anti-immigration politicians cannot be seen as a factor that explains their political success.

However, (IMPORTANT POINT COMING UP):

By pushing the opinion of voters with opposing ideas farther away from their own ideas, populist nationalist leaders broaden/widen the gap between populist voters & other voters, which might indirectly benefit populist success:



Voters who are offended by the intense & emotive rhetoric that goes against their beliefs are likely to express themselves against the anti-immigration politician & its constituency, & in such cases, the anti-immigration party may be ostracized by other parties and/or voters.

However, it looks like such ostracism MAY ACTUALLY INCREASE SUPPORT FOR SUCH PARTIES: when anti-immigration voters, in turn, believe their in-group, their group leader, and/or their shared ideology are threatened, their party identification might be strengthened.



Moreover, when these voters perceive a greater #polarization between their anti-immigration in-group and the out-group of other voters, THEY ARE MORE LIKELY TO ENGAGE IN ALL FORMS OF POLITICAL ACTION, including VOTING for anti-immigration politicians/policies.



NOW do you see why the anti-immigrant Right use inflammatory rhetoric?

NOW do you see why screaming 'NAZI RACIST' at anti-immigrant politicians/voters is NOT a sensible strategy?

Imho, it's EXACTLY WHY they constantly Gaslight us!


IT'S
EXACTLY
WHAT
THEY
WANT YOU
TO DO