Populism in the 21st Century: Comparative Case Studies of Rhetoric and Policy Impact

Priti Samar Sawale
Assistant Professor and Head,
Dept. of Political Science,
B. K. Birla College, Kalyan (Maharashtra)

Abstract

The paper examines how populism came into existence in the 21 st century and evolved, on a case by case analysis, taking into consideration the rhetoric as well as the policy implications. Populism, which tends to be a call to the people against perceived elite in other political structures, cultures and economic situations, softens in different ways. The research paper investigates how simplified stories, emotional appeals, and identity-based messages that politicians employ can receive the support of the population and rebrand the political discussion. The case studies analysis in different areas shows that the trends of populist rhetoric like anti-establishment rhetoric, nationalism, and creation of in-group and out-group relationships are prevalent in different areas.

In addition to the rhetorical observation, the paper evaluates the actual world effects of populist politics particularly in economic policy, immigration, institutional change, and media control. The findings suggest that the populist movement can be linked with the purported inclusivity and systemic change-making but the outcome of the policy may produce opposite outcomes including institutional strain, policy instability, and democratic standard change. Comparative approach enables one to assess convergences and divergences in the sense of the influence of populism on the manner in which the governance and the public policy are carried out.

The paper would contribute to the improved understanding of the relationship between the political communication and the policy change in the new democracies. It brings out the importance of the contextual factor such as economic inequalities, political mistrust, and globalization to dictate populist course. The fact that rhetoric and practical conclusions narrow makes the research useful to policy makers, scholars and institutions that want to find an effective countermeasure to deal with the challenge in contemporary populism.

Keywords: Populism, Political Rhetoric, Policy Impact, Comparative Politics, 21st Century Politics, Anti-Establishment Movements, Nationalism, Democratic Institutions, Political Communication, Governance, Public Policy, Electoral Behavior, Identity Politics, Globalization, Political Leadership

Introduction

Populism is now among the strongest and highly debatable political movements in the 21 st century that have turned the discourse of the democracies of both developed and emerging economies. Populism has no ideological boundaries and it can be left, right and centrist in politics because populism is based on the people vs. perceived elites. The abundance of growth of online communication platforms, economic inequalities, migration pressures, and a negative shift in trust of institutions have made the pre-emptive populist leaders and parties have an easy target to seek out and recruit their own supporters with emotionally charged language and simplified policies.

The issue of populism is discussed in the research paper in a comparative manner, it is specifically the rhetoric construction and the translation of the rhetoric into the material policy. Even though the discursive dimension of populism has been well-researched in the extant literature, the research gap that remains in the literature research is the manifestation of the strength of the populist discourse on the governance, the structure of institutions, and the socio-

economic policies in different national contexts. This paper, through a discussion of some case studies of different political systems, hopes to bridge the gap between rhetoric and the actual policy change.

The article follows a qualitative comparative approach with the application of speeches, policy statements and secondary literature in ascertaining the overall trends in populist communication and governing strategies. A special focus is placed on the following themes as the anti-elitism, nationalism, and the framing of crisis and their consequences on the principles of democracy, economic control, and social integration.

The general intention behind this work is to contribute to a more in-depth understanding of populism by putting it in the framework of modern politics and evaluating its consequences in the long-term. By so doing, it gives some insight as to whether populism is a curative process in democratic processes or a danger to their stability and inclusiveness.

Background of the study

The populism that was followed by the early years of the twenty first century era has been revived dramatically in the twenty first century era in different political systems of existence, the established democracies as well as the emerging economies. Although the notion of populism is not a new principle, the contemporary manifestations of it differ in relation to the extent of its scale, the way of its communication, and the consequences of the implemented policies. Traditionally, as a kind of political strategy according to which the people are opposed to the elite, modern populism is modified depending on globalization, economic inequalities, mass migration and technological revolution. These structural shifts have left the fertile grounds to leaders and movements which claim to be representing the interest of the ordinary citizens and posing a challenge to the existing political institutions and norms.

The financial crises of the late 2000s around the world, along with the growing income inequality and the perceived inefficiency of the old political systems, helped to reduce the public trust in the government. Populist actors have been able to marshal supporters using rhetoric that appeals to the emotions, oversimplified accounts, and appeals based on identity due to this loss of confidence. The modern world has added volume to these messages with the use of digital platforms and political leaders can use digital platforms to avoid traditional media gatekeepers and communicate directly to mass audiences. Consequently, political communication is now personalized, immediate and polarizing, which strengthens the model of rhetoric in the formation of the opinion of the people.

The twenty-first century populism is marked with a lot of variation in regions. It has been manifested as nationalist and anti-immigration movements in the Western democracies, redistributive policies and charismatic governance in some regions of Latin America and Asia. These variations underline the contextuality of populism whereby the ideology orientation and policy implications are based on historical, economic and cultural factors. Irrespective of these differences, the only similarity that can be seen is that rhetoric is strategically used to create a moral dichotomy between the people of purity and the elite of corruption, which is often supported with a critique of institutional checks and balances.

The populist governance policy has become a field of increasing academic attention. Whereas certain sources argue that populist leaders are capable of bringing forward the policies that would focus on dealing with social inequalities and contributing to increased political engagement, others identify the possible dangers, such as weakening the institutions, unstable policies, and a decreased adherence to the principles of democracy. This discrepancy in these results makes it clear why comparative analysis should be systematized. To determine the overall impact of populism on policy and development, it is crucial to understand how rhetoric becomes translated into a policy choice.

Considering the growing popularity of the populist movements around the globe, there is a necessity to explore their dynamics on the basis of the comparative case analysis. This is a

method that can be used to gain a better understanding of the ways the varied political settings determine rhetorical tactics as well as policy outcomes. The research will uncover the trends, the similarities and differences in the operation of the populism in different environments by analyzing a few cases. This, in turn, assists in the creation of more advanced perception of the correlation between the area of political speech and the area of policy activity of the modern age. In this case, this paper aims to examine the populism in the twenty-first century as regards the role of rhetoric and policy. Putting analysis into the comparative context, it is to fill the existing gaps in the literature and shed light on the role of populism discourse in governing activities and influencing the policy.

Justification

The resurgence of populism in the 21 st century has come to be among the biggest phenomena in modern politics that has altered the institution of democracy, popular rhetoric and policy formations in both the developed and developing nations. Having demonstrated so much that, since electoral victories, to policy shifts, the populist movement has been able to influence the processes of governance by accessing the popular will, at times through the language of invectives, which define politics of pop vs. elite. Only a more serious scholarly inquiry into how this type of rhetoric can be translated into practical policy outcomes is needed to bring such a change.

Despite the increase in the literature on populism, the comparative studies have not explored on how to determine a systematic correlation between populist communications strategy and their application in policy implication in the real world. A large portion of the literature is oriented towards either the ideological one or the electoral triumph and the intersection point of rhetoric and governance was given less importance. The proposed study addresses that gap by discussing multiple case studies within different political and cultural contexts, therefore, creating a more accurate depiction of the influence of populist discourses on the decision-making process, along with the policy priorities.

The other reason why the research should be conducted is due to the relevancy in the preservation and assessment of the democratic norms. Populist rhetoric is more likely to challenge institutional checks and balances, undermine the right of the minorities, and dismantle the role of expertise in policymaking. Comparative analysis of these dynamics will assist the study in making its contribution to a greater comprehension of whether populism is becoming more or less democratic responsive or whether populism is becoming more or less democratic stable. These are the lessons, which will have to be learnt by the policymakers, academicians, and the players in the civil society in order to address the issues of contemporary form of governance.

Furthermore, globalization, media of digital nature and economic inequality are facilitating the populist movements and that is why there is the need to learn how the structural factors interact with political communication. The trends, the deviations, and the contextual driver of the success and implications of populism strategies used in the various countries can be defined using the comparative methodology, which has been applied in the given study.

All in all, one can say that the research is justified by its attempt to address the gaps in the theoretical and empirical literature, provide cross-national data, contribute the existing debate on the subject of democracy, governance and political communication. Not only does it add more academic knowledge to it, but it also gives some practical implications of how to address the problem of populism in the world that is becoming increasingly interconnected.

Objectives of the Study

1. To analyze the conceptual basis and development of populism in the 21 st century in various political systems.
2. To examine the rhetorical tricks used by populist leaders in the chosen case study

countries.

3. To draw comparisons between the stories, symbols, and the language of communication that is employed in populist discourse in different parts of the world.
4. To explore the socio-economic and political factors that lead to emergence of populist movements.
5. To determine how populist rhetoric influences the opinions of the population and voter turnout.

Literature Review

Populism has been a growing research topic in the 21 st century, but it is still conceptually controversial and methodologically disjointed. An extensive search of the scientific literature on the subject of populism indicates that it does not have an agreed definition, and the various authors have different conceptual, regional, and ideological perspectives on it (Hunger & Paxton, 2021). In spite of this inconsistency, one school of thought that finds common ground in explaining populism as a form of thin-centered ideology that opposes the pure people and the corrupt elite and is usually applied to larger ideological packages, like nationalism or socialism (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017; Hawkins, 2009).

Populism as Rhetoric and Discourse

One of the most powerful schools of thought views populism as an element of rhetoric and language. According to scholars, the simplicity, appeal to emotions, and creation of hostile binaries between the people and the elite are characteristic features of populist communication (Rheindorf, 2020). The comparative discourse studies also show that populist rhetoric can be observed in various political settings such as Europe, Latin America, and the United States but it can be adapted to the local socio-political contexts without any essential characteristics (Hidalgo-Tenorio et al., 2019).

Recent empirical studies on the topic conducted by the means of computational and linguistic analysis have demonstrated that the populist rhetoric is characterized by emotionally charged and direct speech oriented at building identification with the people and the strengthening of charismatic leadership (Wang et al., 2025). Moreover, the populist messages are observed to produce more engagement on digital platforms than technocratic or neutral political communication, which indicates that they are effective in the modern media space (Ernst et al., 2021).

Comparative Case Perspectives on Populism

Comparative studies highlight that populism does not belong to a particular ideology or region but it is a worldwide phenomenon with variations according to the context. The case-based analyses show that left-wing and right-wing populism are different in policy orientation as well as rhetorical framing. Right-wing populism pays more attention to cultural identity, immigration, and nationalism (Mudde and Kaltwasser, 2017; Abromeit, 2017), whereas left-wing populism prefers to focus on the economic unequal distribution and anti-capitalism (Mudde and Kaltwasser, 2017).

As an example, comparative political studies indicate that populist movements in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Poland have led to the problem of democratic backsliding and authoritarianism (Applebaum, 2020) . Likewise, national-level studies, including those of Turkey and Austria, also highlight that populist rhetoric follows the adaptability of the national-level crisis and modifies the voter behaviour and political affiliations (Mellacher, 2020; Turkish case studies).

Policy Implications of Populism

In addition to rhetoric, researchers have started to take a closer look at the policy implications of populist rule. The initial studies concerning macroeconomic populism demonstrate how short-term political benefits that encourage expansionary fiscal policies have a tendency to bring about long-term economic instability; inflation and stagnation (Dornbusch and Edwards, 1991).

In modern studies, this analysis is furthered to as much as to connect populist discourses to institutional uncertainty, weakened investor confidence, and economic activity disruptions (Bennett et al., 2022).

In addition, governance-oriented literature implies that the populist rhetoric can be supported by weak institutional structures and weak transparency, and guided by strong governance mechanisms (Alonso and Kaltwasser, 2024) can offset the latter. This implies that there is a two-way relationship between populism and policy environments and that rhetoric determines, and is determined by, institutional conditions.

Emerging Trends and Research Gaps

The recent scholarship cites the increasing significance of digital media in the process of enhancing populist rhetoric and making the interaction between leaders and citizens more direct. Nevertheless, there are still no integrated comparative frameworks that concurrently compare the rhetoric and policy outcomes in various political systems. Moreover, the propensity toward the confusion of the populism concept with the host ideologies remains a barrier to theoretical clarity and the comparative analysis (Hunger and Paxton, 2021).

Material and Methodology

Research Design:

The research design of the study is qualitative, comparative case study research design in order to explore the emergence of populism in 21st century in the dual perspectives of policy outcomes and political rhetoric. The sample of countries the research is working with is purposely chosen to cover a variety of political systems and regions and conduct a cross-national analysis of the populist movements. The discourse analysis and policy analysis are used in combination to know how populist narratives are made and how they are converted into governance practices. This design is an interpretive one with the opportunity to explore the contextual factors, leadership style, and institutional responses in depth to determine how populism is manifested in various contexts.

Data Collection Methods:

The study will use a variety of secondary sources in collecting the data to make it depthful and reliable. They are official government sources, policy briefs, political party manifestos, speeches made by political leaders, parliament debates, and reports of international organizations. The development of the populist discourse and its political implications is also traced with the usage of media articles, publications of academic journals, and credible databases. The speeches and social communication are thoroughly analyzed in order to recognize the common themes, stylistic patterns, and framing techniques. Policy documents are analysed to evaluate the modification of the economic, social, and institutional policies that relate to populist rule.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria:

The works aim to cover those countries where populist leaders or parties have become the powerful or influential political forces of the 21st century especially since the year 2000. The selection of cases is based on the presence of credible data, geographic diversity and political and economic context differences. To ensure consistency and validity only sources that are published in English and have valid academic, governmental or institutional sources are included. The study rules out those cases that have inadequate documentation, unclear definition of populism or lack of policy insights. The non-verified information and opinion pieces that are not based on empirical evidence are also not allowed to guarantee academic rigor.

Ethical Considerations:

The study will only use secondary data that is provided publicly thus reducing ethical risks involved in data collection. All sources are properly attributed and cited in order not to plagiarize them. There is the caution of giving political perspectives and policy interpretations in an equal and objective way without any distortion or partial reporting. Academic integrity in the study is

observed through transparency in data selection and analysis process, respect of intellectual property rights of all materials quoted.

Results and Discussion
1. Overview of Comparative Cases
The paper has analyzed four high-profile political cases of modern populism in various parts of the world, including the United States, Brazil, India, and Hungary. These instances have been chosen because of their unique political background and the apparent incorporation of populism within the political system.

Table 1: Selected Case Studies and Context

Country	Leader	Political Orientation	Period of Study	Type of Populism
United States	Donald Trump	Right-wing	2016–2020	Nationalist Populism
Brazil	Jair Bolsonaro	Right-wing	2019–2022	Authoritarian Populism
India	Narendra Modi	Right-wing	2014–Present	Cultural/National Populism
Hungary	Viktor Orbán	Right-wing	2010–Present	Illiberal Populism

2. Patterns in Populist Rhetoric
It was found that the main rhetorical approaches in all cases were anti-elitism, the focus on people, and the creation of the outsider threats.

Table 2: Core Rhetorical Features Identified

Rhetorical Element	United States	Brazil	India	Hungary
Anti-elite discourse	High	High	Moderate	High
Nationalism	High	High	Very High	Very High
Anti-immigration tone	High	Moderate	Low	High
Religious/Cultural appeal	Moderate	Moderate	High	Moderate
Media antagonism	High	High	Moderate	High

Discussion
In all the cases, the anti-elite rhetoric became the most common form, which positioned the political opponents, institutions, and media as alien to the people. Nationism was never used without purpose to bring people on the same wave, although the levels were varied, as India and Hungary proved to have stronger cultural and civilized histories.

The results also show that the populist rhetoric is contextually modified. As an example, the immigration-related appeals were more evident in the United States and Hungary, whereas the culture and religious ones were more significant in India. That implies that populism is not a homogeneous ideology but rather is strategically designed to suit domestic socio-political forces.

3. Policy Impact Assessment
The paper discussed how rhetoric can be translated into economic, social and institutional policy.

Table 3: Policy Outcomes Across Case Studies

Policy Area	United States	Brazil	India	Hungary
Economic Policy	Protectionist	Liberal-conservative	Mixed	State-controlled
Social Policy	Restrictive	Conservative	Welfare-nationalist	Conservative
Immigration Policy	Restrictive	Limited focus	Selective	Highly restrictive
Media Regulation	Indirect pressure	Moderate control	Limited control	Strong control
Institutional Reform	Limited	Moderate	Gradual	Extensive

Discussion

The results demonstrate a partial correlation between policy and rhetoric. Whereas populist leaders are very keen on transformative change, institutional frameworks and economic realities may often limit the actual policy implementation.

- In the United States, economic policies of protectionism were consistent with election politics, but institutional constraints restrained more radical changes in the system.
- Brazil: Brazil demonstrated rhetoric extremeness and relatively inconsistent policy delivery, which was indicative of governance issues.
- India was an example of a hybrid model, which was characterized by the expansion of welfare and nationalist discourses, which revealed a strategy of the strategic fusion of populism and developmental policy.
- Hungary in particular exhibited the most convergence between rhetoric and policy especially institutional restructuring of the state and media control indicating a change towards illiberal forms of governance.

4. Impact on Democratic Institutions

One of the main results of the study is the different level of influence on the democratic institutions.

Table 4: Institutional Impact Indicators

Indicator	United States	Brazil	India	Hungary
Judicial Independence	Strong	Moderate	Strong	Weakened
Media Freedom	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low
Electoral Integrity	Strong	Moderate	Strong	Moderate
Civil Society Engagement	High	Moderate	High	Low

Discussion

The comparative analysis indicates that institutions resilience is essential in mediating the effects of the populist influence. The United States and India, which are generally highly democratic nations, exhibited greater resistance to structural change, even in the case of rhetorical polarization.

On the other hand, Hungary can be used to explain how long-lasting populist rule may contribute towards the institutional decay, especially when such political authority has been

consolidated over a long period. Brazil is in a moderating situation as the democratic institutions still function but are put under pressure periodically.

Limitations of the study

One of the main limitations of the paper is that it involves the use of comparative case study design which is appropriate in order to conduct a detailed study but does not allow generalizing the research results in all political settings. The biases associated with the selection of cases can also create bias because the countries or leaders sampled might not be a comprehensive representation of the populist movements around the world. Moreover, the research relies largely on the secondary data (speeches, policy documents, media reports), where the narratives could be selective or editorial writing bias, which impacts the objectivity of the interpretation. The fact that the analysis of political rhetoric is a subjective process is also problematic, and it can be interpreted differently depending on the vision of the researcher. Moreover, the varying socio-economic, cultural, and institutional structures of individual countries complicate face-to-face comparisons and can restrict the possibility of extracting similar conclusions regarding the policy effects. Another issue is temporal constraints whereby the populist movements are changing at a very high rate and the study might fail to capture the recent changes or the long-term impacts. Lastly, the small data on primary data, including insider opinions or unofficial policy debates, can limit the scope of research on the real effects of populist rhetoric on policy outcomes.

Future Scope

The research in the field of populism in the twenty-first century has some potential avenues that can be fruitful to the scholars and policymakers in the future. With the future trend where political activities are progressively moving to the digital environment, the next wave of research can look at how the social media algorithm, online communities, and digital campaigns enhance populist discourses and influence people in various societies. This can also be an extension of traditional Western case studies to such comparative research which can also encompass new democracies and mixed political systems in Asia, Africa as well as Latin America and therefore provide a broader picture of the impact of cultural, economic and institutional backgrounds upon populist politics. Moreover, the potential impacts of populist rule in the long term in terms of the economy, immigration policy, and welfare systems, and the sustainability of democratic institutions should be further researched. The interdisciplinary approaches that imply the use of political science, communication research, sociology, and data analytics could help to elaborate the relationship between rhetoric and voter behavior and the outcomes of governance. It is also possible to study the input of the leadership style, political polarization, and the world crisis (economic recession, pressures on migration, and climate change) in fuelling or suppressing populist tendencies in future research. These questions will assist in developing a more refined image of the evolving face of populism and its effects on the democratic rule in a world that is increasingly globalized.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis of populism in the 21st century proves that its manifestations in different political structures and cultural settings vary, but its underlying mechanisms are the same, i.e., the idea of creating a moral gap between the people and the elite. The case studies also illustrate how populist rhetoric is not just a symbolic phenomenon, but it also has practical consequences in the sphere of governance, government policies and institutional stability. Populist leadership has increased democratic engagement through mobilizing hitherto non-engaging groups in certain contexts, and has led to polarization, institutional weakening of checks and balances, and short-term and reactionary policies in other contexts. This is because the results indicate that the contribution of populism is not entirely negative and positive, but it

depends on the strength of the democratic institutions, media ecosystems, and civic participation in any nation. Finally, in the study of populism, one needs to go beyond the normative consideration of the issue to a more subtle approach that considers the dual nature of the populist movement in terms of both challenging and disrupting democracy. There may be an opportunity to further research on how the evolving digital communication and world crisis can persist in proceeding with the reform of the populist strategies and sustainable policy effects.

References

1. Akkerman, T., Mudde, C., & Zaslove, A. (2014). How populist are the people? *Comparative Political Studies, 47*(9), 1324–1353.
2. Albertazzi, D., & McDonnell, D. (2008). *Twenty-first century populism: The spectre of Western European democracy*. Palgrave Macmillan.
3. Applebaum, A. (2020). *Twilight of democracy: The seductive lure of authoritarianism*. Doubleday.
4. Ballacci, G., & Goodman, R. (Eds.). (2024). *Populism, demagoguery, and rhetoric in historical perspective*. Oxford University Press.
5. Bonikowski, B. (2017). Ethno-nationalist populism and the mobilization of collective resentment. *The British Journal of Sociology, 68*(S1), S181–S213.
6. Brubaker, R. (2017). Why populism? *Theory and Society, 46*(5), 357–385.
7. Canovan, M. (1999). Trust the people! Populism and the two faces of democracy. *Political Studies, 47*(1), 2–16.
8. Chennattuserry, J. C., Deshpande, M., & Hong, P. (Eds.). (2023). *Encyclopedia of new populism and responses in the 21st century*. Springer.
9. De Cleen, B., & Stavrakakis, Y. (2017). Distinctions and articulations: A discourse theoretical framework. *Political Studies, 65*(2), 301–319.
10. Eatwell, R., & Goodwin, M. (2018). *National populism: The revolt against liberal democracy*. Pelican Books.
11. Enli, G., & Rosenberg, L. T. (2018). Trust in the age of social media. *European Journal of Communication, 33*(5), 1–17.
12. Gerbaudo, P. (2021). *The great recoil: Politics after populism and pandemic*. Verso.
13. Hawkins, K. A. (2009). Is Chávez populist? Measuring populist discourse. *Comparative Political Studies, 42*(8), 1040–1067.
14. Hidalgo-Tenorio, E., Benítez-Castro, M. Á., & De Cesare, F. (Eds.). (2019). *Populist discourse: Critical approaches to contemporary politics*. Routledge.
15. Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2016). Trump, Brexit, and the rise of populism. *Harvard Kennedy School Working Paper*.
16. Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2019). *Cultural backlash: Trump, Brexit, and authoritarian populism*. Cambridge University Press.
17. Kaltwasser, C. R., Taggart, P., Ochoa Espejo, P., & Ostiguy, P. (2017). *The Oxford handbook of populism*. Oxford University Press.
18. Kaufmann, E. (2018). *Whiteshift: Populism, immigration and the future of white majorities*. Allen Lane.
19. Kock, C., & Villadsen, L. (Eds.). (2022). *Populist rhetorics: Case studies and a minimalist definition*. Palgrave Macmillan.
20. Laclau, E. (2005). *On populist reason*. Verso.

21. Moffitt, B. (2016). *The global rise of populism: Performance, political style, and representation*. Stanford University Press.
22. Mudde, C. (2004). The populist zeitgeist. *Government and Opposition, 39*(4), 541–563.
23. Mudde, C., & Kaltwasser, C. R. (2017). *Populism: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.
24. Müller, J.-W. (2016). *What is populism?* University of Pennsylvania Press.
25. Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2019). *Cultural backlash: Trump, Brexit, and authoritarian populism*. Cambridge University Press.
26. Pappas, T. S. (2019). *Populism and liberal democracy: A comparative and theoretical analysis*. Oxford University Press.
27. Rodrik, D. (2018). Populism and the economics of globalization. *Journal of International Business Policy, 1*(1–2), 12–33.
28. Rooduijn, M. (2014). The nucleus of populism. *Acta Politica, 49*(4), 573–591.
29. Stavrakakis, Y., & Katsambekis, G. (2014). Left-wing populism in the European periphery. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 19*(2), 119–142.
30. Vreese, C. H., Esser, F., Aalberg, T., Reinemann, C., & Stanyer, J. (2018). Populism as communication. *The International Journal of Press/Politics, 23*(4), 423–438.
31. Zulianello, M. (2020). Varieties of populist parties and party systems. *Party Politics, 26*(6), 1–12.