Expert knowledge and populist leaders: How Donald Trump made use of research during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Maaren, Didy van

Master thesis

Expert knowledge and populist leaders: How Donald Trump made use of research during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Leiden University

Student: Didy van Maaren

Student Number: s1959131

Date: 09-12-2022

Instructor: Prof.dr. A.K. Yesilkagit

Capstone : Populism and Bureaucracy

Wordcount: 11.326

1.1 Introduction

It was January 18 when the Washington State activated its Emergency Operations Center as a respond to the outbreak of the Coronavirus. Ironically, this was also the day on which samples were taken from – what would later be known as – the first confirmed Covid-19 case in the United States. This confirmation became public two days later, on January 20 (Centre for Disease Control and Prevention, 2022). When a reporter of CBS asked for a reaction of president Trump on the first confirmed case the president said: '*We do have a plan and we think it's gonna be handled very well, we've already handled it very well.*' (Watson, 2020). The statement made by the president was clear and expectations were set. Handling the Coronavirus was easier said than done. Since the United States was confronted with the virus, the virus was slowly starting to spread and a month after the first confirmed Covid-19 case the United States had about 51 confirmed cases. This amount grew fast, because about another month later the situation spiraled out of control with 65,800 confirmed cases (Watson, 2020).

Although over 65,000 cases of a new and unknown virus would look like a crisis to every leader, the tone of Trump stayed lighthearted. In a briefing of the White House Coronavirus task force, Trump spoke of a 'light at the end of the tunnel'. He even made some suggestions that Covid-19 was coming to an end and that large parts of the society could be opened up by Easter (CNBC Television, 2020). At this point the United States had 65,000 confirmed cases and eastern was less than three weeks away. This meant that Trump was having different expectations of the Coronavirus than some of the leading health experts. They were warning the Trump administration to be more cautious. Fauci, who had been through six presidential administration as infectious decease expert, advocated that strict distancing measures were needed (Cancrynk & Cook, 2020). In contrast to Trump, who argued that 'the cure could be worse that the disease' and questioned the measures (Haberman & Sanger, 2020), Fauci argued overreacting would be better than a worst-case scenario (Cancrynk. & Cook, 2020). This worst-case scenario simulated by models suggesting that Covid-19 could kill about up to 200.000 people. So, the reaction of Fauci to Trump's plans wasn't for no reason. The reaction of Trump wasn't only critiqued by health experts like Fauci, the tone in the media was also cynical towards Trumps reaction. The Washington post called it a 'tug-of-war with experts' in their headline (Parker et al., 2020) and the New York Times also was very critical about the ignorance of warnings from health officials (Karni & McNeil Jr., 2020). An extra reason for the criticism on Trumps speech was that his reaction in the speech was a polar opposite to what the rest of the world was doing. India, for example, decided that would be a lockdown through all the country and the Olympic Games where postponed a year (Karni & McNeil Jr., 2020).

The situation sketched above was at the beginning of the Covid-19, but even when the situation regarding the virus worsened the attitude of president Trump towards Covid-19 stayed skeptical. Statements of president Trump that were contesting or conflicting with advice of experts got more

common. Another example of such s situation was in October 2020. At this moment Fauci announced that another peak in the amount of Covid-19 cases was coming and that the winter would be difficult. Trump made conflicting statements. With the upcoming elections he acknowledged the criticism of his voters to the Covid-19 policies. He listened to the fact people were getting tired of it and used this in his own criticism of expertise knowledge. He even called Fauci and his staff 'Fauci and these idiots' (Stolberg et al., 2020). A third example of a controversy statement of Trump is when the Trump commented that he would potentially overrule the FDA about vaccine advise. Fauci called this out and mentioned that the advice of scientists should always be leading, instead of politics (Drash & Rose, 2020).

1.2 Research question

The examples mentioned above show h a clash between advice of experts and the statements made by president Trump. Although it is just statements, this phenomenon is worrying as public health is at stake in this case. If scientific knowledge is ignored or used partly, sience it could mean more people could suffer than would have happened if the knowledge of experts was taken more seriously. Therefor I want to research how Trump has used expert knowledge to make policy during the Covid-19 pandemic. By researching this topic, we can, as mentioned in the research question, get more insights in the research utilization of populist politicians. The relation between experts and politicians and the use of expert knowledge in the political debate has been studied a lot within the subject of public administration. There are dozens of examples, but one of the first social scientists who talked about the different way to use research (Weiss, 1979). Another more recent example of research utilization in public policies Boswell, in her book she talks about the situations in public policy debates where expert knowledge can and can't be ignored. One of these situations is when high risks are at stake. As Covid-19 became a worldwide pandemic this would be a logical case. On top of the debate about the utilization of expert knowledge there is an extra dimension in this scenario. This extra dimension is the concept of populism. The discourse that Trump used during his presidency has proved itself to be populist (Hidalgo-Tenorio & Benítez-Castro, 2022; Schneiker, 2020; Şahin, Johnson & Korkut, 2021). Not only his discourse, but also his actions are described in the literature as populist. One of the key features is of populism is the fact that leaders make different use of science. This is not because they distrust the science itself, but because scientists are distrusted (Szabados, 2019). The anti-elite view of populist can also project itself on elite-scientists (Mede & Schafer, 2020). Although this sounds worrying this does not mean that populist do not use expert knowledge at all. There is space for objective facts, but it is ideologically limited (Head & Banerjee). The fact that knowledge can distrusted or ignored makes it interesting if this also is the case in the Covid-19 policies of Trump. Did the advice Trump got fell under this 'ideologically limited' acceptance for scientific advice from experts in his administration and other public institutions like de CDC.

If we can find out how Trump makes use of research this will also tell something about how not only Trump uses research, but also about how other populist use research of experts. Therefore, the research question of this article is: How is expert knowledge used in the policies of a populist leader?

1.3 Theoretical relevance

The theoretical ambition of this research is to find out how expert knowledge is used in the American Covid-19 policies under Trump. This can add to theories about populism and bureaucracy, specifically the research utilization theory. It can test the research utilization of a populist leader, because it is an example that can either add to the existing knowledge in how populist leaders deal with scientific knowledge. As Trump is a classic modern populist it is interesting to see if the policies that are made are as controversial as the discourse used. This will be especially interesting, because there is certain situation where populist can use expert knowledge without supporting their political message. If it turns out that expert knowledge in the case of Covid-19 is used in a one specific way, it is interesting to see what form of research utilization this is and why. If there is one form of research utilization leading it would be interesting to test if other populist leaders use the same tactics. If it isn't there is an opportunity in the theory if using different research utilization forms is more common for populist leaders or that Trump might be an outlier.

1.4 Societal relevance

As policy has a direct influence on society there is a great societal relevance in this research. In the United State it could be stated that Covid-19 policies worked very poorly, because in July 2020 the United States had more confirmed Covid-19 related infections than the combined total in the next three countries with most cases (Gugushvili et al., 2020). In this case the policies around Covid-19 that led to these results are made by a populistic leader. Populism and public health are a more and more debated discussion, as it is suggested that populism has a negative effect on public health. It is in this case important to know if Trump used one specific model of research utilization, because it could be that this has led to worse results that if he made policy based on another research utilization model. If we know how Trump used his research in it can be compared with leaders with different research utilization. In this comparison policies can be compared and the outcome of these policies. If the policies and the outcome drastically differ (for the good or the bad). This means another style of research utilization gives another public health outcome and it can maybe state that public health would have been better if there was another (non-populistic) leader making policies. It is sad to say that this won't change anything about the result of the Covid-19 pandemic in the United States, but it can help by the set-up of other policies, if needed, during the rest of Covid-19 or during future pandemics and health crises.

1.5 Research approach and structure

To find out how populism plays a part in the utilization of expert knowledge I will be looking at president Trump during the Covid-19 pandemic. To do this I am not going to look at the discourse about the policies, because there will be discrepancies between discourse about policies and the policies itself, but at the policies implemented. As all the policies are probably not possible to research I will examine two important policy areas to research that were impactful and within these policy area's I will research the implemented policies. The outcome of the three policy areas will to a certain extent be generalizable for other policy areas within the Covid-19 policies Implemented by Trump. The policy areas are: vaccinations and lockdowns.

The structure or the paper will be the following. First, I will look at the literature to define some concepts, any missing parts in the theory and explain a bit more about the research utilization theory I am going to use for the research. Second, I will tell in more detail about my hypotheses and variables, and about the case and data selection. Third I will analyse both cases. And in the end, I will conclude the results of the research.

2.1 literature review

To find out what the link is in the literature between populism and research utilization I am going to start with a short overview about the concept of populism and its link to bureaucracy. Second, I am going to give a short overview about the literature on research utilization and policy-making. Lastly, I am going to link those two concepts and the unique relation between the concepts.

Defining populism

To find out the relation between expert knowledge and Trumps populist policy it is important to first look at the term populism itself. Populism is on the rise throughout the world, which lead to some scholars diagnosing it as 'the age of populism' (Smith, 2018). Since the rise of it, the interest the subject populism has grown substantially. This isn't only the case in the non-academic world, where populism was even named the word of the year in 2017 by the Cambridge Dictionary, but also in the academic world there is an increase in the research done about the topic (Rooduijn, 2018). Although the subject is growing in popularity defining populism is still a struggle. There is little scholarly agreeance about the definition, which has led to scholars that mostly described populism very broadly (Kaltwasser, 2018, p.63). Something that can be concluded out of all definitions is that populism is about 'the people'. Deiwiks mentions this in her article by stating out the relationship between 'the people' and sovereignty and 'the people and 'its other' (Deiwiks, 2009, p.2). Other authors go even deeper in on the subject in such way that they even set boundaries. Mudde for example even points out the difference between elitism and pluralism within populism (Mudde, 2004, p.543-544).

Kaltwasser is mentioning this and several other aspects of the definition of Mudde. She is comparing this with the definition of Weyland but is arguing in her article that populism should have a different definition. This shouldn't be too broad like the earlier ones (Kaltwasser, 2018, p.64). Although she pleas for a smaller definition in her article she doesn't give a concrete definition. Some use full definition of populism is given in the book she and Mudde wrote: 'populism a very short introduction' (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017). They describe it as

'*a thin-centered ideology that considers society to be ultimately separated into two homogeneous and antagonistic camps, "the pure people" versus "the corrupt elite," and which argues that politics should be an expression of the volonté générale (general will) of the people'* (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2017, p.6).

This definition is actually very useful in this research as it first includes the 'thin-centered ideology', which is used in literature a lot of time. This is important, because it means that people can have different forms of their 'populist' ideology (Abts & Rummens, 2007). There are certain values given, but if the populist ideology is for example rightist or leftist is still open. The second important aspect is 'the pure people' versus 'the corrupt elite'. This is very present in the vocabulary of Trump. It already starts in his election period. In the covid-19 case this can be also very useful as there is the possibility to place experts in the place of 'the corrupt elite'.

Now the concept of populism has become more clear it is firstly important to look at the literature for the relation between bureaucrats and populism, before going into more detail. The experts that give advice on Covid-19 policies are part of institutions that are a part of Trumps bureaucracy. The bureaucracy of the president is very important as they are the ones making the direct policy but can also be the ones delivering the expert knowledge. There are some criteria before bureaucratic advice can be called expert knowledge, but I will come back to this a bit later. At this point the president needs his bureaucrats to make the policy proposed, but the question is how. How can bureaucrats be hindered during the proposal of populist policy? Although this looks like s self-evident question to ask, there is a lack of research within this area. The relationship between democracy is for example much more researched. This is also stated by Bauer and Becker in their article about the relationship between populists and their reform agenda and the state bureaucracy (Bauer & Becker, 2020). They look at strategies for populist to transform the bureaucracy to implement populist policy. In their article they identify five strategies: centralization of structure, centralization of resources, politization of personnel, personalization of norms and reduction of accountability (Bauer & Becker, 2020, p.20). These strategies are linked to goals which differ per regime. The goal is getting policy through the bureaucracy, but how this is done can differ. It depends on how populist view the state and how fragile of robust a state's administration is. Depending on this a populist leader can either capture, reform, dismantle or sabotage an administration (Bauer & Becker, 2020, p.22).

Although the relationship between the bureaucracy and a populist leader is an important part of literature it is still too broad for this research.

Research utilization theories

In the case of Trump that I am analyzing it is already evident that the bureaucracy agrees on making the populist public policy proposed. The question is not if bureaucrats are willing but how expert knowledge is used in the policies made. As this thesis is directly looking at the relationship between expertise and populist policy it is therefore important to look at evidence-based policy. To see if this is indeed the case it is important to look at research utilization within policy making. It is in this case also important to define what we can see as 'expert knowledge'. The concept seems evident, but there is a line between what can be made by some general person in the administration of a government and when the information is provided by experts and can be called scientific research. The line for this definition is blurry and can be contested in a lot of situations. In the end expert knowledge can be produced by individuals as by government institutions, but there needs to be a distinction between normal administrative word and the work that falls under expert knowledge. Therefor expert knowledge has an extra dimension for which technical methodologies, special equipment, abstract theories or other special research knowledge is needed (Boswell, 2019).

A topic that is written much about in literature and concerned with expert knowledge is research utilization. Research utilization can be described as '*concerned with understanding and improving the utilization of scientific and professional knowledge in settings of public policy and professional practice*' (Dunn, Holzner, & Zaltman, 1985). The fact that this concept is concerned with the understanding of the utilization of scientific and professional knowledge makes it a perfect concept to use for the case of Trump. Within the concept of research utilization there are several different theories that have made an impact. An important theory that was made about research utilization and the lack of it was by Caplan in 1979. With his two community's theory he describes the researchers and the policy makers and explains that the gap between the two group explains why research isn't used (Caplan, 1979). Although this explanation was used in the past a lot it is now criticized several authors in the literature (Newman et al., 2016; Wehrens, 2014). Apart from some discussion around the theory there is still another problem: it only explains why research isn't used. As we are interested in different explanations how and why some research is used, other theory is needed.

In early research 3 types of research utilization were described: the instrumental use, the conceptual use and the symbolic use. The instrumental use of research describes a situation of rational decision-making where research is used to solve a problem (Amara, Ouimet and Landry, 2004). The instrumental used is seen as the most technocritical one to use research (Boswell, 2009). The conceptual use is often referred to as the garbage can model. Research is unstructured and messy and so is its utilization. Research can't always guide a process and is therefore used indirect and defuse. The symbolic use which is confirming research to the research they promote (Amara, Ouimet and

Landry, 2004). The problem with these three types is that the instrumental use of research is criticized more over the years. There is a lot of the times a difference between policies adopted and description of the research. This has led to in-house research units for government agencies, but researchers often complain about the lack of impact. On top of that it is research that conceptual use is more common than instrumental use, because it informs policy rather than a clear policy proposal (Nutley et al., 2007). The symbolic use of research has also gotten more attention. Research has a big role in the political argumentation and the value of research isn't only based on its contribution in policy (Boswell, 2009). There is also a fourth form that is mentioned less in the literature: the process uses of research. This use of research is not about the research itself, but about engaging in the research process. This can help individual from organizations to think or behave in a different and new insightful way (Nutley et al., 2007).

To further explore the theory of research utilization it is important to look at the article of Weiss, who explains in which way expert knowledge is used. This article gives more detailed and sophisticated. typologies of research utilization. Weiss translates the explanation of research used into models. The models he uses are based on ways social science was used in the past. The models he mentions are: The Knowledge-driven model, the Problem-solving model, the Interactive model, the Political model, the Tactical model, the Enlightenment model and Research as part of the intellectual enterprise of society (Weiss, 1979). These models make differences between the reasons research is used and till which extent. The Knowledge-driven model defines a situation where basic research is done, tested and developed into policy if the outcome of the research is positive. The model assumes that knowledge can be found and be used for development. In this model there is a policy problem where a decision is needed, but there is a lack of understanding or information that need to be solved. In this case research can provide empirical evidence for this policy problem. Within this model there is an implicit understanding that there is a consensus between the researchers and policy makers on the policy goal. The Interactive model does not only include scientists but uses a pool of people as a source to get the information needed. This pool is selected on their talents, beliefs and understandings. The conclusion is mostly incoherent, but it can help to come closer to a potential policy response. In this process there is apart from research also experience, political insight, pressure, social technologies and judgement that help by informing the decision-maker. In the Political model decision-makers are having a position towards a policy issue in advance which makes them less deceptive towards new evidence. Evidence can be used, but conclusions of evidence need to be supportive and can be ripped out of context. The Tactical model exists through bureaucratic tactics. The importance of the research is the fact that the research has been done and not the results of the research itself. It can be done to deflect criticism by blaming research or to try to give a certain research organization prestige by letting it do research. The Enlightenment model assumes that social science influences the policy-making process by theories and perspectives that are developed by

social science. Its ideas influence the public and how people think about social issues. It spreads itself through several channels and the research turns non-problems into policy problems for the policy-makers. It differs from the problem-solving model, because it does not assume that results of research must be compatible with the values and goals of decision-makers. In the Research as part of the intellectual enterprise of society model it isn't about social science itself. It is about social science and policy reacting on each other and changing the social thought by doing this (Weiss, 1979). Although the models of Weiss are more detailed they are still connected to the instrumental, conceptual and symbolic type of research use. All the typologies of Weiss can be classified in these 'broader' typologies. The Knowledge-driven model and the Problem-solving model can be categorized as instrumental, because they both see research as a leading aspect in policy-making. When research is used instrumental, a specific piece of research is used to make a specific policy decision. The Interactive model, the Enlightenment model and Research as part of the intellectual enterprise of society can be categorized as conceptual, because they acknowledge that research is lengthy, indirect and complex and that there are several forms and sources of research. It can be used to influence the knowledge or attitude of policymakers. The Political model and the Tactical model can be categorized as strategic, because it points out a lot of other factors in the policy-making process (Nutley et al., 2007). When research is used strategic it is used as an instrument of persuasion. It can provide support, or it can provide arguments against opposition (Nutley et al., 2007).

The relation between populist policy and research usage

As mentioned above is the use of research in policy-making complicated. The instrumental use of research is there for debated a lot and there is more consensus that the conceptual use of research gives a better explanation for the policy-making process (Nutley et al., 2007). The conceptual use of research gives (among other things) a better explanation why research isn't always used rational or direct. It also seems like research used in the conceptual way (Nutley et al. 2007). This also compliments the fact that Weiss states that the enlightenment model is used the most in policy-making (Weiss, 1979). The problem here is that the factor populism isn't considered. Populism has its impact on how policy is made, and this can also account for research.

A first trademark of populism in general, that is mentioned in the introduction, is the distrust of the 'corrupt elite'. This influences the use of scientific research as the researchers can be part of the 'corrupt elite'. Distrust of researchers can lead populist politicians leave out or ignore policy advise based on research, but this isn't the case most of the time. One explanation for the use of research by populist leaders is that objective facts can be part of populist policy, but it is ideologically limited (Head B.W. & Banerjee S., 2020). This means that expert knowledge is used, if it is confirming to the ideas of the populist leader. Another explanation for the use of knowledge within populism is that the expertise is politicized. This explanation is feasible in the case of technocratic populism. Populism has several ways to be categorized. In this case there are three subtypes of populism: inclusive populism,

exclusive populism and technocratic populism. Technocratic populism as one of these sub-types within the field of populism is getting more popular as a research subject (Bickerton and Accetti 2017; Buštíková and Guasti 2019; Havlík 2019; de la Torre 2013). Technocratic populism the leader rules in name of 'the people' but does this on the ground of expertise. They don't give 'power back to people' but claim to be one of 'the good elites' by positioning themselves as political outsider (Buštíková & Guasti, 2018). The expertise used when these populist politicians are into power mostly comes from autonomous researchers. A reason for using expertise from autonomous researchers is to legitimize the ignorance of government institutions and the research and policies that they deliver for certain issues. During crisis technocratic populist leader have the same way of governing, namely by using expertise from outside the political world. In this case expertise is used and politicians can choose for expertise over their voters. The different with non-populist leaders is that technocratic populist leaders can change their style of governing easier. If these leaders choose to pick the public opinion over science in their policies, this is possible. This causes for a relatively unstable and unpredictable way of making policy (Buštíková & Baboš, 2020). Adding to the technocratic approach towards policy is the fact policies are short-term to win more support. Another common trademark of technocratic populist policy is that economic policies are a combination of redistribution and pro-market policies (Castaldo & Verzichelli, 2020)

Research utilization is a popular topic in the literature. Since it took off there is done a lot of research about the topic which has led to a lot of inconsistency in research findings. There is a lot of discussion about the methodology and conceptualization of the concept. There isn't one well developed framework which can explain when research of experts is utilized and when it isn't (Lester J.P., 1993). As this is a gap in the literature that can be filled with empirical research about how expert knowledge is used by political leaders. On top of this is the fact that Trump is a populist and the relation between populists and scientific research is, as mentioned above, a bit complex. It therefore would also be interesting to research how populist leaders have used research in certain situations. This can give more insights in when and how research is utilized and maybe how to increase the utilization of scientific research.

1.2 Research design and hypotheses
As explained earlier, the research question is: How is expert knowledge used in the policies of a populist leader? In this question there are two key variables: expert knowledge and populism. Expert knowledge is the dependent variable and populism the independent variable as the research utilization model used by a leader, in this case Trump, is influenced by populism.
Populist leaders do use expert knowledge, but in another way non-populist leaders do. The most likely relation between these two variables is that populism is used in a strategic way, because the expert knowledge they use is adjusted to their ideology (Head B.W. & Banerjee S., 2020). This matches

strategical research utilization, because in this form of research utilization the expertise used is influenced by a lot more factors than the research itself. If research is utilized in a strategic way there are two models form Weiss that fall in this category: The Political model and the Tactical model. The political model matches populism, because it is already implied that research used is always in line with the ideology of the leader. In the Tactical model research is done but isn't used. This can be a reasonable option in populism. In this case you can legitimize your position as leader by doing research, but if you know it won't be in line with your political view you can ignore it later. This leads to the following hypothesis for the research question.

H1: Expert knowledge is used in a strategical way (so either the Political model or the Tactical model) when a populist leader is in power

To measure if this hypothesis can be rejected or not it is important to explain the dependent and the independent variables a bit better. By explaining the independent variable, so what kind of populist Trump is, we can measure if the utilization of the research matches his ideology, which is needed for the use of the political model. Otherwise it is hard to define if some policy is made strategically. By explaining the dependent variable, we can give indicators to the different research utilization models of Weiss. By doing this it is also possible to make an argument if Trump uses non-strategical models, because there are indicators to test if this is the case.

3.1 Operationalization of the variables

To explain the independent variable, it is important to find out through what form of populism Trump is influenced, because populism is just a 'thin ideology'. It is proven that populist leaders use expert knowledge different form 'normal' political leaders, but different forms of populism provide different motivations for their policies. If we look at Trump he is mostly described as a 'right-wing', 'authoritarian' and 'nationalistic' populist in the literature. These three terms go together a lot of the time in the literature (Brittain, 2018; Kellner, 2018). Right-wing populism is still a quite broad term and can be filled with different forms of populism (Campani, et al., 2022). Within Right-wing populism there isn't only a battle between 'the pure people' and 'the elites', but there is a third group that threatens 'the pure people' Arato & Cohen, 2018). One fitting definition of right-wing populism can therefore be found in the work of Pelinka: '*directed against an ethnically and/or nationally and/or religiously defined 'other''* (Pelinka, 2013). In Donald Trump's style of right-wing populism, we can find all three elements. In a comparative study of Donovan and Redlawsk is found that Trump was the highest scoring right-wing populist leader that was associated with ethnic minorities during his election (Donovan & Redlawsk, 2018). Not only during elections this association was made, but also in his discourse later as president. His discourse was really against migrants, giving it an 'us-them' narrative and he was also negative about minorities. The problem with migration can also be

linked to the 'nationally defined other'. Migrants are seen as a problem for the national working-class fitting in in anti-globalist agenda (Campani, et al., 2022). The nation-state can be found as 'under a threat' from outside and therefore Trump frames the international world also as threat (Wojczewski, 2020). This makes that he promotes the national economy and takes a stand for the working people in the United States that are threatened by these international problems. An example is that he always promotes manufacturing businesses and workers at home. The religiously other gets less attention in the literature, but 81% of the white evangelicals voted for Donald Trump in the elections of 2016. Not even that, most of them approved all his actions a year later. Before the elections Trump was already talking in tweets about 'saving Christianity'. The fact that Trump is so supported widely under the Christians is mostly because of his conservative opinions. An example is that he implemented the ban on homosexual soldiers back again (Şahin, Johnson, & Korkut, 2021). Adding to the conservative opinion is the Islamophobic view Trump expresses (Harris & Steiner, 2018). So, the fact that Trump promoted evangelicals in his discourse and was highly conservative and Islamophobic made that his right-wing populism also had a religious element. As the nationalist element of Trumps populism is explained by the bigger idea of 'right-wing populism' this needs no further explanation. His authoritarian character on the other hand, isn't directly explained by this concept but the tactics are the same. The authoritarian variant of populism is about placing yourself as a 'superhero' who is the only one that can save 'the normal people. It is in Trumps rhetoric still, being racist, conservatist and xenophobic, but it is more linked to fascism and placing yourself more on a pedestal as a leader.

All in all, Trumps right-wing populism takes a stand for the middle-class white American people. He is very anti-globalist, anti-immigrant, very conservative and makes use of this through religion.

To measure the dependent variable – research utilization – the different models of Weiss (1979) are used. Although these models are already described in the literature review, they are still vague. To make them measurable to the way Trump uses research every model needs some measuring indicators. Therefore, I will describe the most important characteristics of every model and using these characteristics in policy makes that a certain model or models are used. These are the most important indicators per model:

1. The knowledge-driven model: the knowledge-driven model can be measured by the four steps it uses. Step 1 is basic research, which discloses some relevant options from public policy. Step 2 is applied research, which defines and tests the results of the basic research and makes the results ready for action. Step 3 is development, in which the right technologies are developed. Step 4 is application, in which the developed technologies are applied. Another important factor is that the existence of knowledge leads to policy and not the other way around. If development of public policy has these four steps and research leads to policy (and not a need from a policy-maker) it is (partly) developed via the knowledge-driven model.

2. The problem-solving model: the problem-solving model has two types. The first type looks a bit like the knowledge-driven model, but in contrast to this model it starts differently. In the problem-solving model you can also follow several steps. Step 1 is that there exists a problem and for this problem needs policy to solve it, but there are several policy options. Step 2 is research to generate a solution for the problem or select one of several solutions. Step 3 is that there is a decision reached through the gap that is filled by the research. In this model there is already a consensus on goals between the policy. Another important factor is that research is done because of a need or a journal or newsletter. So, if development of public policy has these four steps, has a consensus of goals and is developed through a need/journal article it is (partly) developed via the problem-solving model.

   The second type has another route. Step 1 is the definition of a decision, which defines a goal that the policy-maker has. Step 2 is the identification of the missing knowledge, which defines the informational needs they must clarify their choice. Step 3 is acquisition of the research, in which they also find out what the generalization of the research is. Step 4 is interpretation of the research in decision context, in which generalizations are interpreted. Step 5 is the policy choice. In this kind of problem-solving research, the research has direct and immediate impact on decision-making. Another important factor is that it is mostly done in extraordinary circumstances. So, if development of public policy has these five steps, if research directly impacts policy and if there is an extraordinary situation it is (partly) developed via the problem-solving model.

3. The interactive model: in this model research is used in decision making trough an interactive search for knowledge. It is important that research is just a part of a bigger and complicated process of policy-making. Not only scientists are used, but there is a variety of sources and all the people in the knowledge pool are selected based on their talents, beliefs and understandings. So, if development of public policy isn't only made through scientific research, includes a variety of different sources and is made through an interaction of factors it is (partly) developed via the interactive model.

4. The political model: in this model research that is done isn't always used. It is only used if it agrees with a certain ideology of a leader and can be ripped out of context if needed. Research is only used for self-serving purposes and justification. So, if the development of public policy doesn't interrupt with ideology and is used for self-serving purposes only it is (partly) developed via the political model.

5. The tactical model: in this model the result of research doesn't matter, but only the fact that it is done is needed to make public policy. Research that is done is needed to show government responsiveness to deflect criticism of actions. So, if the development of public policy isn't made by content of any research and only the research and not the results is important in the debate it is (partly) developed via the tactical model.

6. The enlightenment model: the enlightenment model also has certain steps you can follow. Step 1 is doing research. Step 2 is finding the theories behind the actual results of the research. Step 3 is using the concepts of theories in public policy. It can also be the case that this kind of conclusions provide new policy problems for policy-makers. So, if the development of public policy is made by these three steps and can turn non-problems into new policy problems it is (partly) developed via the enlightenment model.

7. The research as part of the intellectual enterprise of society model: in this model interest in a certain policy issue leads to funds for social research. Research is seen as another 'dependent variable' and research can be influenced – consciously or unconsciously – by larger fashions of social thought. So, if the development of research is arising from a policy interest, isn't seen as independent and is influenced by popular opinion it is (partly) developed via the research as part of the intellectual enterprise of society model.

Table 1 sets all the indicators next to the models to sum up what is said earlier on and to summarize all the indicators per model.

Table 1: Indicators of the research utilization models of Weiss (1979)

MODEL	INDICATORS
Knowledge-driven	- Following step 1 to 4 (see text) - Research leads to policy (without the need from a policy-maker)
Problem-solving type 1	- Following step 1 to 4 (see text) - Consensus on goals - Research is done out of need or inspiration from academia/news
Problem-solving type 2	- Following step 1 to 5 (see text) - Direct influence research on policy - Extra ordinary situation
Interactive	- Public policy has more factors than only research - Research has a variety of sources - Interaction of factors creates outcome research
Political	- Research is always is line with ideology of policy-maker - Research only self-serving
Tactical	- Doesn't uses content of research - The fact that 'research is done' is most important factor
Enlightenment	- Following step 1 to 3 (see text)

	- Can turn non-problems into policy problems through results of research
Research as part of an enterprise of society	- Social interest – and funds – are the main reason for research interest
	- Research isn't an independent variable
	- Research is influenced by popular opinion

3.2 Case selection

To find out if there is a link between populism and the use of expert knowledge I am going to use the precedency of Trump during the Covid-19 pandemic. The timespan of the policies that are looked at is exactly a year. The starting point is January 20, 2020, because it is the date of the first confirmed Covid-19 case in the United States. At this day Covid-19 became a direct reality for the United States, which asked for more direct policies. As the presidency from Donald J. Trump ended at 20 January 2021 this will be the last date to look at changed policy.

This paper can't research all the Covid-19 policies as this is too broad and it is somewhat a grey area of what a Covid-19 policy is and what isn't. Therefore, it is important to demarcate specific policy areas that are generalizable for all the Covid-19 policies of Trump. To demarcate the concept of 'Covid-19 policies' it is important to examine specific policies that were impactful. In this paper I am going to look at two policy area's: vaccination policies and lockdown policies. The first policy is the vaccination policy. This is interesting as Trump is, in contrast to other measures, since the beginning very positive about vaccines. In February 2020 he is already publicly talking about the urge for vaccines (Trump, 2020a). At the very first moment Trump was sceptical and talking about vaccines causing autism (Hoffman, 2020), but his opinion was change fast enough that you could say that Trump was pro vaccines since the beginning of the Covid-19 pandemic. It is therefore interesting to see which role expert knowledge plays in a policy area that seems to be criticized less by Trump. The second policy is the lockdown policy. This is an interesting area, because Trump is very critical on lockdowns. In his appearances in public Trump is (since the beginning of Covid-19) mostly negative about lockdowns as they are bad for the economy (Holland & Mason, 2020). Although three out of fur Americans were in March under some kind of lockdown Trump is openly very anti lockdowns (BBC, 2020). Most of the time terms like a 'strong travel advisory'. All in all, these two examples cover two policy areas that played a big role in the Covid-19 pandemic. On top of this is the fact that the opinion of Trump about the policy areas was different: a positive opinion towards the ideas promoted by experts and a negative opinion towards the ideas promoted by experts. The difference in situation and the importance of the policy areas make that these three areas can be seen as 'enough proof' to be generalizable for all Trumps Covid-19 policies.

3.3 Methodology

As methodology I am going to use process tracing, because it can provide a causal relation between the outcome of the dependent variable and the independent variable in a single case research design via observations that can 'proof' this relation. This is a good fit for the research done in this paper as we also need to find this causal relation between populism and research utilization as two variables and need 'proof' via the implemented policies that are going to be researched. Process-tracing as a method can either theory-centric or case-centric. Theory-testing process tracing and theory-building process tracing are theory-centric and explaining-outcome process tracing is case-centric. In theory-testing process-tracing a theory is deduced from literature and the causal mechanism in this theory is tested in a case. In theory-building process-tracing a generalizable theory is built from empirical evidence. In explaining-outcome process-tracing doesn't built or test a generalizable theory but explains a puzzling outcome in a specific case. This doesn't mean that the outcome isn't generalizable at all, because the theoretical ambition of explaining-outcome process-tracing is to look further than the single case tested (Beach & Pedersen, 2013). In this case the kind of process tracing that needs to be used is Theory-centric. Theory-centric would be the best option as theory-centric research looks for causal mechanisms and the tested theory is generalizable for other research (Beach & Pedersen, 2013), it is the most logical option for the theory used in this thesis. The theory of Weiss gives several options for the way Trumps covid-19 policy makes use of research given, so these several options are the 'paths' that can result in a particular outcome. In the model made in this thesis the link between Weiss and populism lies in the strategic use of research. This links is strong enough to be seen as a model for populist leaders and research utilization that needs testing and the expected result are written down in the hypothesis H1. The goal of testing H1 is to see if the theory is true and to test it on other cases to find out if there is indeed a relationship between the policies of populist leaders and strategic research utilization. The result can be generalized on other populist leaders and be tested again to see if the result was correct or if theory needs to be changed. Therefore, the research done could be seen as theory-centric and specifically the theory-testing variant (Beach & Pedersen, 2013).

3.4 Data collection and generalizability

As mentioned above the method to analyze the research is process tracing, which means that the research is qualitative. For the data collection I am going to look at the documents achieved between January 20, 2020 and January 20, 2021. I will split up the two cases and will look per subject – vaccines and lockdowns - at the reported documents. In the case of lockdowns, it is a bit more difficult than vaccines. As Trump only uses the word 'shutdown' for the time he closed America only looking for lockdown is a bit to narrow. Only using the term lockdown wouldn't give al the information on the policy needed. Therefor I am also going to look for documents with the term 'shutdown'. To specify this a bit more, I am first of all only going to look at presidential documents, because the independent variable is speaking about the Covid-19 policies implemented by president

Trump. Second, I'm going to filter out e few presidential documents where policy announcement isn't possible like 'keep America great' rally's and tweets posted by the president. If we filter these documents out there is still an N from above 100 cases per category. This gives quite a large N. This will be very useful as some documents will include the same information as an earlier document, because in a statement can be mentioned the same policy as in a press release for example.

As this research is done by explaining-outcome process-tracing the outcome of the research is only generalizable till a certain extent. This is because the goal is in the first place to explain a specific case. In this case the research explains the situation around Covid-19 policies during the Trump presidency. Although it gives in this case is specific explanation it does not mean that it isn't generalizable at all. It first can be generalizable if all policies made by Trump are being examined. Maybe the research utilization strategies he used in the Covid-19 pandemic also in other policy areas and does he have one preferred research utilization strategy in general. Second can it be compared to the research utilization strategy of other populist leaders. If in other cases the same research utilization strategy's there can be more research for a theory about populist leaders and research utilization. All in all, the outcome of this research is only partly generalizable but could help built a bigger theory in the literature on research utilization.

4. Analyses

In this chapter I am going to analyse the two policies areas to see how research is used. First, I am going to give an overview from the most important policies that were implemented and after the overview an analysis will follow on the research utilization model or models that were used in the policies made.

4.1 Vaccines

Vaccines is one of the subjects that Trump seemed supportive of and this is also visible if you look at his policies. His support starts in one of the first news conferences in February where vaccines are presented as one of the five top priorities. Fauci agrees but says that the United States can't only rely on vaccines the get them out of the pandemic (Trump, 2020a). In the following days Trump shows his dedication for developing vaccines by mentioning that he wants to work with Colombia, if needed, to develop vaccines (Trump, 2020b) and is meeting with several therapeutical firms. The president and his staff are meeting the companies to talk about the speed in which vaccines are made, and how it can get faster, about the challenges they could face in the supply chain and to get some general information about developing a Covid-19 vaccine (Trump, 2020c). About a week later Trump and his administration also decide to fund the CDC and other government agencies with 8.3 billion for developing vaccines (Trump, 2020d). Trump also announced, another week later, a new public-private consortium to help with development of new treatments and vaccines (Trump, 2020g). On the

27th of March Trump introduced the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act" or the "CARES" Act. This act made it possible to change the law if needed for Covid-19 regulations (Trump, 2020h). At the moment this act was implemented it didn't have something to do with the vaccine, but it got more important when operation Warp speed was introduced. Something else that was important in the beginning of trying to develop a vaccine was the fact that Trump had contact with other countries to help each other with vaccines if needed (Trump, 2020k).

An important moment in the vaccine policy of Trump was Operation Warp Speed. Operation Warp Speed was introduced on May 15 (Trump, 2020m). The operation was funded through the CARES act, which made 10 billion dollars available, and other flexible funding (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2020). This 10 billion has been made available to support medical research effort. The objective of the operation was to finish developing the Covid-19 vaccine and to manufacture and distribute it as fast as possible. The operation also involved the military. The military was used for the distribution of the vaccine. For manufacturing the vaccine, the government will invest in the vaccines of all top candidates. (Trump, 2020m). Because of this operation vaccines indeed are developed very fast and companies like Pfizer get the opportunity to provide 100 million doses with the opportunity to provide 500 million doses extra (Trump, 2020n). The moment of this approval was July 22, but it still took several months till the vaccines were done with the testing face. It is on December 8 when the first two vaccines, Pfizer and Moderna, can be manufactured and distributed to the public. With this tempo the vaccines for Covid-19 were developed within 9 months which is uniquely fast. The vaccines of Pfizer and Moderna had a 95-percent effectiveness, which was also higher than expected. The plan is apart from distributing it as soon as possible to get it first to the groups who need it the most. This aren't only the seniors, but also doctors, nurses, etc. (Trump, 2020r).

If we look at the policies made on vaccines, there are two models in the research utilization theory that can be detected. These models are the problem-solving model and the political model. It is important to point out that the problem-solving model is very prominently present out of the analyses, but if we go a bit deeper into theory there are some populistic – and therefore political – characteristics to find as well.

First, I will explain why the development of vaccines can be explained by the problem-solving model. The problem-solving model has, as mentioned earlier, two types. The type that can be found in this analysis is type 2. Within this type the emergence of a policy decision has 5 steps. Step 1 is to define a goal/decision. In the case of Trump this is a Covid-19 vaccine. Step 2 is to identification the missing knowledge. The missing knowledge in this case is the vaccine itself and how to develop it. Step 3 is the acquisition of research. This is done by working together with private companies and giving money to vaccine development. Step 4 is the interpretation of the research. In this case it is if the research and testing have worked to develop a vaccine. Step 5 is the policy choice. In this case asking

for research already leads to the policy choice that if there is a vaccine it will be developed and given to people. The fact that vaccine research directly influences the policy that vaccines will be distributed is another indicator of the second type of the knowledge-driven model. The indicator of the second type of the problem-solving model is that it is mostly used in extraordinary situations. The vaccine policy of Trump meets this indicator completely as Covid-19 can't be anything else than an extraordinary situation.

Although the research model Trump uses in his vaccination policy can be seen as problem-solving, it can also be linked at the political model. On indicator of the political model is that research must match the ideology of the policy-maker. Trump was, as mentioned earlier, since the beginning of Covid-19 supporter of a vaccine. This makes that you could argue that a vaccine as solution for Covid-19 is part of his view as a policy-maker. In contrast, you could argue that his supporters aren't all pro vaccinations. A reason for this is that Trump has a lot of religious supporters. In those groups taking vaccinations is a sensitive topic. Other groups are people who have distrust in science and medication due to distrust of elite groups, which is common for supporters of a populist leaders. This is something that shows in the numbers, because republicans are in statistics the group that was mostly likely to not take a vaccine. On top of this, 17 out of 18 states that have the highest percentage voting for Trump also have the lowest vaccination rate. Although this makes it seem not political, it is still only 23% of republicans that would definitely not go for a vaccine, which is almost one out of four (Kamarck, 2021). This is a high percentage if you think about the fact that this percentage does not include the people that are in doubt if they would take it. Making the vaccine mandatory would make him less attractive for these people. This means it is in line with his ideology to make the vaccine not mandatory (Trump, 2020k). Undertaking this policy makes him still appealing for his voters that do not want to take the vaccine at all or doubt it. A last argument that it could be partly political usage of research is that he also uses the fact that 'thanks to him there would be a Covid-19 vaccine' is used during his campaigns for president. There are several occasions that he talks about fixing a vaccine while Biden 'would never be able to do this' and that Biden 'is talking badly about the vaccine', while Trump is so great because he did it (Trump, 2020p; Trump, 2020q). All in all, could be argued that the vaccine policy is a combination of the knowledge-driven model and the political model of research utilization.

4.2 Lockdowns

Trumps view of lockdowns is, in contrast to vaccines, very negative. Even though many Americans had to stay at home for several months Trump claims there was never a lockdown in the United States during his presidency. He is only taking about a short 'shutdown' that was needed. The first action of Trump regarding national restrictions was the travel ban to most European countries on March 11. This was to protect the country from any infected people and although it wasn't anything like a shutdown it limited people in their freedom to move (Liptak &Vazquez, 2020). Before there was an

official shutdown Trump announced on March 16 a 15-day period. In this period, it was recommended to work from home and engage schooling from home, to avoid gatherings of more than 10 people, to avoid unnecessary travel and avoid eating and drinking at bars or food courts. This was also recommended by Birx and Fauci in the same press briefing. Fauci argued that this was indeed the right thing to do, but in described it as a small-print. In places where the virus was more active places like gyms, bars and restaurants should be close. Trump argued – not directly against Fauci, but in the same press conference – that at this point closing down hotspots wasn't needed. This is also a policy that is again not mentioned in the 15-day plan. (Trump, 2020e). During this 15-day plan there is apart from guidelines not much centralized policy. Governors have to decide themselves if more action is needed. Some governors, for example the one from New York, have decided to make rules stricter, but this is no national policy. At this point Trump doesn't have a policy for shutting down, but Fauci does think at this point that it is needed (Trump, 2020f). On the 29th of March Trump extends the guidelines of the 15-day plan as experts are saying that the peak of Covid-19 will be in two weeks (Trump, 2020i). There aren't new guidelines, but there is an urge for every American to follow guidelines as strict as possible. It is also visible that some states are doing worse than others, but there are still no national orders for these places and it still depends upon governors if guidelines are getting stricter locally (Trump, 2020j). Some other problems with the fact that there are only centralized guidelines is that some governors have refrained the stay-at home-orders. This is something that Fauci is critical on.

On April 16, earlier than the set guidelines, Trump announced that new federal guidelines which allows governors to reopen their states. The goal is to let healthy Americans go back to work if it is possible, while still protecting the elderly people. The new guidelines are based on the data that the United States is over the peak of Covid-19 cases and that to be able to set these new guidelines testing is needed (Trump, 2020k). The plan is called 'Opening up America again'. The plan has 3 phases for opening up. In the first phases individuals are encouraged to protect vulnerable individuals, maximize social distancing, don't socialize in a group larger than 9 and minimize non-essential travel. Employers are mostly encouraged to return to work in phases, encourage telework when possible, common areas should be closed, special places for vulnerable population is recommended and minimize non-essential travel. Furthermore, schools should remain closed, bars should remain closed, gyms can open under strict protocols, hospitals have strict cleaning protocols and large venues also have strict social distancing protocols. Phase two is for states who have met the criteria for no evidence of a rebound for a second time. In phase two individuals should protect vulnerable individuals (who should stay home), can't gather in a group larger than 50 people. Employers are still encouraged to telework, common area's in the workspace are still closed and special places for vulnerable population is recommended. Furthermore, schools can reopen, people can visit hospitals, large venues have moderate social distancing rules, gyms have sanitation protocols, and bars may open diminished standing-room. In phase three individuals that are vulnerable can resume public

interactions but should try to social distance and other individuals should consider minimizing time spent in crowded events. Employers do not have restrictions. Other measures are that bars can reopen standing occupancy, large venues have limited social distancing protocols and hospital visits can resume (White House, 2020). Another action that was guided centrally was Trump was undertaking action to support the safe reopening of schools on the 23th of July. The CDC had provided guidelines so locally schools could start to go open (Trump, 2020o). Travel restrictions to other countries aren't considered in these measures. This took a lot longer and got fully lifted after the presidency of Trump.

If we look at the research utilization model Trump used during his lockdown policy the most evident model is the political model. There are a few moments during his policy where he uses the political model.

The first moment is before the national restrictions, namely the travel restrictions to Europe on March 12th. Trump implemented travel restrictions to most European countries, but he applied the restrictions only to foreign nationals and not to screened Americans (Liptak &Vazquez, 2020). The fact that there is a travel ban is good for protecting the country towards the spread of the virus is a smart step, but the fact that it is only for foreign nationals makes it fit in right-populist ideology. He gives a preferable position to American national citizens. Here for he meets the indicator of the political model where research should fit in your ideology.

A second argument why Trump uses the political model also has to do with the indicator 'research has to be in line with the ideology of the policy-maker' is the fact that there are little centralized rules during the 15-day period and the shutdown. Although the United States is a federal country in times of crises Trump could give strict rules to governors to stop spreading the virus. Instead Trump gave only guidelines. This leads for example to governors of his own party who do not refrain the stay-at-home orders (Trump, 2020l). The fact that governors and people have the option to ignore orders fits in the political idea of his party that freedom and freedom to move is important. This ideology becomes also later in the reopening phases more visible. Every time Trumps talks about the opening up of America he points out how important it is for the working-class to earn an income and to get out of their homes. As a nationalist populist this is also very logical, because 'the pure people' that need to be protected is mostly the working class and they do not need a lockdown. It is also this working class that was partly protesting against the lockdowns (Mudde, 2020). These were the right-wing people that is part of Trumps followers. The fact that Trump implemented distancing rules and stay-at-home rules is already out of his political view, but to make it guidelines and federal makes him less of the 'bad guy' and makes it a political case.

A last example why his lockdown policies are political is in the case of reopening schools. This policy meets ideological indicator of the political model as well as the indicator where research needs to be self-serving. When in the end of July Trump said they were providing safety guidelines to reopen schools one of his main argument was that it was recommended, and the CDC was also providing

guidelines (Trump, 2020 July 23). This was true, but only a few days later Fauci warns parents about sending kids back to school although it is desirable. At this moment researchers had just found out that kids as young as 9 could spread the virus and give it to adults. Therefor Fauci said it was important to look again in the fall (Higgins-Dunn, 2020). So, although it was indeed expert knowledge that some school could be opened up again Trump did use research that was only self-serving. It was preferable to his ideology as freedom of movement could be broadened by this policy and parents that have kids at home have a harder time to go to work. This means it was also in line with his nationalist idea's that the working-class should be protected.

All in all, lockdown policy – or a 'shutdown' as Trump it calls – was stimulated by researchers, but the way the policies were filled in it was mostly a political way of using research.

5. Conclusion

The research question that I want to answer is the following: How is expert knowledge used in the policies of a populist leader? This question is answered based on the research utilization model in the case of the Covid-19 policies made by Trump during his presidency. In the literature on populism and research utilization the most logical explanation was that a populist leader would use research in a strategical way. Based on the literature hypothesis H1 was set, which was formulated as follows:

H1: Expert knowledge is used in a strategical way (so either the Political model or the Tactical model) when a populist leader is in power

When analysing the vaccine policy of Donald Trump there were different types of research utilization to be found. The way Trump used research was comparable to the indicators in the knowledge-driven model as well as the political model. This means Trump uses expert knowledge in a mixed form of research utilization models. In the analysis of the lockdown policies of Trump the use of the political model is much clearer. In the policies Trump implemented it was clear that the research he used was comparable to the indicators of the political model. This means by looking at both analyses that the hypothesis does not have to be rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is indeed a link between populist leaders and using research in a strategical way during policy-making. It should be noted that the hypothesis is broad for the results of the analyses. The hypothesis would have been stronger if it only included the political model, because in none of the two cases Trump used the tactical model. On top of that there is still the fact that trump also used the knowledge-driven model of research utilization in his vaccine policies, which makes that Trump does not only makes use of the political model in his policies.

Implementations of this research could be that other policy areas of Trump must be tested on the way expert knowledge is used so it can become clearer if the political model is used as much. If this is the

case it has a positive impact on generalisability. The same implication could be applied on (Covid-19) policies of other populist leaders. In this case it can be tested if other leaders use research also in a strategical or political way. The last implication is to test if populist leaders use research differently in times of crisis. Covid-19 is an extraordinary situation and it would be interesting to see if populist leaders also make strategic use of expert knowledge in their day to day policies.

Literature

- Abts, K. & Rummens S. (2007). Populism versus Democracy, *POLITICAL STUDIES*, VOL 55, 405–424

- Amara, N., Ouimet, M., & Landry, R. (2004). New evidence on instrumental, conceptual, and symbolic utilization of university research in government agencies. *Science communication*, *26*(1), 75-106.

- Arato, A., & Cohen, J. L. (2018). Civil society, populism, and religion. In Routledge handbook of global populism (pp. 98-112). Routledge.

- Bauer, M. W., & Becker, S. (2020). Democratic Backsliding, Populism, and Public Administration. Perspectives on Public Management and Governance 3(1), 19–31

- BBC (2020, March 31). Coronavirus: Three out of four Americans under some form of lockdown, https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-52103066

- Bickerton, C., & Accetti, C. I. (2017). Populism and technocracy: Opposites or complements? *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 20(2), 186–206.

- Boswell, C. (2009). The Political Uses of Expert Knowledge: Immigration Policy and Social Research. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

- Brittain, C. C. (2018). Racketeering in religion: Adorno and evangelical support for Donald Trump. *Critical Research on Religion*, 6(3), 269-288.

- Buštíková, L., & Baboš, P. (2020). Best in Covid: Populists in the time of pandemic. *Politics and Governance*, 8(4), 496-508.

- Buštíková, L., & Guasti, P. (2019). The state as a firm: Understanding the autocratic roots of technocratic populism. East European Politics and Societies, 33(2), 302-330.

- Campani, G., Fabelo Concepción, S., Rodriguez Soler, A., & Sánchez Savín, C. (2022). The Rise of Donald Trump Right-Wing Populism in the United States: Middle American Radicalism and Anti-Immigration Discourse. *Societies*, 12(6), 154.

- Castaldo, A., & Verzichelli, L. (2020). Technocratic populism in Italy after Berlusconi: The trendsetter and his disciples. *Politics and Governance*, 8(4), 485-495.

- Cancrynk, A., & Cook, N. (2020, March 23). Health officials want Trump to 'double down, not lighten up' restrictions. *Politico.* https://www.politico.com/news/2020/03/23/coronavirus-economy-trump-restart-145222

- Caplan, N. (1979). The two communities' theory and knowledge utilization, *American Behavioral Scientist,* 22, 459-470

- Centre for Disease Control and Prevention (2022, August 16). CDC Museum COVID-19 Timeline, https://www.cdc.gov/museum/timeline/covid19.html#:~:text=January%2020%2C%202020,respond%20to%20the%20emerging%20outbreak.

- CNBC Television. (2020, March 24). Trump: Goal is to re-open economy by Easter [Video]. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=i8MmfceRLFU
- Deiwiks, C. (2009). Populism. *Living Reviews in Democracy*, *1*
- De la Torre, C. (2013). Technocratic populism in Ecuador. *Journal of Democracy*, 24(3), 33.
- Donovan, T. & Redlawsk, D. (2018) Donald Trump and right-wing populists in comparative perspective, *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*, 28:2, 190-207
- Drash, W. & Rose, S. (2020, September 24). In Clash with White House, Fauci Says Science, Not Politics, Dictates COVID-19 Vaccine, *GBPNews*. https://www.gpb.org/news/2020/09/24/in-clash-white-house-fauci-says-science-not-politics-dictates-covid-19-vaccine
- Duke, K. (2001). Evidence-based policy making? The interplay between research and the development of prison drugs policy. *Criminal Justice*, *1*(3), 277-300.
- Dunn, W.N., Holzner, B. & Zaltman, G. (1985). Knowledge utilization in T. Husen & T.N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of education.* Oxford: Pergamon
- Gugushvili, A., Koltai, J., Stuckler, D. & McKee, M. (2020). Votes, Populism and Pandemics, *International Journal of Public Health*, 65:721–722
- Haberman, M. & Sanger, D.E. (2020, March 23). Trump Says Coronavirus Cure Cannot 'Be Worse Than the Problem Itself', *The New York Times,* https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/23/us/politics/trump-coronavirus-restrictions.html
- Harris, T. M., & Steiner, R. J. (2018). Beyond the Veil: A Critique of White Christian Rhetoric and Racism in the Age of Trump. *Journal of Communication & Religion*, 41(1).
- Havlík, V. (2019). Technocratic populism and political illiberalism in central Europe. *Problems of PostCommunism,* 66(6), 369–384.
- Hawkins, K.A. & Kaltwasser, C.R. (2018). Measuring populist discourse in the United States and beyond, *Nature Human Behaviour*, VOL 2 241–242
- Head, B.W. & Banerjee, S. (2020) Policy expertise and use of evidence in a populist era, Australian Journal of Political Science, 55:1, 110-121
- Hidalgo-Tenorio E. & Benítez-Castro M.A (2022). Trump's populist discourse and affective politics, or on how to move 'the People' through emotion, Globalisation, Societies and Education, 20:2, 86-109
- Higgins-Dunn N. (2020, July 29). Dr. Fauci says kids over 9 years old can transmit the coronavirus as well as adults as some schools reopen. *CBNC*, https://www.cnbc.com/2020/07/29/dr-fauci-says-kids-over-9-years-old-can-transmit-the-coronavirus-as-well-as-adults-as-some-schools-reopen.html
- Hoffman J. (2020, March 9). President Trump on Vaccines: From Skeptic to Cheerleader. *The New York Times,* https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/09/health/trump-vaccines.html

- Holland S. & Mason J. (2020, March 23). Trump suggests he may scale back closures soon despite worsening coronavirus outbreak, *Reuters*, https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-usa-trump-idUSKBN21A0C6

- Kaltwasser, C. R. (2018). How to define populism? Reflections on a contested concept and its (mis) use in the social sciences. In *Populism and the Crisis of Democracy* (pp. 62-78). Routledge.

- Kamarck, E. (2021, 29 July). COVID-19 is crushing red states. Why isn't Trump turning his rallies into mass vaccination sites? https://www.brookings.edu/blog/fixgov/2021/07/29/covid-19-is-crushing-red-states-why-isnt-trump-turning-his-rallies-into-mass-vaccination-sites/

- Karni, A. & McNeil Jr., D. G., (2020, March 24). Trump Wants U.S. 'Opened Up' by Easter, Despite Health Officials' Warnings. *The New York Times,* https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/24/us/politics/trump-coronavirus-easter.html

- Kellner, D. (2018). Donald Trump, globalization, and modernity. *Fudan Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11(3), 265-284.

- Lasco, G., & Curato, N. (2019). Medical populism. *Social Science & Medicine*, *221*, 1-8.

- Lester, J. P. (1993). The utilization of policy analysis by state agency officials. *Knowledge*, *14*(3), 267-290

- Liptak, K. & Vazquez, M. (2020, March 12). Trump says he's suspending travel from Europe to US, though citizens and others are exempt. *CNN*, https://edition.cnn.com/2020/03/11/politics/donald-trump-coronavirus-statement/index.html

- McCamon S. (2016, November 5). Donald Trump Has Brought On Countless Controversies In An Unlikely Campaign, *NPR* https://www.npr.org/2016/11/05/500782887/donald-trumps-road-to-election-day

- McKee, M., Gugushvili, A., Koltai, J., & Stuckler, D. (2021). Are populist leaders creating the conditions for the spread of COVID-19? Comment on" A scoping review of populist radical right parties' influence on welfare policy and its implications for population health in Europe". *International journal of health policy and management*, *10*(8), 511.

- Mede N. G. & Schafer M.S. (2020). Science-related populism: Conceptualizing populist demands toward science, *Public Understanding of Science*, Vol. 29(5) 473–491

- Mudde, C. (2004). The Populist Zeitgeist. Government and Opposition 39(4): 542–563

- Mudde, C., & Kaltwasser, C. R. (2017). *Populism: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.

- Mudde C. (2020, April 21). The 'anti-lockdown' protests are about more than just quarantines. *The Guardian*, https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/commentisfree/2020/apr/21/anti-lockdown-protests-trump-right-wing

- Newman, J., Cherney, A., & Head, B. W. (2016). Do policy makers use academic research? Re-examining the "two communities" theory of research utilization. *Public Administration Review*, *76*(1), 24-32

- Nutley S, Walter I, Davies H 2007. Using evidence: how research can inform public services. Bristol, Policy Press

- Pelinka, A. (2013). Right-wing populism: Concept and typology. Right-wing populism in Europe: Politics and discourse, 3-22.

- Rooduijn M. (2019). State of the field: How to study populism and adjacent topics? A plea for both more and less focus, *European Journal of Political Research* 58: 362–372

- Şahin, O., Johnson, R. & Korkut U. (2021) Policy-making by tweets: discursive governance, populism, and Trump Presidency, *Contemporary Politics*, 27:5,591-610

- Schneiker A. (2020). Populist Leadership: The Superhero Donald Trump as Saviour in Times of Crisis, *Political Studies*, Vol. 68(4) 857–874

- Smith, A. (2018). Divided nations: Democracy in an age of populism. The Sociological Quarterly 59(1):3–4.

- Stolberg, S. G., Haberman, M. & Weiland, N. (2020 October 19). Trump Calls Fauci 'a Disaster' and Shrugs Off Virus as Infections Soar, *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2020/10/19/us/politics/trump-fauci-covid.html

- Szabados, k. (2019). Can We Win the War on Science? Understanding the Link between Political Populism and Anti-Science Politics, *BRILL*, 207–236

- Trump, D. J. (2020a, February 26). The President's News Conference, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/the-presidents-news-conference-1266

- Trump, D. J. (2020b, March 2). Remarks Prior to a Meeting With President Ivan Duque Marquez of Colombia and an Exchange With Reporters, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-prior-meeting-with-president-ivan-duque-marquez-colombia-and-exchange-with-1

- Trump, D. J. (2020c, March 2). Remarks During a Meeting With Members of the White House Coronavirus Task Force and Pharmaceutical Company Executives, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-during-meeting-with-members-the-white-house-coronavirus-task-force-and

- Trump, D. J. (2020d, March 11). Address to the Nation on the Coronavirus, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/address-the-nation-the-coronavirus

- Trump, D. J. (2020e, March 16). Remarks at a White House Coronavirus Task Force Press Briefing, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-white-house-coronavirus-task-force-press-briefing-2

- Trump, D. J. (2020f, March 20). Remarks at a White House Coronavirus Task Force Press Briefing, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-white-house-coronavirus-task-force-press-briefing-6

- Trump, D. J. (2020g, March 22). Remarks at a White House Coronavirus Task Force Press Briefing, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-white-house-coronavirus-task-force-press-briefing-8

- Trump, D. J. (2020h, March 27). Statement on Signing the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/statement-signing-the-coronavirus-aid-relief-and-economic-security-act

- Trump, D. J. (2020i, March 29). Remarks at a White House Coronavirus Task Force Press Briefing, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-white-house-coronavirus-task-force-press-briefing-14

- Trump, D. J. (2020j, March 31). Remarks at a White House Coronavirus Task Force Press Briefing, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-white-house-coronavirus-task-force-press-briefing-16

- Trump, D. J. (2020k, April 5). Remarks at a White House Coronavirus Task Force Press Briefing, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-white-house-coronavirus-task-force-press-briefing-21

- Trump, D. J. (2020l, April 6). Remarks at a White House Coronavirus Task Force Press Briefing, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-white-house-coronavirus-task-force-press-briefing-29

- Trump, D. J. (2020m, May 15). Remarks on Coronavirus Vaccine Development and an Exchange With Reporters, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-coronavirus-vaccine-development-and-exchange-with-reporters

- Trump, D. J. (2020n, July 22). The President's News Conference, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/the-presidents-news-conference-1244

- Trump, D. J. (2020o, July 23). The President's News Conference. https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/the-presidents-news-conference-1245

- Trump, D. J. (2020p, September 10). The President's News Conference, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/the-presidents-news-conference-1261

- Trump, D. J. (2020q, September 12). Remarks at a "Make America Great Again" Rally in Minden, Nevada, https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-make-america-great-again-rally-minden-nevada

- Trump, D. J. (2020r, December 8). Remarks at the Operation Warp Speed Vaccine Summit and an Exchange With Reporters https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-the-operation-warp-speed-vaccine-summit-and-exchange-with-reporters

- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2020). Explaining Operation Warp Speed, https://www.nihb.org/covid-19/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Fact-sheet-operation-warp-speed.pdf

- Watson, K. (2020, April 3). A timeline of what Trump has said on coronavirus, *CBS News*, https://www.cbsnews.com/news/timeline-president-donald-trump-changing-statements-on-coronavirus/

- Weiss, C.H. (1979). The Many Meanings of Research Utilization. Public Administration Review 39(5), 426-431

- Wehrens, R. (2014). Beyond two communities–from research utilization and knowledge translation to co-production? *Public health*, *128*(6), 545-551.

- White House (2020). Opening Up America Again. https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/openingamerica/#:~:text=Guidelines%20for%20All%20Phases%20Employers&text=Social%20distancing%20and%20protective%20equipment,common%20and%20high%2Dtraffic%20areas

- Wojczewski, T. (2020). Trump, populism, and American foreign policy. Foreign Policy Analysis, 16(3), 292-311.

- Victor, D., Serviss, L. & Paybarah, A. (2020, October 2). In His Own Words, Trump on the Coronavirus and Masks, *The New York Times,* https://www.nytimes.com/2020/10/02/us/politics/donald-trump-masks.html