THE EVOLVING ONLINE PUBLIC SPHERE: REIMAGINING POLITICAL PARTICIPATION IN THE DIGITAL AGE

Nasipat CHANCHAIPITIPHAT[1], Rueangsak NAMDET[1], Alan ARCHAPIRAJ[1] and Kittisak WONGMAHESAK[2*]

    1 Faculty of Political Science, North Bangkok University, Thailand; 681500089@northbkk.ac.th (N. C.); 681500097@northbkk.ac.th (R. N.); 681500259@northbkk.ac.th (A. A.)

    2 Faculty of Political Science, North Bangkok University, Thailand; Publication Research Institute and Community Service, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidenreng Rappang, Indonesia; Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Malaysia; kittisak.wongmahesak@gmail.com (Corresponding Author)

Abstract

This study examines the profound transformation of citizen political participation in the digital era, focusing on the emergent "online public sphere" and its implications for democratic governance. It analyzes how traditional engagement is complemented and challenged by digital activism, social media, and online discourse. Synthesizing scholarly literature (2005-2024), this review examines evolving dynamics of online participation, identifying critical shifts and novel forms of citizen action. It investigates how socio-demographic factors (age, gender, education, socioeconomic status) influence access, engagement, and impact in this digital realm. A novel conceptual framework is introduced—encompassing accessibility, inclusivity, interaction, impact, and feedback—advocating multifaceted approaches to evaluating democratic processes. Recommendations are provided for policymakers, activists, and scholars to promote inclusive participation strategies in a digitized landscape. Ultimately, this research redefines political participation, emphasizing the online public sphere's significance for 21st-century deliberation and civic engagement, and adapting models to digital citizenship.

Keywords: Political Participation, Digital Engagement, Online Public Sphere, Digital Activism, Conceptual Framework

Introduction

Contextual Background

In the 21st-century political landscape, the transition from offline to online political participation represents not just a shift in means but also a fundamental transformation in how citizens perceive and exercise their political rights and responsibilities (Gibson & Cantijoch, 2013; Stein et al., 2025). The advent of digital platforms has enabled unprecedented opportunities for individuals to participate in political discourse and action, fostering participation levels previously unattainable (Amin et al., 2023; Sindermann, 2024). Historically, political participation involved traditional forms such as voting, attending town hall meetings, and engaging in face-to-face discussions (Jantaraviset & Chailertwanitkul, 2013; Kongcham & Rathachatranon, 2014). However, the emergence of the internet and social media has radically altered this experience, facilitating new modes of participation that transcend geographical and social barriers (Zúñiga et al., 2014; Venus et al., 2025).

The significance of digital participation cannot be overstated. Studies indicate that individuals who were previously politically disinterested are increasingly engaging in civic activities through online channels. Borge & Cardenal (2011) argue that the internet serves as a vital pathway for participation, particularly for those who might not have previously identified as politically active. Their findings suggest that online interactions significantly influence levels of political participation, regardless of an individual's initial interest in politics. This democratizing potential resonates across demographics, particularly among youth and marginalized groups, who have often faced barriers to traditional forms of participation (Stein et al., 2025).

As political participation moves online, participants' characteristics are evolving as well (Venus et al., 2025). Best & Krueger (2005) highlight that younger citizens, who are typically less inclined to vote or engage in conventional political activities, tend to exhibit distinct patterns of online participation, such as participating in political discussions on social media and engaging in digital advocacy campaigns. These patterns underscore a generational shift in which the political landscape has adapted to accommodate online forms of expression and mobilization, broadening the definition of participation.

Furthermore, the digital divide remains a critical issue in the discussion of citizen participation in the digital era (Lythreatis et al., 2022). The disparity in internet access and digital literacy among different socio-economic groups can significantly affect political participation. Mihelj et al. (2019) emphasize that the lack of skills needed to navigate online platforms excludes specific demographics from accessing vital political resources. This has profound implications for the inclusiveness and equality of political participation in the digital age. Therefore, understanding these socio-economic dimensions is essential for analyzing the complexities of political participation in the current context.

The intertwining of technology and political participation has also fostered the rise of connective action, as theorized by Bennett and Segerberg (2015). Their work illustrates how digital platforms allow individuals to mobilize around shared interests rather than through traditional, hierarchical mechanisms of organization. This shift towards a more decentralized approach empowers citizens to participate in political processes, often sidestepping established political institutions to forge their paths of participation (Bennett & Segerberg, 2015). As a result, the political landscape is witnessing a transformation, evident in the myriad forms of activism and civic participation emerging within the digital sphere.

The political communication dynamics that characterize today's environment differ significantly from those of previous eras. The rapid flow of information and the ability to share and disseminate political content instantly create new challenges and opportunities for civic participation (Robles-Morales & Córdoba-Hernández, 2019). Political actors must now navigate an ecosystem in which public discourse is shaped not only by traditional media but

also by online interactions and citizen-generated content (Williamson, 2011; Wongsuwan et al., 2022). The ability of citizens to use social media as a platform for political expression further complicates the established narratives of political communication, leading to a more participatory and, at times, adversarial civic environment.

Research Questions

Building upon the aforementioned contextual shifts in citizen political engagement, this study seeks to address the following critical research questions:

1) What are the salient dynamics characterizing citizen political participation as it transitions from offline to online platforms? This inquiry examines the motivations driving the shift from traditional to digital modes of participation, analyzing the differences in influence, scope, and outcomes between the two approaches. Key indicators to be examined include the frequency, modalities, and perceived effectiveness of various forms of online participation as citizens navigate the evolving digital political landscape.

2) What specific forms of political participation are citizens actively engaging in within the digital realm? This question aims to delineate the diverse modes and manifestations of online political participation, encompassing social media activism, online petitions, digital organizing initiatives, and deliberative discussions in virtual forums. Through a systematic classification of these forms, the study seeks to elucidate not only the breadth of participation but also the underlying emotional and cognitive motivations that drive individuals to engage politically online.

3) How do key socio-demographic factors influence both the levels and types of citizen political participation observed online? This investigation aims to explore the impact of demographic variables, including age, gender, educational attainment, and socioeconomic status, on the inclusivity (or lack thereof) of digital political participation. By identifying potential barriers and disparities, this analysis aims to provide critical insights to promote more equitable and accessible pathways to political engagement in the digital sphere.

Significance of the Study

Addressing the transformative impact of digital media on citizen political participation necessitates a rigorous investigation into the salient dynamics, diverse forms, and key socio-demographic influences that shape online engagement, as articulated in the research questions above. This study contributes to the scholarly discourse on citizen political participation in the digital era by directly addressing these critical questions. Understanding how citizens interact with political content online, express their opinions, and mobilize for action is essential for informing policymakers, activists, and scholars about the evolving dynamics of civic participation in contemporary society (Suktam et al., 2024).

The significance of this research is further amplified by growing political disenchantment, particularly among younger demographics who increasingly view traditional political institutions as ineffective or unresponsive (Henn et al., 2005; Bristelle et al., 2024). By focusing on citizens' online political behavior, particularly those who identify as non-politicians, the study aims to reveal the motivations, barriers, and potential of digital participation, providing valuable insights into how to re-engage disaffected segments of the population. As citizens express their frustrations and aspirations through social media, varying forms of online participation, such as protests and advocacy campaigns, reflect a shifting political landscape that necessitates careful examination (Zhu et al., 2019).

Furthermore, this study's exploration of the implications of these participatory behaviors for democratic governance is crucial. Understanding how digital platforms could both enhance and hinder democratic processes is vital to developing frameworks that encourage inclusive participation while addressing the weaknesses of existing political institutions. As digital media continues to evolve (Amin et al., 2023), so too must our understanding of citizen participation,

adapting to the complexities of a rapidly changing communication environment to ensure that democratic practices remain robust and relevant.

To achieve these goals and contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of citizen political participation, this article employs a literature review methodology. By analyzing scholarly research on citizen political participation in the digital era published between 2005 and 2024, this review aims to identify key trends, patterns, and challenges in online political engagement. This synthesis of existing research can reveal patterns associated with demographic factors, digital literacy, and accessibility, thereby enriching the discourse on civic participation in the digital age (Gibson & Cantijoch, 2013). Ultimately, the study highlights the need for a multifaceted approach to evaluating and improving democratic processes in the digital era.

Transition from Offline to Online Political Participation

The ongoing evolution of political participation illustrates a significant shift from traditional offline methods of participation to innovative online platforms. This transition alters the landscape of political participation for citizens globally (Kim et al., 2020; Alodat et al., 2023). This section examines the dynamics underlying this transition, highlights key differences between modes of participation, and explores the socio-demographic influences that shape citizens' participation in these new arenas.

Dynamics of Political Participation

Political participation has undergone substantial changes driven by the digital revolution. Historically, political participation was dominated by face-to-face interactions and physical attendance at political events, such as town halls or rallies (Thanathiti, 2019). However, the rise of the internet and social media has transformed participation into a more multifaceted process, allowing citizens to engage in political discourse from various locations (Boulianne & Theocharis, 2018).

One of the main factors contributing to this shift is the significantly increased accessibility of information and communication technologies (ICTs). The proliferation of smartphones and social media platforms provides citizens with opportunities to connect with others who share similar interests and political causes (Davis, 2009). Social media, in particular, has emerged as a potent tool for political mobilization, facilitating the rapid dissemination of information and enabling users to engage with political content in real time, thereby influencing public opinion and mobilizing activism (Bode, 2017).

Studies also emphasize how online spaces generate new forms of political participation. For instance, online petitions, hashtag activism, and digital protests offer alternatives to traditional forms of political action (Oser et al., 2012). This flexibility enables citizens to engage with issues they care about without adhering solely to conventional political frameworks. In many cases, the emotional resonance of online activism surpasses that of traditional forms of participation (Henn & Foard, 2013).

Moreover, the increased visibility of social and political issues, facilitated by social media, has contributed to a rise in grassroots movements (Pardosi et al., 2024). This phenomenon is especially evident among younger demographics, who are often described as "digital natives." Their familiarity with technology enables them to leverage online platforms to advocate for change, promote awareness, and support causes that matter to them (Keating & Melis, 2017). Recent social movements, such as #MeToo and Black Lives Matter, have leveraged social media to bring about tangible changes in public discourse and political action (Monticelli & Bassoli, 2018; Cooper, 2022).

Despite the positive aspects of online political participation, it also presents challenges. The dynamic nature of online participation can lead to the dissemination of misinformation and adverse effects, such as polarization and the formation of echo chambers (Bright, 2018). The

pace of political discourse online can often lead to superficial participation in issues, potentially hindering deeper understanding and critical analysis (Mihelj et al., 2019).

This transition from offline to online political participation reflects a fundamental change not only in how individuals engage with politics but also in the power structures and governance themselves. Governments are increasingly compelled to adapt their strategies in response to the new political landscape, acknowledging that traditional forms of participation may no longer suffice (Dalton, 2008). Consequently, political institutions must enhance their digital participation strategies to foster inclusivity and responsiveness to citizens' concerns (Yuan et al., 2023; Shin et al., 2024).

In summary, the dynamics of political participation have undergone a significant transformation with the rise of digital platforms. Key shifts include: (1) increased accessibility of information and communication technologies, (2) new avenues for political mobilization and activism through social media, (3) the emergence of new forms of participation like online petitions and hashtag activism, and (4) a transition from traditional, hierarchical structures to more decentralized and individualized forms of participation. While offline participation often relied on established channels and physical presence, online participation has facilitated more diverse, immediate, and geographically unbound forms of political expression.

Key Differences in Participation Modes

The transition from offline to online political participation involves crucial distinctions between how citizens engage politically in these two spheres. Although both offline and online participation aim to influence political processes, the methods, motivators, and implications differ significantly.

Firstly, offline political participation is often characterized by established channels, such as voting, attending rallies, or engaging in community discussions. These activities typically require structured environments and operate within existing political frameworks, emphasizing peer interaction and discourse (Henn & Foard, 2013). Conversely, online participation is more individualized and decentralized, empowering users to shape their political narratives and engage with a global audience (Boulianne & Theocharis, 2018). The shift toward online participation enables a range of methods, including sharing political content and participating in virtual town halls.

Moreover, the accessibility and immediacy of online participation facilitate an increase in micro-participations—low-cost interactions that can occur almost instantly (Phillips, 2024). Citizens can express opinions by liking or sharing posts, commenting on issues, or engaging in viral campaigns with minimal effort (Bode, 2017). While this form of engagement may be criticized as "slacktivism," it can serve as a gateway for individuals to develop political interest or awareness, potentially leading to more substantive involvement (Reardon, 2013).

Another significant difference lies in the audience reach and potential impact. Offline political participation is often confined to localized communities, whereas online platforms transcend these limitations, enabling messages to reach global audiences instantly (Xu et al., 2022). This can amplify the impact of campaigns, as demonstrated by the rapid mobilization of social movements that utilize hashtags for political visibility (Dalton, 2008).

Furthermore, while offline political participation often relies on the legitimacy of established institutions (Saenphumi et al., 2017), online participation frequently occurs outside these traditional frameworks (Hoffman et al., 2013). This decentralization can shift power dynamics between citizens and authorities, fostering grassroots movements that challenge the status quo (Monticelli & Bassoli, 2018). However, it also entails risks, such as potential divisions and radicalization in digital spaces (Bright, 2018).

Lastly, the emotional and psychological dimensions of online participation highlight key differences in modes of participation. The anonymity offered by online platforms can embolden individuals to express opinions they may not share in face-to-face contexts. However, it can

also lead to increased aggressive behaviors and online harassment (Mihelj et al., 2019). This complexity necessitates a critical examination of how citizens navigate the emotional landscapes of online political participation, balancing the accessibility benefits with the potential for toxic interactions (Lapidot-Lefler & Barak, 2012).

In summary, while both offline and online political participation seek to influence change, the dynamics underlying each mode vary considerably. The personal interaction and structured nature of offline participation sharply contrast with the accessibility and immediacy of online participation. Understanding these distinctions is essential for developing effective participation strategies and maximizing the potential for meaningful civic involvement.

Socio-Demographic Influences

The landscape of political participation is intricately connected to socio-demographic factors that shape individuals' experiences and motivations for engagement. These factors, including age, gender, education, and socioeconomic status, affect how citizens access and engage with both offline and online political processes (Henn & Foard, 2013; Narapong & Kulachai, 2024).

Age significantly influences political participation. Research consistently shows that younger demographics, particularly those aged 18-24, are more likely to engage online than participate in traditional political activities (Boulianne & Theocharis, 2018). The integration of digital technologies into daily life has created distinct political preferences among younger citizens, who favor platforms like Twitter and Instagram for political expression (Keating & Melis, 2017). This generational divide necessitates that scholars and policymakers reassess their participation strategies to capture the interests of younger voters better.

Gender also plays a crucial role in shaping political participation. Studies indicate that women often experience different motivators and barriers compared to their male counterparts (Coffé & Bolzendahl, 2010). While women may participate at lower levels in traditional avenues, such as voting (Jantaraviset & Chailertwanitkul, 2013), they often excel in non-institutionalized forms of political action, particularly those addressing social justice issues (Monticelli & Bassoli, 2018). The rise of online platforms provides women with opportunities to voice their concerns and mobilize around critical causes, fostering political participation (Raj, 2023).

Education is another critical socio-demographic factor influencing political involvement; higher educational attainment correlates with greater political participation (Taneerat et al., 2022). Educated individuals tend to access information, resources, and networks that facilitate participation in both offline events and online discussions (Dalton, 2008). Education also influences political efficacy, as individuals with knowledge are more likely to participate actively (Rasmussen & Nørgaard, 2017). However, the relationship between education and political participation is nuanced; motivations and modes of participation can vary significantly across educational backgrounds.

Socio-economic status further complicates the relationship between demographic factors and political participation. Individuals from higher socioeconomic backgrounds often possess more resources, such as time, money, and social capital, which facilitate greater political participation (Henn & Foard, 2013). In contrast, individuals from marginalized communities may face barriers to participation, such as limited internet access or time constraints due to low-wage work. Therefore, efforts to enhance political participation must account for the structural inequalities limiting opportunities for specific socio-economic groups (Ragnedda et al., 2022).

Moreover, perceptions regarding political participation rooted in socio-demographic factors can significantly influence participation. Previous studies indicate variations in perceived political efficacy across demographics, suggesting that individuals who feel disenfranchised may be less likely to engage (Oser et al., 2012). Understanding these perceptions is crucial for designing effective outreach strategies that foster political participation and build trust within historically marginalized groups.

In summary, socio-demographic factors, including age, gender, education, and socio-economic status, significantly shape the dynamics of political participation by influencing both access and motivation. The interplay of these factors creates a complex landscape of opportunities and barriers, necessitating that strategies aimed at promoting more inclusive and equitable political participation in the digital era must directly acknowledge and address these multifaceted influences in the design of effective outreach and participation programs.

Forms of Political Participation in the Digital Era

As political landscapes evolve, the forms of participation employed by citizens in the digital era have diversified significantly. The dynamic interplay between traditional modes of political participation and emerging digital practices provides insights into the evolving nature of civic engagement. In exploring this evolution, this section outlines three crucial subtopics: (1) Institutionalized vs. Non-Institutionalized Participation, (2) the Role of Social Media and Online Platforms, and (3) Psychological Factors Influencing Participation.

Institutionalized vs. Non-Institutionalized Participation

Political participation can broadly be categorized into institutionalized and non-institutionalized forms (Oser, 2022). Structured channels, such as voting, membership in political parties, and attendance at civic meetings, characterize institutionalized participation. These avenues are integral to traditional democratic processes and are often regulated by formal rules (Takyar, 2019). Voting remains the most prominent expression of institutionalized participation, as it signifies a direct channel for citizens to influence government policies and decision-making (Kaim, 2021).

While voting is a critical aspect of institutional participation, it has faced criticism. Scholars have noted that relying solely on traditional modes of participation can lead to alienation among those who feel their voices are not adequately represented (Dwiputra et al., 2022). The bureaucratic nature of institutions often limits participation to a narrowly defined set of actions that fail to resonate with the diverse interests of contemporary citizens (Grassi et al., 2023).

Conversely, non-institutionalized participation encompasses activities outside formal political frameworks, including protests, online activism, and grassroots initiatives. These forms of participation emphasize the importance of collective actions and citizen-driven movements that challenge established political structures (Dwiputra et al., 2022). Recent trends indicate a notable increase in non-institutionalized participation, particularly among different demographic groups who feel disenfranchised by traditional political processes (Grassi et al., 2023; Haenschen et al., 2023).

For instance, movements such as Black Lives Matter and environmental activism often mobilize individuals through social media and public demonstrations, drawing attention to urgent social issues that may not receive adequate representation through institutional channels (Valenzuela et al., 2012; Chong, 2023). Such non-institutional participation allows citizens to express dissent, demand change, and connect with like-minded individuals at a significantly lower cost than traditional forms of participation.

In the digital age, these two forms of participation are increasingly interlinked. Online platforms facilitate non-institutional actions that can culminate in institutional impacts (Bimber et al., 2015). For example, petitions launched on social media can lead to formal discussions within legislative bodies (Holt et al., 2013). This convergence reflects a shifting understanding of the political participation landscape, in which citizens use both institutional and non-institutional channels to amplify their voices and advocate for change.

Role of Social Media and Online Platforms

Social media and online platforms have emerged as pivotal tools for political participation in the digital era. By breaking down geographical barriers and providing instant avenues for sharing information, social media has transformed the way citizens engage with political issues

(Poy & Schüller, 2016). The affordances of platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram enable users to initiate conversations, mobilize support, and promote social movements in ways that were previously unimaginable (Alodat et al., 2023).

One of the most profound impacts of social media is its capacity to democratize political discourse (Puri, 2024). Traditionally, access to political information was controlled by a limited number of media outlets, which often marginalized diverse voices. However, social media enables individuals to share personal stories and insights, thereby fostering a pluralistic dialogue around various political issues (Kreiss et al., 2010). This democratization fosters a greater diversity of perspectives, enriching civic discourse and participation.

Moreover, the participation model that social media fosters tends to favor immediacy and brevity, encapsulated in the "like" and "share" features that encourage quick responses to issues (Zhuravskaya et al., 2019). While critics warn against "slacktivism"—the loose association between online participation and genuine political action (Piat, 2019)—evidence suggests that online activities, such as liking a political post, can lead to increased offline participation (Leyva, 2016). This shifting paradigm underscores the multifaceted nature of participation in contemporary society, where online interactions can catalyze more robust forms of civic engagement.

Additionally, social media has become a decisive battleground for political communication. Political campaigns are now conducted across multiple digital platforms, necessitating a reevaluation of strategies aimed at engaging and influencing voters (Austin et al., 2021). Candidates and political organizations utilize social media to craft targeted messages, circumvent traditional media filters, and actively engage with constituents (Zahroh, 2023).

Despite the numerous advantages social media confers on participation, it also presents evident challenges. The rise of misinformation and troll campaigns has raised questions about the credibility of information and the authenticity of online participation (Austin et al., 2021). The ease of spreading false information can undermine public trust and sow discord among citizens, which poses a significant challenge to the health of democratic processes. As such, the intersection of social media, political participation, and misinformation necessitates careful navigation by citizens, scholars, and policymakers alike (Vasist et al., 2024).

Psychological Factors Influencing Participation

The psychological dimensions of political participation in the digital era warrant careful examination, particularly regarding how individual motivations and beliefs shape patterns of participation. Various psychological constructs—such as political efficacy, civic identity, and emotional resonance—affect individuals' willingness to engage with political issues and participate in democratic processes.

Political efficacy refers to the belief that one's actions can influence political outcomes (Prahara & Rachma, 2023). This construct remains critical in understanding why some individuals choose to participate while others remain passive (Cheung et al., 2024). Studies have shown that individuals with high political efficacy are more likely to engage in both online and offline political activities (Heering et al., 2020). As digital platforms enable more immediate feedback and interaction with political content, they can enhance citizens' perceptions of efficacy, encouraging further participation.

Civic identity also plays a vital role in political participation (Shamionov, 2020). Individuals tend to gravitate toward movements and causes that resonate with their personal experiences and values, thereby enhancing their motivation to participate. Social media platforms often facilitate the formation of civic identities by enabling users to share narratives and experiences about political issues (Karmila et al., 2024). Such identity-congruent participation can lead to increased participation, as individuals seek to contribute to causes that align with their sense of self.

Moreover, emotional factors such as outrage, fear, and hope significantly influence political participation (Martin, 2021). Emotional reactions to social injustices or political events can serve as catalysts for action, prompting individuals to engage in political discourse and activism (Valenzuela et al., 2012). Positive emotions, such as hopefulness and a sense of belonging, can drive civic participation (Noor et al., 2024), while negative emotions may lead to disengagement if individuals feel overwhelmed or powerless in the face of political challenges (Oz & Greeves, 2024).

In summary, forms of citizen political participation in the digital era are diverse, encompassing both institutionalized avenues, such as online voting, and non-institutionalized activities, including digital protests and grassroots activism. Social media and online platforms have fostered new modes of participation, often driven by psychological factors like political efficacy and civic identity. As citizens navigate these evolving digital arenas, understanding these varied forms of participation and the psychological elements that underlie them becomes essential for shaping the future of democratic participation.

Constructing a New Model of Political Participation

The rapid evolution of citizen political participation in the digital sphere necessitates the development of new models that account not only for existing forms of participation but also for the transformations technology has catalyzed. Traditional models of political participation—often limited to electoral processes and institutional frameworks—fail to capture the complexities and nuances of how individuals interact with politics today. This section presents a new model of political participation, specifically designed for the unique dynamics of the digital era. It details the need for such a framework, outlines the proposed model, and emphasizes the importance of measuring and categorizing participation.

The Need for a New Framework

As political participation increasingly migrates online, recognizing the limitations of established frameworks is critical. Traditional models of participation, which primarily focus on voting and participation within formal political institutions, overlook various forms of activism and discourse enabled by digital platforms (Ekman & Amnå, 2012). The advent of social media and the internet has enabled emergent forms of participation that do not fit neatly into conventional categorizations, necessitating a reevaluation of what constitutes political participation in modern democracies (Oser et al., 2012).

Research indicates that contemporary political participation extends beyond mere institutional participation, with citizens utilizing online platforms for a variety of purposes, ranging from mobilization for social movements to informal discussions about political issues (Laer & Aelst, 2010). This shift underscores the importance of reframing political participation within broader social and cultural contexts, as well as of understanding the motivations that drive it in the digital realm. At the same time, the emergence of non-institutionalized modes of participation calls for a framework that is adaptable and encompasses the evolving landscape of civic participation (Oser et al., 2012).

Furthermore, the gap between online and offline participation must also be addressed. While online activities, such as sharing political content, can enhance offline participation (Theocharis et al., 2023), the relationship between the two is complex and warrants careful examination (Halimatusa'diyah, 2024). The lack of a comprehensive framework may marginalize online participation, with significant implications for democratic representation and citizen participation (Alfaruqy & Padmonurcahyo, 2023).

Moreover, recognizing the diverse demographics engaging online is essential, as participation is often influenced by socio-economic factors, age, education, and access to technology. Models that fail to incorporate these variables risk perpetuating existing disparities in political participation, undermining efforts to create an inclusive democratic process. Therefore, a new

framework must address the multidimensional and interconnected nature of political participation in the digital context, focusing on inclusivity and adaptability to ensure that diverse voices and perspectives are heard (Vromen, 2018).

In summary, the need for a new framework for political participation in the digital era arises from the limitations of traditional models, which fail to capture the complexities of online participation. This new framework must address emergent forms of participation, consider the relationship between online and offline activities, and incorporate the socio-demographic factors that influence participation. By acknowledging these dimensions, we can gain a deeper understanding of the evolving nature of political participation in today's rapidly changing environment.

Proposed Model Outline

The proposed model of political participation in the digital era encompasses five key dimensions: accessibility, inclusivity, interaction, impact, and feedback. Each of these dimensions is crucial for comprehending the intricacies of participation in contemporary politics.

1) Accessibility: The framework recognizes the importance of making political participation accessible to all citizens, particularly those from marginalized communities. Digital platforms must reduce barriers to entry, such as education or technological literacy, by offering user-friendly interfaces and resources that facilitate understanding and navigation (Lu & Myrick, 2016). Initiatives that aim to enhance digital literacy and access to technology will foster a more informed and engaged citizenry.

2) Inclusivity: A fundamental aspect of the proposed model is its focus on inclusivity. Political participation must encompass a diverse range of voices and perspectives, particularly from historically marginalized groups (Fialho, 2021). This inclusivity will require platforms to actively engage with underrepresented communities and address systemic biases that inhibit participation. By promoting equitable representation in digital spaces, the model aims to ensure that a broad spectrum of citizens has the opportunity to contribute to political discourse (Theorin & Strömbäck, 2019).

3) Interaction: The model emphasizes interaction as a critical component of political participation in the digital age. The fluid nature of online participation facilitates communicative exchanges between citizens and political actors, enabling real-time dialogue and responsive action (Theocharis & Quintelier, 2014). By facilitating back-and-forth communication, platforms can create a more dynamic political environment where citizens feel empowered to express their opinions, share their experiences, and mobilize collective action (Emruli & Bača, 2011).

4) Impact: Understanding the impact of political participation is essential to assessing the effectiveness of participation strategies. The proposed model encourages measuring outcomes associated with both online and offline activities, examining how citizen participation influences policy decisions, social movements, and public opinion (Roccato & Zogmaister, 2010). By analyzing the intersection of participation and political impact, stakeholders can more effectively evaluate the efficacy of various modes of participation and adjust their strategies accordingly.

5) Feedback: Finally, the model incorporates feedback mechanisms that allow citizens to provide input and assessment of political processes and institutions. Participatory governance structures, such as citizen feedback platforms, can enhance responsiveness by soliciting public perspectives on policies and programs (Taylor, 2007). By integrating citizen feedback, political actors can strengthen trust and accountability while fostering a culture of continuous improvement in governance (Oe & Yamaoka, 2024).

In conclusion, the proposed model of political participation in the digital era offers a comprehensive framework that encompasses accessibility, inclusivity, interaction, impact, and

feedback. By addressing these dimensions, the model aims to create a more equitable and effective landscape for political participation, encouraging active participation from diverse citizen groups and enhancing the democratic process.

Measuring and Categorizing Political Participation

To ensure the practicality of the proposed model, it is essential to establish effective measurement and categorization systems for political participation. This section outlines several approaches to measuring participation, including defining categories by participation level, identifying indicators for each category, and developing metrics to assess participation effectiveness.

1) Defining Categories of Participation: Political participation can be broadly categorized into institutionalized, non-institutionalized, civic, and expressive forms (Školník, 2020). Institutionalized participation encompasses traditional activities such as voting, campaigning, and membership in political parties. Non-institutionalized participation encompasses grassroots movements, protests, and digital activism, whereas civic participation refers to community involvement in public initiatives and community engagement. Expressive participation encompasses activities that convey individual sentiments, such as discussing political issues on social media or contributing to online forums.

To further refine these categories, it is valuable to classify participation into three levels: high, moderate, and low. High participation may include involvement in direct action, frequent discussions on political issues, and active membership in organizations. Moderate participation, on the other hand, may involve occasional involvement in community events and less frequent engagement in political discussions. Low participation may involve passive measures, such as browsing political content without interaction. This multi-tiered approach facilitates a comprehensive understanding of how various individuals engage with politics.

2) Identifying Indicators of Participation: Effective measurement also hinges on identifying key indicators that can objectively assess levels of participation. For example, indicators of institutionalized participation may include voting in elections, joining political parties, or attending political meetings. Non-institutionalized participation indicators can include the frequency of sharing political content, signing online petitions, or participating in protests. Civic participation indicators may encompass volunteer activities and participation in community organizations. Finally, expressive participation can be measured by analyzing the volume and quality of political discourse on social media platforms.

3) Developing Metrics for Assessment: Establishing responsive metrics to gauge the effectiveness of participation is crucial for evaluating the proposed model. Surveys and analytical frameworks could be developed to collect data on individuals' participation patterns and outcomes, both online and offline. This process would enable researchers and policymakers to identify the relationships between different types of participation and their respective impacts on political processes.

Implementing longitudinal studies can be instrumental in tracking changes in political participation over time, elucidating shifts in participation prompted by specific events or technological changes. For example, studies could track the impact of significant political events, social movements, or policy shifts on various forms of participation among different demographic groups (Chan et al., 2021; Ohme et al., 2022).

4) Collaboration between Stakeholders: Government agencies, civil society organizations, and research institutions should collaborate to create frameworks for data collection and analysis. Such partnerships can lead to a deeper understanding of how citizens engage with politics in various contexts, as well as the effectiveness of different participation strategies (Borja et al., 2024). These findings can ultimately inform the model of political participation, enabling informed adjustments to promote inclusivity and accessibility.

In conclusion, measuring and categorizing political participation within the framework of the new model is crucial for understanding the dynamics of participation in the digital realm. By defining clear categories, identifying relevant indicators, and developing metrics for assessment, stakeholders can enhance their understanding of the impact of participation on democratic processes. Such an approach ensures that political participation effectively reflects the diverse voices of the citizenry, further contributing to a vibrant democratic society.

Conclusion and Discussion

The exploration of political participation in the digital era reveals profound transformations that necessitate a reimagining of how we understand civic participation. The discussions throughout this article have highlighted not only the shifts from offline to online participation but also the dynamic interplay among the various forms of participation that citizens use today. As we conclude, it is essential to synthesize the key findings, reflect on their implications for contemporary politics, and outline directions for future research.

Summary of Key Findings

This review identifies critical dimensions that retain and reshape the nature of citizen political participation. The transition from offline to online participation signifies a broader democratization of political discourse, where diverse citizen voices can contest, collaborate, and mobilize for change. Digital platforms, particularly social media, facilitate political conversations that transcend traditional institutional boundaries, engaging citizens in various forms of activism and advocacy. These participations illustrate a movement towards more non-institutionalized forms of participation, emphasizing the role of collective action, particularly among younger generations who express political agency through innovative channels.

A pivotal model of political participation was proposed, emphasizing five dimensions: accessibility, inclusivity, interaction, impact, and feedback. Each of these elements reflects a nuanced understanding of how individuals engage politically, highlighting the barriers and opportunities presented in the digital landscape. Accessibility indicates a need for equitable access to technology and digital literacy. Inclusivity underscores the importance of representing diverse societal segments in political discourse, an area where traditional models often fall short. Interaction reinforces the significance of creating spaces where communication flows freely between citizens and political bodies, enhancing the dynamism of civic participation.

Moreover, the impact dimension necessitates evaluating how participation contributes to political outcomes, shifting the focus from quantity to effectiveness. This perspective is crucial for assessing the practical implications of participating in shaping policies and democratic processes. Ultimately, feedback mechanisms underscore the significance of citizen input in governance, illustrating how participatory structures can be refined to better reflect public sentiment and needs.

Policy Recommendations

Based on the findings, several policy recommendations emerge. Firstly, governments and political institutions should prioritize developing inclusive democratic practices that facilitate political participation across diverse demographics, particularly among underrepresented groups. Programs aimed at improving digital literacy should be implemented alongside initiatives that provide community access to technology (Lerch et al., 2021). This can enhance participation rates and inform a more representative democratic process.

Secondly, political participation strategies must adapt to the diverse modes of participation that citizens now employ. By recognizing the value of non-institutionalized activism, institutions can foster partnerships with grassroots organizations and digital platforms to create collaborative opportunities for participation (Greaves et al., 2018). This participation would

ensure that traditional political structures reflect emerging civic motivations and align with the public's expectations of responsiveness.

Additionally, the academic community, policymakers, and the media should collaborate to provide targeted information and support, exploring how social media can effectively mobilize diverse populations. Research into the long-term implications of online activism for voter participation and political efficacy should be prioritized to fully understand the impact of these modes of participation on democratic health (Zúñiga et al., 2009).

Lastly, the established measures for assessing political participation must evolve to encompass the diverse forms of participation that have emerged in the digital context. This includes developing comprehensive metrics that not only capture the quantity of participation but also the quality and impact of citizens' participation in both online and offline spheres (Schäfer & Schemer, 2024). By adopting a multi-dimensional approach to evaluation, stakeholders can gain richer insights into the nature of political participation and the ways to strengthen democratic processes.

Future Directions for Research

Future research should aim to explore the longitudinal effects of digital political participation on democratic processes. Studies could investigate how technological changes influence trends in political participation across demographic groups, particularly among younger citizens who are increasingly engaging with political content online. This could provide insights into developing proactive strategies to facilitate sustained participation in civic life over time.

Moreover, investigations into the psychological factors influencing digital participation—such as emotional responses, cognitive attitudes, and socio-economic influences—offer fertile ground for understanding the motivations behind different modes of participation. Examining how these factors intersect with environmental cues, generational trends, and cultural contexts can further inform theoretical frameworks of political participation.

Lastly, exploring the global dimensions of political participation in the digital age is essential. Comparative studies could examine how varying political contexts and cultural attitudes influence participation in different countries, thereby elucidating both the universal and localized aspects of civic action. By situating these discussions within a broader international context, researchers can help develop more robust frameworks for understanding political participation in our interconnected world.

In conclusion, citizen political participation in the digital era is a complex, evolving phenomenon that demands a nuanced understanding and adaptive strategies for fostering inclusive democracy. By addressing the limitations of traditional models, establishing a comprehensive framework for participation, and continuously investigating emerging trends, we can work towards a more participatory and effective democratic process. The path forward requires collaboration, creativity, and a commitment to elevating diverse voices within the political landscape.

References

Alfaruqy, M., & Padmonurcahyo, A. (2023). What drives the political engagement of the young generation? A political psychology study. *Indonesian Journal of Religion and Society, 5*(1), 36-46.

Alodat, A., Al-Qora'n, L., & Abu Hamoud, M. (2023). Social Media Platforms and Political Participation: A Study of Jordanian Youth Engagement. *Social Sciences, 12*(7), 402.

Amin, F., Swarizona, S., Kuncahyo, T., Arafat, Y., & Oktarina, R. (2023). Digital democracy political participation through technology in the modern era. *International Journal of Science and Society, 5*(4), 291-301.

Austin, E., Borah, P., & Domgaard, S. (2021). COVID-19 disinformation and political engagement among communities of color: The role of media literacy. *Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation Review, 1*, 1-15.

Bennett, W., & Segerberg, A. (2015). The logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics. In S. Coleman & D. Freelon (eds.). *Handbook of Digital Politics* (pp. 169-198). Gloucestershire: Edward Elgar.

Best, S., & Krueger, B. (2005). Analyzing the representativeness of internet political participation. *Political Behavior, 27*(2), 183-216.

Bimber, B., Cunill, M., Copeland, L., & Gibson, R. (2015). Digital media and political participation: The moderating role of political interest across acts and over time. *Social Science Computer Review, 33*(1), 21-42.

Bode, L. (2017). Gateway political behaviors: The frequency and consequences of low-cost political engagement on social media. *Social Media + Society, 3*(4), 1-10.

Borge, R., & Cardenal, A. (2011). Surfing the net: A pathway to participation for the politically uninterested?. *Policy & Internet, 3*(1), 1-29.

Borja, A., Torneo, A., & Hecita, I. (2024). Challenges to democratization from the perspective of political inaction: Insights into political disempowerment and citizenship in the Philippines. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs, 44*(1), 3-29.

Boulianne, S., & Theocharis, Y. (2018). Young people, digital media, and engagement: A meta-analysis of research. *Social Science Computer Review, 38*(2), 111-127.

Bright, J. (2018). Explaining the emergence of political fragmentation on social media: The role of ideology and extremism. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 23*(1), 17-33.

Bristelle, A., Carbonell, J., Cohen, S., Dressler, M., Kaszás, A., Kostrzewski, A., … & Wirthwein, K. (2024). *How young people facing disadvantage view democracy in Europe.* Brussels: Foundation for European Progressive Studies.

Chan, R., Mak, W., Chan, W., Lin, W. (2021). Effects of social movement participation on political efficacy and well-being: A longitudinal study of civically engaged youth. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 22*, 1981-2001.

Cheung, A., Lui, L., & Mu, Z. (2024). Political efficacy and fertility intentions: A survey experiment study in Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Singapore. *Social Science Research, 120*, 103014.

Chong, M. (2023). Calling for justice with #JusticeforBreonnaTaylor: A case study of hashtag activism in the evolution of the Black Lives Matter movement. *Social Network Analysis and Mining, 13*, 67.

Coffé, H. and Bolzendahl, C. (2010). Same game, different rules? Gender differences in political participation. *Sex Roles, 62*(5-6), 318-333.

Cooper, E. (2022). *Fighting for change in the 21st century: An examination of social activism and the role of social media in the US and France.* B.A. (International Studies) Thesis, Fordham University.

Dalton, R. (2008). Citizenship norms and the expansion of political participation. *Political Studies, 56*(1), 76-98.

Davis, A. (2009). New media and fat democracy: The paradox of online participation. *New Media & Society, 12*(5), 745-761.

Dwiputra, R., Aziz, T., & Nur, M. (2022). Strengthening digital citizens political communication ethics (digital citizenship) in social media. *International Journal Pedagogy of Social Studies, 7*(2), 51-56.

Ekman, J., & Amnå, E. (2012). Political participation and civic engagement: Towards a new typology. *Human Affairs, 22*(3), 283-300.

Emruli, S., & Bača, M. (2011). Internet and political communication - Macedonian case. *International Journal of Computer Science Issues, 8*(3), 154-163.

Fialho, F. (2021). Race and non-electoral political participation in Brazil, South Africa, and the United States. *The Journal of Race Ethnicity and Politics, 7*(2), 262-293.

Gibson, R., & Cantijoch, M. (2013). Conceptualizing and Measuring Participation in the Age of the Internet: Is Online Political Engagement Really Different to Offline?. *The Journal of Politics, 75*(3), 701-716.

Grassi, E., Portos, M., & Felicetti, A. (2023). Young people's attitudes towards democracy and political participation: Evidence from a cross-European study. *Government and Opposition, 59*(2), 582-604.

Greaves, L., Sengupta, N., Townrow, C., Osborne, D., Houkamau, C., & Sibley, C. (2018). Maori, a politicized identity: Indigenous identity, voter turnout, protest, and political party support in Aotearoa New Zealand. *International Perspectives in Psychology, 7*(3), 155-173.

Haenschen, K., Shu, M., & Gilliland, J. (2023). Curated misinformation: Liking Facebook pages for fake news sites. *American Behavioral Scientist, 68*(10), 1290-1307.

Halimatusa'diyah, I. (2024). *Beyond slacktivism: The dynamic relationship between online and offline activism among Southeast Asian youths*. Singapore: ISEAS.

Heering, M., Travaglino, G., Abrams, D., & Goldsack, E. (2020). "If they don't listen to us, they deserve it": The effect of external efficacy and anger on the perceived legitimacy of hacking. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 23*(6), 863-881.

Henn, M., & Foard, N. (2013). Social differentiation in young people's political participation: The impact of social and educational factors on youth political engagement in Britain. *Journal of Youth Studies, 17*(3), 360-380.

Henn, M., Weinstein, M., & Forrest, S. (2005). Uninterested youth? Young people's attitudes towards party politics in Britain. *Political Studies, 53*(3), 556-578.

Hoffman, L., Jones, P., & Young, D. (2013). Does my comment count? Perceptions of political participation in an online environment. *Computers in Human Behavior, 29*(6), 2248-2256.

Holt, K., Shehata, A., Strömbäck, J., & Ljungberg, E. (2013). Age and the effects of news media attention and social media use on political interest and participation: Do social media function as leveller?. *European Journal of Communication, 28*(1), 19-34.

Jantaraviset, A., & Chailertwanitkul, S. (2013). The political participation of people in Sam Chuk, Suphan Buri, towards the amendment of the constitution of the Kingdom of Thailand b.e.2550: According to the concept of Article 291. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Research: Graduate Studies, 2*(2), 105-133.

Kaim, M. (2021). Rethinking modes of political participation: The conventional, unconventional, and alternative. *Democratic Theory, 8*(1), 50-70.

Karmila, L., Rachmiatie, A., K, S., Fardiah, D., Ahmadi, D., & Muhtadi, A. (2024). The role of social media in the political construction of identity: Implications for political dynamics and democracy in Indonesia. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development, 8*(14), 9171.

Keating, A., & Melis, G. (2017). Social media and youth political engagement: Preaching to the converted or providing a new voice for youth?. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations, 19*(4), 877-894.

Kim, H., Kim, Y., & Lee, D. (2020). Understanding the role of social media in political participation: Integrating political knowledge and bridging social capital from the social cognitive approach. *International Journal of Communication, 14*, 4803-4824.

Kongcham, R., & Rathachatranon, W. (2014). The Political Participation of Police in Maung Suphanburi Police Station. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Research: Graduate Studies, 3*(2), 114-120.

Kreiss, D., Finn, M., & Turner, F. (2010). The limits of peer production: some reminders from max weber for the network society. *New Media & Society, 13*(2), 243-259.

Laer, J., & Aelst, P. (2010). Internet and social movement action repertoires. *Information Communication & Society, 13*(8), 1146-1171.

Lapidot-Lefler, N., & Barak, A. (2012). Effects of anonymity, invisibility, and lack of eye-contact on toxic online disinhibition. *Computers in Human Behavior, 28*, 434-443.

Lerch, J., Schofer, E., Frank, D., Longhofer, W., Ramírez, F., Wotipka, C., … & Velasco, K. (2021). Women's participation and challenges to the liberal script: A global perspective. *International Sociology, 37*(3), 305-329.

Leyva, R. (2016). Exploring UK millennials' social media consumption patterns and participation in elections, activism, and "slacktivism". Social Science Computer Review, 35(4), 462-479.

Lu, Y., & Myrick, J. (2016). Cross-cutting exposure on Facebook and political participation. *Journal of Media Psychology Theories Methods and Applications, 28*(3), 100-110.

Lythreatis, S., Singh, S., & El-Kassar, A. (2022). The digital divide: A review and future research agenda. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 175*, 121359.

Martin, A. (2021). *Emotional Motivation: How Anger, Fear, Hope and Pride Impact Women's Political Participation.* Senior Thesis, Bemidji State University.

Mihelj, S., Leguina, A., & Downey, J. (2019). Culture is digital: Cultural participation, diversity and the digital divide. *New Media & Society, 21*(7), 1465-1485.

Monticelli, L., & Bassoli, M. (2018). Precariousness, youth and political participation: The emergence of a new political cleavage. *Rivista Italiana Di Scienza Politica, 49*(1), 99-113.

Narapong, N., & Kulachai, W. (2024). Unlocking the drivers of political participation: A comprehensive review of influential factors. *Ramkhamhaeng Journal of Public Administration, 7*(3), 59-99.

Noor, S., Bilal, M., Mirza, K., & Yasir, W. (2024). Analyzing how cultivating positive emotions like joy, hope, and empathy can motivate individuals to engage in community service and social activism. *Journal for Social Science Archives, 2*(2), 437-454.

Oe, H., & Yamaoka, Y. (2024). The role of citizen feedback in shaping social policies: Enhancing administrative processes and information transparency for inclusive governance. *SocioEconomic Challenges, 8*(3), 16-28.

Ohme, J., Andersen, K., Albæk, E., & de Vreese, C. (2022). Anything goes? Youth, news, and democratic engagement in the roaring 2020s. *The International Journal of Press/Politics, 27*(3), 557-568.

Oser, J. (2022). The Effectiveness of Different Forms of Political Participation. In M. Giugni & M. Grasso (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Political Participation* (pp. 815-837). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Oser, J., Hooghe, M., & Mariën, S. (2012). Is online participation distinct from offline participation? A latent class analysis of participation types and their stratification. *Political Research Quarterly, 66*(1), 91-101.

Oz, M., & Greeves, S. (2024). Examining the impact of incivility and intolerance on participation in social media discussions: An experimental investigation. *First Monday, 29*(11), 13640.

Pardosi, P., Muttaqim, H., & Sugeng, I. (2024). Social Media Activism: The Rise of Digital Movements in the Global South. *Cognitionis Civitatis et Politicae, 1*(6), 411-421.

Phillips, C. (2024). Digital communication and the rise of online activism. *Journal of Communication, 5*(3), 31-44.

Piat, C. (2019). Slacktivism: Not simply a means to an end, but a legitimate form of civic participation. *Canadian Journal of Family and Youth, 11*(1), 162-179.

Poy, S., & Schüller, S. (2020). Internet and voting in the social media era: Evidence from a local broadband policy. *Research Policy, 49*(1), 103861.

Prahara, S., & Rachma, N. (2023). Political efficacy and political participation in the Islamic student association cadres. *Psikis: Jurnal Psikologi Islami, 9*(1), 170-178.

Puri, N. (2024). The Impact of social media in shaping political discourse. *International Journal for Research Publication & Seminar, 16*(1), 1-8.

Ragnedda, M., Ruiu, M., & Addeo, F. (2022). The self-reinforcing effect of digital and social exclusion: The inequality loop. *Telematics and Informatics, 72*, 101852.

Raj, S. (2023). Digital media and women's political participation in India. *Media Watch, 14*(3), 366-385.

Rasmussen, S., & Nørgaard, A. (2017). When and why does education matter? Motivation and resource effects in political efficacy. *European Journal of Political Research, 57*(1), 24-46.

Reardon, S. (2013). Does online "slacktivism" actually do more harm than good?. *NewScientist, 218*(2915), 24.

Robles-Morales, J., & Córdoba-Hernández, A. (2019). *Digital political participation, social networks and big data: Disintermediation in the era of Web 2.0.* Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Roccato, M., & Zogmaister, C. (2010). Predicting the vote through implicit and explicit attitudes: A field research. *Political Psychology, 31*(2), 249-274.

Schäfer, S., & Schemer, C. (2024). Informed participation? An investigation of the relationship between exposure to different news channels and participation mediated through actual and perceived knowledge. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, 1251379

Shamionov, R. (2020). The Role of Civic Identity in the Preferences of Civil and Political Forms of Social Activity in Russian Youth. *RUDN Journal of Psychology and Pedagogics, 17*(3), 459-472.

Shin, B., Floch, J., Rask, M., Bæck, P., Edgar, C., Berditchevskaia, A., … & Branlat, M. (2024). A systematic analysis of digital tools for citizen participation. *Government Information Quarterly, 41*(3), 101954.

Sindermann, C. (2024). Relations between different components of group identification and types of social media political participation in the context of the Fridays for Future movement. *Personality and Individual Differences, 230*, 112773.

Školník, M. (2020). The effects of corruption on various forms of political participation in Colombia. *Latin American Policy, 11*(1), 88-102.

Stein, V., Pentzold, C., Peter, S., & Sterly, S. (2025). Digital political participation for rural development: Necessary conditions and cultures of participation. *The Information Society, 41*(1), 18-32.

Suktam, W., Supsin, J., & Kenpahoom, S. (2024). Digital democracy and religious beliefs: Charting the course of cyber politics in the 21st century. *The Journal of International Buddhist Studies College, 10*(3), 145-168.

Takyar, D. (2019). When interest doesn't turn into action: Discrimination, group identification, and Muslim political engagement in the post-9/11 era. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 82*(3), 231-253.

Taneerat, W., Dongnadeng, H., Kongplod, W., Srisanoy, P., Senghor, P., Phetlek, T., … & Yongjeen, K. (2022). Social media usage behavior and the political participation of the elderly in Mueang Trang District. *Local Administration Journal, 15*(4), 389-406.

Thanathiti, T. (2019). Influential Factors towards Political Participation of Thai Local Senior Citizens. *PSAKU International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research, 8*(1), 86-96.

Theocharis, Y., & Quintelier, E. (2014). Stimulating citizenship or expanding entertainment? The effect of Facebook on adolescent participation. *New Media & Society, 18*(5), 817-836.

Theocharis, Y., Boulianne, S., Koc-Michalska, K., & Bimber, B. (2023). Platform affordances and political participation: How social media reshape political engagement. *West European Politics, 46*(4), 788-811.

Theorin, N., & Strömbäck, J. (2019). Some media matter more than others: investigating media effects on attitudes toward and perceptions of immigration in Sweden. *International Migration Review, 54*(4), 1238-1264.

Valenzuela, S., Arriagada, A., & Scherman, A. (2012). The social media basis of youth protest behavior: The case of Chile. *Journal of Communication, 62*(2), 299-314.

Vasist, P., Chatterjee, D., & Krishnan, S. (2024). The polarizing impact of political disinformation and hate speech: A cross-country configural narrative. *Information Systems Frontiers, 26*, 663-688.

Venus, A., Intyaswati, D., Ayuningtyas, F., & Lestari, P. (2025). Political participation in the digital age: Impact of influencers and advertising on Generation Z. *Cogent Arts & Humanities, 12*(1), 2520063.

Vromen, A. (2018). Political engagement in the Australian digital context. *Papers on Parliament, 69*, 93-115.

Williamson, A. (2011). Disruption and empowerment. Embedding citizens at the heart of democracy. *eJournal of eDemocracy & Open Government, 3*(1), 22-32.

Wongsuwan, N., Jermsittiparsert, K., Tokeaw, W., & Boonsiri, K. (2022). News consumption behaviors among voters in capital's gubernatorial election: Evidence in Bangkok, Thailand. *Przestrzen Społeczna, 22*(1), 305-324.

Xu, P., Johnson, K., & Rundlett, A. (2022). E-participation in contemporary China: A comparison with conventional offline participation. *Chinese Public Administration Review, 13*(3), 150-161.

Yuan, Y., Dwivedi, Y., Tan, G., Cham, T., Ooi, K., Aw, E., … & Currie, W. (2023). Government digital transformation: Understanding the role of government social media. *Government Information Quarterly, 40*(1), 101775.

Zahroh, N. (2023). Political campaign strategy of PDIP in Surabaya on Instagram and Facebook media. *Jurnal Wacana Politik, 8*(1), 79-88.

Zhu, A., Chan, A., & Chou, K. (2019). Creative social media use and political participation in young people: The moderation and mediation role of online political expression. *Journal of Adolescence, 77*(1), 108-117.

Zhuravskaya, E., Petrova, M., & Enikolopov, R. (2019). Political effects of the internet and social media. *Annual Review of Economics, 12*, 415-438

Zúñiga, H., Molyneux, L., & Zheng, P. (2014). Social media, political expression, and political participation: Panel analysis of lagged and concurrent relationships. *Journal of Communication, 64*(4), 612-634.

Zúñiga, H., Puig-i-Abril, E., & Rojas, H. (2009). Weblogs, traditional sources online and political participation: An assessment of how the internet is changing the political environment. *New Media & Society, 11*(4), 553-574.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.