

Digital Media Transformation of Political Participation: An Empirical Evidence

Okil Sunar

Mid-West University, Surkhet, Nepal

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100800712>

Received: 20 August 2026; Accepted: 25 August 2026; Published: 16 September 2026

ABSTRACT

The paper offers an empirical synthesis of scholarly literature exploring the role of digital media in political participation, based on a review of twenty papers published between 2013 and 2026. By employing the methodology of qualitative thematic synthesis, I integrate evidence from longitudinal panels, cross-national surveys, and case studies to study the role of digital media in shaping civic and political participation in democratic, transitional, and authoritarian societies. Four interrelated themes have been identified: the enduring controversy regarding mobilization vs. reinforcement impact of digital media; psychological mediators (political efficacy, interest, and media literacy); the role of institutional context (specifically, a paradox of surveillance and participation in less democratic societies), and the importance of algorithmic gatekeeping and digital affordances. My findings demonstrate that there is a stable, modestly positive correlation between digital media consumption and political participation, but the former is strongly moderated by the level of individual efficacy and literacy as well as political and institutional context. Digital participation is more likely to be risk-free and driven by convenience in stable democracies whereas in authoritarian and transitional countries, the problem of surveillance forces people to become active on encrypted platforms. Thus, it is clear that digital media is a situational and not universal catalyst of political participation, and the need for further research into platform diversification, artificial intelligence, and synthetic media within comparative, non-Western settings is imperative.

Keywords: digital media, political participation, political efficacy, media literacy, algorithmic gatekeeping, mobilization-reinforcement

INTRODUCTION

Background

With great hope the internet and social media came with the promise to enhance democratic life. Initial ideas about e-democracy and digital citizenship held that these technologies would help to make it easier for citizens, notably those who have traditionally been excluded from the formal political arena, to participate in politics. Empirical studies, however, show that the picture is more complex in the Web 2.0 period and even more so in the hypermedia environments of the mid-2020s. Chand and Awasthi (2025) zoom in on the impact of Facebook on youth in Nepal, identifying algorithmic biases and social media engagement as factors explaining more than 86% of variance in political engagement of their political science students, an association much stronger than in the global literature on the topic. The authors suggest that in the Nepalese socio-political context, the algorithmic nature of content curations is actually a much better predictor of political behavior than in Western democracies. Carney et al. (2022), however, identify another important methodological detail: since there is no engagement-based algorithm on WhatsApp, its influence on the voters was associated only with direct and horizontal communication. In India, Hanumanthappa (2024) explicitly highlights this as the central theme in his research, asserting that WhatsApp's encrypted and closed group design makes it extremely difficult for the Election Commission of India and fact-checkers to step in before any false narrative – usually based on caste, religious, or regional affiliations – spreads to millions of voters. On the other hand, Carney et al. (2022) present some opposing views, as their experimental findings revealed that exposure to WhatsApp political groups increased individuals' capability to discriminate between the truth and fiction in political news.

This paper synthesizes some results of the empirical research that was conducted over the last about thirteen years, to offer a comprehensive overview of the relationship between digital media and political behavior, based on the analysis of the German Parliamentary Election by Zeh and Holtz-Bacha (2013), on the cross-national study of five countries by Basha et al. (2026), and on the meta-analysis research tradition set in motion by Boulianne (2009, 2011, 2020), focused on the mobilization-versus-reinforcement dichotomy. While digital platforms are simultaneously means of self-expression, many-to-many communication is also a source of misinformation, polarization and surveillance, as witnessed by the use of digital platforms as tools for political mobilization in the Arab Springs, Black Lives Matter and South Asian digital activism.

Objectives

- To compile empirical findings on links between digital media and political participation in democratic, transitional and authoritarian regimes.
- To explore psychological mediators that influence digital engagement, such as political efficacy, interest and media literacy.
- To examine the influences of institutional arrangements and cultural context on the impact of digital media on participation.
- To track the development of digital affordances and risks, such as algorithmic gatekeeping, surveillance and synthetic media.

Research Questions

RQ1: What are the characteristics and level of the empirical connection between the use of digital media and political participation that are reported from 2013 to 2026?

RQ2: What is the influence of political efficacy, interest and media literacy on this relationship?

RQ3: What are the effects of digital media in institutional and cultural contexts ranging from consolidated democracies to authoritarian regimes?

RQ4: What have been the changes in opportunities and dangers of digital political participation due to changing digital affordances?

METHODOLOGY

In the context of this empirical synthesis paper, the researcher does not make any original data collection, but rather reviews, compares and synthesizes results from empirical research on Digital Media Transformation of Political Participation: An Empirical Synthesis Paper.

Research Design

This paper relies on a qualitative and interpretative synthesis design (narrative and thematic synthesis) which is appropriate for the integration of methodologically diverse studies, rather than pooling of raw data. The results of panel studies, cross-national surveys, case studies were compared and categorised into crosscutting themes, as the main studies are very different in terms of context and statistical method.

Sources of Empirical Studies

The synthesis is based twenty main empirical sources: longitudinal panel studies, cross-national surveys, mixed methods case studies reviews, Conceptual works, such as Pariser (2014), Bennett and Segerberg (2013) and Chadwick and Puig (2017) were interpreted, but not used as primary sources.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The studies were selected if they presented original empirical research on digital or social media use and

political participation, efficacy, and/or civic involvement; they had been peer-reviewed or published by a respected source; and they provided adequate methodological detail. Theoretical and opinion articles, as well as studies that did not relate to political or civic behavior were discarded, while conceptual works were included as an interpretive framing.

Search Strategy and Databases

Search for the sources was done with a structured search using some of the major databases such as Google Scholar, JSTOR using Mid-West University account, Scopus, Web of Science, SAGE Journals, Wiley Online Library and the archive of the American Political Science Review. Snowball searching of reference lists of key sources. Keeping the references of (Boulianne, 2020; Skoric et al., 2016) was also undertaken for further works. The literature was retrieved using . Major Boolean terms included: “Digital media AND Political participation” AND “cyber politics”, “communication technology” AND “political engagement”, “digital literacy”. Hence, 106 articles related to the key terms were gathered in the process of searching for the data. After the abstract and full texts screening, those articles that clearly failed to meet the eligibility criteria were removed. After the screening and full-text assessment, 20 articles have been selected to demonstrate the disciplinary and methodological variety in Evolution of digital media in political participation research.

Publication Time Span

The synthesis is done from 2013 to 2026, from Boulianne's (2020) Mobilization vs Reinforcement, through to the algorithmically driven world captured by Basha et al. (2026), Mousa et al. (2026) and Verma (2026) and the changing landscape of platforms and politics.

Study Selection Procedures

Studies were initially screened from the title and abstract for inclusion based on the defined inclusion criteria, followed by a full-text review of methodological rigor and relevance to the research questions, and then the final set of studies was summarized.

Data Extraction Process

For each included study, authorship, methodological design, geographic context, key variables, and principal findings were extracted and tabulated (Table 1), forming the basis for the cross-study comparison in Section 3.3. Among 106 identified articles from the database were screened to determine their relevance to digital media and political participation discourse. After the abstract and full texts screening, those articles that clearly failed to meet the eligibility criteria were removed. After the screening and full-text assessment, 20 articles have been selected to demonstrate the disciplinary and methodological variety in Evolution of Digital media in political participation research.

Coding and Thematic Analysis Procedures

Findings were coded inductively around recurring concepts (reinforcement, incidental exposure, efficacy, media literacy, surveillance, algorithmic gatekeeping), then organized deductively around the four research questions into the four themes analyzed in Section 3.2.

Trustworthiness and Quality Assessment

Trustworthiness rests on triangulating evidence across panel studies, cross-national surveys, case studies. Limitations affecting the evidence base include persistent difficulty establishing causality despite panel data, inconsistent definitions of online participation, research lagging behind platform change, a lingering WEIRD-context bias only partly addressed by newer cross-national studies, reliance on self-reported data, and a predominance of cross-sectional designs.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Overview of Reviewed Studies

The evidence is based on twenty major empirical studies that include longitudinal panel studies, cross-national surveys, mixed-methods case studies.

Thematic Findings

Coding and thematic analysis produced four interconnected themes, discussed below.

Digital Empowerment and the Mobilization-Reinforcement Debate

One of the key debates is whether digital media is enabling new voices in politics or is a means of giving the voices of the already privileged an even bigger platform. They find an “engaged Matthew” (about 15% of the German electorate) for whom the Internet reinforces their involvement, and a “disengaged Matthew,” a “Silent Majority,” for whom the Internet does not seem to enhance involvement. The mobilization perspective, in contrast posits that low cost, interactive digital media helps to lower some barriers for marginalized groups, as “incidental exposure” is suggested by Boulianne (2020), and “connective action” is identified by Bennett and Segerberg (2013) as how issues can be mobilized outside of formal organizations. The use of Facebook and YouTube by Nepali youth to create “counter-publics” that contest narratives centered on the urban experience is demonstrated by Kharel (2024). The evidence is mixed, with some strengthening inequality, and some providing new, though limited, participation.

Psychological Mediators, Efficacy, Interest, and Literacy

The shift has happened from stimulus-response research to psychological mediators of digital effects. Boulianne (2013) discovers that there is a reciprocal relationship between internet use and political interest, resulting in a “virtuous cycle.” Political efficacy, which can be internal or external, as distinguished by Mousa et al. (2026), predicts online participation; Basha et al. (2026) determine that low levels of political efficacy lead to passive browsing, and that media literacy is strongly correlated to constructive use of online media and less susceptible to misinformation. Interest, efficacy, and literacy are interconnected, so it's important to attend to all three to ensure meaningful participation.

Institutional Context and the Surveillance-Participation Paradox

There is a significant variation in digital impact from institution to institution. In stable, consensual, democratic systems such as Germany, digital participation is ‘low-risk, high-convenience’ and is more likely to be determined by apathy than repression, Zeh and Holtz-Bacha (2013) argue. In transitional and authoritarian settings, “mobilization” and “monitoring” happen with the same tools, there is a paradox. Basha et al. (2026) and Mousa et al. (2026) explain how the perception of surveillance in Egypt and Turkey, respectively, was chilling in Egypt, Turkey and Brazil, respectively, forcing activism to go through encrypted channels that are more effective at keeping people safe, while less effective at mobilizing the masses, which they call “networked authoritarianism.” Cultural values and mobile first infrastructure also shape regional patterns, and access gaps have been termed forms of “digital colonialism.”

Algorithmic Governance and the Evolution of Digital Affordances

The digital environment has moved beyond the “top-down” Web 2.0 model covered by Zeh and Holtz-Bacha (2013) to “bottom-up” communication and then to an algorithmically curated hypermedia environment. Algorithmic gatekeeping, whereby platforms foster engagement rather than diversity, reinforces echo chambers (Pariser, 2014), affective polarization and micro-publics, is described by Basha et al. (2026). Added to this is the surveillance turn mentioned in Theme 3 and, in the future, the risk of informational mistrust from Artificial Intelligence and deep fakes.

Cross-Study Comparison

The methodological traditions listed in Table 1 complement each other. Longitudinal panels (Zeh & Holtz-Bacha, 2013; Boulianne, 2013) most clearly demonstrate causality but are geographically limited. Cross-national studies (Basha et al., 2026; Mousa et al., 2026) provide extension of evidence in the context of authoritarianism, and they uncover the surveillance-participation paradox, but in a cross-sectional manner. Contextual depth adds by way of case studies (Kharel 2024; Van Tran et al 2025) at the expense of generalizability. Mobilization vs reinforcement (Boulianne, 2020; Skoric et al., 2016; Verma, 2026) give an overall effect size but minimize variation in context.

Trends and Patterns

- Nearly 13 years of research showing positive, though moderate, correlation between digital media and political participation.
- The “news effect”: news and public affairs usage more strongly predict participation than any other type of online news–use, such as entertainment or social use.
- Reciprocal causality between media use and participation, with virtuous and vicious cycles of participation.
- A surveillance chill effect that reduces the participation connection in non-democratic or backward slippage circumstances.
- Media literacy serves as a buffer against false information and superficial learning.
- The most powerful psychological motivator towards digital activism is political efficacy.
- The context of the regime affects participation in different ways, as it becomes more expressive and networked, for example by means of hashtag activism.

Interpretation of Findings

The synthesis adopts a critical perspective on digital media as a situational and not a natural “mobiliser of participation”. Scholarship work in the early study period (Zeh & Holtz-Bacha, 2013) proposed that the online communication reinforced already active citizens, while another proposed model (Boulianne, 2013) was the reciprocity effect, and more recent studies emphasized the “dark side” of connectivity, with efficacy and literacy of digital media becoming more salient determinants (Basha et al., 2026). There is evidence that suggests that social media is a mixed political environment, in between institutional control and platform governance.

Comparison with Existing Literature

The results are consistent with current theory. The mobilization-reinforcement tension is in continuity with Boulianne's (2013, 2015 and 2020) tradition which explains mobilization as described by Kharel (2024) and Van Tran et al. (2025) by the concept of connective action (Bennett & Segerberg, 2013). Algorithmic gatekeeping is connected to the filter bubble concept of Pariser (2014) and hybrid media system of Chadwick and Puig (2017). This synthesis builds on that literature by synthesizing the surveillance-participation paradox, which was largely overlooked in the Western scholarship but has been demonstrated to be pivotal in other settings by Basha et al. (2026), Mousa et al. (2026), and Van Tran et al. (2025).

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary of Key Findings

Compared to the general literature, the results highlighted a consistent, moderate positive relationship between digital media use and political participation, which was largely mediated by an individual's sense of efficacy and literacy and mediated by institutional context, i.e., with a low risk and convenient use in democracy and

a repressive use in authoritarianism. The transition to a top-down Web 2.0 infrastructure to an algorithmically managed hypermedia world has created new dangers, such as gatekeeping, polarization, and, potentially, synthetic media.

Conclusions

The digital media-participation relation can be demonstrated in this synthesis as it is complex and multi-dimensional. The Internet has broadened the range of political engagements, but it has not fundamentally changed the foundations of engagement: socio-economic and psychological contexts. Social media is both empowering and constraining – it allows for networked participation and expression by citizens, but also for surveillance and algorithmic control- and the ability to have an impact, to see the world from the political, to have media literacy are important, albeit structurally limited, factors of meaningful engagement. The digital public sphere is not the space where technology will inevitably deliver democracy, but a place that can be a space of democracy and democratic potential but can also be a space of contestation and risks which must be navigated carefully and with sensitivity to the context.

Implications and Future Research Directions

The field has a WEIRD-context bias, and future research should move beyond such a bias, using longitudinal, comparative designs that can follow and compare platforms and phenomena that have come to pass since the evidence base has been established, such as short-video platforms, encrypted messaging, and AI-generated content. The relevance of media literacy and efficacy as safeguards to civic practice and policy suggests a policy rationale for digital literacy education and institutional reforms to enhance external efficacy, especially if there is a sense of surveillance that deters participation. The central challenge now is to preserve digital media's participatory affordances, in response to their surveillance, algorithmic, and informational risks.

REFERENCES

1. Abah, M. A. (2025). Effect of Social Media on public opinion and social movements: Literature review on the role of social media in public opinion, political participation and electoral outcomes. *The Impact of Social Media on Public Opinion and Social Movements*. <https://diversity.researchfloor.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/The-Impact-of-Social-Media-on-Public-Opinion-and-Social-Movements.pdf>
2. Bakker, T. P., & de Vreese, C. H. (2014). What's the bright side of the news? The use of the Internet and involvement of youth in politics. *Communication Research*, 38(4), 451–470. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650210381738>
3. Basha, H., Mustafa, S., & Mousa, K. M. (2026). Media and the democratic participation of citizens: an international perspective. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 8, Article 1719957. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2026.1719957>
4. Boulianne, S. (2013). Has the Internet enhanced citizens' participation? Meta Analysis of research. *Political Communication*, 26(2), 193–211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584600902854363>
5. Boulianne, S. (2015). A Metacognitive Research of Latest Research on Social Media Use and Participation. *Information, Communication & Society*, 18(5), 524–538. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1008542>
6. Boulianne, S. (2015). Are you invigorating or undermining enthusiasm? Interactions between political interest and the news media. *Political Communication*, 28(2), 147–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2010.540305>
7. Boulianne, S. (2020). Twenty Years of the Impact of the Information and Communication Technology on Civic and Political Engagement. *Communication Research*, 47(7), 947–966. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650218808186>
8. Carney, K., Breza, E., Hsiao, C., Lakkaraju, H., & Rao, G. (2022). The effect of social media on voters: Experimental evidence from an Indian election [Working paper]. Harvard University. https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/carney/files/carney_jmp.pdf
9. Chadwick, A., & Puig, I. V. (2017). *A hybrid media system: Politics and power*. Oxford University Press.

10. Chand, P. B., & Awasthi, K. R. (2025). Facebook's influence on Nepali political dynamics: Survey of Tribhuvan University political science students in Nepal. *Quest Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 7(1), 155–166. <https://doi.org/10.3126/qjmss.v7i1.82023>
11. Copland, L & Boulianne, S. (2020). Participation in social media and politics. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Cyber Behavior*. Cambridge University Press.
12. Emmer, M., Wolling, J., & Vowe, G. (2014). The use of and impact of the Internet on political communication: a longitudinal study. Springer-Verlag.
13. Hanumanthappa, D. G. (2024). Fake news, misinformation, and elections: Social media challenges in Indian politics. *International Journal of Political Science (IJPS)*, 10(2), 27–31. <https://doi.org/10.20431/2454-9452.1002004>
14. Kharel, A. B. (2024). Cyber-politics: social media's influence on political mobilization” is a research paper on social media and its influence on the political mobilization. *Journal of Political Science*, 24, 103–115. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jps.v24i1.62857>
15. Kurniawan, W., Arham, M., & Muluk, H. (2024). The influence of social media on political participation based on systematic review and meta analysis in the Psychology field in Indonesia. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 51(1), 1–12.
16. Mousa, K. M., Basha, H., & Mustafa, S. (2026). Social media and Democratization of political participation: A global view. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 8, 1719957. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2026.1719957>
17. Pariser, E. (2014). *The filter bubble: How the Internet is hiding information from you*. Penguin Press.
18. Skoric, M. M., Zhu, Q., Goh, D., & Pang, N. (2016). Meta: Analysis of social media and citizen engagement. *New Media & Society*, 18(9), 1817–1839. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444815616221>
19. Theocharis, Y. (2015). Planning for digitally mediated participation. *Social Media + Society*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305115610140>
20. Van Tran M., Phattharathanasut T., Mousa K. M. (2025). Fighting authoritarianism in Southeast Asia through the use of pro-democracy platforms (Advocacy). Kazantzakis J, Katsivelas P, Kalaitzakis E. *Open Research Europe*. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12084801/>.
21. Verma, S. (2026). A study of political engagement using social media data, conducted via meta-analysis. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 112, 102021. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2026.102021>
22. Zeh, R., & Holtz-Bacha, C. (2013). Use of internet, social media and political participation in the German parliamentary election 2013. In: *Journal of Political Marketing*, 12(1), 43-67