

Social Media, Political Participation and Democratic Governance

Sana Jamil¹

¹ Ph.D. Scholar, Zhongnan University of Economics and Law, China. E-Mail: sanasiyaal976@gmail.com

ORCID <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-5377-8964>

ABSTRACT

Social media platforms have become central infrastructures of public communication, altering how citizens obtain political information, express preferences, mobilize, and evaluate democratic institutions. This article synthesizes peer-reviewed research and institutional evidence on the relationship between social media, political participation, and democratic governance. Drawing on meta-analyses, cross-national surveys, systematic reviews, and governance reports published principally between 2012 and 2026, it treats social media neither as an inherently democratizing technology nor as an inherently corrosive one. Instead, it examines how platform affordances interact with political institutions, media systems, age cohorts, and regulatory environments. The evidence indicates a consistent, modestly positive association between political uses of social media and several forms of civic and political participation, including information seeking, expression, petitioning, and protest coordination. These associations are often stronger in emerging democracies and among younger citizens. At the same time, research documents risks that are more pronounced in established democracies, including affective polarization, declining institutional trust, information disorder, and the commercial amplification of emotionally charged content. Comparative analysis of the United States, Estonia, Brazil, Kenya, and India illustrates that outcomes depend less on platform presence alone than on internet freedom, media pluralism, state capacity, and civic literacy. The article concludes that democratic quality in digital public spheres is a governance problem as much as a technology problem. Policy responses that combine transparency, media and information literacy, independent journalism, and rights-respecting platform accountability are more consistent with available evidence than either unrestricted platform exceptionalism or indiscriminate speech restriction.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received **01-08-2025**
Accepted **21-12-2025**
Published **30-12-2025**

KEYWORDS

social media; political participation; democratic governance; digital citizenship; misinformation; youth engagement; comparative politics

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Sana Jamill
sanasiyaal976@gmail.com



<https://doi.org/10.68740/jjss12>

Introduction

Over the past two decades, social media services have moved from optional supplements to mainstream political communication into core venues of public life. Billions of people now encounter news, commentary, campaign messages, and civic appeals through feeds organized by commercial algorithms rather than through the editorial routines of newspapers, public broadcasters, or party organizations. This shift has altered the cost structure of political expression, the speed of mobilization, the visibility of previously peripheral actors, and the conditions under which citizens form beliefs about government performance.

Early commentary often framed these developments in binary terms. Optimistic accounts treated networked platforms as liberation technologies that would lower barriers to participation, weaken elite gatekeeping, and expand the democratic public sphere. Pessimistic accounts emphasized filter bubbles, viral falsehoods, harassment, foreign interference, and the degradation of deliberation. Subsequent empirical work has complicated both stories. Systematic reviews find that digital media use is associated with higher political participation and information consumption in many settings, especially outside long-established liberal democracies, while associations with declining trust, populist communication, and polarization appear more frequently in established democracies (Lorenz-Spreen et al., 2023).

The stakes of this research agenda have grown as global measures of democratic quality have deteriorated. Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) assessments indicate that autocracies now outnumber democracies and that a large majority of the world's population lives under autocratic rule, with freedom of expression among the most frequently deteriorating components of democratic quality (Nord et al., 2025; V-Dem Institute, 2026). Freedom House has documented a fifteenth consecutive year of decline in global internet freedom, including tighter controls on social media, arrests for online speech, and information-manipulation campaigns (Vesteinsson & Baker, 2025). These trends do not by themselves prove that social media caused democratic erosion. They do, however, make the quality of digitally mediated public engagement a central question for democratic theory and public policy.

This article examines changing patterns of public engagement at the intersection of social media, political participation, and democratic governance. It is organized as a research synthesis rather than as a primary data collection study. The analysis proceeds from a specified research problem and a set of questions, reviews core literatures, outlines a transparent desk-based methodology, and then develops thematic chapters on participation, opportunities, risks, information disorder, youth engagement, and cross-national comparison. A comparative table summarizes major opportunities and risks. The discussion and policy recommendations remain within the limits of published evidence and avoid attributions of motive to particular parties or politicians.

Research Problem

Democratic governance depends on more than periodic elections. It requires that citizens can acquire reasonably accurate information, form and revise preferences, communicate those preferences to representatives and peers, organize collectively, and hold public authority to account. Classic models of participation therefore treat voting, contacting officials, campaign work, protest, and civic association as complementary channels through which publics authorize and constrain power (Verba et al., 1995). Social media reorganizes each of those channels. It compresses the time between event and response, multiplies the number of potential senders, and embeds political content in entertainment, peer conversation, and commercial targeting.

The research problem is that this reorganization is uneven in its democratic consequences and poorly captured by simple statements that social media is “good” or “bad” for democracy. Three tensions define the problem. First, participation gains and deliberative losses can occur simultaneously.

Citizens may become more expressive and more mobilized while becoming less trusting, less willing to compromise, or more exposed to low-quality information. Second, effects vary by regime type and media system. The same platforms that help protesters coordinate under censorship can, in high-choice established democracies, intensify partisan sorting and distrust of professional news. Third, participation on platforms is not equivalent to influence over institutions. Visibility, virality, and networked solidarity do not automatically translate into legislative responsiveness, administrative capacity, or equal representation.

Public opinion data illustrate the ambiguity. In a Pew Research Center study of 27 countries conducted in 2022–2023, majorities in 20 countries said social media had been good for democracy in their nation, with especially positive assessments in several emerging economies; respondents in the United States were among the least likely to offer a positive evaluation (Pew Research Center, 2024a). Later U.S. evidence continues to show mixed patterns: many users say platforms help them find like-minded people and get involved in issues, even as news attention has declined and assessments of democratic performance remain contested (Pew Research Center, 2025a, 2025b; Maese & Jones, 2026). The problem for scholarship and governance is therefore not merely to count users or posts, but to explain under what conditions social media participation strengthens, leaves unchanged, or weakens the quality of democratic rule.

Research Questions and Objectives

The article is guided by five research questions. First, how has political participation been conceptually redefined in social media environments, and which forms of engagement are empirically associated with platform use? Second, in what ways do social media affordances create opportunities for democratic engagement, including information access, expression, mobilization, and oversight of public authority? Third, what risks to democratic governance are most consistently documented in the empirical literature, including polarization, harassment, surveillance, and the weakening of intermediary institutions? Fourth, how do misinformation and disinformation interact with public trust, and what does available evidence imply about the scale and mechanisms of those effects? Fifth, how do patterns of digital political participation differ among young people and across selected national contexts?

Corresponding objectives are to (a) synthesize conceptual and empirical work on political participation, digital citizenship, political communication, online activism, and information disorder; (b) distinguish correlational from causal claims and identify where the evidence base remains thin; (c) compare opportunities and risks in a structured table usable for teaching and policy briefing; (d) examine youth-specific findings without treating younger citizens as a homogeneous or deficient public; and (e) derive policy recommendations that are compatible with freedom of expression, comparative institutional variation, and the limits of current knowledge.

Literature Review

Political Participation

Political participation refers to activity by ordinary citizens that is intended to influence the selection of officials, the making of public policy, or the broader distribution of political power. Verba, Scholzman, and Brady (1995) emphasized that participation is stratified by resources, recruitment, and engagement, and that inequalities in voice can undermine the representative claim of democratic systems. Subsequent research expanded the repertoire beyond voting and party work to include protest, consumer boycotts, petitioning, and lifestyle politics (Norris, 2002; Dalton, 2008).

Digital environments further expanded that repertoire. Scholars now commonly distinguish institutional acts (voting, contacting representatives, joining parties) from extra-institutional acts

(protest, boycotts) and from digitally native acts such as sharing political content, signing online petitions, joining issue groups, or producing user-generated commentary (Theocharis, 2015; Vaccari & Valeriani, 2021). A recurring conceptual debate is whether low-threshold online acts should count as participation at all. Critics worry that liking or sharing substitutes for costlier civic work. Empirical meta-analyses, however, have repeatedly found positive associations between social media use and both online and offline participation, and particularly strong links between online political acts and offline acts among young people (Boulianne, 2015, 2019; Boulianne & Theocharis, 2020). The slacktivism critique is therefore not well supported as a general law, although it remains plausible for some low-effort behaviors that never connect to organizations, elections, or public institutions.

A second debate concerns whether social media participation is a distinct mode rather than merely an online version of older acts. Recent conceptual work argues that platform-based participation is shaped by networked visibility, algorithmic ranking, identity performance, and rapid circulation in ways that make it more than a change of venue (Waeterloos, 2025). That distinctiveness has methodological implications: studies that treat “minutes on social media” as a single independent variable are likely to mix entertainment, sociality, and politics, thereby attenuating or confounding estimated political effects.

Digital Citizenship

Digital citizenship refers to the capacities, rights, and responsibilities involved in using digital networks as a member of a political community. Early formulations stressed access, skills, and civic engagement as prerequisites for meaningful online participation (Mossberger et al., 2008). Later work added attention to privacy, data rights, safety from harassment, and the ability to evaluate information quality (Hintz et al., 2019; Third et al., 2019). Digital citizenship is therefore not exhausted by posting about politics. It includes the competence to navigate platform architectures, the security to speak without disproportionate risk, and the literacy to distinguish reporting, opinion, satire, advertising, and coordinated deception.

The concept also highlights structural inequality. Internet access, device quality, bandwidth, language, disability access, and education remain uneven within and across countries. Even where access is widespread, participation skills and political efficacy are stratified. Research on civic technology and e-participation finds that digital tools can expand the audience for consultation and service delivery, yet they frequently reproduce offline inequalities unless governments invest in inclusion, usability, and feedback that citizens can see (Asimakopoulos et al., 2025). Digital citizenship is accordingly both an individual competence and a public-infrastructure problem.

Social Media and Political Communication

Political communication research has tracked a transition from mass-mediated, professionally gated news environments to hybrid media systems in which parties, journalists, activists, influencers, and ordinary users interact across older and newer channels (Chadwick, 2017). Social media lowers the cost of direct candidate-to-citizen messaging and reduces dependence on editorial intermediaries. Systematic reviews of political communication on platforms find recurring clusters of activity: image management and persuasion by political actors, citizen mobilization and collective action, and the circulation of disinformation or otherwise harmful political content (Frontiers review of 64 studies, 2015–2025; see related syntheses in Lorenz-Spreen et al., 2023).

Platform incentive structures matter. Attention markets reward content that is novel, identity-relevant, and emotionally arousing. That does not mean policy information cannot circulate, but it does mean that personality-centered and conflict-centered messages often travel farther than detailed program discussion. The resulting environment can increase the volume of political communication while changing its tone and its relationship to verification. News consumption data show that social media is a regular news source for large minorities of adults in the United States, with especially high

reliance among younger users and rapid growth of short-video platforms as news venues (Pew Research Center, 2025c, 2025d). Incidental exposure—coming across political news while doing something else—is now a common pathway, particularly among younger adults (Pew Research Center, 2025e).

Cross-national survey evidence from the World Values Survey suggests that more frequent social media use is associated with higher political participation in both democracies and non-democracies, even in settings characterized by censorship and limited rights (Kuznetsova, 2023). This finding is important because it cautions against assuming that platform effects are confined to open societies. It also cautions against assuming that participation gains under authoritarian conditions are equivalent to democratization. Increased expression and protest coordination can coexist with surveillance, selective repression, and sophisticated propaganda.

Online Activism

Research on digital activism distinguishes organizationally brokered collective action from more personalized, network-based “connective action,” in which sharing personal content across platforms itself becomes an organizing mechanism (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). Connective action helps explain large, rapidly assembled campaigns that lack a single hierarchical organization, from protest waves to issue hashtags and transnational youth climate mobilizations. Digital traces can function as both communication and organization: they publicize events, document local actions, recruit participants, and sustain a sense of copresence among geographically dispersed supporters.

Empirical studies of protest and campaign networks show that social media can reduce coordination costs and expand the geographic reach of movements. They also show fragility. Personalized networks may scale quickly and then dissipate, struggle to negotiate internal disagreement, or become vulnerable to infiltration, harassment, and platform policy changes. The literature therefore supports a measured claim: social media can be a powerful infrastructure for activism, but activism that remains only on platforms has limited capacity to alter institutions unless it connects to organizations, legal strategies, elections, workplaces, or streets.

Misinformation and Polarization

Misinformation refers to false or misleading content circulated without demonstrated intent to deceive; disinformation refers to false or misleading content circulated with intent to deceive; malinformation refers to genuine information used in harmful ways, such as leaked private material deployed to intimidate. Together these phenomena are often discussed as information disorder (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017). A substantial review commissioned to map the scientific literature concluded that social media, polarization, and political disinformation interact in complex ways and that many popular claims outrun available causal evidence (Tucker et al., 2018).

Subsequent work has sharpened several points. First, false political content can spread quickly, but exposure is often concentrated among particular subsets of users rather than uniformly distributed across entire electorates. Second, motivated reasoning and prior identities shape whether people accept or share contested claims; platforms amplify those dynamics but do not create them from nothing. Third, affective polarization—dislike of political outgroups—can rise even when policy disagreement is stable, because identity cues and moralized conflict are highly shareable. Fourth, declining trust in news and government can increase susceptibility to alternative narratives, which can further reduce trust, producing a feedback loop rather than a one-way causal arrow (OECD, 2024).

Lorenz-Spreen et al. (2023), reviewing 496 articles, reported that associations pointing toward declining political trust, increasing populism, and growing polarization were more pronounced in established democracies, whereas participation and information-consumption associations that are potentially beneficial for democracy were often observed in autocracies and emerging democracies.

That geographic pattern is one of the most important results in the recent literature because it implies that platform effects are conditional on already existing institutions and conflict structures.

Methodology

This article uses a structured narrative synthesis of published evidence. The approach is appropriate because the research questions concern conceptual relationships and cross-national patterns rather than the estimation of a single causal effect from new primary data. Sources were identified through searches of peer-reviewed journals, academic presses, and institutional repositories, with priority given to meta-analyses, systematic reviews, large-N cross-national surveys, and reports from organizations with transparent methods.

Inclusion criteria were as follows. First, sources had to address social media or digital media in relation to political participation, public opinion, information quality, trust, polarization, activism, youth engagement, or democratic institutions. Second, empirical claims had to be traceable to identifiable methods, such as surveys, experiments, computational analyses, or systematic coding of studies. Third, institutional reports were included when they provided comparative indicators or policy-relevant measurement, including Pew Research Center, the OECD, UNESCO, Freedom House, and V-Dem. Fourth, classic theoretical works were included when necessary to define concepts. Sources that offered only commentary without an evidentiary basis, or that made unverifiable claims about specific parties or politicians, were excluded from the evidentiary core.

The synthesis is organized thematically rather than as a statistical meta-analysis. Where meta-analyses exist, their direction and magnitude of association are privileged over single-country case anecdotes. Where evidence is mixed or correlational, that status is stated. The comparative section uses a most-different systems logic at a high level of aggregation: cases were selected to vary in regime type, internet-freedom scores, and public assessments of social media's democratic effects, not to represent every region equally. The five cases—United States, Estonia, Brazil, Kenya, and India—are used illustratively. They cannot support strong causal inference about any one platform policy.

Limitations follow from the design. Publication bias may inflate positive participation effects. Platform data access remains restricted, so many studies rely on self-reports. Rapid product change, including the rise of short-video recommendation systems and generative artificial intelligence, means that findings from earlier network architectures may not fully generalize. Finally, democratic quality is multi-dimensional; an increase in protest or posting can coincide with a decrease in electoral integrity or judicial independence. The article therefore treats participation and governance as related but not identical outcomes.

Social Media and Political Participation

The most replicated finding in this field is a positive association between social media use—especially political uses of social media—and political participation. Boulianne's (2015) meta-analysis of early studies found that more than 80% of coefficients linking social media use to civic or political participation were positive, although only about half were statistically significant and panel studies were less likely than cross-sectional surveys to report significant positive effects. A later global synthesis of 133 studies reported average standardized effects in a modest range, larger for political expression than for purely informational uses, and smaller for informational uses in countries with a free and independent press (Boulianne, 2019). A twenty-year meta-analytic perspective found that average coefficients increased over time as social networking and online participation tools diffused (Boulianne, 2020).

These results support several inferences. The relationship is real enough to appear across many datasets and countries, but it is not revolutionary in the sense of uniformly large effects that swamp

education, income, partisanship, or institutional context. Expression on platforms is the activity most consistently linked to other forms of engagement. Informational uses matter as well, yet they appear more substitutive in media-rich democracies, where citizens already have abundant news sources, and more complementary where independent news is scarce or constrained.

Participation on social media is internally heterogeneous. A useful distinction separates consumptive acts (reading, watching, lurking), expressive acts (commenting, posting, sharing), mobilizing acts (inviting others, organizing events, circulating petitions), and institutional acts initiated online (registering to vote, contacting officials, donating). Pew Research Center data on U.S. adults show that private chatting about news and liking or saving news posts are more common than public posting, and that younger adults are especially likely to engage in the former observational and semi-public practices (Pew Research Center, 2026a). In 2025, 42% of U.S. social media users said the sites were important for getting involved with political or social issues, a higher share than in 2023, with users under 30 particularly likely to say platforms matter for involvement and for finding like-minded people (Pew Research Center, 2025a).

These patterns complicate the image of social media as a loud public square equally used by all citizens. Much politically relevant activity is ambient, incidental, or private. That activity can still be democratically significant if it increases knowledge, efficacy, or later offline action. It can also be democratically thin if it remains confined to affective reactions among similar users. The participation literature therefore points toward a stratified digital public: a relatively small set of highly active posters and organizers, a larger set of amplifiers and conversationalists, and a still larger set of spectators whose main political practice is watching.

Importantly, participation effects should not be equated with representation effects. People who gain a voice online are not a random sample of the citizenry. They tend to be younger, more digitally skilled, and, in many datasets, more politically interested or extreme in their expressed views than the median voter. Platform visibility can therefore widen some participatory inequalities even as it narrows others. Any assessment of democratic governance must ask not only whether more people are acting, but which people are heard and whether institutions respond.

Opportunities for Democratic Engagement

Social media creates several opportunities that are difficult to dismiss on the available evidence. The first is informational opportunity. Platforms aggregate news, official statements, civic explanations, and first-person testimony at low cost to the user. In societies where print and broadcast outlets are limited, expensive, or captured, this aggregation can expand the practical information set available to ordinary citizens. Cross-national survey work finds that people in many emerging economies are especially likely to say social media has been good for democracy, a judgment consistent with the idea that platforms substitute for weaker traditional media infrastructures (Pew Research Center, 2024a).

The second opportunity is expressive opportunity. Users can publish opinions without passing through editorial gatekeepers. For historically underrepresented groups, this can mean agenda-setting power that earlier media systems denied. Digital citizenship research treats such expression as a component of membership in a political community, provided that users also have safety and literacy supports (Mossberger et al., 2008; Hintz et al., 2019).

The third opportunity is organizational opportunity. Connective action reduces the start-up costs of campaigns and allows geographically dispersed people to coordinate around shared frames (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). Empirical illustrations include protest coordination, disaster response volunteering, voter-information projects, and transnational advocacy networks. Even when movements fail to achieve their preferred policy outcomes, they may still expand civic skills and political networks.

The fourth opportunity is watchdog opportunity. Video documentation of official conduct, crowdsourced fact-checking, and rapid circulation of public records can increase the reputational costs of corruption or rights abuses. This function is fragile—documentation can be decontextualized or drowned by counter-narratives—but it remains one of the clearer ways platforms can support accountability.

The fifth opportunity is governmental listening, at least in principle. Public agencies can use platforms to disseminate services, solicit comments, and detect emerging problems. Reviews of ICT-enabled participation find potential gains in transparency and reach, alongside persistent challenges of inclusion, security, and meaningful uptake of citizen input (Asimakopoulos et al., 2025). Listening that collects comments without institutional response can produce cynicism rather than engagement.

A sixth, more recent opportunity concerns youth incorporation into public life. Because younger cohorts use social media as a primary communication environment, platforms are among the few venues where political content routinely meets them. When that content includes credible news, peer discussion, and invitations to concrete civic acts, meta-analytic evidence indicates offline consequences such as contacting officials, political talk, volunteering, and protest (Boulianne & Theocharis, 2020). The opportunity, in other words, is not automatic exposure but politically relevant use.

Risks to Democratic Governance

Democratic governance requires not only participation but also restraint, pluralism, truthful enough public debate, and institutions capable of converting public inputs into legitimate decisions. Several documented risks bear on those requirements.

One risk is affective polarization and fragmented publics. Recommendation systems optimized for engagement can increase the salience of identity conflict. Users may encounter more political disagreement than in local offline life, yet experience that disagreement as hostile rather than informative. Reviews of polarization and disinformation emphasize that platforms interact with preexisting partisan identities rather than creating cleavage structures independently (Tucker et al., 2018). The governance concern is that highly activated, mutually distrustful publics make compromise and coalition-building more difficult, even when formal electoral procedures remain intact.

A second risk is the weakening of intermediary institutions. Professional news organizations, parties, unions, and civic associations historically filtered, verified, and aggregated claims. Hybrid media systems have not eliminated those institutions, but they have reduced their gatekeeping power (Chadwick, 2017). When verification capacity declines faster than the supply of claims, public debate can become noisier without becoming more representative. UNESCO and related assessments have warned that youth news repertoires increasingly include performative short-video environments in which commentary outpaces reporting and systematic fact-checking is limited (UNESCO, 2024, 2026).

A third risk is coercion and chilling effects. Freedom on the Net 2025 found deteriorating conditions in 27 of 72 countries assessed, record levels of arrests for online expression, and widespread blocking of political or social content. A majority of the world's internet users in the assessed countries live where authorities have restricted social media access or deployed pro-government commentators to manipulate discussion (Vesteinsson & Baker, 2025). In such settings, apparent online participation may be distorted by fear, impersonation, and manufactured consensus.

A fourth risk is commercial and architectural bias. Platforms are not neutral utilities. Their ranking systems, advertising markets, and moderation rules allocate visibility. Political actors adapt by producing content that fits those systems. A systematic review of political communication studies notes a migration toward personality-driven messaging because platform incentives reward affective content over policy substance. The democratic risk is not emotion as such—political life has always been

affective—but the systematic under-supply of slow, complex, locally specific information that governing requires.

A fifth risk is inequality of voice and the illusion of majority. Highly active users and well-resourced campaigns can dominate comment spaces. Bot networks and coordinated inauthentic behavior can exaggerate support. Decision-makers who treat trending topics as a census of public opinion may misread both intensity and distribution of preferences. Participation without representativeness can therefore degrade rather than improve responsiveness.

A sixth risk concerns emergency politics and connectivity shutdowns. Governments facing protest or insecurity have interrupted internet service, as documented in multiple Freedom House country narratives, including severe recent declines associated with protest-related shutdowns (Vesteinsson & Baker, 2025). Shutdowns may be justified by authorities as public-order measures; they also remove a communication infrastructure on which journalists, medical services, and peaceful assembly increasingly depend. The governance implication is that digital participation is only as robust as the legal and physical continuity of the network.

Table 1
Major Opportunities and Risks of Social-Media-Based Political Participation

Dimension	Opportunities	Risks
Information	Low-cost access to news, official information, and first-person testimony; potential substitution where traditional media are weak.	Incidental exposure to unverified claims; displacement of professionally edited reporting; difficulty distinguishing reporting from commentary.
Expression and voice	Reduced gatekeeping; space for marginalized speakers and issue publics; new forms of testimony and agenda setting.	Harassment and chilling effects; unequal visibility; performative expression that does not reach decision-makers.
Mobilization	Lower coordination costs; connective action across distance; rapid assembly for protest, relief, or advocacy.	Fragile networks; short issue attention cycles; vulnerability to infiltration, shutdowns, and platform rule changes.
Accountability	Documentation of official conduct; crowdsourced scrutiny; faster reputational feedback.	Decontextualized video; coordinated smear campaigns; selective leaking; weak due process in online judgment.
Trust and legitimacy	Perceptions of citizen empowerment and listening among some heavy users; alternative channels when institutions are closed.	Declining political and media trust in several established democracies; cynicism if online voice is not met by institutional response.
Pluralism	More senders and frames than in tightly gated mass-media systems; cross-border learning among civic actors.	Affective polarization; manufactured consensus; state or commercial manipulation of apparent public opinion.
Inclusion	Youth incorporation; lower financial barriers to publishing; potential reach beyond party members.	Digital divides in access and skills; language and disability barriers; overrepresentation of highly active minorities.
Institutional conversion	New inputs for consultation, service design, and election information when governments close the feedback loop.	Confusion of virality with majority will; weak translation of online demands into lawful, feasible policy.

Note. The table synthesizes patterns reported in meta-analyses and institutional reviews cited in the text. Entries describe recurrent tendencies, not universal laws.

Misinformation, Disinformation and Public Trust

Information integrity is a democratic resource because citizens cannot evaluate governments, candidates, or policies if the information environment is systematically unreliable. The OECD (2024) has argued that disinformation campaigns create confusion, exacerbate polarization, distort policy

debate, and further deteriorate trust in government, and that strengthening information integrity is therefore part of protecting the social fabric of open societies. UNESCO's platform-governance work similarly treats the inability to distinguish fiction from verified reporting as a threat to dialogue and collective problem-solving (UNESCO, 2023).

Conceptual precision remains essential. Not all false statements are disinformation; not all partisan news is fabricated; not all viral content is influential. Tucker et al. (2018) warned that research and public debate often lump together fabricated news, rumors, slanted reporting, and hyperpartisan commentary. Conflating these categories leads to remedies that are either too narrow (focusing only on obviously fake items) or too broad (treating disagreement as pathology).

What, then, is reasonably established? First, false and misleading political content exists at scale and is economically and politically incentivized. Advertising markets, status rewards, and geopolitical competition all subsidize its production. Second, generative artificial intelligence has reduced the cost of fabricating text, images, and video that resemble authentic speech, a concern now routinely noted in electoral-integrity discussions (UNESCO, 2024). Third, influencers and digital content creators occupy an increasingly large share of the news-adjacent ecosystem; a UNESCO-supported survey reported that a majority of sampled influencers did not routinely fact-check content they shared and that many wanted more training (UNESCO-related reporting, 2024). Fourth, public concern is high: UNESCO communications associated with its Internet for Trust work have highlighted widespread worry about electoral disinformation.

The link to trust is bidirectional. Low trust can increase the appeal of unofficial sources; unofficial sources of low quality can further reduce trust. Meta-analytic work on political trust finds small-to-moderate associations between trust and outcomes such as turnout, vote choice, policy preferences, and compliance, but weaker or null relationships with some informal participation measures (Devine, 2024). Trust is therefore neither a master variable that explains all democratic performance nor an irrelevant attitude. For digital governance, the practical implication is that corrections and labels may fail if they come from institutions the audience already rejects.

Evidence on the electoral decisiveness of online falsehoods is more limited than popular narratives suggest. In several well-studied elections, fabricated news was concentrated among particular audiences and competed with a much larger volume of conventional partisan communication. That finding does not make information disorder harmless. Even if the median voter is not flipped by a single fabricated story, chronic pollution of the information environment can raise the cost of shared factual baselines, intimidate journalists and officials, and justify either public cynicism or authoritarian "cleanup" campaigns that restrict legitimate speech.

A governance-centered view therefore treats information integrity as a system property. It depends on independent journalism with sustainable business models, platform transparency about ranking and political advertising, interoperable fact-checking that is itself accountable, civic education, and legal responses targeted at illegal harms (fraud, incitement that meets legal thresholds, covert foreign interference) rather than at unpopular opinions. The OECD's "facts not fakes" framing is useful precisely because it emphasizes an environment in which reliable information can thrive, not only an after-the-fact takedown machine.

Digital Political Participation among Young People

Young people are not a single political public, but they are the cohort whose coming-of-age has most completely overlapped with social media. Their participation repertoire is correspondingly distinctive. Relative to older adults, they are less likely in many countries to vote at the same rates or to follow national news all the time, and more likely to encounter politics through social platforms, messaging apps, and short-form video (Pew Research Center, 2025e, 2026a). In U.S. data from 2025,

adults under 30 were far more likely than the oldest adults to get news on social media at least sometimes, and TikTok in particular became a regular news source for a large share of younger users (Pew Research Center, 2025d, 2025e).

These habits have generated two opposing stereotypes: the digitally empowered young citizen and the disengaged, misinformed scroller. Meta-analytic evidence supports neither stereotype as a total description. Boulianne and Theocharis (2020) synthesized 106 survey-based studies and 965 coefficients on youth, digital media, and civic or political engagement. They found little evidence of uniformly dire effects. Positive associations depended on directly political uses—blogging, reading online news, and political discussion—and those online activities were linked to offline consequences such as contacting officials, talking politics, volunteering, and protesting. The relationship between online political acts and offline political acts was strong enough to undermine blanket slacktivism claims.

The same body of work cautions that causality can run in both directions. Politically interested youth may select into political uses of digital media; those uses may then further increase engagement. Interventions that only restrict screen time may therefore reduce both harms and civic opportunities. Interventions that increase the quality and civic usefulness of what young people encounter—school-based media literacy, youth news products, invitation into real organizations—are more consistent with the participation evidence.

Qualitative and movement-centered research adds that young people often practice a politics of personal connection: climate, gender, racial justice, education costs, and local services circulate through peer networks rather than through party membership. That pattern can produce impressive bursts of connective action and comparatively weak durable organization. For democratic governance, the implication is institutional: parties, schools, local governments, and civic associations that want younger participation need to meet youth in digital spaces without treating those spaces as sufficient substitutes for civic education, workplace voice, or electoral incorporation.

Risks specific to younger users should be stated without moral panic. Privacy and safety concerns are documented, including targeted advertising and design features that maximize time-on-platform (UNESCO, 2026). News repertoires heavy on commentary-driven short video can leave users with high emotional engagement and thin factual scaffolding. Yet older cohorts have their own vulnerabilities, including closed messaging forwards and partisan television ecosystems. Age differences are differences of pathway more than proof that one generation is uniquely unfit for democratic citizenship.

Comparative Analysis of Selected Countries

Cross-national comparison is necessary because platform brands are global while political institutions are not. The following sketches use published indicators and research rather than original fieldwork. They are intended to show configurational variation, not to rank countries as democratic successes or failures.

United States

The United States combines high platform penetration, strong constitutional protections for speech, a commercial and polarized news market, and intense partisan conflict. Freedom House continued to classify the U.S. online environment as Free in 2025 while recording score declines associated with pressures on online speech and surveillance debates (Freedom House, 2025). Public judgment of social media's democratic role is comparatively negative: in Pew's 27-country study, only about one third of U.S. adults said social media had been good for democracy, versus nearly two thirds who said it had been bad (Pew Research Center, 2024a).

Participation research in the U.S. shows substantial online political activity alongside declining close attention to news relative to 2016 and a large share of adults who encounter political news incidentally rather than by seeking it (Pew Research Center, 2025b, 2025e). A 2025 Kettering Foundation–Gallup study reported mixed associations: heavy social media users were more likely than non-users to believe citizens can be heard, yet less likely to agree that democracy is the best form of government (Maese & Jones, 2026). This combination—empowerment plus skepticism—is consistent with Lorenz-Spreen et al.’s (2023) observation that detrimental associations with trust and polarization are more visible in established democracies. The U.S. case suggests that abundant speech on platforms does not automatically produce shared legitimacy.

Estonia

Estonia is frequently cited as a high-capacity digital-government case and, in Freedom on the Net scoring, as one of the world’s freer online environments after Iceland (Vesteinsson & Baker, 2025). The relevant comparative lesson is not that Estonia is immune to information hazards, but that social media participation is embedded in a broader architecture of e-government, digital identity, and public-service delivery. Where state digital capacity is high and internet freedom is protected, platforms are one layer among several rather than the default public square. Opportunities for consultation and service access are correspondingly easier to institutionalize. The Estonian contrast cautions researchers against attributing democratic outcomes to Facebook, X, YouTube, or TikTok considered in isolation from state capacity and legal culture.

Brazil

Brazil is a large electoral democracy with extraordinarily high messaging-app and social media use in political communication. Scholarship and policy debates have focused on the role of private groups and open platforms in circulating campaign content, rumors, and mobilization appeals. Brazil’s experience illustrates two comparative points. First, platforms that are used as primary news and conversation channels can intensify campaign competition and expand participation among users who do not follow traditional news brands. Second, when electoral authorities, courts, and platforms collide over takedowns and political advertising, the conflict itself becomes part of the legitimacy problem. The Brazilian case is therefore less a story about a single app than about the interaction of mass WhatsApp-style communication, polarized elites, and an assertive judicial-electoral apparatus. Neutral analysis treats those interactions as an open research field rather than as a morality play.

Kenya

Kenya illustrates both the mobilizing promise and the governance vulnerability of digitally organized public life. Social media has been an important venue for political discussion, satire, fact-checking initiatives, and protest coordination. Freedom on the Net 2025 identified Kenya as experiencing one of the year’s most severe score declines after authorities interrupted connectivity during nationwide protests and arrested large numbers of protesters (Vesteinsson & Baker, 2025). The sequence is analytically important. Online networks can assemble publics quickly; states that perceive those publics as threats can disable the network. Comparative research should therefore treat connectivity interruptions as a variable in democratic quality, not as a technical footnote. Participation that can be switched off is participation under sufferance.

India

India combines a vast user base, linguistic diversity, intense electoral competition, and substantial debate over platform regulation, intermediary liability, and online speech. V-Dem coding has placed India among populous countries classified on the autocratic side of its regime typology in recent reports, a classification that itself is contested in public debate and should be cited as an indicator rather than as an uncontested moral verdict (V-Dem Institute, 2026). For the purposes of this article, two

observations suffice. First, social media and messaging platforms are now integral to campaign communication and issue publics in many Indian languages, extending participation beyond English-language legacy media. Second, the same infrastructures are sites of rumor cascades, communal targeting, and legal-political conflict over content takedowns. The Indian case underscores that scale and diversity magnify both opportunity and risk, and that national law, not only global platform policy, structures the digital public sphere.

Cross-Case Implications

Across these cases, three implications recur. Platform presence is compatible with widely different assessments of democracy's health. Public optimism about social media's democratic contribution is higher in several emerging economies than in the United States (Pew Research Center, 2024a), matching the systematic-review pattern that participation benefits appear more salient where older democratic infrastructures are thinner (Lorenz-Spreen et al., 2023). Internet freedom and shutdowns are binding constraints: participation effects cannot be interpreted without knowing whether users can speak and assemble online without arrest or disconnection (Vesteinsson & Baker, 2025). Finally, state digital capacity and independent media determine whether online voice is converted into accountable government or remains a parallel conversation with little institutional uptake.

Discussion

The synthesized evidence supports a conditional, rather than categorical, interpretation of social media's democratic role. Political uses of platforms are associated with more participation of several kinds. That association is among the most stable findings in political communication research over the past decade (Boulianne, 2015, 2019, 2020; Boulianne & Theocharis, 2020; Kuznetsova, 2023). If democratic theory valued only the quantity of citizen acts, the balance sheet would look favorable.

Democratic governance, however, also values the quality of those acts and the institutions that receive them. Here the record is more troubling in established democracies, where researchers observe concurrent associations with distrust, polarization, and populist communication styles (Lorenz-Spreen et al., 2023). Heavy use can coincide with a sense of personal political efficacy and with cooler support for democracy as a system (Maese & Jones, 2026). One coherent interpretation is that platforms excel at activating voice and identity and are weaker at supporting the slower work of coalition, verification, and institutional compromise.

This interpretation helps resolve several apparent contradictions. Social media can be good for participation and bad for social trust at the same time. It can help protesters in restrictive regimes and inflame affective conflict in open ones. It can incorporate young people into public conversation while leaving voting and local civic infrastructure relatively untouched. It can increase the number of speakers and decrease the shared authority of any speaker. None of these pairings is paradoxical once platform affordances are treated as amplifiers of existing institutional strengths and weaknesses.

The discussion also requires epistemic humility. Many widely cited mechanisms—echo chambers, addiction-by-design, microtargeted persuasion, bot-driven majority illusion—are real in some degree but unevenly measured. Tucker et al. (2018) already noted that public debate often ran ahead of causal identification. That gap has narrowed but not closed. Restricted researcher access to platform data remains a structural problem for democratic accountability: societies are asked to regulate systems they are not allowed to inspect.

Normatively, the article does not treat maximum speech volume as identical to democratic health, nor does it treat content moderation as identical to censorship. Democratic theory has long recognized that speech rights coexist with time, place, and manner rules, privacy rights, and prohibitions on a narrow class of harms. The distinctive digital problem is that private infrastructures now perform public-sphere functions at population scale. Governance therefore has to address those infrastructures

without converting them into state ministries of truth. That is a difficult institutional design problem, not a reason to deny either the participation gains or the documented harms.

Policy Recommendations

Policy recommendations follow from the evidence review and are framed as options for governments, platforms, civic organizations, and educators. They are not tailored to any party program.

First, treat information integrity as public infrastructure. The OECD (2024) case for enabling reliable information to thrive implies support for independent public-interest journalism, transparent public communication by agencies, and research access to platform data under privacy-protecting rules. Takedowns alone do not rebuild a shared factual baseline.

Second, regulate process more than viewpoint. Rights-respecting rules can require disclosure of political advertising, labeling of state-controlled media, auditability of ranking systems used in electoral periods, and clear appeals for users whose content is removed. UNESCO's guidelines for digital platform governance emphasize human rights, transparency, user empowerment, and multistakeholder participation (UNESCO, 2023). Process rules are more compatible with pluralism than lists of prohibited opinions.

Third, constrain network shutdowns and speech-based arrests through law. Comparative evidence that governments interrupt connectivity and detain users for political or social posts should be treated as a democratic-governance indicator (Vesteinsson & Baker, 2025). Emergency powers, where they exist, need narrow predicates, legislative oversight, and public after-action reporting.

Fourth, invest in media and information literacy that is civic rather than merely cautionary. Youth findings show that political uses of digital media are linked to offline engagement (Boulianne & Theocharis, 2020). Education systems can teach source comparison, image verification, and the difference between reporting and influencer commentary without instructing students what to conclude about contested policies. Literacy aimed only at reducing time online may reduce civic opportunity.

Fifth, close institutional feedback loops. If agencies solicit comments on platforms, they should publish how those comments affected decisions. Token listening is a documented path to cynicism in e-participation research (Asimakopoulos et al., 2025). Local government, schools, and civic associations remain the conversion layer between connective action and durable representation.

Sixth, address inclusion as a first-order democratic issue. Skills, language, disability access, rural connectivity, and affordable data determine who can use the opportunities listed in Table 1. Digital citizenship policy that ignores these inequalities will amplify already advantaged voices.

Seventh, prepare specifically for synthetic media in elections without panicking the public. Disclosure standards for highly realistic fabricated audiovisual content, rapid authentication channels for official alerts, and newsroom capacity to investigate synthetic forgeries are proportionate responses. Blanket claims that elections are "unprotectable" can themselves erode legitimacy.

Eighth, support independent measurement. Public bodies and research consortia need standardized, open indicators of platform-level political advertising, shutdown events, researcher data access, and harassment against journalists. V-Dem, Freedom House, and national statistical offices already measure adjacent concepts; linking those measures to platform governance would improve policy learning.

Conclusion

Social media has changed the patterns of public engagement by lowering the costs of political expression, accelerating mobilization, and embedding news in everyday peer networks. The research

record supports a clear but limited claim: political uses of social media are positively associated with multiple forms of participation, including among young people and in both democratic and non-democratic regimes. That claim does not authorize technological determinism. The same infrastructures are implicated in information disorder, affective polarization, declining trust in some established democracies, harassment, and state manipulation of online visibility.

Changing patterns of engagement are therefore double-edged. More people can speak; fewer institutions monopolize the microphone; shared standards of verification are harder to maintain; governments can listen more quickly and punish more quickly. Comparative evidence from the United States, Estonia, Brazil, Kenya, and India shows that outcomes follow political institutions, internet-freedom conditions, and media systems as much as they follow platform design. Global indicators of autocratization and declining internet freedom raise the cost of getting this interaction wrong (Nord et al., 2025; V-Dem Institute, 2026; Vesteinsson & Baker, 2025).

Democratic governance in a platform era will not be secured by nostalgia for a mid-twentieth-century news environment that cannot be reconstructed, nor by the hope that market competition among apps will spontaneously produce a healthy public sphere. It will depend on the slower work of building information integrity, protecting speech and safety together, incorporating young citizens into institutions rather than only into feeds, and measuring platform power with the same seriousness that democracies have long applied to parties, courts, and ballots. Social media has become part of the infrastructure of public life. The quality of democracy now depends, in part, on whether that infrastructure is governed as a public problem.

References

- Asimakopoulos, G., Antonopoulou, H., Giotopoulos, K., & Halkiopoulos, C. (2025). Impact of information and communication technologies on democratic processes and citizen participation. *Societies*, 15(2), Article 40. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15020040>
- Bennett, W. L., & Segerberg, A. (2012). The logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 739–768. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.670661>
- Boulianne, S. (2015). Social media use and participation: A meta-analysis of current research. *Information, Communication & Society*, 18(5), 524–538. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1008542>
- Boulianne, S. (2019). Revolution in the making? Social media effects across the globe. *Information, Communication & Society*, 22(1), 39–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1353641>
- Boulianne, S. (2020). Twenty years of digital media effects on civic and political participation. *Communication Research*, 47(7), 947–966. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650218808186>

- Boulianne, S., & Theocharis, Y. (2020). Young people, digital media, and engagement: A meta-analysis of research. *Social Science Computer Review*, 38(2), 111–127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439318814190>
- Chadwick, A. (2017). *The hybrid media system: Politics and power* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Dalton, R. J. (2008). Citizenship norms and the expansion of political participation. *Political Studies*, 56(1), 76–98. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2007.00718.x>
- Devine, D. (2024). Does political trust matter? A meta-analysis on the consequences of trust. *Political Behavior*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-024-09916-y>
- Freedom House. (2025). United States: Freedom on the Net 2025 country report. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/united-states/freedom-net/2025>
- Hintz, A., Dencik, L., & Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2019). Digital citizenship in a datafied society. *Polity*.
- Kuznetsova, D. (2023). Globalizing information networks, social media, and participation. *Social Science Quarterly*, 104(4), 505–520. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.13287>
- Lorenz-Spreen, P., Oswald, L., Lewandowsky, S., & Hertwig, R. (2023). A systematic review of worldwide causal and correlational evidence on digital media and democracy. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 7(1), 74–101. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-022-01460-1>
- Maese, E., & Jones, J. M. (2026, March 30). Social media use linked to mixed views on democracy. Gallup. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/704198/social-media-linked-mixed-views-democracy.aspx>
- Mossberger, K., Tolbert, C. J., & McNeal, R. S. (2008). *Digital citizenship: The internet, society, and participation*. MIT Press.
- Nord, M., Good God, A., & Lindberg, S. I. (2025). *Democracy Report 2025: 25 years of autocratization*. V-Dem Institute, University of Gothenburg.
- Norris, P. (2002). *Democratic phoenix: Reinventing political activism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2024). *Facts not fakes: Tackling disinformation, strengthening information integrity*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/d909ff7a-en>
- Pew Research Center. (2024a, February 23). Majorities in most countries surveyed say social media is good for democracy. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2024/02/23/majorities-in-most-countries-surveyed-say-social-media-is-good-for-democracy/>
- Pew Research Center. (2025a, September 16). 42% of social media users say the sites are important for them getting involved with political, social issues. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2025/09/16/42-of-social-media-users-say-the-sites-are-important-for-them-getting-involved-with-political-social-issues/>
- Pew Research Center. (2025b, December 3). Americans are following the news less closely than they used to. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2025/12/03/americans-are-following-the-news-less-closely-than-they-used-to/>
- Pew Research Center. (2025c, September 25). Social media and news fact sheet. <https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/fact-sheet/social-media-and-news-fact-sheet/>
- Pew Research Center. (2025d, September 25). 1 in 5 Americans now regularly get news on TikTok, up sharply from 2020. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2025/09/25/1-in-5-americans-now-regularly-get-news-on-tiktok-up-sharply-from-2020/>
- Pew Research Center. (2025e, December 3). Young adults and the future of news. <https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/2025/12/03/young-adults-and-the-future-of-news/>
- Pew Research Center. (2026a, July 16). How Americans are engaged with news, politics, religion and civic life. <https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/2026/07/16/how-americans-are-engaged-with-news-politics-religion-and-civic-life/>
- Theocharis, Y. (2015). The conceptualization of digitally networked participation. *Social Media + Society*, 1(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305115610140>
- Third, A., Collin, P., Walsh, L., & Black, R. (2019). *Young people in digital society: Control shift*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- Tucker, J. A., Guess, A., Barberá, P., Vaccari, C., Siegel, A., Sanovich, S., Stukal, D., & Nyhan, B. (2018). Social media, political polarization, and political disinformation: A review of the scientific literature. Hewlett Foundation. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3144139>
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2023). Guidelines for the governance of digital platforms. UNESCO.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2024). Artificial intelligence and democracy. UNESCO / CLACSO.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2026). World trends in freedom of expression and media development. UNESCO.
- Vaccari, C., & Valeriani, A. (2021). Outside the bubble: Social media and political participation in Western democracies. Oxford University Press.
- V-Dem Institute. (2026). Democracy Report 2026. University of Gothenburg.
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics. Harvard University Press.
- Vesteinsson, K., & Baker, G. (2025). Freedom on the Net 2025: An uncertain future for the global internet. Freedom House.
- Waeterloos, C. (2025). Political participation on social media: Conceptual and empirical state of the art and research agenda. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 49(1), 14–31. <https://doi.org/10.1093/anncom/wlae002>
- Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policy making (DGI(2017)09). Council of Europe.

Declarations

◆ Funding	This research received no external funding.
◆ Conflict of Interest	The authors declare that they have no known financial or personal conflicts of interest that could have influenced the work reported in this paper.
◆ Data Availability Statement	Data sharing is not applicable to this article, as no new data were created or analysed in this study.
◆ Ethical Statement	Ethical approval was not required because the study is based exclusively on publicly available data and published literature and did not involve human participants.
◆ AI Use Disclosure	Generative artificial intelligence tools were used in a limited and assistive capacity during the preparation of this manuscript, primarily for idea development, language refinement, and grammatical correction. The authors retain full responsibility for the originality, accuracy, analysis, interpretation, and final content of the manuscript.

Journal Policies *JuriSocial Journal of Social Sciences*

OPEN ACCESS & LICENCE

All articles are freely available on publication under CC BY-NC 4.0. Readers may share and adapt the work for non-commercial purposes with proper attribution.

PEER REVIEW

Every research article undergoes double-blind peer review by at least two independent reviewers.

PLAGIARISM POLICY

All submissions are screened with similarity-detection software; plagiarism in any form leads to rejection.

CORRECTIONS & RETRACTIONS

Errors are corrected through published corrigenda; retractions follow COPE guidelines.

PUBLICATION CHARGES

No article publishing fee charged.

COPYRIGHT

Authors retain copyright and grant JJSS the right of first publication.

PUBLICATION ETHICS

JJSS follows the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) Core Practices and guidelines.

GENERATIVE AI POLICY

AI tools cannot be listed as authors. Any substantive use must be disclosed; authors remain fully responsible for the content.

ARCHIVING & INDEXING

Content is preserved through [PKP Preservation Network / LOCKSS]. DOIs are registered with Crossref.

DISCLAIMER

The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the editors or the publisher.

Submissions & enquiries editor@jjss.jurisocial.org ◆ <https://socialsciences.jurisocial.org/>