

POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION IN THE AGE OF AI: IMPLICATIONS FOR DEMOCRATIZATION AND DE-DEMOCRATIZATION

Kittisak Wongmahesak¹

Sippaphat Rotjanawasuthorn^{2*}

Ismail Suardi Wekke³

Abidin Wakano⁴

Received 17 January 2025

Revised 26 March 2025

Accepted 9 April 2025

Abstract

This review article summarizes the academic literature to explore the complex dynamics between artificial intelligence (AI) and digital communication technologies in the context of political socialization and its impact on democratization and de-democratization processes. This review focuses on scholarly articles and research papers published since the early 2010s, a period characterized by the proliferation of artificial intelligence and its growing impact on various aspects of human life and society. It highlights the crucial role of political socialization in shaping individuals' political beliefs, values and behaviors, which in turn influence their participation in democratic systems. The authors examine the transformative effects of AI, emphasizing its dual capacity to promote civic engagement through the personalized dissemination of information, but also to cause significant challenges such as the widespread dissemination of misinformation and the reinforcement of echo chambers. The analysis provides a comparative framework for understanding differences in political socialization in different socio-political contexts by comparing the experiences of established democracies with those of authoritarian regimes and new democracies. Key factors such as

¹ Faculty of Political Science, North Bangkok University, Thailand; Research Fellow, Shinawatra University, Thailand; Adjunct Research Professor, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidenreng Rappang, Indonesia

² Faculty of Political Science, North Bangkok University, Thailand

^{3 4} Institut Agama Islam Negeri Sorong, Indonesia

Email: ¹ kittisak.wongmahesak@gmail.com, ³iswekke@gmail.com, ⁴abidinwakano05@gmail.com

*Corresponding author email: dr.sippaphas@gmail.com

regime type, cultural predispositions, historical context, and technological accessibility are examined to clarify how these elements affect political engagement and either strengthen or undermine democratic institutions. The interplay between political socialization, populism, and de-democratization is critically assessed, particularly with regard to the role of AI in reinforcing divisive narratives and perpetuating entrenched prejudices. The article concludes with strategic recommendations aimed at promoting inclusive and equitable political socialization practices. This includes tackling the dangers posed by AI-driven misinformation and improving media literacy and critical thinking skills among citizens. It also emphasizes the need to develop robust strategies to protect the integrity and resilience of democratic institutions amidst the advances of AI.

Keywords: Political Socialization, Artificial Intelligence, Digital Communication Technology, Democratization, De-Democratization

Introduction

Political socialization is a fundamental mechanism through which people cultivate their political ideologies, values, and behaviors. This complicated process is shaped by a variety of actors, including the family, educational institutions, peer networks, and media channels (Homtako et al., 2024; Jabali et al., 2024). In today's society, the advent of digital technologies — particularly social media and artificial intelligence (AI) has significantly reshaped the landscape of political socialization and introduced additional layers of complexity (Akyol, 2022; Saud et al., 2023). As people increasingly interact with politically charged content online, their socialization processes are changing, presenting both opportunities and challenges for democratic engagement (Ida et al., 2020). Such changes have profound implications for the dynamics of democratization and de-democratization and have the potential to either enhance or undermine civic participation and political effectiveness (Matthieu & Junius, 2023).

The influence of social media on the shaping of political perspectives is the subject of extensive scientific research (Wongmahesak et al., 2025). Salzman (2018) notes that social media platforms could emulate traditional public forums, thereby facilitating political discourse and user engagement. This phenomenon is particularly pronounced in Latin America, where the increase in social media use correlates with the spread of democratic values among youth (Solano & Rocha, 2022). Empirical studies suggest that social networks significantly increase political participation, especially among younger population groups who like to participate in political campaigns and discussions via these digital channels (Völker, 2019). The connectivity provided by social media allows individuals to engage in dialogue about political issues, which can enrich political socialization and promote civic engagement and participation in democratic processes (Tang & Lee, 2013).

However, the digital environment also presents significant barriers to political socialization. The widespread dissemination of misinformation and disinformation via social media platforms poses a significant risk, distorting political perceptions and undermining trust in democratic institutions (Sun & Xie, 2024; Ahmed et al., 2025a). Diehl et al. (2016) highlight the dualistic nature of social media, which acts as both a facilitator of political engagement and a vehicle for the spread of falsehoods, potentially exacerbating political polarization and disengagement (Salzman, 2018). This concern is exacerbated in the field of artificial intelligence, where algorithms curate content in accordance with user behavior and often reinforce pre-existing beliefs while limiting access to diverse perspectives (Jiang et al., 2019). As a result, individuals can become enmeshed in echo chambers that perpetuate their political

views, thereby reducing their critical engagement with alternative viewpoints (Ohagi, 2024; Vendeville, 2024; Ahmed et al., 2025b).

Moreover, the consequences of political socialization in the age of AI are very different in different socio-political contexts. Factors such as economic development, cultural heritage, and technological access play a crucial role in shaping the political socialization experience (Mayer & Schmidt, 2004; Chen et al., 2021). In established democracies, for example, there may be an emphasis on civic education and active participation, which promotes strong democratic engagement (Diehl et al., 2016; Commonwealth Secretariat, 2021). Conversely, political socialization in less developed or authoritarian contexts may be characterized by oppression and limited access to information, inhibiting democratic aspirations (Cheema & Hashmi, 2021; Abrial et al., 2022). The comparison of Costa Rica and Nicaragua illustrates this discrepancy: Costa Rica's durable democratic framework has fostered a resilient pro-democratic culture, while Nicaragua faces significant challenges to its democratic processes (Yang, 2023; Afşar & Val Sanchez, 2024). This comparative analysis highlights the need to acknowledge the contextual variables that influence political socialization and their impact on democratization and de-democratization.

In summary, political socialization is a dynamic and evolving process that is increasingly shaped by digital technologies and social media platforms. As individuals navigate the intricacies of the digital landscape, their political beliefs and interactions with democratic mechanisms change significantly. Since the early 2010s, the rise of sophisticated AI technologies has exacerbated this dynamic, opening new dimensions for accessing, processing, and sharing political information. To understand these changes, this article first examines the role of political socialization in both democratization and de-democratization. Next, a comparative analysis examines how political socialization differs in societies with different regimes, cultural norms, and technological access. Finally, the article will address the specific ways in which artificial intelligence influences political socialization, considering both its potential to improve engagement and the risks of misinformation and polarization. While social media offers considerable opportunities to promote political engagement and reinforce democratic norms, it also poses serious challenges, particularly in the form of misinformation and polarization, which can potentially undermine democratic processes. Therefore, understanding these dynamics is critical to addressing the implications of political socialization in the context of AI advances and ensuring that societies can effectively harness the opportunities while mitigating the risks to democratic institutions and values.

The Role of Political Socialization in Democratization

Political socialization is crucial in shaping the democratic landscape, as it significantly influences the formation of individuals' political beliefs, values, and behaviors. This process is crucial for fostering civic engagement and participation, which are fundamental to the effective functioning of democratic systems (Saud, 2020). The advent of artificial intelligence and digital communication has changed the mechanisms of political socialization and led to a new dynamic in citizen participation in political processes (Landtsheer et al., 2014). Research shows that political socialization is not just an isolated individual experience but rather is closely interwoven with the social fabric of communities and shaped by various factors, including family influences, educational systems, media consumption, and interactions with peers (Otjes & Rekker, 2021). The importance of political socialization for democratization is particularly pronounced as it produces a politically aware citizenry equipped to participate in democratic governance (Commonwealth Secretariat, 2021).

A crucial way in which political socialization facilitates democratization is through the promotion of civic education and awareness (Yoldaş, 2015). Educational institutions serve as important socialization instances that provide the knowledge and skills necessary for informed political engagement (Ruget, 2006; Żerkowska-Balas & Wenzel, 2020). Empirical studies have shown that students who have received a comprehensive civic education are more likely to participate in political activities, such as voting and community organizing (Jiang, 2023). In the United States, for example, initiatives to improve civic education correlate with higher voter turnout among younger populations (Siegel-Stechler, 2019). Furthermore, the influence of social media as an educational medium is remarkable. Platforms such as Twitter and Facebook act as important arenas for political discourse, allowing users to access a variety of perspectives and engage in discussions about important political issues (Flaxman et al., 2016). This democratization of information is critical to fostering a well-informed electorate, which is a prerequisite for the well-being of democratic institutions.

Nonetheless, the effects of political socialization on democratization are context-dependent and influenced by the levels of political, economic, and social development (Grecu, 2021). In established democracies, political socialization often emphasizes themes of civic responsibility and active participation, fostering robust democratic engagement (Ellis, 2021). Conversely, in authoritarian regimes or nascent democracies, political socialization may be characterized by repression and limited access to information, thereby stifling democratic aspirations (Heinrich & Pleines, 2018). For example, in countries such as Russia, a state-

controlled media environment significantly restricts the flow of information, impeding citizens' capacities to engage critically with political issues (Lonkila et al., 2020). This divergence underscores the necessity of comprehending the contextual factors that underpin political socialization and their implications for democratization processes.

The emergence of AI and digital communication technologies has further reshaped the landscape of political socialization, presenting both opportunities and challenges for democratization (Chen & Madni, 2024). On the one hand, AI can enhance political engagement through personalized content delivery and improved access to diverse information, thereby encouraging civic participation (Huszár et al., 2021). For instance, algorithms that curate news feeds can broaden users' exposure to varying political perspectives, fostering more informed discussions and active engagement (Zerback & Wirz, 2021). Conversely, these same technologies carry the risk of propagating misinformation and creating echo chambers, where individuals are predominantly exposed to viewpoints that reinforce their pre-existing beliefs (Lonkila et al., 2020). This dynamic can exacerbate polarization and diminish civic engagement, ultimately jeopardizing the democratic process. Research suggests that exposure to disinformation on social media can distort political perceptions and erode trust in democratic institutions, highlighting the necessity for critical media literacy and civic education as countermeasures against these trends (Rossini et al., 2023).

In summary, political socialization is a cornerstone of democratization and fundamentally shapes the way individuals interact with political processes and institutions. The interplay between traditional socialization instances — such as family and education — and the emerging influence of digital technologies underscores the complexity of this process in today's society. In addressing the challenges and opportunities presented by AI and digital communication, it is imperative to cultivate inclusive and equitable political socialization mechanisms that uphold democratic values and promote civic engagement. Understanding the nuanced interrelationships between these factors is critical to fostering a vibrant and participatory democratic culture.

Political Socialization and De-Democratization

De-democratization constitutes the systematic erosion or dismantling of democratic institutions and practices, often culminating in a regression toward authoritarian governance (Bogaards, 2018). A pivotal mechanism that drives this phenomenon is political socialization, which profoundly influences citizens' beliefs, values, and behaviors, ultimately either fortifying

or undermining democratic norms (Rennick, 2023). In an era characterized by the proliferation of AI and digital communication, the dynamics of political socialization are evolving, presenting both challenges and opportunities for the resilience of democratic institutions. The interaction between political socialization and de-democratization is particularly salient in the ways citizens engage with political information, the media's influence, and the implications of social networks on political attitudes (Zúñiga et al., 2022).

A principal mechanism through which political socialization contributes to de-democratization is the erosion of trust in democratic institutions (Print, 2017). Empirical research underscores that when citizens perceive their political systems as corrupt or ineffective, their engagement in democratic processes significantly diminishes (Neshkova & Kalesnikaite, 2019; Baghban & Rahbarqazi, 2021). For instance, Brazil has witnessed substantial public disillusionment fueled by rampant corruption scandals, resulting in decreased voter turnout and heightened support for authoritarian alternatives (Rossini et al., 2023). This decline in trust is exacerbated by the proliferation of misinformation and disinformation on social media platforms, which distort citizens' perceptions of political reality and erode confidence in democratic governance (Escolar et al., 2023). The amplification of these issues is further accelerated by AI technologies—specifically, algorithms that prioritize sensational or misleading content—fostering echo chambers that reinforce negative perceptions of democracy and its institutions (Coeckelbergh, 2023).

Moreover, the influence of political socialization on de-democratization is unevenly distributed across diverse contexts. Variations in political, economic, and social development substantially shape individual experiences of political socialization (Mujani & Liddle, 2021). In established democracies, such processes typically underscore civic responsibility and engagement, leading to robust democratic participation (Oser & Hooghe, 2018). Conversely, within authoritarian regimes or nascent democracies, political socialization may be characterized by repression and constrained access to information, suppressing democratic aspirations (Camaj, 2015). The situation in Iran illustrates this disparity; the government's suppression of dissent and its control over media narratives engender a climate of fear that deters political participation and fosters apathy among citizens (Farzaneh, 2023). Similar trends can be observed in Tunisia (Rennick, 2023), highlighting the necessity of understanding the contextual factors that shape political socialization and their implications for de-democratization.

The rising tide of populism and authoritarianism observed globally further complicates the relationship between political socialization and de-democratization. Populist

leaders often exploit citizens' grievances toward the political establishment, positioning themselves as advocates for the “common people” against a perceived corrupt elite (Gidron & Bonikowski, 2013). Such narratives resonate particularly with individuals who feel marginalized or disillusioned by conventional political parties, often resulting in increased support for populist movements that may erode democratic norms (Kinnvall, 2019; Mauk, 2020). Social media platforms, such as Facebook and Twitter, play a pivotal role in facilitating this process, granting populist leaders direct access to their constituents and enabling the dissemination of their messages unmediated by traditional media (Školokay, 2021). Consequently, political socialization in the age of AI can contribute to the normalization of anti-democratic sentiments and behaviors, thus entrenching de-democratization processes (Olaniran & Williams, 2020).

In conclusion, political socialization is a critical lens through which to dissect the dynamics of de-democratization. The erosion of trust in democratic institutions, the influence of misinformation, and the rise of populism underscore the intricate interplay between political socialization and democratic decline. As societies confront the ramifications of AI and digital communication, fostering inclusive and equitable political socialization processes becomes imperative to promoting democratic values and civic engagement. Addressing these dynamics is essential for counteracting the forces of de-democratization and safeguarding the resilience of democratic institutions in the face of contemporary challenges.

Comparative Analysis of Political Socialization Across Societies

Political socialization represents a multifaceted and evolving process significantly shaped by the cultural, historical, and socio-political contexts inherent in different societies (Owen, 2008). This comparative examination investigates the impact of political socialization on the trajectories of democratization and de-democratization across various regions, with a particular emphasis on the implications of AI and digital communication. Through an analysis of case studies encompassing diverse political systems, this discourse elucidates how factors such as economic development, cultural norms, and technological access influence political socialization and its resultant effects on democratic engagement.

The Influence of Regime Type on Political Socialization

A salient example of the divergent nature of political socialization is evident in the contrasting experiences of democratic versus authoritarian regimes (Heyne, 2019). In established democracies, particularly within Western Europe and North America, the emphasis of political socialization is on facilitating civic education, promoting active participation, and

instilling democratic values. For instance, in nations such as Sweden and Canada, educational structures are deliberately designed to bolster civic engagement, fostering critical thinking regarding political issues and underscoring the importance of participation in democratic processes (Sandahl, 2014; Evans et al., 2018). Empirical research indicates that individuals exposed to comprehensive civic education exhibit a higher likelihood of engaging in political activities, including voting and community organizing, in their later lives (Weinberg, 2022).

In contrast, within authoritarian regimes such as Belarus and North Korea, political socialization is frequently dominated by state-driven narratives, which obscure dissent and cultivate loyalty to the ruling authorities (Elsner, 2022; Koliechkin et al., 2024). In these environments, citizens are conditioned to normalize authoritarian governance, which results in diminished political agency and constricted opportunities for democratization. For example, the pervasive control exerted by the Belarusian government over media and educational content has produced a populace largely uninformed about the principles of democracy, thereby perpetuating the cycle of authoritarianism (Elsner, 2022). This underscores the critical role that regime type plays in shaping political socialization and its consequential impact on democratic participation.

Cultural Norms and Historical Contexts

Cultural norms and historical legacies play a significant role in shaping political socialization across various societies. In cultures with a deeply ingrained tradition of civic engagement, such as those found in Scandinavia, political socialization tends to foster a collective sense of responsibility and a proactive interest in democratic processes (Trætteberg, 2017; Hegna, 2020). Conversely, in societies where political involvement has historically been constrained or suppressed—such as in many post-colonial states—political socialization is often characterized by apathy and disillusionment towards democratic institutions (Ricart-Huguet, 2021).

For instance, Brazil's historical experience under a military dictatorship markedly influenced its political culture, resulting in widespread skepticism regarding political institutions and a general trend of disengagement from formal political processes (Franco & Pound, 2022). This historical context underscores the imperative to examine the interplay between cultural variables and political socialization as it pertains to democratic engagement (Haime & Cantú, 2022). Furthermore, in regions distinguished by significant ethnic diversity, such as Nigeria, political socialization can be substantially influenced by ethnic affiliations and inter-group dynamics (Aliyu et al., 2023).

Technology's Role in Political Socialization

The emergence of technology, particularly social media, further complicates the landscape of political socialization across various contexts. In democratic societies, social media platforms serve as crucial arenas for political discourse and engagement, enabling citizens to access diverse perspectives and partake in discussions on pertinent political issues (Larsson, 2023). A notable example is the Arab Spring, during which social media proved instrumental in mobilizing citizens and catalyzing political activism across the Middle East and North Africa (Khondker, 2015). The capacity of social media to connect individuals and stimulate discourse surrounding political matters significantly enhances political socialization, ultimately fostering greater civic engagement and participation within democratic systems (Pang et al., 2021).

However, in authoritarian contexts, social media may also function as a mechanism for surveillance and repression, thereby constraining opportunities for genuine political engagement (Zhang et al., 2022). In countries such as China, the government employs advanced AI algorithms to monitor online behaviors and suppress dissenting opinions, effectively stifling political expression (Lee, 2019; Zeng & Wong, 2022). This duality necessitates a nuanced analysis of the ways in which technology influences political socialization within differing regime types.

Access to Technology and Its Implications

The comparative analysis of political socialization across varied political systems illuminates significant disparities in access to technology and its subsequent implications for political engagement. In established democracies, citizens typically enjoy extensive access to digital technologies and the internet, enhancing their ability to engage with political content and participate in online discourse (Vaccari, 2018). In contrast, individuals in developing nations often encounter restricted access to technology, which can obstruct political socialization and hinder civic engagement. For instance, regions in Africa characterized by low internet penetration frequently rely on traditional methods of political socialization, such as community gatherings and local media, which remain crucial in shaping political attitudes (Mwaura et al., 2023; Ibanga, 2024).

These technological disparities underscore the pressing need for targeted initiatives aimed at enhancing access to technology and improving digital literacy, especially within underrepresented communities (Susanty, 2024). Furthermore, the digital divide poses a risk of exacerbating existing inequalities in political participation, effectively marginalizing individuals lacking sufficient technological access to crucial political dialogues taking place within digital

spaces (Wang & Si, 2024). This concern is heightened in the contemporary era of artificial intelligence, wherein algorithms may perpetuate and amplify entrenched biases and disparities in political socialization (Peters, 2022).

Case Studies: Comparative Perspectives on Political Socialization

To better understand the diverse experiences of political socialization across various societal contexts, specific case studies can be examined to highlight the interrelationship between political socialization and democratization processes. The transition of South Korea from authoritarianism to democracy during the late 20th century serves as a salient example of how political socialization can enhance democratic resilience. This process of democratization was significantly influenced by an active civil society that mobilized citizens to advocate for political reform and increased political participation (Connors, 2021; Easley, 2023). The role of educational institutions in this transformation is critical; they have actively fostered civic engagement and cultivated critical political discourse (Kim & Yu, 2024). The incorporation of civic education within educational curricula has been correlated with heightened political awareness and engagement among youth (Larreguy & Marshall, 2017). Research indicates that individuals who receive comprehensive civic education are notably more predisposed to engage in electoral participation and community organizing later in life (Diehl et al., 2016).

The candlelight protests of 2016 against President Park Geun-hye, which culminated in her impeachment, exemplify the mobilizing power of political socialization in facilitating democratic action. These protests featured widespread participation across diverse demographic groups, underscoring the effectiveness of civic education in instilling a sense of collective agency and responsibility among citizens. Additionally, the role of social media in South Korea significantly amplified the processes of political socialization by providing platforms for political discourse and organization (Lee, 2018; Oh & Chung, 2022). Throughout these protests, as well as in similar instances prior to them, social media emerged as an essential tool for information dissemination, event coordination, and participant solidarity (Suh, 2015, 2016). This context underscores the transformative potential of technology in shaping political socialization and its implications for democratic engagement.

Moreover, South Korea's experience elucidates how a robust foundation of civic education, coupled with the strategic use of technology, can bolster the resilience of democratic institutions. Empirical studies suggest that South Korean youth are increasingly inclined to engage in political discussions and activism via digital channels, thereby contributing to a more informed electorate (Wang et al., 2017). This case study emphasizes

the critical importance of nurturing political socialization processes that empower citizens to actively participate in their democracy.

In stark contrast, the political trajectory of Venezuela under the leadership of Hugo Chávez and Nicolás Maduro exemplifies how political socialization can contribute to the deterioration of democratic norms. The overarching governmental control over media and educational content has severely limited citizens' access to a diversity of political perspectives, fostering a culture of dependence on state-sanctioned narratives (Bracho-Polanco, 2020). As a result, this restrictive framework has led to pervasive disillusionment with democratic institutions and a significant decline in political participation, as citizens increasingly perceive themselves as alienated from the political system.

The Venezuelan government employs a multifaceted strategy to manipulate political socialization, primarily through the promotion of a “Bolivarian” ideology that emphasizes loyalty to the state and its leaders. This ideological framework is deeply supported by state-controlled media, which serves as a conduit for propaganda while systematically marginalizing dissenting voices (Abbott et al., 2017). Consequently, the population becomes conditioned to regard authoritarian governance as normative, culminating in a pronounced lack of political agency and diminishing prospects for democratization. Empirical research underscores that the erosion of trust in democratic institutions significantly contributes to the decline in political participation in Venezuela (Maya & Lander, 2011).

The dynamics of social media in Venezuela further complicate the political socialization framework. Although these platforms possess the potential to enhance political engagement, governmental efforts to regulate online discourse have severely impeded their effectiveness. Strategies such as internet censorship and the deployment of automated bots to manipulate public opinion exemplify this stringent control (Forelle et al., 2015). Such tactics highlight the formidable challenges Venezuelan citizens encounter in navigating their political environment, demonstrating the necessity of examining the interplay between political socialization and regime type in shaping democratic engagement.

The post-communist transitions in Eastern Europe provide an illuminating comparison, emphasizing substantial disparities in political socialization and their implications for democratization. Countries like Poland and the Czech Republic have successfully transitioned to democratic governance, bolstered by robust civil society movements and substantial political participation (Pospieszna & Vráblíková, 2022; Zhang, 2023). In stark contrast, Hungary's political environment has regressed, characterized by governmental consolidation of power and repression of dissent, which has eroded democratic norms (Bozóki

& Hegedűs, 2018). This divergence underscores the significance of contextualizing historical and cultural variables that shape political socialization and its impact on democratic engagement.

China emerges as a compelling case study of political socialization within an authoritarian context, where the government employs advanced artificial intelligence algorithms to surveil online activities and suppress dissent (King et al., 2013). The Chinese Communist Party (CCP) has constructed a comprehensive political socialization system that prioritizes loyalty to the party and adherence to its ideological tenets. This system is reinforced through state-controlled education, media, and digital platforms, which collectively shape the political beliefs and behaviors of citizens (Yang & Tang, 2018; Wu et al., 2019).

The influence of technology on political socialization in China is particularly noteworthy, as the government utilizes artificial intelligence not only for surveillance but also for the regulation of online discourse. Existing research indicates that the CCP's censorship strategies are meticulously designed to suppress dissenting voices while promoting narratives that align with party ideology (Qiang, 2019). These measures have profound implications for political engagement, effectively socializing citizens to conform to state-sanctioned narratives while discouraging the articulation of alternative viewpoints. The extent of this control is reflected in the diminished political agency of citizens, who frequently perceive themselves as powerless to contest the regime (Tang & Wen, 2023).

Furthermore, the Chinese scenario illustrates the complexities that digital technologies introduce into the realm of political socialization. While social media platforms have the potential to foster political discourse, the government's strict control over these channels severely limits their capacity to enhance democratic engagement (Homburg & Moody, 2021). The implementation of the Great Firewall of China exemplifies this limitation, restricting access to foreign information sources and constructing an information landscape that is meticulously curated by the state (Ensafi et al., 2015). This situation emphasizes the necessity of comprehensively understanding the role of technology in shaping political socialization and its broader implications for democratization efforts within authoritarian frameworks (Ham & Seim, 2017).

In summary, the comparative analysis of political socialization highlights its complexity and variability in influencing democratic engagement. Key factors—such as media control, ideological promotion, and technological regulation—significantly shape the political landscape and citizen agency within varying governmental contexts.

The Influence of Artificial Intelligence on Political Socialization

The integration of AI into contemporary society has substantially altered the dynamics of political socialization, fundamentally reshaping the mechanisms through which individuals acquire political knowledge, engage with political content, and participate in democratic processes. The pervasive application of AI technologies presents both opportunities and challenges, significantly influencing citizens' interactions with political information and, by extension, with one another. Subsequent sections seek to explore the nuanced effects of AI on political socialization and critically examine its implications for both democratization and de-democratization within modern political frameworks.

AI as a Catalyst for Political Engagement

AI technologies have the potential to enhance political engagement by offering personalized content and improving access to a diverse array of political information. Advanced algorithms that curate news feeds and social media content can expose users to a broader spectrum of political perspectives, thereby facilitating informed dialogue and active participation in civic life (Xinyue, 2023). For instance, during the 2020 U.S. presidential election, AI-enhanced platforms played a critical role in mobilizing voters, particularly among younger demographics who demonstrate a heightened propensity to engage with political content through digital mediums (Kammerer & Michelson, 2022). Empirical studies indicate that users confronted with a variety of viewpoints on social media are more likely to cultivate nuanced political opinions and participate in civic activities (Xinyue, 2023). Moreover, Mann (2021) elucidates how interactions with chatbots can significantly bolster voter turnout.

In addition to individual engagement, AI can facilitate the organization and mobilization of political movements. Technologies such as chatbots and automated messaging systems optimize communication among activists, enhance campaign operations, and fortify grassroots organizing efforts (Bondi et al., 2021). Notably, AI-powered platforms have been instrumental in various social movements, including Black Lives Matter and climate activism, enabling the coordination of protests, dissemination of crucial information, and mobilization of supporters (Mundt et al., 2018). Such advancements empower citizens to engage actively in political processes, potentially leading to increased levels of political involvement.

Nevertheless, the use of AI to promote political engagement raises significant ethical considerations. The personalization of political content can foster echo chambers, confining individuals to viewpoints that reinforce their pre-existing beliefs (Gardikiotis et al., 2020). This phenomenon exacerbates political polarization and impedes constructive discourse across

divergent perspectives (Otieno, 2023; Qasaye, 2024). Additionally, the application of AI in political campaigns raises critical questions regarding transparency and accountability, as algorithms may unduly favor particular narratives or candidates without sufficient justification (Valeriani & Vaccari, 2017). Consequently, while AI presents opportunities for enhancing political engagement, the associated risks necessitate careful governance to uphold the integrity of democratic discourse.

Misinformation and AI-Driven Disinformation Campaigns

The ramifications of AI on political socialization represent a critical area of inquiry, particularly concerning the proliferation of misinformation and disinformation. AI algorithms possess the capability to generate and disseminate false information on an unprecedented scale, thereby posing substantial threats to democratic processes and eroding public trust in political institutions. Notably, AI-generated deepfakes and manipulated media have been employed to propagate deceptive narratives, thereby undermining the credibility of political adversaries (Kryvoshein, 2023). Scholarly research indicates that exposure to disinformation distorts citizens' perceptions of political realities, leading to a reduction in trust toward democratic institutions and fostering a climate of systemic cynicism (Cerón, 2015).

The role of social media platforms in spreading misinformation deserves great attention. Algorithms that favor sensationalist or emotionally charged content amplify the spread of false stories and make it difficult for users to distinguish credible information from misleading sources (Parmelee & Roman, 2019). This phenomenon is particularly pronounced during election periods, as strategic disinformation campaigns have the potential to influence voter behavior and jeopardize the integrity of the electoral process. For example, the flood of misinformation during the 2016 US presidential election was associated with significant changes in public opinion and voting behavior (Velásquez & Quenette, 2018).

In response to these formidable challenges, there is an emerging consensus regarding the necessity for enhanced media literacy and critical thinking skills that would empower citizens to navigate the intricate information landscape shaped by AI (Hudia & Affandi, 2022). Educational initiatives aimed at improving digital literacy are essential for equipping individuals with the competencies required to critically assess political information and engage with a diverse array of viewpoints. Furthermore, collaboration between policymakers and technology companies is imperative for establishing ethical guidelines and regulatory frameworks that mitigate the risks associated with AI-driven misinformation while promoting transparency and accountability in political communications.

The Role of AI in Shaping Political Identity

AI has emerged as a pivotal force in the construction and evolution of political identities and affiliations. The algorithms that underpin social media platforms play a critical role in curating content that aligns with users' pre-existing preferences and interests. This process of algorithmic filtering often results in the reinforcement of established political identities, effectively creating barriers to engagement with dissenting perspectives (Ciccina & Guzmán-Concha, 2021). Empirical research demonstrates that exposure to a narrow spectrum of political content correlates with increased polarization and a diminished propensity for constructive dialogue among individuals holding divergent beliefs (Bode, 2016).

Moreover, the integration of AI in political advertising and targeted messaging strategies serves to further entrench established political affiliations. Campaigns employing AI-driven data analytics can craft hyper-targeted messages for specific demographic cohorts, skillfully leveraging individual biases and preferences to optimize engagement (David et al., 2016; Barclay et al. 2023). While this approach significantly enhances the precision and efficacy of political outreach, it raises substantial ethical concerns regarding manipulation and the potential reinforcement of detrimental stereotypes (Kamal et al., 2024). The implications of AI-augmented political messaging extend beyond individual campaigns, significantly shaping overarching societal narratives and influencing public perceptions of political issues (Mahmud et al., 2023).

As AI technologies continue to advance, it is crucial to critically examine their impact on political identity formation and the resultant implications for democratic engagement. Promoting diverse political discourse and cultivating an inclusive political culture necessitates coordinated efforts among educators, policymakers, and civil society actors. It is essential to encourage critical engagement with AI-generated content and to challenge the narratives perpetuated by algorithmic filtering.

In conclusion, the influence of AI on political socialization is both profound and nuanced, affecting the mechanisms through which individuals acquire political knowledge, interact with political content, and engage in democratic practices. While AI holds the potential to enhance political engagement and broaden access to information, it simultaneously presents significant challenges related to misinformation, polarization, and the construction of political identities. As societies navigate the complexities of the digital landscape, fostering inclusive and equitable political socialization processes that uphold democratic values and civic engagement becomes an imperative endeavor.

Conclusion, Recommendation, and Future Direction

In conclusion, the ramifications of artificial intelligence on political socialization are extensive and multifaceted, significantly influencing how individuals acquire political knowledge, engage with content, and participate in democratic processes. This article thoroughly explores both the opportunities and challenges presented by AI technologies, highlighting their dual potential to either promote or impede democratization across various contexts.

AI has the ability to enhance political engagement by delivering personalized content and improving access to information. Algorithms that curate news feeds and social media outputs can expose users to a wider array of political viewpoints, thereby fostering informed discourse and active participation. However, this customization can also lead to the creation of echo chambers that reinforce existing beliefs, exacerbating political polarization. Additionally, the proliferation of misinformation and disinformation—a phenomenon magnified by AI capabilities—poses a significant threat to democratic integrity and public trust in political institutions. The ability of AI to generate and disseminate large volumes of misleading information can distort citizens' perceptions of political realities, undermining trust in democratic frameworks and breeding cynicism toward the political system.

Furthermore, AI plays a pivotal role in shaping political identity and affiliation. Algorithms utilized by social media platforms can strategically influence user beliefs by promoting content that aligns with their preferences, complicating engagement with opposing perspectives. This tendency can entrench existing political identities and hinder constructive dialogue among individuals with differing viewpoints. As AI technologies continue to evolve, a careful examination of their impact on the construction of political identity and its implications for democratic participation becomes increasingly essential.

Implications for Future Research

Given the rapid advancements in AI and its increasing influence on political socialization, future research must critically examine its multifaceted implications for democratic engagement. Scholars should investigate the long-term consequences of AI-driven political communication on public opinion, political participation, and civic engagement, paying particular attention to the interactions of various demographic groups with AI technologies and how these interactions shape their political beliefs and behaviors.

To address the potential for manipulation and bias, future studies should also explore the political economy of political communication in the age of AI. This includes analyzing the

role of technology companies and media organizations in shaping the information landscape and how their economic incentives and political agendas may influence the dissemination of information and the construction of political realities. Understanding the power dynamics inherent in the control of AI technologies and media platforms is crucial for assessing their impact on democratic processes. Building upon this, the ethical implications concerning transparency, accountability, and the potential for manipulation within AI-driven political communication merit particular attention.

Furthermore, research should explore the technical dimensions of mitigating the negative impacts of AI on political socialization. This includes investigating the design and governance of algorithms to minimize bias, reduce the formation of echo chambers, and promote exposure to diverse perspectives while simultaneously safeguarding freedom of expression.

Finally, given the challenges posed by AI-driven misinformation and the increasing complexity of the information landscape, the intersection of AI and media literacy presents a crucial avenue for research. It is imperative to equip citizens with the requisite skills to critically evaluate political information and navigate the complexities of an AI-influenced information environment. Future studies should assess the effectiveness of diverse educational interventions in promoting media literacy and facilitating informed political engagement.

Recommendations for Practice

Addressing the challenges posed by AI in the field of political socialization requires the formulation of targeted recommendations for practitioners, educators and policy makers. First and foremost, it is imperative to promote inclusive and equitable political socialization processes that uphold democratic values and encourage civic engagement. Implementing educational initiatives that emphasize critical thinking, media literacy and the importance of diverse political discourse can greatly enhance the formation of a well-informed and actively engaged citizenry.

Furthermore, collaboration between policymakers and technology companies is essential to create ethical guidelines and regulatory frameworks that aim to mitigate the risks associated with AI-driven misinformation while promoting transparency and accountability in political communication. This collaborative approach should include developing standards for algorithm transparency, ensuring informed consent for data use, and developing strategies to combat the spread of misinformation via social media platforms.

Finally, cultivating a culture of civic engagement and political participation is crucial to counteracting the negative effects of AI on political socialization. This can be achieved by fostering grassroots movements, supporting community organizing initiatives, and promoting inclusive political dialogs that respect and value diverse perspectives. By creating an environment that fosters constructive engagement, societies can drive the strengthening of democratic institutions.

Conclusion

The implications of artificial intelligence on political socialization presents a complex and multi-layered landscape that embodies both potential advances and inherent challenges to democratic processes. While AI systems promise to significantly improve political participation by facilitating access to information, they also pose significant risks, such as the spread of misinformation, increased polarization and the complicated modulation of political identities.

As societies grapple with the complexity's characteristic of the digital age, it is crucial to develop a framework for political socialization that is not only inclusive but also equitable, thus promoting democratic values and encouraging civic engagement. It is of utmost importance to effectively address the multiple challenges of AI while harnessing its capabilities for constructive outcomes. In this way, we can foster the emergence of a more informed, engaged and resilient citizenry capable of navigating the complicated realities of the age of AI.

References

- Abbott, J., Soifer, H., & Hau, M. (2017). Transforming the nation? The Bolivarian education reform in Venezuela. **Journal of Latin American Studies**, 49(4), 885-916.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0022216x17000402>
- Abrial, S., Alexandre, C., Bedock, C., Gonthier, F., & Guerra, T. (2022). Control or participate? The yellow vests' democratic aspirations through mixed methods analysis. **French Politics**, 20(3-4), 479-503. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41253-022-00185-x>
- Afşar, Ö. A., & Val Sanchez, K. V. (2024). Contrasting democratic trajectories: A comparative analysis of Costa Rica and Nicaragua. **Journal of Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Economics and Administrative Sciences Faculty**, 11(3), 1113-1135.
<https://doi.org/10.30798/makuiibf.1461753>

- Ahmed, S., Chandra, S., Jain, A., Wongmahesak, K., & Singh, B. (2025a). Impact of AI-Generated Misinformation on Electoral Integrity and Public Trust. In K. Wongmahesak, I. Wekke, C. Seftyono & N. Nurdin (eds.). **Democracy and Democratization in the Age of AI** (pp. 57-72). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-8749-8.ch004>
- Ahmed, S., Wongmahesak, K., Singh, B., & Kumar, S. (2025b). Empowering Democratic Processes With AI: Innovations in Voter Engagement, Policy Analysis, and Decision-Making Process. In K. Wongmahesak, I. Wekke, C. Seftyono & N. Nurdin (eds.). **Democracy and Democratization in the Age of AI** (pp. 121-132). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-8749-8.ch007>
- Akyol, E. (2022). Political socialization experiences of Turkish citizen university students of Syrian origin. **International Journal of Intercultural Relations**, **87**, 142-156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2022.02.002>
- Aliyu, A., Yongjun, Y., Huayan, N., Samsu, K., & Ismail, M. (2023). Influence of political socialization agents on political participation among electorate: An empirical study in Bauchi State-Nigeria. **International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences**, **13**(18), 217-231. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v13-i18/19961>
- Baghban, S., & Rahbarqazi, M. (2021). Modeling corruption perception effects on non-electoral participation in Morocco (2018-2019). **Política Y Sociedad**, **58**(3), e73306. <https://doi.org/10.5209/poso.73306>
- Barclay, A., Gibson, R., & Dommett, K. (2023). The regulatory ecosystem of data driven campaigning in the UK. **Frontiers in Political Science**, **5**, 1146470. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2023.1146470>
- Bode, L. (2016). Pruning the news feed: Unfriending and unfollowing political content on social media. **Research & Politics**, **3**(3), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168016661873>
- Bogaards, M. (2018). De-democratization in Hungary: Diffusely defective democracy. **Democratization**, **25**(8), 1481-1499. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2018.1485015>
- Bondi, E., Xu, L., Acosta-Navas, D., & Killian, J. (2021). Envisioning communities: A participatory approach towards AI for social good. In **AIES '21: Proceedings of the 2021 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society** (pp.425-436). Association for Computing Machinery, United States. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3461702.3462612>
- Bozóki, A., & Hegedűs, D. (2018). An externally constrained hybrid regime: Hungary in the European Union. **Democratization**, **25**(7), 1173-1189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2018.1455664>

- Bracho-Polanco, E. (2020). Chávez's Aló Presidente and its impact on Venezuela's journalistic practice. **Iberoamericana – Nordic Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies**, 49(1), 42-51. <https://doi.org/10.16993/iberoamericana.474>
- Camaj, L. (2015). Governments' uses and misuses of freedom of information laws in emerging european democracies: FOI laws' impact on news agenda-building in Albania, Kosovo, and Montenegro. **Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly**, 93(4), 923-945. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699015610073>
- Cerón, A. (2015). Internet, news, and political trust: The difference between social media and online media outlets. **Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication**, 20(5), 487-503. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12129>
- Cheema, A. T., & Hashmi, R. S. (2021). Struggling for democracy: A case of democratization in Pakistan. **Journal of Development and Social Sciences**, 2(4), 554-562. [http://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2021\(2-IV\)46](http://doi.org/10.47205/jdss.2021(2-IV)46)
- Chen, C., Li, A., & Zhang, S. (2021). The gift of authoritarian experience: The determinants of online political efficacy in new democracies. **Telematics and Informatics**, 63, 101674. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2021.101674>
- Chen, M., & Madni, G. (2024). Unveiling the role of political education for political participation in China. **Heliyon**, 10(10), e31258. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e31258>
- Ciccia, R., & Guzmán-Concha, C. (2021). Protest and social policies for outsiders: The expansion of social pensions in Latin America. **Journal of Social Policy**, 52(2), 294-315. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047279421000623>
- Coeckelbergh, M. (2023). Democracy, epistemic agency, and AI: Political epistemology in times of artificial intelligence. **AI and Ethics**, 3, 1341-1350. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-022-00239-4>
- Commonwealth Secretariat. (2021). **Overview of Youth Development in Ghana**. Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Connors, M. K. (2021). Civil society and the State in Democratic East Asia: Between Entanglement and Contention in Post High Growth.: David Chiavacci, Simona Grano, and Julia Obinger (eds) (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2020). **Journal of Contemporary Asia**, 52(3), 495–496. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472336.2021.1901960>
- David, E., Zhitomirsky-Geffet, M., Koppel, M., & Uzan, H. (2016). Utilizing Facebook pages of the political parties to automatically predict the political orientation of Facebook users. **Online Information Review**, 40(5), 610-623. <https://doi.org/10.1108/oir-09-2015-0308>

- Diehl, T., Weeks, B., & Zúñiga, H. (2016). Political persuasion on social media: Tracing direct and indirect effects of news use and social interaction. **New Media & Society**, 18(9), 1844-1862. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444815616224>
- Easley, L. (2023). Korean NGOs and reconciliation with Japan. **Journal of East Asian Studies**, 23(1), 45-70. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jea.2022.21>
- Ellis, A. (ed.). (2021). **Impact of political socialization on the support for democratic principles: Emerging research and opportunities**. IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-4291-0>
- Elsner, R. (2022). Praying instead of protesting? The Belarusian churches and political protest after the 2020 presidential election. **Nationalities Papers**, 51(4), 770-786. <https://doi.org/10.1017/nps.2022.81>
- Ensafi, R., Winter, P., Mueen, A., & Crandall, J. (2015). Analyzing the great firewall of China over space and time. **Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies**, 2015(1), 61-76. <https://doi.org/10.1515/popets-2015-0005>
- Escolar, M., Lilleker, D., & Frade, A. (2023). A systematic literature review of the phenomenon of disinformation and misinformation. **Media and Communication**, 11(2), 76-87. <https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v11i2.6453>
- Evans, M., Evans, R., & Vemic, A. (2018). Youth civic engagement and formal education in Canada: Shifting expressions, associated challenges. In A. Peterson, G. Stahl, H. Soong (eds.). **The Palgrave Handbook of Citizenship and Education** (pp. 1-17). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-67905-1_4-1
- Farzaneh, M. (2023). The challenging facing city council, as a democratic institution, in Iran towards Sustainability: A Case Study of Mahmoodabad, Mazandaran. **Tuijin Jishu/Journal of Propulsion Technology**, 44(4), 1675-1689. <https://doi.org/10.52783/tjjpt.v44.i4.1675>
- Flaxman, S., Goel, S., & Rao, J. (2016). Filter bubbles, echo chambers, and online news consumption. **Public Opinion Quarterly**, 80(S1), 298-320. <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfw006>
- Forelle, M., Howard, P., Monroy-Hernández, A., & Savage, S. (2015). Political bots and the manipulation of public opinion in Venezuela. **arXiv**. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1507.07109>
- Franco, A., & Pound, N. (2022). The foundations of Bolsonaro's support: Exploring the psychological underpinnings of political polarization in Brazil. **Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology**, 32(5), 846-859. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2599>
- Gardikiotis, A., Navrozidou, E., & Euaggelou-Navarro, O. (2020). Social media and political participation: The role of social psychological and social media variables. **Psychology: The Journal of the Hellenic Psychological Society**, 23(2), 37-52. https://doi.org/10.12681/psy_hps.22601

- Gidron, N., & Bonikowski, B. (2013). **Varieties of populism: Literature review and research agenda** (Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, Harvard University Working Paper No. 13-0004). Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, Harvard University.
- Grecu, S. (2021). Social representations of the democracy. Cognitions and attitudes in 34 nations. **Technium Social Sciences Journal**, 25(1), 653-662.
<https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v25i1.5118>
- Haime, A., & Cantú, F. (2022). Negative partisanship in Latin America. **Latin American Politics and Society**, 64(1), 72-92. <https://doi.org/10.1017/lap.2021.54>
- Ham, C., & Seim, B. (2017). Strong states, weak elections? How state capacity in authoritarian regimes conditions the democratizing power of elections. **International Political Science Review**, 39(1), 49-66. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512117697544>
- Hegna, K. (2020). Young citizenship: civic engagement and participation in Four Nordic Countries. In: T. Strand (ed.). **Rethinking Ethical-Political Education. Contemporary Philosophies and Theories in Education** (pp. 13-28). Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-49524-4_2
- Heinrich, A., & Pleines, H. (2018). The meaning of ‘limited pluralism’ in media reporting under authoritarian rule. **Politics and Governance**, 6(2), 103-111.
<https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v6i2.1238>
- Heyne, L. (2019). The making of democratic citizens: how regime-specific socialization shapes Europeans’ expectations of democracy. **Swiss Political Science Review**, 25(1), 40-63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spsr.12338>
- Homburg, V., & Moody, R. (2021). Weibo to the rescue? A study of social media use in citizen–government relations in China. **Transforming Government People Process and Policy**, 16(1), 128-139. <https://doi.org/10.1108/tg-06-2021-0101>
- Homtako, K., Suvaddho, A., & Piyaweero, E. (2024). An integration of buddhadhamma principle for enhancement of political socialization in democratic regime of the youth in Surat Thani Province. **Thai Interdisciplinary and Sustainability Review**, 13(2), 171-180. <https://doi.org/10.14456/tisr.2024.33>
- Hudia, R., & Affandi, I. (2022). Students’ perceptions of the use of Instagram social media as one of generation Z’s political education facilities. **Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research**, 636, 314-320.
<https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.220108.057>

- Huszár, F., Ktena, S., O'Brien, C., Belli, L., Schlaikjer, A., & Hardt, M. (2021). Algorithmic amplification of politics on Twitter. **Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences**, **119**(1), e2025334119. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2025334119>
- Ibanga, D. (2024). Africa and the prospects of rotational democracy. **The Philosophical Forum**, **55**(2), 157-172. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phil.12360>
- Ida, R., Saud, M., & Mashud, M. (2020). An empirical analysis of social media usage, political learning and participation among youth: A comparative study of Indonesia and Pakistan. **Quality & Quantity**, **54**, 1285–1297. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-020-00985-9>
- Jabali, O., Khalili, F., & Jabali, S. (2024). Political socialization and its impact on psychological resilience and PTSD among individuals engaged with Israeli occupation forces on Mount Sabih. **European Journal of Trauma & Dissociation**, **8**(2), 100413. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejtd.2024.100413>
- Jiang, H. (2023). Factors affecting the institutionalized political participation of Chinese women. **International Journal of Electronic Government Research**, **19**(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.4018/ijegr.333055>
- Jiang, R., Chiappa, S., Lattimore, T., György, A., & Kohli, P. (2019). Degenerate feedback loops in recommender systems. In **AIES '19: Proceedings of the 2019 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society** (pp. 383-390). Association for Computing Machinery, United States. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3306618.3314288>
- Kamal, R., Kaur, M., Kaur, J., & Malhan, S. (2024). artificial intelligence-powered political advertising: harnessing data-driven insights for campaign strategies. In R. Kumar, A. Joshi, H. Sharan, S. Peng & C. Dudhagara (eds.). **The Ethical Frontier of AI and Data Analysis** (pp. 100-109). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-2964-1.ch006>
- Kammerer, E., & Michelson, M. (2022). You better vote: Drag performers and voter mobilization in the 2020 election. **PS: Political Science & Politics**, **55**(4), 655-660. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1049096522000713>
- Khondker, H. (2015). New Media, Political Mobilization, and the Arab Spring. In J. Wright (ed.). **International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences** (2nd ed.) (pp. 798-804). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.64135-1>
- Kim, H., & Yu, K. (2024). Vocational education and political engagement: The case of South Korea. **International Journal of Educational Research**, **127**, 102409. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2024.102409>

- King, G., Pan, J., & Roberts, M. (2013). How censorship in China allows government criticism but silences collective expression. **American Political Science Review**, 107(2), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0003055413000014>
- Kinnvall, C. (2019). Populism, ontological insecurity and Hindutva: Modi and the masculinization of Indian politics. **Cambridge Review of International Affairs**, 32(3), 283-302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09557571.2019.1588851>
- Koliechkin, V., Strunhar, A., Hnatyuk, M., Diakiv, V., & Shmilyk, I. (2024). Verbal warfare: Assessing how contemporary political rhetoric shapes societal dynamics. **Library Progress International**, 44(3), 18408-18419. <https://doi.org/10.48165/bapas.2024.44.2.1>
- Kryvoshein, V. (2023). Transformation of political perceptions in the age of information technologies: Analyzing the impact on political beliefs. **Futurity of Social Sciences**, 1(3), 20-32. <https://doi.org/10.57125/fs.2023.09.20.02>
- Landtsheer, C., Farnen, R., German, D., Dekker, H., Sünker, H., Song, Y., & Miao, H. (2014). **E-Political Socialization, the Press and Politics: The Media and Government in the USA, Europe and China**. Peter Lang.
- Larreguy, H., & Marshall, J. (2017). The effect of education on civic and political engagement in nonconsolidated democracies: Evidence from Nigeria. **The Review of Economics and Statistics**, 99(3), 387-401. https://doi.org/10.1162/REST_a_00633
- Larsson, A. (2023). The rise of Instagram as a tool for political communication: A longitudinal study of European political parties and their followers. **New Media & Society**, 25(10), 2744-2762. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448211034158>
- Lee, C. (2019). Datafication, dataveillance, and the social credit system as China's new normal. **Online Information Review**, 43(6), 952-970. <https://doi.org/10.1108/oir-08-2018-0231>
- Lee, S. (2018). The role of social media in protest participation: The case of candlelight vigils in South Korea. **International Journal of Communication**, 12, 1523-1540.
- Lonkila, M., Shpakovskaya, L., & Torchinsky, P. (2020). Digital activism in Russia: The evolution and forms of online participation in an authoritarian state. In D. Gritsenko, M. Wijermars & M. Kopotev (eds.). **The Palgrave Handbook of Digital Russia Studies** (pp. 135-153). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-42855-6_8
- Mahmud, A., Jumadi, Tahir, H., Kasmawati, A., & Kamaruddin, S. A. (2023). Media power relations in politics: Critical analysis perspective. **International Journal of Law and Politics Studies**, 5(5), 49-57. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijlps.2023.5.5.7>

- Mann, C. (2021). Can conversing with a computer increase turnout? Mobilization using chatbot communication. **Journal of Experimental Political Science**, 8(1), 51-62.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/XPS.2020.5>
- Matthieu, J., & Junius, N. (2023). Searching for a democratic equalizer: Citizenship education's moderating effect on the relationship between a political home and internal political efficacy. **Social Science Research**, 115, 102928.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2023.102928>
- Mauk, M. (2020). **Citizen support for democratic and autocratic regimes**. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198854852.001.0001>
- Maya, M., & Lander, L. (2011). Participatory Democracy in Venezuela: Origins, Ideas, and Implementation. In D. Smilde & D. Hellinger (eds.). **Venezuela's Bolivarian Democracy: Participation, Politics, and Culture under Chávez** (pp. 58-79). Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv120qts7.6>
- Mayer, J., & Schmidt, H. (2004). Gendered political socialization in four contexts: Political interest and values among junior high school students in China, Japan, Mexico, and the United States. **The Social Science Journal**, 41(3), 393-407.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sosij.2004.04.024>
- Mujani, S., & Liddle, R. (2021). Explaining democratic deconsolidation: Evidence from Asian democracies. **Journal of Global Strategic Studies**, 1(1), 16-36.
<https://doi.org/10.36859/jgss.v1i1.570>
- Mundt, M., Ross, K., & Burnett, C. M. (2018). Scaling social movements through social media: the case of Black Lives Matter. **Social Media + Society**, 4(4), 1-14.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305118807911>
- Mwaura, J., Dambo, T., Ataguba, O., Mare, A., Mukhongo, L., Chuma, W., & Mano, W. (2023). Digital technologies and revolution in Africa: Complexities, ambivalences, and contextual realities. **AoIR Selected Papers of Internet Research**. 1-17.
<https://doi.org/10.5210/spir.v2023i0.13524>
- Neshkova, M., & Kalesnikaite, V. (2019). Corruption and citizen participation in local government: Evidence from Latin America. **Governance**, 32(4), 677-693.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12401>
- Oh, C., & Chung, S. W. (2022). Multitude and democracy: A social network analysis of the Korean candlelight vigils and national flag rallies. **SAGE Open**, 12(4), 1-12.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221141886>

- Ohagi, M. (2024). Polarization of autonomous generative AI agents under echo chambers. In O. Clercq, V. Barriere, J. Barnes, R. Klinger, J. Sedoc & S. Tafreshi (eds.). **Proceedings of the 14th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis** (pp. 112-124). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Olaniran, B., & Williams, I. (2020). Social media effects: Hijacking democracy and civility in civic engagement. In J. Jones & M. Trice (eds.). **Platforms, Protests, and the Challenge of Networked Democracy** (pp. 77-94). Palgrave Macmillan.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-36525-7_5
- Oser, J., & Hooghe, M. (2018). Democratic ideals and levels of political participation: The role of political and social conceptualizations of democracy. **British Journal of Politics and International Relations**, 20(3), 568-586. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1369148118768140>
- Otieno, P. (2023). The impact of social media on political polarization. **Journal of Communication**, 4(1), 56-68. <https://doi.org/10.47941/jcomm.1686>
- Otjes, S., & Rekker, R. (2021). Socialised to think in terms of left and right? The acceptability of the left and the right among European voters. **Electoral Studies**, 72, 102365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2021.102365>
- Owen, D. (2008). Political socialization in the twenty-first century: Recommendations for researchers. Paper presented at **the Future of Civic Education in the 21st Century**. the Center for Civic Education and the Bundeszentrale fur politische Bildung, James Madison's Montpelier, USA. https://www.civiced.org/pdfs/GermanAmericanConf2009/DianaOwen_2009.pdf
- Pang, H., Qin, K., & Ji, M. (2021). Can social network sites facilitate civic engagement? Assessing dynamic relationship between social media and civic activities among young people. **Online Information Review**, 46(1), 79-94. <https://doi.org/10.1108/oir-10-2020-0453>
- Parmelee, J., & Roman, N. (2019). Insta-politicos: Motivations for following political leaders on Instagram. **Social Media + Society**, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305119837662>
- Peters, U. (2022). Algorithmic political bias in artificial intelligence systems. **Philosophy & Technology**, 35, 25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-022-00512-8>
- Pospieszna, P., & Vráblíková, K. (2022). Cultural liberal and conservative mobilizing potential and political participation in post-communist countries. **East European Politics and Societies and Cultures**, 36(4), 1422-1448. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08883254221083996>
- Print, M. (2017). Political socialization in a failed democracy: Civic education in Thailand. **PCS – Politics, Culture and Socialization**, 8(1-2), 81-94. <https://doi.org/10.3224/pcs.v8i1-2.04>

Qasaye, O. (2024). Political polarization and its impact on democratic institutions.

International Journal of Science and Research, 13(1), 1132-1137.

<https://dx.doi.org/10.21275/SR24116110024>

Qiang, X. (2019). The road to digital unfreedom: president xi's surveillance state. **Journal of**

Democracy, 30(1), 53-67. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2019.0004>

Rennick, S. A. (2023). Losing support to democracy: Political socialization, popular conceptualizations, and the formation of political grievances among marginalized youth in Tunisia.

Mediterranean Politics, 30(2), 338-362. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13629395.2023.2297119>

Ricart-Huguet, J. (2021). The origins of colonial investments in former British and French

Africa. **British Journal of Political Science**, 52(2), 736-757.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0007123420000678>

Rossini, P., Mont'Alverne, C., & Kalogeropoulos, A. (2023). Explaining beliefs in electoral misinformation in the 2022 Brazilian election: The role of ideology, political trust, social media, and messaging apps. **Harvard Kennedy School Misinformation**

Review, 4(3), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.37016/mr-2020-115>

Ruget, V. (2006). The renewal of civic education in France and in America: Comparative perspectives. **The Social Science Journal**, 43(1), 19-34.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2005.12.002>

Salzman, M. (2018). Going deeper: Social media use and the development of democratic attitudes in Latin America. **Global Media and Communication**, 15(1), 85-101.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1742766518818871>

Sandahl, J. (2014). Walking the tightrope: The case of Swedish civics education. In M.

Micheletti (ed.). **Democratization and citizenship discourses in the Mena region** (pp. 169-184). Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul.

Saud, M. (2020). Civic engagement, youth socialisation and participation in public spheres in Indonesia. **Children and Youth Services Review**, 119, 105669.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105669>

Saud, M., Ida, R., Mashud, M., Yousaf, F., & Ashfaq, A. (2023). Cultural dynamics of digital space:

Democracy, civic engagement and youth participation in virtual spheres. **International**

Journal of Intercultural Relations, 97, 101904. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jintrel.2023.101904>

Siegel-Stechler, K. (2019). Is civics enough? High school civics education and young adult voter turnout. **Journal of Social Studies Research**, 43(3), 241-253.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2018.09.006>

- Školkay, A. (2021). Populism and social media: An introduction into meta-theory. **Studia Politica Slovaca**, 14(2-3), 5-21. <https://doi.org/10.31577/SPS.2021-2.1>
- Solano, E., & Rocha, C. (2022). **Youth and Democracy in Latin America**. Luminate.
- Suh, J. (2015). Forecasting the daily outbreak of topic-level political risk from social media using hidden Markov model-based techniques. **Technological Forecasting and Social Change**, 94, 115-132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2014.08.014>
- Suh, J. H. (2016). Comparing writing style feature-based classification methods for estimating user reputations in social media. **SpringerPlus**, 5(1), 261. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40064-016-1841-1>
- Sun, Y., & Xie, J. (2024). Who shares misinformation on social media? A meta-analysis of individual traits related to misinformation sharing. **Computers in Human Behavior**, 158, 108271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2024.108271>
- Susanty, L. (2024). Critical analysis of the research on digital literacy. **Sinergi International Journal of Education**, 2(1), 12-25. <https://doi.org/10.61194/education.v2i1.149>
- Tang, G., & Lee, F. L. F. (2013). Facebook use and political participation: The impact of exposure to shared political information, connections with public political actors, and network structural heterogeneity. **Social Science Computer Review**, 31(6), 763–773. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439313490625>
- Tang, Y., & Wen, Q. (2023). An empirical study of the impact of social media use on online political participation of university students in western China. **Journalism and Media**, 4(1), 75-89. <https://doi.org/10.3390/journalmedia4010006>
- Trætteberg, H. S. (2017). Active Citizenship in Scandinavian Schools and Nursing Homes. In K. Sivesind & J. Saglie (eds.). **Promoting Active Citizenship** (pp. 203-259). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-55381-8_6
- Vaccari, C. (2018). Online mobilization in comparative perspective: Digital appeals and political engagement in Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom. In K. Koc-Michalska & D. Lilleker (eds.). **Digital Politics: Mobilization, Engagement and Participation** (pp. 69-88). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429459955-5>
- Valeriani, A., & Vaccari, C. (2017). Political talk on mobile instant messaging services: A comparative analysis of Germany, Italy, and the UK. **Information Communication & Society**, 21(11), 1715-1731. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118x.2017.1350730>
- Velásquez, A., & Quenette, A. M. (2018). Facilitating Social Media and Offline Political Engagement During Electoral Cycles: Using Social Cognitive Theory to Explain Political Action Among Hispanics and Latinos. **Mass Communication and Society**, 21(6), 763–784. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2018.1484489>

- Vendeville, A. (2024). **The echo chamber effect in social networks: Theoretical analysis and steering strategies** [Doctoral dissertation]. Discover UCL Library Services.
<https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10185036/>
- Völker, T. (2019). Deliberative democracy in the age of social media. **Revista Publicum**, 5(2), 73-105. <https://doi.org/10.12957/publicum.2019.47202>
- Wang, C. H., Weng, D. C., & Jin, H. J. (2017). Personality traits and voter turnout in South Korea: The mediation argument. **Japanese Journal of Political Science**, 18(3), 426-445. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s146810991700010x>
- Wang, C., & Si, L. (2024). The intersection of public policy and public access: Digital inclusion, digital literacy education, and libraries. **Sustainability**, 16(5), 1878.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su16051878>
- Weinberg, J. (2022). Civic education as an antidote to inequalities in political participation? New evidence from English secondary education. **British Politics**, 17, 185-209.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41293-021-00186-4>
- Wongmahesak, K., Wekke, I. S., Seftyono, C., & Nurdin, N. H. (2025). **Democracy and Democratization in the Age of AI**. IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-8749-8>
- Wu, J., Li, Y., & Song, C. (2019). Temporal dynamics of political trust in China: A cohort analysis. **China Information**, 34(1), 109-136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0920203x19852917>
- Xinyue, D. (2023). Social Media as a Tool for Political Mobilization: A Case Study of the 2020 Hong Kong Protests. **Journal of Public Representative and Society Provision**, 3(1), 10-20. <https://doi.org/10.55885/jprsp.v3i1.199>
- Yang, M. (2023). So near yet so far: Nicaragua and Costa Rica's divergent fate in pursuing democracy. **Lecture Notes in Education Psychology and Public Media**, 20(1), 184-188. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7048/20/20231344>
- Yang, P., & Tang, L. (2018). "Positive energy": Hegemonic intervention and online media discourse in China's Xi Jinping era. **China an International Journal**, 16(1), 1-22.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/chn.2018.0000>
- Yoldaş, Ö. (2015). Civic Education and Learning Democracy: Their Importance for Political Participation of Young People. **Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences**. 174(12), 544-549. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.703>
- Zeng, Y., & Wong, S. H. (2022). Social media, fear, and support for state surveillance: The case of China's social credit system. **China Information**, 37(1), 51-74.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0920203x221088141>

- Zerback, T., & Wirz, D. S. (2021). Appraisal patterns as predictors of emotional expressions and shares on political social networking sites. **Studies in Communication Sciences**, 21(1), 27-45. <https://doi.org/10.24434/j.scoms.2021.01.003>
- Żerkowska-Balas, M., & Wenzel, M. (2020). Education through democracy – Civic activation of the youth: Self-reflection on program evaluation methodology. **Journal of Social Science Education**, 19(2), 60-74. <https://doi.org/10.4119/jsse-2353>
- Zhang, L. (2023). Democratization prospects and challenges in central and eastern Europe after the Cold War: A focus on the Visegrad group in the context of European integration. **SHS Web of Conferences**, 178, 01009. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202317801009>
- Zhang, Y., Thorgusen, S., & Fan, X. (2022). News coverage of social protests in global society. **International Journal of Comparative Sociology**, 63(3), 105-127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00207152221085601>
- Zúñiga, H., González-González, P., & Goyanes, M. (2022). Pathways to political persuasion: linking online, social media, and fake news with political attitude change through political discussion. **American Behavioral Scientist**, 69(2), 240-261. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027642221118272>