

Social Sciences, Humanities and Education Journal (SHE Journal)

Volume 3 (2) 185 – 199, May 2022 | ISSN: 2720-9946 (Online) ISSN: 2723-3626 (Print)

The article is published with Open Access at: <http://e-journal.unipma.ac.id/index.php/SHE>

SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS, SOCIAL MEDIA USE, POLITICAL AGENDA, FILIPINO VALUES, AND SOCIAL MEDIA INTERACTION AS DETERMINANTS OF ELECTION PARTICIPATION AMONG YOUNG ADULT FILIPINOS

Robel Abbie Narido ✉; De La Salle University

Denya Citadel Agustin; De La Salle University

Kisha Carla Tan; De La Salle University

Nadine Alyanna Dubongco; De La Salle University

Rowalt Alibudbud; De La Salle University

Abstract: The study provides information on social media participation in relation to social responsibility in voting. The results showed that sociodemographic factors have no bearing on the likelihood of democratic engagement because the elections affect all citizens of the country. Moreover, TikTok has a positive effect on the odds of election participation among young adults. As for social media interaction, it was found that bad interactions led to lower odds of participation. Political agendas such as agriculture, education, and law & order also led to lower odds of participation. The research utilized a survey questionnaire consisting of three sections which were sociodemographic factors, social media campaign factors, and voting behaviors of the young adult Filipino participants.

Keywords: social media participation, socio-demographic factors, values portrayed, voting behavior, voting participation

✉ robel_narido@dlsu.edu.ph

Citation: Narido, R.A., Agustin, D.C., Tan, K.C., Dubongco, N.A. & Alibudbud, R.. (2022). Sociodemographic characteristics, social media use, political agenda, filipino values, and social media interaction as determinants of election participation among young adult filipinos. *Social Sciences, Humanities and Education Journal (SHE Journal)*, 3(2), 185 – 199. DOI: 10.25273/she.v3i2.12684.



Published by Universitas PGRI Madiun. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

INTRODUCTION

Election participation background and importance

The internet and social media offer several advantages and possibilities for the younger generation to empower themselves differently. In today's era, social media has become an essential aspect of people's lives as it is a significant factor in engaging people and building connections (Coyle, 2018). The youth can retain social ties and relationships that they would not have been able to sustain otherwise. They have access to more knowledge compared to the previous generations.

In the context of voting, election, and politics, most of the studies found are qualitative and focused only on campaigning methods, voters' behavior, and voting patterns. Researchers in this field studied the visible effects of using social media as a platform for candidates; they also hinged on studying the behavior itself and not its reason (Aslan et al., 2021). With that said, when considering societal and behavioral variations, the impact of the environment should become more prominent. Nowadays, the internet, digital technology, and mobile gadgets are altering the face of human behavior in many cultures (Dentzel, 2014).

According to Iyengar et al. (2000), voters essentially use the information to have an idea to determine which candidate they will opt for. Since different people, particularly teenagers, have different values, beliefs, and advocacies, this could lead to choosing the candidates that best fit their interests; however,

not much attention has been given to this aspect. Political content evident in social media platforms helps disseminate information that is accessed by present-day voters (Schauer, 2018). Using social media outlets, which are inexpensive and accessible to anybody with internet access, political newcomers can significantly increase politics (Petrova and Sen, 2016). The result is significant because it demonstrates how social media may increase competition in politics, where accessibility to official communication channels and money are significant hurdles to newcomers.

Other studies supporting this discovery also went further to analyze and determine the characteristics of voters who use social media, the behavior of politicians, strategies, and the connection formed by both parties through the instant two-way communication available. According to Pablo et al. (2014), people are more motivated and encouraged to vote with candidates they engage with. Bruns et al. (2002) also found out about the effect of popularity in social media on the voters' decisions through quantitative research. Researchers such as Ratkiewicz et al. (2011) found out that there are harms evident in the strategies utilized by candidates who manifest as a form of deception.

With the current advantages and progression of the internet, specifically as a platform for social media campaigning, many Filipino voters use this to their advantage when it comes to political information (Nott, 2020). Thus, there is a need to explore voting behaviors

and their relationship with social media campaigning.

Factors

Social media has been a huge platform for campaigning, especially when it comes to election season. According to Stier (2018), politicians mostly replicate their campaign messages from traditional platforms to modern social media platforms and limit their engagement with their audience while also tailoring toward the preference of the voters online. According to the multivariate regression models of Nielsen and Vaccari (2013), most political candidates can only reach a small number of people, because most of the users who engage with their platforms are already interested in them, to begin with.

On social media platforms, politicians are exposed to different demographics and political interests, therefore they have to market and campaign their strategies in a way that would reach their target audience (Stier et al., 2018). The politicians themselves rarely use direct humor, but the campaign teams distributed humorous posts through different platforms (Chernobrov, 2021).

The social media campaign factors such as the platform used by candidates, the agenda of their campaign, and the values they try to portray on social media play a significant role in the behavior of young adults in terms of voting (Ahmad et al., 2019).

According to Hall (2019), an existing problem among young voters is their lack of participation in voting. However, the research they conducted landed on a conclusion

that social media may be one of the ways voting turnout among young individuals may be changed. This leads to politicians having to find a way to persuade young adults through social media platforms.

According to Kusama (2020), social media contributes to communication and connection through the instant exchange of knowledge and interaction. Another factor to consider is the fact that humans are social creatures and that it is inherent to them to be incentivized by other people. According to Aslan (et al., 2021), social media is essential since it provides recognition among individuals giving them an opportunity for their messages to be amplified and conveyed to others. This gives political figures and parties a chance to manipulate the outcome of elections in their favor. However, in this research, it was also found that the participation of individuals in the discourse on social media often increases their interest in politics. Elder (2020), also states that people are more willing to participate in social media discourse compared to in-person discourse.

It can be concluded that most of the time people prefer to engage with content that piques their interest and thirst for something controversial and entertaining.

Objective and Significance

The study analyzed the voting behavior of young adults in relation to their sociodemographic factors and the social media campaign factors on the leading social media platforms (Youtube, Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, Tiktok, and Pinterest) of the presidential candidates. Moreover, it

determined the participation of young adults when it comes to crucial, social responsibilities such as voting. Their preferences among the groups and affiliations of the candidates are also looked in. Determining the relationship between social media campaign factors, and the sociodemographic characteristics and voting behaviors of young adults will shed light on the importance of social media participation in relation to social responsibility in voting.

METHODS

Research design, Ethical Considerations, and Population

This quantitative study determined the voting behavior and its relationship with sociodemographic factors and the social media campaign factors among young adults. In doing so, this study utilized a cross-sectional design to determine the relationship between these variables. An online survey questionnaire was used to collect the data among young adult students.

Moreover, prior to any study procedure, institutional ethical approval was secured. Once approved, only then did the study commence. The participants were informed about its aim, purpose, and procedures. They were not coerced nor unduly influenced to participate. Moreover, it was emphasized to the respondents that they are free to refuse or stop the survey at any time without repercussion/sanction. Moreover, informed consent was secured before the administration of the questionnaires. Once with informed consent, only then shall the respondents complete the

questionnaire. To protect the privacy and confidentiality of the respondents, it was stored in a password-protected laptop owned by the investigators. Once all questionnaire data were encoded, the Google Forms survey will be closed from receiving responses. The data, however, was kept for five (5) years after the presentation of the study, as there may be instances where the researchers might need the data. Moreover, numerical codes were used in lieu of identifying data. Finally, no part of any subsequent publication from this study was used the individual identifying data of the respondents.

This study involved 167 Filipino young adults. In particular, this study recruited Filipino nationals who are 18 years old to 24 years old and residing in the Philippines. This study did not include individuals who are above the age of 24, currently living abroad, or non-Filipino nationals living in the country. Eligible individuals were initially recruited from the investigators' social network. It utilized a non-probability convenience sampling in which the participants in the sample group are chosen whenever it is convenient for the researchers as it is an easy way to recruit sources for the primary data of the study (Edgar & Manz, 2017). Additionally, the link to the online survey questionnaire was posted in social media groups for young adult Filipinos.

Data Collection and Measures

This study utilized an online survey questionnaire consisting of three sections. These sections are composed of questions focused on sociodemographic factors, social

media campaign factors, and voting behavior.

The first section focused on the voting behaviors of young adults and it also included the sociodemographic factors of the participants. It included questions regarding their age, sex, sexual orientation, educational attainment, religion, household income, and place of residence. Age was measured in years. Sex referred to an individual's sex at birth which was measured by noting whether they are male, female, or others. The participant was also asked to indicate their sexual orientation by noting how they identify themselves and to whom they are attracted. Educational attainment referred to the highest level of education that the participant has completed according to the classification of the Philippine Statistics Authority (PSA). Religion referred to which worship/belief the participant subscribes to. Household income was measured based on the Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS) classification referring to which income group an individual fall into. The household income groups used for this study were also from the Philippine Institute for Development Studies. Lastly, place of residence referred to where the participant currently resides in terms of regions in the Philippines.

The second section focused on the social media campaign factors utilized by the candidates to the audience. This included the type of platform on which the candidates' campaign, their agenda, the values that they portray, misconduct, and coalition formation. The type of platform referred to the online platform where the voters usually see the political parties promoting or

campaigning for themselves. Agenda was measured by listing general agendas that may be the goal of the political parties based on their projects and asking the participants which among the agendas they value the most. The misconduct was measured by the frequency of the politicians' actions online.

The third section focused on voting behavior in the Filipino context. Participation was measured by asking their intent to vote or not to vote in elections. Preferences referred to the participant's preferences among groups based on their social media platform characteristics. This was done by listing the parties and asking the participants which among the list they consider when voting.

Initially, possible participants were invited through online messaging applications such as Facebook Messenger or Telegram. The researchers informed them of the aim, risk, benefits, and needs of the study for participants. They were asked to encourage other individuals from their social network who fit the inclusion criteria to participate. After accommodating the invitation, they were thanked for their participation. When they agreed to participate in the study, a link to the online survey questionnaire was sent.

The participant went to the informed consent form which contained information regarding the study's risk, benefit, aim, and confidentiality of their information and the study. Afterward, they answered the online questionnaire starting from the section regarding the sociodemographic factors to the questions regarding voting behavior. Participants were recruited for at least one month. The questionnaire

was regularly checked if enough participants have been recruited for this study. Likewise, possible participants were regularly encouraged to participate. After collecting all the necessary data, the link to the online questionnaire was closed and all the collected data were encoded in Microsoft Excel.

Data Analysis

The data analysis was done using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Categorical data were summarized using frequencies and percentages. On the other hand, continuous data were summarized using mean and standard deviation. Afterward, social media campaign factors and sociodemographic characteristics were used as predictors in a logistic regression model to determine the factors affecting political participation among the participants. Initially, the significance of the regression model was noted using the chi-square score. Likewise, the index of determination of the models was analyzed to determine the amount of variation accounted for by the model on political participation. Then, the odds ratio and p-values of each predictor were analyzed to determine its effect on the different voting behaviors. A p-value of $<.05$ will be considered significant in this study.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Sociodemographic characteristics, social media use, political agenda, Filipino values, social media interaction, and election participation of the respondents

Table 1 showed that the average age of the respondents was

18.34 (SD=.91). Majority of the participants were females (n=117, 58.5%), heterosexual individuals (n=145, 72.5%), senior high school graduates (n=148, 74.0%), and had catholic religion (n=168, 84.0%). More than half of the respondents reported a monthly household income of 43,828 or above. Thus, most of them came from the middle to the upper economic class.

Based on the average hour of daily use, the most used social media was YouTube (3.30hour, SD=3.22) while the least used social media was Pinterest (.50 hours, SD=.75).

The top three agendas that were important to the respondents were education (mean=4.87, SD=0.35), poverty and social welfare (mean=4.88, SD=0.40), and health (mean=4.92, SD=0.34). Contrastingly, the least important agenda for the respondents were tourism (mean=4.04, SD=0.87), public works and highways (mean=4.21, SD=0.84), and drug abuse (mean=4.32, SD=0.79).

The respondents also reported higher-good interactions with other voters (mean=3.24, SD=1.08) than bad interactions (mean=2.07, SD=1.41). Likewise, they also reported higher-good interaction with election candidates (mean=2.53, SD=1.52) than bad interaction (mean=1.64, SD=1.46). They also reported seeing election candidate misconduct (mean=3.85, SD=1.12) and political party posts (mean=4.15, SD=1.13). Moreover, one out of eight respondents also reported that they will participate in the next election (n=167, 83.50%).

TABLE 1. Descriptive statistics of sociodemographic characteristics, social media use, political agenda, social media

interaction, and election participation among the respondents (n=200)

Sociodemographic characteristics	Mean/Frequency	SD/%
Age	18.34	0.91
Sex		
male	83	41.50
female	117	58.50
Sexual orientation		
heterosexual	145	72.50
LGBTQ+	55	27.50
Highest educational attainment		
Primary education	3	1.50
Junior high school	30	15.00
Senior high school	148	74.00
Bachelor's degree	18	9.00
Master's level	1	0.50
Religion		
Catholic	168	84.00
Non catholic	32	16.00
Household income		
less than PhP 10,967	14	7.00
between PhP 10,957 to PhP 21,914	16	8.00
between PhP 21,914 to PhP 43,828	35	17.50
between PhP 43,828 to PhP 76,699	36	18.00
between PhP 76,699 to PhP 131,484	48	24.00
between PhP 131,483 to PhP 219,140	23	11.50
at least PhP 219,140	28	14.00
Social media use		

Facebook	2.22	2.09
Twitter	2.28	2.75
Instagram	1.87	1.78
Youtube	3.30	3.22
TikTok	2.34	2.77
Pinterest	0.50	0.75
Agenda		
Agriculture	4.57	0.60
Corruption	4.81	0.46
Drug Abuse	4.32	0.79
Economics	4.61	0.60
Education	4.87	0.35
Employment	4.80	0.46
Energy Sector	4.34	0.73
Environment	4.77	0.47
Health	4.92	0.34
Foreign Policy	4.38	0.70
ICT	4.41	0.72
Law and Order	4.74	0.58
Poverty and Social Welfare	4.88	0.40
Public Works and Highway	4.21	0.84
Science and Technology	4.54	0.66
Tourism	4.04	0.87
Transportation	4.62	0.60
Social media political interaction		
Good interaction with other voters	3.24	1.08
Bad interaction with other voters	2.07	1.41
Good interaction with election candidate	2.53	1.52
Bad interaction with election candidate	1.64	1.46
Political party post	4.15	1.13
Election participation		
Election participation	167	83.50

Regression model summaries

This study utilized a regression model with election participation as the dependent variable while sociodemographic characteristics, social media use, political agenda, and social media interaction were used as predictors. Table 2 showed that the model predictors had collective significance in determining the variation of election participation, $\chi^2(34)=49.722, p <.04$). The R square of the model can also be used to determine the variance accounted for by the model predictors. In this regard, this model showed an R square of 0.220 to 0.372. Given these, it can be assumed that the variation accounted for by the model used to determine the odds of election participation among the respondent was 22.0% to 37.2%.

TABLE 2. Model summary

Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square	Chi-square	Sig.
0.220	0.372	49.722	0.04

Association of election participation with sociodemographic characteristics, social media use, political agenda, and social media interaction among the respondents

This study found that election participation had no significant association with the sociodemographic characteristics. Among the social media applications that may influence behavior, it was found that those who had higher use of TikTok may have higher odds of election participation (OR=1.455, 95%CI [1.079, 1.962], p .014). On the other hand, the findings revealed that respondents who found that

agriculture (OR=0.287, 95%CI [.0083, 0.99], p .049), education (OR=0.523, 95%CI 0.086, 3.162], p .048), and law and order (OR=0.161, 95%CI [0.037, 0.706,], p .015) as important political agenda had lower odds of election participation.

In terms of social media interaction, it seemed that interactions with other voters whether good or bad did not affect election participation among the respondents (p >.05). Contrastingly, seeing political party post increase the odds of election participation by almost twice (OR=1.732, 95%CI [1.093, 2.744] p .019) while those who had a higher bad interaction with political candidates had lower odds of political participation (OR=0.523, 95%CI [0.282, 0.968], p .039).

TABLE 3. Association of election participation with sociodemographic characteristics, social media use, political agenda, and social media interaction among the respondents

	OR	Sig.
Socio-demographic characteristics		
Age	0.812	0.626
Sex		
male	Referent	
female	0.999	0.998
Sexual orientation		
heterosexual cisgender	Referent	
LGBTQ+	2.267	0.191
Highest educational	1.23	0.531

attainment		
Religion		
Catholic	Referent	
Non catholic	4.007	0.169
Household income	1.22	0.262
Social media use		
Facebook	0.902	0.459
Twitter	1.174	0.265
Instagram	1.249	0.325
Youtube	0.94	0.401
TikTok	1.455*	0.014
Pinterest	0.847	0.663
Agenda		
Agriculture	0.287*	0.048
Corruption	2.478	0.177
Drug Abuse	0.496	0.119
Economics	2.308	0.161
Education	0.523*	0.48
Employment	1.327	0.643
Energy Sector	2.215	0.167
Environment	3.288	0.086
Health	1.873	0.482
Foreign Policy	0.78	0.666
ICT	0.669	0.500
Law and Order	0.161*	0.015
Poverty and Social Welfare	1.688	0.525
Public Works and Highway	1.023	0.964
Science and Technology	0.958	0.935

Tourism	0.733	0.429
Transportation	1.74	0.304
Social media political interaction		
Good interaction with other voters	1.084	0.768
Bad interaction with other voters	1.489	0.088
Good interaction with candidates	1.26	0.350
Bad interaction with candidates	0.523*	0.039
Political party post	1.732*	0.019

Discussion

This study found that sociodemographic factors have no association with the odds of political participation. This lack of association suggests that the election is of concern to all young adults who are eligible to vote regardless of age, sex, educational attainment, religion, household income, and place of residence (McClendon, 2017).

TikTok may influence the political participation of young adults. This may be because its video content is short, easy to comprehend, and highly immersive, with its main aim to capture the attention of users for as long as possible. Likewise, it is easier for the users to get information immediately (Montag, 2021). Nowadays, scholars and political observers in Southeast Asia are concerned about public opinions circulating on social media as three

countries — the Philippines, Malaysia, and Indonesia — prepare for elections (Jalli, 2022). As the most popular app in Southeast Asia, TikTok might now be used as a new strategic instrument by propagandists to promote a media narrative during the election period (Jalli, 2022). This may be because TikTok has special qualities that allow propaganda to reach a wider audience, as its content-sharing methodology is different compared to its predecessors, focusing on the substance rather than the number of followers. According to Cervi et al., (2021), it is often used to promote particularly, in political matters due to its effectiveness in enticing users through entertainment and emotional appeal. With the political nature of TikTok in mind, this further supports our finding that the more time people spend on it, the more likely they are to participate in the election. For the upcoming 2022 Presidential elections, TikTok has partnered with the Commission on Elections (COMELEC) to provide reliable and easy information with the goal of educating voters and advocating voter participation (Malasig, 2021).

The findings also suggest that there is a relationship between political participation and interactions with political parties among young adult Filipinos. Those with bad interactions showed lower odds of political participation. Cantoni & Pons (2020) previously found that direct connection and interaction between candidates and inactive voters did not result in any major impacts. However, with effort, these interactions significantly increased the number of votes they received from active voters. Thus, this

implies that voters take the efforts that the candidates show into consideration when they are persuaded to vote for them. These efforts included door-to-door visits of candidates on the doorsteps of voters' homes. Voters were then swayed due to the devotion shown in these actions which are clear positive interactions.

Moreover, younger generations are less interested in agriculture due to the sector being underappreciated, decreasing contribution to the GPD of the country, and migration of young workers from the Philippines (Asis, 2020). In education, on the other hand, older people are more likely to participate in elections rather than younger people with high educational attainment (Democratic Audit, 2010). In terms of law and order, Edre Olalia (President of NUPL) claims that there is something wrong with the country's justice system, which does not help the comfort of the public in having confidence in law and order (Añago, 2021). In terms of education, according to a study conducted in Cebu, Philippines, Cebuano voters who were high school and college graduates require more from political candidates and have higher standards in comparison to those who were vocational and elementary graduates (Ereno & Langoyan, 2016). Thus, it is suggested that these agendas are not given much attention nor make young adult voters interested as they have stringent standards, underappreciated fields, and a lack of trust in these political agendas. Hence, political agendas such as agriculture, education, and law and order have lower odds of affecting political participation.

CONCLUSION

Overall, this study showed that there is no correlation between the sociodemographic factors of the participants and their election participation. As for social media use, young adults who had high usage of Tiktok were more likely to participate in the elections. The same goes for social media interactions with the candidates wherein good interactions results in higher odds of participation and vice versa. Therefore, it can be taken from the study that social media campaigning affects the participation of the voters. It suggests that using TikTok for political purposes is rampant as it now plays a role in the election campaigns of various candidates.

Limitations

Since the population pool for the online questionnaire survey was narrowed down by convenience sampling, the results had limited generalizability. There might also be a selection bias because the sample is not completely randomized. Since there were a limited number of participants and the study utilized convenience sampling, the findings may not be generalizable to the general population. Since the questionnaire was also uploaded through online forms, the study was not able to represent those who do not have online access since the survey questionnaire can only be accessed online.

Recommendations

This research could be further expounded upon by filling in the numerous gaps present in this study. First is the information regarding

location of voters, which could have been potentially utilized to explore the relationship between the surroundings of voters and their behaviors and opinions. The environment of the individual and the people around them, and expectations can posit pressure on people to do a certain behavior and participate in important decision-making (Rogers et al., 2017). Second is the potential extension of the research regarding why these respondents choose to believe the information that are presented to them on social media. This could be explored by asking comprehensive questions about whether the principles and political beliefs of the respondent's family or peers had an effect on their political stance and political participation. This is an important facet to consider because the identity of a political party that their parents support is generally of interest to children and young adults and their identity will be a part of the child's life for the rest of their life (Turan & Tiras, 2017). Lastly, another possible research focus related to this study, could be on the importance of the relationship between social media participation and the social responsibility of individuals in voting. According to Hruska & Maresova (2020), the rise of social media usage opens a lot of opportunities for communication and interaction yet, it also opens opportunities for exploring patterns within it. This could imply that there is a clear influence present on social media platforms. However, there must also be additional analysis on how the influence present exists and how it is able to impact individuals. This focus could aim to answer the question on

whether these potential impacts provide positive or negative effects on the voting behavior or electoral participation of individuals. Furthermore, exploring this topic or research can also be further utilized to shed light on the matters of impacts of technology on the political environment.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, T., Alvi, A., & Ittefaq, M. (2019). The Use of Social Media on Political Participation Among University Students: An Analysis of Survey Results From Rural Pakistan. *SAGE Open*, 9(3), 215824401986448. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019864484>
- Akee, R., Copeland, W., Costello, E. J., Holbein, J. B., & Simeonova, E. (2018, June 1). *Family Income and the Intergenerational Transmission of Voting Behavior: Evidence from an Income Intervention*. National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://www.nber.org/papers/w24770>
- Alibudbud, R. (2022). Googling depression and major depressive disorder after mental health legislation and during the COVID-19 pandemic in the Philippines: An infodemiological study. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, 72, 103093. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2022.103093>
- Añago, B. (2021, October 14). *Philippine rule of law remains one of Asia's weakest*. BusinessWorld Online. <https://www.bworldonline.com/top-stories/2021/10/15/403771/philippine-rule-of-law-remains-one-of-asias-weakest/>
- Asis, M. (2020, March 16). *Sowing Hope: Agriculture as an Alternative to Migration for Young Filipinos? The Future of Work: Labor Migrants in the 21st Century*. <https://www.icmc.net/future-of-work/report/06-philippines/>
- Aslan, A., Bekiroğlu, O., & Karakoç, E. (2021). The Effect of Social Media on Voter Behavior: The Sample of Kayseri Province. 3. *SEKTÖR SOSYAL EKONOMİ DERGİSİ*. <https://doi.org/10.15659/3.sektor-sosyal-ekonomi.21.05.1583>
- Ben-Bassat, A., & Dahan, M. (2010). Social identity and voting behavior. *Public Choice*, 151(1-2), 193-214. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11127-010-9742-2>
- Bocar, A. C., Pasok, P. C., Perez, N. C., & Guangco, L. L. (2013). Voters' Participation to the Election Activities on October 29, 2007 in the Selected Urban Communities in Ozamiz City, Philippines. *IAMURE International Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.7718/ijss.v5i1.395>
- Cantoni, E., & Pons, V. (2020). Do Interactions with Candidates Increase Voter Support and Participation? *Experimental*

- Evidence from Italy. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.
<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3637734>
- Cervi, L., Tejedor, S., & Marín Lladó, C. (2021). Tiktok and the new language of political communication. *Cultura, Lengua Y Representación*, 26, 267-287.
 doi:10.6035/clr.5817
- Chernobrov, D. (2021). Strategic humour: Public diplomacy and comic framing of foreign policy issues. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 24(2).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/136914812111023958>
- Croke, K., Grossman, G., Larreguy, H. A., & Marshall, J. (2016). Deliberate Disengagement: How Education Can Decrease Political Participation in Electoral Authoritarian Regimes. *American Political Science Review*, 110(3), 579-600.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0003055416000253>
- Dentzel, Z. (2014). *How the Internet Has Changed Everyday Life*. OpenMind.
<https://www.bbvaopenmind.com/en/articles/internet-changed-everyday-life/>
- Edgar, T. W., & Manz, D. O. (2017). Convenience sampling. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/computer-science/convenience-sampling>
- Elder, A. (2019). The interpersonal is political: unfriending to promote civic discourse on social media. *Ethics and Information Technology*.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-019-09511-4>
- Dommett, K., & Temple, L. (2018). Digital Campaigning: The rise of facebook and satellite campaigns. *Parliamentary Affairs*, 71(Suppl_1), 189-202.
 doi:10.1093/pa/gsx056
- Ereno, N., & Langoyan, J. (2016). *A Psychographics Study on the Voting Behavior of the Cebuano Electorate*. Manuscript submitted for publication, Session 5-2: Factoring Governance Statistics in Sustainable Development, 13th National Convention on Statistics.
- Fernández-Prados, J. S., Lozano-Díaz, A., & Ainz-Galende, A. (2021). Measuring Digital Citizenship: A Comparative Analysis. *Informatics*, 8(1), 18.
 doi:10.3390/informatics8010018
- Grzanka, P. R., Zeiders, K. H., Spengler, E. S., Hoyt, L. T., & Toomey, R. B. (2020). Do beliefs about sexual orientation predict voting behavior? Results from the 2016 U.S. presidential election. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 7(3), 241-252.
 doi:10.1037/sgd0000434
- Hall, H. (2019). Voting behavior among young adults: An analysis of youth voters and how behavioral economic concepts can be applied to increase young voter turnout.

- https://digitalcommons.pace.edu/honorscollege_theses/256
- Hernandez, Y. (2019). "The Technology Gap Across Generations: How Social Media Affects the Youth Vote," *Political Analysis*: Vol. 20 , Article 1.
- Hruska, J., & Maresova, P. (2020). Use of social media platforms among adults in the United States—behavior on social media. *Societies*, 10(1), 27. doi:10.3390/soc10010027
- Jalli, N. (2022, March 25). *TikTok is propagandists' new tool to win elections in Southeast Asia*. BusinessWorld Online. <https://www.bworldonline.com/world/2022/03/25/438207/tiktok-is-propagandists-new-tool-to-win-elections-in-southeast-asia/>
- Kusuma, A. (2019). Impact of Social Media on Youth. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3506607>
- Malasig, J. (2021, September 16). *From dare to partnership: TikTok teams up with Comelec for reliable info dissemination on 2022 elections*. Interaksyon. <https://interaksyon.philstar.com/trends-spotlights/2021/09/16/200321/tiktok-teams-up-with-comelec-reliable-info-dissemination-on-2022-elections/>
- McClendon, G., & Sherraden, M. (2017, October 25). Inclusive Participation in Voting: Evidence and Engagement to Strengthen Democracy. <https://cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/sites.wustl.edu/dist/a/1278/files/2016/05/Concept-Note.pdf>
- Montag, C., Yang, H., & Elhai, J. D. (2021). On the Psychology of TikTok Use: A First Glimpse From Empirical Findings. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 9(641673). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2021.641673>
- Nielsen, R. K., & Vaccari, C. (2011). Do People "Like" Candidates on Facebook? Not Really — From Direct to Indirect and Institutional Effects of Social Media in Politics. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 7(24). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2274082>
- Nott, L. (2020, June 26). Political Advertising on Social Media Platforms. www.americanbar.org. https://www.americanbar.org/groups/crsj/publications/human_rights_magazine_home/voting-in-2020/political-advertising-on-social-media-platforms/
- Office of the Ombudsman. (2014). *Book on Psychographics Study: UNDP*. UNDP Book on Psychographics Study Comments. <https://www.ombudsman.gov.ph/UNDP4/book-on-psychographics-study/index.html>
- Pablo, Z. C., Oco, N., Roldan, M. D., Cheng, C., & Roxas, R. E. (2014). Toward an enriched understanding of factors influencing Filipino behavior

- during elections through the analysis of Twitter data. *Philippine Political Science Journal*, 35(2), 203-224. doi:10.1080/01154451.2014.964794
- Philippines: Most-used social media platforms 2021. (2022, March 23). <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1127983/philippines-leading-social-media-platforms/>.
- Rogers, T., Green, D. P., Ternovski, J., & Ferreros Young, C. (2017). Social pressure and voting: A Field Experiment conducted in a high-salience election [Abstract]. *Electoral Studies*, 46, 87-100. doi:10.1016/j.electstud.2017.02.004
- Stier, S., Bleier, A., Lietz, H., & Strohmaier, M. (2018). Election campaigning on social media: Politicians, audiences, and the mediation of political communication on Facebook and Twitter. *Political Communication*, 35(1), 50-74. doi:10.1080/10584609.2017.1334728
- Turan, E., & Tıraş, Ö. (2017). Family's Impact on Individual's Political Attitude and Behaviors. *International Journal of Psycho-Educational Sciences*, 6. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1254813.pdf>
- Velmonte, G. L. (2020). Voters Practices in the Philippine Election [Abstract]. *Electronic Research Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, 2.
- Vonbun-Feldbauer, R., & Matthes, J. (2017). Do channels matter? *Journalism Studies*, 19(16),
- World Health Organization: WHO. (2019). *Adolescent health*. Who.int; World Health Organization: WHO. <https://www.who.int/southeastasia/health-topics/adolescent-health>
- Yildirim, P. (2020, August 17). How Social Media Is Shaping Political Campaigns. *Knowledge at Wharton*. <https://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article/how-social-media-is-shaping-political-campaigns>