



International Journal of Sociology Civics Research

The Role of Social Media in Shaping Civic Engagement among Urban Youth

Dr. Anjali A Rao

Department of Sociology, University of Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

* Corresponding Author: **Dr. Anjali A Rao**

Article Info

ISSN (Online): 3107-6637

Volume: 01

Issue: 05

September - October 2025

Received: 03-07-2025

Accepted: 04-08-2025

Published: 01-09-2025

Page No: 01-02

Abstract

Social media platforms are increasingly central to the political socialization and civic engagement of urban youth worldwide. This article systematically reviews contemporary literature to examine how digital connectivity influences youth participation in civic life, including activism, public discourse, and community involvement. The review highlights the capacity of social media to amplify youth voices, enhance political awareness, and facilitate mobilization around social issues. However, it also critically assesses challenges such as misinformation, polarization, and digital divides. Findings suggest social media is a powerful, though complex, catalyst for contemporary urban youth civic engagement, with implications for democratic participation and policy-making.

Keywords: Misinformation, Polarization, and Digital Divide

1. Introduction

Civic engagement, broadly defined as individual and collective actions to address issues of public concern, remains a cornerstone of democratic societies. The advent of social media has transformed traditional pathways to civic involvement, especially among youth populations in urban settings who are often early adopters of digital technologies. Urban youth leverage social media platforms such as Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, and TikTok not only as social spaces but also as arenas for political discourse, campaign organization, and social advocacy.

This paper aims to synthesize existing empirical and theoretical work on social media's role in shaping civic engagement among urban youth, focusing on mechanisms of influence, patterns of participation, and the broader societal impact.

Methodology

A systematic literature review approach was adopted, searching databases including JSTOR, SagePub, ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar for peer-reviewed articles, reports, and theses published between 2015 and 2025. Keywords included "social media," "civic engagement," "urban youth," "political socialization," and "digital activism." Selected sources were filtered for relevance, focusing on urban contexts and youth aged 15–30 years.

Social Media Use among Urban Youth

Urban youth exhibit high levels of social media engagement, with platforms such as Instagram and TikTok dominating. Digital literacy and mobile device penetration facilitate widespread and continuous access. Social media functions as an information resource, communication channel, and mobilization tool.

Patterns of Use and Civic Participation

Research shows that youth use social media for diverse civic activities, including:

- Sharing political content and opinions
 - Organizing protests and community projects
-

- Participating in online petitions and fundraising
- Engaging in dialogues on governance and social justice
- Disseminating news and fact-checking information

These activities manifest online as well as translate into offline behaviors such as volunteering and attending protests, blurring the digital-physical divide in civic participation.

Impact of Social Media on Political Awareness and Engagement

Enhancing Political Interest and Knowledge

Social media platforms increase exposure to political content, thereby elevating political interest and awareness among youth who might otherwise be disengaged through traditional media or formal education systems.

Facilitating Youth Mobilization

Instant, low-cost communication allows rapid organization of civic events and amplifies grassroots movements. The mobilization capacity extends particularly to marginalized youth groups who often lack access to mainstream political structures.

Democratizing Access and Expression

Social media reduces barriers related to socioeconomic status and geography, offering more equitable access to political discourse. Youth can form virtual communities fostering solidarity and collective action.

Challenges and Limitations

Misinformation and Polarization

The spread of false or biased information can distort public perceptions and exacerbate societal divisions among youth demographics.

Digital Divide

Despite increased accessibility, disparities in digital skills, connectivity, and platform use persist, limiting the inclusive potential of social media civic engagement.

Surveillance and Censorship

In some urban contexts, social media activism faces governmental restrictions and surveillance, constraining youth participation.

Case Studies and Examples

- The use of Twitter and Instagram during youth-led protests in global cities has demonstrated the effective role of social media in civic mobilization.
- TikTok's unique format has engaged younger demographics in social justice campaigns, making complex issues accessible and shareable.

Implications for Policy and Practice

To harness social media's full potential for civic engagement, recommendations include:

- Integrating digital literacy and civic education in urban youth programs
- Promoting platform transparency and combating misinformation
- Supporting youth-led digital advocacy initiatives
- Investing in equitable internet access and affordable technology

Conclusion

Social media is a powerful agent shaping civic engagement among urban youth by fostering political awareness, facilitating mobilization, and democratizing access to public discourse. While challenges of misinformation, polarization, and digital inequality remain, strategic approaches can optimize these tools for strengthening democratic participation and social cohesion in fast-evolving urban landscapes.

References

1. Oden A. The kids are online: teen social media use, civic engagement, and political polarization. *Social Media Soc.* 2023;9(3):20563051231186364.
2. Saud M. Cultural dynamics of digital space: democracy, civic engagement, and youth participation. *Int J Commun.* 2023;17:1529.
3. Goli M, Shao L. Impact of social media usage on civic engagement towards societal problems: qualitative modeling approach. *JNDDS.* 2022;11:121215.
4. Plan International. Urban research series: civic engagement and social capital among urban youth in Sub-Saharan Africa. 2024 Jan 8.
5. Mainsah H. Social media, design and civic engagement by youth. In: *Proceedings of Media Studies Conference.* ACM. 2012;1:2347635.
6. Micheli M. Socioeconomic status and digital access: bridging the divide in youth political participation. *Youth Soc.* 2016;48(7):853-877.
7. Krueger B. Internet use and political participation: theory and evidence. *Political Anal.* 2002;10(4):381-401.
8. Anduiza E, Cantijoch M. The role of Internet in civic participation among youth. *J Inf Technol Polit.* 2010;7(1):44-60.
9. Best P, Krueger B. Social media and political engagement: youth digital involvement. *New Media Soc.* 2005;7(5):831-855.
10. Quintelier E, Vissers S. Explaining political participation online and offline. *Acta Polit.* 2008;43(2):228-258.
11. Wang H, *et al.* Online political participation and social capital among youth: a cross-national study. *Int J Public Opin Res.* 2018;30(1):107-130.
12. Hill M. Black Twitter and political mobilization. *J Afr Am Stud.* 2018;22(4):393-407.
13. Peterson-Salahuddin Z. Digital counterpublics and youth civic engagement in social media. *J Contemp Ethnogr.* 2022;51(5):673-693.
14. Brady H, Verba S, Schlozman K. Resource model of political participation. *Am Polit Sci Rev.* 1995;89(2):271-294.
15. Micheli M. Digital divide and political participation: social inclusion through social media. *Commun Soc.* 2020;33(1):56-70.
16. Hermida A. Social media and citizen engagement in politics. *New Media Soc.* 2014;16(4):503-507.
17. Leston-Bandeira C. Digital democracy and youth participation. *Politics.* 2016;36(3):269-278.
18. Theocharis Y. The digital public sphere and youth mobilization. *Polit Commun.* 2015;32(4):563-583.