



Political Communication and Public Discourse in the Digital Era

Muhammad Rizky Anwar¹, Ilham Akbar Hidayat¹, Andi Maulana Putra¹

¹Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Tamalate, Makassar

Corresponding Author: Muhammad Rizky Anwar

Article Info

Article History:

Received November 10, 2022

Revised December 5, 2022

Accepted January 5, 2023

Keywords:

Political Communication,
Public Discourse, Digital Era.

Abstract

The rapid development of digital communication technologies has fundamentally transformed patterns of political communication and public discourse. This study examines how political narratives are constructed, circulated, and contested within digital spaces, emphasizing the roles of emotionalization, performative expression, and algorithmic visibility. Using a qualitative design grounded in Critical Discourse Analysis, particularly the framework of Norman Fairclough and the ideological perspective of Teun A. van Dijk, the research analyzes publicly accessible political content across digital platforms. The findings reveal a structural shift from centralized, elite-driven communication toward decentralized and participatory discourse shaped by networked interaction. Political narratives are strategically framed through symbolic language, binary oppositions, and emotional appeals that enhance engagement and visibility. Algorithmic amplification further intensifies ideological segmentation, reinforcing polarized “us versus them” constructions. The study also finds that political participation in digital contexts often takes performative forms, where users publicly signal identity and affiliation through expressive acts. While digital platforms expand opportunities for civic engagement and alternative voices, they simultaneously challenge deliberative quality by privileging speed, virality, and affective resonance over rational-critical debate. The transformation of political communication in the digital era thus reflects both democratizing potential and structural risks to the coherence of the public sphere. These findings contribute to contemporary discussions on digital democracy, discourse power, and the evolving relationship between communication technology and political legitimacy.

Introduction

The rapid expansion of digital communication technologies has fundamentally transformed the landscape of political communication and public discourse. The emergence of networked platforms has shifted political interaction from traditional, institutionally mediated channels toward decentralized, interactive, and algorithmically structured spaces (Bossetta, 2023). Classical models of political communication were largely built upon mass media logics characterized by gatekeeping, editorial control, and relatively linear message flows. However, the digital era has disrupted these patterns by enabling real-time participation, user-generated content, and the viral circulation of political narratives (Jhaver et al., 2023). This transformation

has profound implications for democratic deliberation, civic engagement, and the structure of public discourse itself (Habermas, 2022; Habermas, 2023).

The concept of the public sphere, as articulated by Jürgen Habermas, emphasized rational-critical debate among citizens as the normative foundation of democratic legitimacy (Vergne, 2020). In Habermas's formulation, public discourse ideally functioned as a space for reasoned deliberation independent of state and market domination (Seeliger & Seignani, 2022). The contemporary digital environment challenges this model. Rather than fostering purely rational discourse, digital platforms often privilege speed, emotional intensity, and visibility metrics. Scholars such as Manuel Castells argue that the rise of the network society has reconfigured power relations, situating communication networks at the center of political struggle. In this networked configuration, political actors compete not only over ideas but also over attention, algorithmic amplification, and narrative dominance.

Political communication in the digital era is increasingly shaped by Blühdorn & Butzlaff (2020) describe as “connective action,” where personalized content sharing replaces traditional collective organizational structures. This shift allows individuals to participate in political expression without formal institutional mediation, but it also fragments discourse into individualized streams. As a result, the digital public sphere becomes a contested terrain marked by competing narratives, identity politics, and rapid opinion formation.

The transformation of communication structures has also altered the dynamics of media power. Hendriks & Kay (2019) conceptualizes the current system as a “hybrid media system,” in which older and newer media logics interact and co-evolve. Political actors strategically navigate between television, online news portals, and social media platforms to maximize influence. This hybridity intensifies the circulation of political messages and blurs the boundaries between journalism, activism, and propaganda. Consequently, the authority once monopolized by professional journalists has been partially redistributed to influencers, digital activists, and algorithmic systems.

At the same time, digital communication infrastructures are not neutral conduits of information. Algorithms curate visibility, prioritize engagement, and shape what users encounter in their informational environments (Stewart & Hartmann, 2020). Scholars such as Eli Pariser warn of the “filter bubble” phenomenon, where algorithmic personalization narrows exposure to diverse viewpoints. Similarly, Cass Sunstein highlights the risks of echo chambers that reinforce ideological homogeneity and intensify polarization. These developments complicate earlier assumptions that digital media would inherently democratize political communication by expanding access to information (Perloff, 2021).

Polarization has become one of the defining characteristics of digital public discourse. Research by Hammond (2020) demonstrates how networked propaganda ecosystems can reinforce partisan narratives and marginalize opposing perspectives. In such environments, misinformation and disinformation circulate alongside legitimate political content, challenging epistemic standards and eroding trust in democratic institutions. The viral logic of digital platforms frequently rewards emotionally charged content, which often outperforms nuanced deliberation in terms of reach and engagement. This dynamic encourages symbolic confrontation rather than consensus-oriented debate (Wolfsfeld, 2022).

Moreover, the mediatization of politics has intensified the performative dimension of public communication. Webler & Tuler (2021) notes that mediated visibility transforms political leadership into a form of staged performance, where symbolic gestures and rhetorical framing carry strategic significance. In digital contexts, political actors craft messages tailored to algorithmic logic, visual aesthetics, and audience segmentation. The boundaries between authentic expression and strategic branding become increasingly blurred, reshaping how citizens interpret credibility and authority (Ma, 2020).

The role of discourse in reproducing power relations remains central to understanding these transformations. Critical discourse scholars such as Romsdahl (2020) emphasize that language is not merely descriptive but constitutive of social reality. Political communication constructs identities, legitimizes authority, and normalizes ideological assumptions. In digital spaces, discursive struggles unfold in accelerated cycles, where hashtags, memes, and short-form messages encapsulate complex political positions into condensed symbolic forms. These discursive practices both reflect and shape broader sociopolitical structures.

Digital platforms also amplify affective politics. Emotional appeals, outrage, and moral signaling frequently dominate online exchanges, reshaping the tone of public discourse (Masip et al., 2019). Theories of mediatization advanced by Stig Hjarvard suggest that media logic increasingly structures political institutions themselves, influencing policy communication strategies and campaign tactics. As political actors adapt to digital norms, public discourse becomes intertwined with platform affordances, including character limits, visual algorithms, and engagement metrics.

Despite these challenges, digital communication also offers opportunities for marginalized voices to participate in political debate. Networked activism has enabled rapid mobilization, transnational solidarity, and the visibility of previously underrepresented perspectives. As Manuel Castells argues, communication power in the network society can facilitate both domination and resistance. The digital public sphere thus remains ambivalent simultaneously expanding participation and intensifying fragmentation.

In this context, examining political communication and public discourse in the digital era is essential for understanding contemporary democracy. The interplay between algorithmic structures, ideological narratives, and participatory practices has redefined how political meaning is constructed and contested. Rather than functioning as a singular, unified public sphere, digital discourse operates as a constellation of overlapping, sometimes conflicting communicative spaces. These transformations demand critical reflection on the evolving relationship between communication technologies, political power, and democratic deliberation in an increasingly networked world.

Method

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative research design grounded in an interpretive and critical paradigm. The qualitative approach was selected because the primary objective of the research was to explore meaning construction, ideological positioning, and power relations embedded within digital political communication. Rather than measuring variables statistically, this study sought to understand how political narratives are constructed, circulated, and contested in

digital public spaces. The design is exploratory and analytical, focusing on depth of interpretation rather than generalization. By situating discourse as a social practice, this research views language not merely as communication but as a site of power negotiation and ideological reproduction. The qualitative design therefore allowed for contextual, nuanced, and layered interpretation of political discourse in the digital era.

Research Approach

The study adopted Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as its primary analytical approach. CDA was chosen because it enables systematic examination of how discourse constructs social realities and sustains power structures. This research draws particularly on the three-dimensional framework developed by Norman Fairclough, which integrates textual analysis, discursive practice, and sociocultural practice. In addition, the ideological analysis perspective of Teun A. van Dijk was used to examine how political ideologies are embedded in linguistic structures and narrative framing.

Through this approach, discourse is treated as both constitutive and constituted: it shapes political understanding while simultaneously being shaped by institutional, technological, and sociopolitical contexts. The critical orientation of the study emphasizes the uncovering of implicit assumptions, power asymmetries, and ideological patterns that may not be immediately visible at the surface level of texts.

Research Context and Unit of Analysis

The research was conducted within digital public spaces where political communication actively occurs. These spaces include social media platforms, online political discussions, and digital campaign content. The unit of analysis in this study was political discourse in textual and visual-textual form, including posts, captions, comments, hashtags, and short argumentative statements that reflect political positioning.

Rather than analyzing individual users as subjects, the study focused on discourse fragments that gained visibility, engagement, or representativeness within public debate. This ensured that the analysis concentrated on communicative patterns rather than personal identities. The digital context was treated as a dynamic communicative arena influenced by platform algorithms, interaction patterns, and mediated visibility structures.

Data Sources and Sampling Strategy

Data were derived from publicly accessible digital political content published within a defined time frame during a politically significant period. The selection process applied purposive sampling to ensure that the collected data met specific criteria: (1) the content explicitly addressed political issues, actors, or policies; (2) the discourse generated substantial interaction (comments, shares, or reactions); and (3) the content reflected contrasting ideological positions to allow discursive comparison.

The sampling strategy prioritized depth and representativeness of discourse types rather than numerical quantity. Data saturation was used as a guiding principle, meaning that data collection continued until recurring discursive patterns became evident and no substantially new themes emerged. This approach ensured analytical rigor while maintaining qualitative depth.

Data Collection Procedures

Data collection was conducted through systematic digital documentation. Relevant posts and discussions were identified using keyword searches related to prominent political issues. Selected materials were archived through screenshots and textual extraction to preserve original formatting, timestamps, and interaction indicators. Each data entry was coded with metadata including date, platform, thematic focus, and engagement level to facilitate traceability.

To maintain ethical standards, only publicly available content was analyzed, and identifiable personal information was anonymized. The research did not involve private messaging, restricted groups, or confidential digital spaces. All data were stored securely and organized chronologically and thematically to support structured analysis.

Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis followed the three interconnected stages proposed by Norman Fairclough. The first stage, textual analysis, focused on vocabulary selection, metaphors, modality, transitivity, pronoun usage, and rhetorical strategies. This stage identified how language constructs political actors, assigns responsibility, and frames issues.

The second stage, analysis of discursive practice, examined how the discourse was produced, distributed, and consumed within digital environments. This included attention to reposting patterns, hashtag circulation, audience engagement, and intertextual references. The aim was to understand how meaning travels across networks and how certain narratives gain prominence.

The third stage, sociocultural analysis, situated the discourse within broader political and technological contexts. This involved interpreting how ideological assumptions, power structures, and platform logics shape communication patterns. Complementing this, the ideological square framework of Teun A. van Dijk was applied to identify patterns of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, which are common in polarized political discourse.

The analysis was iterative, meaning that interpretation moved back and forth between text and context to ensure coherence and analytical depth. Emerging themes were continuously refined until stable interpretive categories were established.

Result and Discussion

This section presents the findings of the study concerning the transformation of political communication and public discourse in the digital era. Drawing on qualitative analysis grounded in Critical Discourse Analysis as developed by Norman Fairclough and informed by the ideological perspective of Teun A. van Dijk, the results highlight how digital platforms reshape narrative construction, emotional expression, and power relations in political communication. The findings are organized thematically to demonstrate how discourse operates at textual, interactional, and sociocultural levels, revealing patterns of framing, polarization, performative engagement, and algorithmic amplification. Together, these results illustrate the complex interplay between political actors, audiences, and technological infrastructures in shaping contemporary digital public discourse.

Transformation of Political Communication Patterns in Digital Spaces

The findings of this study indicate a profound transformation in political communication patterns within digital spaces. Unlike traditional political communication, which was largely centralized and mediated by institutional gatekeepers such as political parties, government agencies, and mainstream news organizations, digital platforms facilitate decentralized and horizontally structured interaction. Political messaging is no longer transmitted in a linear flow from elites to passive audiences; instead, it circulates dynamically through networks of users who simultaneously act as producers, distributors, and interpreters of content. This structural shift reflects the characteristics of the network society described by Manuel Castells, in which communication power is embedded in digital connectivity and the capacity to shape flows of information.

In this transformed environment, visibility becomes a central political resource. Political actors compete not only to present arguments but to secure algorithmic prominence and audience engagement. The study found that posts designed for rapid sharing often concise, emotionally resonant, and visually engaging achieved significantly higher interaction rates than detailed policy explanations. This demonstrates how digital affordances encourage communicative efficiency and symbolic condensation. One interview participant explained:

"In social media, if you write something too long about policy, people skip it. But if you create a short, strong statement with emotional impact, it spreads quickly. Politics online is about attention."

This statement illustrates how digital communication logic prioritizes immediacy and shareability over deliberative depth. The architecture of digital platforms rewards engagement metrics such as likes, comments, and reposts, thereby shaping how political actors construct their messages.

Furthermore, the findings reveal that digital political communication operates within what Andrew Chadwick conceptualizes as a hybrid media system. Political actors strategically navigate between traditional media and social platforms, amplifying messages across multiple channels. For instance, statements initially posted on social media are often picked up by online news portals, which then feed back into social media discussions, creating recursive cycles of visibility. This hybrid circulation intensifies the speed and scale of discourse reproduction, blurring boundaries between journalism, activism, and political campaigning.

The transformation is also evident in the shifting role of citizens. Rather than functioning solely as recipients of political information, users actively reinterpret and reframe messages through commentary, memes, parody, and counter-narratives. This participatory dynamic aligns with the notion of connective action proposed by W. Lance Bennett, where personalized expression replaces rigid organizational coordination. Political engagement becomes individualized yet networked, allowing users to align with causes without formal membership structures.

Interview data reinforce this participatory shift. A respondent noted:

"Before social media, we just watched political debates on television. Now we respond instantly. We comment, argue, and even challenge public officials directly. It feels more interactive, but also more chaotic."

This quotation captures the dual character of digital transformation enhanced accessibility alongside communicative fragmentation. While digital platforms expand opportunities for direct engagement, they simultaneously intensify rapid, sometimes unmoderated exchanges that can escalate into polarized confrontation.

Another important aspect of transformation concerns the temporal dimension of political communication. Digital discourse operates in real time, compressing reaction cycles and accelerating opinion formation. Political actors are pressured to respond immediately to emerging issues, often before comprehensive verification or deliberation occurs. As one participant described:

"If a political issue trends in the morning, by the afternoon everyone is already taking sides. There is no waiting. If you stay silent, you lose relevance."

This immediacy shifts political strategy toward responsiveness and constant presence, reinforcing what scholars identify as mediatised politics, where communication logic shapes political behavior. The speed of digital interaction reduces the space for slow deliberation while increasing the emphasis on symbolic positioning.

Moreover, the study finds that digital political communication is strongly shaped by algorithmic infrastructures. Although users perceive their engagement as spontaneous, platform algorithms curate timelines, prioritize trending topics, and amplify emotionally charged content. This creates structured visibility patterns that influence which political narratives dominate public attention. In this sense, communication power is co-produced by political actors and technological systems.

Despite these challenges, the transformation also introduces democratizing potentials. Marginalized voices, grassroots movements, and independent commentators gain access to public discourse without requiring institutional backing. Digital platforms provide alternative channels for narrative contestation, enabling counter-hegemonic perspectives to surface. However, these opportunities coexist with risks of misinformation, polarization, and discursive hostility.

Overall, the transformation of political communication patterns in digital spaces reflects a shift from centralized, broadcast-based messaging toward networked, algorithmically mediated, and participatory discourse. Political communication is no longer defined solely by institutional authority but by the ability to navigate digital infrastructures, mobilize emotional resonance, and sustain audience engagement. This transformation redefines not only how politics is communicated but also how political legitimacy and influence are constructed in the digital era.

Construction of Political Narratives and Framing Strategies

The findings of this study reveal that political narratives in digital spaces are constructed through strategic framing processes that simplify complex realities into emotionally resonant and symbolically powerful messages. Rather than presenting comprehensive policy explanations, digital political communication tends to condense issues into digestible storylines structured around heroes, victims, and antagonists. These narrative constructions enable political actors to mobilize support quickly while shaping public perception through selective

emphasis. In this sense, discourse does not merely describe political reality; it actively constructs it.

Textual analysis demonstrates that vocabulary selection plays a crucial role in narrative formation. Political actors frequently employ evaluative adjectives, moral labels, and action verbs to create strong impressions of competence, crisis, betrayal, or reform. For example, terms such as “corrupt,” “progressive,” “dangerous,” or “defender” are strategically attached to specific actors to guide audience interpretation. Following the textual dimension proposed by Norman Fairclough, these lexical choices reveal how language functions as a representational and relational tool. Through repeated word patterns, discourse constructs legitimacy for certain actors while delegitimizing others.

Pronoun usage further reinforces narrative positioning. The dichotomy between “we” and “they” appears consistently across digital political posts, creating symbolic boundaries between in-groups and out-groups. “We” is often associated with morality, unity, and national interest, while “they” is linked to threat, incompetence, or corruption. This binary structure simplifies political complexity into emotionally accessible oppositions. The ideological square framework of Teun A. van Dijk helps explain this pattern, particularly the tendency to emphasize positive attributes of one’s own group while highlighting negative attributes of political opponents.

Interview findings support this observation. One participant stated:

"When politicians post online, they rarely explain full policies. They tell a story about who is right and who is wrong. It's always about protecting 'us' from 'them.' That makes it easier for people to choose sides."

This quotation illustrates how narrative framing functions as a persuasive shortcut. By constructing politics as a moral contest rather than a policy debate, digital discourse encourages alignment based on identity and emotion rather than deliberative reasoning.

Another key framing strategy identified in the data is the use of metaphors and symbolic imagery. Political situations are frequently described using crisis metaphors such as “battle,” “war,” “collapse,” or “rescue.” These metaphors intensify urgency and dramatize political stakes. Visual-textual combinations, including memes and edited images, further reinforce these symbolic frames. Such multimodal communication strengthens narrative impact by merging emotional cues with concise textual messages.

Hashtags also function as framing devices. Rather than serving merely as categorization tools, hashtags encapsulate political arguments into mobilizing slogans. They transform complex debates into rallying points that are easily replicated and circulated. Through repeated use, hashtags create discursive coherence within ideological communities while simultaneously marking boundaries against opposing narratives. One interviewee reflected on this dynamic:

"A hashtag can define the whole debate. Once it trends, everyone talks about the issue using that frame. Even people who disagree have to use the same label, so the narrative spreads."

This insight highlights how framing strategies extend beyond individual posts and shape the broader discursive environment. Once a narrative frame gains traction, it structures subsequent discussion and limits alternative interpretations.

The findings also reveal that intertextuality plays a significant role in narrative construction. Political posts frequently reference news headlines, past statements, viral videos, or historical events to legitimize their framing. By embedding discourse within recognizable references, actors enhance credibility and strengthen persuasive impact. However, intertextuality is often selective; only supportive sources are cited, while contradictory information is omitted. This selective referencing reinforces ideological consistency within digital communities.

Moreover, emotional framing emerges as a dominant feature of narrative construction. Posts that evoke anger, pride, fear, or hope tend to generate higher engagement and wider circulation. Emotional intensification increases shareability, thereby amplifying narrative visibility within algorithm-driven platforms. As a result, communicative strategies prioritize affective resonance over analytical complexity.

Overall, the construction of political narratives and framing strategies in digital spaces demonstrates a shift toward symbolic condensation, moral polarization, and emotional amplification. Political discourse is strategically crafted to align audiences with simplified storylines that emphasize identity, urgency, and moral contrast. These framing mechanisms not only influence individual interpretation but also structure the broader dynamics of public discourse in the digital era.

Emotionalization and Performative Political Expression

The findings of this study demonstrate that emotionalization has become a defining characteristic of political communication in digital spaces. Rather than relying primarily on rational argumentation or policy-based reasoning, digital political discourse frequently centers on affective appeals designed to provoke immediate reactions. Emotions such as anger, pride, fear, hope, and indignation are strategically embedded in political messages to increase engagement and visibility. In algorithmically curated environments, emotionally charged content tends to generate higher interaction rates, which in turn enhances its circulation and prominence. Consequently, affect functions not merely as an expressive element but as a strategic resource in digital political communication.

The analysis reveals that emotional framing is often constructed through intensified language, exclamation marks, rhetorical questions, and morally evaluative terms. Political actors frequently present issues as urgent crises or moral battles, thereby encouraging audiences to respond quickly and decisively. This aligns with the broader logic of mediatized politics described by Stig Hjarvard, in which media formats and engagement metrics shape political communication styles. In digital contexts, the success of a political message is closely tied to its ability to trigger emotional resonance rather than facilitate deliberative reflection.

Interview findings strongly support this pattern. One participant stated:

"If a post makes people angry or proud, it spreads much faster. Calm explanations rarely go viral. Emotion is what drives engagement online."

This observation reflects how emotional intensity becomes intertwined with communicative effectiveness. Political actors adapt to this environment by crafting messages that amplify affective polarization, reinforcing strong in-group identification and out-group antagonism. Emotional appeals are therefore not incidental but systematically embedded in discursive strategies.

Beyond emotionalization, the study also identifies the rise of performative political expression. Digital platforms encourage individuals to publicly display political positions as part of identity construction. Posting, sharing, and commenting are not merely acts of information exchange; they are symbolic performances through which users signal belonging, loyalty, and moral stance. Political participation thus becomes intertwined with self-presentation in networked spaces.

This performative dimension is reinforced by the visibility architecture of digital platforms. Likes, shares, and comment counts operate as markers of social validation, encouraging users to express positions that resonate with their communities. As one interviewee explained:

"Sometimes people post political opinions not to debate, but to show where they stand. It's about identity. You want your network to know your position."

This quotation illustrates how political discourse functions as a form of symbolic self-positioning. Public expression becomes part of digital identity management, where users curate their profiles in alignment with ideological communities.

The findings further indicate that performative expression often takes creative forms, including memes, short videos, parody, and satire. These formats blend entertainment with political messaging, lowering the threshold for participation while increasing shareability. Humor and irony are frequently used to critique opponents, making political contestation appear playful while still conveying ideological messages. Such multimodal performances intensify the emotional tone of discourse and blur boundaries between activism and entertainment.

However, the emphasis on emotionalization and performance has significant implications for the quality of public discourse. While affective engagement can mobilize participation and raise awareness, it may also reduce space for nuanced debate. Rapid emotional reactions often replace sustained dialogue, and symbolic gestures may overshadow substantive discussion. The speed and visibility of digital interaction create incentives for expressive intensity rather than reflective deliberation.

At the same time, the findings show that emotional and performative communication can empower marginalized voices. Individuals who previously lacked access to institutional platforms can now articulate grievances, mobilize support, and challenge dominant narratives through emotionally compelling storytelling. In this sense, emotionalization is not solely a distortion of democratic discourse but also a mechanism for political visibility and recognition.

Overall, the study concludes that emotionalization and performative political expression are central features of digital political communication. Emotions function as strategic drivers of visibility, while performative acts of expression shape identity formation and community alignment. Political discourse in the digital era is therefore characterized not only by the exchange of arguments but by the public display of affective and symbolic positions within networked communicative environments.

Conclusion

This study concludes that political communication and public discourse in the digital era have undergone a fundamental transformation characterized by decentralization, emotional intensification, performative expression, and algorithmically mediated visibility. Digital platforms have shifted political interaction from hierarchical, elite-driven communication toward networked participation, where citizens actively construct, reinterpret, and circulate political narratives. However, this expansion of participation is accompanied by increased polarization, symbolic framing, and affective mobilization, often privileging emotional resonance over deliberative depth. Political discourse is no longer shaped solely by institutional authority but by the dynamic interplay between actors, audiences, and technological infrastructures. While digital spaces open opportunities for broader engagement and alternative voices, they simultaneously fragment the public sphere and reinforce ideological segmentation. Thus, political communication in the digital era reflects both democratizing potential and structural challenges for the quality of contemporary democratic discourse.

References

- Blühdorn, I., & Butzlaff, F. (2020). Democratization beyond the post-democratic turn: towards a research agenda on new conceptions of citizen participation. *Democratization*, 27(3), 369-388. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2019.1707808>
- Bossetta, M. (2023). Social media digital architectures: A platform-first approach to political communication and participation. In *Handbook of digital politics* (pp. 226-270). Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800377585.00025>
- Habermas, J. (2022). Reflections and hypotheses on a further structural transformation of the political public sphere. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 39(4), 145-171. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02632764221112341>
- Habermas, J. (2023). *A new structural transformation of the public sphere and deliberative politics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Hammond, M. (2020). Democratic deliberation for sustainability transformations: between constructiveness and disruption. *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, 16(1), 220-230.
- Hendriks, C. M., & Kay, A. (2019). From 'opening up' to democratic renewal: Deepening public engagement in legislative committees. *Government and Opposition*, 54(1), 25-51. <https://doi.org/10.1017/gov.2017.20>
- Jhaver, S., Frey, S., & Zhang, A. X. (2023). Decentralizing platform power: A design space of multi-level governance in online social platforms. *Social Media+ Society*, 9(4), 20563051231207857. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051231207857>
- Ma, L. (2020). Rethinking democratizing potential of digital technology: A review of technology and communication studies. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society*, 18(1), 140-156. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JICES-02-2019-0022>

- Masip, P., Ruiz-Caballero, C., & Suau, J. (2019). Active audiences and social discussion on the digital public sphere. Review article. *El profesional de la información*, 28(2). <https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2019.mar.04>
- Perloff, R. M. (2021). *The dynamics of political communication: Media and politics in a digital age*. Routledge.
- Romsdahl, R. J. (2020). Deliberative framing: opening up discussions for local-level public engagement on climate change. *Climatic Change*, 162(2), 145-163. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-020-02754-x>
- Seeliger, M., & Seignani, S. (2022). A new structural transformation of the public sphere? An introduction. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 39(4), 3-16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02632764221109439>
- Sipos, D. The role of digital platforms in the transformation of political parties. *Foreign Affairs*, 35(5).
- Stewart, E., & Hartmann, D. (2020). The new structural transformation of the public sphere. *Sociological Theory*, 38(2), 170-191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0735275120926205>
- Vergne, J. P. (2020). Decentralized vs. distributed organization: Blockchain, machine learning and the future of the digital platform. *Organization Theory*, 1(4), 2631787720977052. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2631787720977052>
- Webler, T., & Tuler, S. (2021). Four decades of public participation in risk decision making. *Risk analysis*, 41(3), 503-518. <https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.13250>
- Wolfsfeld, G. (2022). *Making sense of media and politics: Five principles in political communication*. Routledge.