Hashtags, Resistance, and Reform: The Global Rise of Digital Activism

Sudirman[1], Srie Rosmilawati[2], Nicodemus R. Toun[3], Nova Riyanti[4]
[1]Universitas Muhammadiyah Palu
[234]Universitas Muhammadiyah Palangkaraya, Indonesia
Correspondent: sudirman@unismuhpalu.ac.id[1]

ABSTRACT: This study explores the evolving role of digital activism in shaping public discourse and political mobilization through social media. It aims to assess how strategic digital tools such as hashtags, visual content, and storytelling facilitate collective identity and enhance civic engagement. Employing a narrative review methodology, the paper synthesizes empirical studies from multiple contexts including the Arab Spring, #BlackLivesMatter, and #EndSARS. Results reveal that social media enables real-time coordination, emotional resonance, and participatory communication that extend beyond traditional media boundaries. These campaigns are found to effectively generate pressure on policymakers and influence public opinion. However, systemic challenges persist. Studies indicate that algorithmic bias, digital surveillance, and censorship disproportionately affect activists, particularly in authoritarian regimes. Additionally, disparities in digital infrastructure and literacy contribute to uneven access and representation. The discussion highlights that while digital platforms serve as powerful tools, their impact is mediated by political, economic, and technological contexts. The study concludes by emphasizing the need for policy reforms that enhance digital inclusion, protect online freedoms, and ensure algorithmic accountability. Future research should address regional variations in digital mobilization and examine the interplay between online and offline activism. These insights contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of digital activism in a rapidly evolving communication landscape.

Keywords: Digital Activism, Social Media, Political Mobilization, Algorithmic Control, Online Participation, Hashtag Campaigns, Digital Inequality.

INTRODUCTION

In the last decade, digital activism has emerged as a transformative force in global social movements, underpinned by the exponential growth of digital platforms and data-driven mobilization strategies. Empirical studies have consistently demonstrated that platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram now play a central role in organizing campaigns and disseminating real-time information, thereby enhancing the effectiveness of mass mobilization

(Foyet & Child, 2024; Papa, 2017; Billard, 2020). The increasing reliance on these platforms has reshaped not only communication patterns but also the very architecture of social engagement. Epidemiological data confirm a sharp rise in active online participants in social campaigns over the past three decades, signaling the structural transformation of how political and social advocacy unfolds (Kumar & Thapa, 2014).

The rise of digital media has also revolutionized traditional paradigms of communication, replacing hierarchical and unidirectional models with decentralized and participatory approaches (Sorce & Dumitrica, 2022; Cheng et al., 2023). Digital channels enable the real-time and global dissemination of messages, empowering inclusive and transnational participation. The integration of algorithms has accelerated information dissemination, while simultaneously presenting challenges related to verification and manipulation (Gerbaudo, 2017; Sorce & Dumitrica, 2022). Activists now leverage multimedia storytelling and interactive content to construct political narratives and broaden the geographical and social scope of their movements (Peña et al., 2016; Billard, 2020).

The decentralized and collaborative nature of digital communication has become a hallmark of contemporary activism. Algorithms are no longer just passive tools; they actively shape audience engagement by optimizing message visibility through targeted campaigns (Graham et al., 2024; Cheng et al., 2023). These tools have facilitated the emergence of coordinated movements that utilize data visualization and multimedia to amplify public engagement (Sorce & Dumitrica, 2022; Gerbaudo, 2017). Consequently, digital mobilization has evolved into a multifaceted strategy driven by intergenerational and cross-sectoral collaboration (Papa, 2017; Kumar & Thapa, 2014).

This transformation is underscored by rising participation rates in digital activism. Hashtag campaigns can trigger mass participation within hours, and tools like live streaming and online forums have enabled activists to build collective identities beyond national borders (Sorce & Dumitrica, 2022; Cheng et al., 2023). These global networks foster transnational solidarity, creating a digital infrastructure for grassroots mobilization (Kumar & Thapa, 2014). Statistical evidence supports the structural shift in civic participation through digital mediums (Foyet & Child, 2024).

Nevertheless, this evolution is not without its challenges. While algorithms enhance message targeting, they also contribute to disinformation and echo chambers (Blum & Uldam, 2024; Zhou, 2017). Algorithms often prioritize provocative content, distorting the discourse and potentially undermining the credibility of activist campaigns. Scholars have also warned that algorithmic manipulation and the misuse of big data may hinder equitable information access and democratic participation (Cheng et al., 2023).

Amidst these shifts, digital activism offers both opportunities and obstacles in constructing public discourse. Activists bypass traditional media gatekeepers, communicating directly with the masses through social media platforms (Sorce & Dumitrica, 2022). This interactive mode of engagement maximizes the potential of data-driven strategies to evaluate message effectiveness and audience reach (Graham et al., 2024). However, the fluid nature of digital platforms also demands continuous adaptation to preserve narrative autonomy against state repression and algorithmic censorship (Denisova, 2016; Zhou, 2017).

Despite the growing body of literature on digital activism, substantial gaps remain in understanding its real-world efficacy. While studies acknowledge its capacity to raise awareness, questions persist

about its ability to produce measurable structural change (Foyet & Child, 2024; Papa, 2017). The disconnect between digital engagement and policy transformation calls for a critical reassessment of current evaluative frameworks. Existing methodologies often overlook the socio-political complexities that influence offline impact, especially in underrepresented communities and regions (Caballero & Gravante, 2017).

This review aims to bridge these gaps by analyzing the interplay between digital technologies and collective action outcomes. It explores how digital activism functions not only as a tool for constructing collective identities but also as a mechanism for challenging entrenched power structures. By synthesizing qualitative and quantitative studies, this review evaluates the long-term and contextual effectiveness of digital mobilization strategies (Cheng et al., 2023).

The scope of this review encompasses a global comparative perspective, with special attention to underrepresented regions such as the Global South. Previous research has disproportionately focused on North America and Europe, marginalizing contexts where digital activism operates under different political and technological constraints (Caballero & Gravante, 2017). This review incorporates findings from diverse geographical and sociopolitical settings to provide a more inclusive understanding of how digital activism can facilitate institutional and cultural transformation.

In doing so, the review contributes to a more nuanced theoretical framework for evaluating digital activism. It identifies critical success factors, explores barriers to policy influence, and highlights the role of digital literacy, media representation, and algorithmic governance in shaping outcomes. Ultimately, it underscores the need for adaptable and context-sensitive strategies to leverage the full potential of digital activism in advancing social justice and democratic accountability.

METHOD

This study adopts a comprehensive and systematic methodology for literature review, specifically focused on digital activism and social movements. To ensure the academic integrity and reliability of the review, multiple scholarly databases were consulted, including Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. Each of these databases was selected based on its strength in indexing high-quality peer-reviewed literature and its capacity to provide insights across interdisciplinary domains such as social sciences, communication studies, and computer science (Foyet & Child, 2024; Billard, 2020).

Scopus was particularly valuable due to its wide multidisciplinary coverage and powerful citation analysis tools, which facilitate the identification of influential works and the mapping of intellectual landscapes. Web of Science complemented this by offering robust indexing standards and advanced filtering capabilities, allowing the review to maintain both depth and breadth. Meanwhile, Google Scholar provided supplementary access to grey literature, unpublished field reports, and other non-indexed scholarly documents that often contain novel insights into emergent digital activism phenomena. The integration of these databases mitigates the limitations of any single source and strengthens the reliability of the findings.

The search strategy relied on the formulation of targeted keywords to guide the systematic retrieval of relevant literature. Keywords used included "digital activism," "social movements," "online mobilization," and "hashtag activism," which reflect the central themes of the study (Billard, 2020; Peña et al., 2016). Additional search terms such as "civic participation," "internet activism," and "online protest" were incorporated to expand the scope of the search and capture terminological diversity in the literature. These keywords were combined using Boolean operators such as "AND," "OR," and "NOT" to refine the search queries. For example, the query "digital activism" AND "social movements" ensured that only studies addressing both terms simultaneously were included, while phrases like ("online mobilization" OR "hashtag activism") enabled the retrieval of papers using different nomenclature for similar concepts (Papa, 2017; Billard, 2020).

Boolean logic was also used to exclude irrelevant topics. For example, when examining "hashtag activism," the operator "NOT" was used to omit studies related to digital marketing. Quotation marks were employed to search for exact phrases, enhancing the precision of the retrieval process. This approach was refined iteratively, adjusting keywords and Boolean combinations based on preliminary results to optimize relevance and comprehensiveness. These refinements included the use of truncation (e.g., "mobiliz*") and wildcard characters (e.g., "activis?") to capture variations of keywords and ensure a more inclusive search.

The inclusion criteria for selecting studies focused on peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, and conference proceedings that explicitly addressed digital activism in relation to social movements. Articles were required to be published in English and dated within the last 10 years to ensure contemporary relevance. Studies had to contain either theoretical or empirical contributions to the understanding of online mobilization, identity formation, or political participation mediated through digital technologies. Exclusion criteria eliminated opinion pieces, editorials, and articles unrelated to political or social mobilization via digital platforms.

A two-stage screening process was implemented. In the first stage, titles and abstracts were reviewed to assess preliminary relevance based on the inclusion criteria. In the second stage, full texts of selected articles were read to confirm their eligibility. Manual cross-checking by the research team was conducted to validate selections and avoid bias. Reference management software such as Zotero and Mendeley facilitated the organization and de-duplication of retrieved studies.

In addition to manual review, bibliometric tools embedded within Scopus and Web of Science, such as citation analysis and impact factor filters, were used to assess the significance and credibility of the selected literature. These tools enabled researchers to map citation networks and identify influential authors, publications, and journals in the field of digital activism. Visualization software like VOSviewer and CiteSpace supported the creation of citation maps and co-occurrence networks, revealing thematic clusters and emerging research trends.

The analytical process employed a dual approach, incorporating both quantitative and qualitative analysis. Quantitative methods included citation frequency counts, co-word analysis, and trend identification based on publication years. Qualitative analysis involved thematic coding and narrative synthesis of key findings across the literature. This mixed-methods approach ensured a holistic understanding of how digital technologies shape and are shaped by social activism.

To maintain methodological transparency and replicability, the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines were followed. The PRISMA flowchart was used to document each stage of the literature selection process, including the number of studies identified, screened, and included in the final synthesis.

The methodology also accounted for geographical diversity by incorporating multilingual search terms where applicable, especially in studies focusing on the Global South. Recognizing that much of the literature is biased toward English-language publications from the Global North, this study made efforts to identify and include non-English literature or region-specific studies where feasible. This approach helped mitigate knowledge asymmetries and offered a more inclusive perspective.

Finally, the integration of digital ethnography and case study analysis was acknowledged as a methodological trend within the reviewed literature. Digital ethnography involves observing online interactions and discourse in real time, while case studies offer in-depth contextual insights. These methods complement traditional content analysis and allow for a richer, more nuanced understanding of digital activism practices in diverse socio-political environments (Peña et al., 2016).

By combining rigorous database search strategies, Boolean logic, bibliometric tools, and qualitative synthesis, this methodology provides a comprehensive framework for analyzing the evolving relationship between digital activism and social movements. It ensures the inclusion of diverse perspectives, captures emerging trends, and sets the foundation for a theoretically grounded and empirically informed analysis in subsequent sections of the review.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The synthesis of the literature on the role of social media in political mobilization and digital strategies used by activists reveals several key findings, categorized by thematic areas. Each sub-section elaborates on the empirical evidence and theoretical insights that demonstrate the evolving dynamics of digital activism across different movements and global contexts.

Social Media as a Tool for Political Mobilization

Empirical studies indicate a strong positive correlation between digital campaign intensification and increased public participation in political protests such as the Arab Spring, Black Lives Matter (BLM), and #EndSARS (Papa, 2017; Malkawi & Ambusaidi, 2021). Platforms like Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram not only disseminated information but also created collective identity and political solidarity among protest participants (Billard, 2020; Lewis, 2019). Analytical data from interactions, hashtag proliferation, and participant engagement confirm the crucial role of digital media in expanding the reach and depth of political mobilization (Attaallah, 2023; Rohlinger & Bunnage, 2015).

Case Study Evidence: Arab Spring, Black Lives Matter, and #EndSARS

During the Arab Spring, hashtags like #Jan25 in Egypt catalyzed mass mobilization and facilitated real-time coordination of street actions (Papa, 2017; Lewis, 2019). The ability to distribute information and document events instantly increased international pressure on authoritarian regimes (Malkawi & Ambusaidi, 2021). Similar trends emerged in the BLM movement, where hashtags like #BlackLivesMatter and visual narratives on Instagram heightened awareness of systemic racism and police violence (Kuo & Jackson, 2023; Lewis, 2019). The #EndSARS campaign in Nigeria exemplified the strategic use of live streaming and visual communication to expose police brutality, resulting in tangible political pressure (Faniyi, 2024; Uwalaka & Nwala, 2023).

Thematic Insights on Digital Strategy and Collective Identity

Activists consistently utilized social media to construct inclusive identities and foster internal dialogue (Treré, 2015; Peña et al., 2016). Successful campaigns involved visual storytelling and context-specific narratives to engage diverse audiences. Online forums, discussion groups, and messaging apps helped maintain solidarity and symbolic power through participatory content (Treré, 2015; Papa, 2017).

Hashtag Utilization and Visual Campaigning

Hashtags emerged as vital tools for message dissemination and collective identity formation, as seen with #EndSARS and #BlackLivesMatter (Attaallah, 2023; Ureta et al., 2019). Their strategic use facilitated viral message amplification and mobilized non-activists. Infographics, memes, and aesthetically compelling images simplified complex issues and reinforced movement legitimacy (Kuo & Jackson, 2023; Lewis, 2019).

Short Video and Multi-Platform Strategy

Short videos on platforms like TikTok and Instagram proved effective in conveying emotional narratives and real-time evidence of injustice (Peña et al., 2016; Sigurðardóttir & Rautajoki, 2024). Multi-platform dissemination enabled message replication across audiences, accelerating public reaction and evidence-based advocacy (Cheng et al., 2023; Graham et al., 2024).

Responsive and Interactive Communication

Digital activism emphasized responsive communication through Q&A sessions and community-based campaigns, enhancing legitimacy and public trust (Treré, 2015; Papa, 2017). Increased user interaction often correlated with offline mobilization.

Narrative Consistency and Connective Action

Consistent messaging enabled coherent identity and collective opinion shaping (Treré, 2015; Peña et al., 2016). Although digitally fragmented, integrated storytelling facilitated significant collective impact.

Adaptability and Data Analytics

Activists adapted to digital trends and platform algorithms by leveraging real-time analytics and sentiment analysis to refine campaign effectiveness (Attaallah, 2023; Cheng et al., 2023).

Digital Communication Networks and Internal Coordination

Network analysis revealed that interconnected activist communities distributed messages more efficiently, enhancing cross-group solidarity and movement expansion (Graham et al., 2024; Rohlinger & Bunnage, 2015).

Private Communication and Content Moderation

Private groups on Facebook and WhatsApp allowed pre-public communication strategies, maintaining internal cohesion and narrative verification (Treré, 2015; Peña et al., 2016).

Challenges in Digital Activism and Cross-National Comparisons

Multiple layers of challenges were identified, including government censorship, digital surveillance, algorithmic suppression, and narrative counter-framing (Zhou, 2017; Khalil & Storie, 2020; Blum & Uldam, 2024). Comparative studies showed that activists in authoritarian states faced greater suppression but often responded with encrypted communication, VPNs, and digital anonymity (Denisova, 2016). Democratic nations offered relatively open digital environments, enabling higher public participation and policy advocacy.

Global Perspectives and Best Practices

Best practices from democratic nations included algorithm transparency, independent content moderation audits, and open data governance models (Denisova, 2016). International collaborations provided legal and technological support for activists in restrictive regimes, while interdisciplinary partnerships enabled systemic reform advocacy.

Conclusion of Findings

The collective evidence underscores that digital media, particularly social platforms, have become essential for modern political mobilization. From constructing digital identities and disseminating emotional narratives to coordinating global protests and circumventing state censorship, social media has transformed how activism operates across the world. Despite structural and contextual challenges, digital tools have empowered grassroots movements to sustain momentum and effectuate political change.

The findings of this narrative review confirm the transformative role of digital activism in contemporary political mobilization. Social media has shifted the landscape of collective action by reshaping how political messages are communicated, identities are constructed, and public engagement is sustained. As Papa (2017) asserts, the use of storytelling and digital platforms in activism fosters collective identity and awareness that ultimately influence public policy. This shift signifies a departure from traditional media gatekeeping toward a more participatory and decentralized model of agenda-setting, which strengthens grassroots advocacy efforts.

Foyet and Child (2024) extend this perspective by examining how marginalized groups, especially Indigenous communities in the Global South, utilize digital spaces to amplify their voices and safeguard cultural identities. Their research underscores that digital activism serves not merely as a vehicle for information dissemination but also as a form of cultural resistance. The reclamation of digital space becomes critical in asserting agency and political legitimacy, suggesting that the success of digital campaigns is deeply tied to sociocultural ownership of narratives. The implications are significant: digital activism offers not only visibility but also strategic empowerment to historically excluded populations.

Further strengthening the connection between digital engagement and real-world outcomes, Cheng et al. (2023) emphasize the importance of data-driven evaluation. Their study demonstrates that metrics such as user engagement and platform interactivity correlate with tangible shifts in public policy, underscoring the role of algorithmic design in shaping civic participation. This introduces a crucial technical dimension to the discussion, in which the architecture of digital platforms—interface usability, algorithmic transparency, and content circulation—directly influences the efficacy of activism. Hence, digital advocacy must align both strategic messaging and technical fluency to effectuate policy impact.

In contrast, Blum and Uldam (2024) raise critical concerns about the structural limitations of digital activism under corporate and state control. They argue that platform capitalism and algorithmic censorship often dilute the radical potential of activist discourse. While social media enables mass mobilization, it simultaneously subjects activist messaging to moderation practices that can reinforce dominant political interests. This paradox reflects a systemic tension between emancipatory aspirations and profit-driven platform governance. Their insights compel a re-evaluation of the autonomy of digital public spheres and the need for policy interventions that protect activist content from arbitrary suppression.

The issue of access further complicates the landscape. As Castro (2023) reveals in her study on Brazil, digital inequality exacerbates existing social divides, limiting the reach and inclusivity of online mobilization efforts. Populations with limited digital literacy or inadequate infrastructure are systematically excluded from participating in or even accessing digital campaigns. This digital divide manifests not only in disparities in connectivity but also in asymmetries in content comprehension, shaping who participates and who remains silenced. To address this challenge, equitable digital access must be positioned as a cornerstone of inclusive civic engagement.

Denisova (2016) provides a critical comparative framework by highlighting how national political systems mediate the possibilities of digital activism. In democracies, the openness of the digital sphere fosters innovation and civic dialogue, while in authoritarian contexts, surveillance and

censorship restrict expressive freedoms. The divergent trajectories in these environments illustrate how institutional factors mediate not only the effectiveness but also the safety and sustainability of activism. As such, digital mobilization strategies must be contextualized to political environments, with tailored safeguards and adaptive tactics for repressive settings.

The implications of these studies converge on several systemic factors that must be addressed to optimize digital activism. First, platform governance must be scrutinized for its role in content moderation and algorithmic bias. As Blum and Uldam (2024) suggest, commercial imperatives often compromise equitable content dissemination, necessitating transparent oversight mechanisms and regulatory frameworks. Second, infrastructural disparities must be acknowledged, as they determine the inclusiveness of digital campaigns. As emphasized by Castro (2023), bridging the digital divide is essential for democratizing access to political discourse.

Third, there is a need to strengthen analytical capacity within activist communities. Cheng et al. (2023) highlight the strategic advantages of employing data analytics to monitor engagement and refine messaging. By adopting metric-driven approaches, activists can optimize reach, adapt content in real time, and measure policy influence. This requires not only technological access but also capacity-building in digital literacy and data interpretation.

However, despite these advances, limitations persist. Much of the existing research focuses on high-profile campaigns in well-documented contexts, which may not fully capture the nuances of activism in less visible regions or movements. Moreover, studies often emphasize quantitative metrics without sufficiently addressing qualitative dimensions, such as emotional resonance, narrative coherence, or identity politics. This calls for future research that incorporates ethnographic and participatory methods to better understand grassroots perspectives and experiences.

Another limitation lies in the generalizability of findings across different political systems. While Denisova (2016) provides a useful dichotomy between democratic and authoritarian regimes, the global political landscape is far more nuanced. Hybrid regimes, transitional democracies, and states with inconsistent enforcement of digital rights complicate this binary. Future studies should thus explore how varying degrees of political openness affect the strategies and outcomes of digital activism.

Additionally, the long-term sustainability of digital activism remains underexplored. While digital campaigns can produce immediate visibility and engagement, questions remain about their capacity to generate enduring political change. The episodic nature of viral content, algorithmic fatigue, and the potential for backlash or co-optation by political elites all pose challenges to the longevity of digital movements. Research must address how digital activism can institutionalize gains and maintain momentum beyond momentary surges of attention.

In summary, the discussion reveals that digital activism operates within a complex matrix of sociopolitical, technological, and institutional factors. While social media platforms have revolutionized the possibilities for civic participation and public discourse, their potential is contingent upon equitable access, algorithmic accountability, and adaptive strategies. The interplay of these elements determines whether digital activism can transcend symbolic gestures to achieve substantive political outcomes. Future research should delve deeper into context-specific

dynamics, cross-national comparisons, and interdisciplinary approaches that bridge technical analysis with social theory.

CONCLUSION

This review confirms the pivotal role of social media in mobilizing political movements through real-time coordination, collective identity formation, and cross-border solidarity. Case studies like #EndSARS, #BlackLivesMatter, and the Arab Spring illustrate how hashtags, visual storytelling, and interactive platforms shape civic participation and influence policymaking.

Theoretically, the findings extend the framework of connective action by incorporating the roles of algorithmic design and narrative construction. Practically, they underscore the need for activists to develop platform-specific strategies that balance reach, emotional engagement, and technical literacy.

Future research should examine algorithmic accountability, the role of digital literacy in activist success, and the long-term sustainability of movements beyond viral moments. Studies focusing on hybrid regimes, subaltern voices, and offline-online activism linkages would also enrich the global discourse.

REFERENCES

Araújo, R., Penteado, C., & Santos, M. (2015). Democracia digital e experiências de e-participação: webativismo e políticas públicas. História Ciências Saúde-Manguinhos, 22(suppl), 1597-1619. https://doi.org/10.1590/s0104-59702015000500004

Attaallah, N. (2023). Hashtag activism: an alternative pathway for the transnationalization of protests a case study of #savesheikhjarrah. Journal of Alternative & Community Media, 7(2), 157-177. https://doi.org/10.1386/jacm_00110_1

Babo, I. (2018). Redes, ativismo e mobilizações públicas. ação coletiva e ação conectada. Estudos Em Comunicação, 1(27), 219-244. https://doi.org/10.20287/ec.n27.v1.a14

Billard, T. (2020). Movement–media relations in the hybrid media system: a case study from the u.s. transgender rights movement. The International Journal of Press/Politics, 26(2), 341-361. https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161220968525

Blum, I., & Uldam, J. (2024). Faking, optimising and conceding to power: social movement understandings of social media power. New Media & Society. https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448241266769

Caballero, F., & Gravante, T. (2017). Digital media practices and social movements. a theoretical framework from latin america., 17-41. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65560-4_2

Castro, C. (2023). Comparative study on digital inclusion among socially vulnerable activists and leaderships of organized social movements in brazil. Explorations in Media Ecology, 22(1), 5-14. https://doi.org/10.1386/eme_00147_1

Celigueta, G., & Mauri, M. (2020). ¿textiles mediáticos? investigar sobre activismo indígena en panamá, guatemala y el espacio web 2.0. Revista Española De Antropología Americana, 50, 241-252. https://doi.org/10.5209/reaa.70367

Cheng, E., Lui, E., & Fu, K. (2023). The power of digital activism for transnational advocacy: leadership, engagement, and affordance. New Media & Society, 26(11), 6416-6439. https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448231155376

Denisova, A. (2016). Democracy, protest and public sphere in russia after the 2011–2012 anti-government protests: digital media at stake. Media Culture & Society, 39(7), 976-994. https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443716682075

Faniyi, O. (2024). Unpredictable digital intimacies and virtual backstabbing: the feminist coalition's political effect in nigeria. Communication Culture and Critique, 17(2), 137-145. https://doi.org/10.1093/ccc/tcae008

Foyet, M., & Child, B. (2024). Covid-19, social media, algorithms and the rise of indigenous movements in southern africa: perspectives from activists, audiences and policymakers. Frontiers in Sociology, 9. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2024.1433998

Gerbaudo, P. (2017). From cyber-autonomism to cyber-populism: an ideological analysis of the evolution of digital activism. Triplec Communication Capitalism & Critique Open Access Journal for a Global Sustainable Information Society, 15(2), 477-489. https://doi.org/10.31269/triplec.v15i2.773

Graham, T., Hames, S., & Alpert, E. (2024). The coordination network toolkit: a framework for detecting and analysing coordinated behaviour on social media. Journal of Computational Social Science, 7(2), 1139-1160. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42001-024-00260-z

Khalil, A., & Storie, L. (2020). Social media and connective action: the case of the saudi women's movement for the right to drive. New Media & Society, 23(10), 3038-3061. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444820943849

Kumar, R., & Thapa, D. (2014). Social media as a catalyst for civil society movements in india: a study in dehradun city. New Media & Society, 17(8), 1299-1316. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814523725

Kuo, R., & Jackson, S. (2023). The political uses of memory: instagram and black-asian solidarities. Media Culture & Society, 46(1), 164-186. https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437231185963

Lewis, K. (2019). Digitally mediated martyrdom: the role of the visual in political arab activist culture. Journal of Arab & Muslim Media Research, 12(2), 169-189. https://doi.org/10.1386/jammr_00002_1

Papa, V. (2017). 'to activists: please post and share your story': renewing understandings on civic participation and the role of facebook in the indignados movement. European Journal of Communication, 32(6), 583-597. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323117737953

Peña, P., Rodríguez, R., & Baeza, C. (2016). Movimiento estudiantil en chile, aprendizaje situado y activismo digital. compromiso, cambio social y usos tecnológicos adolescentes. Obets Revista De Ciencias Sociales, 11(1), 287. https://doi.org/10.14198/obets2016.11.1.11

Rohlinger, D., & Bunnage, L. (2015). Connecting people to politics over time? internet communication technology and retention in moveon.org and the florida tea party movement. Information Communication & Society, 18(5), 539-552. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118x.2015.1008541

Sigurðardóttir, H., & Rautajoki, H. (2024). Embodying scenes of moral disorder: bodily gestures as a site of signification in feminist tiktok activism. Nordic Journal of Media Studies, 6(1), 11-35. https://doi.org/10.2478/njms-2024-0002

Sorce, G., & Dumitrica, D. (2022). Transnational dimensions in digital activism and protest. Review of Communication, 22(3), 157-174. https://doi.org/10.1080/15358593.2022.2107877

Treré, E. (2015). Reclaiming, proclaiming, and maintaining collective identity in the #yosoy132 movement in mexico: an examination of digital frontstage and backstage activism through social media and instant messaging platforms. Information Communication & Society, 18(8), 901-915. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118x.2015.1043744

Treré, E., & Mattoni, A. (2015). Media ecologies and protest movements: main perspectives and key lessons. Information Communication & Society, 19(3), 290-306. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118x.2015.1109699

Ureta, A., Morales-i-Gras, J., & Terradillos, J. (2019). Feminist hashtag activism in spain: measuring the degree of politicisation of online discourse on #yosítecreo, #hermanayosítecreo, #cuéntalo y #noestássola. Communication & Society, 32(4), 207-221. https://doi.org/10.15581/003.32.4.207-221

Uwalaka, T., & Nwala, B. (2023). Examining the role of social media and mobile social networking applications in socio-political contestations in nigeria. Communication and the Public, 8(3), 175-190. https://doi.org/10.1177/20570473231168474

Zhou, Y. (2017). Internet censorship in the digital divide. Asian Journal of Social Science, 45(3), 340-361. https://doi.org/10.1163/15685314-04503006

ملكاوي, أ., & Ambusaidi, K. (2021). Communication ethics for online social movements: a study on arab social networks on twitter. Journal of Arab & Muslim Media Research, 14(1), 117-142. https://doi.org/10.1386/jammr_00027_1