The Role of Social Media in Political Engagement among Thai Youth[*]

Songkhram Chantakiri
Banklongluang school, Thailand
E-mail chantakiri_17@hotmail.com

Abstract

This paper explores the role of social media in shaping political engagement among Thai youth. It examines how digital platforms facilitate access to alternative political information, foster peer-based discourse, and support protest mobilization, particularly during the 2020–21 student-led movements. Drawing on concepts such as connective action, political efficacy, and media ecology, the study also highlights the structural limitations of online activism in Thailand, including censorship, misinformation, surveillance, and the digital divide. The analysis underscores that while social media empowers youth political participation, its transformative potential remains constrained by legal repression and uneven access to digital and civic education. The paper concludes by calling for policy reforms that promote digital rights, media literacy, and inclusive governance to sustain democratic engagement in the digital age.

Introduction

Political engagement in Thailand has undergone significant transformations in recent decades, particularly in response to cycles of authoritarianism and democratic aspirations. Historically, political participation was shaped by hierarchical patron-client relationships and limited electoral engagement (Phongpaichit & Baker, 2004). However, in the post-2006 and post-2014 coup periods, traditional forms of civic participation were curtailed by legal and institutional repression, prompting new modalities of engagement—particularly among youth.

Amid growing disillusionment with entrenched elites, young Thais have emerged as key actors in challenging political orthodoxy. The youth-led movements of 2020–2021, organized largely online through platforms such as Twitter (now X), Facebook, and TikTok, marked a turning point in Thai civic life. These movements

demanded constitutional reform, monarchical accountability, and educational transformation, signaling a generational rupture with past political cultures (Sattayanurak, 2021).

Social media has been central to this evolution. It provides a relatively accessible space for political expression, mobilization, and identity formation—especially for digital natives. These platforms allow youth to bypass traditional media censorship, organize flash protests, and engage in meme-based satire that communicates complex political dissent in culturally resonant ways (Montesano, 2021; Thanaporn, 2022). Hashtag activism (e.g., #WhatHappenedInThailand, #SaveParit, #BananaRepublic) has demonstrated the power of decentralized, networked participation in shaping public discourse and contesting state narratives (Sinpeng, 2021).

However, the use of social media for political engagement is not without constraints. Thailand's restrictive legal environment—especially the enforcement of lèse majesté laws and the Computer Crime Act—has produced a climate of surveillance and self-censorship (Human Rights Watch, 2020). Moreover, online spaces often foster misinformation, digital echo chambers, and performative "slacktivism," which may weaken long-term movement sustainability and inclusive political education (Lee & Lee, 2022).

This paper explores the dual role of social media as both an enabler and inhibitor of political engagement among Thai youth. It argues that while digital platforms have empowered youth to participate in civic life in unprecedented ways, they also introduce new forms of risk, inequality, and repression. The analysis will unpack how Thai youth engage politically online, what drives their activism, and what socio-political barriers they confront in doing so.

Conceptualizing Political Engagement in the Digital Age

In understanding the political behavior of Thai youth in the digital era, it is essential to define key concepts that shape both theory and analysis. Political participation refers broadly to activities undertaken by citizens to influence political outcomes—ranging from voting and campaigning to protesting and petitioning (Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 1995). Civic engagement, while closely related, encompasses a broader spectrum of involvement in public life, including community activism, volunteerism, and discourse in the public sphere (Putnam, 2000). Digital activism, or "cyberactivism," refers specifically to political actions mediated through digital technologies such as social media, blogs, and messaging platforms. These forms of activism can range from awareness-raising campaigns to coordinated mass mobilizations and even forms of symbolic protest such as memes and hashtags (Tufekci, 2017).

A crucial distinction exists between traditional and digital forms of political participation. Traditional participation typically includes structured, institutionalized

acts such as voting, joining political parties, or attending rallies. In contrast, digital participation is decentralized, informal, and often individualized, encompassing activities like liking or sharing political content, engaging in online discussions, and organizing or joining online protest events (Theocharis & van Deth, 2018). In Thailand, this shift has been especially pronounced among youth who, facing restrictive political environments, find social media to be a safer and more accessible space for political expression (Sinpeng, 2021).

The motivations for political engagement among Thai youth include dissatisfaction with systemic inequality, frustration over authoritarian governance, and inspiration from global youth movements. These motivations are often intensified by the affective and viral nature of social media, which facilitates immediate feedback and a sense of community (Lee & Lee, 2022). However, significant barriers remain, such as fear of legal repercussions under Thailand's stringent lèse majesté laws, low trust in institutions, digital surveillance, and limited political education (Human Rights Watch, 2020; Sattayanurak, 2021). Generationally, youth political engagement also reflects broader identity shifts—favoring issue-based, horizontal movements over hierarchical or partisan affiliations (Montesano, 2021).

Several theoretical frameworks help interpret these emerging dynamics:

1. Connective Action Theory (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012) posits that contemporary political engagement increasingly relies on personalized content sharing through digital networks. Unlike traditional collective action, which is coordinated through formal organizations, connective action thrives in loosely connected digital ecosystems where individuals engage through shared hashtags, memes, and personal narratives.

2. Political efficacy—the belief that one's participation can influence political processes—is both a predictor and outcome of engagement. Research suggests that online participation can increase internal efficacy (confidence in one's abilities) and external efficacy (perception of institutional responsiveness), which in turn fosters further engagement (Zmerli & van Deth, 2009).

3. The Media Ecology framework emphasizes how technological environments shape human perception and behavior (McLuhan, 1964). In this context, platform affordances—such as TikTok's algorithmic virality or Twitter's real-time information flow—affect the form, reach, and symbolic impact of political engagement (Couldry & Hepp, 2017). These digital architectures enable new forms of political communication that can bypass traditional gatekeeping but also expose users to manipulation and surveillance.

Collectively, these frameworks illuminate how social media is not merely a tool for communication but a transformative space where political identity, community, and agency are constructed and contested—especially for politically aware but structurally marginalized youth in Thailand.

Social Media Landscape in Thailand

Thailand's digital ecosystem is a dynamic and contested space that reflects broader tensions between political expression and authoritarian constraint. Social media platforms have become crucial channels through which Thai citizens—especially youth—access political information, engage in discourse, and mobilize for action. However, this landscape is heavily shaped by state censorship, cultural taboos, and strategic navigation of digital affordances.

1. Popular Platforms: Facebook, Twitter (X), TikTok, and Line

The most widely used platforms in Thailand are Facebook, Twitter (now X), TikTok, and Line, each serving distinct functions in the realm of political engagement. Facebook remains the dominant platform for general communication and organizing, particularly among older users and grassroots activists. It has been instrumental in hosting pages such as "Free Youth" and "Thalufah," which coordinate protest activities and share political content (Sinpeng, 2021).

Twitter, by contrast, has become the preferred space for political discussion among urban youth due to its real-time broadcasting capabilities, anonymity, and culture of hashtag activism. During the 2020–2021 pro-democracy protests, hashtags like #SaveParit, #WhatHappenedInThailand, and #ReformTheMonarchy trended globally, amplifying domestic dissent on the international stage (Lee & Lee, 2022).

TikTok, originally a space for entertainment and dance trends, has evolved into a subversive platform for political satire, parody, and meme activism. Young Thais use it to critique the military, monarchy, and elite structures in creative, humorous formats that both bypass direct censorship and appeal to peer audiences (Thanaporn, 2022). Meanwhile, Line, a messaging app integrated with daily life in Thailand, is used for private coordination of protests, secure dissemination of political material, and direct messaging among activist groups (DigitalReach, 2021).

2. Censorship Laws and Digital Surveillance

Despite the vibrancy of online expression, Thailand has one of the most restrictive digital environments in Southeast Asia. The lèse majesté law (Article 112 of the Criminal Code) criminalizes defamation of the monarchy with penalties of up to 15 years per offense, and has been broadly used against youth activists and even online users who retweet or "like" critical content (Human Rights Watch, 2020).

The Computer Crime Act (CCA), revised in 2017, further empowers the state to surveil, block, and prosecute online content under ambiguous terms such as "threat to national security." These laws have created a chilling effect, where users engage in self-censorship, delete posts, or rely on coded language and satire to express dissent (Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, 2021).

The state has also developed programs such as "Cyber Scouts"—youth volunteers trained to monitor and report online behaviors deemed harmful to the monarchy or national unity (Sinpeng, 2020). Additionally, digital surveillance is deployed through AI-based systems and cooperation with platform companies, raising concerns about the erosion of online privacy and freedom of expression.

3. Influencers, Meme Culture, and Anonymity in Thai Political Discourse

Thai political discourse online is heavily shaped by influencers, some of whom blend lifestyle content with subtle political messaging. Figures like "Netiwit Chotiphatphaisal" and anonymous parody accounts such as "The METTAD" have amassed large followings for their critiques of the status quo, often employing humor, irony, and visual culture to attract youth audiences (Montesano, 2021).

Meme culture—especially during the protests—has become a form of "vernacular resistance" where young users adapt pop culture tropes, anime references, or national symbols to critique political authorities. This not only lowers the barrier to participation but also fosters a shared identity among digitally active youth (Tufekci, 2017; Thanaporn, 2022).

Anonymity is also a critical feature. Many youth activists rely on pseudonyms or anonymous accounts to shield their identities, especially when discussing sensitive topics like monarchy reform. This practice reflects the high-risk nature of political expression in Thailand, but also demonstrates resilience and tactical adaptation within digital spaces.

4. Hybrid Spaces of Expression: Satire, Protest Hashtags, and Viral Content

Thai digital activism operates within a hybrid media space that blends formal political critique with entertainment and affective storytelling. Satirical content—often humorous or absurdist—allows dissent to circulate under the radar of censorship, using ambiguity and shared cultural codes to critique powerful institutions (Chumchan & Niyomsilp, 2022).

Protest hashtags function as rallying points, not only organizing offline actions but also aggregating discourse, building narratives, and framing political debates. Viral content, such as protest TikToks or Twitter threads, serves both to mobilize participants and to internationalize the Thai struggle for democracy (Sinpeng, 2021).

These practices represent a form of digital insurgency in which expression is mediated not just by platforms but also by a deeply aware and adaptive youth culture that knows how to navigate repression while amplifying collective political voices.

Drivers of Youth Engagement through Social Media

The rise of youth political participation in Thailand over the past decade is deeply intertwined with the growth of digital technologies and social media platforms. These technologies have created new opportunities for political awareness, identity formation, and mobilization—especially in a context where traditional political spaces are limited or repressed. Several key drivers explain how and why social media fosters political engagement among Thai youth.

1. Access to Political Information and Alternative Narratives

One of the most significant contributions of social media to youth engagement is its role in providing unfiltered access to political information. Unlike traditional media in Thailand, which is often state-influenced or self-censoring, platforms like Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube allow users to access alternative viewpoints, investigative journalism, and dissident voices (Sinpeng, 2021). This is especially vital

in a country where state-controlled narratives dominate mainstream channels and laws such as the lèse majesté provision restrict public discussion about the monarchy.

Through digital media, youth gain exposure to content that challenges hegemonic discourse, such as critiques of military rule, royal privilege, and judicial politicization (Sattayanurak, 2021). Independent sources, activist accounts, and grassroots news outlets like The Reporters or Voice TV serve as key nodes in the digital information ecosystem. The availability of such content contributes to greater political awareness and critical thinking, enabling youth to question institutional authority and engage with broader democratic ideals.

2. Peer-to-Peer Political Discourse and Community Formation

Beyond information consumption, social media fosters horizontal communication and deliberation. Platforms enable peer-to-peer interactions that are informal, dialogical, and identity-affirming. Thai youth often engage in discussions through memes, comment threads, and group chats that create a shared vocabulary of dissent (Lee & Lee, 2022). These interactions cultivate a sense of belonging to a political community, even in the absence of formal party structures or civic organizations.

Digital spaces such as fan pages, Twitter threads, and Discord servers operate as affective communities, where users exchange not only political content but also emotions, humor, and mutual support. This type of participatory culture is crucial for sustaining engagement, especially in a climate of political anxiety and legal repression (Jermsittiparsert & Rattanaphan, 2021).

3. Mobilization and Protest Coordination (e.g., 2020–21 Student-Led Movements)

Social media has also proven essential in coordinating offline political actions. The 2020–2021 youth-led protest movements in Thailand, inspired by frustrations with military rule, educational authoritarianism, and calls for monarchy reform, were largely organized through digital platforms (Montesano, 2021). Hashtags such as #RespectYouthVoice, #FreeYouth, and #ReformTheMonarchy acted as rallying points that both aggregated sentiment and guided collective action.

Twitter was especially instrumental in real-time updates during protests, while Facebook events and Telegram channels were used to disseminate logistics such as locations, protest tactics, and legal assistance (DigitalReach, 2021). This form of decentralized, networked coordination allowed the movement to persist despite arrests, legal intimidation, and physical suppression.

Moreover, the visual culture of protests—placards, costumes, and symbolic gestures—was carefully curated and amplified online, making the demonstrations not only political events but also media spectacles designed for viral circulation.

4. Role of Digital Literacy and Civic Education in Engagement Quality

While access and participation are essential, the quality of political engagement is shaped by the level of digital literacy and civic education among youth. Digital literacy involves the ability to critically evaluate online content, verify sources, and resist manipulation. High levels of digital literacy correlate with more meaningful

political participation, including issue-based discussion and active deliberation rather than passive sharing or performative "slacktivism" (Chantarasat & Pheunpha, 2022).

In Thailand, however, civic education has traditionally focused on promoting loyalty to the nation, religion, and monarchy, rather than fostering democratic values or critical citizenship (Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, 2021). In response, NGOs and progressive educators have attempted to fill the gap through workshops, alternative curricula, and online campaigns that promote critical thinking, human rights awareness, and democratic dialogue.

The intersection of digital and civic literacy is therefore pivotal. Empowering youth to understand not only how to navigate social media but also how to interpret its content and political context enhances the depth and durability of their engagement.

Risks and Limitations of Social Media Political Engagement

While social media has expanded the horizons of youth political participation in Thailand, it also introduces a range of structural and behavioral limitations that constrain the quality, sustainability, and inclusivity of such engagement. These risks can dilute the democratic potential of digital platforms and in some cases reinforce existing inequalities or generate new forms of political harm.

1. Misinformation and Echo Chambers

One of the most pervasive problems in digital political engagement is the spread of misinformation. On platforms like Facebook and Twitter, where algorithmic feeds prioritize engagement over accuracy, false or misleading content spreads rapidly—especially during moments of political crisis or protest (Chantarasat & Pheunpha, 2022). Thai youth, despite being tech-savvy, are often exposed to partisan narratives, conspiracy theories, and unverifiable information.

This is compounded by the formation of echo chambers—closed digital environments in which users are predominantly exposed to information that confirms their existing beliefs. These echo chambers hinder deliberative dialogue, reinforce ideological polarization, and can lead to radicalization or political disillusionment (Sinpeng, 2021). In the Thai context, such dynamics deepen generational and ideological divides, particularly around contentious topics like monarchy reform or military governance.

2. "Slacktivism" vs. Sustained Activism

The ease of online participation also raises concerns about "slacktivism"—a term used to describe low-effort digital actions (liking, sharing, hashtagging) that substitute for deeper political commitment or sustained offline engagement (Morozov, 2011). While such actions can raise awareness, they may fail to translate into institutional change or long-term movement building.

In the Thai case, many protest hashtags have trended globally, but sustaining engagement beyond viral moments has proven difficult due to repression, fatigue, and the lack of organizational infrastructure (Montesano, 2021). Moreover, the reliance on digital expression can sometimes dilute the strategic coherence of movements, as diverse actors engage in fragmented, symbolic performances rather than coordinated political agendas.

3. Digital Surveillance and Self-Censorship

Thailand's repressive digital environment poses a significant risk to online political actors. The Computer Crime Act and lèse majesté laws have been systematically used to monitor, charge, and imprison users for content deemed threatening to the monarchy or national security (Human Rights Watch, 2020). This legal climate produces a chilling effect, where users—especially youth—engage in self-censorship, obscure their identities, or refrain from participating in political discussions altogether.

Surveillance technologies are further reinforced by programs like Cyber Scouts, where students are recruited to monitor peers' online behavior (Sinpeng, 2020). Activists report increased anxiety, digital harassment, and the need to migrate to encrypted platforms, which in turn limits the openness and inclusivity of digital political spaces.

4. Online Harassment, Trolling, and Polarization

Social media also serves as a site of digital violence, particularly for outspoken youth activists, women, and LGBTQ+ individuals. Harassment, doxing, hate speech, and coordinated trolling campaigns are frequent tactics used by ultraroyalist groups or pro-government actors to silence dissent (Chumchan & Niyomsilp, 2022). This not only undermines political participation but also poses serious psychological risks and discourages marginalized voices from engaging in public debate.

Moreover, the toxic nature of online debate, often fueled by anonymity and polarization, has led to the breakdown of constructive discourse. Debates around monarchy reform, for example, have frequently devolved into binary conflicts that make nuanced discussion difficult, further entrenching societal divides.

5. Digital Divide (Urban-Rural, Socioeconomic Gaps)

Lastly, digital political engagement in Thailand is unevenly distributed. There exists a digital divide between urban and rural populations, as well as among different income groups. While urban youth in Bangkok and major cities often have high-speed internet, access to smartphones, and digital literacy, rural youth may face limited connectivity, inadequate devices, and lower levels of online engagement (Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, 2021).

This divide undermines the inclusivity of digital movements, as voices from peripheral regions are underrepresented in national discourses. Furthermore, platform algorithms may privilege elite or urban narratives, reinforcing the marginalization of rural political concerns and widening the participatory gap between socio-economic classes.

Implications for Democracy and Policy in Thailand

The interplay between social media and youth political engagement in Thailand has significant consequences for the evolution of the country's democratic culture, state-society relations, and policymaking. While digital platforms have empowered young citizens to participate in political discourse and mobilization, they have also exposed the structural limitations of Thailand's political system. The following subsections address the key democratic and policy implications arising from these developments.

1. How Digital Platforms Shift Political Culture Among Youth

Social media has fundamentally altered the political culture of Thai youth by fostering values of autonomy, decentralization, and expressive participation. Unlike previous generations, which often operated within patronage networks and hierarchical party structures, young Thais now engage through horizontal, personalized, and issue-based interactions (Bennett & Segerberg, 2012). Platforms such as Twitter, TikTok, and Facebook have not only amplified political grievances but also created new avenues for forming alternative civic identities that challenge traditional norms of deference and silence.

The 2020–21 student-led movements illustrate this shift, as youth organizers demanded not only procedural democratic reforms but also structural transformations of the monarchy, military, and education systems. These demands emerged organically from online discussions and were expressed through culturally resonant forms such as memes, satire, and protest fashion—demonstrating that aesthetic and affective expression has become central to Thailand's emerging youth-led political culture (Thanaporn, 2022; Montesano, 2021).

2. Impact on Democratic Norms, Civic Education, and Participation

The increased use of digital platforms has redefined key democratic norms, including freedom of expression, pluralism, and political accountability. While traditional institutions—such as political parties, schools, and mass media—have failed to fully adapt, social media has become the de facto public sphere where issues are debated, movements organized, and power critiqued (Sinpeng, 2021). However, the absence of structured civic education and the dominance of pro-authoritarian narratives in Thai curricula limit the ability of youth to engage critically and sustainably in this digital democratic space (Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, 2021).

Civic education in Thailand often emphasizes loyalty to the monarchy and state rather than democratic participation or critical citizenship. As a result, youth political engagement via social media remains reactive and emotionally driven, with limited institutional translation. Without systemic reform in civic education, the risk remains that digital activism will remain performative rather than transformative (Chantarasat & Pheunpha, 2022).

3. State Response: Repression vs. Reform

The Thai state's response to digital activism has been predominantly repressive. Authorities have invoked the lèse majesté law (Article 112), the Computer Crime Act, and emergency decrees to arrest, surveil, and silence online dissenters (Human Rights Watch, 2020). During the 2020 protests alone, over 150 activists—many of them minors or university students—faced legal charges for their online and offline expression (DigitalReach, 2021).

This strategy of criminalization and surveillance has generated a climate of fear, pushing activists toward anonymous accounts, encrypted platforms, and self-censorship. At the same time, there are emerging reformist voices within civil society, opposition parties, and academia calling for greater protection of digital rights, repeal of draconian laws, and institutional safeguards for online freedoms (Lee & Lee, 2022).

The tension between repression and reform reflects a broader conflict between authoritarian resilience and democratic aspiration. Without genuine institutional change, youth discontent may deepen, and political polarization may intensify.

The Need for Digital Rights, Media Literacy Education, and Inclusive Governance

To harness the democratic potential of youth digital engagement, Thailand must invest in a rights-based digital framework. This includes reforming restrictive laws (e.g., repealing Article 112), ensuring online privacy protections, and guaranteeing the freedom of digital expression within democratic boundaries (Sinpeng, 2020).

Furthermore, media literacy education must be embedded within national curricula to equip young citizens with the tools to critically assess political information, resist misinformation, and engage responsibly in digital public spheres (Chantarasat & Pheunpha, 2022). This also entails recognizing and integrating youth perspectives into governance processes—whether through youth councils, digital policy consultations, or civic innovation labs.

Ultimately, fostering inclusive governance requires that the state view youth not as threats to national unity but as stakeholders in democratic renewal. Digital activism should not be criminalized but rather channeled through participatory mechanisms that allow institutional responsiveness, accountability, and intergenerational dialogue.

Conclusion

The emergence of social media as a central arena for political engagement among Thai youth represents both a transformative and contested development in the country's democratic trajectory. Platforms such as Facebook, Twitter (X), TikTok, and Line have enabled young people to access alternative political narratives, form peer-based political communities, and mobilize for collective action in ways that transcend the limitations of traditional institutions. These digital spaces have cultivated new political identities and modes of expression—particularly among the post-2006 and post-2014 generations—that are characterized by creativity, irreverence, and horizontal participation.

However, the democratic promise of social media is deeply constrained by structural risks and political repression. The spread of misinformation, formation of ideological echo chambers, and prevalence of "slacktivism" raise critical concerns about the sustainability and quality of youth political participation. More seriously, Thailand's repressive legal environment—including the lèse majesté law and Computer Crime Act—continues to criminalize digital dissent and foster widespread self-censorship. Combined with state surveillance, online harassment, and digital inequality, these forces threaten to fragment and marginalize the very communities that digital technologies have empowered.

The implications for Thai democracy are profound. While youth-led digital engagement reflects an expanding public consciousness and desire for reform, the absence of supportive institutional frameworks—such as inclusive civic education, digital rights protections, and participatory governance—risks neutralizing this momentum. Bridging the gap between online activism and democratic transformation

will require not only legal reform and media literacy but also a genuine reconfiguration of how the state views and engages its youth citizens.

Ultimately, social media has become a **double-edged instrument** in the hands of Thai youth: a tool for liberation and self-expression, but also a site of control, fragmentation, and vulnerability. Whether digital engagement will evolve into a durable force for democratic renewal depends on the choices made by policymakers, educators, and young people themselves in negotiating the promises and perils of the digital political age.

References

Bennett, W. L., & Segerberg, A. (2012). The logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics. *Information, Communication & Society, 15*(5), 739–768. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.670661

Chantarasat, P., & Pheunpha, N. (2022). Digital citizenship and civic engagement among Thai youth: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Education and Society, 5*(2), 113–129.

Couldry, N., & Hepp, A. (2017). *The mediated construction of reality*. Polity Press.

DigitalReach. (2021). *Digital Authoritarianism in Thailand*. https://www.digitalreach.asia/reports/digital-authoritarianism-in-thailand/

Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (FES). (2021). *Shrinking space for online civic engagement in Thailand*. https://th.fes.de

Human Rights Watch. (2020). *Thailand: End abusive use of lèse majesté law*. https://www.hrw.org/news/2020/12/01/thailand-end-abusive-use-lese-majeste-law

Jermsittiparsert, K., & Rattanaphan, S. (2021). Social media and youth political engagement in Thailand: A study of affective publics. *Asian Politics & Policy, 13*(1), 76–93. https://doi.org/10.1111/aspp.12445

Lee, H., & Lee, R. (2022). *Youth, digital activism, and political efficacy: A study of Southeast Asian student protests*. Asian Journal of Communication, 32(3), 205–224. https://doi.org/10.1080/01292986.2022.2031535

McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. McGraw-Hill.

Montesano, M. J. (2021). *A youthquake in Thai politics? Social media and the monarchy challenge*. In S. Ivarsson & T. McCargo (Eds.), *Contemporary Thai Politics* (pp. 87–110). NUS Press.

Montesano, M. J. (2021). A youthquake in Thai politics? Social media and the monarchy challenge. In S. Ivarsson & T. McCargo (Eds.), *Contemporary Thai Politics* (pp. 87–110). NUS Press.

Morozov, E. (2011). *The net delusion: The dark side of internet freedom*. PublicAffairs.

Phongpaichit, P., & Baker, C. (2004). *Thaksin: The business of politics in Thailand*. Silkworm Books.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon & Schuster.

Sattayanurak, S. (2021). *Youth and ideological resistance in Thailand: Cultural roots of the 2020 movement*. *Journal of Asian Studies*, 80(4), 893–915.

Sinpeng, A. (2020). *Cyber sovereignty and digital repression in Thailand*. *Political Geography, 82*, 102275. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2020.102275

_____. (2021). *Hashtag activism and digital repression in Thailand*. *Communication and the Public*, 6(1), 58–73. https://doi.org/10.1177/2057047321994335

Thanaporn, S. (2022). *TikTok as a tool of protest: Thai youth, humor, and censorship avoidance*. *Asian Politics & Policy*, 14(2), 309–327. https://doi.org/10.1111/aspp.12511

Theocharis, Y., & van Deth, J. W. (2018). *Political participation in a changing world: Conceptual and empirical challenges in the study of citizen engagement*. Routledge.

Tufekci, Z. (2017). *Twitter and tear gas: The power and fragility of networked protest*. Yale University Press.

Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Harvard University Press.

Zmerli, S., & van Deth, J. W. (2009). Civicness, equality, and political support: A comparative analysis of citizens' perceptions in Europe. *European Political Science Review, 1*(2), 191–224.