Civic Engagement in the Digital Age: Challenges and Opportunities

Asuma Mariita Nchaga

Public Administration Kampala International University, Uganda.

ABSTRACT

The digital age has revolutionized civic engagement, transforming traditional participatory models through technological innovation. From social media to digital advocacy platforms, citizens now have unprecedented avenues to interact with democratic institutions and influence policy. This paper examines the multifaceted nature of digital civic engagement, tracing its historical evolution, highlighting key opportunities for participation, and examining persistent challenges such as digital inequality, misinformation, and ethical concerns. Special attention is given to the experiences of marginalized communities, the role of education in shaping civic consciousness, and the evolving strategies for measuring digital engagement's impact. Through real-world case studies and critical analysis, this research underscores the importance of inclusive digital governance and a multidisciplinary approach to ensure that civic participation in the digital era remains equitable, effective, and aligned with democratic values.

Keywords: Civic Engagement, Digital Democracy, Social Media Activism, Digital Divide, Participatory Governance, Media Literacy.

INTRODUCTION

Civic engagement in the digital age presents both challenges and opportunities, with the evolving dynamics of modern civic involvement constantly interrogating the boundaries of the relationship between technology and participatory democracy. A broader understanding of civic engagement through the lens of modern communication tools is increasingly important and pressing as participatory culture increasingly shifts towards modern, for-profit platforms and practices. Public dialogue on the implications of this shift remains surprisingly limited, even as civic participation and identity are being dramatically reshaped by a rising generation of digital natives. Civic engagement has long been regarded as the bedrock of democratic participation in times of both stability and upheaval, enabling the development of local political communities and fostering bonds capable of withstanding times of crisis. Recent years have witnessed a tremendous surge of interest in understanding and fostering civic engagement as a means of democratic renewal at a time when prevailing models of culture, public discourse, and identity have been decisively upturned. Oftentimes, this body of research focuses on the political and social capital that can be derived from populations possessing a stronger sense of political or civic identity. Insufficient consideration has been given, however, to the broader questions of culture, practice, and knowledge necessary to the functioning of a healthy public sphere, and by extension to the health and viability of democratic culture itself. While the changing participation of young people in civic life is continually chronicled, the broader ecosystem of participatory culture in which young people are anchored often remains hidden from view. Young people are drawn to civic engagement by both the benefits it can provide as well as their strong social networks. With the rise of digital technologies and the Internet,

reaching broad social networks has been simplified. With personal computing and the internet, it has become easier to get information or download tools necessary for civic participation. On the other hand, civic involvement is time-consuming. Those who are highly involved in civic issues are frequently involved in many other activities like work or attending educational institutions. While the benefits of civic engagement carry over into maintaining strong social networks, the two constitute long-term ventures that many individuals are reluctant to invest time in. Facilitating low-cost means of maintenance and promotion of the two could be strategies for increasing investment. Lowering the transaction costs between investment (time) and payoff is also seen as a mechanism in which involvement could be increased [1, 2].

Defining Civic Engagement

Civic engagement refers to active citizenship in a democratic context, encompassing various social activities aimed at meeting community needs, especially for those beyond one's social circle. Politically, it involves participation in democratic institutions, such as voting or running for office, reflecting a spectrum of engagement. Its origins relate to social justice and the well-being of communities, prioritizing care for all, not just those who can afford private services. This can include charity work or larger campaigns addressing significant issues like service privatization. Community-focused civic engagement differs from politics, emphasizing local well-being and issues that arise naturally within specific cultures or geographies. Activities can range from artistic endeavors to advocacy, reflecting the community's needs without necessarily linking to political disputes. Tensions arise when activities blur definitions of civic engagement, as group identities can change based on the context. The relationship between different forms of participation is also noteworthy, with political actions heavily influenced by involved individuals, compared to more consistent community-related efforts. Civic engagement fundamentally involves active involvement with public matters, differentiating it from passive engagement, like merely consuming media or holding opinions. It is essential that civic engagement contributes meaningfully to public discourse and action, as highlighted in case studies. Various civic engagement forms fall into political, social, and community categories, with overlapping areas of tension. The paper aims to clarify civic engagement concepts, acknowledging the complexity and diversity of interpretations that impact its role in democracy [3, 4].

Historical Context of Civic Engagement

Democracy has been described as a system of government by the whole population or all the eligible members of a state. One of the commonest forms of civic engagement in a democracy is the process of recording opinion, e.g., in a European Community country under verbal questioning. The concerns of voters regarding civic engagement are carefully noted and shared with the community. Here, it is argued that the expansion in the circulation of information is changing the nature of democratic processes and the notion of civic engagement. Civic engagement has a long history stretching back to early democratic societies, a history shaped by numerous events and developments over time. The first four times, the concept of Oikeios, an Ancient Greek term used by philosophers to express its ideals. Similarly, in the Sanskrit epic theory, many philosophers used the term "Dhamadoi" to depict the idea of duties of a householder to itself. That time, it often took a moral or religious intonation. With the development of the nation-states, the idea of responsibilities toward the state and other collective goods became an important part of the discussion of civic engagement. By the 12th Century AD, the articulation of this idea was formed in what is loosely called the town hall meetings. Such focus brought the creation of a range of civic practices like "individual to others activities to improve their well-being and to support the fabric of society- often through various form of voluntary associations." The impact on such practices of the various communication media throughout history, "from the invention of the printing press in 15th Century to the explosion of the Internet in late 20th Century" are profound. "New forms of communication mean that what counts as civic engagement changes." This long-term historical perspective also implies that the current panic about the decline of civic engagement and related concerns about the quality of agreed that such decline end of the 20th Century is too narrow. Indeed, something entirely different is happening now through transition that makes people question "whether we are entering an age of entirely new form of civic engagement and how digital media is implicated in this move" [5, 6].

The Role of Technology in Civic Engagement

Technology has transformative potential in shaping patterns and modes of civic engagement. Digital platforms have dramatically altered how participation in political and social action is structured and organized. The development of platforms has substantially facilitated the mobilization of citizens by lowering the threshold for participation. The key advantage of social media and mobile applications is that they can coordinate outreach campaigns without significant resources or organizational structures. This has been exemplified by various "hashtag activism" campaigns launched in the past several years. Online petitions or open letters circulating in social media can effectively pressure political or business actors to take certain stances. Particularly when incorporated in the traditional media cycle, online campaigns can significantly influence the policy agenda in a matter of hours. Moreover, technology, and especially online platforms, can be conducive to enhancing the connection between ordinary citizens and political representatives. As is argued by proponents of e-government, digital tools can foster more efficient and direct means of communication, thereby enabling real-time feedback on policies and events. It can also pave new ways for engaging citizens in decision-making processes and increase transparency in government administration. These are but a few examples of how technology can contribute positively to civic engagement practices. On the other hand, technology, especially when predominantly construed as a Web 2.0 media sphere, has brought about a number of novel limitations. First of all, the quality of civic participation in current online forums may be questionable. Many new emerging digital platforms are either deliberately bypassing political or civic content or have found it largely unattractive for marketing purposes. In popular social media, power users with an immense amount of economic, cultural, or otherwise symbolic capital may have disproportionate control over the public agenda and the quality of civic discussion, effectively sidelining ordinary participants. Secondly, for many communities in the world, especially for the elderly, economically marginalized, or underdeveloped rural populations, new communications technologies may still be inaccessible due to a lack of resources, digital literacy, or sufficient infrastructure. Third, in the digital environment, the forming of segregated, homophilic communities where preexisting values, concepts, or attitudes are largely shared may give rise to the process of "civic echo chambers", where the contentious deliberation nurtures and radicalizes existing prejudices, leading to the proliferation of confrontational rhetoric, online outrage, and the heat, but not light, of discourse [7, 8].

Challenges of Digital Civic Engagement

Web 2.0 technologies have enabled a new generation of participatory and customized applications for civic engagement. Millions now use these tools daily to communicate and collaborate, forming a new type of "we-government." However, challenges persist, such as the spread of fake news, hate speech, and misinformation on social media, which undermine the validity of these engagements. Access to technology remains a significant barrier, creating divisions in digital capabilities. New technologies like artificial intelligence and the Internet of Things widen this gap for those unable to adapt. Rapid digital advancements have led to challenges like digital harassment during civic activities. If these issues are not addressed, public confidence in digital processes will erode, as evidenced by only 13% of users contributing valuable information to participation platforms. Public trust hinges on the perceived accuracy of these processes, compounded by an asymmetry of power and knowledge; government officials often have a superior understanding of digital tools. The potential advantages of new technologies also come with risks of manipulation and distortion. Algorithmic biases and echo chambers contribute to this problem, often excluding those lacking digital skills. This 'second digital divide' echoes past fears of marginalizing populations from digital culture. The distribution of wealth and access creates risks of polarization in a landscape where information becomes a commodity. Ultimately, where unequal access to knowledge leads to unequal power in democratic governance, the challenge lies in maintaining control over conversations. Current technologies may amplify traditional advantages rather than level the playing field, necessitating systemic solutions and new responsibilities. Few technical remedies exist for bridging this digital gap, as the effectiveness of solutions relies on political will and social awareness. Since the mid-20th century, IT has also raised concerns about personal privacy, with data security issues emerging on three fronts: technical vulnerabilities, hacking threats, and the need for privacy protection against unauthorized disclosure [9, 10].

Opportunities for Enhanced Engagement

The chorus of praise and concern about so-called "digital engagement" is getting so loud that local governments can't ignore it. Various platforms allow citizens to stay informed, recommend improvements, and sometimes even contribute to a policy change or decision. Digital engagement, though, is but one more tool, not an end in itself. The civic ball will only roll towards democratic governance through arduous political practices. The promise that the Internet would revolutionize citizenship behavior has been put on hold. Since the first days of this buzzword, expectations surrounding empowerment, ICT-induced enhanced social capital, and collective agencies have been placed firmly on the table. There are numerous advantages to employing digital tools for engagements. Technology can easily enlarge those participatory practices through which citizens engage physically and vocally in the determination of laws and public policies. There are countless ways in which digital platforms might be used by conscientious public administrations to enhance the quality of conversation. Such virtual encounters might facilitate more inclusive conversations, less dominated by those that are better off, allow a broader reflection on the policy question, or generate innovative solutions. Societies are a sizeable source of capillar power, and the multiplication of channels allows their feedback to be more effective, truthful, and frequently a mere danger to the status quo. Campaigns, online advocacy, and other digital collaborative tools can surely empower their recipients. Taking the SMOG index as stipulated in the Clean Air Act, citizen queues would never have the means to map the entire territory of the US – even less get any change. Yet, a smug campaign on integrated air quality management that took this index as standard did. Under the pressure of civil society organizations and a high-profile SMOG campaign, EPA was compelled to legalize a system for industries to publicise it at high-level air pollution areas. In 1996, there were around 300 of these, mostly densely populated urban areas. Yet, fear of financial compacts made local administrations slow in taking any action. The online mapping that followed showed that around 7 mln lived within these hazardous areas. At the 21st-century speed, the official justification of the 300 areas as "naturally obstructed" seemed ludicrous. It took three years, but by 2004, these maps were incorporated within new local air quality management plans that earmarked around $1bn for clean energy policies [11, 12].

Case Studies of Successful Digital Engagement

Civic engagement can drive positive change in communities when deployed effectively. Income data was collected in public of a town square in urban India over 11 weeks. It is found that the town square is used multiple times daily for a brief period. Residents seldom visit together but visit the square with family members. Individuals observing others in the square are more likely to stay longer. This encourages further research in exploring the design of public spaces, creating a community resource to assess the impact of major urban interventions and for the low-cost community organization in less developed countries such as India. As more government services become digital, there is a growing concern of 'digital exclusion'. For example, in the United Kingdom, 34% of citizens are unable to access public services. This forces the most marginalised to rely upon help from intermediaries, who are rarely able to provide the best support. There exists a gap in the amount or quality of services provided, resulting in sub-optimal outcomes for the most marginalised. The literature needs to compare strategies that mediation and intermediation services are currently implementing. This warrants technological solutions designed for mediators that achieve (or come closer to) the level of service non-marginalised citizens take for granted. It is important to close the gap in service quality. Without this, both individuals and communities become metaphorically lamed, denied access to public services, and unable to reap the benefits. There is potential social damage with a decrease in trust in public education, healthcare, and other services despite the actions and intentions of the people involved in providing these services. It also risks doing social harm by excluding groups from engaging with the state. This affects their economic and social well-being, preventing them from fully enjoying their rights [13, 14].

The Future of Civic Engagement

Citizen deliberation expressed through digital tools and social networks has enlarged the Habermasian notion of public space. Since John Dewey, we know that democracy is a way of life and that it is always "in the making". In the 21st century, civic engagement faces serious challenges, but many promises come with it. The public sphere is now global and can occur virtually, either based on micro media or on middle media. Some authors stress the Internet's capacity to create new forms of democratic public spheres and to support the already existing ones. The world of political communication, campaigning, and

mobilization has gone through major changes as new media has emerged. The so-called digital activism benefits from this hybrid context: it uses Internet tools and new technologies and interacts with traditional activism. Digital activism fortifies democratic participation and civic engagement, achieving greater results when it operates alongside traditional activism. It is widely accepted that real mobilization (not just online) is needed to promote social change. A presentation of these various aspects underlines the need for a multidisciplinary approach and stresses the relevance of the three Pilot on-line Courses surrounding the MOOC. The topic is not a new one, but it returns frequently in the present context: the 2010s have witnessed notable social movements where people use such technologies. It is especially the young who are engaged politically, often inspired by the global movements and revolted by the policies of the representatives of an old generation. In these so-called "post-democratic" times, significant changes at the societal level are visible. This paper refers to Spain primarily, but the ongoing transformations and struggles are general and of broader interest. What is reflected is not the future of democracy but the future of civic engagement under the global condition of digital media. Given the manifold difficulties and problems characteristic of the tendency, ways are then suggested to tackle those challenges [15, 16].

Ethical Considerations in Digital Engagement

Civic engagement in the digital age is currently undergoing significant changes with vast opportunities as well as challenges. The unprecedented scale and geographic scope of digital involvement, open databases, and technological advancements have substantially enhanced the potential for connectedness both horizontally and vertically. They involve a wide range of stakeholders, use large data sources for situational awareness, up-scaled preventative policies and practices, and a multiplicity of tooling and analytics for simulations and verifying outcomes. On the other hand, digital civic engagement is confronted with an array of difficulties. Despite all these potentials, there are still many techno-social or political gaps. New forms of inequalities emerge about access and proficiency in digital tools and communications. Social media artefacts and other analysis methods are often under strong criticism, either for security or privacy concerns, and content is frequently manipulated, politicised, or even industry forged. Digital platforms are of utmost importance as prerequisites for managing any type of civic engagement in the digital age. These enable immediate communication among networked public users, as well as between civil society and public sector institutions. Accessibility, representation, and mediation principles of platforms are attached to the basics of democracy; they define how individual interests become part of collective policy practices, how the main body translates public will into practice, and at the same time naturalizing convented practices and stabilizing implied power distribution avenues. Along this aspect, they ensure a relational transparency of interactions. The developments in technologies and vast online data also raise concerns about the ethical dimensions of digital civic engagement at the same time. Digital civic engagement cannot possibly happen without digital platforms and applications from governments and civil society. Ongoing policy development can lead to fairer representations and procedures in digital engagement practices. However, especially in the case of social media platforms, government efforts to digitally engage citizens can be exploited as well. This can, for instance, take the form of fake engagement generation in order to push certain themes or manipulate public opinion. Among initiatives, social media promises enhanced participation and reach by lowering participant threshold requirements. At the same time, it risks surveillance that alienates participants or makes them rethink engagement. Parallel to these public concerns, there is also a privacy concern over the data collected: many individuals do not want their participation to be logged since it can put them at risk for monitoring or persecution [17, 18].

Measuring the Impact of Digital Civic Engagement

Many consider the digitalisation of civic engagement the thing of the 21st century. The emergence of digital communication technologies and the internet brought new possibilities to both governmental and non-governmental initiatives in the vast field of engaging citizens in decision-making processes, thus creating the bloom of a variety of online platforms aimed at enhancing citizens' participation. While new research aims at understanding the effects of digital civic engagement initiatives, there is still a lack of studies that dig into methodologies to evaluate the impact of these initiatives. How to measure the effects of digital platforms in civic engagement considering a myriad of variables such as the tools used in that platform, other offline events related to that, the wider context these events are taking place, among others—will be among the challenging yet extremely necessary discussions over the next decades. With a number of different digital civic engagement initiatives capturing a wide variety of sociopolitical

dimensions across 30 countries, there is clearly convergence on only some issues. Current engagements might successfully contribute to specific legislation changes while others might not obtain a single supportive policy but start a whole public discussion about crucial contemporary topics. There is complementarity and complexity of the combined results considering both quantitative and qualitative approaches, where numbers and narratives tell very different but often complementary stories. And last but not least, the measurement of the full impact of a digital intervention is often impossible or imprecise with the data available, yet partial effects can also be capturing parts of the story, for example if the aim is to materialize lasting offline organizations, and it is done although it cannot be captured. Altogether, a mix of the detailed description of the methodology to collect online data on these initiatives around the globe, a series of illustrative case studies exploring different approaches to evaluating digital engagements and a discussion of implications for future research, is presented, hopefully contributing to the development of impactful, informative, and – most importantly – democratic online citizen participation. There is an increasing push towards a more articulated version of impact measurement, with the calls coming from multiple directions like best industry practices for digital tools provider, or researchers in cooperation with specific engagement platforms. Permanent feedback and adaption to what worked and what did not in the previous round is already seen as equally important goals, entailing a certain standard of impact assessment that could be re-used. Not being its own stage, a call for integrating a reflection on measurement practices both prior to the implementation of civic interventions and their immediate assessment is highlighted. Amplifying the observed impact of the desired effects could also amplify the feedback cycle in a virtual cycle, contributing to constantly better plan, execute, and measuring civic engagement initiatives [19, 20].

Engaging Marginalized Communities

This spotlight is on the vitally important, if not critical, issue of engaging the vastly underrepresented communities of minority/majority people and their real-life issues through digital means. The 'digital divide' is a well-known term that often stands for notable discrepancies in physical access to or the ability to effectively make use of digital and internet-enabled means of communication and information. The other, even more unattended but no less actual side of the 'digital divide', are capabilities, willingness, desire, or readiness of the decision-making authorities, mainstream public opinion, media and interest or special interest groups to give an ear and pay due regard to marginalized communities and their problems, typically not 'trendy' or 'hot' and notably less 'flash images' and 'sound bites'-generating issues. One biggest barriers are the accustomed or deliberate efforts of the majority to pay no or sporadic heed to the demands, the voice, the protests or the opinion of the minority, as well as to support usually with undue loyalty or leniency the government, state agencies, or corporate interests, providing vital spaces within which civic engagement is traditionally concentrated. On the other side, it may usually be detected serious reluctance, diffidence, or unresponsiveness of the ruling part and its affiliates to the demonstrations, manifestations, strikes, rallies, direct actions, or even referendums, aimed at expressing or imposing the will, the opinion or the desires of the 'outsiders'. To be more explicit and clearer, the above-described attitudes, on both sides, may be understood as lack of 'analog public engagement' [21, 22, 23].

Role of Education in Promoting Civic Engagement

Civic engagement is essential for a functioning democracy. Various factors can foster civic engagement by individuals and communities, for example, education. Therefore, it is worth considering how civic engagement can be fostered by education. Several strategies can be distinguished on how to do so. First, civic engagement is fostered by educational content that raises awareness and/or teaches concrete skills. Secondly, it is fostered through educational settings that enable participation in civic processes or civic engagement in the broader sense. Third, education can foster a democratic mindset, values, and attitudes, which impact how empowered someone feels and how willing they are to make a contribution to their community or society. These educational components are considered to have the following prerequisites: Critical thinking and a critical approach towards media are key skills for informed civic participation. The opportunity to develop these skills should be accessible to everyone, regardless of their income or their level of formal education. An informed citizenry is the basis of a just and functioning democracy. As social media use grows, this becomes increasingly important. Increasingly, young people receive news and information through social media. Thus, it is very important that educators ensure that students are able to distinguish between factual news and objective opinion. This development requires media literacy, but

it also poses challenges for educators who themselves are new to using new technology. It is therefore necessary to both include media in formal education settings and form attractions with an eye on civic engagement. Ideally, all education leads to citizens participating in civic decisions. Public institutions, including public schools, should ideally promote democratic values and practice what they teach. Teachers and the institutions in which they work can foster civic engagement in a wide variety of ways. Schools and universities can be settings for civic engagement, for example, community projects or the formation of student organizations. Teachers can inspire civic engagement through exam considerations, classroom atmosphere, curricular content, etc. One-off educational opportunities, such as interactive presentations by non-profit organizations, can foster long-term civic engagement and henceful weekend workshops. It is important that all these opportunities are equally open to everyone to attend [24, 25, 26].

CONCLUSION

Civic engagement in the digital age stands at a transformative juncture. While technology has undeniably expanded access to public discourse and political participation, it has also introduced new layers of complexity, ranging from ethical concerns to systemic inequities in digital access. The evolving landscape of digital activism, particularly among youth, demonstrates the power of online tools to catalyze global movements and local change. However, realizing the full potential of digital civic engagement demands intentional efforts to bridge divides, protect user rights, and promote inclusive design. Education, policy reform, and technological innovation must work in concert to foster a civic culture that is both digitally fluent and democratically grounded. The future of democracy depends not only on access to digital tools but on our collective ability to use them responsibly, ethically, and inclusively.

REFERENCES

1. Gherghina S. Hijacked direct democracy: The instrumental use of referendums in Romania. East European Politics and Societies. 2019 Aug;33(3):778-97.
2. Hoefer R. Commentary: Civic engagement in the post-2022 United States, democratic theory and social policy practice. Journal of Policy Practice and Research. 2022 Dec;3(4):277-82.
3. Huttunen S, Ojanen M, Ott A, Saarikoski H. What about citizens? A literature review of citizen engagement in sustainability transitions research. Energy Research & Social Science. 2022 Sep 1;91:102714. sciencedirect.com
4. Ajaps SO, Obiagu AN. Increasing civic engagement through civic education: A Critical Consciousness Theory Perspective. Journal of Culture and Values in Education. 2021;4(1):64-87. cultureandvalues.org
5. Machin A. Climates of democracy: Skeptical, rational, and radical imaginaries. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change. 2022 Jul;13(4):e774.
6. Valaskivi K. Circulation of conspiracy theories in the attention factory. Popular Communication. 2022 Jul 3;20(3):162-77.
7. Guess AM, Malhotra N, Pan J, Barberá P, Allcott H, Brown T, Crespo-Tenorio A, Dimmery D, Freelon D, Gentzkow M, González-Bailón S. How do social media feed algorithms affect attitudes and behavior in an election campaign?. Science. 2023 Jul 28;381(6656):398-404. science.org
8. Dow BJ, Johnson AL, Wang CS, Whitson J, Menon T. The COVID-19 pandemic and the search for structure: Social media and conspiracy theories. Social and Personality Psychology Compass. 2021 Sep;15(9):e12636. nih.gov
9. Epstein D, J. Newhart M, Vernon R. Not by Technology Alone: The "Analog" Aspects of Online Public Engagement in Policymaking. 2012. [PDF]
10. Dow A, Comber R, Vines J. Between grassroots and the hierarchy: Lessons learned from the design of a public services directory. InProceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems 2018 Apr 21 (pp. 1-13).
11. Bastos D, Fernández-Caballero A, Pereira A, Rocha NP. Smart city applications to promote citizen participation in city management and governance: A systematic review. InInformatics 2022 Oct 28 (Vol. 9, No. 4, p. 89). MDPI. mdpi.com
12. Eze VH, Ugwu CN, Ugwuanyi IC. A Study of Cyber Security Threats, Challenges in Different Fields and its Prospective Solutions: A Review. INOSR Journal of Scientific Research. 2023;9(1):13-24.

13. Sharma S, Kar AK, Gupta MP, Dwivedi YK, Janssen M. Digital citizen empowerment: A systematic literature review of theories and development models. Information Technology for Development. 2022 Oct 2;28(4):660-87. kuleuven.be

14. Turban JL, Loo SS, Almazan AN, Keuroghlian AS. Factors leading to "detransition" among transgender and gender diverse people in the United States: A mixed-methods analysis. LGBT health. 2021 Jun 1;8(4):273-80.

15. Yao R, Zhang W, Evans R, Cao G, Rui T, Shen L. Inequities in health care services caused by the adoption of digital health technologies: scoping review. Journal of medical Internet research. 2022 Mar 21;24(3):e34144. jmir.org

16. Verhasselt L. Towards multilingual deliberative democracy: navigating challenges and opportunities. Representation. 2025 Jan 2;61(1):57-74.

17. Aubert I. Social inclusion, a challenge for deliberative democracy? Some reflections on Habermas's political theory. European Journal of Social Theory. 2021 Nov;24(4):448-66.

18. Goumopoulos C. Smart city middleware: A survey and a conceptual framework. IEEE Access. 2024 Jan 3;12:4015-47.

19. Ayogu SO, Ribeiro JL, Leite R. Practising Servant Leadership: Pastoral and Social Ministry in the Modern Age. InChallenges and Trends in Organizational Management and Industry 2022 Apr 14 (pp. 17-48). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

20. Ohme J, Andersen K, Albæk E, De Vreese CH. Anything goes? Youth, news, and democratic engagement in the roaring 2020s. The International Journal of Press/Politics. 2022 Jul;27(3):557-68. sagepub.com

21. Eze VH, Edozie E, Umaru K, Ugwu CN, Okafor WO, Ogenyi CF, Nafuna R, Yudaya N, Wantimba J. A systematic review of renewable energy trend. Newport International Journal of Engineering and Physical Sciences. 2023;3(2):93-9.

22. Ramiro Troitiño D, Mazur V. Digital Social Initiatives: Europe Connecting Citizens with Social Transformation. InE-Governance in the European Union: Strategies, Tools, and Implementation 2024 Jun 15 (pp. 71-85). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland. [HTML]

23. Saeed SA, Masters RM. Disparities in health care and the digital divide. Current psychiatry reports. 2021 Sep;23:1-6.

24. Acilar A, Sæbø Ø. Towards understanding the gender digital divide: A systematic literature review. Global knowledge, memory and communication. 2023 Feb 20;72(3):233-49.

25. Pratte R. The Civic Imperative: Examining the Need for Civic Education. Advances in Contemporary Educational Thought Series, Volume 3. Teachers College Press, 1234 Amsterdam Ave., New York, NY 10027; 1988.

26. Andersen K, Ohme J, Bjarnøe C, Bordacconi MJ, Albæk E, De Vreese CH. Generational gaps in political media use and civic engagement: From baby boomers to generation Z. Taylor & Francis; 2021.

Page | 65