

# The psychology of online activism and social movements: relations between online and offline collective action

Hedy Greijdanus<sup>1</sup>, Carlos A de Matos Fernandes<sup>2</sup>,  
Felicity Turner-Zwinkels<sup>3</sup>, Ali Honari<sup>4</sup>, Carla A Roos<sup>1</sup>,  
Hannes Rosenbusch<sup>3</sup> and Tom Postmes<sup>1</sup>

We review online activism and its relations with offline collective action. Social media facilitate online activism, particularly by documenting and collating individual experiences, community building, norm formation, and development of shared realities. In theory, online activism could hinder offline protests, but empirical evidence for slacktivism is mixed. In some contexts, online and offline action could be unrelated because people act differently online versus offline, or because people restrict their actions to one domain. However, most empirical evidence suggests that online and offline activism are positively related and intertwined (no digital dualism), because social media posts can mobilise others for offline protest. Notwithstanding this positive relationship, the internet also enhances the visibility of activism and therefore facilitates repression in repressive contexts.

## Addresses

<sup>1</sup> Heymans Institute for Psychological Research, University of Groningen, The Netherlands

<sup>2</sup> Department of Sociology/Interuniversity Center for Social Science Theory and Methodology (ICS), University of Groningen, The Netherlands

<sup>3</sup> Department of Social Psychology, Tilburg University, The Netherlands

<sup>4</sup> Department of Sociology, Utrecht University, The Netherlands

Corresponding authors: Greijdanus, Hedy ([h.j.e.greijdanus@rug.nl](mailto:h.j.e.greijdanus@rug.nl)), Postmes, Tom ([t.postmes@rug.nl](mailto:t.postmes@rug.nl))

Current Opinion in Psychology 2020, 35:49–54

This review comes from a themed issue on **Social Change (Rallies, Riots and Revolutions) (2020)**

Edited by **Séamus A Power**

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2020.03.003>

2352-250X/© 2020 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Oftentimes, when thinking of activism people envision mass behaviours such as demonstrations and disruptive activities (blockades, riots). This contrasts sharply with online activism by individuals united in their worldviews yet dispersed in time and/or place. This review of online activism investigates the role of online activities in the larger repertoire of contention. We first briefly review

collective action as it occurs online. Many studies on online activism also consider its relations to offline protest. We discuss evidence for, respectively, negative, inconsistent, and positive relations between online and offline actions and their outcomes. We conclude with a consideration of protest in repressive contexts, and a discussion including directions for future research.

## Online activism

Online activism takes many forms, from symbolic signaling of one's stance on a politicised issue (e.g. changing one's social media profile picture) to more complex engagement (e.g. writing detailed posts about a social issue [1]). Social media facilitate online activism in three key ways. First, they allow individuals to express experiences and opinions, relating them to collective causes (see #metoo [2,3]). Second, they allow online community members to provide support, organise activities, and challenge negative responses to their activities [4]. One example is 'digilantism', where perceived norm transgressions (e.g. misogyny) are exposed and publicly sanctioned [5]. Within in-groups, this can raise awareness and nourish activism. Nevertheless, it has downsides similar to vigilantism and can invite an inter-group backlash [6]. Third, social media allow people to involve others outside their online community to collectively negotiate new shared realities and spread these [4,7]. This can empower communities, as exemplified by women's #freethenipple posts of topless photos to normalise unsexualised representations of breasts and reclaim the female body [4]. In sum, three types of communication via social media can boost activism: Relating individual perspectives to activist causes, organising activist communities, and negotiating shared realities with outsiders.

## Relations between online and offline action

The formation of online activist communities is rarely isolated: The online and offline are typically closely integrated. Indeed, online activism facilitates offline protest by advertising and organising it [8]. Increasingly, this means that mass protests can occur without formal structures (e.g. trade unions). Some suggest we are witnessing the birth of an entirely new form of *connective* action [9,10]: Bottom-up mobilisation that occurs when calls to action cascade through interconnected personal networks. Of course, social media vastly increase communication faculties, but throughout history comparable

bottom-up protests have regularly occurred. Pre-19th century, these were probably predominant, and studies of food riots and riots during the reformation [11,12] suggest that communications of the day (pamphlets, town square assemblies, rumours) played a role in the group dynamics of mobilisation similar to that played by social media today. Notwithstanding these similar communication functions, the literature provides a mixed view on the links between online and offline action —supporting, respectively, a negative, no unequivocal, or a positive relationship between online and offline activism. We will now discuss the empirical basis of these three perspectives.

#### **Negative relation: the trade-off hypothesis**

Especially when it was unfamiliar, online activism was dismissed as ‘slacktivism’ that was supposedly effort-free, unproductive, and inhibiting more effortful, effective offline protest (the latter is essentially a trade-off hypothesis). Increasingly, this reasoning is seen as simplistic [13]. Several factors moderate whether online and offline activism relate negatively. For instance, online activism does not inhibit offline protest if activists perceive their actions as effective [14<sup>••</sup>]. Other moderators are age (for older users online engagement is not sufficient) and network heterogeneity (homogeneity increases carry-over between online and offline activism through social support [15]). Furthermore, effortful online actions (producing videoclips, managing events) cross over to offline action [16]. Other mechanisms can also cause negative relations between the unfolding of collective action online and offline. For example, activists can online distance themselves from offline riots [17], illustrating how online and offline actions may react to each other by contrasting away from the other domain. Alternatively, online and offline activities can be complementary over phases of action: Planning and mobilisation, real-time reporting and framing, and aftertalk ‘reviewing’ actions and demobilisation. To recap, a few isolated studies suggest that online activism occasionally substitutes offline activism, but this appears to be rare. The relationship appears more complex than the trade-off hypothesis suggests.

#### **Inconsistent relation: digital divide, echo chambers, and digital dualism**

Other sources indicate that in some contexts, online and offline protests are neither negatively nor positively related. Three processes can explain this finding: (1) digital divides, (2) spiral of silence and echo chamber effects, and (3) digital dualism. First, people engaging in online action may differ from those acting offline — that is, digital divides. For instance, working-class people are less politically active online because they feel less technology savvy [18]. Furthermore, some evidence suggests that younger people engage more online and older men engage more offline [19]. This is contradicted by findings

that digital divides do not play a role in online petition signing [20]: The effort required for actions may play a moderating role.

Second, relations between online and offline activism become unreliable if processes that encourage or dampen activism evolve differently online versus offline. One such a process is the spiral of silence [21]: People self-censor opinions that they expect to be unpopular. But meta-analytic evidence suggests that the spiral of silence is equally strong online and offline [22]. Also, self-segregation into like-minded networks allegedly would cause online activism to be different. Social media characteristics (e.g. ease of ‘unfriending’) facilitate echo chambers [23], in which the same shared realities are echoed and socially validated, encouraging the formation of monocultures. The resulting perceived sharedness can strengthen people’s world views [24]. But the literature is not clear whether this is a greater problem online than offline and, moreover, evidence indicates that opinion heterogeneity (the opposite of echo chambers) can also fuel collective action [25].

Third, digital dualism suggests that people enact different personae online versus offline. Relatively anonymous online environments free people from concerns to be positively evaluated and consequent social restrictions to their behaviour [2,26,27]. This may facilitate online activism without fear of social repercussions. Online disinhibition becomes particularly likely if people lack self-control [28], are low in avoidant or anxious attachment [29], or suffer psychological distress [30]. A persistent misconception regarding online (relative) anonymity is that when people feel less individually identifiable they become deindividuated and, hence, less responsive to all social norms. Anonymity to outsiders instead empowers people to behave more consistently with the norms of their own group of ‘insiders’ [31<sup>•</sup>]. That is, pseudonymised online community members are only more likely to riot if that community consists of violent activists but disorderly behaviour is *less* likely if their community consists of pacifists. Thus, online activism potentially diverges from offline activism but the exact nature of this divergence is context-dependent.

#### **Positive relation: intrapersonal consistency and interpersonal mobilisation**

Ample evidence supports positive relations between online and offline activism [8,32,33,34]. Online activism participation can stimulate individuals to also protest offline — an *intrapersonal* effect. Small online actions can ease people into more costly offline action (although this foot-in-the-door technique may backfire especially for non-profit movements [35]). Besides this compliance technique, other psychological mechanisms may play a role. For instance, social media might encourage transition from online to offline activism by facilitating social identity formation — albeit recent

meta-analytic evidence is mixed [36<sup>••</sup>]. Online activism may thus cultivate the psychological preconditions to embolden individuals to embrace more burdensome offline protest. These preconditions include tightly knit, thick social identities characterised by online and offline interest alignment [37–40], morality, solidarity, or shared belief regarding the issue at hand [40–44], self-efficacy [44], and unfairness [45]. In addition to such gateway effects from online to offline action, the reverse may also occur; when one's offline action spills over into the online domain [46]. And finally, intrapersonal concurrence between online and offline activism may result from the intertwining of one's offline and online lives (e.g. incorporation of Tinder in people's intimate 'offline' life [47]). Thus, online and offline activism seem strongly related within persons — arguing against digital dualism [48].

Alternatively, *interpersonal* effects occur when individuals coordinate, recruit, develop social identities and shared realities, and share information online before, during, and after movements' initial rise [14<sup>••</sup>, 43, 49, 50, 51<sup>•</sup>, 52, 53]. Indeed, social media and online activism have been heralded as instrumental (albeit not without obstacles) in mobilising potential new participants for offline action [54]. Both intrapersonal and interpersonal consistency between online and offline activism paint a general picture of collective action as positively related across the two domains.

### Internet as technology for democratisation or repression

Most research on relationships between online and offline activism concerns western democracies. The few studies analysing non-democratic, repressive contexts mostly focus on macro-level cross-country analyses [55–57] on how internet access or use influences protests. The internet has a two-faced function [58], as liberation technology supporting activism [57] or repressive control technology [56]. Online actions can be subject to horizontal surveillance (social control among citizens, digilantism [5, 6]). Repressive regimes can also use the internet for vertical surveillance, controlling citizens and suppressing protests that threaten their power. Although the internet may support online activism and its spread to offline protest, such increases in (online and offline) protest can invigorate repression [55]. Thus, at the macro level online activism may initially stimulate offline activism under repressive regimes while the relation subsequently becomes complicated by the regimes' responses to these actions.

Micro-level analyses in these matters are rare, mainly due to the lack of individual-level data on activism in repressive contexts. As one exception, recent panel data indicate that Iranian Green Movement supporters who are more active online are also more active offline, and vice versa [59]. Additional micro-level support for positive

relations between online and offline activism comes from a cross-national survey in Muslim-majority countries around the Arab Spring [60]. Notably, individuals' general internet use was unrelated to offline protest. In sum, what people do online is more important than mere internet access in the relationship between online and offline activism.

### Discussion and conclusion

We have reviewed online activism and its relations with offline protest. To recap, several social media characteristics facilitate online activism: Particularly its role in documenting and collating individual experiences, in community building and norm formation, and in the development of shared social realities. There is mixed empirical evidence that online protest prevents offline protests, resulting in ineffective slacktivism. Other evidence suggests that in some cases, online and offline actions are relatively unrelated because people act differently online versus offline (intrapersonal effect) or because different people engage in online versus offline action (interpersonal effect). Overall, the literature currently suggests that in many cases online and offline activism correlate, either because people's online and offline behaviours are intertwined or because one person's online activism can mobilise others for offline protest. That is, the current evidence argues against digital dualism. In repressive contexts, macro-level analyses indicate that the internet can stimulate activism and revolutions, but also facilitate top-down repression. Micro-level evidence supports a positive relation between online activism and offline protest among citizens under repressive regimes.

Together, these findings suggest valuable avenues for future research. More research is needed on understudied phenomena such as restricted communication and repression. Future research could also focus on relations between technology and psychological outcomes, by exploring differences between online platforms (Facebook, Twitter), different online behaviours (commenting, sharing, liking), or new technologies (e.g. live streaming, asynchronous video-sharing [61]). Furthermore, research could cover more completely the life-cycle of online movements. Specifically, it could move beyond the predominant focus on the initial stages of (online) action development (cf. [62<sup>••</sup>]) by investigating unsuccessful social movements or cycles between online and offline action.

In conclusion, the current state of the literature paints an intriguing picture about how social media are utilised for collective action. The internet is widely used for emancipatory actions to raise awareness, rally people, set activist agendas, to debate and evaluate actions, but also antagonistically (by groups and authorities) to polarise, misinform, and repress unwanted actions. Unmistakably, minority groups can more easily make contact and make themselves heard through social media. This gives social

media a great vibrancy and pluralism, but it may also divide and polarise societies. Increasingly, online and offline activism are inseparable and complementary social-psychological instruments for politicisation, debate, mobilisation, and conflict.

### Conflict of interest statement

Nothing declared.

### Author note

This research was partly funded by a grant of the National Coordinator for Security and Counterterrorism at the Dutch Ministry of Justice and Security (grant number 40100013112) to Tom Postmes and Hedy Greijdanus. The funding source did not play a role in design, analysis, interpretation, writing, or any of the other stages of this research.

The authors thank Patrick Dülzen, Wouter Kieken, and Inka Papenfuss for their help with the literature search.

### CRedit authorship contribution statement

**Hedy Greijdanus:** Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Carlos A de Matos Fernandes:** Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Felicity Turner-Zwinkels:** Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Ali Honari:** Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Carla A Roos:** Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Hannes Rosenbusch:** Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Tom Postmes:** Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing.

### References and recommended reading

Papers of particular interest, published within the period of review, have been highlighted as:

- of special interest
  - of outstanding interest
1. Gomez EM, Kaiser CR: **From pixels to protest: using the internet to confront bias at the societal level.** In *Confronting Prejudice and Discrimination: The Science of Changing Minds and Behaviors*. Edited by Robyn K, Mallett RK, Monteith MJ. Elsevier; 2019:319-335 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-814715-3.00011-4>.
  2. Bogen KW, Bleiweiss KK, Leach NR, Orchowski LM: **# MeToo: disclosure and response to sexual victimization on Twitter.** *J Interpers Violence* 2019:0886260519851211 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0886260519851211>.
  3. Mendes K, Ringrose J, Keller J: **# MeToo and the promise and pitfalls of challenging rape culture through digital feminist activism.** *Eur J Women's Stud* 2018, **25**:236-246 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1350506818765318>.
  4. Rudolfsdottir AG, Johannsdottir A: **Fuck patriarchy! An analysis of digital mainstream media discussion of the #freethenipple activities in Iceland in March 2015.** *Fem Psychol* 2018, **28**:133-151 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0959353517715876>.
  5. Schwarz KC, Richey LA: **Humanitarian humor, digilantism, and the dilemmas of representing volunteer tourism on social media.** *New Media Soc* 2019, **21**:1928-1946 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1461444819834509>.
  6. Jane EA: **Online misogyny and feminist digilantism.** *Continuum* 2016, **30** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10304312.2016.1166560>.
  7. Turley E, Fisher J: **Tweeting back while shouting back: social media and feminist activism.** *Fem Psychol* 2018, **28**:128-132 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0959353517715875>.
  8. Zhuravskaya E, Petrova M, Enikolopov R: **Political Effects of the Internet and Social Media.** *Forthcoming.* *Annu Rev Econ.* <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3439957>.
  9. Bennett WL, Segerberg A: **The logic of connective action: digital media and the personalization of contentious politics.** *Inf Commun Soc* 2012, **15**:739-768 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.670661>.
  10. Nekmat E, Gower KK, Zhou S, Metzger M: **Connective-collective action on social media: moderated mediation of cognitive elaboration and perceived source credibility on personalness of source.** *Commun Res* 2019, **46**:62-87 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0093650215609676>.
  11. Pollmann J: **Countering the reformation in France and the Netherlands: clerical leadership and catholic violence 1560-1585.** *Past Present* 2006, **190**:83-120 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtj003>.
  12. Thompson EP: **The moral economy of the English crowd in the eighteenth century.** *Past Present* 1971, **50**:76-136 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/past/50.1.76>.
  13. Halupka M: **The legitimisation of clicktivism.** *Aust J Political Sci* 2018, **53**:130-141 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10361146.2017.1416586>.
  14. Wilkins DJ, Livingstone AG, Levine M: **All click, no action? Online action, efficacy perceptions, and prior experience combine to affect future collective action.** *Comput. Hum. Behav. Hum Behav* 2019, **91**:97-105 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.09.007>.
  - The authors use actual online activism (i.e. sharing an article about an issue on participants' own social media page) as the basis for a quasi-experimental design. They show that social media sharing increases further activism, provided that people were already active and perceive their act of online activism as effective.
  15. Kwak N, Lane DS, Weeks BE, Kim DH, Lee SS, Bachleda S: **Perceptions of social media for politics: testing the slacktivism hypothesis.** *Hum Commun Res* 2018, **44**:197-221 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/hcr/hqx008>.
  16. Manduley AE, Mertens AE, Plante I, Sultana A: **The role of social media in sex education: dispatches from queer, trans, and racialized communities.** *Fem Psychol* 2018, **28**:152-170 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0959353517717751>.
  17. LeFebvre RK, Armstrong C: **Grievance-based social movement mobilization in the #Ferguson Twitter storm.** *New Media Soc* 2018, **20**:8-28 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1461444816644697>.
  18. Schradie J: **The digital activism gap: how class and costs shape online collective action.** *Soc Probl* 2018, **65**:51-74 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spx042>.
  19. Hoffmann CP, Lutz C: **Digital divides in political participation: the mediating role of social media self-efficacy and privacy concerns.** *Policy Internet Early View* 2019:1-24 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/poi3.22>.
  20. Elliott T, Earl J: **Online protest participation and the digital divide: modeling the effect of the digital divide on online petition-signing.** *New Media Soc* 2018, **20**:698-719 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1461444816669159>.
  21. Noelle-Neumann E: **The spiral of silence a theory of public opinion.** *J Commun* 1974, **24**:43-51 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1974.tb00367.x>.



22. Matthes J, Knoll J, von Sikorski C: **The “spiral of silence” revisited: a meta-analysis on the relationship between perceptions of opinion support and political opinion expression.** *Commun Res* 2018, **45**:3-33 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0093650217745429>.
23. Sasahara K, Chen W, Peng H, Ciampaglia GL, Flammini A, Menczer F: **On the inevitability of online echo chambers.** *arXiv* 2019. preprint arXiv:1905.03919 In: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1905.03919.pdf>.
24. Echterhoff G, Higgins ET: **Shared reality: construct and mechanisms.** *Curr Opin Psychol* 2018, **23**:iv-vii <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2018.09.003>.
25. Guidetti M, Cavazza N, Graziani AR: **Perceived disagreement and heterogeneity in social networks: distinct effects on political participation.** *J Soc Psychol* 2016, **156**:222-242 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2015.1095707>.
26. Krämer NC, Schäwel J: **Mastering the challenge of balancing self-disclosure and privacy in social media.** *Curr Opin Psychol* 2019, **31**:67-71 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.08.003>.
27. Suler J: **The online disinhibition effect.** *Cyber Psychol Behav* 2004, **7**:321-326 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/1094931041291295101094931041291295>.
28. Voggeser BJ, Singh RK, Göritz AS: **Self-control in online discussions: disinhibited online behavior as a failure to recognize social cues.** *Front Psychol* 2018, **8**:2372 <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02372>.
29. Chen L, Hu N, Shu C, Chen X: **Adult attachment and self-disclosure on social networking site: a content analysis of Sina Weibo.** *Pers Individ Diff* 2019, **138**:96-105 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.09.028>.
30. Luo M, Hancock J: **Self-disclosure and social media: motivations, mechanisms and psychological well-being.** *Curr Opin Psychol* 2019, **31**:110-115 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.08.019>.
31. Reicher SD, Spears R, Postmes T, Kende A: **Disputing deindividuation: Why negative group behaviours derive from group norms, not group immersion.** *Behav. Brain Sci. Brain Sci* 2016, **39** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X15001491>.  
Analyzing data from Hungary, Romania, Germany, the UK, the US, and Australia, the authors show that individual differences and exposure to events through social media promote group consciousness, which in turn predicts solidarity with refugees.
32. Boulianne S: **Twenty years of digital media effects on civic and political participation.** *Commun Res Online First* 2018:1-20. 0093650218808186. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0093650218808186>.
33. Chae Y, Lee S, Kim Y: **Meta-analysis of the relationship between internet use and political participation: examining main and moderating effects.** *Asian J Commun* 2019, **29**:35-54 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01292986.2018.1499121>.
34. Slavina A, Brym R: **Demonstrating in the internet age: a test of Castells' theory.** *Soc Mov Stud* 2019:1-21 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2019.1627866>.
35. Greitemeyer T, Sagioglou C: **When positive ends tarnish the means: the morality of nonprofit more than of for-profit organizations is tainted by the use of compliance techniques.** *J Exp Soc Psychol* 2018, **76**:67-75 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.12.007>.
36. Priante A, Ehrenhard ML, van den Broek T, Need A: **Identity and collective action via computer-mediated communication: a review and agenda for future research.** *New Media Soc* 2018, **20**:2647-2669 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1461444817744783>.  
In this systematic review of literature on identity and online activism, the authors provide a nuanced view of both limits and affordances of online platforms for identity processes relevant to activism.
37. Boulianne S, Theocharis Y: **Young people, digital media, and engagement: a meta-analysis of research.** *Soc Sci Comput Rev* 2018, **38**:111-127 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0894439318814190>.
38. Davis JL, Love TP, Fares P: **Collective social identity: synthesizing identity theory and social identity theory using digital data.** *Soc Psychol Q* 2019, **82**:254-273 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0190272519851025>.
39. Kahne J, Bowyer B: **The political significance of social media activity and social networks.** *Political Commun* 2018, **35**:470-493 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2018.1426662>.
40. Rohlinger DA, Bunnage LA: **Collective identity in the digital age: thin and thick identities in moveon. Org and the tea party movement.** *Mobilization* 2018, **23**:135-157 <http://dx.doi.org/10.17813/1086-671X-23-2-135>.
41. Alberici AI, Milesi P: **Online discussion and the moral pathway to identity politicization and collective action.** *Eur J Psychol* 2018, **14**:143 <https://doi.org/10.5964%2Fejop.v14i1.1507>.
42. Smith LG, McGarty C, Thomas EF: **After Aylan Kurdi: how tweeting about death, threat, and harm predict increased expressions of solidarity with refugees over time.** *Psychol Sci* 2018, **29**:623-634 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0956797617741107>.
43. Thomas EF, Cary N, Smith LG, Spears R, McGarty C: **The role of social media in shaping solidarity and compassion fade: how the death of a child turned apathy into action but distress took it away.** *New Media Soc* 2018, **20**:3778-3798 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1461444818760819>.
44. Velasquez A, Quenette AM: **Facilitating social media and offline political engagement during electoral cycles: using social cognitive theory to explain political action among Hispanics and Latinos.** *Mass Commun Soc* 2018, **21**:763-784 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2018.1484489>.
45. Chon M, Park H: **Social media activism in the digital age: testing an integrative model of activism on contentious issues.** *J Mass Commun Q* 2019, **97**:72-97 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077699019835896>.
46. Kim Y, Russo S, Amnå E: **The longitudinal relation between online and offline political participation among youth at two different developmental stages.** *New Media Soc* 2016, **19**:899-917 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1461444815624181>.
47. Newett L, Churchill B, Robards B: **Forming connections in the digital era: tinder, a new tool in young Australian intimate life.** *J Sociol* 2018, **54**:346-361 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1440783317728584>.
48. Jurgenson N: **Digital dualism versus augmented reality.** *Soc Pages* 2011, **24**.
49. Kaun A, Uldam J: **‘Volunteering is like any other business’: civic participation and social media.** *New Media Soc* 2018, **20**:2186-2207 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1461444817731920>.
50. Kaun A, Uldam J: **“It Only Takes Two Minutes”: the So-called Migration Crisis and Facebook As Civic Infrastructure.** 2019.
51. Valenzuela S, Correa T, Iga H: **Ties, likes, and tweets: Using strong and weak ties to explain differences in protest participation across Facebook and Twitter use.** *Political Commun* 2018, **35**:117-134 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2017.1334726>.  
With a cross-sectional, face-to-face survey on a representative sample of Chilean youths, the authors find that the paths through which social media influence offline activism differ across platforms. Facebook is most influential through strong-tie networks, whereas Twitter is most influential through weak-tie networks.
52. Jackson S: **Young feminists, feminism and digital media.** *Fem Psychol* 2018, **28**:32-49 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0959353517716952>.
53. Jost JT, Barberá P, Bonneau R, Langer M, Metzger M, Nagler J, Sterling J, Tucker JA: **How social media facilitates political protest: information, motivation, and social networks.** *Political Psychol* 2018, **39**:85-118 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/pops.12478>.
54. Dumitrica D, Felt M: **Mediated grassroots collective action: negotiating barriers of digital activism.** *Inf Commun Soc* 2019:1-17 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1618891>.
55. Christensen B, Groshek J: **Emerging media, political protests, and government repression in autocracies and democracies from 1995 to 2012.** *Int Commun Gaz Online First* 2019:1-20 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1748048518825323>.

56. Rød EG, Weidmann NB: **Empowering activists or autocrats? The internet in authoritarian regimes.** *J Peace Res* 2015, **52**:338-351 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0022343314555782>.
57. Ruijgrok K: **From the web to the streets: internet and protests under authoritarian regimes.** *Democratization* 2017, **24**:498-520 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2016.1223630>.
58. Diamond L, Plattner MF: *Liberation Technology: Social Media and the Struggle for Democracy.* JHU Press; 2012.
59. Honari A: *Online and Offline Political Participation under Repression: Iranian Green Movement Supporters Between Two Elections, 2009-2013.* 2019.
60. Kim HH, Lim C: **From virtual space to public space: the role of online political activism in protest participation during the Arab Spring.** *Int J Comp Sociol* 2020, **60**:409-434 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0020715219894724>.
61. Martini M: **Online distant witnessing and live-streaming activism: emerging differences in the activation of networked publics.** *New Media Soc* 2018, **20**:4035-4055 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1461444818766703>.
62. Rohman A: **Persistent connection and participation: New media use in post-peace movement Ambon, Indonesia.** *New Media Soc* 2019, **21**:1787-1803 <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1461444819831973>.

Using interviews and participant observation, the author shows that peace movement actors in Ambon, Indonesia, employ social media to sustain their movement. This is a rare example of a study that follows a social movement's online behaviours after its initial rise and peak.