



Relationship between online and *offline* political participation in sub-national campaigns

Relación de la participación política online y *offline* en el contexto de campañas subnacionales

Relação de participação política online e offline no contexto de campanhas subnacionais

Alejandra Rodríguez-Estrada, Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, Baja California, México (alejandra.rodriguez33@uabc.edu.mx)

Carlos Muñiz, Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León, Nuevo León, México (carlos.munizm@uanl.mx)

Martín Echeverría Victoria, Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Puebla, México (echevemartin@yahoo.com.mx)

ABSTRACT | It is relevant to observe how public opinion is configured in the new media, especially in the role of the actor as someone who even participates in the institutions. For this, a post-election digital analytical survey was applied in the Mexican states of Nuevo León in 2015 (N = 294) and Puebla in 2016 (N = 301), to get to know and compare the relationship between the report of online political participation with both the *offline* conventional and non-conventional participation for each entity. Differences were found in the digital involvement that even affect the electoral game.

KEYWORDS: new media; online political participation; conventional political participation; democracy.

HOW TO CITE

Rodríguez-Estrada, A., Muñiz, C., & Echeverría, M. (2019). Relación de la participación política *online* y *offline* en el contexto de campañas subnacionales. *Cuadernos.info*, (46), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.7764/cdi.46.1712>

RESUMEN | Resulta relevante observar cómo se configura la opinión pública en los nuevos medios, sobre todo en el rol del actor como alguien que incluso participa de las instituciones. Para ello, se aplicó una encuesta analítica digital postelectoral en los estados mexicanos de Nuevo León en 2015 (N = 294) y Puebla en 2016 (N = 301), para conocer y comparar la relación entre el reporte de la participación política online con la offline, tanto convencional como no convencional para cada entidad. Se encontraron diferencias en el involucramiento digital que incluso repercuten en el juego electoral.

PALABRAS CLAVE: *new media*; participación política online; participación política convencional; participación política no convencional; democracia.

RESUMO | É relevante observar como a opinião pública se configura nas novas mídias, especialmente no papel do ator como alguém que até participa das instituições. Para isso, uma pesquisa analítica digital pós-eleitoral foi aplicada nos estados mexicanos de Nuevo León em 2015 (N = 294) e Puebla em 2016 (N = 301), a fim de conhecer e comparar a relação entre o relato de participação política on-line, com off-line convencional e não convencional para cada entidade. Diferenças foram encontradas no envolvimento digital que até afetam o jogo eleitoral.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *newmedia*; participação política on-line; participação política convencional; participação política não convencional; democracia.

INTRODUCTION

This article shows the importance of political participation in Mexico, especially from the understanding of a citizen-actor in institutional processes, considering that more communicative and action alternatives exist currently in parts of the population due to digital platforms. Then, from the existing conceptualization of traditional and non-traditional political participation, we attempt to understand its differences in the context of subnational campaigns, one with more social network use than the other, to distinguish how active citizens report their predispositions to participate digitally. In a first moment, this article explores the concept of political participation in general and reviews the literature on political participation online and its approaches; following, it focuses in the Mexican case from the political and digital scenes and, next, in two subnational campaign cases and its context. The research questions are derived from postulates by Kim, Ruso and Amnå (2016) that propose the methodological approach. Further, preliminary comparative results are presented (Nuevo León and Puebla) and some discussions.

THE CONCEPT OF POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

There is an epistemological tension in the literature on institutions (Colomer, 2001; March & Olsen, 1997) that creates a great field of analysis and reflection to approach the richness in current models of participation, either by introducing the concept of active citizens, the institution or the actor itself and his process of choice and decision. The fact that an institution conceives itself from its foundations permits coherence and consistency due to cohesion and, at the same time, legitimacy.

In their work, March and Olsen (1997) said that “institutional practices are cultural products and individuals abide to them because they do not consider alternatives to the socialization process” (p. 17). That is, our political cultural consumption appears to be given, and to this end different agents are disposed to contribute to it. Rivas (2002), on his end, indicates institutions make a mark in the structure of domination and political power, given that, although they are structured due to the political system, the practices, behaviors, rules, routines and codes are also consolidated through the socialization process that allow to visualize the possibility to participate and the capacity to achieve common goals.

Finally, it cannot be forgotten that mobility or stability in institutions is provided by legitimacy between the individuals that participate in them; an institution will end when it loses the meaning that legitimizes that institution. Hence, we may understand certain reproduction process and the active roles that agents play to build in society, in contrast with the powerlessness or the demotivation or demoralization that could only produce passivity or easy positions such as

free riders. Besides, these predispositions may be activated or not with new participation possibilities using new media; and observing the latter, they also amplify the analysis and theory spectrum from traditional paradigms.

New questions awoke by the expression spaces that could be offered by the so-called new media and its role in citizens' political participation. The literature reviewed in the subsequent section proposes that political participation online must be analyzed in relationship with political participation offline. Besides, it is relevant to understand it not just by the reports with respect voting (traditional political participation) but also its construction (nontraditional political participation), which is mainly activated by electoral campaigns.

In an ideal scenario, considering what was mentioned, an environment with governability and robust institutions would be expected, to allow a consolidated democracy in the expectation of installing models that use the active relationship between the actor and the institution. Although the democratic and digital scenarios present conditions that may be considered adequate, the citizens' report may not be completely optimal. Following data by Latinobarómetro (2016), there is a social environment in Mexico that is characterized by citizens' disaffection, and manifested in data such as the low satisfaction with democracy. Only 19% of Mexican are satisfied with democracy, much below the regional mean (Latin America) of 37%. These circumstances appear to also have consequences in electoral turnout.

Uhlener (1985, quoted by Delfino & Zubieta, 2010) states that political participation is an instrumental phenomenon, given that it is mean to achieve other political ends. However, it may also be possible to observe it as an end in itself, as it permits the empowerment of citizens and understand citizens as actors in the democratic system it belongs, and not just as a passive observer.

There are different conceptualizations of political participation in the literature, both in traditional theories and in more recent studies that tackle the offline world. In this regard, Delfino and Zubieta (2010) group them in a study by considering classic authors such as Verba, Barnes and Kaase, and distinguish them in the dichotomy of active and passive, aggressive and nonaggressive, structural and nonstructural, governmental and nongovernmental, directed and voluntary, with expected and unexpected results. This proposal allows to understand the concept's complexity. A dichotomy that is relevant to the topic to be explored is that of institutional or mobilization (Seligson, 1980 in Delfino & Zubieta, 2010). On the other hand, the literature also finds a strong debate on the categorization of traditional and nontraditional political participation (Sabucedo & Arce, 1991; Barnes & Kaase, 1979; Delfino & Zubieta, 2010).

For some authors, traditional political participation consists in discussing politics with friends, to convince people of voting for a party, to attend political meetings, contact or relate with politicians and to do campaign with candidates (Delfino & Zubieta, 2010). Nontraditional political participation, in contrast, tends to be understood as the “protest potential” (Delfino & Zubieta, 2010, p. 212), that is, those practices of pressure to the margin of law.

Other authors tend to define this nontraditional political participation as non-orthodox and even illegal. While in traditional definitions political participation has a legitimizing function of established order, nontraditional states a conception that may be considered as constructivist, but breaking the status quo.

Political participation online

Translating the concept of political participation to new action spaces as social media (new media), as mentioned above, is to enter the inescapable scenario of power games (Castells, 2009). With respect to this field of study, different approaches may be observed in previous works.

In the literature, most of those that relate political participation in reference to new media are framed by two phenomena: social mobilization (Vissers & Stolle, 2014; Hirzalla, van Zoonen, & de Ridder, 2010; Anduiza, Cristancho, & Sabucedo, 2014; Krueger, 2002) the opportunities to participate via the Internet should disproportionately extend to high-resource individuals. I argue that the focus on access has important theoretical limitations. If one accepts the future possibility of near-equal access, then explorations of the Internet’s participatory potential should include theoretical guidance about what types of individuals would most likely participate if equal Internet access were achieved. Drawing on diverse literature, two expectations develop; one predicts the reinforcement of existing participation patterns, and the other suggests a change in those patterns to include new types of individuals. I empirically test these competing claims, concluding that given equalized access, the Internet shows genuine potential to bring new individuals into the political process.

,"author":{"dropping-particle":"","family":"Krueger","given":"B. S.","non-dropping-particle":"","parse-names":false,"suffix":""},"container-title":"American Politics Research","id":"ITEM-1","issue":"5","issued":{"date-parts":[["2002"]]},"page":"476-498","title":"Assessing the Potential of Internet Political Participation in the United States: A Resource Approach","type":"article-journal","volume":"30"},"uris":["http://www.mendeley.com/documents/?uuiid=5dc2c70f-b025-4822-bf8c-0d3e00be8188"]},"mendeley":{"formattedCitation":"(Krueger, 2002 and the electoral environment (Tolbert & Mcneal, 2003; Bavoleo, 2013).

In the former, political mobilizations’ literature recognizes that electronic pivot potentializes of collective actions and the possibilities of its behavior. For

example, Harlow (2011) points out that platforms such as Facebook and Twitter help in organizing protests, as was observed in the Guatemalan case. In addition, the study analyzes how social movements are sustained in function to affiliation and risk perception, showing that nonaffiliated participants tend to attend to low-risk events, while those that have a strong affiliation or identity attend to high risk mobilizations, as long as a better way of life is foreshadowed. In this sense, the literature offers more elements to nontraditional political participation but is more oriented towards mobilization, which may even go against current laws.

Furthermore, in the case of political mobilizations or protests, Vissers and Stolle (2014) observe that political participation in social media tends to foster other actions that are linked or has indirect effects in offline protests. This study finds a strong relationship between Facebook posts and attending offline protests. Hence, it appears to confirm that political activity in the platform is mobilized and reinforced. This result is similar to that observed by Quintelier and Vissers (2007), who point out that online activities are clearly and significantly associated with offline political participation.

On the other hand, and considering a more complex dimension to online participation, there are studies that study slacktivism, that originates in digital platforms, where participation is recognized in platforms as sensations of welfare in citizens but may have no impact in real life for those who practice it (Córdoba, 2017; Cornelissen, Karellaia, & Soyer, 2013). These studies also show the relativity of online participation, which may imply a less level of commitment from citizens, but a degree of satisfaction that may create some simulation of citizenship. In this sense, Bennet, Wells and Freelon (2011) make another category of citizens' practices that may be relevant, as Actualizing Citizens (AC) and Dutiful Citizens (DC), which deepens in the degree of commitment that citizens may have.

Regarding the electoral environment, these views tend to highlight that Internet tools enable the increase of participation (Tolbert & Mcneal, 2003). In their North American study, these authors observe that the probability of voting increases from 7.5% to 12%, reinforcing the mobilizing potential of Internet, that is also associated with other types of participation beyond voting (Tolbert & McNeal, 2003).

Further, Calendar and Meier (2009) point out that, even if Internet has a relevant role in new politics¹ and may reinvigorate political participation, it does not trigger a shift from old politics, that is, it cannot confirm that the existence

1. Which is a reference to new ways to do politics in a digital era, against old inertia and that derivates in bad practices from old politics.

of new mechanisms to participate in politics will imply new practices; probably, old practices will be reproduced with different rhetorical practices. Although, as Brunsting and Postmes (2002) highlight, if participation from peripheral members permeates, it may activate collective actions. On the other hand, Tang and Lee (2013) indicate that the positive relationship between digital platforms and political participation remains, but this association is observed mostly in those that have connections with political actors, who follow them and expose themselves to their information. In this regard, the space of new actors may permit power dynamics more plural and participative, but not necessarily new practices.

In terms of traditional political participation, Wang (2007) suggests that using Internet promotes feelings of trust and efficacy, which propitiates that individuals become more engaged in political participation and its institutions. On the other hand, there are studies showing that Internet use decreases political participation (Kim et al., 2016), especially in the case of regions with more inequality, where political participation tends to decrease. It is likely that, in virtue of this inhibition to participate actively (because of different elements that are not to be studied here) users have a sublimation in social media, that is, they may have more motivation to participate. Nonetheless, in Latin America there is not much research on this regard, and there is need for studies that clarify the relationship between online and offline participation. In previous studies, both those that analyze new media in social mobilization and those that study electoral events, there is a trend to study the role of one political participation instead of the other, offline over online and vice versa, and not the relationship between both.

Regarding the relationship between offline and online political participation, Kim et al. (2016) group four hypothesis from the available literature: the independency hypothesis, the spillover hypothesis, the gateway hypothesis and, lastly, that of reciprocity.

The independence hypothesis indicates that online and offline participation are autonomous, and report separate behaviors, so there is no influence between them (Baumgartner & Morris, 2010; Emmer, Wolling, & Vowe, 2012). On the other hand, the spillover hypothesis proposes that citizens that participate offline have tools online to exert their influence; that is, those who were previously involved offline may extend it in online participation with the platforms that allow it, highlighting political participation offline above online (Delli Carpini, 2002; Norris, 2001).

Furthermore, the gateway hypothesis shows that political participation online has influence in political participation offline. It establishes that people may contribute qualities online that develops a psychological empowerment, and

allows more active participation offline (Velasquez & LaRose, 2015), and reports that participation online potentializes political participation offline.

The last hypothesis is that of reciprocity that asserts that political participation online and offline mutually affect each other. As it is held by Nam (2012), citizens that are active online are also offline. It is interesting to test such hypothesis in Mexico because of the relevance of the Mexican digital context in general, and because of the particularities in the two subnational campaigns that did a different digital management.

In the next section we contextualize the Mexican case and the two subnational campaigns. Next, we present the methodology and results and, finally, discussions and conclusions.

POLITICAL AND DIGITAL CONTEXT IN MEXICO

The Mexican political system had a set of power shifts between the new possibilities that is provided by alternance, opening to independent candidates and the challenges of legislation in digital political communication. Optimistically, it is said that it was a transition from a nondemocratic system to a democracy, and it enabled mechanisms of political and electoral competition, moderate pluralism, and political participation (Navarrete, 2008).

Latinobarómetro (2016) reports that the role played by new technologies in shifting perceptions has been remarkable, as well as the incidence in public opinion. It says that:

It is likely that social media and the Internet's immediacy is related with this sense of time, where past appears not to exist. What happens this morning is already old in the afternoon, and people anxiously looks forward to what is next. The world's speed has change but not the speed of politics, which is as tedious as before. This disparity produces impatience and frustration, and social movements and protests are related with this malady and the speed of change. What 5 years ago was tolerable, is not today (p. 7).

That is not a minor statement, as it is part of a longitudinal study with a standardized comparison² that follows over ten years and, hence, is sensitive to the impact of attitudes and perceptions that citizens have of transformations product of

2. Although the methodology may be improved, the report shows a useful comparation on countries.

new technologies. In fact, following its 2016 report, Latinobarómetro created a new paradigm in analysis regarding the role of social media in setting public opinion.

Traditionally, political communication is understood as a process of production, dissemination and perception of political information to achieve consent on a political action (Chekunova, Barabash, Trofimova, & Lenko, 2016), but it is almost always a one-way exchange or transmission of knowledge. Literature on this regard is built from this assumption, which lags researchers to produce new science on the issue, as it must be known how is communication articulated with its possibilities and limitations in new mass media.

Technological circumstances that allow to visualize the interaction and exchange permit to rethink the traditional theoretical assumptions, at least in Latin America which may be lagged behind in this sense (Muñoz Dader, Téllez, & Salazar, 2016; Alvidrez, 2017; Treré & Cargnelutti, 2014). By itself, digital platforms like Twitter or Facebook represent the greatest media concentration of all times (Castells, 2009). The current political communication model may include small influences from citizens, even assigning the issues agenda or by interaction and report in social media, previously observed in the literature review.

Back to the digital arena, according to the AMIPCI (Asociación Mexicana de Internet, 2018), 65.8% of Mexicans (74 million) have access to Internet and, in this number, most of them are involved in social networks culture either by exposure, interaction or belonging. 95% of internet users reports to be registered in some social media (MillwardBrown, 2017) and 79% report to use them frequently.

Although the trend is increasing the use of Internet due to demographics and expanding coverage, there are other elements like education and income, that differentiate access. Between those that have secondary or postsecondary education, 80% to 90% are reported as users (<http://www.inegi.org.mx>). In this situation, even though it may be pointed out that coverage is greater every day, it is different for the youngest and more educated.

Another interesting fact in Mexico is the regional distribution, similar to trends in economic development, where the north has more households with Internet and the south fewer (according to figures from the 2015 Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía, INEGI). Federal entities with more households with this service in 2015, following INEGI (2015), are Mexico City (65%), Nuevo León (59%), Baja California Sur (58%), Sonora (56%) and Baja California (55%); while Chiapas (14%), Oaxaca (19%), Tabasco (23%), Guerrero (24%) and Tlaxcala (25%) report less households with connectivity. Regarding cities, for example, Monterrey city reports almost 70% of coverage, while Puebla has around 50%.

Context of electoral campaigns

Electoral campaigns are a melting pot that allows visualizing political preferences of citizens, they show attitudes, perceptions and actions; there is an effervescent environment so it is relevant to observe what is projected in this regard. To analyze two elections in different periods and, from this, do comparative studies, provides insights on online political participation in social media that establishes some relationship with offline political participation. Further, it is in campaigns where it is possible to achieve “effective dissemination of political information” (Muñiz et al., 2016, p. 136).

For this paper we are interested in understanding the role of political participation online, specifically that of social media both in traditional offline political participation and nontraditional offline participation; in one hand, to assess the degree of citizens’ empowerment with respect to its entity in periods of campaign, and, on the other hand, to differentiate between two subnational campaigns in Mexico. Besides, it tries to approach the dependence of every type of political participation, online and offline, in a *post hoc* effort to locate any of the assumptions from the literature, following the proposal by Kim et al. (2016). For this, it is relevant to study and compare political participation online and offline in two states of Mexico that underwent political processes like the electoral campaign to governors: Nuevo León in 2015 and Puebla 2016. This, using the features of both processes and the context of each state that we provide next.

The Nuevo León subnational election is a milestone in Mexico, as it was the first recorded case in recent history where an independent candidate won for Governor³. Nuevo León elections were on June 7th of 2015 after a strong campaign between the official candidates and their coalitions: the Partido de la Revolución democrática (PRI) with the Partido Verde Ecologista de México (PVEM) and the Partido Nueva Alianza (PANAL), known as the “Alliance for your security;” the Partido Acción Nacional (PAN) and the Partido de la Revolución Democrática (PRD)⁴, and the independent candidate Jaime Heliódoro Rodríguez Calderón, nicknamed the Bronco.

The campaign was characterized by traditional strategies by established parties and a strategical campaign based in digital media and social networks (Facebook, Twitter and YouTube) by the independent party. Following Berumen and Medellín (2016), “the youngest Mexican voters with more years of education

3. It was also the third instance of alternance in the state.

4. Which also included candidates from the Partidos del Trabajo (PT), Movimiento Ciudadano (MC), Partido Cruzada Ciudadana (PCC), Movimiento Regeneración Nacional (Morena), Partido Humanista (PH) and the Partido Encuentro Social (PES).

decided the election in favor of the candidate” (p. 61). In addition to state governor elections, the state had major and congress elections, creating a wobbly electoral environment. In the nominal list, 3,506,457 people were registered and, after the election, 2,090,280 actually voted, meaning a 58.7% turnout (<https://www.ceenl.mx/>). These elements produced a strong and sustained electoral environment.

On the other hand, the Puebla state governor election was a contest for a year and eight months office, given the homologation with state and federal elections. Puebla elections were on June 5th of 2016 after a campaign with two coalitions: *Sigamos Avanzando* (Keep Advancing), with the PAN (Partido Acción Nacional), the PANAL (Nueva Alianza), CPP (Compromiso por Puebla), PSI (Pacto Social de Integración) and the PT (Partido del Trabajo) with the candidate José Antonio Gali Fayad, and the coalition shaped by the PRI (Partido Revolucionario Institucional) and the PVEM (Verde Ecologista de México), led by candidate Blanca Alcalá Ruíz. Furthermore, Roxana Luna by the PRD (Partido de la Revolución Democrática), Abraham Quiroz by MORENA (Movimiento de Regeneración Nacional) and Ana Teresa Aranda Orozo as independent, were also running for office.

In this election, 4,298,082 citizens were listed to vote and only 44.67% actually voted (www.preppuebla.org). The winner was José Antonio Gali Fayad from Sigamos Avanzando coalition, who won 45.3% of votes, followed by Blanca Alcalá Ruíz with 33.5% of votes (following data from 2016 by PREP Puebla). In contrast with Nuevo León, Puebla had a campaign of continuity which kept the incumbent party, with less electoral participation, probably because it is a small office and the campaign did not have as much presence as in Nuevo León.

In both campaigns these elements and turnout data may shed light on comparative analysis, specially to understand its effects in political participation online or offline, traditional or nontraditional; in a country that, for these elections, was undergoing a process of digital transition, where observing the type of participation is relevant.

For this, an exploratory approach, using this context and literature, especially those assumptions by Kim et al. (2016), pose the following research questions, considering too that there is existing literature on online participation in Mexico but none of the relations nor on subnational campaigns:

- RQ1. Is there a difference in the degree of online political participation between Nuevo León and Puebla?
- RQ2. Is there a difference in the degree of traditional offline political participation between Nuevo León and Puebla?

- RQ3. Is there a difference in the degree of nontraditional offline political participation between Nuevo León and Puebla?
- RQ4. How are different kinds of political participation related between both states?
- RQ5. What is the hypothesis that explains better the relationship between types of political participation?

METHODOLOGY

Data is from a study elaborated with the School of Political Science and International Relationships in the Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León (UANL) and the Institute of Government Sciences and Strategic Development in the Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla (BUAP). This study generated a survey using a sample applied to both states that were exposed to electoral campaigns. With this purpose, Facebook users were invited to participate in the online survey that was promoted by advertisement.

The data collection in Nuevo León was in June and July 2015, after the election. It was replicated a year later in Puebla 2016 after elections. The survey was limited to people 18 years old or older and registered in the electoral nominal list of each state.

The online survey in Nuevo León had a sample of 294 individuals, 51% were male and 49% female. From these, 50% had college degrees, 38% had postgraduate degrees, 8% had a high school degree, and 2% attended middle and elementary school. The mean age was 34 years (SD 12.57). In contrast with Puebla, we notice a higher degree of education and income. Finally, we asked participants to self-report their ideology between left (0) and right (10): in Nuevo León, the sample was slightly center-right ($M=5.32$, $SD=2.28$) in the spectrum.

The online survey in Puebla had 301 participants, 60% male and 40% female. It is observed that 58% had college degree, 20% had postgraduate degrees and 17% finished high school, while only 5% has elementary and middle school; that is, the sample had high degree of education but, as mentioned, no more than Nuevo León. The sample cannot be considered representative of Puebla's population; it is understood as a sample with its own characteristics. Regarding age, the mean person was 39 years old ($SD=14.5$) and, ideologically, they report a center-left orientation ($M=4.94$, $SD=2.75$).

Variables used

Offline traditional political participation. To construct an indicator over traditional political participation, a scale was created by adding four replies that

measured actions that reflect traditional political actions. The survey questions the collaboration or work (2) or not (1) in electoral campaigns, work with a candidate or party in the campaign, attended meetings by political parties or made requests or visit to politicians, governors or public servants. The internal consistency of this scale was assessed and an acceptable reliability was found in Nuevo León ($\alpha = 0.74$) and Puebla ($\alpha = 0.72$).

Offline nontraditional political participation. The indicator was constructed with replies that reflect actions of nontraditional or formal political participation. Participants were asked a yes (2) or no (1) question on their attendance to demonstrations or boycotts of public acts, or attendance to demonstrations in favor or against candidates and attendance to demonstrations, blockades or others⁵. The internal consistency was assessed and found reliable in Nuevo León ($\alpha = 0.72$) and Puebla ($\alpha = 0.80$).

Online traditional political participation. Finally, alongside the traditional participation offline, political participation and involvement in online practices was measured, specifically through social media. For this, a scale was design with nine items that measured the degree of involvement in, for example, granting support and cheer for candidates, making direct questions to candidates or indicating a candidate's message as favorite in their social networks. The Likert scale between none (1) and a lot (5) was used. The reliability analysis proved a high degree of internal consistency in Nueva León ($\alpha = 0.91$) and Puebla ($\alpha = 0.87$), having an acceptable reliability for this variable.

RESULTS

The first research questions stated suggests the existence or not of differences between both states with respect to different kinds of political participation. Specially, it tries to find if measurements of political participation online and offline are equal or which one is larger in each case (Nueva León and Puebla).

In the case of the question: is there a difference in the degree of online political participation between Nuevo León and Puebla? A t-test for independent sample shows a clear difference in both states. Henceforth, the offline political participation is different in Nueva León ($M = 0.30$, $SD = 0.35$) and in Puebla ($M = 0.23$, $SD = 0.32$), which is slightly larger in Nueva León than Puebla, $t(593) = 2.542$, $p = 0.012$, $d = 0.238$ (Table 1).

5. Public street's blockades and blanket demonstrations were alternative mechanisms used by citizen to alter the established order and receive attention from authorities.

These results appear to reinforce that a social media-oriented campaign, as Nuevo León apparently had, indeed has an effect in the use of these tools by citizens; apparently, being digitally involved implies more participation in the electoral game than, in some ways, may influence performance of participative democracy. In this sense, it is consistent with studies such as Tang and Lee (2013) regarding the role of social networks reinforcing political participation, in the case of study, associated to information exposure in these media. In addition, in the Nuevo León campaign, voting was composed mostly of young voters with higher degree of education, as it is shown by Berumen and Medellín (2017) and, in Mexico, these groups are more involved in new media. On the other hand, for the second research question, RQ2 is there a difference in the degree of traditional offline political participation between Nuevo León and Puebla?, data shows that it has the same behavior in both elections. This is because the t-Student test, when comparing means does not report differences in that of the respondents in each case, $t(593) = 0.687, p = 0.492, d = 0.064$ (Table 1).

The third research question (RQ3) stated: is there a difference in the degree of nontraditional offline political participation between Nuevo León and Puebla? Data shows that there are differences in both states, given that the means are different while running a t-Student test, ($t(587) = 3084, p = 0.002, d = 0.247$). A larger mean was reported in Nueva León ($M = 2.07, SD = 0.97$) than in Puebla ($M = 1.85, SD = 0.80$). That is, in this case, it seems that a campaign with more use of social networks may guide nontraditional behavior but further exploration on these circumstances should be performed to separate the effect.

Traditional and nontraditional offline political participation are dichotomic questions where 2 implies participation and 1 is no-participation. On the other hand, political participation online is a scale from 1 (none) to 5 (a lot).

It remains convoluted to draw conclusions on the role of new media in citizens' political participation. Authors such as John Keane (2008) state the monitored democracy model where, although social media may be an extension of offline political participation, they also permit a follow up, specifically in a strong and frequent current of information as exists today. Hence, it is relevant to observe the relationship between types of political participation, both traditional and nontraditional offline and online. In this sense, a fourth research question was stated, RQ4 How are different kinds of political participation related between both states? To understand, following Kim et al. (2016) categories, if different types of political participation influence each other, that is, from the three components, traditional political participation (offline), nontraditional political participation (offline), and social network political participation (online).

Variable	Nuevo León (N = 294)		Puebla (N = 301)		p
	M	DE	M	DE	
Offline traditional political participation	0.30	0.35	0.23	0.32	0.012
Offline nontraditional political participation	0.19	0.31	0.17	0.31	0.492
<i>Electoral political participation in social networks online</i>	2.07	0.97	1.85	0.80	0.002

M = mean, SD = standard deviation, p = p-value.

Table 1. t-test in independent sample for Nueva León and Puebla

Source: Own elaboration.

To answer this question, a Somers’ D nonparametric correlation test was practiced, to identify the directionality components in the association. That is, against other symmetric correlation tests, this one permits to determine the dependent and independent variables in the relationship, determining the influence of one over the other (Table 2).

In Nuevo León’s case, traditional political participation (offline) is the independent variable in a relationship relatively strong with the dependent variable of political participation in social networks (online), ($r = 0.400$). On the other hand, the relationship with the dependent variable nontraditional political participation was smaller, ($r = 0.197$).

Nontraditional political participation (offline) as independent variable is correlated with some strength with traditional political participation ($r = 0.268$) and with political participation in social networks (online) ($r = 0.295$) as dependent variables.

Political participation in social networks as independent variable has little correlation with nontraditional participation (offline) ($r = 0.160$).

The Nuevo León case ($r = 0.295$) kept some institutional conduct, which seems reinforced because social network campaign had great impact, as it involved the online interaction more than Puebla, described below.

For Puebla, the variables had a similar behavior: traditional political participation (offline) is the independent variable in a relatively strong relationship ($r = 0.365$) with the dependent variable of social network political participation (online),

while the relationship with the dependent variable of nontraditional political participation was ($r = 0.218$), slightly stronger than in Nueva León.

Offline traditional political participation has an influence in political participation in social networks (online) ($r = 0.361$), hence, it may be held that online political participation is an extension of offline political participation, which supports the spillover hypothesis by Kim et al. (2016).

In the case of Puebla, it highlights the strength of the correlation between nontraditional political participation (offline) as independent and political participation in social networks ($r = 0.370$) as dependent (Table 2). That is, in the Puebla case, there seems to be more strength in non-institutional participation to extend it in social networks.

From the analysis above, it was considered that political participation online has an effect in traditional political participation offline, and the inverse in Nuevo León, and in a lesser degree in Puebla.

It is the inverse in the case of Puebla, where nontraditional political participation offline has an effect in political participation online and, in lesser degree, it happens in the Nuevo León.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study attempts to explore the relationship between political participation offline and political participation online, using study cases from digital surveys in Nuevo León (2015) and Puebla (2016) during subnational electoral campaigns, at a moment where citizens are more exposed to political content. Furthermore, both campaigns had different natures. As it was contextualized at the beginning, the Nuevo León campaign was characterized not just by an independent candidate, but because it was more oriented to social network use in propaganda, setting a milestone in Mexican campaign's design; on the other hand, the Puebla campaign, besides having less political interest for citizens, because it is smaller administration to last only two years, it was spread by traditional media.

Social networks, as stated in the literature (Muñoz Dader, Téllez, & Salazar, 2016; Alvidrez, 2017; Treré & Cargnelutti, 2014), offer a new space for political participation and new means of expression with novel implications, as it was observed in this exploratory study by the survey.

Following Kim et al. (2016), nonetheless, they have an important role, as they may be the basis for empowerment in political participation in global terms, that is, those who participate in both frameworks on/off, may be part of a positive

		Dependent			
		Variable	PPC	PPNC	PPRS
Nuevo León (N = 294)	Independent	Traditional political participation off	---	0.197	0.400
		Nontraditional political participation	0.268	---	0.295
		Political participation in social networks	0.295	0.160	---
Puebla (N = 301)		Traditional political participation off	---	0.218	0.361
		Nontraditional political participation	0.300	---	0.370
		Political participation in social networks	0.241	0.179	---

Nota: las iniciales en las columnas son correspondientes a las variables de las filas.

Table 2. Correlations between type of political participation by state

Source: Own elaboration.

feedback. This type of observation allows to glimpse at future campaign designs and the implications in the types of political participation, both traditional and nontraditional, and whether it will continue to exist a transfer from old politics (Calenda & Meijer, 2009) to these novel participation and expression scenarios.

Back to the two cases in particular, it is notorious that traditional participation in Nuevo León is more related with social network use to participate online, while in Puebla, nontraditional political participation is more related with online political participation. In Nuevo León, there was also an offer of more traditional channels to participate due to the campaign’s nature, more oriented to digital media. In the case of Puebla, in contrast, there was an old politics framework and it was a less institutionalized scheme in social network use, thus, nontraditional political participation offline was more related to social network participation as expression of participation. That is, in a campaign that is less directed towards social networks, nontraditional participation is channeled more through new media, as a way to channel the participation in a traditional framework. Nonetheless, further exploration is required to understand if this is directly linked with the campaign’s traditional management.

Digital media open new opportunities for citizens’ to exchange or participate, and there are many possibilities to analyze their development; in this article, there is an attempt to approach an exploration from what the literature has reported, in an effort to understand two particular cases that answer specially to the dynamic of those that are in social networks, given that the sample was found by these means.

It is recommended that future research incorporates items in the instrument, such as those proposed by Bennet, Wells and Freelon (2011) on the type of commitment that citizens have, Actualizing Citizen (AC) and Dutiful Citizen (DC), given that it permits to identify the types of political participation, especially in social networks, by type of use, to understand that the types of political participation, on and off, have different natures regarding the degree of involvement and the nature of action spaces.

Research like this one attempts to give evidence on how we interact to construct citizenship, because of our offline political participation and the online, and whether this follows institutionalization terms or not. It is convenient to derive new questions in this regard and to translate some to other scenarios, perhaps by comparing campaigns that are entirely online against those that are entirely offline, although that will prove complicated, as it is undeniable the predominance of campaigns in both frameworks.

REFERENCES

- Anduiza, E., Cristancho, C., & Sabucedo, J. M. (2014). Mobilization through *online* social networks: the political protest of the *indignados* in Spain. *Information, Communication & Society*, 17(6), 750-764. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2013.808360>
- Alvídrez, S. (2017). Interactivity in twitter: Effects of party identity on the evaluation of political candidates and on their vote intentions. *Comunicación y Sociedad*, (29), 117-137. <https://doi.org/10.32870/cys.v0i29.6416>
- Alvídrez, S. & Rodríguez, O. F. (2016). Powerful communication style on twitter: Effects on credibility and civic participation. *Comunicar*, 24(47), 89-97. <https://doi.org/10.3916/C47-2016-09>
- AMIPCI. (2017). *13° Estudio sobre los hábitos de los usuarios de Internet en México 2017* (13th Study on the habits of Internet users in Mexico 2017). Retrieved from <http://asociaciondeInternet.org.mx/es/component/remository/Habitos-de-Internet/13-Estudio-sobre-los-Habitos-de-los-Usuarios-de-Internet-en-Mexico-2017/lang,es-es/?Itemid=>
- Baumgartner J. & Morris J. (2010). MyFaceTube politics: social networking web sites and political engagement of young adults. *Social Science Computer Review*, 28(1), 24-44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439309334325>
- Barnes, S. H. & Kaase, M. (1979). *Political action: mass participation in five western democracies*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bavoleo, B. I. (2013). Medios y política: La participación política vía Internet en Corea del Sur (Media and politics: Political participation via the Internet in South Korea). *CONfines de relaciones internacionales y ciencia política*, 9(17), 69-84. Retrieved from <https://confines.mty.itesm.mx/articulos17/Mediosypolitica.pdf>

- Bennett, W. L., Wells, C., & Freelon, D. (2011). Communicating Civic Engagement: Contrasting Models of Citizenship in the Youth Web Sphere. *Journal of Communication*, 61(5), 835–856. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01588.x>
- Berumen, G. & Medellín, L. (2016). Marketing de los candidatos a la gubernatura de Nuevo León en las redes sociales durante el proceso electoral de 2015 (Marketing of the candidates for the governorship of Nuevo Leon in the social networks during the 2015 electoral process). *Apuntes Electorales*, 15(54), 57-90. Retrieved from <http://aelectorales.ieem.org.mx/index.php/ae/article/view/71>
- Brunsting, S. & Postmes, T. (2002). Social Movement Participation in the Digital Age. *Small Group Research*, 33(5), 525–554. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104649602237169>
- Brussino, S., Rabbia, H., & Sorribas, P. (2009). Perfiles Sociocognitivos de la Participación Política de los Jóvenes (Sociocognitive Profiles of Youth Political Participation). *Interamerican Journal of Psychology*, 43(2), 279-287. Retrieved from <https://ri.conicet.gov.ar/handle/11336/36867>
- Calenda, D. & Meijer, A. (2009). Young people, the Internet and political participation. *Information, Communication & Society*, 12(6), 879–898. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691180802158508>
- Castells, M. (2009). *Comunicación y poder (Communication Power)*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Chekunova, M. A., Barabash, V. V, Trofimova, G. N., & Lenko, G. N. (2016). New media in political communication: general approaches. In *SHS Web of Conferences* (vol. 29, art. 01015). EDP Sciences. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20162901015>
- Colomer, J. (2001). *Instituciones políticas (Political institutions)*. Barcelona: Editorial Ariel.
- Córdoba Hernández, A. (2017). El slacktivismismo como recurso de movilización en redes sociales: el caso de #BringBackOurGirls (Slacktivism as a mobilization resource in social networks: The #BringBackOurGirls case). *Comunicación y Sociedad*, (30), 239-263. <https://doi.org/10.32870/cys.v0i30.6241>
- Cornelissen, G., Karelai, N., & Soyer, E. (2013). Clicktivism or Slacktivism? Impression Management and Moral Licensing. In G. Cornelissen, E. Reutskaja, & A. Valenzuela (Eds.), *European Advances in Consumer Research*, 10 (pp. 244-244). Duluth: Association for Consumer Research.
- Delfino, G. & Zubieta, E. (2010). Participación política: concepto y modalidades (Political participation: concept and types). *Anuario de Investigaciones*, 17, 211-220. Retrieved from <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/3691/369139946011.pdf>
- Delli Carpini M. & Keeter S. (2002). The Internet and an informed citizenry. In D. M. Anderson & M. Cornfield (Eds.), *The Civic Web: Online Politics and Democratic Values* (pp. 129-153). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Emmer M., Wolling J., & Vowe G. (2012). Changing political communication in Germany: findings from a longitudinal study on the influence of the Internet on political information, discussion and the participation of citizens. *Communications*, 37(3), 233–252. <https://doi.org/10.1515/commun-2012-0013>

- Harlow, S. (2011). Social media and social movements: Facebook and an online Guatemalan justice movement that moved *offline*. *New Media & Society*, 14(2), 225-243. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444811410408>
- Hirzalla, F., van Zoonen, L., & de Ridder, J. (2010). Internet Use and Political Participation: Reflections on the Mobilization/Normalization Controversy. *The Information Society*, 27(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01972243.2011.534360>
- INEGI. (2018). *Encuesta Nacional sobre Disponibilidad y Uso de Tecnologías de la Información en los Hogares* (National Survey on Availability and Use of Information Technologies in Households) Retrieved from <https://www.inegi.org.mx/programas/dutih/2018/>
- Keane, J. (2008). *Monitory Democracy?* Paper prepared for the ESRC Seminar Series, *Emergent Publics*, The Open University, Milton Keynes, 13th-14th March 2008. Milton Keynes: Open University.
- Kim, Y., Russo, S., & Amna, E. (2016). The longitudinal relation between *online* and *offline* political participation among youth at two different developmental stages. *New Media & Society*, 19(6), 899-917. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444815624181>
- Krueger, B. S. (2002). Assessing the Potential of Internet Political Participation in the United States: A Resource Approach. *American Politics Research*, 30(5), 476-498. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673X02030005002>
- Latinobarómetro. (2016). Informe 2016 (2016 Report) (PDF file). Retrieved from <http://www.latinobarometro.org/latContents.jsp>
- March, J. & Olsen, J. (1997). *El redescubrimiento de las instituciones. La base organizativa de la Política* (The rediscovery of the institutions. The organizational basis of politics). Mexico, DF: FCE.
- Muñoz, C., Dader, J., Téllez, N., & Salazar, A. (2016). ¿Están los políticos políticamente comprometidos?: Análisis del compromiso político 2.0 desarrollado por los candidatos a través de Facebook (Are politicians politically engaged? Analysis of the political commitment 2.0 developed through Facebook). *Cuadernos.info*, (39), 135-150. <https://doi.org/10.7764/cdi.39.970>
- MillwardBrown. (2017). *Estudio de consumo de medios y dispositivos entre internautas mexicanos* (Media and device consumption study in Mexican users) (PDF file). Retrieved from http://www.iabmexico.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/ECMYD_2016_Version_Prensa.pdf
- Navarrete, J. (2008). Sistema político mexicano: desarrollo y reacomodo del poder (Mexican political system: development and readjustment of power). *Iberofórum. Revista de Ciencias Sociales de la Universidad Iberoamericana*, 3(6), 131-148. Retrieved from <https://ibero.mx/iberoforum/6/default.html>
- Nam, T. (2012). Dual effects of the Internet on political activism: reinforcing and mobilizing. *Government Information Quarterly*, 29(S1), S90-S97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2011.08.010>
- Norris, P. (2001). *Digital Divide: Civic Engagement, Information Poverty, and the Internet Worldwide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quintelier, E. & Vissers, S. (2007). The Effect of Internet Use on Political Participation. *Social Science Computer Review*, 26(4), 411-427. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439307312631>

- Rivas, J. A. (2003). El neoinstitucionalismo y la revalorización de las instituciones (Neoinstitutionalism and the revaluation of institutions). *Reflexión política*, 5(9). Retrieved from <https://revistas.unab.edu.co/index.php/reflexion/article/view/748>
- Sabucedo, J. & Arce, C. (1991). Types of Political Participation: a multidimensional analysis. *European Journal of Political Research*, 20(1), 93-102. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.1991.tb00257.x>
- Stromer-Galley, J. (2002). New Voices in the Public Sphere: A Comparative Analysis of Interpersonal and Online Political Talk. *Javnost - The Public*, 9(2), 23-41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13183222.2002.11008798>
- Tang, G. & Lee, F. L. F. (2013). Facebook Use and Political Participation. *Social Science Computer Review*, 31(6), 763-773. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439313490625>
- Tolbert, C. J. & Mcneal, R. S. (2003). Unraveling the Effects of the Internet on Political Participation? *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(2), 175-185. <https://doi.org/10.1177/106591290305600206>
- Treré, E. & Cargnelutti, D. (2014). Social movements, social media and web 2.0: The case of the movement for peace with justice and dignity. *Communication & Society*, 27(1), 183-203. Retrieved from <https://www.unav.edu/publicaciones/revistas/index.php/communication-and-society/article/view/36010>
- Velasquez, A. & LaRose, R. (2015). Youth collective activism through social media: the role of collective efficacy. *New Media & Society*, 17(6), 899-918. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444813518391>
- Vissers, S. & Stolle, D. (2014). Spill-Over Effects Between Facebook and On/Offline Political Participation? Evidence from a Two-Wave Panel Study. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 11(3), 259-275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2014.888383>
- Wang, S. I. (2007). Political Use of the Internet, Political Attitudes and Political Participation. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 17(4), 381-395. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01292980701636993>

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

ALEJANDRA RODRÍGUEZ-ESTRADA, Doctor in Social Sciences by the Instituto Tecnológico de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey (ITESM), in Monterrey and Master in Sciences with a specialization in International Communication in the same institution (México). She is member in the National System of Research, level I. She is a research professor at the Universidad Autónoma de Baja California (UABC). Her research fields include the development of the scientific field in the political communications in México, and related issues in political communication, process of political communication, and process of political participation.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1825-0097>

CARLOS MUÑIZ, Doctor in Mass Communications and current professor at the School of Political Sciences and Public Management at the Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León (México). He is member in the Mexican System of Research with level II. His research fields focus on the analysis of effects of mass media and political communication, specially from framing of events and representations of social groups in media.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1825-0097>

MARTÍN ECHEVERRÍA VICTORIA, Mass Communications major and Doctor in Mass Communications and Culture (Universidad de Sevilla), Master in Political Communication and Public Opinion (Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona). He is also a research professor at the Institute of Government Sciences and Strategic Development in the Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, México. He is member of the National System of Research, level I. His research fields are audiovisual formats of political communication, political journalism studies, and the relationship between media consumption, youth and politics.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1825-0097>