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Abstrak

Peranan media sosial dari segi penyertaan politik dalam talian tidak boleh dipandang remeh. Namun, agak kurang kajian dijalankan beakaitan fenomena ini, terutamanya dari perspektif perbandingan. Oleh itu, kajian ini menggunakan Teori Penglibatan Kognitif (CET) untuk mengkaji hubungan antara Akses kepada Maklumat Politik di Facebook dan Twitter (APIFT), Minat kepada Politik (PI), Kepuasan terhadap Polisi (PS) dan Penyertaan Politik dalam talian di Facebook dan Twitter (OPPFT ) di Nigeria dan Malaysia yang digabungkan, serta secara individu mengikut negara. Peranan Pengetahuan Politik (PK) sebagai penyederhana dalam hubungan ini turut dianalisis. Satu kajian keratan rentas telah dijalankan ke atas 369 pelajar pra-ijazah daripada Ahmad Bello University, Zaria dan Universiti Utara Malaysia. Borang soal selidik telah digunakan untuk mengumpul data yang dianalisis menggunakan Partial Least Squares-Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) dan Partial Least Squares-MultiGroup Analysis (PLS-MGA). Hasil kajian menunjukkan semua hubungan langsung yang dihipotesis antara APIFT, PI, dan PS dengan OPPFT dalam kajian ini diterima bagi gabungan responden, responden Nigeria dan Malaysia secara individu, kecuali untuk hubungan antara PS dan OPPFT bagi responden Malaysia. Juga, PK tidak menyederhana hubungan antara APIFT dan OPPFT bagi responden gabungan serta responden Malaysia, bagaimanapun ia menjadi penyederhana untuk responden Nigeria. Begitu juga dalam hubungan antara PI dan OPPFT, PK tidak menyederhana hubungan bagi responden gabungan dan responden Nigeria, bagaimanapun ia menyederhana untuk responden Malaysia. Tambah lagi, PK tidak menyederhana hubungan antara PS dan OPPFT bagi responden gabungan dan responden Malaysia tetapi menyederhana untuk responden Nigeria. Selain itu, bagi perbezaan negara dari segi hubungan langsung, tidak terdapat perbezaan yang signifikan antara responden Nigeria dan Malaysia dari segi hubungan antara APIFT dan OPPFT, bagaimanapun terdapat perbezaan yang signifikan bagi hubungan antara PI dan PS dengan OPPFT. Secara umumnya, kajian ini menunjukkan bahawa APIFT, PI dan PS mengurangkan jurang dalam OPPFT dalam kalangan belia di Nigeria dan Malaysia. Di samping itu, PK juga merupakan penyederhana yang berpotensi untuk hubungan ini. Dengan itu, kajian ini telah menyumbang kepada pemodelan hubungan antara CET dan penyertaan politik. Jadi, penemuan kajian empirikal ini menambah kepada pengetahuan mengenai penyertaan politik dalam talian.

Kata kunci: media social, penyertaan politik dalam talian, penglibatan kognitif, , Nigeria, Malaysia.
Abstract

The role of social media in online political participation cannot be understated. Yet, limited research has been conducted in this area. Thus, this study aims to investigate this phenomenon in comparative terms from the cognitive engagement perspective. This study adopts the Cognitive Engagement Theory (CET) to examine the relationship between Access to Political Information on Facebook and Twitter (APIFT), Political Interest (PI) and Policy Satisfaction (PS) and Online Political Participation of youth via Facebook and Twitter (OPPFT) in Nigeria and Malaysia combined, and each country individually. This study also analyses the moderating role of Political Knowledge (PK) in this relationship. A cross-sectional survey was conducted on 476 undergraduate students of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and Universiti Utara Malaysia. A questionnaire was used to collect data which was analysed using Partial Least Squares-Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) and Partial Least Squares-MultiGroup Analysis (PLS-MGA). Results reveal that APIFT, PI and PS lead to OPPFT among the youth in Nigeria and Malaysia, except the relationship between PS and OPPFT for Malaysian youth. Also, PK moderates the relationship between APIFT and OPPFT for the combined youth as well as Malaysian youth, but not for Nigerian youth. Furthermore, in the relationship between PI and OPPFT, PK does not moderate the relationship for the combined youth and Nigerian youth, but it does for the Malaysian youth. Additionally, PK is found not to moderate the relationship between PS and OPPFT for the combined youth and Malaysian youth but it does for Nigerian youth. Furthermore, for country differences in terms of direct relationships, there is no significant difference between Nigerian and Malaysian youth in terms of the relationship between APIFT and OPPFT, but there is a significant difference in the relationship between PI and PS with OPPFT. Generally, these findings suggest that from a social media angle, access to political information, PI, PK and PS are likely to reduce the gap in political participation among the youth in Nigeria and Malaysia. Consequently, this study contributes in the modelling of the relationship between CET and political participation. Thus, empirical findings of this study add to the body of knowledge on online political participation.

Keywords: Social media, online political participation, cognitive engagement, Nigeria, Malaysia
Acknowledgement

My foremost gratitude goes to Allah (SWT) for His protection throughout this journey and making this task possible. Also, to the Prophet Muhammad (SAW) for being an exemplary being, inspiration and guide in my life.

I also express my heartfelt appreciation to my exceptionally great supervisors, Dr Norsiah binti AbdulHamid and Dr Mohd Sobhi bin Ishak for their guidance, constructive criticism and excellent supervision. They challenged me in ways that are indicative of true mentorship and never cease to amaze me with their patience and understanding. Their mentorship is greatly appreciated. In many regards, I am truly privileged to have had met and worked with Dr Norsiah, her encouragement, humility and great proof reading skills were an inspiration for me to put in my best which contributed immensely to my academic progress. I am also grateful to Dr Sobhi who always found time to ensure my work was methodologically and statistically right at all times. His valuable comments and tutorship through this journey cannot be forgotten. May Allah reward you both abundantly.

My appreciation also goes to the management of Universiti Utara Malaysia for providing me the research grant used to carry out this study and also University of Ilorin for giving me the opportunity to come for this programme. My thanks also goes Dr Mohd Khairie Bin Ahmad, Dr Rosli Mohammed, Dr Awan, Dr Norizah, Dr Ariffin and other staff of SMMTC for their encouragement and guidance.

Indeed I am deeply indebted to my parents, Prof Raufu Adebisi and Hajia Kudirat Ibrahim Adebisi for their spiritual, emotional and financial support through it all. None of this would have been possible without the opportunities you have presented me. Their prayers and confidence that I could attain this qualification propelled me towards this task. The immense contributions of my siblings Dr Lukman, Dr Abdulhafis, Rukkaya and Suleiman are deeply appreciated. They have been a great source of love and support when the pressure of work seemed overwhelming. I deeply appreciate you all and pray that Allah guide and guard you always.

My dear husband, Barr. Jamil Omoshola Salau, has also shown great love, patience and persistent encouragement during this journey. Indeed he made it look achievable even on days when it felt difficult. I am truly fortunate to have found someone willing to accept some of my responsibilities and give me the time needed to achieve my goals. My appreciation also goes to my in-laws, especially Dr Suleiman Salau for his mentorship since my Bachelor degree days.

Many thanks also goes to my friends and colleagues at the University of Ilorin and Universiti Utara Malaysia for their companionship, educational and emotional support. May we all reap the fruits of our labour.
Table of Contents

Permission to Use ........................................................................................................... ii
Abstrak ....................................................................................................................... iii
Abstract ....................................................................................................................... iv
Acknowledgement ....................................................................................................... v
Table of Contents ....................................................................................................... vi
List of Tables ............................................................................................................... xiii
List of Figures ............................................................................................................. xvi
List of Appendices ..................................................................................................... xvii
List of Abbreviations ................................................................................................. xviii

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION ............................................................................... 1
1.1 Background of the Study ...................................................................................... 1
1.2 Statement of Problem ......................................................................................... 2
1.3 Research Questions ............................................................................................. 9
1.4 Research Objectives .......................................................................................... 11
1.5 Significance of Research .................................................................................. 12
1.6 Scope of the Study ............................................................................................ 13
1.7 Rationale for Comparative Study ....................................................................... 13
1.8 Background on Nigeria and Malaysia ................................................................. 18
  1.8.1 Nigeria .......................................................................................................... 18
  1.8.2 Malaysia ....................................................................................................... 20
1.9 Conceptual Definition of Terms .......................................................................... 21
  1.9.1 Cognitive Engagement ............................................................................... 21
  1.9.2 Access to Information ................................................................................. 21
  1.9.3 Political Knowledge .................................................................................. 21
  1.9.4 Political Interest ....................................................................................... 22
  1.9.5 Policy Satisfaction .................................................................................... 22
  1.9.6 Social Media ........................................................................................... 22
  1.9.7 Online Political Participation on Facebook and Twitter ......................... 23
CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW .................................................. 25

2.1 Introduction ......................................................................................... 25

2.2 Online Political Participation .............................................................. 25
   2.2.1 Conceptualizing Online Political Participation on Social Media ........31

2.3 Gaps in Literature ............................................................................. 39

2.4 Online Political Participation on Social Media ..................................... 41
   2.4.1 Online Political Participation on Facebook .................................... 43
   2.4.2 Online Political Participation on Twitter ......................................... 46

2.5 Online Political Participation of Youth on Social Media ....................... 50
   2.5.1 Online Political Participation on Social Media among Youth in Nigeria 55
   2.5.2 Online Political Participation on Social Media among Youth in Malaysia 59

2.6 Cognitive Engagement Theory .......................................................... 63
   2.6.1 Theoretical Framework ............................................................... 64
   2.6.2 Education as a Feature of the Cognitive Engagement Theory .......... 69
   2.6.3 Cognitive Engagement Theory and Political Participation .......... 71
      2.6.3.1 Access to Political Information ............................................. 72
      2.6.3.2 Political Interest ................................................................. 80
      2.6.3.3 Policy Satisfaction ............................................................ 80
      2.6.3.4 Political Knowledge .......................................................... 82

2.7 Conceptual Framework and Formulation of Research Hypotheses ......... 84
   2.7.1 Access to Political Information on Facebook and Twitter and Online
      Political Participation on Facebook and Twitter .................................. 84
   2.7.2 Political Interest and Online Political Participation on Facebook and
      Twitter ............................................................................................... 86
   2.7.3 Policy Satisfaction and Online Political Participation on Facebook and
      Twitter ............................................................................................... 88
   2.7.4 Political Knowledge and Online Political Participation on Facebook and
      Twitter ............................................................................................... 89
2.7.5 Comparison between Nigeria and Malaysia in terms of the relationship between Cognitive Engagement and Online Political Participation on Facebook and Twitter ................................................................. 93
2.8 Summary of Research Objectives and Hypothesis .............................................. 95
2.9 Chapter Summary ............................................................................................. 100

CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY ................................................................ 101
3.1 Introduction ....................................................................................................... 101
3.2 Research Philosophy ......................................................................................... 101
3.3 Research Design ............................................................................................... 102
3.4 Instrument of Data Collection ......................................................................... 103
3.5 Operationalization and Measurement of Variables ......................................... 106
   3.5.1 Access to Political Information on Facebook and Twitter ...................... 106
      3.4.1.1 Attention ................................................................................ 107
      3.4.1.2 Exposure .............................................................................. 107
      3.4.1.3 Reliance ............................................................................... 107
   3.5.2 Political Interest ....................................................................................... 108
   3.5.3 Policy Satisfaction ................................................................................... 108
   3.5.4 Online Political Participation on Facebook and Twitter ....................... 109
      3.5.4.1 Online Political Participation on Facebook ................................ 110
      3.5.4.2 Online Political Participation on Twitter .................................... 112
   3.5.5 Political Knowledge ............................................................................... 112
   3.5.6 Ethnicity ............................................................................................... 114
   3.5.7 Religion ............................................................................................... 114
   3.5.8 Age ....................................................................................................... 115
   3.5.9 Gender ................................................................................................. 115
3.6 Location of Research ....................................................................................... 116
3.7 Population of the Study ................................................................................. 117
3.8 Sample Size and Sampling Technique ........................................................... 119
3.9 Pretesting and Pilot Study ............................................................................... 124
3.10 Data Collection Method ............................................................................... 128
3.11 Data Analysis Method ................................................................................................. 128
   3.11.1 Descriptive Statistics ............................................................................................ 129
   3.11.2 Inferential Statistics ............................................................................................. 129
      3.11.2.1 Exploratory Data Analysis (EDA) ................................................................. 129
      3.11.2.2 Partial Least Squares – Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) ................. 130
         3.11.2.2.1 Measurement Model ............................................................................. 132
         3.11.2.2.2 Structural Model ................................................................................. 132
         3.11.2.2.3 Partial Least Squares – Multigroup Analysis (PLS-MGA) ......................... 133
3.12 Ethical Considerations ............................................................................................... 134
3.13 Chapter Summary ....................................................................................................... 135

CHAPTER FOUR RESULTS .................................................................................................. 137
4.1 Introduction .................................................................................................................. 137
4.2 Survey Response ......................................................................................................... 137
   4.2.1 Response Rate ..................................................................................................... 137
   4.2.2 Non-Response Bias Test ..................................................................................... 139
4.3 Demographic Profile of Respondents ......................................................................... 144
4.4 Descriptive Statistics of Research Constructs (Variables) ........................................ 147
4.5 Data Screening ............................................................................................................. 149
   4.5.1 Missing Value Analysis ....................................................................................... 149
   4.5.2 Assessment of Outliers ...................................................................................... 151
   4.5.3 Normality Test ................................................................................................... 152
   4.5.4 Multicollinearity Test ........................................................................................ 154
4.6 Assessment of PLS-SEM Path Model Results ............................................................ 155
   4.6.1 Assessment of a Measurement Model (Nigeria and Malaysia) ............................. 156
      4.6.1.1 Assessment of First Stage Hierarchical Construct Model (Nigeria and Malaysia) ........................................................................................................... 158
         4.6.1.1.1 Internal Consistency Reliability ................................................................. 159
         4.6.1.1.2 Indicator Reliability ................................................................................ 160
4.6.1.1.3 Convergent Validity .............................................................. 160
4.6.1.1.4 Discriminant Validity .......................................................... 162

4.6.1.2 Assessment of Second Stage Hierarchical Construct Model
(Nigeria and Malaysia) ........................................................................ 165

4.6.2 Assessment of Structural Model (Nigeria and Malaysia) ............ 168
4.6.2.1 Assessment of Variance Explained in the Endogenous Latent
Variables .................................................................................................. 171
4.6.2.2 Assessment of Effect Size ($f^2$) .............................................. 172
4.6.2.3 Assessment of Predictive Relevance ........................................ 173

4.6.3 Assessment of Measurement Model (Nigeria) .......................... 175
4.6.3.1 Assessment of First Stage Hierarchical Construct Model (Nigeria)
................................................................................................................ 176
4.6.3.1.1 Internal Consistency Reliability (Nigeria) ....................... 177
4.6.3.1.2 Indicator Reliability (Nigeria) .............................................. 178
4.6.3.1.3 Convergent Validity (Nigeria) ............................................. 178
4.6.3.1.4 Discriminant Validity (Nigeria) ......................................... 179
4.6.3.2 Assessment of Second Stage Hierarchical Construct Model
(Nigeria) ................................................................................................... 182
4.6.3.3 Assessment of Structural Model (Nigeria) ............................. 184

4.6.4 Assessment of Measurement Model (Malaysia) ....................... 187
4.6.4.1 Assessment of First Stage Hierarchical Construct Model
(Malaysia) ................................................................................................. 187
4.6.4.1.1 Internal Consistency Reliability (Malaysia) ..................... 188
4.6.4.1.2 Indicator Reliability (Malaysia) ........................................... 189
4.6.4.1.3 Convergent Validity (Malaysia) ......................................... 189
4.6.4.1.4 Discriminant Validity (Malaysia) ..................................... 190
4.6.4.2 Assessment of Second Stage Hierarchical Construct Model
(Malaysia) ................................................................................................. 193
4.6.4.3 Assessment of Structural Model (Malaysia) .......................... 195

4.7 Partial Least Squares Multi-Group Analysis (PLS-MGA) ............. 197
4.7.1 PLS-MGA to Test for Moderating Effect of Political Knowledge (Nigeria and Malaysia) ........................................................................................................ 198
4.7.2 PLS-MGA to Test for Moderating Effect of Political Knowledge (Nigeria) ........................................................................................................ 202
4.7.3 PLS-MGA to Test for Moderating Effect of Political Knowledge (Malaysia) ................................................................................................. 204
4.7.4 PLS-MGA to Test for Comparative difference between Nigeria and Malaysia based on Exogenous and Endogenous Variables .......... 206
4.8 Summary of Findings ....................................................................................... 207
4.9 Post Hoc G*Power Analysis ........................................................................... 210
4.10 Chapter Summary ........................................................................................... 212

CHAPTER FIVE DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSION ........213

5.1 Introduction ........................................................................................................ 213
5.2 Summary of Findings ........................................................................................ 213
5.3 Discussion .......................................................................................................... 217
  5.3.1 The Influence of Access to Political Information on Facebook and Twitter on Online Political Participation on Facebook and Twitter .......... 217
  5.3.1.1 Access to Political Information on Facebook and Twitter and Online Political Participation on Facebook and Twitter .................. 218
  5.3.2 The Influence of Political Interest on Online Political Participation on Facebook and Twitter ................................................................. 220
  5.3.2.1 Political Interest and Online Political Participation on Facebook and Twitter ................................................................. 220
  5.3.3 The Influence of Policy Satisfaction on Online Political Participation on Facebook and Twitter ................................................................. 222
  5.3.3.1 Policy Satisfaction and Online Political Participation on Facebook and Twitter ................................................................. 222
  5.3.4 Moderating Effect of Political Knowledge .................................................. 224
  5.3.4.1 Moderating Effect of Political Knowledge on the relationship between Access to Political Information on Facebook and Twitter and
Online Political Participation on Facebook and Twitter in Nigeria and Malaysia ................................................................. 224

5.3.4.2 Moderating Effect of Political Knowledge on the relationship between Political Interest and Online Political Participation on Facebook and Twitter in Nigeria and Malaysia .................................................. 227

5.3.4.3 Moderating Effect of Political Knowledge on the relationship between Policy Satisfaction and Online Political Participation on Facebook and Twitter in Malaysia .................................................... 228

5.3.5 Difference between Nigerian and Malaysian Youth in terms of the Relationship between the Exogenous Variables and the Endogenous Variable ............................................................................................................. 230

5.3.5.1 Comparison of the Relationship between the Exogenous Variables and the Endogenous Variable .......................................................................................................................... 231

5.4 Implications of the Study ................................................................................................................................. 232

5.4.1 Theoretical Implication ................................................................................................................................. 232

5.4.2 Practical Implication ................................................................................................................................. 235

5.4.3 Methodological Implication ................................................................................................................................. 237

5.5 Limitations of the Study ................................................................................................................................. 238

5.6 Recommendations for Future Studies ............................................................................................................. 240

5.7 Conclusion ................................................................................................................................................. 241

REFERENCES ......................................................................................................................................................... 245

Appendix A ......................................................................................................................................................... 284

Appendix B ......................................................................................................................................................... 291

Appendix C ......................................................................................................................................................... 298

Appendix D ......................................................................................................................................................... 300

Appendix E ......................................................................................................................................................... 302

Appendix F ......................................................................................................................................................... 303

Appendix G ......................................................................................................................................................... 304

Appendix H ......................................................................................................................................................... 305
List of Tables

Table 1.1 Waves of Democratization................................................................. 15
Table 2.1 Ten Most Visited Sites in the World................................................... 43
Table 3.1 Summary of Scales ........................................................................... 116
Table 3.2 Disproportionate Allocation Stratified Sampling ......................... 124
Table 3.3 Reliability and Validity of Constructs (n=80) ................................. 126
Table 3.4 Latent Variable Correlation ............................................................. 127
Table 3.5 Threshold Values for a Reflective Model ....................................... 132
Table 3.6 Threshold Values for Structural model ......................................... 133
Table 4.1 Response Rate of the Questionnaires ............................................. 139
Table 4.2 Administered, Returned and Usable Questionnaires ..................... 139
Table 4.3 Results for Independent-Samples T-test for Non-Response Bias (Nigeria and Malaysia) ................................................................. 141
Table 4.4 Results for Independent-Samples T-test for Non-Response Bias (Nigeria) ........................................................................................................ 142
Table 4.5 Results for Independent-Samples T-test for Non-Response Bias (Malaysia) ............................................................................................... 143
Table 4.6 Demographic Distribution of Respondents .................................... 144
Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistics for Latent Variables ...................................... 147
Table 4.8 Descriptive Statistics for Political Knowledge (Combined, Nigeria and Malaysia) ....................................................................................... 148
Table 4.9 Total and Percentage of Missing Values ......................................... 151
Table 4.10 Correlation Matrix of the Exogenous Latent Constructs ............... 155
Table 4.11 Loadings, Average Variance Extracted (AVE) and Reliabilities for First Stage Hierarchical Construct Model (Nigeria and Malaysia) .... 161
Table 4.12 Discriminant Validity (Fornell-Larcker Criterion) for First Stage Hierarchical Construct Model (Nigeria and Malaysia) ..................... 163
Table 4.13 Cross-Loadings for First Stage Hierarchical Construct Model (Nigeria and Malaysia) ........................................................................ 164
Table 4.14 Loadings, Cross-loadings, Average Variance Extracted (AVE) and Reliabilities for Second Stage Model (Nigeria and Malaysia) .......................... 167
Table 4.15 Discriminant Validity (Fornell-Larcker Criterion) for Second Stage Constructs (Nigeria and Malaysia) ................................................................ 167
Table 4.16 Structural Model Assessment (Nigeria and Malaysia) ................................................................. 170
Table 4.18 Construct Cross-Validated Redundancy .................................................. 174
Table 4.19 $q^2$ Effect Sizes of Exogenous Latent Variable ........................................ 175
Table 4.20 AVE, Cronbach’s Alpha and Composite Reliability (Nigeria) ............. 179
Table 4.21 Discriminant Validity (Fornell Larcker Criterion) for First Stage Constructs (Nigeria) ........................................................................................................... 180
Table 4.22 Cross-Loadings for First Stage Items (Nigeria) ........................................ 181
Table 4.23 Discriminant Validity (Fornell-Larcker Criterion) for Second Stage Constructs (Nigeria) ........................................................................................................... 184
Table 4.24 Cross-loadings for Second Stage Items (Nigeria) ..................................... 184
Table 4.25 Structural Model Assessment (Nigeria) .................................................. 185
Table 4.26 AVE, Cronbach’s Alpha and Composite Reliability (Malaysia) ........... 190
Table 4.27 Discriminant Validity (Fornell-Larcker Criterion) for First Stage Constructs (Malaysia) ........................................................................................................... 191
Table 4.28 Cross Loadings for First Stage Items (Malaysia) ....................................... 192
Table 4.29 Discriminant Validity (Fornell-Larcker Criterion) for Second Stage Constructs (Malaysia) ........................................................................................................... 194
Table 4.30 Cross Loadings for Second Stage Construct (Malaysia) ....................... 195
Table 4.31 Structural Model Assessment (Malaysia) .............................................. 196
Table 4.32 PLS-MGA for Respondents Without or With Political Knowledge (Nigeria and Malaysia) ......................................................................................... 201
Table 4.33 PLS-MGA for Respondents Without or With Political Knowledge (Nigeria) ........................................................................................................... 203
Table 4.34 PLS-MGA for Respondents Without or With Political Knowledge (Malaysia) ........................................................................................................... 205
Table 4.35  PLS-MGA for Group Difference between Exogenous and Endogenous Variables between Nigeria and Malaysia

Table 4.36  Summary of Hypothesis Testing
List of Figures

Figure 2.1. Theoretical Framework (Developed from the ideas of Inglehart, 1977; Dalton, 2008; and Whiteley, 2005) ........................................................................65
Figure 2.2. Conceptual Framework................................................................................95
Figure 3.1 Output of a Priori Power Analysis.............................................................120
Figure 4.1. Histogram and Normal Probability Plot .................................................153
Figure 4.2. Q-Plot.......................................................................................................154
Figure 4.3. First Stage Hierarchical Construct Model (Nigeria and Malaysia) ......159
Figure 4.4. Second Stage Hierarchical Construct Model (Nigeria and Malaysia) ..166
Figure 4.5. Structural Model (Nigeria and Malaysia) .............................................169
Figure 4.6. First Stage Hierarchical Construct Model (Nigeria)..............................177
Figure 4.7. Second Stage Hierarchical Construct Model (Nigeria) .........................183
Figure 4.8. First Stage Hierarchical Construct Model (Malaysia) .........................188
Figure 4.9. Second Stage Hierarchical Construct Model (Malaysia) .....................194
Figure 4.10. Second Stage Hierarchical Construct Model MGA for Respondents without Political Knowledge (Nigeria and Malaysia) ..................................199
Figure 4.11. Second Stage Hierarchical Construct Model MGA for Respondents with Political Knowledge (Nigeria and Malaysia) ........................................200
Figure 4.12. Output of Post-Hoc Power Analysis....................................................211
List of Appendices

Appendix A Survey Questionnaire for Nigeria…………………………….….284
Appendix B Survey Questionnaire for Malaysia………………………………291
Appendix C Missing Value Output……………………………………………298
Appendix D SmartPLS Output – Measurement Model (Combined Data)……..300
Appendix E SmartPLS Output- Blindfolding Procedure Output (Combined Data)..........................................................................................302
Appendix F SmartPLS Output (Nigerian Data).........................................303
Appendix G SmartPLS Output (Malaysian Data)........................................304
Appendix H Cover Letter...........................................................................305
List of Abbreviations

ABU- Ahmadu Bello University
AC- Action Congress
ACI- Arewa Christian Initiative
ACN- Action Congress of Nigeria
ANPP- All Nigeria’s Peoples Party
APGA- All Progressive Grand Alliance
API- Access to Political Information
APIFT- Access to Political Information on Facebook and Twitter
APC- All Progressive Congress
AVE- Average Variance Extracted
BN- Barisa Nasional/ National Front
CET- Cognitive Engagement Theory
CMC- Computer Mediated Communication
CMV- Common Method Variance
CPC- Congress for Progressive Change
DAP- Democratic Action Party
EC (SPR) - Election Commission
EDA- Exploratory Data Analysis
EiE- Enough is Enough
FOIA- Freedom of Information Act
GE13- 13th Malaysian General Election
HCM- Hierarchical Component Model
HOC- Higher-Order Construct
HTMT- Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio
ICT- Information and Communication Technology
IM- Instant Messaging
INEC- Independent National Electoral Commission
LOC- Lower-Order Construct
LP- Labour Party
MCMC- Malaysian Communication and Multimedia Commission
MGA - Multigroup Analysis
n2n - Neighbour to Neighbour
OPP- Online Political Participation
OPPFT- Online Political Participation on Facebook and Twitter
PAS- Parti Islam Se-Malaysia
PI- Political Interest
PDP- Peoples Democratic Party
PK- Political Knowledge
PR- Pakatan Rakayat
PS- Policy Satisfaction
PTP- Political Transformation Programme
PAS- Pan Malaysian Islamic Party
PDP- Peoples Democratic Party
PLS- Partial Least Square
PLS-MGA – Partial Least Squares Multigroup Analysis
PLS-SEM- Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modelling
PKR – Peoples Justice Party
PRU13- Pilihanraya Umum keh 13
R² – R-Squared
SEM- Structural Equation Model
SES- Socio- Economic - Status
SMS – Short Message Service
SNSs- Social Networking Sites
SPSS- Statistical Packages for Social Sciences
UGC –User-Generated-Content
UMNO- United Malay National Organization
UPN- Unity Party of Nigeria
UK- United Kingdom
US- United States
UUM- Universiti Utara Malaysia
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The Internet, from its web 1.0 technology to its recent web 2.0 technology, has affected the way politics works (Dimitrova & Bystrom, 2013; Deursen, Dijk & Helsper, 2014; Iwokwagh & Okoro, 2012; Yamamoto & Kushin, 2013). It is a ‘deliberative space’ which is highly democratic (Cogburn & Espinoza-Vasquez, 2008), such that it has added to tools of politicking among citizens (Ternes, Mittelstadt & Towers, 2014). This has made it a powerful tool for political participation (Campante, Durante & Sobrio, 2013).

Seemingly, the role played by the Internet in politics has led to the emergence of concepts, such as e-participation (Gibson & Cantijoch, 2013; Grönlund & Wakabi 2015; Vincente & Novo, 2014); cyber-democracy (Chun, 2012); digital democracy (Hyun, 2012); and ‘Netizens’. These concepts have led to situations where the Internet is being used as an important participation tool during political campaigns (Boubacar, 2005). Therefore, the Internet has made possible the provision of inexpensive news releases, such that political elites could communicate with voters and build online communities. Hence, the political lives of citizens and candidates have been strengthened by Internet through interactivity, which is crucial to the functioning of democracy (Zhao, 2014).
The contents of the thesis is for internal user only
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