

# **YOUTH LIFESTYLES, DIGITAL ENGAGEMENT AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATION AS RESEARCH VARIABLES – ARE WE MEASURING IT RIGHT?**

*Lai Che Ching  
Hamisah Hasan  
Jamali Samsudin*

## **Abstract**

This paper aim to highlight some of issues arose in measuring youth lifestyles, digital engagement and political participation. These variables were part of a nationwide survey titled “Youth in the marginalised society: From the Transitional to the Generational Approach.” This issue need attention due to the fact that the fast changing technologies are affecting youth lifestyles as well as their digital engagement and political participation. It has never happened before. During the newspapers, radio and television technology, life is very slow. There was a clear demarcation between sources and recipients. However, with the web 2.0 technology which allows for users to become producers, it certainly changed the entire media landscape. The changes are affecting youth lifestyles, digital engagement as well as the nature of their political participation hence the question are we measuring it right?

Literatures shows that lifestyles can be measured based on three dimensions, namely behaviour, interest and preferences as well as attitudes. However, in the study above, two dimensions namely behaviour and interest were used to measure youth lifestyles. Does measuring youth lifestyle based on two dimensions is right? Further analysis lead to a conclusion that it was possible to measure youth lifestyle based on two dimensions.

Internet usage as a variable has been used by most researcher and it was defined mostly in relation to the time spent on-line. However, the recent trend called for more rigorous measurement than time spent online. Hence, the digital engagement variables were developed to measure the youth engagement on the internet. The discussion shows that these variables seem to be measuring what it supposed to measure.

The final variable is political participation. The issue about this variable is related to whether its measure the online or the offline political participation. This is because Collins (2008) argued that young people realised internet as a legitimate online political participation. The discussion found that the measurement used in this study to measure political participation was to measure offline political participation. This need to be reviewed as the findings could lead to the wrong conclusion.

Asking this simple question of ‘are we measuring it right’ would probably highlight the weaknesses of the existing measurement and provide better understanding of how we could ask the right questions particularly in the context of fast changing environment surrounding the youth.

**Keywords:** Youth, lifestyle, digital engagement, political participation.

## **Introduction**

A short article published on 6th December 2016 in The Star, titled ‘Millennial take social media very seriously’ highlighted how the millennial were using social media as a form of expression. Citing a Norfolk psychologist, Adela Roxas who argued that social media seem to be an extension of how we express our identity. Millennial are heavily depending on the social media as just another way to let people know what is going on in their life, moreover what seems like a waste of time to some older people is a major part of the millennials life. For them, it is hard to imagine life without it.

That article is a clear example of how the young people are heavily depending on the social media. There were numerous studies being conducted to look into the relationship between social media usage and the youth. One such study entitled the “Youth in the marginalised society: From the transitional to the generational approach.” The study investigated variables that were related to the millennials such as youth lifestyles, digital engagement and the youth political participation.

The above study employed quantitative approach whereby a survey was conducted to collect the data involving some 5400 respondents.

However, this paper does not discuss the findings of the above-mentioned survey but raises the issues surrounding the measurement of the variables. The self-reflection nature of this paper intends to highlight possible issues when measuring the relationships of the above-mentioned variables.

The discussion will be divided into three main parts. The first part will touch on the background of the research mentioned above. It will then be followed by the discussion of issues surrounding the measurement of youth lifestyles, issues in digital engagement and finally, issues in the youth political participation. The final part will be the discussion and conclusion. The above mentioned research was motivated by the growth of the internet that has dramatically altered the patterns of individual usage of the media. Literatures showed that it was the youth who were at the forefront of these changes (Montgomery, Robbels & Larson, 2004). Youth who were normally aged between 15 to 25 years old formed one of the largest groups in any society. Moreover, today's youths fit the bill of the digital natives, a term coined by Marc Prensky (2001) indicating a generation who were born with the digital technology and were relying heavily on technology in their life. Prensky described the generation of young people born since 1980 as 'digital natives' due to what he perceived as an innate confidence in using new technologies such as the internet, video games, mobile telephone and "all the other toys and tools of the digital age" (Prensky, 2001, p. 1).

Digital technology was not merely part of their everyday lives yet, as Prensky argued technology was essential to these young people's existence. It was as though they were now being constantly 'surrounded' and 'immersed' by these new technologies in ways that older generations were not. Prensky also argued that this permanent state of technological immersion and dependence was encapsulated in the lifestyles of upcoming generations of 'i-kids' (Prensky, 2008), who remain 'plugged into' portable, personalised devices such as mobile telephones, MP3 players and handheld games consoles. Prensky's writing typifies a burgeoning body of recent commentary that has sought to document the distinct technological cultures and lifestyles of emerging generations of young people. Youth are more than just consumers of digital content. However, they are also active participants and creators of this new media culture, developing content themselves,

designing personal websites, and launching their own online enterprises. The proliferation of youth-created web pages and message-board postings, and the popularity of instant messaging among young people all contribute to the booming use of the digital media for communication among youth (Montgomery, Robbels & Larson, 2004). This development certainly leads to the formation of new lifestyle among the youth.

The access to the internet has also revived the interest of research on youth participation especially in political participation and this seems obvious in the western democracy countries (Kirby et al., 2003; Reimer, 2003). There has also been an increasing interest in using the Internet to promote youth participation in democracy (Coleman & Rowe, 2005), and, for instance in Australia, most state governments with a youth portfolio and youth-serving non-government organisations (NGOs) have integrated the internet into their policies and strategies for youth engagement. However, the authors of this article believe that, as yet, there was no research that looked into the youth lifestyle as variable even though research on lifestyle and media usage has been way back in 1979 by Eastman.

The focus on youth was due to the fact that they were the heavy users and early adopters of new media (Krueger, 2002). They frequently embraced the kind of participatory culture that can be facilitated by new media and were the most likely to use the internet for entertainment and socializing. As shown from a study by Jones and Fox (2009), 43% of those aged 18–32 read blogs, 20% create blogs, and 67% use social networking sites.

In the context of Malaysia, recent survey shows that 25 million of Malaysian have access to the internet. The age groups of 16 – 24 years old were the highest group who has access (73%) to the internet. This is consistent with the finding of the National Youth Survey in 2008 conducted by Merdeka centre whereby, 96% of the youth being interviewed (n=2518) owned a mobile phone. The most pertinent issues was the finding from the same survey that showed 80% of the youth did not join any form of organizations (volunteering organization). While the remaining 20% joined non-political organizations such as sports, recreational, religious or cultural group.

If the internet and youth were inseparable, as discussed above, then it leads to some optimism that the Internet can be utilised to increase youth political participation. The question then that need to be addressed would be what makes youth becomes politically engaged through the Internet? This led to the needs to examine, at least in the context of Malaysian society, on the relationship between youth lifestyle and digital engagement with the youth political participation. The need to examine into lifestyle that was motivated by use of technology as argued by Prensky (2008) that digital natives' dependence on technology is affecting their lifestyle. Bennett, Freelon and Weels (2010) also believed that there was evidence of sweeping social changes in youth that were manifested in their lifestyles. Scholars have argued that internet usage and penetration in Malaysia has reached the maturity stage (Hazita et al., 2014).

This implies that there was a need to venture into the next level of investigation on internet in Malaysia hence this study was interested to examine the engagement of technology particularly the internet. The following were the research questions of this study; (i) Youth today are tremendously immersed in the media usage particularly the social media. Therefore, the study aims to answer the question of what is the lifestyle of youth today in relations to their digital engagement. (ii) Since they were reported as heavily using the social media, what is the level of their digital engagement? If they were digitally engaged, are they civic and politically engaged as well?

However, one particular concern was the validity of measurement used to measure the above-mentioned variables. Thus the following discussion will attempt to raise the question 'are we measuring it right?'

### *Youth lifestyles*

The issue that needs to be addressed properly in this variable is the question of definition. While the existing literature are overwhelmingly in support of the importance of lifestyles as the variables in segmenting people's media behaviour there was no conclusive definition on the conceptualizing and operationalizing of lifestyles. Lifestyle was a conception that represents the

modern society. It has taking over the concept of class and social stratification in sociology (Coulangeon, 2010). Even though lifestyle has becomes a popular concepts but it was an ambiguous and challenging term (Blaxter, 2004). For instance, Giddens (2008) defined lifestyle as a fairly coordinated set of behaviours and activities of a particular person in everyday life that requires a set of habits and orientation. Miles (2000) on the other hand defined lifestyle as the outward expression of individuals' cultural identities. Another scholar defined lifestyle as to reflect people's consumption practices whereby lifestyle and consumption pattern is a fluid relationship (Smith, 2011). Miles (2000) echo the same sentiment when he argued that the centrality of electronic media usage to youths' lifestyle was connected to their consumption practices and exists as the "material expression of an individual's identity". Coulangeon (2010) also offer similar definition of lifestyle when he proposed that lifestyles can be measured based on cultural leisure and cultural consumption.

The most popular definition of lifestyle can be traced back into the way market research and consumer behaviours' researcher look at lifestyle. For consumer behaviours' scholars, lifestyle consists of three dimensions. These dimensions are activities which is looking into the consumption behaviour of the consumers or attempting to answer what consumer buys or how would they spend their time. The second dimension refers to the interests of consumer. In this dimension, researchers were interested in investigating consumer preferences, such as for jobs, recreation, fashion or foods. The final dimension in studying lifestyle was the opinion dimension. In this dimension, investigators attempt to answer questions such as the views and feelings of consumers on local, world, economic as well as social issues (Ran Wei, 2006).

This implies that any study about lifestyle should consist all or some of the above mentioned dimension. Some researchers like Seddon (2011) defined lifestyle as a way of living, of the things that a particular person or group of people usually do. Lifestyles were based on individual choices, characteristics, personal preferences and circumstances. In their free leisure time many choose to engage in the arts and culture, read a book,

visit the cinema, go on holiday and participate in sporting activities. Social participation includes looking after the family or home and care giving; interpersonal roles of friend and family member; life roles such as student, worker and volunteer; and community roles such as participant in religious, activity based, or voluntary help organisations. Seddon' definition about lifestyle consists of two dimensions namely behaviour and interests.

Coulangeon (2010) argued that in French, the French Ministry of culture has for a long time commissioned a large-scale survey on the French cultural practices. Since the early seventies, five consecutive surveys have thus been completed, in 1973, 1981, 1988, 1997 and 2008. These surveys, made on representative samples of a little more than 1 500 individuals in 1973, and of about 4 to 5 000 for the following ones, give a quite detailed picture of people habits in the field of cultural leisure and cultural consumption, including both 'high-brow' and very legitimate cultural practices, on the one hand, such as classical and contemporary literature reading, classical music listening, theatre attendance, museums visits, and 'middle-brow' or 'low-brow' practices, belonging to popular and mass culture, on the other hand, such as TV watching, pop music listening, gambling, etc... (p.3). This kind of explanation implied how lifestyle was measured based on one dimension only, behaviour.

Another example of lifestyle definition can be seen from other discipline such as the definition given by Laska et al. (2009) in studying lifestyle and health risks. They measured lifestyles based on behavioural pattern of the respondents such as physical activities, dietary intake, stress management as well as alcohol and tobacco consumptions. This is another example to highlight how lifestyle can be measured based on a single dimension.

However, there were other scholars who insists on measuring lifestyle based on at least two dimension such as Hartmann (1999) who argued that, studying lifestyles must involve attitude and behaviour (Hartmann, 1999). Veal (1993) combined activities, behaviours, values and attitudes in his construct of lifestyle. Salama (2007) operationalized lifestyles as work based, attitude based and status based.

Arguably as presented above there were various definitions of lifestyle. Depending on the type of study, lifestyle can be measured based on all the dimensions or a combination of two or with just one dimension. It seems from the above discussion that whichever route a researcher chooses in defining lifestyle, it will be still acceptable. It does not really matter whether a researcher use multiple dimension in measuring lifestyle or a single dimension.

Therefore for this research project, the youth lifestyle was measured based on two dimensions: behaviour and interest. The reason for choosing these two dimensions was based on the fact that lifestyles are reflection of consumption practice. The attitude dimension was not taken into consideration because attitude represents cognitive and reflects on mental state instead of behaviour.

Thus for this study, a total of 15 items (questions) were developed to measure the frequency of consumption by a 5-point Likert-scale. Respondents were asked how they would spend their leisure time. Table 1 below shows that there were five domains of the measurement of lifestyle. These domains were media usage, community, and recreational, vocational and High-brow culture. The media domain was represented by four items namely watching movies/TV, surfing the social media like Facebook, YouTube, playing games both on the computers as well as mobile phone and reading (novel, books, magazine, newspapers). While three items representing the community domain (B17 – B19), two items explained the recreational domain (B20-B21), three items were used to measure the vocational domain (B22 – B24) and there were four items to represent the high-brow culture domain (B25 – B27).



**Table 1** Items developed to measure the lifestyle of youth

| No. | Statement   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B13 | Watching movies / TV  |   |   |   |   |   |
| B14 | Surfing social media such as Facebook, YouTube etc.   |   |   |   |   |   |
| B15 | Playing games on computers / mobile phone   |   |   |   |   |   |
| B16 | Reading novel / books / magazine / newspapers   |   |   |   |   |   |
| B17 | Visiting worship places such as Surau / Church / Temple / Community Meeting / ‘Gotong-royong’ |   |   |   |   |   |
| B18 | Visiting Café (Coffee bean, Starbucks, Kopitiam etc.)   |   |   |   |   |   |
| B19 | Involves as volunteers in Orphanage / Environmental activities                                |   |   |   |   |   |
| B20 | Recreational (Jogging / Exercising / Cycling / Football, etc)                                 |   |   |   |   |   |
| B21 | Joining self-defence activities   |   |   |   |   |   |
| B22 | Learn how to repair cars / motorcycle / bicycle etc.  |   |   |   |   |   |
| B23 | Learn how to sew / cook / making cake / self-presentation etc.                                |   |   |   |   |   |
| B24 | Learn how to use computer / repair computer / repair mobile phone etc.                        |   |   |   |   |   |
| B25 | Watching concert at the Cultural Palace / Theatre / Orchestra                                 |   |   |   |   |   |
| B26 | Visiting museum   |   |   |   |   |   |
| B27 | Vacation local / overseas   |   |   |   |   |   |

While there are several definition and conception of lifestyle, it is safe to say that for this study the measurement of youth lifestyle should be accepted and it is right. This is because previous studies have suggested that measuring lifestyle can be done by using either one of the dimension or by combining two or the entire dimension.

### *Digital Engagement*

When it comes to the usage of internet, most researcher will directly points to the time spent by the respondent online. Quintellier and Vissers (2008) argued the internet’s potentially overwhelming effects might be mediated in two ways: first, through the amount of time young people spend online and, second, in the various forms of the activities they engage in. Indeed playing games will have different effects on political participation than will chatting on political websites.

This shows that in measuring youth digital engagement particularly in relation to the youth political participation it is better to measure youth digital engagement rather than measuring their time spent online. Polat (2005), Turkle, (1995) argued that different patterns of internet use also have different effects (e.g., positive or negative) on the level of political engagement.

Scholars are in agreement on the needs to differentiate between times spent on the internet with the different patterns of internet use. Quintellier and Vissers (2008) argued that when one wants to understand the effects of internet use on political participation levels, it is critical to distinguish different forms of internet use. Other scholars such as De Vreese (2007); Jung, Qiu and Kim (2001) as well as Norris (1996) also echo the same sentiment. They acknowledged that the amount of time spent online matters, but so too does the content of the activities people engaged in.

Thus, this study adopted a digital engagement measurement developed by local scholar SA Rahim. The measurement consists of 13 online activities which SA Rahim termed as level of digital engagement. The level of digital engagement was divided into three; basic, intermediate and advance level. The questions are shown in the following Table 2.

**Table 2** Items to measure youth’ digital engagement

| No  | Online activities  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.  | Communicating with friends                                       |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2.  | Surfing for educational contents                                 |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3.  | Surfing for entertainment / travel                               |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4.  | Shopping online  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5.  | Playing games  |   |   |   |   |   |
| 6.  | E-banking transactions   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 7.  | Surfing government websites for jobs, paying license etc.        |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8.  | Uploading pictures and videos                                    |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9.  | Commenting / voicing opinions on current issues in blog/news     |   |   |   |   |   |
| 10. | Reading current news/sports/entertainment online                 |   |   |   |   |   |
| 11. | Surfing websites on environment, volunteerism, charity work, etc |   |   |   |   |   |
| 12. | Creating groups on social media to discuss youth related issues  |   |   |   |   |   |

\*5 point Likert scale (1 = no engagement at all to very 5 = very frequent engagement

This kind of questions was also developed by Johan Ostman (2012) in his attempts to move from the typical measurement of time spent online. Johan developed three categories to measured youth level of digital engagement. These categories are (i) User Generated Content, (ii) Informational Internet use; (iii) News consumption.

Unlike the previous and the next variables, this variable did not have any issues. It is safe to say that based on literature, this variable is well supported. The only point worth mentioning here is the fact that researchers are agreeable on the need to bring the measurement to another level from the usual measurement of time spent online. This is because time spent online only tells us the amount of time and is unable to tell the researcher on what the respondents was doing online.

### *Political Participation*

Political participation can be defined as a variety of acts undertaken by citizens to influence politics including party activism, signing a petition, attending a demonstration, contacting an official or wearing a campaign badge (Robertson, 2009). Brady (1999) simply defined political participation as the essence of activity by the citizens to influence political decision. Bimber et al. (2015) put it clearly by defining political participation in the traditional forms such as voting, working on campaigns, and contacting public officials.

Obviously, the above definitions of political participation implied the traditional, offline participation particularly in the context of youth who are connected to the net 24/7. Because, according to Collin (2008), youth today who are digitally connected realised ‘internet’ as a legitimate online political participation. In other words, the youth today feel that their online activities in politics such as participating in the online forum is considered, for them, as a political participation.

Thus, in conducting research especially when the respondents are mainly youth a researcher may need to consider this new form of political participation. This is the issue that are related to this variable. The

methodological issues of are we measuring it right about youth political participation, moreover in an attempt to link the relationship between youth digital engagement and youth political participation.

Researchers were often blind by the light in believing in the argument as put forward by Ward (2011) who claimed that online interest among youth will increased rates of traditional participation and website hold the potential for spaces of interactivity and discussion. Local scholars also share the same believes that the internet is indeed a powerful platform to engage the youth. (Joorabchi, Hassan & Osman, 2013; Faradillah & Rahim, 2015).

However, finding from previous studies on this issue shows inconclusive results. Xenos, Vronen and Loarder (2014) in their studies on social media use and political participation suggested a strong, positive relationship between the two across all three advance democratic countries, and suggested that social media may be helping to soften traditional patterns of political inequality (p.152). Bode (2012), Valenzuela, Park and Kee (2009), Zhang, Seltzer and Bichard (2013) also suggested that there were positive relationships between social media use and youth political participation. Other studies reported positive relationships between social media use and political engagement, but limited those relationships to specific kinds of social media use or a circumscribed set of engagement outcomes (Gil de Zúñiga et al., 2012; Vitak et al., 2011). These studies suggested that the spread of social media among young people and the broader public has had salutary effects on political engagement, but at the same time suggest that the relationship between social media use and engagement may be limited to individuals who would likely be relatively engaged without social media.

However, there were other studies suggesting that there was a very weak relationship between social media use and political engagement, or none at all (Baumgartner & Morris, 2009; Dimitrova & Bystrom, 2013). Baumgartner and Morris (2009), for instance, found small and inconsistent effects of social networking site use on a range of engagement outcomes in their study of social networking site use during the 2008 Iowa caucuses, ultimately concluding that ‘the hyperbole surrounding new Web developments...as they relate to citizenship may be just that – hype’ (p. 38).

In another survey (Flash Euro barometer 375) to determine the European youth intention to vote in the EU Election 2014 that was compared to the same survey conducted in 2011, showed a decrease in participation (voting in an election). 62% of youth surveyed in 2011 indicated that they have voted, but in 2014 only 56% indicated that they have participated in the election. Majority of respondent (79%) will not consider standing as an election candidate N=12,927; aged 15 – 30 years old.

Among the reason given for this limited, weak relationship between internet usage and civic and political participation was the fact that the social network site (SNS) or the new media were still at the infancy level. From the point of methodology, it does not measure what it was supposed to measure. Apart from methodological problem, Leyva (2016) also argued that investigating internet usage and political participation among the youth was indeed a very complex and involved intertwined factors to determine the direct relationship.

Researchers somehow tend to forget that today's youth digital engagement is somehow different than the way we used to. This is a clear case of methodological problem. Reliance on quantitative approaches has somehow limit researcher definition of 'youth participation' or in other words, 'how participation is defined. (Livingstone et al. 2005, pp. 289–290). This dilemma reflects a wider limitation of existing research on young people's political participation, epitomised by quantitative studies with predetermined notions of how young people relate to the political and how they translate their conception of the political into action (O'Toole et al 2003, p.53, Marsh et al. 2007, p.18) [Collins, 2008, p.528].

In this study, most of the questions asked were offline political activities in nature. There were no questions to ask about the respondent online political activities. From the above argument, this could be the flaw of this study. In this study, as in other study we often asking question based on the respondent offline participation while we attempt to measure the relationship between the youth digital engagement and their political participation. It was like asking question of your reading habit influence your body weight management. While this can be statistically proven, we

cannot really say that people who are heavy reader is obese, because we have eliminated other important variables.

Likewise in looking into the relationship between youth digital engagement and youth political participation it seems that we are repeating the same mistake again. While we can statistically prove the link between the youth digital engagement with their offline political participation, we cannot really say whether the link is direct or indirect. Often we will be left with an assumption that there are strong or weak relationships. This is probably due to us asking the not-so-true question. The following table shows the questions being asked in this survey about youth political participation.

**Table 3** Items to measure youth’ political participation

| No | Activities  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Meeting government officer to resolve problem                 |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2. | Wearing a batch/sticker to support/oppose a particular issues |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3. | Meeting a district officer to solve problem / express opinion |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4. | Participating in activities organized by a political party    |   |   |   |   |   |

\*5 point Likert scale (1= no engagement at all to 5= very frequent engagement)

The above questions clearly demonstrate that this survey only asked offline political participation among the youth. There are two apparent consequences of this. First, it shows how ignorant we are as a researcher in acknowledging the changes that is happening around the youth today. We acknowledge that the youth are ‘digitally connected’ which somehow do affect their lifestyle yet, we measured their political participation based on the values created long before the emergence of digital technology.

This ignorant could lead a researcher to come into ill-informed conclusion. If the study shows there was no link or showing weak relationship between the youth digital engagement and their political participation then it will lead the researcher to conclude that the youth today are apolitical. Whereas the youth today are not apolitical, it is just that their way of expressing or participating in politics is different than what we used to. The youth today are more into online political participation rather than offline.

## **Conclusion**

Understanding youth particularly in the context of technological dynamism requires a researcher to adopt dynamism approach. It is essential to contextualise the research, particularly in choosing and measuring the appropriate variables to suit the current condition of the youth. Researchers, who are ignorant of the current condition of the subject, tend to force their values towards the respondents. This may lead to unsubstantiated conclusion of the research.

## **References**

- Barker, C. (1999). *Television, Globalization & Cultural Identity*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Baumgartner, J. C., & Morris, J. S. 2009. MyFaceTube politics: Social networking web sites and political engagement of young adults. *Social Science Computer Review*, 28 (1), 24–44. doi:10.1177/ 0894439309334325
- 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:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01588.x
- Bode, L. (2012). Facebooking it to the polls: A study in online social networking and political behavior. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 9 (4), 352–369. doi:10.1080/19331681.2012.709045.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). (Transl.). R. Rice. *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. London: Routledge and Keagan Paul.
- Coleman, S. & Rowe, C. (2005) *Remixing citizenship: Democracy and young people’s use of the internet a report for the Carnegie Young People’s Initiative*.
- Collin P. (2008). The internet, youth participation policies and the development of young people’s political identities in Australia. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 11 (5), 527 – 542, doi 10.1080/13676260802282992.
- Dimitrova, D. V., & Bystrom, D. (2013). The effects of social media on political participation and candidate image evaluations in the 2012 Iowa Caucuses. *American Behavioral Scientist*, doi:10.1177/ 0002764213489011.
- Eastman, S. T. (1979). Uses of television viewing and consumer life styles: A multivariate analysis. *Journal of Broadcasting*, 23, 491–500.
- Faradillah I.O., & S.A. Rahim. (2015). The relationship between internet usage and digital inclusion of women entrepreneurs in Malaysia. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 2 (Oct), 77 – 83.
- Farthing, R. (2012). Why youth participation? Some Justification and Critiques of Youth Participation Using New Labour’s Youth Policies as a Case Study. *Youth & Policy*, No.109.

- Gil de Zúñiga, H., Jung, N., & Valenzuela, S. (2012). Social media use for news and individuals' social capital, civic engagement and political participation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17(3), 319–336.
- Hazita A., Salman A., Norizan AR., Hussin S., Hashim, MS., Hassan M. (2014). Determining digital maturity among ICT users in Malaysia. *Jurnal Komunikasi Malaysian Journal of Communication*, 30 (1), 23–35.
- Jones, S., & Fox, S. (2009). Generations Online 2009. Pew Internet and American Life Project, Survey December 2008.
- Joorabchi, TN., Hassan, MS. & Osman, MN. (2013). Relationship between internet usage and positive youth development in Malaysia. *SEARCH: The Journal of South East Asia Research Centre for Communication and Humanities*, 5 (2), 37–64
- Kirby, P., C Lanyon, K., Cronin & R. Sinclair. (2003). Building a Culture of Participation: Involving Children and Young People in Policy, Service Planning, Delivery and Evaluation - Research Report. London: Department for Education and Skills.
- 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.
- Laska, M.N., et al. (2009). Latent Class Analysis of Lifestyle Characteristics and Health Risk Behaviors among College Youth. *Prev Sci*. 10, 376–386.
- Leyva, R. (2016). Exploring UK Millennials' Social Media Consumption Patterns and Participation in Elections, Activisms and 'Slacktivism'. *Social Science Computer Review*, 1–18, doi: 101177/0894439316655738
- Miles, S. (2000). Youth lifestyles in a changing world. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Montgomery, K., Gottlieb-Robles, B., & Larson, G.O., (2004). Youth as e-citizens: Engaging the digital generation [online]. Centre for Social Media, American University. Available from: [http:// www.centerforsocialmedia.org/ecitizens/youthreport.pdf](http://www.centerforsocialmedia.org/ecitizens/youthreport.pdf)
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants. *On The Horizon*, 9 (5) 1–6.
- Prensky, M. (2008). Young Minds, Fast Timersdquo. *Edutopia*. Available online: [www.edutopi.org/ikid-digital-learner-technology](http://www.edutopi.org/ikid-digital-learner-technology)
- Reimer, E. (2003). A scaffold for participation in agency work. *Children Australia*, 28 (3). 30–37.
- Ruggiero, T. (2000). Users and gratification theory in the 21st century. *Mass Communication and Society*, 3 (1), 3–37.
- Salama, A.M. (2007). Navigating Housing Affordability between Trans-disciplinary and Life-style Theories: The Case of Gulf States. *Archnet-IJAR*, 1 (2), 57–76.
- Seddon, C. (2011). Lifestyle and social participation. UK: Office of National Statistic.



- Shah, D., Kwak, N., & Holbert, R. L. (2001). Connecting and disconnecting with civic life: Patterns of internet use and the production of social capital. *Political Communication, 18*, 141–162.
- Smith, A. (2011). Youth, media & lifestyles: An Audience study on media (television) consumption and the lifestyles of black youth living in both Durban and Alice, South Africa. Doctoral thesis. University of KwaZulu-Natal. Unpublished.
- Steele, J. R., & Brown, J.D. (1995). Adolescent room culture: Studying media in the context of everyday life. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 24* (5), 551–576.
- Valenzuela, S., Park, N., & Kee, K. F. (2009). Is There Social Capital in a Social Network Site? Facebook Use and College Students' Life Satisfaction, Trust and Participation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 14* (4), 875–901.
- Veal, A. J., (1993). The Concept of Lifestyle: A Review. *Leisure Studies, 12* (4), 233–252.
- Vitak, J., Zube, P., Smock, A., Carr, C.T., Ellison, N., & Lampe, C. (2011). It's complicated: Facebook users' political participation in the 2008 election. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking, 14* (3), 107–114. doi:10.1089/cyber.2009.0226.
- Ward, J. (2011). Reaching citizens online: How youth organizations are evolving their web presence. *Information, Communication and Society, 14* (6), 917–936.
- Xenos, M., Vromen, A., & Loader, B. (2014). The great equalizer? Patterns of social media use and youth political engagement in three advanced Democracies: *Information, Communication & Society, 17* (2), 151–167.
- Zhang, W., Seltzer, T., & Richard, S. L. (2013). Two sides of the coin: Assessing the influence of social network site use during the 2012 U.S. Presidential campaign. *Social Science Computer Review.*

