

Chapter 1

Social Media and Electoral Processes: An Exploration of Facebook Adoption During the 2019 European Parliament Election Campaign in Romania

Bianca Fox

University of Wolverhampton, UK

Valentina Marinescu

University of Bucharest, Romania

ABSTRACT

Existing research documents extensively explain the reasons for social media use during electoral campaigns. However, there is insufficient evidence showing that social media are indeed being used to complement traditional ways of communication. This chapter uses the diffusion of innovations theory to explain the adoption and non-adoption of Facebook (FB) by Romanian political parties during the 2019 European election campaign. The chapter addresses two research questions: the differences between Facebook adopters and non-adopters during this campaign in Romania and how this adoption or non-adoption impacted the overall election results. 885 Facebook posts were content analysed. This chapter evidences that adopting Facebook to engage the posts does not always result in improved electoral outcomes.

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-7998-4820-2.ch001

INTRODUCTION

Social media create more significant opportunities for all members of society to interconnect with each other in various ways and across a series of platforms. The immediacy offered by the advent of social media platforms ensures not only that immediate remote contact is now available to a sizeable proportion of the global population but also that traditional forms of communication dwindle. The ubiquity of social networking websites (SNSs) has fundamentally changed the way individuals communicate, initiate and maintain social relationships and the way they express their political views and act as active citizens. Given that the way people interact with the world has changed, political organisations too had to rapidly adapt their communication efforts to the advent of SNSs, finding new ways to allow for more transparency and dialogue between citizens and political candidates. SNSs have become essential tools for both politicians, who want to connect with voters or mobilise their supporters and voters, allowing everyone to participate, free of charge: often giving a voice to the voiceless. Indeed, voters are more empowered than ever, being able to communicate, free of charge, with each other and interact directly with political candidates at any point during any electoral campaign. Undoubtedly, SNS use has revolutionised political communication by creating new ways to fairer dialogues between ordinary people and the political elites; and enabling citizens to publicly scrutinise their actions, shifting, therefore, the very foundation of the political process (Gainous & Wagner, 2013; Grassegger and Krogerus, 2017; Allcott & Gentzkow, 2017). The use of social media is expected to become universal (Gulati & Williams, 2013).

Romanian politicians are not entirely new to using social media in their campaigns. They first used blogs to communicate with their voters in the 2007 campaign for the European Parliament. Politicians then used the blogs for self-promotion only (Aparaschivei, 2011). Social networking websites were not used in electoral campaigns until 2009, when in addition to blogs, *Facebook* began to be used extensively and *YouTube*. One of the most active politicians on social media in 2009 was Traian Basescu, the then leader of the Democratic Liberal Party, who went on to win a second mandate and served as Romania's president until 2014. The use of SNSs in political campaigns have become ubiquitous, with a record number of politicians setting up personal *Facebook* pages. However, it appears as if very few of them have grasped that social media should be avenues for creating honest and open dialogues with the citizens.

SNSs started being used as online campaign tools in 2006 (Gulati & Williams, 2013). Their interactive and instantaneous nature has rapidly become a *must-have* for any politician and political organisation. They are considered an innovative way to reach a global audience in a very short period. *Facebook* was first recorded

15 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: www.igi-global.com/chapter/social-media-and-electoral-processes/275014

Related Content

Student Peer Feedback in a Translation Task: Experiences With Questionnaires and Focus Group Interviews

Carmen Heine (2019). *Quality Assurance and Assessment Practices in Translation and Interpreting* (pp. 337-357).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/student-peer-feedback-in-a-translation-task/208895

Vision of the Other: Word and Image in Mikhail Bakhtin

Susan Petrilli (2018). *International Journal of Semiotics and Visual Rhetoric* (pp. 120-136).

www.irma-international.org/article/vision-of-the-other/202479

Pretty Persuasion: Visual Rhetoric of an American Corporate Campus

Kathryn Northcut (2026). *International Journal of Semiotics and Visual Rhetoric* (pp. 1-26).

www.irma-international.org/article/pretty-persuasion/399452

The Traffic Sign as A Sign: Silent Speech Acts

Frank Nuessel (2017). *International Journal of Semiotics and Visual Rhetoric* (pp. 1-10).

www.irma-international.org/article/the-traffic-sign-as-a-sign/183635

Networks in Rare Diseases: Identities, Partnership, and Advocacy in Brazil

Maria Angelica de Faria Domingues de Lima, Ana Cristina B. Gilbertand Dafne D. G. Horovitz (2020). *Communicating Rare Diseases and Disorders in the Digital Age* (pp. 225-249).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/networks-in-rare-diseases/248326