Influence of Facebook to Voters' Political Practices

Pinky Salvador[1], Princess Caroline Vivar[2], Eduardo de Vera III[3], Reynaldo B. Inocian[2], Rufina C. Rosaroso[4]
[1, 2, 3]Political Science State Scholars, College of Arts and Sciences, Cebu Normal University, Cebu City, Philippines, 6000
[2,4]Social Sciences & Public Governance Departments, College of Arts and Sciences, Cebu Normal University, Cebu City, Philippines, 6000
[1]palangkikayweb@gmail.com, [2]vivarprincess04@gmail.com, [3]eduarddevera14@gmail.com, [2]inocian03@yahoo.com

Abstract - *This study described influence of Facebook to voters' political practices and aimed to (1) identify the effects of Facebook to the voters' decision-making and the effects of online promotions and campaign regarding their opinion about their electoral candidates; (2) examine the role of Facebook as an electoral tool; and (3) ascertain the influence of Facebook as a source of political information to voters' behavior. The study utilized a case study design of three barangays: with two rural barangays in Cebu Province and one urban barangay in Cebu City, Philippines. Key Informants (KIs) were asked using unstructured questionnaire and interviews. Thematic analysis was used based on verbatim accounts. The vibrant influence of Facebook to voters' political practices remained tremendous in an urban village compared to a rural village, more especially among the millennials. Facebook had an undersized connection to voters' practices in terms of social demographics and work affiliation in government. Voters in a rural village had limited access to Facebook because of low level of education and simple way of life. Though, Facebook created voters' personal choice of a trusted candidate during the casting of votes; but, in a rural village, voters were influenced by the radio, newspaper, television, campaign brochures, and leaflets in discerning on whom to vote.*

Keywords: *Facebook, Social Media, Political Participation, Voter's Practices*

INTRODUCTION

Adapting to the new age and advance technology, time has changed. With the emergence of technological development, communication and exchange of information has never been made this possible. What is used then as a manual election, it is now automated and election campaign platforms are brought to a wider and higher coverage using Facebook, Twitter, and other social media outlets. These forms of media communication sites become avenues for individuals and organizations to socialize and interact with health, commerce, social issues, current events, and even political matters.

The widespread development of social networking sites has allowed more achievable exchange of information. This information has facilitated influence and promoting messages. Social networking sites offer one to express interests, share opinions and even sell ideas or products. Among the lists of social networking sites visited and joined by many, Facebook is one of the most accessible and widely used social media in the Philippines, paving the way for political electorates, giving information, communicating, influencing users into their ideas, plans, opinions, platforms, and most importantly making these users vote for them in return.

Facebook is a modern political tool to help these political aspirants to cast more votes, helping them become popular and bringing them closer to the masses, without even making a personal contact with them [1]. Given these significant reasons, many politicians are investing on promotions in many social networking sites particularly Facebook. This study is pursued because today Facebook has become a convenient part of everyone's life and has been used as a good venue for campaigns for political election. The recent 2016 presidential election in the Philippines has elevated President Rodrigo Roa Duterte to victory even with less political machinery because of the popular use of Facebook among the techno-savvy voters and the millennials. Facebook is a good opportunity to advertise one politician

representing his or her ideals and aspirations to the public compared to Twitter and other social media.

As to the 3rd quarter of 2016, there are 1.79 billion active monthly Facebook users of which 47 million are Filipinos making the Philippines the second largest users in Southeast Asia [2]. As compared to Twitter of the same quarter, there are 317 million active users of which 10.40 million users are projected from 2014 to 2019 [3]. Between Facebook and Twitter, it is obvious that Facebook is more popular to the Filipinos compared than Twitter. This means that Facebook captures the need of the common masses for chatting compared to blogging that needs more intellectual convergences in Twitter. Granting if the 16.60 million Filipinos, who vote for President Duterte toss for his landslide victory in May election, use Facebook, this population constitutes roughly the entire 34% of the entire Filipino Facebook users. The proportion of the 66% of the 47 million is divided among the other three presidential contenders: Jejomar Binay, Grace Poe, and Mar Roxas, roughly each of them receives a share of 22% of votes, leaving Rodrigo Roa Duterte to have a margin of 12% winning votes from each of the three other contenders.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE
Popularity of Facebook

Facebook Statistics report that there is a continuous growth of popular networking sites, which users share on what they think, what information they get, and what activities they undertake that facilitate the biggest growth for more than 400 million Facebook user [4], and eventually has been trending in every quarter of the year. Apparently, Facebook has been ranked second of the most used websites next to Google [5].

Changing Demographics

Perrin, Duggan, Rainie, Smith, Greenwood, Porteus and Page have found out that 65% of adults are now social media users [6]. This supports the notion that adults are coping to be digital immigrants to interface with millennials who are digital natives. They are trying their best to be electronically-savvy and observe proper netiquette. Further, they discover that 35% of SNS users are characterized below 50 years old, college level, and constantly exposed to social media, as a device to boost people to cast their ballots [6]." Smith, Schlozman, Brady and Verba have found out that those with high income and have a college background are politically active whether online or offline [7]. This implies that Facebook users

are educated and economically advantaged individuals. It has cracked "a new era where the candidates no longer have complete control over the message" [8]. In a study between the U.S. and U.K. News Consumption and Social Network use, Saldana, McGregor and Zuniga discover that traditional and social media use play, as an important factor on the political knowledge of the citizens since both are considered sources of political knowledge [9]. Furthermore, the study on the 2008 U.S. Presidential Election has shown for one in every five internet users, it has posted a political commentary online [6].

Facebook as a Medium of Communication

To Kaplan [10], "the new way of interaction in the World Wide Web is participatory regardless of economic status, educational attainment and literacy since its availability has risen as a tool of communication." This nuances that Facebook has now become one of the latest emerging communication institutions in the 21st century. To Ellison, the improvement in communication allows engagement of political supporters to have access and user friendly interface [11]. The convergences of communication can never be discounted; it enhances one's efficacy, it expands political consciousness, and it promotes civic mindedness. Mendoza [12]; Yousif and Alsamydai [13] share similar insights on the possibility of electoral candidates to win since Facebook is a good avenue for communication, where politicians can inform, persuade, and encourage potential voters, especially courting the millennials, to cast their votes for them.

Facebook as a Tool for Social Connection

Facebook is a modern way for someone to curate personal photos, videos, and other files in order to boost personal ego gain emotional support among friends as measured in trending likes and dislikes. Valenzuela, et al. [14] state that SNS (Social Networking Sites) strengthen current bonds of people in communities in keeping users to be continually updated on their friend's activities. It is in Facebook that users can connect to their friends and receive advertisements for business and for political matters. Through Facebook, prior elections give political aspirants the capacity to regulate on their personal images and messages.

Facebook as a Tool for Civic Involvement

Based on survey on social media and political engagement, 39% mature individuals have

accomplished one of the civic activities in social media [6]. In a similar study, Zúñiga, et al. lament that news on community involvement can be acquired from various social networking sites [5]. This is evident on community projects initiated by government and non-government organizations posted online, which invite possible collaborators and greater participation of community members. Vitak, et al. disclose that SNS impact like Facebook allows everyone to express or share their civic values, back up a certain electoral candidate, socialize through other users on civic matters and current events [15]. Zhang, Johnson and Seltzer [16] view SNS and political involvement during campaign cycles have a positive relationship between one's reliance on SNS and civic engagement; but no relationship between SNS reliance and political participation. This means that SNS remain the independent variable which does not affect voters' political participation. Gulati [17] says that the connection on social media utilization and to any political or civic activity is focused on providing access on the candidates' political campaigns using the SNS. Sappenfield [18] offers personal blogs, as another option to politicians that contains a ready access to their platforms and projects. Bond & Fariss, in Carlisle & Patton [19], consider technology to have allowed people the process to establish connecting networks for their political interests.

Facebook as Platform for Political Participation
Political participation, as defined by Towner [20], is "the ability to express political opinions and assert political influence in both online and offline world." As voters are getting techno-savvy, the use of social media becomes the instant outlet in getting the personal and political life of a certain political candidate. Cornfield and Rainie, in Geurgenivia [21] discuss the influence of the internet on political campaigns, which start through email in the United States in 1996. Twenty years later, the use of email has been overshadowed with use of social media such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram and others, where political campaigns are posted either in News Feed or in wall. To complement, the use of Facebook may project voters to know better the political campaigns of a certain political aspirant.

According to Delli Carpini [22], "greater political participation can be acquired from internet sites; internet users can join political groups, download candidate applications, and share their political opinions." Facebook users can have access on activities that their friends join by either commenting their friends to engage on a healthy conversation on political matters of their interest or by simply reading online news in order to get abreast of the current political situations. Based on this, people in all walks of life can have a Facebook account to get updated on political advertisement, as they desire to become socially informed and politically conscious. Bakker and De Vreese [23] propose to have "political participation in four types such as: digital passive; digital active; traditional passive; and traditional active." Both of them found out that "using the Internet to gather news is a positive predictor for all the four identified types of political participation." Though, quite limited are the studies on the effects of social media pertaining to civic behaviors and political attitudes on citizens [24]; there is so much desire to know how much influence Facebook has to voters' political preferences. As mentioned by Kenski & Stroud [25], in Valenzuela, Park & Kee [14], "people who use information in the internet exhibit complex level of inner effectiveness, political information, and community involvement."

On Voters' Participation and Preference
Several studies have been conducted by the Pew Internet Research to provide free data and analysis on the social science research pertaining to the influence of social media to voters' preference. In order to make sure who are the most credible among the candidates, the use of Facebook is the best tool to break their doubts and biases on certain political parties and corresponding line up. Using Facebook as an electoral tool, Sprierings, Niels and Jacobs [26] discuss that the number of preference votes that a candidate receives and the number of followers or actual media usage helps the electoral candidate to access Facebook as an electoral device. Mondal [27] identify nine factors influencing political participation such as: (1) psychological or cognitive traits, (2) social environment, (3) political environment, (4) level of modernization and urbanization, (5) political socialization, (6) modes of participation, (7) voting, (8) campaign activities, and (9) cooperative activity. In Facebook, voters' participation is influenced in any of these identified nine factors. Voters in urban areas likely cast their votes on political candidates whose political parties have more online advertisements in a democratic social and political environment. During campaign activities such as in presidential debates, voters follow the candidates' political convictions, arguments, and political plans. These voters can click

their likes, dislikes, and comments; they can upload their videos and photos during the actual campaigns, which influence their friends either to support or not to support their respective candidates.

Vráblíková [28] states that political participation is motivated in two negative predispositions: the voters' reluctance toward a certain candidate or the so-called the "*they can't*" (voters' belief on the incapacities of the candidates) and the voters' disapproval toward a certain candidate or the so-called the "*don't want to*" (voters' displeasure about the candidates). These two penchants are reasons why voters refuse to be involved in politics. The voters' reluctance depends on the social and economic backgrounds of the political candidates which include their educational attainment, revenue, and age. The voters' displeasure, on the other hand, depends on the attitudes and political motivations of candidates, which are characterized with low interest and opinion in politics.

The Facebook Feat: The US Election Experience

Carlisle & Patton state that the price of political involvement is notably reduced and it is now far lesser costly to participate in political activities online compared to the offline counterpart [19]. During the 2008 Presidential Election in the United States, Facebook takes off as a vital medium that allows candidates to disseminate information, share their beliefs, and interact on interesting issues. Facebook users start engaging in more activities relative to politics such as: availing on the different political information in the News Feed; knowing their favorite candidates; affiliating to certain political organizations; and other similar activities, which enable them to chat with friends on election matters in the Facebook. Users in Facebook are allowed to interact with information posted on friends and between friends and other users [6]. The online political audience has doubled; compared to the 2000 election wherein, more adults from 30-49 years old rely news on the internet; while 18-29 years old post comments about politics. Gueorguieva rejoins that during the 2008 election, "two thirds of social media is utilized at some point a certain political activity" [21], which enhances better election turn-out.

The Facebook Feat: The Philippine Election Context

Based on the record by the Commission on Elections (COMELEC), chair Juan Andres Bautista announces that about 40 million Filipino voters have casted their votes out of the 54.4 million registered voters, during the presidential election last May 9, 2016 [29]. Following the findings of Perrin et al., an assumption of 26 million Filipino voters constitute the 65% are social media users and 10.14 million Filipino voters who have performed political activities (39%) using social media [6]. The 10.14 million is over and above 16.60 million or (16,601,997 votes) garnered by Rodrigo Roa Duterte, as the 16th President of the Republic of the Philippines. The total number of winning votes nuances a 25.35% more than the expected 100% casted votes among the 40 million voters who presumably use the social media catapults President Duterte's landslide success from the rest of the other presidential aspirants. The lack of political machinery including the inadequate financial budget allocation during the presidential campaigns shows no deterrence of Mr. Duterte's success; the number of likes to support him has exceeded the number of dislikes in the political ads posted in the voters' social media accounts.

The study of Rainie, et al. [30] reveals a 40% liking or promoting political material; a 30% encouraging everyone to cast their votes; a 34% posting their ideas on issues pertaining to the community and the nation; a 32% reposting content materials for political awareness, a 31% encouraging everyone to respond on certain issues, a 28% posting related online sites to stories related to politics; a 21% political groups with SNS connection; and a 20% following political aspirants with Facebook accounts and other social media. These findings are sufficient grounds for social media literacy in choosing for the best political candidates that voters like, as the case of President Duterte.

On the other hand, Metzgar and Maruggi discuss the candidates' notion of their messages' lost control and reason out the fluidity of online connections in seconds and minutes with almost no one can keep holding on information posted in any social media [31]. Once posted, the information becomes a public knowledge with captured interest to other social media users. Media-politicians' relationship is about media broadcasting politicians' statements, actions and stories while politicians need media to grow popularity and to create a bond with voters; but since the certain relationship has its problems, considering politicians who always have no control over the political messages. To resolve the problem, politicians have used the opportunity to surpass the traditional media and resort in new media and social media as their own controlled media to communicate their

messages and share information essential to their campaign.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This research described Facebook's role and influence, as an electoral tool and source of political information to the voters. The study aimed to identify the effects of Facebook to the voters' decision-making and the effects of online promotions and campaign regarding their opinion about their electoral candidates; examine the role of Facebook as an electoral tool; and ascertain the influence of Facebook as a source of political information to voters' behavior.

METHODS

Research Design

This study utilized the case study design on voter's preferences on the use of Facebook in three selected barangays. Narratives of voters were captured and written down as field notes and were classified according to themes. The key informants of this study were 15 eligible and registered voters, active users of Facebook, ages between 30-50 years old, and earned a college degree. They were randomly selected from three different areas in Cebu; 5 in Banawa, Cebu City, 5 in San Remegio, Cebu, and another 5 in Dumanjug, Cebu. Ethical considerations were employed in the study, a transmittal letter was sent to the chairman of the barangay for approval to gather data. A separate letter of consent was shown and signed by the key informants expressing their willingness to answer the questionnaire. Token of recognition was given also to the key informants after the interview was conducted.

Research Tools

The researchers used survey questionnaires and interview guide in gathering data. In terms of validation, the survey questionnaire was checked by three faculty experts in both the Department of Public Governance and the Social Sciences Department, was tried out among the millennials in the City and residents in one of the rural barangays in Northern Cebu, before it was used to target key informants. The researchers distributed the survey questionnaires to the different key informants. In the interview part, responses of the respondents were recorded using video tape, these were transcribed to support on the information gathered from the questionnaires.

Research Environment

The research was conducted in one central rural barangay, one distant rural barangay and in one urban barangay. The central rural barangay is Poblacion, San Remegio located in the northern part of Cebu is designated as the Case A barangay. The distant rural barangay is Tapon, Dumanjug situated in the southern part of Cebu which was the Case B Barangay. The last barangay is Banawa, Cebu City, which is considered to be one of the most progressive barangays in the city, was designated as Case C barangay. There were five key informants or KIs 1-5 constituted Case A, five key informants or KIs 6-10 comprised Case B, and another five key informants or KIs 11-15 composed of Case C. A division of labor was adopted to gather data on three selected locales. This was conducted with 3 and ½ months including the retrieval, collation, and clustering of verbal data using axial coding system.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The responses of the key informants on the influence of Facebook to voter's practices were divided into three that shows; role of Facebook in the electoral process; political influence of Facebook on voters' decision-making and individuals' political choice. These three derived themes were outputs of Vitak, et al., [15] who assumed that Facebook has been widely accepted as a political information venue, political activism, and political participation.

Role of Facebook in the Electoral Process

Key informants in Cases A, B, and C believed that Facebook played a vital role in the electoral process. Based on the responses of the informants, 14 Key Informants (93%) agreed on the significant role of Facebook in the electoral process except for one Key Informant (7%) from Case A, who lamented that Facebook is not that significant medium for election unlike other traditional forms of media (KI-1). On the hand, it was observed in Case C's KI-12 and KI-14 who said that, "Politicians could express their thoughts and platforms in Facebook."

Facebook provided Information and Free Access in Making Political Decision.

Facebook provided people access to information of the particular politician (KI-3 and KI-4).The networking site was useful to politicians to promote themselves especially to those voters who remained undecided whom to vote (KI-7). As a support, KI-1 in Case A said: "*Facebook provided easy access to its users and almost everyone had an fb account already. So if a political aspirant had an fb page he did not need to invest more on social media sites since it is offered for free.*" Meanwhile, KI-3 said, "*Politicians could receive feedback from a number of comments*

and shares from the people." Case B supported the two statements as KI-6 said, *"Facebook was used by candidates as propagandas and at the same time we could be informed of their wrongdoings, irregularities and shortcomings."* KI-8 from Case B added that *"Facebook would inform users about the platforms and programs of the running candidates."* The same is observed in Case C where both KI-12 and KI-14 said, *"Politicians could express their thoughts and platforms in Facebook."* The aforementioned statements of key informants verified one of the assumptions of Vitak, et al [15] that Facebook provided political information. Facebook's easy access made it easier for politicians to express their propagandas, platforms and programs online.

Facebook provided Information Similar to the Traditional Media

As posited by Gromark and Schliesmann, [32] voters could acquire high political information in traditional or new media. However, few of the respondents believed that Facebook was not a good source or it created unreliable source of information on credentials and platforms of each candidate compared to the use of traditional media such as television and radio broadcast. They added that there were other means to monitor candidates (Case A, KI-1, Case B, KI-9 and Case C, KI-14). For Saldana, et al. [9] social media was used for political news; but it had not been as effective as the traditional media like the television, radio, and newspaper. As two key informants lamented, *"News reported in televisions gave more impact than news posted in Facebook"* (Case A, KI-5) and Case B, KI-9 insisted that *"Most people based their preference on Facebook but there were many ways to monitor and check the background of a politician like his campaign ads and news presented in the television."* The Case C Barangay had two key informants who said, *"Facebook was not a reliable source because posts could be too opinionated and had chances to contain lies" (K-11& K-12).* With the less effective comparison of Facebook from the rest of the other traditional media, its users contemplated in holding on the right decision on the posted political campaign advertisements whether they were hiding, liking or commenting online.

Effects of Facebook on Political Participation Behavior

The key informants' behavior online provided an avenue for political activism/political participation. Among all possible political behaviors only KI-3 from Case A showed a great interest in political participation in Facebook through joining/liking a group/page, supporting a certain candidate, posting a comment, updating his/her status and uploading a picture about politics. KI-3 contended that, *"Online and offline political participation did not have a difference because both could express a person's political view."* Half (50%) of the key informants used Facebook to check political updates; however, the rest (50%) of the key informants did not use Facebook to express their political views. This was because informants thought that Facebook had a significant role when presidential election was fast approaching more especially among the voters in the urban area; while the rest did not have shown the same interest more especially on the voters in the rural areas who seldom used their Facebook accounts or never had any interest to open one.

Voter's Online Participation was motivated by Occupation and Interest

Vráblíková [28] contended two factors on how political participation was motivated which depended on a person's predisposition. First factor was the dependency on the individual resources, his or her status in the society such as educational attainment, financial, and age maturity. The second factor was the individual's predilection, which included his or her attitudes and motivations in any political agenda, which depended on a person's political interest and opinion. This was verified by the key informants when they shared why they did not actively participate online after having exposed that only one of them seriously participated in politically online. One of the reasons behind low online participation was the occupation of the informants which Vráblíková [28] identified as a motivation to political participation. This was verified based on the narratives of the 60% key informants who stated that those government employees were expected to be non-partisan and were not allowed to show any political favor whether online or offline (KIs 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13 & 15). Case A's KI-1 said, *"Because we teachers were not allowed to join the certain group for the sake of our job we should remain non-partisan."* Case B's KI-8 added that, "As a teacher we are expected to be non-partisan." This was supported by KI-2 who also stated that, *"Posting in Facebook could cause plenty of risks because under the Code of Ethics, government officials should remain non-partisan.''* Case B's KI-7 shared the same opinion and said, *"I kept myself neutral because I am a public servant."*

A persons' SES (socio-economic status) could also be related with the risk of Facebook's privacy which had been the longest issue in social media. Having said that government officials should remain non-partisan, Government officials who voiced out their political opinions online could possibly result to plenty of outcomes either positive or negative. The positive effect was manifested when users engaged in a political debate involving Facebook friends. The negative effect was displayed when users are being fired from their jobs for violating certain ethical standards or simply did not follow netiquette conventions. *"It was better to keep your political thoughts in private because it was a risk involving your job if you did violate certain ethics too (KI-3)."* Another narrative said that, *"Facebook could jeopardize our privacy to publicly support a certain candidate (KI-9 and KI-10)."* One way or another, Vráblíková's [28] two motivations on political participation were interrelated because a person's political interest/opinion could be dependent on a person's SES. For government officials and employees who shared that politics was out of their interest because of their job as sanctioned on civil service rules on non-partisanship reiterated the same reasons on why they were discouraged to attend political events organized both online and offline.

Facebook Remained Exclusive for Politically Motivated Netizens Only

Since the key informants revealed that they were non-participative online because of the restraint sanctioned by their jobs of being government servants; and the limitations brought by varying motivations or predispositions, Facebook as a political tool remained an online site to perform political interactions more especially to the motivated netizens who represented mostly in the private sectors. As Ellison [11] stated, "A politically motivated person whether offline or online would remain the same; otherwise he or she would be included regular participants in daily conversations like: sharing and liking to any political issues. *"There was a difference to being politically active online; Facebook was only for the netizens who were really politically active. I was not into politics and whether on a regular basis, I refused to talk about politics that much (KI-2)."*

Political Influence of Facebook on Voters' Decision-making or Individuals' Political Choice

The following were the various Facebook's activities could be participated in by users: online debates, posting politics related topics and articles, and sharing a politician's posts or page which are considered to be influential on voters' decision making and political choice. Though these were not highly believed to be influential by the key informants; these remained vital since these were the common practices found online. Few (40%) of the key informants believed in the posts sent by their friends, expressing political thoughts and the posts posted by politicians on their agendas and platform. When asked why these posts or shares did not influence them to vote or be discouraged to vote for a specific candidate, the key informants had these responses. Case A's KI-1 and KI-3 stated that, *"All of us have different opinions and it is up to us who to believe."* Case B's KI-9 and KI-10 said that, *"Those posted opinions are from what others believe and I also have my own."* KI-7 from the same Case supported that, "*We always differ in opinion; we just have to respect each other's opinion."* In Case C, KI-13 said that believing on the posts is conditional saying, *"It depends on how the person posted his/her opinion."* KI-5 from Case A also supported this statement saying, *"It will depend on who posts the ad relating to politics."*

Online debates provided people the thoughts of others on a certain politician. Sharing one's opinion could be read by friends and followers that made the political message delivered in a wider coverage than spending effort and money to organize an event to meet and personally share thoughts on a certain politicians or issues, Facebook could only require an internet connection to do this. A key informant from Case B said, *"The opinions of others trigger my own opinion because I also tend to favor one of the debating sides (KI-6)."* Several reasons were found why the respondents were not highly influenced by posts in Facebook. According to Smith, et al., [7] adult SNS' users were not politically passionate online whether commenting on a political discussion or posting political comments because they were considered the less SNS users.

Online and Offline Support Resulted in in Having the Same Effect.

Several key informants (KI-3, KI-8, and KI-9) shared the same belief that the influence of support expressed online was equal to the personal support expressed by a friend to a certain politician. As one key informant shared, *"A friend's post whether online or offline is the same, it depended on how well you know that certain friend that you are open to accept their thoughts on a certain politician."*

CONCLUSION

To a wide community of social media users in the Philippines, Facebook created a personal choice (an inner voice for a trusted candidate to vote) during the actual casting of votes inside the respective precincts. Although Facebook was actively used compared to Twitter and other forms of social media, demographic limitations and level of education affected the voter's opinions on whom to vote during the election. Though, other voters still relied on traditional media sources such as radio, newspaper, television, campaign brochures and leaflets, as form of traditional media, to discern on whom to vote; the likelihood of mature voters to use Facebook remained remarkable as digital migrants to interface with the millennials as digital natives. To political organizations, Facebook played a significant role in the electoral process for politicians to influence their platforms. Voters acknowledged flexibility of Facebook to allow electoral candidates be advertised in social media; but Facebook had an undersized connection to voters' practices. Posting and sharing of political information and opinions did not encourage or influence judgement to vote for a specific political candidate publicly more especially to voters who worked in the government sector guided by the principle of non-partisan politics in context with the civil service regulations on ethical standards of public officials. But, Facebook influenced to non-government workers to respect on their opinions on whom to vote regardless on the array of information posted online. Wihbey [33] supported that "even if there was a positive relationship between the utilization of SNS as a participation of civic duty or engagement in politics, it showed a weak connection between social-media use to voters' election-campaign participation."

RECOMMENDATION

The recommendations of the study will be limited to (1) social institutions to provide proper guidance on the use of proper discernment in making the right decisions on whom to vote, by not just relying on unprocessed opinions; (2) the university to conduct studies on the millennials' system of beliefs and practices in the use of Facebook in supporting their political candidate; and (3) the social media entrepreneurs that they may provide user-friendly programs for adults, the elderly, and persons with disabilities to have access on the use of political advertisements, political campaigns, and other platforms to increase a number of users.

REFERENCES

[1] Pariabras, R. (2013). *Philippines 8th Facebook user, The Manila Times.* Date Retrieved December 3, 2015 from https://goo.gl/cRfQne

[2] Statistics Portal (2015). *Number of Facebook Users in the Philippines from 2015 to 2021 (in millions).* Date Retrieved January 25, 2017 from https://goo.gl/x0TWUN

[3] Statistics Portal (2014). *Numbers of Twitter Users in the Philippines from 2015 to 2019 (in millions).* Date Retrieved January 25, 2017 from https://goo.gl/GL9JO7

[4] Facebook Statistics (2010) Date Retrieved December 3, 2015, https://goo.gl/aCXMBb

[5] Zuniga H.G., Jung, N. and Valenzuela, S. (2012). *Social Media Use for New and Individual's Social Capital, Civic Engagement and Political Participation. Journal of Computer Mediated Community*, 319-336.

[6] Perrin, A., Duggan, M., ,L., Smith, A., Greenwood, S., Porteus, M. and Page, D. *Social Media Usage.* Pew Research Center. Date Retrieved February 14, 2015, from Pew Internet database.

[7] Smith, A., Schlozman, K.L., Brady, H. and Verba, S. (2009). *The Internet and Civic Engagement*. Pew Research Center. Date Retrieved: February 14,2015, from PewInternet database.

[8] Johnson. T. and Perlmutter D. (2011). *New Media, Campaigning and the 2008 Facebook Election.* New York: Routledge,

[9] Saldana, m., McGregor, S. and Zuniga, H. (2015). *Social Media as Public Space for Politics Cross National Comparison of News Consumption and participatory Behavior in the United Kingdom and United States.* International Journal of Communication, 3304-3326. Date Retrieved: December 3, 2015; from Proquest database.

[10] Kaplan, A.M. and Haenkin, M. (2010).*Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media.Business Horizons.* Date Retrieved: December 2,2015, from doi:10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.003.

[11] Ellison, N. (2007). *Facebook Use on Campus: A social capital perspective on social sites.* Date Retrieved: December 3,2015, from https://goo.gl/0rV7Mi

[12] Mendoza, M.E. (2013). *#Halalan 2013: Analyzing the role of social media in 2013 Philippine Senatorial Elections*, BA Political Science, College of Social Sciences and Philosophy.

[13] Yousif, R. O. and Alsamydai, M. J. (2012). *The impact of political promotion via facebook on individuals' political orientations*. International Journal of Business and Management. 10. Date Retrieved November 21, 2015; from Proquest database.

[14] Valenzuela, S., Park, N., and Kee K.F. (2008). *Is there social capital in a social net worksite? Facebook use and college student's life satisfaction, trust and participation. Journal of Computer Mediated Communication 2009*, 14; 875-901. Date Retrieved from JMMC Database.

[15] Vitak, J., Zabe, P., Smock, A., Carr, C., Ellison, N. & Lampe, C. (2010). *It's complicated*: Facebook User's Political participation in the 2008 Election.

[16] Zhang, W., Johnson, T.J., & Seltzer (?). *The revolution will be networked: The influence of social networking sites on political attitudes and behaviors*. Social Science Computer Review, 28:75–92

[17] Gulati, J. (2004). *Revisiting the Link Between Electoral Competition and Policy Extremism in the U.S. Congress*. American Politics Research. September 2004 vol. 32 no. 5 495-520.

[18] Sappenfield, M. (2009). *More politicians write blogs to bypass mainstream media*. The Christian Science Monitor. Date Retrieved: November 28, 2015, from https://goo.gl/14SR4k.

[19] Carlisle, J. E. and Patton, R.C. (2013). *Is social media changing how we understand political engagement? An analysis of facebook and the 2008 presidential elections.* Political Research Quarterly. 66. 883-895. Date Retrieved: November 21, 2015; from Proquest database.

[20] Towner, T. L. (2013). All political participation is socially networked? New media and the 2012 election. *Social Science Computer Review*. Retrieved December 3, 2015, from doi: 10:1177/089443931489686.

[21] Geurguiovua, V. (2008). *Voters, Myspace and Youtube*: *The impact of alternative Communication channels on the 2006 election cycle and beyond.* Social Science Computer *Review*, 2008, 26:88-300. Date Retrieved from http:/ssc.sagepub.com/content/26/3/288.

[22] Delli Carpini, M.X. (2000). *Youth, civic engagement, and the new information environment. Political Communication 2000*, 17:341–9.Retrieved December 3,2015,from Gen.com database.

[23] Bakker, T. and Claes, H. (2011). *Good News for the Future? Young People, Internet Use and Political Participation.* Communication Research. Date Retrieved: February,14,2016, from https://goo.gl/SZtkD6

[24] Ellison, N., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2011). *Connection strategies: Social capital implications of Facebook enabled communication practices*. New Media & Society, 13, 1–20. doi:10.1177/1461444810385389.

[25] Kenski, K., & Stroud, N. J. (2006). *Connections Between Internet Use and Political Efficacy, Knowledge, and Participation*. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 50(2), 173-192. doi: 10.1207/s15506878jobem5002_1

[26] Sprierings, N. & Jacobs (2014) *Getting Personal? The impact of social media on preferencial voting behaviour*. Date Retrieved November 26,2015, from doi: 10.1007/s11109-013-9228-2.

[27] Mondal, J. (2015). *Political Participation: 9 Factors influencing Political Participation*. Political Institutions. Date Retrieved: February 9,2016, from https://goo.gl/KD1mRV

[28] Vráblíková, K. (2010). *Contextual Determinants of Political Participation*. Institute for Comparative Political Research. Retrieved February 14, 2016, from https://goo.gl/OfQPsh

[29] Bersamina, Kristine, D & Adel, Rosette (2016), "Comelec records historic 81.62% voter turnout", *Philippine Star,* May 9, 2016, Date Retrieved: November 26, 2016. Retrieved from https://goo.gl/xsqxyx

[30] Rainie, L.,Smith, A., Schlozman, K.L., Brady, H. and Verba, S. (2012). *Social Media and Political Engagement*. Pew Research Center. Date Retrieved: February 14,2015, from PewInternet database.

[31] Metzgar, E. and Maruggi A. *Social Media and the 2008 US Presidential Election*.Journal of New Communications Research 2009. Date Retrieved: December 3,2015, from https://goo.gl/JCU8pX

[32] Gromark and Schliesmann(2010). *The effects of politicians' social media activity on voting behaviour*. Stockholm School of Economics. Date Retrieved: February 8,2016 ;from https://goo.gl/fPif4s.

[33] Wihbey, J. (2015). *How does social media use influence political participation and civic engagement? A meta-analysis*. Journalist Resource. Date Retrieved: February 17,2016; from https://goo.gl/fGQ8u3