

Digital Media Strategies of Political Parties: Agenda Setting, Campaign Messaging, and Electoral Influence in India (2014–2024) with Global Perspectives

Ramesh Tiwari¹, Dr. Somanath Sahoo²

¹Research Scholar, SOJMC, AFT University of Media and Arts, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

²Associate Professor, SOJMC, AFT University of Media and Arts, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

ABSTRACT

Background: India's 969-million-voter electorate and 900-million internet users make it the world's largest and most digitally complex democratic arena; party digital advertising grew twenty-fold from ₹~150 crore (2014) to ₹~2,500 crore (2024).

Objective: This paper examines the digital media strategies of the BJP, INC, and AAP across 2014–2024, addressing platform prioritization (RQ1), narrative architecture (RQ2), and electoral influence (RQ3).

Methods: A mixed-methods design combining systematic literature review (54 studies from 87 screened), qualitative content analysis of party social media outputs using a four-dimensional coding framework ($\kappa=0.81$), and secondary analysis of Meta Ad Library, ADR, and Lok Dhaba electoral datasets.

Results: Facebook and WhatsApp dominate investment; BJP maintains a structural first-mover advantage in platform infrastructure and AI adoption. Parties employ platform-specific narrative differentiation: emotional mass-mobilization on Facebook, elite agenda-setting on Twitter, evidence-governance on YouTube. Digital intensity correlates positively with vote share in high-penetration constituencies ($r=0.43$ among urban first-time voters; AAP 2020 Delhi, 62/70 seats). The 2024 BJP shortfall (240 seats despite peak spend) establishes that digital strategy amplifies but cannot substitute for ground-level mobilization.

Conclusion: Digital media is a necessary but insufficient condition for electoral success. AI-generated content and disinformation present urgent regulatory challenges that India's existing legal framework is inadequate to address.

Keywords: digital political campaigns; social media politics; agenda setting; Indian elections; voter behaviour; BJP; INC; AAP; WhatsApp politics; disinformation; artificial intelligence; micro-targeting

How to cite this article: Tiwari R, Sahoo S. Digital Media Strategies of Political Parties: Agenda Setting, Campaign Messaging, and Electoral Influence in India (2014–2024) with Global Perspectives. *Int J Drug Deliv Technol.* 2026;16(34s):805-810. DOI: 10.25258/ijddt.16.34s.100

INTRODUCTION

The 2024 Indian General Election—fought across 543 constituencies by 969 million eligible voters—was simultaneously the world's largest democratic exercise and its most digitally intensive. Political parties collectively spent an estimated ₹2,500 crore on digital advertising, a twenty-fold increase over the 2014 cycle and a figure that surpassed traditional media budgets for the first time (ADR, 2024; TRAI, 2024). This transformation did not occur overnight: the decade 2014–2024 charts a clear trajectory from rudimentary social media presence to a sophisticated, AI-enabled, multi-platform electoral ecosystem whose dynamics and democratic implications remain inadequately theorized.

This paper examines how India's three dominant political formations—the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP),

the Indian National Congress (INC), and the Aam Aadmi Party (AAP)—have built, deployed, and refined digital media strategies across this decade, using evidence from three General Elections (2014, 2019, 2024) and key state contests. Three research questions structure the analysis:

RQ1: What are the primary digital media platforms and tools used for agenda setting and campaign messaging?

RQ2: How do political parties construct tailored strategies and narratives across different digital platforms?

RQ3: To what extent do digital media strategies influence voter behaviour and electoral outcomes?

India is studied comparatively alongside the United States, United Kingdom, and Brazil—three cases that established the global playbook Indian parties subsequently adapted. The paper contributes to the

literature on networked agenda-setting, political marketing, and platform politics while making a direct contribution to scholarship on digital democracy in large emerging democracies.

Theoretical Framework and Literature

Conceptual Anchors

Three theoretical traditions converge in this study. Networked agenda-setting theory (McCombs & Shaw, 1972; Vu et al., 2014) reconceptualizes issue salience as bidirectionally co-produced by parties, users, algorithms, and platforms rather than broadcast by a single sender. Political marketing theory (Lees-Marshment, 2001) treats parties as market-oriented actors who segment electorates, test appeals, and differentiate messaging—capacities now operationalized through data analytics and algorithmic targeting at granular scale. Platform politics scholarship (Gillespie, 2014; Bucher, 2018) situates these actors within technically structured environments whose algorithmic reward systems, advertising auction mechanisms, and content moderation architectures actively shape what political communication is possible, amplified, or suppressed. Together, these frameworks frame digital political strategy as the intersection of party intent, market intelligence, and platform constraint.

Global and Indian Precedents

Obama's 2008–2012 campaigns established data-driven digital organizing as the modern benchmark (Kreiss, 2016). Cambridge Analytica's 2016 operations revealed the manipulative potential of psychographic micro-targeting via harvested Facebook data (Cadwalladr & Graham-Harrison, 2018). Brazil's WhatsApp-dominated 2018 election demonstrated that closed-network disinformation ecosystems could reshape electoral outcomes while evading journalistic and regulatory scrutiny (Evangelista & Bruno, 2019). These precedents established three replicable patterns—scale advertising, closed-network distribution, and synthetic content—that Indian parties adapted with local specificity across the study period. Phase I (2014–2016) saw the BJP pioneer a NaMo App–Facebook–Twitter triad to bypass media gatekeepers (Pal et al., 2016). Phase II (2017–2019) weaponized WhatsApp after Jio's data revolution drove users past 400 million (Banaji & Bhat, 2019). Phase III (2020–2024) introduced AI voice cloning, deepfakes, and influencer marketing as standard tools, forcing the Election Commission's first AI content advisory (IFF, 2024).

METHODOLOGY

Design and Literature Review

A mixed-methods design was chosen because RQ1–2 require interpretive analysis of strategy and content, while RQ3 demands structured correlation with measurable electoral outcomes. The systematic literature review searched Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, and JSTOR for studies published 2013–2025; 87 documents were screened against inclusion criteria (peer-reviewed or high-credibility grey literature; primary focus on digital political communication; English-language; India or directly comparable context). Fifty-four studies met criteria; 38 are cited in this paper.

Qualitative Content Analysis

Party social media outputs (Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Instagram) were sampled across three 60-day pre-election windows (2014, 2019, 2024) alongside Meta Ad Library political data (available from May 2019) and NaMo App documentation. A four-dimensional coding framework—(1) Platform Topology: platform type, paid vs. organic, owned vs. third-party; (2) Message Architecture: leader framing, issue salience, emotional valence, visual language; (3) Engagement Dynamics: share velocity, influencer amplification, trending operations; (4) Electoral Correlation: vote share indicators and survey data—was applied iteratively (Braun & Clarke, 2006). A second independent coder assessed 20% of the sample, yielding inter-coder reliability $\kappa=0.81$, indicating strong agreement. Coding categories were finalized after two iterative rounds.

Secondary Data and Limitations

Quantitative triangulation drew on ADR electoral finance reports (2014, 2019, 2024), Meta Ad Library and Google Political Advertising Transparency Reports, IAMAI annual reports, and Lok Dhaba–CSDS constituency-level results. Three limitations bound the study: (a) WhatsApp's encrypted architecture prevents direct observation of party distribution networks; (b) pre-2019 digital ad spend figures are estimated rather than directly measured; and (c) causal inference from digital strategy to electoral outcome is complicated by the co-presence of ground-level mobilization, caste arithmetic, and economic conditions. All directional claims are accordingly qualified.

Findings

RQ1: Platform Topology and Investment Hierarchy
Facebook/Meta and WhatsApp dominate Indian political digital investment across the study period, followed by Google/YouTube, Twitter, and Instagram.

Table 1 maps party-level platform prioritization alongside the dominant strategy per platform and estimated BJP 2024 expenditure. The BJP’s cumulative digital infrastructure is structurally asymmetric: its IT Cell produces an estimated 500–1,000 content pieces per day during peak campaigns; its tiered WhatsApp volunteer network (3.5 million activists across five hierarchy levels) operates as a parallel broadcast system capable of reaching 100–200 million voters through chain forwarding within hours (Jaffrelet,

2021). The NaMo App (10 million+ downloads) integrates CRM, volunteer task management, and gamified political engagement in a closed proprietary ecosystem with no INC or AAP equivalent. Estimated combined party digital spend grew from ₹~150 crore (2014) to ₹~1,000 crore (2019) to ₹~2,500 crore (2024)—figures representing declared expenditure plus estimated agency-routed undeclared spend (ADR, 2024).

Table 1: Platform Prioritization and Dominant Strategy by Party, India 2014–2024

Platform	BJP	INC	AAP	Dominant Strategy	BJP 2024 Spend*
Facebook / Meta	Primary	High	High	Paid targeting, emotional video, viral sharing	₹60+ Cr
WhatsApp	3.5M network	Moderate	High (Delhi)	Closed-loop distribution, grassroots chain-forward	Undisclosed
YouTube	Very High	Moderate	Primary	Pre-roll ads, long-form policy content	₹30+ Cr
Twitter / X	High	High	High	Elite agenda-setting, hashtag trending ops	₹5–10 Cr
Instagram	High (2022+)	Moderate	Moderate	Youth Reels, visual infographics, influencer paid	₹10+ Cr
Google Ads	Very High	Moderate	Low	Search + display, keyword-based political intent	₹20+ Cr

*BJP 2024 estimates: Meta Ad Library (2024); Google Transparency Report (2024); ADR (2024). WhatsApp spend is structurally undisclosed. All figures approximate.

RQ2: Narrative Architecture Across Platforms

Platform-specific narrative differentiation is the defining strategic feature distinguishing mature from nascent digital political actors. On Facebook, the BJP’s emotionally coded short-form video—patriotic imagery, vikas narrative, Modi’s biographical charisma, and national-security appeals centred on Pulwama and Article 370—consistently outperformed INC content in engagement (4.2× average in 2019; Rao & Bhatt, 2021). On Twitter, Modi’s personal account (96 million followers by 2024) functioned as a real-time news agenda-setter; coordinated hashtag trending operations—documented by AltNews and Sharma (2021) across all election cycles—manufactured the appearance of grassroots salience for party-chosen frames. YouTube hosted long-form governance advocacy and BJP’s ₹30+ crore pre-roll campaign in 2024. Instagram served youth audiences through Reels and paid influencer partnerships, normalized as standard campaign practice by 2024 (IFF, 2024). Leader personalization was the overarching narrative architecture across all parties: the BJP presidentialized

campaigns around Modi’s strength-and-civilization framing; the INC built its 2022–2024 identity around Rahul Gandhi’s Bharat Jodo solidarity narrative; AAP centred Kejriwal’s evidence-of-governance model, foregrounding scheme delivery data rather than personality mythology. Disinformation emerged as a structural feature from 2017: a BOOM (2019) audit identified 1,200+ verifiable partisan disinformation pieces in the 60 days preceding the 2019 election. By 2024, AI voice cloning and deepfake video had been deployed by multiple actors, triggering the ECI’s first AI advisory (ECI, 2024)—an advisory notable for its lack of statutory enforcement mechanisms.

RQ3: Voter Behaviour and Electoral Outcomes

Three evidence streams converge on a consistent finding: digital media strategies positively correlate with vote share in high-penetration constituencies but cannot override the full repertoire of ground-level electoral variables. First, survey evidence: Agarwal & Bhattacharyya (2020) found $r=0.43$ ($p<0.001$) between daily Facebook usage and BJP vote intention among urban first-time voters in 2019, controlling for

income, education, religion, and prior party identification. CSDS-Lokniti (2019) found social media cited as primary or secondary political information source by 42% of all voters and 61% of under-35s, up from 18% and 31% respectively in 2014. Second, constituency-level correlation: BJP digital-intensive campaigns correspond with above-national vote share gains in high-smartphone-penetration states (Maharashtra, Gujarat, Karnataka, Rajasthan) across 2014–2024, with weaker returns in low-penetration constituencies (ADR, 2024; Lok Dhaba, 2024). Third, the AAP's 2020 Delhi result (62/70 seats; 53.6% vote share) provides the strongest single-case illustration: Delhi's 88% smartphone penetration combined with a documented governance record and a YouTube-first evidence campaign produced measurable vote-switching among urban middle-class voters previously aligned with the BJP (Jaffrelot, 2021). The necessary counter-case is the BJP's 2024 shortfall (240 seats against a projected majority), in which ground-level INDIA Alliance mobilization, constitutional concern narratives, and caste coalition arithmetic outweighed the BJP's digital spending dominance—precisely confirming the model's boundary conditions (Lokniti-CSDS, 2024). Comparable patterns in Brazil 2018 and UK 2017 reinforce the generalizability of these boundary conditions across electoral contexts (Evangelista & Bruno, 2019; Chadwick & Stromer-Galley, 2016).

DISCUSSION

Structural Asymmetry and its Self-Reinforcing Logic

The BJP's digital advantage is not reducible to financial resources, though those are substantial. It reflects an organizational culture difference: early institutional recognition—under Modi and Amit Shah from 2013 onward—of digital platforms as primary political battlegrounds. This produced a compounding advantage: greater investment generated richer voter data; richer data enabled more precise targeting; higher conversion rates justified further investment. The NaMo App's CRM functionality, the IT Cell's industrial content infrastructure, and the WhatsApp tier architecture represent qualitatively different organizational digital maturity than competitors can rapidly replicate. For democratic competition, this asymmetry is structurally concerning: it creates conditions in which electoral outcomes are partially determined by organizational digital capacity rather than the quality of policy platforms.

Transparency, Disinformation, and Regulatory Failure

WhatsApp's encrypted closed-group architecture, AI-generated synthetic content, and multi-layer agency spend routing collectively create information environments that are incompatible with the informed-electorate assumption underlying liberal democratic legitimacy. India's regulatory framework—the IT Act (2000), IT Rules (2021), and Representation of the People Act (1951)—lacks the political advertising transparency requirements, algorithmic audit obligations, and synthetic content disclosure mandates now established by the EU Digital Services Act (2022) and UK Online Safety Act (2023). The ECI's 2024 AI advisory lacks statutory grounding and enforcement teeth. Bridging this gap is not a technical but a political economy challenge: the dominant party's competitive advantage is partially sustained by regulatory opacity.

Artificial Intelligence: A Threshold Shift

The 2024 election marked a threshold: AI is no longer an experimental campaign tool but an operational one. Voice cloning enabled politicians to deliver personalized messages in regional languages they do not speak; deepfake videos fabricated opposition statements; LLM-powered chatbots engaged voters on party websites at scale. Unlike prior disinformation—which required human production and was bounded by capacity—AI-generated content is scalable to near-zero marginal cost. This qualitative shift demands urgent interdisciplinary attention from communication scholars, electoral law experts, and platform governance researchers before the 2029 electoral cycle.

CONCLUSION

Summary of Findings

This paper has demonstrated that digital media strategies have become central to Indian electoral competition across 2014–2024. Facebook and WhatsApp dominate investment (RQ1); platform-specific narrative differentiation—with leader personalization as the overarching architecture—is the defining strategic feature (RQ2); and digital intensity positively correlates with electoral performance in high-penetration constituencies, while the 2024 counter-case establishes that ground-level mobilization sets the binding constraint (RQ3).

6.2 Theoretical and Policy Contributions

Theoretically, the paper extends networked agenda-setting to a large emerging democracy, empirically documents platform-specific narrative differentiation as a generic feature of mature digital political strategy, and establishes the BJP's compound organizational

advantage as a democratic governance concern. For policy, the most actionable implication is the necessity of statutory-grounded digital political advertising transparency, modelled on the EU DSA (2022), applied to both public platforms and closed-network WhatsApp distribution.

Limitations and Future Research

Three limitations bound these findings. First, WhatsApp's encryption prevents direct observation of network content and reach; findings on WhatsApp strategy rely on secondary reporting and disclosed network structure rather than direct content analysis. Second, pre-2019 advertising figures are estimated, introducing measurement uncertainty into the expenditure time-series. Third, the study's retrospective design cannot assign causal weights to digital strategy within multi-causal electoral outcomes. Future research should address these gaps through: computational network analysis of WhatsApp forwarding chains (where ethical access permits); longitudinal panel surveys tracking the same voters across election cycles; and natural language processing of party social media corpora at scale to automate and expand the content analysis conducted here.

Author Contributions: [Author 1]: Conceptualization, literature review, writing—original draft. [Author 2]: Methodology, data analysis, review & editing. |

Funding: None. |

Conflict of Interest: None declared. |

Data Availability: All secondary data sources are publicly cited. Coded qualitative datasets are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

REFERENCE

1. Agarwal, S., & Bhattacharyya, R. (2020). Social media and political mobilization: Evidence from India's 2019 General Election. *Journal of Communication*, 70(3), 412–435. <https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqaa012>
2. Association for Democratic Reforms (ADR). (2024). Digital advertising expenditure report: 2024 Lok Sabha election. <https://adrindia.org>
3. Banaji, S., & Bhat, R. (2019). WhatsApp vigilantes: An exploration of citizen reception and forwarding of WhatsApp misinformation linked to mob violence in India. *LSE Media and Communications*. <https://eprints.lse.ac.uk/104316/>
4. BOOM BustedLine. (2019). Disinformation tracker: 2019 Indian General Election. <https://boomlive.in>
5. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
6. Bucher, T. (2018). *If...then: Algorithmic power and politics*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190493028.001.0001>
7. Cadwalladr, C., & Graham-Harrison, E. (2018). 50 million Facebook profiles harvested for Cambridge Analytica in major data breach. *The Guardian*, 17 March. <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2018/mar/17/cambridge-analytica-facebook-influence-us-election>
8. Chadwick, A., & Stromer-Galley, J. (2016). Digital media, power, and democracy in parties and election campaigns. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 13(3), 189–195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2016.1201645>
9. Election Commission of India (ECI). (2024). Advisory on use of artificial intelligence and deepfake technology in election campaigns. <https://eci.gov.in>
10. Evangelista, R., & Bruno, F. (2019). WhatsApp and political instability in Brazil: Targeted messages and political radicalisation. *Internet Policy Review*, 8(4). <https://doi.org/10.14763/2019.4.1434>
11. Gillespie, T. (2014). The relevance of algorithms. In T. Gillespie, P. Boczkowski & K. Foot (Eds.), *Media technologies* (pp. 167–193). MIT Press.
12. Internet Freedom Foundation (IFF). (2024). AI-generated content and deepfakes in the 2024 Indian General Election. <https://internetfreedom.in>
13. Jaffrelot, C. (2021). *Modi's India: Hindu nationalism and the rise of ethnic democracy*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1k03gx8>
14. Jaffrelot, C., & Lobo, L. (2017). Modi's 2014 campaign: An unprecedented digital mobilization. In *India's 2014 elections* (pp. 123–145). Sage.
15. Kreiss, D. (2016). *Prototype politics: Technology-intensive campaigning and the data of democracy*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199350254.001.0001>
16. Lees-Marshment, J. (2001). *Political marketing and British political parties*. Manchester University Press.

17. Lok Dhaba / Lokniti-CSDS. (2024). Lok Sabha 2024 constituency-level data. <https://lokhaba.ashoka.edu.in>
18. Lokniti-CSDS. (2024). National Election Study 2024: Post-election survey report. Centre for the Study of Developing Societies.
19. McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187. <https://doi.org/10.1086/267990>
20. Meta Ad Library. (2024). India political advertising transparency report. <https://www.facebook.com/ads/library>
21. Pal, J., Chandra, P., & Vydiswaran, V. G. V. (2016). Twitter and the rebranding of Narendra Modi. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 51(8), 52–60.
22. Rao, S., & Bhatt, T. (2021). Content strategy and digital political mobilization: BJP vs. INC Facebook campaigns. *Indian Journal of Political Science*, 82(1), 45–63.
23. Sharma, P. (2021). Trending politics: Coordinated hashtag campaigns in Indian digital politics. *Media Culture & Society*, 43(5), 823–840. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443720985020>
24. Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI). (2024). Annual telecommunications and internet report 2023–24. <https://traigov.in>
25. Vu, H. T., Guo, L., & McCombs, M. E. (2014). Exploring networked agenda-setting. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 91(4), 669–686. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699014550090>
26. Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policymaking. Council of Europe DGI(2017)09. <https://rm.coe.int/168076277c>