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Changing Media Environment

• The rise of the Internet
  – From 20% to 80% daily users since 2000

• The decline of traditional media outlets
  – TV penetration rate 93% → 88%
  – Print newspaper 59% → 33%

• Changing Landscape of the traditional media outlets?
TV Landscape

TV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>2008 (%)</th>
<th>2016 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OLD Three</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTV</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERA</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEXT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVBS</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Newspapers Landscape

Newspapers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>2008 (%)</th>
<th>2016 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China Times</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Daily News</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Times</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Daily</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Status

• Traditional media, new format
  – Web portals for newspapers

• The rise of social media
  – Facebook (2016): 18 million accounts; 13 million daily users

• Advertisement allocation
  – Internet > Traditional media
What’s important?

• What is the relationship between media consumption and political participation? (TEDS 2008; 2012; 2016)

• Is the rise of the Internet plays a significant role that shapes Taiwan’s new political landscape? Focusing on social media (TSCS 2014)

• Challenging Issues
  – Quality of media report
  – Anti-media-monopoly legislation (China factor again!)
    • Regulation vs. Deregulation
  – Independent online media
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[Bar chart showing daily consumption for election news across TV, Radio, Internet, and Newspaper for 2008, 2012, and 2016]
Demographic Breakdown (Gender)
Demographic Breakdown (Age)
Demographic Breakdown (Edu)
Breakdown by Party Support
Voting Behavior and Media Consumption

• Dependent variables:
  – Voting Participation
  – Vote Choice

• Independent variables:
  – Types of media consumption
  – Demographic variables
  – Political variables: party support, political efficacy, political interest

• Result:
  – Only TV watch matters on voting participation (positively correlated)
Non-conventional Political Participation and Use of Social Media

• Facebook becomes SUPER important for politicians (but not for all)
• Use of social media becomes the most important factor in campaign
• Controversies:
  – Online activities are associated with offline participation
    • Particularly for non-conventional participation
  – Online activities are not associated with offline participation
    • FB friends vs. political participation
    • Use of FB vs. political efficacy and participation
    • Cynicism
Measurement of Non-conventional Political Participation

- sign a petition
- boycott certain products
- take part in a demonstration
- attend political meeting or rally
- contact a politician
- donate money or raise funds
- contact media
Measurement of FB Use

• Some “facts” from TSCS Survey data (2014)
  – Internet Users 65% (1228/1875)
  – FB users 54% (1021/1875)
  – FB daily users 44% (833/1875)

• Measurement on depth (depth score): 4 points scale: 4=very often; 3=sometimes; 2=rarely; 1=never
  – watch
  – share
  – comment
  – join community (or add friends)
  – participate into political related actions

• Measurement on breadth (breadth score): numbers of friends
## Depth Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) By Gender</th>
<th>(2) By Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3) By Education</th>
<th>(4) By Party Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high school</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or vocational school</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical college</td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University and above</td>
<td>9.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education Level**

**Party Identification**
Breadth Score

(1) By Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) By Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>19-34</th>
<th>35-50</th>
<th>51+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) By Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Primary school</th>
<th>Junior high school</th>
<th>High school or vocational school</th>
<th>Technical college</th>
<th>University and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(4) By Party Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party Identification</th>
<th>Pan-Blue</th>
<th>Pan-Green</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Modeling Analysis

• Dependent variable
  – Non-conventional participation

• Independent variables:
  – Depth score
  – Breadth score
  – Demographic variables
  – Political variables: political efficacy, political discussion with others

• Results:
  – Both depth and breadth scores matter!
FB Use and Non-conventional Participation: Party difference?
Future Modifications

• General media use and political participation
  – Problem: not much interesting

• Social media use and non-conventional political participation
  – Problem: not causality
  – Interaction terms

• Development of media environment?
  – Polarized media
  – China influence
  – New online media