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Online citizenship (Scheufele & Nisbet, 2002) and online behavior is being debated as new technologies and Social Networking Sites (SNS) are altering and enhancing traditional political campaign practices. Across the world, technologically driven campaigns are being used aggressively for increasing political socialization of voters, encouraging online blogs, online political support groups, political efficacy, political engagement and voting behavior (Bentivegna, 2006; Bimber & Davis, 2003; Chang, 2003; Chadwick, 2009; Davis, 1999; Karan, Gimeno & Tandoc, 2009; Willnat, 2009; Yamamoto, 2006).

New democracies (First election in 1996) like Taiwan’s have already jumped the bandwagon. The country’s political campaigns are not only following the pattern of Western countries, but are extensively using the SNS for political engagement, campaigning and participation. This study through a theoretical background on social networks, explores the use and impact of SNS in Taiwan, particularly Facebook. How are political parties building ‘political friendships’ through SNS and gaining political trust that is gradually declining in most countries of the world? How are these strategies looked upon by citizens- to what extent are they prepared to become friends with politicians, and allow them to intrude upon their personal space, and what impact does this have on their voting behavior? Through an case study of campaign strategies and an online web survey of over 371 Taiwanese, the study find some interesting data on a new tactical area of using Social Networking Sites in political friendships in election studies.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to thank Jesus for giving me peace and accompanying me this whole time. He directed my life, and led me back to the major I’ve always dreamt of studying in. I thank my family: my dad Jack and my mom Sueellen, who gave me the opportunity to learn and explore what I am passionate about. My brother Kevin and my sister Winny, who put me in their prayers daily, even though we are so far away. They love me, support me and encourage me whenever I need their advice. Without them, I would have never made it.

I would like to give the deepest appreciation to my committee chair Dr. Kavita Karan, who has patiently guided me and encouraged me while I had problems doing this research. She inspired me by her life experiences and her working attitude. She shed light on my research and shared the latest findings or thoughts to me that related to my topics. Without her constant support and supervision, this research paper would not have been possible. Yang Feng and Dr. Xie guided me on my data analysis processes.

Moreover, I would like to thank all my friends who encouraged me, cooked for me, and were there for me when I felt burnt out. Specifically, I want to thank Haley, the best roommate and English teacher in the world. She is a great friend in various ways. Oh! And her wonderful Jamaica Me Crazy coffee is the best coffee on earth. Also I want to thank my best study buddy Mi Young. Mi Young accompanied me day and night staying in Morris Library, the public library, teashop Blend, or coffee shop Common Grounds. She made my routine studying days became all awesome days. I want to thank Echo, who prayed for me, and helped me to purchase journals or books I needed for my research from Taiwan. I would like to thank my friends Elizabeth, Brandi, and Grace (Fu Tao) from MCMA Graduate programs. You ladies really helped me a lot. Thanks for being so great, nice and supported.
I want to thank the professors and friends from Taiwanese Student Association. Dr. Echu Liu, Dr. Lin, Jimmy, Kai, Rain, Chris, Abbie, and Ming. Thank you for being so generous to me, giving me so many hands when I needed, and bringing me so much joy, and food.

Lastly, I would like to thank my small group members/ best friends: Genevieve, Edwin, Julie, Adam, Xuan, and Eric. Thank you friends so much for being there for me when I went through ups and downs. You all are truly great blessings in my life. Again, I thank Jesus for all the wonderful people and relationships I have in my life.

Thank you.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 1 – Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 2 – Literature Review</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 3 – Research Questions &amp; Methodology</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 4 – Case Study of the 2012 Taiwan General Elections</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 5 – Data Analysis – The Impact of the Campaigns of the Electorate</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 6 – Discussion and Conclusions</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDICES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A – Survey Question</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VITA</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE

PAGE

Figure 1 ...........................................................................................................26

Figure 2 ...........................................................................................................28

Figure 3 ...........................................................................................................29

Figure 4 ...........................................................................................................30

Figure 5 ...........................................................................................................31

Figure 6 ...........................................................................................................32

Figure 7 ...........................................................................................................32

Figure 8 ...........................................................................................................33

Figure 9 ...........................................................................................................33

Figure 10 .........................................................................................................34

Figure 11 .........................................................................................................35

Figure 12 .........................................................................................................35

Figure 13 .........................................................................................................36

Figure 14 .........................................................................................................36

Figure 15 .........................................................................................................36
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Across the world, political campaigns are being using new media and social networking sites (SNS) more frequently than ever before in history. Online citizenship (Scheufele & Nisbet, 2002) and online behavior is being debated as new technologies and Social Networking Sites (SNS) are altering and enhancing traditional political campaign practices. Across the world, technologically driven campaigns are being used aggressively for increasing political socialization of voters, encouraging online blogs, online political support groups, political efficacy, political engagement and voting behavior (Bentivegna, 2006; Bimber & Davis, 2003; Chang, 2003; Chadwick 2009; Davis 1999; Karan, Gimeno & Tandoc, 2009; Willnat & Aw, 2009; Yamamoto, 2006).

*Facebook, YouTube, Twitter* and mobile phones are becoming the new media being used to reach the electorate and particularly for the technology savvy youth of the countries (Campbell & Kwak, 2011; Powell, Richmond, & Williams, 2011). New democracies (First election in 1996) like Taiwan’s have already jumped the bandwagon. The country’s political campaigns are not only following the pattern of Western countries, but are extensively using the SNS for political engagement, campaigning and participation (Chang, 2003). Taiwan is a highly networked country with 77.09% of over 17 million (17,980,000) people connected to the Internet (Ho, 2013), and 80% (11,410,000) of them are using *Facebook* (Taiwan Network Information Center, 2012). Chen (2012) found that politicians in Taiwan use *Facebook* as an important approach to campaigning to provides citizens with political information, and create conversations about daily life to influence voting behavior (Wang, 2013). Taiwan, a democracy since 1996 is also witnessing a sudden upsurge in the use of new media in the last 2012 elections. As a typical third wave democracy country, with the first election held in 1996 Taiwan’s political campaigns seem to be following the pattern of Western countries.
Most of the past research that has focused on political advertising in Taiwan has covered different aspects of the use of mass traditional media (Lin, 2012). There is very little research that has focused on the use of new media technologies, and in recent years what has been the influence of social networking sites on political campaigns in Taiwan. How politicians use social networking sites and the internet as tools to build more personal relationships with the community has also not been thoroughly researched. This study evaluates how these technologies were used and the perceptions and impact of the new media technologies on youth in the 2012 elections. Through a case study and survey, it focuses on the behaviors of voters age 20 and over in Taiwan, exemplifies how social networks help in developing personal rapport among the leaders and the people, how it affects voters’ political engagement and support candidates to win the elections.

**Political and Socio Economic Profile of the country**

Taiwan, a democratic country, is about 240 miles long and 85 miles wide, and shaped like a sweet potato, is located around 120 miles east of the Chinese coast, some 400 miles south west of Okinawa, and north of the Philippines (Mendel, 1970). The population of Taiwan was 23.3 million at the end of 2013 (Ministry of the Interior, 2013). Taiwan’s historical and political profile has been influenced by the Dutch occupation, the Koxingan period, the Qing Dynasty period (also known as Manchu dynasty), “republic”, Japanese colonial period, and the Republic of China period (Kerr, 1974; Mendel, 1970).

Since 1945, Taiwan’s international status is known as the Republic of China (R.O.C.). Mendel (1970) mentions that Taiwan “ha[s] been governed since 1945 by the Republic of China, and since 1949 as the one Chinese area free of Communist control.” (p. 9). From 1945 to 1949, Taiwan was under Mainland’s Communist control, which was governed by General
Chen Yi. Taiwanese people have been through the tragedy of the 2-28 Revolution\(^1\); since 1945, Kuomintang (KMT) has governed Taiwan under the reign of White Terror\(^2\) from 1949 to 1955 those secret police are everywhere, they abuse their powers and have no regard for the law: “They interfered with free elections. They made numberless illegal arrests. They tortured and they blackmailed . . .The liberties of the people are almost totally suppressed.” (Huei, 2011, quoted from Exiled Governor-General Wu Kuo-chen in 1954, P. 60). Starting in 1950, there was a strike opposing martial law, which had controlled the Taiwanese community for 38 years. People did not have right to gather, freedom to publish was limited, and freedom of speech was denied while under the martial law.

KMT built up a wall of fear, a division between races (Chinese and Taiwanese), and the barrier between government and the public (Huei, 2011; Rampal, 1994).

Now, Taiwan is assumed to be a third wave democratic country that followed up the first wave democratic countries such as the United States and France, and the second wave countries since 1960-1975 like Germany, Italy, and Japan. The political system in Taiwan is similar to other democratic countries. Presidential, state and local elections in Taiwan are held every four years. All citizens of Taiwan have to be at least twenty years old to vote in elections. Every person has one vote for any election, and voters only vote for him or herself. People need to follow the basic principles; all voting decisions are confidential while voting (Rigger, 1999).

In Taiwan, there are two main political parties, which dominate other parties: the Democratic Progressive Party (the Green Party) and the Chinese Nationalist Party (also

\(^1\) Chinese police killed the “range from ten thousands to twenty thousands if one counts prisoners presumed dead and those who disappeared [,]”(Mendel, 1970, p. 37) in 1947, by making up seditious conspiracy was happening in the overall Taiwanese community.

\(^2\) “During the period of the White Terror from 1949 to 1955, the régime arrested about 90,000 suspects, executing possibly up to half of them.” (Huei, 2011, p. 60).
known as Kuomintang, (KMT, the Blue Party). Presidential elections have been held every four years since 1996.

The first official government from Mainland China that was founded in Taiwan is the Republic of China and the founding father is Dr. Sun Yet-Sen. It was the original party of Chinese Nationalist Party. It started as a single-party domination after it arrived in Taiwan in 1949 (Rampal, 1994). The Democratic Progressive Party is a central-left political party illegally founded in 1986, while under the martial law. It was founded by a group of Taiwanese people who majored in law, who were highly educated in the knowledge of law and democracy. This party followed the Western countries system of governance. “The legalization of the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) in 1989 was the consequence of the will of President Chiang Ching-kuo, who died on January 13, 1988[.]” (Rampal, 1994, p. 74). The Democratic Progressive Party pushed Taiwan into a democratic country, started unraveling the single-party domination, and won the second presidential election in Taiwan in 2000. After the lifting of martial law, media became a channel not only for the government to communicate, but also for citizens.

Because of the history of martial law, which “controls peoples’ freedom and rights to gather, publish and talk about politics,” politics was, and still is a sensitive topic for people to discuss. Martial law also caused a fear to discuss politics among citizens of Taiwan (Rampal, 1994). However, the generations who were born after 1988 were not restricted by martial law in the past, and didn’t experience the fear that came from a single-party dominated government. They have a more positive attitude towards elections and the whole democratic political system. During elections the mass media are extensively used for campaigning like most democratic countries. In Taiwan too, similar strategies are being used and of late, in the last few elections, the new media technologies are being used, similar to those in the western
democracies and particularly the use by President Barack Obama in the 2012 US elections (Wortham, 2012).

Taiwan is a highly networked country with 17,980,000 people. 77.09% the overall people have the access and are regularly connecting to the Internet (Ho, 2013); and to Social Networking Sites (SNS) with the most popular being Facebook with 11,410,000 people being connected to Facebook (InsightXplorer, 2012). Political parties have extensively used social networking sites, developing fan pages and Facebook sites to reach and persuade the electorate.

From this research, I intend to find if Facebook was an effective media used for political campaigning towards voters, or for the future younger generation. The political campaigns advertised on Facebook are more positive than those using negative strategies in the traditional media, and whether these may become one of the primary media used by political campaigns that can really have an impact on voters’ voting behavior and how candidates win the elections.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Third Wave Democracy Country and Cultural Imperialism

Several scholars define Taiwan as a third wave democracy. A third wave democracy country is defined as a country, which has a government that shifted from an authoritarian to a democratic system between 1974 and 1990. It was a global democratic revolution and is considered as the most important political trend in the late twentieth century. The new democracies, the emerging democracies or less developed countries are all considered to be third wave democratic countries. These are the countries, which in the last 25 years or so, having become democratic countries and are following the pattern of the first democratic countries such as United States or other Western countries (Chang, 1996; Huntington, 1991; Solinger, 2001). Chang (1996) gives a detailed description of Taiwan’s political environment, which has rapidly changed in its political values, the organizational changes through regular elections, economy, the behavior of voters, and media usage following the first wave of democratic countries.

Thussu (2006) talks about cultural imperialism in *International Communication: Continuity and Change*. Schiller’s definition of cultural imperialism is, “the sum of the processes by which a society is brought into the modern world system and how its dominating stratum is attracted, pressured, forced, and sometimes bribed into shaping social institutions to correspond to, or even to promote, the values and structures of the dominant center of the system,” (2006, p. 47). It is difficult to keep cultural imperialism working as well as it did in the 1990s, because of the “international information society.” Cultural imperialism seems to be turning into another idea called “media imperialism.” As technology has improved, people can get the general knowledge or information that they want easily.
Hesmondhalgh (2013) mentions that the power of cultural industries can influence individuals, and even whole cultures. Cultural imperialism starts influencing people’s values, but not through the use of strict laws, which quickly change the way people live their lives. Cultural imperialism is much more dangerous, because it is a slightly changing traditional systems that can have a drastic impact over a longer period of time unknowingly to the public. In general, people are blinded when there is a lack of information about a specific topic. When people receive information, most of the time, they will research to find the accuracy to believe and act upon it.

The combination of the theories of third wave democracy, cultural industries and cultural imperialism is important to Taiwan’s political environment. These theories provide the information needed from Western cultures, in order to see the whole environment outside of Taiwan’s own view of the political system. In this paper, the United States will be used as the example of a first wave democracy country to compare the differences between the two countries in terms of the political campaigns in the last elections where, Taiwan followed a few of the strategies used by the United States in their presidential elections, and also the 2012 elections in US preceded the Taiwan elections.

**Traditional Media Usage in Political Advertising**

Most of the earlier research on political advertising has focused on the use of traditional media and negative campaigning (Chang, 2002b; Chou & Lien, 2010; Chung, 2006; Chuang, 2006; Sullivan, 2009; Sullivan & Sapir, 2012). However, the more recent studies have given greater emphasis on the use and impact of new media technologies in elections (Powell, Richmond, and Williams 2011; Pasek, more, & Romer, 2009). Taiwan election strategies have also followed similar strategies that we further discuss.
Chuang (2006) claimed negative advertising in election campaigns is being aggressive and highly negative toward the opponent candidates. It is commonly used, and can almost be a tradition in the United States. The political campaign culture in Taiwan follows the steps, and thrives on negativity. Most political advertisements similar to the United States tend to be negative, and tend to focus on attacking the opposing candidates and their politics parties. Sullivan (2009) found that analyzing advertisements for political campaigns on television and newspapers could give voters a broader view of the campaign in order to make better voting decisions. Although advertisements are negatively promoted, they have been proved to be a worthy investment, and are becoming more and more important. Moreover, Chang (2003) found that using political advertising in campaigns is influential even though party bias exists in Taiwan’s society. However, voters may limit the impact of political advertising’s effect on their decisions.

Sullivan & Sapir (2012) found that the level of negative content in advertising campaigns increases when elections are more competitive. Negative campaign communications are influential, which reveals the inherent political culture in Taiwan. Like other democracies, the variety of mass media in campaigns help build up the candidates’ image and political ideologies. The results of a negative campaign also reveal the impact of voter’s decision making.

Research focused on traditional advertising in Taiwan has shown that voter behaviors after being exposed to the positive and negative advertising messages are different. Partisans who strongly support a certain party normally felt disappointed by the manipulations used by candidates; however, their reaction as voters was expressed in a stronger support for affiliated candidates. They tried to show that the opposing candidates were not persuasive; however they were persuaded, but only by the advertisements, which support their existing views. On the other hand, independents that are indifferent about political parties were not receptive to
campaign messages, and they tend to be less willing to vote for those candidates or be influenced by their campaign advertising (Chang, 2002b).

Chang (2002a) found that the way news and advertising is framed could have a strong impact on peoples’ minds. She points out that media should focus more on political issues when it comes to political campaigning, and not only on candidates’ personal issues, campaign strategies, and targeting specific voter groups. Moreover, Chang (2002a) found that negative advertising didn’t lower Taiwanese voters political confidence, or political efficacy. (Which is the opposite of voters in the U.S.). Taiwanese voters find negative advertising helpful in making their voting decision; on the other hand, it helps them to make their final voting decision. However, Chang (2002a) found that lacking confidence in politics is the main reason why voters are not willing to vote.

During 1998 Taipei mayoral election, Chang (2002a) found that the overall usage of negative advertising in the top three most popular newspapers: China Times, Liberty Times, United Daily News in Taiwan had 21% of the political advertising on newspaper. Chang (2002a) also found that 19% of the overall political advertising on television is negative.

Further, Chung (2006) found that the similarity between three presidential elections in Taiwan and the United States from 1996 to 2004 was negative advertising on television, which is the most powerful medium for advertising. In the United States, two thirds of the political advertising for presidential elections was negative and Taiwan seems to be catching up with the trend. In Taiwan, the amount of negative advertising rapidly increased during these three elections. He also found that in Taiwan most of the political advertisements on the Internet are different than traditional media, focusing on anything but negative advertising. On the other hand, there are many differences between the US and Taiwan when using advertisements for political campaigns due to the cultural differences. Culture determines advertising, and advertising reflects the culture.
Taiwan is a collective and high-context culture, different than the individual and low-context culture in the United States. People in the high-context cultures tend to focus more on the benefits and harmony of the overall community; the relationships between people are important and more valuable and less on individual gratification (Chung, 2006). Therefore, although both countries are using negative advertising, the negative advertising in Taiwan is using implication of issues but not directly mentioning names. It also tends to influence voters psychology by using emotional appeals. However, negative advertising in the United States is direct and obvious; political candidates focus more on attacking the opponents, on social economic and political issues and voters need to make choices of believability. In other words, attacking the opponent is common in America. Chung (2006) found that negative advertising is the actual reason that leads the public to political alienation and avoid voting, not because of the overflow political advertising.

Other scholars think negative advertising on traditional media has its influence. Dzwo (2008) argued that in Taiwan the agenda setting on traditional media could have an impact on voter’s behavior on the Internet. If certain topics have been discussed extensively in the newspapers or on television, it would make the public feel like these issues are important. After that the readers would discuss the topics on the Internet and make these topics become popular topics online. This inter-media influence is subconsciously influencing voters. According to Dzwo, if the issues are more related to voters, the impact is stronger. However, voters showed negative reactions towards the on-going political advertising that have no connection with them. Wang (2010) also found that political elections still rely on newspaper, TV commercials and other traditional media, although new media have a lot of benefits, these do not seem as influential as other traditional media.

Wang (2010) finds that “Traditional media, especially newspaper, can have the direct influence on audiences on political knowledge and political efficacy, and will indirectly
influence their involvement and behavior towards politics.” (Direct translation from Wang, 2010, p.10). Newspapers have a stronger influence than TV news because newspapers have a more in depth analysis, and show more details about specific issues. However, data also shows that audiences who expose themselves to traditional media are more involved in politics.

Political campaigns in Taiwan use both the traditional and new media. These campaigns have become more and more influential particularly the use of new media in reaching out toward the younger generation who are technology savvy and live with high levels of citizen engagement through the use of new media.

New Media Usage in Political Campaigning

Wang (2010) found that Taiwanese voters most often gather information from traditional media compared with new media, but new media development in Taiwan has changed political campaigning. Earlier, political campaigning used to focus on political parties; however, due to the new strategies of new media marketing and promotion, it has changed its way of election campaigning so that the focus is on candidate image.

Social networking has become a new tool for political advertising because of the Internet’s increasing role in current years. Powell, Richmond, and Williams (2011) found that voters’ conversations about politics are mostly taking place on SNS in three areas: information exchanging, political arguments, and the latest news. In addition, a lot of people enjoy the personal “friendship” with politicians. Candidates’ social networking participation can be a factor for voters to change their attitude towards them. However, since the majority of voters using social media are college students, the results of the research are limited to that majority which uses social media.
Wang (2010) states that now is the age of “candidate-image election”. “Election is actually a game that is participated by candidates, media and voters.” (p. 22). Wang (2010) mentions “Many scholars assumed that in order to win the election, candidates’ image is the key point of winning, and it is far more important than any other variable, even their political issues that are the most important things for difference among different candidates.” (Direct translation from Wang, 2010, p. 3). Moreover, since voters are obviously more interested in candidates image than the political issues the candidates stand for, it also subconsciously has a strong influence on their voting decisions. In recent years with the popularity of SNS, politicians are switching their strategies from traditional media to different media in the latest presidential election in 2012, and a few other elections.

Previous research has shown that Facebook has dominated other social networking sites in Taiwan. According to Taiwan Network Information Center (2012), there are more than 17,530,000 people in Taiwan who had access to the Internet in 2012, which is about 75 percent of the overall Taiwanese people. Eighty percent of people in Taiwan are using Facebook. There are 11,410,000 people who have an account on Facebook, and according to InsightXplorer’s IX Survey Online Market Research, 96.8% of those people visited Facebook during the research month in October 2012, (InsightXplorer, 2012). In 2011, 36% of the Taiwanese Facebook users were between the ages of 25 to 34, 28% are from ages 18-24, and 15% are from age 35-44, (Ministry of the Interior, 2011).

According to Business Next magazine’s research of “The top 100 websites in Taiwan” in March 2013, Facebook won first place for the most popular and most frequently used website in Taiwan, which is the third time it is winning this honor since 2011. Yahoo! and YouTube follow Facebook as the second and third most visited sites in Taiwan. Research shows that social networking sites have became the focus of observation and will be the future trend of the network industry and trend in political campaigns, as well (Chen, 2013).
Data from Nielsen’s research in 2012 shows that Facebook is the top SNS in many countries across the world and Taiwan is the third largest networked country in Asia. There are 11,068,000 unique audiences which access Facebook daily, and 77.9% of Taiwanese people are actively using Facebook from their home and/or office computers.

Chen (2013) focused on the 2011 legislators election and determined that politicians in Taiwan currently use Facebook as an important approach to campaigning. He found that no matter if it’s during election time or during legislators’ terms of office, Facebook usage in Taiwan was mostly providing citizens with political information and sharing their personal life. During the 2011 legislator election campaign from December 1st to December 31st, 53% were using Facebook for providing political information, had the highest rate of usage among others strategies like sharing their daily life, or attacking other candidates. Chen’s research results showed that potential voters and citizens were looking for this interactive personal relationship with politicians especially during election time. Chen argued that although the strategy of using Facebook seems more effective than traditional media, it’s important to maintain the relationship as a stable, two-way long-term relationship, but more than just using it as an election tool by making up candidate images or attracting the public.

Due to the great amount of information on social networks, receiving information and exchanging thoughts and opinions about political campaigns has become easy. The traditional political environment is inherently negative on television and newspaper. In general, media biases are hard to recognize however, I think that political campaigns, which use SNS, have an important role to provide the voters a general view of the overall campaign.

However, the one trait of SNS is that it is very easy to unintentionally expose users to sporadic messages and information. Lin (2012) found that although the social networking sites spread the messages, there was very little influence on voter’s voting behavior, even among voters who have been highly exposed to the information on social networking sites.
However, the political information they read or see while they are browsing SNS only has an impact on voters who have passive attitudes towards politics, and who also spend a lot of time browsing social networking sites. In other words, SNS do not have a direct impact on those who normally vote in elections, but might have an impact on voters who don’t have much interest in elections.

Wang (2013) found that SNS form a new culture of political fandom. These fans like to be friends with candidates, to join their fan groups, or to “like” their posts on social networking sites. She found that social networking sites’ frequent users or those who pay more attention on social media in politics, are more likely to attend political activities, campaigns, discussions, petitions, and to donate both on online and in real time. However, she pointed out this new phenomenon surprisingly does not have a connection with their voting behavior.

The relationship between social networking sites usage and civic engagement is inconsistent. Pasek, more, and Romer (2009) found that although social networking sites help users building up trust and positive attitude to the information they gather, but are not particularly engaged. However, the positive level on their social capital is not relevant to their offline behavior. Users’ behavior in real life has little relationship with their engagement on SNS. Pasek, more, and Romer argued that interpersonal trust does not build up in the online world.

Wang (2013) mentioned the concept of general social networking sites usage is for showing concern and having a connection with friends. Voters use SNS to show their befriending behaviors to candidates. However, she argued that some voters will actually “like” opponent candidates’ pages for gathering information, so it is not always reflected in the election result. However, studies across the world are reflecting on the impact of these SNS in political engagement and voting behavior, which we want to explore in this study.
Previous studies show that political advertising is beneficial in Taiwan’s political environment, and it can benefit candidates in elections. Although research shows that most of the political advertising in traditional media is using negative campaigns, and people in Taiwan claimed they don’t believe what they’ve received from the media; however, data shows that political advertising is subconsciously having strong impacts on the public.

SNS and Internet are becoming powerful for the younger generation to receive information. They are also taking over the place of traditional media, and becoming a lifestyle for younger voters to connect the world. SNS in Taiwan seems toward becoming a very useful form of media on political advertising and communication, just as it does in the United States. As political parties and candidates in Taiwan are extensively using the traditional and SNS for campaigning and as a majority of them are using Facebook for campaigning, this research will further find out how Facebook can help elections.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH QUESTIONS & METHODOLOGY

The aim of this paper is to analyze and determine the extent to which using social media and social networking sites aid political campaigns in Taiwan and whether it provides an overall advantage for candidates.

1. What are the strategies used by political parties for campaigning during the 2012 presidential elections? How are candidates and political parties using Social Networking Sites and Facebook in particular?

2. Is the use of political advertising during elections in Taiwan strongly influenced by the social networking sites usage like the Western societies?

3. To what extent does social media/networking benefit candidates and campaigns in Taiwan?

4. To what extent are candidates connecting to social media/networking sites and making friends with voters?

5. What is the impact of Facebook and friendships political engagement, political efficacy and on the voter decisions?

Methodology

A Case study and Survey methods were used for this study. Case study is defined as “the in-depth study of instances of a phenomenon” that can help in providing an overall main trend on specific issues (Education researchers Gall et al. quoted in Duff, 2008, p.22).

Case Study: A case study was done to find out how both traditional media and the new media were used during the 2012 presidential election in Taiwan and particularly how SNS are being used for political advertising. The case study focused on Facebook campaigns in the latest 2012 presidential election campaign in Taiwan and compared with the United
States to examine the similarities and differences between these campaigns to observe the trend of Taiwan’s political advertising and political communication. As social media is largely used by the younger generation, the study will examine the ways in which they access political advertising and their attitude towards politics.

Survey: A survey was posted on Facebook, which is the most popular social networking site in Taiwan. The goal of the survey was a combination of collecting data for both descriptive and analytical analysis. Descriptive surveys try to find out and “explain what exists at the moment,” and an analytical survey tries to find out “why situations exist.” (Wimmer & Dominick, 2009, p. 179). An online survey comprised of 38 questions (Appendix -1). The survey was divided into four parts: demographic information, media access and exposure, political interest, SNS advertising, awareness of elections and voting behavior.

The questionnaire was mostly made up of close-ended questions such as multiple-choice and forced-choice questions. It also included a few open-ended questions that tried to probe into the personal opinions of the respondents. The survey was translated into Mandarin and was posted on Wenjuan.com. Wenjuan is a direct pronunciation from the word ‘survey’ in Mandarin Chinese. Wenjuan.com is a Chinese website that allows users to gather unlimited data, and without any cost. Since political opinions are still under the influence of personal privacy or information, it is better to have a survey that can provide a more personal space when participants answer questions. This survey was spread out through Facebook, the most popular SNS in Taiwan, and via email.

Sample: This survey was conducted over the course of 22 days, from February 24 to March 17, 2014, and gathered a total of 371 responses. The sample of this survey were legal voters age 20 and above, both male and female. According to the usage of Facebook in Taiwan, 64% of the overall Facebook users are in the age range 18 to 34 years, and most of
them are using Facebook as a tool to gather information, and to interact with the world through social media (InsightXplorer, 2012). Distributing this way is the most effective and cost efficient way to gather the data. Additionally, emails were sent out to reach voters from different age groups.

In the first section on interest in politics and voting behavior, the questions focused on understanding voting behavior from different perspectives. For example, voters’ political interests, their motivation for voting, voters’ decisions from previous elections, attendance in elections, their involvement in political campaigns, and other potential influencing factors such as family, friends, career, party loyalty, etc.

The second section of the survey examined voter's media exposure. It focused on the time they spent on using different media. The survey was divided into four parts: demographic information, media access and exposure, political interest, SNS advertising, awareness and voting behavior.

Traditional media is most often used for political campaigns, such as newspapers, television, and the Internet. Survey questions were planned based on voters’ experience viewing and/or hearing political advertisements in the past few elections, and what kinds of media they remember.

The third section determined whether voters were aware of the political advertising and campaigns on social networking sites, and how they reacted to them. In this section, questions were more in depth to find out if political campaigns/candidates on Facebook pages will affect their opinions and attitude toward politics, and their potential to influence their voting decisions.

The last part included questions for gathering participants' demographic information such as gender, career type, income, and education level. In the following chapters the case studies of the campaigns are discussed followed by the results of the survey.
CHAPTER 4

CASE STUDY OF THE 2012 TAIWAN GENERAL ELECTIONS

In this chapter, the campaign strategies of the major political parties and the use of traditional and new media are studied in detail.

Democratic Progressive Party - Taiwan Next

Tsai Ing-Wen, is the first woman presidential candidate in Taiwanese history to run for the Democratic Progressive Party (The Green party) in 2012. It is very interesting that the Democratic Progressive Party changed the traditional green color to different colors. This move demonstrated that the Democratic Progressive Party aimed to start a new journey in this country. It was the first time for the Democratic Progressive Party to have a woman running for the president in a very traditionally man-orientated society and it also encouraged the younger generation and women to make a change, to vote for a better future.

Tsai Ing-Wen’s campaign symbol is based on a white background with black text and a yellow arrow mark; meaning the power from people is gathering, and Taiwan is on its way to a better future. It emphasizes the importance of the compromise between races in Taiwan; a loving and justice society that can make Taiwan a better country to make the life more satisfied and happier (Hsiao, 2012). According to the website, the yellow arrow is pointing Taiwanese to a homeland without nuclear fear, to an environment of a knowledge-based economy, and also pointing to see more of the world/let the world see the country. It is clearly a campaign using the word “Next” to target the younger voting generation, and also to make a great divide between the leader Ma Ying-Jeou’s years of being in term, and her future years of being in office. “Taiwan Next” is a campaign that used more negative strategies by attacking the opponent Ma Ying-Jeou’s party and its campaign. It strongly encouraged the public to stand up for themselves to change the incompetent government that is in office. Tsai Ing-Wen’s tagline of her campaign is: “The good days will not always be stable, but if a wise
president makes up her mind and leads well, it will go forward, and the good day will keep going.”

**Chinese Nationalist Party- Like! Taiwan**

Ma Ying-Jeou, (referred to as Ma in future) is the Chinese Nationalist Party’s (The Blue party) candidate, who got elected in 2008. The 2012 presidential election was his second time running for Chinese Nationalist Party. His campaign “Like! Taiwan” has the combination of encouraging people to appreciate how great Taiwan is, and cheer for it. The content of “Like! Taiwan” is: “The changes have already happened. The reform cannot stop. Taiwan can’t go backward in history. Taiwan has to keep going forward for a better future!” Let’s cheer for Republican of China, let’s “Like! Taiwan” (Hsiao, 2012).

Putting “Taiwan” in the slogan of the campaign was an innovative and brilliant strategy to silently break the race stereotype and the barrier between the local Taiwanese people and the people who were originally from China. Ma Ying-Jeou’s team uses this creative, free and easy way to connect the extremely serious political topic to the Taiwanese community.

Both the parties extensively used the traditional and the new media for campaigning.

**The Use of New Media Technologies, Microfilms and Social Networking Sites**

New media usage such as Plunk, Twitter, YouTube, Facebook apps, mobile apps, Google +, micro film, SMS, QR codes, online donation, and the most popular website for academic chat rooms, PTT, were used by the Green and the Blue parties for advertising.

Another new way of media advertising in the 2012 political campaigns is using microfilm. Micro film is a short film that is longer than the regular television commercial, has a story line between 1 to 30 minutes that is more detailed and can normally attract more
attention, is more approachable on multiple media, and can subconsciously impact the public’s mind without notice.

Ma’s team filmed three microfilms: *Love’s Visa, The National Flag Girl (First and second episode)*, and *Save the National Flag*. The three microfilms were targeting younger generations with the focus on emotionally arousing the electorate to support the party and candidate. The basic ideas were to transmit the messages of Ma’s achievements during his presidential career. The most important issues that were highlighted were: economy, how well he did on diplomacy, and was also trying to strengthen the Taiwanese identity with the spirit of loving our national flag. Although all Ma’s micro films mostly built up the happy or positive atmosphere throughout the films, they still implicitly used negative taglines to attack Tsai’s party at the end of the films. Hsiao (2012) found that, based on the clicks on each link, attacking taglines affected peoples’ interests in these microfilms.

Tsai’s team filmed a series of a microfilm, *NG Life*. *NG* is short for “No Good,” and the entire series was based on two main characters’ life in the four years of president Ma’s term of office. Problems, future, and their financial problems were the main points for Tsai’s party to attack Ma.

*Facebook* was a huge battleground in the 2012 presidential election in Taiwan. Both the parties created *Facebook* pages and called for support through friendships and likes for the pages. Hsiao (2012) explains the use and investment in *Facebook* advertising. Tsai’s *Facebook* had 660,000 fans, and Ma had 1,410,000 fans on *Facebook* and the number must be increasing. On *Facebook*, you can easily click on the “like” button to “thumbs up” on almost everything you see, read, listen to, or watch. However, the “like” word on *Facebook* in Mandarin Chinese not only has the literal meaning of “like” but also can be “appreciate,” “awesome,” “cheers,” “win,” “bravo,” and can also connect to a deeper meaning “better.” Ma used the “thumbs up” to make a direct connection with the people who love using *Facebook,*
who have a higher chance to click “like” on Facebook. Ma’s campaign encourages the public to like his Facebook page; furthermore, focusing on the meaning of encouraging the public to be appreciative of the beautiful country and people, cheers for Taiwan, and make Taiwan a better country. Ma uses pictures of him going to different events, showing his concerns about the country to build up the emotional connection with the public. Moreover, Ma’s Facebook page uses blue sky as cover photos, which symbolically relates to promote the meaning of the Taiwan’s National flag, which is also the symbol for his party (Also to be noted is that Chinese Nationalist Party made the Taiwan’s National flag when it first came to Taiwan).

Li (2011) observed the most popular presidential candidates on Facebook, Ma and Tsai, before the 2012 presidential election. By July, Ma had 2.79 times more fans than Tsai on Facebook; however, polls showed Ma was winning support by only 1%. Li (2011) also found that the way the two candidates managing their own fan pages used totally different strategies. Ma’s team used Facebook to announce important issues and news about him and in an analysis of the overall posts, 11% are photo links, 15% are article links, and 70% are video links. On the other hand, Tsai’s team focuses on the trait of social media: connect and communicate with voters. Her Facebook page allows everyone to post his or her own thoughts and have a direct connection with her. Tsai mostly shared statuses on her own opinions and ideas on political issues: 75% of the overall posts are without links; 4% were photo links; and 19% were article links. However, Li (2011) pointed out the “likes” both candidates received on videos, pictures, or statuses showed that videos and pictures are more attractive to the younger generation, who are mostly browsing on social networking sites.

The one trait of SNS is it’s very easy to unintentionally expose users to sporadic messages and information. Lin (2012) found that although the SNS spread the messages, there was very little influence on voter’s voting behavior, even voters who have been highly exposed to the information on these sites. The political information they read or see while
they are browsing SNS only has an impact on voters who have passive attitudes towards politics, and who also spend a lot of time browsing SNS. In other words, these sites do not have a direct impact on those who normally vote in elections, but might have an impact on voters who don’t really care about elections. This is an area that I tried to investigate in this study.

Wang (2013) found that SNS forms a new culture of political fandom. These fans like to be friends with candidates, to join their fan groups, or to “like” their posts on SNS. She found that social networking sites’ frequent users or those who pay more attention on social media in politics, are more likely to attend political activities, campaigns, discussions, petitions, and to donate both on online and in real life. However, she pointed out this new phenomenon surprisingly does not have a connection with voters voting behavior.

Wang (2013) found the concept of general SNS usage is for showing concern and having a connection with friends. Voters use social networking sites to show their befriending behaviors to candidates. However, she argued that some voters will actually “like” opponent candidates’ pages for gathering information, so it is not always reflected in the election result.

On YouTube, Tsai has a total of 320 videos, and Ma has 158 videos on it (Hsiao, 2012). Su (2013) focused on Ma’s campaign video on YouTube, which was shared by Ma the most during the 2012 election on his Facebook page. He found that the two main strategies KMT (The Chinese Nationalist Party) used were building up a candidate’s image and rational appeal to the political issues. Although Ma’s campaign used different strategies than the traditional way on emotional appeal, which still proved it had an overall 52% clicks on all the campaign videos. Su (2013) found that advertising through video is effective by analyzing the average click on each video, and was considered as highly preferred among web users. He believes video advertising has a powerful impact on voters and their voting behavior.
Mass Media and Other Methods of Election Campaigning

Although new media played a big role in the 2012 presidential campaign, advertising through the traditional media like newspapers, television commercials, magazine and on billboards and flyers, also continued to play a major role in reaching out to the electorate. Guerilla marketing strategies also were resorted to through indoor and outdoor advertising.

Both parties used newspaper and magazine advertising and both used positive/supportive and attack strategies in their advertising. Magazine advertising by both parties was different with celebrities supporting the parties and candidates. Ma was using the same strategies on the supportive advertising as he was in newspapers, but used celebrities to share their own opinions instead. Tsai picked the most popular magazine among the younger generation, the Next Magazine, to advertise. However, she used “The Nobody Strategy,” which was using the average person in different generations with single tagline to show support. Hsiao (2012) questioned the effectiveness of Tsai’s advertising in magazines.

In comparing both parties, television commercials used by Ma’s team and Tsai’s team is 15:9. Ma has 14 positive and one negative commercial; Tsai has four positive and five negative commercials (Hsiao, 2012). In general, Ma had a good strategy of spreading out the political messages toward different target audience groups with 75% of the ads using emotional appeals, which is, according to Su (2013), is the most preferable way of advertising to Taiwan community. Tsai, on the other hand, mostly focused on attacking Ma’s four years in his term of office, was making her advertising mostly serious and somber.

Interestingly, using Pop Art like the 2012 presidential election in America was the main idea for both parties. Ma’s office built up an open coffee shop area that fits in his “thumbs up” logo on first floor in his campaign office. Tsai’s office had a “Taiwan Tree” that
was shaped like Taiwan, which stood for prayer and blessing among the whole country. Both parties had their own stores to sell their campaign-related products (Hsiao, 2012).

Support groups, particularly intellectuals supported the candidates. Ma’s team had more than 1700 professors and 14 elder politicians recommending him by telling the public about the Mr. Ma they know and his abilities as the candidate to vote. Tsai’s supportive advertising was focused on the support from different unions, such as lawyers, laborers, engineers, scientists, and those from academia. Negative advertising appeared on newspapers more frequently especially nearer the Election Day. On the last day before the Election Day, both parties used newspaper to have the one last battle, strengthen their political stands on issues, and tried to make a remarkable end (Hsiao, 2012).

More campaign activities such as live band performances, student clubs, informal discussion meetings held on University campuses were targeting to the first time voting group, and the younger voters over 30 years of age. According to Hsiao (2012), the Ministry of the Interior in Taiwan in December of 2011, the first voting group from age 20-24 were 1,6004,000, is 8.88% of the overall 18,060,000 legal voters. The First time voting group with the people in between age 25 to 29 was the group of people who were indifferent to politics. It’s also a challenge for both the Green and the Blue party to influence them.

The 2012 presidential campaign was more intense than the previous few campaigns in every way. However, Hsiao (2012) pointed out the voting rate was surprising the lowest, than the past few presidential elections, only had the overall 74% voting rate. (Figure -1). Mr. Ma, 61, of the Chinese Nationalist Party, or Kuomintang, won with 51.6% of the vote. Ms. Tsai, of the Democratic Progressive Party, was close winning 45.6 percent. A third candidate, James Soong of the People First Party, who had been expected to siphon off as much a tenth of the electorate from Mr. Ma, received 2.8 percent, according to the Central Election Commission.
Turnout was more than 74 percent. In the end, Ma reelected with 6,891,139 votes, and Tsai had 6,093,578 votes that lost the election by only 5% votes (Figure -1).

Figure -1. Voter Turnout from 1996 - 2012 elections
CHAPTER 5

DATA ANALYSIS

THE IMPACT OF THE CAMPAIGNS ON THE ELECTORATE

A broadening literature on traditional media shows that intensive campaigning and advertising has an impact on voters and in recent years the use of new media especially social networking sites are also being used and having an considerable impact on younger generations. Campaigning on SNS and Facebook and the “friendship” that people have with candidates in a highly networked country like Taiwan elections was something unique as discussed earlier and this study further tested the impact of election campaigns and particularly the impact of the SNS and Facebook. Reflecting on the literature, it was hypothesized that Facebook would have an impact on younger Taiwanese voters’ opinions towards politics, their interest in politics and even their future voting intention.

Socio Economic Profile of the Respondents

Overall 371 respondents completed this survey and were connected through Facebook or were invited to participate through email. Participants needed to be 20 years old and at an above legal voting age to participate.

The demographics show 51% of the participants were male and 49% female. 73% of the people are younger voters in between age 20 to age 30, which considered as younger voting group in Taiwan; and about 86% of the participants have college education level. In Taiwan, the average minimum monthly salary you can earn after graduating from university is 20,000 NT dollars (USD 660). Results show that nearly half (45%) earn between 20,000-50,000 NT dollars as many of them are in business and working in the industries. 44% of the respondents have an income below 20,000 NT dollars. This is expected, as most of them are a
combination of 39% student groups, with the 4% jobless people are earning less than 20,000 NT dollars (Figure -2).
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**Media Access of the Respondents**

A majority of respondents use the Internet the most, even more than watching television or reading newspapers. The highest media usage is through the mobile phone (72.78%), following by Facebook (69.91%), Internet usage is largely information (55.80%), and for email (48.79%) (Figure -3). Surprisingly, traditional media is not as frequently used than ever before.
47% respondents spend less than three hours every week on television, and 23% of them spend 3-5 hours per week on television. On the other hand, 30% of the respondents spend 20-30 hours on the Internet per week, 29% spend more than 30 hours per week. In other words, 30% of the respondents spend more than at least 4 hours on the internet every day. 19% follow up spending 10-20 hours on the Internet per week. (Figure -3). Result shows a fact that the internet and its related media are an irreplaceable media trend in Taiwan.

Figure -3. Media Usage
Interest in Politics and Political Engagement

It was found that 9% of the respondents were very interested in politics, and 33% were interested when it concerned them. Further 32% were somewhat interested and one fourth of them (26%) we not interested (Figure -4).

The majority members discuss politics with family and friends the most, results show ‘a lot’ 10.9% and ‘sometimes’ 51.8%; Further, 4.6% discuss politics ‘a lot’ with coworkers and 42.86% ‘sometimes’ do. Interesting members hardly ever talk about politics with people who express political views differently from them (45.55%) (Figure -4).

The participants’ attitude towards politics was interesting as it was measured on a scale of level of agreement or disagreement. It was found that almost 89.5% had their own opinion towards the government (‘Strongly disagree’ 36.39%, ‘disagree’ 53.10%) and on the statement that they don’t care about politics, and it wouldn’t influence their life as 46.63% ‘disagree’ and 17.25% ‘strongly disagree’ that they did not care about politics. Lastly, 70% of the participant’s showed positive point of view on politics. 22.37% ‘strongly disagreed’ on their vote can’t make a difference and 42.59% ‘disagreed’, which shows participants agree that their vote has an impact on overall politics. Therefore, it can be stated that there is a high level of interest in politics, people discuss politics, care about politics and know that their vote counts in the elections.

Figure -4. Interest in Politics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of political discussion</th>
<th>Family/ friends</th>
<th>Co-worker/ acquaintances</th>
<th>Who have different political view</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>10.78%</td>
<td>4.58%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>51.75%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>23.72%</td>
<td>9.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardly ever</td>
<td>27.22%</td>
<td>35.31%</td>
<td>45.55%</td>
<td>22.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>10.24%</td>
<td>17.25%</td>
<td>27.49%</td>
<td>65.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A majority of the respondents were interested in who was elected in the 2012 presidential election. 42% cared a lot, 43% somewhat cared on who won the elections, and the remaining 13% did not care who won the elections (Figure -5).

**Figure -5. Degree of Care towards the 2012 Elected President**

Access to Social Networking Sites

When it comes to SNS, 98% of the participants are connected to Facebook, followed by Yahoo (18.6%). Other SNSs have very little connection with less than 10%. This
phenomenon logically describes the characteristics of SNS that is used to build up an interactive relationship with one and another (Figure -6). Moreover, 30% of the participants claimed they are always on Facebook, or spend more than 30 hours a week on it. 27% use it less than five hours a week. Using Facebook seems like having two extreme groups: those who are always checking it and those who probably check on it less than an hour per day.

Figure -6. Access to Social Networking Sites

![Bar chart showing access to social networking sites.]

Figure -7. Time Spent on Facebook

**Hours spent on Facebook every week**

- Less than 5 hours
- 5-10 hours
- 10-20 hours
- 20-30 hours
- 30 hours and over/ I am always on FB

Facebook, Websites and Politics

The awareness and knowledge of political information on the new media and SNS was tested. It was found that 54% of the participants are aware of the fact that political parties and candidates are now on Facebook, 73% of the participants claimed they have seen political information being shared by friends or others on Facebook. Only 22% of the
participants said they never seen any (Figure -8). However, 31% know a little about Facebook campaigning, and only 15% of the participants never heard of it. (Figure -9).

Interestingly, 44% of the participants accessed political parties’ Facebook pages. 22% have accessed both KMT and DPP, or their candidates’ Facebook page. 13% have accessed more than just the two parties, 6% accessed KMT and 3% accessed DPP (Figure -9).

Figure -8. Political Information on Facebook

Figure -9. Awareness of Politics on Facebook

Although political parties and candidates’ Facebook pages had not been visited much that 56% of the participants never checks on them. It still presents a higher online awareness than political parties’ websites. Only 32% of the overall participants had visited political parties’ websites.
Factors Influencing Voting Behavior and Voting Behavior

In terms of factors influencing voting behavior, it was found that politics issues, candidates and parties influenced ‘a lot’ (37.74%), followed by family loyalty 19.68%. In terms of media influence, 52.83% were ‘somewhat’ influenced by media, and about a third 29% were not at all influenced by the media. There was a near equal ‘somewhat’ influence of family (50.67%), peers, friends and coworkers (49.87%) and other political factors of issues, candidates etc (48.8%). The Table -1 shows that overall personal political factors like issues and candidates influenced the most (78%), followed by family (70%), and media (59%) in the voting behavior.

Moreover, more personal factors that influenced voters to vote are as follows: it is my right (88%), it is my duty (63%), candidates (41%), parents (22%), and peer pressure (13.7%). Result shows that candidate is the most countable reason for participants to vote. Networks have really small impact on voters’ voting behavior (Figure -11).
Table -1. Factors that Influenced Voting Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family royalty (for a party/person)</td>
<td>19.68%</td>
<td>50.67%</td>
<td>29.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends, peers, or coworkers</td>
<td>4.31%</td>
<td>49.87%</td>
<td>45.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media (News, commercials, campaigns)</td>
<td>6.47%</td>
<td>52.83%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics (Issues, candidates, parties)</td>
<td>37.74%</td>
<td>48.79%</td>
<td>13.48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure - 11. Other Factors that Motivated Respondents to Vote

Voting Behavior in the past: the 2012 presidential election

It was found that 64% of respondents voted in the last 2012 presidential election and only 36% didn’t vote. (Figure -12). An overall 53% were very likely to vote in the next election, follow up by 27% ‘somewhat likely’ voters.

Figure - 12. Respondents’ Voting Behavior in the 2012 elections
Figure 13. Voting Intention for 2016

Impact of Candidate’s Facebook Campaigns’

73% agree that having "friendship" with candidates can influence peoples’ attitude towards candidates, but 17% of them think it won’t affect them. (Figure -14). However, 22% think Facebook advertising for candidates can be effective, and can make them like the candidates more.

Figure 14. “Friendship” with Candidates Can Affect Voters’ Opinion

Figure 15. Perceptions of Candidates on Facebook Advertising
Tests were conducted to find out the impact of Facebook on the participants. Cronbach’s Alphas used for testing the political trust on Facebook consisted of four items was .656. It was found that the internal consistency of political trust in Facebook among participants is acceptable. (Table -2).

Table -2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.656</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPUTE political_trust_in_FB=(Q301+Q303+Q304+Q306)/4.

To analyze participants’ attitude towards candidates’ Facebook pages, correlation analysis on variables was done to see their opinions to candidates’ information and Facebook pages, (Q281&Q282 r (df = 369) = .65, $p < .01$). (Table -3).

Table -3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q281</th>
<th>Q282</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q281</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q282</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.652**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Political Interest and Attitude towards Facebook

Results showed that there was significant relationship between participants’ political interests and their political attitude towards Facebook page, $\beta = 1.66$, $p < .05$. Political
interest may lead to political attitude and behavior. However, surprisingly, political attitude towards Facebook page had no significant relationship between participants’ networks and their own attitude. Opinions from family, friends, coworkers, or people around participants have a small impact on participants’ involvement or attitude on/towards Facebook page.

The ‘awareness of political parties and candidates Facebook page’, and ‘participants behaviors on checking these pages’ showed statistically significant results that $\beta = .153, p < .05$, and $\beta = .303, p < .05$. Results showed both factors (awareness and behaviors on Facebook) might have an impact on their political attitude towards Facebook page. (Table - 4.1).

**Political Trust in Facebook**

Results also showed a significant relationship between political trust in Facebook and participants attitude towards Facebook, $\beta = .231, p < .05$. The more positive attitude they have towards information on Facebook, the more likelihood of political trust they have towards candidates on Facebook. People ‘who express political views differently than participants’ ($\beta = .132, p < .05$), ‘the frequency of seeing political advertisements on Facebook’ ($\beta = .282, p < .05$), and ‘attitude towards Facebook page’ ($\beta = .231, p < .05$) are also significant in predicting the political trust in Facebook. (Table -4.1).

**Voting Intention for 2016**

Using demographic factors and previous voting behavior in 2012 to predict the future voting intention, results first showed a significant relationship on ‘incomes’ ($\beta = -.158, p < .05$), ‘political interests’ ($\beta = .273, p < .05$), and ‘participants attitude towards Facebook page’ ($\beta = .198, p < .05$). Higher income people seemed to not vote as much as other income
groups. Moreover, political interests and attitude towards Facebook both show potential impacts for future voting intention. (Table -4.2).

‘Friendship’ with Candidates on Facebook

On Facebook, ‘political interests’ (β = .221, p < .05), and ‘personal friendship with candidates’ (β = .142, p < .05) have a significant relationship between participants’ behavior on checking candidates’ or parties’ Facebook pages. Political interest and participants who have “friendship” with candidates will be more likely to check their Facebook page than others who don’t. (Table -4.2).

Table -4.1 Results of Regression Based on Four Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Attitude towards Facebook page</th>
<th>Political trust in Facebook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.008**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4g</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 Results of Regression Based on Four Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>-1.158</td>
<td>0.019**</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>-0.221</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.005**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Demographic factors (1a = Gender; 1b = Age; 1c = Education Level; 1d = Incomes); 2 = Political interests; 3 = Networks (3a = Family and Friends; 3b = Co-workers and acquaintances; 3c = People who express different political views; 3d = Others); 4 = Political awareness and behavior on Facebook (4a = The frequency of Facebook usage; 4b = The frequency of seeing political advertising on Facebook; 4c = Experiences of seeing political information on Facebook; 4d = Awareness of political candidates and parties on Facebook; 4e = The behavior of checking candidates’ Facebook page; 4f = Frequency of seeing friends sharing political information on Facebook; 4g = Personal behavior on candidates’ Facebook page); 5 = Attitude towards Facebook page; 6 = Political trust in Facebook; 7 = Voting behavior.
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Taiwan is a typical third wave democracy country that follows along with western countries that have more mature democratic systems. Elections are held every four years and with two major parties and other smaller parties contesting the elections. The country is extensively connected to the Internet and people are on social networking sites particularly on Facebook. There is a high level of interest in politics as many people are actively engaged in political discussions, vote in the elections and care about who wins the elections. The two main political parties extensively followed the western styles of campaigning, using traditional and new media systems. Based on the differing positions of the ruling party and the opposition party, strategies used are similar to those used as the United States in 2012. During the elections negative advertising attacked and counterattacked each political party. The ruling party stood at an advantageous position by having the authority to “make a change,” using innovative creative promotions on new media, subconsciously changing the publics’ attitude towards politics. The opposition party was mostly using negative campaigning.

The use of microfilms, videos and advertising through the newspapers, using celebrities for support and campaigning are reflective of how campaigns are being professionally managed in emerging democracies like Taiwan. Further, in a highly networked county, the SNS are being used and ‘political’ SNS and other new media have become the most useful platforms for campaigning, just like United States and other countries. Candidates and parties use SNSs as free media platforms to build up their images, sharing information, their political agendas, opinions on issues and other related personal and political opinions and also befriending them Facebook.
The frequency of *Facebook* usage in Taiwan is incredible with over 70 percent connected to the Internet. This most popular SNS in Taiwan prompted the candidates and political parties to connect to *Facebook* and they started the *Facebook* campaigns. This was done by setting up their own *Facebook* fan pages to share politics, personal statuses, videos, and pictures, which has become necessary to connect and update the fans and followers, who are the ultimate supporters and voters. There are a million fans that are friends of the political parties and candidates. Result found that *Facebook* users have a positive point of view and trust towards *Facebook* page, and this attitude may have an impact on the information they see or read. Most of them like to access the pages and read about the developments, not only of the candidates they support but others also.

The personal friendship that candidates have with voters is somewhat influential as observed in this study. However, it is interesting to find that voter’s personal networks have very little impact on their own voting decision, but candidate’s *Facebook* pages are a factor for them to follow and also vote in the elections. Data show that Taiwanese voters have a positive point of view on their own vote, and have an overall concern towards politics, and the majority intended to vote in the future elections.

The potential danger of using SNS, in future is toward the younger voters, who may be dependent only on this medium for political information. Since they grow up with social networking sites and the Internet, they tend to subconsciously receive and trust the information from those sources without a second thought. As it is easy to use social networking sites, as sometimes as the only media platforms to reach these young audiences, it is essential that political parties must try their best to control this media well, by being careful on the information, the opinions, learn to answer questions for the candidate, and avoid controversy and attack strategies. As I mentioned earlier, in the current “international media imperialism” type of society, people can be blinded by fully trusting what they receive or find
on the Internet. Given the observation from the study, in Taiwan the use of Facebook will be a future platform for all political, economic and social communication and based on the population of Facebook usage in Taiwan, the government or any party, if it uses wisely and if it can manage and control the strategy in communicating continuously through Facebook, in a long term, the likelihood of this certain party losing elections is probably close to zero.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX -1

The Influence of Political Advertising on Taiwanese Voters

Dear Respondent/Participant
Hello,
I am Yun-Sen Chan, a graduate student at Southern Illinois University. I am conducting a survey on Taiwan’s political system and electoral behavior. I would be sincerely appreciated if you could take about 15 minutes to complete this survey. The survey is totally anonymous, and the results will only be used for academic purposes. Questions about this study can be directed to Dr. Kavita Karan, School of Journalism.
If you have any question about this survey, please contace me at sensenkdc@siu.edu, or my advisor Dr. Kavita Karan a kavitak@siu.edu.

Thank you very much for completing this survey.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Sponsored Projects Administration, SIUC, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

Instructions
Please mark the answer that is closest to your opinion or situation.

Section I: Interest in Politics and Voting Behavior

1. Generally speaking, how interested are you in politics and the campaigns?
   A. Very interested
   B. Interested when it concerns me
   C. Somewhat interested
   D. Not interested

2. How much do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I rarely care about politics because I think it wouldn't influence my life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People like me don’t have any say about what the government does</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes government and politics seem so complicated that a person like me can’t really understand what is going on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether I vote or not has no influence on what politicians do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How often did you talk about news and politics with the following people in the last two weeks?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Hardly ever</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family and friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers and acquaintances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who express political view you disagree with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Did you vote in the last presidential election?
   A. Yes
   B. No

5. Do you intend to vote in the next election?
   A. Very likely
   B. Somewhat likely
   C. Don’t know
   D. Unlikely
   E. No

6. During the presidential elections, did you care who won?
   A. Cared a lot
   B. Somewhat cared
   C. Did not care at all
   D. I don’t know

7. To what extent do the following influence your voting decisions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My family support for a party/person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinions from peers, friends or coworkers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media (News, commercials, campaigns)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics (Issues, candidates, parties)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others Specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. What are your motivations to vote? (Select all that apply)
   A. It is my right to vote
   B. It is my duty to vote
   C. My parents want me to
   D. Everyone around me votes
   E. I like the candidates
   F. I don’t vote
   G. Others (specify) ________________________

9. In the past five years, what type of elections have you voted? (Select all that apply)
   A. I vote in all kinds of elections
   B. President
   C. Legislator
   D. City/Country Mayor
   E. Village/Township Mayor
   F. Elected Representative (Local)
G. I never vote
H. Other (specify) __________________________

Section II: Media Exposure

10. From the table below, what is the frequency of accessing the following media?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
<th>6-7 days a week</th>
<th>4-5 days a week</th>
<th>2-3 days a week</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Newspaper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Television</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Internet (for information)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Internet (for other purposes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Emails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Facebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Other social Networking sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Blogs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Mobile phones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Other media (specify__________________)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How many hours do you spend on watching TV every week?
   A. Less than 3 hours
   B. 3-5 hours
   C. 5-8 hours
   D. 8-12 hours
   E. 12 hours and over (Please specify about how many hours in the blank after other)
   F. Other ______________

12. How many hours do you spend on Internet every week?
   A. Less than 5 hours
   B. 5-10 hours
   C. 10-20 hours
   D. 20-30 hours
   E. 30 hours and over (Please specify about how many hours in the blank after other)
   F. Other ______________

13. Which Social Networking Sites are you connected to?
   A. Facebook
   B. Yahoo! Taiwan Blogs
   C. Plurk.com
   D. Weibo.com
   E. Any other (Specify________________________)

14. How many hours do you spend on Facebook every week? (The combination of any devices.)
   A. I am always on Facebook/ I check on my mobile phone all the time
   B. Less than 5 hours
   C. 5-10 hours
D. 10-20 hours
E. 20-30 hours
F. 30 hours and over (Please specify about how many hours in the blank after other)
G. Other __________________

[Please answer the following questions based on your previous experiences during last few elections]

15. From the following sources where did you see most of the political advertisements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Hardly ever/Rarely</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Television</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Mobile phones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Facebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Brochures and print forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Please give a reason why you saw the most political advertisement from the sources you mentioned in the earlier question?
   A. I am used to it
   B. I try to follow the public opinion of society through it
   C. It carries fair and balanced news about politics
   D. It fits my personality orientation
   E. It fits my political orientation
   F. I don’t know

17. In general, do you think the coverage of political advertising in the media is too little, adequate or too much?
   A. Too little
   B. Adequate
   C. Too much
   D. I don't know
   E. No answer

18. Have you watched of the following programs on television?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Debates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Talk Shows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (specify________)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section III: Social Networking Sites and Political Parties

19. Have you seen political information on Facebook?
   A. Yes
   B. No
   C. I don’t know

20. Are you aware of Facebook pages of political parties and candidates?
   A. Know a lot
   B. Know a little
   C. Never heard of them

21. Have you seen any of the political parties websites to get information about them?
   A. Yes, I have seen both main parties’ websites
   B. Yes, I have seen the Chinese Nationalist Party, or its candidates’ websites
   C. Yes, I have seen the Democratic Progressive Party, or its candidates’ websites
   D. Yes, I have seen multiple websites on multiple parties (more than the main two parties)
   E. No, I never visited any of the websites

22. Have you seen any of the political parties Facebook pages to get information about them?
   A. Yes, I have seen both main parties’ pages
   B. Yes, I have seen the Chinese Nationalist Party, or its candidates’ pages
   C. Yes, I have seen the Democratic Progressive Party, or its candidates’ pages
   D. Yes, I have seen multiple pages on multiple parties (more than the main two parties)
   E. No, I never visited any of the websites

23. Do you check on candidates Facebook page during elections?
   A. A lot
   B. Somewhat
   C. Hardly ever
   D. Not at all

24. Generally speaking, do you see political information shared by your friends on Facebook during election times?
   A. A lot
   B. Somewhat
   C. Hardly ever
   D. Not at all

25. Did you ever leave messages on any candidate’s Facebook page?
   A. Yes, and I’ve got some responses
   B. Yes, but I never get any responses
   C. Yes, but I don’t know if I got any responses
   D. Never
   E. No, and that’s why I don’t check it often
   I. I don’t know

26. Have you ever liked any candidates’ Facebook pages, in order to see his or her updates pop up on your News feed?
   A. Yes
B. No

27. Have you been requested by political parties and candidates to join their face book pages?
   1. Yes, and I have accepted them
   2. Yes, but I have not accepted them
   3. No, I have not been requested
   4. No, but I have sent them a request to become friends.

28. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I enjoy seeing the parties/candidates pages being set up on Facebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel like I understand the candidates more when I read their status, see their pictures, or watch their videos online or Facebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I think the candidate on the news are different than themselves on Facebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Have you shared any politics related information, news, or YouTube video on Facebook?
   A. A lot
   B. Somewhat
   C. Hardly ever
   D. Never

30. How much do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think the information on Facebook is more accurate than the news or other media since I can look up more information online myself right away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I normally look up more information after I read or watch something on Facebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I normally don’t talk about politics in public but on Facebook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk about politics on Facebook instead of in public because I feel more secure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I talk about politics in person, but only with people I trust

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I feel I am personally connected to the politicians when I see them on Facebook

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

31. In your opinion, is it a good idea for politicians to use Facebook for advertising, creating “friendships” and influencing voters?

____________________________________________

32. Do you think having the news update by the candidates on their Facebook pages make you like the candidate you support more? Why and Why not?

____________________________________________

**Section IV: General Information**

33. Gender
   A. Male
   B. Female

34. Age
   A. 20-25
   B. 26-30
   C. 31-35
   D. 36-40
   E. 41-50
   F. 51-60
   G. 61-70
   H. 71 and above

35. City of Living
   ___________________________

36. Please choose your highest level of Education?
   A. No formal education
   B. Primary school education
   C. Secondary Education
   D. University education (undergraduate)
   E. University education (graduate)
   F. Technical education/Vocational Training
   G. Other_____________________

37. Career title ___________________________

38. How would you describe your average income per month in NT Dollars (Taiwanese Dollars)?
A. Less than 20,000
C. 20,000 and less than 30,000
D. 30,000-below 40,000
E. 40,000-below 50,000
F. 50,000-below 600000
G. 60,000-below 70,000
H. 70,000 and above
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