

**Symposium
on
Media and Internet Use
During General Election 2015**

Wednesday, 27 January 2016

Conference Room, Level 1, Oei Tiong Ham Building

Swing Voters vs. Non-Swing Voters: Comparing Their Demographics, Political Attributes, and Media Usage Patterns

Associate Professor Zhang Weiyu

Department of Communications and New Media
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
National University of Singapore

Swing Voters vs. Non-Swing Voters

Comparing Their Demographics,
Political Attributes, and Media Usage
Patterns

Zhang Weiyu

Department of Communications and New Media
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
National University of Singapore

Definition of Swing Voters

- Those who voted for one party in 2011 and another party in 2015
- Type 1: from PAP to Opposition
- Type 2: from Opposition to PAP

2015 distribution

	Number of respondents	Percentages
Non-swing voters	821	87.1%
Type 1	44	4.7%
Type 2	78	8.2%

Age

- No significant differences in terms of average age

	Average age
Non-swing voters	41
Type 1	38
Type 2	43

Gender***

	Male	Female
Non-swing voters	50.4	49.6
Type 1	29.5	70.5
Type 2	69.2	30.8

$p < .001$ ***

Ethnicity**

	Chinese	Malay	Indian	Others
Non-swing voters	74%	11%	12%	3%
Type 1	52%	11%	32%	5%
Type 2	81%	9%	5%	5%

$p < .01^{**}$

Housing Type***

	HDB 1 or 2 room	HDB 3 room	HDB 4 room	HDB 5 room
Non-swing voters	1%	15%	34%	28%
Type 1	33%	11%	29%	16%
Type 2	4%	5%	39%	31%

$p < .001$ ***

Education

- No overall significant differences among the three categories
- But Type 2s have higher* education than Type 1s.

$p < .05^*$

Political Attributes

- No significant differences in political interest, talk, and knowledge
- No significant differences in buying campaign products or participating in a good cause
- Type 1s are significantly lower in online participation, such as expressing their views on YouTube, blogs, SNSs, or forums, compared to non-swing voters.

Rally Participation

	Overall*	PAP**	WP***
Non-swing voters	28%	57%	62%
Type 1	44%	84%	21%
Type 2	35%	37%	79%

$p < .05^*$, $p < .01^{**}$, $p < .001^{***}$

Media Usage Patterns

- Type 1s watched more TV* and used more party web sources* but listened to radio* less, compared to non-swing voters
- Type 1s trusted blogs* and SNSs* more but radio* less, compared to non-swing voters.
- No sig differences between Type 1s and Type 2s, or Type 2s and non-swing voters.

$p < .05^*$

Voting Concerns

- Compared to both non-swing voters and Type 2s, Type 1s are least concerned about bonus, SG50, policy change, town council management, LKY's passing, opposition forming government, sg's vulnerability; but they are **most concerned about having different voices in parliament.**

Summary

- Type 1s (from PAP to Opposition) tended to be females, both Chinese and Indian, and dwell in HDB 1 or 2 room units; Type 2s (from Opposition to PAP) tended to be males, Chinese and dwell in HDB 4 or 5 room units
- Both types of swing voters tended to participate in rallies more but they participated more in those held by the party from which they swung.
- The biggest differences in terms of online participation and media usage patterns lay with Type 1s vs. non-swing voters.

weiyu.zhang@nus.edu.sg

Twitter: weiyuz

Website: www.weiyuzhang.net

THANK YOU!

**Symposium
on
Media and Internet Use
During General Election 2015**

Wednesday, 27 January 2016

Conference Room, Level 1, Oei Tiong Ham Building