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Citizens in the higher socio-economic groups tend to be more ‘critical’, in that they are more questioning or demanding of the system and its outcome.
Research Background and Objectives
Research Background & Objectives

POPS
or ‘Perception Of Policies in Singapore’ Survey Series

• An IPS survey series to take timely snap-shots of stakeholders’ response to changes or events in the policy and political environment, for policy discussion.

• Questions and analysis by IPS research team, fieldwork by third party survey firm.

• Random sample of about 2000 Singapore citizens of voting age, 21 years and above.
POPS (5): Presidential Election (PE) Survey
Presented in November 2011.

The main objective is to understand the factors that shaped voters’ decision-making in the 27 August 2011 Presidential Election.

It was only the second election since 28 August 1993, for an institution that is young and complex.
Research Objectives & Background

The Burning Questions for PE2011 Survey

• Do voters know the roles of the Elected President?

• What are the qualities voters look for in candidates?

• What medium of communication influenced their decision?

• Overall, how do voters view the election system and its outcome?
Methodology
Methodology

• Fieldwork conducted from 20 September to 5 October 2011. Survey administered via telephone by firm, Degree Census at its premises. Phone numbers were picked randomly out of the residential phone book.

• Actual and weighted sample size is n=2025. Weight factors used were based on the proportions of the gender, race and age groups in the Singapore Citizen population (Census 2010) and are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Malay</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-29</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-54</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and above</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEMALES</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Malay</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-29</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-54</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and above</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Methodology - Weighted Sample Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Event</th>
<th>Response Distribution</th>
<th>(n=2,025)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted in Aug 27 election</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted in May 7 election</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Own account worker</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unpaid family worker</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time homemaker</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time student</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retiree</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Occupation of employee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>(n=1,699)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior executives</td>
<td>S 54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians, supervisors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical workers</td>
<td>I 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators, semiskilled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled workers</td>
<td>W 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Housing type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDB 1-3 room</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDB 4 room</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDB 5-6 room/Executive</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Methodology – Weighted Sample Profile

### Ethnic group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Household income
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None - $1,999</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S$2,000 - $4,999</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S$5,000 - $6,999</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S$7,000 and above</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Age group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-29</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-54</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 &amp; above</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Post-independence (21-44) 46%

### Pre-independence (Above 45) 54%

### Education level
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSLE or below</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post secondary</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/ Professional</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L  Low
LM Low-Middle
MM Middle-Middle
UM Upper-Middle
Methodology - Response Rate

Total calls: 18,583.

Calls found ineligible (like, non-citizens): 2,336.

Out 15,247 remaining calls, completed surveys: 2,025.

Refusals: 420

The rest: 14,827

They were
• unanswered calls
• answered but interviewers asked to ring again (i.e. eligible residents were not home)
• survey was incomplete
Methodology - Response Rate

The following slides provide the key findings of the survey.

The text boxes above the bar charts describe the relationship that the listed variable has with other demographic variables at the level of statistical significance.

The sections in red highlight the findings that are different from those when the data was weighted according to resident population.

**Limitations**: While the survey asked respondents about their voting choices, the response rate was too low and bore little relation to the voting outcome to justify reporting those findings or using them for further statistical analysis.
Roles of the Elected President
Understanding of and agreement with the roles of the Elected President, based on the official interpretation, was limited.

Representing Singapore in foreign relations was the most recognised role.

Key:
12 statements.
1 removed in analysis.
‘Yes’ if it is a role, ‘no’ if it is not.
‘Important’ or ‘not important’ in shaping vote.
Roles of the Elected President

Number of statements...

11 out of 11
10 out of 11
9 out of 11
8 out of 11
7 out of 11
6 out of 11
5 out of 11
4 out of 11
3 out of 11
2 out of 11
1 out of 11
0 out of 11

%ages
1
2
4
7
12
16
25
17
10
4
2
0

42% cited 6 or more correctly
Likely to be Service class, middle-middle income group, highly-educated, Chinese, males and people living in private housing.

58% cited 5 or less correctly
Likely to be 65 years & above, Working class, low-income group, less-educated (PSLE or below), Malay, females, and people living in HDB 1-3 room flats.

BASE: All respondents (2025)
Roles of the Elected President

To represent Singapore in meeting and visiting foreign leaders.

- **Roles aligned to official interpretation**
  - 6% Yes, 94% No
  - 15% Yes, 85% No

Head of State

To block the Government’s intention to spend national reserves if he disagrees with the plan.

- 21% Yes, 79% No

To block the appointment of people to important positions in the public service if he disagrees with the Government’s choice.

- 38% Yes, 62% No

Not to speak publicly on any national issue unless the Government advises him to.

- 43% Yes, 57% No

Important or Not Important

3rd Most Important

- 9% Not Important, 91% Important

Most Important

- 6% Not Important, 94% Important

2nd Most Important

- 8% Not Important, 92% Important

- 15% Not Important, 85% Important

BASE: All respondents (2025), figures in percentages
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>2nd Most Important</th>
<th>3rd Most Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that the Government manages the economy wisely.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free to speak publicly on national issues he thinks are important.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that Government does what it promised in the general election.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free to decide on Singapore’s policy on multiracialism.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free to decide the best way for the country to manage its foreign relations.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Government</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BASE:** All respondents (2025), figures in percentages
Roles of the Elected President

• Top three roles cited
  ➢ To represent Singapore in meeting and visiting foreign leaders
  ➢ Head of state
  ➢ To ensure that the Government manages the economy wisely, (most likely cited by post-secondary respondents)

• Top three roles, when cited, were considered ‘important’ in shaping vote
  ➢ To ensure that the Government manages the economy wisely
  ➢ To ensure that Government does what it promised in the general election
  ➢ To block the Government’s intention to spend national reserves if he disagrees with the plan

• We call this our ‘political knowledge’ indicator, where mean score is 5.4 out of a possible 11 points.
Political Knowledge

“I am interested in matters related to Singapore’s governing system.” Respondents who strongly agreed and agreed were likely to have just a slightly higher mean score, but difference is of statistical significance.

![Mean Scores Chart]

- Strongly Disagree / Disagree
- Neutral
- Strongly Agree / Agree

Statistical difference
Where a<b
p < 0.05
Political Knowledge

GENDER
Male respondents were closer to official interpretation.

Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male a</th>
<th>Female b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical difference
Where a>b
p < 0.05

\[ t(2023) = 5.849 \]

p < 0.001
**Political Knowledge**

**ETHNICITY**

Chinese respondents were closer to official interpretation.

---

**Mean Scores**

- Chinese: 5.6
- Malay: 4.8
- Indian: 5.1
- Others: 5.2

Statistical difference
Where $a > b$
$p < 0.05$
Political Knowledge

**AGE**
The oldest respondents were furthest from the official interpretation.

---

**Mean Scores**

- 21-29 years
- 30-39 years
- 40-54 years
- 55-64 years
- 65 and above

*Age brackets*
- Statistical difference
- Where a>b, p < 0.05

*Pre/Post-independence*
- $t(203) = 1.530$, not significant
Political Knowledge

EDUCATION
Better-educated were closest to official interpretation.

Mean Scores

- PSLE or below: 4.2
- Secondary: 4.9
- Post secondary: 5.5
- Diploma: 5.5
- University/Professional: 6.3

Statistical difference: Where a<b, b<c, c<d, p < 0.05
Political Knowledge

HOUSEHOLD INCOME
Respondents in higher household income brackets were closer to official interpretation.

Mean Scores

- Low
- Low Middle
- Middle Middle
- Upper Middle

Statistical difference
Where a<b, b<c
p < 0.05
Political Knowledge

OCCUPATIONAL CLASS
Respondents in the Service occupational class were closer to official interpretation.

Mean Scores

- Working
- Intermediate
- Service

Statistical difference
Where a < b, b < c
p < 0.05
Political Knowledge

HOUSING TYPE
Respondents in private dwelling type were closer to official interpretation.

![Mean Scores Chart]

- HDB 1-3 room
- HDB 4 room
- HDB 5-6 room/Executive
- Private

Statistical difference
Where a<b, b<c
p < 0.05
Characteristics of Candidates
Characteristics of Candidates

Honesty, fairness and ability to represent the country well were the most important qualities.

Independence from political parties and resonance with candidates’ views on national issues with respondents were least important.

Scale 1 to 5
1: Not important at all
2: Not so important
3: Neutral
4: Important
5: Very important
Characteristics of Candidates

How important...

**Honesty**
More important to post-independence respondents and those between 40 – 54 years old, the most highly educated, new / first time ones, and those in private housing. The higher the occupational class and income, the higher the importance.

**Fair Person**
More important to post-independence respondents, esp. young adults, post-secondary educated, new / first time voters, Malays or Indians, residents in private housing. The higher the occupational class, the higher the importance.

**Ability to represent the country well**
More important to respondents in 40 – 54 years old category, intermediate class, upper middle & above income group, diploma holders, Indians, those in 5-6 rm/exec flats and private housing.

**Committed to serving the public**
Important to post-independence respondents, 21 – 29 years old, upper-middle & above income, most highly educated, new/first-time voters, Indians, 5-6 rm/exec flats. The higher the occupational class, the greater the importance.
Characteristics of Candidates

How important...

**Good communication skills**
- More important to respondents 21 – 29 years old, upper-middle & above income group, those with post-secondary education, Indians, females, those in 5-6 rm/exec flats.
- Mean: 4.4
- Base: 2013

**Empathy**
- More important to 30 – 39, 40 – 54 years old, new / first-time voters, Malays, females.
- Mean: 4.3
- Base: 2007

**Independent-minded**
- More important to respondents 40 – 54 years old, the most highly educated. The higher the income, the greater the importance.
- Mean: 4.2
- Base: 1985

**Credentials and work experience**
- More important to pre-independence respondents, especially the middle aged those with secondary level education, old voters, Indians, females.
- Mean: 4.1
- Base: 2004

Legend:
- Not impt at all
- Not impt
- Neutral
- Impt
- Very impt
Characteristics of Candidates

How important...

Shares your views about national issues

- More important to respondents in the intermediate class, those with secondary level education, Indians, females, those in 5-6 rm/exec flats.
- More important to those in low income group, those with PSLE and below education, in lower occupational class, females, Malays, and those in HDB 1-3 rm flats.

Complete lack of formal ties to political parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Characteristics of Candidates

• Independence from political parties was more important to those in the
  - Working Class
  - Those with PSLE education and below

• Why did it matter more to this group and less to the others? Perhaps because the others took a realistic view that candidates are likely to have some association with political parties.
Communication Channels
Communication Channels

Traditional media - newspapers and TV, followed by the Internet, were significant in providing material that shaped voter preferences.

Scale 1 to 5
1: Not important at all
2: Not so important
3: Neutral
4: Important
5: Very important
### Influence of Communication Channel

#### In shaping voting decision...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>More important to respondents in the 40 – 54 years bracket, in intermediate class, secondary level educated, people who have voted previously, Indians, females, residents of 5-6 rm/exec flats.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local free-to-air television</td>
<td>More important to those in the intermediate class, low-middle income group, those with secondary education level qualifications, and Malays, females, residents of 1-3 rm flats.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>More important to post-independence respondents, those in the upper-middle &amp; above income group, diploma holders, new / first-time voters, males and residents of 5-6 rm/exec flats. The lower the age, the higher the occupational class, the higher the importance.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Rallies</td>
<td>More important to the post-independence respondents, especially those in the 21 – 29 years bracket, low-middle income group, secondary level educated, new / first-time voters, Malays, those in 1 to 3 rm flats.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Influence of Communication Channel

#### In shaping voting decision...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with candidate(s)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-of-mouth (family, friends)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>1994</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with candidate(s)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-of-mouth (family, friends)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Meeting with candidate(s)**: More important to post-independence respondents, especially 21 – 29 year olds, intermediate class, low income group, Diploma holders, Malays, residents of 4 rm flats.
- **Radio**: More important to pre-independence respondents, especially 65 years & above, people who have previously voted, Malays, residents of 4 rm flats. The lower the occupational class, income and education level, the higher the importance.
- **Word-of-mouth (family, friends)**: More important to post-independence respondents, those in the low-middle income group, new / first-time voters, Indians, females, residents in 4 rm flats. The lower the age, the greater the importance.
### Influence of Communication Channel

**In shaping voting decision…**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>1986</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting supporters of candidate(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More important to those in the lower educational bands, and Malays, those in 1-3 rm flats. The lower the occupational class and income, the greater the importance.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More important with respondents in the intermediate class, low income group, post-secondary educated respondents, new / first-time voters, Malays, females, residents of 1-3 rm flats.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More important for the post-independence respondents, those in the intermediate class, low-middle income group, post-secondary educated, new / first-time voters, Malays, those in 1-3 rm flats. The lower the age, the higher the importance.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Influence of Communication Channel

**Top 5 Online Channels Mentioned**

- **Facebook**: More important to those in 21 – 29 years old category, those with post-secondary education level, new / first-time voters, those in 5-6 rm/exec flats. 46
- **Yahoo website**: More important to those in the 30 – 39 years old category, Diploma holders. 37
- **Google website**: More important for those in 21 – 29 years old category, those most highly educated, those who cited 6 or more roles correctly. 20
- **Channel News Asia website**: More important to those in 21 – 29 years old category, working class, post-secondary education level, new / first-time voters, those who cited 5 or less roles correctly. 14
- **Twitter**: More important to those in 21 – 29 years old category, working class, post-secondary education level, new / first-time voters, those who cited 5 or less roles correctly. 12

BASE: Respondents were those who found Internet or Mobile Phone important (1327)
### Influence of Communication Channel

**In shaping voting decision...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Presidential Election 2011</th>
<th>General Election 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television (Local, free-to-air)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Rallies</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with candidate(s)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television (Local)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Election Rallies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassroots Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communication Channels

• Newspapers still most important but less so for respondents in the following categories:
  ➢ 21 – 29 to 30 – 39 age bracket
  ➢ Service class
  ➢ New / first-time voters

• Those groups tended to view Internet as an important channel. It was more influential
  ➢ the lower the age; and
  ➢ the higher the occupational class.

• Among Internet sources, different groups were attracted to the top two sources of Facebook and Yahoo website.
Election System and Others
In this section of the survey on the election system and its outcome, two further indicators were developed - ‘political legitimacy’ and ‘institutional independence’.

On ‘political legitimacy’, those in the lower socio-economic groups and older respondents score higher; they are more likely to feel that both the election system and outcome are legitimate.

On ‘institutional independence’, those in the higher socio-economic groups and younger respondents score higher; they are more likely to feel that the system should stand independent of other centres of authority.
Election System and Others

**Agree or disagree that...**

The process of certifying who is eligible to contest for the post of Elected President is necessary.

More agree in the 30 – 39 years old, middle-middle income group categories, females. Less agree in the 21 – 29 / 65 and above categories, low middle income categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2011 process of certification gave those I think were truly qualified the chance to contest.

More agree among the less-educated, Malays. Less agree among diploma holders, Chinese and higher occupational groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The issue of the financial competence of the candidates was very important in my decision about who to vote.

More agree among the pre-independence respondents, those who voted previously, less educated and Malays. Less agree among the highly educated and Chinese.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Election System and Others

**Agree or disagree that…**

- **The Elected President must be chosen through an election by Singaporeans and not selected by Parliament.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean: 4.3</td>
<td>Base: 2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **I believe a person of an ethnic minority group can be elected as president through the current system.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean: 4.0</td>
<td>Base: 1961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Overall, there is no need to change anything in the system of the Elected Presidency.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean: 3.4</td>
<td>Base: 1945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Election System and Others

Agree or disagree that…

**Political parties** should not be allowed to endorse candidates in the presidential election.

More agree among 30 – 39 years old, new/first-time voters, Middle-Middle income group, Indians, males those in private housing. The higher the occupational and educational class, the more likely to agree. Less agree among those who are 65 years & above, in the low income group, Chinese.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 3.8  Base: 1945

**Social organisations, unions or other community groups should not be allowed to endorse candidates in the presidential election.**

More agree among the respondents in the 40 – 54 years old category, service class, upper middle income group, better-educated (diploma and degree holders), males, dwellers of 5-6 rm/exec flats and those in the ‘others’ ethnic group. Less agree in the 65 & above group, low income group and Chinese.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 3.7  Base: 1945
All candidates got fair coverage by the mass media, that is, free-to-air television, newspapers and radio.

The Patrick Tan issue was very important in my decision about who to vote.

More agree in the pre-independence group, among those who have voted before, secondary educated and Indians, females and 1-3 rm flat dwellers. Less agree from the degree holders and netizens. The lower the age, higher the occupational group and income, the lower the agreement.

More agree in the post-independence category, new/first-time voters, young adults, low income and Malays, 1-3 rm flat dwellers. Less agree in the Old category, the middle middle income, higher occupational category and degree holders.
Election System and Others

Agree or disagree that...

The outcome of who has been elected on 27 August will strengthen Singapore’s governing system.

More agree in the pre-independence respondents, old voters and those with lower education, females and 1-3 rm flat dwellers. The lower the age, the higher the occupational group and income level, the lower the agreement.

Mean 3.6  Base 1904

6 35 8 44 8 3.1 1949

More agree the lower the occupational class, income and educational level, those in 4 rm flats and among Malays. Chinese tend to disagree.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree
Election System and Others

Agree or disagree that...

The Elected President should be paid more than the Prime Minister.

More agreed in the 65 years & above category, those with secondary level education, 1-3 rm flat dwellers and Malays. Less agree in the 40 – 54 years old bracket, degree holders. The higher the occupational class and income, the lower the agreement.

Mean: 2.6  
Base: 1855
Election System and Others

Agree or disagree that...

I am interested in matters related to Singapore’s governing system.

More agree among the 40-54 age category, degree holders, Indians, males and dwellers of private homes. The higher the occupational class and income the higher the agreement. Less agree in the 21 – 29 years old bracket, those who with PSLE or below and among Chinese. Those more interested in politics would have cited more than six statements about the role of the presidency correctly.

Mean 3.8  Base 1972
Political Legitimacy
Engaging Minds, Exchanging Ideas

Draws on responses to four statements on the election system:

• The 2011 process of certification gave those I think were truly qualified the chance to contest.

• Overall, there is no need to change anything in the system of the Elected Presidency.

• All candidates got fair coverage by the mass media, that is, free-to-air television, newspapers and radio.

• The outcome of who has been elected on 27 August will strengthen Singapore’s governing system.

• Mean score of 14.5 out of 20 points.

Political Legitimacy
Political Legitimacy

GENDER
Female respondents scored higher.

Mean Scores
14.4  14.7

Male  Female

Statistical Difference
a < b
t(203) = -2.415
p < 0.05
Political Legitimacy

ETHNICITY

‘Others’ scored the lowest.

Mean Scores

- Chinese
- Malay
- Indian
- Others

Statistical difference:
Where a < b, b > c, a > c
p < 0.05
Political Legitimacy

AGE
The older respondents, 55 years and above, scored higher than the rest.
Lower educated respondents, secondary level scored higher than the rest.

Statistical difference
Where a<b, p < 0.05
Political Legitimacy

HOUSEHOLD INCOME
Respondents in low income group scored differently from those in the upper-middle income group.

Mean Scores

- Low\(^a\) (15.0)
- Low Middle \(^a, b\) (14.7)
- Middle Middle \(^b, c\) (14.5)
- Upper Middle \(^c\) (14.3)

Statistical difference: Where \(a > b\), \(p < 0.05\)
OCCUPATIONAL CLASS
Service class respondents scored the lower than the rest.

Mean Scores

- Working: 15.0
- Intermediate: 14.9
- Service: 14.2

Statistical difference
Where a > b, p < 0.05
Political Legitimacy

HOUSING TYPE
Respondents in least expensive dwelling types scored differently from those in private housing.

![Bar chart showing mean scores for different housing types.]

- HDB 1-3 room
- HDB 4 room
- HDB 5-6 room
- Executive
- Private

Mean Scores:
- 14.9
- 14.6
- 14.4
- 14.3

Statistical difference: Where a > b, p < 0.05
Institutional Independence
Institutional Independence

Draws on responses to three statements on the election system:

- The person who exercises the powers of the Elected President must be chosen through an election by Singaporeans and not selected by Parliament.

- Social organisations, unions or other community groups should not be allowed to endorse candidates in the presidential election.

- Political parties should not be allowed to endorse candidates in the presidential election.

- Mean score is 11.8 out of 15 points.
Institutional Independence

GENDER
Male respondents scored higher.

Mean Scores

- Male: 12.0
- Female: 11.6

Statistical difference:
Where $a > b$
$t(2023) = 4.189,$
p < 0.001
ETHNICITY
No difference in ratings on institutional independence among the ethnic groups.

Mean Scores

- Chinese: 11.7
- Malay: 12.0
- Indian: 12.0
- Others: 12.3

Statistical difference
Where a<b, p < 0.05
Institutional Independence

AGE
The post-independence group scored lower than the pre-independence one.

### Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-29 years</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-54 years</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 years</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and above</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-independence</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-independence</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age brackets**

Statistical difference
Where a>b, b>c,
p < 0.05

**Pre/Post-independence**

Statistical difference
Where a>b
t(2023) = 2.433,
p < 0.05
Institutional Independence

EDUCATION
Respondents in the PSLE or below category scored lower than the rest.

![Mean Scores Bar Chart]

- PSLE or below
- Secondary
- Post secondary
- Diploma
- University/Professional

Statistical difference:
Where a<b, b<c
p < 0.05
HOUSEHOLD INCOME
Those in the low category were different in their response when compared to those in the upper-middle category.
Institutional Independence

**OCCUPATIONAL CLASS**
Respondents in Service Class scored the higher than the rest.

![Bar Chart]

- **Working**
- **Intermediate**
- **Service**

**Mean Scores**
- Working: 11.5
- Intermediate: 11.7
- Service: 12.0

*Statistical difference where a<b, p < 0.05*
Institutional Independence

HOUSING TYPE
Respondents in the HDB 1-3 room category scored differently from those in private housing.

Mean Scores

- HDB 1-3 room: 11.5
- HDB 4 room: 11.7
- HDB 5-6 room/Executive: 11.9
- Private: 11.9

Statistical difference
Where a<b, p < 0.05
Correlations Among Political Attitudes

Those who are politically knowledgeable prefer more institutional independence for the PE, and are less likely to view the election system as fully legitimate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Political Legitimacy</th>
<th>Institutional Independence</th>
<th>Political Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Legitimacy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Independence</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Knowledge</td>
<td>-0.167 **</td>
<td>0.076**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table showing Pearson r coefficients
* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$
Conclusion

• More education is needed on the role of the elected president for an informed debate on the system and in time for the next election.

• Survey suggests however that the more knowledgeable the voter, the more likely he or she will be a critical one – someone who questions if the election system or the outcome are the best for Singapore.

• This survey reinforces the idea that those in the higher socio-economic groups are more critical voters.

• The younger, better-educated netizens are less likely to think all candidates got fair coverage by traditional media, and would rely on social and alternative online media too.
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