

Hougang Bukit Batok Pioneer Fengshan Bukit Panjang Radin Mas Potong Pasir
Marsiling-Yew Tee GRC Chua Chu Kang GRC Aljunied GRC Tampines GRC
Bishan-Toa Payoh GRC West Coast GRC Jurong GRC Marine Parade GRC

POST-ELECTION CONFERENCE 2015

Tanjong Pagar GRC Ang Mo Kio GRC East Coast GRC Pasir Ris-Punggol GRC
Holland-Bukit Timah GRC Nee Soon GRC Jalan Besar GRC Sembawang GRC
MacPherson Yuhua Hong Kah North Sengkang West Punggol East Mountbatten

Wednesday, 4 November 2015
Ballroom 1 & 2, Orchard Hotel

IPS **POST-ELECTION** CONFERENCE 2015

Session One
The IPS GE2015 Surveys

Presentation by

Associate Professor Tan Ern Ser

Department of Sociology
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
National University of Singapore

EXPLAINING THE GE2015 OUTCOMES:

Insights from the Perceptions of Governance Survey

4 November 2015

Orchard Hotel, Singapore

Theoretical Discussions: Inglehart (1997)

- Post-modernization (post-materialist condition) produces fundamental value shift which favors democracy.
- Declining respect for authority and growing emphasis on participation and self-expression.
- More elite-challenging, issue-oriented, and direct form of democracy.

Theoretical Discussions: Chu, Nathan, Diamond, & Shin (2013)

- Democracy as an abstract idea is widely embraced, (but) not so many people endorsed it as a preferred form of government under all circumstances.
- Democracy will have a hard time winning people's hearts if regimes are able to deliver social stability and economic development.
- In short, it is about survival (bread and butter issues) vs democracy (political pluralism). Note also that late 20th century and after characterized by economic insecurity.

Singapore: Survival and political pluralism

Period/ Time-line	PAP	Non-PAP	Outcomes
1960's-70's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survival Ideology version 1 		One-party dominance
1970's- Early 1980's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Living the Singapore Dream: 5 C's, upgrading 		
Late 1980's- 2000's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial Crisis • Job and income insecurity • Unraveling of the Singapore Dream 		

Singapore: Survival and political pluralism

Period/ Time- line	PAP	Non-PAP	Outcomes
GE 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hot-button issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WP seen as credible opposition • Support for political pluralism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Watershed” election • “New normal”
GE 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New survival ideology (version 2) • Reinforced by SG50 • LKY legacy • Ground was sweeter, but hot-button issues still matter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future-oriented • Support for political pluralism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confidence in the party • Political pluralism • Party polarization?

Survey Findings: Outline of Presentation

- Research Questions
- Methodology
- **Satisfaction with Government Performance**
- **Issues which influenced how Singaporeans voted**
- **Views on Governance**
- **Views on Electoral System**
- **Life Satisfaction**
- **Party voted for**
- **Impact of Party and Election Campaign**
- **Differences across the 3 waves**
- Summary
- Conclusion

Research Questions

Research Questions

- How do voters rate government performance?
- Which issues matter most and which matter least to voters?
- How do voters rate governance?
- How do voters rate the electoral system?
- To what extent do voters support political pluralism?
- How satisfied are the voters with their life situation?
- Which party did voters opt for?
- What criteria influence voters' choice?

Methodology

Methodology

- 3 phases of data collection
 - Wave 1: 14 Aug - 1 Sep 2015
 - Wave 2: 2 Sep - 10 Sep 2015
 - Wave 3: 11 Sep - 17 Sep 2015
- Polling day was on 11 September 2015.
- All surveys were administered by YouGov Asia-Pacific via the Internet.
- Weighted sample size is N=3,000 adults aged 21 and above. Weight factors used were based on the proportions of gender, ethnicity and age in the Singapore Citizen population (Population Trends 2014, DOS).

Satisfaction with Government Performance

Satisfaction with Government Performance (n=3,000)

5 <u>most</u> satisfied areas	Mean
Law & order	7.12
Defence & national security	7.09
Crisis management	6.99
Prevention of corruption	6.86
Relations between races	6.59

Scale 1 to 9

1: Very dissatisfied, 9: Very satisfied

**Government rated higher on management of society,
followed by economy.**

Satisfaction with government performance (n=3,000)

5 <u>least</u> satisfied areas	Mean
Cost of living	4.01
Closing the gap between the rich and the poor	4.14
Ministerial salary	4.18
Housing affordability	4.47
Immigration policies	4.58

Scale 1 to 9

1: Very dissatisfied, 9: Very satisfied

**Government rated lower on some of the GE2011 hot-button issues.
Do these matter?**

Satisfaction with Government Performance by class and age

- Higher class – Higher rating on government performance in managing society.
- Aged 55-64 (“near elderly”) – Higher rating on government performance in managing society.

Issues Which Influenced How Singaporeans Voted

Issues Which Influenced How Singaporeans Voted (n=3,000)

5 <u>most</u> influential issues	Per cent
Cost of living	64.6
Housing affordability	43.2
Healthcare affordability	42.0
Meeting retirement needs	37.2
Government transparency & accountability	35.1

GE2011 hot-button issues still matter.

Issues Which Influenced How Singaporeans Voted (n=3,000)

5 <u>least</u> influential issues	Per cent
Increasing birth rate	3.6
Crisis management	5.0
Relations between races	6.7
Childcare	8.0
Civil rights & liberties	9.9

Higher scoring issues ranked low in influence.

Issues Which Influenced How Singaporeans Voted by class and age

- Overall rated low. Lower middle class seem most affected.
- Lower class most affected.
- Aged 30-39 most affected. Just setting up home?
- Aged 40-54: Belonging to the sandwiched generation?

Views on Governance

Views on Governance (n=3,000)

Statements	Mean
The Government does what is right for Singapore	5.77
In general, government policies are fair	5.49
The Government does a good job in explaining the rationale behind policy decisions	5.30
Government policies benefit Singaporeans like me	5.28
The Government understands the concerns of Singaporeans like me	4.86
Singaporeans like me can influence Government decision-making	4.81

**The scores are somewhere around the mid-point on scale of 1-9.
Do they really matter in GE2015?**

Views on Governance by class and age

- Post-Sec gave lower rating to governance.
- HDB 1-3-roomers gave lower scores to governance.
- Lower income - Lower scores for governance
- Aged 30-39 - Lower scores for governance.

Views on Electoral System

Views on Electoral System (n=3,000)

Statements	Mean
It is important to have political diversity in Parliament	6.93
All things considered, our electoral system works well for Singapore	5.78
The election laws are fair to all political parties	5.50
Newspaper and television are fair when they report on Singapore politics, political parties and election	4.78

**Higher support for political pluralism.
Lower score for mainstream news coverage**

Views on Electoral System by class and age

- Higher educated - Lower scores for mainstream news coverage.
- HDB 1-3-roomers - Lower scores for electoral system.
- Higher income – Greater support for political pluralism.
- Seniors scored higher on political pluralism? Why so?
- Aged 30-39 scored lower on views on electoral system.

Life Satisfaction

Life Satisfaction (n=3,000)

Life Satisfaction	Mean
Life satisfaction five years ago	5.47
Life satisfaction at present	5.17
Life satisfaction five years from now	5.27

Overall scores just above the mid-point on a scale of 1-9.

Life Satisfaction by class and age

- Higher educated – Higher life satisfaction.
- Higher housing type – Higher life satisfaction
- Higher income – Higher life satisfaction.
- Younger – More satisfied.

Party Voted For

Party Voted For

Voted in 11 Sep 2015 election	N	%
Yes	956	95.6
No	44	4.4
Total	1,000	100.0

Party voted for	N	%
Non-PAP	161	28.95
PAP	396	71.05
Total	557	100.00

Figures resemble GE2015 actual results.

GE2011 and GE2015 Results Compared

Party voted for in GE 2011	N ('000)	%
People's Action Party	1,212	60.14
Workers' Party	258	12.83
National Solidarity Party	242	12.04
Singapore Democratic Party	97	4.83
Reform Party	86	4.28
Singapore People's Party	62	3.11
Singapore Democratic Alliance	55	2.78
People's Power Party	N.A.	N.A.
Singaporeans First Party	N.A.	N.A.
Sub-total	2,015	85.63
Spoilt votes	44	
Walkover votes	292	
Total electorate	2,350	100

Party voted for in GE 2015	N	%
People's Action Party	396	71.1
Workers' Party	68	12.3
National Solidary Party	9	1.5
Singapore Democratic Party	15	2.7
Reform Party	13	2.4
Singapore People's Party	25	4.4
Singapore Democratic Alliance	8	1.4
People's Power Party	11	1.9
Singaporeans First Party	5	0.9
None of the above	7	1.3
Total	557	100.0

IPS Perceptions of Governance Survey, 2015.

Figures resemble GE2015 actual results.

Impact of Party and Election Campaign

Impact of Party and Election Campaign (n=1,000)

Party voted for	Mean
My confidence in the party	7.31
The reputation of the party	7.26
The need for an opposition presence in Parliament	7.01
The SMC candidate/ GRC candidates fielded by the party	6.90
The arguments presented by the party during the election campaign	6.79
The election manifesto presented by the party	6.72

**Importance of confidence in and reputation of party.
Need for political pluralism seems like a given.**

Non-PAP and PAP Compared

Non-PAP and PAP Compared (n=557)

5 Most Satisfied Areas (Government Performance)	Mean		
	Non-PAP	PAP	Difference
Law & order***	6.21	7.52	1.31
Defence & national security***	6.18	7.49	1.31
Crisis management, e.g., SARS***	6.17	7.23	1.06
Prevention of corruption***	5.60	7.46	1.86
Relations between races***	5.72	6.92	1.20

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.

Non-PAP and PAP: Significantly different at .05 level

Non-PAP and PAP Compared (n=557)

5 Top Issues Which Influenced On How Singaporeans Votes	Mean		
	Non-PAP	PAP	Difference
Cost of living***	2.81	4.73	1.92
Housing affordability***	3.28	5.39	2.11
Healthcare affordability***	3.79	5.53	1.74
Meeting retirement needs***	3.40	5.52	2.12
Government transparency & accountability***	3.81	6.26	2.45

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.

Non-PAP and PAP: Significantly different at .05 level

Non-PAP and PAP Compared (n=557)

Statements on Governance and Electoral System	Mean		
	Non-PAP	PAP	Difference
The Government does what is right for Singapore***	4.04	6.72	2.68
The Government understands the concerns of Singaporeans like me***	3.30	5.93	2.63
The Government does a good job in explaining the rationale behind policy decisions***	3.78	6.32	2.54
Newspaper and television are fair when they report on Singapore politics, political parties and election***	3.18	5.84	2.66
Singaporeans like me can influence Government decision-making***	3.54	5.66	2.12
In general, government policies are fair***	3.78	6.46	2.68
Government policies benefit Singaporeans like me***	3.68	6.18	2.50
It is important to have political diversity in Parliament***	7.21	6.67	-0.54
The election laws are fair to all political parties***	3.69	6.59	2.90
All things considered, our electoral system works well for Singapore***	3.83	6.82	2.99

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.

Non-PAP and PAP: Significantly different at .05 level

Non-PAP and PAP Compared (n=557)

Life Satisfaction	Mean		
	Non-PAP	PAP	Difference
Life satisfaction five years ago***	4.29	6.01	1.72
Life satisfaction at present***	3.89	6.05	2.16
Life satisfaction five years from now***	3.79	6.15	2.36

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.

Non-PAP and PAP: Significantly different at .05 level

Non-PAP and PAP Compared (n=557)

Views on Election Campaign	Mean		
	Non-PAP	PAP	Difference
The election manifesto presented by the party	6.72	6.90	0.18
The SMC candidate/ GRC candidates fielded by the party**	6.71	7.20	0.49
The arguments presented by the party during the election campaign	6.88	6.88	0.00
The need for an opposition presence in Parliament***	7.99	6.40	-1.59
The reputation of the party***	6.92	7.64	0.72
My confidence in the party***	7.14	7.65	0.51

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.

Non-PAP and PAP: Significantly different at .05 level

Differences Across The 3 Waves

Differences Across The 3 Waves

While there were no major shifts across waves, a slight decline across waves was observed.

In terms of the implications, the campaign period seems to have minimal impact on voter choice.

Summary

Summary

- The Government was rated higher on management of society, followed by economy.
- The Government was rated lower on GE2011 hot-button issues such as Cost of Living and Closing Gap Between The Rich and Poor.
- Areas with high satisfaction ranked low on influence on voting behaviour.
- Lower socioeconomic class (lower education, and smaller housing type, lower monthly income) most affected by hot-button issues.
- Aged 30-39 most affected by hot-button issues (just setting up home?).
- Aged 40-54 are also affected by hot-button issues(sandwiched generation?)

Summary

- Scores on governance around mid-point, on a scale of 1 to 9.
- High scores for political pluralism. Implication for the future?
- Aged 30-39 scored lower on perception of electoral system.
- Higher class tend to have higher life satisfaction.
- Aged 20-29 tend to have higher life satisfaction.
- Confidence in and reputation of party most important for choice of party.
May indicate that voters are future-oriented.
- Clear contrast between PAP supporters and non-PAP supporters on many items.
- Campaign period did not seem to influence choice of party.

Conclusion

Conclusion

- Hot-button issues still matter.
- Can't tell if the ground in GE2015 is sweeter than in GE2011.
- Emergence of Survival Ideology version 2, aided by SG50, LKY legacy, and economic outlook.
- Voters are more future-oriented, as indicated by confidence in party voted for.
- Opposition has a foothold, given support for political pluralism.

Research Team

- A/P Tan Ern Ser, Department of Sociology, NUS.
- Dr Leong Chan Hoong, Senior Research Fellow, Institute of Policy Studies, NUS.

Hougang Bukit Batok Pioneer Fengshan Bukit Panjang Radin Mas Potong Pasir
Marsiling-Yew Tee GRC Chua Chu Kang GRC Aljunied GRC Tampines GRC
Bishan-Toa Payoh GRC West Coast GRC Jurong GRC Marine Parade GRC

POST-ELECTION CONFERENCE 2015

Tanjong Pagar GRC Ang Mo Kio GRC East Coast GRC Pasir Ris-Punggol GRC
Holland-Bukit Timah GRC Nee Soon GRC Jalan Besar GRC Sembawang GRC
MacPherson Yuhua Hong Kah North Sengkang West Punggol East Mountbatten

Wednesday, 4 November 2015
Ballroom 1 & 2, Orchard Hotel