Are Young Singaporeans Happy?

26 September 2012

NUSS Kent Ridge Guild House

Acknowledgement

**IPS is grateful to the Tote Board
and Singapore Pools (Private) Limited
for their support of the
IPS Young Singaporeans Conference 2012**

Contents

YOUNG SINGAPOREANS CONFERENCE 2012

ARE YOUNG SINGAPOREANS HAPPY?

26 SEPTEMBER 2012

FULL REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In cosmopolitan Singapore, a city-state that does not sleep, situated at the crossroads of international trade and finance, one would not bat an eyelid if told that it was an unhappy place. The images of competition and climbing up the next rung of the proverbial career ladder come to mind almost immediately. However, contrary to conventional wisdom, Singapore has in fact been pronounced as one of the four happiest places,[1] the other three being Århus in Denmark, San Luis Obispo in the United States and Monterrey in Mexico. In 2011, the issue of "happiness" was raised in Parliament where members debated whether or not Singapore had been too focused on gross domestic product growth as an indicator of progress, and if there could be a closer look at other measures to enhance "happiness" and well-being for Singaporeans. [2] This prompted a subsequent public debate. More recently, in January 2012, Professor Lily Kong from the National University of Singapore suggested creating a Singaporean Index that would "adequately capture the happiness and well-being of Singaporeans".[3]

The theme for Young Singaporeans Conference (YSC) 2012 centred on happiness, with the conference title "Are Young Singaporeans Happy?". More specifically, what makes them happy? And if they are unhappy, what can be done to engender happiness among them, and to a larger extent, the nation as a whole? Aside from the government, how can other sectors of society help to build or improve upon the foundations for a happier society?

To tackle the subject of happiness, the central theme was further categorised into three sub-themes. The first examined the conventionally held notion of happiness as linked with vast accumulations of wealth; second, following from the first, was an examination of other ways of attaining happiness, namely, through family and community; and the third examined the environment we live in which influences our

---

1. Dan Buettner. *Thrive: finding happiness the Blue Zones way* (Washington, D. C.: National Geographic, 2010).
2. Tessa Wong, "Parliament; Sylvia Lim, PAP MPs spar over happiness gauge," *The Straits Times* (18 October 2011).
3. Esther Ng, "A Singaporean Happiness Index?," *Today* (1 February 2012), 22.

level of happiness[4]. It also has further implications on creativity since unhappy people are also generally said to be less creative.[5]

The presentations from Session 1 provided an overview to the debate on whether money is the main driver of happiness. The panel was informed by economic research as well as research in the areas of behavioural economics and psychology. The general consensus presented to the participants by the panellists is that income is but one of the many important drivers of happiness. The panellists urged policymakers to concentrate more on non-materialistic goals of attaining happiness, for example health and education, and to focus on GNH (Gross National Happiness), besides GDP.

Session 2 provided an opportunity to examine other non-materialistic areas that are important for happiness. The spotlight was focused on two areas — family and community. Both panellists, through the course of their presentations, challenged participants to ask themselves what happiness means to them and how they might find it through their roles in their families and the community. Pertinent points that were brought up over the course of the Q&A session included the redefinition of family and addressing young Singaporeans' aspirations to build families.

Session 3 focused on how the physical environment can contribute to the happiness of the people living in it, and more importantly how this has implications on creativity. The work of Ground-Up Initiative (GUI) was offered as a case study of an enabling environment that led to projects as a result of creativity and innovation. The second presentation went a step further by offering a way to happiness that required one to "create, resist, and lastly, connect."

4. Krishna Dutt Amitava and Benjamin Radcliff, eds., *Happiness, economics and politics: towards a multi-disciplinary approach* (Cheltenham, UK; Northhampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 2009); Belinda Yuen and Ooi Giok Ling, "World Cities – Challenges to Liveability, Sustainability and Vibrancy," in *World Cities: Achieving Liveability and Vibrancy*, ed. Ooi Giok Ling and Belinda Yuen (Singapore: World Scientific Press, 2009), 1–11.
5. Bill Breen, "The 6 Myths of Creativity," *Fast Company* (1 December 2004). Accessed 17 March 2012. http://www.fastcompany.com/51559/6-myths-creativity.

Session I: Money is (Really) Not Everything?

Your Money or Your Life

Dr Nattavudh Powdthavee, Principal Research Fellow at the Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics, began by stressing that the secret to a happy life was simply finding out what you like to do, and then finding someone who is willing to pay you to do it. However, he noted that to accomplish this is difficult. While many of the decisions we make in life are motivated by happiness, he highlighted the importance of money and how economists think of money as a form of compensation for tiresome jobs. However, do we really need money that much, that we are willing to sacrifice other things like work-life balance? He went on to discuss four facts about money and happiness.

The first fact is that the rich are happier than the poor. This is generally true of GDP comparisons within and between countries. Dr Powdthavee noted that this could be due to reverse causality: Perhaps happier people earn more money. According to Dr Powdthavee, physiological research has also shown that for every extra £40,000 a year, heartbeat is one beat slower a minute.

Secondly, people care as much about relative income as absolute income. Research shows that life satisfaction levels have remained mostly stagnant in US and Britain despite GDP growth. Here, Dr Powdthavee cited the Easterlin Paradox: as society becomes richer, people care more about relative income, and therefore satisfaction levels remain stagnant. There is also a negative relationship between income inequality and level of child well-being.

Thirdly, people adapt fairly quickly to an increase in income, explained Dr Powdthavee. Although a pay rise leads to a quick rise in happiness level, it drops just as quickly. Also, higher levels of happiness lead to higher income aspirations.

Dr Powdthavee highlighted a fourth fact: money buys happiness — but only in small units. He explained that happiness economists can pitch different factors that make a person happy together, and calculate how much money all these things are worth. They can then gauge how much money to give an unemployed and unhappy person to make him as happy as if he were employed. This is known as shadow pricing. Holding everything constant, there is a drop in happiness that is equivalent to a drop of more than £20,000 from employed to unemployed status. There is also a massive drop in happiness when health drops from excellent to fair condition. In comparison to life events, money buys very little happiness.

Lastly, he pointed out that people "know" the facts about money and happiness but "act" as if they do not. Dr Powdthavee pointed out that longer commuting time leads to lower life satisfaction. Happiness drops by quite a lot in a non-linear fashion as commuting time rises. However, Dr Powdthavee highlighted a study where people in England sacrificed commuting time to earn higher income, particularly people in the fourth income quartile, who were willing to sacrifice a lot. Yet, the money they get from longer commutes to work does not compensate in terms of unhappiness. He also stated that in Data Recall Memory (DRM) studies, when asked to review how they had spent their time, richer people reported devoting

more of their time to work, or on activities that do not make themselves happier. In richer countries, happiness is running flat or declining. In Britain, psychological distress has risen from 1991 to 2004. This may be due to increasing stressful work, where high-strain jobs have increased from 1992 to 2006.

There have been attempts to discourage people from sacrificing too much life in the pursuit of wealth. One example that Dr Powdthavee provided was the tax on luxury goods. He questioned whether creating awareness about the paradoxical relationship between money and happiness was enough to warn people off from pursuing wealth. He acknowledged that it had become a deep-rooted mentality for many. He quoted the adage "contentment makes poor men rich, and discontentment makes rich men poor". He claimed that the value of money on happiness may have been exaggerated and also stressed the erroneous way of focusing only on specific things about money, such as taking vacations and purchasing sport cars.

In his conclusion, he urged policy-makers in the coming century to concentrate more on non-materialistic goals of attaining happiness, and to focus on Gross National Happiness (GNH), and not on GDP.

Singapore: A Happy State of Mind

Dr Tambyah Siok Kuan, Senior Lecturer at NUS Business School, focused her presentation on the state of happiness in Singapore. She noted that the pursuit of happiness is very much in the Singaporean national psyche as happiness is found in the Singapore pledge. She highlighted that many surveys in the popular press show the surprising fact that Singaporeans seem to be quite happy. For example, Singapore ranked 20th in the *Newsweek* survey of "The Best Countries in the World"; and in the World Values Survey, 95% of Singaporeans are very happy or quite happy. In the Gallup-Healthways Well-being Index, Singapore is ranked as the happiest place in Southeast Asia, with an index of 6.9 out of 10, although Dr Tambyah suggested that was probably in comparison to the poverty and challenges facing the region. She stressed that by comparing ourselves with others, we are bound to find someone else who is less happy.

For the purpose of her presentation, Dr Tambyah defined happiness as an *affective* assessment of a person's well-being or quality of life, and life satisfaction as a *cognitive* assessment. Comparing the results from the 2006 and 2011 Asian Barometer surveys, a significant drop in the happiness index was observed from 2006 to 2011, whereas a small dip in enjoyment index was observed over the same period. This suggests that there have not been corresponding improvements in happiness ratings with the rise in GDP, and Singapore is not an exception. Moreover, Dr Tambyah stressed that it is pertinent to look at income distribution rather than absolute income. Greater income inequality decreases the level of happiness.

Having made the argument that happiness and GDP do not go hand-in-hand, Dr Tambyah presented the profile of happy Singaporeans. She noted that men and women are equally happy, but married Singaporeans are happier than single Singaporeans, although she raised a caveat that it is not certain if the married people were already happy before getting married. In 2011, young Singaporeans between the ages of 25 to 34 were least happy and enjoyed life the least. High-income households were the happiest and enjoyed life the most in 2011, as compared to in 2006, when it was the medium-income households.

Dr Tambyah further listed the range of things that Singaporeans are most and least satisfied with. This was based on data collected in 2006 and 2011, which found that interpersonal life, personal relationships, social networks and national pride were factors that made Singaporeans happy. She suggested that perhaps the reason why many young Singaporeans are unhappy now is because they do not feel proud to be Singaporean. In addition, having a government that ensures that different races and ethnic groups get along harmoniously is an important indicator of happiness. Relationship with children ranked the highest, followed by relationship with parents, siblings and spouses. Satisfaction with life and health dropped from 2006 to 2011. While overall satisfaction with life showed a slight increase, overall satisfaction with living in Singapore dipped. Security, cleanliness and law enforcement ranked the highest consistently through the years. On the other hand, Singaporeans are most unsatisfied with the cost of living, high cost of cars, properties and healthcare, career opportunities and quality of customer services.

Dr Tambyah followed up by discussing the role of government in the scheme of things. The government, she opined, could look into addressing the concerns of ageing population, healthcare, improving public transport, expanding educational resources, and better law enforcement. She highlighted that the latter part was addressed recently in a newspaper article that lamented how Singaporeans were too caught up in bread-and-butter issues and did not seem to be keen on the broader issues such as a vision for Singapore. The writer had suggested that Singaporeans were too dependent on the government to provide solutions for everything, and that we should realise that the government cannot solve all the problems. Dr Tambyah agreed to a certain extent, because surveys have shown that Singaporeans are indeed concerned with bread-and-butter issues, but she felt that we should also give credit to some Singaporeans who have indicated their willingness to share their dreams and aspirations of Singapore. She also highlighted that there are already many voices online that have been doing this for a long time, if only we would listen. Also, she stressed that since we voted the government in to provide solutions; the government should give and take, and also practise its moral obligation. Some critics have used the moral economy argument that Singapore's government does its job in terms of looking after GDP and making sure Singaporeans reach socially desirable goals. Dr Tambyah believes that there can be a win-win situation, in which moral goals can also contribute to positive economic outcomes. For example, if the government provides affordable primary healthcare, it can allay some of the more prohibitive cost of tertiary healthcare in the long run.

Dr Tambyah concluded that beyond materialistic goals like GDP, we should look into other non-materialistic areas like health and education. National indices of happiness like Bhutan's Gross National Happiness look at components like time use, culture, vitality or country and psychological well-being, with economic well-being as just one aspect. Singapore did not do well in the Happy Planet Index, because of our large carbon footprint. She ended by emphasising that a reasonable level of GDP is necessary, but not a sufficient condition for good quality of life and standard of living. To move to a first-world democracy as suggested by some politicians, we have to be willing to accept that there are other ways to find happiness besides the prescribed way.

Does Money Make You Happy?

Dr Ng Weiting, Senior Lecturer of the Psychology Programme at the School of Arts and Social Sciences, SIM University, defined happiness by breaking it down into two components: the emotional aspects of positive and negative affect, and the cognitive evaluation aspect of life satisfaction. She pointed out that there are many benefits of positive affect and happiness. For example, under the Broad-and-Build Model, one broadens his scope of action, cognition and behaviours, building physical, intellectual and social resources, thereby undoing detrimental physiological effects of negative affect and improving psychological resilience. Positive affect leads to successful outcomes in important life domains like work, social relationships, and mental and physical health. Happier people are more likely to have superior work performance, higher incomes, better evaluations from supervisors, stronger social relationships, and receive more social support. Happiness is not only related to success, but also leads to success.

With regard to the question on whether money can buy happiness, she cautioned that the question is too broad and general, because happiness is a multi-faceted construct. It depends on which components are being examined, because income relates differently to the different components. Utilising data from the Gallup World Poll (GWP), income was shown to be strongly associated with the cognitive component of life evaluation/satisfaction — as income increases, life evaluation increases. However, there is no gratification, even at income levels beyond US$120,000, and diminishing marginal utility of money was observed. The same differences in raw income produce larger effects in the poor than the rich. Therefore, income affects life evaluation, but the raw amount of income required to produce the same change is much higher at the higher-income levels.

On the other hand, Dr Ng explained that the effect of income satiates around US$75,000 for three measures of emotional well-being: positive affect, negative affect and stress. She explained that positive and negative aspects are more closely related to the fulfilment of psychological needs like respect, autonomy, using one's skills, and learning something new. Thus, she concluded that strong predictors for positive feelings (emotional) are neither income nor GDP, but the fulfilment of psychological needs. However, for life evaluation (cognitive), the most important predictors are GDP and satisfaction with standard of living, like possession of luxury conveniences.

Comparing between higher-income and lower-income groups, Dr Ng noted that individuals in the lower-income groups have lower well-being across all measures of well-being like positive and negative affect, life evaluation and stress. This has been consistently verified by data from large scale surveys, like the German Social Economic Panel, the World Values Survey, the Gallup World Poll, Gallup-Healthways Well-being Index, where a large mean difference exists in life satisfaction between the two groups. Although money matters for happiness, in particular for life evaluation or the cognitive aspect of happiness, other factors still matter, as shown in the GWP, where factors like social support and safety still predicted life satisfaction even after controlling household incomes. Societal conditions like poverty and safety affect well-being. In Singapore, life evaluation

scores are high, but negative affect scores are also high, despite the high GDP. This may have given rise to the perception that we are not a very happy nation.

Dr Ng also provided her take on the Easterlin Paradox: Why does rising income not match rising levels of happiness? One explanation is that for richer individuals, well-being is impacted more by relative than absolute income. This is explained by the diminishing marginal utility of income. Another explanation is that income relates differently to different components of happiness. Rising income is accompanied by rising life satisfaction, but not by more positive feelings or fewer negative feelings. She emphasised that it is more accurate to say that rising incomes in societies are accompanied by rising life satisfaction but not by more positive feelings or less negative feelings.

A number of researchers had re-analysed past data from the World Values Survey, and found that increases in GDP are associated with corresponding increases in happiness. However, Dr Ng cautioned that economic indicators alone are not sufficient to capture all the necessary information, for example, commuting time, pollution, transport infrastructure and urban planning. She stated that certain policies like zoning to enable work, shopping and housing areas to be near one another would be more beneficial to well-being than other policies like building expressways to connect to outlying housing areas.

Separately, Dr Ng also noted the strong criticism against happiness measures being subjective and inadequate for representing a nation's progress and development. She suggested that one way around this was to measure happiness with objective indicators, pointing out an example like the Human Development Index, which operationalises well-being into three main dimensions (longevity and health, access to knowledge, standard of living). She noted that besides Bhutan, the UK and France have also started to announce the inclusion of well-being and happiness measures as indicators of social and economic progress.

In closing, Dr Ng reiterated that money is important for happiness, although more so for life evaluation, and less so for positive and negative feelings. She stated that fulfilment of psychological needs like mastery of a challenging new skill can also lead to happiness. According to the Self-Determination Theory, the fulfilment of basic and universal human psychological needs leads to happiness. Overall, the global standard of evaluation is such that absolute income matters, but she believes that a combination of economic and well-being measures should be examined instead.

Open Discussion

Alternative values

The Q&A session, moderated by Mr Aaron Maniam, Director at the Institute of Policy Development, Civil Service College, began with a question pertaining to other alternative measures of happiness besides income and what steps the government can take to look into these alternative values. Dr Powdthavee pointed out that happiness has been measured simply by income because it was simple and tangible; however, academics and, increasingly, governments now realise that income is not the sole measure. Nevertheless, he noted that there was a trade-off between simplicity and alternative measures, and eventually policy-makers may have to deal with the problem of having too many measures. Dr Tambyah, on the other hand, pointed out that alternative measures of happiness do exist; for example, social relationships and the level of connectedness at which people identified with society. She stated that many self-reported data on alternative measures are available. Hence, she disagreed that any trade-offs exist.

Dr Ng added that psychological values are too fuzzy a concept to measure, but with advances in research methodologies, a set of concrete measures can be constructed. She stated that it may not be possible to include every single value; therefore, nations should focus on universal indicators, and this would allow for comparisons across countries. Mr Maniam agreed and noted that he was aware of ongoing research to develop a potentially interesting way of measuring alternative forms of values, in the form of a prototype social stock exchange. This suggested further that other dimensions that do not fall in the mould of traditional material values do exist.

Role of the government

Referring to the newspaper article that Dr Tambyah had cited in her presentation, a participant commented on the relationship pertaining to independence, personal pride and happiness. Giving a hypothetical example of a government that is hands-off and solves fewer problems for its citizens, the participant asked whether Singaporeans will be happier with such a model of government, and whether this may in fact instil a stronger sense of civic responsibility among Singaporeans. Dr Powdthavee responded that at the individual level, we often make choices that we think make us happy, that turn out to be wrong choices — the reason being cognitive biases often lead us to wrong choices. Thus, the role of government is that of a "corrector".

Dr Tambyah observed that Singaporeans have been dependent on the government for too a long time; therefore, it is hard for them to take the initiative for change. People see Singapore's government as a "Happiness Architect", and expect the government to manufacture happiness. She opined that the government has already withdrawn in certain ways, like leaving some of the social services to the VWOs, but have kept others like control of the media. Yet, she believes that we cannot have it both ways — being a free-thinking creative society and yet having

rules. The government and Singaporeans have to decide what they want. She added that if we want to be self-sufficient, we have to stand up and do it.

Commuting time, crowding and happiness

Another participant pointed out that since there have been studies on the relationship between commuting time and satisfaction, have there been any on crowding and satisfaction? Dr Powdthavee replied that it is not crowding per se, but how people project their unhappiness from commuting. A study has shown that unhappiness from commuting is larger than the money compensated from work. Over time, people adapt to their rise in income, but not to their long commuting times. Unlike a sudden surge in income, we tend to attend to our problem of commuting and crowding all the time, and this is reflected in surveys.

Dr Tambyah offered an alternative viewpoint that the main reason for crowding in Singapore is not because of the increasing number of cars, but rather the increasing number of people. She remarked that spaces in Singapore are not crowded on long weekends, when many Singaporeans are overseas. The crowding happens not only on our transportation system, but also our public places, and she does not believe that we can support a population of six million. To her, this is a people/population issue.

Policy-making considerations

A participant observed that certain policies implemented to change behaviour are creating unhappiness. For example, COE and ERP policies have successfully shifted traffic behaviour, but have also created unhappiness among commuters. This conflicts with the goal of making young Singaporeans happy. This was echoed by another participant who pointed out that most unhappy people are young Singaporeans. This is not surprising as they have just graduated and are into their first jobs, and have to think about stressful issues like money and marriage.

Dr Powdthavee explained that when policy-makers craft policies, for example, when they make car prices expensive, sometimes they do not really have other alternatives. Happiness policies are based on technical evaluations from studies, and there are no universal indicators that make every individual happy.

Education and happiness

With the many debates about PSLE reform and curriculum development, a participant observed that young students are neither happy nor engaged. Further down the road, they are not able to get jobs, and eventually experience unhappiness transitioning into the working world. Another opined that there was too much emphasis in our education system on meritocracy and academic excellence. The country should move towards a more talent-centric focus. Talents in the arts, music, entrepreneurship, community service and volunteerism should be recognised.

In response to the discussion on education, Dr Powdthavee highlighted the difference between British and Singaporean students and how their learning attitudes differ. He suggested that it could be related to meritocracy in the Singapore system. He believes that it is unsurprising as we are devaluing students who are not high-performing. To him, those who have lower performance have low chances of excelling.

Comparison across countries

A question was raised regarding happiness levels in other countries apart from Singapore. Why do some countries like Hong Kong and South Korea have lower levels of happiness? Dr Tambyah directed the audience to 2006 data that can be found in the book *The Well-being of Singaporeans*. It has comparisons between countries, including ASEAN countries. She added that the challenges are not unique, and we can look at how other countries deal with similar problems.

Session II: The Good Life — Family, Community, Work and Happiness

The Good Life — Family, Community, Work and Happiness

The first speaker was Mr Lim Soon Hock, Chairman of the National Family Council (NFC) and the Centre for Fathering. The NFC was formed in 2006 to promote resilient families. Mr Lim shared his personal thoughts with conference participants that life's "recipe for success" lay in passionately serving in one's profession, family and community. He believed that true success in life can only be underpinned by the love and fulfilment of family, and that family is the "centre of gravity" of happiness.

Citing the *World Happiness Report*, Mr Lim noted that "good mental and physical health, having someone to count on, job security, children and a stable family" were all crucial factors to happiness.[6] As Chairman of NFC, he opined that an enduring marriage and stable family life are also pertinent to the well-being of both parents and children. He challenged participants to ask what happiness meant to them, as finding happiness would depend on understanding their own individual priorities.

Mr Lim shared that he was heartened to know that young people in Singapore generally enjoyed stable and healthy ties with their families — 92 per cent of youth surveyed by the National Youth Council in 2010 felt they were appreciated by their family members while 86 per cent reported that their families enjoyed having dinner together and talking. The survey also found that 90 per cent of youths felt that parents were important in inculcating values, while 62 per cent felt the same for teachers, and 42 per cent for grandparents. This showed that family was an important foundation of social capital for the next generation. However, family life was "not a computer programme that runs on its own", noted Mr Lim, but would need continual input from its members. Quality time and consistent communication between family members was thus important.

Mr Lim concluded by noting that the NFC would like to champion key family values, which included communication, love, respect, care and commitment. These values are an important part of the eco-system and are essential for the pursuit of a higher level of happiness for individuals, families and the nation.

---

6. John Helliwell, Richard Layard and Jeffrey Sachs, *World Happiness Report* (New York: The Earth Institute, 2012).

The Happiness Quotient: Our Youth, Our Community

Madam Moliah Hashim, Chief Executive Officer of Yayasan MENDAKI, shared her thoughts on happiness in her roles as CEO of MENDAKI, a mother of four and a former educator. Citing the concept of the "happiness quotient", and the frequency with which happiness was quantified and measured, she challenged the audience to think carefully if this is the best method. Her proposition was that policy-makers should view happiness indices with caution and the information obtained from such indices should be used with care especially when designing policies to make Singaporeans happy, lest it results in the propagation of a "myth of happiness."

Mdm Moliah observed that it is common for Singaporeans to seek to quantify aspects of life, but in doing so it could have the effect of impeding a "real pursuit of happiness". She noted that much effort had been put into set up councils and committees aimed at developing an "eco-system" in which happiness could be created for Singaporeans. However, she opined that for these efforts to succeed, Singaporeans must first find a way to articulate diverse meanings of happiness in society, and the ways in which they could aspire to achieve happiness in their personal, professional and family lives.

As a former educator and school administrator, she acknowledged the efficiency of surveys as a means of measuring satisfaction. For instance, surveys could be done in schools to see if parents were happy and to assess the efficacy of the school's work. Happiness indices can be useful in the same way to inform decision-making among leaders of organisations and governments. Citing Singapore's 90th position out of 152 countries on the Happy Planet Index, she observed that such indicators could be a cause for worry as it had implications for business opportunities, investments and sustainable economic growth. At the same time, Mdm Moliah suggested that such indicators should be probed further with regard to their validity given the subjective nature of happiness; no one basket of characteristics is universal — just because Costa Rica had topped the Happy Planet Index for two years running did not mean Singaporeans would rush to migrate there.

As CEO of a self-help agency, Mdm Moliah felt that efforts to bring happiness and meet the needs of the community were no easy feat. She observed that an important part of MENDAKI's work is about empowering people to define happiness for themselves and to pursue the happiness they envision for their own lives. For instance, MENDAKI could arrange for academic intervention for families who felt their children needed it. However, she said that empowerment also had to be done in an integrated manner — by helping people find their place in society.

In closing, she asked conference participants not to be too clinical in the way they defined happiness. "Perhaps we need to learn how to embrace diversity within our community — that there may be people who define happiness differently, who would rather take a different route, who have a different level of material wealth to… be very happy", she said. She quoted a saying from the Qur'an that inspired her personally, "You live so that others can live". She challenged participants, as young Singaporeans, to think about how they could contribute to the community to make Singapore a happier place.

Open Discussion

Redefining happiness in Singapore

Associate Professor Paulin Straughan, Vice-Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and Deputy Head of the Department of Sociology, National University of Singapore, chaired the discussion. She drew attention to the speakers' contrasting approaches to happiness — happiness based on enjoying a good family life and individuals defining their own happiness, lest it be unachievable when defined by others in society. Associate Professor Straughan opined that for Singapore, it is difficult to abide by differing visions of personal happiness as it often seems that a "monolithic voice" is advocating the pursuit of a "homogenous ideal" of desirable aspirations — for instance, the encouragement of single Singaporeans to approach accredited agencies if they are not married by a certain time and the exhortation for Singaporeans to bear children. In this context, alternative voices were muted in the face of economic imperatives and material aims. A strong sense of social affirmation also accompanies those who had succeeded on a typical path to excellence by obtaining good academic grades. If this were indeed a valid concern, how might citizens take on various roles in attempting to redefine happiness according to a different set of cherished values? How could society affirm multiple "paths to excellence" by putting resources into structuring these paths?

One participant observed that what is commonly talked about as "happiness" really refers to two different feelings — one is associated with enjoyment, for example of one's favourite food or activity, while the other is qualitatively different in terms of the kind of deeper joy it produces, for example watching one's child learning to walk. He said the latter — the joy his family gives him — was something he would fight for, and that made this "happiness" distinct for him.

Dr Straughan agreed that focusing on such distinct "happinesses" *[sic]* that matter to Singaporeans as core concerns in society would help focus policy-making. Another pointed out that a focus on society's shared happiness also means recognising a "minimum happiness" that each citizen should be able to attain, and this will require a minimum level of social protection and safety nets for those who are struggling. For instance, a self-help group had noticed that its members were frustrated at the lack of health assistance provided to lower-income beneficiaries. One participant spoke up to say that it was important to him that "the whole of society grows together" and he would be willing to compromise on the rate of economic growth as a trade-off if it meant more redistribution of wealth.

Plural definitions of happiness need not be divisions

On the topic of how unhappiness seemed very prevalent in Singapore, one panellist felt that the high level of complaints among Singaporeans was a disturbing phenomenon, as some of the "unhappiness" expressed was unreasonable and had led to much stress and angst. As a follow-up to the above observation, a participant disagreed with the idea that societal discourse should always be harmonious. He quoted Member of Parliament Mr Chen Show Mao's recent comment in Parliament,

which he agreed with: "Differences are not divisions — it is the intolerance of differences that will be divisive." The participant felt that the starting point of any discussion on happiness and aspirations should be an acceptance that a consensus may not exist, but that Singaporeans should celebrate a diversity of views. A more plural method of societal discourse would surely provide a reassuring backdrop for Singaporeans to find their own personal happiness. For Singaporeans who may harbour aspirations and hopes of achieving and defining non-mainstream means of happiness, he believes that their apprehension towards any kind of national conversation stemmed from a fear that a false consensus would be reached, which would then impose a majority consensus on the minority in Singapore. Perhaps a new view of finding consensus is not to perceive complaints or contestation, or divisions in society as a bad thing.

Redefining "family" in policy-making

The idea of what constitutes family and the possible need to redefine this pertinent institution was another point raised by another participant. While family is often attributed as a basis for happiness, family-friendly policies serving to encourage couples to start families should be reconsidered because singles at the work place would simultaneously have to bear the brunt of covering work duties of their married colleagues when the latter are on child leave, and have to take care of their own family members without similar leave allowances. The expansion of the definition of family was also suggested: everyone ought to be entitled to a leave allowance enabling them to take care of their family members. Single mothers must also be taken into consideration. However, at the moment, "family" is too narrowly defined and incentivised in a way that marginalises singles and those with non-traditional families.

Addressing young Singaporeans' aspirations to build families

The dissonance between young people's aspirations towards building a family and the circumstances that make it difficult was raised during the session. One participant recounted that as Mr Lim's presentation had highlighted, 96 per cent of youth respondents in the 2010 National Youth Council Survey reported they prioritised their family whereas 65 per cent reported they prioritised their career. This suggested that young people in Singapore wished to form families of their own, but in reality there was a huge divergence between such desires and actual action. Many felt the means and circumstances to do so were lacking, as they worried about being able to afford housing and educational expenses for their children. Even with Built-to-Order (BTO) flats becoming more affordable, the long waiting time of three years is a disincentive to young people wanting to get married and start families, as living with their parents would crowd the family home. In fact, the participant noted that even among those earning above the income ceiling for HDB flats, the immediate reaction to the idea of having children was, "we cannot afford it". How then was the National Family Council thinking of addressing such issues and concerns?

Mr Lim responded by saying that many of these concerns have been festering over the last few years. It was indeed unfortunate that many of the government's family-friendly policies, such as Marriage and Parenthood Package measures have not achieved the result of increasing Singapore's total fertility rate. While some

incentives worked for a while, their effectiveness eventually tapered off, and now new recommendations are being made. Two revolutionary approaches suggested by the NFC included increasing the supply of rental flats to families waiting for their BTO flats to be completed, since access to an independent home was identified as an important factor. The second was to establish a family charter that ensures all national policies are reviewed for their impact on families before their introduction.

More robust social safety nets to support families

As a final comment, Mdm Moliah believed that such policies, while incremental, had not been robust enough to encourage the changes Singaporeans would like to see. As one participant had mentioned, one concern that young prospective parents had was over the level of support rendered to families and children who were not in the "mainstream" — this could include special needs children who do not strictly qualify for subsidies. Young people may not feel assured that structures and resources would be available to support them, if and when they needed help. After all, Singaporeans had been taught to "always depend on ourselves" and not on the government. To address these concerns, stronger social safety nets would be important.

Session III: Happy Place — Happiness, Liveability and Creativity

Chairperson Dr Chang Jiat Hwee, Assistant Professor, Department of Architecture, National University of Singapore, began the panel presentations by observing that the conference began with how happiness could be related to GDP and national growth, but ended with presentations on how this perspective could be critiqued and dismantled, allowing for a discussion on how happiness could be thought of in other ways. He grounded the discussion on how the physical environment could contribute and shape the well-being and level of happiness of the people living in it.

Happiness — As Simple As ABC

Mr Tay Lai Hock, Founder and President, Ground-Up Initiative (GUI), through his own personal experiences, spoke on how communities can be better connected with nature. He was inspired by Leo Tolstoy's quote: "One of the first conditions of happiness is that the link between man and nature should not be broken." Fifteen years ago, after leaving a six-figure salary job, he spent four years travelling in 35 countries and realised that upon coming back to Singapore, he could not live his life as he had previously.

Citing the Happiness Index, which currently ranks Singapore in 90th position, he observed the indicators utilised: i) well-being, ii) life expectancy and iii) ecological footprint, and realised that Singapore needed improvement on the third indicator. Even though he was neither an engineer nor an architect, he started GUI in 2008, and from an initial plot of 100sqm in the Bottle Tree Park given by businessmen, it is now a 1,200sqm compound built from more than 90% recyclable materials. Since no funding or handouts were given, the GUI community had to be creative. He mentioned three essential components for the success of GUI — hardware in the form of a physical space to come together, and software in the form of activities and programmes that would bring people together. The last component of heartware; was his dream of building a model for sustainable living.

Apathy was one root consequence of urbanised living that he hoped to change among Singaporeans through starting GUI. Thus, the autonomy of decision-making and the building of the hardware of GUI were given to volunteers who were interested in growing the community.

The software portion in the form of activities such as "Balik Kampung", which educates the public through the various stages of farming, also enables the growth of a heterogeneous community across variables such as class, nationality, education and age. Both the hardware and software work together to nurture organic creativity, attracting talented engineers, craftsmen and others scouted by organisations such as NASA and Google to start their own ventures as part of the GUI team. The GUI team has seen the creation of innovations such as the iBam — portable speakers made from bamboo. Autonomy and ownership — through ventures such as the innovation lab and urban farming that have led to other spin-off projects — is what he calls the essence of the 21st century "kampung" culture.

Mr Tay also pointed out that GUI has especially reached out to the Generation Y demographic: those born after 1980. He feels that they are increasingly frustrated at their inability to see change created by them in Singapore. Thus, having ownership by playing a part on deciding how GUI's goal of sustainable living serves to create a culture that is not just creative, but inclusive.

Mr Tay believes living creatively is about "looking into the minute particulars involving more and more individuals daring to create their own lives, daring to create their own art, daring to listen to their voices within their deepest original nature, and deeper still, the voice within the earth". To inspire people means to first provide a beautiful environment not confined within a concrete space, but one that involves nature in its unruly natural form.

Finally, he noted that happiness to him is about "ABC" — "a beautiful connection". Backpacking has taught him that the essentials in life can be contained in an 80-litre backpack, and anything else can be given up. Letting go is an on-going process. This is because trade-offs are part and parcel of life and one must come to terms with it in order to truly achieve happiness.

Create, Resist and Connect

Mr Huzir Sulaiman, Creative Director, Studio Wong Huzir, spoke in his capacity as a playwright, writer/publisher and director contributing to the public life and civil society in Singapore. He also indicated that though he was not a citizen, he was a permanent resident who was concerned about Singapore. He asked the young Singaporeans to continually "create, resist and lastly, connect." However, he noted that this was "not a direct path to happiness but to embracing life in its immeasurable messiness, in its fertility borne from conflict and in its endless merging of kindred spirits". This has also been a path on which he has tried to embark on.

On creating, Mr Huzir noted that the core of creation is utility, or the lack thereof. In Singapore, where all worthwhile activities are thought of as measurable in a quantitative way, there is an inability to measure things which are important to the soul — such as friendship, love, charm, wit, grace, honour and so on. While it is impractical to stop the measurement of things, he urged for the understanding that some things cannot be measured, and that those things can be far more important than the things that can be.

"Create" in this sense did not mean engaging in the arts or creative industries, but "to consider as art, all those things that do not have a direct use but lend meaning to one's life". In this sense, there is no point extolling the economic benefits of creativity, since that would have lost the point of creativity. He pointed out arts, sexual love and religion as things that provide immense comfort to man and are glories of civilisation, which should not be reduced to logic or key performance indicators (KPIs). Since the success of creating something is always subjective, one might not know that he or she has succeeded, which can be a lonely process if one needs external validation. To counter this, one must accept that creation is a game with no clear rules, and only then can creation bring happiness.

The second point — that of creating to resist, is this: Conflict must be accepted as an inevitable part of life. Mr Huzir noted that Singaporeans are adverse to conflict, since social order and cohesion are valued. Though not a bad thing in itself, Singaporeans seem to be "simmering with anger" beneath the façade of little or no open hostility. He felt that life is about open conflict and debate, constant negotiation and resistance, which is both necessary and healthy. If one can acknowledge that life is messy, it can also paradoxically lead to less anger, but to disallow robust and open conflict will only cause more distress when problematic issues occur. This requires inoculation to "toughen ourselves up" that requires careful listening and engagement. His question then was this: Had open dissent not been avoided but encouraged, would the state be so rattled by it? He encouraged the multitude of viewpoints so that people would be able to discern for themselves. Discernment is "a muscle that needs to be trained". Additionally, criticism is in fact constructive because it results in self-reflection.

Resistance also leads to, the final point, connecting to others. It is important to listen, as well as be heard. He noted that Singaporeans in general do not seem interested in other people. The curiosity for another person seems to last "only as long as it was needed to judge and classify another" based on educational

background, personal success, socio-economic status and ideology. In this way, connecting with others seems to only be for instrumental reasons. He attributed this to urbanisation, the wish not to stand out from others too starkly in case they are seen as weird or controversial. Mr Huzir espoused that it is only by focusing on another, that one's own life can be better illuminated. Thus, it was important to make a human connection and acknowledge each other's humanity in order to make Singapore a better place to live.

To conclude, he pushed for the idea that one should not be shackled by what can be measured. One should create so as to bring meaning into one's life and "enjoy the drama of human conflict". Resisting and encouraging resistance was also important. Lastly, by listening to one another, it will then be possible to connect and embrace the complexities of life — which would bring one closer to attaining happiness.

Open Discussion

Creativity

A participant asked Mr Tay that if he could transfer the idea of GUI to the whole of Singapore, what changes would he want to see in the physical landscape. Mr Tay replied that he was doing what Mr Huzir had shared — that of creating. He shared that he hoped the land that GUI was on would turn into an actual university for learning how to live sustainably. He also spoke of how GUI tries to equip Singaporeans with a sense of resilience by providing an environment that one can fail in, and yet try again, as well as one where people can engage in open debate on any issue. Though GUI seems to lack a structure or rules, it still functions well.

A question directed to Mr Huzir asked about the stagnation of the creative industry in Singapore — if there was insufficient demand or the inability to reach out to the international market or if people did not want to enter the industry based on future prospects. In response, he shared the creative industry was in a good place currently, and that there was potential talent that could be nurtured. However, he felt that certain structural barriers had to be removed first, such as space and cost restrictions that budding creatives simply could not afford. He saw arts housing schemes as a step towards the right direction, but believe it was not enough. Berlin was a good example of what could be done, he mentioned, with a laissez-faire attitude towards the use of creative spaces as well as cheap rent. He also felt that the arts, as an emotional transaction or exchange, did not need to be measured by quantity or ticket sales. Mr Tay added that it was because of government handouts that people were not being forced to be creative, because they were not placed in a realistic environment where they could be challenged.

Practical applications for creating, bonding and nurturing happiness

One participant asked Mr Tay how he would translate the concept of a kampung spirit and sustainable living into a workplace and the office, and asked Mr Huzir if he could suggest practical applications of his three points on living in the workplace to better connect with others. Mr Tay suggested cooking together and having cooking parties instead of bringing food in, he opined that a small action like that could change the dynamics of the workplace that might imbue the kampung spirit. He added that it was about sincerity and warmness, which can be felt by people. Mr Huzir suggested creating and measuring the "right thing" at the workplace — at the team level, it would mean looking at each individual and asking what is important to someone that is not currently related to the job, e.g., things like work-life balance. Both individual and group contributions in coming up with indicators of success, coupled with institutional willpower, can make changes in the workplace possible. Resistance can also mean creating policies, e.g., hiring policies that are more accepting of diversity as well as rewarding risk-taking behaviour.

On allowing a "free space" in society

Another participant asked how Mr Huzir saw free discussion taking place in a society where race and religion are still flash points, to which he replied that the United States is an interesting case study, where there are constitutional safeguards

on free speech, but also where the criminalisation of hate speech is complemented by effective policing. He felt that inoculation is necessary in acquainting people with a diversity of views in order for them to access situations thoroughly. He also felt that it is time to stop bringing up the past racial riots in Singapore as a certainty in the future when racial or religious issues were being debated.

A participant commented that there was a common theme of space — not just of physical space but mental space in order to have the kind of creativity that both speakers had discussed earlier. If mental space could be worked on in some way, then the problem of physical space could also be easier to deal with. Another participant chimed in to ask what the model space for Singaporeans could be for one to live and be creative. Mr Huzir replied that model space did not mean public housing sizes, but that of public space. Historically, creativity has been borne out of public spaces that have been liberalised, deregulated and where barriers to organic flourishing of ideas are diminished. Naturally occurring bohemia can only occur when structural obstacles are removed.

Mr Tay added on that humans needed space not just for economic growth, but also for social growth. He agreed that Singapore had become too sanitised, and GUI is the antithesis. Mr Huzir also noted that because of the rooted use of social media in the current younger generations, human interaction has also been lacking in quality — childhood and friendship currently is very different. If people could not talk, how were they supposed to convince anybody of anything, be it to woo someone, or to form a friendship? His answer was that Singaporeans needed to connect first above all else.

Challenges for the next generation

Mr Huzir was asked on his views regarding the type of the political leadership in the future for the generation that attended YSC 2012 and what he thought would be the risks and challenges for the leaders of that future generation. He felt that his worry was that the next generation would not have the ability or be emotionally ready to deal with any form of resistance that might occur. Secondly, they might not be disposed to the fact that there will always be a multitude of views, which demands a certain level of toughness,

In addition, another participant asked what could be done for the increasingly "me-first" generation that he saw today. Mr Huzir replied that co-operative behaviour should be rewarded, since one can only learn about one's self when focusing on others. People can take ownership of their own space through service learning. Japan and Finland both utilise service learning, which helps in the bonding process, e.g., students maintaining their own school grounds, is a good example of how the younger generation takes ownership of their immediate surroundings.

He noted that National Service inculcates moral lessons on teamwork and learning to connect with people from different classes, which is equally beneficial.

*****

This report was prepared by IPS Research Assistants Rachel Hui, Danielle Hong and Zhou Rongchen.

Programme

Wednesday, 26 September 2012

8:30 am – 9:00 am	**Registration**

9:00 am – 9:10 am   **Welcome Remarks**
Mr Janadas Devan
Director
Institute of Policy Studies

9:10 am – 9:20 am   **Overview of YSC 2012**
Dr Kang Soon Hock
Research Fellow
Institute of Policy Studies

9:20 am – 11:20 am   **Session I**
Money is (Really) Not Everything?

Chairperson
Mr Aaron Maniam
Director
Institute of Policy Development
Civil Service College

Speakers
Dr Nattavudh Powdthavee
Principal Research Fellow
Centre for Economic Performance
The London School of Economics
and
Professorial Research Fellow
The Melbourne Institute of Applied Economics and Social Research
University of Melbourne

Dr Tambyah Siok Kuan
Senior Lecturer
NUS Business School
National University of Singapore

Dr Ng Wei Ting
Senior Lecturer
Psychology Programme, School of Arts & Social Sciences
SIM University

Question and Answer Session

11:20 am – 11:35 am	**Tea Break**
11:35 am – 1:15 pm	**Session II** The Good Life — Family, Community, Work and Happiness

Chairperson
Associate Professor Paulin Straughan
Vice-Dean, Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences
and
Deputy Head, Department of Sociology
National University of Singapore

Speakers
Mr Lim Soon Hock
Chairman
National Family Council

Madam Moliah Hashim
Chief Executive Officer
Yayasan MENDAKI

Question and Answer Session

1:15 pm – 2:10 pm	**Lunch**
2:10 pm – 3:50 pm	**Session III** Happy Place — Happiness, Liveability, and Creativity

Chairperson
Dr Chang Jiat Hwee
Assistant Professor, Department of Architecture
School of Design and Environment
National University of Singapore

Speakers
Mr Tay Lai Hock
Founder and President
Ground-Up Initiative

Mr Huzir Sulaiman
Creative Director
Studio Wong Huzir

Question and Answer Session

3:50 pm – 6:00 pm	**Session IV** Group Discussions
6:00 pm – 6:45 pm	**Break**
6:45 pm – 7:00 pm	**Cocktail**
7:00 pm – 8:00 pm	**Dinner**
8:00 pm – 9:00 pm	**Session V** Dialogue with Mr Heng Swee Keat Minister for Education

APPENDIX

Report on Anonymous Collaborative Mind Mapping Exercise on Happiness
Chiang Wai Fong
Research Fellow, Institute of Policy Studies

I.   Introduction

The Young Singaporeans Conference was held on 26 September 2012 with the theme "Are Young Singaporeans Happy?". A total of 80 young Singaporeans from 25 to 35 years old representing diverse sectors of the Singapore society were invited to attend the conference. During the full-day conference, participants were asked to put down their thoughts on "What is Happiness to you?" onto a mind map[7] using keywords. The activity served two objectives: first, as an effort of anonymous collaboration to brainstorm on the contents of happiness that young Singaporeans are looking for; and second, to encourage participants to think about the theme in their personal capacity while attending the conference.

In the happiness mind map that was given to participants during the conference, a main branch with the keyword "Self" and one of its child branches with the keyword "Achievements" were provided to kick-start the mind-mapping process. Participants were free to make changes to these two keywords. Forty-one completed Happiness mind maps were collected at the end of the conference. Responses from these mind maps were sorted onto a new collaborative mind map that gives an overview of what young Singaporeans want for their own happiness. This report shares some of the findings from the overview mind map.

II. Findings

1. Overview of Young Singaporeans' Happiness Expectations

When collating inputs from the completed mind maps, similar keywords were sorted together. For example, "Work", "Work place" and "Career" were grouped under "Work".

---

7. First introduced by British psychologist Tony Buzan, a Mind Map is a thought or information organisation technique using visual diagram. It is often created using keywords, images, colour, icons and connecting branches and lines, with a central node/idea and major categories radiating from it. Contrasting it from the traditional linear style of notes presentation, mind-mapping encourages associative thinking and allows users to visualise information relations in a radially integrated, instead of linearly fragmented, picture.

In total, participants contributed seven first-level main branches to the Happiness mind map: Self, Family, Work, Community, Society, Nation and Environment. The following table shows the number of participants who used these keywords to name their first-level main branches as well as the number of keywords contributed under each main branch:

Table 1. First-level main branch of the happiness mind map

	Number of participants using the same keyword for their main branches	Number of keywords under each branch
SELF	37	72
FAMILY (incl. home)	29	35
WORK (incl. work place, career)	14	37
COMMUNITY	10	20
SOCIETY (incl. social)	9	30
NATION (incl. country)	6	23
ENVIRONMENT	1	13

The table above clearly shows that participants who completed the mind maps put the greatest emphases on "self" and "family" when thinking about their own happiness. Over 90% of the respondents regarded the "self" as an important component of their happiness, while about 70% considered "family" important too. Only 34% placed equal emphasis to their work or career, while only one respondent considered the "environment" as an important factor for his or her personal happiness.

The findings also show that respondents had the most things to say about how to make the self happy. A total of 72 keywords were generated for that branch and its child branches. On the contrary, looking at the number of keywords alone, there were not as many things that the respondents expected from the environment or the nation to make them happy. The follow sections discuss the contents of these branches in greater details.

2. The Contents of Happiness

There were seven key components to the "self" branch that determine happiness for young Singaporeans, they are "Hopes", "Aspirations", "Achievements", "Values", "Friendship", "Learning/Studies" and "Leisure". Materialistic wants did not feature prominently in this mind map, the only two related items listed in this category were monetary freedom and being able to afford housing and private transport. The majority of keywords are non-material, focusing on hopes and aspirations like developing talent, pursuing dreams, acquiring useful skills, living a meaningful life, and acquiring spiritual well-being. There are also demands for personal growth in terms of life-long learning and embodying good values like honesty, humility, self-determination, and passionate as well as being honourable, useful and compassionate.

3. Valuing Values

"Values" featured prominently in the Happiness mind map for young Singaporeans. Besides values for the Self as mentioned in the section above, respondents also listed various values under the main branches of Family, Nation, Society and Work. Having a sense of identity for the nation is considered a "value" by some respondents that would eventually make them happy. With regard to society, respondents emphasises on values like resilience, freedom and agency for one to live happily in it. As for the work place, there must be passion, respect and recognition of talent and skill to make a young Singaporean happy.

Besides listing the values that would make one happy, respondents also identified existing values to be reviewed. One respondent pointed out the necessity to review "elitism" in the Singapore society, while another called for a redefinition of family values.

4. Freedom

Another keyword that was featured prominently was "Freedom". The term appeared under the branches of Self, Family, Society and Work. The content for freedom converges for the branches of Self and Family with both alluding to financial and monetary freedom. Whereas at the Society branch, several young Singaporeans confessed that freedom for creativity and freedom as a societal value would potentially make them happy. In addition, freedom at work that translates to having the flexibility to balance or pursue different lifestyles is also an important consideration for happiness.

5. Diversity

Diversity was mentioned in several branches. At the Self level, some respondents considered acquiring diverse skill sets as personal achievement that would make them happy. Similarly, being able to accumulate diverse working experiences is seen

as a positive impetus for happiness. In addition, young Singaporeans revealed that part of being happy is to see a more diverse Singapore society as well as to have the assurance that the diversity is being recognised.

Respondents also expressed the desire to see the country being governed in ways that promote the embracement of diversities as well as showcase the willingness to deal with messiness.

III. Discussion and Conclusion

This anonymous collaboration exercise to find out what happiness meant to young Singaporeans elicited several dimensions. The overall picture is encouraging in the sense that young Singaporeans at the conference are relatively clear about what they want in order to be happy. The happiness contents are generally realistic, and they reflect mature thinking and passionate aspirations.

There is also an eagerness to engage the community and society at large for bonding, giving and shared ownership. The desire to look beyond economic achievements for the nation, job scope KPIs for career satisfaction, and material attainment for personal success and growth, shows that young Singaporeans are prepared for a paradigm shift in development management. On the other hand, this paradigm shift could be propelled further with greater fervour if more voices are heard championing for environmental issues, including global climate, food nutrition, air quality and human relationship with nature.

Findings of this exercise will be useful for policy-makers in understanding what young Singaporeans of today want for happiness, and also to review and fine-tune relevant policies, governance ideologies and management strategies.