Elections, Prediction, and Voting Behavior in Taiwan

Eric Chen-hua Yu
Election Study Center & Department of Political Science
National Chengchi University, Taiwan
Outline

◆ Early Development
  ■ Election and Democratization Process

◆ Basis of Electoral Competition
  ■ Factional politics
  ■ Party organization

◆ Recent Development
  ■ Dynamic of party competition
  ■ New Institution
  ■ Maturing electoral politics?
Early Development
Early History of Taiwan’s Election

◆ 1935/11: first Taiwan local election in the Japanese colonial era
  - 10 county/city level; 260 street district level
  - Half seats by elections, the other half designated by the governor
  - Lots of limitations
    - Age
    - Male
    - Property: $5 tax
  - Total population: 4M
  - Eligible Voters: 2.8K
Development of Political Participation

◆ 1950: Local Elections
  ■ Limited competition
◆ 1972: Legislative Yuan (Partial)
◆ 1992: Legislative Yuan
◆ 1994: Taiwan Province (Governor), Taipei and Kaohsiung Mayors
◆ 1996: President
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Taiwan’s Political Development

1950s Chian Kai-shek leadership
- Concern about the legitimacy of the state
- 228 incident in 1947

Ethnic Cleavage
- Mainlander
- Native Taiwanese
  - Minnan
  - Hakka
- Aboriginal
Democratization in Taiwan

- **Factors forced Democratization**
  - Popular election
  - Organized contests

- **Early stage: KMT and local elections**
  - Mobilize Taiwanese support for the mainlander regime
    - factions
    - Patron-client relations
  - Co-opt local elites
  - One-party domination
    - Lei Chen
Changing Environment in the 1970s

- Lost UN seat in 1971
- Nixon’s journey to China
- KMT’s response
  - Limited Competitive National Elections
    - Supplementary seats in the Legislative Yuan in 1972
    - Generation Effect: growing middle class born in Taiwan
  - Indigenization
Starting the Transition

- 1983 Tangwai (non-KMT)
  - Tangwai Candidates Campaign Committee

- Interparty competition
  - 1986 DPP was born
  - 1987 lifted of martial law
Political Variables for Transition

◆ Indigenization of the KMT
  ■ 1970-80
  ■ Lee Teng-huei
  ■ Control the party, military, and the government
  ■ Battle between Taiwanese and Mainlander
Political Variables for Transition

◆ DPP’s Effort
  ■ Radicals vs. Moderates
  ■ KMT gradually offered rooms for competition.

◆ DPP becomes a electoral machine?
  ■ All-purpose party in the 1990s?
    ■ Anti-corruption
    ■ Taiwan Independence
    ■ Political reform
    ■ Social justice
Political Variables for Transition

◆ Multi-party system
  - New Party—3rd force
    - Different issue dimensions
    - Alliance based on issues
    - Early 1990s—emerging cross-cutting issues

◆ Money and Politics
  - Monopolistic economic incentive
  - Special loans
  - Public contract
  - Land speculation and zoning

◆ Legislative Yuan
  - Domination of executive power
  - Develop stronger legislative power

◆ Cross-strait relations
Political Values in Taiwan

◆ Confusion Norm
  ■ Deference, tolerance, outspokenness in public setting

◆ Changes of attitudes in modernization process

◆ Structural vs. attitude changes
  ■ By structure: social economic variables
    ■ Age, ethnicity, education, occupation
  ■ By attitude: liberal and western concepts

◆ Both changed over the transition period (80-early 90)
Adoption of the KMT

◆ Kinds of adoption
  ▪ Efficiency
    ▪ Party goal
  ▪ Responsiveness to external pressures

◆ Hirschman’s feedback model
  ▪ Exit
  ▪ Voice
  ▪ Loyalty

◆ So the KMT managed to change on the basis of the feedback model, given different party goals
Different periods

◆ **1950s**
  - Compete against the CCP to retake China
  - Consolidate its rule in Taiwan
  - Opportunities for exit and voice were tightly controlled

◆ **Chiang Ching-Kuo**
  - Immediate concern and reputation
  - Changing international environment
    - Organizational and personnel changes to consolidate his base
      - Youth commission
      - Focus on elections

◆ **Taiwanization**
  - Efficiency: better personnel
  - Responsiveness: local demand
Basics of Electoral Competition
Taiwan’s Electoral Competition:
Faction as a starting point

**Faction:**
- Personal network (Chen 1995)
  - Dual relationship
- To obtain or allocate public or semi-public resource
- Voluntary accord/contract
- Obligation for exchange (Land’e 1977)
Characteristics of factions

- Non-destructive
- No confrontation
- Defensive
- Balance
- Non-ideology
- Rent-seeking
- Zero-sum game
Impact of political factions

◆ Corruption
  ■ Money politics
  ■ Joseph Fewsmith (1986)
    ■ Institutionalize corruption: use government position to obtain long-term interests

◆ Deadlock of policy
  ■ Result of zero-sum game
  ■ Final judge

◆ Weak in solving political crisis
  ■ How to become a legitimate “agent”
Development of factions in Taiwan

- **Dominated by the central government**
  - Chiag Ching-kao as the head

- **Patterns of development**
  - Limit scope
    - No challenge to the central government
  - Balance
    - At least two factions in a locality
  - Economic Incentive
  - Gradual replacement
    - Use

- **No vertical linkage**
  - County and village level
  - Lin Yang-kan vs. Lee Teng-huei
Faction’s power base

◆ Ability to mobilize voters
  ■ Substantial
    ■ Vote-buying
  ■ network
    ■ Relatives, neighbors....

◆ KMT’s primary system
  ■ Use party officials to replace faction leaders in the early 1990
KMT’s strategy for local elections in the past

◆ Multiple mobilization tools
  ■ Head quarter: factions
  ■ Party organization: members
  ■ Social mobilization: network

◆ How to mobilize
  ■ From top to down
  ■ Organization

◆ Vote Captain (樁腳)
  ■ Vote-buying system
  ■ Information: bottom-up
  ■ Resources: top-down
Faction and Mafia

◆ Mafia in Election
  ■ Social type
    ■ Intimidate, blackmail
    ■ In metropolitan area
  ■ Economic type
    ■ Electioneering, vote-buying, consolidate vote captain
    ■ In metropolitan area
  ■ Political type
    ■ Direct participation
    ■ In village

◆ Mafia and faction
  ■ Business relationship
  ■ Recognition, trust, friendship

◆ Mafia and faction are electable?
  ■ Depends on level of elections
  ■ Depends on party label
Do you know any local factions in Taichung?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Prop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you, your family members, relatives, friends or neighbors have ever known anyone who belongs to local factions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Prop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Personal experience</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Family and relatives</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Heard of who belongs to local factions</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Known by media report</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent do you think local factions influence this election?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>item</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Prop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very common</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Common</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not common</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not very common</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent do you think Mafia influence this election?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Freq</th>
<th>Prop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very serious</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not serious</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not very serious</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Electoral mobilization—party

- **Party branch**
  - Especially for the KMT
  - Leninist party organization

- **The most effective mobilization: military, veterans**
  - Special party branch：veterans branch (黃復興黨部) as province level branch
    - Village for veterans
    - Mainlander
    - Up to 2009: about 200K (but can influence 2.5M)

- **Why did they vote as a bloc?**
  - Context: special candidate
  - Network: military ranks
  - Concept of responsible area: based on personal relationship
Ex: Huang Fu-hsin party branch

◆ Organization
  ■ County branch
    ■ Area, precinct level
      ■ Organizations related to Veterans Affairs Commission

◆ Characteristics
  ■ Mainlander, military family
  ■ Highly concentration
  ■ Village autonomy committee (or council)
    ■ Social network (but not all villagers belong to the party branch)
    ■ Personal persuasion
  ■ Low mobilization
  ■ High turnout
  ■ Highly stable
Operation of the Huang branch

◆ SNTV
  ■ Large number of seats
  ■ Small district (geographical)
    ■ Easy to concentrate
  ■ Evaluate possible candidate nominated by the party branch first
  ■ If not possible, then delegate the power to the party branch
  ■ Responsible area

◆ Ideology destroys organization?
  ■ The emergence of New Party in the 1990s
Election and Marketing

◆ Election strategy
  ■ District characteristics
  ■ Candidate characteristics
  ■ Demographic variables in the district, campaign resource
◆ Type of electoral competition
  ■ nature
    ■ Ideological cleavage
    ■ Coalition building
  ■ operation
    ■ advertising
    ■ organization
◆ election and marketing strategy
  ■ Relative advantage
    ■ issue ownership
  ■ First party defense, second party offense, third party guerrilla warfare
Campaign Strategy

◆ Negative Campaign
◆ Vote Buying
◆ Professional campaign
Make it Emotional...
**Coalition campaign, equal distribution**
- Party is more important than candidate
- Loyalty to the party

**Four season (四季紅配票)—1995 Taipei South district**
- Seats: 9, DPP has 30% of vote share
- Unified campaign: nominate 4 candidates
- Too much difference—difficult to distribute vote share 沈富雄、葉菊蘭、顏錦福、黃天福
- Use birthday
  - Difficult to implement
- Still use responsible area
  - 沈富雄 Shen obtained too many votes across area
New Party in 1995—Taipei county, Taipei city, and Taoyuan county
- Taipei county has 5 responsible areas: 周筌、傅崑成、蔡正揚、楊世雄、張馥堂
- Not allow to campaign across areas
- But difficult to control personal network
- Different candidate popularity

Factors that affect vote allocation
- Candidate factor
- Number of nomination
- Candidate geographical strength
- Campaign strategy: unified campaign?
- Supporters’ level of education
Recent Development
Since 1992, every year Taiwan has at least one election except in 1997, 2003, and 2007.

- Presidential elections: 5 times
- Legislative Yuan elections: 7 times
- Mayoral elections in major cities: 5 times
- Local (county magistrate) elections: 5 times

A total of 22 elections over the past 20 years
Impacts of Elections

• Elections shape Taiwan’s Democratic Development
  - Party system
    - KMT’s splitters in mid-1990s and 2000
  - Political cleavage
    - From ethnic identity to National identity
  - Government system
    - Divided government under Chen Shui-bian

• Importance of elections
  - Relatively high turnout
  - Always unpredictable
Did elections matter?
A viewpoint from the general public

◆ Broad Pictures of Taiwan’s public opinion
  ■ Partisanship
  ■ National identity
  ■ Cross-strait relations

◆ Change of electoral institution
  ■ Legislative Yuan elections
  ■ Perception about the new electoral system

◆ Perception about presidential election

◆ Key to win elections
  ■ Performance matter
Partisanship has been shaped by presidential elections.
National Identity

Changes in the Taiwanese/Chinese Identity of Taiwanese as Tracked in Surveys by the Election Study Center, NCCU (1992~2011.12)

Increasing Trend of Taiwanese all the time!!
Cross-Strait Relations

Changes in the Unification - Independence Stances of Taiwanese as Tracked in Surveys by Election Study Center, NCCU (1994～2011.12)

- Increasing trend of SQ
- No market for Unification
In the past decade, the two major parties have competed against each other while following the trends of public opinion. Yet, the two parties have different concerns:

- Sorting effects
  - KMT: maintain the SQ
  - DPP: Taiwanese identity

Recent important Issues

- Economic Development
  - 11.7% in 2008

- Cross-strait relations
  - 10.8% in 2008

- Political stability
  - 8.8% in 2008
New Electoral System for the Legislative Yuan

Electoral Reform

- New Electoral System for the Legislative Yuan (parliamentary) elections since 2008.
  - From SNTV (Single-Non Transferable Vote) system to mixed single member district (SMD) with proportional representation based on national party votes (i.e., MMM: Mixed-Member Majoritarian system).
  - Voters caste two ballots: one for district candidate and the other for PR party list
  - Number of seats: from 225 to 113 Seats
    - SMD: 73
    - PR: 34
    - Aboriginal districts: 6 seats for 2 multiple member districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KMT: 81 (district: 61)</td>
<td>KMT: 64 (district: 44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPP: 27 (district: 13)</td>
<td>DPP: 40 (district: 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFP: 1</td>
<td>PFP: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-partisan Solidarity Union: 3</td>
<td>Non-partisan Solidarity Union: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-partisan: 1</td>
<td>Non-partisan: 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two Party System in Legislative Yuan?

**Toward two party system?**
- PFP and TSU successfully gained seats in the 2012 election.
- Both parties become significant minor parties as their party caucuses are able to join in the negotiation phase of the law-making process.

**The current electoral system is in favor of major parties.**

### Effective Numbers of Parties in Legislative Yuan (Laakso & Taagepera 1979)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Electoral Rule</th>
<th>Effect # of Parties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Single Non-Transferable Vote System</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Single Non-Transferable Vote System</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Single Non-Transferable Vote System</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Mixed-Member Majoritarian system</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Mixed-Member Majoritarian system</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Mixed-Member Majoritarian system</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Mixed-Member Majoritarian system</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does the electoral rule make the difference?

◆ Under SNTV
  ■ Party may nominate multiple candidates in a single mid-/large-size district
  ■ Intraparty competition may become more severe than interparty competition
  ■ From a party’s perspective: need to nominate the “right” number of candidates

◆ Under MMM in which the majority of the seats are determined by SMD (73 out of the total 113 seats)
  ■ No way for a party to nominate multiple candidates
  ■ From a party’s perspective: need to nominate the “right” candidate
  ■ Facilitate inter-party competition
### Perception: New Electoral System

#### Comparing the new electoral system with the old one, is it easier or harder to elect your ideal candidate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>much easier</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a little easier</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about the same</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a little harder</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much harder</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comparing the new electoral system with the old one, does it decrease or increase divisions in our society?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>decrease a lot</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decrease a little</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about the same</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase a little</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase a lot</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Perception: New Electoral System II

#### Comparing the new electoral system with the old one, does it decrease or increase vote buying?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>decrease a lot</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decrease a little</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about the same</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase a little</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase a lot</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Size</strong></td>
<td><strong>1240</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comparing the new electoral system with the old one, does it decrease or increase people's willingness to vote?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>decrease a lot</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decrease a little</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about the same</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase a little</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase a lot</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample Size</strong></td>
<td><strong>1240</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Perception: New Electoral System III

Comparing the new electoral system with the old one, is it better or worse for Taiwan's future democratic development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>much better</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a little better</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about the same</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a little worse</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much worse</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the new electoral system with the old one, is the quality of the elected legislators higher or lower?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>much higher</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a little higher</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about the same</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a little lower</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much lower</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>1240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pros and cons of the new electoral system

◆ Pros
  ■ Less “extreme” candidates
  ■ Relatively difficult for vote-buying

◆ Cons
  ■ Focused on nurturing the district
  ■ Small parties barely survived

◆ Major parties become electoral machine?
  ■ Ex: same candidate nomination system by adopting polling primary
    ■ only care about competitiveness
      ■ Electability
      ■ Conflict resolution
Presidential Election on Major Cleavages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you think this presidential election helped to promote ethnic harmony, intensify ethnic conflict, or did it not have any influence in this area?</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoted ethnic harmony</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensified ethnic conflict</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No influence in this area</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you think this presidential election strengthened the popular consciousness for Taiwan independence, strengthened the popular consciousness for Chinese unification, or did it not have any influence in this area?</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened Taiwan independence</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened Chinese unification</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No influence in this area</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both were strengthened</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Presidential Election on Democracy and Stability

**Do you think this presidential election improved democracy in Taiwan, damaged democracy in Taiwan, or did it not have any influence in this area?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>improved democracy</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>damaged democracy</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no influence in this area</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do you think this presidential election promoted social stability, caused social instability, or did it not have any influence in this area?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>promoted social stability</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caused social instability</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no influence in this area</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Quality of Election and Future Perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, did you think the electoral process in this presidential election was fair or not fair?</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very fair</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very unfair</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After going through this presidential election, are you pessimistic or optimistic about Taiwan's future?</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very optimistic</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimistic</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither optimistic not pessimistic</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pessimistic</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very pessimistic</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceptions about Elections

- Perception about the presidential election is improving:
  - Positive in 2008 compared with that in 2004
  - Maybe more positive in 2012 (will be analyzed in months)

- It is not about Taiwan independence
  - Practical concerns
    - Better performance
      - Ex: economic voting
    - Better governance
Economic voting

Dimensions

- Retrospective vs. Prospective
- Pocketbook vs. sociotropic
- Incumbent vs. open seat
- Central vs. Local (district)
- Punishment vs. Reward
- Referendum voting on what?
  - Different levels of elections
Taiwan’s economic voting

- **Central level**
  - Focused on retrospective voting
  - Answer: Yes or No
    - Mixed results as cross-strait issues dominate voting behavior
    - Combinations of cross-strait issues and economy
- **Legislative Yuan**
  - Evaluations on (2001)
    - Economic development
    - Social welfare
    - Black-gold politics
  - By-elections (2011)
    - Performance of central government
Second-order elections

◆ County magistrate/city mayoral elections
  ■ Presidential job performance
  ■ Incumbency

◆ Different effects on voters
  ■ Partisan voters
  ■ Independent voters
Ex: Ma’s approval rate and vote choice in local elections, KMT supporters

Ma’s performance: 1-low; 4-high

% Support KMT county magistrate candidate

Ma英九滿意度 (1 ~ 4: 低 ~ 高)

支持國民黨縣市長參選人（%）
Ex: Overall economic assessment and vote choice, DPP supporters

% support
DPP county magistrate candidate

Overall economic assessment: worse, not change, better
Ex: Personal economic assessment and vote choice, independent voter

Personal economic assessment: worse, not change, better

% support
DPP county magistrate candidate
Future Theme—All about China?
2012 Presidential Election as a case

- Since the Kuomintang (KMT) won both the 2008 legislative and presidential elections, the overall support for the KMT has been declining.
- **2008 Result as a base case:**
  - Ma—7.65 million (58.5%) vs. Hsieh—5.44 million (41.5%)
- **Some second-ordered elections since then:**
  - KMT lost a number of legislative by-elections
    - 9 out of 13 seats
  - KMT “lost” in the 2009 “Three-In-One” local election
    - Although the DPP only gained one additional seat (i.e., an increase from 3 to 4 seats out of the total 17 seats), its vote share reached a new high record of 45.32%, which exceeds its performances in any of the previous local elections.
  - KMT “maintained” the “status quo” in the 2010 “Five Municipalities” election
    - the DPP vote share in fact exceeds the KMT vote share by almost 5 percentage points (i.e., 49.8% vs. 44.5%).
## Final Verdict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ying-wen TSAI</th>
<th>Ying-jeou MA</th>
<th>James SOONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Votes</td>
<td>6,093,578</td>
<td>6,891,139</td>
<td>369,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Voter Turnout: 74.4%**
Media Polls: A Close Race?

By the end of December, multiple survey results showed the trend that the margin could be slim.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Major Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/17/11</td>
<td>DDP vice-presidential candidate Su Jia-chyuan's farm house scandal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17/11</td>
<td>Ma threw out the idea of cross-strait peace accord in a press conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/19/11</td>
<td>Su donated his farmland and the farmhouse to Changjih Township in Pingtung County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/01/11</td>
<td>The beginning of DPP’s piggy bank campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/11</td>
<td>《Next Magazine》 reported that President Ma Ying-jeou had met privately with bookie Chen Ying-chu in Chiayi in September.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/11</td>
<td>Referendum on cross-strait peace accord?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/11</td>
<td>Farmers’ subsidy issue between DDP and KMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/11</td>
<td>Council for Cultural Affairs minister Emile Sheng has resigned after spending NT$215 million (US$7.1 million) of public money on a rock musical (Dreamers) that was only staged twice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/26/11</td>
<td>DDP showed the wrong price of persimmon that was used in campaign material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/11</td>
<td>Tsai Ing-wen apologized for an inaccurate picture that was used in campaign material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/03/11</td>
<td>Presidential candidates’ first televised debate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/11</td>
<td>Controversy of Yu-Chang Biologics Co. of DDP presidential candidate Tsai Ing-wen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/02/12</td>
<td>Former president Chen Shui-bian's mother in-law dies, and he will ask permission to attend the funeral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/06/12</td>
<td>Former president Chen Shui-bian pays respects at his mother in-law's funeral.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did Those Early Events Matter?

- About how Su Jia-chyuan handled his farm house issue:
  - 22% positive vs. 54% negative

- About peace accord (from mid-Oct to mid-Nov):
  - Support declined from 50% to 45%
  - Oppose raised from 30% to 33%

- About farm subsidy:
  - Favor KMT’s proposal (NT$316 per month) 18%
  - Favor DPP’s proposal (NT$1,000 per month) 30%
Campaign and Debates

- Heard about DPP’s piggy bank campaign?
  - Yes 70% vs. No 30%

- Who did better in the presidential debates?
  - Ma: around 32%
  - Tsai: about 21%-27%
  - Soong: around 18%

- Bottom Line: created short-term surges and declines, but never built long-term momentum
What if Tsai had won...
  - Denial of 92 Consensus → Unstable cross-strait relations?

Since late December, some business tycoons stepped up to support 92 Consensus
Did the 92 Consensus Really Matter?

Did Soong’s supporters (or potential KMT defectors) fear about unstable cross-strait relations and tend to vote strategically (abandon Soong)?

Among voters in the final month
- Continue using the 92 Consensus: consistently around 40-42%
- Abandon the 92 Consensus (or claimed that it does not exist): dropped from around 30% to 20%
- Significant increase on “No response”

The preliminary result suggested that when the election date approached, people do think about the importance of cross-strait relations (via the 92 Consensus).
Strategic Voting?

By the end of December:
- More than 9% of Ma’s 2008 supporters tended to vote for Soong
- About 7% of Hsieh’s 2008 supporters tended to vote for Soong

But in the final week (by 3 days prior to the election date)
- KMT’s defectors dropped to 5%
- DPP’s defectors dropped to 3%

So at the end of the day:
- Ma maintained about 70% of his previous support
- Tsai maintained about 80% of Hsieh’s support
- Among previous non-voters, Tsai led by 10 percentage points, but they are unlikely to turn out to vote...Thus Ma still have the edge.
Major Themes of the Elections

- Not much identity politics
- But all about cross-strait relations
  - 2008: It is about whether we should open up the cross-strait relations
  - 2012: It is about impact of cross-strait economic exchanges
    - Create new winners and losers
Battle of Issues and Images

❖ Battle of Issues
  ▪ KMT: economic development
    ▪ Premise—stable cross-strait relations
  ▪ DPP: social inequality
    ▪ Premise—KMT’s China policy only favored businessmen
  ▪ Issue ownership: both parties tried to sell the issues they owned
    ▪ KMT advantages on economic development, cross-strait relations...
    ▪ DPP advantages on social justice, gender inequality...

❖ Battle of Images
  ▪ Ma: honest
  ▪ Tsai: sensitive
  ▪ Soong: capable
Example of Milkfish?

◆ One of the 18 ECFA’s early harvest list (also like Garoupa fish)
◆ Last year, China’s Shanghai Fisheries General Corp agreed to buy milkfish from Syuejia District (學甲) fishermen under a contract:
  ■ Each one of the 100 fishermen will provide 18,000 kg of milkfish at a guarantee purchase price of NT$27 a kilogram
    ■ average production cost for milkfish is about NT$21 a kilogram
    ■ the transaction price by milkfish ponds is usually between NT$18 and NT$24
◆ In a comparison with the result of 2008
  ■ DPP gained 300 more votes
  ■ KMT lost 1,000 votes
◆ But the turnout remained low
  ■ The turnout rates in most of the southern counties are 2-3 percentage points below the average.
  ■ Need further investigation...
Institution Design
- Legislative Yuan
  - Majority rule vs. Minority right

Better political culture

Future concerns
- Will China factor become an important one to influence Taiwan’s electoral politics?
- What can China learn from Taiwan’s political development?
  - Elections—from the bottom to the top
Thank You!