



**Public Opinion & Political Development
in Hong Kong**

Survey Results

(Press Release)

October 22, 2014

To gauge people's views on various issues about political development in Hong Kong, the Centre for Communication and Public Opinion Survey at the School of Journalism and Communication, Chinese University of Hong Kong launched a project named *Public Opinion and Political Development Studies* in August. The Project conducts telephone interviews and publishes the findings regularly for the reference of various parties.

The second wave study was conducted in October 8-15, 2014. Using the method of random sampling, the Centre successfully interviewed 802 Hong Kong Cantonese-speaking residents aged 15 or above on phone (with a sampling error of 3.5% at 95% confidence level). The response rate was 37%. All data were weighted by the proportion of gender, age and education according to the most recent statistics of people aged 15 or above issued by the Census and Statistics Department of the Hong Kong SAR Government. The summary of the findings are provided below:

(1) Whether Hong Kong people support the “Occupy Movement”

37.8% indicate “support” (strongly support/ quite support) for the “Occupy Movement”; 35.5% respondents indicate “not support” (strongly not support/quite not support). 23.2% respondents are “so-so”. (See Table 1)

Further analysis by demographics (See Table 2):

- The younger they are the more likely they support “Occupy Movement”:
(Age 15-24: 62.1%; Age 25-39: 46.2%; Age 40-59: 28.4%; Age 60 or above: 29.6%).

Compared with first wave study, the proportion of supporting Occupy Movement has increased sharply in the age group of 15-24 (1st wave: 46.7%; 2nd wave: 62.1%). (Table 3)





- The higher the education the more likely the support for “Occupy Movement” (Tertiary or above: 46.7%; F. 4-F.7: 39.0%; F. 3 or below: 27.4%)
- Pan-democrats (radical/moderate democrats) are more likely to support Occupy Movement (66.3%). Pro-establishment respondents (including pro-Beijing and industrial-commercial) tend not to support (86.7%). Respondents who claim themselves to be “middle-neutral” or “possessing no political orientation” also tend not to support the movement.

(2) Views on police’s handling of protestors of the movement by using tear gas

53.7% respondents consider the use of tear gas by the Hong Kong police in the movement “not appropriate” (very inappropriate/ quite inappropriate); 22.1% consider it appropriate (very appropriate/ quite appropriate); 17.5% consider it “so-so”. (See Table 4)

Further analysis by demographics (See Table 5):

- The younger they are the more likely they consider the use of tear gas “not appropriate”: (Age 15-24: 81.5%; Age 25-39:60.1%; Age 40-59: 47.6%; Age 60 or above: 40.2%.)
- The higher the education the more likely they consider the use of tear gas “not appropriate” (Tertiary or above: 61.4%; F. 4-F.7: 58.9%; F. 3 or below: 40.1%)
- Apart from pro-establishment respondents (including pro-Beijing and industrial-commercial), pan-democrats (radical/moderate democrats), “middle-neutral” or respondents “possessing no political orientation” all tend to consider the use of tear gas by the police “not appropriate”.

(3) Views on police’s handling of conflicts between supporters and opponents of the Occupy Movement

42.2% respondents consider the police’s way in handling the conflicts between supporters and opponents of the movement “not appropriate” (very inappropriate/ quite inappropriate); 26.7% consider it appropriate (very appropriate/ quite appropriate); 23.1% consider it “so-so”. (Table 6)





Further analysis by demographics (See Table 5):

- The younger they are the more likely they consider the way used by the police in handling conflicts between supporters and opponents of the movement “not appropriate”: (Age 15-24: 72.4%; Age 25-39:49.7%; Age 40-59: 35.6%; Age 60 or above: 27.8%.)
- The higher the education the more likely they consider the police’s handling of conflicts between the two groups “not appropriate” (Tertiary or above: 51.3%; F. 4-F.7: 44.1%; F. 3 or below: 30.6%)
- Pan-democrats (radical/moderate democrats) are more likely to consider the way used by the police in handling conflicts between supporters and opponents of the movement “not appropriate”. Pro-establishment respondents (including pro-Beijing and industrial-commercial) tend to consider it “appropriate”.

(4) Trust in the police force

Respondents assess their trust in the Hong Kong Police Force along a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being “no trust at all”, 10 being “total trust”, and 5 being “so-so”. Results show that the mean score for people’s trust in the Hong Kong Police Force is 5.49. 44.1% respondents tend to trust the police force (score ranging from 0 to 4) and 28.6% respondents tend not to trust the police force (score ranging from 6 to 10). The trust of 25.3% respondents in the police force is “so-so” (a score of 5) (See Table 8)

Further analysis by demographics (See Table 9):

- The younger they are the more likely they don’t trust the Hong Kong police force: (Age 15-24: 51.9%; Age 25-39:36.0%; Age 40-59: 22.8%; Age 60 or above: 16.3%).
- The higher the education the more likely the distrust in police force (Tertiary or above: 34.8%; F. 4-F.7: 29.6%; F. 3 or below: 21.2%).
- Apart from pan-democrats (radical/moderate democrats), pro-establishment respondents (including pro-Beijing and industrial-commercial), “middle-neutral” or respondents “possessing no political orientation” tend to trust the police.





(5) Whether the Legislative Council should approve or reject the draft for the 2017 election of Hong Kong Chief Executive?

Following the decision of the Standing Committee of the People's Congress, Hong Kong Government will propose a draft for the 2017 one-person one-vote Chief Executive election. If the proposed draft will forbid people having different political views from the Central Government to stand for the election, 48.5% respondents consider that the Legislative Council should reject the draft while 36.1% consider that the Legislative Council should approve it. (Compared with the 1st wave study result: Reject 53.7%; Approve 29.3%) (See Table 10)

Further analysis by demographics (See Table 11):

- The younger they are the more likely they consider that the Legislative Council should reject the draft:
(Age 15-24: 71.7%; Age 25-39:58.5%; Age 40-59: 44.8%; Age 60 or above: 31.1%).
- The higher the education the more likely they favour rejection of the draft:
(Tertiary or above: 59.9%; F. 4-F.7: 54.4%; F. 3 or below: 29.2%).
- Pan-democrats (radical/moderate democrats) and “middle-neutral” respondents tend to favour rejection of the draft while pro-establishment respondents (including pro-Beijing and industrial-commercial) and those “possessing no political orientation” tend to favour approval of the draft.

(6) Among those who favor rejection of the draft, whether they would accept a version which revises the composition of the nomination committee reducing political vetting of the candidates for the chief executive election?

If Hong Kong Government proposes a draft for the 2017 one-person one-vote Chief Executive election in which the composition and formation method of the nomination committee is revised in order to reduce political vetting of the candidates, 40.2% of those who reject the earlier draft will accept (accept strongly/quite accept) this revised draft while 12.5% will not accept (not accept strongly/not quite accept); 42.2% indicate “so-so”.

From a combined analysis, it is found that if the government proposes a version revising the nomination committee composition and formation method, reducing political vetting of the candidates for the Chief Executive election, there is a likelihood that the proportion favouring





approval of the draft by the Legislative Council will be increased to 55.6%. (Table 14)

(7) Among those who favor rejection of the draft, whether they would accept the draft if the central government pledges to continue to reform the election method of the Chief Executive?

If Hong Kong Government proposes a draft for the 2017 one-person one-vote Chief Executive election in which political vetting of the candidates still exists, but the central government pledges to continue to reform the election method of the Chief Executive, 52.9% of those who reject the earlier draft will still not accept (not accept strongly/quite not accept) the draft while 17.6% will accept (accept strongly/quite accept); 27.2% indicate “so-so”. (See Table 13)

From a combined analysis, it is found that if the government proposes a version which does not reduce political vetting of the candidates for the Chief Executive election, but pledges to continue to reform the election method, there is a likelihood that the proportion favouring approval of the draft by the Legislative Council will be increased to 44.6%. (Table 14)

(8) Views on future development of Hong Kong

Respondents assess the future of Hong Kong along a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being “extremely pessimistic”, 10 being “extremely optimistic”, and 5 being “so-so”. Results show that the mean score for people’s view about Hong Kong’s future is 4.57. 37.7% respondents tend to feel pessimistic (score ranging from 0 to 4) and 27.6% respondents tend to feel optimistic (score ranging from 6 to 10). 33.8% respondents consider Hong Kong’s future development “so-so” (a score of 5). (1st wave result: 4.22) (See Table 15)

Further analysis by demographics (See Table 16):

- The younger they are the more likely they are pessimistic about Hong Kong’s future: (Age 15-24: 51.7%; Age 25-39: 52.3%; Age 40-59: 29.0%; Age 60 or above: 29.6%).
- The higher the education the more likely they are pessimistic: (Tertiary or above: 47.8%; F. 4-F.7: 41.4%; F. 3 or below: 22.9%).





香港中文大學 傳播與民意調查中心
Centre for Communication and Public Opinion Survey
The Chinese University of Hong Kong

- Apart from pro-establishment respondents (including pro-Beijing and industrial-commercial), pan-democrats (radical/moderate democrats), “middle-neutral” or respondents “possessing no political orientation” all tend to be pessimistic about Hong Kong’s future.





【The total N may not add up to 100% due to rounding errors and weighting】

Table 1: Support “Occupy Movement” or not

	1 st Wave	2 nd Wave
	%	%
Strongly support	14.2	18.6
Quite support	16.9	19.2
So-so	20.5	23.2
Quite not support	12.5	8.7
Strongly not support	33.8	26.8
No Opinion / Refuse to answer	2.2	3.5
Total (N)	100.0 (1006)	100.0 (802)

Question: Recently Hong Kong broke out an “Occupy Movement” to fight for a 2017 election plan for Chief Executive without screening, do you personally support the movement or not? Strongly support, quite support, so-so, quite not support, or strongly not support?

Table 2 : Demographics by Support of Occupy Movement

	Support	So-So	Not Support	No View/ Refuse	Total	(n)
Age						
15 - 24	62.1	30.1	7.7	0.0	100.0	(112)
25 - 39	46.2	26.6	25.7	1.4	100.0	(189)
40 - 59	28.4	22.8	44.7	4.1	100.0	(303)
60 or Above	29.6	16.8	47.1	6.5	100.0	(192)
Education						
F. 3 or Below	27.4	20.1	46.0	6.5	100.0	(244)
F. 4 – F. 7	39.0	25.1	33.1	2.8	100.0	(279)
Tertiary or Above	46.7	24.2	27.6	1.5	100.0	(274)
Political Orientation						
Pan-democrats	66.3	20.0	12.7	1.0	100.0	(292)
Middle-neutral	26.6	28.9	39.3	5.2	100.0	(217)
Pro-establishment	1.4	11.8	86.7	0.0	100.0	(77)
No orientation	21.2	26.6	45.4	6.8	100.0	(182)





Table 3 : Support of “Occupy Movement” in Two Waves of Study

	1 st Wave %	2 nd wave %
Age		
15 - 24	46.7	62.1
25 - 39	39.8	46.2
40 - 59	20.9	28.4
60 or Above	29.5	29.6
Education		
F. 3 or Below	26.7	27.4
F. 4 - F. 7	26.5	39.0
Tertiary or Above	39.2	46.7
Political Orientation		
Pan-democrats	52.3	66.3
Middle-neutral	18.5	26.6
Pro-establishment	7.2	1.4
No orientation	18.6	21.2
Total (N)	100.0 (1006)	100.0 (802)

Table 4 : Appropriateness of Using Tear Gas by Hong Kong Police

	n	%
Very appropriate	110	13.7
Quite appropriate	68	8.4
So-so	140	17.5
Quite inappropriate	124	15.4
Very inappropriate	307	38.3
No Opinion / Refuse to answer	53	6.7
Total (N)	802	100.0

Question: What is your view about the use of tear gas by the Hong Kong police in handling the Occupy Movement? Very appropriate, quite appropriate, so-so, quite inappropriate, or very inappropriate?





Table 5 : Demographics by Appropriateness in using tear gas by Hong Kong police

	Appro- priate	So-so	In-appro- priate	No view/ Refuse	Total	(n)
Age						
15 - 24	1.4	15.9	81.5	1.1	100.0	(112)
25 - 39	15.5	21.4	60.1	3.1	100.0	(189)
40 - 59	26.4	18.1	47.6	7.9	100.0	(303)
60 or Above	34.8	13.6	40.2	11.4	100.0	(192)
Education						
F. 3 or Below	32.4	16.1	40.1	11.4	100.0	(244)
F. 4 - F. 7	20.5	15.6	58.9	5.0	100.0	(279)
Tertiary or Above	14.4	20.1	61.4	4.2	100.0	(274)
Political Orientation						
Pan-democrats	9.0	12.4	77.8	0.8	100.0	(292)
Middle-neutral	21.9	23.5	47.0	7.6	100.0	(217)
Pro-establishment	64.0	18.9	10.6	6.5	100.0	(77)
No orientation	26.0	17.6	41.5	14.9	100.0	(182)

Table 6 : Appropriateness of Police's handling of supporters and opponents of the occupy movement

	n	%
Very appropriate	98	12.2
Quite appropriate	116	14.4
So-so	185	23.1
Quite inappropriate	159	19.8
Very inappropriate	180	22.5
No Opinion / Refuse to answer	64	8.0
Total (N)	802	100.0

Question: What is your view about the way Hong Kong police handles the supporters and opponents of the Occupy Movement? Very appropriate, quite appropriate, so-so, quite inappropriate, or very inappropriate?





Table 7 : Demographics by Police's handling of supporters and opponents of Occupy Movement

	Appro- priate	So-so	In-appro- priate	No view/ Refuse	Total	(n)
Age						
15 - 24	2.3	22.5	72.4	2.9	100.0	(112)
25 - 39	19.0	25.6	49.7	5.7	100.0	(189)
40 - 59	32.0	23.8	35.6	8.6	100.0	(303)
60 or Above	40.5	19.4	27.8	12.4	100.0	(192)
Education						
F. 3 or Below	35.4	21.5	30.6	12.5	100.0	(244)
F. 4 - F. 7	22.3	25.3	44.1	8.3	100.0	(279)
Tertiary or Above	22.5	22.4	51.3	3.8	100.0	(274)
Political Orientation						
Pan-democrats	11.8	20.9	65.6	1.7	100.0	(292)
Middle-neutral	28.0	30.5	34.1	7.4	100.0	(217)
Pro-establishment	80.1	8.3	10.0	1.6	100.0	(77)
No orientation	28.3	25.9	26.9	18.8	100.0	(182)





Table 8: Trust in Hong Kong Police Force

	n	%
0 No Trust at all	75	9.3
1	14	1.8
2	31	3.9
3	46	5.7
4	64	7.9
5 So-so	203	25.3
6	67	8.4
7	81	10.1
8	91	11.4
9	14	1.8
10 Total trust	100	12.5
No View/ Refuse	16	2.0
Total	802	100.0
Mean* (N) = 5.49 (786)		

* No view/ Refuse are excluded from calculation of the mean

Question: How high is your trust in the Hong Kong police force? Along a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being “no trust at all”, 10 being “total trust”, and 5 being “so-so”, what score will you give?





Table 9: Demographics by Trust in Police

	0-4分 Tend not to trust	5分 So-so	6-10分 Tend to trust	No view / Refuse	Total	(n)
Age						
15 - 24	51.9	19.3	28.0	0.7	100.0	(112)
25 - 39	36.0	23.3	40.1	0.7	100.0	(189)
40 - 59	22.8	24.9	51.7	0.6	100.0	(303)
60 or Above	16.3	31.4	46.1	6.2	100.0	(192)
Education						
F. 3 or Below	21.2	32.0	42.2	4.7	100.0	(244)
F. 4 - F. 7	29.6	24.8	44.5	1.1	100.0	(279)
Tertiary or Above	34.8	20.1	44.7	0.5	100.0	(274)
Political Orientation						
Pan-democrats	49.1	22.5	28.0	0.4	100.0	(292)
Middle-neutral	23.2	26.5	49.2	1.0	100.0	(217)
Pro-establishment	1.5	13.5	85.0	0.0	100.0	(77)
No orientation	17.0	28.6	49.5	4.9	100.0	(182)

Table 10: Views on whether the Legislative Council should approve or reject the draft for the 2017 election of Hong Kong Chief Executive

	1 st Wave %	2 nd Wave %
Approve	29.3	36.1
Reject	53.7	48.5
No view / refuse	17.0	15.4
Total (N)	100.0 (1006)	100.0 (802)

Question: Following the decision of the Standing Committee of the People's Congress, Hong Kong Government will propose a draft for the 2017 one-person one-vote Chief Executive election. If the proposed draft will forbid people having different political views from the Central Government to stand for the election, do you think the Legislative Council at that time should approve the draft or reject it?





Table 11: Demographics by Approval or Rejection of Draft

	Approve	Reject	No view / Refuse	Total	(n)
Age					
15 - 24	21.6	71.7	6.7	100.0	(112)
25 - 39	31.2	58.5	10.3	100.0	(189)
40 - 59	42.0	44.8	13.1	100.0	(303)
60 or Above	40.5	31.1	28.4	100.0	(192)
Education					
F. 3 or Below	42.2	29.2	28.6	100.0	(244)
F. 4 - F. 7	35.8	54.4	9.8	100.0	(279)
Tertiary or Above	30.8	59.9	9.2	100.0	(274)
Political Orientation					
Pan-democrats	21.1	73.4	5.5	100.0	(292)
Middle-neutral	40.0	47.5	12.5	100.0	(217)
Pro-establishment	77.5	11.6	10.9	100.0	(77)
No orientation	40.8	29.6	29.7	100.0	(182)

Table 12: Views about Accepting Draft reducing political vetting of candidates for Chief Executive election

	n	%	Valid %
Strongly accept	21	2.7	5.5
Quite accept	135	16.9	34.8
So-so	164	20.5	42.2
Quite not accept	22	2.7	5.6
Strongly not accept	27	3.4	7.0
No view / Refuse	19	2.4	5.0
No need to answer this question	413	51.5	Missing value
Total	389	100.0	100.0

Question: If Hong Kong Government proposes a draft for the 2017 one-person one-vote Chief Executive election in which the composition and formation method of the nomination committee is revised in order to reduce political vetting of the candidates, will you accept it?





Table 13: Acceptance of Central Government's pledge to continue to reform the election method of CE

	n	%	Valid %
Strongly accept	15	1.9	3.9
Quite accept	54	6.7	13.8
So-so	106	13.2	27.2
Quite not accept	89	11.1	23.0
Strongly not accept	117	14.5	30.0
No view / Refuse	9	1.1	2.2
No need to answer this question	413	51.5	Missing value
Total	389	100.0	100.0

Question: If Hong Kong Government proposes a draft for the 2017 one-person one-vote Chief Executive election in which political vetting of the candidates still exists, but the central government pledges to continue to reform the election method of the Chief Executive, will you accept it?

Table 14: Approval of Draft under different scenarios

	n	n	n
Should approve draft on the basis of People's Congress' framework	289	289	289
Should reject the draft, but will accept if nomination committee democratised		157	--
Should reject the draft , but will accept if central government pledges to continue to reform the election rules		--	69
Total (%)*	289 (36.1%)	446 (55.6%)	358 (44.6%)

*N=802





Table 15: Views about Future of Hong Kong

	n	%
0 Extremely pessimistic	77	9.6
1	18	2.3
2	27	3.4
3	95	11.9
4	85	10.6
5 So-So	271	33.8
6	96	12.0
7	57	7.1
8	38	4.8
9	3	0.4
10 Extremely optimistic	27	3.3
No view / Refuse to answer	8	1.0
Total	802	100.0
Mean* (N) = 4.57(794) (2 nd wave); 4.22(996)(1 st wave)		

* Don't know / Refuse to answer are not included in the calculation of the mean

Questions: What is your view about the future development of Hong Kong? Along a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being "extremely pessimistic", 10 being "extremely optimistic", and 5 being "so-so", what score will you give?





Table 16 : Demographics by Views of Hong Kong's future

	0-4 Tend to be pessi- mistic	5 S0-so	6-10 Tend to be optimistic	No view / Refuse	Total	(n)
Age						
15 - 24	51.7	16.6	31.6	0.0	100.0	(112)
25 - 39	52.3	21.7	26.0	0.0	100.0	(189)
40 - 59	29.0	39.4	31.1	0.5	100.0	(303)
60 or Above	29.6	46.3	21.3	2.8	100.0	(192)
Education						
F. 3 or Below	22.9	52.1	22.8	2.2	100.0	(244)
F. 4 - F. 7	41.4	28.5	29.5	0.6	100.0	(279)
Tertiary or Above	47.8	23.2	28.7	0.3	100.0	(274)
Political Orientation						
Pan-democrats	50.2	25.1	24.7	0.0	100.0	(292)
Middle-neutral	35.8	35.8	27.6	0.8	100.0	(217)
Pro-establishment	14.9	37.1	46.3	1.7	100.0	(77)
No orientation	30.4	43.5	25.0	1.1	100.0	(182)





Basic Demographic Data

Sex

	<u>Before weighting</u>		<u>After weighting</u>	
	n	%	n	%
M	388	48.4	385	48.0
F	414	51.6	417	52.0
Total	802	100.0	802	100.0

Age

	<u>Before weighting</u>		<u>After weighting</u>	
	n	%	n	%
15 – 17	51	6.4	32	4.0
18 – 19	30	3.7	21	2.6
20 – 24	52	6.5	59	7.3
25 - 29	45	5.6	60	7.5
30 – 34	45	5.6	64	8.0
35 - 39	50	6.2	65	8.0
40 - 44	92	11.5	70	8.7
45 – 49	72	9.0	76	9.5
50 – 54	99	12.3	84	10.5
55 – 59	76	9.5	74	9.2
60 – 64	75	9.4	58	7.2
65 - 69	55	6.9	39	4.8
70 or Above	54	6.7	95	11.9
Refuse	6	0.7	6	0.8
Total	802	100.0	802	100.0





Education

	<i>Before weighting</i>		<i>After weighting</i>	
	n	%	n	%
No edu / Kindergarten	9	1.1	32	4.1
Primary	63	7.9	106	13.2
Secondary (F.1 - F.3)	114	14.2	105	13.2
Secondary (F.4 - F.5)	222	27.7	216	26.9
Secondary (F.6 - F.7)	98	12.2	63	7.8
Tertiary (Non-degree)	69	8.6	68	8.5
Bachelor Degree	180	22.4	164	20.5
Graduate Studies (MA or above)	42	5.2	42	5.2
Refuse	5	0.6	6	0.7
Total	802	100.0	802	100.0

Political Orientation

	<i>Before weighting</i>		<i>After weighting</i>	
	n	%	n	%
Radical democrats	23	2.9	25	3.1
Moderate democrats	288	35.9	267	33.3
Middle/neutral	218	27.2	217	27.1
Pro-establishment	39	4.9	38	4.8
Business-industrial	10	1.2	8	1.0
Pro-Beijing	29	3.6	30	3.7
No orientation / not belonging to any orientation	166	20.7	182	22.7
Don't Know/ Hard to say / Refuse to answer	29	3.6	35	4.3
Total	802	100.0	1006	100.0

Question: You consider yourself leaning toward which political orientation? Radical democrats, moderate democrats, middle-neutral, pro-establishment, business-industrial, or pro-Beijing?

Please refer any questions to Prof. Clement So at 3943 7665

-- End --

