



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

**Survey Results**

(Press Release)

March 15, 2015

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, The Chinese University of Hong Kong launched a project named *Public Opinion and Political Development Studies* in August 2014. The Project conducts telephone interviews and publishes the findings regularly for the reference of various parties.

The fifth wave study was conducted in March 2 - 9, 2015. Using the method of random sampling, the Centre successfully interviewed 1009 Hong Kong Cantonese-speaking residents aged 15 or above on phone (with a sampling error of 3.1% at 95% confidence level). The response rate was 43%. 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 respondents aged 15 to 17 constituted only 4% of the total sample. Their inclusion did not affect the results significantly.

A summary of the findings is provided below:

**(1) Perceived impact of the “Occupy Movement” on Hong Kong’s future development**

39.6% of respondents indicated that the “Occupy Movement” had a “negative” (very negative /somewhat negative) impact; 31.0% of respondents indicated “positive” (very positive/somewhat positive) impact; 26.4% indicated “so-so”. (See Table 1)

Further analysis by demographics (See Table 2):

- The older the respondents, the more likely they indicated “negative” impact:  
(Age 60 or above: 53.8%; Age 40 - 59: 48.5%; Age 25 - 39: 27.9%; Age 15 - 24: 12.1%)
- The lower the education, the more likely respondents indicated “negative” impact:  
(F. 3 or below: 51.6%; F.4 - F.7: 39.4%; Tertiary or above: 30.0%)





- Pro-establishment respondents (including pro-Beijing and industrial-commercial) tended to indicate “negative” impact (77.3%). Pan-democrats (radical/moderate democrats) tended to indicate “positive” impact (56.2%). Respondents who claim themselves to be “middle-neutral” (46.1%) or “possessing no political orientation” (53.6%) also tended to indicate “negative” impact.

### **(2) Belief that activities demanding political reforms in Hong Kong should be peaceful and non-violent**

80.5% of respondents “agree” (exceedingly agree/somewhat agree) that activities demanding political reforms in Hong Kong must be conducted in a peaceful and non-violent manner; 6.1% of respondents indicated “disagree” (exceedingly disagree/somewhat disagree); 12.1% of respondents indicated “so-so”. (See Table 3)

### **(3) Whether the Legislative Council should approve or reject the draft for the 2017 election of the Hong Kong Chief Executive**

Following the decision of the Standing Committee of the People’s Congress, it is highly likely that the Hong Kong Government will propose a draft for the 2017 one-person one-vote Chief Executive election in accordance with the Committee’s decision. If the proposed draft will forbid people having different political views from the Central Government to stand for the election, 46.9% of respondents considered that the Legislative Council should reject the draft while 40.2% considered that the Legislative Council should approve it. (See Table 4)

Comparison of findings in 4 waves of study:

“Approve draft”: 40.2% (Mar); 38.3% (Dec); 36.1% (Nov); 36.1% (Oct); 29.3% (Sep)

“Reject draft”: 46.9% (Mar); 43.1% (Dec); 46.7% (Nov); 48.5% (Oct); 53.7% (Sep)

If the Hong Kong government continues to follow the decision of the Standing Committee of the People’s Congress, but the proposed draft abolishes the corporate votes and board of director votes, such that all nomination committee members for the election of Chief Executive in 2017 would be elected through individual votes from the four sectors, 38.1% of respondents considered that the Legislative Council should reject the draft while 44.4% considered that the Legislative Council should approve it. (See Table 5)





If the Hong Kong government continues to follow the decision of the Standing Committee of the People's Congress, but in addition makes a public commitment to continue to review the process of electing the Chief Executive after the 2017 election, 33.5% of respondents considered that the Legislative Council should reject the draft while 57.7% considered that the Legislative Council should approve it. (See Table 6)

#### (4) Perceived level of autonomy in Hong Kong under “one country two systems”

Respondents indicated the level of autonomy that Hong Kong “should have” under “one country two systems” based on the scale from 0 to 10. The score 0 represent “should have absolutely no autonomy” and 10 represent “should have full autonomy”. The average score was 7.11. (See Table 7)

Moreover, respondents indicated the level of autonomy that Hong Kong “currently has” under “one country two systems” based on the scale from 0 to 10. The score 0 represent “currently has absolutely no autonomy” and 10 represent “currently has total autonomy”. The average score was 5.07. (See Table 8)

Further analysis by demographics (See Table 9):

- Comparison of responses on the level of autonomy that Hong Kong “should have” with level of autonomy that Hong Kong “currently has” based on age.

	“should have full autonomy” <u>Average</u>	“current level of autonomy” <u>Average</u>
15 – 24 years old	7.37	4.58
25 – 39 years old	7.59	4.28
40 – 59 years old	7.01	5.37
60 and above	6.60	5.68

- Comparison of responses on the level of autonomy that Hong Kong “should have” with level of autonomy that Hong Kong “currently has” based on education.





	“should have full autonomy” <u>Average</u>	“current level of autonomy” <u>Average</u>
F3 and below	6.61	5.53
F4 – F7	7.23	5.08
Tertiary and above	7.37	4.70

- Comparison of responses on the level of autonomy that Hong Kong “should have” with level of autonomy that Hong Kong “currently has” based on political orientation.

	“should have full autonomy” <u>Average</u>	“current level of autonomy” <u>Average</u>
“pan-democrats”	7.72	4.05
“pro-establishment”	6.85	7.09
“middle-neutral”	6.84	5.27
“no political orientation”	6.75	5.60

### (5) Satisfaction with the implementation of “one country two systems” in Hong Kong by the Central government

Respondents indicated their satisfaction with the Central government’s implementation of “one country two systems” in Hong Kong along a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being “totally dissatisfied”, 10 being “totally satisfied”, and 5 being “so-so”. Results show that the mean score is 4.84. In addition, 32.3% of the respondents tended to be satisfied (score ranging from 6 to 10) with the central government’s implementation of “one country two systems” in Hong Kong and 10.3% gave a score of 10, i.e., “totally satisfied”. On the other hand, 36.0% tended to be dissatisfied (score ranging from 0 to 4) and 13.3% give a score of 0, i.e., “totally dissatisfied”; 30.2% of the respondents indicated “so-so” (score 5). (See Table 10)

Comparison of findings in 2 waves of study:

“Tend to be satisfied”	:	32.3% (Mar)	;	37.8% (Dec)
“Tend to be dissatisfied”	:	36.0% (Mar)	;	36.1% (Dec)
Mean score	:	4.84 (Mar)	;	4.99 (Dec)





### (6) Trust in the Hong Kong SAR Government

Respondents indicated their trust in the Hong Kong SAR Government 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 HKSAR Government is 4.76. Moreover, 41.7% of the respondents tended not to trust the HKSAR Government (score ranging from 0 to 4) and 10.3% gave a score 0, i.e., “no trust at all”. 35.6% of respondents tended to trust the HKSAR Government (score ranging from 6 to 10) and 7.2% gave a score of 10, i.e., “total trust”. The trust of 22.2% respondents in HKSAR Government is “so-so” (a score of 5). (See Table 11)

Comparison of findings in 4 waves of study:

“Tend to trust”	: 35.6% (Mar) ;	36.5% (Dec) ;	26.1% (Oct) ;	22.5% (Sep)
“Tend not to trust”	: 41.7% (Mar) ;	40.3% (Dec) ;	47.9% (Oct) ;	49.7% (Sep)
Mean score	: 4.76 (Mar) ;	4.76 (Dec) ;	4.17 (Oct) ;	4.02 (Sep)

### (7) Trust in the Central Government

Respondents indicated their trust in the Central Government 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 Central Government is 4.62. Moreover, 42.6% of respondents tended not to trust the Central Government (score ranging from 0 to 4) and 15.0% gave a score of 0, i.e., “no trust at all”. 33.9% of respondents tended to trust the Central Government (score ranging from 6 to 10) and 8.4% gave a score of 10, i.e., “total trust”. The trust of 21.3% respondents in the Central Government is “so-so” (score 5). (See Table 12)

Comparison of findings in 4 waves of study:

“Tend to trust”	: 33.9% (Mar) ;	34.7% (Dec) ;	27.5% (Oct) ;	25.0% (Sep)
“Tend not to trust”	: 42.6% (Mar) ;	41.3% (Dec) ;	47.3% (Oct) ;	48.5% (Sep)
Mean score	: 4.62 (Mar) ;	4.62 (Dec) ;	4.14 (Oct) ;	4.05 (Sep)





### (8) Trust in the Hong Kong Police Force

Respondents indicated 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 5.79. While 46.7% of respondents tended to trust the police force (score ranging from 6 to 10), 25.4% tended not to trust (score ranging from 0 to 4); 26.5% of respondents indicated “so-so” (score 5). (See Table 13)

Comparison of findings in 4 waves of study:

“Tend to trust”	: 46.7% (Mar) ;	48.5% (Dec) ;	55.6% (Nov) ;	44.1% (Oct)
“Tend not to trust”	: 25.4% (Mar) ;	29.4% (Dec) ;	20.0% (Nov) ;	28.6% (Oct)
Mean score	: 5.79 (Mar) ;	5.64 (Dec) ;	6.25 (Nov) ;	5.49 (Oct)

### (9) Views on the future development of Hong Kong

Respondents assessed 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”. Results show that the mean score for people’s view about Hong Kong’s future is 4.61. Moreover, 38.4% of respondents tended to feel pessimistic (score ranging from 0 to 4) and 23.7% of respondents tended to feel optimistic (score ranging from 6 to 10). 37.1% respondents considered Hong Kong’s future development “so-so” (score 5). (See Table 14)

Comparison of findings in 5 waves of study::

“Tend pessimistic”	: 38.4% (Mar) ;	39.0% (Dec) ;	34.0% (Nov) ;	37.7% (Oct) ;	45.6% (Sep)
“Tend optimistic”	: 23.7% (Mar) ;	27.5% (Dec) ;	26.3% (Nov) ;	27.6% (Oct) ;	21.2% (Sep)
Mean score	: 4.61 (Mar) ;	4.62 (Dec) ;	4.80 (Nov) ;	4.57 (Oct) ;	4.22 (Sep)

### (10) Migration

81.0% respondents have not considered migration at present; 18.8% of respondents have considered migration. (See Table 15)

Comparison of findings in 4 waves of study:

“Not consider to migrate”	:81.0% (Mar) ;	78.2% (Dec) ;	77.7% (Oct) ;	77.2% (Sep)
“Consider to migrate”	:18.8% (Mar) ;	20.7% (Dec) ;	21.6% (Oct) ;	21.2% (Sep)





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

**Table 1: Perceived impact of the “Occupy Movement” on Hong Kong’s future development**

	n	%
Very positive	96	9.5
Somewhat positive	217	21.6
So-so	267	26.4
Somewhat negative	196	19.5
Very negative	204	20.2
No opinion / Refuse to answer	29	2.9
Total	1009	100.0

Question: Recently, the Occupy Movement took place in Hong Kong. Overall, do you think the Occupy Central movement has had a positive or negative impact on Hong Kong? Very positive, Somewhat positive, So-so, Somewhat negative, or Very negative?





**Table 2: Demographic breakdown on perceived impact of the “Occupy Movement” on Hong Kong’s future development**

	Positive %	So-so %	Negative %	No view / Refuse %	Total %	(n)
<b>Age</b>						
15 – 24 years old	54.6	33.3	12.1	0.0	100.0	(141)
25 – 39 years old	41.8	29.2	27.9	1.0	100.0	(239)
40 – 59 years old	24.9	24.8	48.5	1.8	100.0	(383)
60 or Above	16.6	22.2	53.8	7.4	100.0	(242)
<b>Education</b>						
F.3 or Below	15.4	26.0	51.6	7.0	100.0	(304)
F4 – F.7	32.1	26.5	39.4	2.0	100.0	(343)
Tertiary or Above	43.2	26.5	30.0	0.3	100.0	(359)
<b>Political Orientation</b>						
Pan-democrats	56.2	27.6	16.0	0.2	100.0	(349)
Middle-neutral	20.4	32.1	46.1	1.4	100.0	(306)
Pro-establishment	7.3	14.0	77.3	1.4	100.0	(89)
No orientation	18.3	17.7	53.6	10.4	100.0	(212)







**Table 3: Belief that activities demanding political reforms in Hong Kong should be peaceful and non-violent**

	n	%
Strongly agree	556	55.1
Somewhat agree	257	25.4
So-so	122	12.1
Somewhat disagree	31	3.1
Strongly disagree	30	3.0
No opinion / Refuse to answer	13	1.3
Total	1009	100.0

Question: Do you agree or disagree that activities demanding political reforms in Hong Kong must be peaceful and non-violent? Strongly agree, Somewhat agree, So-so, Somewhat disagree, or Strongly disagree?

**Table 4: Whether the Legislative Council should approve or reject the draft for the 2017 election of the Hong Kong Chief Executive (Have different political views)**

	5 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Mar 2-9) %	4 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Dec 8-12) %	3 <sup>rd</sup> Wave (Nov 5-11) %	2 <sup>nd</sup> Wave (Oct 8-15) %	1 <sup>st</sup> Wave (Sep 10-17) %
Approve	40.2	38.3	36.1	36.1	29.3
Reject	46.9	43.1	46.7	48.5	53.7
No view / Refuse	12.9	18.6	17.2	15.4	17.0
Total (N)	100.0 (1009)	100.0 (1011)	100.0 (1030)	100.0 (802)	100.0 (1006)

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 5: Whether the Legislative Council should approve or reject the draft for the 2017 election of the Hong Kong Chief Executive (Individual votes from four sectors)**

	5 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Mar 2-9) %	3 <sup>rd</sup> Wave (Nov 5-11) %
Approve	44.4	45.4
Reject	38.1	35.0
No view / Refuse	17.5	19.6
Total (N)	100.0 (1009)	100.0 (1030)

Question: If the Hong Kong government continues to follow the decision of the Standing Committee of the People's Congress, but the proposed draft abolishes the corporate votes and board of director votes, such that all chief executive nomination committee members would be elected through individual votes from the four sectors, do you think the Legislative Council at that time should approve the draft or reject it?

**Table 6: Whether the Legislative Council should approve or reject the draft for the 2017 election of the Hong Kong Chief Executive (Public commitment by HK government)**

	n	%
Approve	582	57.7
Reject	338	33.5
No view / Refuse	89	8.8
Total (N)	1009	100.0

Question: If the Hong Kong government continues to follow the decision of the Standing Committee of the People's Congress, but in addition makes a public commitment to continue to review the process of electing the Chief Executive after the 2017 election, do you think the Legislative Council at that time should approve the draft or reject it?





**Table 7: Level of autonomy Hong Kong “should have” under “one country two systems”**

	n	%
0 Should have absolutely no autonomy	26	2.5
1	1	0.1
2	12	1.2
3	15	1.5
4	23	2.3
5	170	16.8
6	84	8.3
7	161	16.0
8	232	23.0
9	66	6.6
10 Should have full autonomy	179	17.8
No View/ Refuse	40	3.9
Total	1009	100.0
Mean* (N) = 7.11 (969)		

\* No view/Refuse are not included in calculation of the mean

Question: Under “one country two systems”, what level of autonomy do you think Hong Kong should have? Along a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being “should have absolutely no autonomy” and 10 being “should have full autonomy”, what score will you give?





**Table 8: Level of autonomy Hong Kong “currently has” under “one country two systems”**

	n	%
0 Currently has absolutely no autonomy	69	6.8
1	20	2.0
2	56	5.5
3	108	10.7
4	122	12.1
5	231	22.9
6	106	10.5
7	83	8.3
8	95	9.5
9	24	2.4
10 Currently has full autonomy	69	6.8
No View/ Refuse	23	2.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>1009</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Mean* (N) = 5.07 (986)		

\* No view/Refuse are not included in calculation of the mean

Question: Under “one country two systems”, what level of autonomy do you think Hong Kong currently have?  
Along a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being “currently have absolutely no autonomy” and 10 being  
“currently have full autonomy”, what score will you give?





**Table 9: Demographic breakdown of level of autonomy Hong Kong “should have” and “currently has” under “one country two systems”**

	Level of autonomy Hong Kong “should have” Mean* (N)	Level of autonomy Hong Kong “currently has” Mean* (N)
<b>Age</b>		
15 – 24 years old	7.37 (141)	4.58 (141)
25 – 39 years old	7.59 (235)	4.28 (238)
40 – 59 years old	7.01 (375)	5.37 (380)
60 or Above	6.60 (216)	5.68 (224)
<b>Education</b>		
F.3 or Below	6.61 (277)	5.53 (285)
F4 – F.7	7.23 (336)	5.08 (341)
Tertiary or Above	7.37 (354)	4.70 (358)
<b>Political Orientation</b>		
Pan-democrats	7.72 (348)	4.05 (349)
Middle-neutral	6.84 (300)	5.27 (302)
Pro-establishment	6.85 (86)	7.09 (86)
No orientation	6.75 (192)	5.60 (205)

\* No view/Refuse are not included in calculation of the mean





**Table 10: Satisfaction with Central Government's implementation of "one country two systems" in Hong Kong**

	5 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Mar 2-9) %	4 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Dec 8-12) %
0 Totally dissatisfied	13.3	14.2
1	3.8	2.3
2	3.8	5.2
3	8.4	8.9
4	6.7	5.6
5 So-so	30.2	23.4
6	6.1	6.6
7	6.3	7.9
8	7.3	8.7
9	2.3	3.1
10 Totally satisfied	10.3	11.5
No View/ Refuse	1.5	2.7
Total	100.0(1009)	100.0(1011)
Mean* (N)	4.84 (994)	4.99 (984)

\* No view/Refuse are not included in calculation of the mean

Question: Are you satisfied with the way the Central Government is implementing the "one country two systems" in HK? Along a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being "totally dissatisfied", 10 being "totally satisfied", and 5 being "so-so", what score will you give?





**Table 11: Trust in Hong Kong SAR Government**

	5 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Mar 2-9) %	4 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Dec 8-12) %	2 <sup>nd</sup> Wave (Oct 8-15) %	1 <sup>st</sup> Wave (Sep 10-17) %
0 No Trust at all	10.3	13.6	13.9	15.8
1	4.2	3.3	5.8	4.1
2	7.7	7.2	8.9	7.4
3	9.5	9.5	11.0	10.8
4	9.9	6.7	8.3	11.5
5 So-so	22.0	21.4	23.7	27.3
6	8.8	7.2	7.2	7.6
7	8.6	8.8	5.7	6.6
8	9.5	9.9	7.6	3.6
9	1.5	2.5	0.9	1.1
10 Total trust	7.2	8.1	4.7	3.5
No View/ Refuse	0.8	1.7	2.3	0.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean* (N)	4.76 (1001)	4.76 (993)	4.17 (783)	4.02 (1000)

\* No view/Refuse are not included in calculation of the mean

Question: How high is your trust in the HKSAR Government? 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 12: Trust in Central Government**

	5 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Mar 2-9) %	4 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Dec 8-12) %	2 <sup>nd</sup> Wave (Oct 8-15) %	1 <sup>st</sup> Wave (Sep 10-17) %
0 No Trust at all	15.0	16.5	19.2	19.6
1	3.2	3.6	5.1	4.3
2	7.2	7.1	7.3	6.3
3	8.1	7.4	9.5	10.0
4	9.1	6.7	6.2	8.2
5 So-so	21.3	18.5	20.7	24.2
6	7.8	6.2	6.5	6.6
7	7.6	8.8	5.2	5.0
8	7.9	7.9	6.1	6.5
9	2.2	2.2	1.8	1.0
10 Total trust	8.4	9.5	7.8	6.0
No View/ Refuse	2.3	5.6	4.6	2.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean* (N)	4.62 (986)	4.62 (955)	4.14 (765)	4.05 (983)

\* No view/Refuse are not included in calculation of the mean

Question: How high is your trust in the Central Government? 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 13: Trust in Hong Kong Police Force**

	5 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Mar 2-9) %	4 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Dec 8-12) %	3 <sup>rd</sup> Wave (Nov 5-11) %	2 <sup>nd</sup> Wave (Oct 8-15) %
0 No Trust at all	5.3	9.1	3.8	9.3
1	2.9	2.6	1.9	1.8
2	4.8	5.1	3.1	3.9
3	7.0	7.7	5.9	5.7
4	5.4	4.9	5.3	7.9
5 So-so	26.5	21.2	22.8	25.3
6	6.6	7.6	8.5	8.4
7	9.4	9.4	11.3	10.1
8	11.9	12.3	14.7	11.4
9	5.2	4.6	4.4	1.8
10 Total trust	13.7	14.7	16.7	12.5
No View/ Refuse	1.3	1.0	1.6	2.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean* (N)	5.79 (996)	5.64 (1001)	6.25 (1014)	5.49 (786)

\* No view/Refuse are not included in calculation of the mean

Question: How high is your trust in the HK 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 14: Views about Future of Hong Kong**

	5 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Mar 2-9) %	4 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Dec 8-12) %	3 <sup>rd</sup> Wave (Nov 5-11) %	2 <sup>nd</sup> Wave (Oct 8-15) %	1 <sup>st</sup> Wave (Sep 10-17) %
0 Extremely pessimistic	7.8	9.5	7.3	9.6	10.8
1	1.9	1.8	1.3	2.3	2.0
2	5.7	4.9	3.4	3.4	7.0
3	10.8	12.0	10.5	11.9	13.6
4	12.2	10.8	11.5	10.6	12.1
5 Half-half	37.1	31.5	37.4	33.8	32.2
6	7.7	8.8	7.7	12.0	9.4
7	6.3	7.4	8.3	7.1	5.7
8	4.8	6.2	4.8	4.8	2.6
9	0.5	0.7	1.3	0.4	0.2
10 Extremely optimistic	4.5	4.5	4.2	3.3	3.2
No View/ Refuse	0.8	1.9	2.3	1.0	1.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mean* (N)	4.61 (1001)	4.62 (992)	4.80 (1006)	4.57 (794)	4.22 (996)

\* No view/Refuse are not included in 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 15: Migration**

	5 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Mar 2-9) %	4 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Dec 8-12) %	2 <sup>nd</sup> Wave (Oct 8-15) %	1 <sup>st</sup> Wave (Sep 10-17) %
Yes	18.8	20.7	21.6	21.2
No	81.0	78.2	77.7	77.2
No view / Refuse	0.2	1.1	0.7	1.6
Total	100.0 (1009)	100.0 (1011)	100.0 (802)	100.0 (1006)

Question: Are you considering migration to overseas?





### Basic Demographic Data

#### Sex

	<i>Before weighting</i>		<i>After weighting</i>	
	n	%	n	%
M	482	47.8	483	47.9
F	527	52.2	526	52.1
Total	1009	100.0	1009	100.0

#### Age

	<i>Before weighting</i>		<i>After weighting</i>	
	n	%	n	%
15 – 17	44	4.4	40	4.0
18 – 19	30	3.0	27	2.7
20 – 24	64	6.3	74	7.3
25 - 29	62	6.1	76	7.5
30 – 34	57	5.6	81	8.1
35 - 39	76	7.5	82	8.1
40 - 44	116	11.5	88	8.7
45 – 49	85	8.4	96	9.5
50 – 54	135	13.4	106	10.5
55 – 59	92	9.1	93	9.2
60 – 64	81	8.0	73	7.2
65 - 69	72	7.1	49	4.8
70 or Above	91	9.0	120	11.9
Refuse	4	0.4	4	0.4
Total	1009	100.0	1009	100.0





### Education

	<i>Before weighting</i>		<i>After weighting</i>	
	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
No edu / Kindergarten	28	2.8	38	3.8
Primary	86	8.5	130	12.9
Secondary (F.1 - F.3)	129	12.8	136	13.5
Secondary (F.4 - F.5)	263	26.1	266	26.4
Secondary (F.6 - F.7)	108	10.7	77	7.6
Tertiary (Non-degree)	86	8.5	94	9.4
Bachelor Degree	237	23.5	214	21.2
Graduate Studies (MA or above)	70	6.9	51	5.0
Refuse	2	0.2	3	0.3
Total	1009	100.0	1009	100.0

### Political orientation

	<i>Before weighting</i>		<i>After weighting</i>	
	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Radical democrats	40	4.0	41	4.0
Moderate democrats	311	30.8	309	30.6
Middle/neutral	315	31.2	306	30.3
Pro-establishment	58	5.7	56	5.5
Business-industrial	13	1.3	11	1.1
Pro-Beijing	24	2.4	23	2.2
No orientation / not belonging to any orientation	206	20.4	212	21.0
Don't Know/ Hard to say / Refuse to answer	42	4.2	51	5.1
Total	1009	100.0	1009	100.0

-- End --

