



Public Opinion & Political Development in Hong Kong

Survey Results

(Press Release)

May 27, 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 sixth wave study was conducted in May 13 - 20, 2015. Using the method of random sampling, the Centre successfully interviewed 1041 Hong Kong Cantonese-speaking residents aged 15 or above on phone (with a sampling error of 3.0% at 95% confidence level). The response rate was 42%. 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. The appendix shows the results of samples targeting people aged 15 or above and people aged 18 or above respectively.

A summary of the findings is provided below:

(1) Whether the Legislative Council should approve or reject the proposed reform package for the 2017 election of the Hong Kong Chief Executive

45.0% of respondents consider that the Legislative Council should approve the proposed reform package while 42.9% consider that the Legislative Council should reject it. (See Table 1)





Further analysis by demographics (See Table 2):

- The younger they are the more likely they consider that the Legislative Council should reject the proposed reform package:
(Age 15-24: 66.4%; Age 25-39: 53.3%; Age 40-59: 34.8%; Age 60 or above: 31.8%).
- The higher the education the more likely they favour rejection of the proposed reform package:
(Tertiary or above: 58.5%; F. 4-F.7: 36.8%; F. 3 or below: 31.0%).
- Pro-democrats mostly favour rejection of the proposed reform package (83.7%) while pro-establishment respondents overwhelmingly favour approval of the proposed reform package (90.3%). Among respondents who claim themselves to be “Middle” (57.4%) or “possessing no political orientation” (42.4%), a greater proportion favour approval of the proposed reform package.

If the proposed reform package 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, 38.8% of respondents consider that the Legislative Council should approve the proposed reform package while 32.7% consider that the Legislative Council should reject it. 27.3% of respondents indicate “don’t know/difficult to say”. (See Table 3)

If the government makes a public commitment to continue to review the process of electing the Chief Executive after the 2017 election, 60.2% of respondents consider that the Legislative Council should approve the proposed reform package while 29.3% consider that the Legislative Council should reject it. (See Table 4)

(2) Adequacy of the representativeness of Nominating Committee

Regarding the Hong Kong government’s proposed reform package, 44.2% of respondents consider the representativeness of Nominating Committee “inadequate” (very inadequate /quite inadequate) ; 19.1% of respondents consider it “adequate” (very adequate/quite adequate) ; 28.4% consider it “so-so”. (See Table 5)





Further analysis by demographics (See Table 6):

- The younger the respondents, the more likely they consider the representativeness of Nominating Committee “inadequate” :
(Age 15 - 24: 62.4%; Age 25 - 39: 55.0%; Age 40 - 59: 37.3%; Age 60 or above: 34.5%)
- The higher the education, the more likely respondents consider the representativeness of Nominating Committee “inadequate”:
(Tertiary or above: 59.4%; F.4 - F.7: 40.3%; F. 3 or below: 30.8%)
- A large proportion of pro-democrats consider the representativeness of Nominating Committee “inadequate” (81.5%) while 60% of pro-establishment respondents consider it “adequate” (60.4%). Among respondents who claim themselves to be “Middle” (36.4%) or “possessing no political orientation” (29.5%), a greater proportion consider the representativeness of Nominating Committee “inadequate”.

(3) Whether the respondents agree or disagree to the statement “The Hong Kong government’s proposed reform package places unreasonable constraints on the candidates for Chief Executive”

44.9% of respondents “agree” (exceedingly agree/somewhat agree) that the Hong Kong government’s proposed reform package places unreasonable constraints on the candidates for Chief Executive; 25.0% of respondents “disagree” (exceedingly disagree/somewhat disagree) to this statement; 22.7% of respondents indicate “so-so”. (See Table 7)

Further analysis by demographics (See Table 8):

- The younger the respondents, the more likely they “agree” to the statement :
(Age 15 - 24: 67.4%; Age 25 - 39: 54.1%; Age 40 - 59: 39.2%; Age 60 or above: 32.3%)
- The higher the education, the more likely respondents “agree” to the statement:
(Tertiary or above: 58.8%; F.4 - F.7: 43.1%; F. 3 or below: 30.2%)
- Over 3/4 pro-democrats “agree” to the statement (76.7%) while more than half of pro-establishment respondents “disagree” to the statement (55.3%). Among respondents who claim themselves to be “Middle”, a higher proportion (39.2%) “agree” to the statement of “unreasonable constraints”; but for those “possessing no political orientation”, a smaller proportion (22.8%) “agree” to that statement.





(4) Whether the respondents agree or disagree to the statement “the Hong Kong government’s proposed reform package provides every citizen a vote to elect the Chief Executive, which is better than the current system for electing the Chief Executive”

47.8% of respondents “agree” (exceedingly agree/somewhat agree) that the Hong Kong government’s proposed reform package provides every citizen a vote to elect the Chief Executive, which is better than the current system for electing the Chief Executive; 38.0% of respondents “disagree” (exceedingly disagree/somewhat disagree) to this statement; 11.8% of respondents indicate “so-so”. (See Table 9)

Further analysis by demographics (See Table 10):

- The older the respondents, the more likely they “agree” to the statement :
(Age 60 or above: 56.1%; Age 40 - 59: 55.8%; Age 25 - 39: 41.3%; Age 15 - 24: 22.9%)
- The lower the education, the more likely respondents “agree” to the statement:
(F. 3 or below: 58.5%; F.4 - F.7: 53.6%; Tertiary or above: 33.3%)
- 3/4 pro-democrat respondents (75.3%) “disagree” to the statement that providing every citizen a vote to elect the Chief Executive is better than keeping the current system. But nearly 90% pro-establishment respondents “agree” to the statement (89.1%). Respondents who claim themselves to be “Middle” (58.9%) or “possessing no political orientation” (52.2%) are also more likely to “agree” to the statement.

(5) Whether the respondents believe or not believe that the government would improve the electoral system next time if the Legislative Council passes the proposed reform package for electing the Chief Executive

If the Legislative Council passes the proposed reform package for electing the Chief Executive, 37.0% of respondents “do not believe” (strongly not believe/somewhat not believe) that the government would improve the electoral system next time while 27.9% of respondents “believe” so (strongly believe/somewhat believe); 28.9% of respondents indicate “so-so”. (See Table 11)





(6) Whether the respondents believe or not believe that there would be no more political reform in the future if the Legislative Council rejects the proposed reform package for electing the Chief Executive

If the Legislative Council rejects the proposed reform package for electing the Chief Executive, 33.4% of respondents “believe” (strongly believe/somewhat believe) that there would be no more political reform in the future while 21.7% of respondents “do not believe” it (strongly not believe/somewhat not believe); 35.5% of respondents indicate “so-so”. (See Table 12)

(7) Has the Central government been sincere or insincere in allowing the implementation of a universal suffrage in Hong Kong to choose the Chief Executive

Respondents indicate their view along a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being “totally insincere”, 10 being “very sincere”, and 5 being “so-so”. Results show that the mean score is 4.74. While 41.3% of respondents tend to think that the Central government has been insincere in implementing a universal suffrage to choose the Chief Executive in Hong Kong (score ranging from 0 to 4) and 17.9% give a score 0, i.e., “totally insincere”, 35.3% tend to think that the Central government has been sincere (score ranging from 6 to 10) and 14.2% give a score 10, i.e., “very sincere”; 20.8% of respondents indicate “so-so” (score 5). (See Table 13)

(8) Does the Hong Kong government make an effort to fight for the interests of Hong Kong people when dealing with the Central government in political reforms of Hong Kong

Respondents indicate their view along a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being “absolutely no effort”, 10 being “utmost effort”, and 5 being “so-so”. Results show that the mean score is 4.39. While 43.6% of respondents tend to think that the Hong Kong Government makes no effort to fight for the interests of Hong Kong people when dealing with the Central government during the political reform process (score ranging from 0 to 4) and 21.7% give a score 0, i.e., “absolutely no effort”, 32.9% of respondents tend to think that the Hong Kong Government makes an effort (score ranging from 6 to 10) and 11.6% give a score 10, i.e., “utmost effort”; 21.5% respondents indicate “so-so” (score 5). (See Table 14)





【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. For the sample which excluded respondents aged from 15 to 17, all data were also weighted by the proportion of gender, age and education according to the most recent statistics of people aged 18 or above issued by the Census and Statistics Department. The total N may not add up to 100% due to rounding errors and weighting】

Table 1: Whether the Legislative Council should approve or reject the proposed reform package for the 2017 election of the Hong Kong Chief Executive

	Aged 15 or above		Aged 18 or above	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Approve	469	45.0	458	45.4
Reject	446	42.9	428	42.4
Don't know / Hard to say	117	11.2	114	11.3
Refusal	9	0.8	9	0.9
Total	1041	100.0	1009	100.0

Question: Should the Legislative Council approve or reject the proposed reform package for selecting the Chief Executive in 2017?

Table 2: Demographics by Approval or rejection of the proposed reform package for 2017 election of Chief Executive

	Approve %	Reject %	Don't know / Hard to say / %	Refusal	Total %	(N)
Age						
15 – 24 years old	24.3	66.4	9.3	0.0	100.0	(146)
25 – 39 years old	37.8	53.3	9.0	0.0	100.0	(247)
40 – 59 years old	53.1	34.8	10.9	1.3	100.0	(396)
60 or Above	51.8	31.8	14.9	1.5	100.0	(250)
Education						
F.3 or Below	48.0	31.0	19.7	1.4	100.0	(306)
F4 – F.7	51.9	36.8	10.4	0.9	100.0	(357)
Tertiary or Above	36.1	58.5	5.0	0.3	100.0	(373)
Political Orientation						
Pro-democrats	10.6	83.7	4.7	0.9	100.0	(296)
Pro-establishment	90.3	4.0	5.8	0.0	100.0	(110)
Middle	57.4	31.5	10.2	0.9	100.0	(469)
No orientation	42.4	27.2	28.8	1.6	100.0	(128)





Table 3: Whether the Legislative Council should approve or reject the proposed reform package for the 2017 election of the Hong Kong Chief Executive (Individual votes from four sectors)

	Aged 15 or above		Aged 18 or above	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Approve	404	38.8	395	39.1
Reject	341	32.7	321	31.9
Don't know / Hard to say	284	27.3	282	27.9
Refusal	11	1.1	11	1.1
Total	1041	100.0	1009	100.0

Question : If the proposed reform package 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 proposed reform package or reject it?

Table 4: Whether the Legislative Council should approve or reject the proposed reform package for the 2017 election of the Hong Kong Chief Executive (Public commitment by HK government)

	Aged 15 or above		Aged 18 or above	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Approve	626	60.2	608	60.2
Reject	305	29.3	293	29.0
Don't know / Hard to say	105	10.1	104	10.3
Refusal	5	0.5	5	0.5
Total	1041	100.0	1009	100.0

Question: If the Hong Kong government 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 proposed reform package or reject it?





Table 5: Adequacy of the representativeness of Nominating Committee

	Aged 15 or above		Aged 18 or above	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Very adequate	78	7.5	78	7.8
Quite adequate	122	11.7	120	11.9
So-so	296	28.4	281	27.8
Quite inadequate	144	13.9	136	13.5
Very inadequate	316	30.4	308	30.6
Don't know / Refusal	86	8.2	85	8.5
Total	1041	100.0	1009	100.0

Question: Regarding the Hong Kong government's proposed reform package, do you think the Nominating Committee has adequate representativeness? Very adequate, quite adequate, so-so, quite inadequate or very inadequate?

Table 6: Adequacy of the representativeness of Nominating Committee - by Demographics

	adequate %	So-so %	inadequate %	Don't know/ Refusal %	Total %	(N)
Age						
15 – 24 years old	5.7	30.3	62.4	1.6	100.0	(146)
25 – 39 years old	10.2	29.4	55.0	5.4	100.0	(247)
40 – 59 years old	22.5	32.5	37.3	7.6	100.0	(396)
60 or Above	30.3	19.7	34.5	15.5	100.0	(250)
Education						
F.3 or Below	22.9	28.9	30.8	17.4	100.0	(306)
F4 – F.7	22.5	30.6	40.3	6.6	100.0	(357)
Tertiary or Above	12.5	25.9	59.4	2.1	100.0	(373)
Political Orientation						
Pro-democrats	2.9	14.3	81.5	1.3	100.0	(296)
Pro-establishment	60.4	27.6	1.9	10.1	100.0	(110)
Middle	20.2	39.4	36.4	4.1	100.0	(469)
No orientation	16.0	22.5	29.5	32.0	100.0	(128)





Table 7: Whether the respondents agree or not agree to the statement “The Hong Kong government’s proposed reform package places unreasonable constraints on the candidates for Chief Executive”

	Aged 15 or above		Aged 18 or above	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Strongly agree	280	26.9	276	27.4
Somewhat agree	187	18.0	172	17.0
So-so	236	22.7	226	22.4
Somewhat disagree	129	12.4	126	12.5
Strongly disagree	131	12.6	132	13.1
Don’t know / Refusal	78	7.5	77	7.6
Total	1041	100.0	1009	100.0

Question: Some people say that the Hong Kong government’s proposed reform package places unreasonable constraints on the candidates for Chief Executive. To what extent do you agree or disagree? Strongly agree, somewhat agree, so-so, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree?

Table 8: Whether the respondents agree or not agree to the statement “The Hong Kong government’s proposed reform package places unreasonable constraints on the candidates for Chief Executive” - by Demographics

	Agree %	So-so %	Disagree %	Don’t know / Refusal %	Total %	(N)
Age						
15 – 24 years old	67.4	23.5	7.4	1.6	100.0	(146)
25 – 39 years old	54.1	25.7	16.9	3.2	100.0	(247)
40 – 59 years old	39.2	22.7	32.6	5.5	100.0	(396)
60 or Above	32.3	19.3	30.7	17.7	100.0	(250)
Education						
F.3 or Below	30.2	22.8	29.5	17.6	100.0	(306)
F4 – F.7	43.1	24.8	27.5	4.5	100.0	(357)
Tertiary or Above	58.8	20.8	18.7	1.7	100.0	(373)
Political Orientation						
Pro-democrats	76.7	10.2	11.6	1.5	100.0	(296)
Pro-establishment	14.9	19.4	55.3	10.3	100.0	(110)
Middle	39.2	30.7	24.5	5.6	100.0	(469)
No orientation	22.8	26.0	28.7	22.6	100.0	(128)





Table 9: Whether the respondents agree or disagree to the statement “the Hong Kong government’s proposed reform package provides every citizen a vote to elect the Chief Executive, which is better than the current system for electing the Chief Executive”

	Aged 15 or above		Aged 18 or above	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Strongly agree	285	27.4	285	28.2
Somewhat agree	213	20.4	201	19.9
So-so	122	11.8	112	11.1
Somewhat disagree	100	9.6	95	9.4
Strongly disagree	295	28.4	291	28.9
Don’t know / Refusal	25	2.4	25	2.5
Total	1041	100.0	1009	100.0

Question: Some people say that the Hong Kong government’s proposed reform package provides every citizen a vote to elect the Chief Executive, which is better than the current system for electing the Chief Executive. To what extent do you agree or disagree? Strongly agree, somewhat agree, so-so, somewhat disagree or strongly disagree?

Table 10: Whether the respondents agree or disagree to the statement “the Hong Kong government’s proposed reform package provides every citizen a vote to elect the Chief Executive, which is better than the current system for electing the Chief Executive” - by Demographics

	Agree %	So-so %	Disagree %	Don’t know / Refusal %	Total %	(N)
Age						
15 – 24 years old	22.9	22.3	54.1	0.8	100.0	(146)
25 – 39 years old	41.3	13.7	44.1	0.9	100.0	(247)
40 – 59 years old	55.8	10.2	32.3	1.7	100.0	(396)
60 or Above	56.1	6.3	31.6	5.9	100.0	(250)
Education						
F.3 or Below	58.5	9.7	26.8	5.0	100.0	(306)
F4 – F.7	53.6	13.2	30.9	2.3	100.0	(357)
Tertiary or Above	33.3	12.2	54.0	0.5	100.0	(373)
Political Orientation						
Pro-democrats	11.9	10.6	75.3	2.2	100.0	(296)
Pro-establishment	89.1	3.0	5.3	2.6	100.0	(110)
Middle	58.9	14.2	25.9	0.9	100.0	(469)
No orientation	52.2	13.4	30.7	3.7	100.0	(128)





Table 11: Whether the respondents believe or not believe that the government would improve the electoral system if the Legislative Council passes the proposed reform package for electing the Chief Executive

	Aged 15 or above		Aged 18 or above	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Strongly believe	133	12.8	132	13.1
Somewhat believe	158	15.2	151	15.0
So-so	301	28.9	288	28.6
Somewhat not believe	135	12.9	128	12.7
Strongly not believe	251	24.1	245	24.3
Don't know / Refusal	64	6.1	65	6.4
Total	1041	100.0	1009	100.0

Question: If the Legislative Council passes the proposed reform package for electing the Chief Executive, to what extent do you believe or not believe that the government would improve the electoral system? Strongly believe, somewhat believe, so-so, somewhat not believe or strongly not believe?

Table 12: Whether the respondents believe or not believe that there would be no more political reform in the future if the Legislative Council rejects the proposed reform package for electing the Chief Executive

	Aged 15 or above		Aged 18 or above	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Strongly believe	158	15.2	157	15.5
Somewhat believe	189	18.2	177	17.5
So-so	370	35.5	359	35.6
Somewhat not believe	125	12.0	119	11.8
Strongly not believe	101	9.7	101	10.0
Don't know / Refusal	97	9.4	97	9.6
Total	1041	100.0	1009	100.0

Question: If the Legislative Council rejects the proposed reform package for electing the Chief Executive, to what extent do you believe or not believe that there would be no more political reform in the future? Strongly believe, somewhat believe, so-so, somewhat not believe or strongly not believe?





Table 13: Has the Central government been sincere or insincere in allowing the implementation of a universal suffrage in Hong Kong to choose the Chief Executive?

	Aged 15 or above		Aged 18 or above	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
0 Totally insincere	186	17.9	180	17.8
1	29	2.8	28	2.8
2	72	6.9	67	6.7
3	80	7.7	73	7.2
4	64	6.1	61	6.0
5 So-so	217	20.8	216	21.4
6	70	6.7	66	6.5
7	54	5.2	49	4.8
8	82	7.9	82	8.1
9	14	1.3	13	1.2
10 Very sincere	148	14.2	149	14.8
No opinion / Refuse to answer	26	2.5	27	2.7
Total	1041	100.0	1009	100.0
Mean* (N)	4.74 (1015)		4.78 (982)	

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

Question: Do you think the Central government has been sincere or insincere in allowing the implementation of a universal suffrage in Hong Kong to choose the Chief Executive? Along a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being "totally insincere", 10 being "very sincere" and 5 being "so-so", what score will you give?





Table 14: Does the Hong Kong government make an effort to fight for the interests of Hong Kong people when dealing with the Central government?

	Aged 15 or above		Aged 18 or above	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
0 Absolutely no effort	226	21.7	224	22.2
1	52	5.0	44	4.4
2	63	6.1	61	6.0
3	85	8.2	80	7.9
4	28	2.7	24	2.4
5 So-so	223	21.5	220	21.8
6	54	5.2	50	4.9
7	75	7.2	72	7.2
8	74	7.1	73	7.2
9	19	1.8	19	1.9
10 Utmost effort	121	11.6	122	12.1
No opinion / Refuse to answer	21	2.0	21	2.1
Total	1041	100.0	1009	100.0
Mean* (N)	4.39 (1020)		4.43 (988)	

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

Question: During the political reform process, to what extent do you think the Hong Kong government made an effort to fight for the interests of Hong Kong people when dealing with the Central government? Along a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being “absolutely no effort”, 10 being “utmost effort” and 5 being “so-so”, what score will you give?





Basic Demographic Data

Sex

	<i>Before weighting</i>		<i>After weighting</i>	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
M	538	51.7	500	48.0
F	503	48.3	541	52.0
Total	1041	100.0	1041	100.0

Age

	<i>Before weighting</i>		<i>After weighting</i>	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
15 – 17	32	3.1	41	4.0
18 – 19	24	2.3	28	2.7
20 – 24	67	6.4	77	7.4
25 - 29	57	5.5	78	7.5
30 – 34	56	5.4	84	8.1
35 - 39	66	6.3	84	8.1
40 - 44	116	11.1	91	8.7
45 – 49	115	11.0	99	9.6
50 – 54	129	12.4	109	10.5
55 – 59	99	9.5	96	9.2
60 – 64	101	9.7	75	7.2
65 - 69	80	7.7	50	4.8
70 or Above	96	9.2	124	11.9
Refuse	3	0.3	3	0.3
Total	1041	100.0	1041	100.0





Education

	<i>Before weighting</i>		<i>After weighting</i>	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
No edu / Kindergarten	21	2.0	39	3.7
Primary	84	8.1	129	12.4
Secondary (F. 1 - F. 3)	133	12.8	138	13.3
Secondary (F. 4 - F. 5)	239	23.0	273	26.2
Secondary (F. 6 - F. 7)	116	11.1	85	8.1
Tertiary (Non-degree)	116	11.1	98	9.4
Bachelor Degree	234	22.5	223	21.4
Graduate Studies (MA or above)	93	8.9	52	5.0
Refuse	5	0.5	5	0.5
Total	1041	100.0	1041	100.0

Political orientation

	<i>Before weighting</i>		<i>After weighting</i>	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Pro-democrats	303	29.1	296	28.4
Pro-establishment	120	11.5	110	10.6
Middle	466	44.8	469	45.1
No orientation / not belonging to any orientation	122	11.7	128	12.3
Don't Know/ Hard to say / Refuse to answer	30	2.9	37	3.5
Total	1041	100.0	1041	100.0

-- End --

