



## Public Opinion & Political Development in Hong Kong

### Survey Results

(Press Release)

July 24, 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.

This survey aims to examine citizens' opinions and views following the rejection of the Hong Kong SAR Government's proposed Electoral Reform Package by the Legislative Council on June 18. The eighth wave study was conducted in July 14 - 21, 2015. Using the method of random sampling, the Centre successfully interviewed 1006 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 41%. 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 level of sincerity demonstrated by the Central government in allowing the implementation of universal suffrage in Hong Kong to choose the Chief Executive**

Respondents indicate their view along a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being "absolutely insincere", 10 being "absolutely sincere", and 5 being "so-so". Results show that the mean score is 4.51. 40.1% of respondents tend to think that the Central government has been insincere in implementing universal suffrage to choose the Chief Executive in Hong Kong (score ranging from 0 to 4), and 23.5% give a score 0, i.e., "absolutely insincere". 30.8% tend to think that the Central government has been sincere (score ranging from 6 to 10), and 14.5% give a score 10, i.e., "absolutely sincere"; 26.4% of respondents indicate "so-so" (score 5). (See Table 1)





Comparison of findings in 2 waves of study:

“Insincere” :	40.1%	(July)	;	41.3%	(May)
“Sincere” :	30.8%	(July)	;	35.3%	(May)
Mean :	4.51	(July)	;	4.74	(May)

**(2) Perceived level of effort demonstrated by the Hong Kong SAR government in fighting for the interests of Hong Kong people when dealing with the Central government regarding 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 4.38. 44.8% of respondents tend to think that the Hong Kong SAR Government made 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 23.1% give a score 0, i.e., “absolutely no effort”. 31.2% of respondents tend to think that the Hong Kong SAR Government makes an effort (score ranging from 6 to 10), and 12.9% give a score 10, i.e., “utmost effort”. 22.0% of respondents indicate “so-so” (score 5). (See Table 2)

Comparison of findings in 2 waves of study:

“Lack of effort” :	44.8%	(July)	;	43.6%	(May)
“Made effort” :	31.2%	(July)	;	32.9%	(May)
Mean :	4.38	(July)	;	4.39	(May)

**(3) Level of agreement on whether the election method of the HK Chief Executive will affect national security**

46.7% respondents “disagree” (strongly disagree/quite disagree) that how the Hong Kong Chief Executive is elected will affect national security; 25.0% respondents “agree” (strongly agree/quite agree); 24.3% indicate “so-so”. (See Table 3)

Comparison of findings in 2 waves of study:

“Disagree” :	46.7%	(July 2015)	;	51.8%	(September, 2014)
“Agree” :	25.0%	(July 2015)	;	24.1%	(September, 2014)





Further analyses by demographics (See Table 4)

- Among age groups, more than 40% in each group indicate “disagree” (Age 15 – 24: 51.3%; Age 25 – 39: 41.9%; Age 40 – 59: 48.6%; Age 60 or above: 45.7%)
- Among groups separated by education level, more than 40% of each group indicate “disagree” (F. 3 or below: 43.2%; F.4 – F.7: 48.3%; Tertiary or above: 48.3%)
- Among groups separated by political orientation, more than half of pan-democrats (“radical” and “moderate democrats”) indicate “disagree” (55.4%). The figure was 36.4% for pro-establishment respondents (including “pro-Beijing” and “industrial-commercial”); 42.7% for those who claim themselves to be “middle-neutral”, and 43.0% for those “possessing no political orientation”

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

79.4% 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; 4.4% of respondents indicate “disagree” (exceedingly disagree/somewhat disagree); 14.8% of respondents indicate “so-so”. (See Table 5)

Comparison of findings in 2 waves of study:

“Agree”:	79.4%	(July)	;	80.5%	(March)
“Disagree”:	4.4%	(July)	;	6.1%	(March)

#### **(5) Desire for the current Chief Executive Leung Chun-ying to be re-elected in the 2017 Chief Executive Election**

56.6% of respondents “do not want” (exceedingly do not want/somewhat do not want) the current Chief Executive to be re-elected in the 2017 Chief Executive election, and 42.8% of respondents indicate “exceedingly do not want”. 11.8% of respondents “want” (exceedingly want/somewhat want) the current Chief Executive to be re-elected, and 5.5% of respondents indicate “exceedingly want”; 26.2% of respondents indicate “so-so”. (See Table 6)





Further analyses by demographics (See Table 7):

- The younger the respondents, the more likely they indicate “do not want” the current Chief Executive to be re-elected  
(Age 15 – 24: 78.6%; Age 25 – 39: 63.9%; Age 40 – 59: 53.4%; Age 60 or above: 42.1%)
- The higher the education level, the more likely respondents indicate “do not want” the current Chief Executive to be re-elected  
(Tertiary or above: 69.4%; F.4 - F.7: 55.7%; F. 3 or below: 42.8%)
- 81.1% of pan-democrats (“radical” and “moderate democrats”) indicate they “do not want” the current Chief Executive to be re-elected. The figures are 49.8% for those who claim themselves to be “middle-neutral”, and 39.9% for those “possessing no political orientation”. 42% of pro-establishment respondents (including “pro-Beijing” and “industrial-commercial”) “want” the current Chief Executive to be re-elected

Respondents who indicate they “do not want” the current Chief Executive to be re-elected were then asked who they most preferred to be the next Chief Executive. Among them, 73.5% indicate “do not know”; 6.1% indicate John Tsang Chun-wah; 3.4% indicate Carrie Lam Cheng Yuet-ngor; and 2.4% indicate Alan Leong Kah-kit. (See Table 8).

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

Respondents indicate 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 6.79. (See Table 9)

Moreover, respondents indicate 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 4.89. (See Table 10)

Comparison of findings in 2 waves of study:

“Should have”: 6.79 (July) ; 7.11 (March)

“Actually has”: 4.89 (July) ; 5.07 (March)

*Difference*: 1.90 (July) ; 2.04 (March)





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

Respondents indicate 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 4.38. Moreover, 42.9% of the respondents tended not to trust the HKSAR Government (score ranging from 0 to 4), and 17.5% gave a score 0, i.e., “no trust at all”. 28.7% of respondents tended to trust the HKSAR Government (score ranging from 6 to 10), and 7.7% gave a score of 10, i.e., “total trust”. The trust of 27.5% respondents in HKSAR Government is “so-so” (a score of 5). (See Table 11)

Comparison of findings in 5 waves of study:

	July 2015	March 2015	December 2014	October 2014	September 2014
“Trust”	28.7%	35.6%	36.5%	26.1%	22.5%
“Do not trust”	42.9%	41.7%	40.3%	47.9%	49.7%
Mean	4.38	4.76	4.76	4.17	4.02

### (8) Trust in the Central Government

Respondents indicate 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 4.54. Moreover, 43.1% of respondents tended not to trust the Central Government (score ranging from 0 to 4) and 17.9% gave a score of 0, i.e., “no trust at all”. 31.4% of respondents tended to trust the Central Government (score ranging from 6 to 10), and 10.7% gave a score of 10, i.e., “total trust”. The trust of 23.7% respondents in the Central Government is “so-so” (score 5). (See Table 12)

Comparison of findings in 5 waves of study:

	July 2015	March 2015	December 2014	October 2014	September 2014
“Trust”	31.4%	33.9%	34.7%	27.5%	25.0%
“Do not trust”	43.1%	42.6%	41.3%	47.3%	48.5%
Mean	4.54	4.62	4.62	4.14	4.05







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

Respondents indicate 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 5.41. 45.8% of respondents tended to trust the police force (score ranging from 6 to 10), and 12.8% expressed “total trust” (score of 10). 31.6% tended not to trust (score ranging from 0 to 4), and 11.0% expressed “total lack of trust” (score of 0). 21.6% of respondents indicate “so-so” (score 5). (See Table 13)

Comparison of findings in 5 waves of study:

	July 2015	March 2015	December 2014	October 2014	September 2014
“Trust”	45.8%	46.7%	48.5%	55.6%	44.1%
“Do not trust”	31.6%	25.4%	29.4%	20.0%	28.6%
Mean	5.41	5.79	5.64	6.25	5.49





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

**Table 1: Has the Central government been sincere or insincere in allowing the implementation of a universal suffrage in Hong Kong to choose the Chief Executive?**

	8 <sup>th</sup> Wave (July 14-21) %	6 <sup>th</sup> Wave (May 13-20) %
0 Absolutely insincere	23.5	17.9
1	3.2	2.8
2	4.7	6.9
3	5.4	7.7
4	3.3	6.1
5 So-so	26.4	20.8
6	4.0	6.7
7	5.3	5.2
8	4.9	7.9
9	2.2	1.3
10 Absolutely sincere	14.5	14.2
No opinion / Refuse to answer	2.7	2.5
Total	100.0 (1006)	100.0 (1041)
Mean* (N)	4.51 (979)	4.74 (1015)

\* 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 “absolutely insincere”, 10 being “absolutely sincere” and 5 being “so-so”, what score will you give?





**Table 2: Does the Hong Kong government make an effort to fight for the interests of Hong Kong people when dealing with the Central government?**

	8 <sup>th</sup> Wave (July 14-21) %	6 <sup>th</sup> Wave (May 13-20) %
0 Absolutely no effort	23.1	21.7
1	3.4	5.0
2	6.0	6.1
3	8.1	8.2
4	4.3	2.7
5 So-so	22.0	21.5
6	4.2	5.2
7	6.2	7.2
8	5.8	7.1
9	2.0	1.8
10 Utmost effort	12.9	11.6
No opinion / Refuse to answer	1.9	2.0
Total	100.0 (1006)	100.0 (1041)
Mean* (N)	4.38 (987)	4.39 (1020)

\* 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?

**Table 3: Whether election method of HK Chief Executive will affect national security?**

	8 <sup>th</sup> Wave (July 14-21, 2015) %	1 <sup>st</sup> Wave (Sep 10-17, 2014) %
Strongly agree	12.1	12.4
Somewhat agree	12.9	11.7
So-so	24.3	19.8
Somewhat disagree	18.0	23.7
Strongly disagree	28.7	28.1
No opinion / Refuse to answer	4.1	4.2
Total	100.0 (1006)	100.0 (1006)

Question: Some people say that how to elect the Chief Executive of Hong Kong will affect national security. Do you agree with this view? Strongly agree, quite agree, so-so, quite disagree or strongly disagree?







**Table 4: Question on “National security” by demographics**

	Agree %	So-so %	Disagree %	No view / Refuse %	Total %	(n)
<b>Age</b>						
15 – 24 years old	18.9	29.8	51.3	0.0	100.0	(141)
25 – 39 years old	25.3	30.5	41.9	2.3	100.0	(238)
40 – 59 years old	27.5	19.9	48.6	3.9	100.0	(383)
60 or Above	24.5	22.2	45.7	7.7	100.0	(242)
<b>Education</b>						
F.3 or Below	21.2	26.5	43.2	9.1	100.0	(300)
F4 – F.7	27.5	21.8	48.3	2.4	100.0	(337)
Tertiary or Above	25.6	25.1	48.3	1.0	100.0	(364)
<b>Political Orientation</b>						
Pan-democrats	19.8	22.3	55.4	2.5	100.0	(365)
Middle-neutral	28.0	26.9	42.7	2.4	100.0	(289)
Pro-establishment	40.8	19.0	36.4	3.8	100.0	(93)
No orientation	26.4	24.9	43.0	5.6	100.0	(200)

**Table 5: Belief that activities demanding political reform should be peaceful and non-violent**

	8 <sup>th</sup> Wave (July 14-21) %	5 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Mar 2-9) %
Strongly agree	57.6	55.1
Somewhat agree	21.8	25.4
So-so	14.8	12.1
Somewhat disagree	2.6	3.1
Strongly disagree	2.8	3.0
No opinion / Refuse to answer	1.4	1.3
Total	100.0 (1006)	100.0 (1009)

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





**Table 6: Desire for the current Chief Executive to be re-elected**

	Frequency	%
Exceedingly want	56	5.5
Somewhat want	63	6.3
So-so	264	26.2
Somewhat do not want	139	13.8
Exceedingly do not want	431	42.8
No view / Refuse answer	54	5.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>1006</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Question: In the 2017 Chief Executive elections, do you want Leung Chun-ying to be re-elected? Exceedingly want  
Somewhat want, So-so, Somewhat do not want, Exceedingly do not want

**Table 7: Desire for the current Chief Executive to be re-elected – by demographics**

	Want %	So-so %	Do not want %	No view / Refuse %	Total %	(n)
<b>Age</b>						
15 – 24 years old	1.8	17.6	78.6	2.0	100.0	(141)
25 – 39 years old	5.9	28.5	63.9	1.7	100.0	(238)
40 – 59 years old	12.6	28.0	53.4	5.9	100.0	(383)
60 or Above	22.3	26.0	42.1	9.7	100.0	(242)
<b>Education</b>						
F.3 or Below	18.3	31.4	42.8	7.4	100.0	(300)
F4 – F.7	9.7	29.8	55.7	4.7	100.0	(337)
Tertiary or Above	7.9	18.9	69.4	3.7	100.0	(364)
<b>Political Orientation</b>						
Pan-democrats	3.7	13.5	81.1	1.6	100.0	(365)
Middle-neutral	8.0	37.8	49.8	4.4	100.0	(289)
Pro-establishment	42.0	32.7	20.1	5.3	100.0	(93)
No orientation	15.9	34.0	39.9	10.3	100.0	(200)





**Table 8: Choice for the next Chief Executive [for those who indicate “somewhat do not want” and “exceedingly do not want” on the re-election of the current Chief Executive]**

	Frequency	%
John Tsang Chun Wah	35	6.1
Carrie Lam Cheng Yuet-ngor	20	3.4
Alan Leong Kah-kit	13	2.4
Other*	75	13.2
Do not know	419	73.5
Refuse to answer	8	1.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Question: Who would you like to be elected to be the next Chief Executive?

\* All other individuals received less than 2%

**Table 9: Level of autonomy Hong Kong “should have” under “one country two systems”**

	8 <sup>th</sup> Wave (July 14-21) %	5 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Mar 2-9) %
0 Should have absolutely no autonomy	4.4	2.5
1	0.1	0.1
2	0.8	1.2
3	1.7	1.5
4	1.7	2.3
5	24.6	16.8
6	6.0	8.3
7	14.6	16.0
8	21.4	23.0
9	2.9	6.6
10 Should have full autonomy	18.5	17.8
No View/ Refuse	3.2	3.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0 (1006)</b>	<b>100.0 (1009)</b>
<b>Mean* (N)</b>	<b>6.79 (974)</b>	<b>7.11 (969)</b>

\* 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 10: Level of autonomy Hong Kong “currently has” under “one country two systems”**

	8 <sup>th</sup> Wave (July 14-21) %	5 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Mar 2-9) %
0 Currently has absolutely no autonomy	10.4	6.8
1	2.4	2.0
2	5.7	5.5
3	9.5	10.7
4	9.0	12.1
5	26.6	22.9
6	6.9	10.5
7	9.3	8.3
8	8.7	9.5
9	0.8	2.4
10 Currently has full autonomy	8.1	6.8
No View/ Refuse	2.6	2.3
Total	100.0 (1006)	100.0 (1009)
Mean* (N)	4.89 (980)	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 11: Trust in Hong Kong SAR Government**

	8 <sup>th</sup> Wave (July 14-21, 2015) %	5 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Mar 2-9, 2015) %	4 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Dec 8-12, 2014) %	2 <sup>nd</sup> Wave (Oct 8-15, 2014) %	1 <sup>st</sup> Wave (Sep 10-17, 2014) %
0 No Trust at all	17.5	10.3	13.6	13.9	15.8
1	3.5	4.2	3.3	5.8	4.1
2	5.8	7.7	7.2	8.9	7.4
3	8.3	9.5	9.5	11.0	10.8
4	7.9	9.9	6.7	8.3	11.5
5 So-so	27.5	22.0	21.4	23.7	27.3
6	6.7	8.8	7.2	7.2	7.6
7	7.2	8.6	8.8	5.7	6.6
8	6.3	9.5	9.9	7.6	3.6
9	0.9	1.5	2.5	0.9	1.1
10 Total trust	7.7	7.2	8.1	4.7	3.5
No View/ Refuse	0.9	0.8	1.7	2.3	0.6
Total	100.0 (1006)	100.0 (1009)	100.0 (1011)	100.0 (802)	100.0 (1006)
Mean* (N)	4.38 (997)	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**

	8 <sup>th</sup> Wave (July 14-21, 2015) %	5 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Mar 2-9, 2015) %	4 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Dec 8-12, 2014) %	2 <sup>nd</sup> Wave (Oct 8-15, 2014) %	1 <sup>st</sup> Wave (Sep 10-17, 2014) %
0 No Trust at all	17.9	15.0	16.5	19.2	19.6
1	2.9	3.2	3.6	5.1	4.3
2	5.9	7.2	7.1	7.3	6.3
3	9.8	8.1	7.4	9.5	10.0
4	6.6	9.1	6.7	6.2	8.2
5 So-so	23.7	21.3	18.5	20.7	24.2
6	5.1	7.8	6.2	6.5	6.6
7	7.4	7.6	8.8	5.2	5.0
8	6.1	7.9	7.9	6.1	6.5
9	2.1	2.2	2.2	1.8	1.0
10 Total trust	10.7	8.4	9.5	7.8	6.0
No View/ Refuse	1.8	2.3	5.6	4.6	2.3
Total	100.0 (1006)	100.0 (1009)	100.0 (1011)	100.0 (802)	100.0 (1006)
Mean* (N)	4.54 (988)	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**

	8 <sup>th</sup> Wave (July 14-21, 2015)	5 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Mar 2-9, 2015)	4 <sup>th</sup> Wave (Dec 8-12, 2014)	2 <sup>nd</sup> Wave (Oct 8-15, 2014)	1 <sup>st</sup> Wave (Sep 10-17, 2014)
	%	%	%	%	%
0 No Trust at all	11.0	5.3	9.1	3.8	9.3
1	2.4	2.9	2.6	1.9	1.8
2	6.3	4.8	5.1	3.1	3.9
3	6.1	7.0	7.7	5.9	5.7
4	5.7	5.4	4.9	5.3	7.9
5 So-so	21.6	26.5	21.2	22.8	25.3
6	7.3	6.6	7.6	8.5	8.4
7	10.0	9.4	9.4	11.3	10.1
8	12.0	11.9	12.3	14.7	11.4
9	3.7	5.2	4.6	4.4	1.8
10 Total trust	12.8	13.7	14.7	16.7	12.5
No View/ Refuse	1.0	1.3	1.0	1.6	2.0
Total	100.0 (1006)	100.0 (1009)	100.0 (1011)	100.0 (1030)	100.0 (802)
Mean* (N)	5.41 (996)	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?





### Basic Demographic Data

#### Sex

	<i>Before weighting</i>		<i>After weighting</i>	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
M	473	47.0	483	48.0
F	533	53.0	523	52.0
Total	1006	100.0	1006	100.0

#### Age

	<i>Before weighting</i>		<i>After weighting</i>	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
15 – 17	52	5.2	40	4.0
18 – 19	39	3.9	27	2.7
20 – 24	82	8.2	74	7.4
25 - 29	55	5.5	76	7.5
30 – 34	42	4.2	81	8.1
35 - 39	65	6.5	81	8.1
40 - 44	87	8.6	88	8.7
45 – 49	104	10.3	96	9.6
50 – 54	117	11.6	106	10.5
55 – 59	100	9.9	93	9.2
60 – 64	93	9.2	73	7.2
65 - 69	70	7.0	49	4.8
70 or Above	97	9.6	120	11.9
Refuse	3	0.3	2	0.2
Total	1006	100.0	1006	100.0





### Education

	<i>Before weighting</i>		<i>After weighting</i>	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
No edu / Kindergarten	20	2.0	39	3.9
Primary	90	8.9	130	12.9
Secondary (F .1 - F. 3)	144	14.3	132	13.1
Secondary (F. 4 – F. 5)	236	23.5	267	26.5
Secondary (F. 6 – F. 7)	97	9.6	70	6.9
Tertiary (Non-degree)	103	10.2	95	9.5
Bachelor Degree	246	24.5	214	21.2
Graduate Studies (MA or above)	65	6.5	55	5.5
Refuse	5	0.5	5	0.5
Total	1006	100.0	1006	100.0

### Political orientation

	<i>Before weighting</i>		<i>After weighting</i>	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Radical democrats	37	3.7	37	3.7
Moderate democrats	343	34.1	328	32.6
Middle/neutral	285	28.3	289	28.8
Pro-establishment	54	5.4	52	5.2
Business-industrial	16	1.6	14	1.3
Pro-Beijing	28	2.8	28	2.7
No orientation / not belonging to any orientation	194	19.3	200	19.9
Don't Know/ Hard to say / Refuse to answer	49	4.9	58	5.8
Total	1006	100.0	1006	100.0

Please refer any questions to Ms. Chung at 3943 1788. Thank you.

-- End --

