



Public Opinion & Political Development in Hong Kong

Survey Results

(Press Release)

June 7, 2017

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 tenth wave of the survey was conducted in May 23 to June 2, 2017. Using the method of random sampling, the Centre successfully interviewed 1028 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 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 respondents aged 15 to 17 constituted only 3.1% of the total sample. Their inclusion did not affect the results significantly.

A summary of the findings is provided below:

(1) 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 5.17. In addition:

(See Table 1)

30.2% of the respondents tended to be “dissatisfied”	(score ranging from 0 to 4)
38.7% of the respondents tended to be “satisfied”	(score ranging from 6 to 10)
30.1% of the respondents indicated “so-so”	(score 5)





Comparison of findings across 5 waves of study: (See Table 2)

	2017.5	2016.7	2015.7	2015.3	2014.12
Mean score:	5.17	4.77	4.87	4.84	4.99

(2) Trust in the Hong Kong SAR Government, the Central Government and the Hong Kong Police Force

Respondents indicated their trust in the Hong Kong SAR Government, the Central Government and 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”. Summarized mean scores are as follows: (See Tables 3, 5, 7)

Trust in Hong Kong SAR Government	4.86
Trust in the Central Government	4.91
Trust in the Hong Kong Police Force	6.09

Comparison of findings across 7 waves of study: (See Tables 4, 6, 8)

	2017.5	2016.7	2015.7	2015.3	2014.12	2014.10	2014.9
HKSAR Government	4.86	4.43	4.38	4.76	4.76	4.17	4.02
Central Government	4.91	4.33	4.54	4.62	4.62	4.14	4.05
	2017.5	2016.7	2015.7	2015.3	2014.12	2014.11	2014.10
Hong Kong Police Force	6.09	5.93	5.41	5.79	5.64	6.25	5.49

(3) Views on the state of Hong Kong society since the handover

When considering the current state of Hong Kong society since the handover 20 years ago, 62.9% of the respondents indicated that Hong Kong society has worsened (“worsened a lot” / “worsened slightly”); 15.4% of the respondents indicated that Hong Kong society has improved (“improved a lot” / “improved slightly”); 19.2% of the respondents indicated that the state of Hong Kong society is “about the same”. (See Table 9)

(4) Views on the future development of Hong Kong

Respondents indicated their perceived optimism and pessimism on 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 is 4.84. In addition:





(See Table 10)

33.4% of the respondents tended to be “pessimistic” (score ranging from 0 to 4)
29.1% of the respondents tended to be “optimistic” (score ranging from 6 to 10)
37.1% of the respondents indicated “so-so” (score 5)

Comparison of findings in 8 waves of study: (See Table 11)

	2017.5	2016.7	2015.7	2015.3	2014.12	2014.11	2014.10	2014.9
Mean score	4.84	4.81	4.59	4.61	4.62	4.80	4.57	4.22

(5) Intention to emigrate overseas

79.0% of respondents have not considered emigrating overseas while 19.9% have considered emigrating. Of the latter, 16.1% have “thought about” emigration; 2.6% have “planned” to emigrate; and 1.1% have “commenced” with the emigration process.

(See Tables 12, 13)

(6) Views on the prospects of Hong Kong after 2047

There have been some discourses in society regarding the prospects of Hong Kong after 2047. Respondents indicated their level of support and non-support for the following three scenarios: “Maintenance of one country two systems”, “Direct governance by China”, and “Independence” (the order of the three scenarios was randomly allocated by the computer for each interviewed respondent). Summarized findings are as follows:

(See Tables 14, 15)

71.2% of respondents “support” (strongly support/somewhat support) the “**Maintenance of one country two systems**”; 4.9% “do not support” (strongly against/somewhat against); 22.3% indicate “so-so”.

	2017.5	2016.7
“Support”	71.2%	69.6%
“Against”	4.9%	6.0%

14.7% of respondents “support” (strongly support/somewhat support) “**Direct governance by China**”; 58.6% “do not support” (strongly against/somewhat against); 24.3% indicate “so-so”.

	2017.5	2016.7
“Support”	14.7%	13.8%
“Against”	58.6%	59.2%





11.4% of respondents “support” (strongly support/somewhat support) Hong Kong “**Independence**”; 60.2% “do not support” (strongly against/somewhat against); 25.9% indicate “so-so”.

	2017.5	2016.7
“Support”	11.4%	17.4%
“Against”	60.2%	57.6%

(7) Perceived possibility that Hong Kong can attain independence in the future

83.5% of respondents indicated “not possible” (absolutely not possible/not possible); 2.9% of respondents indicated it is “possible” (absolutely possible/somewhat possible); 12.5% indicated “so-so”

	2017.5	2016.7	(See Tables 16, 17)
“Not possible”	83.5%	81.2%	
“Possible”	2.9%	3.6%	

(8) Impressions on the three political camps

Respondents indicated their general impression along a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being “very negative”, 10 being “very positive”, and 5 being “so-so”, on the following three political camps: “Localist”, “pan-democratic”, and “pro-establishment” (the order of the groups was randomly allocated by the computer for each interviewed respondent).

Summarized mean scores are as follows:

Comparison of findings in 2 waves of study: (See Tables 18, 19)

	2017.5	2016.7
“Localist”	3.48	3.45
“Pan-democratic”	4.51	4.53
“Pro-establishment”	3.90	4.00

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

78.4% of respondents “agree” (exceedingly agree/somewhat agree) that activities demanding political reforms should be peaceful and non-violent; 4.8% of respondents indicate “disagree” (exceedingly disagree/somewhat disagree); 15.5% of respondents indicate “so-so” (See Table 20)





Comparison of findings in 4 waves of study: (See Table 21)

	2017.5	2016.7	2015.7	2015.3
“Agree”:	78.4%	71.3%	79.4%	80.5%
“Disagree”:	4.8%	5.9%	4.4%	6.1%

(10) Perceived importance of eight social values

Respondents indicated their view along a scale from 0 to 10, with 0 being “very unimportant”, 10 being “very important”, on the following social values: “press freedom”, “social harmony”, “democratic development”, “economic development”, “judicial independence”, “national interest”, “Corruption-free society” and “Efficient governance” (the order of the social values was randomly allocated by the computer for each interviewed respondent). The mean score for each value is as follows along with the comparison of findings in 2 waves of study: (See Tables 22, 23)

	2017.5		2016.7	
“Corruption-free society”	9.02	(1 st)	--	
“Judicial independence”	8.94	(2 nd)	8.84	(1 st)
“Press freedom”	8.66	(3 rd)	8.49	(3 rd)
“Social harmony”	8.65	(4 th)	8.57	(2 nd)
“Economic development”	8.51	(5 th)	8.26	(4 th)
“Efficient governance”	8.10	(6 th)	--	
“Democratic development”	7.69	(7 ^h)	7.61	(5 th)
“National interest”	7.23	(8 th)	7.07	(6 th)





【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. Respondents who answered “No view/Do not know” or refused to answer are not included in the calculation of the means.】

Table 1: Satisfaction with Central Government’s implementation of “one country two systems” in Hong Kong

	Age 15 and above	Age 18 and above
	%	%
0 Totally dissatisfied	11.3	11.5
1	1.6	1.6
2	4.6	4.6
3	6.4	6.5
4	6.3	6.4
5 So-so	30.1	29.5
6	8.4	8.2
7	8.0	7.8
8	10.3	10.5
9	3.3	3.5
10 Totally satisfied	8.8	9.0
No View/ Refuse	1.0	1.0
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (984)
Mean* (N)	5.17 (1018)	5.17 (974)

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?

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



Table 2: Satisfaction with Central Government’s implementation of “one country two systems” in Hong Kong (Comparison)

	10 th Wave	9 th Wave	8 th Wave	5 ^h Wave	4 th Wave
	2017.5	2016.7	2015.7	2015.3	2014.12
	%	%	%	%	%
0 Totally dissatisfied	11.3	13.5	13.9	13.3	14.2
1	1.6	3.0	2.6	3.8	2.3
2	4.6	5.6	5.9	3.8	5.2
3	6.4	6.8	7.2	8.4	8.9
4	6.3	7.2	4.4	6.7	5.6
5 So-so	30.1	28.3	33.2	30.2	23.4
6	8.4	8.8	4.8	6.1	6.6
7	8.0	7.7	6.6	6.3	7.9
8	10.3	7.7	6.1	7.3	8.7
9	3.3	2.3	1.7	2.3	3.1
10 Totally satisfied	8.8	7.7	12.1	10.3	11.5
No View/ Refuse	1.0	1.4	1.3	1.5	2.7
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100.0(1010)	100.0(1006)	100.0(1009)	100.0(1011)
Mean *(N)	5.17 (1018)	4.77 (996)	4.87 (992)	4.84 (994)	4.99 (984)



Table 3: Trust in Hong Kong SAR Government

	Age 15 and above	Age 18 and above
	%	%
0 No Trust at all	10.3	10.4
1	2.7	2.8
2	6.0	6.2
3	7.9	7.8
4	7.2	7.0
5 So-so	29.8	29.7
6	9.6	9.4
7	10.6	10.4
8	9.1	9.3
9	2.0	2.1
10 Total trust	4.7	4.7
No View/ Refuse	0.2	0.2
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (984)
Mean* (N)	4.86 (1025)	4.86 (982)

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?

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



Table 4: Trust in Hong Kong SAR Government (Comparison)

	10 th Wave	9 th Wave	8 th Wave	5 th Wave	4 th Wave	2 nd Wave	1 st Wave
	2017.5	2016.7	2015.7	2015.3	2014.12	2014.10	2014.9
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
0 No Trust at all	10.3	14.1	17.5	10.3	13.6	13.9	15.8
1	2.7	3.7	3.5	4.2	3.3	5.8	4.1
2	6.0	6.4	5.8	7.7	7.2	8.9	7.4
3	7.9	10.8	8.3	9.5	9.5	11.0	10.8
4	7.2	7.6	7.9	9.9	6.7	8.3	11.5
5 So-so	29.8	24.9	27.5	22.0	21.4	23.7	27.3
6	9.6	9.5	6.7	8.8	7.2	7.2	7.6
7	10.6	9.3	7.2	8.6	8.8	5.7	6.6
8	9.1	8.1	6.3	9.5	9.9	7.6	3.6
9	2.0	1.2	0.9	1.5	2.5	0.9	1.1
10 Total trust	4.7	4.0	7.7	7.2	8.1	4.7	3.5
No View/ Refuse	0.2	0.6	0.9	0.8	1.7	2.3	0.6
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (1010)	100.0 (1006)	100.0 (1009)	100.0 (1011)	100.0 (802)	100.0 (1006)
Mean*(N)	4.86 (1025)	4.43 (1004)	4.38 (997)	4.76 (1001)	4.76 (993)	4.17 (783)	4.02 (1000)



Table 5: Trust in the Central Government

	Age 15 and above	Age 18 and above
	%	%
0 No Trust at all	11.2	11.5
1	3.0	2.9
2	6.1	6.1
3	9.1	9.0
4	8.0	7.6
5 So-so	23.9	23.5
6	9.8	9.7
7	7.6	7.8
8	9.4	9.6
9	3.3	3.4
10 Total trust	7.4	7.6
No View/ Refuse	1.3	1.3
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (984)
Mean* (N)	4.91 (1015)	4.92 (971)

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?

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



Table 6: Trust in the Central Government (Comparison)

	10 th Wave	9 th Wave	8 th Wave	5 th Wave	4 th Wave	2 nd Wave	1 st Wave
	2017.5	2016.7	2015.7	2015.3	2014.12	2014.10	2014.9
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
0 No Trust at all	11.2	18.3	17.9	15.0	16.5	19.2	19.6
1	3.0	3.8	2.9	3.2	3.6	5.1	4.3
2	6.1	7.9	5.9	7.2	7.1	7.3	6.3
3	9.1	7.6	9.8	8.1	7.4	9.5	10.0
4	8.0	7.2	6.6	9.1	6.7	6.2	8.2
5 So-so	23.9	22.1	23.7	21.3	18.5	20.7	24.2
6	9.8	8.3	5.1	7.8	6.2	6.5	6.6
7	7.6	7.0	7.4	7.6	8.8	5.2	5.0
8	9.4	7.7	6.1	7.9	7.9	6.1	6.5
9	3.3	2.7	2.1	2.2	2.2	1.8	1.0
10 Total trust	7.4	6.2	10.7	8.4	9.5	7.8	6.0
No View/ Refuse	1.3	1.3	1.8	2.3	5.6	4.6	2.3
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (1010)	100.0 (1006)	100.0 (1009)	100.0 (1011)	100.0 (802)	100.0 (1006)
Mean* (N)	4.91 (1015)	4.33 (997)	4.54 (988)	4.62 (986)	4.62 (955)	4.14 (765)	4.05 (983)



Table 7: Trust in the Hong Kong Police Force

	Age 15 and above	Age 18 and above
	%	%
0 No Trust at all	4.3	4.4
1	1.7	1.8
2	3.6	3.6
3	6.1	6.2
4	5.6	5.4
5 So-so	17.9	17.7
6	11.7	11.4
7	16.4	16.4
8	17.5	17.6
9	4.9	4.9
10 Total trust	9.8	10.1
No View/ Refuse	0.5	0.5
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (984)
Mean* (N)	6.09 (1023)	6.10 (979)

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?

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



Table 8: Trust in the Hong Kong Police Force (Comparison)

	10 th Wave	9 th Wave	8 th Wave	5 th Wave	4 th Wave	3 rd Wave	2 nd Wave
	2017.5	2016.7	2015.7	2015.3	2014.12	2014.11	2014.10
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
0 No Trust at all	4.3	5.1	11.0	5.3	9.1	3.8	9.3
1	1.7	2.6	2.4	2.9	2.6	1.9	1.8
2	3.6	3.1	6.3	4.8	5.1	3.1	3.9
3	6.1	6.0	6.1	7.0	7.7	5.9	5.7
4	5.6	6.0	5.7	5.4	4.9	5.3	7.9
5 So-so	17.9	20.4	21.6	26.5	21.2	22.8	25.3
6	11.7	11.2	7.3	6.6	7.6	8.5	8.4
7	16.4	13.8	10.0	9.4	9.4	11.3	10.1
8	17.5	16.3	12.0	11.9	12.3	14.7	11.4
9	4.9	5.1	3.7	5.2	4.6	4.4	1.8
10 Total trust	9.8	9.4	12.8	13.7	14.7	16.7	12.5
No View/ Refuse	0.5	0.9	1.0	1.3	1.0	1.6	2.0
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (1010)	100.0 (1006)	100.0 (1009)	100.0 (1011)	100.0 (1030)	100.0 (802)
Mean* (N)	6.09 (1023)	5.93 (1001)	5.41 (996)	5.79 (996)	5.64 (1001)	6.25 (1014)	5.49 (786)



Table 9: Views on the overall state of Hong Kong society since the handover

	Age 15 and above	Age 18 and above
	%	%
Improved a lot	6.5	6.4
Improved a little	8.9	7.9
About the same	19.2	19.1
Worsened slightly	24.9	25.2
Worsened a lot	38.0	38.8
Do not know	1.7	1.8
No View/ Refuse	0.8	0.8
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (984)

Question: Since the handover 20 years ago, do you think the current state of Hong Kong society has improved a lot, improved slightly, about the same, worsened slightly, or worsened a lot?



Table 10: Views on the future development of Hong Kong

	Age 15 and above	Age 18 and above
	%	%
0 Extremely pessimistic	7.0	7.2
1	1.6	1.6
2	4.4	4.4
3	9.0	9.1
4	11.5	11.3
5 Half-half	37.1	37.1
6	9.1	8.7
7	9.0	9.0
8	6.4	6.3
9	1.4	1.4
10 Extremely optimistic	3.2	3.4
No View/ Refuse	0.4	0.4
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (984)
Mean *(N)	4.84 (1024)	4.82 (980)

Question: 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?

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



Table 11: Views on the future development of Hong Kong (Comparison)

	10 th Wave	9 th Wave	8 th Wave	5 th Wave	4 th Wave	3 rd Wave	2 nd Wave	1 st Wave
	2017.5	2016.7	2015.7	2015.3	2014.12	2014.11	2014.10	2014.9
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
0 Extremely pessimistic	7.0	5.9	8.7	7.8	9.5	7.3	9.6	10.8
1	1.6	1.1	2.5	1.9	1.8	1.3	2.3	2.0
2	4.4	4.9	5.5	5.7	4.9	3.4	3.4	7.0
3	9.0	9.7	9.8	10.8	12.0	10.5	11.9	13.6
4	11.5	12.1	9.8	12.2	10.8	11.5	10.6	12.1
5 Half-half	37.1	37.0	38.5	37.1	31.5	37.4	33.8	32.2
6	9.1	10.9	8.4	7.7	8.8	7.7	12.0	9.4
7	9.0	8.9	6.1	6.3	7.4	8.3	7.1	5.7
8	6.4	5.5	4.3	4.8	6.2	4.8	4.8	2.6
9	1.4	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.7	1.3	0.4	0.2
10 Extremely optimistic	3.2	2.8	4.7	4.5	4.5	4.2	3.3	3.2
No View/ Refuse	0.4	0.7	1.1	0.8	1.9	2.3	1.0	1.0
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (1010)	100.0 (1006)	100.0 (1009)	100.0 (1011)	100.0 (1030)	100.0 (802)	100.0 (1006)
Mean *(N)	4.84 (1024)	4.81 (1003)	4.59 (995)	4.61 (1001)	4.62 (992)	4.80 (1006)	4.57 (794)	4.22 (996)



Table 12: Intention to emigrate overseas

	Age 15 and above %	Age 18 and above %
Yes, thought about it	16.1	16.3
Yes, planning to	2.6	2.6
Yes, in the process	1.1	1.1
No	79.0	78.7
Do not know	0.4	0.4
No View/ Refuse	0.8	0.8
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (984)

Question: Have you considered emigrating overseas? [If yes: have thought about it; are planning to; have commenced the process?]

Table 13: Intention to emigrate overseas (Comparison)

	10 th Wave 2017.5 %	9 th Wave 2016.7 %
Yes, thought about it	16.1	16.4
Yes, planning to	2.6	3.3
Yes, in the process	1.1	1.3
No	79.0	78.4
Do not know	0.4	0.4
No View/ Refuse	0.8	0.2
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100 (1010)



Table 14: Views on the prospects of Hong Kong after 2047

	Age 15 and above			Age 18 and above		
	Maintenance %	Direct governance %	Independence %	Maintenance %	Direct governance %	Independence %
Very support	44.9	6.1	4.4	45.1	6.3	4.5
Somewhat support	26.3	8.6	6.9	26.0	8.9	6.8
So-so	22.3	24.3	25.9	22.3	24.2	25.4
Somewhat against	3.0	18.2	17.5	3.0	17.5	17.1
Very against	1.9	40.4	42.7	2.0	40.7	43.6
No view / Refuse	1.5	2.4	2.5	1.6	2.5	2.5
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (984)	100.0 (984)	100.0 (984)

Question: Do you support or not support the maintenance of one country two systems? Very support, Somewhat support, So-so, Somewhat against, or Very against?

Question: Do you support or not support direct governance by China? Very support, Somewhat support, So-so, Somewhat against, or Very against?

Question: Do you support or not support Hong Kong independence? Strongly support, Somewhat support, So-so, Somewhat against, or Strongly against?

Table 15: Views on the prospects of Hong Kong after 2047 (comparison)

	Maintenance of one country two systems %		Direct governance by China %		Independence %	
	10 th Wave 2017.5	9 th Wave 2016.7	10 th Wave 2017.5	9 th Wave 2016.7	10 th Wave 2017.5	9 th Wave 2016.7
Very support	44.9	45.1	6.1	5.8	4.4	6.2
Somewhat support	26.3	24.4	8.6	8.0	6.9	11.2
So-so	22.3	21.7	24.3	23.4	25.9	22.9
Somewhat against	3.0	3.2	18.2	19.1	17.5	19.0
Very against	1.9	2.8	40.4	40.1	42.7	38.6
No view / Refuse	1.5	2.7	2.4	3.6	2.5	2.1
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (1010)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (1010)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (1010)



Table 16: Perceived possibility that Hong Kong can attain independence in the foreseeable future

	Age 15 and above %	Age 18 and above %
Absolutely impossible	57.1	58.2
Not possible	26.4	26.0
So-so	12.5	11.8
Somewhat possible	1.0	1.0
Absolutely possible	1.9	2.0
No view / Refuse	1.1	1.1
Total	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (984)

Question: In the foreseeable future, do you think it is possible or not possible for Hong Kong to attain independence?
Absolutely impossible, Not possible, So-so, Somewhat possible, or Absolutely possible?

Table 17: Perceived possibility that Hong Kong can attain independence in the foreseeable future (Comparison)

	10 th Wave 2017.5 %	9 th Wave 2016.7 %
Absolutely impossible	57.1	53.3
Not possible	26.4	27.9
So-so	12.5	13.0
Somewhat possible	1.0	1.8
Absolutely possible	1.9	1.9
No view / Refuse	1.1	2.2
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100 (1010)



Table 18: Impressions on the three political camps (Age 15 and above)

	Localist	Pan-democratic	Pro-establishment
	%	%	%
0 Very negative	24.0	12.4	17.9
1	2.6	1.9	2.8
2	5.0	3.3	7.5
3	8.9	7.6	9.9
4	7.1	8.6	8.9
5 So-so	30.8	34.8	26.3
6	7.0	11.9	9.4
7	4.0	9.3	5.2
8	3.2	5.2	5.4
9	0.2	0.4	0.7
10 Very positive	0.6	1.6	1.6
No view / Refuse	6.7	3.3	4.3
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (1028)
Mean* (N)	3.48 (959)	4.51 (994)	3.90 (983)

Question: What are your impressions of the following political camps. Please give a score of 0 to 10, with 0 representing very negative, 10 representing very positive, and 5 representing so-so [random allocation of groups]:

What is your impression of the localist camp? (0-10). What is your impression of the pan-democratic camp? (0-10).

What is your impression of the pro-establishment camp? (0-10).

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



Table 18 (continued): Impressions on the three political camps (Age 18 and above)

	Localist	Pan-democratic	Pro-establishment
	%	%	%
0 Very negative	24.6	12.8	18.4
1	2.4	1.8	2.8
2	5.1	3.4	7.5
3	9.1	7.5	9.7
4	7.0	8.6	8.8
5 So-so	30.1	34.6	26.1
6	6.8	11.4	9.1
7	3.9	9.2	5.3
8	3.2	5.3	5.6
9	0.2	0.3	0.6
10 Very positive	0.6	1.6	1.6
No view / Refuse	6.9	3.4	4.5
Total (N)	100.0 (984)	100.0 (984)	100.0 (984)
Mean* (N)	3.44 (916)	4.48 (951)	3.89 (940)

Table 19: Impressions on the three political camps (Comparison)

	10 th Wave 2017.5 Mean* (N)	9 th Wave 2016.7 Mean* (N)
Localist	3.48 (959)	3.45 (917)
Pan-democratic	4.51 (994)	4.53 (941)
Pro-establishment	3.90 (983)	4.00 (933)



Table 20: Belief that activities demanding political reforms in Hong Kong should be peaceful and non-violent

	Age 15 and above	Age 18 and above
	%	%
Strongly agree	57.0	57.6
Somewhat agree	21.3	20.7
So-so	15.5	15.5
Somewhat disagree	2.8	2.8
Strongly disagree	2.1	2.1
No opinion / Refuse to answer	1.3	1.4
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (984)

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 21: Belief that activities demanding political reforms in Hong Kong should be peaceful and non-violent (Comparison)

	10 th Wave	9 th Wave	8 th Wave	5 th Wave
	2017.5	2016.7	2015.7	2015.3
	%	%	%	%
Strongly agree	57.0	49.6	57.6	55.1
Somewhat agree	21.3	21.7	21.8	25.4
So-so	15.5	22.0	14.8	12.1
Somewhat disagree	2.8	3.5	2.6	3.1
Strongly disagree	2.1	2.4	1.8	3.0
No opinion / Refuse to answer	1.3	0.8	1.4	1.3
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (1010)	100.0 (1006)	100.0 (1009)



Table 22: Perceived importance of eight social values (age 15 and above)

	Press freedom	Social harmony	Democratic development	Economic development	Judicial independence	National interest	Corruption-free society	Efficient governance
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
0 Very unimportant	0.5	0.6	1.9	0.2	0.5	3.1	0.3	0.6
1	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.3
2	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.0	0.2	1.6	0.5	0.4
3	0.2	0.4	1.1	0.5	0.4	2.0	0.5	1.1
4	0.5	0.4	1.2	0.2	0.1	1.5	0.1	0.9
5	4.5	3.7	11.3	3.1	3.2	13.6	2.6	6.4
6	4.6	3.5	7.4	3.6	2.5	10.3	2.8	5.2
7	7.1	10.5	14.1	15.0	7.8	14.9	5.0	15.1
8	22.9	21.8	25.5	27.7	16.5	21.8	17.4	27.6
9	12.0	13.4	9.7	11.7	12.1	5.8	12.4	10.3
10 Very important	46.9	45.2	26.4	37.8	54.8	23.5	57.7	30.6
No view / Refuse	0.2	0.2	0.7	0.3	2.0	1.5	0.7	1.7
Total (N)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (1028)	100.0 (1028)
Mean* (N)	8.66 (1026)	8.65 (1026)	7.69 (1020)	8.51 (1025)	8.94 (1008)	7.23 (1013)	9.02 (1020)	8.10 (1011)

Question: In the following I will mention 8 social values. We would like to know if you think they are important or not important. Please give a score of 0 to 10, with 0 representing very unimportant and 10 representing very important [random allocation of social values]:

Press freedom, do you think it is important or unimportant? (0-10). Social harmony, do you think it is important or unimportant? (0-10). Democratic development, do you think it is important or unimportant? (0-10). Economic development, do you think it is important or unimportant? (0-10). Judicial independence, do you think it is important or unimportant? (0-10). National interest, do you think it is important or unimportant? (0-10). Corruption-free society, do you think it is important or unimportant? (0-10). Efficient governance, do you think it is important or unimportant? (0-10).

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



Table 22 (continued): Perceived importance of eight social values (age 18 and above)

	Press freedom %	Social harmony %	Democratic development %	Economic development %	Judicial independence %	National interest %	Corruption-free society %	Efficient governance %
0 Very unimportant	0.6	0.6	2.0	0.2	0.5	3.2	0.3	0.6
1	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.3
2	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.0	0.2	1.7	0.5	0.4
3	0.2	0.4	1.1	0.5	0.4	1.9	0.5	1.1
4	0.5	0.4	1.3	0.2	0.1	1.5	0.1	0.9
5	4.7	3.8	11.5	3.1	3.0	13.5	2.6	6.5
6	4.6	3.4	7.4	3.1	2.4	10.0	2.7	5.0
7	6.6	10.1	13.8	14.9	7.8	14.5	4.6	14.5
8	22.4	21.6	25.2	27.6	15.8	22.2	17.2	27.5
9	11.7	13.0	9.2	11.4	11.7	5.6	11.7	10.3
10 Very important	48.1	46.3	27.0	38.8	56.2	24.2	59.1	31.3
No view / Refuse	0.2	0.2	0.8	0.4	2.0	1.5	0.8	1.7
Total (N)	100.0 (984)	100.0 (984)	100.0 (984)	100.0 (984)	100.0 (984)	100.0 (984)	100.0 (984)	100.0 (984)
Mean* (N)	8.68 (982)	8.67 (982)	7.69 (977)	8.54 (980)	8.97 (964)	7.25 (969)	9.04 (976)	8.11 (967)



Table 23: Perceived importance of six social values (Comparison)

	10th Wave	9th Wave
	2017.5	2016.7
	Mean* (N)	Mean* (N)
Press freedom	8.66 (1026)	8.49 (1002)
Social harmony	8.65 (1026)	8.57 (1009)
Democratic development	7.69 (1020)	7.61 (988)
Economic development	8.51 (1025)	8.26 (1004)
Judicial independence	8.94 (1008)	8.84 (981)
National interest	7.23 (1013)	7.07 (986)



Basic Demographic Data

Sex

	<i>Before weighting</i>		<i>After weighting</i>	
	n	%	n	%
M	471	45.8	489	47.6
F	557	54.2	539	52.4
Total	1028	100.0	1028	100.0

Education

	<i>Before weighting</i>		<i>After weighting</i>	
	n	%	n	%
None / Kindergarten	10	1.0	35	3.4
Primary	81	7.9	119	11.6
Secondary (F. 1 - F. 3)	109	10.6	140	13.7
Secondary (F. 4 – F. 5)	259	25.2	247	24.0
Secondary (F. 6 – F. 7)	139	13.5	81	7.8
Tertiary (Non-degree)	89	8.7	93	9.0
Bachelor Degree	259	25.2	243	23.6
Graduate Studies (MA or above)	74	7.2	62	6.0
Refuse	8	0.8	8	0.8
Total	1028	100.0	1028	100.0



Age

	<i>Before weighting</i>		<i>After weighting</i>	
	n	%	n	%
15 – 17	44	4.3	32	3.1
18 – 19	42	4.1	28	2.7
20 – 24	77	7.5	72	7.0
25 - 29	36	3.5	76	7.4
30 – 34	62	6.0	82	7.9
35 - 39	66	6.4	81	7.9
40 - 44	101	9.8	88	8.5
45 – 49	93	9.0	90	8.8
50 – 54	105	10.2	106	10.3
55 – 59	112	10.9	100	9.8
60 – 64	92	8.9	78	7.6
65 - 69	89	8.7	60	5.9
70 or Above	99	9.6	125	12.2
Refuse	10	1.0	9	0.8
Total	1028	100.0	1028	100.0



Political orientation

	<i>Before weighting</i>		<i>After weighting</i>	
	n	%	n	%
Localist	45	4.4	52	5.1
Radical democrats	29	2.8	26	2.5
Moderate democrats	334	32.5	321	31.2
Middle/neutral	220	21.4	217	21.1
Pro-establishment	83	8.1	71	6.9
Business-industrial	22	2.1	23	2.2
Pro-Beijing	29	2.8	25	2.5
No orientation / not belonging to any orientation	233	22.7	257	25.0
Don't Know/ Hard to say / Refuse to answer	33	3.2	36	3.5
Total	1028	100.0	1028	100.0

Question: Which political camp do you think reflects your political orientation? Localist, Radical democrats, Moderate democrats, Middle/neutral, Pro-establishment, Business-industrial, Pro-Beijing?

-- End --