

Onsite Survey Findings in Hong Kong's Anti- Extradition Bill Protests

Research Report

Centre for Communication and Public Opinion Survey

The Chinese University of Hong Kong

August 2019

Introduction

The Fugitive Offenders and Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Legislation Bill (known thereafter as the extradition bill), proposed by the Hong Kong government in February 2019, has triggered a series of mass assemblies and demonstrations across the semi-autonomous territory since March. The scale and intensity of such collective actions have surpassed any of the city's previous protests.

In view of this, a team of university researchers, led by Professor Francis L. F. Lee (*School of Journalism and Communication, The Chinese University of Hong Kong*), Dr. Samson Yuen (*Department of Political Science, Lingnan University*), Dr. Gary Tang (*Department of Social Science, The Hang Seng University of Hong Kong*) and Dr. Edmund W. Cheng (*Department of Government and International Studies, Hong Kong Baptist University*), has conducted a series of onsite surveys since the "Safeguard Hong Kong anti-extradition bill march" organized by the Civil Human Rights Front on June 9.

The research was also supported and coordinated by the Centre for Communication and Public Opinion Survey at the School of Journalism and Communication, the Chinese University of Hong Kong. The team would like to thank Dr. Dennis K.K. Leung, Ms. Rachel S.M. Wong, Ms. Wendy L.Y Leung, Mr. Hans Tse, Ms. Cheryl S.Y. Shea, Ms. Megan M.Y. Chick and Mr. Hiu Fung Chung for their dedicated research support.

Sample Size

As of August 4, the team has conducted a total of 12 onsite surveys, with a total sample size of 6,688 respondents. Excluding the Yuen Long rally on July 27, which took place under exceptional circumstances, the overall response rate is 87.6%.

Citation of this report by academic works should appear as:

Francis L. F. Lee, Gary Tang, Samson Yuen, and Edmund W. Cheng, "Onsite Survey Findings in Hong Kong's Anti-Extradition Bill Protests", *Centre for Communication and Public Opinion Survey, The Chinese University of Hong Kong*, August 2019.

Executive Summary

1. In general, participants of the anti-extradition bill movement were mostly young people, aged between 20-30. Their education level is high, with the majority of them having university qualification. More respondents identified themselves as belonging to the middle class than as belonging to the lower class. But in some specific protests, especially those with a more confrontational atmosphere, the ratio of middle-class participants to lower class participants was close to 1:1.
2. Participants exhibited a wide range of political orientations. “Moderate democrats” were the core participants of the movement, followed by those who regarded themselves as “localists” in a broad sense. It is worth noting that the proportion of participants who identified themselves as “centrist” or having “no political affiliation” was also significant.
3. “Calling for the complete withdrawal of the extradition bill” and “expressing dissatisfaction with the police’s handling of the protest” were the two most important motivations for protesters to participate in the protests throughout the movement. On the contrary, “calling for the resignation of Carrie Lam and major officials” was not their major demand. It is notable that “striving for Hong Kong’s democracy” also became a key motivation for protesters since July. Overall, police power and the failure of the government to completely withdraw the bill were the two key reasons why protesters continued to participate.
4. Around 80 percent of the participants believed that the protests should continue if the government did not make further concessions other than simply suspending the extradition bill. Among them, about half supported escalating their actions, while the other half believed that the current form and scale of the protests should be maintained. Suspending the protests, however, is an unpopular option.
5. Over half of the respondents also participated in 2014’s Umbrella Movement. Along with the June-Fourth vigil, these two events were the “first social movement experience” for the one-fourths of the respondents, respectively. At the same time, the anti-extradition bill movement was also the first social movement for more than one-eighths of the respondents.
6. Half of the respondents in the June protests believed that peaceful, rational and non-violent protest was no longer useful. On the other hand, more and more participants considered radical protests to be more effective in making the government heed public opinion. The majority of participants also agreed that radical tactics could alienate the general public. This finding shows that the participants were still concerned about the attitude of the general public towards the movement.
7. A popular slogan in the movement was “climbing mountains together, making your own effort.” It conveys the idea that supporters of peaceful and radical tactics each have their role to play in the movement. The survey findings also provide evidence of the strong solidarity among the protesters. Most of the participants agreed that “the maximum impact could only be achieved when peaceful assembly and confrontational actions work together”. In the July protests, it is interesting to note that more and more participants agreed that “the use of radical tactics by protesters is understandable when the government fails to listen”.

Methods and data

In total, we conducted onsite surveys on 12 protests throughout June and July 2019: June 9, June 12, June 16, June 17, June 21, June 26, July 1, July 14, July 21, July 27 and August 4. Because of resource constraints and judgment of the scale and relative importance of upcoming protests, we could not cover every single protest activity (e.g., the Sheung Shui protest on July 13 and the Mongkok protest on August 3 were among the “missing” cases). Besides, we conducted an onsite survey during the pro-government rally on July 20. But since this report focuses on the anti-extradition bill movement itself, findings from the July 20 rally are not reported here.

The protests covered in this report can be categorized into three types. Type I are mass rallies that begin with the assembling of protesters at an assembling point before following a specific route to a designated destination. Type II are static demonstrations that involve the gathering of protesters at a specific location. Type III are fluid demonstrations where protesters first gather at a specific location but then became more mobile and unpredictable, spontaneously moving to various locations like wildcat strikes. The table below summarizes certain basic information about each protest onsite survey.

Date of protest	Location	Nature	Type	Sample size	Online-based sample (face-to-face)	Online-based sample (leaflet)	Paper-based sample	Response rate	Standard error
June 9	Victoria Park -- CGO	Mass rally	I	285	N/A	N/A	285	74.0%	5.8%
June 12	CGO	Fluid demonstration	III	175	85	N/A	90	N/A	7.4%
June 16	Victoria Park -- CGO	Mass rally	I	875	265	N/A	610	89.0%	3.3%
June 17	CGO, Police HQ and Revenue Tower	Fluid demonstration	III	717	598	N/A	119	91.5%	3.7%
June 21	CGO	Fluid demonstration	III	316	184	N/A	132	87.8%	5.5%
June 26	Edinburgh Place	Static demonstration	II	418	164	N/A	254	90.7%	4.8%
July 1	Victoria Park -- CGO	Mass rally	I	1169	686	N/A	483	83.1%	2.9%
July 14	Shatin	Mass rally	I	546	254	N/A	292	87.8%	4.2%
July 21	Victoria Park -- Southorn Playground	Mass rally	I	680	275	N/A	405	90.8%	3.8%
July 27	Yuen Long	Mass rally	I	235	N/A	235	N/A	13.1%	6.4%
August 5	Tseung Kwan O	Mass rally	I	717	64	511	142	85.6%	3.7%
August 5	Sai Wan	Static demonstration	II	555	106	338	111	92.7%	4.2%

Types of protests

Generally, interviewers are asked to invite every tenth person they see within a designated area/route to complete the survey. If they are turned down, they will then ask the next tenth person — so on and so forth. However, since each protest has its unique spatial dynamics, it is necessary to make slight adjustment in the sampling methods.

- Mass rallies (Type I): We first divide the area where the rally begins into different zones, and we also designate several destinations along the protest route. Each interviewer is assigned to a specific zone where he/she begins to conduct the survey. He/she is instructed to follow the protest crowd within the designated zone to start walking until reaching his/her assigned destination. Along this route, the interviewer continues to conduct the survey following the sampling procedure.
- Static demonstrations (Type II): We divide the area where the rally begins into different zones. Each interviewer is assigned to a specific zone where he/she walks around (in circles) to conduct the survey following the sampling procedure.
- Fluid demonstrations (Type III): The method is similar to Type II. But because of the fluidity of the protest, the fieldwork supervisor monitors the situation onsite and redeploys interviewers to different locations.

In each protest, the fieldwork team was led by two to three supervisors. The number of interviewers ranged from 10 to 25, which vary according to the expected turnout. Interviewers are asked to switch on their live location function on Whatsapp so that their actual location can be monitored. This is to facilitate the redeployment of interviews to new locations if needed.

Survey methods

The fieldwork team surveyed protest participants through two options: 1) online-based questionnaire using QR code or 2) paper-based questionnaire. Interviewees were usually first approached with the first option. If they accepted the survey request, they would scan a QR code presented by the interviewer using their own phones and then finish it on their own without the help of the interviewer. If they were interested in the survey but declined the use of online-based questionnaire, interviewees would be presented with the second option: the paper-based questionnaire. The interviewer would read out each question and then fill in the questionnaire together with the interviewee. This conventional face-to-face interview typically takes around 10 minutes. Rejections of both options (that is, refusal to participate in the survey altogether) were recorded by the interviewer.

The combination of the two survey options aims to strike a balance between getting a large enough sample size and making sure that the sample is representative of the protest participants. The use of online-based questionnaires is useful for achieving the first objective. Given that protests were usually announced at short notice, the research team encountered the difficulty in building a large team of interviewers to ensure a significant amount of sample. An important task was therefore to maximize the sample size even with a small team of interviewers. Using Qualtrics, an online survey software, the online-based questionnaires -- which were completed by interviewees on their own capacity -- could reduce the time for interviewers to solicit responses, thus resulting in larger sample sizes.

To be sure, online-based questionnaires have their limitations. First, people who are less tech-savvy are more likely to decline the survey request. Even if they might have started the online survey with the help of interviewers, they are more likely to drop out during the process. Second, because protesting has become an increasingly risky activity under Hong Kong's present political climate, some participants worried that filling in an online questionnaire through their own mobile phones might bring legal or political repercussions. These two limitations may systematically exclude a portion of the protest participants, thus resulting in response biases. A final limitation is that online-based questionnaires hinges on good Internet connection. In large protests, however, Internet connection oftentimes becomes slow and unstable. Signals may jam and may also get interfered with by the authorities.

Therefore, we use face-to-face, paper-based questionnaires to circumvent these limitations. Paper-based questionnaires take substantially more time to complete. But the upside is that they will not exclude people who are not used to technology and also those who worried about the risk of leaving digital footprints. And obviously, they are not affected by the quality of Internet connection. The use of paper-based questionnaires can thus ensure that at least a portion of the sample is representative of the protest participants, as compared with the sample collected through the online-based survey.

Weighing of samples

Interviewers would be tasked to enter the data of the completed questionnaires through the online system within two days after the concerned protest. This allows the research team to acquire the full sample. The last two columns of the above table show the breakdown of the number of interviewees recruited through the two survey methods. In general, we found that interviewees who completed the online-based questionnaires are younger and more educated -- an indication of the exclusionary impact of technology. If such differences between the sub-samples are statistically significant, we would weigh the sample based on the data collected through the paper-based questionnaires, which is more likely to be representative of the protester population, to mitigate the response bias. This can help balance the objective of maximizing the sample size and the need to keep the sample representative.

Although the above correction may help mitigate the impact of response bias, another possible concern in the sampling process is selection bias. Selection bias is a problem associated with the interviewers, which happens when they systematically (either intentionally or unintentionally) exclude people with certain characteristics from the survey. For instance, young interviewers may be inclined to invite young protesters to complete the survey, whom they assume to be less likely to turn them down. Interviewers are generally more inclined to talk to friendly-looking people than unfriendly ones. Walgrave and Verhulst (2011) argued that one way to mitigate selection bias is to have fieldwork supervisors serve as “pointers” and select interviewees. This can prevent interviewers from selecting interviewees to their own liking and ensures the sampling method to be strictly followed. But while we see the merits of this method, it may not be practical for the recent protests in Hong Kong. The method requires a large team of fieldwork supervisors, which is difficult to put together given the insufficient planning time. More fundamentally, protests in Hong Kong are often very large in scale, involving hundreds of thousands of people. It is virtually impossible for pointers to systematically select interviewees from the protest crowd.

For these reasons, we decided to delegate the selection to the interviewers. But to ensure that they would follow the sampling procedures, we provided a training session for interviewers before each protest to brief them about the questions and the sampling procedures. In addition to that, we also imposed a quota limiting the maximum number of samples they could collect within an hour (usually 10-15), such that they would space out the interviews rather than doing them in groups (for instance, on a group of protesters)

Post-hoc surveys

All of the protest events were surveyed through the above method -- with the exception of the July 27 mass rally in Yuen Long. The Yuen Long protest was unique because it received a Letter of Objection from the police, which made the protest “illegal”. The protest also took place a week after thugs dressed in white shirts, who were widely suspected to be triad members, launched an indiscriminate attack against citizens in the Yuen Long MTR station. Because of the concerns over safety, we decided to change our survey approach from face-to-face surveys to post-hoc surveys. We dispatched four helpers to distribute 1800 leaflets printed with a QR-code that was linked to an online survey. The response rate, as expected, was much lower than the previous approach, but we were still able to collect around 235 responses (13% response rate) by noon the next day.

We later learnt that the approach used in the Yuen Long protest may in fact be effective in reducing the selection bias caused by helpers when they select interviewees. The reason is that distributing leaflets may reach more protesters

and avoid systematically excluding certain types of protesters. As a result, we combined this approach with our standard approach in the Tseung Kwan-O rally and the Sai Wan demonstration on August 4. The results showed that using leaflets can significantly increase the sample size.

One final limitation to note is that these onsite surveys may have excluded the militant protesters who are on the protest frontline. This is especially plausible in the fluid demonstrations which often involved violent confrontations with the police. To protect the safety of interviewers, we advised them not to conduct surveys on the frontline. For example, in the June 21 survey, although we asked the interviewers to conduct interviews outside the Police Headquarters (at that time surrounded by protesters), the interviewers probably could not reach those protesters who stood closest to the front door of the police station. Moreover, militant protesters are often tense and dressed in protective gear. They are thus less likely to accept survey requests as compared with “ordinary” protesters. As a result, militant protesters are likely to be somewhat under-represented in our samples.

Findings

1. Demographics

Gender

Across the 12 surveys, the percentage of male respondents, ranging from 50.5% to 64.2%, was generally higher than that of female -- except in the June 26 assembly when there were only 42.6% male respondents (See Table 1).

Age

In general, the majority of respondents belong to the age group 20-24 and 25-29. The proportion of respondents aged 20-24 ranged from 16.3% to 54.2% (See Table 1), and the proportion aged 25-29 ranged from 11.6% to 34.2% across the surveys (See Table 1). Meanwhile, there were also younger respondents aged 19 or below, ranging between 6.0% and 15.6% (See Table 1). In mass rallies (Type I), protesters were more evenly distributed across age groups. In particular, mass rallies often featured higher participation rates of those aged 30 or above: they accounted for 43.1% to 57.3% of all the participants in the rallies (See Table 1).

However, in the case of fluid demonstrations (Type III), which often involved more confrontations, the proportion of protesters aged 30 or above significantly dropped (between 13.8% and 30.4%, see Table 1). That is to say, fluid demonstrations were mostly dominated by young people under the age of 30. As for static demonstrations (Type II), the age profile is in between Type I and Type III. Around 23% to 43% of participants in these demonstrations were 30 or above (See Table 1).

Education level

The education level of survey respondents was generally high. Among the three types of protest, participants of mass rallies were relatively less highly-educated. But still, 68.2% to 76.8% of them have completed tertiary education (See Table 1). For static demonstrations (Type II) and fluid demonstrations (Type III), however, participants on average were more highly-educated. More than 80% of them reported to have received tertiary education (See Table 1).

Socio-economic status

As respondents were likely to be reluctant to reveal information about their income, the research team asked respondents to self-report their family's socio-economic status. The answering options were upper-class, middle-class and lower-class. Overall, only a minimal number of respondents (less than 2%) identified themselves as upper class (See Table 1). Middle-class and lower-class protesters were the main participants of the anti-extradition bill movement. In the mass rallies (Type I), 46.9% to 54.0% of the respondents identified themselves as middle-class, while 28.1% to 45.0% identified themselves as lower-class (see Table 1). In static demonstrations (Type II) and fluid demonstrations (Type III), middle class and lower-class participants were more or less equally represented. Lower-class participants even constituted a slight majority in some cases (See Table 1).

2. Political Orientation

For political orientation, respondents were given the following options: pro-establishment, moderate democrats, radical democrats, localists, centrist, no political affiliation, others and don't know. In general, moderate democrats were the core participants of the anti-extradition bill movement. They were clearly the majority in mass rallies (type I), where they accounted for 34.9% to 43.2% of the total respondents (See Table 2). In static demonstrations (type II) and fluid demonstrations (type III), fewer participants identified themselves as moderate democrats, but moderate democrats still accounted for 27.8% to 35.1% of the total respondents (See Table 2).

Across the 12 surveys, we see a gradual increase in the proportion of respondents identifying themselves as radical democrats over time. They went from 3.2% on June 9 (mass rally) to 7.5% on June 17 (fluid demonstration). Thereafter, the proportion was maintained at a steady level, from 6.6% to 9.7% (See Table 2). The second most popular political affiliation is localism. Localists can be broadly defined as people who support democracy but place the focus on protecting local interests. The proportion of localist protesters fluctuated between 18% and 28.6% in different kinds of protests. However, in the June 26 assembly, July 27 rally and the two protests on August 4, localist protesters were more active, accounting for 35.1% to 40.2% of the respondents (See Table 2).

The proportion of respondents who regarded themselves as centrist or having no political affiliation was slightly lower than the localists, but still significant. In the early stage of the movement, the proportion was around 20% -- except in the June 12 assembly when it rose to 38.9%. However, the number of centrists declined over time as the movement continued. For instance, in the three most recent protests took place in the districts, there were only around 10% of the respondents who regarded themselves as centrists.

There were few respondents (from 0.8% to 12.6% of the respondents) who chose “others” as their political affiliation. Also, there were even fewer who regarded themselves as someone supporting the pro-establishment camp. Pro-establishment supporters accounted for no more than 1% of the respondents across the surveys (See Table 2).

3. Protest Motivations

One of the main objectives of the research is to find out why people participated in the movement and the importance of different motivations. As protesters’ demands and the political atmosphere have been changing since the beginning of the large-scale protests in June, the research team kept updating the list of motivations based on new developments. Below are the results showing the percentages of respondents who regarded particular motivations as important.

Across the 12 surveys, “calling for the withdrawal of the extradition bill” has always been one of the most important motivations for protesters to participate in the concerned protest. The percentage of respondents who saw it as “quite important” and “very important” remained at a high-level ranging from 97.0% to 98.8% in June and July. It only decreased to about 95% in August (See Table 3-4, 6-10). That is to say, despite the effort by the Chief Executive Carrie Lam to state that the bill is “suspended” or “dead”, protesters’ demand for the complete withdrawal of the bill remained strong.

Meanwhile, the research team also provided a range of options regarding political accountability. In the mass rally on June 9, 95.8% of the respondents said that “expressing dissatisfaction with the government’s handling of the bill” (See Table 3) was an important motivation for participation. On June 16, 99% of the respondents maintained that “continuing to pressure the government to withdraw the bill” was the main reason for them to participate. Also, 98.5% of the respondents hoped to “express their dissatisfaction over the failure of the government to heed public opinion” (See Table 4). However, “calling for the resignation of Carrie Lam or major officials” was not the main reason for the respondents to participate in the protests. The percentage of respondents who treated it as important was kept within 72.8% to 79.3% (See Table 6-10) -- except on June 16, when 84.5% considered it an important motivation (See Table 4).

We also found that “expressing dissatisfaction with the police’s handling of the protesters” was another key reason of why the participants joined the protests. The percentage of respondents who regarded it as “important” or “very important” ranged from 97.2% to 99.1%. Since mid-July, it had actually become the most important motivation for people to participate in the protests. Over time the survey also included options related to more specific actions of the police. Proportions of respondents who chose “important” and “very important” in the following options were: “protesting against arbitrary arrest by the police” (June 16, 97.8%) (See Table 4) and “expressing the dissatisfaction

with the riot charges imposed by the police against the 7.28 protesters” (August 4 TKO, 97.1%; SW, 96.5%) (See Table 10). The high percentages reflected the concerns of respondents over police abuse of power.

To gauge the support for other items among the five demands, the research team included the options of “demanding the government to retract its characterization of the June 12 protest as a riot” and “calling for the establishment of an independent commission of inquiry” in the later protests. The percentages of respondents ranking these reasons as “important” or “very important” were all high: 95.5% to 97.6% for the former (See Table 7-10) and 95.2% to 98.1% for the latter (See Table 8-10). The positive response shows that these two demands were also crucial to the participants of the movement. Besides, “striving for Hong Kong’s democracy” was another new option we added in later protests. Around 94.3% to 98.0% of the respondents said that it was “important” or “very important” for their participation (See Table 6, 8-10). Similarly, “striving for dual universal suffrage”, an option added on July 17, received high approval as well: 94.3% of respondents that day thought that motivated them to participate (See Table 7).

In the early stage of this series of large-scale protests, we also found that many respondents participated in order to “boost the number of participants” and “arouse international attention”. Percentages of respondents rating these motivations as “important” or “very important” ranged from 83.1% to 90.6% and 94.0% to 95.8% (See Table 3, 4 & 6) respectively. It showed that participants believed that gaining attention from the world would be important to the movement. As the movement evolved, the research team added new options that would correspond to a particular protest and the events preceding it. For instance, as there were deaths and suicides linked to the protests in late June, the research team added “mourning the deaths of people involved in the movement” as a new option on July 1. 90.2% of the respondents (See Table 6) saw it as an “important” or “very important” reason for their participation. For the July 14 Shatin rally, we added “demanding the government to attend to community problems in Shatin”, because it was the first time in the movement when a protest was held in a residential neighbourhood. A total of 63.1% of the respondents (See Table 7) saw it as an important reason to participate. Although demonstrating against the extradition bill was still the mainstay in the July 14 rally, there were quite some respondents who wanted to bring attention to community problems.

The research team asked the respondents to rank their “motivations” on June 17’s fluid demonstration in the area outside the Legislative Council Complex and the office of the Chief Executive. Respondents were asked to choose two among four motivations. From the data, police’s excessive use of force and the refusal of the government to completely withdraw the bill were the two major reasons for the protesters to participate on that day (See Table 5). However, the team decided to revert to the previous set of questions in later surveys.

4. Movement participation experiences

Our data supported the widely held perception that young people were the major participants in the anti-extradition bill movement. In recent years, Hong Kong has experienced several large-scale social movements such as the anti-national education movement of 2012 and the Umbrella Movement of 2014. Participants in the current movement may have also participated in these previous movements. The research team is interested in knowing: (1) whether previous protest experiences would affect the participants in this movement and (2) how many of the participants are actually “amateurs” who had no protest experience. Hence, the team included two questions in the surveys, including “whether you have participated in the Occupy Movement/Umbrella Movement in 2014” and “what is the first time you joined a protest”.

One of the major findings is that many participants in the anti-extradition bill movement had participated in the Umbrella Movement of 2014. Across the 12 surveys, the percentage of respondents who participated in the Umbrella Movement ranged from 44.3% to 76.6% (See Table 11). For the mass rallies (Type I), the percentage of respondents who had joined the Umbrella Movement was lower, ranging from 44.3% to 67.2% (See Table 11). As for the static

demonstrations (Type II) and fluid demonstrations (Type III), the percentage of respondents who had joined the Umbrella Movement was higher, ranging from 60.3% to 76.6% (See Table 11).

To investigate the protest participation history of the participants, the team provided a list of major social movements and protests in post-handover Hong Kong for the respondents to choose from. The options included the annual June-Fourth vigil, the annual July 1 rally, the July 1 rally of 2019, the anti-XRL movement of 2009-2010, the anti-national education movement in 2012, the Umbrella Movement of 2014, the Liberate Protests during 2015, the Mongkok civil unrest of 2016, and the anti-extradition bill movement of 2019.

The data shows that the June-Fourth vigil is most likely to be the first-time protest experience for many participants -- 20.8% to 30.2% of the respondents (See Table 12). The importance of the Umbrella Movement was similar to June Fourth. It was the first-time experience for 17.0% to 28.5% of the respondents (See Table 12). The anti-national education movement of 2012 and the annual July 1 rally were the first-time protest experience for 5.9% to 11.7% and 11.1% to 20.4% (See Table 12) of the respondents, respectively. Notably, a significantly high percentage of respondents had not participated in any social movements before. In our onsite surveys, these respondents accounted for 12.7% to 22.5% of the respondents (See Table 12). Our findings suggested that the anti-extradition bill movement has become a critical event in enlightening the political participation of many participants.

5. Views on radicalization

Over the past two months, whether the anti-extradition bill protests would escalate or radicalize was one of the major concerns of the Hong Kong society and the international community. For most of the surveys since June 21, the research team has included the question: “If the government insists only to ‘suspend’ the bill but do not make any further concession, what should be the next step of the movement?”. The options included “escalating the protest”, “sustain the current form of protest and mobilize people to demonstrate from time to time”, and “suspend the movement and leave time for the society to recover”. Except for the July 1 rally, around half of the participants believed they should “escalate the protest”; and the percentage of respondents who picked this option even rose to 54.1% in the Aug 4 mass assembly in Sai Wan (See Table 13). The percentages of participants who chose to “sustain the current form” and “escalate the protest” were close to each other across the surveys. This phenomenon over time could be understood as signifying an internal tension between the moderate and radical camps of the movement. But the protesters continued to participate despite their differences. This also served as a proof of the accommodation of diverse protest approaches in the movement.

To study the protesters’ changing views on radicalization, we included statements expressing different purposes and outcomes of radicalization. During the four protests in June, we asked the respondents the extent to which they would agree with the saying that “peaceful, rational, non-violent demonstration is no longer effective”. From June 12 to June 26, the percentage of respondents who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the statement was decreasing, from 57.6% on June 12 to 42.1% on June 26 (See Table 14). In other words, although the movement has shown signs of radicalization in the early days, protesters were, in fact, less resistant to the “peacefulness, rationality and non-violence” approach, and to some extent more supportive of the approach over time. As for the view regarding “radical approach could alienate the general public from the movement”, the percentage of respondents expressing “agreed” or “strongly agreed” ranged from 47.1% and 61.2% between June 12 and July 1 (See Table 16). However, a significant drop and consistently low percentages were observed in the four surveys conducted after July 1. The percentage of respondents “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the statement were 33.1% (July 21), 32.3% (July 28), 35.7% (August 4, Tseung Kwan O), and 33.8% (August 4, Sai Wan) (See Table 16) Nevertheless, these percentages were still higher than the percentages of respondents who disagreed with the statements. As a key slogan “climbing mountains together, making your own effort” suggests, the colorful diversity of protest repertoire is a key feature of this movement. We asked if the respondents agreed with the saying that “the maximum impact could only be achieved when peaceful

assembly and confrontational actions work together”. The findings from June 17 to August 4 showed that most of the respondents “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with this statement, ranging from 71.0% to 89.0% (See Table 17).

In addition, the research team looked into how the respondents understand the relationship between government response and radicalization. In seven surveys conducted between June 12 and July 27, the percentage of respondents who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the saying “radical protest approach was more effective to make the government heed to public opinion” increased from 38.2% to 65.5% (See Table 15). However, the percentage decreased to 50.1% (Tseung Kwan O) and 47.3% (Sai Wan) on August 4 (See Table 15). We also asked the respondents the extent to which they would agree with the saying “the use of violence by protesters is understandable when the government fails to listen”. The percentage of respondents who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” significantly increased over time. When the question was first asked on June 16, only 69.1% of the respondents said that they “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with it (See Table 18); on July 1, it rose to 83.5%. On July 21, July 27, and August 4, the corresponding percentages already exceeded 90% (See Table 18).

6. Views on change in demands

Despite the government’s announcement of the suspension of the bill, the movement has continued to diffuse into different districts and accommodate specific local issues. For example, the protest in Tuen Mun was linked to the noise nuisance in the park, while the rally in Sheung Shui was targeted at parallel traders. With the intensified conflict between the police and the protesters, concerns over police brutality have also unfolded. Given this situation, we began to ask respondents how they think about the change in demands since mid-July. The respondents were asked how much they agree with the shift of demands from “withdraw the extradition bill” to “restart political reform”, “focus on police brutality” and “focus on community issues”.

The percentage of respondents who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” to shift the demands to “restart political reform” and “focus on political brutality” has increased over time (Table 19 and Table 20). Supporters of the former demand increased from 64.1% on July 21, to 68.1% (Tseung Kwan O) and 73.7% (Sai Wan) on August 4 (See Table 19); the latter also increased from 79.2% on July 21, to 84.6% (Tseung Kwan O) and 86.4% (Sai Wan) on August 4 (See Table 20). Meanwhile, respondents who “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with the shift to community issues increased from 40.2% on July 21 to over 45% on August 4 (See Table 21). Although all percentages showed an increasing trend, political brutality was ranked higher than political reform or community issues. It has arguably become the major concern of the movement in its current stage.

Part 1: Demographics

Table 1: Demographics (Gender, age, education level and socioeconomic status)

	6/9	6/12	6/16	6/17	6/21	6/26	7/1	7/14	7/21	7/27	8/4 (TKO)	8/4 (SW)
Gender												
Male	64.2%	53.8%	50.5%	50.5%	56.4%	42.6%	53.0%	56.8%	51.7%	56.6%	61.0%	54.1%
Female	34.4%	46.2%	49.5%	49.5%	43.6%	57.4%	47.0%	43.2%	48.3%	43.4%	39.0%	45.9%
Don't know/ Refuse to answer	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total (Sample size)	100% (285)	100% (175)	100% (875)	100% (717)	100% (316)	100% (418)	100% (1,169)	100% (546)	100% (680)	100% (235)	100% (717)	100% (555)
Age												
19 or below	10.5%	6.3%	15.6%	15.5%	14.6%	11.2%	12.9%	7.3%	11.9%	6.0%	8.6%	6.8%
20-24	20.7%	27.9%	16.3%	33.0%	54.2%	40.9%	18.6%	23.9%	23.3%	26.0%	27.9%	28.7%
25-29	11.6%	34.2%	18.3%	25.8%	16.4%	23.7%	18.3%	18.5%	17.5%	19.6%	20.5%	21.4%
30-34	8.4%	19.0%	12.9%	11.4%	8.6%	12.7%	11.0%	12.3%	10.6%	18.3%	10.5%	11.4%
35-39	5.6%	5.1%	9.0%	4.1%	4.6%	4.1%	6.1%	8.5%	5.6%	8.1%	8.0%	6.6%
40-44	6.3%	2.5%	5.4%	2.1%	0.0%	1.7%	7.8%	6.2%	5.3%	8.1%	7.5%	5.3%
45-49	4.6%	1.3%	4.2%	2.1%	0.6%	2.6%	4.5%	4.2%	3.4%	6.0%	3.8%	4.0%
50-54	8.4%	0.8%	6.6%	2.1%	0.0%	0.2%	4.9%	5.8%	5.8%	2.6%	6.2%	7.0%
55-59	6.0%	1.7%	4.2%	1.0%	0.0%	1.2%	6.1%	4.2%	5.6%	2.6%	3.0%	4.1%
60-64	6.7%	0.0%	2.7%	1.4%	0.0%	0.5%	4.9%	4.1%	4.7%	0.9%	2.8%	3.7%
65 or above	7.4%	0.0%	4.7%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	3.6%	3.8%	1.3%	1.3%	0.9%
Don't know/ Refuse to answer	3.9%	1.1%	0.1%	0.9%	1.0%	1.2%	1.3%	1.4%	2.6%	0.9%	0.0%	0.1%
Total (Sample size)	100% (285)	100% (175)	100% (875)	100% (717)	100% (316)	100% (418)	100% (1,169)	100% (546)	100% (680)	100% (235)	100% (717)	100% (555)

Education												
Primary or below	2.8%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%	0.2%	1.6%	2.3%	1.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.8%
Secondary	25.6%	13.8%	30.3%	15.8%	17.9%	10.5%	28.3%	29.2%	28.9%	12.8%	22.8%	21.3%
Tertiary or above	70.5%	86.3%	68.2%	84.1%	81.2%	88.5%	70.0%	68.6%	69.4%	86.4%	76.8%	77.8%
Don't know/	1.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%
Refuse to answer												
Total (Sample size)	100% (285)	100% (175)	100% (875)	100% (717)	100% (316)	100% (418)	100% (1,169)	100% (546)	100% (680)	100% (235)	100% (717)	100% (555)
Socioeconomic												
Status												
Upper class	1.8%	0.0%	0.5%	0.6%	1.2%	1.0%	0.7%	1.0%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%	0.3%
Middle class	64.9%	43.1%	55.2%	41.9%	42.9%	41.9%	52.1%	46.9%	48.4%	50.6%	54.0%	58.8%
Lower class	28.1%	48.6%	42.5%	46.0%	48.4%	46.4%	38.4%	45.0%	42.9%	40.0%	37.3%	33.2%
Don't know/	5.3%	8.3%	1.8%	11.4%	7.4%	10.8%	8.8%	7.1%	7.5%	8.5%	8.0%	7.7%
Refuse to answer												
Total (Sample size)	100% (285)	100% (175)	100% (875)	100% (717)	100% (316)	100% (418)	100% (1,169)	100% (546)	100% (680)	100% (235)	100% (717)	100% (555)

Remarks:

- (1) The on-site surveys on 6/12, 6/16, 6/17, 6/21, 7/1, 7/14, 7/21, and 8/4 are mixed-mode surveys using both paper and online surveys to collect data. To improve the representativeness of the survey data, the figures collected online on the above days had been weighted according to the proportional distribution of the demographic information (i.e. gender, age and educational level) of the paper samples. *The above figures had been weighted.*
- (2) The total percentage of some questions might not be exactly equal to 100% due to rounding.

Part 2: Political Orientation

Table 2: Political orientation of respondents

	6/9	6/12	6/16	6/17	6/21	6/26	7/1	7/14	7/21	7/27	8/4 (TKO)	8/4 (SW)
Pro-establishment	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%	0.2%
Moderate Democrats	43.2%	29.5%	41.1%	31.6%	29.8%	27.8%	43.0%	38.9%	44.9%	34.9%	38.2%	35.1%
Radical democrats	3.2%	2.1%	3.4%	7.5%	7.8%	8.4%	6.6%	9.7%	7.1%	8.5%	7.6%	9.4%
Localists	27.0%	25.4%	18.0%	26.0%	28.6%	40.2%	24.5%	28.0%	27.0%	37.4%	35.1%	39.5%
Centrists/ no political affiliation	21.1%	38.9%	21.3%	21.2%	21.1%	12.0%	18.6%	14.6%	13.4%	8.9%	10.9%	9.5%
Others	NA	4.0%	12.6%	4.5%	3.0%	2.6%	1.6%	1.5%	1.2%	3.0%	3.1%	0.8%
Don't know/ Refuse to answer	5.3%	0.0%	3.2%	8.8%	9.6%	8.6%	5.5%	7.3%	6.1%	7.2%	4.9%	5.5%
Total (Sample size)	100% (285)	100% (175)	100% (875)	100% (717)	100% (316)	100% (418)	100% (1,169)	100% (546)	100% (680)	100% (235)	100% (717)	100% (555)

Remarks:

- (1) The on-site surveys on 6/12, 6/16, 6/17, 6/21, and 7/1, 7/14, 7/21 and 8/4 are mixed-mode surveys using both paper and online surveys to collect data. To improve the representativeness of the survey data, the figures collected online on the above days had been weighted according to the proportional distribution of the demographic information (i.e. gender, age and educational level) of the paper samples. *The above figures had been weighted.*
- (2) The total percentage of some questions might not be exactly equal to 100% due to rounding.
- (3) Different surveys of different days might be with different options. They would be marked as “NA” if the options are unavailable on that day.

Part 3: Motivation to join the Anti-Extradition Bill Movement

9th June

Question: “How important are the following factors in motivating you to participate in today’s protest?”

Table 3: Motivations of respondents who participated in the June 9 protest

	Not at all important	Of little importance	So-so	Important	Very Important	Don't know/ Refuse to answer	Total (Sample size)
Call for the withdrawal of the extradition bill	1.1%	0.4%	1.1%	4.9%	92.6%	0.0%	100% (285)
Demand the government to restart consultation for the extradition bill	7.4%	1.4%	5.6%	13.3%	70.9%	1.4%	100% (285)
Increase the number of participants	3.2%	2.8%	10.2%	19.6%	63.5%	0.7%	100% (285)
Raise international attention	1.4%	0.7%	3.9%	14.4%	79.6%	0.0%	100% (285)
Express dissatisfaction with the government’s handling of the bill	0.4%	1.4%	1.8%	10.2%	85.6%	0.7%	100% (285)

Remarks:

(1) The total percentage of some questions might not be exactly equal to 100% due to rounding.

12th June

The questions of survey on this day did not include the reason of participation.

16th June

Question: “How important are the following factors in motivating you to participate in today’s protest?”

Table 4: Motivations of respondents who participated in the June 16 protest

	Unimportant	Of little importance	So-so	Important	Very Important	Don't know/	Total
--	-------------	----------------------	-------	-----------	----------------	-------------	-------

							Refuse to answer	(Sample size)
Call for the complete withdrawal of the extradition bill	0.1%	0.2%	0.7%	4.0%	94.8%	0.1%	100% (875)	
Continue to pressure the government to withdraw the bill	0.0%	0.2%	0.7%	9.0%	90.0%	0.1%	100% (875)	
Increase the number of participants	0.3%	1.1%	7.5%	21.8%	68.8%	0.6%	100% (875)	
Raise international attention	0.2%	0.4%	3.1%	16.4%	79.4%	0.4%	100% (875)	
Express dissatisfaction with Carrie Lam's disregard of public opinions	0.1%	0.5%	0.4%	6.7%	91.8%	0.6%	100% (875)	
Call for Carrie Lam's resignation	0.6%	2.5%	12.2%	21.0%	63.5%	0.3%	100% (875)	
Express dissatisfaction with the police's handling of the protests	0.1%	0.1%	1.3%	8.2%	89.8%	0.6%	100% (875)	
Protest against arbitrary arrests by the police	0.1%	0.0%	1.6%	8.9%	88.9%	0.5%	100% (875)	
Support young protesters	0.3%	0.9%	3.0%	16.1%	79.0%	0.8%	100% (875)	

Remarks:

- (1) This on-site survey is a mixed-mode survey using both paper and online surveys to collect data. To improve the representativeness of the survey data, the figures collected online this day had been weighted according to the proportional distribution of the demographic information (i.e. gender, age and educational level) of the paper samples. *The above figures had been weighted.*
- (2) The total percentage of some questions might not be exactly equal to 100% due to rounding.

17th June

Question: "Among the following four, which two are key reasons that made you persist in participating in the movement?"

Table 5: Motivations that made them persist in participating in the June 17 protest

Police's excessive use of force	63.9%
CE's refusal to withdraw the bill	79.4%
CE's attitude	33.9%
Sacrifice of protesters	10.6%
Others	4.1%

Don't know	0.7%
Total (Sample Size)	717

Remarks:

- (1) This on-site survey is a mixed-mode survey using both paper and online surveys to collect data. To improve the representativeness of the survey data, the figures collected online this day had been weighted according to the proportional distribution of the demographic information (i.e. gender, age and educational level) of the paper samples. *The above figures had been weighted.*
- (2) Interviewees could choose more than one options, therefore the total percentage is not equal to 100% when summing up together.

21st June

The questions of survey on this day did not include the reason of participation.

26th June

The questions of survey on this day did not include the reason of participation.

1st July

Question: “How important are the following factors in motivating you to participate in today’s protest?”

Table 6: Motivations of respondents who participated in the July 1 protest

	Unimportant	Of little importance	So-so	Important	Very Important	Don't know/ Refuse to answer	Total (Sample size)
Call for the complete withdrawal of the extradition bill	0.3%	0.3%	1.3%	8.1%	89.4%	0.5%	100% (1,169)
Demand Carrie Lam and major government officials to resign	1.6%	6.1%	17.5%	27.3%	47.4%	0.2%	100% (1,169)
Express dissatisfaction with the police's handling of the protests	0.4%	0.4%	1.4%	12.6%	84.6%	0.6%	100% (1,169)
Raise international attention	0.7%	0.7%	4.7%	18.5%	74.8%	0.6%	100% (1,169)

Increase the number of participants	2.1%	2.6%	10.1%	23.8%	60.7%	0.8%	100% (1,169)
Support young protesters	1.0%	0.8%	4.2%	19.3%	74.1%	0.7%	100% (1,169)
Mourn protesters who sacrificed their lives	0.8%	1.0%	7.3%	23.5%	66.7%	0.7%	100% (1,169)
Strive for Hong Kong's democracy	0.5%	1.0%	2.9%	12.0%	82.5%	1.1%	100% (1,169)
Demand the government to improve people's livelihood	0.9%	3.1%	8.8%	17.5%	68.9%	0.7%	100% (1,169)

Remarks:

- (1) This on-site survey is a mixed-mode survey using both paper and online surveys to collect data. To improve the representativeness of the survey data, the figures collected online this day had been weighted according to the proportional distribution of the demographic information (i.e. gender, age and educational level) of the paper samples. *The above figures had been weighted.*
- (2) The total percentage of some questions might not be exactly equal to 100% due to rounding.

14th July

Question: “How important are the following factors in motivating you to participate in today’s protest?”

Table 7: Motivations of respondents who participated in the July 14 protest

	Unimportant	Of little importance	So-so	Important	Very Important	Don't know/ Refuse to answer	Total (Sample size)
Call for the complete withdrawal of the extradition bill	0.2%	0.4%	1.2%	10.0%	88.0%	0.2%	100% (546)
Demand Carrie Lam and major government officials to resign	1.5%	5.4%	20.1%	26.0%	46.8%	0.1%	100% (546)
Express dissatisfaction with the police's handling of the protests	0.2%	0.0%	0.4%	8.7%	90.4%	0.3%	100% (546)
Call for the withdrawal of the “riot” characterization of the June 12 protest	0.2%	0.6%	3.0%	10.5%	85.0%	0.8%	100% (546)
Demand genuine universal suffrage of the LegCo and the CE election	0.7%	0.2%	4.5%	19.3%	74.9%	0.4%	100% (546)
Demand the government to attend to community problems in Shatin	3.1%	7.2%	25.5%	29.2%	33.9%	1.1%	100% (546)

Remarks:

- (1) This on-site survey is a mixed-mode survey using both paper and online surveys to collect data. To improve the representativeness of the survey data, the figures collected online this day had been weighted according to the proportional distribution of the demographic information (i.e. gender, age and educational level) of the paper samples. *The above figures had been weighted.*
- (2) The total percentage of some questions might not be exactly equal to 100% due to rounding.

21st July

Question: “How important are the following factors in motivating you to participate in today’s protest?”

Table 8: Motivations of respondents who participated in the July 21 protest

	Unimportant	Of little importance	So-so	Important	Very Important	Don't know/ Refuse to answer	Total (Sample size)
Call for the complete withdrawal of the extradition bill	0.8%	0.1%	2.1%	9.9%	87.1%	0.0%	100% (680)
Demand Carrie Lam and major government officials to resign	2.1%	3.9%	14.4%	24.5%	54.8%	0.3%	100% (680)
Express dissatisfaction with the police's handling of the protests	0.7%	0.0%	1.0%	7.1%	90.9%	0.3%	100% (680)
Call for the withdrawal of the "riot" characterization of the June 12 protest	0.9%	0.3%	0.9%	11.2%	86.4%	0.3%	100% (680)
Call for the establishment of an independent commission of inquiry	0.7%	0.1%	0.4%	5.6%	92.5%	0.6%	100% (680)
Strive for Hong Kong's democracy	0.7%	0.1%	0.9%	10.8%	87.2%	0.3%	100% (680)

Remarks:

- (1) This on-site survey is a mixed-mode survey using both paper and online surveys to collect data. To improve the representativeness of the survey data, the figures collected online this day had been weighted according to the proportional distribution of the demographic information (i.e. gender, age and educational level) of the paper samples. *The above figures had been weighted.*
- (2) The total percentage of some questions might not be exactly equal to 100% due to rounding.

27th July

Question: "How important are the following factors in motivating you to participate in today's protest?"

Table 9: Motivations of respondents who participated in the July 27 protest

	Unimportant	Of little importance	So-so	Important	Very Important	Don't know/ Refuse to answer	Total (Sample size)
--	-------------	----------------------	-------	-----------	----------------	------------------------------	---------------------

Call for the complete withdrawal of the extradition bill	0.9%	0.9%	4.3%	8.5%	85.1%	0.4%	100% (235)
Demand Carrie Lam and major government officials to resign	3.4%	7.2%	12.8%	20.4%	55.7%	0.4%	100% (235)
Express dissatisfaction with the police's handling of the protests	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	98.3%	0.9%	100% (235)
Call for the withdrawal of the "riot" characterization of the June 12 protest	0.4%	1.7%	5.1%	8.5%	83.8%	0.4%	100% (235)
Call for the establishment of an independent commission of inquiry	0.0%	0.4%	1.3%	2.6%	94.9%	0.9%	100% (235)
Strive for Hong Kong's democracy	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%	8.9%	88.1%	0.9%	100% (235)

Remarks:

(1) The total percentage of some questions might not be exactly equal to 100% due to rounding.

4th August

Question: "How important are the following factors in motivating you to participate in today's protest?"

Table 10: Motivations of respondents who participated in the August 4 protests (TKO and Sai Wan)

	Unimportant	Of little importance	So-so	Important	Very Important	Don't know/ Refuse to answer	Total (Sample size)
(Tseung Kwan-O)							
Call for the complete withdrawal of the extradition bill	0.8%	0.5%	3.1%	8.1%	87.3%	0.2%	100% (717)
Demand Carrie Lam and major government officials to resign	2.8%	5.4%	16.0%	24.7%	51.0%	0.1%	100% (717)

Express dissatisfaction with the police's handling of the protests	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	95.4%	0.7%	100% (717)
Call for the establishment of an independent commission of inquiry	0.9%	0.3%	1.0%	4.5%	92.8%	0.6%	100% (717)
Call for the withdrawal of the "riot" characterization of the June 12 protest	0.8%	0.4%	2.1%	10.3%	85.9%	0.6%	100% (717)
Express dissatisfaction with the arrests of protesters on Jul 28 based on riot charges	0.8%	0.1%	0.7%	7.8%	90.1%	0.6%	100% (717)
Strive for Hong Kong's democracy	0.8%	0.0%	1.5%	12.1%	85.0%	0.7%	100% (717)
(Sai Wan)							
Call for the complete withdrawal of the extradition bill	1.0%	0.8%	3.6%	8.5%	85.9%	0.2%	100% (555)
Demand Carrie Lam and major government officials to resign	2.1%	7.2%	16.5%	24.6%	49.4%	0.2%	100% (555)
Express dissatisfaction with the police's handling of the protests	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	95.1%	0.7%	100% (555)
Call for the establishment of an independent commission of inquiry	1.0%	0.3%	1.3%	5.5%	91.1%	0.7	100% (555)
Call for the withdrawal of the "riot" characterization of the June 12 protest	1.0%	0.7%	2.4%	9.9%	85.3%	0.7%	100% (555)
Express dissatisfaction with the arrests of protesters on Jul 28 based on riot charges	1.0%	0.0%	0.8%	6.5%	91.0%	0.7%	100% (555)
Strive for Hong Kong's democracy	0.8%	0.3%	2.0%	8.3%	88.2%	0.3%	100% (555)

Remarks:

- (1) This on-site survey is a mixed-mode survey using both paper and online surveys to collect data. To improve the representativeness of the survey data, the figures collected online this day had been weighted according to the proportional distribution of the demographic information (i.e. gender, age and educational level) of the paper samples. *The above figures had been weighted.*
- (2) The total percentage of some questions might not be exactly equal to 100% due to rounding.

Part 4: Previous experience in social movements

Question: Did you participate in the Occupy Central/Umbrella Movement of 2014?

Table 11: Proportion of respondents who participated in the Occupy Central/ Umbrella Movement of 2014

	6/9	6/12	6/16	6/17	6/21	6/26	7/1	7/14	7/21	7/27	8/4 (TKO)	8/4 (SW)
Yes	61.8%	76.6%	44.3%	72.5%	64.0%	72.7%	55.3%	59.3%	52.9%	67.2%	57.8%	60.2%
No/ Don't know/ Refuse to answer	38.2%	23.4%	55.7%	27.5%	36.0%	27.3%	44.7%	40.7%	47.1%	32.8%	42.2%	39.8%
Total (Sample Size)	100% (285)	100% (175)	100% (875)	100% (717)	100% (316)	100% (418)	100% (1,169)	100% (546)	100% (680)	100% (235)	100% (717)	100% (555)

Remarks:

- (1) The on-site surveys on 6/12, 6/16, 6/17, 6/21, 7/1, 7/14, 7/21 and 8/4 are mixed-mode surveys using both paper and online surveys to collect data. To improve the representativeness of the survey data, the figures collected online on the above dates had been weighted according to the proportional distribution of the demographic information (i.e. gender, age and educational level) of the paper samples. *The above figures had been weighted.*

Question: When is the first time you joined a protest?

Table 12: The first social movement that respondents joined

	6/9	6/17	6/21	6/26	7/1	7/14
June Fourth vigil	25.2%	29.3%	25.4%	20.8%	23.8%	30.2%
July 1 rally	16.5%	12.1%	11.1%	17.7%	18.5%	20.4%
July 1 rally 2019	NA	NA	NA	NA	5.8%	NA
Anti-express rail link movement in 2009 and 2010	0.6%	1.3%	0.9%	2.4%	1.4%	1.2%
Anti-national education movement in 2012	8.0%	9.2%	9.3%	11.7%	5.9%	7.1%
Umbrella Movement/Revolution in 2014	28.5%	23.9%	25.3%	25.8%	17.0%	17.8%

Liberate Protests in different districts in 2015	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
Mongkok civil unrest in 2016	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%
Anti-extradition bill movement in 2019	14.6%	13.9%	22.5%	14.1%	19.7%	12.7%
Others	2.1%	7.6%	3.5%	5.5%	5.6%	8.6%
Don't know/ refuse to answer	4.1%	2.6%	2.0%	1.4%	2.1%	1.7%
Total (Sample Size)	100% (175)	100% (717)	100% (316)	100% (418)	100% (1,169)	100% (546)

Remarks:

- (1) The on-site surveys on 6/12, 6/17, 6/21, 7/1, 7/14, 7/21 and 8/4 are mixed-mode surveys using both paper and online surveys to collect data. To improve the representativeness of the survey data, the figures collected online on the above dates had been weighted according to the proportional distribution of the demographic information (i.e. gender, age and educational level) of the paper samples. *The above figures had been weighted.*
- (2) The question is not included in the surveys on 6/9, 6/16, 7/21 and 7/24.
- (3) Interviewees could choose more than one options, therefore the total percentage is not equal to 100% when summing up together.

Part 5: Views on radicalisation

Question: If the government insists to only ‘suspend’ the bill but do not make any further concession, what should be the next step of the movement?”

Table 13: Respondent’s view on the next step of the movement

	6/21	6/26	7//1	7/14	7/21	7/27	8/4 (TKO)	8/4 (SW)
Escalate the protest	46.1%	48.8%	39.1%	50.9%	44.8%	49.4%	50.7%	54.1%
Sustain current form and mobilize from time to time	43.5%	41.1%	45.1%	43.0%	48.9%	44.3%	41.0%	38.7%
Suspend the movement and leave time for society to recover	2.2%	1.4%	5.1%	0.3%	1.0%	1.3%	0.7%	1.9%
Don’t know/ refuse to answer	8.2%	8.6%	10.7%	5.8%	5.3%	5.1%	7.6%	5.3%
Total (Sample Size)	100% (316)	100% (418)	100% (1,169)	100% (546)	100% (680)	100% (235)	100% (717)	100% (555)

Remarks:

- (1) The on-site surveys on 6/21, 7/1, 7/14, 7/21 and 8/4 are mixed-mode surveys using both paper and online surveys to collect data. To improve the representativeness of the survey data, the figures collected online on the above dates had been weighted according to the proportional distribution of the demographic information (i.e. gender, age and educational level) of the paper samples. *The above figures had been weighted.*
- (2) The total percentage of some questions might not be exactly equal to 100% due to rounding.

Question: “To what extent do you agree with the following statement? ‘Peaceful, rational and non-violent protests are no longer useful’?”

Table 14: Respondents’ views on the effectiveness of peaceful, rational and non-violent protests

	6/12	6/17	6/21	6/26
Strongly disagree	2.9%	8.6%	2.5%	6.9%
Disagree	14.7%	22.8%	24.1%	25.1%
So-so	24.0%	24.6%	25.5%	22.7%
Agree	42.1%	31.0%	33.6%	26.3%
Strongly agree	15.5%	12.4%	13.7%	15.8%
Don’t know/ refuse to answer	0.8%	0.6%	0.6%	3.1%
Total (Sample Size)	100% (175)	100% (717)	100% (316)	100% (418)

Remarks :

(1) The on-site surveys on 6/12, 6/16, 6/17, 6/21, 7/1, 7/14, 7/21 and 8/4 are mixed-mode surveys using both paper and online surveys to collect data. To improve the representativeness of the survey data, the figures collected online on the above dates had been weighted according to the proportional distribution of the demographic information (i.e. gender, age and educational level) of the paper samples. *The above figures had been weighted.*

(2) The question is not included in the surveys on 6/9, 6/16, 7/1, 7/14, 7/21, 7/27 and 8/4.

(3) The total percentage of some questions might not be exactly equal to 100% due to rounding.

Question: “To what extent do you agree with the following statement? ‘Radical protests could make the government heed public opinion.’”

Table 15: Respondents’ views on whether radical protests could make the government heed public opinion

	6/12	6/17	6/21	6/26	7/1	7/21	7/27	8/4 (TKO)	8/4 (SW)
Strongly disagree	3.2%	4.1%	1.0%	3.1%	8.8%	3.5%	0.9%	3.7%	3.5%
Disagree	14.2%	13.1%	8.1%	11.2%	17.8%	9.8%	4.3%	8.7%	11.3%
So-so	41.7%	28.8%	28.3%	26.1%	30.7%	30.7%	27.2%	35.1%	36.4%
Agree	33.0%	39.9%	47.4%	40.7%	29.0%	36.3%	36.6%	33.4%	32.8%
Strongly agree	5.2%	13.3%	14.3%	15.6%	11.5%	18.0%	28.9%	16.7%	14.5%

Don't know/ refuse to answer	2.7%	0.8%	0.9%	3.3%	2.2%	1.7%	2.1%	2.5%	1.5%
Total (Sample Size)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(175)	(717)	(316)	(418)	(1,169)	(680)	(235)	(717)	(555)

Remarks :

(1) The on-site surveys on 6/12, 6/17, 6/21, 7/1, 7/21 and 8/4 are mixed-mode surveys using both paper and online surveys to collect data. To improve the representativeness of the survey data, the figures collected online on the above dates had been weighted according to the proportional distribution of the demographic information (i.e. gender, age and educational level) of the paper samples. *The above figures had been weighted.*

(2) The question is not included in the surveys on 6/9, 6/16, and 7/14.

(3) The total percentage of some questions might not be exactly equal to 100% due to rounding.

Question: "To what extent do you agree with the following statement? 'Radical protests could alienate the general public.'"

Table 16: Respondents' views on whether radical protests could alienate the general public

	6/12	6/17	6/21	6/26	7/1	7/21	7/27	8/4 (TKO)	8/4 (SW)
Strongly disagree	1.9%	1.5%	1.2%	2.2%	3.1%	6.2%	6.0%	5.8%	3.8%
Disagree	9.9%	7.0%	8.8%	12.2%	9.1%	14.5%	15.3%	15.1%	14.1%
So-so	33.0%	29.5%	32.5%	36.1%	32.0%	45.1%	44.7%	42.2%	47.2%
Agree	47.1%	50.7%	47.8%	40.9%	42.6%	28.3%	23.4%	28.4%	26.2%
Strongly agree	5.5%	10.5%	8.8%	6.2%	12.3%	4.8%	8.9%	7.3%	7.6%
Don't know/ refuse to answer	2.6%	0.9%	0.9%	2.4%	0.9%	1.2%	1.7%	1.2%	1.1%
Total (Sample Size)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(175)	(717)	(316)	(418)	(1,169)	(680)	(235)	(717)	(555)

Remarks :

(1) The on-site surveys on 6/12, 6/17, 6/21, 7/1, 7/21 and 8/4 are mixed-mode surveys using both paper and online surveys to collect data. To improve the representativeness of the survey data, the figures collected online on the above dates had been weighted according to the proportional distribution of the demographic information (i.e. gender, age and educational level) of the paper samples. *The above figures had been weighted.*

- (2) The question is not included in the surveys on 6/9, 6/16, and 7/14.
- (3) The total percentage of some questions might not be exactly equal to 100% due to rounding.

Question: “To what extent you do agree with the following statement? “The maximum impact could only be achieved when peaceful assembly and confrontational actions work together.””

Table 17: Respondents’ views on whether the maximum impact could only be achieved when peaceful assembly and confrontational actions work together

	6/17	6/21	6/26	7/1	7/21	7/27	8/4 (TKO)	8/4 (SW)
Strongly disagree	1.3%	0.7%	1.0%	2.6%	0.6%	0.4%	1.0%	0.2%
Disagree	3.2%	1.1%	3.6%	7.0%	2.2%	2.1%	1.2%	1.7%
So-so	12.0%	7.9%	7.4%	17.7%	14.8%	8.9%	10.3%	9.0%
Agree	33.4%	36.0%	33.5%	27.3%	29.2%	18.3%	23.5%	22.8%
Strongly agree	46.2%	53.0%	51.4%	43.7%	52.4%	67.7%	63.2%	65.7%
Don’t know/ refuse to answer	3.9%	1.3%	3.1%	1.6%	0.8%	2.6%	0.8%	0.7%
Total (Sample Size)	100% (717)	100% (316)	100% (418)	100% (1,169)	100% (680)	100% (235)	100% (717)	100% (555)

Remarks :

- (1) The on-site surveys on 6/12, 6/17, 6/21, 7/1, 7/21 and 8/4 are mixed-mode surveys using both paper and online surveys to collect data. To improve the representativeness of the survey data, the figures collected online on the above dates had been weighted according to the proportional distribution of the demographic information (i.e. gender, age and educational level) of the paper samples. *The above figures had been weighted.*
- (2) The question is not included in the surveys on 6/9, 6/16, and 7/14.
- (3) The total percentage of some questions might not be exactly equal to 100% due to rounding.

Question: “To what extent do you agree with the following statement? “When the government fails to listen, the use of radical tactics by protesters is understandable.””

Table 18: Respondents’ views on whether the use of radical tactics of protesters is understandable when the government fails to listen

	6/16	7/1	7/21	7/27	8/4 (TKO)	8/4 (SW)
Strongly disagree	8.4%	2.1%	0.3%	1.3%	0.7%	0.9%
Disagree	4.1%	2.8%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%
So-so	17.1%	10.3%	3.7%	1.7%	2.7%	4.8%
Agree	32.4%	28.8%	25.8%	10.6%	17.0%	13.7%
Strongly agree	36.7%	54.7%	68.9%	84.7%	78.9%	79.4%
Don't know/ refuse to answer	1.4%	1.3%	0.9%	1.3%	0.4%	0.9%
Total (Sample Size)	100% (875)	100% (1,169)	100% (680)	100% (235)	100% (717)	100% (555)

Remarks :

- (1) The on-site surveys on 6/12, 6/17, 6/21, 7/1, 7/21 and 8/4 are mixed-mode surveys using both paper and online surveys to collect data. To improve the representativeness of the survey data, the figures collected online on the above dates had been weighted according to the proportional distribution of the demographic information (i.e. gender, age and educational level) of the paper samples. *The above figures had been weighted.*
- (2) The question is not included in the surveys on 6/9, 6/16, and 7/14.
- (3) The total percentage of some questions might not be exactly equal to 100% due to rounding.

Part 6: Views on change in demands

Question: “As the government announced the ‘suspension’ of the bill, how much do you agree with the shift of demand, from ‘withdraw the extradition bill’ to ‘restart political reform?’”

Table 19: Respondents’ view on changing the demand to “restart political reform”

	7/21	7/27	8/4 (TKO)	8/4 (SW)
Strongly Disagree	4.6%	5.5%	4.8%	4.1%
Disagree	5.9%	6.0%	5.7%	3.9%
So-so	23.7%	20.9%	19.1%	17.1%
Agree	26.4%	18.3%	24.1%	20.7%
Strongly Agree	37.7%	47.2%	44.0%	53.0%
Don’t know/ refuse to answer	1.8%	2.1%	2.4%	1.2%
Total (Sample Size)	100% (680)	100% (235)	100% (717)	100% (555)

Remarks :

- (1) The on-site surveys on 7/21 and 8/4 are mixed-mode surveys using both paper and online surveys to collect data. To improve the representativeness of the survey data, the figures collected online on the above dates had been weighted according to the proportional distribution of the demographic information (i.e. gender, age and educational level) of the paper samples. *The above figures had been weighted.*
- (2) The question is not included in the surveys on 6/9, 6/12, 6/16, 6/17, 6/21, 6/26, 7/1 and 7/14.
- (3) The total percentage of some questions might not be exactly equal to 100% due to rounding.

Question: “As the government announced the ‘suspension’ of the bill, how much do you agree with the shift of demand, from ‘withdraw the extradition bill’ to ‘focus on police brutality?’”

Table 20: Respondents’ view on changing the demand to “focus on police brutality”

	7/21	7/27	8/4 (TKO)	8/4 (SW)
--	------	------	--------------	-------------

Strongly Disagree	2.6%	2.1%	2.2%	2.5%
Disagree	3.6%	3.8%	2.7%	2.0%
So-so	13.7%	12.8%	9.7%	8.5%
Agree	23.1%	13.6%	15.7%	17.8%
Strongly Agree	56.1%	67.2%	68.9%	68.6%
Don't know/ refuse to answer	0.9%	0.4%	0.8%	0.7%
Total (Sample Size)	100% (680)	100% (235)	100% (717)	100% (555)

Remarks :

- (1) The on-site surveys on 7/21 and 8/4 are mixed-mode surveys using both paper and online surveys to collect data. To improve the representativeness of the survey data, the figures collected online on the above dates had been weighted according to the proportional distribution of the demographic information (i.e. gender, age and educational level) of the paper samples. *The above figures had been weighted.*
- (2) The question is not included in the surveys on 6/9, 6/12, 6/16, 6/17, 6/21, 6/26, 7/1 and 7/14.
- (3) The total percentage of some questions might not be exactly equal to 100% due to rounding.

Question: “As the government announced the ‘suspension’ of the bill, how much do you agree with the shift of demand, from ‘withdraw the extradition bill’ to ‘focus on community issues?’”

Table 21: Respondents’ view on changing the demand to “focus on community issues”

	7/21	7/27	8/4 (TKO)	8/4 (SW)
Strongly Disagree	7.9%	9.8%	9.3%	8.2%
Disagree	14.5%	14.0%	10.1%	8.5%
So-so	35.5%	35.7%	32.3%	34.5%
Agree	20.6%	18.3%	25.2%	26.2%
Strongly Agree	19.6%	19.6%	20.1%	20.3%
Don't know/ refuse to answer	2.0%	2.6%	3.1%	2.4%
Total (Sample Size)	100% (680)	100% (235)	100% (717)	100% (555)

Remarks :

- (1) The on-site surveys on 7/21 and 8/4 are mixed-mode surveys using both paper and online surveys to collect data. To improve the representativeness of the survey data, the figures collected online on the above dates had been weighted according to the proportional distribution of the demographic information (i.e. gender, age and educational level) of the paper samples. *The above figures had been weighted.*
- (2) The question is not included in the surveys on 6/9, 6/12, 6/16, 6/17, 6/21, 6/26, 7/1 and 7/14.
- (3) The total percentage of some questions might not be exactly equal to 100% due to rounding.