

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG PUBLIC OPINION PROGRAMME (POP)

CIVIC EXCHANGE

JOINTLY CONDUCT

2004 Legislative Council Direct Election: Survey on Individual Constituency 【 Hong Kong Island 】

SURVEY REPORT

Research Team Members

Project Director	:	CHUNG Ting-Yiu Robert
Project Manager	:	PANG Ka-Lai Karie
Project Executive	:	LAM Mo-Chun Calvin
Data Analyst	:	TSOI Pui-Ching Tony
Report Translator	:	CHAN Ka-Man Carmen

JUNE 2004

CONTACT INFORMATION

Date of survey	:	24 May 2004
Survey method	:	Telephone survey with interviewers.
Target population	:	Cantonese-speaking population of Hong Kong aged 18 or above, and currently residing in Hong Kong Island
Sampling method	:	Standard POP telephone sampling method was used. Telephone numbers were selected randomly from residential telephone directories and mixed with additional numbers generated by the computer. If more than one subject had been available, the one who had his/her birthday next was selected.
Weighting method	:	The data reported have been adjusted according to the gender, age and living district distributions of the Hong Kong population as reported in the 2001 Population Census.
Sample size	:	532 successful cases
Response Rate	:	71.0%
Std sampling error	:	Less than 2.2%

Everything in this publication is the work of individual researchers, and does not represent the stand of the University of Hong Kong. CHUNG Ting-yiu Robert is responsible for the work of the Public Opinion Programme (POP) of the University of Hong Kong.

1. Preamble

1.1 The Public Opinion Programme (POP) was established in June 1991 to collect and study public opinion on topics that could be of interest to academics, journalists, policy-makers, and the general public. POP was at first under the Social Sciences Research Centre, a unit under the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Hong Kong, and was transferred to the Journalism and Media Studies Centre in the University of Hong Kong in May 2000. In January 2002, it was transferred back to the Faculty of Social Sciences in the University of Hong Kong. Since its establishment, POP has been conducting opinion researches on various social and political issues and providing quality survey services to a wide range of public and subvented bodies provided that they agreed to publicizing the findings to the general public, as well as allowing the research team to design and conduct the research independently, including the sampling method, questionnaire design, fieldwork supervision, data analysis, and report writing.

1.2 In May 2004, Civic Exchange commissioned the POP Team to conduct a series of public opinion surveys on the 2004 Legislative Council direct election. The first survey was targeted at the general population in Hong Kong and the results have already been released. As the first geographical constituency survey, Hong Kong Island was studied, with the main areas of investigation as follows:

- i. Hong Kong Island residents' voting inclination;
- ii. Hong Kong Island voters' voting behaviour and propensity to vote;
- iii. Hong Kong Island residents' participation in political activities.

1.3 The questionnaire was designed independently by the POP Team after consultation with the client, whilst fieldwork operations and data analysis were also conducted independently by the POP Team. In order to maintain neutrality, the POP Team did not provide advisory or consultative services of any kind apart from data interpretations and analyses.

2. Research Method

- 2.1 Random telephone survey with interviewers under strict supervision was adopted. To minimize sampling bias, telephone numbers were first drawn randomly from the residential telephone directories as "seed numbers", from which another set of numbers was generated using the "plus/minus one/two" method, in order to capture the unlisted numbers. Duplicated numbers were then filtered, and the remaining numbers were mixed in random order to produce the final telephone sample.
- 2.2 The target population of this survey was Cantonese-speaking population of Hong Kong aged 18 or above, who was currently residing in Hong Kong Island. When telephone contact was successfully established with a target household, one person aged 18 or above was selected. If more than one subject had been available, selection was made using the "next birthday rule" which selected the person who had his/her birthday next from all those present.
- 2.3 Telephone interviews were conducted on 24 May 2004. A total of 532 qualified respondents were successfully interviewed. The overall response rate of this survey was 71.0% (Table 1 Appendix II), and the standard sampling error based on this sample was less than 2.2 percentage points. In other words, the sampling error for all percentages was less than plus/minus 4 percentage points at 95% confidence level.
- 2.4 As shown in Table 2, among the 2,566 telephone numbers sampled for the survey, 475 were confirmed ineligible, among them 42 were fax or data lines, 243 were invalid telephone numbers, 5 were call-forwarding numbers, while another 43 were non-residential numbers. Besides, 53 of them were invalidated due to special technological reasons, while 89 cases were voided because target respondents were unavailable at the numbers provided.
- 2.5 Meanwhile, a total of 1,091 telephone numbers were invalidated since the research team could not confirm their eligibility. Among them 297 were busy lines and 469 were no-answer calls after making a maximum of 5 times' recalls. Thirteen cases were diverted to answering devices while another 58 were blocked. Moreover, 42 cases were treated as unsuccessful because of language problems, while 211 interviews were terminated before the screening question. One case was voided for other problems of the line.

- 2.6 On the other hand, 468 cases were qualified, yet failed to complete the interview. Among them 10 were rejected at the household level, another 3 rejected the interview immediately after their eligibility was confirmed, 432 were unfinished cases with appointment dates beyond the end of fieldwork period. Besides, 22 cases were incomplete due to unexpected termination of interviews, 1 was classified as miscellaneous due to other non-contact problems, and the remaining 532 were successful cases (Table 2 in Appendix II).

3. Key Findings

(Please refer to Appendix II for cross-reference of the tables cited.)

3.1 Hong Kong Island Residents' Voting Inclination

3.1.1 This survey revealed that, if the Legislative Council election were to be held tomorrow, and the respondents in Hong Kong Island had the right to vote, of the 12 candidates or lists predetermined by the POP Team, a quarter of the respondents (25%) said they would cast their votes to Audrey Eu of Article 45 Concern Group, which made her the most popular candidate on the list. The 2nd and 3rd places fell to the independent candidate Rita Fan and Martin Lee of Democratic Party, obtaining 13% and 10% of vote shares respectively. Also, 9% of the respondents would vote for any list from the pro-democracy camp, while 6% of the respondents would vote for Alan Leong of Article 45 Concern Group. On the other hand, 15% had not yet decided, while 5% claimed they would not vote. Due to the high sampling error, those obtained less than 5% of vote shares were not discussed here (Table 3a; for the vote shares obtained by each candidate or list after excluding those respondents who failed to give a concrete choice, please refer to Table 3b).

3.1.2 Table 4 shows the reallocations of hypothetical vote shares after teaming up any two of the candidates among the 12 candidates or lists. For instance, if Audrey Eu teamed up with Alan Leong, their joint vote share would become 41%. Extra caution, however, should be taken when interpreting these figures as the calculation of the joint vote share was based on a mere summation of individual vote shares obtained by each candidate or list within a team. In real-life situations, some of the team-ups would be quite unlikely. Also, while people's voting behaviours are relatively not predictable, the summation of individual vote shares obtained by each candidate or list within a team might not accurately reflect the joint vote shares after teaming up.

3.1.3 Respondents were further asked for their best alternatives if their first choices dropped out from the competition. As shown in Table 5, the shaded area indicates the absence of that specific candidate, while the horizontal-axis and vertical-axis indicate the respondents' first choice and second choice respectively. When interpreting vertically, the column figures represent the re-distribution of vote shares under each hypothetical drop-out scenario. For instance, the first

column of Table 5 shows the vote shares obtained by other candidates if Martin Lee dropped out, i.e. Yeung Sum would obtain 11% of vote share (an 8-percentage-point increase from the first voting exercise, Table 3b) whereas Cyd Ho would obtain 2% of vote share (no change, Table 3b).

- 3.1.4 If respondents' first two choices did not run for the election, what would be the further changes in the vote shares? Table 6 to Table 15 reveal the distribution of votes if two candidates or lists dropped out from the competition, with the shaded area indicating the absence of that specific candidate. Again, figures should be interpreted vertically. To illustrate, the second column of Table 6 gives the vote shares obtained by other candidates if neither Martin Lee nor Yeung Sum ran for the HK Island Constituency. In such case, Cyd Ho would obtain 6% of vote share (a 5-percentage-point increase from the first voting exercise, Table 3b), and Jasper Tsang would obtain 4% (no change, Table 3b), so on and so forth.
- 3.1.5 Put it in another way, if candidates from Democratic Party, Democratic Alliance for the Betterment of Hong Kong, Liberal Party, Frontier, Article 45 Concern Group, and some other independent candidates all took part in the election, 43% of the respondents in Hong Kong Island stated that they would never support Democratic Alliance for the Betterment of Hong Kong, 15% would never support Democratic Party and 12% would never support Liberal Party. The corresponding percentages obtained by Frontier and Article 45 Concern Group were relatively low, both at 5%. It is worth noticing that one-third (34%) of the respondents had not yet decided which party or independent candidate they would never support at the interview time (Table 18).
- 3.1.6 Among the 322 respondents who claimed they would support the Democratic Party or the pro-democracy camp earlier, 64% (or 39% of total sample) of them indicated that if candidates from these two groups ran in the same list, they would still vote for such a list, while 17% (or 11% of total sample) would re-consider and 19% had not decided yet (or 11% of total sample; Table 19).
- 3.1.7 This survey also found that, in order to support the camp which appealed to them, 36% of these Hong Kong Island respondents would go for the list of this camp, no matter they liked or disliked the candidates on the list. Meanwhile, 57% would not (Table 20).
- 3.1.8 As regards the respondents' reaction to the vote-allocation instructions given out by the camp they supported (such as casting their votes to another list belonging

to the same camp according to their ID card number or birthday), 71% of the respondents said that they would not follow such instructions, while 21% would (Table 21).

3.2 Hong Kong Island Voters' Voting Behaviour and Propensity to Vote

3.2.1 Of the 440 registered voters captured in this survey (Table 22), 9% (or 8% of total sample) submitted their registration less than a year ago, while 28% (or 23% of total sample) registered at least four years ago. Besides, as high as 48% (or 39% of total sample) had forgotten when they registered (Table 23).

3.2.2 The survey also found that, 58% (or 48% of total sample) of these voters self-reported that they had voted in the District Council election last November, whilst 41% (or 34% of total sample; Table 24) had not. Besides, 81% (or 67% of total sample) of this sub-group claimed that they had voted in the past Council election in different tiers, 17% (or 14% of total sample) had not (Table 25).

3.2.3 As a snapshot taken three and a half months ahead of the Legislative Council election, the registered voters' propensity to vote was found to be 82% within the Hong Kong Island constituency (Table 26). Nevertheless, this percentage should never be taken as a projection of the actual turnout rate because many people who claimed they would vote at this stage would eventually not vote.

3.3 Hong Kong Island Residents' Participation in Political Activities

3.3.1 When being asked whether they had participated in the July 1 rally last year and the January 1 rally this year, 23% and 4% of the respondents in Hong Kong Island said "yes" respectively (Table 27 and Table 28).