Macau Legislative Assembly Election (September 1992)

Preliminary Report

Chung Ting-yiu Robert

(copyright reserved)

PREAMBLE

On 20 September 1992, Macau had its 5th Legislative Assembly election. The election captured the attention of not just the Macau population, but also reporters and researchers from Hong Kong. The main reason being that Hong Kong was in the middle of a debate on possible alternatives for its 1994/95 election, and the Macau model of election had provided a valuable occasion for thoughts and comparison.

Partly for this reason, and partly out of his interest to study various forms of political culture, the author, under the sponsorship of Dr Stanley Ho, Managing Director of Sociedade de Turismo e Diversoes de Macau, S.A.R.L., brought a research team of 12 over from Hong Kong to conduct a series of polls during the election period.

In the afternoon of 19 September, and then the morning of 20 September, the research team conducted telephone surveys using random telephone numbers drawn from the telephone directory. A total of 159 residents of 18 years and above were successfully interviewed.

Meanwhile, on 20 September, between 9:30 a.m. and 5:45 p.m., interviewers were deployed at all seven polling stations to conduct an exit poll. A total of 284 voters were successfully interviewed.

The contact information of both surveys are given in Tables X-1 and T-1. The present report summarizes the main findings of the two surveys, in order that more in-depth analyses could be performed at a later date. Although the sample size for both surveys are relatively small, and the interpretations

might be more qualitative than quantitative, the figures presented in this report should be able to pave the way for further studies. When findings from both surveys echoed each other, it should be clear that the phenomenon deserves more attention and examination. Because questionnaires used in both surveys were almost identical, the findings are, as far as possible, grouped together for discussion, but because the sample size of the exit poll were bigger, and the results more representative, they are normally presented first. Tables with prefice X- refer to exit poll data, while those prefixed by T- refer to telephone poll results.

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILES

Tables X-2 to X-8 and T-2 to T-8 give the demographic profiles of the respondents for the exit and telephone poll respectively. Sampling errors can be calculated by comparing this profile to that of the actual voters of the election. Such analysis is not made in this report.

SUMMARY FINDINGS

Voter rationality and sophistication

Out of the 159 respondents interviewed during the telephone poll, only 37% were registered voter. Table T-10 shows that the main explicit reason was their sense of civic responsibility, followed by an urge to improve their livelihood. Very few people claimed that they had done do due to calls from candidates or political groups. This trend was almost echoed in Tables X-9 and T-14, which tabulates the reasons to vote. Our exit poll data shows that about half of the respondents who turned out to vote claimed that they have done so out of their sense of civic responsibility, another 21% claimed that they would like to improve their livelihood. Again, very few people claimed that they turned out to vote because they would like to support certain candidate or group. Those who would not register, or would not turn out to vote, often said they have no spare time. These figures, in their absolute sense, may not tell the real motives of the voters, but their comparison across time and different elections could be quite useful in studying the changing forces.

In the September direct election, there were nine groups competing for eight seats. Tables X-10 and X-18 show that only 57% of the exit poll respondents got the correct answer for the number of groups, and even less people, 46%, counted the seats correctly. This indicates a very low level of voter sophistication, although their knowledge level was already better than the telephone survey respondents. Upon analysis, it was not surprising to find that those with higher education have better knowledge of the election. Nevertheless, on the question of voting age, almost 80% of the exit poll respondents gave the correct answer, but the percentage diminishes with age, especially after 50. Data from our telephone poll shows that the general population's knowledge about the election system was even less, Tables T-15, T-21 and T-23 show that only 27% got the correct number of groups, 19% got the correct number of seats, and 73% gave the voting age correctly. A corollary of this finding is that actual voters are more knowledgeable about the voting system than non-voters.

Opinion on the voting system

The Macau direct election system follows the proportional representation model, and from this 1992 election onward, a revised D'Hont counting system was adopted. The basic philosophy of the system is to let the people vote for different groups, rather than for individuals. When asked whether they actually preferred to vote this way, 41% of our exit poll respondents replied yes, but another 36% preferred voting individuals. (Table X-12) The margin is not a big one, especially when 16% did not have any preference, and 7% replied "don't know". This small margin was also registered at the telephone poll (Table T-16). Upon analysis, it was found that younger and more educated respondents tend to favour voting for individuals, while the less educated favour voting for groups, but they also have much higher percentages of "neutral" and "don't know". These findings indicate some kind of dissatisfaction at the voting system among the young and the more educated.

As on the new counting system, almost one-fifth of our exit poll respondents was not aware of the change, one-fifth did not have any opinion, and one-fifth said it didn't matter. 31% preferred the new method, while 9% preferred the old system. This again indicates a low level of voter sophistication. Similar figures were obtained by the telephone poll.

Thus, on the whole, were our respondents satisfied with the election system?

Table X-15 shows that 57% were satisfied, and 24% not satisfied. Apparently, those who favoured voting for groups are more satisfied with the system than those who opted for individual candidates.

The pace of democracy

Table X-16 shows that 46% of the exit poll respondents were satisfied with the present distribution of seats in the Legislative Assembly across direct elected, indirect elected, and appointed seats. Only 28% were not satisfied. However, when asked to give their ideal ratio of the different seats, only 17% gave the present ratio. 6% would like to abolish the appointed seats, 22% opted for more direct elected seats (but still maintain the indirect election element), while 9% would like to see all seats being directly elected. A big portion of 43%, however, had difficulty giving an answer. To sum up, we can say that 38% of the respondents would like to see an increase in the direct election element, 20% did not agree, and 43% had no opinion. Respondents who preferred voting for candidates tended to be less satisfied with the present seat ratio.

Finally, on the performance of the Legislative Assembly during the last session, three-quarter of our exit poll respondents felt that the Assembly was only partially representative of the public opinion. 18% felt it didn't reflect public opinion at all. Respondents to our telephone polls were even more critical of the Legislative Assembly (Table T-22). Perhaps this explains why most of them did not bother to register.

CONCLUSION

Findings from the two surveys reported clearly shows that actual voters in Macau, not to say the general population, was quite unaware of the technical details of the election system, including the number of seats, the counting system, and the number of competing organizations. However, average voters appears to be quite satisfied with the system, but the young and educated tend to take a more critical view. On the performance of the Legislative Assembly during the last session, most respondents felt that it was only partially representative. Practically no-one was very satisfied.

TABLE X-1 CONTACT INFORMATION

	Frequency	Percent
Completed interviews	284	65.7%
Incomplete interviews	24	5.6%
Refusal	117	27.1%
Other problems	7	1.6%
TOTAL	**432**	**100.0%**

TABLE X-2 DISTRIBUTION BY GENDER

	Frequency	Percent
Male	148	53.0%
Female	131	47.0%
TOTAL	**279**	**100.0%**

TABLE X-3 DISTRIBUTION BY AGE

	Frequency	Percent
18-19	7	2.5%
20-24	18	6.5%
25-29	32	11.6%
30-34	38	13.8%
35-39	53	19.2%
40-44	43	15.6%
45-49	25	9.1%
50-54	15	5.4%
55-59	9	3.3%
60-64	13	4.7%
65-69	8	2.9%
70+	15	5.4%
TOTAL	**276**	**100.0%**

TABLE X-4 DISTRIBUTION BY EDUCATION

	Frequency	Percent
Primary and below	74	26.7%
Secondary	170	61.4%
Post-Secondary	33	11.9%
TOTAL	**277**	**100.0%**

TABLE X-5 YEARS LIVING IN MACAU

	Frequency	Percent
5 - 9	10	3.6%
10 - 14	58	21.1%
15 - 19	18	6.5%
20 - 24	26	9.5%
25 - 29	24	8.7%
30 - 34	37	13.5%
35 - 39	31	11.3%
40 - 44	26	9.5%
45 - 49	13	4.7%
50+	32	11.6%
TOTAL	**275**	**100.0%**

TABLE X-6 ETHNICITY

	Frequency	Percent
Chinese	250	90.6%
Macanese	12	4.3%
Portuguese	13	4.7%
Others	1	0.4%
TOTAL	**276**	**100.0%**

TABLE X-7 DISTRIBUTION BY OCCUPATION

	Frequency	Percent
White collars	129	46.9%
Blue collars	77	28.0%
students	5	1.8%
Housewives	29	10.5%
Other economic inactive	24	8.7%
Unclassified	11	4.0%
TOTAL	**275**	**100.0%**

TABLE X-8 DISTRIBUTION BY INCOME

	Frequency	Percent
Below $1,999	2	0.9%
$2,000 - $3,999	59	26.6%
$4,000 - $5,999	61	27.5%
$6,000 - $7,999	42	18.9%
$8,000 - $9,999	17	7.7%
$10,000 - $11,999	15	6.8%
$12,000 - $13,999	6	2.7%
Over $14,000	20	9.0%
TOTAL	**222**	**100.0%**

TABLE X-9 REASON TO VOTE

	Frequency	Percent
Civic responsibility	160	51.6%
Improving people's livelihood	65	21.0%
For democracy	7	2.3%
Suggested by friends / relatives	9	2.9%
Support for certain candidates	17	5.5%
Support for certain groups	14	4.5%
Habit	15	4.8%
No specific reason	18	5.8%
Others	5	1.6%
TOTAL	**310**	**100.0%**

TABLE X-10 KNOWLEDGE OF NO. OF GROUPS (Correct answer=9)

	Frequency	Percent
Right answer	170	56.9%
Wrong answer	129	43.1%
TOTAL	**299**	**100.0%**

TABLE X-11 KNOWLEDGE OF NO. OF GROUPS (Correct answer=9)

	Right answer	Wrong answer	Total	Right answer	Wrong answer	Total
TOTAL	**170**	**129**	**299**	**56.9%**	**43.1%**	**100.0%**
Primary or below	33	41	74	44.6%	55.4%	100.0%
Secondary	104	64	168	61.9%	38.1%	100.0%
Post-secondary	25	8	33	75.8%	24.2%	100.0%

TABLE X-12 PREFER VOTING FOR INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP

	Frequency	Percent
For individuals	107	36.1%
For group	120	40.5%
Doesn't matter	47	15.9%
Don't know	22	7.4%
TOTAL	296	100.0%

TABLE X-13 PREFER VOTING FOR INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP

	For candidate	For party	Same	Don't know	Total	For candidate	For party	Same	Don't know	Total
Total	107	120	47	22	296	36.1%	40.5%	15.9%	7.4%	100.0%
18-19	4	2	0	1	7	57.1%	28.6%	0.0%	14.3%	100.0%
21-24	9	7	2	0	18	50.0%	38.9%	11.1%	0.0%	100.0%
25-29	15	15	1	1	32	46.9%	46.9%	3.1%	3.1%	100.0%
30-34	14	17	6	1	38	36.8%	44.7%	15.8%	2.6%	100.0%
35-39	18	24	8	3	53	34.0%	45.3%	15.1%	5.7%	100.0%
40-44	21	13	8	1	43	48.8%	30.2%	18.6%	2.3%	100.0%
45-49	8	9	6	1	24	33.3%	37.5%	25.0%	4.2%	100.0%
50-54	5	9	0	1	15	33.3%	60.0%	0.0%	6.7%	100.0%
55-59	2	4	2	1	9	22.2%	44.4%	22.2%	11.1%	100.0%
60-64	2	6	2	3	13	15.4%	46.2%	15.4%	23.1%	100.0%
65-69	2	0	1	4	7	28.6%	0.0%	14.3%	57.1%	100.0%
70 or above	4	7	1	3	15	26.7%	46.7%	6.7%	20.0%	100.0%
Primary or below	21	25	14	13	73	28.8%	34.2%	19.2%	17.8%	100.0%
Secondary	68	75	20	6	169	40.2%	44.4%	11.8%	3.6%	100.0%
Post-secondary	16	13	3	1	33	48.5%	39.4%	9.1%	3.0%	100.0%

TABLE X-14 PREFER WHICH COUNTING SYSTEM

	Frequency	Percent
New system	91	31.2%
Previous system	26	8.9%
Doesn't matter	53	18.2%
Don't know the change	55	18.8%
Don't know	67	22.9%
TOTAL	**292**	**100.0%**

TABLE X-15 SATISFIED WITH THE PRESENT ELECTION SYSTEM

	Frequency	Percent
Very satisfied	17	5.8%
(Just) satisfied	148	50.9%
Neutral	40	13.7%
(Just) dissatisfied	63	21.6%
Very dissatisfied	6	2.1%
Don't know	17	5.8%
TOTAL	**291**	**100.0%**

TABLE X-16 SATISFIED WITH PRESENT SEAT RATIO

	Frequency	Percent
Very satisfied	13	4.6%
(Just) satisfied	117	41.3%
Neutral	43	15.2%
(Just) dissatisfied	67	23.7%
Very dissatisfied	13	4.6%
Don't know	30	10.6%
TOTAL	**283**	**100.0%**

TABLE X-17 THE IDEAL SEAT RATIO

	Frequency	Percent
Existing ratio	49	30.2%
All seats become direct-elected	26	16.0%
Abolish appointed seats	18	11.1%
Increase ratio of direct-elected seats	62	38.3%
Reduce ratio of direct-elected seats	7	4.3%
TOTAL	**162**	**100.0%**

TABLE X-18 KNOWLEDGE OF NO. OF SEATS (Correct answer=8)

	Frequency	Percent
Right answer	129	45.9%
Wrong answer	152	54.1%
TOTAL	**281**	**100.0%**

TABLE X-19 KNOWLEDGE OF NO. OF SEATS (Correct answer=8)

	Right answer	Wrong answer	Total	Right answer	Wrong answer	Total
TOTAL	129	152	281	45.9%	54.1%	100.0%
Primary or below	28	46	74	37.8%	62.2%	100.0%
F.1 - F.3	32	38	70	45.7%	54.3%	100.0%
Upper Secondary	45	54	99	45.5%	54.5%	100.0%
Poat Secondary	24	9	33	72.7%	27.3%	100.0%
TOTAL	129	147	276	46.7%	53.3%	100.0%

TABLE X-20 WHETHER PREVIOUS LEG. ASSEMBLY REFLECTED PUBLIC OPINION

	Frequency	Percent
Very much	10	4.2%
Only partial	179	75.5%
No at all	42	17.7%
Reflect members' own interests	2	0.8%
Others	4	1.7%
TOTAL	**237**	**100.0%**

TABLE X-21 KNOWLEDGE OF VOTING AGE (Correct answer=18)

	Frequency	Percent
Right answer	208	77.0%
Wrong answer	62	23.0%
TOTAL	**270**	**100.0%**

計劃員編號：＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

訪問員編號：＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿

調查結果：
1. 全部完成
2. 部份完成
3. 拒絕接受訪問
4. 言語不通

訪員註釋：
1. 特殊情況
2. 商業
3. 公立屋邨
4. 臨時房屋
5. 花園洋樓
6. 村屋
7. 別墅

如因未能全部完成：

性別　　住計年齡　1.男　2.女（2位數字）

關於訪問時間：

開始時間：＿＿＿＿　時　＿＿＿＿　分

7. 你知唔知今天（直選）有幾多組別？
＿＿　＿＿　（91＝唔知，92＝拒答）

8. 你覺得選個人選好的定係選組別好啲？
1. 選人
2. 選組
3. 1 樣，無所謂
4. 唔知／難講
0. 拒答

9. 你比較贊成今天嘅分界方法定係以前嘅好呢？
1. 今天（改良嘅選法）
2. 以前（舊選法）
3. 無所謂
4. 唔知冇意見
5. 唔知／難講／唔識
0. 拒答

10. 整體黎講，你覺唔覺香港今天嘅選舉方法？
1. 非常滿意
2. 滿意
3. 中立
4. 不滿意
5. 非常不滿意
6. 唔知／難講
0. 拒答

6. 請問你今天嘅新發展最重要？（追問最主要原因）
1. 要從民生社區，民生
2. 改善社區、民生
3. 民選市民主發展甲論
4. 維持穩定
5. 民主特其其其民是人
6. 要支持其身政治團體
7. 原性、大大勢投票率
8. 廳雞播問，根據問
9. 其他
0. 拒絕作答

11. 澳門立法會前幾有三分一直選，三分一間選，及三分一委任議員，你對呢個制度認唔認同呀？
1. 非常認同
2. 幾認同
3. 中立
4. 不認同
5. 非常不認同
6. 唔知/難講
0. 拒答

12. 你心目中邊個理想比例？

直選 ___
間選 ___
委任 ___

（註：「全部直選」 ＝ 1:0:0
唔識就唔答 ＝ 0:0:0 ）

13. 你知唔知今次要選出幾多直選議員？

___
（91＝唔知，92＝拒答）

14. 你覺得上屆立法會有冇真正代表及反映民意？

1. 完全反映民意
2. 只反映部分民意
3. 冇反映民意
4. 只代表官員嘅利益
5. 其他……
6. 不知道/無意見

15. 你知唔知幾多歲先可以出嚟投票？

___
（91＝唔知，92＝拒答）

想問你些少個人資料，方便分析

16. 性別　　1. 男　　2. 女

17. 年齡 ___ [詳細數字，98＝98歲及以上，00＝拒絕回答]

18. 教育程度
1. 小學以下
2. 中一至中三
3. 高中
4. 大專或以上
0. 拒絕回答

19. 你在澳門住咗幾多年？ ___
[年數，2位數字，00＝拒絕回答]

20. 你係邊籍人？
1. 中國人　　2. 土生葡人　　3. 葡國人　　4. 其他　　0. 拒絕回答

21. 職業
1. 官類
2. 普類
3. 學生
4. 家庭主婦
5. 其他非住職者（包括退休，失業）
6. 不能辨別

22. 你每月收入大概幾多？（實數，以千位為準，999,999＝拒答）

___ ___ ___ , ___ ___ ___

TABLE T-1 CONTACT INFORMATION

Telephone numbers attempted		650	
Invalid lines	58		
Busy / no answer	213		
Business lines	9		
Valid contacts		370	100.0%
Failed to qualify	26		7.0%
Immediate refusal	55		14.9%
Target respondent not available	51		13.8%
Refusal by target respondent	40		10.8%
Incomplete	4		1.1%
Other problems	34		9.2%
Successful	**160**		**43.2%**

TABLE T-2 DISTRIBUTION BY GENDER

	Frequency	Percent
Male	71	44.9%
Female	87	55.1%
TOTAL	**158**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-3 DISTRIBUTION BY AGE

	Frequency	Percent
18-19	7	4.5%
20-24	18	11.6%
25-29	30	19.4%
30-34	29	18.7%
35-39	24	15.5%
40-44	19	12.3%
45-49	7	4.5%
50-54	4	2.6%
55-59	2	1.3%
60-64	4	2.6%
65-69	1	0.6%
70+	10	6.5%
TOTAL	**155**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-4 DISTRIBUTION BY EDUCATION

	Frequency	Percent
Primary and below	64	40.8%
Secondary	81	51.6%
Post-Secondary	12	7.6%
TOTAL	**157**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-5 YEARS LIVING IN MACAU

	Frequency	Percent
5 - 9	18	11.5%
10 - 14	47	29.9%
15 - 19	13	8.3%
20 - 24	19	12.1%
25 - 29	15	9.6%
30 - 34	16	10.2%
35 - 39	11	7.0%
40 - 44	10	6.4%
45 - 49	2	1.3%
50+	6	3.8%
TOTAL	**157**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-6 ETHNICITY

	Frequency	Percent
Chinese	134	84.3%
Macanese	5	3.1%
Portuguese	17	10.7%
Others	3	1.9%
TOTAL	**159**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-7 DISTRIBUTION BY OCCUPATION

	Frequency	Percent
White collars	43	27.4%
Blue collars	62	39.5%
Students	7	4.5%
Housewives	16	10.2%
Other economic inactive	19	12.1%
Unclassified	10	6.4%
TOTAL	**157**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-8 DISTRIBUTION BY INCOME

	Frequency	Percent
Below $1,999	12	10.4%
$2,000 - $3,999	45	39.1%
$4,000 - $5,999	29	25.2%
$6,000 - $7,999	13	11.3%
$8,000 - $9,999	1	0.9%
$10,000 - $11,999	10	8.7%
$12,000 - $13,999	2	1.7%
Over $14,000	3	2.6%
TOTAL	**115**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-9 DISTRIBUTION BY VOTER CATEGORY

	Frequency	Percent
Registered voters	58	36.5%
Non-registered voters	101	63.5%
TOTAL	**159**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-10 REASONS FOR VOTER REGISTRATION

	Frequency	Percent
Civic responsibility	30	53.6%
Improving people's livelihood	10	17.9%
For democracy	1	1.8%
Suggested by friends / relatives	3	5.4%
Call by certain candidates	1	1.8%
Call by certain groups	1	1.8%
No specific reason	7	12.5%
Others	3	5.4%
TOTAL	**5 6**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-11 REASONS FOR NOT REGISTERING (For non-registered voters only)

	Frequency	Percent
Tired of election	5	5.1%
Not interested	1 1	11.2%
Election useless	1 5	15.3%
No time	4 1	41.8%
Don't know how to register	7	7.1%
Others	1 9	19.4%
TOTAL	**9 8**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-12 WILL YOU VOTE ON ELECTION DAY (Registered voters only)

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	37	68.5%
No	6	11.1%
Not yet decided	1 1	20.4%
TOTAL	**5 4**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-13 REASONS FOR NOT GOING TO VOTE (Registered voters onl

	Frequency	Percent
Tired of election	1	10.0%
Not interested	1	10.0%
Election useless	2	20.0%
No time	2	20.0%
Others	4	40.0%
TOTAL	**1 0**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-14 REASONS FOR GOING TO VOTE (Registered voters only)

	Frequency	Percent
Civic responsibility	19	52.8%
Improving people's livelihood	8	22.2%
Suggested by friends / relatives	1	2.8%
Support for certain candidates	3	8.3%
Support for certain groups	2	5.6%
Others	3	8.3%
TOTAL	**3 6**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-15 KNOWLEDGE OF NO. OF GROUPS (Correct answer=9)

	Frequency	Percent
Right answer	4 2	26.8%
Wrong answer	1 1 5	73.2%
TOTAL	**1 5 7**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-16 PREFER VOTING FOR INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP

	Frequency	Percent
For individuals	45	28.8%
For groups	49	31.4%
Doesn't matter	27	17.3%
Don't know	35	22.4%
TOTAL	**156**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-17 PREFER WHICH COUNTING SYSTEM

	Frequency	Percent
New system	45	29.4%
Previous system	15	9.8%
Doesn't matter	18	11.8%
Don't know the change	16	10.5%
Don't know	59	38.6%
TOTAL	**153**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-18 SATISFIED WITH THE PRESENT ELECTION SYSTEM

	Frequency	Percent
Very satisfied	9	6.9%
(Just) satisfied	59	45.0%
Neutral	30	22.9%
(Just) dissatisfied	13	9.9%
Very dissatisfied	3	2.3%
Don't know	17	13.0%
TOTAL	**131**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-19 SATISFIED WITH PRESENT SEAT RATIO

	Frequency	Percent
Very satisfied	8	5.6%
(Just) satisfied	59	41.0%
Neutral	29	20.1%
(Just) dissatisfied	15	10.4%
Very dissatisfied	3	2.1%
Don't know	30	20.8%
TOTAL	**144**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-20 THE IDEAL SEAT RATIO

	Frequency	Percent
Existing ratio	41	50.0%
All seats become direct-elected	17	20.7%
Abolish appointed seats	2	2.4%
Increase ratio of direct-elected seats	22	26.8%
TOTAL	**82**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-21 KNOWLEDGE OF NO. OF SEATS (Correct answer=8)

	Frequency	Percent
Right answer	30	19.0%
Wrong answer	128	81.0%
TOTAL	**158**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-22 WHETHER PREVIOUS LEG. ASSEMBLY REFLECTED PUBLIC OPINION

	Frequency	Percent
Very much	1	0.9%
Only partial	64	56.6%
No at all	37	32.7%
Reflect member's own interests	7	6.2%
Others	4	3.5%
TOTAL	**113**	**100.0%**

TABLE T-23 KNOWLEDGE OF VOTING AGE (Correct answer=18)

	Frequency	Percent
Right answer	115	72.8%
Wrong answer	43	27.2%
TOTAL	**158**	**100.0%**

第一部份　簡介　　自我介紹

你好，我係香港大學社會科學研究中心打嚟嘅，想問你幾分鐘時間訪問你幾條問題。（註：凡保被訪者意見，你既任何資料保會絕對保密。）

[如果戶中有成年人，訪問至終：多謝合作，收線。]

第二部份　選出被訪者

請問你屋企裏面宜家有冇 18 歲或以上嘅人，因為我哋要隨機抽出，所以揀個你屋企生日最近嗰位嘅嚟講。

第三部份　投票調查

1. 請問你宜家有冇登記選民？

   1. 是　（註登記，重複認......）
   2. 否
   0. 唔答
   ----- skip to Q.3
   ----- skip to Q.4

2. (Q1 = 1) 你登記嘅係邊區嘅選民？

   1. 華人代表、社團、民生
   2. 改善社會，民生
   3. 促進民主發展
   4. 親友、鄰居甲團
   5. 要支持某某候選人甲

   6. 某某政治團體選舉
   7. 關心選舉法，做嗰啲嘢
   8. 其他
   0. 拒絕作答

3. (Q1 = 2) 你就係唔曾登記嘅選民？

   1. 覺得選舉冇乜用
   2. 對選舉冇興趣
   3. 選舉冇乜用
   4. 有偏嘅人
   5. 唔識嗰啲候選人
   6. 其他
   0. 拒答

4. 你9月20日會唔會/有冇去投票？

   1. 會/正在　　----- Skip to Q.6
   2. 唔會　　　----- Skip to Q.5
   3. 未決定　　----- Skip to Q.7
   4. 拒答　　　----- Skip to Q.7

   (註：如果選民已經投咗票或話去咗投票嘅，訪問員終止訪問，資料作廢)

5. (Q4 = 2) 你點解唔會去投票？

   1. 覺得選舉冇乜用
   2. 對選舉冇興趣
   3. 選舉冇乜用
   4. 有偏嘅人
   5. 唔識嗰啲候選人
   6. 其他
   0. 拒答

6. (Q4 = 1) 你點解想會去/正在投票？（還個最主要原因）

   1. 華人代表、社團、民生
   2. 改善社會，民生
   3. 促進民主發展
   4. 親友、鄰居甲團
   5. 要支持某某候選人

   6. 要支持某某政治團體
   7. 關心選舉法，做嗰張投票
   8. 關懷選舉，做嗰啲嘢，沒有其他原因
   9. 其他
   0. 拒絕回答　　　　......

7. 你知唔知今天（直選）有幾多個組？

　　　　 （91 ＝ 唔知，92 ＝ 拒答）

8. 你覺得選自人話好定係選組別話好啲？
1. 選人
2. 選組
3. （選人、選組）無所謂
4. 唔知/難講
0. 拒答

9. 你比較贊成今天幾分票方法定係以前邊種呢？
1. 今天（改良選法）
2. 以前（舊選法）
3. 無所謂
4. 唔知唔覺
5. 唔知/難講/唔識
0. 拒答

10. 整個嚟講，你覺唔覺今天幾選舉方法？
1. 非常滿意
2. 滿意
3. 中立
4. 不滿意
5. 非常不滿
6. 唔知/難講
0. 拒答

11. 現時立法會面係有三分一直選，三分一功能組別，及三分一委任議員，你對呢種安排滿唔滿意？
1. 非常滿意
2. 滿意
3. 中立
4. 不滿意
5. 非常不滿
6. 唔知/難講
0. 拒答

12. 你心目中覺理想比例係點？

　直 ： 功 ： 委

　___ ： ___ ： ___

　（註：「全部直選」 ＝ 1:0:0
　　　　唔願意拒答 ＝ 0:0:0 ）

13. 你知唔知今天要選出幾多個直選議員？

　　　　 （91 ＝ 唔知，92 ＝ 拒答）

　___ ___

14. 你覺得上屆立法會有冇真正代表或反映民意？
1. 完全反映民意
2. 只反映部分民意
3. 完全不反映民意
4. 只代表個別議員的利益
5. 其他
6. 不知道/無意見

15. 你知唔知邊度分發多款先可以出嚟做示？

請用嚟三少組人資料，方便分析。

16. 性別　　　　1. 男　　2. 女

17. 年齡　　____　　[詳細數字，99 = 99 歲及以上，00 = 拒絕回答]

18. 教育程度
1. 小學以下
2. 中一至中三
3. 高中
4. 大專或以上
0. 拒絕回答

19. 你在香港住用住咗幾多年？　____
[年數，2位數字，00 = 拒絕回答]

20. 你係屬於
1. 中國人　　2. 土生香港人　　3. 新香港人　　4. 其他　　0. 拒絕回答

21. 職業
1. 白領
2. 藍領
3. 學生
4. 家庭主婦
5. 其他非在職者（包括退休、失業）
6. 不能界別
0. 拒絕作答

22. 你每月收入大概幾多？（實數，以千位為準，999,999 = 拒答）

____，____