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Executive Summary

Background

1. This study is part of an on-going series of opinion surveys conducted by the Committee on the Promotion of Civic Education on civic education. Eight surveys in the series have been conducted between 1986 and 2002. The main objectives of the survey are to assess the community’s sense of belonging to and confidence in Hong Kong, to assess the community’s perceived sense of identity. The emphasis of 2004 survey is to obtain information related to the following three categories:
   a) National identity and national pride, including sense of belonging to and identity with Hong Kong;
   b) Civil behaviour and personal values; and
   c) Civic duties and participation.

2. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were adopted for the study to develop comprehensive understanding of civic education, namely focus group discussions and territory-wide household survey. Five focus group discussions were conducted with participants who were elderly persons, middle-aged adults and youth. Information obtained from the focus group discussions was used to design the questionnaire for the household survey. For the territory-wide household survey, conducted through face-to-face interviews, a representative sample of 1,054 persons aged 15 - 69 were successfully enumerated during the period from October to December 2004, with a response rate of 70.2%.

Framework for data analysis

General national pride

3. Eight questions were used to gauge general national pride of respondents, covering aspects like allegiance, nation superiority and whether ashamed. These eight questions were found to represent three different domains of general national pride, namely “allegiance”, “superiority” and “whether ashamed”. As the question on “whether ashamed” was considered not quite related to the other 7 questions, only seven questions were used to compute the general national pride index. Given that these seven questions represented two different dimensions of general national pride, two sub-indexes were also be compiled, on “allegiance” and “superiority”.


National pride in specific achievements

4. Ten questions were used to measure national pride in specific achievements. These ten questions were found to reflect two dimensions of national pride in specific achievements. One dimension was related to “national pride in the state” which covered different activities such as democracy, social welfare system, economy, achievements in technology, the army, etc. The other was related to “national pride in the nation” including people within a society, history, culture, sports, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.55</td>
<td>中國的民主情況</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.56</td>
<td>中國對世界的政治影響力</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.57</td>
<td>中國的經濟成就</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.58</td>
<td>中國的社會福利制度</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.59</td>
<td>中國的科技成就</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.60</td>
<td>中國在運動方面的成就</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.61</td>
<td>中國的文學及文藝成就</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.62</td>
<td>中國的軍隊</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.63</td>
<td>中國的歷史文化</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.64</td>
<td>中國的名山大川，地大物博</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Data obtained from the survey for the ten questions were used to compute the index of national pride in specific achievements. In addition, two sub-indexes were also be compiled, on dimensions of “nation” and “state” for national pride in specific achievements.
Two distinct groups of respondents

6. In-depth analysis of answers given by respondents to questions related to national identity and national pride revealed that the respondents could be grouped into two relatively homogeneous groups, or clusters. About 30% of respondents belonged to Cluster 1 and the remaining 70% Cluster 2.

7. Appended below is a table contrasting the difference in the respondents’ answers to questions related to national identity and national pride. To facilitate comparison, for questions related to national identity, an average score was computed based on a Likert scale of 1 to 5, with “1” denoting “not important at all” and “5” denoting “very important”. As regards the index of general national pride, the index was computed based on a Likert scale of 5 with “1” denoting “strongly disagree” and “5” denoting “strongly agree” with statements related to general national pride. As regards the index of national pride in specific achievements, the index was also computed based on a Likert scale of 5 with “1” denoting “not proud at all” and “5” denoting “very proud” for questions related to national pride in specific achievements.

8. It may be seen from the table below that respondents belonging to Cluster 1 had a lower score in their national identity and national pride than those in Cluster 2. In other words, respondents in Cluster 1 in general had a lower sense of national identity and a lower level of national pride, as compared with those in Cluster 2. It should be noted that the number of clusters is determined by data themselves, and not by the study team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>All respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unweighted mean</td>
<td>SD*</td>
<td>Unweighted mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a citizen of China</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I respect the political system and legal system in Mainland China</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I recognize I am a Chinese</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can speak Mandarin</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ancestry/descent is Chinese</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of National Pride in Specific Achievements</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of General National Pride</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*standard deviation
**Profile of respondents**

**Demographic characteristics**

9. About 53% of all respondents were female and the remaining 47% male. About 21% of respondents were youth aged 15 – 24, another 52% adults aged 25 – 49 and the remaining 27% aged 50 or above. As shown in the chart below, Cluster 1 had relatively higher proportion of younger respondents, while Cluster 2 had a relatively higher proportion of older respondents.

![Chart: Distribution of respondent’s age group by cluster](chart.png)

10. Over half (68%) of all respondents were born in Hong Kong and a further 30% in Mainland China. For Cluster 2, more than half (61%) were born in Hong Kong and about 36% in Mainland China. For Cluster 1, on the other hand, the great majority (83%) of them were born in Hong Kong.
Educational attainment

11. About 22% of all respondents had post-secondary or university education and a further 57% had secondary education. Less than one fifth (19%) had only primary education or below. It may be seen from the chart below that compared with Cluster 1, a slightly higher proportion of respondents in Cluster 2 had university education. The proportion of respondents in Cluster 2 who had primary education was also relatively higher.
Economic characteristics

12. Over half of all respondents (56%) were employed (as employees, self-employed or employers) and a further 37% economically inactive (i.e. those who were studying, home-makers and retired). About 4% were not at work. As shown in the chart below, a relatively higher proportion of respondents in Cluster 2 were home-makers or retirees, whereas for Cluster 1, a relatively higher proportion of them were students.

![Chart: Distribution of respondent's economic activity status by cluster](image)

Views towards China and Hong Kong

National identity

China connection

13. Connection with Mainland China may be reflected by the extent to which people have “physical” contacts with Mainland China, either through watching Mainland China television or listening to Mainland China radio, and working or visiting Mainland China. About 89% of all respondents had “physical” contacts with Mainland China. About half of those who had physical connection, or 45% of all respondents, maintained such contacts on a regular basis, daily, weekly or monthly.
14. As shown in the chart below, a relatively higher proportion of respondents in Cluster 2 had daily contacts with Mainland China. For those in Cluster 1, on the other hand, a higher proportion had never had any contact with Mainland China.

![Chart: Distribution of respondents by extent of physical connection with Mainland China by cluster](image)

15. Another dimension of Mainland China connection may be reflected by cognitive relationship with Mainland China. A question was included in the survey to assess this dimension by asking respondents if they were concerned about affairs happening in Mainland China. About 75% of all respondents indicated that they were concerned or very concerned about affairs in Mainland China.

16. Comparing respondents in Clusters 1 and 2, as depicted in the chart below, a relatively higher proportion of those in Cluster 2 were concerned or very concerned with affairs in Mainland China. For respondents in Cluster 1, on the other hand, a higher proportion of them were not concerned with affairs in Mainland China.

![Chart: Distribution of respondents by extent of cognitive connection with Mainland China by cluster](image)
Perceived self-identity

17. Slightly less than half (48%) of all respondents identified themselves as Chinese or Chinese from Hong Kong. A lower proportion (40%) identified themselves as Hong Kong people or Hong Kong people from China. A higher proportion of those in Cluster 1 identified themselves as Hong Kong people. For Cluster 2, a relatively higher proportion of respondents identified themselves as Chinese, Chinese from Hong Kong or Hong Kong people from China.

![Chart: Distribution of respondents by perceived self-identity by cluster](chart_image)

- Cluster 1:
  - Chinese: 29.7%
  - Chinese from Hong Kong: 20.0%
  - Hong Kong people from China: 39.8%
  - Others: 14.0%
  - No comment: 1.2%
  - More than one option: 0.1%

- Cluster 2:
  - Chinese: 21.4%
  - Chinese from Hong Kong: 24.7%
  - Hong Kong people from China: 13.2%
  - Others: 2.0%
  - No comment: 0.1%
  - More than one option: 0.1%
Dimensions of National identity

18. In addition to simple perception of self-identity, a more sophisticated approach was adopted in the survey. Seven items were included in the survey to tap the respondents’ views towards different aspects of national identity. Three questions were found to be related to the civic dimension, two questions related to the birth/residence dimension and 2 related to the ethnic dimensions, as depicted in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Civic</th>
<th>Birth/residence</th>
<th>Ethnic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>我在中国大陆出生</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>我是中国公民</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>我长期在中国大陆生活</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>我尊重大陆的政治体制和法律</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>我觉得我是中国人</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>我会说普通话</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>我是华裔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Civic dimension

19. Over half of all respondents considered that “I am a citizen of China” (53%) and “I feel I am Chinese” (74%) were very important or quite important to them. Nearly half (49%) considered that “I respect political and legal system in China” as very important or quite important to them. A much higher proportion of the respondents in Cluster 2 (70%) considered that “I am a citizen of China” was very important or quite important. The corresponding percentage for Cluster 1 was only 12%.

20. For the second question, a much higher proportion of the respondents in Cluster 2 (63%) considered that “respect to political and legal systems in China” was very important or quite important. The corresponding percentage for Cluster 1 was only 17%.

21. For the third question, the great majority of the respondents in Cluster 2 (97%) considered that “I feel I am Chinese” was very important or quite important. The corresponding percentage for Cluster 1 was only 21%. In other words, a much higher proportion of respondents in Cluster 2, as compared with those from Cluster 1, considered statements related to the civic dimension of national identity important.
Birth/residence dimension

22. Two questions were related to the birth/residence dimension of national identity. As expected, given the historical background of Hong Kong status before 1997, not many considered having been born (25%) or lived for a long time (16%) in Mainland China quite important or very important. About 33% of respondents in Cluster 2 considered that having been born in Mainland China was very important or quite important. The corresponding percentage for Cluster 1 was even lower, at 6%.

23. For the second question, only about 20% of the respondents in Cluster 2 and 6% in Cluster 1 considered that having lived for a long time in Mainland China was very important or quite important.

Ethnic dimension

24. For the ethnic dimension, more than half considered “I am able to speak Putonghua” (60%) and “I am ethnically Chinese” (52%) very important or quite important. About 74% of those in Cluster 2 considered “I am able to speak Putonghua” was very important or quite important. The corresponding percentage for Cluster 1 was much lower, at 27%.

25. About 64% of those in Cluster 2 considered that “I am ethnically Chinese” was very important or quite important. The corresponding percentage for Cluster 1 was only 24%.

National pride

General national pride - Allegiance

26. As pointed out in para.3 above, four questions were related to the domain of “allegiance” of general national pride. More than half of respondents agreed and strongly agreed that “I am proud of being Chinese” (accounting for 73% of respondents), “I believe that working hard myself will help the development of China” (51%), “I will pay more attention to incidents in Mainland China than those in other countries” (66%) and “I am glad that I am a citizen of China and not that of another country” (51%).

General national pride - Superiority

27. Three questions were related to the “superiority” domain of general national pride. While about 41% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that “China is in general much better than other countries”, only about 15% agreed or strongly agreed that “even if China makes mistakes, we should still support it” and about 27% agreed or strongly agreed that “if peoples from other countries are like Chinese, the world would be much better”.

10
Overall general national pride index and sub-indexes

28. For all respondents, the average general national pride index was 3.12. The sub-index for the dimension of “allegiance” was 3.43 which was higher than the sub-index for the dimension of “superiority”, at 2.71.

29. For respondents in Cluster 2, the majority (65%) had the general national pride index in the range of 3.01 – 4.00, while for those in Cluster 1, more than half (57%) had an index in the range of 2.01 – 3.00. This shows that respondents in Cluster 2 in general had a higher national pride when compared to those in Cluster 1.

30. For the general national pride sub-index (allegiance), the majority of respondents in Cluster 2 (73%) had an index in the range of 3.01 – 4.00, while for those in Cluster 1, half (50%) had an index in the range of 2.01 – 3.00. This shows that respondents in Cluster 2 in general had a higher national pride in the “allegiance” dimension when compared to those in Cluster 1.

31. For the general national pride sub-index (superiority), the majority of respondents in Cluster 2 (77%) had an index in a wider range of 2.01 – 4.00, while for those in Cluster 1, the great majority (87%) had an index of 3.00 or below. This shows that respondents in Cluster 2 had a higher national pride in the “superiority” dimension when compared to those in Cluster 1.
32. When analyzed by the age of respondents, it may be seen from the chart below that the index and sub-indexes of general national pride increased with age. In other words, the older the respondents, the higher was their national pride.

![Chart: General national pride index and sub-indexes by age group](chart1.png)

33. When analyzed by the educational attainment of respondents, the general national pride index was slightly higher for respondents with lower level of education. In particular, the sub-index for dimension on “superiority” was significantly higher for those with lower level of education. For the sub-index for the dimension on “allegiance”, on the other hand, it was only marginally higher for those with primary or junior secondary level of education.

![Chart: General national pride index and sub-indexes by educational attainment](chart2.png)
34. When analyzed by the economic activity status of respondents, it may be noted from the chart below that the index was lowest for students and highest for retirees and home-makers. The sub-indexes were also lowest for students and highest for retirees and home-makers.

National pride in specific achievements

National pride in specific achievements of the state

35. More than half of respondents were proud or very proud of the army (accounting for 58% of respondents), achievements in science and technology (70%), economic achievements (68%) and world political influence of China (64%). However, only a small proportion was proud or very proud of the social welfare system (17%) and democratic conditions of China (23%).

National pride in specific achievements of the nation

36. The majority of respondents were proud or very proud of entities related to the nation, including achievements in sports (accounting for 89% of respondents), literature and arts (73%), and history & culture (80%), as well as the famous mountains and rivers and the vast territory of China (85%).
Overall national pride index in specific achievements and sub-indexes

37. For all respondents, the average national pride index in specific achievements was 3.49. The sub-index for the dimension related to the state was 3.15 which was much lower than the sub-index for the dimension related to the nation, at 4.00.

38. The great majority (91%) of respondents in Cluster 2 had the national pride index in specific achievements in the range of 3.01 – 5.00, while for those in Cluster 1, the majority (85%) had an index in the range of 2.01 – 4.00. This shows that respondents in Cluster 2 in general had a higher national pride in specific achievements when compared to those in Cluster 1.

39. For national pride in specific achievements sub-index (state), more than half (65%) of respondents in Cluster 2 had an index in the range of 3.01 – 5.00, while for those in Cluster 1, the majority (74%) had an index in the range of 2.01 – 4.00. This shows that respondents in Cluster 2 in general had a higher national pride in specific achievements related to the state when compared to those in Cluster 1.

40. For national pride in specific achievements sub-index (nation), nearly all respondents (96%) in Cluster 2 had an index in a wider range of 3.01 – 5.00. The corresponding percentage for those in Cluster 1 was lower, at 69%. This shows that respondents in Cluster 2 had a higher national pride in specific achievements related to the nation when compared to those in Cluster 1.
When analyzed by the age of respondents, as shown in the chart below, the national pride index in specific achievements and its sub-index for the state dimension increased with age. The sub-index for the nation dimension was also relatively higher for respondents in the age range of 20 – 29 and lower for those aged 15 – 19.

When analyzed by the educational attainment of respondents, it may be noted from the chart below that those with lower levels of education had a marginally higher overall national pride index in specific achievements. While the sub-index for the state dimension was higher for those with lower level of education, the sub-index for the nation dimension was higher for those with higher level of education.
43. When analyzed by the economic activity status of respondents, it may be noted from the chart below that the index was lowest for students and highest for retirees and home-makers. The sub-index (state) was also lowest for students and highest for retirees and home-makers.

**Chart: Index of national pride in specific achievements and sub-indexes by economic activity status of respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Retired/home-makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Views related to national identity**

**Actions to show allegiance to China**

44. Less than half (38%) of all respondents agreed or strongly agreed that “public schools in Hong Kong should conduct national flag hoisting ceremony every day”. Slightly more than half (51%) agreed or strongly agreed that “we should match up macroeconomic adjustment plans of the central government of China that affect Hong Kong, regardless of whether such plans will bring benefit to Hong Kong or not”. The percentage was much higher, at 69%, for those who agreed or strongly agreed that “Hong Kong’s economic and political development should not hurt national interest”.

45. Comparing respondents in Clusters 1 and 2, a higher proportion of respondents in Cluster 2 agreed or strongly agreed with statements related to actions to show allegiance to China. In other words, a higher proportion of respondents in Cluster 2, as compared with those in Cluster 1, supported actions that reflected allegiance to China.

**Actions that were considered as unpatriotic**

46. As regards actions that could be regarded as not patriotic, only a small proportion (13%) agreed or strongly agreed that “criticizing the central government” was not patriotic. A slightly higher proportion (20%) agreed or strongly agreed that “asking foreign governments to put pressure on China to promote democracy and human right” was not patriotic. And about 23% agreed or strongly agreed that “criticizing China affairs in front of foreign governments” were not patriotic. Over half of respondents disagreed that these actions were unpatriotic.
47. For actions that were considered as not patriotic, the views of respondents in Clusters 1 and 2 were quite similar. For example, only a small proportion of respondents in both Clusters 1 and 2 were of the view that “criticizing the central government”, “asking foreign governments to put pressure on China to promote democracy and human right” and “criticizing China affairs in front of foreign governments” were not patriotic.

**Views about Mainland China**

**Satisfaction with conditions in Mainland China**

48. The majority of respondents (74%) were quite satisfied or very satisfied with economic development of Mainland China. About 46% were also quite satisfied or very satisfied with the daily living conditions in Mainland China, and a slightly lower proportion (42%) were quite satisfied or very satisfied with employment opportunity there. However, only a small proportion were quite satisfied or very satisfied for other conditions like law and order (12%), freedom of speech (16%), rule of law (15%) and incorruptibility of officials in Mainland China (7%).

49. Concerning the daily living conditions in Mainland China, more than half of respondents (53%) in Cluster 2 were quite satisfied or very satisfied. For those in Cluster 1, on the other hand, only about 29% were quite satisfied with the daily living conditions in Mainland China.

50. More than half of respondents in both Clusters 1 and 2 were not quite satisfied or highly dissatisfied with law and order, freedom of speech, rule of law and incorruptibility of officials in Mainland China. The proportion of respondents who were satisfied, on the other hand, was relatively higher for respondents in Cluster 2, as compared with those in Cluster 1.

51. On the other hand, more than half of respondents in Clusters 1 and 2 were quite satisfied or very satisfied with economic development in Mainland China. A higher proportion of respondents in Cluster 2, as compared with those in Cluster 1, were satisfied with economic development in Mainland China.

52. Views of respondents on employment opportunities in Mainland China were quite divided. While about 32% of respondents in Cluster 1 and 46% of those in Cluster 2 were satisfied with employment opportunities in Mainland China, about 44% of those in Cluster 1 and 36% of those in Cluster 2 were not satisfied.

**Confidence in China**

53. The majority of all respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the international status of China was improving continuously in different aspects, including politics (accounting for 88% of respondents), economy (93%), military (80%), sports (94%) and arts (75%).
Global citizenship

54. The majority of respondents had positive views on different responsibilities of being global citizens. Over 80% agreed or strongly agreed that “Hong Kong people and government have the moral responsibility to provide economic aid to people affected by disasters in poor countries” (84%), “people from different countries or cultures should follow universal values such as human right of the world” (90%), “making friends with others should not be affected by their racial or religious backgrounds” (94%), and “the United Nations should take intervention measures against countries infringing human rights” (85%).

Sense of belonging to Hong Kong

55. Three items were used to measure respondents’ sense of belonging to Hong Kong. The majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that “I am very concerned about Hong Kong society” (accounting for 86% of respondents), “Hong Kong is my home” (96%) and “I hope my children will regard Hong Kong as their home” (79%).

56. Similar questions were asked in previous rounds of surveys conducted in 1998, 2000 and 2002. The percentages of respondents who agreed that “I am very concerned about Hong Kong society” and “Hong Kong is my home” showed an increase over time.
For all respondents, the average index of sense of belonging to Hong Kong was 3.99. The great majority of respondents (95%) ranked quite high in their sense of belonging to Hong Kong, with the index greater than 3.00. The index of sense of belonging to Hong Kong for respondents in both Clusters 1 and 2 was quite similar. A slightly higher proportion of those in Cluster 2, as compared with that of Cluster 1, had an index above 4.00.

When analyzed by the age of respondents, as shown in the chart below, the index increased slightly with age. The index was relatively lower for respondents in the age range of 15 – 29 and higher for those aged 40 or above.
When analyzed by the educational attainment of respondents, those with lower levels of education had a marginally higher index of sense of belonging to Hong Kong. The index was slightly higher for respondents with junior secondary education and lower for those with university education.

Confidence in Hong Kong

More than half of respondents (58%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that “I have confidence in Hong Kong’s economic situation in the coming two years”. For political situation, the percentage of respondents who had confidence was lower, with slightly less than half (48%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that “I have confidence in Hong Kong’s political situation in the coming two years”.

Similar questions were asked in previous rounds of surveys conducted in 1998, 2000 and 2002. The percentages of respondents who agreed that they had confidence in Hong Kong’s economic and political situation in the coming two years were higher in 2004, as compared that those in previous years.
62. More than half of respondents in Cluster 2 had confidence in Hong Kong’s political (accounting for 51% of respondents in Cluster 2) and economic situations (63%) in the coming two years. For those in Cluster 1, on the other hand, the proportion who had confidence was lower, with the percentage who had confidence in the region of 38% for political situation and 47% for economic situation.

63. When analyzed by the age of respondents, it may be noted from the chart below that in 2004 a higher proportion of youth aged 15 – 24 had confidence in Hong Kong’s economic and political situation in the coming two years. The percentage who had confidence in Hong Kong’s political situation in the coming two years was lowest for those in the age group 25 – 49.
64. When analyzed by the educational attainment of respondents, it may be noted from the chart below that in 2004 while a higher proportion of those post-secondary education and above had confidence in Hong Kong’s economic situation in the coming two years, a higher proportion of those who primary education and below had confidence in Hong Kong’s political situation in the coming two years.

**Intention to emigrate**

65. Only about 2% of respondents admitted that they were returned emigrants. For the greater majority (98%) who said that they were not returned emigrants, about 23% indicated that they would definitely not consider emigrating even though they were able to do so. And 56% indicated they would definitely or likely not consider emigrating even though they were able to do so. Only about 28% indicated they definitely or likely consider emigrating if they were able to do so. A higher proportion of those in Cluster 2, as compared with those in Cluster 1, indicated that they would definitely not consider emigrating even though they were able to do so.

**Civil behaviour and personal values**

**Uncivil behaviour**

66. Three aspects of civility were included in the survey, namely tolerance towards uncivil behaviour, respect for rights and rule of law. Six questions asked in the survey were related to uncivil behaviour causing inconvenience to others or affecting the environment. The survey findings showed that less than one third of respondents always or most of the time encountered uncivil behaviour. The percentage ranged from 11% for “making loud noises at night near domestic premises” to as high as 31% for “using foul languages in public”. More than one third of respondents indicated that they sometimes or occasionally encountered uncivil behaviour. The percentage was relatively higher for “smoking in non-smoking areas” (40%) and “polluting public areas” (40%) and lower for “making loud noises at night near domestic premises” (29%).
67. As regards acts of politeness, one question was asked in the survey on “giving up seats to elderly, children or disabled in public transport vehicles”. Slightly more than one quarter (27%) indicated that they always or most of the time saw people giving up seats to elderly, children or disabled in public transport vehicles. About half indicated that they sometimes encountered such behaviour.

**Attitudes towards uncivil behaviour**

68. When asked about their reactions towards uncivil behaviour, people tended to be less tolerant towards misbehaviour. More than half of respondents would react by either speaking up or asking those in charge to stop such acts, or would leave the scene immediately for acts like “jumping queue” (82%), “smoking in non-smoking areas” (75%), “polluting public areas” (67%) and “use foul languages in public” (54%). It may be worth noting that for acts like “using foul languages”, as high as 43% indicated that they would show no reaction.

**Index of uncivil behaviour**

69. For all respondents, the average index of uncivil behaviour was 3.18. Over half of respondents (56%) ranked quite high in their perceived level of uncivil behaviour in Hong Kong, with the index greater than 3.00.

**State of social morality**

70. As another indication of social morality in Hong Kong, respondents were asked if they were satisfied with the present state of social morality. The opinion of respondents was mixed. About 44% indicated that they were quite satisfied while another 42% indicated that they were not quite satisfied.

71. More than half of respondents (54%) considered that on the whole the state of social morality in Hong Kong had improved in recent years, while about one third indicated that there was no change. Only about 10% considered that the state of social morality in Hong Kong had worsened.

**Personal values**

**Post-material values**

72. Different measures were used in the society to gauge people’s perception of values important to a civil society. Respondents in general were more supportive of values that were considered as important in a civil society. More than half agreed or strongly agreed that family and friends were more important than career and money (66%). Nearly half (48%) agreed or strongly agreed that environmental protection was more important than economic development, while 37% considered that the two were equally important. Only a small proportion (19%) agreed or strongly agreed that material life was more important than spiritual life. Views of respondents in both Clusters 1 and 2 were quite similar.
Democratic values

73. More than half of respondents were supportive of democratic development like guaranteeing freedom to demonstrate even though demonstration might cause certain inconvenience (accounting for 83% of respondents) and election of the Chief Executive (59%) and Legislative Councillors (59%) by universal suffrage as soon as possible. About 50% considered that the human rights conditions in Hong Kong had worsened after the handover in 1997. The views of respondents in Clusters 1 and 2 were quite similar.

74. A similar question was asked in previous rounds of surveys conducted in 1998, 2000 and 2002 on whether human right condition had worsened after the handover. The percentage of respondents who agreed that human rights conditions had worsened after the handover showed an increasing trend over time. Nevertheless, the percentage (at 50%) in 2004 was lower than that in 2002 (57%).

[Chart: Percentage of respondents who agreed that human rights conditions had worsened after the handover, 1998, 2000, 2002 and 2004]

Rights assessments

75. As regards people’s perception of current condition regarding the rule of law, human right protection and press freedom in Hong Kong, the great majority agreed or strongly agreed that human rights protection was satisfactory (accounting for 73% of respondents), rule of law was upheld in Hong Kong (92%) and press freedom was protected in Hong Kong (80%). Views of respondents in Clusters 1 and 2 were quite similar.
A similar question was asked in previous rounds of surveys conducted in 1998, 2000 and 2002 on whether rule of law was upheld in Hong Kong. The percentage of respondents who agreed that rule of law was upheld in Hong Kong showed an increasing trend over time. The percentage in 2004 was higher than those in previous years.

![Chart: Percentage of respondents who agreed that rule of law was upheld in Hong Kong, 1998, 2000, 2002 and 2004](chart.png)

Conservative values

Most respondents considered that they should not follow blindly traditional obedience to their superiors or parents. More than half disagreed or strongly disagreed that subordinates should not object openly even though their superiors are unreasonable (accounting for 56% of respondents) and that children should obey even though their parents are unreasonable (66%). Views of respondents in Clusters 1 and 2 were quite similar.

Liberal values

Two questions on attitudes towards weaker segments of the society were included in the survey to measure liberal values of the people. More than half of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that patients in the terminal stage of incurable diseases should have the right to ask medical personnel to end their life (62%). On the other hand, more than half of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that prostitution should be legalized (59%).
Civic engagement and civic responsibility

Civic engagement

79. About 40% of respondents had participated in at least one category of civic organizations in the last 12 months. The percentage was relatively higher for those who had participated in parent/teacher associations, school boards, alumni associations and other educational bodies (19%) and lower for those who participated in political parties, pressure groups and other interest groups (3%).

80. Comparing respondents in Clusters 1 and 2, a relatively higher proportion of those in Cluster 1 participated in activities of cultural/recreational and religious organizations. For those in Cluster 2, a relatively higher proportion of them participated in parent/teacher associations, school boards, alumni associations and other educational bodies and mutual aid committees, kai fongs, owners’ corporations.

81. As high as 80% of respondents had participated in different kinds of informal social activities organized among friends and colleagues in the last 12 months. More than half of respondents had participated in physical exercises (62%), cultural and recreational activities (64%) organized among friends. While less than 30% participated in community related activities (28%), about 38% participated in activities conducted over the Internet. It may also be noted for those who had participated in Internet activities, most of them did so frequently, on a weekly basis.

Civic responsibility

82. About 25% of respondents said that they had participated in volunteer work. Among them, over half (52%) indicated that they had worked as volunteers less than 10 times in the last 12 months, and a further 25% said that they had not worked as volunteers in the last 12 months.

83. For those who had participated in volunteer work, about 26% of them had worked for less than 10 hours in the last 12 months and a further 29% worked 10 – 59.9 hours in the last 12 months.

84. For the 75% of respondents who had not participated in volunteer work, more than half of them (66%) explained that they did not have time to participate in volunteer work. A further 16% admitted that they had no interest in participating in volunteer work.

85. About 60% of respondents indicated that they had made donations in the last 12 months. Among them, the majority (80%) had made donations to social services or charitable organizations. About 37% had made donations to schools or school sponsoring bodies. Only a small proportion had made donations to professional associations (4%) or political parties (4%).

86. For those who had made donations in the last 12 months, about 45% had donated less than $100 and a further 30% donated $100 - $500 in the last 12 months.