

# Macau Municipal Assemblies Election (May 1993)

## Preliminary Report

Chung Ting-yiu Robert

*(copyright reserved)*

### PREAMBLE

In 1997 and 1999 respectively, Hong Kong and Macau will be reverted to China to become Special Administrative Zones. In this last decade of colonial history, both societies are experiencing tremendous changes in their political culture.

In order to study such changes on a comparative basis, the author first studied Macau Legislative Assembly election on 20 September 1992 through two opinion surveys, preliminary results of which has already been reported. As a follow-up to that study, the author again took a team over to Macau between 29 and 31 May 1993 to study the 2nd Municipal Assemblies elections, results of which are reported herewith.

Under the sponsorship of Dr Stanley Ho, Managing Director of Sociedade de Turismo e Diversoes de Macau, S.A.R.L., and Fundacao Orientethe (the Oriental Foundation), a research team of twelve conducted an exit poll at all the nine polling stations for the election. A total of 571 actual voters were successfully interviewed, while another 42 were partially interviewed, the total sample size was more than double that of the 1992 exit poll. The contact information for the survey is summarized in Table 1. 64.8% of the respondents claimed to have voted in the 1992 direct election. (Table 16)

For the sake of comparison, the questionnaire used in the survey was almost the same as that in 1992, which specifically tests voters' knowledge of the electoral system, as well as their opinion on possible alternatives. Although detailed comparative analyses will be performed at a later stage, major

findings are presented in comparison to that from previous surveys, whenever possible. Nevertheless, this report might best be taken as an independent summary of major findings from the 1993 survey. In-depth analysis and discussion papers are expected to be published in two months' time.

Before reporting the findings, it should be noted from the onset that technically there was not one, but two, municipal council elections - one being for "Mainland Macau" and one for the "Islands" of Taipa and Coloane. However, for simplicity, the following findings have grouped both constituencies together as a collectively whole. Breakdown analyses of voter behaviour across constituencies are reserved for the future. 84, or 13.7%, of our respondents in this survey came from the Island area.

### DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILES

Tables 2 to 9 give the demographic profiles of the respondents for the survey. Errors due to sampling 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

Tables 10 and 11 show that the main given reason for voters, especially the more educated respondents, turning out to vote was because of their sense of civic responsibility, followed by the desire to improve their livelihood. Very few people claimed that they had done so due to calls from candidates or political groups. This pattern was almost a duplicate of the 1992 exit poll result. These figures, of course, may not tell the real motives of the voters, but their fluctuation across time and election may become very useful indicators of voter incentive.

For the 1993 municipal councils direct elections, there were four groups competing for the Macau Municipal Council, and five for the Islands Municipal Council. Out of the 603 respondents interviewed for this question, 68.0% got

the correct answer (Table 12), which was slightly higher than that of the 1992 exit poll (56.9%). This might be due to the less number of groups competing this time, and therefore, more easily remembered. When asked for the number of seats to be filled by the election, only 22.5% got the correct answer (Table 22), which is clearly an indication of poor voter sophistication. Upon analysis, it was found that young voters with higher education tend to have better knowledge of the election. (Tables 13 and 26)

#### Opinion on the voting system

The Macau direct election system follows that of Portugal, which adopts the proportional representation system. However, the vote counting system used in Macau since 1992 was a revised version of the D'Hont system, which essentially gives more advantage to small groups/parties. Asked whether they prefer this new counting system to the old one, 27.6% percent prefers the current system, over 60%, however, could not tell the difference. Such a high level of unfamiliarity was also registered in previous surveys.

Asked for their opinion on the basic tenet of the Macau elections, that people cast their votes for political groups rather than persons, 45.7% prefers voting for groups, but a significant 31.3% opted for a different system. This shows that satisfaction over the present system is far from overwhelming, and when the low level of voter sophistication is taken into consideration, one could anticipate that there could be plenty of room for change, when voters become more educated. The survey has also found that students, although only constitute about 10% of our sample, has showed a significantly different preference: 56% of them preferred voting for persons rather than for groups. (Table 15)

#### The pace of democracy

Table 18 shows that 54% of the respondents were satisfied with the present distribution of seats in the Municipal Assemblies across direct elected, indirect elected, and appointed seats, less than 20% were not satisfied. Respondents with higher education tend to be less satisfied with the current ratio. (Table 19) When respondents were asked to give their ideal ratio of the different types of seats, however, only 31.0% gave the present ratio.

2.9% would like to abolish the appointed seats, 16.3% opted for more direct elected seats (but still maintain the indirect election element), while 12.8% would like to see all seats being directly elected. To sum up, we can say that approximately one-third of the respondents were satisfied with the current ratio, one-third opted for more direct elected elements, while one-third did not have any opinion. Younger respondents with higher education tend to favour more direct elected seats. (Tables 20 and 21)

Finally, on the performance of the Municipal Assemblies during the last session, over 62.7% of the respondents felt that the Assemblies were only partially representative of the public opinion, 16.4% felt it didn't reflect public opinion at all, 12.7% did not have an opinion. (Table 24) Young people tend to be more critical of the Assemblies. (Table 23)

## CONCLUSION

Although more analyses have to be done before drawing further conclusions, findings from this survey has confirmed the general observations of the 1992 surveys. Voters in Macau were apparently quite unfamiliar with the technical aspect of the electoral system, including the number of seats, the counting system, and the number of competing organizations. Given this low level of sophistication, the average voter appears to be quite satisfied with the system, until alternative options were suggested. On the performance of the Municipal Assemblies during the last session, most respondents were only partially satisfied.

## Acknowledgment

The author would like to acknowledge the following persons without whose support the project would not have been possible:

Dr Stanley Ho, Managing Director of Sociedade de Turismo e Diversoes de Macau, S.A.R.L., for sponsoring half the cost of hotel accommodation during the research period; Fundacao Oriente for a generous donation of HK\$3,400 towards the project; Mr Wong Hon Keong and Professor Herbert Yee of the University of Macau, Mr Victor Chan of Teledifusao de Macau, for supplying the most precious information about the background of the election; Mr Joao Baptista Manuel Leao of Leal Senado de Macau, and Mr Anthonio Madeira de Carvalho of Servico de Administracao e Funcao Publica, for providing us with the information about previous elections. Finally, the research team is grateful to Mr Jeremias Madeira, a long friend of the author, for his very thoughtful arrangements off the working hours.

**TABLE 1 CONTACT INFORMATION**

	Frequency	Percent
Completed interviews	571	70.4%
Incomplete interviews	42	5.2%
Refusal	194	23.9%
Other problems	4	0.5%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>811</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 2 DISTRIBUTION BY GENDER**

	Frequency	Percent
Male	311	54.5%
Female	260	45.5%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 3 DISTRIBUTION BY AGE**

	Frequency	Percent
18-19	41	7.3%
20-24	41	7.3%
25-29	53	9.4%
30-34	84	14.9%
35-39	77	13.6%
40-44	84	14.9%
45-49	46	8.1%
50-54	40	7.1%
55-59	17	3.0%
60-64	22	3.9%
65-69	30	5.3%
70+	30	5.3%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 4 DISTRIBUTION BY EDUCATION**

	Frequency	Percent
Primary or below	172	30.3%
Secondary	337	59.3%
Post-Secondary	59	10.4%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 5 YEARS LIVING IN MACAU**

	Frequency	Percent
0 - 4	2	0.4%
5 - 9	16	2.8%
10 - 14	116	20.5%
15 - 19	49	8.7%
20 - 24	51	9.0%
25 - 29	48	8.5%
30 - 34	80	14.1%
35 - 39	58	10.2%
40 - 44	45	8.0%
45 - 49	32	5.7%
50+	69	12.2%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>566</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 6 ETHNICITY**

	Frequency	Percent
Chinese	498	87.7%
Macanese	44	7.7%
Portuguese	22	3.9%
Others	4	0.7%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 7 CLAIMED NATIONALITY FOR CHINESE RESPONDENTS**

	Frequency	Percent
Portuguese passport holders	171	34.3%
Chinese passport holders	16	3.2%
Macau I.D. Card holders	291	58.4%
Others	20	4.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>498</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 8 DISTRIBUTION BY OCCUPATION**

	Frequency	Percent
White collars	176	31.1%
Blue collars	116	20.5%
Students	59	10.4%
Housewives	62	11.0%
Other economically inactive	54	9.5%
Unclassified	99	17.5%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>566</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 9 DISTRIBUTION BY MONTHLY INCOME**

	Frequency	Percent
Below \$1,999	16	4.2%
\$2,000 - \$3,999	94	24.6%
\$4,000 - \$5,999	123	32.2%
\$6,000 - \$7,999	56	14.7%
\$8,000 - \$9,999	28	7.3%
\$10,000 - \$11,999	46	12.0%
\$12,000 - \$13,999	4	1.0%
Over \$14,000	15	3.9%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 10 REASON TO VOTE**

	Frequency	Percent
Civic responsibility	306	50.5%
Improving people's livelihood	126	20.8%
For democracy	9	1.5%
Suggested by friends / relatives	27	4.5%
Support for certain candidates	26	4.3%
Support for certain groups	21	3.5%
Habit	40	6.6%
No specific reason	29	4.8%
Others	22	3.6%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 11 REASON TO VOTE**

	Civic responsibility	Improving livelihood	Habit	Others	Total	Civic responsibility	Improving livelihood	Habit	Others	Total
<b>Total</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>50.5%</b>	<b>20.8%</b>	<b>6.6%</b>	<b>22.1%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Distribution by age</b>										
18-29	73	23	7	31	134	54.5%	17.2%	5.2%	23.1%	100.0%
30-39	89	30	3	37	159	56.0%	18.9%	1.9%	23.3%	100.0%
40-49	68	30	11	21	130	52.3%	23.1%	8.5%	16.2%	100.0%
50-59	33	17	3	4	57	57.9%	29.8%	5.3%	7.0%	100.0%
60-69	18	11	7	16	52	34.6%	21.2%	13.5%	30.8%	100.0%
70+	10	3	5	11	29	34.5%	10.3%	17.2%	37.9%	100.0%
<b>Distribution by education</b>										
Primary or below	63	42	17	49	171	36.8%	24.6%	9.9%	28.7%	100.0%
Secondary	184	64	18	68	334	55.1%	19.2%	5.4%	20.4%	100.0%
Post-secondary	46	9	1	3	59	78.0%	15.3%	1.7%	5.1%	100.0%
<b>Distribution by occupation</b>										
White collars	112	29	7	27	175	64.0%	16.6%	4.0%	15.4%	100.0%
Blue collars	59	30	2	24	115	51.3%	26.1%	1.7%	20.9%	100.0%
students	28	13	1	16	58	48.3%	22.4%	1.7%	27.6%	100.0%
Housewives	20	17	8	17	62	32.3%	27.4%	12.9%	27.4%	100.0%
Other economically inactive	22	6	8	17	53	41.5%	11.3%	15.1%	32.1%	100.0%
Unclassified	50	21	9	19	99	50.5%	21.2%	9.1%	19.2%	100.0%

**TABLE 12 KNOWLEDGE OF NO. OF GROUPS**

(Correct answer : 4 for Mainland Macau & 5 for Islands)

	Frequency	Percent
Right answer	410	68.0%
Wrong answer	193	32.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>603</b>	<b>100.0%</b>



**TABLE 13 KNOWLEDGE OF NO. OF GROUPS**

(Correct answer : 4 for Mainland Macau & 5 for Islands)

	Right answer	Wrong answer	Total	Right answer	Wrong answer	Total
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>603</b>	<b>68.0%</b>	<b>32.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Distribution by age</b>						
18-29	107	28	135	79.3%	20.7%	100.0%
30-39	112	49	161	69.6%	30.4%	100.0%
40-49	91	38	129	70.5%	29.5%	100.0%
50-59	41	15	56	73.2%	26.8%	100.0%
60-69	27	25	52	51.9%	48.1%	100.0%
70+	10	20	30	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
<b>Distribution by education</b>						
Primary or below	88	83	171	51.5%	48.5%	100.0%
Secondary	252	85	337	74.8%	25.2%	100.0%
Post-secondary	51	7	58	87.9%	12.1%	100.0%
<b>Distribution by occupation</b>						
White collars	146	29	175	83.4%	16.6%	100.0%
Blue collars	78	38	116	67.2%	32.8%	100.0%
students	44	15	59	74.6%	25.4%	100.0%
Housewives	34	27	61	55.7%	44.3%	100.0%
Other economically inactive	23	31	54	42.6%	57.4%	100.0%
Unclassified	65	34	99	65.7%	34.3%	100.0%
<b>Distribution by nationality (Chinese)</b>						
Portuguese passport holders	129	42	171	75.4%	24.6%	100.0%
Chinese passport holders	14	2	16	87.5%	12.5%	100.0%
Macau I.D. Card holders	173	116	289	59.9%	40.1%	100.0%
Others	17	3	20	85.0%	15.0%	100.0%

**TABLE 14 PREFER VOTING FOR INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP**

	Frequency	Percent
For individuals	187	31.3%
For group	273	45.7%
Doesn't matter	79	13.2%
Don't know	59	9.9%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>598</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 15 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	187	273	79	59	598	31.3%	45.7%	13.2%	9.9%	100.0%
<b>Distribution by education</b>										
Primary or below	36	71	32	33	172	20.9%	41.3%	18.6%	19.2%	100.0%
Secondary	124	163	34	16	337	36.8%	48.4%	10.1%	4.7%	100.0%
Post-Secondary	23	31	4	1	59	39.0%	52.5%	6.8%	1.7%	100.0%
<b>Distribution by occupation</b>										
White collars	63	88	19	6	176	35.8%	50.0%	10.8%	3.4%	100.0%
Blue collars	28	57	19	12	116	24.1%	49.1%	16.4%	10.3%	100.0%
Students	33	23	1	2	59	55.9%	39.0%	1.7%	3.4%	100.0%
Housewives	19	24	8	11	62	30.6%	38.7%	12.9%	17.7%	100.0%
Other economically inactive	14	23	8	9	54	25.9%	42.6%	14.8%	16.7%	100.0%
Unclassified	25	49	15	10	99	25.3%	49.5%	15.2%	10.1%	100.0%

**TABLE 16 VOTED ON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ELECTION LAST YEAR**

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	385	64.8%
No	165	27.8%
No, not a registered voter at that time	34	5.7%
Not remember	10	1.7%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>594</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 17 PREFER WHICH COUNTING SYSTEM**

	Frequency	Percent
New system	162	27.6%
Previous system	24	4.1%
Doesn't matter	43	7.3%
Don't know the difference	147	25.1%
Don't know	210	35.8%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>586</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 18 SATISFIED WITH PRESENT SEAT RATIO**

	Frequency	Percent
Very satisfied	25	4.3%
(Just) satisfied	290	49.7%
Neutral	48	8.2%
(Just) dissatisfied	96	16.4%
Very dissatisfied	17	2.9%
Don't know	108	18.5%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 19 SATISFIED WITH PRESENT SEAT RATIO**

	Very satisfied	(Just) satisfied	Neutral	(Just) dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total	Very satisfied	(Just) satisfied	Neutral	(Just) dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
Total	25	290	48	96	17	476	5.3%	60.9%	10.1%	20.2%	3.6%	100.0%
<b>Distribution by sex</b>												
Male	12	158	15	70	13	268	4.5%	59.0%	5.6%	26.1%	4.9%	100.0%
Female	10	125	32	25	4	196	5.1%	63.8%	16.3%	12.8%	2.0%	100.0%
<b>Distribution by education</b>												
Primary or below	13	78	11	9	4	115	11.3%	67.8%	9.6%	7.8%	3.5%	100.0%
Secondary	8	180	35	63	6	292	2.7%	61.6%	12.0%	21.6%	2.1%	100.0%
Post-secondary	1	23	1	23	7	55	1.8%	41.8%	1.8%	41.8%	12.7%	100.0%
<b>Whether previous Mun. Assembly reflected public opinion</b>												
Very much	4	25	3	3	0	35	11.4%	71.4%	8.6%	8.6%	0.0%	100.0%
Only partial	10	188	28	65	9	300	3.3%	62.7%	9.3%	21.7%	3.0%	100.0%
No at all	4	42	5	22	8	81	4.9%	51.9%	6.2%	27.2%	9.9%	100.0%
Don't know	3	27	11	4	0	45	6.7%	60.0%	24.4%	8.9%	0.0%	100.0%

**TABLE 20 THE IDEAL SEAT RATIO**

	Frequency	Percent
Existing ratio	181	31.0%
All seats become direct-elected	75	12.8%
All seats become indirect-elected	1	0.2%
Abolish appointed seats	17	2.9%
Abolish indirect-elected seats	10	1.7%
Abolish direct-elected seats	1	0.2%
Increase ratio of direct-elected seats	95	16.3%
Reduce ratio of direct-elected seats	5	0.9%
Don't know	199	34.1%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 21 THE IDEAL SEAT RATIO**

	Existing ratio	All become direct-elected	Inc. ratio of direct-elected	Others	Total	Existing ratio	All become direct-elected	Inc. ratio of direct-elected	Others	Total
<b>Total</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>47.0%</b>	<b>19.5%</b>	<b>24.7%</b>	<b>8.8%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Distribution by sex</b>										
Male	96	53	57	106	311	30.5%	17.0%	18.3%	34.1%	100.0%
Female	82	22	36	120	260	31.5%	8.5%	13.8%	46.2%	100.0%
<b>Distribution by age</b>										
18-29	40	19	35	41	135	29.6%	14.1%	25.9%	30.4%	100.0%
30-39	41	20	28	72	161	25.5%	12.4%	17.4%	44.7%	100.0%
40-49	47	16	21	46	130	36.2%	12.3%	16.2%	35.4%	100.0%
50-59	21	5	6	25	57	36.8%	8.8%	10.5%	43.9%	100.0%
60-69	17	11	2	22	52	32.7%	21.2%	3.8%	42.3%	100.0%
70	8	4	0	18	30	26.7%	13.3%	0.0%	60.0%	100.0%
<b>Distribution by education</b>										
Primary or below	45	27	5	95	172	26.2%	15.7%	2.9%	55.2%	100.0%
Secondary	113	38	67	119	337	33.5%	11.3%	19.9%	35.3%	100.0%
Post-secondary	19	10	20	10	59	32.2%	16.9%	33.9%	16.9%	100.0%
<b>Distribution by occupation</b>										
White collars	60	25	38	53	176	34.1%	14.2%	21.6%	30.1%	100.0%
Blue collars	36	16	14	50	116	31.0%	13.8%	12.1%	43.1%	100.0%
students	17	4	18	20	59	28.8%	6.8%	30.5%	33.9%	100.0%
Housewives	16	5	4	37	62	25.8%	8.1%	6.5%	59.7%	100.0%
Other economically inactive	15	12	2	25	54	27.8%	22.2%	3.7%	46.3%	100.0%
Unclassified	31	13	17	38	99	31.3%	13.1%	17.2%	38.4%	100.0%
<b>Prefer voting for individual or group</b>										
For individuals	61	26	47	50	184	33.2%	14.1%	25.5%	27.2%	100.0%
For group	89	32	38	112	271	32.8%	11.8%	14.0%	41.3%	100.0%
Doesn't matter	21	14	7	33	75	28.0%	18.7%	9.3%	44.0%	100.0%
Don't know	10	3	3	38	54	18.5%	5.6%	5.6%	70.4%	100.0%
<b>Satisfied with present seat ratio</b>										
Very satisfied	12	1	0	9	22	54.5%	4.5%	0.0%	40.9%	100.0%
(Just) satisfied	142	31	30	86	289	49.1%	10.7%	10.4%	29.8%	100.0%
Neutral	13	3	6	26	48	27.1%	6.3%	12.5%	54.2%	100.0%
(Just) dissatisfied	6	25	50	15	96	6.3%	26.0%	52.1%	15.6%	100.0%
Very dissatisfied	0	8	2	7	17	0.0%	47.1%	11.8%	41.2%	100.0%
<b>Whether previous Mun. Assembly reflected public opinion</b>										
Very much	21	4	4	11	40	52.5%	10.0%	10.0%	27.5%	100.0%
Only partial	127	45	66	121	359	35.4%	12.5%	18.4%	33.7%	100.0%
No at all	15	19	19	41	94	16.0%	20.2%	20.2%	43.6%	100.0%
Don't know	13	6	4	50	73	17.8%	8.2%	5.5%	68.5%	100.0%

**TABLE 22 KNOWLEDGE OF NO. OF SEATS**  
(Correct answer: 5 for Mainland Macau & 3 for Islands)

	Frequency	Percent
Right answer	130	22.5%
Wrong answer	448	77.5%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>578</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 23 WHETHER PREVIOUS MUN. ASSEMBLY REFLECTED PUBLIC OPINION**

	Very much	Only partial	No at all	Don't know	Total	Very much	Only partial	No at all	Don't know	Total
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>569</b>	<b>7.0%</b>	<b>63.3%</b>	<b>16.7%</b>	<b>13.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Distribution by age</b>										
18-29	3	85	35	11	134	2.2%	63.4%	26.1%	8.2%	100.0%
30-39	10	110	23	15	158	6.3%	69.6%	14.6%	9.5%	100.0%
40-49	8	83	17	20	128	6.3%	64.8%	13.3%	15.6%	100.0%
50-59	6	39	5	7	57	10.5%	68.4%	8.8%	12.3%	100.0%
60-69	6	24	8	12	50	12.0%	48.0%	16.0%	24.0%	100.0%
70+	6	12	5	7	30	20.0%	40.0%	16.7%	23.3%	100.0%
<b>Distribution by education</b>										
Primary or below	17	84	28	40	169	10.1%	49.7%	16.6%	23.7%	100.0%
Secondary	21	230	54	27	332	6.3%	69.3%	16.3%	8.1%	100.0%
Post-secondary	2	42	11	4	59	3.4%	71.2%	18.6%	6.8%	100.0%
<b>Distribution by occupation</b>										
White collars	4	127	34	9	174	2.3%	73.0%	19.5%	5.2%	100.0%
Blue collars	10	73	13	19	115	8.7%	63.5%	11.3%	16.5%	100.0%
students	2	37	16	4	59	3.4%	62.7%	27.1%	6.8%	100.0%
Housewives	4	34	9	13	60	6.7%	56.7%	15.0%	21.7%	100.0%
Other economically inactive	5	23	11	13	52	9.6%	44.2%	21.2%	25.0%	100.0%
Unclassified	14	61	10	13	98	14.3%	62.2%	10.2%	13.3%	100.0%

**TABLE 24 WHETHER PREVIOUS MUN. ASSEMBLY REFLECTED PUBLIC OPINION**

	Frequency	Percent
Very much	40	7.0%
Only partial	359	62.7%
No at all	94	16.4%
Reflect members' own interests	3	0.5%
Others	4	0.7%
Don't know	73	12.7%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>573</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 25 KNOWLEDGE OF VOTING AGE (Correct answer=18)**

	Frequency	Percent
Right answer	482	84.4%
Wrong answer	89	15.6%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

**TABLE 26 KNOWLEDGE OF VOTING AGE (Correct answer=18)**

	Right answer	Wrong answer	Total	Right answer	Wrong answer	Total
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>482</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>571</b>	<b>84.4%</b>	<b>15.6%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Distribution by age</b>						
18-29	125	10	135	92.6%	7.4%	100.0%
30-39	140	21	161	87.0%	13.0%	100.0%
40-49	115	15	130	88.5%	11.5%	100.0%
50-59	50	7	57	87.7%	12.3%	100.0%
60-69	34	18	52	65.4%	34.6%	100.0%
70+	13	17	30	43.3%	56.7%	100.0%
<b>Distribution by education</b>						
Primary or below	126	46	172	73.3%	26.7%	100.0%
Secondary	302	35	337	89.6%	10.4%	100.0%
Post-secondary	53	6	59	89.8%	10.2%	100.0%
<b>Distribution by occupation</b>						
White collars	158	18	176	89.8%	10.2%	100.0%
Blue collars	99	17	116	85.3%	14.7%	100.0%
students	57	2	59	96.6%	3.4%	100.0%
Housewives	52	10	62	83.9%	16.1%	100.0%
Other economically inactive	33	21	54	61.1%	38.9%	100.0%
Unclassified	82	17	99	82.8%	17.2%	100.0%

訪問員編號： \_\_\_\_\_

7. 你知唔知今次 (直選) 有幾多個組? (指所屬選區: 澳門區或海島區)  
\_\_\_\_\_ (9 1 = 唔知, 9 2 = 拒答)

- 1. 慈幼
- 2. 商業
- 3. 官立
- 4. 嘉諾撒
- 5. 濠江
- 6. 鮑思高
- 7. 花地瑪
- 8. 德仔
- 9. 路環

8. 你覺得邊個人選好D定係邊個組別選好D?

- 1. 選人
- 2. 選組
- 3. 一樣、無所謂
- 4. 唔知/難講
- 0. 拒答

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

9. 你舊年9月20日有無投票選立法會呀?

- 1. 有
- 2. 無
- 3. 無: 當時唔係選民
- 4. 唔記得
- 0. 拒答

開始訪問時間: \_\_\_\_\_ HR \_\_\_\_\_ MIN

如果未能全部完成: 性別 \_\_\_\_\_ 1. 男 2. 女  
估計年齡 \_\_\_\_\_ (2位數字)

我係香港大學社會科學研究中心既調查員, 呢張係我既證件, 想阻你少少時間, 問下你對今次選舉既意見, 你提供既資料係會絕對保密既。

10. 你比較喜歡新既漢選分票法定係舊既漢選法呢?

- 1. 新 (改良) 漢選法
- 2. 舊漢選法
- 3. 無所謂
- 4. 唔知有乜分別
- 5. 唔知/難講
- 0. 拒答

6. 請問你今次點解黎投票呢? (追問最主要原因)

- 1. 盡公民責任
- 2. 改善社會、社區、民生
- 3. 促進民主發展
- 4. 親友、鄰居呼籲
- 5. 票支持某某候選人
- 6. 票支持某某政治團體
- 7. 慣性、次次都投票
- 8. 順應潮流、襯熱鬧、沒有其他事做...
- 9. 其他
- 0. 拒答

1 1. 澳門市議會面議有三分之一直選，三分之一間選，及三分之一委任議員，你滿唔滿意呢。個比例？

1. 非常滿意
2. 滿意
3. 中立
4. 不滿
5. 非常不滿
6. 唔知/難講
0. 拒答

1 2. 你心目中唔理想比例係點？

直 : 問 : 委

(註：「全部直選」 = 0 1 : 0 0 : 0 0  
跟現行一樣 = 0 1 : 0 1 : 0 1  
唔識或拒答 = 0 0 : 0 0 : 0 0)

1 3. 你知唔知今次要選出幾多個直選議員？

(9 1 = 唔知, 9 2 = 拒答)

1 4. 你覺得上屆市議會有沒有其正代表或反映民意？

1. 完全反映民意
2. 只反映部份民意
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

1 5. 你知唔知幾多歲先可以出黎投票？

想問你些少個人資料，方便分析

1 6. 性別      1. 男      2. 女

1 7. 年齡      \_\_\_\_\_ [準確數字, 9 8 = 9 8 歲及以上, 0 0 = 拒答]

1 8. 教育程度

1. 無證書
2. 私塾/幼稚園
3. 小學
4. 中一至中三
5. 高中
6. 大專或以上
0. 拒答

1 9. 你在澳門住咗幾年？ \_\_\_\_\_

[年數, 2 位數字, 0 0 = 拒答]

2 0. 你係屬於

1. 中國人
2. 土生葡人
3. 葡國人
4. 其他
5. 拒答

2 1. (如果你係中國人, 追問) 請問你持有乜嘢護照？

1. 葡國護照
2. 中國護照
3. 只有澳門身份證
4. 其他

2 2. 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. 不能辨別

0. 拒答

2 3. 你每月收入大概幾多？ (實數, 以千位為準, 9 9 9, 9 9 9 = 拒答)