

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG
PUBLIC OPINION PROGRAMME

**Survey on the Secretary for Education and
Educational Issues in Hong Kong**



Survey Report

20 June 2016

Copyright of this report is held jointly by the Office of Ip Kin Yuen Legislative Councillor and the Public Opinion Programme (POP) at The University of Hong Kong (HKU). Everything in this publication is the work of individual researchers, and does not represent the stand of HKU. Dr Robert Chung is fully responsible for the work of the POP.

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG PUBLIC OPINION PROGRAMME

Survey on the Secretary for Education and Educational Issues in Hong Kong

Survey Report

Research Team Members

Research Directors : CHUNG Ting-Yiu Robert
PANG Ka-Lai Karie
Project Manager : LEE Wing-Yi Winnie
Project Executive : CHU Cho-Leung Stanley
Data Analyst : TAI Chit-Fai Edward

June 2016

Public Survey – Contact Information

Survey date	: 24 – 26 May 2016
Survey method	: Random telephone survey conducted by real interviewers
Target population	: Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong citizens aged 18 or above
Sampling method	: Telephone numbers are randomly generated using known prefixes assigned to telecommunication services providers under the Numbering Plan provided by the Office of the Communications Authority (OFCA). Invalid numbers are then eliminated according to computer and manual dialing records to produce the final sample. If more than one subject had been available, the one who had his/her birthday next was selected.
Sample size	: 1,010 successful cases
Response rate	: 70.0%
Standard error	: Less than 1.6% (i.e. at 95% confidence level, the maximum sampling error of all percentages should be no more than +/-3.1 percentage points)

Teachers' Survey – Contact Information

Survey date	: 24 May – 8 June 2016
Survey method	: Random telephone survey conducted by real interviewers
Target population	: Cantonese-speaking members of the Hong Kong Professional Teachers' Union (HKPTU)
Sampling method	: Telephone numbers are randomly drawn from the list provided by the commissioning organization to produce the final sample.
Sample size	: 1,002 successful cases
Response rate	: 79.8%
Standard error	: Less than 1.6% (i.e. at 95% confidence level, the maximum sampling error of all percentages should be no more than +/-3.1 percentage points)

Contents

	Page
Research Background	1
Research Design	1-2
Contact Information and Response Rate	3-4
Frequency Tables	5-11
<i>Appendix I: Demographics of the Respondents</i>	<i>12-16</i>
<i>Appendix II: Bilingual Questionnaires</i>	<i>17-41</i>

I. Research Background

- 1.1 In May 2016, **Office of Ip Kin Yuen Legislative Councillor** commissioned The Public Opinion Programme (POP) at The University of Hong Kong to conduct this “Survey on the Secretary for Education and Educational Issues in Hong Kong”. The survey comprises a public survey and a teachers’ survey, which targeted at Cantonese-speaking citizens of Hong Kong of age 18 or above and members of the Hong Kong Professional Teachers’ Union (HKPTU) respectively. The main objective of the survey was to gauge the views of Hong Kong citizens and local teachers on the performance of the Secretary for Education and some important educational issues of Hong Kong.
- 1.2 The research instrument used in this study was designed entirely by the POP Team after consulting the Office of Ip Kin Yuen Legislative Councillor. Fieldwork operations and data analysis were also conducted independently by the POP Team, without interference from any outside parties. In other words, although POP has sought opinion from the commissioning organization regarding the questionnaire design, POP was given full autonomy to design and conduct the survey, and POP would take full responsibility for all the findings reported herewith.

II. Research Design

- 2.1 This was a random telephone survey conducted by telephone interviewers under close supervision. All data were collected by interviewers using a Web-based Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (Web-CATI) system invented in-house by the research team, which allowed real-time data capture and consolidation. To ensure data quality, on top of on-site supervision and random checking, voice recording, screen capturing and camera surveillance were used to monitor the interviewers’ performance.
 - 2.2 For the public survey, telephone numbers were randomly generated using known prefixes assigned to telecommunication services providers under the Numbering Plan provided by the Office of the Communications Authority (OFCA). Invalid numbers were then eliminated according to computer and manual dialing records to produce the final sample. As for the teachers’ survey, a list of telephone numbers of the target respondents was provided by the commissioning organization. They were then randomly selected to become the final sample.
-

- 2.3 The target population of the public survey was **Hong Kong residents aged 18 or above who spoke Cantonese**. After telephone contact was successfully established with a target household, one eligible person was selected using “next birthday rule” for the interview. Telephone interviews were conducted during the period of **24 to 26 May, 2016**. A total of **1,010** Hong Kong residents of age 18 or above were successfully interviewed. The response rate of this survey was **70.0%** (Table 2), and the standard sampling error for percentages based on this sample was less than 1.6 percentage points. In other words, the sampling error for all percentages using the total sample was less than plus/minus 3.1 percentage points at 95% confidence level.
- 2.4 On the other hand, telephone interviews for the teachers’ survey were conducted during the period of **24 May to 8 June, 2016**. A total of **1,002 members of the HKPTU** were successfully interviewed. The response rate of this survey was **79.8%** (Table 4), and the standard sampling error for percentages based on this sample was less than 1.6 percentage points. In other words, the sampling error for all percentages using the total sample was less than plus/minus 3.1 percentage points at 95% confidence level.
- 2.5 To ensure representativeness of the findings, the raw data of the public survey have been rim-weighted according to provisional figures obtained from the Census and Statistics Department regarding the gender-age distribution of the Hong Kong population in 2015 year-end and the educational attainment (highest level attended) distribution collected in the 2011 Census. Figures of the public survey in this report are based on the weighted sample, while those of the teachers’ survey are based on the raw sample without any weighting applied.

III. Contact Information and Response Rate

Public Survey

Table 1 Contact information

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Respondents' ineligibility confirmed	3,354	15.7%
<i>Fax / data line</i>	380	1.8%
<i>Invalid number</i>	2,506	11.7%
<i>Call-forwarding / mobile / pager number</i>	80	0.4%
<i>Non-residential number</i>	358	1.7%
<i>Special technological difficulties</i>	15	0.1%
<i>No eligible respondents</i>	15	0.1%
Respondents' ineligibility not confirmed	9,652	45.1%
<i>Line busy</i>	931	4.3%
<i>No answer</i>	7,047	32.9%
<i>Answering device</i>	1,039	4.8%
<i>Call-blocking</i>	28	0.1%
<i>Language problem</i>	221	1.0%
<i>Interview terminated before the screening question</i>	384	1.8%
<i>Others</i>	2	<0.1%
Respondents' eligibility confirmed, but failed to complete the interview	7,408	34.6%
<i>Household-level refusal</i>	3	<0.1%
<i>Known respondent refusal</i>	3	<0.1%
<i>Appointment date beyond the end of the fieldwork period</i>	7,351	34.3%
<i>Partial interview</i>	43	0.2%
<i>Miscellaneous</i>	8	<0.1%
Successful cases	1,010	4.7%
Total	21,424	100.0%

Table 2 Calculation of response rate

Response rate	
=	$\frac{\text{Successful cases}}{\text{Successful cases} + \text{Incomplete cases}^* + \text{Refusal cases by eligible respondents}^\wedge}$
=	$\frac{1,010}{1,010 + (43 + 384) + (3 + 3)}$
=	70.0%

* Including "partial interview" and "interview terminated before the screening question"

^ Including "household-level refusal" and "known respondent refusal"

Teachers' Survey**Table 3 Contact information**

	Frequency	Percentage
Respondents' ineligibility confirmed	206	3.4%
<i>Fax / data line</i>	2	<0.1%
<i>Invalid number</i>	80	1.3%
<i>Call-forwarding / mobile / pager number</i>	46	0.8%
<i>Special technological difficulties</i>	2	<0.1%
<i>No eligible respondents</i>	76	1.3%
Respondents' ineligibility not confirmed	3,693	61.3%
<i>Line busy</i>	165	2.7%
<i>No answer</i>	2,260	37.5%
<i>Answering device</i>	1,014	16.8%
<i>Language problem</i>	11	0.2%
<i>Interview terminated before the screening question</i>	243	4.0%
Respondents' eligibility confirmed, but failed to complete the interview	1,126	18.7%
<i>Appointment date beyond the end of the fieldwork period</i>	1,113	18.5%
<i>Partial interview</i>	11	0.2%
<i>Busy (driving), flat cell phone battery, poor cell phone signal</i>	2	<0.1%
Successful cases	1,002	16.6%
Total	6,027	100.0%

Table 4 Calculation of response rate

Response rate	
=	$\frac{\text{Successful cases}}{\text{Successful cases} + \text{Incomplete cases}^* + \text{Refusal cases by eligible respondents}^\wedge}$
=	$\frac{1,002}{1,002 + (11 + 243) + (0 + 0)}$
=	79.8%

* Including "partial interview" and "interview terminated before the screening question"

^ Including "household-level refusal" and "known respondent refusal"

IV. Frequency Tables

Table 5 [Q1] Please use a scale of 0 to 100 to rate your extent of support to the Secretary for Education Mr Eddie Ng Hak-kim, with 0 indicating absolutely not supportive, 100 indicating absolutely supportive and 50 indicating half-half. How would you rate the Secretary for Education Mr Eddie Ng Hak-kim? (If respondents cannot give a score, interviewer to ask: then have you ever heard of the name Eddie Ng Hak-kim?)

	<u>Public survey</u>		<u>Teachers' survey</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,009)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,002)
0	204	20.2%	258	25.7%
1-49	257	25.5%	467	46.6%
50	262	26.0%	138	13.8%
51-99	200	19.8%	130	13.0%
100	14	1.4%	2	0.2%
Don't know him / haven't heard of Eddie Ng	38	3.8%	1	0.1%
Don't know / hard to say	34	3.4%	6	0.6%
Total	1,009	100.0%	1,002	100.0%
Missing	1		--	
Mean score		37.7		28.3
Median		50.0		30.0
Standard error		0.88		0.74
Base		937		995

Table 6 [Q2] If you had the right to vote on the reappointment or dismissal of Eddie Ng Hak-kim as the Secretary for Education tomorrow, how would you vote?

	<u>Public survey</u>		<u>Teachers' survey</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=983)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=996)
Reappointment	150	15.2%	49	4.9%
Dismissal	458	46.6%	725	72.8%
Abstention	375	38.2%	222	22.3%
Total	983	100.0%	996	100.0%
Missing	27		6	

Table 7 [Q3] Please use a scale of 0 to 10 to rate your satisfaction towards the performance of the Secretary for Education Eddie Ng Hak-kim in handling the following issues, with 0 indicating very dissatisfied, 10 indicating very satisfied and 5 indicating half-half. How would you rate? [Interviewer to read out each item, question order of items 1 to 5 to be randomized by computer]

	Issues on free kindergarten education policy			
	<u>Public survey</u>		<u>Teachers' survey</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,010)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,002)
0	135	13.3%	144	14.4%
1-4	231	22.8%	435	43.4%
5	232	22.9%	196	19.6%
6-9	239	23.7%	159	15.9%
10	36	3.6%	5	0.5%
Don't know / hard to say	137	13.6%	63	6.3%
Total	1,010	100.0%	1,002	100.0%
Missing	--		--	
Mean score		4.4		3.5
Median		5.0		3.0
Standard error		0.09		0.07
Base		873		939
	Controversies over Primary 3 Territory-wide System Assessment (TSA)			
	<u>Public survey</u>		<u>Teachers' survey</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,007)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,001)
0	264	26.2%	284	28.4%
1-4	274	27.2%	484	48.4%
5	192	19.1%	111	11.1%
6-9	155	15.4%	109	10.9%
10	18	1.8%	3	0.3%
Don't know / hard to say	105	10.4%	10	1.0%
Total	1,007	100.0%	1,001	100.0%
Missing	3		1	
Mean score		3.3		2.6
Median		3.0		3.0
Standard error		0.09		0.07
Base		903		991

Table 7 (cont'd) [Q3] Please use a scale of 0 to 10 to rate your satisfaction towards the performance of the Secretary for Education Eddie Ng Hak-kim in handling the following issues, with 0 indicating very dissatisfied, 10 indicating very satisfied and 5 indicating half-half. How would you rate? [Interviewer to read out each item, question order of items 1 to 5 to be randomized by computer]

	Contract teacher issues			
	<u>Public survey</u>		<u>Teachers' survey</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,010)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,001)
0	155	15.4%	270	27.0%
1-4	273	27.0%	464	46.4%
5	215	21.3%	131	13.1%
6-9	123	12.2%	67	6.7%
10	16	1.6%	1	0.1%
Don't know / hard to say	228	22.6%	68	6.8%
Total	1,010	100.0%	1,001	100.0%
Missing	--		1	
Mean score		3.7		2.5
Median		4.0		3.0
Standard error		0.09		0.07
Base		782		933
	Falling number of secondary students			
	<u>Public survey</u>		<u>Teachers' survey</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,010)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=999)
0	130	12.9%	185	18.5%
1-4	232	23.0%	455	45.5%
5	272	26.9%	189	18.9%
6-9	150	14.9%	102	10.2%
10	18	1.8%	3	0.3%
Don't know / hard to say	207	20.6%	65	6.5%
Total	1,010	100.0%	999	100.0%
Missing	<1		3	
Mean score		4.0		3.1
Median		5.0		3.0
Standard error		0.09		0.07
Base		802		934

Table 7 (cont'd) [Q3] Please use a scale of 0 to 10 to rate your satisfaction towards the performance of the Secretary for Education Eddie Ng Hak-kim in handling the following issues, with 0 indicating very dissatisfied, 10 indicating very satisfied and 5 indicating half-half. How would you rate? [Interviewer to read out each item, question order of items 1 to 5 to be randomized by computer]

	Allocation of educational resources			
	<u>Public survey</u>		<u>Teachers' survey</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,010)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,000)
0	175	17.3%	162	16.2%
1-4	261	25.9%	531	53.1%
5	235	23.3%	167	16.7%
6-9	158	15.6%	98	9.8%
10	14	1.4%	3	0.3%
Don't know / hard to say	167	16.5%	39	3.9%
Total	1,010	100.0%	1,000	100.0%
Missing	--		2	
Mean score		3.7		3.1
Median		4.0		3.0
Standard error		0.09		0.07
Base		843		961
	Overall performance in administering education policies			
	<u>Public survey</u>		<u>Teachers' survey</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,007)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,002)
0	191	19.0%	172	17.2%
1-4	318	31.6%	610	60.9%
5	225	22.3%	117	11.7%
6-9	189	18.7%	96	9.6%
10	12	1.2%	1	0.1%
Don't know / hard to say	71	7.1%	6	0.6%
Total	1,007	100.0%	1,002	100.0%
Missing	3		--	
Mean score		3.7		2.8
Median		4.0		3.0
Standard error		0.08		0.06
Base		936		996

Table 8 [Q4] Which of the following do you think are the most important qualities for a Secretary for Education? Please choose at most 3 options. (Read out first 7 options, order to be randomized by computer, 3 answers at most)

	<u>Public survey</u>			<u>Teachers' survey</u>		
	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=2,706)	% of valid sample (Base=1,008)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=2,926)	% of valid sample (Base=1,002)
With integrity and accountable / Would not shift responsibility to others	605	22.3%	60.0%	698	23.9%	69.7%
Receptive to suggestions and public views	542	20.0%	53.8%	534	18.3%	53.3%
Familiar with education policies	454	16.8%	45.0%	562	19.2%	56.1%
Have a sense of mission towards education	438	16.2%	43.5%	622	21.3%	62.1%
Can handle crises quickly	388	14.4%	38.6%	411	14.0%	41.0%
Can maintain close communication and good relationship with Legislative Councillors	182	6.7%	18.1%	76	2.6%	7.6%
Follow the instructions of the Chief Executive	60	2.2%	6.0%	14	0.5%	1.4%
Other qualities (see below)	4	0.1%	0.4%	7	0.2%	0.7%
Don't know / hard to say	33	1.2%	3.2%	2	0.1%	0.2%
Total	2,706	100.0%		2,926	100.0%	
Missing	2			--		
<u>Public survey – Other qualities</u>						Freq.
Can nurture talented people						1
Capable of dealing with issue of students' degrees						1
Capable of changing the current education system						1
Foresighted						<1
Sub-total						4
<u>Teachers' survey – Other qualities</u>						Freq.
Don't interfere with education policies, just provide support						1
Can put himself/herself into others' shoes, empathetic						1
Can communicate with people						1
Put students in the first place						1
Can advance development towards civilized and open education						1
Have good communication with the education sector						1
Receptive to students' suggestions and views						1
Sub-total						7

Table 9 [Q5] Do you think the administration of Eddie Ng Hak-kim as the Secretary for Education has affected your confidence in the development of education in Hong Kong? If yes, has your confidence increased or decreased? [Interviewer to probe intensity]

	<u>Public survey</u>		<u>Teachers' survey</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,008)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,001)
Yes, greatly increased	41	4.1%	33	3.3%
Yes, slightly increased	58	5.7%	34	3.4%
No effect	304	30.1%	140	14.0%
Yes, slightly decreased	208	20.7%	280	28.0%
Yes, greatly decreased	324	32.2%	503	50.2%
Don't know / hard to say	73	7.2%	11	1.1%
Total	1,008	100.0%	1,001	100.0%
Missing	2		1	

Table 10 [Q6] Do you think the amount of pressure Hong Kong teachers are facing is big or small? Please rate on a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 indicating very small amount of pressure or no pressure, 10 indicating very big amount of pressure and 5 indicating half-half.

	<u>Public survey</u>		<u>Teachers' survey</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,010)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,002)
0	11	1.0%	1	0.1%
1-4	17	1.7%	10	1.0%
5	154	15.2%	42	4.2%
6-9	606	60.0%	779	77.7%
10	194	19.2%	166	16.6%
Don't know / hard to say	28	2.8%	4	0.4%
Total	1,010	100.0%	1,002	100.0%
Missing	<1		--	
Mean score		7.6		8.2
Median		8.0		8.0
Standard error		0.06		0.04
Base		981		998

Table 11 [Q7] Do you think the amount of pressure Hong Kong students are facing is big or small? Please rate on a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 indicating very small amount of pressure or no pressure, 10 indicating very big amount of pressure and 5 indicating half-half.

	<u>Public survey</u>		<u>Teachers' survey</u>	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,010)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,002)
0	8	0.8%	1	0.1%
1-4	30	3.0%	16	1.6%
5	117	11.6%	55	5.5%
6-9	625	61.9%	795	79.3%
10	200	19.8%	129	12.9%
Don't know / hard to say	30	2.9%	6	0.6%
Total	1,010	100.0%	1,002	100.0%
Missing	<1		--	
Mean score		7.7		7.8
Median		8.0		8.0
Standard error		0.06		0.05
Base		980		996

Appendix I

Demographics of the Respondents

Demographics of the Respondents

Public Survey

Table 12 Gender

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,010)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,010)
Male	457	45.2%	456	45.1%
Female	553	54.8%	554	54.9%
Total	1,010	100.0%	1,010	100.0%

Table 13 Age

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=999)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=999)
18 – 19	29	2.9%	48	4.8%
20 – 29	119	11.9%	128	12.8%
30 – 39	83	8.3%	182	18.2%
40 – 49	143	14.3%	181	18.2%
50 – 59	214	21.4%	201	20.1%
60 – 69	236	23.6%	137	13.7%
70 or above	175	17.5%	122	12.2%
Total	999	100.0%	999	100.0%
Missing	11		11	

Table 14 Education attainment

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=997)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=997)
Primary or below	150	15.0%	236	23.7%
Secondary	454	45.5%	479	48.1%
<i>Junior secondary (F.1-F.3)</i>	147	14.7%	115	11.5%
<i>Senior secondary (F.4-F.5)</i>	243	24.4%	272	27.3%
<i>Matriculation (F.6-F.7)</i>	64	6.4%	93	9.3%
Tertiary or above	393	39.4%	282	28.3%
<i>Tertiary, non-degree</i>	83	8.3%	51	5.1%
<i>Tertiary, degree</i>	240	24.1%	176	17.6%
<i>Postgraduate or above</i>	70	7.0%	55	5.5%
Total	997	100.0%	997	100.0%
Missing	13		13	

Table 15 Occupation

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,002)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,002)
Executives and professionals	231	23.1%	226	22.5%
Clerical and service workers	150	15.0%	215	21.4%
Production workers	60	6.0%	91	9.1%
Students	60	6.0%	74	7.3%
Homemakers	148	14.8%	152	15.2%
Others	353	35.2%	244	24.4%
Total	1,002	100.0%	1,002	100.0%
Missing	8		8	

Table 16 Monthly personal income

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=945)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=939)
No income	270	28.6%	252	26.8%
HK\$9,999 or below	201	21.3%	178	19.0%
HK\$10,000-14,999	117	12.4%	149	15.8%
HK\$15,000-19,999	75	7.9%	96	10.2%
HK\$20,000-39,999	178	18.8%	174	18.6%
HK\$40,000 or above	89	9.4%	70	7.5%
Unstable	15	1.6%	20	2.1%
Total	945	100.0%	939	100.0%
Missing	65		71	

Teachers' Survey

Table 17 Gender

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,002)
Male	376	37.5%
Female	626	62.5%
Total	1,002	100.0%

Table 18 Age

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=997)
18-29	163	16.3%
30-39	261	26.2%
40-49	185	18.6%
50-59	215	21.6%
60 or above	173	17.4%
Total	997	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>	5	

Table 19 Education attainment

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=996)
Secondary	38	3.8%
<i>Junior Secondary (F1-F3)</i>	1	0.1%
<i>Senior Secondary (F4-F5)</i>	23	2.3%
<i>Matriculation (F6-F7)</i>	14	1.4%
Tertiary or above	958	96.2%
<i>Tertiary, non-degree</i>	93	9.3%
<i>Tertiary, degree</i>	506	50.8%
<i>Postgraduate or above</i>	359	36.0%
Total	996	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>	6	

Table 20 Type of school

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=997)
Kindergartens	97	9.7%
Primary schools	245	24.6%
<i>Government / Government aided</i>	213	21.4%
<i>Direct Subsidy Scheme</i>	13	1.3%
<i>Private (non-international schools)</i>	19	1.9%
<i>International schools (e.g. ESF schools)</i>	0	0.0%
Secondary schools	377	37.8%
<i>Government / Government aided</i>	327	32.8%
<i>Direct Subsidy Scheme</i>	43	4.3%
<i>Private (non-international schools)</i>	4	0.4%
<i>International schools (e.g. ESF schools)</i>	3	0.3%
Tertiary institutes (including institutes offering associate degree / higher diploma / Diploma Yi Jin programmes, IVE, member institutions of the VTC, etc.)	106	10.6%
Special schools	29	2.9%
Private schools offering non-formal curriculum (tutorial schools, computer schools, language schools, etc.)	4	0.4%
Retired	114	11.4%
Others / Cannot be grouped	25	2.5%
Total	997	100.0
<i>Missing</i>	5	

Table 21 Length of service as a teacher (before retirement)

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=968)
1-5 years	188	19.4%
6-10 years	196	20.2%
11-20 years	190	19.6%
21-30 years	237	24.5%
31-40 years	147	15.2%
41 years or above	10	1.0%
Total	968	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>	34	

Appendix II

Bilingual Questionnaires

Office of Ip Kin Yuen Legislative Councillor

Public Opinion Programme, HKU

Jointly conduct

Survey on the Secretary for Education and Educational Issues of Hong Kong

<p>Public Survey Questionnaire</p>

May 23, 2016

Part I Self-Introduction

Good evening! My name is X. I'm an interviewer from The Public Opinion Programme of The University of Hong Kong. We are commissioned by Legislative Councillor Mr Ip Kin Yuen to ask for your opinion on the Secretary for Education and other educational issues. The interview would only take you about 5 minutes. Is it okay for us to start this survey?

- Yes → S1
 No → Interview ends, thank you, bye-bye

Please rest assured that your phone number is randomly selected by our computer and your information provided will be kept strictly confidential and used for aggregate analysis only. If you have any question about the research, you can call xxxx-xxxx to talk to our supervisors. If you want to know more about the rights as a participant, please contact The University of Hong Kong (full name: Human Research Ethics Committee of The University of Hong Kong) at xxxx-xxxx during office hours. For quality control purpose, our conversation may be recorded for internal reference but will be destroyed within 6 months. The interview begins now.

[S1] Is your residential telephone number xxxx-xxxx?

- Yes → S2
 No → Interview ends, thank you, bye-bye

Part II Selection of Respondent

[S2] The target population of this survey is **Hong Kong residents of age 18 or above**. May I know how many members in your household belong to this group? [If there is no eligible respondent, interview ends, thank you for your cooperation, bye-bye]

- One → Start the interview [If the eligible respondent is not the one who answered the phone, invite him/her to the phone and repeat the self-introduction]
 More than one, ____ → S3
 None → Interview ends, thank you, bye-bye
 Refuse to answer → Interview ends, thank you, bye-bye

[S3] Since there is more than one eligible respondent, I would like to speak to the one **who will have his/her birthday next**. Is it okay? [Interviewer can explain like this: "For example, is there anyone whose birthday is in May or the coming three months?"]

- Yes, the one who answered the phone is the respondent → Start the interview
 Yes, another family member is the respondent → Start the interview [Repeat self-introduction]
 The selected family member is not at home / not available → Make appointment for interview
 No, family member refuses to pass the phone → Interview ends, thank you, bye-bye
 No, respondent refuses to be interviewed → Interview ends, thank you, bye-bye

Part III Survey Questions

[Q1] Please use a scale of 0 to 100 to rate your extent of support to the Secretary for Education Mr Eddie Ng Hak-kim, with 0 indicating absolutely not supportive, 100 indicating absolutely supportive and 50 indicating half-half. How would you rate the Secretary for Education Mr Eddie Ng Hak-kim? (If respondents cannot give a score, interviewer to ask: then have you ever heard of the name Eddie Ng Hak-kim?)

_____ (0-100)

Don't know him / haven't heard of Eddie Ng

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

[Q2] If you had the right to vote on the reappointment or dismissal of Eddie Ng Hak-kim as the Secretary for Education tomorrow, how would you vote?

Reappointment

Dismissal

Abstention

Refuse to answer

[Q3] Please use a scale of 0 to 10 to rate your satisfaction towards the performance of the Secretary for Education Eddie Ng Hak-kim in handling the following issues, with 0 indicating very dissatisfied, 10 indicating very satisfied and 5 indicating half-half. How would you rate? [Interviewer to read out each item, question order of items 1 to 5 to be randomized by computer]

	(0-10)	Don't know / hard to say	Refuse to answer
Issues on free kindergarten education policy			
Controversies over Primary 3 Territory-wide System Assessment (TSA)			
Contract teacher issues			
Falling number of secondary students			
Allocation of educational resources			
Overall performance in administering education policies			

[Q4] Which of the following do you think are the most important qualities for a Secretary for Education? Please choose at most 3 options. (Read out first 7 options, order to be randomized by computer, 3 answers at most)

Can handle crises quickly

Familiar with education policies

With integrity and accountable / Would not shift responsibility to others

Follow the instructions of the Chief Executive

Have a sense of mission towards education

Can maintain close communication and good relationship with Legislative Councillors

Receptive to suggestions and public views

Other qualities: _____ (Please specify)

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

[Q5] Do you think the administration of Eddie Ng Hak-kim as the Secretary for Education has affected your confidence in the development of education in Hong Kong? If yes, has your confidence increased or decreased? [Interviewer to probe intensity]

Yes, greatly increased

Yes, slightly increased

No effect

Yes, slightly decreased

Yes, greatly decreased

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

[Q6] Do you think the amount of pressure Hong Kong **teachers** are facing is big or small? Please rate on a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 indicating very small amount of pressure or no pressure, 10 indicating very big amount of pressure and 5 indicating half-half.

_____ (0-10)

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

[Q7] Do you think the amount of pressure Hong Kong **students** are facing is big or small? Please rate on a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 indicating very small amount of pressure or no pressure, 10 indicating very big amount of pressure and 5 indicating half-half.

_____ (0-10)

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

Part IV Personal Information

We would like to know some of your personal particulars for aggregate analysis. Please be assured that the information you provide is anonymous and will be kept strictly confidential.

[DM1] Gender

Male
Female

[DM2a] Age

_____ (Input exact figure)
Refuse to answer

[DM2b] [Only ask those who refused to disclose their exact age] Age interval [Interviewers can read out the intervals]

18 – 19
20 – 29
30 – 39
40 – 49
50 – 59
60 – 69
70 or above
Refuse to answer

[DM3] Education attainment

Primary or below
Secondary
Matriculation
Tertiary, non-degree
Tertiary, degree
Postgraduate or above
Refuse to answer

[DM4] Occupation

Managers and administrators

Professionals

Associate professionals

Clerks

Service workers

Sales workers

Skilled agricultural and fishery workers

Craft and related workers

Plant and machine operators and assemblers

Drivers

Non-skilled workers

Students → [Skip to end]

Homemakers → [Skip to end]

Retired → [Skip to end]

Not classifiable

Unemployed and other people who are not employed → [Skip to end]

Others

Refuse to answer

[DM5] Monthly personal income

No income

HK\$5,000 or below

HK\$5,000 – 7,099

HK\$7,100 – 9,999

HK\$10,000 – 14,999

HK\$15,000 – 19,999

HK\$20,000 – 29,999

HK\$30,000 – 39,999

HK\$40,000 – 49,999

HK\$50,000 or above

Unstable

Refuse to answer

The interview is finished. Thank you for your time. If you have any question regarding this interview, you can call xxxx-xxxx to talk to our supervisors or xxxx-xxxx during office hours to ask about your rights as a participant. Good-bye.

Office of Ip Kin Yuen Legislative Councillor

Public Opinion Programme, HKU

Jointly conduct

*Survey on the Secretary for Education
and Educational Issues of Hong Kong*

Teachers' Survey Questionnaire

May 23, 2016

Part I Self-Introduction

Good evening! My name is X. I'm an interviewer from The Public Opinion Programme of The University of Hong Kong. We are commissioned by Vice-President of the Hong Kong Professional Teachers' Union (HKPTU) and Legislative Councillor Mr Ip Kin Yuen to ask for your opinion on the Secretary for Education and other educational issues. The interview would only take you about 5 minutes. Is it okay for us to start this survey?

Yes → S1

No → Interview ends, thank you, bye-bye

Please rest assured that your phone number is randomly selected by our computer from the list provided by the commissioning organization and your information provided will be kept strictly confidential and used for aggregate analysis only. If you have any question about the research, you can call xxxx-xxxx to talk to our supervisors. If you want to know more about the rights as a participant, please contact The University of Hong Kong (full name: Human Research Ethics Committee of The University of Hong Kong) at xxxx-xxxx during office hours. For quality control purpose, our conversation may be recorded for internal reference but will be destroyed within 6 months. The interview begins now.

[S1] Is your telephone number xxxx-xxxx?

Yes → S2

No → Interview ends, thank you, bye-bye

Part II Selection of Respondent

[S2] The target population of this survey is **members of the HKPTU**. May I know if you are a **member of the HKPTU**?

Yes → Start the interview

No → Interview ends, thank you, bye-bye

Refuse to answer → Interview ends, thank you, bye-bye

Part III Survey Questions

[Q1] Please use a scale of 0 to 100 to rate your extent of support to the Secretary for Education Mr Eddie Ng Hak-kim, with 0 indicating absolutely not supportive, 100 indicating absolutely supportive and 50 indicating half-half. How would you rate the Secretary for Education Mr Eddie Ng Hak-kim? (If respondents cannot give a score, interviewer to ask: then have you ever heard of the name Eddie Ng Hak-kim?)

_____ (0-100)

Don't know him / haven't heard of Eddie Ng

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

[Q2] If you had the right to vote on the reappointment or dismissal of Eddie Ng Hak-kim as the Secretary for Education tomorrow, how would you vote?

Reappointment

Dismissal

Abstention

Refuse to answer

[Q3] Please use a scale of 0 to 10 to rate your satisfaction towards the performance of the Secretary for Education Eddie Ng Hak-kim in handling the following issues, with 0 indicating very dissatisfied, 10 indicating very satisfied and 5 indicating half-half. How would you rate? [Interviewer to read out each item, question order of items 1 to 5 to be randomized by computer]

	(0-10)	Don't know / hard to say	Refuse to answer
Issues on free kindergarten education policy			
Controversies over Primary 3 Territory-wide System Assessment (TSA)			
Contract teacher issues			
Falling number of secondary students			
Allocation of educational resources			
Overall performance in administering education policies			

[Q4] Which of the following do you think are the most important qualities for a Secretary for Education? Please choose at most 3 options. (Read out first 7 options, order to be randomized by computer, 3 answers at most)

Can handle crises quickly

Familiar with education policies

With integrity and accountable / Would not shift responsibility to others

Follow the instructions of the Chief Executive

Have a sense of mission towards education

Can maintain close communication and good relationship with Legislative Councillors

Receptive to suggestions and public views

Other qualities: _____ (Please specify)

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

[Q5] Do you think the administration of Eddie Ng Hak-kim as the Secretary for Education has affected your confidence in the development of education in Hong Kong? If yes, has your confidence increased or decreased? [Interviewer to probe intensity]

Yes, greatly increased

Yes, slightly increased

No effect

Yes, slightly decreased

Yes, greatly decreased

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

[Q6] Do you think the amount of pressure Hong Kong **teachers** are facing is big or small? Please rate on a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 indicating very small amount of pressure or no pressure, 10 indicating very big amount of pressure and 5 indicating half-half.

_____ (0-10)

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

[Q7] Do you think the amount of pressure Hong Kong **students** are facing is big or small? Please rate on a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 indicating very small amount of pressure or no pressure, 10 indicating very big amount of pressure and 5 indicating half-half.

_____ (0-10)

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

Part IV Personal Information

We would like to know some of your personal particulars for aggregate analysis. Please be assured that the information you provide is anonymous and will be kept strictly confidential.

[DM1] Gender

Male
Female

[DM2a] Age

____ (Input exact figure)
Refuse to answer

[DM2b] [Only ask those who refused to disclose their exact age] Age interval [Interviewers can read out the intervals]

18 – 19
20 – 29
30 – 39
40 – 49
50 – 59
60 – 69
70 or above
Refuse to answer

[DM3] Education attainment

Primary or below
Secondary
Matriculation
Tertiary, non-degree
Tertiary, degree
Postgraduate or above
Refuse to answer

[DM4] Type of school

Kindergartens

Primary schools – Government / Government aided

Primary schools – Direct Subsidy Scheme

Primary schools – Private (non-international schools)

Primary schools – International schools (e.g. ESF schools)

Secondary schools – Government / Government aided

Secondary schools – Direct Subsidy Scheme

Secondary schools – Private (non-international schools)

Secondary schools – International schools (e.g. ESF schools)

Tertiary institutes (including institutes offering associate degree / higher diploma / Diploma Yi
Jin programmes, IVE, member institutions of the VTC, etc.)

Special schools

Private schools offering non-formal curriculum (tutorial schools, computer schools, language
schools, etc.)

Retired

Others / Cannot be grouped: _____ (Please specify)

Refuse to answer

[DM5] Length of service as a teacher (before retirement)

_____ (Input exact figure)

1-5 years

6-10 years

11-20 years

21-30 years

31-40 years

41 years or above

Refuse to answer

The interview is finished. Thank you for your time. If you have any question regarding this interview, you can call xxxx-xxxx to talk to our supervisors or xxxx-xxxx during office hours to ask about your rights as a participant. Good-bye.

立法會葉建源議員辦事處委託
香港大學民意研究計劃

進行

香港教育局局長及教育問題意見調查

公眾部分調查問卷

2016年5月23日

第一部分 自我介紹

喂，先生／小姐／太太你好，我姓 X，係香港大學民意研究計劃嘅訪問員嚟嘅，我哋受立法會議員葉建源先生嘅委託，而家進行緊一項有關香港教育局局長同教育問題嘅調查，我哋只會阻你大概 5 分鐘時間，請問你願唔願意接受我哋訪問呢？

願意 →S1

唔願意 →終止訪問，多謝，拜拜

請你放心，你嘅電話號碼係經由我哋嘅電腦隨機抽樣抽中嘅，問卷係唔記名嘅，而你提供嘅資料係會絕對保密，並只會用作綜合分析。如果你對今次嘅訪問有任何疑問，你可以打去熱線電話 XXXX-XXXX 同我哋嘅督導員張先生或陳小姐聯絡。如果你想知多啲關於參與調查嘅權利，你可以喺辦公時間致電 XXXX-XXXX 向香港大學研究操守委員會查詢。為左保障數據嘅真確性，我哋嘅訪問可能會被錄音，但只會用作內部參考，並會喺六個月內銷毀。而家我哋開始訪問。

[S1] 請問你嘅住宅電話號碼係唔係 XXXX-XXXX？

係 →S2

唔係 →終止訪問，多謝，拜拜

第二部分 選出被訪者

[S2] 呢份問卷嘅訪問對象係 18 歲或以上嘅香港居民，請問你屋企宜家有幾多位屬於呢個組別嘅呢？【如果戶中有合資格嘅被訪者，訪問告終；多謝合作，收線】

有一位 →開始訪問 [如合資格家庭成員不是接聽電話者，請邀請合資格家庭成員聽電話並重覆自我介紹]

有多過一位，____位 →S3

冇 →終止訪問，多謝，拜拜

拒絕回答 →終止訪問，多謝，拜拜

[S3] 因為多過一位合資格嘅家庭成員，我想請即將生日嗰位嚟聽電話。請問可唔可以呢？【訪問員可舉例說明：「例如有冇 5/6 月或未來三個月內生日嘅人？」】

可以，接聽電話者係被訪者 →開始訪問

可以，其他家人係被訪者 →開始訪問 [訪問員：請重覆自我介紹，開始訪問前必須讀出「為左保障數據嘅真確性，訪問可能會被錄音，但只會用作內部參考，並會喺六個月內銷毀。」]

被選中家庭成員不在家／沒空 →另約時間再致電

唔可以，接聽電話者拒絕給被選中家庭成員聽電話 →終止訪問，多謝，拜拜

唔可以，被選中家庭成員拒絕接受訪問 →終止訪問，多謝，拜拜

第三部分 問卷主體部分

[Q1] 請你用 0 至 100 分評價你對教育局局長吳克儉先生既支持程度，0 分代表絕對唔支持，100 分代表絕對支持，50 分代表一半半，你會俾幾多分教育局局長吳克儉呢？
(如被訪者不能評分，請訪員追問：咁請問你有冇聽過吳克儉呢個名呢?)

_____ (0-100 分)

唔識佢 / 從未聽過吳克儉

唔知 / 難講

拒答

[Q2] 假設明天你有權投票決定續任或者罷免吳克儉作為教育局局長，你會投續任、罷免、定棄權票？

續任票

罷免票

棄權票

拒答

[Q3] 請你話俾我知你有幾滿意或唔滿意教育局局長吳克儉嘅以下事件嘅施政表現？請你用 0 至 10 分表示，0 分代表非常唔滿意，10 分代表非常滿意，5 分代表一半半，你會俾幾多分？[訪員讀出每項，1-5 項次序由電腦隨機排列]

	(0-10 分)	唔知 / 難講	拒答
處理免費幼兒教育政策嘅問題			
處理小三 TSA (即全港性系統評估) 爭議			
處理合約教師問題			
處理中學學生人數下降嘅問題			
處理教育資源分配問題			
處理教育政策嘅總體表現			

[Q4] 你認為以下邊啲係教育局局長最需要具備嘅條件？請選最多 3 項。[讀出首 7 項答案，次序由電腦隨機排列，最多選三項]

能迅速處理危機

熟悉教育政策

有誠信肯承擔 / 不會逃避責任

遵從行政長官指令

對教育有使命感

與立法會議員有緊密溝通及良好關係

肯聽取意見，回應訴求

其他條件：_____ (請註明)

唔知 / 難講

拒答

[Q5] 你認為教育局局長吳克儉在任期間嘅施政，有冇影響你對香港教育發展嘅信心？如果有，係增加定減少？[訪員追問程度]

有，大大增加

有，略為增加

冇影響

有，略為減少

有，大大減少

唔知 / 難講

拒答

[Q6] 你認為現時香港**教師**面對嘅壓力係屬於大定係細呢？請你用 0 至 10 分表示，0 分代表非常細或完全冇壓力，10 分代表非常大壓力，5 分代表一半半，你會俾幾多分？

____ (0-10 分)

唔知 / 難講

拒答

[Q7] 你認為現時香港**學生**面對嘅壓力係屬於大定係細呢？請你用 0 至 10 分表示，0 分代表非常細或完全冇壓力，10 分代表非常大壓力，5 分代表一半半，你會俾幾多分？

____ (0-10 分)

唔知 / 難講

拒答

第四部分 個人資料

我哋想請問您一啲簡單嘅個人資料以作綜合分析，你所提供嘅資料係唔記名同埋會絕對保密，請放心。

[DM1] 性別

男
女

[DM2a] 年齡

____ (入實數)
拒答

[DM2b] 【只問不肯透露準確年齡被訪者】年齡 (範圍) [訪問員可讀出範圍]

18 – 19 歲
20 – 29 歲
30 – 39 歲
40 – 49 歲
50 – 59 歲
60 – 69 歲
70 歲或以上
拒答

[DM3] 教育程度

小學或以下
中學
預科
專上非學位
專上學位
研究院或以上
拒答

[DM4] 職業

老闆、經理及行政人員

專業人員

輔助專業人員

文員

服務工作人員

商店銷售人員

漁農業熟練工人

手工藝及有關人員

機台及機器操作員及裝配員

司機

非技術工人

學生 →[Skip to end]

家庭主婦 →[Skip to end]

已退休 →[Skip to end]

不能辨別

失業 / 待業 / 其他非在職 → [Skip to end]

其他

拒答

[DM5] 每月個人收入

沒有收入

HK\$5,000 以下

HK\$5,000 – 7,099

HK\$7,100 – 9,999

HK\$10,000 – 14,999

HK\$15,000 – 19,999

HK\$20,000 – 29,999

HK\$30,000 – 39,999

HK\$40,000 – 49,999

HK\$50,000 或以上

不穩定

拒答

問卷已經完成，多謝您接受我哋嘅訪問。如果你對今次嘅訪問有任何疑問，你可以打去熱線電話 xxxx-xxxx 同我哋嘅督導員聯絡，或者喺辦公時間打去熱線電話 xxxx-xxxx 查詢有關參與研究嘅權利。拜拜。

立法會葉建源議員辦事處委託
香港大學民意研究計劃

進行

香港教育局局長及教育問題意見調查

教師部分調查問卷

2016年5月23日

第一部分 自我介紹

喂，你好，我姓 X，係香港大學民意研究計劃嘅訪問員嚟嘅，而家受教協副會長立法會議員葉建源先生嘅委託，進行緊一項有關香港教育局局長同教育問題嘅調查，我哋只會阻你大概 5 分鐘時間，請問你願唔願意接受我哋訪問呢？

願意 →S1

唔願意 →終止訪問，多謝，拜拜

請你放心，你嘅電話號碼係由委託機構提供並經由我哋嘅電腦隨機抽樣抽中嘅，問卷係唔記名嘅，而你提供嘅資料係會絕對保密，並只會用作綜合分析。如果你對今次嘅訪問有任何疑問，你可以打去熱線電話 XXXX-XXXX 同我哋嘅督導員張先生或陳小姐聯絡。如果你想知多啲關於參與調查嘅權利，你可以喺辦公時間致電 XXXX-XXXX 向香港大學研究操守委員會查詢。為左保障數據嘅真確性，我哋嘅訪問可能會被錄音，但只會用作內部參考，並會喺六個月內銷毀。而家我哋開始訪問。

[S1] 請問你嘅電話號碼係唔係 XXXX-XXXX？

係 →S2

唔係 →終止訪問，多謝，拜拜

第二部分 選出被訪者

[S2] 呢份問卷嘅訪問對象係教協會員，請問你係唔係教協會員呢？

係 →開始訪問

唔係 →終止訪問，多謝，拜拜

拒絕回答 →終止訪問，多謝，拜拜

第三部分 問卷主體部分

[Q1] 請你用 0 至 100 分評價你對教育局局長吳克儉先生既支持程度，0 分代表絕對唔支持，100 分代表絕對支持，50 分代表一半半，你會俾幾多分教育局局長吳克儉呢？
(如被訪者不能評分，請訪員追問：咁請問你有冇聽過吳克儉呢個名呢?)

_____ (0-100 分)

唔識佢 / 從未聽過吳克儉

唔知 / 難講

拒答

[Q2] 假設明天你有權投票決定續任或者罷免吳克儉作為教育局局長，你會投續任、罷免、定棄權票？

續任票

罷免票

棄權票

拒答

[Q3] 請你話俾我知你有幾滿意或唔滿意教育局局長吳克儉嘅以下事件嘅施政表現？請你用 0 至 10 分表示，0 分代表非常唔滿意，10 分代表非常滿意，5 分代表一半半，你會俾幾多分？[訪員讀出每項，1-5 項次序由電腦隨機排列]

	(0-10 分)	唔知 / 難講	拒答
處理免費幼兒教育政策嘅問題			
處理小三 TSA (即全港性系統評估) 爭議			
處理合約教師問題			
處理中學學生人數下降嘅問題			
處理教育資源分配問題			
處理教育政策嘅總體表現			

[Q4] 你認為以下邊啲係教育局局長最需要具備嘅條件？請選最多 3 項。[讀出首 7 項答案，次序由電腦隨機排列，最多選三項]

能迅速處理危機

熟悉教育政策

有誠信肯承擔 / 不會逃避責任

遵從行政長官指令

對教育有使命感

與立法會議員有緊密溝通及良好關係

肯聽取意見，回應訴求

其他條件：_____ (請註明)

唔知 / 難講

拒答

[Q5] 你認為教育局局長吳克儉在任期間嘅施政，有冇影響你對香港教育發展嘅信心？如果有，係增加定減少？[訪員追問程度]

有，大大增加

有，略為增加

冇影響

有，略為減少

有，大大減少

唔知 / 難講

拒答

[Q6] 你認為現時香港**教師**面對嘅壓力係屬於大定係細呢？請你用 0 至 10 分表示，0 分代表非常細或完全冇壓力，10 分代表非常大壓力，5 分代表一半半，你會俾幾多分？

_____ (0-10 分)

唔知 / 難講

拒答

[Q7] 你認為現時香港**學生**面對嘅壓力係屬於大定係細呢？請你用 0 至 10 分表示，0 分代表非常細或完全冇壓力，10 分代表非常大壓力，5 分代表一半半，你會俾幾多分？

_____ (0-10 分)

唔知 / 難講

拒答

第四部分 個人資料

我哋想請問您一啲簡單嘅個人資料以作綜合分析，你所提供嘅資料係唔記名同埋會絕對保密，請放心。

[DM1] 性別

男
女

[DM2a] 年齡

____ (入實數)
拒答

[DM2b] 【只問不肯透露準確年齡被訪者】 年齡 (範圍) [訪問員可讀出範圍]

18 – 19 歲
20 – 29 歲
30 – 39 歲
40 – 49 歲
50 – 59 歲
60 – 69 歲
70 歲或以上
拒答

[DM3] 教育程度

小學或以下
中學
預科
專上非學位
專上學位
研究院或以上
拒答

[DM4] 任教學校類別

幼稚園

小學 - 官立/政府資助

小學 - 直資

小學 - 私立 (非國際學校)

小學 - 國際學校 (如英基等)

中學 - 官立/政府資助

中學 - 直資

中學 - 私立 (非國際學校)

中學 - 國際學校 (如英基等)

大專院校 (包括提供副學士/高級文憑/毅進的院校、IVE、職業訓練局成員等)

特殊學校

非正規私校 (補習學校、電腦學校、語言學校等)

已退休

其他或不能分類，請註明：

拒答

[DM5] (退休前) 任教年資

_____ (入實數)

1-5 年

6-10 年

11-20 年

21-30 年

31-40 年

41 年或以上

拒答

問卷已經完成，多謝您接受我哋嘅訪問。如果你對今次嘅訪問有任何疑問，你可以打去熱線電話 xxxx-xxxx 同我哋嘅督導員聯絡，或者喺辦公時間打去熱線電話 xxxx-xxxx 查詢有關參與研究嘅權利。拜拜。