



HONG KONG PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH INSTITUTE

香港民意研究所

Hong Kong Public Opinion Program of Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute

PopPanel Research Report No. 62 cum “We Hongkongers” Research Report No. 45

Survey Date: 24 February to 1 March 2021

Release Date: 5 March 2021

Copyright of this report was generated by the Hong Kong Public Opinion Program (HKPOP) and opened to the world. HKPOP proactively promotes open data, open technology and the free flow of ideas, knowledge and information. The predecessor of HKPOP was the Public Opinion Programme at The University of Hong Kong (HKUPOP). “POP” in this publication may refer to HKPOP or HKUPOP as the case may be.

Research Background

"We Hongkongers" is an initiative advocated by Hong Kong Public Opinion Program (HKPOP) of Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute (HKPORI), with the support of many members of the civic society. With reference to the petition website "We the People" hosted by the White House of the United States, "We Hongkongers" aims to reflect public sentiment by conducting scientific research on any issues raised by Hong Kong citizens: https://www.pori.hk/wehongkongers_factsheet_20191017_chi.

"We Hongkongers" Project officially started on 17 October 2019, in the form of intensive rolling surveys. A total of 12 reports were published as of December 23, 2019. In mid-May 2020, in response to the rapid changes in Hong Kong's political and public sentiment, HKPOP redeveloped the "We Hongkongers" Project. Coupled with the rapid development of the "HKPOP Panel" established by PORI in July 2019, PORI decided to launch the "We Hongkongers Panel Survey" to further strengthen interaction with the public and as well as collect and analyze public opinion and there are 29 reports in total. In January 2021, PORI redeveloped the "We Hongkongers" Project again to strengthen the cooperation with non-governmental organizations, civil society organizations, concern groups and professional organizations, and the results will be released in the form of mini-forums to initiate policy discussions.

This report also represents Report No. 62 under HKPOP Panel survey series, as well as Report No. 45 under the "We Hongkongers" Project Series. The research is co-organized with the Hong Kong Social Workers' General Union on the theme "Lump Sum Grant (LSG) Subvention System".

HKPOP sent out emails to all panel members at the beginning of the survey, inviting them to fill in the questionnaire at the designated online platform. Members were allowed to make repeated submissions, while only the last submission of each individual member would be used for analysis.

Contact Information

Herewith the contact information of the "We Hongkongers" Panel Survey:

Table 1: Detailed Contact Information

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Survey method | Online survey |
| Target population | HKPOP Panel samples, namely Hong Kong People Representative Panel (Probability-based Panel) and Hong Kong People Volunteer Panel (Non-probability-based Panel) |
| Weighting method | The figures are rim-weighted according to 1) gender-age distribution, educational attainment (highest level attended) distribution, economic activity status distribution of Hong Kong population and by District Councils population figures from Census and Statistics Department; 2) Voting results of District Councils Election from Registration and Electoral Office; 3) rating distribution of Chief Executive from regular tracking surveys. |
| Date of survey | February 24, 1pm – March 1, 3pm |
| Total sample size | 6,517 |
| Response rate | 6.8% |
| Sampling error ^[1] | Sampling error of percentages at +/-1% at 95% confidence level |

[1] All error figures in this release are calculated at 95% confidence level. "95% confidence level" means that if we were to repeat a certain survey 100 times with different random samples, we would expect 95 times having the population parameter within the respective error margins calculated. Because of sampling errors, when quoting percentages, journalists should refrain from reporting decimal places, whereas one decimal place can be used when quoting rating figures.

PopPanel Composition

Regarding data collection, survey data from both the Hong Kong People Representative Panel and Hong Kong People Volunteer Panel were collected in the form of online questionnaire.

Among them, the Hong Kong People Representative Panel comes from members of the "HKPOP Panel" recruited in regular random telephone surveys. HKPOP uses "HKPOP Panel" as a framework for conducting surveys for different research projects, any eligible family member in the household may be invited to participate in a specific research.

Meanwhile, members of the Hong Kong People Volunteer Panel are recruited online. Citizens only need to self-register in HKPORI website to participate in online questionnaires.

All panel data collected will be adjusted using rim-weighting, to minimize the effects of self-selection bias or participation bias. Details are documented in the Weighting Procedure section.

Response Rate

HKPOP adopts a set of contact definition in compliance with most international standards. Historically, the social research community in Hong Kong has developed its own set of contact rates, cooperation rates, response rates, and so on. HKPOP normally reports the "success rate" for online surveys.

The calculation of the success rates in this study refers to the following tables.

Table 2: Calculation of success rate of the HKPOP Panel (by HKPOP definition)

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Success rate | |
| = | $\frac{\text{Successful cases}}{\text{Panel size of the Hong Kong People Representative Panel}} \times 100.0\%$ |
| = | $\frac{6,517}{95,546} \times 100.0\%$ |
| = | 6.8% |

Weighting Procedure

HKPOP has continuously adopted and enhanced its weighting method over the past few decades. For this survey, HKPOP adopts a "2 by 5 by 2 by 4 by 18 by 3 by 13" weighting procedure involving seven variables, namely, gender, age, educational attainment, economic activity status, district (18 cells), voting record (3 cells) and rating of Chief Executive (13 cells). Basically, the raw data of practically all random telephone surveys conducted by HKPOP are rim-weighted by the figures obtained from the Hong Kong Census and Statistics Department and/or Registration and Electoral Office so that the marginal distribution of the sample in terms of gender, age, educational attainment and economic activity status would match with that of the general population figures from the Hong Kong Census and Statistics Department. The marginal distribution of the sample in terms of district and voting record would match that of the general population figures from the Hong Kong Census and Statistics Department and/or Registration and Electoral Office. The marginal distribution of the sample in terms of "rating of Chief Executive" would match that of the general population in HKPOP's regular tracking surveys. This rim-weighting method (sometimes called raking) is found to be the most practicable method in processing HKPOP's survey data.

Specifically, the gender and age groupings used for weighting are as follows:

- Male 12-29
- Male 30-39
- Male 40-49
- Male 50-59
- Male 60 or above
- Female 12-29
- Female 30-39
- Female 40-49
- Female 50-59
- Female 60 or above

The educational attainments used for weighting are as follows:

- Secondary or below
- Tertiary or above

The economic activity statuses used for weighting are as follows:

- Working population / Others
- Home-makers / Housewives
- Students
- Retired person

The districts used for weighting are as follows:

- Central and Western
- Wan Chai
- Eastern
- Southern
- Yau Tsim Mong
- Sham Shui Po
- Kowloon City
- Wong Tai Sin
- Kwun Tong
- Tsuen Wan
- Tuen Mun
- Yuen Long
- North
- Tai Po
- Sai Kung
- Sha Tin
- Kwai Tsing
- Islands

The voting records used for weighting are as follows:

- Candidates of pro-democracy camp
- Candidates of non-pro-democracy camp
- Did not vote / blank/void vote

The "rating of Chief Executive" groupings used for weighting are as follows:

- 0 mark
- 1-9 mark(s)
- 10-19 marks
- 20-29 marks
- 30-39 marks
- 40-49 marks
- 50 marks
- 51-60 marks
- 61-70 marks
- 71-80 marks
- 81-90 marks
- 91-99 marks
- 100 marks

Quantitative Analysis Results

Quantitative analysis results of the “We Hongkongers” Panel Survey, after applying the standard weighting procedures, are as follows, all questions listed hereby are opinion questions:

Table 3: Q1 Survey results; Survey period: 24/2-1/3/2021

| Q1 How much do you know about the “lump sum grant” system in the social welfare sector? | Combined ^[2] (Base=6,214) |
|---|---|
| A lot | 3% |
| Quite a bit | 13% |
| Half-half | 41% |
| Somewhat little | 17% |
| Very little / not at all | 19% |
| Don't know / hard to say | 7% |
| Mean^[3] | 2.6 |

[2] The aggregated figures come from adjusting the by-group weighted figures using ratio of “pan-democratic” vs “non-pan-democratic” collected in regular tracking survey.

[3] The mean value is calculated by quantifying all individual responses into 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 marks according to their degree of positive level, where 1 is the lowest and 5 the highest, and then calculate the sample mean.

Chart 1: Q1 Combined chart




Table 4: Q2 Survey results; Survey period: 24/2-1/3/2021

| | | |
|---|--|-------|
| Q2 Overall speaking, how positive or negative do you think the effect of the lump sum grant system has on the development of social services? | Combined^[4] (Base=6,216) | |
| Very positive | 1% | } 13% |
| Somewhat positive | 12% | |
| Half-half | 33% | |
| Somewhat negative | 21% | } 30% |
| Very negative | 8% | |
| Don't know / hard to say | 24% | |
| Mean^[5] | 2.7 | |

[4] The aggregated figures come from adjusting the by-group weighted figures using ratio of "pan-democratic" vs "non-pan-democratic" collected in regular tracking survey.

[5] The mean value is calculated by quantifying all individual responses into 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 marks according to their degree of positive level, where 1 is the lowest and 5 the highest, and then calculate the sample mean.

Chart 2: Q2 Combined chart




Table 5: Q3 Survey results; Survey period: 24/2-1/3/2021

| | | |
|--|--|--------------|
| Q3 How much do you support or oppose the implementation of "equal pay for equal work" in the social welfare sector? ^[6] | Combined^[7] (Base=1,404) | |
| Strongly support | 35% | } 62% |
| Somewhat support | 26% | |
| Half-half | 18% | |
| Somewhat oppose | 9% | } 19% |
| Strongly oppose | 11% | |
| Don't know / hard to say | 1% | |
| Mean^[8] | 3.7 | |

[6] Only include those who know "A lot" / "Quite a bit" about the "lump sum grant" system in the social welfare sector.

[7] The aggregated figures come from adjusting the by-group weighted figures using ratio of "pan-democratic" vs "non-pan-democratic" collected in regular tracking survey.

[8] The mean value is calculated by quantifying all individual responses into 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 marks according to their degree of positive level, where 1 is the lowest and 5 the highest, and then calculate the sample mean.

Chart 3: Q3 Combined chart




Table 6: Q4 Survey results; Survey period: 24/2-1/3/2021


| Q4 How much do you support or oppose the implementation of a system that recognises work experience in the social welfare sector? ^[9] | Combined^[10] (Base=1,404) | |
|--|---|--------------|
| Strongly support | 20% | } 56% |
| Somewhat support | 36% | |
| Half-half | 26% | |
| Somewhat oppose | 9% | } 16% |
| Strongly oppose | 6% | |
| Don't know / hard to say | 2% | |
| Mean^[11] | 3.6 | |

[9] Only include those who know “A lot” / “Quite a bit” about the “lump sum grant” system in the social welfare sector.

[10] The aggregated figures come from adjusting the by-group weighted figures using ratio of “pan-democratic” vs “non-pan-democratic” collected in regular tracking survey.

[11] The mean value is calculated by quantifying all individual responses into 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 marks according to their degree of positive level, where 1 is the lowest and 5 the highest, and then calculate the sample mean.

Chart 4: Q4 Combined chart



Appendices

Appendix 1: Demographic profile of respondents

| Gender: | Pro-democracy camp supporters | | | | Non-pro-democracy camp supporters # | | | | Total | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|-------------------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|------------|--------|-----------------|--------|
| | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | |
| | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % |
| Male | 2,943 | 53.6% | 1,005 | 46.7% | 397 | 54.1% | 1,936 | 52.0% | 3,340 | 53.7% | 2,941 | 50.1% |
| Female | 2,528 | 46.1% | 1,126 | 52.4% | 334 | 45.5% | 1,787 | 48.0% | 2,862 | 46.0% | 2,913 | 49.6% |
| Other | 18 | 0.3% | 19 | 0.9% | 3 | 0.4% | 1 | <0.1% | 21 | 0.3% | 20 | 0.3% |
| Total | 5,489 | 100.0% | 2,150 | 100.0% | 734 | 100.0% | 3,724 | 100.0% | 6,223 | 100.0% | 5,874 | 100.0% |
| Missing case(s) | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |

| Age: | Pro-democracy camp supporters | | | | Non-pro-democracy camp supporters # | | | | Total | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|-------------------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|------------|--------|-----------------|--------|
| | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | |
| | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % |
| 12 - 29 | 903 | 16.5% | 665 | 31.0% | 77 | 10.5% | 469 | 12.6% | 980 | 15.8% | 1,134 | 19.3% |
| 30 - 39 | 1,421 | 25.9% | 348 | 16.3% | 170 | 23.2% | 535 | 14.4% | 1,591 | 25.6% | 883 | 15.1% |
| 40 - 49 | 1,400 | 25.5% | 345 | 16.1% | 169 | 23.0% | 601 | 16.2% | 1,569 | 25.2% | 946 | 16.1% |
| 50 - 59 | 1,122 | 20.5% | 474 | 22.1% | 190 | 25.9% | 1,504 | 40.4% | 1,312 | 21.1% | 1,978 | 33.7% |
| 60 or above | 639 | 11.6% | 311 | 14.5% | 128 | 17.4% | 614 | 16.5% | 767 | 12.3% | 926 | 15.8% |
| Total | 5,485 | 100.0% | 2,143 | 100.0% | 734 | 100.0% | 3,724 | 100.0% | 6,219 | 100.0% | 5,868 | 100.0% |
| Missing case(s) | 4 | 0% | 6 | 0% | 0 | | 0 | | 4 | | 6 | |

| Education attainment: | Pro-democracy camp supporters | | | | Non-pro-democracy camp supporters # | | | | Total | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|-------------------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|------------|--------|-----------------|--------|
| | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | |
| | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % |
| Primary or below | 12 | 0.2% | 5 | 0.2% | 4 | 0.5% | 12 | 0.3% | 16 | 0.3% | 16 | 0.3% |
| Secondary | 815 | 14.9% | 742 | 34.5% | 162 | 22.1% | 1,183 | 31.8% | 977 | 15.7% | 1,925 | 32.8% |
| Tertiary or above | 4,657 | 84.9% | 1,402 | 65.2% | 567 | 77.4% | 2,529 | 67.9% | 5,224 | 84.0% | 3,931 | 66.9% |
| Total | 5,484 | 100.0% | 2,149 | 100.0% | 733 | 100.0% | 3,723 | 100.0% | 6,217 | 100.0% | 5,872 | 100.0% |
| Missing case(s) | 5 | 0% | 1 | 0% | 1 | | 1 | | 6 | | 2 | |

| Occupation: | Pro-democracy camp supporters | | | | Non-pro-democracy camp supporters # | | | | Total | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|-------------------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|------------|--------|-----------------|--------|
| | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | |
| | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % |
| Administrators and professionals | 2,227 | 40.6% | 356 | 16.6% | 259 | 35.4% | 842 | 22.7% | 2,486 | 40.0% | 1,198 | 20.4% |
| Clerks and service workers | 1,498 | 27.3% | 552 | 25.7% | 194 | 26.5% | 852 | 22.9% | 1,692 | 27.2% | 1,404 | 23.9% |
| Workers | 114 | 2.1% | 108 | 5.0% | 31 | 4.2% | 306 | 8.3% | 145 | 2.3% | 414 | 7.1% |
| Students | 238 | 4.3% | 459 | 21.4% | 12 | 1.6% | 182 | 4.9% | 250 | 4.0% | 642 | 10.9% |
| Home-makers / housewives | 223 | 4.1% | 212 | 9.9% | 28 | 3.8% | 199 | 5.4% | 251 | 4.0% | 411 | 7.0% |
| Others | 1,179 | 21.5% | 462 | 21.5% | 208 | 28.4% | 1,332 | 35.9% | 1,387 | 22.3% | 1,794 | 30.6% |
| Total | 5,479 | 100.0% | 2,149 | 100.0% | 732 | 100.0% | 3,713 | 100.0% | 6,211 | 100.0% | 5,862 | 100.0% |
| Missing case(s) | 10 | | <1 | | 2 | | 11 | | 12 | | 12 | |

| District: | Pro-democracy camp supporters | | | | Non-pro-democracy camp supporters # | | | | Total | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|-------------------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|------------|--------|-----------------|--------|
| | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | |
| | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % |
| Central & Western | 239 | 4.4% | 19 | 0.9% | 35 | 4.8% | 121 | 3.3% | 274 | 4.4% | 140 | 2.4% |
| Wan Chai | 110 | 2.0% | 20 | 0.9% | 21 | 2.9% | 115 | 3.1% | 131 | 2.1% | 135 | 2.3% |
| Eastern | 510 | 9.3% | 200 | 9.4% | 78 | 10.7% | 417 | 11.2% | 588 | 9.5% | 617 | 10.5% |
| Southern | 196 | 3.6% | 10 | 0.5% | 28 | 3.8% | 133 | 3.6% | 224 | 3.6% | 143 | 2.4% |
| Yau Tsim Mong | 223 | 4.1% | 92 | 4.3% | 32 | 4.4% | 84 | 2.3% | 255 | 4.1% | 176 | 3.0% |
| Sham Shui Po | 281 | 5.1% | 145 | 6.8% | 43 | 5.9% | 288 | 7.7% | 324 | 5.2% | 432 | 7.4% |
| Kowloon City | 296 | 5.4% | 51 | 2.4% | 48 | 6.6% | 248 | 6.7% | 344 | 5.6% | 299 | 5.1% |
| Wong Tai Sin | 278 | 5.1% | 89 | 4.2% | 35 | 4.8% | 169 | 4.6% | 313 | 5.1% | 258 | 4.4% |
| Kwun Tong | 407 | 7.5% | 333 | 15.6% | 60 | 8.2% | 304 | 8.2% | 467 | 7.5% | 636 | 10.9% |
| Tsuen Wan | 250 | 4.6% | 89 | 4.2% | 33 | 4.5% | 156 | 4.2% | 283 | 4.6% | 245 | 4.2% |
| Tuen Mun | 348 | 6.4% | 164 | 7.7% | 49 | 6.7% | 228 | 6.1% | 397 | 6.4% | 393 | 6.7% |
| Yuen Long | 375 | 6.9% | 206 | 9.7% | 56 | 7.7% | 261 | 7.0% | 431 | 7.0% | 467 | 8.0% |
| North | 179 | 3.3% | 49 | 2.3% | 27 | 3.7% | 237 | 6.4% | 206 | 3.3% | 286 | 4.9% |
| Tai Po | 273 | 5.0% | 177 | 8.3% | 24 | 3.3% | 76 | 2.0% | 297 | 4.8% | 253 | 4.3% |
| Sai Kung | 434 | 8.0% | 87 | 4.1% | 46 | 6.3% | 312 | 8.4% | 480 | 7.8% | 399 | 6.8% |
| Sha Tin | 615 | 11.3% | 244 | 11.5% | 70 | 9.6% | 187 | 5.0% | 685 | 11.1% | 431 | 7.4% |
| Kwai Tsing | 313 | 5.7% | 112 | 5.2% | 31 | 4.2% | 271 | 7.3% | 344 | 5.6% | 383 | 6.5% |
| Islands | 130 | 2.4% | 42 | 2.0% | 15 | 2.1% | 114 | 3.1% | 145 | 2.3% | 156 | 2.7% |
| Total | 5,457 | 100.0% | 2,127 | 100.0% | 731 | 100.0% | 3,722 | 100.0% | 6,188 | 100.0% | 5,849 | 100.0% |
| Missing case(s) | 32 | | 23 | | 3 | | 2 | | 35 | | 24 | |

| Political inclination: | Pro-democracy camp supporters | | | | Non-pro-democracy camp supporters # | | | | Total | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|-------------------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|------------|--------|-----------------|--------|
| | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | |
| | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % |
| Pro-democracy camp | 2,986 | 54.4% | 1,346 | 62.6% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 2,986 | 48.0% | 1,346 | 22.9% |
| Pro-establishment camp | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 49 | 6.7% | 448 | 12.0% | 49 | 0.8% | 448 | 7.6% |
| Localist | 2,503 | 45.6% | 804 | 37.4% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 2,503 | 40.2% | 804 | 13.7% |
| Centrist | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 216 | 29.4% | 1,108 | 29.7% | 216 | 3.5% | 1,108 | 18.9% |
| Others | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| No political inclination / politically neutral / don't belong to any camp | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 469 | 63.9% | 2,169 | 58.2% | 469 | 7.5% | 2,169 | 36.9% |
| Don't know / hard to say | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Total | 5,489 | 100.0% | 2,150 | 100.0% | 734 | 100.0% | 3,724 | 100.0% | 6,223 | 100.0% | 5,874 | 100.0% |
| Missing case(s) | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |

| Voted political camp: | Pro-democracy camp supporters | | | | Non-pro-democracy camp supporters # | | | | Total | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|-------------------------------------|--------|-----------------|--------|------------|--------|-----------------|--------|
| | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | |
| | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % | Freq | % |
| Democratic | 5,240 | 95.8% | 1,082 | 50.3% | 452 | 61.7% | 544 | 14.7% | 5,692 | 91.8% | 1,625 | 27.8% |
| Non-democratic | 11 | 0.2% | 53 | 2.5% | 112 | 15.3% | 1,473 | 39.8% | 123 | 2.0% | 1,527 | 26.1% |
| Did not vote / blank vote / void vote / don't know / hard to say / refuse to answer | 135 | 2.5% | 381 | 17.7% | 126 | 17.2% | 1,052 | 28.4% | 261 | 4.2% | 1,433 | 24.5% |
| Not a registered voter | 81 | 1.5% | 632 | 29.4% | 42 | 5.7% | 629 | 17.0% | 123 | 2.0% | 1,261 | 21.6% |
| Total | 5,467 | 100.0% | 2,148 | 100.0% | 732 | 100.0% | 3,698 | 100.0% | 6,199 | 100.0% | 5,846 | 100.0% |

*(Only for respondents aged 18 or above or refuse to answer age)

Including pro-establishment camp supporters, centrist supporters, no political inclination / politically neutral / do not belong to any camp

Appendix 2: Contact Information

| | |
|-------------------------|---------------|
| Total valid samples | 6,517 |
| Survey period | 24/2-1/3/2021 |
| Success rate | 6.8% |
| Questionnaires sent out | 95,546 |
| Questionnaires received | 7,091 |
| Ineligible samples | 31 |
| Invalid samples | 268 |
| Incomplete samples | 275 |
| Standard error | 0.6% |
| Sampling error | 3.8% |

Appendix 3: Quantitative analyses

Q1 Survey results; Survey period: 24/2-1/3/2021

| Q1 How much do you know about the “lump sum grant” system in the social welfare sector? | Pro-democracy camp supporters | Non-pro-democracy camp supporters # | Total |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Percentages (Base=2,150) | Percentages (Base=3,724) | Percentages (Base=5,873) |
| A lot | 3.3% | 2.1% | 2.6% |
| } A lot/quite a bit | 14.9% | 15.9% | 15.5% |
| Quite a bit | 11.6% | 13.7% | 13.0% |
| Half-half | 40.5% | 41.4% | 41.0% |
| Somewhat little | 19.3% | 15.4% | 16.8% |
| } Little/not at all | 40.2% | 34.1% | 36.3% |
| Very little / not at all | 20.8% | 18.7% | 19.5% |
| Don't know / hard to say | 4.4% | 8.7% | 7.1% |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Mean values | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| Standard error of mean | <0.1 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
| Median | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| <i>Refuse to answer</i> | <1 | <1 | 0 |
| Net value (A lot/quite a bit- Little/not at all) | -25.3% | -18.2% | -20.8% |

Including pro-establishment camp supporters, centrist supporters, no political inclination / politically neutral / do not belong to any camp

Q2 Survey results; Survey period: 24/2-1/3/2021

| Q2 Overall speaking, how positive or negative do you think the effect of the lump sum grant system has on the development of social services? | Pro-democracy camp supporters | Non-pro-democracy camp supporters # | Total |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | Percentages (Base=2,136) | Percentages (Base=3,679) | Percentages (Base=5,815) |
| Very positive | 1.8% | 1.3% | 1.5% |
| Somewhat positive | 6.9% | 14.3% | 11.6% |
| Half-half | 24.4% | 38.1% | 33.0% |
| Somewhat negative | 28.3% | 17.1% | 21.2% |
| Very negative | 9.5% | 7.6% | 8.3% |
| Don't know / hard to say | 29.2% | 21.6% | 24.4% |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Mean values | 2.5 | 2.8 | 2.7 |
| Standard error of mean | <0.1 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
| Median | 2.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| <i>Refuse to answer</i> | 13 | 45 | 58 |
| Net value (Positive- Negative) | -29.2% | -9.0% | -16.4% |

Including pro-establishment camp supporters, centrist supporters, no political inclination / politically neutral / do not belong to any camp

Q3 Survey results; Survey period: 24/2-1/3/2021

| Q3 Suppose the government will hold the LegCo Election in September this year as scheduled, how fair or unfair do you think the election will be? * | Pro-democracy camp supporters | Non-pro-democracy camp supporters # | Total |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | Percentages (Base=321) | Percentages (Base=547) | Percentages (Base=867) |
| Strongly support } Support | 49.0% | 27.4% | 35.4% |
| Somewhat support | 22.3% | 28.4% | 26.1% |
| Half-half | 1.8% | 27.3% | 17.9% |
| Somewhat oppose } Oppose | 15.5% | 4.4% | 8.5% |
| Strongly oppose | 7.4% | 12.4% | 10.6% |
| Don't know / hard to say | 4.0% | 0.0% | 1.5% |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Mean values | 3.9 | 3.5 | 3.7 |
| Standard error of mean | 0.1 | 0.1 | <0.1 |
| Median | 5.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| <i>Refuse to answer</i> | 1829 | 3177 | 5,006 |
| Net value (Support- Oppose) | +48.3% | +38.9% | +42.4% |

Including pro-establishment camp supporters, centrist supporters, no political inclination / politically neutral / do not belong to any camp

* Only include those who know “A lot” / “Quite a bit” about the “lump sum grant” system in the social welfare sector.

Q4 Survey results; Survey period: 24/2-1/3/2021

| Q3 Suppose the government will hold the LegCo Election in September this year as scheduled, how fair or unfair do you think the election will be? * | Pro-democracy camp supporters | Non-pro-democracy camp supporters # | Total |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | Percentages (Base=320) | Percentages (Base=592) | Percentages (Base=912) |
| Strongly support } Support | 43.4% | 7.8% | 20.3% |
| Somewhat support | 20.9% | 44.4% | 36.2% |
| Half-half | 7.7% | 36.6% | 26.5% |
| Somewhat oppose } Oppose | 11.5% | 7.9% | 9.2% |
| Strongly oppose | 12.2% | 3.2% | 6.4% |
| Don't know / hard to say | 4.2% | 0.0% | 1.5% |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Mean values | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Standard error of mean | 0.1 | <0.1 | <0.1 |
| Median | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| <i>Refuse to answer</i> | 1829 | 3132 | 4,961 |
| Net value (Support- Oppose) | +40.5% | +41.1% | +40.9% |

Including pro-establishment camp supporters, centrist supporters, no political inclination / politically neutral / do not belong to any camp

* Only include those who know “A lot” / “Quite a bit” about the “lump sum grant” system in the social welfare sector.

Appendix 4: Survey questionnaire

HKPORI: We Hongkongers & Community Health Survey

Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute is politically neutral, we welcome different opinions. All personal data will be kept strictly confidential. You can fill in the questionnaire again at any time to express your latest views, and your last submission will be collated. For enquiries, please email us at panel@pori.hk.

Last updated: xxxx-xx-xx xx:xx

Tentative next update: xxxx-xx-xx

***Required**

(Registered member) Panel ID: *

(Please do not alter the pre-filled ID)

(Registered member) Invitation token: *

(Please do not alter the pre-filled token)

(New member) Please first register as a HKPOP Panel member at

<https://www.pori.hk/panel.html?lang=en> *

- Already registered as a member earlier (Please go to the survey platform by clicking on the designated hyperlink sent to you by email)
- Have just registered as a member
- Not yet registered as a member, and will register after completing the survey (Please note: Your response will be removed if you have not yet successfully registered as a member at the time of data analysis)

Eligibility Confirmation

(New member)

Email used / will be used in registration: *

Are you a Hong Kong resident aged 12 or above? *

- Yes
- No

We Hongkongers

How much do you know about the "lump sum grant" system in the social welfare sector?

- A lot → [Need to answer questions on next page](#)
- Quite a bit → [Need to answer questions on next page](#)
- Half-half → [Skip questions on next page](#)
- Somewhat little → [Skip questions on next page](#)
- Very little / not at all → [Skip questions on next page](#)
- Don't know / hard to say → [Skip questions on next page](#)

Overall speaking, how positive or negative do you think the effect of the lump sum grant system has on the development of social services?

- Very positive
- Somewhat positive
- Half-half
- Somewhat negative
- Very negative
- Don't know / hard to say

We Hongkongers

How much do you support or oppose the implementation of "equal pay for equal work" in the social welfare sector?

- Strongly support
- Somewhat support
- Half-half
- Somewhat oppose
- Strongly oppose
- Don't know / hard to say

How much do you support or oppose the implementation of a system that recognises work experience in the social welfare sector?

- Strongly support
- Somewhat support
- Half-half
- Somewhat oppose
- Strongly oppose
- Don't know / hard to say

Community Health

How likely do you think it is that you will contract novel coronavirus pneumonia over the next one month?

(Please select the closest answer. If you have another answer, please fill in the last item.)

- 0% chance (Certainly not)
- 0.001% chance (1 in 100,000)
- 0.01% chance (1 in 10,000)
- 0.1% chance (1 in 1,000)
- 1% chance (1 in 100)
- 5% chance (1 in 20)
- 10% chance (1 in 10)
- 15% chance
- 20% chance
- 25% chance
- 30% chance
- 35% chance
- 40% chance
- 45% chance
- 50% chance
- 60% chance
- 70% chance
- 80% chance
- 90% chance
- 100% chance (Certainly will)
- Don't know / hard to say
- Other: _____

Community Health**What do you think is the appropriate timing to completely lift the regulation prohibiting gatherings of more than a specific number of people in public places under the pandemic?**

(Please select the closest answer; If there is no suitable answer at all, please select "don't know / hard to say".)

- Should completely lift the regulation prohibiting gatherings of more than a specific number of people in public places unconditionally → [Skip questions related to this regulation](#)
- Number of recovered cases exceeds newly confirmed cases each day
- Number of newly confirmed cases each day falls to a single digit
- No more newly confirmed local case
- No more newly confirmed local or imported case
- No more newly confirmed local case in L consecutive days (Please input L in the next page)
- No more newly confirmed local and imported case in N consecutive days (Please input N in the next page)
- Don't know / hard to say

Community Health**How many consecutive days (the value of L mentioned before) with no more newly confirmed local case do you think there should be before it is appropriate to completely lift the regulation prohibiting gatherings of more than a specific number of people in public places?**

Community Health**How many consecutive days (the value of N mentioned before) with no more newly confirmed local and imported case do you think there should be before it is appropriate to completely lift the regulation prohibiting gatherings of more than a specific number of people in public places?**

Community Health**How many newly confirmed cases each day should there be before it would be appropriate to prohibit gatherings of more than 2 people?
[The pandemic should be at its worst; For reference, there are 12 newly confirmed cases on February 23, 2021]**

(To opt for "don't know / hard to say", please input 99999)

How many newly confirmed cases each day should there be before it would be appropriate to prohibit gatherings of more than 4 people?\n[The number of newly confirmed cases should be fewer than that in the previous question]

(To opt for "don't know / hard to say", please input 99999)

How many newly confirmed cases each day should there be before it would be appropriate to prohibit gatherings of more than 8 people?\n[The number of newly confirmed cases should be fewer than that in the previous question]

(To opt for "don't know / hard to say", please input 99999)

How many newly confirmed cases each day should there be before it would be appropriate to prohibit gatherings of more than 16 people?\n[The number of newly confirmed cases should be fewer than that in the previous question]

(To opt for "don't know / hard to say", please input 99999)

Please list combinations of [number of cases & number of people allowed in gatherings] that you think is appropriate in the field below:

Other Opinions

How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the government's performance in handling novel coronavirus pneumonia?

- Very much satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Half-half
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very much dissatisfied
- Don't know / hard to say

Please rate on a scale of 0 to 100 your extent of support to the Chief Executive Carrie Lam, with 0 indicating absolutely not supportive, 100 indicating absolutely supportive and 50 indicating half-half. How would you rate the Chief Executive Carrie Lam?

(To opt for "don't know / hard to say", please input 8888)

Generally speaking, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the current political condition in Hong Kong?

- Very much satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Half-half
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very much dissatisfied
- Don't know / hard to say

Generally speaking, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the current economic condition in Hong Kong?

- Very much satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Half-half
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very much dissatisfied
- Don't know / hard to say

Generally speaking, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the current livelihood condition in Hong Kong?

- Very much satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Half-half
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very much dissatisfied
- Don't know / hard to say

Other Opinions

Do you have any survey question to suggest for our surveys?

(If you do not have any suggestion, please leave this space blank.)

Do you have any needs which you want us to forward to your District Councillor or other persons you name here? (Please write down your contacts)

(The request you make here is not part of our study, we simply want to bridge people who need help with people who can help.)

Personal Information (Registered member)

The following section is about personal information, including: gender, age, educational attainment, occupation, political inclination, area of residence, voting behaviour in the 2019 District Council Election. If you have already provided relevant information in the previous PopPanel survey series and have nothing to add or update, you may skip these questions. We will use the past data you provided in this survey series for analysis.

- I have already provided my personal information, and has nothing to add or update (skip questions on personal information)
- Provide / update personal information now

Personal Information**Gender**

- Male
- Female
- Other

Age

Age range

(If prefer not to provide exact age)

- 12 - 14
- 15 - 17
- 18 - 19
- 20 - 24
- 25 - 29
- 30 - 34
- 35 - 39
- 40 - 44
- 45 - 49
- 50 - 54
- 55 - 59
- 60 - 64
- 65 - 69
- 70 or above

Educational attainment

(The highest level attended, regardless of whether you have completed the course, including what you are attending)

- Primary or below
- Lower secondary (Secondary 1 to 3)
- Upper secondary (Secondary 4 to 7 / DSE / Yi Jin)
- Tertiary: non-degree course (including diploma / certificate / sub-degree course)
- Tertiary: bachelor degree course
- Tertiary: postgraduate school or above

Occupation

(Owner / self-employed / freelance / part time / civil servant are not valid answers, please answer according to the job nature or content)

- Administrator and professional
- Clerical and service worker
- Production worker
- Student
- Home-maker / housewife
- Retired person
- Unemployed / between jobs / other non-employed
- Other: _____

Which of the following best describes your political inclination?

- Localist
- Pro-democracy camp
- Centrist
- Pro-establishment camp
- No political inclination / politically neutral / do not belong to any camp
- Don't know / hard to say
- Other: _____

Area of residence

- Central & Western District
- Wan Chai
- Eastern District
- Southern District
- Yau Tsim Mong
- Sham Shui Po
- Kowloon City
- Wong Tai Sin
- Kwun Tong
- Tsuen Wan
- Tuen Mun
- Yuen Long
- North District
- Tai Po
- Sai Kung
- Sha Tin
- Kwai Tsing
- Islands

Which candidate did you vote for in the 2019 District Council Election?

- Candidate of pro-democracy camp, including localist
- Candidate of non-pro-democracy camp, including pro-establishment camp and centrist
- Don't know / hard to say
- Blank / void vote
- Did not vote (was a registered voter of the election)
- Did not vote (was not a registered voter of the election)

End of Questionnaire

Thank you for completing the survey. For enquiries, please email us at panel@pori.hk or call us at 3844 3111 during office hours.