

2020 年 3 月 3 日 新聞公報

民研計劃發放財政預算案首輪跟進調查結果

特別宣佈

1. 香港民意研究計劃（香港民研）前身為香港大學民意研究計劃（港大民研）。公報內的「民研計劃」指的可以是香港民研或其前身港大民研。
2. 民研計劃今年進行的財政預算案調查，包括即時及跟進調查，可能是最後一次，來年會否繼續，要視乎公眾是否支持。

公報簡要

民研計劃於預算案發表後由真實訪問員以隨機抽樣電話訪問方式成功訪問了 512 名香港居民。調查顯示，今年財政預算案發表當日，市民的即時反應屬於正面，滿意淨值為正 19 個百分點，評分為 54.1 分。經過傳媒一兩天的報導後，反應轉為負面，滿意淨值急劇下跌 41 個百分點至負 22 個百分點，而滿意度評分亦急跌 13.9 分至 40.2 分，創 2008 年有紀錄以來新低，顯示市民在初步消化各方面的資訊和討論後，評價明顯轉差。此外，支持和反對立法會通過預算案的市民各佔 39%，20% 被訪市民滿意政府的理財策略，60% 表示不滿，滿意淨值為負 40 個百分點，創 2003 年以來新低。同時，52% 認為香港的稅制公平，認為不公平者則佔 35%。至於香港財富分配的情形，24% 認為合理，67% 則認為不合理。調查的實效回應比率為 70.3%。在 95% 置信水平下，調查的百分比誤差不超過 +/-4%，淨值誤差不超過 +/-8%，評分誤差不超過 +/-2.7。

樣本資料

調查日期	:	27-28/2/2020
調查方法	:	由真實訪問員進行隨機抽樣電話訪問
訪問對象	:	18 歲或以上操粵語的香港居民
成功樣本數目 ^[1]	:	512 (包括 255 個固網及 257 個手機樣本)
實效回應比率 ^[2]	:	70.3%
抽樣誤差 ^[3]	:	在 95% 置信水平下，百分比誤差不超過 +/-4%，淨值誤差不超過 +/-8%，評分誤差不超過 +/-2.7
加權方法	:	按照政府統計處提供的統計數字以「反覆多重加權法」作出調整。全港人口年齡及性別分佈統計數字來自《二零一八年年中人口數字》，而教育程度（最高就讀程度）及經濟活動身分統計數字則來自《香港的女性及男性 - 主要統計數字》（2018 年版）。

[1] 數字為調查的總樣本數目，個別題目則可能只涉及次樣本。有關數字請參閱下列數表內列出的樣本數目。

- [2] 民研計劃在 2017 年 9 月前以「整體回應比率」彙報樣本資料，2017 年 9 月開始則以「實效回應比率」彙報。2018 年 7 月，民研計劃再調整實效回應比率的計算方法，因此改變前後的回應比率不能直接比較。
- [3] 此公報中所有誤差數字均以 95% 置信水平計算。95% 置信水平，是指倘若以不同隨機樣本重複進行有關調查 100 次，則 95 次各自計算出的誤差範圍會包含人口真實數字。由於調查數字涉及抽樣誤差，傳媒引用百分比數字時，應避免使用小數點，在引用評分數字時，則可以使用一個小數點。

最新數據

以下是 2017 至 2020 年財政預算案的首輪跟進調查結果，與同年即時調查結果並列：

	即時調查 ^[4]	首輪跟進調查	變化
2020 年度			
調查日期	<u>26/2/2020</u>	<u>27-28/2/2020</u>	--
樣本數目 ^[5]	991	512	--
回應比率	75.5%	70.3%	--
對預算案的評價：滿意率 ^[6]	46%	28+/-4%	-18%^[7]
對預算案的評價：不滿率 ^[6]	27%	50+/-4%	+23%^[7]
滿意率淨值	19%	-22+/-8%	-41%^[7]
平均量值 ^[6]	3.2	2.5+/-0.1	-0.7^[7]
預算案滿意度評分	54.1	40.2+/-2.7	-13.9^[7]
2019 年度			
調查日期	<u>27/2/2019</u>	<u>28/2-1/3/2019</u>	--
樣本數目 ^[5]	561	512	--
回應比率	78.2%	67.8%	--
對預算案的評價：滿意率 ^[6]	23%	24%	+1%
對預算案的評價：不滿率 ^[6]	39%	50%	+11% ^[7]
滿意率淨值	-16%	-26%	-9%
平均量值 ^[6]	2.7	2.5	-0.1
預算案滿意度評分	47.1	43.1	-4.0 ^[7]
2018 年度			
調查日期	<u>28/2/2018</u>	<u>1-2/3/2018</u>	--
樣本數目 ^[5]	551	507	--
回應比率	67.5%	62.6%	--
對預算案的評價：滿意率 ^[6]	26%	31%	+5% ^[7]
對預算案的評價：不滿率 ^[6]	41%	54%	+13% ^[7]
滿意率淨值	-14%	-23%	-9% ^[7]
平均量值 ^[6]	2.7	2.5	-0.2 ^[7]
預算案滿意度評分	48.2	42.8	-5.4 ^[7]

	即時調查 ^[4]	首輪跟進調查	變化
2017 年度			
調查日期	<u>22/2/2017</u>	<u>23-24/2/2017</u>	--
樣本數目 ^[5]	502	506	--
回應比率	64.4%	70.4%	--
對預算案的評價：滿意率 ^[6]	33%	26%	-7% ^[7]
對預算案的評價：不滿率 ^[6]	18%	27%	+9% ^[7]
滿意率淨值	15%	0%	-15% ^[7]
平均量值 ^[6]	3.2	2.9	-0.3 ^[7]
預算案滿意度評分	55.7	52.6	-3.1 ^[7]

[4] 即時調查的題目會撇除未聞／不知道財政預算案內容的被訪者，表內數字已是次樣本數目。

[5] 民研計劃在 2020 年 3 月前彙報的次樣本數目為加權數字，2020 年 3 月開始則以原始數字彙報。

[6] 數字採自五等量尺。平均量值是把答案按照正面程度，以 1 分最低 5 分最高量化成為 1、2、3、4、5 分，再求取樣本平均數值。

[7] 該數字與上次調查結果的差異超過在 95% 置信水平的抽樣誤差，表示有關變化在統計學上表面成立。不過，變化在統計學上成立與否，並不同有關變化是否有實際用途或意義，而不同調查的加權方法亦可能有所不同。

今年財政預算案發表當日，市民的即時反應屬於正面，滿意淨值為正 19 個百分點，而市民對預算案的滿意度即時評分為 54.1 分。預算案發表後，經過傳媒一兩天的報導，反應轉為負面，最新滿意率為 28%，不滿率 50%，滿意淨值急劇下跌 41 個百分點至負 22 個百分點，平均量值為 2.5 分，即整體上介乎「一半半」及「幾不滿」之間，而滿意度評分亦急劇下跌 13.9 分至 40.2 分，創 2008 年有紀錄以來新低，顯示市民在初步消化各方面的資訊和討論後，評價變得負面。

至於市民對立法會通過預算案的態度、對政府理財策略的滿意程度及其他相關議題的調查結果，則表列如下：

調查日期	25-26/2/16	23-24/2/17	1-2/3/18	28/2-1/3/19	27-28/2/2020	最新變化
樣本數目	514	506	507	512	512	--
回應比率	68.6%	70.4%	62.6%	67.8%	70.3%	--
最新結果	結果	結果	結果	結果	結果及誤差	--
支持立法會通過預算案比率 ^[8]	--	--	--	--	39+/-4%	--
反對立法會通過預算案比率 ^[8]	--	--	--	--	39+/-4%	--
支持率淨值	--	--	--	--	<1+/-8%	--
平均量值 ^[8]	--	--	--	--	2.9+/-0.1	--
政府理財策略滿意率 ^[8]	37%	32% ^[10]	32%	25% ^[10]	20+/-4%	-4%
政府理財策略不滿率 ^[8]	34%	32%	50% ^[10]	56%	60+/-4%	+5%
滿意率淨值	3%	0%	-18% ^[10]	-31% ^[10]	-40+/-7%	-9%
平均量值 ^[8]	2.9	2.9	2.6 ^[10]	2.4 ^[10]	2.2+/-0.1	-0.2^[10]
認為香港稅制公平比率 ^[9]	58%	58%	56%	59%	52+/-4%	-7%^[10]
認為香港稅制不公平比率 ^[9]	28%	28%	32%	31%	35+/-4%	+4%
認為香港財富分配合理比率 ^[9]	30%	20% ^[10]	26% ^[10]	23%	24+/-4%	+1%
認為香港財富分配不合理比率 ^[9]	57%	68% ^[10]	67%	66%	67+/-4%	+1%

[8] 數字採自五等量尺。平均量值是把答案按照正面程度，以 1 分最低 5 分最高量化成為 1、2、3、4、5 分，再求取樣本平均數值。

[9] 數字採自四等量尺。

[10] 該數字與上次調查結果的差異超過在 95% 置信水平的抽樣誤差，表示有關變化在統計學上表面成立。不過，變化在統計學上成立與否，並不同有關變化是否有實際用途或意義，而不同調查的加權方法亦可能有所不同。

最新調查顯示，支持和反對立法會通過預算案的市民各佔 39%。另外，20% 被訪市民滿意政府的理財策略，60% 表示不滿，滿意淨值為負 40 個百分點，創 2003 年以來新低，平均量值為 2.2，即整體上接近「幾不滿」。同時，52% 認為香港的稅制公平，認為不公平者則佔 35%。至於香港財富分配的情形，24% 認為合理，67% 則認為不合理。

數據分析

調查顯示，今年財政預算案發表當日，市民的即時反應屬於正面，滿意淨值為正 19 個百分點，評分為 54.1 分。經過傳媒一兩天的報導後，反應轉為負面，滿意淨值急劇下跌 41 個百分點至負 22 個百分點，而滿意度評分亦急跌 13.9 分至 40.2 分，創 2008 年有紀錄以來新低，顯示市民在初步消化各方面的資訊和討論後，評價明顯轉差。此外，支持和反對立法會通過預算案的市民各佔 39%，20% 被訪市民滿意政府的理財策略，60% 表示不滿，滿意淨值為負 40 個百分點，創 2003 年以來新低。同時，52% 認為香港的稅制公平，認為不公平者則佔 35%。至於香港財富分配的情形，24% 認為合理，67% 則認為不合理。



HONG KONG PUBLIC OPINION PROGRAM
HONG KONG PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH INSTITUTE
香港民意研究所 之 香港民意研究計劃

Tel 電話: (852) 3844 3111

Fax 傳真: (852) 3705 3361

Website 網址: <https://www.pori.hk>

Address: Units 9-11, 6/F, Tower B, Southmark, 11 Yip Hing Street, Wong Chuk Hang

地址: 黃竹坑業興街 11 號南滙廣場 B 座 6 樓 9-11 室

Press Release on March 3, 2020

POP releases findings of Budget first follow-up survey

Special Announcements

1. The predecessor of Hong Kong Public Opinion Program (HKPOP) was The Public Opinion Programme at The University of Hong Kong (HKUPOP). “POP” in this release can refer to HKPOP or its predecessor HKUPOP.
2. The Budget surveys, including instant and follow-up polls, conducted by POP this year may be the last of its series, whether it will be continued next year or not will depend on public support.

Abstract

POP successfully interviewed 512 Hong Kong residents by random telephone survey conducted by real interviewers right after the Budget Speech was delivered. Our survey shows that people’s instant reaction to this year’s Budget on the day it was released can be considered positive, with a net satisfaction of positive 19 percentage points and a rating of 54.1 marks. After one to two days of media coverage, the reaction turns negative. The net satisfaction rate plunges by 41 percentage points to negative 22. Its satisfaction rating also plunges by 13.9 marks to 40.2, registering an all-time low since records began in 2008. This shows people’s response has significantly worsened after digesting some information and discussions on the Budget. Besides, 39% each supported or opposed the Legislative Council passing the Budget. Meanwhile, 20% were satisfied with the government’s strategy in monetary arrangement, whereas 60% were dissatisfied, thus net satisfaction stands at negative 40 percentage points, registering a new record low since 2003. With respect to Hong Kong’s tax system, 52% considered it fair, whilst 35% thought it was unfair. Last of all, 24% perceived the distribution of wealth in Hong Kong reasonable, as contrast to 67% who regarded it unreasonable. The effective response rate of the survey is 70.3%. The maximum sampling error of percentages is +/-4%, that of net values is +/-8% and that of ratings is +/-2.7 at 95% confidence level.

Contact Information

Date of survey	: 27-28/2/2020
Survey method	: Random telephone survey conducted by real interviewers
Target population	: Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong residents aged 18 or above
Sample size ^[1]	: 512 (including 255 landline and 257 mobile samples)
Effective response rate ^[2]	: 70.3%
Sampling error ^[3]	: Sampling error of percentages not more than +/-4%, that of net values not more than +/-8% and that of ratings not more than +/-2.7 at 95% conf. level

Weighting method : Rim-weighted according to figures provided by the Census and Statistics Department. The gender-age distribution of the Hong Kong population came from “Mid-year population for 2018”, while the educational attainment (highest level attended) distribution and economic activity status distribution came from “Women and Men in Hong Kong - Key Statistics (2018 Edition)”.

- [1] This figure is the total sample size of the survey. Some questions may only involve a subsample, the size of which can be found in the tables below.
- [2] Before September 2017, “overall response rate” was used to report surveys’ contact information. Starting from September 2017, “effective response rate” was used. In July 2018, POP further revised the calculation of effective response rate. Thus, the response rates before and after the change cannot be directly compared.
- [3] 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.

Latest Figures

Results of the first Budget follow-up surveys of 2017 to 2020 together with their corresponding instant polls are tabulated below:

	Instant survey ^[4]	First follow-up survey	Change
2020			
Date of survey	<u>26/2/2020</u>	<u>27-28/2/2020</u>	--
Sample size ^[5]	1,038	512	--
Response rate	75.5%	70.3%	--
Appraisal of Budget: Satisfaction rate ^[6]	46%	28+/-4%	-18% ^[7]
Appraisal of Budget: Dissatisfaction rate ^[6]	27%	50+/-4%	+23% ^[7]
Net satisfaction rate	19%	-22+/-8%	-41% ^[7]
Mean value ^[6]	3.2	2.5+/-0.1	-0.7 ^[7]
Satisfaction rating of Budget	54.1	40.2+/-2.7	-13.9 ^[7]
2019			
Date of survey	<u>27/2/2019</u>	<u>28/2-1/3/2019</u>	--
Sample size ^[5]	561	512	--
Response rate	78.2%	67.8%	--
Appraisal of Budget: Satisfaction rate ^[6]	23%	24%	+1%
Appraisal of Budget: Dissatisfaction rate ^[6]	39%	50%	+11% ^[7]
Net satisfaction rate	-16%	-26%	-9%
Mean value ^[6]	2.7	2.5	-0.1
Satisfaction rating of Budget	47.1	43.1	-4.0 ^[7]

	Instant survey ^[4]	First follow-up survey	Change
2018			
Date of survey	<u>28/2/2018</u>	<u>1-2/3/2018</u>	--
Sample size ^[5]	551	507	--
Response rate	67.5%	62.6%	--
Appraisal of Budget: Satisfaction rate ^[6]	26%	31%	+5% ^[7]
Appraisal of Budget: Dissatisfaction rate ^[6]	41%	54%	+13% ^[7]
Net satisfaction rate	-14%	-23%	-9% ^[7]
Mean value ^[6]	2.7	2.5	-0.2 ^[7]
Satisfaction rating of Budget	48.2	42.8	-5.4 ^[7]
2017			
Date of survey	<u>22/2/2017</u>	<u>23-24/2/2017</u>	--
Sample size ^[5]	502	506	--
Response rate	64.4%	70.4%	--
Appraisal of Budget: Satisfaction rate ^[6]	33%	26%	-7% ^[7]
Appraisal of Budget: Dissatisfaction rate ^[6]	18%	27%	+9% ^[7]
Net satisfaction rate	15%	0%	-15% ^[7]
Mean value ^[6]	3.2	2.9	-0.3 ^[7]
Satisfaction rating of Budget	55.7	52.6	-3.1 ^[7]

[4] Questions in instant surveys would exclude respondents who had not heard of / did not have any knowledge of the Budget. Figures in the table are subsample sizes.

[5] Before March 2020, weighted count was used to report subsample size. Starting from March 2020, raw count was used instead.

[6] Collapsed from a 5-point scale. 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.

[7] The difference between the figure and the result from the previous survey has gone beyond the sampling error at 95% confidence level, meaning that the change is statistically significant prima facie. However, whether the difference is statistically significant is not the same as whether they are practically useful or meaningful, and different weighting methods could have been applied in different surveys.

People's instant reaction to this year's Budget the day it was released can be considered positive, with a net satisfaction of positive 19 percentage points. As for the rating of the Budget, this year's instant survey gave a rating of 54.1 marks. After one to two days of media coverage, the reaction turns negative. The latest satisfaction rate stands at 28%, dissatisfaction rate 50%, net satisfaction rate plunges by 41 percentage points to negative 22. The mean score is 2.5, meaning between "half-half" and "quite dissatisfied" in general. Its satisfaction rating also plunges by 13.9 marks to 40.2, registering an all-time low since records began in 2008. This shows people's response has become negative after digesting some information and discussions on the Budget.

With respect to people's attitude toward the Budget, their satisfaction with the government's strategy in monetary arrangement and other relevant issues, the figures are summarized below:

Date of survey	25-26/2/16	23-24/2/17	1-2/3/18	28/2-1/3/19	27-28/2/2020	<i>Latest change</i>
Sample size	514	506	507	512	512	--
Response rate	68.6%	70.4%	62.6%	67.8%	70.3%	--
Latest findings	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding & error	--
Support the Legislative Council passing the Budget ^[8]	--	--	--	--	39+/-4%	--
Oppose the Legislative Council passing the Budget ^[8]	--	--	--	--	39+/-4%	--
Net support rate	--	--	--	--	<1+/-8%	--
Mean value ^[8]	--	--	--	--	2.9+/-0.1	--
Government's strategy in monetary arrangement: Satisfaction rate ^[8]	37%	32% ^[10]	32%	25% ^[10]	20+/-4%	-4%
Government's strategy in monetary arrangement: Dissatisfaction rate ^[8]	34%	32%	50% ^[10]	56%	60+/-4%	+5%
Net satisfaction rate	3%	0%	-18% ^[10]	-31% ^[10]	-40+/-7%	-9%
Mean value ^[8]	2.9	2.9	2.6 ^[10]	2.4 ^[10]	2.2+/-0.1	-0.2^[10]
Perceived the tax system in Hong Kong to be fair ^[9]	58%	58%	56%	59%	52+/-4%	-7%^[10]
Perceived the tax system in Hong Kong to be unfair ^[9]	28%	28%	32%	31%	35+/-4%	+4%
Perceived the distribution of wealth in Hong Kong to be reasonable ^[9]	30%	20% ^[10]	26% ^[10]	23%	24+/-4%	+1%
Perceived the distribution of wealth in Hong Kong to be unreasonable ^[9]	57%	68% ^[10]	67%	66%	67+/-4%	+1%

[8] Collapsed from a 5-point scale. 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.

[9] Collapsed from a 4-point scale.

[10] The difference between the figure and the result from the previous survey has gone beyond the sampling error at 95% confidence level, meaning that the change is statistically significant prima facie. However, whether the difference is statistically significant is not the same as whether they are practically useful or meaningful, and different weighting methods could have been applied in different surveys.

Latest results revealed that 39% each supported or opposed the Legislative Council passing the Budget. Meanwhile, 20% were satisfied with the government's strategy in monetary arrangement, whereas 60% were dissatisfied, thus net satisfaction stands at negative 40 percentage points, registering a new record low since 2003. The mean value is 2.2, which is close to "quite dissatisfied" in general. With respect to Hong Kong's tax system, 52% considered it fair, whilst 35% thought it was unfair. Last of all, 24% perceived the distribution of wealth in Hong Kong reasonable, as contrast to 67% who regarded it unreasonable.

Data Analysis

Our survey showed that people's instant reaction to this year's Budget on the day it was released can be considered positive, with a net satisfaction of positive 19 percentage points and a rating of 54.1 marks. After one to two days of media coverage, the reaction turns negative. The net satisfaction rate

plunges by 41 percentage points to negative 22. Its satisfaction rating also plunges by 13.9 marks to 40.2, registering an all-time low since records began in 2008. This shows people's response has significantly worsened after digesting some information and discussions on the Budget. Besides, 39% each supported or opposed the Legislative Council passing the Budget. Meanwhile, 20% were satisfied with the government's strategy in monetary arrangement, whereas 60% were dissatisfied, thus net satisfaction stands at negative 40 percentage points, registering a new record low since 2003. With respect to Hong Kong's tax system, 52% considered it fair, whilst 35% thought it was unfair. Last of all, 24% perceived the distribution of wealth in Hong Kong reasonable, as contrast to 67% who regarded it unreasonable.