

2022 年 10 月 20 日 新聞公報

香港民研發放施政報告即時調查結果及特首民望數字

特別宣佈

香港民意研究所（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「香港民研」指的可以是香港民意研究所或其前身港大民研。

公報簡要

施政報告即時調查顯示，撇除不清楚施政報告內容的被訪者後，34%表示滿意施政報告，31%不滿，滿意淨值為正 3 個百分點。以 0 至 100 分計，平均分為 51.1 分。各項數字均顯示市民對今次施政報告的評價較去年有顯著改善。

至於特首李家超，我們由 10 月 10 日開始進行的電話調查結果顯示，截至昨天晚上，他的最新評分為 54.2 分，民望淨值為正 8 個百分點，與 9 月份錄得的民望數字相若。如果只計算發表施政報告後所收集的數據，包括隨機電話樣本和「香港民研意見群組」網上及電話樣本，特首所得的評分為 52.0 分，民望淨值則為正 9 個百分點。

施政報告即時調查顯示了市民的即時反應，後續反應則有待觀察。

樣本資料

(1) 施政報告即時調查

香港民研於昨日特首李家超發表施政報告後，即日進行調查，部分結果已於昨晚發放。除了隨機抽樣固網和手機號碼樣本，我們同時邀請了「香港民研意見群組」成員透過網上或電話訪問參與調查，而調查結果只包括意見群組中的「香港市民代表組群」（即隨機樣本組群）的成功樣本。調查的電話訪問於昨日下午約一時半開始至晚上約九時半結束，而網上調查則於下午二時十五分開始至晚上六時結束。調查共錄得 745 個成功個案，當中包括 194 個隨機抽樣固網樣本、191 個隨機抽樣手機樣本、92 個意見群組電話訪問樣本及 268 個意見群組網上調查樣本。原始數據已經按照人口比例、隨機電話樣本的政治取向和政治狀況評價，以及各抽樣架的比重加權處理，以確保數據的代表性。

調查撇除意見群組樣本後的實效回應比率為 57.2%。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 +/-7%，評分誤差不超過 +/-2.7。

調查日期	: 19/10/2022
調查方法	: (1a) 隨機抽樣固網電話訪問 (1b) 隨機抽樣手機電話訪問 (2a) 電話訪問「香港民研意見群組」中的「香港市民代表組群」 (2b) 電郵邀請「香港民研意見群組」中的「香港市民代表組群」參與網上調查
訪問對象	: 18 歲或以上操粵語的香港居民
成功樣本數目 ^[1]	: 745 (包括 194 個隨機抽樣固網樣本、191 個隨機抽樣手機樣本、92 個意見群組電話訪問樣本及 268 個意見群組網上調查樣本)
實效回應比率	: 57.2% (撇除意見群組樣本)
抽樣誤差 ^[2]	: 在 95% 置信水平下，百分比誤差不超過 +/-4%，淨值誤差不超過 +/-7%，評分誤差不超過 +/-2.7
加權方法	: 首先將隨機抽樣固網和手機電話訪問樣本以「反覆多重加權法」作出調整。相關變項包括：年齡及性別、教育程度（最高就讀程度）及經濟活動身分，相關數字由政府統計處提供；以及兩個隨機抽樣架的比重，比例設為 1:1。由此計算得出隨機抽樣電話訪問樣本的政治取向和政治狀況評價。 然後，再將所有四個抽樣架以「反覆多重加權法」重新作出調整。相關變項包括：年齡及性別、教育程度（最高就讀程度）及經濟活動身分，相關數字由政府統計處提供；政治取向和政治狀況評價，相關數字由第一個步驟得出；以及四個抽樣架的比重，比例設為 1:1:1:1。 以上所述的全港人口年齡及性別分佈統計數字來自《二零二一年年中人口數字》，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》（2021 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] 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。

(2) 特首民望

另外，香港民研亦於十月由真實訪問員以隨機抽樣電話訪問方式成功訪問了 1,093 名香港居民。

調查的實效回應比率為 61.5%。在 95% 置信水平下，調查的百分比誤差不超過 +/-3%，淨值誤差不超過 +/-6%，評分誤差不超過 +/-1.8。

調查日期	: 10-19/10/2022
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 ^[3]	: 1,093 (包括 553 個固網及 540 個手機樣本)
實效回應比率	: 61.5%
抽樣誤差 ^[4]	: 在 95% 置信水平下，百分比誤差不超過 +/-3%，淨值誤差不超過 +/-6%，評分誤差不超過 +/-1.8

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《二零二一年年中人口數字》，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》（2021年版）。

[3] 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。

[4] 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

以下是市民對本年度施政報告的滿意程度及過往多年的相關數字：

調查日期	樣本數目 ^[5]	對施政報告的評價					
		滿意率 ^[6]	一半半	不滿率 ^[6]	滿意率淨值	平均量值 ^[6]	施政報告 評分
19/10/22	590	34+/-4%^[8]	19+/-3%^[8]	31+/-4%^[8]	3+/-7%^[8]	3.0+/-0.1^[8]	51.1+/-2.7^[8]
6/10/21	621	25% ^[8]	13% ^[8]	50% ^[8]	-25% ^[8]	2.4 ^[8]	34.2 ^[8]
25/11/20	512	19%	9%	64%	-46%	2.0	27.2
16/10/19	679	17% ^[8]	8% ^[8]	65% ^[8]	-47% ^[8]	2.0 ^[8]	29.7 ^[8]
10/10/18	534	33% ^[8]	24%	34% ^[8]	-1% ^[8]	2.9 ^[8]	48.5 ^[8]
11/10/17	526	48% ^[8]	28% ^[8]	14% ^[8]	34% ^[8]	3.5 ^[8]	62.4 ^[8]
18/1/17	512	34% ^[8]	22%	29% ^[8]	5% ^[8]	3.0 ^[8]	52.3 ^[8]
13/1/16	522	19% ^[8]	23%	39%	-20% ^[8]	2.5 ^[8]	41.1 ^[8]
14/1/15	503	30% ^[8]	24% ^[8]	35%	-5% ^[8]	2.8	49.5 ^[8]
15/1/14	611	36%	30% ^[8]	31% ^[8]	5%	3.0	54.1 ^[8]
16/1/13	759	36% ^[8]	35%	24% ^[8]	11% ^[8]	3.1	56.4 ^[8]
12/10/11	816	47% ^[8]	32%	18%	28% ^[8]	3.3	59.1
13/10/10	747	41% ^[8]	33% ^[8]	19% ^[8]	22% ^[8]	3.2	58.9 ^[8]
14/10/09	462	30%	37%	28%	2%	3.0	53.5
15/10/08	515	31% ^[8]	35% ^[8]	26% ^[8]	4% ^[8]	3.0	53.8 ^[8]
10/10/07	602	52% ^[8]	29% ^[8]	10% ^[8]	42% ^[8]	3.5	65.2 ^[8]
11/10/06	445	30% ^[8]	37%	22% ^[8]	8% ^[8]	3.0	55.8 ^[8]
12/10/05	377	48% ^[8]	33%	9% ^[8]	39% ^[8]	3.5	66.4 ^[8]
12/1/05	391	38% ^[8]	30%	20% ^[8]	18% ^[8]	3.2	56.3 ^[8]
7/1/04	381	25%	26%	33% ^[8]	-8%	2.8	49.3
8/1/03 ^[7]	377	22% ^[8]	29%	27%	-5%	2.8	51.6 ^[8]
10/10/01	433	29%	33%	28%	1%	3.0	56.7
11/10/00	262	25% ^[8]	28%	31%	-6% ^[8]	2.9	55.2
6/10/99	236	31% ^[8]	30%	25% ^[8]	6% ^[8]	3.0	57.3
7/10/98	508	22% ^[8]	35% ^[8]	35% ^[8]	-14% ^[8]	2.8	--
8/10/97	534	45%	30% ^[8]	14% ^[8]	31%	3.4	--

[5] 已撇除未聞／不知道施政報告內容而沒有作答的被訪者。香港民研在 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] 2003 年施政報告的即時反應調查分 2 天進行，本表只列舉首天錄得的統計數字，以作直接比較分析之用。

[8] 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。

撇除不清楚施政報告內容的被訪者後，34% 表示滿意施政報告，31% 不滿，滿意淨值為正 3 個百分點，平均量值為 3.0 分，即整體上「一半半」。以 0 至 100 分計，平均分為 51.1 分。各項數字均顯示市民對今次施政報告的評價較去年有顯著改善。

以下是 1997 年至今，歷任特首在發表施政報告後的即時民望變化：

董建華民望									
施政報告發表日期	8/10/97	7/10/98	6/10/99	11/10/00	10/10/01	8/1/03	7/1/04	12/1/05	
施政報告前評分	65.8	55.8	54.0	48.2	48.4	46.6	42.9	47.2	
即時調查評分	66.1	56.1	54.3	50.7	50.6	47.3	44.6	48.4	
評分變化	+0.3	+0.3	+0.3	+2.5^[10]	+2.2^[10]	+0.7	+1.7^[10]	+1.2	
曾蔭權民望									
施政報告發表日期	12/10/05	11/10/06	10/10/07	15/10/08	14/10/09	13/10/10	12/10/11		
施政報告前評分	68.0	62.9	65.8	52.7	55.2	55.4	48.4		
即時調查評分	67.4	59.8	64.4	53.9	54.2	56.2	50.6		
評分變化	-0.6	-3.1^[10]	-1.4^[10]	+1.2	-1.0	+0.8	+2.2^[10]		
施政報告前支持率淨值	68%	48%	48%	5%	7%	-1%	-45%		
即時調查支持率淨值	65%	36%	48%	10%	8%	0%	-41%		
支持率淨值變化^[9]	-3%	-12%^[10]	--	+5%	+1%	+1%	+4%		
梁振英民望									
施政報告發表日期		16/1/13	15/1/14	14/1/15	13/1/16	18/1/17			
施政報告前評分		48.9	45.6	40.6	37.5	41.3			
即時調查評分		52.2	48.9	44.8	37.0	41.7			
評分變化		+3.3^[10]	+3.3^[10]	+4.2^[10]	-0.5	+0.4			
施政報告前支持率淨值		-20%	-31%	-39%	-44%	-44%			
即時調查支持率淨值		-11%	-24%	-35%	-54%	-57%			
支持率淨值變化^[9]		+9%^[10]	+7%^[10]	+4%	-10%^[10]	-13%^[10]			
		林鄭月娥民望					李家超民望		
施政報告發表日期		11/10/17	10/10/18	16/10/19	25/11/20	6/10/21	19/10/22		
施政報告前評分		59.6	52.3	22.3	30.8	33.9	53.5+/-1.9		
即時調查評分		61.1	47.6	22.7	26.8	30.5	52.0+/-2.4		
評分變化		+1.5	-4.7^[10]	+0.3	-4.1^[10]	-3.4^[10]	-1.5		
施政報告前支持率淨值		10%	4%	-65%	-48%	-46%	13+/-6%		
即時調查支持率淨值		23%	-10%	-64%	-57%	-48%	9+/-7%		
支持率淨值變化^[9]		+13%^[10]	-14%^[10]	+1%	-9%^[10]	-2%	-4%		

[9] 施政報告即時調查自 2004 年開始涵蓋特首支持率問題，因此沒有列入董建華施政報告調查系列。

[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。

而以下是根據隨機抽樣電話調查，特首李家超的最新民望數字：

調查日期	特首林鄭月娥		特首李家超				
	30/4-6/5/22	31/5-5/6/22	4-7/7/22	1-9/8/22	5-9/9/22	10-19/10/22	最新變化
樣本數目	1,000	1,000	1,003	1,004	1,002	1,093	--
回應比率	41.5%	39.8%	50.1%	58.6%	48.6%	61.5%	--
最新結果	結果	結果	結果	結果	結果	結果及誤差	--
特首評分	34.7	36.0	53.8 ^[11]	54.9	53.5	54.2+/-1.8	+0.7
特首支持率	14%	17%	45% ^[11]	48%	49%	47+/-3%	-2%
特首反對率	78%	77%	39% ^[11]	36%	36%	39+/-3%	+2%
支持率淨值	-64%	-60%	5% ^[11]	12%	13%	8+/-6%	-5%

[11] 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。

特首李家超於昨天 (10 月 19 日) 發表首份施政報告，我們由 10 月 10 日開始進行的電話調查結果顯示，截至昨天晚上，他的最新評分為 54.2 分，支持率為 47%，反對率為 39%，民望淨值為正 8 個百分點，全部與 9 月份錄得的民望數字相若。如果只計算發表施政報告後所收集的數據，包括隨機電話樣本和「香港民研意見群組」網上及電話樣本，特首所得的評分為 52.0 分，民望淨值則為正 9 個百分點。

下次新聞公報／發佈會 (暫定)

- [新聞公報] 10 月 25 日 (星期二) 下午二時三十分
台灣及西藏問題



HONG KONG PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH INSTITUTE
香港民意研究所

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 October 20, 2022

PORI releases findings of Policy Address instant survey and popularity figures of CE

Special Announcement

The predecessor of Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute (PORI) was The Public Opinion Programme at The University of Hong Kong (HKUPOP). “PORI” in this release can refer to Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute or its predecessor HKUPOP.

Abstract

Our instant survey shows that after excluding those respondents who said they did not have any knowledge of the Policy Address, 34% said they were satisfied with it, 31% were dissatisfied, giving a net satisfaction rate of positive 3 percentage points. On a scale of 0-100, the average rating is 51.1 marks. Various figures show that people’s appraisal of this Policy Address has significantly improved compared to last year.

As for CE John Lee, our telephone survey conducted since Oct 10 up till last night shows that, his latest rating is 54.2 marks, while net approval rate stands at positive 8 percentage points. Both figures are similar to those registered in September. If we only include data collected after the Policy Address was delivered, including random telephone samples and both online and telephone samples from our “HKPOP Panel”, CE’s rating stands at 52.0 marks, while net approval rate is positive 9 percentage points.

The instant survey describes people’s instant reaction toward the Policy Address. Their reactions later remain to be seen.

Contact Information

(1) Policy Address Instant Survey

After Chief Executive John Lee delivered the Policy Address yesterday, PORI conducted an instant survey on the same day and released part of the findings last night. In addition to the random sample of landline and mobile numbers, we also invited members of our “HKPOP Panel” to participate in this survey via online or telephone interviews, while only those from our “Hong Kong People Representative Panel” (i.e., a panel comprising randomly recruited samples) within the panel were included in our data analysis. Our telephone survey began at around 1:30pm and ran till around 9:30pm, while our online survey started at 2:15pm and ended at 6pm yesterday. A total of 745 successful cases were collected, including 194 random landline samples, 191 random mobile samples, 92 panel telephone survey samples and 268 panel online survey samples. The raw data have been weighted by population statistics, both political inclination and appraisal of political condition based on random telephone samples, as well as proportions of different sampling frames to ensure data representativeness.

The effective response rate of the survey excluding panel samples is 57.2%. The maximum sampling error of percentages is +/-4%, that of net values is +/-7% and that of ratings is +/-2.7 at 95% confidence level.

Date of survey	: 19/10/2022
Survey method	: (1a) Random landline telephone survey (1b) Random mobile telephone survey (2a) Telephone survey targeting “Hong Kong People Representative Panel” within “HKPOP Panel” (2b) Online survey with email invitation targeting “Hong Kong People Representative Panel” within “HKPOP Panel”
Target population	: Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong residents aged 18 or above
Sample size ^[1]	: 745 (including 194 random landline samples, 191 random mobile samples, 92 panel telephone survey samples and 268 panel online survey samples)
Effective response rate	: 57.2% (excluding panel samples)
Sampling error ^[2]	: Sampling error of percentages not more than +/-4%, that of net values not more than +/-7% and that of ratings not more than +/-2.7 at 95% conf. level
Weighting method	: First, the random landline and mobile telephone samples are rim-weighted according to the gender, age, educational attainment (highest level attended) and economic activity status population statistics, as provided by the Census and Statistics Department; and the relative weights of the two random sampling frames was set as 1:1. The political inclination and appraisal of political condition distributions of the random telephone samples are derived from the resulting dataset. Then, samples from all four sampling frames are rim-weighted afresh according to the gender, age, educational attainment (highest level attended) and economic activity status population statistics, as provided by the Census and Statistics Department as well as political inclination and appraisal of political condition distribution derived from the first step; and the relative weights of the four sampling frames was set as 1:1:1:1. The gender-age distribution of the Hong Kong population came from “Mid-year population for 2021”, while the educational attainment (highest level attended) distribution and economic activity status distribution came from “Women and Men in Hong Kong - Key Statistics (2021 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] 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.

(2) Popularity of CE

Meanwhile, PORI also successfully interviewed 1,093 Hong Kong residents by a random telephone survey conducted by real interviewers in October.

The effective response rate of the survey is 61.5%. The maximum sampling error of percentages is +/-3%, that of net values is +/-6% and that of ratings is +/-1.8 at 95% confidence level.

Date of survey	: 10-19/10/2022
Survey method	: Random telephone survey conducted by real interviewers
Target population	: Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong residents aged 18 or above
Sample size ^[3]	: 1,093 (including 553 landline and 540 mobile samples)
Effective response rate	: 61.5%
Sampling error ^[4]	: Sampling error of percentages not more than +/-3%, that of net values not more than +/-6% and that of ratings not more than +/-1.8 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 2021”, while the educational attainment (highest level attended) distribution and economic activity status distribution came from “Women and Men in Hong Kong - Key Statistics (2021 Edition)”.

[3] 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.

[4] 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

People’s satisfaction figures with this year’s Policy Address are summarized below together with the previous findings:

Date of survey	Sample size ^[5]	Appraisal of Policy Address					
		Satisfaction rate ^[6]	Half-half	Dissatisfaction rate ^[6]	Net satisfaction rate	Mean value ^[6]	Rating of Policy Address
19/10/22	590	34+/-4%^[8]	19+/-3%^[8]	31+/-4%^[8]	3+/-7%^[8]	3.0+/-0.1^[8]	51.1+/-2.7^[8]
6/10/21	621	25% ^[8]	13% ^[8]	50% ^[8]	-25% ^[8]	2.4 ^[8]	34.2 ^[8]
25/11/20	512	19%	9%	64%	-46%	2.0	27.2
16/10/19	679	17% ^[8]	8% ^[8]	65% ^[8]	-47% ^[8]	2.0 ^[8]	29.7 ^[8]
10/10/18	534	33% ^[8]	24%	34% ^[8]	-1% ^[8]	2.9 ^[8]	48.5 ^[8]
11/10/17	526	48% ^[8]	28% ^[8]	14% ^[8]	34% ^[8]	3.5 ^[8]	62.4 ^[8]
18/1/17	512	34% ^[8]	22%	29% ^[8]	5% ^[8]	3.0 ^[8]	52.3 ^[8]
13/1/16	522	19% ^[8]	23%	39%	-20% ^[8]	2.5 ^[8]	41.1 ^[8]
14/1/15	503	30% ^[8]	24% ^[8]	35%	-5% ^[8]	2.8	49.5 ^[8]
15/1/14	611	36%	30% ^[8]	31% ^[8]	5%	3.0	54.1 ^[8]
16/1/13	759	36% ^[8]	35%	24% ^[8]	11% ^[8]	3.1	56.4 ^[8]

Date of survey	Sample size ^[5]	Appraisal of Policy Address					
		Satisfaction rate ^[6]	Half-half	Dissatisfaction rate ^[6]	Net satisfaction rate	Mean value ^[6]	Rating of Policy Address
12/10/11	816	47% ^[8]	32%	18%	28% ^[8]	3.3	59.1
13/10/10	747	41% ^[8]	33% ^[8]	19% ^[8]	22% ^[8]	3.2	58.9 ^[8]
14/10/09	462	30%	37%	28%	2%	3.0	53.5
15/10/08	515	31% ^[8]	35% ^[8]	26% ^[8]	4% ^[8]	3.0	53.8 ^[8]
10/10/07	602	52% ^[8]	29% ^[8]	10% ^[8]	42% ^[8]	3.5	65.2 ^[8]
11/10/06	445	30% ^[8]	37%	22% ^[8]	8% ^[8]	3.0	55.8 ^[8]
12/10/05	377	48% ^[8]	33%	9% ^[8]	39% ^[8]	3.5	66.4 ^[8]
12/1/05	391	38% ^[8]	30%	20% ^[8]	18% ^[8]	3.2	56.3 ^[8]
7/1/04	381	25%	26%	33% ^[8]	-8%	2.8	49.3
8/1/03 ^[7]	377	22% ^[8]	29%	27%	-5%	2.8	51.6 ^[8]
10/10/01	433	29%	33%	28%	1%	3.0	56.7
11/10/00	262	25% ^[8]	28%	31%	-6% ^[8]	2.9	55.2
6/10/99	236	31% ^[8]	30%	25% ^[8]	6% ^[8]	3.0	57.3
7/10/98	508	22% ^[8]	35% ^[8]	35% ^[8]	-14% ^[8]	2.8	--
8/10/97	534	45%	30% ^[8]	14% ^[8]	31%	3.4	--

[5] Respondents who did not answer this question because they had not heard of / did not have any knowledge of the Policy Address have been excluded. 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 2003 Policy Address instant survey was conducted for two days. Only figures registered in the first day of fieldwork are listed in this table for direct comparison and analysis.

[8] 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.

After excluding those respondents who said they did not have any knowledge of the Policy Address, 34% said they were satisfied with it, 31% were dissatisfied, giving a net satisfaction rate of positive 3 percentage points. The mean score is 3.0, meaning “half-half” in general. On a scale of 0-100, the average rating is 51.1 marks. Various figures show that people’s appraisal of this Policy Address has significantly improved compared to last year.

Figures on various Chief Executives’ popularity before and after the Policy Address Speech since 1997 are summarized as follows:

Popularity of Tung Chee-hwa								
Date of PA Speech	8/10/97	7/10/98	6/10/99	11/10/00	10/10/01	8/1/03	7/1/04	12/1/05
Rating before the PA	65.8	55.8	54.0	48.2	48.4	46.6	42.9	47.2
Rating at instant survey	66.1	56.1	54.3	50.7	50.6	47.3	44.6	48.4
Change in rating	+0.3	+0.3	+0.3	+2.5^[10]	+2.2^[10]	+0.7	+1.7^[10]	+1.2

Popularity of Donald Tsang							
Date of Policy Address Speech	12/10/05	11/10/06	10/10/07	15/10/08	14/10/09	13/10/10	12/10/11
Rating before the PA	68.0	62.9	65.8	52.7	55.2	55.4	48.4
Rating at instant survey	67.4	59.8	64.4	53.9	54.2	56.2	50.6
Change in rating	-0.6	-3.1^[10]	-1.4^[10]	+1.2	-1.0	+0.8	+2.2^[10]
Net approval rate before the PA	68%	48%	48%	5%	7%	-1%	-45%
Net approval rate at instant survey	65%	36%	48%	10%	8%	0%	-41%
Change in net approval rate^[9]	-3%	-12%^[10]	--	+5%	+1%	+1%	+4%
Popularity of CY Leung							
Date of Policy Address Speech			16/1/13	15/1/14	14/1/15	13/1/16	18/1/17
Rating before the PA			48.9	45.6	40.6	37.5	41.3
Rating at instant survey			52.2	48.9	44.8	37.0	41.7
Change in rating			+3.3^[10]	+3.3^[10]	+4.2^[10]	-0.5	+0.4
Net approval rate before the PA			-20%	-31%	-39%	-44%	-44%
Net approval rate at instant survey			-11%	-24%	-35%	-54%	-57%
Change in net approval rate^[9]			+9%^[10]	+7%^[10]	+4%	-10%^[10]	-13%^[10]
Popularity of	Carrie Lam					John Lee	
Date of Policy Address Speech	11/10/17	10/10/18	16/10/19	25/11/20	6/10/21	19/10/22	
Rating before the PA	59.6	52.3	22.3	30.8	33.9	53.5+/-1.9	
Rating at instant survey	61.1	47.6	22.7	26.8	30.5	52.0+/-2.4	
Change in rating	+1.5	-4.7^[10]	+0.3	-4.1^[10]	-3.4^[10]	-1.5	
Net approval rate before the PA	10%	4%	-65%	-48%	-46%	13+/-6%	
Net approval rate at instant survey	23%	-10%	-64%	-57%	-48%	9+/-7%	
Change in net approval rate^[9]	+13%^[10]	-14%^[10]	+1%	-9%^[10]	-2%	-4%	

[9] Instant surveys on Policy Address included CE's approval rate since 2004, so it is not listed under Tung's series.

[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.

Meanwhile, the latest popularity figures of CE John Lee based on random telephone surveys are summarized as follows:

	CE Carrie Lam		CE John Lee				<u>Latest change</u>
	<u>30/4-6/5/22</u>	<u>31/5-5/6/22</u>	<u>4-7/7/22</u>	<u>1-9/8/22</u>	<u>5-9/9/22</u>	<u>10-19/10/22</u>	
Date of survey							
Sample size	1,000	1,000	1,003	1,004	1,002	1,093	--
Response rate	41.5%	39.8%	50.1%	58.6%	48.6%	61.5%	--
Latest findings	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding & error	--
Rating of CE	34.7	36.0	53.8 ^[11]	54.9	53.5	54.2+/-1.8	+0.7
Vote of confidence in CE	14%	17%	45% ^[11]	48%	49%	47+/-3%	-2%
Vote of no confidence in CE	78%	77%	39% ^[11]	36%	36%	39+/-3%	+2%
Net approval rate	-64%	-60%	5% ^[11]	12%	13%	8+/-6%	-5%

[11] 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.

CE John Lee has delivered his first Policy Address yesterday (Oct 19). Our telephone survey conducted since Oct 10 up till last night shows that, his latest rating is 54.2 marks, approval rate at 47% and disapproval at 39%, giving a net approval rate of positive 8 percentage points. All these figures are similar to those registered in September. If we only include data collected after the Policy Address was delivered, including random telephone samples and both online and telephone samples from our “HKPOP Panel”, CE’s rating stands at 52.0 marks, while net approval rate is positive 9 percentage points.

Upcoming Press Release / Press Conference (Tentative)

- [Press Release] October 25 (Tuesday) at 14:30
Taiwan and Tibetan issues