PORI

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. 112 cum "We Hongkongers" Research Report No. 76

Survey Date: 12 to 18 November 2021

Release Date: 19 November 2021

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 23 December 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. 112 under HKPOP Panel survey series, as well as Report No. 76 under the "We Hongkongers" Project Series. The theme of this report is "MPF and Universal Retirement Protection Scheme" under the "Hong Kong Social Life Observation Project".

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:

<u>Table 1: Detailed Contact Information</u>

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	12 November, 3pm – 18 November, 3pm
Total sample size	5,442
Response rate	6.1%
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)

$$\text{Success rate} = \frac{\text{Successful cases}}{\text{Panel size of the HKPOP Panel}} \times 100.0\%$$

$$= \frac{5,442}{89,784} \times 100.0\%$$

$$= 6.1\%$$

.

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: 12-18/11/2021

Q1 To what extent do you think the current Mandatory Provident Fund (MPF) system is **capable of providing basic retirement protection to the people**?		**Combined[2]** (Base=5,176)	
Very capable	} **Capable**	<1%	} 8%
Somewhat capable		8%	
Half-half		27%	
Somewhat incapable	} **Incapable**	42%	} **59%**
Not capable at all		17%	
Don't know / hard to say		6%	
Mean[3]		2.3	

[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 fairness level, where 1 is the lowest and 5 the highest, and then calculate the sample mean.

Chart 1: Q1 Combined chart

^ 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

Table 4: Q2 Survey results; Survey period: 12-18/11/2021

Q2 **How much improvement do you think the abolition of the MPF offsetting mechanism** will bring to the MPF system?	**Combined[4]** **(Base=5,171)**
Significant improvement	24%
Slight improvement	41%
No improvement	12%
Even worse	5%
Don't know / hard to say	18%

[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.

Chart 2: Q2 Combined chart

^ 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

Table 5: Q3 Survey results; Survey period: 12-18/11/2021

Q3 How much do you support or oppose the idea of **converting the lump-sum withdrawal of MPF benefits after retirement to an annuity with monthly payout**?		**Combined[5]** (Base=5,175)
Strongly support	} Support	6% } 23%
Somewhat support		17%
Half-half		29%
Somewhat oppose	} Oppose	12% } 43%
Strongly oppose		31%
Don't know / hard to say		5%
Mean[6]		2.5

[5]   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.

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

Chart 3: Q3 Combined chart

^ 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

Table 6: Q4 Survey results; Survey period: 12-18/11/2021

Q4 How much do you support or oppose the implementation of **universal retirement protection**?		Combined[7] (Base=5,174)	
Strongly support	} **Support**	28%	} **57%**
Somewhat support		29%	
Half-half		18%	
Somewhat oppose	} **Oppose**	5%	} 13%
Strongly oppose		8%	
Don't know / hard to say		12%	
Mean[8]		3.7	

[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 fairness level, where 1 is the lowest and 5 the highest, and then calculate the sample mean.

Chart 4: Q4 Combined chart

^ 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

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	2,605	56.6%	646	41.8%	318	55.3%	1,741	50.9%	2,923	56.5%	2,387	48.1%
Female	1,990	43.2%	899	58.2%	256	44.5%	1,679	49.1%	2,246	43.4%	2,577	51.9%
Other	7	0.2%	<1	<0.1%	1	0.2%	<1	<0.1%	8	0.2%	<1	<0.1%
Total	4,602	100.0%	1,544	100.0%	575	100.0%	3,420	100.0%	5,177	100.0%	4,964	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	561	12.2%	473	30.6%	33	5.7%	400	11.7%	594	11.5%	873	17.6%
30 - 39	1,129	24.5%	212	13.8%	94	16.4%	473	13.8%	1,223	23.6%	686	13.8%
40 - 49	1,172	25.5%	280	18.1%	128	22.3%	581	17.0%	1,300	25.1%	861	17.3%
50 - 59	1,110	24.1%	326	21.1%	175	30.5%	1,150	33.6%	1,285	24.8%	1,476	29.7%
60 or above	628	13.7%	253	16.4%	144	25.1%	815	23.8%	772	14.9%	1,068	21.5%
Total	4,600	100.0%	1,544	100.0%	574	100.0%	3,420	100.0%	5,174	100.0%	4,964	100.0%
Missing case(s)	2		<1		1		<1		3		<1	

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	5	0.1%	<1	<0.1%	3	0.5%	30	0.9%	8	0.2%	30	0.6%
Secondary	721	15.7%	563	36.5%	146	25.5%	986	28.8%	867	16.8%	1,549	31.2%
Tertiary or above	3,874	84.2%	979	63.5%	424	74.0%	2,403	70.3%	4,298	83.1%	3,382	68.2%
Total	4,600	100.0%	1,542	100.0%	573	100.0%	3,420	100.0%	5,173	100.0%	4,962	100.0%
Missing case(s)	2		2		2		<1		4		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	1,875	40.8%	187	12.1%	199	34.7%	758	22.2%	2,074	40.1%	945	19.0%
Clerks and service workers	1,253	27.3%	589	38.2%	142	24.8%	784	22.9%	1,395	27.0%	1,373	27.7%
Workers	108	2.4%	40	2.6%	23	4.0%	218	6.4%	131	2.5%	257	5.2%
Students	128	2.8%	263	17.0%	6	1.0%	168	4.9%	134	2.6%	430	8.7%
Home-makers / housewives	189	4.1%	104	6.7%	19	3.3%	179	5.2%	208	4.0%	283	5.7%
Others	1,042	22.7%	362	23.4%	184	32.1%	1,310	38.3%	1,226	23.7%	1,672	33.7%
Total	4,595	100.0%	1,544	100.0%	573	100.0%	3,417	100.0%	5,168	100.0%	4,961	100.0%
Missing case(s)	7		<1		2		3		9		4	

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	186	4.1%	3	0.2%	27	4.9%	142	4.2%	213	4.2%	145	3.0%
Wan Chai	105	2.3%	10	0.7%	19	3.4%	232	6.9%	124	2.4%	242	5.0%
Eastern	482	10.6%	82	5.4%	62	11.2%	294	8.7%	544	10.7%	376	7.7%
Southern	185	4.1%	31	2.1%	25	4.5%	130	3.9%	210	4.1%	161	3.3%
Yau Tsim Mong	186	4.1%	124	8.2%	22	4.0%	166	4.9%	208	4.1%	289	5.9%
Sham Shui Po	232	5.1%	128	8.5%	21	3.8%	155	4.6%	253	5.0%	283	5.8%
Kowloon City	240	5.3%	22	1.4%	29	5.2%	195	5.8%	269	5.3%	216	4.4%
Wong Tai Sin	242	5.3%	119	7.9%	29	5.2%	91	2.7%	271	5.3%	211	4.3%
Kwun Tong	314	6.9%	205	13.6%	33	5.9%	72	2.1%	347	6.8%	277	5.7%
Tsuen Wan	224	4.9%	69	4.6%	36	6.5%	171	5.1%	260	5.1%	240	4.9%
Tuen Mun	257	5.7%	111	7.3%	32	5.8%	135	4.0%	289	5.7%	245	5.0%
Yuen Long	305	6.7%	85	5.6%	38	6.8%	420	12.5%	343	6.7%	505	10.4%
North	142	3.1%	21	1.4%	22	4.0%	236	7.0%	164	3.2%	256	5.3%
Tai Po	187	4.1%	54	3.5%	24	4.3%	104	3.1%	211	4.1%	157	3.2%
Sai Kung	356	7.8%	168	11.2%	36	6.5%	300	8.9%	392	7.7%	469	9.6%
Sha Tin	532	11.7%	112	7.4%	61	11.0%	227	6.7%	593	11.6%	338	6.9%
Kwai Tsing	264	5.8%	160	10.6%	32	5.8%	271	8.0%	296	5.8%	431	8.8%
Islands	99	2.2%	7	0.5%	7	1.3%	27	0.8%	106	2.1%	34	0.7%
Total	4,538	100.0%	1,509	100.0%	555	100.0%	3,368	100.0%	5,093	100.0%	4,877	100.0%
Missing case(s)	64		35		20		52		84		87	

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	2,716	59.0%	1,043	67.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2,716	52.5%	1,043	21.0%
Pro-establishment camp	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	40	7.0%	593	17.3%	40	0.8%	593	11.9%
Localist	1,886	41.0%	501	32.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1,886	36.4%	501	10.1%
Centrist	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	199	34.6%	1,031	30.2%	199	3.8%	1,031	20.8%
Others	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	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	0.0%	336	58.4%	1,796	52.5%	336	6.5%	1,796	36.2%
Don't know / hard to say	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	4,602	100.0%	1,544	100.0%	575	100.0%	3,420	100.0%	5,177	100.0%	4,964	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	4,376	95.3%	704	45.9%	348	60.5%	604	17.7%	4,724	91.4%	1,308	26.4%
Non-democratic	12	0.3%	127	8.2%	88	15.3%	1,514	44.3%	100	1.9%	1,640	33.1%
Did not vote / blank vote / void vote / don't know / hard to say / refuse to answer	153	3.3%	403	26.2%	113	19.7%	1,096	32.0%	266	5.1%	1,499	30.2%
Not a registered voter	50	1.1%	302	19.6%	26	4.5%	206	6.0%	76	1.5%	508	10.3%
Total	4,591	100.0%	1,535	100.0%	575	100.0%	3,420	100.0%	5,166	100.0%	4,955	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	5,442
Survey period	12-18/11/2021
Success rate	6.1%
Questionnaires sent out	89,784
Questionnaires received	5,872
Ineligible samples	45
Invalid samples	0
Incomplete samples	385
Standard error	0.7%
Sampling error	3.8%

Appendix 3: Quantitative analyses

Q1 Survey results; Survey period: 12-18/11/2021

Q1 To what extent do you think the current Mandatory Provident Fund (MPF) system is capable of providing basic retirement protection to the people?	Pro-democracy camp supporters		Non-pro-democracy camp supporters #		Total	
	Percentages (Base=1,544)		Percentages (Base=3,420)		Percentages (Base=4,964)	
Very capable	0.0%	}1.3%	0.5%	}10.8%	0.3%	}7.9%
Somewhat capable }Capable	1.3%		10.4%		7.5%	
Half-half	27.1%		27.4%		27.3%	
Somewhat incapable	40.9%	}67.5%	42.3%	}55.0%	41.9%	}58.9%
Not capable at all }Incapable	26.6%		12.7%		17.0%	
Don't know / hard to say	4.1%		6.7%		5.9%	
Total	100.0%		100.0%		100.0%	
Mean values	2.0		2.4		2.3	
Standard error of mean	<0.1		<0.1		<0.1	
Median	2.0		2.0		2.0	
Refuse to answer	*<1*		*0*		*<1*	
Net value (Capable- Incapable)	**-66.2%**		**-44.2%**		**-51.1%**	

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

Q2 Survey results; Survey period: 12-18/11/2021

Q2 How much improvement do you think the abolition of the MPF offsetting mechanism will bring to the MPF system?	Pro-democracy camp supporters	Non-pro-democracy camp supporters #	Total
	Percentages (Base=1,544)	Percentages (Base=3,420)	Percentages (Base=4,964)
Significant improvement	24.8%	23.6%	24.0%
Slight improvement	40.1%	41.7%	41.2%
No improvement	9.2%	13.5%	12.1%
Even worse	9.0%	2.9%	4.8%
Don't know / hard to say	16.9%	18.3%	17.8%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Refuse to answer	*<1*	*<1*	*0*

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

Q3 Survey results; Survey period: 12-18/11/2021

Q3 How much do you support or oppose the idea of converting the lump-sum withdrawal of MPF benefits after retirement to an annuity with monthly payout?		Pro-democracy camp supporters		Non-pro-democracy camp supporters #		Total	
		Percentages		Percentages		Percentages	
		(Base=1,544)		(Base=3,420)		(Base=4,964)	
Strongly support	**}Support**	10.1%	}17.6%	4.9%	}26.0%	6.5%	}23.4%
Somewhat support		7.4%		21.2%		16.9%	
Half-half		22.2%		31.9%		28.9%	
Somewhat oppose	**}Oppose**	11.8%	}56.3%	11.8%	}37.1%	11.8%	}43.1%
Strongly oppose		44.5%		25.3%		31.2%	
Don't know / hard to say		3.9%		5.0%		4.7%	
Total		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%	
Mean values		2.2		2.7		2.5	
Standard error of mean		<0.1		<0.1		<0.1	
Median		2.0		3.0		3.0	
Refuse to answer		*<1*		*<1*		*<1*	
Net value (Support- Oppose)		**-38.8%**		**-11.1%**		**-19.7%**	

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

Q4 Survey results; Survey period: 12-18/11/2021

Q4 How much do you support or oppose the implementation of universal retirement protection?		Pro-democracy camp supporters	Non-pro-democracy camp supporters #	Total
		Percentages (Base=1,544)	Percentages (Base=3,420)	Percentages (Base=4,964)
Strongly support	**}Support**	33.1% }51.2%	26.1% }59.5%	28.3% }56.9%
Somewhat support		18.1%	33.4%	28.6%
Half-half		25.1%	14.2%	17.6%
Somewhat oppose	**}Oppose**	2.2% }13.6%	6.4% }13.4%	5.1% }13.4%
Strongly oppose		11.4%	7.0%	8.4%
Don't know / hard to say		10.2%	12.9%	12.0%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean values		3.7	3.7	3.7
Standard error of mean		<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Median		4.0	4.0	4.0
Refuse to answer		*<1*	*0*	*<1*
Net value (Support- Oppose)		**+37.6%**	**+46.2%**	**+43.5%**

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

Appendix 4: Survey questionnaire (12-18/11/2021)

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 to express your latest views. When we need to work on the data, your last submission will be used. For enquiries, please email us at panel@pori.hk.

Last updated: xxxx-xx-xx

Tentative next update: xxxx-xx-xx

*Required

Eligibility Confirmation

Are you a Hong Kong resident aged 12 or above (i.e., currently residing in Hong Kong)? *

o   Yes

o   No

We Hongkongers Series

To what extent do you think the current Mandatory Provident Fund (MPF) system is capable of providing basic retirement protection to the people?

o   Very capable

o   Somewhat capable

o   Half-half

o   Somewhat incapable

o   Not capable at all

o   Don't know / hard to say

How much improvement do you think the abolition of the MPF offsetting mechanism will bring to the MPF system?

o   Significant improvement

o   Slight improvement

o   No improvement

o   Even worse

o   Don't know / hard to say

How much do you support or oppose the idea of converting the lump-sum withdrawal of MPF benefits after retirement to an annuity with monthly payout?

o   Strongly support

o   Somewhat support

o   Half-half

o   Somewhat oppose

o   Strongly oppose

o   Don't know / hard to say

How much do you support or oppose the implementation of universal retirement protection?

o   Strongly support

o   Somewhat support

o   Half-half

o   Somewhat oppose

o   Strongly oppose

o   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)

o   0% chance (Certainly not)   o   20% chance   o   70% chance

o   0.001% chance (1 in 100,000)   o   25% chance   o   80% chance

o   0.01% chance (1 in 10,000)   o   30% chance   o   90% chance

o   0.1% chance (1 in 1,000)   o   35% chance   o   100% chance (Certainly will)

o   1% chance (1 in 100)   o   40% chance   o   _____ % chance

o   5% chance (1 in 20)   o   45% chance   o   Don't know / hard to say

o   10% chance (1 in 10)   o   50% chance

o   15% chance   o   60% chance

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

o   Very much satisfied

o   Somewhat satisfied

o   Half-half

o   Somewhat dissatisfied

o   Very much dissatisfied

o   Don't know / hard to say

Other Opinions

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?

o   _____

o   Don't know / hard to say

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

(Randomise the three conditions)

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

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 message you want us to forward to your District Councillor or other locally known persons you name here? (Please provide their identities and your contacts)

(The request you make here is not part of our study. We simply want to assist people who want to send a message to current or former District Councillor, new or senior community leaders, persons in charge of community organisations, and so on. If you do not have any suggestion, please leave this space blank.)

_____

Personal Information

(Registered member) This section is about personal information. If you have already provided relevant information in this 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.

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

o   Provide / update personal information now

Gender

o   Male

o   Female

o   Other

Age

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

Educational attainment

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

o   Primary or below

o   Lower secondary (Secondary 1 to 3)

o   Upper secondary (Secondary 4 to 7 / DSE / Yi Jin)

o   Tertiary: non-degree course (including diploma / certificate / sub-degree course)

o   Tertiary: bachelor degree course

o   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)

o   Administrator and professional

o   Clerical and service worker

o   Production worker

o   Student

o   Home-maker / housewife

o   Retired person

o   Unemployed / between jobs / other non-employed

o   Other: _____

Which of the following best describes your political inclination?

(Randomise the four camps)

o   Localist

o   Pro-democracy camp

o   Centrist

o   Pro-establishment camp

o   Other: _____

o   No political inclination / politically neutral / do not belong to any camp

o   Don't know / hard to say

Area of residence

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

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

o   Candidate of pro-democracy camp, including localist

o   Candidate of non-pro-democracy camp, including pro-establishment camp and centrist

o   Don't know / hard to say

o   Blank / void vote

o   Did not vote (was a registered voter of the election)

o   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.