

## 2022 年 2 月 24 日 新聞公報

### 香港民研發放財政預算案即時調查結果

#### 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

香港民研於昨日財政司司長陳茂波發表財政預算案後，即日進行調查，部分結果已於昨晚發放。是次調查除了隨機抽樣固網和手機號碼，同時加入「香港民研意見群組」中的「香港市民代表組群」（即隨機樣本組群），並透過電話訪問或電郵邀請參與網上調查。調查的電話訪問於昨日下午約一時半開始至晚上約七時半結束，而網上調查則於下午約一時半開始至晚上約八時結束。調查共錄得 917 個成功個案，當中包括 185 個隨機抽樣固網樣本、164 個隨機抽樣手機樣本、129 個意見群組電話訪問樣本及 439 個意見群組網上調查樣本。原始數據已經按照人口比例及各抽樣架的比重加權處理，以確保數據的代表性。

調查顯示，撇除不清楚財政預算案內容的被訪者後，42% 表示滿意預算案，27% 不滿，滿意淨值為正 15 個百分點，平均量值為 3.1 分，即整體上接近「一半半」。以 0 至 100 分計，平均分則為 51.8 分。各項民意數字均較去年的歷史低位大幅變好。至於財政司司長陳茂波，相比一月初，其支持度評分在昨日發表財政預算案後有所改善，最新評分為 47.6 分，明顯上升 5.3 分，而其支持率為 36%，反對率為 30%，民望淨值為正 6 個百分點。財政預算案即時調查顯示了市民的即時反應，後續反應則有待觀察。

調查撇除意見群組樣本的實效回應比率為 47.6%。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 +/-6%，評分誤差不超過 +/-2.1。

#### 樣本資料

調查日期	:	23/2/2022
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 <sup>[1]</sup>	:	917 (包括 185 個隨機抽樣固網樣本、164 個隨機抽樣手機樣本、129 個意見群組電話訪問樣本及 439 個意見群組網上調查樣本)
實效回應比率	:	47.6% (撇除意見群組樣本)

抽樣誤差<sup>[2]</sup>：在 95% 置信水平下，百分比誤差不超過 +/-4%，淨值誤差不超過 +/-6%，評分誤差不超過 +/-2.1

加權方法：原始數據來自 4 個不同的抽樣架，同時按照兩組權重以「反覆多重加權法」進行加權調整。第一組權重是政府統計處提供的人口相關統計數字，包括 a) 《二零二零年年中人口數字》中全港人口年齡及性別分佈統計數字，b) 《香港的女性及男性-主要統計數字》(2020 年版) 中的教育程度 (最高就讀程度) 及 c) 同一來源的經濟活動身分統計數字。第二組權重是按照各抽樣架下的預設目標樣本數目的比例調整，即固網電話隨機抽樣調查 5 個單位，手機電話隨機抽樣調查 5 個單位，意見群組樣本電話調查 6 個單位，及意見群組樣本網上調查 4 個單位。

[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。

## 最新數據

以下是市民對本年度財政預算案的滿意程度及往年的相關數字：

調查日期	樣本數目 <sup>[3]</sup>	對預算案的評價					
		滿意率 <sup>[4]</sup>	一半半 <sup>[4]</sup>	不滿率 <sup>[4]</sup>	滿意率淨值	平均量值 <sup>[4]</sup>	預算案評分
<b>23/2/22</b>	<b>819</b>	<b>42+/-4%<sup>[5]</sup></b>	<b>24+/-3%<sup>[5]</sup></b>	<b>27+/-3%<sup>[5]</sup></b>	<b>15+/-6%<sup>[5]</sup></b>	<b>3.1+/-0.1<sup>[5]</sup></b>	<b>51.8+/-2.1<sup>[5]</sup></b>
24/2/21	731	20% <sup>[5]</sup>	18% <sup>[5]</sup>	56% <sup>[5]</sup>	-36% <sup>[5]</sup>	2.2 <sup>[5]</sup>	36.4 <sup>[5]</sup>
26/2/20	991	46% <sup>[5]</sup>	23%	27% <sup>[5]</sup>	19% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.2 <sup>[5]</sup>	54.1 <sup>[5]</sup>
27/2/19	561	23%	26%	39%	-16%	2.7	47.1
28/2/18	551	26% <sup>[5]</sup>	28%	41% <sup>[5]</sup>	-14% <sup>[5]</sup>	2.7 <sup>[5]</sup>	48.2 <sup>[5]</sup>
22/2/17	502	33%	30%	18%	15%	3.2	55.7
24/2/16	500	36% <sup>[5]</sup>	31%	20%	17% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.2	57.2 <sup>[5]</sup>
25/2/15	529	45% <sup>[5]</sup>	28%	18% <sup>[5]</sup>	28% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.3 <sup>[5]</sup>	60.2 <sup>[5]</sup>
26/2/14	695	24% <sup>[5]</sup>	26% <sup>[5]</sup>	45% <sup>[5]</sup>	-20% <sup>[5]</sup>	2.7 <sup>[5]</sup>	49.8 <sup>[5]</sup>
27/2/13	813	30% <sup>[5]</sup>	37% <sup>[5]</sup>	31% <sup>[5]</sup>	-1% <sup>[5]</sup>	2.9 <sup>[5]</sup>	53.6 <sup>[5]</sup>
1/2/12	826	38% <sup>[5]</sup>	33%	26% <sup>[5]</sup>	12% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.1 <sup>[5]</sup>	57.0 <sup>[5]</sup>
23/2/11	911	27% <sup>[5]</sup>	34%	35% <sup>[5]</sup>	-8% <sup>[5]</sup>	2.8 <sup>[5]</sup>	51.5 <sup>[5]</sup>
24/2/10	724	47% <sup>[5]</sup>	35% <sup>[5]</sup>	14% <sup>[5]</sup>	32% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.4 <sup>[5]</sup>	60.8 <sup>[5]</sup>
25/2/09	669	30% <sup>[5]</sup>	43% <sup>[5]</sup>	22% <sup>[5]</sup>	8% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.1 <sup>[5]</sup>	54.8 <sup>[5]</sup>
27/2/08	811	68% <sup>[5]</sup>	21% <sup>[5]</sup>	5% <sup>[5]</sup>	63% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.8 <sup>[5]</sup>	70.6
28/2/07	673	62% <sup>[5]</sup>	25%	9% <sup>[5]</sup>	53% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.6 <sup>[5]</sup>	--
22/2/06	577	50%	26%	19% <sup>[5]</sup>	31%	3.3	--
16/3/05	544	47% <sup>[5]</sup>	29%	11%	36% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.4	--
10/3/04	395	37% <sup>[5]</sup>	33% <sup>[5]</sup>	12% <sup>[5]</sup>	25% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.3 <sup>[5]</sup>	--
5/3/03	495	20% <sup>[5]</sup>	23%	50% <sup>[5]</sup>	-30% <sup>[5]</sup>	2.5 <sup>[5]</sup>	--
6/3/02	539	47% <sup>[5]</sup>	23%	17%	30% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.3 <sup>[5]</sup>	--
7-8/3/01	263	57% <sup>[5]</sup>	25% <sup>[5]</sup>	13% <sup>[5]</sup>	44% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.5 <sup>[5]</sup>	--
8/3/00	643	70% <sup>[5]</sup>	12% <sup>[5]</sup>	4% <sup>[5]</sup>	66% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.9 <sup>[5]</sup>	--
3/3/99	598	46% <sup>[5]</sup>	27% <sup>[5]</sup>	10% <sup>[5]</sup>	36% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.4 <sup>[5]</sup>	--
18/2/98	638	55%	20%	7%	47%	3.6	--

- [3] 已撇除未聞／不知道財政預算案內容而沒有作答的被訪者。香港民研在 2020 年 3 月前在各次定期調查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。
- [4] 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。
- [5] 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。

撇除不清楚財政預算案內容的被訪者後，42% 表示滿意預算案，27% 不滿，滿意淨值為正 15 個百分點，平均量值為 3.1 分，即整體上接近「一半半」。以 0 至 100 分計，平均分則為 51.8 分。各項民意數字均較去年的歷史低位大幅變好。

以下是 2001 年至今，歷任財政司司長在發表財政預算案後的即時民望變化：<sup>[6]</sup>

	曾蔭權 民望	梁錦松民望			唐英年民望				曾俊華 民望
財政預算案發表日期	7/3/01	6/3/02	5/3/03	10/3/04	16/3/05	22/2/06	28/2/07	27/2/08	
財政預算案前評分	71.9	57.2	48.1	57.4	59.7	63.0	60.8	56.0	
即時調查評分	69.7	63.4	49.8	59.9	63.3	63.0	64.1	67.9	
<b>評分變化</b>	<b>-2.2<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+6.2<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+1.7<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+2.5<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+3.6<sup>[7]</sup></b>	--	<b>+3.3<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+11.9<sup>[7]</sup></b>	
財政預算案前 支持率淨值	--	--	--	--	53%	57%	50%	24%	
即時調查支持率淨值	--	--	--	--	59%	56%	56%	54%	
<b>支持率淨值變化</b>	--	--	--	--	<b>+6%<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>-1%</b>	<b>+6%<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+30%<sup>[7]</sup></b>	
	<b>曾俊華民望</b>								
財政預算案發表日期	25/2/09	24/2/10	23/2/11	1/2/12	27/2/13	26/2/14	25/2/15	24/2/16	
財政預算案前評分	56.7	58.3	55.4	50.6	57.8	56.7	58.6	62.3	
即時調查評分	54.9	61.3	52.4	54.1	56.6	54.0	61.0	62.2	
<b>評分變化</b>	<b>-1.8<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+3.0<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>-3.0<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+3.5<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>-1.2</b>	<b>-2.7<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+2.4<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>-0.1</b>	
財政預算案前 支持率淨值	32%	46%	33%	13%	45%	33%	42%	51%	
即時調查支持率淨值	28%	46%	13%	3%	35%	27%	44%	48%	
<b>支持率淨值變化</b>	<b>-4%</b>	--	<b>-20%<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>-10%<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>-10%<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>-6%</b>	<b>+2%</b>	<b>-3%</b>	
	<b>陳茂波民望</b>								
財政預算案發表日期		22/2/17	28/2/18	27/2/19	26/2/20	24/2/21	<b>23/2/22</b>		
財政預算案前評分		34.0	44.3	37.6	26.6	35.2	<b>42.3+/-2.5</b>		
即時調查評分		47.4	44.5	40.5	43.5	36.2	<b>47.6+/-2.0</b>		
<b>評分變化</b>		<b>+13.4<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+0.2</b>	<b>+2.9</b>	<b>+16.8<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+1.0</b>	<b>+5.3<sup>[7]</sup></b>		
財政預算案前支持率淨值		-29%	-12%	-26%	-36%	-21%	<b>3+/-7%</b>		
即時調查支持率淨值		4%	-12%	-31%	-14%	-24%	<b>6+/-5%</b>		
<b>支持率淨值變化</b>		<b>+33%<sup>[7]</sup></b>	--	<b>-4%</b>	<b>+22%<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>-3%</b>	<b>+3%</b>		

[6] 財政預算案即時調查於 2001 年首次加入財政司司長評分問題，及至 2005 年再加入財政司司長支持率的問題，因此上表的起點為 2001 年。

[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。

即時調查顯示，相比一月初，財政司司長陳茂波的支持度評分在昨日發表財政預算案後有所改善，最新評分為 47.6 分，明顯上升 5.3 分，而其支持率為 36%，反對率為 30%，民望淨值為正 6 個百分點。

## 數據分析

最新的財政預算案即時調查顯示，撇除不清楚財政預算案內容的被訪者後，42%表示滿意預算案，27%不滿，滿意淨值為正 15 個百分點，平均量值為 3.1 分，即整體上接近「一半半」。以 0 至 100 分計，平均分則為 51.8 分。各項民意數字均較去年的歷史低位大幅變好。

至於財政司司長陳茂波，相比一月初，其支持度評分在昨日發表財政預算案後有所改善，最新評分為 47.6 分，明顯上升 5.3 分，而其支持率為 36%，反對率為 30%，民望淨值為正 6 個百分點。

財政預算案即時調查顯示了市民的即時反應，後續反應則有待觀察。



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

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

## Press Release on February 24, 2022

### PORI releases findings of Budget instant survey

#### 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

After Financial Secretary Paul Chan delivered the Budget Speech yesterday, PORI conducted an instant survey on the same day and already released part of the findings last night. Apart from random landline and mobile numbers, this survey also included samples from our “Hong Kong People Representative Panel” (i.e., a panel comprising randomly recruited samples) within “HKPOP Panel”, interviewed by telephone or invited through email to complete an online survey. Our telephone survey began at around 1:30pm till around 7:30pm, while our online survey started at around 1:30pm till around 8pm. A total of 917 successful cases were collected, including 185 random landline samples, 164 random mobile samples, 129 panel telephone survey samples and 439 panel online survey samples. The raw data have been weighted by population statistics and proportions of different sampling frames to ensure data representativeness.

Our survey shows that, after excluding those respondents who said they did not have any knowledge of the Budget, 42% said they were satisfied with it, 27% were dissatisfied, giving a net satisfaction rate of positive 15 percentage points. The mean score is 3.1, meaning close to “half-half” in general, while the average rating is 51.8 marks on a scale of 0 to 100. All popularity figures have significantly improved compared to the historical lows registered last year. As for Financial Secretary Paul Chan, compared to early January, his support rating has improved after he delivered the Budget Speech yesterday. His latest support rating is 47.6 marks, significantly up by 5.3 marks. His approval rate stands at 36% and his disapproval rate is 30%, giving a net approval rate of positive 6 percentage points. The instant survey describes people’s instant reaction toward the Budget. Their reactions later remain to be seen. The instant survey describes people’s instant reaction toward the Budget. Their reactions later remain to be seen.

The effective response rate of the survey excluding panel samples is 47.6%. The maximum sampling error of percentages is +/-4%, that of net values is +/-6% and that of ratings is +/-2.1 at 95% confidence level.

## Contact Information

Date of survey	: 23/2/2022
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 <sup>[1]</sup>	: 917 (including 185 random landline samples, 164 random mobile samples, 129 panel telephone survey samples and 439 panel online survey samples)
Effective response rate	: 47.6% (excluding panel samples)
Sampling error <sup>[2]</sup>	: Sampling error of percentages not more than +/-4%, that of net values not more than +/-6% and that of ratings not more than +/-2.1 at 95% conf. level
Weighting method	: The raw data comes from 4 different sampling frames. It is rim-weighted by two sets of weighting factors simultaneously. The first set of weighting factors comprises population figures provided by the Census and Statistics Department, they include (a) the gender-age distribution of the Hong Kong population from “Mid-year population for 2020”, (b) educational attainment (highest level attended) distribution from “Women and Men in Hong Kong - Key Statistics (2020 Edition)”, and (c) economic activity status distribution from the last source. The second set of weighting factors is adjusted based on the relative target sample size of different sub-sampling frames, namely, random telephone survey using landline numbers set at 5 units, random telephone survey using mobile numbers set at 5 units, telephone survey of randomly pre-selected panel members set at 6 units, and online survey of randomly pre-selected panel members set at 4 units.

[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.

## Latest Figures

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

Date of survey	Sample size <sup>[3]</sup>	Appraisal of Budget					
		Satisfaction rate <sup>[4]</sup>	Half-half <sup>[4]</sup>	Dissatisfaction rate <sup>[4]</sup>	Net satisfaction rate	Mean value <sup>[4]</sup>	Rating of Budget
<b>23/2/22</b>	<b>819</b>	<b>42+/-4%<sup>[5]</sup></b>	<b>24+/-3%<sup>[5]</sup></b>	<b>27+/-3%<sup>[5]</sup></b>	<b>15+/-6%<sup>[5]</sup></b>	<b>3.1+/-0.1<sup>[5]</sup></b>	<b>51.8+/-2.1<sup>[5]</sup></b>
24/2/21	731	20% <sup>[5]</sup>	18% <sup>[5]</sup>	56% <sup>[5]</sup>	-36% <sup>[5]</sup>	2.2 <sup>[5]</sup>	36.4 <sup>[5]</sup>
26/2/20	991	46% <sup>[5]</sup>	23%	27% <sup>[5]</sup>	19% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.2 <sup>[5]</sup>	54.1 <sup>[5]</sup>
27/2/19	561	23%	26%	39%	-16%	2.7	47.1
28/2/18	551	26% <sup>[5]</sup>	28%	41% <sup>[5]</sup>	-14% <sup>[5]</sup>	2.7 <sup>[5]</sup>	48.2 <sup>[5]</sup>
22/2/17	502	33%	30%	18%	15%	3.2	55.7
24/2/16	500	36% <sup>[5]</sup>	31%	20%	17% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.2	57.2 <sup>[5]</sup>

Date of survey	Sample size <sup>[3]</sup>	Appraisal of Budget					
		Satisfaction rate <sup>[4]</sup>	Half-half <sup>[4]</sup>	Dissatisfaction rate <sup>[4]</sup>	Net satisfaction rate	Mean value <sup>[4]</sup>	Rating of Budget
25/2/15	529	45% <sup>[5]</sup>	28%	18% <sup>[5]</sup>	28% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.3 <sup>[5]</sup>	60.2 <sup>[5]</sup>
26/2/14	695	24% <sup>[5]</sup>	26% <sup>[5]</sup>	45% <sup>[5]</sup>	-20% <sup>[5]</sup>	2.7 <sup>[5]</sup>	49.8 <sup>[5]</sup>
27/2/13	813	30% <sup>[5]</sup>	37% <sup>[5]</sup>	31% <sup>[5]</sup>	-1% <sup>[5]</sup>	2.9 <sup>[5]</sup>	53.6 <sup>[5]</sup>
1/2/12	826	38% <sup>[5]</sup>	33%	26% <sup>[5]</sup>	12% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.1 <sup>[5]</sup>	57.0 <sup>[5]</sup>
23/2/11	911	27% <sup>[5]</sup>	34%	35% <sup>[5]</sup>	-8% <sup>[5]</sup>	2.8 <sup>[5]</sup>	51.5 <sup>[5]</sup>
24/2/10	724	47% <sup>[5]</sup>	35% <sup>[5]</sup>	14% <sup>[5]</sup>	32% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.4 <sup>[5]</sup>	60.8 <sup>[5]</sup>
25/2/09	669	30% <sup>[5]</sup>	43% <sup>[5]</sup>	22% <sup>[5]</sup>	8% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.1 <sup>[5]</sup>	54.8 <sup>[5]</sup>
27/2/08	811	68% <sup>[5]</sup>	21% <sup>[5]</sup>	5% <sup>[5]</sup>	63% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.8 <sup>[5]</sup>	70.6
28/2/07	673	62% <sup>[5]</sup>	25%	9% <sup>[5]</sup>	53% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.6 <sup>[5]</sup>	--
22/2/06	577	50%	26%	19% <sup>[5]</sup>	31%	3.3	--
16/3/05	544	47% <sup>[5]</sup>	29%	11%	36% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.4	--
10/3/04	395	37% <sup>[5]</sup>	33% <sup>[5]</sup>	12% <sup>[5]</sup>	25% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.3 <sup>[5]</sup>	--
5/3/03	495	20% <sup>[5]</sup>	23%	50% <sup>[5]</sup>	-30% <sup>[5]</sup>	2.5 <sup>[5]</sup>	--
6/3/02	539	47% <sup>[5]</sup>	23%	17%	30% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.3 <sup>[5]</sup>	--
7-8/3/01	263	57% <sup>[5]</sup>	25% <sup>[5]</sup>	13% <sup>[5]</sup>	44% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.5 <sup>[5]</sup>	--
8/3/00	643	70% <sup>[5]</sup>	12% <sup>[5]</sup>	4% <sup>[5]</sup>	66% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.9 <sup>[5]</sup>	--
3/3/99	598	46% <sup>[5]</sup>	27% <sup>[5]</sup>	10% <sup>[5]</sup>	36% <sup>[5]</sup>	3.4 <sup>[5]</sup>	--
18/2/98	638	55%	20%	7%	47%	3.6	--

[3] Respondents who did not answer this question because they had not heard of / did not have any knowledge of the Budget have been excluded. Before March 2020, PORI reported weighted sub-sample size in all our tracking survey reports. Starting from March 2020, we report raw sub-sample size instead.

[4] 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.

[5] 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 Budget, 42% said they were satisfied with it, 27% were dissatisfied, giving a net satisfaction rate of positive 15 percentage points. The mean score is 3.1, meaning close to “half-half” in general, while the average rating is 51.8 marks on a scale of 0 to 100. All popularity figures have significantly improved compared to the historical lows registered last year.

Figures on various Financial Secretaries' popularity before and after their Budget Speeches since 2001 are summarized as follows: <sup>[6]</sup>

	Popularity of Donald Tsang	Popularity of Antony Leung		Popularity of Henry Tang				Popularity of John Tsang
Date of Budget Speech	7/3/01	6/3/02	5/3/03	10/3/04	16/3/05	22/2/06	28/2/07	27/2/08
Rating before the Budget	71.9	57.2	48.1	57.4	59.7	63.0	60.8	56.0
Rating at instant survey	69.7	63.4	49.8	59.9	63.3	63.0	64.1	67.9
<b>Change in rating</b>	<b>-2.2<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+6.2<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+1.7<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+2.5<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+3.6<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>--</b>	<b>+3.3<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+11.9<sup>[7]</sup></b>
Net approval rate before the Budget	--	--	--	--	53%	57%	50%	24%
Net approval rate at instant survey	--	--	--	--	59%	56%	56%	54%
<b>Change in net approval rate</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>+6%<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>-1%</b>	<b>+6%<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+30%<sup>[7]</sup></b>
	<b>Popularity of John Tsang</b>							
Date of Budget Speech	25/2/09	24/2/10	23/2/11	1/2/12	27/2/13	26/2/14	25/2/15	24/2/16
Rating before the Budget	56.7	58.3	55.4	50.6	57.8	56.7	58.6	62.3
Rating at instant survey	54.9	61.3	52.4	54.1	56.6	54.0	61.0	62.2
<b>Change in rating</b>	<b>-1.8<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+3.0<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>-3.0<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+3.5<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>-1.2</b>	<b>-2.7<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+2.4<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>-0.1</b>
Net approval rate before the Budget	32%	46%	33%	13%	45%	33%	42%	51%
Net approval rate at instant survey	28%	46%	13%	3%	35%	27%	44%	48%
<b>Change in net approval rate</b>	<b>-4%</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>-20%<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>-10%<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>-10%<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>-6%</b>	<b>+2%</b>	<b>-3%</b>
	<b>Popularity of Paul Chan</b>							
Date of Budget Speech			22/2/17	28/2/18	27/2/19	26/2/20	24/2/21	23/2/22
Rating before the Budget			34.0	44.3	37.6	26.6	35.2	42.3+/-2.5
Rating at instant survey			47.4	44.5	40.5	43.5	36.2	47.6+/-2.0
<b>Change in rating</b>			<b>+13.4<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+0.2</b>	<b>+2.9</b>	<b>+16.8<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>+1.0</b>	<b>+5.3<sup>[7]</sup></b>
Net approval rate before the Budget			-29%	-12%	-26%	-36%	-21%	3+/-7%
Net approval rate at instant survey			4%	-12%	-31%	-14%	-24%	6+/-5%
<b>Change in net approval rate</b>			<b>+33%<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>--</b>	<b>-4%</b>	<b>+22%<sup>[7]</sup></b>	<b>-3%</b>	<b>+3%</b>

[6] Rating of the Financial Secretary was introduced in our Budget instant survey in 2001, while approval rate was introduced in 2005. This table therefore starts from 2001.

[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.

Instant survey shows that compared to early January, Financial Secretary Paul Chan's support rating has improved after he delivered the Budget Speech yesterday. His latest support rating is 47.6 marks, significantly up by 5.3 marks. His approval rate stands at 36% and his disapproval rate is 30%, giving a net approval rate of positive 6 percentage points.

### **Data Analysis**

Our latest Budget instant survey shows that, after excluding those respondents who said they did not have any knowledge of the Budget, 42% said they were satisfied with it, 27% were dissatisfied, giving a net satisfaction rate of positive 15 percentage points. The mean score is 3.1, meaning close



to “half-half” in general, while the average rating is 51.8 marks on a scale of 0 to 100. All popularity figures have significantly improved compared to the historical lows registered last year.

As for Financial Secretary Paul Chan, compared to early January, his support rating has improved after he delivered the Budget Speech yesterday. His latest support rating is 47.6 marks, significantly up by 5.3 marks. His approval rate stands at 36% and his disapproval rate is 30%, giving a net approval rate of positive 6 percentage points.

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