

2023 年 1 月 10 日 新聞公報

香港民研發放市民身分認同感最新結果

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。

香港民研在去年六月初正式啟動「一國兩制 25 周年中期民情總結」，已先後發表了官員民望、六四民情、身份認同、核心社會指標、政府民望、回歸周年調查、信任及信心指標、社會現況評價、兩岸政治人物民望、市民對各地人民及政府觀感、自由指標、法治指標、司長民望、新聞傳媒評價、紀律部隊及駐港解放軍民望以及年終回顧及前瞻調查的總結，並將會在今年上半年繼續總結其他調查系列。另外，由去年七月開始，我們將定期民意調查的次數由每月兩次減至一次，自八月起，定期記招的次數亦已縮減至每月兩次，改為投放更多資源進行公民教育工作。我們現已在網站開展了「民研快訊」的欄目，當中包括香港民研的最新消息和問與答，及最新增加了「鍾言亦議」轉載專欄，日後會繼續豐富欄目內容，並逐漸增加服務項目。除此之外，我們會在各大社交媒體（包括 Facebook, Instagram 和 Twitter）發放更多圖像訊息，包括圖表和分析，歡迎追蹤。

公報簡要

香港民研於 2022 年 12 月初由真實訪問員以隨機抽樣電話訪問方式成功訪問了 1,004 名香港居民。

調查顯示，以沒有涉及身分對立問題的獨立評分計，無論是按認同感、重要性或認同指數排名，「香港人」身分均繼續排行第一位，之後是「亞洲人」、「中華民族一分子」、「中國人」、「世界公民」和「中華人民共和國國民」，唯「中華民族一分子」的重要性平均而言略高於「亞洲人」。對比半年前，「香港人」、「亞洲人」、「中華民族一分子」以及「中國人」的所有數據均顯著上升。當中，「亞洲人」的認同感和認同指數創 2018 年以來新高，重要性更創 2008 年有紀錄以來新高。「中華民族一份子」的重要性和認同指數創 2016 年以來新高，認同感則創 2012 年以來新高。「中國人」的所有指標均創 2012 年以來新高，而「中華人民共和國國民」的重要性和認同指數創 2012 年以來新高，認同感則創 2009 年以來新高。

如果把「香港人」和「中國人」身分對立比較，讓市民在「香港人」、「中國人」、「香港的中國人」和「中國的香港人」四者中選擇自己最認同的身分，無論是狹義或廣義地自稱為「香港人」的比率，都比同樣定義的「中國人」比率為高。與半年前比較，自稱為「香港人」之比率顯著下跌，創 2012 年以來新低，自稱為「中國人」之比率創 2017 年以來新高，而自稱為「中國的香港人」之比率則創 1997 年有紀錄以來新高。

調查的實效回應比率為 60.2%。在 95% 置信水平下，調查的百分比誤差不超過 +/-4%，評分誤差不超過 +/-3.1。

樣本資料

調查日期	: 5-9/12/2022
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 ^[1]	: 1,004 (包括 503 個固網及 501 個手機樣本)
實效回應比率	: 60.2%
抽樣誤差 ^[2]	: 在 95% 置信水平下，百分比誤差不超過 +/-4%，評分誤差不超過 +/-3.1
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）。

[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

關於香港市民各項身分的獨立評分數字表列如下：

調查日期		7-10/12/20	7-10/6/21	29/11-3/12/21	31/5-5/6/22	5-9/12/22	最新變化
樣本數目		529-648	586-703	576-708	567-700	506-514	--
回應比率		70.0%	55.1%	44.9%	39.8%	60.2%	--
最新結果 ^[3]		結果	結果	結果	結果	結果及誤差	--
香港人	認同感	8.26 ^[4]	7.78 ^[4]	7.94	7.77	8.41+/-0.20	+0.64 ^[4]
	重要性	7.89 ^[4]	7.80	7.64	7.64	8.22+/-0.21	+0.58 ^[4]
	認同指數	79.5 ^[4]	76.3 ^[4]	75.9	75.4	81.8+/-2.0	+6.4 ^[4]
亞洲人	認同感	7.84	7.74	7.79	7.74	8.15+/-0.22	+0.41 ^[4]
	重要性	6.65	6.56	6.62	6.57	7.10+/-0.26	+0.53 ^[4]
	認同指數	70.1	69.1	69.8	69.3	73.6+/-2.5	+4.3 ^[4]
中華民族 一分子	認同感	6.44	6.46	6.38	6.79 ^[4]	7.56+/-0.26	+0.77 ^[4]
	重要性	6.04	6.01	6.06	6.42	7.15+/-0.29	+0.72 ^[4]
	認同指數	60.7	61.0	60.7	65.0 ^[4]	71.8+/-2.8	+6.8 ^[4]
中國人	認同感	5.93	6.02	6.13	6.52	7.32+/-0.29	+0.80 ^[4]
	重要性	5.40	5.59	5.61	6.18 ^[4]	7.06+/-0.30	+0.89 ^[4]
	認同指數	54.9	56.0	56.8	61.5 ^[4]	70.7+/-3.0	+9.2 ^[4]
世界公民	認同感	6.97	6.79	6.86	6.62	6.73+/-0.25	+0.12
	重要性	6.53	6.45	6.45	6.30	6.44+/-0.27	+0.14
	認同指數	66.5	64.8	65.0	63.3	63.7+/-2.4	+0.4
中華人民 共和國國民	認同感	5.16	5.30	5.71	6.14	6.47+/-0.32	+0.34
	重要性	4.99	5.08	5.32	5.95 ^[4]	6.19+/-0.33	+0.24
	認同指數	49.3	50.5	53.6	59.1 ^[4]	61.9+/-3.1	+2.9

- [3] 「認同指數」計算自個別樣本之認同感評分和重要性評分的幾何平均數再乘以 10。若個別樣本欠缺認同感或重要性評分之數據，則由整體認同感平均分或重要性平均分所取代。
- [4] 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。

沒有涉及身分對立問題的獨立評分結果顯示，無論是按認同感、重要性或認同指數排名，「香港人」身分均繼續排行第一位，之後是「亞洲人」、「中華民族一分子」、「中國人」、「世界公民」和「中華人民共和國國民」。認同感評分分別為 8.41、8.15、7.56、7.32、6.73 及 6.47。重要性評分則分別為 8.22、7.10、7.15、7.06、6.44 及 6.19，亦即「中華民族一分子」的重要性平均而言略高於「亞洲人」。把個別樣本之認同感評分和重要性評分的幾何平均數乘以 10，就得出 0 至 100 分的「認同指數」，0 分代表絕不投入，100 分代表絕對投入，最新數字分別為 81.8、73.6、71.8、70.7、63.7 及 61.9。

對比半年前，「香港人」、「亞洲人」、「中華民族一分子」以及「中國人」的所有數據均顯著上升。當中，「亞洲人」的認同感和認同指數創 2018 年以來新高，重要性更創 2008 年有紀錄以來新高。「中華民族一分子」的重要性和認同指數創 2016 年以來新高，認同感則創 2012 年以來新高。「中國人」的所有指標均創 2012 年以來新高，而「中華人民共和國國民」的重要性和認同指數創 2012 年以來新高，認同感則創 2009 年以來新高。

至於採自行之已久的「香港人」與「中國人」身分對立提問方式的調查結果，則表列如下：

調查日期	7-10/12/20	7-10/6/21	29/11-3/12/21	31/5-5/6/22	5-9/12/22	最新變化
樣本數目	639	605	609	627	513	--
回應比率	70.0%	55.1%	44.9%	39.8%	60.2%	--
最新結果	結果	結果	結果	結果	結果及誤差	--
自稱為「香港人」之比率	44% ^[5]	44%	39%	39+/-4%	32+/-4%	-7% ^[5]
自稱為「中國人」之比率	15%	13%	18% ^[5]	18+/-3%	21+/-4%	+3%
自稱為「香港的中國人」之比率	14%	13%	11%	11+/-3%	12+/-3%	+1%
自稱為「中國的香港人」之比率	25%	28%	31%	31+/-4%	34+/-4%	+3%
自認為廣義「香港人」之比率	69% ^[5]	72%	70%	70+/-4%	66+/-4%	-4%
自認為廣義「中國人」之比率	29% ^[5]	26%	28%	29+/-4%	32+/-4%	+4%
自稱「香港人」和「中國人」混合身分之比率	38%	42%	42%	42+/-4%	46+/-4%	+4%

- [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。

如果把「香港人」和「中國人」身分對立比較，讓市民在「香港人」、「中國人」、「香港的中國人」和「中國的香港人」四者中選擇自己最認同的身分，有 32% 稱自己為「香港人」，21% 自稱為「中國人」，12% 自稱為「香港的中國人」，而 34% 則自稱為「中國的香港人」。換言之，66% 認為自己是廣義的「香港人」（即回答「香港人」或「中國的香港人」），32% 認為自己是廣義的「中國人」（即回答「中國人」或「香港的中國人」），46% 則選擇了「香港人」和「中國人」的混合身分（即回答「香港的中國人」或「中國的香港人」）。無論是狹義或廣義地自稱為「香港人」的比率，都比同樣定義的「中國人」比率為高。與半年前比較，自稱為「香港人」之比率顯著下跌，創 2012 年以來新低，自稱為「中國人」之比率創 2017 年以來新高，而自稱為「中國的香港人」之比率則創 1997 年有紀錄以來新高。

下次新聞公報／發佈會 (暫定)

- [發佈會] 1 月 18 日 (星期三) 下午三時
題目：待定



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 January 10, 2023

PORI releases latest results on people's ethnic identity

Special Announcements

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.

PORI launched the “One Country Two Systems 25-year Mid-term Review” in early June last year and has already released reviews on the popularity of officials, June Fourth Incident, ethnic identity, core social indicators, government popularities, handover anniversaries, trust and confidence indicators, people's appraisal of society's current conditions, popularity of cross-strait political figures, people's feelings towards different peoples and governments, freedom indicators, rule of law indicators, popularity figures of Secretaries of Departments, people's appraisal of news media, popularity of disciplinary forces and the PLA Hong Kong Garrison, as well as year-end review and forecast. More reviews of other survey series will be released during the first half of this year. Meanwhile, starting from July last year, we have reduced the frequency of our tracking surveys from twice to once a month, and from August onwards, our regular press conferences have also been reduced to twice a month in order to conserve our resources for civic education work. We have already launched our “PORI Express” column in our website, including latest news of PORI and Q&A as well as reposts from the latest “Chung's Blunt Words” Facebook Page. We will continue to enrich its content, then add more services. In addition, we will release infographics with more charts and analyses on our social media platforms (including Facebook, Instagram and Twitter), welcome to follow.

Abstract

PORI successfully interviewed 1,004 Hong Kong residents by a random telephone survey conducted by real interviewers during early December 2022.

Our survey results using independent rating questions that do not involve choosing one among identities show that whether in terms of strength rating, importance rating or identity index, the identity of “Hongkongers” continues to rank first, followed by “Asians”, “members of the Chinese race”, “Chinese”, “global citizens” and “citizens of the PRC”, only that the average importance rating of “members of the Chinese race” is slightly higher than that of “Asians”. Compared with half a year ago, all the figures of “Hongkongers”, “Asians”, “members of the Chinese race” and “Chinese” have increased significantly. Specifically, the strength rating and identity index of “Asians” have registered new record highs since 2018, while its importance rating has even registered an all-time high since 2008. The importance rating and identity index of “members of the Chinese race” have registered new record highs since 2016, while its strength rating has registered a new high since 2012. All three indicators of “Chinese” have registered new highs since 2012. The importance rating and identity index of “citizens of the PRC” have registered new highs since 2012, while its strength rating has registered a new high since 2009.

If we use a dichotomy of “Hongkonger” versus “Chinese” identity and ask people to make a choice among four identities, namely, “Hongkongers”, “Chinese”, “Chinese in Hong Kong” and “Hongkongers in China”, whether in their narrow and broad senses, the proportions of people identifying themselves as “Hongkongers” outnumber those of “Chinese”. Compared with half a year ago, the proportion of people identifying themselves as “Hongkongers” has decreased significantly, registering a new record low since 2012. The proportion of people identifying themselves as “Chinese” has registered a new high since 2017, while the proportion of people identifying themselves as “Hongkongers in China” has registered an all-time high since 1997.

The effective response rate of the survey is 60.2%. The maximum sampling error of percentages is +/-4% and that of ratings is +/-3.1 at 95% confidence level.

Contact Information

Date of survey	: 5-9/12/2022
Survey method	: Random telephone survey conducted by real interviewers
Target population	: Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong residents aged 18 or above
Sample size ^[1]	: 1,004 (including 503 landline and 501 mobile samples)
Effective response rate	: 60.2%
Sampling error ^[2]	: Sampling error of percentages not more than +/-4% and that of ratings not more than +/-3.1 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)”.

[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

Latest figures on Hong Kong people’s ratings on different identities are tabulated as follows:

Date of survey		7-10/12/20	7-10/6/21	29/11-3/12/21	31/5-5/6/22	5-9/12/22	<u>Latest change</u>
Sample size		529-648	586-703	576-708	567-700	506-514	--
Response rate		70.0%	55.1%	44.9%	39.8%	60.2%	--
Latest findings ^[3]		Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding & error	--
Hongkongers	Strength rating	8.26 ^[4]	7.78 ^[4]	7.94	7.77	8.41+/-0.20	+0.64^[4]
	Importance rating	7.89 ^[4]	7.80	7.64	7.64	8.22+/-0.21	+0.58^[4]
	Identity index	79.5 ^[4]	76.3 ^[4]	75.9	75.4	81.8+/-2.0	+6.4^[4]

Date of survey	7-10/12/20	7-10/6/21	29/11-3/12/21	31/5-5/6/22	5-9/12/22	<i>Latest change</i>	
Sample size	529-648	586-703	576-708	567-700	506-514	--	
Response rate	70.0%	55.1%	44.9%	39.8%	60.2%	--	
Latest findings ^[3]	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding & error	--	
Asians	Strength rating	7.84	7.74	7.79	7.74	8.15+/-0.22	+0.41^[4]
	Importance rating	6.65	6.56	6.62	6.57	7.10+/-0.26	+0.53^[4]
	Identity index	70.1	69.1	69.8	69.3	73.6+/-2.5	+4.3^[4]
Members of the Chinese race	Strength rating	6.44	6.46	6.38	6.79 ^[4]	7.56+/-0.26	+0.77^[4]
	Importance rating	6.04	6.01	6.06	6.42	7.15+/-0.29	+0.72^[4]
	Identity index	60.7	61.0	60.7	65.0 ^[4]	71.8+/-2.8	+6.8^[4]
Chinese	Strength rating	5.93	6.02	6.13	6.52	7.32+/-0.29	+0.80^[4]
	Importance rating	5.40	5.59	5.61	6.18 ^[4]	7.06+/-0.30	+0.89^[4]
	Identity index	54.9	56.0	56.8	61.5 ^[4]	70.7+/-3.0	+9.2^[4]
Global citizens	Strength rating	6.97	6.79	6.86	6.62	6.73+/-0.25	+0.12
	Importance rating	6.53	6.45	6.45	6.30	6.44+/-0.27	+0.14
	Identity index	66.5	64.8	65.0	63.3	63.7+/-2.4	+0.4
Citizens of the PRC	Strength rating	5.16	5.30	5.71	6.14	6.47+/-0.32	+0.34
	Importance rating	4.99	5.08	5.32	5.95 ^[4]	6.19+/-0.33	+0.24
	Identity index	49.3	50.5	53.6	59.1 ^[4]	61.9+/-3.1	+2.9

[3] “Identity index” is calculated for each respondent by taking the geometric mean of the strength and importance ratings and then multiplied by 10. If either the strength or importance rating of a respondent is missing, it is substituted by the sample mean.

[4] 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.

Results of independent rating questions that do not involve choosing one among identities show that whether in terms of strength rating, importance rating or identity index, the identity of “Hongkongers” continues to rank first, followed by “Asians”, “members of the Chinese race”, “Chinese”, “global citizens” and “citizens of the PRC”. The strength ratings are 8.41, 8.15, 7.56, 7.32, 6.73 and 6.47 respectively, while the importance ratings are 8.22, 7.10, 7.15, 7.06, 6.44 and 6.19 respectively, which means the average importance rating of “members of the Chinese race” is slightly higher than that of “Asians”. Taking the geometric mean of the strength and importance ratings of each respondent and then multiply it by 10, we have an “identity index” between 0 and 100, with 0 meaning no feeling and 100 meaning extremely strong feeling. The latest figures are 81.8, 73.6, 71.8, 70.7, 63.7 and 61.9 respectively.

Compared with half a year ago, all the figures of “Hongkongers”, “Asians”, “members of the Chinese race” and “Chinese” have increased significantly. Specifically, the strength rating and identity index of “Asians” have registered new record highs since 2018, while its importance rating has even registered an all-time high since 2008. The importance rating and identity index of “members of the Chinese race” have registered new record highs since 2016, while its strength rating has registered a new high since 2012. All three indicators of “Chinese” have registered new highs since 2012. The importance rating and identity index of “citizens of the PRC” have registered new highs since 2012, while its strength rating has registered a new high since 2009.

As for the results from the survey mode used for long on Hong Kong people’s sense of ethnic identity, latest figures are tabulated as follows:

Date of survey	7-10/12/20	7-10/6/21	29/11-3/12/21	31/5-5/6/22	5-9/12/22	<u>Latest change</u>
Sample size	639	605	609	627	513	--
Response rate	70.0%	55.1%	44.9%	39.8%	60.2%	--
Latest findings	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding & error	--
Identified as “Hongkongers”	44% ^[5]	44%	39%	39+/-4%	32+/-4%	-7%^[5]
Identified as “Chinese”	15%	13%	18% ^[5]	18+/-3%	21+/-4%	+3%
Identified as “Chinese in Hong Kong”	14%	13%	11%	11+/-3%	12+/-3%	+1%
Identified as “Hongkongers in China”	25%	28%	31%	31+/-4%	34+/-4%	+3%
Identified as “Hongkongers” in broad sense	69% ^[5]	72%	70%	70+/-4%	66+/-4%	-4%
Identified as “Chinese” in broad sense	29% ^[5]	26%	28%	29+/-4%	32+/-4%	+4%
Identified with a mixed identity of “Hongkongers” and “Chinese”	38%	42%	42%	42+/-4%	46+/-4%	+4%

[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.

If we use a dichotomy of “Hongkonger” versus “Chinese” identity and ask people to make a choice among four identities, namely, “Hongkongers”, “Chinese”, “Chinese in Hong Kong” and “Hongkongers in China”, 32% identified themselves as “Hongkongers”, 21% as “Chinese”, 12% as “Chinese in Hong Kong” and 34% as “Hongkongers in China”. In other words, 66% identified themselves as “Hongkongers” in a broad sense (i.e., either as “Hongkongers” or “Hongkongers in China”), 32% identified themselves as “Chinese” in a broad sense (i.e., either as “Chinese” or “Chinese in Hong Kong”), while 46% chose a mixed identity of “Hongkongers” and “Chinese” (i.e., either as “Chinese in Hong Kong” or “Hongkongers in China”). Whether in their narrow and broad senses, the proportions of people identifying themselves as “Hongkongers” outnumber those of “Chinese”. Compared with half a year ago, the proportion of people identifying themselves as “Hongkongers” has decreased significantly, registering a new record low since 2012. The proportion of people identifying themselves as “Chinese” has registered a new high since 2017, while the proportion of people identifying themselves as “Hongkongers in China” has registered an all-time high since 1997.

Upcoming Press Release / Press Conference (Tentative)

- [Press Conference] January 18 (Wednesday) at 15:00
Topic: TBC