

## 2023 年 10 月 26 日 新聞公報

### 香港民研發放施政報告即時調查結果及市民對新聞傳媒評價

#### 特別宣佈

香港民意研究所（香港民研）早前已經宣布，基於社會責任和延續歷史記錄的使命，今年繼續進行施政報告即時調查，但就引入電話短訊隨機邀請市民參與網上調查的方法，與時並進。透過各種不同方法收集的數據，已按照嚴格的統計方法加權調整，詳情請細閱樣本資料部份。香港民研將繼續研究不同方法的利弊，適時調整日後的操作。

#### 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，40%不滿，滿意淨值為負 6 個百分點。以 0 至 100 分計，平均分為 44.4 分。數據顯示市民對今次施政報告的評價略較去年差。

至於特首李家超，其最新評分為 49.7 分，支持率為 51%，反對率為 31%，民望淨值為正 20 個百分點，與發表施政報告前分別不算大。

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。

至於市民對新聞傳媒評價，香港民研於十月初由真實訪問員以隨機抽樣電話訪問方式，成功訪問了 500 名香港居民。

調查顯示，在多種新聞傳媒之中，互聯網和電視繼續是市民的主要新聞來源，而主要透過報紙得悉新聞者比率較半年前顯著下跌。電視和互聯網亦繼續是市民最信任的新聞來源，而報章的信任程度較半年前顯著下跌，並創 1993 年有紀錄以來最低。家人作為新聞來源的信任程度則較半年前顯著上升。

市民對新聞傳媒整體表現的最新滿意淨值為正 16 個百分點，當中對電視和互聯網的滿意率淨值較一年前分別大幅上升 14 和 15 個百分點，而電視及雜誌的滿意率淨值分別創 2017 及 1996 年以來新高。

香港新聞自由程度的最新滿意淨值為負 8 個百分點，與半年前數字相同。認為香港新聞傳媒有充分發揮言論自由的淨值為負 13 個百分點，再創 1997 年有紀錄以來新低。同時，認為香港新聞傳媒有誤用或濫用新聞自由的淨值為負 5 個百分點，同樣再創 1997 年有紀錄以來新低。此外，認為香港新聞傳媒報道負責任的淨值為負 2 個百分點。認為香港新聞傳媒批評中央和特區政府時有顧忌的淨值分別為正 58 和正 32 個百分點，兩者淨值均繼一年前再創 1997 年有紀錄以來最高。認為香港新聞傳媒有自我審查的淨值則為正 32 個百分點。最後，以 0-10 分為標準，市民對香港新聞傳媒公信力的評分為 5.29 分。

新聞傳媒評價調查的實效回應比率為 55.8%。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 +/-9%，評分誤差不超過 +/-0.16。

## 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，我們亦邀請「香港民研意見群組」成員參與網上調查，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。此外，今年我們亦加入了以隨機抽樣方式透過電話短訊邀請市民參與網上調查的樣本。

調查於昨日下午約一時半開始，至晚上約九時結束，共收集到 681 個成功個案，當中包括 127 個隨機抽樣固網樣本、129 個隨機抽樣手機樣本、79 個隨機抽樣電話短訊網上調查樣本及 346 個意見群組網上調查樣本。原始數據已經按照人口比例、隨機電話訪問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。

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 +/-2.9。電話訪問部分的實效回應比率為 58.0%。

調查日期	: 25/10/2023
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 (2) 隨機抽樣電話短訊邀請參與網上調查 (3) 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>	: 681 (包括 127 個隨機抽樣固網樣本、129 個隨機抽樣手機樣本、79 個隨機抽樣電話短訊網上調查樣本及 346 個意見群組網上調查樣本)
實效回應比率	: 58.0% (撇除電話短訊及意見群組網上調查樣本)
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 +/-8%，評分誤差不超過 +/-2.9
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《二零二二年年中人口數字》，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》(2022 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) 市民對新聞傳媒評價

另外，香港民研亦於十月初由真實訪問員以隨機抽樣電話訪問方式成功訪問了 500 名香港居民。

調查的實效回應比率為 55.8%。在 95%置信水平下，調查的百分比誤差不超過 $\pm 4\%$ ，淨值誤差不超過 $\pm 9\%$ ，評分誤差不超過 $\pm 0.16$ 。

調查日期	:	3-16/10/2023
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 <sup>[3]</sup>	:	500 (包括 250 個固網及 250 個手機樣本)
實效回應比率	:	55.8%
抽樣誤差 <sup>[4]</sup>	:	在 95%置信水平下，百分比誤差不超過 $\pm 4\%$ ，淨值誤差不超過 $\pm 9\%$ ，評分誤差不超過 $\pm 0.16$
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《二零二二年年中人口數字》，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》（2022 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。

### 施政報告即時調查

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 <sup>[5]</sup>	對施政報告的評價					
		滿意率 <sup>[6]</sup>	一半半	不滿率 <sup>[6]</sup>	滿意率淨值	平均量值 <sup>[6]</sup>	施政報告 評分
<b>25/10/23</b>	<b>551</b>	<b>34<math>\pm</math>4%</b>	<b>17<math>\pm</math>3%</b>	<b>40<math>\pm</math>4%</b> <sup>[8]</sup>	<b>-6<math>\pm</math>8%</b>	<b>2.8<math>\pm</math>0.1</b> <sup>[8]</sup>	<b>44.4<math>\pm</math>2.9</b> <sup>[8]</sup>
19/10/22	590	34%[8]	19%[8]	31%[8]	3%[8]	3.0[8]	51.1[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]

調查日期	樣本數目 <sup>[5]</sup>	對施政報告的評價					
		滿意率 <sup>[6]</sup>	一半半	不滿率 <sup>[6]</sup>	滿意率淨值	平均量值 <sup>[6]</sup>	施政報告 評分
14/10/09	462	30%	37%	28%	2%	3.0	53.5
15/10/08	515	31% <sup>[8]</sup>	35% <sup>[8]</sup>	26% <sup>[8]</sup>	4% <sup>[8]</sup>	3.0	53.8 <sup>[8]</sup>
10/10/07	602	52% <sup>[8]</sup>	29% <sup>[8]</sup>	10% <sup>[8]</sup>	42% <sup>[8]</sup>	3.5	65.2 <sup>[8]</sup>
11/10/06	445	30% <sup>[8]</sup>	37%	22% <sup>[8]</sup>	8% <sup>[8]</sup>	3.0	55.8 <sup>[8]</sup>
12/10/05	377	48% <sup>[8]</sup>	33%	9% <sup>[8]</sup>	39% <sup>[8]</sup>	3.5	66.4 <sup>[8]</sup>
12/1/05	391	38% <sup>[8]</sup>	30%	20% <sup>[8]</sup>	18% <sup>[8]</sup>	3.2	56.3 <sup>[8]</sup>
7/1/04	381	25%	26%	33% <sup>[8]</sup>	-8%	2.8	49.3
8/1/03 <sup>[7]</sup>	377	22% <sup>[8]</sup>	29%	27%	-5%	2.8	51.6 <sup>[8]</sup>
10/10/01	433	29%	33%	28%	1%	3.0	56.7
11/10/00	262	25% <sup>[8]</sup>	28%	31%	-6% <sup>[8]</sup>	2.9	55.2
6/10/99	236	31% <sup>[8]</sup>	30%	25% <sup>[8]</sup>	6% <sup>[8]</sup>	3.0	57.3
7/10/98	508	22% <sup>[8]</sup>	35% <sup>[8]</sup>	35% <sup>[8]</sup>	-14% <sup>[8]</sup>	2.8	--
8/10/97	534	45%	30% <sup>[8]</sup>	14% <sup>[8]</sup>	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% 被訪者表示滿意施政報告，40% 不滿，滿意淨值為負 6 個百分點，平均量值為 2.8 分，即整體上接近「一半半」。以 0 至 100 分計，平均分為 44.4 分。數據顯示市民對今次施政報告的評價略較去年差。

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
<b>評分變化</b>	<b>+0.3</b>	<b>+0.3</b>	<b>+0.3</b>	<b>+2.5<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+2.2<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+0.7</b>	<b>+1.7<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+1.2</b>
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	
<b>評分變化</b>	<b>-0.6</b>	<b>-3.1<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>-1.4<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+1.2</b>	<b>-1.0</b>	<b>+0.8</b>	<b>+2.2<sup>[10]</sup></b>	
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%	
<b>支持率淨值變化<sup>[9]</sup></b>	<b>-3%</b>	<b>-12%<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>--</b>	<b>+5%</b>	<b>+1%</b>	<b>+1%</b>	<b>+4%</b>	

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
<b>評分變化</b>	<b>+3.3<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+3.3<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+4.2<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>-0.5</b>	<b>+0.4</b>
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%
<b>支持率淨值變化<sup>[9]</sup></b>	<b>+9%<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+7%<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+4%</b>	<b>-10%<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>-13%<sup>[10]</sup></b>
林鄭月娥民望					
施政報告發表日期	11/10/17	10/10/18	16/10/19	25/11/20	6/10/21
施政報告前評分	59.6	52.3	22.3	30.8	33.9
即時調查評分	61.1	47.6	22.7	26.8	30.5
<b>評分變化</b>	<b>+1.5</b>	<b>-4.7<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+0.3</b>	<b>-4.1<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>-3.4<sup>[10]</sup></b>
施政報告前支持率淨值	10%	4%	-65%	-48%	-46%
即時調查支持率淨值	23%	-10%	-64%	-57%	-48%
<b>支持率淨值變化<sup>[9]</sup></b>	<b>+13%<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>-14%<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+1%</b>	<b>-9%<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>-2%</b>
李家超民望					
施政報告發表日期	19/10/22		25/10/23		
施政報告前評分	53.5		52.6+/-2.0		
即時調查評分	52.0		49.7+/-2.6		
<b>評分變化</b>	<b>-1.5</b>		<b>-2.9</b>		
施政報告前支持率淨值	13%		24+/-6%		
即時調查支持率淨值	9%		20+/-7%		
<b>支持率淨值變化<sup>[9]</sup></b>	<b>-4%</b>		<b>-4%</b>		

[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。

以下是特首李家超在發表施政報告前後的民望走勢：

調查日期	3-18/5/23	1-8/6/23	11-21/7/23 <sup>[9]</sup>	1-10/8/23	7-19/9/23	25/10/23	最新變化
樣本數目	1,003	1,005	1,004	1,005	1,001	681	--
回應比率	52.4%	61.9%	50.0%	54.5%	53.0%	58.0%	--
最新結果	結果	結果	結果	結果	結果	結果及誤差	--
特首評分	56.9	51.5 <sup>[12]</sup>	49.7	50.7	52.6	49.7+/-2.6	-2.9
特首支持率 <sup>[11]</sup>	51%	44% <sup>[12]</sup>	50% <sup>[12]</sup>	53%	55%	51+/-4%	-4%
特首反對率 <sup>[11]</sup>	36%	45% <sup>[12]</sup>	29% <sup>[12]</sup>	29%	31%	31+/-4%	--
支持率淨值 <sup>[11]</sup>	15%	-1% <sup>[12]</sup>	21% <sup>[12]</sup>	24%	24%	20+/-7%	-4%

[11] 2023 年 7 月開始，特首假設投票問題的字眼已經由「假設明天選舉特首，而你又有權投票，你會唔會選李家超做特首？」更新為「假設你而家有權決定續任或者罷免李家超作為特首，你會點樣決定？」以呼應香港現在的發展。答案選項亦已由「會」和「唔會」改變為「續任」、「罷免」和「棄權」，而「唔知／難講」和「拒答」選項則繼續採用。

[12] 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，特首李家超的最新評分為 49.7 分，其支持率為 51%，反對率為 31%，民望淨值為正 20 個百分點，與發表施政報告前分別不算大。

## 市民對新聞傳媒評價

新聞傳媒調查的最新結果表列如下：

調查日期	16-23/9/21	21-25/3/22	5-9/9/22	6-20/3/23	3-16/10/23	最新變化
樣本數目	636-660	560-691	507-517	520-526	500	--
回應比率	44.1%	42.1%	48.6%	42.8%	55.8%	--
最新結果	結果	結果	結果	結果	結果及誤差	--
市民的主要新聞來源：						
互聯網	64% <sup>[14]</sup>	64%	64%	70% <sup>[14]</sup>	75+/-4%	+4%
電視	60%	65%	67%	65%	71+/-4%	+5%
報紙	28% <sup>[14]</sup>	21% <sup>[14]</sup>	26% <sup>[14]</sup>	31%	24+/-4%	-7% <sup>[14]</sup>
電台	24%	21%	23%	25%	22+/-4%	-3%
家人	10% <sup>[14]</sup>	13%	12%	13%	14+/-3%	+1%
認為最值得信任的新聞來源：						
電視	29%	35% <sup>[14]</sup>	37%	39%	39+/-4%	--
互聯網	23% <sup>[14]</sup>	24%	22%	22%	28+/-4%	+5%
電台	12%	9%	11%	10%	9+/-3%	-1%
報紙	9% <sup>[14]</sup>	8%	10%	13%	7+/-2%	-6% <sup>[14]</sup>
家人	6%	4%	5%	2%	5+/-2%	+3% <sup>[14]</sup>
電視表現滿意率 <sup>[13]</sup>	--	42% <sup>[14]</sup>	44%	--	56+/-4%	+12% <sup>[14]</sup>
電視表現不滿率 <sup>[13]</sup>	--	25%	26%	--	24+/-4%	-2%
滿意率淨值	--	17% <sup>[14]</sup>	18%	--	32+/-8%	+14% <sup>[14]</sup>
平均量值 <sup>[13]</sup>	--	3.1	3.2	--	3.3+/-0.1	+0.1
電台表現滿意率 <sup>[13]</sup>	--	32%	43% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	42+/-4%	-1%
電台表現不滿率 <sup>[13]</sup>	--	18% <sup>[14]</sup>	18%	--	11+/-3%	-6% <sup>[14]</sup>
滿意率淨值	--	15%	25% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	31+/-6%	+6%
平均量值 <sup>[13]</sup>	--	3.2	3.4 <sup>[14]</sup>	--	3.5+/-0.1	+0.1
互聯網表現滿意率 <sup>[13]</sup>	--	31% <sup>[14]</sup>	39% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	45+/-4%	+7% <sup>[14]</sup>
互聯網表現不滿率 <sup>[13]</sup>	--	19%	24%	--	16+/-3%	-8% <sup>[14]</sup>
滿意率淨值	--	12% <sup>[14]</sup>	15%	--	30+/-7%	+15% <sup>[14]</sup>
平均量值 <sup>[13]</sup>	--	3.1 <sup>[14]</sup>	3.1	--	3.4+/-0.1	+0.3 <sup>[14]</sup>
報章表現滿意率 <sup>[13]</sup>	--	22%	29% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	29+/-4%	+1%
報章表現不滿率 <sup>[13]</sup>	--	28%	30%	--	29+/-4%	-2%
滿意率淨值	--	-6%	-2%	--	1+/-7%	+2%
平均量值 <sup>[13]</sup>	--	2.7 <sup>[14]</sup>	2.8	--	2.9+/-0.1	+0.1
雜誌表現滿意率 <sup>[13]</sup>	--	8% <sup>[14]</sup>	15% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	14+/-3%	-2%
雜誌表現不滿率 <sup>[13]</sup>	--	26% <sup>[14]</sup>	30%	--	24+/-4%	-5%
滿意率淨值	--	-18%	-14%	--	-11+/-6%	+4%
平均量值 <sup>[13]</sup>	--	2.5	2.6 <sup>[14]</sup>	--	2.7+/-0.1	--

調查日期	16-23/9/21	21-25/3/22	5-9/9/22	6-20/3/23	3-16/10/23	最新變化
樣本數目	636-660	560-691	507-517	520-526	500	--
回應比率	44.1%	42.1%	48.6%	42.8%	55.8%	--
最新結果	結果	結果	結果	結果	結果及誤差	--
新聞傳媒整體表現滿意率 <sup>[13]</sup>	--	33%	40% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	44+/-4%	+5%
新聞傳媒整體表現不滿率 <sup>[13]</sup>	--	32%	27%	--	29+/-4%	+2%
滿意率淨值	--	2%	13% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	16+/-8%	+3%
平均量值 <sup>[13]</sup>	--	3.0	3.1 <sup>[14]</sup>	--	3.2+/-0.1	+0.1
香港新聞自由滿意率 <sup>[13]</sup>	31%	28%	36% <sup>[14]</sup>	37%	38+/-4%	+1%
香港新聞自由不滿率 <sup>[13]</sup>	48%	51%	44% <sup>[14]</sup>	45%	46+/-4%	+1%
滿意率淨值	-18%	-23%	-8% <sup>[14]</sup>	-8%	-8+/-8%	--
平均量值 <sup>[13]</sup>	2.5	2.5	2.7 <sup>[14]</sup>	2.7	2.8+/-0.1	--
<b>認為香港新聞傳媒：</b>						
報道負責任 <sup>[13]</sup>	24%	22%	29% <sup>[14]</sup>	33%	34+/-4%	+1%
報道不負責任 <sup>[13]</sup>	36%	42% <sup>[14]</sup>	38%	30% <sup>[14]</sup>	36+/-4%	+6%
淨值	-12%	-20%	-10% <sup>[14]</sup>	3% <sup>[14]</sup>	-2+/-7%	-5%
平均量值 <sup>[13]</sup>	2.8	2.6 <sup>[14]</sup>	2.8 <sup>[14]</sup>	3.0 <sup>[14]</sup>	2.9+/-0.1	-0.1
批評中央政府時有顧忌	--	63%	70% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	74+/-4%	+4%
批評中央政府時沒有顧忌	--	23%	20%	--	16+/-3%	-4%
淨值	--	40%	50% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	58+/-7%	+8%
批評特區政府時有顧忌	--	51% <sup>[14]</sup>	60% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	63+/-4%	+3%
批評特區政府時沒有顧忌	--	40% <sup>[14]</sup>	34% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	31+/-4%	-3%
淨值	--	11% <sup>[14]</sup>	26% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	32+/-8%	+6%
有自我審查	50%	48%	53%	61% <sup>[14]</sup>	57+/-4%	-4%
沒有自我審查	33%	31%	30%	26%	25+/-4%	-1%
淨值	17%	17%	23%	35% <sup>[14]</sup>	32+/-8%	-3%
有充分發揮言論自由	--	43%	44%	--	39+/-4%	-5%
沒有充分發揮言論自由	--	46%	48%	--	53+/-4%	+4%
淨值	--	-3%	-4%	--	-13+/-9%	-10%
有誤用／濫用新聞自由	--	49%	43%	--	43+/-4%	-1%
沒有誤用／濫用新聞自由	--	37%	43% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	47+/-4%	+5%
淨值	--	12%	1% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	-5+/-9%	-5%
香港新聞傳媒公信力評分 (0-10)	4.81 <sup>[14]</sup>	4.94	5.11	5.11	5.29+/-0.16	+0.18

[13] 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。

[14] 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。

最新調查發現，分別有 75% 及 71% 被訪者表示主要透過互聯網和電視得悉新聞。另外，分別有 24% 及 22% 被訪者主要透過報紙和電台得悉新聞，當中前者較半年前顯著下跌。信任程度方面，分別有 39% 和 28% 被訪者認為電視和互聯網是最值得信任的新聞來源。然而，只有 7% 被訪者表示報章最值得信任，較半年前顯著減少，並創 1993 年有紀錄以來最低。是次調查中亦有 5% 被訪者表示家人為最值得信任的新聞來源，較半年前顯著增加。

各新聞渠道表現的評價方面，市民對電視、電台、互聯網、報章和雜誌作為新聞傳媒的滿意率分別為 56%、42%、45%、29%和 14%，滿意淨值分別為正 32、正 31、正 30、正 1 和負 11 個百分點，當中對電視和互聯網的滿意率淨值較一年前分別大幅上升 14 和 15 個百分點，而電視及雜誌的滿意率淨值分別創 2017 及 1996 年以來新高。整體而言，市民對新聞傳媒整體表現的最新滿意率為 44%，滿意淨值為正 16 個百分點，平均量值為 3.2，即整體上接近「一半半」。

調查亦發現，38%被訪市民表示滿意香港的新聞自由程度，46%表示不滿，滿意淨值為負 8 個百分點，與半年前數字相同，平均量值為 2.8，即整體上接近「一半半」。與此同時，43%被訪者認為香港新聞傳媒有誤用或濫用新聞自由，47%認為沒有，淨值為負 5 個百分點，再創 1997 年有紀錄以來新低。至於言論自由方面，39%被訪者認為香港新聞傳媒有充分發揮言論自由，53%認為沒有，淨值為負 13 個百分點，同樣再創 1997 年有紀錄以來新低。

同時，34%認為香港新聞傳媒的報道負責任，36%認為不負責任，淨值為負 2 個百分點，平均量值為 2.9，即整體上接近「一半半」。

另外，74%被訪者認為香港新聞傳媒批評中央政府時有顧忌，淨值為正 58 個百分點；認為批評特區政府時有顧忌的，則有 63%，淨值為正 32 個百分點，兩者淨值均繼一年前再創 1997 年有紀錄以來新高。此外，57%認為香港新聞傳媒有自我審查，25%認為沒有，淨值為正 32 個百分點。

最後，以 0-10 分為標準，市民對香港新聞傳媒公信力的評分為 5.29 分。

### **未來新聞發佈活動**

- 10 月 31 日（星期二）新聞公報和數據更新：特首及政府民望、社會狀況評價
- 11 月 7 日（星期二）新聞公報和數據更新：民情指數之按性別與年齡組別分析
- 11 月 14 日（星期二）新聞公報和數據更新：民情指數之按經濟活動狀況分析
- 11 月 21 日（星期二）新聞公報和數據更新：特首及政府民望
- 11 月 30 日（星期四）下午三時新聞發佈會：信任及信心指標
- 12 月 5 日（星期二）新聞公報和數據更新：民情指數之按統獨傾向分析
- 12 月 12 日（星期二）新聞公報和數據更新：政府民望、對政府政策範疇評價
- 12 月 19 日（星期二）新聞公報和數據更新：特首及司長民望、市民最熟悉政治人物
- 12 月 27 日（星期三）下午三時新聞發佈會：年終回顧





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 Oct 26, 2023

### HKPORI releases findings of Policy Address instant survey and people's appraisal of news media

#### Special Announcement

Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute (HKPORI) has announced earlier that out of social responsibility and the mission of continuing historical records, it would continue to conduct a Policy Address Instant Survey this year, but it would also introduce random selection of SMS users to join its online survey, in order to keep pace with the times. Data collected through different methods have been weighted in accordance with strict statistical methods. Please read the contact information section for details. HKPORI will continue to study the pros and cons of different methods and adjust its future operations accordingly.

#### 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, 40% were dissatisfied, giving a net satisfaction rate of negative 6 percentage points. On a scale of 0-100, the average rating is 44.4 marks. The results show that people's appraisal of this Policy Address is somewhat worse than that in last year.

As for CE John Lee, his latest support rating is 49.7 marks. Meanwhile, his approval rate stands at 51% and disapproval stands at 31%, giving a net approval rate of positive 20 percentage points, which has not changed that much compared to before the Policy Address was delivered.

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

As for people's appraisal of news media, HKPORI successfully interviewed 500 Hong Kong residents by random telephone survey conducted by real interviewers in early October.

Our survey shows that among various types of news media, internet and television remain to be people's main sources of news, while the percentage of people using newspapers as their main source of news has significantly decreased compared to half a year ago. Television and internet also continue to be the most trustworthy sources of news, while the trustworthiness of newspapers has significantly decreased compared to half a year ago, registering an all-time record low since 1993. The trustworthiness of family members as source of news has increased significantly compared to half a year ago.

People's latest net satisfaction rate with the overall performance of news media is at positive 16 percentage points. Among them, the net satisfactions towards television and internet have significantly increased by 14 and 15 percentage points respectively compared to a year ago. Meanwhile, net satisfactions towards television and magazines have registered new record highs since 2017 and 1996 respectively.

The net satisfaction rate with the freedom of the press in Hong Kong stands at negative 8 percentage points, staying practically the same as half a year ago. The net value of people believing the local news media to have given full play to the freedom of speech is at negative 13 percentage points, registering another all-time low since 1997. At the same time, the net value of people believing the local news media to have misused or abused the freedom of press stands at negative 5 percentage points, also registering another all-time record low since 1997. In addition, the net value of people perceiving the local news media to be responsible in their reporting stands at negative 2 percentage points. The net values of people who thought the local news media had scruples when criticizing the Central and HKSAR Government stand at positive 58 and positive 32 percentage points respectively. Just like a year ago, both net values have again registered all-time record highs since 1997. The net value of people who thought the local news media had practiced self-censorship is positive 32 percentage points. Lastly, on a scale of 0-10, the credibility rating of the Hong Kong news media is 5.29 marks.

The effective response rate of the survey on people’s appraisal of news media is 55.8%. The maximum sampling error of percentages is +/-4%, that of net values is +/-9% and that of ratings is +/-0.16 at 95% confidence level.

## **Contact Information**

### **(1) Policy Address Instant Survey**

After Chief Executive John Lee delivered the Policy Address yesterday, HKPORI conducted an instant survey 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 online survey, 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. This year, we have also added random samples recruited by SMS to complete our online survey.

Our survey began at around 1:30pm and ran till around 9pm yesterday. A total of 681 successful cases were collected, including 127 random landline samples, 129 random mobile samples, 79 random SMS online survey samples and 346 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 survey samples, as well as proportions of different sampling frames to ensure data representativeness.

The maximum sampling error of percentages is +/-4%, that of net values is +/-8% and that of ratings is +/-2.9 at 95% confidence level. The effective response rate of the telephone surveys is 58.0%.

Date of survey	: 25/10/2023
Survey method	: (1a) Random landline telephone survey (1b) Random mobile telephone survey (2) Online survey by random SMS invitation (3) 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>	: 681 (including 127 random landline samples, 129 random mobile samples, 79 random SMS online survey samples and 346 panel online survey samples)
Effective response rate	: 58.0% (excluding SMS and panel online survey samples)
Sampling error <sup>[2]</sup>	: Sampling error of percentages not more than +/-4%, that of net values not more than +/-8% and that of ratings not more than +/-2.9 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 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 2022”, while the educational attainment (highest level attended) distribution and economic activity status distribution came from “Women and Men in Hong Kong - Key Statistics (2022 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) People’s Appraisal of News Media

Meanwhile, HKPORI also successfully interviewed 500 Hong Kong residents by a random telephone survey conducted by real interviewers in early October.

The effective response rate of the survey is 55.8%. The maximum sampling error of percentages is +/-4%, that of net values is +/-9% and that of ratings is +/-0.16 at 95% confidence level.

Date of survey	: 3-16/10/2023
Survey method	: Random telephone survey conducted by real interviewers
Target population	: Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong residents aged 18 or above
Sample size <sup>[3]</sup>	: 500 (including 250 landline and 250 mobile samples)
Effective response rate	: 55.8%
Sampling error <sup>[4]</sup>	: Sampling error of percentages not more than +/-4%, that of net values not more than +/-9% and that of ratings not more than +/-0.16 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 2022”, while the educational attainment (highest level attended) distribution and economic activity status distribution came from “Women and Men in Hong Kong - Key Statistics (2022 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.

## **Policy Address Instant Survey**

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

Date of survey	Sample size <sup>[5]</sup>	Appraisal of Policy Address					
		Satisfaction rate <sup>[6]</sup>	Half-half	Dissatisfaction rate <sup>[6]</sup>	Net satisfaction rate	Mean value <sup>[6]</sup>	Rating of Policy Address
<b>25/10/23</b>	<b>551</b>	<b>34+/-4%</b>	<b>17+/-3%</b>	<b>40+/-4%<sup>[8]</sup></b>	<b>-6+/-8%</b>	<b>2.8+/-0.1<sup>[8]</sup></b>	<b>44.4+/-2.9<sup>[8]</sup></b>
19/10/22	590	34% <sup>[8]</sup>	19% <sup>[8]</sup>	31% <sup>[8]</sup>	3% <sup>[8]</sup>	3.0 <sup>[8]</sup>	51.1 <sup>[8]</sup>
6/10/21	621	25% <sup>[8]</sup>	13% <sup>[8]</sup>	50% <sup>[8]</sup>	-25% <sup>[8]</sup>	2.4 <sup>[8]</sup>	34.2 <sup>[8]</sup>
25/11/20	512	19%	9%	64%	-46%	2.0	27.2
16/10/19	679	17% <sup>[8]</sup>	8% <sup>[8]</sup>	65% <sup>[8]</sup>	-47% <sup>[8]</sup>	2.0 <sup>[8]</sup>	29.7 <sup>[8]</sup>
10/10/18	534	33% <sup>[8]</sup>	24%	34% <sup>[8]</sup>	-1% <sup>[8]</sup>	2.9 <sup>[8]</sup>	48.5 <sup>[8]</sup>
11/10/17	526	48% <sup>[8]</sup>	28% <sup>[8]</sup>	14% <sup>[8]</sup>	34% <sup>[8]</sup>	3.5 <sup>[8]</sup>	62.4 <sup>[8]</sup>
18/1/17	512	34% <sup>[8]</sup>	22%	29% <sup>[8]</sup>	5% <sup>[8]</sup>	3.0 <sup>[8]</sup>	52.3 <sup>[8]</sup>
13/1/16	522	19% <sup>[8]</sup>	23%	39%	-20% <sup>[8]</sup>	2.5 <sup>[8]</sup>	41.1 <sup>[8]</sup>
14/1/15	503	30% <sup>[8]</sup>	24% <sup>[8]</sup>	35%	-5% <sup>[8]</sup>	2.8	49.5 <sup>[8]</sup>
15/1/14	611	36%	30% <sup>[8]</sup>	31% <sup>[8]</sup>	5%	3.0	54.1 <sup>[8]</sup>
16/1/13	759	36% <sup>[8]</sup>	35%	24% <sup>[8]</sup>	11% <sup>[8]</sup>	3.1	56.4 <sup>[8]</sup>
12/10/11	816	47% <sup>[8]</sup>	32%	18%	28% <sup>[8]</sup>	3.3	59.1
13/10/10	747	41% <sup>[8]</sup>	33% <sup>[8]</sup>	19% <sup>[8]</sup>	22% <sup>[8]</sup>	3.2	58.9 <sup>[8]</sup>
14/10/09	462	30%	37%	28%	2%	3.0	53.5
15/10/08	515	31% <sup>[8]</sup>	35% <sup>[8]</sup>	26% <sup>[8]</sup>	4% <sup>[8]</sup>	3.0	53.8 <sup>[8]</sup>
10/10/07	602	52% <sup>[8]</sup>	29% <sup>[8]</sup>	10% <sup>[8]</sup>	42% <sup>[8]</sup>	3.5	65.2 <sup>[8]</sup>
11/10/06	445	30% <sup>[8]</sup>	37%	22% <sup>[8]</sup>	8% <sup>[8]</sup>	3.0	55.8 <sup>[8]</sup>
12/10/05	377	48% <sup>[8]</sup>	33%	9% <sup>[8]</sup>	39% <sup>[8]</sup>	3.5	66.4 <sup>[8]</sup>
12/1/05	391	38% <sup>[8]</sup>	30%	20% <sup>[8]</sup>	18% <sup>[8]</sup>	3.2	56.3 <sup>[8]</sup>
7/1/04	381	25%	26%	33% <sup>[8]</sup>	-8%	2.8	49.3
8/1/03 <sup>[7]</sup>	377	22% <sup>[8]</sup>	29%	27%	-5%	2.8	51.6 <sup>[8]</sup>
10/10/01	433	29%	33%	28%	1%	3.0	56.7
11/10/00	262	25% <sup>[8]</sup>	28%	31%	-6% <sup>[8]</sup>	2.9	55.2
6/10/99	236	31% <sup>[8]</sup>	30%	25% <sup>[8]</sup>	6% <sup>[8]</sup>	3.0	57.3
7/10/98	508	22% <sup>[8]</sup>	35% <sup>[8]</sup>	35% <sup>[8]</sup>	-14% <sup>[8]</sup>	2.8	--
8/10/97	534	45%	30% <sup>[8]</sup>	14% <sup>[8]</sup>	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% of the respondents said they were satisfied with it, 40% were dissatisfied, giving a net satisfaction rate of negative 6 percentage points. The mean score is 2.8, meaning close to “half-half” in general. On a scale of 0-100, the average rating is 44.4 marks. The results show that people’s appraisal of this Policy Address is somewhat worse than that in last year.

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

<b>Popularity of Tung Chee-hwa</b>								
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
<b>Change in rating</b>	<b>+0.3</b>	<b>+0.3</b>	<b>+0.3</b>	<b>+2.5<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+2.2<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+0.7</b>	<b>+1.7<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+1.2</b>
<b>Popularity of Donald Tsang</b>								
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	
<b>Change in rating</b>	<b>-0.6</b>	<b>-3.1<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>-1.4<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+1.2</b>	<b>-1.0</b>	<b>+0.8</b>	<b>+2.2<sup>[10]</sup></b>	
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%	
<b>Change in net approval rate<sup>[9]</sup></b>	<b>-3%</b>	<b>-12%<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>--</b>	<b>+5%</b>	<b>+1%</b>	<b>+1%</b>	<b>+4%</b>	
<b>Popularity of CY Leung</b>								
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
<b>Change in rating</b>				<b>+3.3<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+3.3<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+4.2<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>-0.5</b>	<b>+0.4</b>
Net approval rate before the PA				-20%	-31%	-39%	-44%	-44%
Net approval rate at instant survey				-11%	-24%	-35%	-54%	-57%
<b>Change in net approval rate<sup>[9]</sup></b>				<b>+9%<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+7%<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+4%</b>	<b>-10%<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>-13%<sup>[10]</sup></b>
<b>Popularity of Carrie Lam</b>								
Date of Policy Address Speech				11/10/17	10/10/18	16/10/19	25/11/20	6/10/21
Rating before the PA				59.6	52.3	22.3	30.8	33.9
Rating at instant survey				61.1	47.6	22.7	26.8	30.5
<b>Change in rating</b>				<b>+1.5</b>	<b>-4.7<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+0.3</b>	<b>-4.1<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>-3.4<sup>[10]</sup></b>
Net approval rate before the PA				10%	4%	-65%	-48%	-46%
Net approval rate at instant survey				23%	-10%	-64%	-57%	-48%
<b>Change in net approval rate<sup>[9]</sup></b>				<b>+13%<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>-14%<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>+1%</b>	<b>-9%<sup>[10]</sup></b>	<b>-2%</b>
<b>Popularity of John Lee</b>								
Date of Policy Address Speech				19/10/22		25/10/23		
Rating before the PA				53.5		52.6+/-2.0		
Rating at instant survey				52.0		49.7+/-2.6		
<b>Change in rating</b>				<b>-1.5</b>		<b>-2.9</b>		
Net approval rate before the PA				13%		24+/-6%		
Net approval rate at instant survey				9%		20+/-7%		
<b>Change in net approval rate<sup>[9]</sup></b>				<b>-4%</b>		<b>-4%</b>		

[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.

Recent figures on John Lee's popularity before and after the Policy Address speech are as follows:

Date of survey	3-18/5/23	1-8/6/23	11-21/7/23 <sup>[3]</sup>	1-10/8/23	7-19/9/23	25/10/23	<i>Latest change</i>
Sample size	1,003	1,005	1,004	1,005	1,001	<b>681</b>	--
Response rate	52.4%	61.9%	50.0%	54.5%	53.0%	<b>58.0%</b>	--
Latest findings	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding	<b>Finding &amp; error</b>	--
Rating of CE	56.9	51.5 <sup>[12]</sup>	49.7	50.7	52.6	<b>49.7+/-2.6</b>	<b>-2.9</b>
Vote of confidence in CE <sup>[11]</sup>	51%	44% <sup>[12]</sup>	50% <sup>[12]</sup>	53%	55%	<b>51+/-4%</b>	<b>-4%</b>
Vote of no confidence in CE <sup>[11]</sup>	36%	45% <sup>[12]</sup>	29% <sup>[12]</sup>	29%	31%	<b>31+/-4%</b>	--
Net approval rate <sup>[11]</sup>	15%	-1% <sup>[12]</sup>	21% <sup>[12]</sup>	24%	24%	<b>20+/-7%</b>	<b>-4%</b>

[11] Starting from July 2023, the question on hypothetical voting on CE has been revised from "If a general election of the Chief Executive were to be held tomorrow, and you had the right to vote, would you vote for John Lee?" to "If you had the right to decide whether to reappoint or dismiss John Lee as the Chief Executive now, how would you decide?" to echo the development in Hong Kong now. Answer options have also been changed from "yes" and "no" to "reappoint", "dismiss" and "abstain", while "don't know / hard to say" and "refuse to answer" options continue to exist.

[12] 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 CE John Lee's latest support rating is 49.7 marks. Meanwhile, his approval rate stands at 51% and disapproval stands at 31%, giving a net approval rate of positive 20 percentage points, which has not changed that much compared to before the Policy Address was delivered.

### **People's Appraisal of News Media**

Latest results of the news media survey are tabulated as follows:

Date of survey	16-23/9/21	21-25/3/22	5-9/9/22	6-20/3/23	3-16/10/23	<i>Latest change</i>
Sample size	636-660	560-691	507-517	520-526	<b>500</b>	--
Response rate	44.1%	42.1%	48.6%	42.8%	<b>55.8%</b>	--
Latest findings	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding	<b>Finding &amp; error</b>	--
People's main source of news						
Internet	64% <sup>[14]</sup>	64%	64%	70% <sup>[14]</sup>	<b>75+/-4%</b>	<b>+4%</b>
Television	60%	65%	67%	65%	<b>71+/-4%</b>	<b>+5%</b>
Newspapers	28% <sup>[14]</sup>	21% <sup>[14]</sup>	26% <sup>[14]</sup>	31%	<b>24+/-4%</b>	<b>-7%<sup>[14]</sup></b>
Radio	24%	21%	23%	25%	<b>22+/-4%</b>	<b>-3%</b>
Family members	10% <sup>[14]</sup>	13%	12%	13%	<b>14+/-3%</b>	<b>+1%</b>

Date of survey	<u>16-23/9/21</u>	<u>21-25/3/22</u>	<u>5-9/9/22</u>	<u>6-20/3/23</u>	<u>3-16/10/23</u>	<u>Latest change</u>
Sample size	636-660	560-691	507-517	520-526	<b>500</b>	--
Response rate	44.1%	42.1%	48.6%	42.8%	<b>55.8%</b>	--
Latest findings	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding	<b>Finding &amp; error</b>	--
Most trustworthy source of news:						
Television	29%	35% <sup>[14]</sup>	37%	39%	<b>39+/-4%</b>	--
Internet	23% <sup>[14]</sup>	24%	22%	22%	<b>28+/-4%</b>	+5%
Radio	12%	9%	11%	10%	<b>9+/-3%</b>	-1%
Newspapers	9% <sup>[14]</sup>	8%	10%	13%	<b>7+/-2%</b>	-6% <sup>[14]</sup>
Family members	6%	4%	5%	2%	<b>5+/-2%</b>	+3% <sup>[14]</sup>
Satisfaction rate of television <sup>[13]</sup>	--	42% <sup>[14]</sup>	44%	--	<b>56+/-4%</b>	+12% <sup>[14]</sup>
Dissatisfaction rate of television <sup>[13]</sup>	--	25%	26%	--	<b>24+/-4%</b>	-2%
Net satisfaction rate	--	17% <sup>[14]</sup>	18%	--	<b>32+/-8%</b>	+14% <sup>[14]</sup>
Mean value <sup>[13]</sup>	--	3.1	3.2	--	<b>3.3+/-0.1</b>	+0.1
Satisfaction rate of radio <sup>[13]</sup>	--	32%	43% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	<b>42+/-4%</b>	-1%
Dissatisfaction rate of radio <sup>[13]</sup>	--	18% <sup>[14]</sup>	18%	--	<b>11+/-3%</b>	-6% <sup>[14]</sup>
Net satisfaction rate	--	15%	25% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	<b>31+/-6%</b>	6%
Mean value <sup>[13]</sup>	--	3.2	3.4 <sup>[14]</sup>	--	<b>3.5+/-0.1</b>	+0.1
Satisfaction rate of Internet <sup>[13]</sup>	--	31% <sup>[14]</sup>	39% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	<b>45+/-4%</b>	+7% <sup>[14]</sup>
Dissatisfaction rate of Internet <sup>[13]</sup>	--	19%	24%	--	<b>16+/-3%</b>	-8% <sup>[14]</sup>
Net satisfaction rate	--	12% <sup>[14]</sup>	15%	--	<b>30+/-7%</b>	+15% <sup>[14]</sup>
Mean value <sup>[13]</sup>	--	3.1 <sup>[14]</sup>	3.1	--	<b>3.4+/-0.1</b>	+0.3 <sup>[14]</sup>
Satisfaction rate of newspapers <sup>[13]</sup>	--	22%	29% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	<b>29+/-4%</b>	+1%
Dissatisfaction rate of newspapers <sup>[13]</sup>	--	28%	30%	--	<b>29+/-4%</b>	-2%
Net satisfaction rate	--	-6%	-2%	--	<b>1+/-7%</b>	+2%
Mean value <sup>[13]</sup>	--	2.7 <sup>[14]</sup>	2.8	--	<b>2.9+/-0.1</b>	+0.1
Satisfaction rate of magazines <sup>[13]</sup>	--	8% <sup>[14]</sup>	15% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	<b>14+/-3%</b>	-2%
Dissatisfaction rate of magazines <sup>[13]</sup>	--	26% <sup>[14]</sup>	30%	--	<b>24+/-4%</b>	-5%
Net satisfaction rate	--	-18%	-14%	--	<b>-11+/-6%</b>	+4%
Mean value <sup>[13]</sup>	--	2.5	2.6 <sup>[14]</sup>	--	<b>2.7+/-0.1</b>	--
Satisfaction rate of news media in general <sup>[13]</sup>	--	33%	40% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	<b>44+/-4%</b>	+5%
Dissatisfaction rate of news media in general <sup>[13]</sup>	--	32%	27%	--	<b>29+/-4%</b>	+2%
Net satisfaction rate	--	2%	13% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	<b>16+/-8%</b>	+3%
Mean value <sup>[13]</sup>	--	3.0	3.1 <sup>[14]</sup>	--	<b>3.2+/-0.1</b>	+0.1
Satisfaction rate of freedom of the press in HK <sup>[13]</sup>	31%	28%	36% <sup>[14]</sup>	37%	<b>38+/-4%</b>	+1%
Dissatisfaction rate of freedom of the press in HK <sup>[13]</sup>	48%	51%	44% <sup>[14]</sup>	45%	<b>46+/-4%</b>	+1%
Net satisfaction rate	-18%	-23%	-8% <sup>[14]</sup>	-8%	<b>-8+/-8%</b>	--
Mean value <sup>[13]</sup>	2.5	2.5	2.7 <sup>[14]</sup>	2.7	<b>2.8+/-0.1</b>	--

Date of survey	16-23/9/21	21-25/3/22	5-9/9/22	6-20/3/23	3-16/10/23	<i>Latest change</i>
Sample size	636-660	560-691	507-517	520-526	<b>500</b>	--
Response rate	44.1%	42.1%	48.6%	42.8%	<b>55.8%</b>	--
Latest findings	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding	<b>Finding &amp; error</b>	--
<b>Perceived that the local news media:</b>						
Were responsible in their reporting <sup>[13]</sup>	24%	22%	29% <sup>[14]</sup>	33%	<b>34+/-4%</b>	<b>+1%</b>
Were irresponsible in their reporting <sup>[13]</sup>	36%	42% <sup>[14]</sup>	38%	30% <sup>[14]</sup>	<b>36+/-4%</b>	<b>+6%</b>
Net value	-12%	-20%	-10% <sup>[14]</sup>	3% <sup>[14]</sup>	<b>-2+/-7%</b>	<b>-5%</b>
Mean value <sup>[13]</sup>	2.8	2.6 <sup>[14]</sup>	2.8 <sup>[14]</sup>	3.0 <sup>[14]</sup>	<b>2.9+/-0.1</b>	<b>-0.1</b>
Had scruples when criticizing the Central Government	--	63%	70% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	<b>74+/-4%</b>	<b>+4%</b>
Had no scruples when criticizing the Central Government	--	23%	20%	--	<b>16+/-3%</b>	<b>-4%</b>
Net value	--	40%	50% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	<b>58+/-7%</b>	<b>+8%</b>
Had scruples when criticizing the HKSAR Government	--	51% <sup>[14]</sup>	60% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	<b>63+/-4%</b>	<b>+3%</b>
Had no scruples when criticizing the HKSAR Government	--	40% <sup>[14]</sup>	34% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	<b>31+/-4%</b>	<b>-3%</b>
Net value	--	11% <sup>[14]</sup>	26% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	<b>32+/-8%</b>	<b>+6%</b>
Had practiced self-censorship	50%	48%	53%	61% <sup>[14]</sup>	<b>57+/-4%</b>	<b>-4%</b>
Had not practiced self-censorship	33%	31%	30%	26%	<b>25+/-4%</b>	<b>-1%</b>
Net value	17%	17%	23%	35% <sup>[14]</sup>	<b>32+/-8%</b>	<b>-3%</b>
Had given full play to the freedom of speech	--	43%	44%	--	<b>39+/-4%</b>	<b>-5%</b>
Had not given full play to the freedom of speech	--	46%	48%	--	<b>53+/-4%</b>	<b>+4%</b>
Net value	--	-3%	-4%	--	<b>-13+/-9%</b>	<b>-10%</b>
Had misused/ abused the freedom of press	--	49%	43%	--	<b>43+/-4%</b>	<b>-1%</b>
Had not misused/ abused the freedom of press	--	37%	43% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	<b>47+/-4%</b>	<b>+5%</b>
Net value	--	12%	1% <sup>[14]</sup>	--	<b>-5+/-9%</b>	<b>-5%</b>
Credibility rating of the local news media (0-10)	4.81 <sup>[14]</sup>	4.94	5.11	5.11	<b>5.29+/-0.16</b>	<b>+0.18</b>

[13] 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.

[14] 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.

Our latest news media survey results show that 75% and 71% of the respondents claimed their main sources of news were internet and television respectively. Besides, 24% and 22% said their main sources of news were newspapers and radio respectively. The former has significantly decreased compared to half a year ago. As for trustworthiness, 39% and 28% of the respondents respectively found television and internet to be the most trustworthy sources of news. Yet, only 7% of the respondents found newspapers the most trustworthy. This figure has significantly decreased compared to half a year ago and registered an all-time record low since 1993. There were also 5% of the respondents who found family members to be the most trustworthy source of news. The figure has significantly increased compared to half a year ago.



As for people's appraisal of the performance of various types of news media, the satisfaction rates of television, radio, internet, newspapers and magazines as news media are 56%, 42%, 45%, 29% and 14%, while net satisfaction rates are positive 32, positive 31, positive 30, positive 1 and negative 11 percentage points respectively. Among them, net satisfactions towards television and internet have significantly increased by 14 and 15 percentage points respectively compared to last year. Meanwhile, net satisfactions towards television and magazines have registered new record highs since 2017 and 1996 respectively. Overall speaking, people's latest satisfaction rate with the performance of news media in general is 44%, net satisfaction at positive 16 percentage points. The mean value is 3.2, meaning close to "half-half" in general.

Results also show that 38% of the respondents were satisfied with the freedom of the press in Hong Kong while 46% were dissatisfied, net satisfaction is thus negative 8 percentage points, which stays practically the same with half a year ago. The mean value is 2.8, meaning close to "half-half" in general. At the same time, 43% believed the local news media had misused or abused the freedom of press, 47% believed they had not, net value at negative 5 percentage point, which registered another all-time record low since 1997. As for freedom of speech, 39% believe they had given full play to the freedom of speech, 53% believe they had not, and thus net value is at negative 13 percentage points, which also registered another all-time record low since 1997.

Meanwhile, 34% perceived the local news media to be responsible in their reporting, 36% regarded the local news media as irresponsible, giving a net value of negative 2 percentage points. The mean value is 2.9, meaning close to "half-half" in general.

Besides, 74% thought the local news media had scruples when criticizing the Central Government, with a net value of positive 58 percentage points; 63% thought they had scruples when criticizing the HKSAR Government, with a net value of positive 32 percentage points. Just like a year ago, both net values have again registered all-time record highs since 1997. In addition, 57% of the respondents thought the local news media had practised self-censorship while 25% perceived the contrary, giving a net value of positive 32 percentage points.

Lastly, on a scale of 0-10, the credibility rating of the Hong Kong news media is 5.29 marks.

### **Upcoming Press Events**

- October 31 (Tuesday) press release and figures update: Popularities of CE and SAR Government, Appraisal of Society's Conditions
- November 7 (Tuesday) press release and figures update: PSI per Gender and Age
- November 14 (Tuesday) press release and figures update: PSI per Economic Activity Status
- November 21 (Tuesday) press release and figures update: Popularities of CE and SAR Government
- November 30 (Thursday) at 15:00, press conference: Trust and Confidence Indicators
- December 5 (Tuesday) press release and figures update: PSI per Centrality
- December 12 (Tuesday) press release and figures update: Popularity of SAR Government, Appraisal of Policy Areas of the Government
- December 19 (Tuesday) press release and figures update: Popularities of CE and Secretaries of Departments, People's Most Familiar Political Figures
- December 27 (Wednesday) at 15:00, press conference: Year-end Review