

## 2020 年 6 月 16 日 新聞公報

### 民研計劃發放香港市民身分認同調查結果

#### 特別宣佈

1. 香港民意研究計劃（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「民研計劃」指的可以是香港民研或其前身港大民研。
2. 香港民研今日發放的香港市民身分認同調查結果，是本年 7 月 1 日前發放的最後一次，未來會否繼續，要視乎公眾是否支持。

#### 公報簡要

民研計劃於六月初由真實訪問員以隨機抽樣電話訪問方式成功訪問了 1,002 名香港居民。最新結果顯示，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」、「世界公民」、「中華民族一分子」、「中國人」和「中華人民共和國國民」。數字對比半年前全部沒有明顯變化，但「中華民族一分子」和「中國人」的認同感就分別創 2007 年和 1997 年有紀錄以來新低，重要性和認同指數則創 2008 年有紀錄以來新低。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。數字對比半年前同樣沒有明顯變化。調查的實效回應比率為 64.3%。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	:	1-4/6/2020
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>[1]</sup>	:	1,002 (包括 503 個固網及 499 個手機樣本)
實效回應比率 <sup>[2]</sup>	:	64.3%
抽樣誤差 <sup>[3]</sup>	:	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《二零一九年年中人口數字》，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》（2019 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] 民研計劃在 2017 年 9 月前以「整體回應比率」彙報樣本資料，2017 年 9 月開始則以「實效回應比率」彙報。2018 年 7 月，民研計劃再調整實效回應比率的計算方法，因此改變前後的回應比率不能直接比較。
- [3] 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		4-7/6/18	3-6/12/18	17-20/6/19	4-10/12/19	1-4/6/20	最新變化
樣本數目 <sup>[4]</sup>		564-682	543-607	607-692	596-677	575-690	--
回應比率		56.3%	54.6%	58.7%	62.8%	64.3%	--
最新結果 <sup>[5]</sup>		結果	結果	結果	結果	結果及誤差	--
香港人	認同感	8.54 <sup>[6]</sup>	8.34	8.61 <sup>[6]</sup>	8.51	8.57+/-0.18	+0.07
	重要性	8.30 <sup>[6]</sup>	8.02 <sup>[6]</sup>	8.46 <sup>[6]</sup>	8.42	8.34+/-0.20	-0.08
	認同指數	83.0 <sup>[6]</sup>	80.8	84.6 <sup>[6]</sup>	82.6	83.1+/-1.9	+0.5
亞洲人	認同感	8.16 <sup>[6]</sup>	8.07	7.69 <sup>[6]</sup>	7.82	7.83+/-0.21	+0.01
	重要性	6.99	7.05	6.64 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.79	6.89+/-0.23	+0.11
	認同指數	74.1	74.1	70.1 <sup>[6]</sup>	70.9	72.3+/-2.0	+1.4
世界公民	認同感	6.61 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.86	6.89	7.06	6.93+/-0.25	-0.13
	重要性	6.30	6.49	6.53	6.63	6.64+/-0.26	--
	認同指數	63.5 <sup>[6]</sup>	65.6	66.2	66.7	66.6+/-2.3	-0.1
中華民族一分子	認同感	7.10	6.98	6.27 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.46	6.25+/-0.31	-0.21
	重要性	6.68	6.67	5.96 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.99	5.89+/-0.32	-0.10
	認同指數	68.0	67.3	60.2 <sup>[6]</sup>	60.7	59.2+/-3.1	-1.5
中國人	認同感	6.89	6.59	5.87 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.12	5.74+/-0.29	-0.38
	重要性	6.67	6.19 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.54 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.63	5.50+/-0.30	-0.13
	認同指數	66.6	62.4 <sup>[6]</sup>	55.2 <sup>[6]</sup>	57.3	54.6+/-3.0	-2.7
中華人民共和國國民	認同感	5.85	5.91	4.82 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.24 <sup>[6]</sup>	4.90+/-0.32	-0.35
	重要性	5.68	5.68	4.79 <sup>[6]</sup>	4.99	4.77+/-0.32	-0.21
	認同指數	56.3	57.1	46.2 <sup>[6]</sup>	49.6	46.8+/-3.1	-2.8

[4] 民研計劃在 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。

[5] 「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。

[6] 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」、「世界公民」、「中華民族一分子」、「中國人」和「中華人民共和國國民」。認同感評分分別為 8.57、7.83、6.93、6.25、5.74 及 4.90。重要性評分則分別為 8.34、6.89、6.64、5.89、5.50 及 4.77。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 83.1、72.3、66.6、59.2、54.6 及 46.8。以上數字對比半年前全部沒有明顯變化，但「中華民族一分子」和「中國人」的認同感就分別創 2007 年和 1997 年有紀錄以來新低，重要性和認同指數則創 2008 年有紀錄以來新低。

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	4-7/6/18	3-6/12/18	17-20/6/19	4-10/12/19	1-4/6/20	最新變化
樣本數目 <sup>[7]</sup>	614	585	643	577	602	--
回應比率	56.3%	54.6%	58.7%	62.8%	64.3%	--
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	41%	40%	53% <sup>[8]</sup>	55%	50+/-4%	-5%
自稱為「中國人」之比率	18% <sup>[8]</sup>	15%	11% <sup>[8]</sup>	11%	13+/-3%	+2%
自稱「香港人」和「中國人」混合身分之比率	39% <sup>[8]</sup>	43%	36% <sup>[8]</sup>	32%	36+/-4%	+4%
自認為廣義「香港人」之比率	67%	66%	76% <sup>[8]</sup>	78%	75+/-4%	-2%
自認為廣義「中國人」之比率	30%	32%	23% <sup>[8]</sup>	21%	24+/-3%	+3%

[7] 民研計劃在 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。

[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。

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 50% 稱自己為「香港人」，13% 自稱為「中國人」，11% 自稱為「香港的中國人」，而 25% 則自稱為「中國的香港人」。換言之，75% 認為自己是廣義的「香港人」（即回答「香港人」或「中國的香港人」），24% 認為自己是廣義的「中國人」（即回答「中國人」或「香港的中國人」），36% 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。以上數字對比半年前同樣沒有明顯變化。

## 民意日誌

民研計劃於 2007 年開始與慧科訊業有限公司合作，由慧科訊業按照民研計劃設計的分析方法，將每日大事記錄傳送至民研計劃，經民研計劃核實後成為「民意日誌」。

由於本新聞公報所涉及的調查項目，上次調查日期為 4-10/12/2019，而今次調查日期則為 1-4/6/2020，因此是次公報中的「民意日誌」項目便以上述日期為依歸，讓讀者作出比較。以涵蓋率不下 25% 本地報章每日頭條新聞和報社評論計，在上述期間發生的相關大事包括以下事件，讀者可以自行判斷有關事件有否影響各項民調數字：

4/6/20	六四悼念活動於多區進行
3/6/20	國務院副總理韓正與林鄭月娥會晤
29/5/20	特朗普公布有關中國及香港的新措施，並指中國以「一國一制」取代「一國兩制」
28/5/20	全國人大通過訂立港區國安法
27/5/20	反國歌法及國安法示威中逾 360 人被捕
24/5/20	反國安法遊行於港島舉行，逾 180 人被捕
22/5/20	國安法實施後將有中央政府國安機構駐港
21/5/20	全國人大將審議港區國安法
20/5/20	台灣總統蔡英文宣誓就職
18/5/20	李慧琼當選立法會內會主席
16/5/20	考評局通識科兩經理辭職
15/5/20	監警會發表報告指沒有任何證據顯示 8.31 太子站事件中有人死亡

8/5/20	立法會內會發生衝突，11 名民主派議員被逐離場
28/4/20	政府宣布跨境學童及特定商務客入境可豁免檢疫
21/4/20	港澳辦刊登多篇聲明批評郭榮鏗
18/4/20	李柱銘、黎智英等 15 名民主派人士被捕
15/4/20	中聯辦主任駱惠寧指香港要維護國家安全
14/4/20	林鄭月娥指港澳辦及中聯辦沒有干預香港事務
13/4/20	港澳辦及中聯辦批評立法會議員郭榮鏗
27/3/20	政府宣布禁 4 人以上公眾聚會
23/3/20	政府禁止非港人由機場入境
17/3/20	政府宣布所有海外國家來港人士需隔離 14 日
8/3/20	警方深夜拘捕 17 人涉嫌製作爆炸品
4/3/20	政府首批包機接回滯留湖北港人
29/2/20	美國國務院及多名議員對黎智英、李卓人及楊森被捕表示關注
28/2/20	警方拘捕黎智英、李卓人及楊森
19/2/20	鑽石公主號郵輪首批港人乘坐包機回港
13/2/20	夏寶龍被委任為港澳辦主任
5/2/20	政府宣布經中國大陸來港人士將需隔離 14 日
3/2/20	政府宣布進一步關閉關口
1/2/20	醫管局員工陣線通過罷工
28/1/20	政府宣布局部封關
27/1/20	政府限制湖北居民及曾赴湖北者入境
22/1/20	香港現兩宗「高度懷疑」武漢肺炎個案
19/1/20	中環集會演變成警民衝突
11/1/20	蔡英文勝出台灣總統選舉
4/1/20	駱惠寧被委任為中聯辦主任
1/1/20	民間人權陣線舉辦元旦大遊行
31/12/19	除夕夜多區出現示威抗爭活動
28/12/19	來自中國大陸的旅行團數量大跌
25/12/19	聖誕節期間多區出現示威抗爭活動
16/12/19	林鄭月娥到北京述職
11/12/19	監警會國際專家小組全體退出
8/12/19	民間人權陣線指約 80 萬人參與國際人權日遊行

## 數據分析

最新調查結果顯示，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」、「世界公民」、「中華民族一分子」、「中國人」和「中華人民共和國國民」。數字對比半年前全部沒有明顯變化，但「中華民族一分子」和「中國人」的認同感就分別創 2007 年和 1997 年有紀錄以來新低，重要性和認同指數則創 2008 年有紀錄以來新低。

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。數字對比半年前同樣沒有明顯變化。



HONG KONG PUBLIC OPINION PROGRAM  
HONG KONG PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH INSTITUTE  
香港民意研究所 之 香港民意研究計劃

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 June 16, 2020

### POP releases survey on Hong Kong people's ethnic identity

#### Special Announcements

1. The predecessor of Hong Kong Public Opinion Program (HKPOP) was The Public Opinion Programme at The University of Hong Kong (HKUPOP). "POP" in this release can refer to HKPOP or its predecessor HKUPOP.
2. The survey on Hong Kong people's ethnic identity released today by POP is the last of its kind before July 1, 2020. Whether it will be continued or not will depend on public support.

#### Abstract

POP successfully interviewed 1,002 Hong Kong residents by a random telephone survey conducted by real interviewers in early June. Latest 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", "global citizens", "members of the Chinese race", "Chinese" and "citizens of the PRC". All the figures have not registered significant change compared to half a year ago. However, the strength ratings of "members of the Chinese race" and "Chinese" have registered historical lows since 2007 and 1997 respectively, while their importance ratings and identity indexes have registered historical lows since 2008. 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". These figures also remained comparable to those half a year ago. The effective response rate of the survey is 64.3%. The maximum sampling error of percentages is +/-4% and that of ratings is +/-3.1 at 95% confidence level.

#### Contact Information

Date of survey	: 1-4/6/2020
Survey method	: Random telephone survey conducted by real interviewers
Target population	: Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong residents aged 18 or above
Sample size <sup>[1]</sup>	: 1,002 (including 503 landline and 499 mobile samples)
Effective response rate <sup>[2]</sup>	: 64.3%
Sampling error <sup>[3]</sup>	: 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 2019”, while the educational attainment (highest level attended) distribution and economic activity status distribution came from “Women and Men in Hong Kong - Key Statistics (2019 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] Before September 2017, “overall response rate” was used to report surveys’ contact information. Starting from September 2017, “effective response rate” was used. In July 2018, POP further revised the calculation of effective response rate. Thus, the response rates before and after the change cannot be directly compared.
- [3] 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		4-7/6/18	3-6/12/18	17-20/6/19	4-10/12/19	1-4/6/20	<u>Latest change</u>
Sample size <sup>[4]</sup>		564-682	543-607	607-692	596-677	<b>575-690</b>	--
Response rate		56.3%	54.6%	58.7%	62.8%	<b>64.3%</b>	--
Latest findings <sup>[5]</sup>		Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding	<b>Finding &amp; error</b>	--
Hongkongers	Strength rating	8.54 <sup>[6]</sup>	8.34	8.61 <sup>[6]</sup>	8.51	<b>8.57+/-0.18</b>	<b>+0.07</b>
	Importance rating	8.30 <sup>[6]</sup>	8.02 <sup>[6]</sup>	8.46 <sup>[6]</sup>	8.42	<b>8.34+/-0.20</b>	<b>-0.08</b>
	Identity index	83.0 <sup>[6]</sup>	80.8	84.6 <sup>[6]</sup>	82.6	<b>83.1+/-1.9</b>	<b>+0.5</b>
Asians	Strength rating	8.16 <sup>[6]</sup>	8.07	7.69 <sup>[6]</sup>	7.82	<b>7.83+/-0.21</b>	<b>+0.01</b>
	Importance rating	6.99	7.05	6.64 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.79	<b>6.89+/-0.23</b>	<b>+0.11</b>
	Identity index	74.1	74.1	70.1 <sup>[6]</sup>	70.9	<b>72.3+/-2.0</b>	<b>+1.4</b>
Global citizens	Strength rating	6.61 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.86	6.89	7.06	<b>6.93+/-0.25</b>	<b>-0.13</b>
	Importance rating	6.30	6.49	6.53	6.63	<b>6.64+/-0.26</b>	--
	Identity index	63.5 <sup>[6]</sup>	65.6	66.2	66.7	<b>66.6+/-2.3</b>	<b>-0.1</b>
Members of the Chinese race	Strength rating	7.10	6.98	6.27 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.46	<b>6.25+/-0.31</b>	<b>-0.21</b>
	Importance rating	6.68	6.67	5.96 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.99	<b>5.89+/-0.32</b>	<b>-0.10</b>
	Identity index	68.0	67.3	60.2 <sup>[6]</sup>	60.7	<b>59.2+/-3.1</b>	<b>-1.5</b>
Chinese	Strength rating	6.89	6.59	5.87 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.12	<b>5.74+/-0.29</b>	<b>-0.38</b>
	Importance rating	6.67	6.19 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.54 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.63	<b>5.50+/-0.30</b>	<b>-0.13</b>
	Identity index	66.6	62.4 <sup>[6]</sup>	55.2 <sup>[6]</sup>	57.3	<b>54.6+/-3.0</b>	<b>-2.7</b>
Citizens of the PRC	Strength rating	5.85	5.91	4.82 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.24 <sup>[6]</sup>	<b>4.90+/-0.32</b>	<b>-0.35</b>
	Importance rating	5.68	5.68	4.79 <sup>[6]</sup>	4.99	<b>4.77+/-0.32</b>	<b>-0.21</b>
	Identity index	56.3	57.1	46.2 <sup>[6]</sup>	49.6	<b>46.8+/-3.1</b>	<b>-2.8</b>

[4] Before March 2020, weighted count was used to report subsample size. Starting from March 2020, raw count was used instead.

[5] “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.

[6] 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”, “global citizens”, “members of the Chinese race”, “Chinese” and “citizens of the PRC”. The strength ratings are 8.57, 7.83, 6.93, 6.25, 5.74 and 4.90 respectively, while the importance ratings are 8.34, 6.89, 6.64, 5.89, 5.50 and 4.77 respectively. 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 83.1, 72.3, 66.6, 59.2, 54.6 and 46.8 respectively. All the figures mentioned above have not registered significant change compared to half a year ago. However, the strength ratings of “members of the Chinese race” and “Chinese” have registered historical lows since 2007 and 1997 respectively, while their importance ratings and identity indexes have registered historical lows since 2008.

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	<u>4-7/6/18</u>	<u>3-6/12/18</u>	<u>17-20/6/19</u>	<u>4-10/12/19</u>	<u>1-4/6/20</u>	<u>Latest change</u>
Sample size <sup>[7]</sup>	614	585	643	577	<b>602</b>	--
Response rate	56.3%	54.6%	58.7%	62.8%	<b>64.3%</b>	--
Latest findings	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding	<b>Finding &amp; error</b>	--
Identified as “Hongkongers”	41%	40%	53% <sup>[8]</sup>	55%	<b>50+/-4%</b>	<b>-5%</b>
Identified as “Chinese”	18% <sup>[8]</sup>	15%	11% <sup>[8]</sup>	11%	<b>13+/-3%</b>	<b>+2%</b>
Identified with a mixed identity of “Hongkongers” and “Chinese”	39% <sup>[8]</sup>	43%	36% <sup>[8]</sup>	32%	<b>36+/-4%</b>	<b>+4%</b>
Identified as “Hongkongers” in broad sense	67%	66%	76% <sup>[8]</sup>	78%	<b>75+/-4%</b>	<b>-2%</b>
Identified as “Chinese” in broad sense	30%	32%	23% <sup>[8]</sup>	21%	<b>24+/-3%</b>	<b>+3%</b>

[7] Before March 2020, weighted count was used to report subsample size. Starting from March 2020, raw count was used instead.

[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.

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”, 50% identified themselves as “Hongkongers”, 13% as “Chinese”, 11% as “Chinese in Hong Kong” and 25% as “Hongkongers in China”. In other words, 75% identified themselves as “Hongkongers” in a broad sense (i.e. either as “Hongkongers” or “Hongkongers in China”), 24% identified themselves as “Chinese” in a broad sense (i.e. either as “Chinese” or “Chinese in Hong Kong”), while 36% 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”. The figures mentioned above also remained comparable to those half a year ago.

## Opinion Daily

In 2007, POP started collaborating with Wisers Information Limited whereby Wisers supplies to POP a record of significant events of that day according to the research method designed by POP. These daily entries would then become “Opinion Daily” after they are verified by POP.

For the polling items covered in this press release, the previous survey was conducted from 4 to 10 December, 2019 while this survey was conducted from 1 to 4 June, 2020. During this period, herewith the significant events selected from counting newspaper headlines and commentaries on a daily basis and covered by at least 25% of the local newspaper articles. Readers can make their own judgment if these significant events have any impacts to different polling figures.

4/6/20	June 4 vigils are held in various districts.
3/6/20	Vice-Premier of the State Council Han Zheng meets Carrie Lam.
29/5/20	Donald Trump announces new measures toward China and Hong Kong and says China has replaced one country, two systems with one country, one system.
28/5/20	National People’s Congress passes resolution to enact national security law in Hong Kong.
27/5/20	Over 360 people are arrested in protests against the National Anthem Bill and the national security law.
24/5/20	People rally against the national security law on Hong Kong Island. Over 180 people are arrested.
22/5/20	The Central Government will set up national security agencies in Hong Kong after implementation of national security law.
21/5/20	National People’s Congress will deliberate on national security law in Hong Kong.
20/5/20	Taiwan President Tsai Ing-wen is sworn into office.
18/5/20	Starry Lee Wai-king is elected the chairperson of the House Committee of the Legislative Council.
16/5/20	Two managers of liberal studies resign from the Hong Kong Examinations and Assessment Authority.
15/5/20	Independent Police Complaints Council releases a report saying there is no evidence of casualties in the Prince Edward MTR incident on August 31.
8/5/20	Eleven democrats get thrown out after conflicts occur in a meeting of the House Committee of the Legislative Council.
28/4/20	The government announces that cross-boundary students and certain business travelers can be exempted from quarantine.
21/4/20	The Hong Kong and Macau Affairs Office issues multiple statements to criticize Dennis Kwok.
18/4/20	15 pan-democrats including Martin Lee and Jimmy Lai are arrested.
15/4/20	Director of the Liaison Office Luo Huining says Hong Kong needs to safeguard national security.
14/4/20	Carrie Lam claims the Hong Kong and Macau Affairs Office and the Liaison Office did not interfere in Hong Kong affairs.
13/4/20	The Hong Kong and Macau Affairs Office and the Liaison Office criticize Legislative Councillor Dennis Kwok.
27/3/20	The government announces the ban on gathering with more than 4 people.
23/3/20	The government announces ban on non-residents arrivals at the airport from entering Hong Kong.
17/3/20	The government announces people entering Hong Kong from any foreign country will be put in a 14-day quarantine.
8/3/20	Police arrests during midnight 17 people who are suspected of making explosives.
4/3/20	The first batch of government-chartered flights bring back Hong Kong people in Hubei.
29/2/20	US Department of State and some councillors express concern over the arrest of Jimmy Lai, Lee Cheuk-yan and Yeung Sum.



28/2/20	Police arrests Jimmy Lai, Lee Cheuk-yan and Yeung Sum.
19/2/20	The first batch of Hong Kong people on the cruise Diamond Princess return to Hong Kong by a charter flight.
13/2/20	Xia Baolong is appointed the Director of the Hong Kong and Macau Affairs Office.
5/2/20	The government announces people entering Hong Kong from mainland China will be put in a 14-day quarantine.
3/2/20	The government announces further closure of borders.
1/2/20	Hospital Authority Employees Alliance members vote to go on strike.
28/1/20	The government announces partial border closure.
27/1/20	The government imposes immigration restrictions on Hubei residents and people who visited Hubei.
22/1/20	Two “highly suspected” Wuhan pneumonia cases are found in Hong Kong.
19/1/20	Rally at Central turns into a conflict between protestors and the police.
11/1/20	Tsai Ing-wen wins Taiwan’s presidential election.
4/1/20	Luo Huining is appointed the Director of the Liaison Office.
1/1/20	The Civil Human Rights Front organizes the New Year Rally.
31/12/19	Protesting activities occur in multiple districts on New Year’s Eve.
28/12/19	Number of tours for tourists from mainland China has plunged.
25/12/19	Protesting activities occur in multiple districts during Christmas.
16/12/19	Carrie Lam pays a duty visit to Beijing.
11/12/19	All members of the Independent Police Complaints Council International Expert Panel quit.
8/12/19	The Civil Human Rights Front announces that around eight hundred thousand people participated in the International Human Rights Day protest.

## **Data Analysis**

Latest 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”, “global citizens”, “members of the Chinese race”, “Chinese” and “citizens of the PRC”. All the figures have not registered significant change compared to half a year ago. However, the strength ratings of “members of the Chinese race” and “Chinese” have registered historical lows since 2007 and 1997 respectively, while their importance ratings and identity indexes have registered historical lows since 2008.

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”. These figures also remained comparable to those half a year ago.