



HONG KONG PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH INSTITUTE

香港民意研究所

Hong Kong Public Opinion Program of Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute

PopPanel Research Report No. 101 cum “We Hongkongers” Research Report No. 69

Survey Date: 13 to 16 September 2021

Release Date: 17 September 2021

Copyright of this report was generated by the Hong Kong Public Opinion Program (HKPOP) and opened to the world.
HKPOP proactively promotes open data, open technology and the free flow of ideas, knowledge and information.
The predecessor of HKPOP was the Public Opinion Programme at The University of Hong Kong (HKUPOP).
“POP” in this publication may refer to HKPOP or HKUPOP as the case may be.

Research Background

"We Hongkongers" is an initiative advocated by Hong Kong Public Opinion Program (HKPOP) of Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute (HKPORI), with the support of many members of the civic society. With reference to the petition website "We the People" hosted by the White House of the United States, "We Hongkongers" aims to reflect public sentiment by conducting scientific research on any issues raised by Hong Kong citizens: https://www.pori.hk/wehongkongers_factsheet_20191017_chi.

"We Hongkongers" Project officially started on 17 October 2019, in the form of intensive rolling surveys. A total of 12 reports were published as of 23 December 2019. In mid-May 2020, in response to the rapid changes in Hong Kong's political and public sentiment, HKPOP redeveloped the "We Hongkongers" Project. Coupled with the rapid development of the "HKPOP Panel" established by PORI in July 2019, PORI decided to launch the "We Hongkongers Panel Survey" to further strengthen interaction with the public and as well as collect and analyze public opinion and there are 29 reports in total. In January 2021, PORI redeveloped the "We Hongkongers" Project again to strengthen the cooperation with non-governmental organizations, civil society organizations, concern groups and professional organizations, and the results will be released in the form of mini-forums to initiate policy discussions.

This report also represents Report No. 101 under HKPOP Panel survey series, as well as Report No. 69 under the "We Hongkongers" Project Series. The theme of this report is "Expectations of Policy Address".

HKPOP sent out emails to all panel members at the beginning of the survey, inviting them to fill in the questionnaire at the designated online platform. Members were allowed to make repeated submissions, while only the last submission of each individual member would be used for analysis.

Contact Information

Herewith the contact information of the “We Hongkongers” Panel Survey:

Table 1: Detailed Contact Information

Survey method	Online survey
Target population	HKPOP Panel samples, namely Hong Kong People Representative Panel (Probability-based Panel) and Hong Kong People Volunteer Panel (Non-probability-based Panel)
Weighting method	The figures are rim-weighted according to 1) gender-age distribution, educational attainment (highest level attended) distribution, economic activity status distribution of Hong Kong population and by District Councils population figures from Census and Statistics Department; 2) Voting results of District Councils Election from Registration and Electoral Office; 3) rating distribution of Chief Executive from regular tracking surveys.
Date of survey	13 September, 3pm – 16 September, 3pm
Total sample size	5,807
Response rate	6.4%
Sampling error ^[1]	Sampling error of percentages at +/-1% at 95% confidence level

[1] All error figures in this release are calculated at 95% confidence level. “95% confidence level” means that if we were to repeat a certain survey 100 times with different random samples, we would expect 95 times having the population parameter within the respective error margins calculated. Because of sampling errors, when quoting percentages, journalists should refrain from reporting decimal places, whereas one decimal place can be used when quoting rating figures.

PopPanel Composition

Regarding data collection, survey data from both the Hong Kong People Representative Panel and Hong Kong People Volunteer Panel were collected in the form of online questionnaire.

Among them, the Hong Kong People Representative Panel comes from members of the “HKPOP Panel” recruited in regular random telephone surveys. HKPOP uses “HKPOP Panel” as a framework for conducting surveys for different research projects, any eligible family member in the household may be invited to participate in a specific research.

Meanwhile, members of the Hong Kong People Volunteer Panel are recruited online. Citizens only need to self-register in HKPORI website to participate in online questionnaires.

All panel data collected will be adjusted using rim-weighting, to minimize the effects of self-selection bias or participation bias. Details are documented in the Weighting Procedure section.

Response Rate

HKPOP adopts a set of contact definition in compliance with most international standards. Historically, the social research community in Hong Kong has developed its own set of contact rates, cooperation rates, response rates, and so on. HKPOP normally reports the "success rate" for online surveys.

The calculation of the success rates in this study refers to the following tables.

Table 2: Calculation of success rate of the HKPOP Panel (by HKPOP definition)

Success rate	
=	$\frac{\text{Successful cases}}{\text{Panel size of the HKPOP Panel}} \times 100.0\%$
=	$\frac{5,807}{91,154} \times 100.0\%$
=	6.4%

Weighting Procedure

HKPOP has continuously adopted and enhanced its weighting method over the past few decades. For this survey, HKPOP adopts a "2 by 5 by 2 by 4 by 18 by 3 by 13" weighting procedure involving seven variables, namely, gender, age, educational attainment, economic activity status, district (18 cells), voting record (3 cells) and rating of Chief Executive (13 cells). Basically, the raw data of practically all random telephone surveys conducted by HKPOP are rim-weighted by the figures obtained from the Hong Kong Census and Statistics Department and/or Registration and Electoral Office so that the marginal distribution of the sample in terms of gender, age, educational attainment and economic activity status would match with that of the general population figures from the Hong Kong Census and Statistics Department. The marginal distribution of the sample in terms of district and voting record would match that of the general population figures from the Hong Kong Census and Statistics Department and/or Registration and Electoral Office. The marginal distribution of the sample in terms of "rating of Chief Executive" would match that of the general population in HKPOP's regular tracking surveys. This rim-weighting method (sometimes called raking) is found to be the most practicable method in processing HKPOP's survey data.

Specifically, the gender and age groupings used for weighting are as follows:

- Male 12-29
- Male 30-39
- Male 40-49
- Male 50-59
- Male 60 or above
- Female 12-29
- Female 30-39
- Female 40-49
- Female 50-59
- Female 60 or above

The educational attainments used for weighting are as follows:

- Secondary or below
- Tertiary or above

The economic activity statuses used for weighting are as follows:

- Working population / Others
- Home-makers / Housewives
- Students
- Retired person

The districts used for weighting are as follows:

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

The voting records used for weighting are as follows:

- Candidates of pro-democracy camp
- Candidates of non-pro-democracy camp
- Did not vote / blank / void vote

The "rating of Chief Executive" groupings used for weighting are as follows:

- 0 mark
- 1-9 mark(s)
- 10-19 marks
- 20-29 marks
- 30-39 marks
- 40-49 marks
- 50 marks
- 51-60 marks
- 61-70 marks
- 71-80 marks
- 81-90 marks
- 91-99 marks
- 100 marks

Quantitative Analysis Results

Quantitative analysis results of the “We Hongkongers” Panel Survey, after applying the standard weighting procedures, are as follows, all questions listed hereby are opinion questions:

Table 3: Q1 Survey results, by camp type; Survey period: 13-16/9/2021


Q1 CE Carrie Lam will soon deliver the 2021 Policy Address. How important or unimportant do you think the Polity Address is?	Pro-democracy camp supporters (Base=4,949)	Non-pro-democracy camp supporters ^[2] (Base=568)	Combined ^[3] (Base=5,517)
Very important	6%	13%	11%
Somewhat important	13%	43%	33%
Half-half	17%	12%	14%
Somewhat unimportant	20%	13%	15%
Very unimportant	24%	12%	19%
Don't know / hard to say	10%	6%	7%
Mean^[4]	2.3	3.3	3.0

[2] Include: pro-establishment camp supporters, centrist supporters, no political inclination / politically neutral / do not belong to any camp

[3] The aggregated figures come from adjusting the by-group weighted figures using ratio of “pan-democratic” vs “non-pan-democratic” collected in regular tracking survey.

[4] 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.

Chart 1: Q1 Combined chart, by camp type



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

^ The aggregated figures come from adjusting the by-group weighted figures using ratio of "pan-democratic" vs "non-pan-democratic" collected in regular tracking survey


Table 4: Q2 Survey results, by camp type; Survey period: 13-16/9/2021

Q2 Irrespective of how important you think the Policy Address is, how much expectation do you have on it?	Pro-democracy camp supporters (Base=4,948)	Non-pro-democracy camp supporters ^[5] (Base=567)	Combined ^[6] (Base=5,515)
Very high expectation	1%	2%	2%
Somewhat high expectation	6%	16%	13%
Half-half	8%	38%	28%
Somewhat low expectation	8%	10%	10%
Very low expectation	11%	3%	6%
No expectation	66%	29%	41%
Don't know / hard to say	<1%	1%	1%

[5] Include: pro-establishment camp supporters, centrist supporters, no political inclination / politically neutral / do not belong to any camp

[6] The aggregated figures come from adjusting the by-group weighted figures using ratio of “pan-democratic” vs “non-pan-democratic” collected in regular tracking survey.

Chart 2: Q2 Combined chart, by camp type



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

^ The aggregated figures come from adjusting the by-group weighted figures using ratio of "pan-democratic" vs "non-pan-democratic" collected in regular tracking survey

Table 5: Q3a Survey results, by camp type; Survey period: 13-16/9/2021


Q3a Irrespective of how important you think the Policy Address is, how necessary is it that it deals with the <u>Housing</u> issue?	Pro-democracy camp supporters (Base=4,947)	Non-pro-democracy camp supporters ^[7] (Base=568)	Combined ^[8] (Base=5,515)
Very necessary Somewhat necessary } Necessary Half-half Somewhat unnecessary Very unnecessary } Unnecessary Don't know / hard to say	60% 19% } 79% 14% 1% } 2% 1% 4%	69% 20% } 89% 8% 1% } 3% 2% <1%	66% 20% } 86% 10% 1% } 2% 2% 2%
Mean^[9]	4.4	4.5	4.5

[7] Include: pro-establishment camp supporters, centrist supporters, no political inclination / politically neutral / do not belong to any camp

[8] The aggregated figures come from adjusting the by-group weighted figures using ratio of “pan-democratic” vs “non-pan-democratic” collected in regular tracking survey.

[9] 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.

Chart 3: Q3a Combined chart, by camp type



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

^ The aggregated figures come from adjusting the by-group weighted figures using ratio of "pan-democratic" vs "non-pan-democratic" collected in regular tracking survey

Table 6: Q3b Survey results, by camp type; Survey period: 13-16/9/2021


Q3b Irrespective of how important you think the Policy Address is, how necessary is it that it deals with the <u>Healthcare and public health</u> issue?	Pro-democracy camp supporters (Base=4,947)	Non-pro-democracy camp supporters ^[10] (Base=567)	Combined ^[11] (Base=5,514)
Very necessary Somewhat necessary } Necessary Half-half Somewhat unnecessary Very unnecessary } Unnecessary Don't know / hard to say	65% 22% } 87% 3% 2% 2% } 4% 7%	55% 32% } 88% 8% 2% 2% } 4% 1%	58% 29% } 87% 6% 2% 2% } 4% 3%
Mean^[12]	4.6	4.4	4.4

[10] Include: pro-establishment camp supporters, centrist supporters, no political inclination / politically neutral / do not belong to any camp

[11] The aggregated figures come from adjusting the by-group weighted figures using ratio of “pan-democratic” vs “non-pan-democratic” collected in regular tracking survey.

[12] 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.

Chart 4: Q3b Combined chart, by camp type



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

^ The aggregated figures come from adjusting the by-group weighted figures using ratio of "pan-democratic" vs "non-pan-democratic" collected in regular tracking survey

Table 7: Q3c Survey results, by camp type; Survey period: 13-16/9/2021


Q3c Irrespective of how important you think the Policy Address is, how necessary is it that it deals with the <u>Education</u> issue?	Pro-democracy camp supporters (Base=4,930)	Non-pro-democracy camp supporters ^[13] (Base=565)	Combined ^[14] (Base=5,495)
Very necessary Somewhat necessary } Necessary Half-half Somewhat unnecessary Very unnecessary } Unnecessary Don't know / hard to say	38% 16% } 54% 13% 7% 11% } 18% 15%	40% 32% } 72% 16% 8% 4% } 12% <1%	39% 27% } 66% 15% 8% 6% } 14% 5%
Mean^[15]	3.7	4.0	3.9

[13] Include: pro-establishment camp supporters, centrist supporters, no political inclination / politically neutral / do not belong to any camp

[14] The aggregated figures come from adjusting the by-group weighted figures using ratio of “pan-democratic” vs “non-pan-democratic” collected in regular tracking survey.

[15] 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.

Chart 5: Q3c Combined chart, by camp type



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

^ The aggregated figures come from adjusting the by-group weighted figures using ratio of "pan-democratic" vs "non-pan-democratic" collected in regular tracking survey

Table 6: Q3d Survey results, by camp type; Survey period: 13-16/9/2021


Q3d Irrespective of how important you think the Policy Address is, how necessary is it that it deals with the <u>Social welfare</u> issue?	Pro-democracy camp supporters (Base=4,943)	Non-pro-democracy camp supporters ^[16] (Base=565)	Combined ^[17] (Base=5,508)
Very necessary Somewhat necessary } Necessary Half-half Somewhat unnecessary Very unnecessary } Unnecessary Don't know / hard to say	50% 29% } 79% 13% <1% } 2% 2% 7%	34% 39% } 73% 21% 4% } 6% 2% <1%	39% 36% } 75% 18% 2% } 5% 2% 2%
Mean^[18]	4.3	4.0	4.1

[16] Include: pro-establishment camp supporters, centrist supporters, no political inclination / politically neutral / do not belong to any camp

[17] The aggregated figures come from adjusting the by-group weighted figures using ratio of “pan-democratic” vs “non-pan-democratic” collected in regular tracking survey.

[18] 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.

Chart 8: Q3d Combined chart, by camp type



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

^ The aggregated figures come from adjusting the by-group weighted figures using ratio of "pan-democratic" vs "non-pan-democratic" collected in regular tracking survey

Table 9: Q3e Survey results, by camp type; Survey period: 13-16/9/2021


Q3e Irrespective of how important you think the Policy Address is, how necessary is it that it deals with the <u>Labour policy</u> issue?	Pro-democracy camp supporters (Base=4,946)	Non-pro-democracy camp supporters ^[19] (Base=562)	Combined ^[20] (Base=5,498)
Very necessary Somewhat necessary } Necessary Half-half Somewhat unnecessary Very unnecessary } Unnecessary Don't know / hard to say	37% 36% } 72% 19% <1% 2% } 2% 7%	29% 36% } 65% 31% 3% 2% } 4% <1%	31% 36% } 67% 27% 2% 2% } 3% 2%
Mean^[21]	4.1	3.9	4.0

[19] Include: pro-establishment camp supporters, centrist supporters, no political inclination / politically neutral / do not belong to any camp

[20] The aggregated figures come from adjusting the by-group weighted figures using ratio of “pan-democratic” vs “non-pan-democratic” collected in regular tracking survey.

[21] 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.

Chart 7: Q3e Combined chart, by camp type



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

^ The aggregated figures come from adjusting the by-group weighted figures using ratio of "pan-democratic" vs "non-pan-democratic" collected in regular tracking survey

Appendices

Appendix 1: Demographic profile of respondents

Gender:	Pro-democracy camp supporters				Non-pro-democracy camp supporters #				Total			
	Raw sample		Weighted sample		Raw sample		Weighted sample		Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Male	2,840	57.4%	910	52.6%	324	57.0%	1,606	44.0%	3,164	57.3%	2,516	46.8%
Female	2,106	42.5%	818	47.3%	241	42.4%	2,043	56.0%	2,347	42.5%	2,861	53.2%
Other	6	0.1%	2	0.1%	3	0.5%	<1	<0.1%	9	0.2%	2	<0.1%
Total	4,952	100.0%	1,730	100.0%	568	100.0%	3,649	100.0%	5,520	100.0%	5,379	100.0%
Missing case(s)	0		0		0		0		0		0	

Age:	Pro-democracy camp supporters				Non-pro-democracy camp supporters #				Total			
	Raw sample		Weighted sample		Raw sample		Weighted sample		Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
12 - 29	688	13.9%	606	35.1%	29	5.1%	221	6.0%	717	13.0%	827	15.4%
30 - 39	1,212	24.5%	140	8.1%	97	17.1%	487	13.3%	1,309	23.7%	626	11.6%
40 - 49	1,227	24.8%	391	22.6%	133	23.4%	705	19.3%	1,360	24.6%	1,096	20.4%
50 - 59	1,128	22.8%	347	20.1%	171	30.1%	1,279	35.1%	1,299	23.5%	1,627	30.2%
60 or above	695	14.0%	246	14.2%	138	24.3%	957	26.2%	833	15.1%	1,203	22.4%
Total	4,950	100.0%	1,730	100.0%	568	100.0%	3,649	100.0%	5,518	100.0%	5,379	100.0%
Missing case(s)	2		<1		0		0		2		<1	

Education attainment:	Pro-democracy camp supporters				Non-pro-democracy camp supporters #				Total			
	Raw sample		Weighted sample		Raw sample		Weighted sample		Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Primary or below	9	0.2%	<1	<0.1%	3	0.5%	44	1.2%	12	0.2%	45	0.8%
Secondary	740	15.0%	593	34.3%	132	23.4%	907	25.2%	872	15.8%	1,499	28.1%
Tertiary or above	4,194	84.8%	1,136	65.7%	430	76.1%	2,651	73.6%	4,624	84.0%	3,787	71.0%
Total	4,943	100.0%	1,729	100.0%	565	100.0%	3,602	100.0%	5,508	100.0%	5,331	100.0%
Missing case(s)	9		1		3		47		12		48	

Occupation:	Pro-democracy camp supporters				Non-pro-democracy camp supporters #				Total			
	Raw sample		Weighted sample		Raw sample		Weighted sample		Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Administrators and professionals	1,969	39.8%	238	13.7%	199	35.2%	1,026	28.1%	2,168	39.3%	1,263	23.5%
Clerks and service workers	1,318	26.7%	597	34.5%	135	23.9%	776	21.3%	1,453	26.4%	1,373	25.6%
Workers	108	2.2%	99	5.7%	17	3.0%	57	1.6%	125	2.3%	156	2.9%
Students	192	3.9%	233	13.5%	8	1.4%	81	2.2%	200	3.6%	315	5.9%
Home-makers / housewives	220	4.4%	212	12.3%	22	3.9%	238	6.5%	242	4.4%	450	8.4%
Others	1,137	23.0%	351	20.3%	185	32.7%	1,466	40.2%	1,322	24.0%	1,818	33.8%
Total	4,944	100.0%	1,730	100.0%	566	100.0%	3,644	100.0%	5,510	100.0%	5,374	100.0%
Missing case(s)	8		<1		2		5		10		5	

District:	Pro-democracy camp supporters				Non-pro-democracy camp supporters #				Total			
	Raw sample		Weighted sample		Raw sample		Weighted sample		Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Central & Western	206	4.2%	17	1.0%	25	4.5%	186	5.1%	231	4.2%	204	3.8%
Wan Chai	114	2.3%	6	0.3%	16	2.9%	73	2.0%	130	2.4%	78	1.5%
Eastern	498	10.2%	69	4.1%	57	10.2%	224	6.2%	555	10.2%	292	5.5%
Southern	193	3.9%	68	4.0%	24	4.3%	247	6.8%	217	4.0%	315	5.9%
Yau Tsim Mong	210	4.3%	144	8.5%	26	4.7%	198	5.5%	236	4.3%	342	6.4%
Sham Shui Po	255	5.2%	70	4.2%	22	3.9%	208	5.8%	277	5.1%	279	5.2%
Kowloon City	258	5.3%	97	5.7%	31	5.6%	144	4.0%	289	5.3%	241	4.5%
Wong Tai Sin	249	5.1%	33	2.0%	31	5.6%	275	7.6%	280	5.1%	309	5.8%
Kwun Tong	343	7.0%	291	17.2%	40	7.2%	127	3.5%	383	7.0%	418	7.9%
Tsuen Wan	226	4.6%	42	2.5%	37	6.6%	227	6.3%	263	4.8%	269	5.1%
Tuen Mun	297	6.1%	179	10.5%	26	4.7%	178	4.9%	323	5.9%	356	6.7%
Yuen Long	325	6.6%	114	6.7%	42	7.5%	516	14.3%	367	6.7%	630	11.9%
North	140	2.9%	13	0.8%	10	1.8%	53	1.5%	150	2.8%	66	1.3%
Tai Po	192	3.9%	22	1.3%	25	4.5%	215	5.9%	217	4.0%	237	4.5%
Sai Kung	419	8.6%	97	5.7%	38	6.8%	242	6.7%	457	8.4%	339	6.4%
Sha Tin	566	11.6%	296	17.5%	58	10.4%	357	9.9%	624	11.5%	653	12.3%
Kwai Tsing	284	5.8%	127	7.5%	37	6.6%	139	3.8%	321	5.9%	265	5.0%
Islands	117	2.4%	10	0.6%	12	2.2%	8	0.2%	129	2.4%	18	0.3%
Total	4,892	100.0%	1,694	100.0%	557	100.0%	3,617	100.0%	5,449	100.0%	5,311	100.0%
Missing case(s)	60		36		11		32		71		67	

Political inclination:	Pro-democracy camp supporters				Non-pro-democracy camp supporters #				Total			
	Raw sample		Weighted sample		Raw sample		Weighted sample		Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Pro-democracy camp	2,854	57.6%	1,214	70.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2,854	51.7%	1,214	22.6%
Pro-establishment camp	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	40	7.0%	565	15.5%	40	0.7%	565	10.5%
Localist	2,098	42.4%	516	29.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2,098	38.0%	516	9.6%
Centrist	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	189	33.3%	1,060	29.1%	189	3.4%	1,060	19.7%
Others	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No political inclination / politically neutral / don't belong to any camp	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	339	59.7%	2,024	55.5%	339	6.1%	2,024	37.6%
Don't know / hard to say	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	4,952	100.0%	1,730	100.0%	568	100.0%	3,649	100.0%	5,520	100.0%	5,379	100.0%
Missing case(s)	0		0		0		0		0		0	

Voted political camp: *	Pro-democracy camp supporters				Non-pro-democracy camp supporters #				Total			
	Raw sample		Weighted sample		Raw sample		Weighted sample		Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Democratic	4,704	95.3%	882	51.0%	353	62.3%	567	15.6%	5,057	91.9%	1,449	27.0%
Non-democratic	9	0.2%	96	5.6%	96	16.9%	1,897	52.1%	105	1.9%	1,993	37.1%
Did not vote / blank vote / void vote / don't know / hard to say / refuse to answer	150	3.0%	384	22.2%	95	16.8%	923	25.4%	245	4.5%	1,306	24.3%
Not a registered voter	74	1.5%	368	21.3%	23	4.1%	251	6.9%	97	1.8%	619	11.5%
Total	4,937	100.0%	1,730	100.0%	567	100.0%	3,638	100.0%	5,504	100.0%	5,368	100.0%

*(Only for respondents aged 18 or above or refuse to answer age)

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

Appendix 2: Contact Information

Total valid samples	5,807
Survey period	13-16/9/2021
Success rate	6.4%
Questionnaires sent out	91,154
Questionnaires received	6,222
Ineligible samples	35
Invalid samples	1
Incomplete samples	379
Standard error	0.7%
Sampling error	3.9%

Appendix 3: Quantitative analyses

Q1 Survey results; Survey period: 13-16/9/2021

Q1 CE Carrie Lam will soon deliver a new Policy Address. How important or unimportant do you think the Polity Address is?	Pro-democracy camp supporters		Non-pro-democracy camp supporters #		Total	
	Percentages (Base=1,730)		Percentages (Base=3,649)		Percentages (Base=5,379)	
Very Important	6.3%	}19.0%	13.5%	}56.7%	11.2%	}44.6%
Somewhat important	12.7%		43.3%		33.4%	
Half-half	16.8%		12.4%		13.8%	
Somewhat unimportant	20.1%	}54.4%	12.7%	}25.2%	15.1%	}34.6%
Very unimportant	34.3%		12.4%		19.5%	
Don't know / hard to say	9.9%		5.7%		7.1%	
Total	100.0%		100.0%		100.0%	
Mean values	2.3		3.3		3.0	
Standard error of mean	<0.1		<0.1		<0.1	
Median	2.0		4.0		3.0	
<i>Refuse to answer</i>	<1		0		<1	
Net value (Important- Unimportant)	-35.4%		+31.6%		+10.0%	

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

Q2 Survey results; Survey period: 13-16/9/2021

Q2 Irrespective of how important you think the Policy Address is, how much expectation do you have on it?	Pro-democracy camp supporters	Non-pro-democracy camp supporters (pro-establishment camp supporters, centrist supporters, no political inclination / politically neutral / do not belong to any camp)	Total
	Percentages (Base=1,729)	Percentages (Base=3,620)	Percentages (Base=5,349)
Very high expectation	1.2%	2.4%	2.0%
Somewhat high expectation	5.7%	16.1%	12.7%
Half-half	7.7%	38.0%	28.2%
Somewhat low expectation	8.4%	10.3%	9.7%
Very low expectation	11.1%	3.0%	5.6%
No expectation	65.9%	28.8%	40.8%
Don't know / hard to say	0.0%	1.5%	1.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
<i>Refuse to answer</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>29</i>

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

Q3a Survey results; Survey period: 13-16/9/2021

Q3a Irrespective of how important you think the Policy Address is, how necessary is it that it deals with the following issues? [Housing]	Pro-democracy camp supporters	Non-pro-democracy camp supporters #	Total
	Percentages (Base=1,730)	Percentages (Base=3,649)	Percentages (Base=5,379)
Strongly necessary	60.4%	68.9%	66.1%
Somewhat necessary } Necessary	18.9%	20.4%	19.9%
Half-half	14.3%	7.9%	10.0%
Somewhat unnecessary	0.5%	1.0%	0.9%
Strongly unnecessary } Unnecessary	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%
Don't know / hard to say	4.3%	0.3%	1.6%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean values	4.4	4.5	4.5
Standard error of mean	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Median	5.0	5.0	5.0
<i>Refuse to answer</i>	<1	0	<1
Net value (Necessary- Unnecessary)	+77.4%	+86.7%	+83.7%

Q3b Survey results; Survey period: 13-16/9/2021

Q3b Irrespective of how important you think the Policy Address is, how necessary is it that it deals with the following issues? [Healthcare and public health]	Pro-democracy camp supporters	Non-pro-democracy camp supporters #	Total
	Percentages (Base=1,730)	Percentages (Base=3,649)	Percentages (Base=5,379)
Strongly necessary	64.7%	55.5%	58.4%
Somewhat necessary } Necessary	22.0% } 86.6%	32.3% } 87.8%	29.0% } 87.4%
Half-half	3.4%	7.8%	6.4%
Somewhat unnecessary	1.9%	2.0%	2.0%
Strongly unnecessary } Unnecessary	1.6% } 3.5%	1.5% } 3.5%	1.5% } 3.5%
Don't know / hard to say	6.5%	0.9%	2.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean values	4.6	4.4	4.4
Standard error of mean	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Median	5.0	5.0	5.0
<i>Refuse to answer</i>	<1	<1	<1
Net value (Necessary- Unnecessary)	+83.1%	+84.2%	+83.9%

Q3c Survey results; Survey period: 13-16/9/2021

Q3c Irrespective of how important you think the Policy Address is, how necessary is it that it deals with the following issues? [Education]	Pro-democracy camp supporters	Non-pro-democracy camp supporters #	Total
	Percentages (Base=1,716)	Percentages (Base=3,642)	Percentages (Base=5,358)
Strongly necessary	37.9%	40.2%	39.5%
Somewhat necessary } Necessary	15.8%	31.8%	26.7%
Half-half	12.7%	15.5%	14.6%
Somewhat unnecessary	6.9%	7.9%	7.6%
Strongly unnecessary } Unnecessary	11.4%	4.2%	6.5%
Don't know / hard to say	15.3%	0.4%	5.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean values	3.7	4.0	3.9
Standard error of mean	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Median	4.0	4.0	4.0
<i>Refuse to answer</i>	14	7	20
Net value (Necessary- Unnecessary)	+35.4%	+60.0%	+52.1%

Q3d Survey results; Survey period: 13-16/9/2021

Q3d Irrespective of how important you think the Policy Address is, how necessary is it that it deals with the following issues? [Social welfare]	Pro-democracy camp supporters	Non-pro-democracy camp supporters #	Total
	Percentages (Base=1,730)	Percentages (Base=3,568)	Percentages (Base=5,298)
Strongly necessary	50.2%	33.8%	39.1%
Somewhat necessary } Necessary	28.6% } 78.9%	39.4% } 73.1%	35.9% } 75.0%
Half-half	12.9%	20.7%	18.1%
Somewhat unnecessary	0.2%	4.0%	2.7%
Strongly unnecessary } Unnecessary	1.5% } 1.8%	1.9% } 5.9%	1.8% } 4.5%
Don't know / hard to say	6.5%	0.4%	2.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean values	4.3	4.0	4.1
Standard error of mean	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Median	5.0	4.0	4.0
<i>Refuse to answer</i>	<1	81	81
Net value (Necessary- Unnecessary)	+77.1%	+67.2%	+70.5%

Q3e Survey results; Survey period: 13-16/9/2021

Q3e Irrespective of how important you think the Policy Address is, how necessary is it that it deals with the following issues? [Labour policy]	Pro-democracy camp supporters	Non-pro-democracy camp supporters #	Total
	Percentages (Base=1,730)	Percentages (Base=3,555)	Percentages (Base=5,285)
Strongly necessary	36.7%	28.6%	31.3%
Somewhat necessary } Necessary	35.7% } 72.5%	36.0% } 64.6%	35.9% } 67.1%
Half-half	19.0%	30.9%	27.0%
Somewhat unnecessary	0.4%	2.6%	1.9%
Strongly unnecessary } Unnecessary	1.6% } 1.9%	1.6% } 4.2%	1.6% } 3.5%
Don't know / hard to say	6.6%	0.4%	2.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Mean values	4.1	3.9	3.9
Standard error of mean	<0.1	<0.1	<0.1
Median	4.0	4.0	4.0
<i>Refuse to answer</i>	<1	94	94
Net value (Necessary- Unnecessary)	+70.5%	+60.4%	+63.7%

Appendix 4: Survey questionnaire (13-16/9/2021)

We Hongkongers & Community Health Survey

Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute is politically neutral. We welcome different opinions. All personal data will be kept strictly confidential. You can fill in the questionnaire again to express your latest views. When we need to work on the data, your last submission will be used. For enquiries, please email us at panel@pori.hk.

Last updated: xxxx-xx-xx

Tentative next update: xxxx-xx-xx

***Required**

Eligibility Confirmation

Are you a Hong Kong resident aged 12 or above? *

- Yes
- No

(New member) Please first register as a HKPOP Panel member at

<https://www.pori.hk/panel.html?lang=en> *

- Already registered as a member earlier (Please go to the survey platform by clicking on the designated hyperlink sent to you by email)
- Have just registered as a member
- Not yet registered as a member, and will register after completing the survey (Please note: Your response will be removed if you have not yet successfully registered as a member at the time of data analysis)

(New member) Email used / will be used in registration: *

We Hongkongers Series

CE Carrie Lam will soon deliver the 2021 Policy Address. How important or unimportant do you think the Polity Address is?

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Half-half
- Somewhat unimportant
- Very unimportant
- Don't know / hard to say

Irrespective of how important you think the Policy Address is, how much expectation do you have on it?

- Very high expectation
- Somewhat high expectation
- Half-half
- Somewhat low expectation
- Very low expectation
- No expectation
- Don't know / hard to say

Irrespective of how important you think the Policy Address is, how necessary is it that it deals with the following issues?

(Randomise the various issues)

	Strongly necessary	Somewhat necessary	Half-half	Somewhat unnecessary	Strongly unnecessary	Don't know / hard to say
Housing						
Healthcare and public health						
Education						
Social welfare						
Labour policy						

Community Health

How likely do you think it is that you will contract novel coronavirus pneumonia over the next one month?

(Please select the closest answer)

- 0% chance (Certainly not)
- 0.001% chance (1 in 100,000)
- 0.01% chance (1 in 10,000)
- 0.1% chance (1 in 1,000)
- 1% chance (1 in 100)
- 5% chance (1 in 20)
- 10% chance (1 in 10)
- 15% chance
- 20% chance
- 25% chance
- 30% chance
- 35% chance
- 40% chance
- 45% chance
- 50% chance
- 60% chance
- 70% chance
- 80% chance
- 90% chance
- 100% chance (Certainly will)
- _____ % chance
- Don't know / hard to say

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

- Very much satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Half-half

- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very much dissatisfied
- Don't know / hard to say

Other Opinions

Please rate on a scale of 0 to 100 your extent of support to the Chief Executive Carrie Lam, with 0 indicating absolutely not supportive, 100 indicating absolutely supportive and 50 indicating half-half. How would you rate the Chief Executive Carrie Lam?

- _____
- Don't know / hard to say

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

(Randomise the three conditions)

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

Other Opinions

Do you have any survey question to suggest for our surveys?

(If you do not have any suggestion, please leave this space blank.)

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

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

Personal Information

(Registered member) This section is about personal information. If you have already provided relevant information in this survey series and have nothing to add or update, you may skip these questions. We will use the past data you provided in this survey series for analysis.

- I have already provided my personal information, and has nothing to add or update ([skip questions on personal information](#))
- Provide / update personal information now

Gender

- Male
- Female
- Other

Age

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

Educational attainment

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

- Primary or below
- Lower secondary ([Secondary 1 to 3](#))
- Upper secondary ([Secondary 4 to 7 / DSE / Yi Jin](#))
- Tertiary: non-degree course ([including diploma / certificate / sub-degree course](#))
- Tertiary: bachelor degree course
- Tertiary: postgraduate school or above

Occupation

(Owner / self-employed / freelance / part time / civil servant are not valid answers, please answer according to the job nature or content)

- Administrator and professional
- Clerical and service worker
- Production worker
- Student
- Home-maker / housewife
- Retired person
- Unemployed / between jobs / other non-employed
- Other: _____

Which of the following best describes your political inclination?

(Randomise the four camps)

- Localist
- Pro-democracy camp
- Centrist
- Pro-establishment camp
- Other: _____
- No political inclination / politically neutral / do not belong to any camp
- Don't know / hard to say

Area of residence

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

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

- Candidate of pro-democracy camp, including localist
- Candidate of non-pro-democracy camp, including pro-establishment camp and centrist
- Don't know / hard to say
- Blank / void vote
- Did not vote (was a registered voter of the election)
- Did not vote (was not a registered voter of the election)

End of Questionnaire

Thank you for completing the survey. For enquiries, please email us at panel@pori.hk.