

## 2024 年 9 月 30 日 新聞公報

### 香港民研發放社會及自由指標、盛事經濟調查質性意見分析

#### 公報簡要

香港民意研究所（香港民研）於九月初由真實訪問員以隨機電話抽樣成功訪問了 673 名香港居民，同時繼續測試電話短訊調查方法。本報告集中分析電話訪問部分所得的數據（即不包括電話短訊網上調查樣本），雖然樣本總數有所減少，但與以往的調查及分析方法一致，因此結果可以直接比較。

電話訪問部分顯示，以 0 至 10 分評價，市民對五項核心社會指標的評分由高至低分別是「安定」、「法治」、「自由」、「繁榮」和「民主」，得分分別為 6.07、6.05、5.47、5.26 和 4.65 分，除了「安定」顯著上升以外，其餘指標與半年前的數字相比均沒有顯著變化。至於七項非核心指標中，獲最高分的為「治安」、「文明」和「廉潔」，其次為「社會福利」和「效率」，而「公平」和「平等」的得分則相對較低，當中「治安」創 2019 年 5 月以來新高。相比半年前，除了「文明」及「平等」以外的指標全部錄得顯著升幅。

自由次指標方面，獲最高分的首兩項為「出入境自由」和「信仰自由」，其次為「學術研究自由」、「文藝創作自由」、「罷工自由」和「言論自由」，再次之為「新聞自由」、「結社自由」和「出版自由」，而「遊行示威自由」的得分則明顯較低，只有 3.85 分。相比半年前，除了「文藝創作自由」錄得顯著升幅之外，其餘指標均沒有顯著變化。至於兩項法治次指標，法庭公正程度得 5.79 分，司法制度公平程度則為 5.52 分，兩者於半年內的變化並未超出抽樣誤差，而司法制度公平程度創 2019 年 5 月以來新高。

電話訪問部分的實效回應比率為 45.8%。在 95% 置信水平下，此部分調查的評分誤差不超過 +/- 0.39。

另外，香港民研亦於九月中以網上調查方式訪問「香港民研意見群組」成員，收集他們對於哪些盛事較有印象及對所述盛事的印象。相關質性意見分析載於報告後半部分。

#### 樣本資料 (社會及自由指標部分)

調查日期	:	2-4/9/2024 (電話訪問部分)
調查方法	:	(1) 隨機抽樣固網電話訪問 (2) 隨機抽樣手機電話訪問 (3) 隨機抽樣電話短訊邀請參與網上調查
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>	:	673 (電話訪問部分；包括 338 個固網樣本、335 個手機樣本)

實效回應比率	: 45.8% (電話訪問部分)
抽樣誤差 <sup>[2]</sup>	: 在 95% 置信水平下，評分誤差不超過 +/-0.39 (電話訪問部分)
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《按性別及年齡劃分的年中人口》(2023 年中)，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》(2023 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。

## 社會及自由指標

以下是五項核心社會指標的最新數字：

調查日期	<u>1-9/2/23</u>	<u>3-18/5/23</u>	<u>1-10/8/23</u>	<u>4-7/3/24</u> <sup>[3]</sup>	<u>2-4/9/24</u> <sup>[3]</sup>	最新變化
樣本數目	516-522	509-513	511-514	338-344	<b>338-346</b>	--
回應比率	58.0%	52.4%	54.5%	43.3%	<b>45.8%</b>	--
最新結果	結果	結果	結果	結果	結果及誤差	--
安定指標	6.21	5.74 <sup>[4]</sup>	5.67	5.66	<b>6.07 +/- 0.26</b>	<b>+0.41<sup>[4]</sup></b>
法治指標	6.14 <sup>[4]</sup>	5.53 <sup>[4]</sup>	5.58	5.66	<b>6.05 +/- 0.30</b>	<b>+0.39</b>
自由指標	6.22 <sup>[4]</sup>	5.87 <sup>[4]</sup>	5.74	5.67	<b>5.47 +/- 0.32</b>	<b>-0.20</b>
繁榮指標	5.83 <sup>[4]</sup>	5.61	5.42	4.92 <sup>[4]</sup>	<b>5.26 +/- 0.24</b>	<b>+0.34</b>
民主指標	5.25	4.66 <sup>[4]</sup>	4.92	4.46 <sup>[4]</sup>	<b>4.65 +/- 0.36</b>	<b>+0.19</b>

[3] 各項數字只計算電話訪問部分，不包括電話短訊網上調查樣本。

[4] 根據兩次調查的數字合併計算，有關差異在 95% 置信水平下表面成立。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，而不同加權方法亦可能會得出不同結果。

以下是七項非核心社會指標的最新數字：

調查日期	<u>1-9/8/22</u>	<u>1-9/2/23</u>	<u>1-10/8/23</u>	<u>4-7/3/24</u> <sup>[5]</sup>	<u>2-4/9/24</u> <sup>[5]</sup>	最新變化
樣本數目	507-515	516-521	509-517	338-340	<b>339-348</b>	--
回應比率	58.6%	58.0%	54.5%	43.3%	<b>45.8%</b>	--
最新結果	結果	結果	結果	結果	結果及誤差	--
治安指標	6.55 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.61	5.57 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.06 <sup>[6]</sup>	<b>6.63 +/- 0.25</b>	<b>+0.57<sup>[6]</sup></b>
文明指標	6.01 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.31 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.81 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.02	<b>6.21 +/- 0.27</b>	<b>+0.19</b>
廉潔指標	5.86 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.29 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.71 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.62	<b>6.15 +/- 0.26</b>	<b>+0.53<sup>[6]</sup></b>
社會福利指標	6.05 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.17	5.83 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.52	<b>5.93 +/- 0.27</b>	<b>+0.41<sup>[6]</sup></b>
效率指標	5.30 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.94 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.66	5.36	<b>5.87 +/- 0.27</b>	<b>+0.51<sup>[6]</sup></b>
公平指標	5.05 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.40 <sup>[6]</sup>	4.93 <sup>[6]</sup>	4.62	<b>5.23 +/- 0.28</b>	<b>+0.61<sup>[6]</sup></b>
平等指標	5.34 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.72 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.20 <sup>[6]</sup>	4.93	<b>5.21 +/- 0.29</b>	<b>+0.29</b>

[5] 各項數字只計算電話訪問部分，不包括電話短訊網上調查樣本。

[6] 根據兩次調查的數字合併計算，有關差異在 95% 置信水平下表面成立。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，而不同加權方法亦可能會得出不同結果。

以下是十項自由次指標的最新數字：

調查日期	1-9/8/22	1-9/2/23	1-10/8/23	4-7/3/24 <sup>[7]</sup>	2-4/9/24 <sup>[7]</sup>	最新變化
樣本數目	507-515	515-523	510-517	339-343	338-347	--
回應比率	58.6%	58.0%	54.5%	43.3%	45.8%	--
最新結果	結果	結果	結果	結果	結果及誤差	--
自由指標 (重複顯示)	5.43 <sup>[8]</sup>	6.22 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.74 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.67	5.47+/-0.32	-0.20
出入境自由	6.15 <sup>[8]</sup>	7.49 <sup>[8]</sup>	7.37	7.52	7.82+/-0.25	+0.29
信仰自由	7.30 <sup>[8]</sup>	7.63 <sup>[8]</sup>	7.34	7.67	7.68+/-0.26	+0.01
學術研究自由	5.67	6.37 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.85 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.94	6.00+/-0.33	+0.06
文藝創作自由	5.36	5.72	5.59	4.89 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.56+/-0.34	+0.67 <sup>[8]</sup>
罷工自由	5.44 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.60	5.21 <sup>[8]</sup>	4.92	5.17+/-0.36	+0.26
言論自由	5.20 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.64 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.01 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.16	5.06+/-0.36	-0.10
新聞自由	5.19 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.40	4.70 <sup>[8]</sup>	4.67	4.81+/-0.36	+0.14
結社自由	4.86 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.41 <sup>[8]</sup>	4.90 <sup>[8]</sup>	4.57	4.77+/-0.39	+0.20
出版自由	4.97 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.18	4.74 <sup>[8]</sup>	4.32	4.61+/-0.37	+0.29
遊行示威自由	4.06 <sup>[8]</sup>	4.50 <sup>[8]</sup>	3.75 <sup>[8]</sup>	3.61	3.85+/-0.24	+0.24

[7] 各項數字只計算電話訪問部分，不包括電話短訊網上調查樣本。

[8] 根據兩次調查的數字合併計算，有關差異在 95% 置信水平下表面成立。不過，變化在統計學上成立與否，並不同等有關變化是否有實際用途或意義，而不同加權方法亦可能會得出不同結果。

以下是兩項法治次指標的最新數字：

調查日期	1-9/8/22	1-9/2/23	1-10/8/23	4-7/3/24 <sup>[9]</sup>	2-4/9/24 <sup>[9]</sup>	最新變化
樣本數目	507-518	518-524	511-513	339-340	341-345	--
回應比率	58.6%	58.0%	54.5%	43.3%	45.8%	--
最新結果	結果	結果	結果	結果	結果及誤差	--
法治指標 (重複顯示)	5.74 <sup>[10]</sup>	6.14 <sup>[10]</sup>	5.58 <sup>[10]</sup>	5.66	6.05+/-0.30	+0.39
法庭公正程度	5.68 <sup>[10]</sup>	5.85	5.38 <sup>[10]</sup>	5.59	5.79+/-0.32	+0.20
司法制度公平程度	5.37 <sup>[10]</sup>	5.43	5.42	5.19	5.52+/-0.32	+0.33

[9] 各項數字只計算電話訪問部分，不包括電話短訊網上調查樣本。

[10] 根據兩次調查的數字合併計算，有關差異在 95% 置信水平下表面成立。不過，變化在統計學上成立與否，並不同等有關變化是否有實際用途或意義，而不同加權方法亦可能會得出不同結果。

以 0 至 10 分評價，市民對五項核心社會指標的評分由高至低分別是「安定」、「法治」、「自由」、「繁榮」和「民主」，得分分別為 6.07、6.05、5.47、5.26 和 4.65 分，除了「安定」顯著上升以外，其餘指標與半年前的數字相比均沒有顯著變化。

至於七項非核心指標中，獲最高分的為「治安」、「文明」和「廉潔」，分別得 6.63、6.21 和 6.15 分；其次為「社會福利」和「效率」，分別得 5.93 和 5.87 分，而「公平」和「平等」的得分則相對較低，分別得 5.23 和 5.21 分。非核心指標當中，「治安」創 2019 年 5 月以來新高。相比半年前，除了「文明」及「平等」以外的指標全部錄得顯著升幅。

自由次指標方面，獲最高分的首兩項為「出入境自由」和「信仰自由」，分別得 7.82 和 7.68 分；其次為「學術研究自由」、「文藝創作自由」、「罷工自由」和「言論自由」，分別得 6.00、5.56、5.17 和 5.06 分；再次之為「新聞自由」、「結社自由」和「出版自由」，分別得 4.81、4.77 和 4.61 分，而「遊行示威自由」的得分則明顯較低，只有 3.85 分。自由次指標當中，「出入境自由」

錄得 2018 年 5 月以來新高，而「信仰自由」則錄得 2019 年 9 月以來新高。相比半年前，除了「文藝創作自由」錄得顯著升幅之外，其餘指標均沒有顯著變化。

至於兩項法治次指標，法庭公正程度得 5.79 分，司法制度公平程度則為 5.52 分，兩者於半年內的變化並未超出抽樣誤差，而司法制度公平程度創 2019 年 5 月以來新高。

## 盛事經濟質性意見分析

香港民研於 9 月 11 至 20 日以網上調查方式訪問「香港民研意見群組」成員有關政府民望和社會及自由指標等問題。此外，是次網上調查還設有兩道有關盛事經濟的開放式問題，嘗試探討受訪者於特區政府本年推動的一系列盛事經濟措施中，對哪些盛事較有印象，最終共有 488 名 12 歲或以上受訪者回答相關問題。本報告集中分析當中所收集的質性意見，量性結果及詳細樣本資料將會適時公佈。

我們將「對於哪些盛事較有印象」及「對所述盛事的印象」兩個組別的答案透過「PyCantonese」進行分詞 (word segmentation)，並移除當中意義不大或只出現一次的字詞、標點符號及中英文單字。最後，我們在兩組答案中分別選取約 50 個於原始樣本中最常出現的字詞，使用「HTML5 Word Cloud」製成文字雲 (word cloud)。

以下為市民對於哪些盛事較有印象之分析結果：



以下為市民對所述盛事的印象之分析結果：



此外，我們亦以人工智能系統 Perplexity AI 歸納收集到的答案。我們將上述兩道題目的回應上載至系統，並指示其將內容以不同方式歸納。Perplexity AI 以英文回應後，我們透過 DeepL 翻譯器將其回應直譯成中文，以便讀者參考。（請以英文版本為準）

以下是由 AI 歸納得出市民對盛事印象的評價方向（由 DeepL 翻譯器提供）：

市民對盛事印象的評價方向	
<p><b>1. 盛事的成效及經濟影響</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>許多盛事被認為未能有效推動本地經濟。</li> <li>受訪者對於在組織不善的活動上浪費金錢表示關注。</li> <li>受訪者普遍認為活動未能吸引大量遊客的興趣。</li> <li>有些受訪者指出，夜市等活動並沒有促進當地消費。</li> <li>許多活動缺乏可衡量的成果，令人對其價值產生懷疑。</li> </ul>	
<p><b>2. 公眾情緒與參與</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>「多啦 A 夢」展覽被視為充滿吸引力和趣味性，因而獲得正面的評價。</li> <li>香港國際七人欖球賽 (Hong Kong Rugby Sevens) 則維持其年度盛事的美譽。</li> <li>受訪者批評的是被視為帶有政治色彩或爭議性的活動，例如邁阿密國際球賽。</li> <li>許多回應者認為活動缺乏本地文化的代表性，使其吸引力大打折扣。</li> <li>有些評論則強調政府措施與大眾利益或需求脫節。</li> </ul>	
<p><b>3. 活動的品質與組織</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>有幾個活動的組織被批評執行不力，令人失望。</li> <li>許多回應者認為，與前幾年相比，今年活動的整體品質不佳。</li> <li>煙火匯演等活動被指無趣且缺乏創意。</li> <li>對於 Doraemon 無人機秀的評價則褒貶不一，有些人稱讚其創新性，有些人則認為缺乏深度。</li> <li>有評論指出，希望未來的活動能有更多獨特且與文化相關的節目。</li> </ul>	

以下是由 AI 歸納得出市民對各項盛事的印象（由 DeepL 翻譯器提供）：

市民對各項盛事的印象
<p><b>1. 多啦 A 夢展覽</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 因吸引眾多參觀者並帶來熱鬧氣氛而備受稱讚。</li><li>• 在人群參與度和經濟效益方面，被視為少數成功的活動之一。</li><li>• 有助於提升周邊購物商場和飯店的營業額。</li></ul>
<p><b>2. Tatler XFEST（美斯足球事件）</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 因美斯缺席而備受批評，導致負面宣傳，令香港的活動策劃能力蒙羞。</li><li>• 被形容為混亂不堪，未能達到預期效果。</li></ul>
<p><b>3. 七人欖球賽</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 傳統上最受歡迎的賽事，但隨著時間流逝而失去魅力和吸引力。</li><li>• 被視為有利於營造熱鬧的社會氣氛，但其對經濟的影響備受質疑。</li></ul>
<p><b>4. 夜市</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 被標籤為效率低、組織不善，據報導經濟效益微乎其微。</li><li>• 被批評為缺乏吸引當地人和遊客的獨特產品。</li><li>• 在推廣當地文化和促進夜間消費方面被視為失敗。</li></ul>
<p><b>5. 煙火表演</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 被批評為無趣且浪費金錢，無法引起興趣。</li></ul>
<p><b>6. 充氣裝置（例如：Chubby Hearts）</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 被指沒有創意、幼稚、浪費公帑，入場率和參與率低。</li><li>• 被批評為缺乏深度和文化意義。</li></ul>

### 2024 年 10 月新聞發佈活動預告（暫定）

- 10 月 8 日（星期二）新聞公報和數據更新：民情指數之按年齡或世代分析
- 10 月 17 日（星期四）下午三時新聞發佈會：施政報告即時調查
- 10 月 22 日（星期二）新聞公報和數據更新：民情指數之按教育程度分析
- 10 月 31 日（星期四）下午三時新聞發佈會：社會及自由指標、「民情指數第 6.45 號報告」

## Press Release on September 30, 2024

### HKPORI releases social and freedom indicators along with qualitative opinion data analysis on mega event economy

#### Abstract

The Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute (HKPORI) successfully interviewed 673 Hong Kong residents in early September, by means of a random telephone survey conducted by real interviewers, while the testing of online survey conducted via random SMS invitation is still in progress. This release focuses on the telephone survey sample only (i.e., excluding the SMS online sample). Although the sample size has been reduced, the research and analysis method are consistent with previous surveys and thus the results are suitable for direct comparison.

Results from the telephone survey show that, on a scale of 0 to 10, people's ratings on the five core social indicators ranked from the highest to the lowest are "stability", "rule of law", "freedom", "prosperity" and "democracy". Their scores are 6.07, 6.05, 5.47, 5.26 and 4.65 respectively. Except for "stability" which has increased significantly, there are no significant changes in all ratings of core social indicators compared to six months ago. As for the seven non-core indicators, "public order", "civilization" and "corruption-free practices" got the highest ratings, followed by "social welfare sufficiency" and "efficiency". "Fairness" and "equality" got relatively lower ratings. Among non-core indicators, "public order" has hit a new high since May 2019. All ratings of non-core indicators except "civilization" and "equality" have increased significantly over the past six months.

As for the freedom sub-indicators, the top 2 go to freedoms of "entering or leaving Hong Kong" and "religious belief", followed by freedoms of "academic research", "artistic and literary creation", "strike" and "speech". The next tier is formed by freedoms of "press", "association" and "publication", while freedom of "procession and demonstration" scored much lower than the other sub-indicators, at 3.85 marks only. Compared with half a year ago, except for freedom of "artistic and literary creation" which has increased significantly, there are no significant changes in ratings of all freedom sub-indicators. Regarding the two rule of law sub-indicators, "impartiality of the courts" got 5.79 marks, while "fairness of the judicial system" got 5.52 marks. Both changes registered over the past six months are within sampling errors, while "fairness of the judicial system" has reached a new high since May 2019.

The effective response rate of the telephone survey is 45.8%. The maximum sampling error of ratings is +/-0.39 at 95% confidence level.

In addition, HKPORI also interviewed "POP Panel" members in mid-September via an online survey to find out which mega events were more memorable to them and their impressions of such events. The qualitative opinion data analysis can be found in the latter half of this release.

#### Contact Information (Social and Freedom Indicators)

Date of survey : 2-4/9/2024 (for telephone survey)

Survey method	: (1) Random landline telephone survey (2) Random mobile telephone survey (3) Online survey by random SMS invitation
Target population	: Cantonese-speaking Hong Kong residents aged 18 or above
Sample size <sup>[1]</sup>	: 673 (for telephone survey, including 338 landline, 335 mobile)
Effective response rate	: 45.8% (for telephone survey)
Sampling error <sup>[2]</sup>	: Sampling error of ratings not more than +/-0.39 at 95% conf. level (for telephone survey)
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 by Sex and Age group” (2023 mid-year), while the educational attainment (highest level attended) distribution and economic activity status distribution came from “Women and Men in Hong Kong - Key Statistics” (2023 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.

### Social and Freedom Indicators

Herewith are the latest figures for the five core social indicators:

Date of survey	<u>1-9/2/23</u>	<u>3-18/5/23</u>	<u>1-10/8/23</u>	<u>4-7/3/24</u> <sup>[3]</sup>	<u>2-4/9/24</u> <sup>[3]</sup>	<u>Latest change</u>
Sample size	516-522	509-513	511-514	338-344	<b>338-346</b>	--
Response rate	58.0%	52.4%	54.5%	43.3%	<b>45.8%</b>	--
Latest findings	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding	<b>Finding &amp; error</b>	--
Degree of stability	6.21	5.74 <sup>[4]</sup>	5.67	5.66	<b>6.07+/-0.26</b>	<b>+0.41<sup>[4]</sup></b>
Compliance with the rule of law	6.14 <sup>[4]</sup>	5.53 <sup>[4]</sup>	5.58	5.66	<b>6.05+/-0.30</b>	<b>+0.39</b>
Degree of freedom	6.22 <sup>[4]</sup>	5.87 <sup>[4]</sup>	5.74	5.67	<b>5.47+/-0.32</b>	<b>-0.20</b>
Degree of prosperity	5.83 <sup>[4]</sup>	5.61	5.42	4.92 <sup>[4]</sup>	<b>5.26+/-0.24</b>	<b>+0.34</b>
Degree of democracy	5.25	4.66 <sup>[4]</sup>	4.92	4.46 <sup>[4]</sup>	<b>4.65+/-0.36</b>	<b>+0.19</b>

[3] Various figures are based only on samples from the telephone surveys but not those from the SMS online survey.

[4] Based on figures from two surveys, the change is statistically significant prima facie at 95% confidence level. However, statistically significant changes may not be useful or meaningful, and different weighting methods can produce different results.

Herewith are the latest figures for the seven non-core social indicators:

Date of survey	<u>1-9/8/22</u>	<u>1-9/2/23</u>	<u>1-10/8/23</u>	<u>4-7/3/24</u> <sup>[5]</sup>	<u>2-4/9/24</u> <sup>[5]</sup>	<u>Latest change</u>
Sample size	507-515	516-521	509-517	338-340	<b>339-348</b>	--
Response rate	58.6%	58.0%	54.5%	43.3%	<b>45.8%</b>	--
Latest findings	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding	<b>Finding &amp; error</b>	--
Degree of public order	6.55 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.61	5.57 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.06 <sup>[6]</sup>	<b>6.63+/-0.25</b>	<b>+0.57<sup>[6]</sup></b>



Date of survey	<u>1-9/8/22</u>	<u>1-9/2/23</u>	<u>1-10/8/23</u>	<u>4-7/3/24<sup>[5]</sup></u>	<u>2-4/9/24<sup>[5]</sup></u>	<u>Latest change</u>
Sample size	507-515	516-521	509-517	338-340	<b>339-348</b>	--
Response rate	58.6%	58.0%	54.5%	43.3%	<b>45.8%</b>	--
Latest findings	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding	<b>Finding &amp; error</b>	--
Degree of civilization	6.01 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.31 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.81 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.02	<b>6.21+/-0.27</b>	<b>+0.19</b>
Degree of corruption-free practices	5.86 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.29 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.71 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.62	<b>6.15+/-0.26</b>	<b>+0.53<sup>[6]</sup></b>
Degree of social welfare sufficiency	6.05 <sup>[6]</sup>	6.17	5.83 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.52	<b>5.93+/-0.27</b>	<b>+0.41<sup>[6]</sup></b>
Degree of efficiency	5.30 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.94 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.66	5.36	<b>5.87+/-0.27</b>	<b>+0.51<sup>[6]</sup></b>
Degree of fairness	5.05 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.40 <sup>[6]</sup>	4.93 <sup>[6]</sup>	4.62	<b>5.23+/-0.28</b>	<b>+0.61<sup>[6]</sup></b>
Degree of equality	5.34 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.72 <sup>[6]</sup>	5.20 <sup>[6]</sup>	4.93	<b>5.21+/-0.29</b>	<b>+0.29</b>

[5] Various figures are based only on samples from the telephone surveys but not those from the SMS online survey.

[6] Based on figures from two surveys, the change is statistically significant prima facie at 95% confidence level. However, statistically significant changes may not be useful or meaningful, and different weighting methods can produce different results.

Herewith are the latest figures for the ten freedom sub-indicators:

Date of survey	<u>1-9/8/22</u>	<u>1-9/2/23</u>	<u>1-10/8/23</u>	<u>4-7/3/24<sup>[7]</sup></u>	<u>2-4/9/24<sup>[7]</sup></u>	<u>Latest change</u>
Sample size	507-515	515-523	510-517	339-343	<b>338-347</b>	--
Response rate	58.6%	58.0%	54.5%	43.3%	<b>45.8%</b>	--
Latest findings	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding	<b>Finding &amp; error</b>	--
Degree of freedom (repeated listing)	5.43 <sup>[8]</sup>	6.22 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.74 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.67	<b>5.47+/-0.32</b>	<b>-0.20</b>
Freedom to enter or leave Hong Kong	6.15 <sup>[8]</sup>	7.49 <sup>[8]</sup>	7.37	7.52	<b>7.82+/-0.25</b>	<b>+0.29</b>
Freedom of religious belief	7.30 <sup>[8]</sup>	7.63 <sup>[8]</sup>	7.34	7.67	<b>7.68+/-0.26</b>	<b>+0.01</b>
Freedom to engage in academic research	5.67	6.37 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.85 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.94	<b>6.00+/-0.33</b>	<b>+0.06</b>
Freedom to engage in artistic and literary creation	5.36	5.72	5.59	4.89 <sup>[8]</sup>	<b>5.56+/-0.34</b>	<b>+0.67<sup>[8]</sup></b>
Freedom to strike	5.44 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.60	5.21 <sup>[8]</sup>	4.92	<b>5.17+/-0.36</b>	<b>+0.26</b>
Freedom of speech	5.20 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.64 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.01 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.16	<b>5.06+/-0.36</b>	<b>-0.10</b>
Freedom of press	5.19 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.40	4.70 <sup>[8]</sup>	4.67	<b>4.81+/-0.36</b>	<b>+0.14</b>
Freedom of association	4.86 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.41 <sup>[8]</sup>	4.90 <sup>[8]</sup>	4.57	<b>4.77+/-0.39</b>	<b>+0.20</b>
Freedom of publication	4.97 <sup>[8]</sup>	5.18	4.74 <sup>[8]</sup>	4.32	<b>4.61+/-0.37</b>	<b>+0.29</b>
Freedom of procession and demonstration	4.06 <sup>[8]</sup>	4.50 <sup>[8]</sup>	3.75 <sup>[8]</sup>	3.61	<b>3.85+/-0.24</b>	<b>+0.24</b>

[7] Various figures are based only on samples from the telephone surveys but not those from the SMS online survey.

[8] Based on figures from two surveys, the change is statistically significant prima facie at 95% confidence level. However, statistically significant changes may not be useful or meaningful, and different weighting methods can produce different results.

Herewith the latest figures of the two rule of law sub-indicators and the rating of the Chief Justice:

Date of survey	<u>1-9/8/22</u>	<u>1-9/2/23</u>	<u>1-10/8/23</u>	<u>4-7/3/24<sup>[9]</sup></u>	<u>2-4/9/24<sup>[9]</sup></u>	<u>Latest change</u>
Sample size	507-518	518-524	511-513	339-340	<b>341-345</b>	--
Response rate	58.6%	58.0%	54.5%	43.3%	<b>45.8%</b>	--
Latest findings	Finding	Finding	Finding	Finding	<b>Finding &amp; error</b>	--
Compliance with the rule of law (repeated listing)	5.74 <sup>[10]</sup>	6.14 <sup>[10]</sup>	5.58 <sup>[10]</sup>	5.66	<b>6.05+/-0.30</b>	<b>+0.39</b>
Impartiality of the courts	5.68 <sup>[10]</sup>	5.85	5.38 <sup>[10]</sup>	5.59	<b>5.79+/-0.32</b>	<b>+0.20</b>
Fairness of the judicial system	5.37 <sup>[10]</sup>	5.43	5.42	5.19	<b>5.52+/-0.32</b>	<b>+0.33</b>

[9] Various figures are based only on samples from the telephone surveys but not those from the SMS online survey.

[10] Based on figures from two surveys, the change is statistically significant prima facie at 95% confidence level. However, statistically significant changes may not be useful or meaningful, and different weighting methods can produce different results.

On a scale of 0 to 10, people’s ratings on the five core social indicators ranked from the highest to the lowest are “stability”, “rule of law”, “freedom”, “prosperity” and “democracy”. Their scores are 6.07, 6.05, 5.47, 5.26 and 4.65 respectively. Except for “stability” which has increased significantly, there are no significant changes in all ratings of core social indicators compared to six months ago.

As for the seven non-core indicators, “public order”, “civilization” and “corruption-free practices” got the highest ratings with 6.63, 6.21 and 6.15 marks, followed by “social welfare sufficiency” and “efficiency” at 5.93 and 5.87 marks respectively. “Fairness” and “equality” got relatively lower ratings, which stand at 5.23 and 5.21 marks respectively. Among non-core indicators, “public order” has hit a new high since May 2019. All ratings of non-core indicators except “civilization” and “equality” have increased significantly over the past six months.

As for the freedom sub-indicators, the top 2 go to freedoms of “entering or leaving Hong Kong” and “religious belief”, with 7.82 and 7.68 marks respectively, followed by freedoms of “academic research”, “artistic and literary creation”, “strike” and “speech”, with 6.00, 5.56, 5.17 and 5.06 marks respectively. The next tier is formed by freedoms of “press”, “association” and “publication”, with 4.81, 4.77 and 4.61 marks respectively, while freedom of “procession and demonstration” scored much lower than the other sub-indicators, at 3.85 marks only. Among the freedom sub-indicators, “entering or leaving Hong Kong” has registered a new high since May 2018, and “religious belief” has also registered a new high since September 2019. Compared with half a year ago, except for freedom of “artistic and literary creation” which has increased significantly, there are no significant changes in ratings of all freedom sub-indicators.

Regarding the two rule of law sub-indicators, “impartiality of the courts” got 5.79 marks, while “fairness of the judicial system” got 5.52 marks. Both changes registered over the past six months are within sampling errors, while “fairness of the judicial system” has reached a new high since May 2019.

### **Qualitative Opinion Data Analysis on Mega Event Economy**

HKPORI interviewed “POP Panel” members from September 11 to 20 via an online survey with questions on the popularity of the government as well as social and freedom indicators. Besides, there were two open-ended questions on mega event economy, in an attempt to find out which mega events promoted by the SAR Government this year were more memorable and people’s impressions of such events. A total of 488 respondents aged 12 or above responded to the questions. This release focuses on the analysis of the qualitative opinions collected only. The quantitative results and detailed contact information of that survey will be released in due course.



In addition, HKPORI also attempted to summarize the responses collected using Perplexity AI. All responses to the two open-ended questions were uploaded to Perplexity AI with prompts to summarize the contents in various ways.

The following is the summary of people’s **impressions of mega events from different perspectives**:

<b>People’s Impressions of Mega Events from Different Perspectives</b>
<p><b>1. Event Effectiveness and Economic Impact</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many events were perceived as ineffective in boosting the local economy.</li> <li>• Interviewees expressed concern over wasteful spending on poorly organized events.</li> <li>• There was a general sentiment that events failed to attract significant tourist interest.</li> <li>• Some respondents noted that events like night markets did not enhance local consumption.</li> <li>• The lack of measurable outcomes for many events raised doubts about their value.</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Public Sentiment and Engagement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive feelings were associated with the Doraemon exhibition, seen as engaging and fun.</li> <li>• The Hong Kong Rugby Sevens maintained its reputation as a beloved annual event.</li> <li>• Criticism was directed at events perceived as politically charged or controversial, such as the Inter Miami match.</li> <li>• Many respondents felt that events lacked local cultural representation, making them less appealing.</li> <li>• Some comments highlighted a disconnect between government initiatives and public interests or needs.</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Quality and Organization of Events</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The organization of several events was criticized for being poorly executed, leading to disappointment.</li> <li>• Many respondents felt that the overall quality of events was subpar compared to previous years.</li> <li>• Events like the fireworks display were labeled as uninteresting and lacking creativity.</li> <li>• The Doraemon drone show received mixed reviews, with some praising its innovation while others found it lacking depth.</li> <li>• Comments indicated a desire for more unique and culturally relevant programming in future events.</li> </ul>

The following is the summary of people’s **impressions of various mega events**:

<b>People’s Impressions of Various Mega Events</b>
<p><b>1. Doraemon Exhibition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Praised for attracting many visitors and generating excitement.</li> <li>• Seen as one of the few successful events in terms of crowd engagement and economic benefits.</li> <li>• Helped boost business for surrounding shopping malls and hotels</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Tatler XFEST (Messi Football Incident)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heavily criticized due to Messi's absence, leading to negative publicity and embarrassment for Hong Kong's event planning capabilities</li> <li>• Described as chaotic and messy, failing to meet expectations</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Rugby Sevens</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A traditional favorite but noted for losing its charm and appeal over time</li> <li>• Seen as beneficial for creating a lively social atmosphere but questioned regarding its economic impact</li> </ul> <p><b>4. Night Markets</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Labeled as ineffective and poorly organized, with minimal economic benefit reported</li> </ul>

### **People's Impressions of Various Mega Events**

- Criticized for lacking unique offerings that would attract both locals and tourists
- Seen as a failure in promoting local culture and boosting nighttime consumption

#### **5. Fireworks Display**

- Criticized as uninteresting and a waste of money, failing to generate excitement

#### **6. Inflatable Installations (e.g. Chubby Hearts)**

- Labeled as uncreative, childish and a waste of public funds with low attendance and engagement
- Criticized for lacking depth and cultural significance

### **Press Events Forecast for October 2024 (Tentative)**

- October 8 (Tuesday) press release and figures update: PSI per Age or Generation
- October 17 (Thursday) at 15:00, press conference: Policy Address Instant Poll
- October 22 (Tuesday) press release and figures update: PSI per Educational Attainment
- October 31 (Thursday) at 15:00, press conference: Social and Freedom Indicators, "PSI Report No. 6.45"