

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG 香港大學
PUBLIC OPINION PROGRAMME 民意研究計劃

Tel 電話：(852) 3921-2700 Fax 傳真：(852) 2517 6951 Website 網址：http://hkupop.hku.hk

Address: 5/F, Kennedy Town Centre, 23 Belcher's Street, Kennedy Town, Hong Kong

地址：香港堅尼地城卑路乍街二十三號堅城中心 5 樓



2011 年 12 月 29 日 公開說明

關於「香港人身分認同」民調設計

鑑於今日下午不斷有電子及文字傳媒向香港大學民意研究計劃查詢，要求民研計劃總監鍾庭耀就中聯辦宣傳文體部部長郝鐵川批評民研計劃「香港人身分認同」民調一事作出回應，民研計劃總監鍾庭耀特此向新聞界發表下列文稿，統一說明有關調查的設計（有關說明已於較早前，以即問即答方式，以電郵傳送至曾經查詢的傳媒機構，因此並不存在「沒有回應」的問題）：

- (1) 民研計劃歡迎所有關於民意研究設計的認真討論，集思廣益。不過，學術討論最好是保留在學術討論的層面，而不涉及政治考慮。嚴謹的學術討論，應可全面展示有關調查的優劣和利弊。
- (2) 關於「香港人身分認同」民調中，部份題目以「香港人」跟「中國人」身分對立的研究方法，民研計劃在多年來的新聞公報中已經詳細說明箇中利弊。多年前，民研計劃已在調查中加入六個單獨評分測試項目，解決問題。近年來，民研計劃更加建立「身分認同指數」，多角度說明香港市民的「身分認同」情況。以下是昨天新聞公報的部份內容：
 - 由於「香港人」、「中國的香港人」、「中國人」、及「香港的中國人」四者可能意識重疊，四擇其一未必能夠反映各項身分認同的強弱；因此，民研計劃一早就以 0 至 10 分同時測試市民對「香港人」及「中國人」的認同程度。2007 年 6 月開始，民研計劃把香港市民身分認同感的研究擴充，加入「中華人民共和國的國民身分」、「中華民族的一份子」、「亞洲人身分」及「世界公民身分」4 個單獨測試項目……
 - 把個別樣本之認同感評分乘以同一樣本之重要度評分，求取幾何平均數後再乘以 10，就得出 0 至 100 分的「身分認同指數」，0 分代表絕不投入，100 分代表絕對投入，50 分代表一半半。以認同指數計，香港市民六種身分的得分依次序為「香港人」、「中華民族一份子」、「亞洲人」、「中國人」、「世界公民」及「中華人民共和國國民」，分數為 79.1、72.5、72.1、67.9、67.0 及 61.1 分。
- (3) 以「香港人」跟「中國人」身分對立的研究方法，在上世紀八十年代已經廣為本地社會學家採用，並非出自民研計劃，各界人士可以輕易驗證。民研計劃在 1991 年成立後，已經把研究方法大幅改良，包括加入單獨評分和重要程度評分，以及建立等「身分認同指數」等，與時並進。
- (4) 由於單獨評分測試方式不會互相干擾，民研計劃非常歡迎其他研究機構加入「英國人」或其他身分進行測試，互相比較。

民研計劃總監鍾庭耀重申，學術討論應該是保留在學術討論的層面，不應涉及政治目的和考慮。



Public Explanation of December 29, 2011

About the Survey Design of “Hong Kong People’s Ethnic Identity”

In view of numerous enquiries from both print and electronic media made to the Public Opinion Programme (POP) at the University of Hong Kong, asking for Director Robert Chung’s response to the criticism made by Hao Tiechuan, Director of the Publicity, Cultural and Sports Department of the Liaison Office of the Central People’s Government in Hong Kong, on the “latest survey on Hong Kong people’s ethnic identity”, Director Robert Chung hereby issues this document to the press to explain the design of the survey in one go (such explanations have been sent to individual media via email immediately upon their enquiry, there is never any issue of “non-response” from POP):

1. POP welcomes all serious discussions on the methodology of public opinion research, in order to gather collective wisdom. However, academic discussions should remain on the academic level and should not include any political concern. Rigorous academic discussions should be able to comprehensively reveal the pros and cons of our surveys.
2. Concerning the use of a dichotomy of “Hong Kong citizens” versus “Chinese citizens” to measure Hong Kong people’s ethnic identity, POP has already explained its pros and cons in its press releases over the years. Many years ago, POP added 6 individual rating items in its surveys to solve the problem. Recently, POP also constructed “identity indexes” to describe Hong Kong people’s “ethnic identity” from various angles. The following is an excerpt from yesterday’s press release:
 - Because the concepts of “Hong Kong citizens”, “Chinese Hong Kong citizens”, “Chinese citizens” and “Hong Kong Chinese citizens” may overlap with each other, and making a one-in-four choice may not reflect the actual strengths of one’s ethnic identities, POP has right from the beginning conducted parallel tests on the strengths of people’s separate identities as “Hong Kong citizens” and “Chinese citizens” using a scale of 0-10. In June 2007, POP expanded its study to include four new identities for strength rating.....
 - Taking the geometric mean of the strength and importance ratings of each respondent and then multiply it by 10, we have an ‘identity index’ for the respondent for a certain identity between 0 and 100, with 0 meaning no feeling, 100 meaning extremely strong feeling, and 50 meaning half and half. Using these identity indices, the rank order of Hong Kong people’s six identities were “Hong Kong citizens”, “members of the Chinese race”, “Asians”, “Chinese citizens”, “global citizens” and “citizens of PRC”. Their scores were 79.1, 72.5, 72.1, 67.9, 67.0 and 61.1 marks respectively.
3. The dichotomy of “Hong Kong citizens” versus “Chinese citizens” as a research instrument was widely used by local sociologists in 1980s, it was not invented by POP. Anybody can easily verify this. Since its establishment in 1991, POP has already enhanced the instrument a lot by adding separate ratings and importance ratings, as well as constructing different “identity indexes”.
4. Since individual ratings would not interfere with each other, POP welcomes other research institutes to add “British citizens” or other identities to their studies for comparison.

Director of POP Robert Chung reiterates that academic discussions should remain on the academic level, and not include any political objective or concern.