香港大學民意研究計劃
香港社會服務聯會

合作進行

市民的慈善捐款行為意見調查 2009

調查報告

鍾庭耀、彭嘉麗、
李偉健及鄭文青聯合撰寫

2009 年 10 月 6 日

目錄

香港大學民意研究計劃

市民的慈善捐款行為意見調查 2009

研究背景

1.　繼 2007 及 2008 年後，香港社會服務聯會(社聯)於 2009 年 7 月第三次委託香港大學民意研究計劃進行是次「市民的慈善捐款行為意見調查」，以探討市民對慈善捐款的習慣、對象及選擇因素等意見，並與過去兩年的數據作出比較。

2.　調查問卷由港大民研計劃諮詢香港社會服務聯會後獨立設計，所有操作、數據收集及分析皆由民研計劃獨立進行，不受任何機構影響。換句話說，民研計劃在今次調查的設計及運作上絕對獨立自主，結果亦由民研計劃全面負責。

調查設計

3.　在技術操作的層面，本調查以電話訪問形式進行，由嚴格督導下的訪員親身進行電話訪問。為使抽樣誤差減至最低，調查首先以隨機方法從研究組的住宅電話號碼資料庫中，抽取部份住宅電話號碼作「種籽」號碼，再用「加一減一；加二減二」的方法產生另一組號碼混合使用，以減低因忽略非登記住戶而出現的誤差。在過濾重覆號碼後，所有電話號碼再以隨機排列方式混合成為最後樣本。調查的訪問對象為 **24 歲或以上操粵語的香港居民**。訪問員在成功接觸目標住戶後，再從住戶適齡人士中以「即將生日」的方法抽取一名符合條件的成員接受訪問。

4.　調查於 2009 年 8 月 18 至 29 日期間進行，透過電話成功訪問了 **1,000 名** 符合上述條件的香港居民。整體回應比率是 **65.2%** (附錄一表一及二)，標準誤差則少於 1.6 個百分比，亦即在 95% 置信水平下，各個百分比的抽樣誤差為少於正負 3.2 個百分比。

5.　為增加結果的代表性，調查數字已經按照政府統計處提供 2008 年終全港人口年齡及性別分佈初步統計數字，以「加權」方法作出調整。報告內的數據皆以「加權」樣本為準。

6.　為進行比較分析，研究組使用「百分比差測試」以檢定調查結果與上次調查中變化的顯著程度，並以雙星號（**）表示該數字於 p=0.01 水平下，被檢定為統計學上變化顯著；單星號（*）則表示該數字於 p=0.05 水平下，被檢定為統計學上變化顯著（見附錄二，各表）。不過，數字變化在統計學上成立與否，並不等同有關變化的實際用途和意義，讀者敬請留意。

調查結果

7. 調查問卷的主體部分共有十一題，當中九條問題沿自過去兩年的調查，其餘兩條(Q9 和 Q11)為本年度新增題目。被訪者的個人背景資料則置於問卷最後部分。以下是主要部分的調查結果簡述，所有數表已詳列於附錄二中。

8. 調查首先詢問被訪者於過去 12 個月內曾否捐錢給慈善團體，包括以任何渠道或方式，*但不包括宗教奉獻，如添香油、祈福、做法事等*。結果顯示，八成六(86%)被訪者表示有在過去一年捐錢給慈善團體，較去年同期下跌 4 個百分比，而其餘一成四(14%)則沒有，較去年明顯上升 4 個百分比（表三）。

9. 就曾經捐錢的被訪市民，調查續問他們通常透過什麼渠道或方式作出捐款。結果發現，858 個去年曾捐錢的被訪者中，近六成(59%)表示通常透過「買旗」作出捐款，此捐款方式已連續三年成為最普遍的渠道，數字比去年大幅增加 8 個百分比。其次，三成半(35%)被訪者表示會「透過銀行」直接捐款，而四分一(26%)則表示透過「商店內或街頭捐款箱」捐款，後者較去年同期下跌 6 個百分比。其他較普及的捐款渠道或方式還包括「支票捐款」(9%)、「買獎券（如電影或餐舞會籌款門券）」(8%)、「電視／電台籌款節目／特備節目／廣告」(6%)、「定期自動捐款（如助養）」(6%)、「教會轉交慈善團體」(4%)、「學校籌款活動」(4%)、「直接捐款給慈善機構」(3%)及「義賣活動」(3%)等等，其他答案可參考表四及五。

10. 跟去年的情況相似，調查發現不少市民於過去一年內曾捐款給近年各地的自然災害之救援及重建工作，特別是 2008 年四川地震及 2009 年台灣風災。在今年調查的 857 個捐款者之中，最多人表示仍以「2008 年四川地震之救援及重建工作」為主要捐款項目，比率為 35%，但較去年大幅下跌 27 個百分比。其次，22% 曾捐款予本年 8 月初發生的「台灣風災之救援及重建工作」。與此同時，分別有 20% 及 16% 選擇以「兒童」或「長者」為捐款的服務對象，11% 的捐款受惠對象則為「殘障人士（如智障或傷殘人士）」，而 10% 表示其捐款會用於「健康與醫療」的項目。其他較受市民歡迎的慈善項目和捐款對象還包括「其他地區之災害救援及重建工作」(8%)、「扶貧」(6%)、「2008 年內地雪災」(4%)、「教育」及「復康人士」(同為 3%)等等。另外，今年的樣本中有 20% 的捐款人士回答「唔知／難講／無所謂」，即對受惠對象或項目並不知情，數字較去年的結果明顯上升 5 個百分比(表六及七)。

11. 當被問到過去一年共捐了多少善款予慈善機構時，撇除沒有給予肯定答案的人士，736名被訪者表示曾捐贈兩元至三十六萬元不等的答案，而中位數為 800 元，眾數為 1,000元，平均數則為 2,986 元（標準誤差為 541 元），較去年同期上升近 420 元，同時亦為 2007 年以來的新高。綜合數字顯示，6%有關被訪者於過去一年內共捐了不多於 99元予慈善機構，11%則捐了 100 至 199 元，16%捐了 200 至 499 元，17%捐了 500 至999 元，17%捐了 1,000 至 1,499 元，4%捐了 1,500 至 1,999 元，9%捐了 2,000 至 2,999元，另有 8%捐了 3,000 至 4,999 元，6%捐了 5,000 至 9,999 元。最後，有 5%相關被訪者表示其去年的總捐款數目高達 10,000 元或以上（表八）。

12. 至於市民捐助哪間慈善機構的決定因素方面，調查沿用去年方式，要求所有捐款人士以 0-10 分逐一評價六項因素對其決定的重要性，0 分代表完全不重要，5 分代表一半半，10 分代表非常重要。結果顯示，在撇除沒有給予評分的被訪者後，首先，九成人(91%)認為「**慈善機構信譽好**」重要，即給予 6 至 10 分，另有 8%給 5 分，1%給 0至 4 分；整體平均分數為 8.5，標準誤差為 0.06 分。至於「**慈善機構透明度高**」方面，八成多(86%)捐款者表示此因素重要，即給予 6 至 10 分，10%給 5 分，4%給 0 至 4分，整體平均分數為 8.1，標準誤差為 0.07 分。另外，77%認為「**慈善項目有助解決社會現時的急切需要**」重要，即給予 6 至 10 分，17%給 5 分，6%給 0 至 4 分，整體平均分數為 7.4，標準誤差為 0.08 分。就「**捐款方法的方便程度**」，七成被訪者(73%)覺得重要，即給予 6 至 10 分，18%給 5 分，9%給 0 至 4 分，整體平均分數為 7.1，標準誤差為 0.08 分。與此同時，63%對「**行政費用合理**」表示重要，即給予 6 至 10分，22%給 5 分，15%給 0 至 4 分，整體平均分數為 6.7，標準誤差為 0.10 分。最後，只有 38%被訪者認為「**公眾人物或朋友的呼籲**」對他們的捐款決定重要，即給予 6至 10 分，32%給 5 分，30%給 0 至 4 分，整體平均分數為 5.1，標準誤差為 0.09 分。換言之，以整體平均分計，6 項因素的重要性依次序為：慈善機構「信譽好」(8.5 分)、「透明度高」(8.1 分)、「慈善項目有助解決社會現時的急切需要」(7.4 分)、「捐款方法的方便程度」(7.1 分)、「行政費用合理」(6.7 分)及「公眾人物或朋友的呼籲」(5.1分)，其中只有「慈善項目有助解決社會現時的急切需要」的平均分較去年同期錄得顯著跌幅，並大概回落至 2007 年的水平，其他決定因素則相對平穩(表九至十四及綜合數表一)。

綜合數表一：　各項因素對決定捐助哪間慈善機構的重要性，0-10 分

	2007 年 8 月			2008 年 8 月			2009 年 8 月		
	平均分	標準誤差	評分人數	*平均分*	標準誤差	評分人數	*平均分*	標準誤差	評分人數
慈善機構信譽好	**7.9**	0.08	749	**8.3****	0.07	875	**8.5**	0.06	836
慈善機構透明度高	**8.0**	0.08	743	**8.3****	0.07	871	**8.1**	0.07	824
慈善項目有助解決社會現時的急切需要	**7.5**	0.08	738	**7.7***	0.07	862	**7.4****	0.08	828
捐款方法的方便程度	**6.9**	0.08	738	**7.0**	0.08	868	**7.1**	0.08	816
行政費用合理	**--**	--	--	**6.8**	0.09	831	**6.7**	0.10	772
公眾人物或朋友的呼籲	**5.0**	0.09	735	**4.9**	0.09	869	**5.1**	0.09	818

* 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.05 水平下有顯著差異。
** 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.01 水平下有顯著差異。

13. 問卷繼續探討哪些情況會促使被訪者再次捐錢給同一慈善機構，訪問員先讀出六個選項(次序由電腦隨機排列)，然後要求被訪者從中選取合適的答案，或提供自己的意見，可答多項。結果大致上跟過去兩年的類同，當中最大的誘因仍然是捐款人「得悉善款被妥善運用」，佔 75%；其次為「得悉受惠人的情況」，佔 61%；至於選擇「得悉慈善項目的工作進度」、「收到／遇上慈善機構再次呼籲」、「行政費用合理」和「有更方便的捐款方法」的比率分別有 50%、44%、43% 及 41%。此外，分別有 3% 和 2% 表示「沒有特別原因／只想繼續支持」或提供了其他答案，另有 2% 表示「唔知／難講」（表十五及十六）。

14. 就過去一年完全沒有捐款的 140 位被訪者，跟進問題的結果顯示，近半數(48%)表示是因為「沒有能力」作出任何捐獻，該百分比遠遠拋離第二及第三位的「沒有收到／遇上慈善機構的呼籲」(10%)及「不信任慈善機構」(8%)，其他原因還包括「太多慈善機構，不清楚他們的工作」和「沒有捐款習慣」(各佔 6%)、「沒有興趣」(5%)及「捐款方法不方便」(4%)等等。與此同時，13% 表示「沒有任何原因」(表十七)。

15. 姑勿論有關被訪者沒有捐款的原因為何，調查接著要求沒有捐款人士以 0-10 分逐一評價八項因素對他們將來決定捐助哪間慈善機構的重要性，0 分代表完全不重要，5 分代表一半半，10 分代表非常重要。在撤除沒有給予評分的被訪者後，首先，近八成人(79%)認為「**慈善機構信譽好**」重要，即給予 6 至 10 分，另有 18% 給 5 分，3% 給 0 至 4 分，整體平均分數為 7.9，標準誤差為 0.18 分。「**慈善機構透明度高**」次之，77% 表示重要，即給予 6 至 10 分，17% 給 5 分，6% 給 0 至 4 分，整體平均分數為 7.7，標準誤差為 0.21 分。另外，73% 認為「**了解慈善機構的工作**」重要，即給予 6 至 10

分，21%給 5 分，6%給 0 至 4 分，整體平均分數為 7.3，標準誤差為 0.20 分。同樣有 73%認為「**慈善項目有助解決社會現時的急切需要**」重要，即給予 6 至 10 分，18% 給 5 分，9%給 0 至 4 分，整體平均分數為 7.2，標準誤差為 0.20 分。至於「**捐款方法 的方便程度**」方面，64%覺得重要，即給予 6 至 10 分，25%給 5 分，11%給 0 至 4 分， 整體平均分數為 6.8，標準誤差為 0.23 分。而認為「**行政費用合理**」重要的比率為 55%， 即給予 6 至 10 分，34%給 5 分，11%給 0 至 4 分，整體平均分數為 6.5，標準誤差為 0.22 分。另外，48%認為「**收到／遇上慈善機構的呼籲**」重要，即給予 6 至 10 分， 39%給 5 分，14%給 0 至 4 分，整體平均分數為 6.0，標準誤差為 0.23 分。最後，不 足四成(35%)被訪者覺得「**公眾人物或朋友的呼籲**」重要，即給予 6 至 10 分，49%給 5 分，16%給 0 至 4 分，整體平均分數為 5.5，標準誤差 0.21 分。換句話說，以整體 平均分計，「慈善機構信譽好」(7.9 分)在是次調查中再次超越「慈善機構透明度高」 (7.7 分)位列第一，第三至第四位分別是「了解慈善機構的工作」(7.3 分)和「慈善項 目有助解決社會現時的急切需要」(7.2 分)，其他考慮因素依次為「捐款方法的方便 程度」(6.8 分)、「行政費用合理」(6.5 分)、「收到／遇上慈善機構的呼籲」(6.0 分) 及「公眾人物或朋友的呼籲」(5.5 分)，除「行政費用合理」外，其他七項因素的平 均分跟去年調查比較都有所上升，當中「收到／遇上慈善機構的呼籲」更錄得顯著升 幅(表十八至二十五及綜合數表二)。

綜合數表二： 各項因素對將來決定捐助哪間慈善機構的重要性，0-10 分

	2007 年 8 月			2008 年 8 月			2009 年 8 月		
	平均分	標準誤差	評分人數	*平均分*	標準誤差	評分人數	*平均分*	標準誤差	評分人數
慈善機構信譽好	**7.8**	0.18	207	**7.3**	0.28	84	**7.9**	0.18	135
慈善機構透明度高	**7.7**	0.19	202	**7.5**	0.29	84	**7.7**	0.21	129
了解慈善機構的工作	**6.8**	0.20	196	**6.6**	0.29	82	**7.3**	0.20	131
慈善項目有助解決社會現時的急切需要	**7.3**	0.19	205	**7.0**	0.29	84	**7.2**	0.20	130
捐款方法的方便程度	**6.6**	0.21	200	**6.4**	0.29	84	**6.8**	0.23	127
行政費用合理	**--**	--	--	**6.7**	0.34	79	**6.5**	0.22	126
收到／遇上慈善機構的呼籲	**5.1**	0.23	184	**4.9**	0.31	86	**6.0****	0.23	130
公眾人物或朋友的呼籲	**5.1**	0.22	203	**5.3**	0.28	83	**5.5**	0.21	131

** 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.01 水平下有顯著差異。

16. 今年的調查特別加入一條新增問題,以探討被訪者對「慈善機構信譽好」的理解,訪問員會首先讀出四個選項,並要求被訪者從中選取合適的答案,或提供自己的意見,可答多項。結果顯示,三分二(66%)被訪者表示「慈善機構信譽好」令他們即時聯想到「機構服務質素好」,54%則表示該說法應解作「機構歷史悠久」,另分別有 33%及 18%認為是指「機構規模大」或「有社會知名人士參與管治的組織」。此外,分別有 4%和 2%表示「以上皆否」或提供了其他答案,另有 3%表示「唔知╱難講」(表二十六至二十七)。

17. 問卷最後部分嘗試了解所有被訪者可有為未來一年訂下慈善捐款的預算。結果發現,九成(89%)皆表示沒有,只有一成(11%)人表示已為來年訂下慈善捐款的預算,整體情況跟去年非常相似,但與 2007 年比較(6%),表示有訂下捐款預算的比率差不多遞增一倍,亦是三年以來的新高(表二十八)。當被問到為什麼沒有為來年訂下捐款預算時,於 885 位有關被訪者中,最多人(42%)表示是因為「只是間中見到有需要就捐,沒有選定一個長期支持的慈善團體╱項目」,其次是由於「收入不穩定╱沒有收入╱沒有能力作出捐獻」(28%)。此外,分別有 18%和 9%表示對訂下預算一事「沒有想過╱沒有興趣」或「沒有需要」,而 7%則表示沒有任何原因(表二十九)。

結語

18. 去年發生的四川大地震及今年的台灣風災,似乎都鼓動了香港市民捐款予賑災有關的捐獻工作。是次調查顯示,以 24 歲或以上香港市民計,有近半數港人曾捐助四川地震或台灣風災的救援及重建工作,令過去一年曾捐助慈善團體的百分比,仍然可維持在近九成的高水平,情況令人鼓舞。

19. 至於捐款的渠道,「買旗」連續三年成為最普遍的捐款方式,而透過以「銀行」或「商店內或街頭捐款箱」捐款者略為減少。款額方面,以一年捐款的總數計,平均款項由去年錄得的約 2,600 元增加至 3,000 元,是三年來的新高,反映市民普遍的捐款意欲及金額並沒有受到金融海嘯的影響。

20. 此外,過去三年的調查結果都顯示,香港市民的慈善捐款行為似乎相當理智。不論是否捐款者,被訪者一致認為慈善機構的信譽和透明度頗為重要,而捐款項目是否有急切需要,則屬次要考慮。其他人士或名人的呼籲,則更加次要。換言之,慈善機構在推動募捐活動時,最好能夠同時發放更多數據和資訊,讓市民安心應捐。

21. 最後值得一提的是,只有少數(約一成)被訪市民有為來年訂下慈善捐款的預算,情況跟去年相若。至於沒有訂下預算者,多數是屬於「不定期的捐款者」或是「沒有能力作出捐獻」的一群。

附錄一

樣本資料

表一　　詳細樣本資料及整體回應比率

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{整體回應比率} &= \frac{\text{成功訪問樣本}}{\text{成功訪問樣本 + 未完成整個訪問樣本* + 合資格而拒絕者^}} \\
&= \frac{1{,}000}{1{,}000 + (431 + 71) + (10 + 21)} \\
&= 65.2\%
\end{aligned}
$$

*包括「未能完成整個訪問」及「被訪者於篩選題前中斷訪問」
^包括「家人拒絕接受訪問」及「被訪者拒絕接受訪問」

表二　　詳細樣本資料

	頻數	百分比
確定為不合資格的電話號碼	**5,934**	**50.7**
傳真機號碼	588	5.0
無效電話號碼	4,629	39.6
電話轉駁號碼	77	0.7
非住戶電話號碼	582	5.0
技術問題	32	0.3
被訪者不合資格	26	0.2
未能確定是否具合資格被訪者的電話號碼	**1,781**	**15.2**
電話線路繁忙	104	0.9
電話無人接聽	853	7.3
電話錄音	32	0.3
密碼阻隔	183	1.6
言語不通	164	1.4
被訪者於篩選題前中斷訪問	431	3.7
其他線路問題	14	0.1
確定具合資格被訪者的電話號碼，但未能進行訪問	**2,983**	**25.5**
家人拒絕接受訪問	10	0.1
被訪者拒絕回答	21	0.2
預約跨越調查期限	2,861	24.5
未能完成整個訪問	71	0.6
其他問題	20	0.2
成功樣本	**1,000**	**8.5**
合計	**11,698**	**100.0**

附錄二
頻數表

表三 [Q1] 係過去 12 個月，請問你有冇捐過錢俾慈善團體？包括任何渠道或方式，但不包括宗教奉獻，如：添香油、祈福、做法事等。

	2007 年 8 月		2008 年 8 月		2009 年 8 月	
	頻數	百分比 (基數=1,006)	頻數	百分比 (基數=1,007)	頻數	百分比 (基數=1,000)
有	777	77.2	905	89.9**	860	86.0**
沒有（跳至 Q7）	229	22.8	102	10.1**	140	14.0**
合計	1,006	100.0	1,007	100.0	1,000	100.0

** 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.01 水平下有顯著差異。

以下題目(Q2-Q6)只問去年「有捐款」的被訪者，2009 年的樣本基數為 860 人，並列出 2007 及 2008 年相關數字作比較分析。

表四 [Q2] 你通常透過乜野渠道或方式作出捐款？ [可選多項]

	2007 年 8 月		2008 年 8 月		2009 年 8 月		
	頻數	佔次樣本百分比 (基數=771)	頻數	佔次樣本百分比 (基數=901)	頻數	佔答案百分比(基數=1,475)	佔次樣本百分比 (基數=858)
買旗	555	72.0	461	51.2**	502	34.0	58.5**
透過銀行捐款	11	1.4	336	37.3**	304	20.6	35.4
商店內／街頭捐款箱	97	12.6	288	31.9**	224	15.2	26.1**
透過支票捐款	0	0.0	11	1.2	74	5.0	8.7**
買獎券／電影籌款門券／餐舞會門券	107	13.9	49	5.4**	72	4.9	8.3*
電視／電台籌款節目／特備節目／廣告	45	5.8	36	4.0	49	3.3	5.8
定期自動捐款（如助養）	121	15.7	71	7.9**	49	3.3	5.7
透過教會轉交慈善團體	0	0.0	16	1.8	38	2.6	4.4**
學校籌款活動	8	1.0	44	4.9**	37	2.5	4.4
沒有受任何人或活動呼籲，自己直接捐款給慈善機構	35	4.5	32	3.6	22	1.5	2.6
義賣活動	31	4.1	19	2.1*	21	1.4	2.5
透過工作機構集體捐款	0	0.0	57	6.3	20	1.4	2.4**
慈善機構郵寄單張	55	7.2	30	3.4**	16	1.1	1.9
網上捐款	7	0.8	31	3.5**	15	1.0	1.7*
步行／馬拉松／競技／飢饉活動籌款	25	3.2	18	2.0	13	0.9	1.6
直接從薪金扣除作捐款	0	0.0	3	0.3	3	0.2	0.4
打電話捐款	0	0.0	5	0.6	3	0.2	0.3
因特別日子而捐贈（如生日、結婚、畢業、子女出生）	1	0.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
其他（見表五）	20	2.6	13	1.5	7	0.5	0.8
唔知／唔記得	1	0.1	3	0.3	5	0.3	0.6
合計	1,118		1,523		1,475	100.0	
缺數	6		4		2		

* 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.05 水平下有顯著差異。
** 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.01 水平下有顯著差異。

表五 [Q2_others] 你通常透過乜野渠道或方式作出捐款？(其他答案)

	頻數
朋友集體捐款	2
透過區議會捐款	2
報章的捐款計劃	1
透過街坊轉交慈善團體	1
交給子女代為捐款	1

表六 [Q3] 咁呢 D 捐款通常係用作邊類慈善項目或者捐款對象呢？[可選多項]

	2007 年 8 月		2008 年 8 月		2009 年 8 月		
	頻數	佔次樣本百分比 (基數=775)	頻數	佔次樣本百分比 (基數=902)	頻數	佔答案百分比 (基數=1,509)	佔次樣本百分比 (基數=857)
2008 年四川地震之救援及重建工作 (如：賑災、捐助物資)	--	--	555	61.5	297	19.7	34.6**
2009 年台灣風災之救援及重建工作 (如：賑災、捐助物資)	--	--	--	--	187	12.4	21.8
兒童	142	18.3	180	19.9	170	11.3	19.8
長者	173	22.4	126	14.0**	139	9.2	16.2
殘障 (如：智障或傷殘人士)	104	13.4	97	10.7	98	6.5	11.4
健康與醫療	142	18.4	110	12.1**	85	5.7	10.0
其他地區之災害救援及重建工作	87	11.2	36	4.0**	67	4.4	7.8**
扶貧	61	7.9	56	6.2	53	3.5	6.2
2008 年內地雪災之救援及重建工作 (如：賑災、捐助物資)	--	--	39	4.3	31	2.0	3.6
教育	38	4.9	21	2.4**	25	1.6	2.9
復康人士 (如：更新人士、戒毒或精神病康復者)	27	3.5	13	1.4**	22	1.5	2.6
青少年	22	2.8	20	2.2	18	1.2	2.1
中國內地社區發展項目	57	7.3	28	3.1**	18	1.2	2.1
家庭及社區 (如：新來港人士、少數族裔、家庭暴力受害者等)	18	2.3	8	0.9*	18	1.2	2.1*
環境保護	16	2.1	13	1.5	18	1.2	2.1
2008 年緬甸風災之救援及重建工作 (如：賑災、捐助物資)	--	--	20	2.2	10	0.7	1.2
動物保護	14	1.8	9	1.0	10	0.7	1.2
婦女	6	0.8	8	0.9	6	0.4	0.8
人權	4	0.5	0	0.0	4	0.2	0.4
文化藝術	1	0.1	0	0.0	1	0.1	0.2
其他（見表七）	28	3.6	41	4.5	63	4.2	7.4*
唔知／難講／無所謂	261	33.7	130	14.5**	168	11.1	19.6**
合計	1,202		1,509		1,509	100.0	
缺數	2		3		3		

* 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.05 水平下有顯著差異。
** 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.01 水平下有顯著差異。

表七 [Q3_others] 咁呢 D 捐款通常係用作邊類慈善項目或者捐款對象呢？（其他答案）

	頻數
宗教團體	12
公益金	11
宣明會	8
樂施會	8
東華三院	7
紅十字會	7
保良局	7
奧比斯	6
無國界醫生	2
政治團體	2
懲教處	1
仁濟醫院	1
上次消防員捐軀	1
明愛	1

表八 [Q4] 以過去一年計，你大約總共捐左幾多錢俾慈善機構？

	2007 年 8 月#		2008 年 8 月		2009 年 8 月	
	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比
$1-99	86	16.0	42	5.7**	46	6.3
$100-199	93	17.2	55	7.5**	78	10.6*
$200-299	42	7.8	65	8.9	61	8.3
$300-399	41	7.6	48	6.5	45	6.1
$400-499	17	3.1	23	3.1	14	1.9
$500-999	78	14.4	134	18.1	126	17.1
$1,000-1,499	66	12.2	117	15.9	124	16.8
$1,500-1,999	13	2.5	26	3.5	28	3.8
$2,000-2,999	38	7.1	83	11.2*	68	9.2
$3,000-4,999	30	5.6	55	7.5	61	8.3
$5,000-9,999	14	2.6	52	7.1**	46	6.3
$10,000 或以上	21	3.9	37	5.0	38	5.2
合計	539	100.0	737	100.0	736	100.0
平均數	$1,620		$2,569*		$2,986	
標準誤差	$232		$309		$541	
中位數	$400		$1,000		$800	
眾數	$100		$1,000		$1,000	
總基數	777		905		860	
缺數（包括「唔知 難講／唔記得」）	238 (226)		270 (167)		125 (123)	

* 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.05 水平下有顯著差異。
** 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.01 水平下有顯著差異。
 # 已經撇除次樣本中最大答案($55,000,000)，以減低極端數字的影響。倘若保留有關數字，平均數將會增加至$76,728。

表九至十四　[Q5] 請你用 0-10 分逐一評價以下 6 項因素對你決定捐助邊間慈善機構既重要性，0 分代表完全唔重要，5 分代表一半半，10 分代表非常重要。

表九 [Q5a] 請問你認為「慈善機構信譽好」對你既決定有幾重要？

	2007 年 8 月		2008 年 8 月		2009 年 8 月	
	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比
0	13 }	1.8 }	10 }	1.1 }	2 }	0.2* }
1 – 2	4 } 28	0.5 } 3.7	2 } 14	0.3 } 1.6	2 } 10	0.2 } 1.2
3 – 4	10 }	1.4 }	2 }	0.2** }	6 }	0.7 }
5	114	15.2	97	11.1*	63	7.6*
6 – 7	99 }	13.1 }	98 }	11.2 }	117 }	14.0 }
8 – 9	231 } 608	30.8 } 81.1	300 } 764	34.3 } 87.3	310 } 763	37.1 } 91.2
10	279 }	37.2 }	366 }	41.8 }	336 }	40.2 }
合計	749	100.0	875	100.0	836	100.0
平均數	7.9		8.3**		8.5	
標準誤差	0.08		0.07		0.06	
總基數	777		905		860	
缺數（包括「唔知 難講」）	28 (25)		30 (28)		24 (24)	

* 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.05 水平下有顯著差異。
** 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.01 水平下有顯著差異。

表十 [Q5b] 請問你認為「慈善機構透明度高」對你既決定有幾重要？

	2007 年 8 月		2008 年 8 月		2009 年 8 月	
	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比
0	8 }	1.1 }	9 }	1.0 }	7 }	0.8 }
1 – 2	4 } 32	0.5 } 4.4	5 } 22	0.5 } 2.5	8 } 37	1.0 } 4.4
3 – 4	21 }	2.8 }	8 }	1.0** }	22 }	2.6** }
5	94	12.6	83	9.5*	80	9.7
6 – 7	101 }	13.5 }	106 }	12.2 }	102 }	12.4 }
8 – 9	246 } 617	33.1 } 83.0	309 } 767	35.4 } 88.0	294 } 707	35.7 } 85.8
10	271 }	36.4 }	352 }	40.4 }	311 }	37.8 }
合計	743	100.0	871	100.0	824	100.0
平均數	8.0		8.3**		8.1	
標準誤差	0.08		0.07		0.07	
總基數	777		905		860	
缺數（包括「唔知 難講」）	34 (32)		34 (33)		36 (36)	

* 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.05 水平下有顯著差異。
** 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.01 水平下有顯著差異。

表十一 [Q5c] 請問你認為「慈善項目有助解決社會現時的急切需要」對你既決定有幾重要？

	2007 年 8 月		2008 年 8 月		2009 年 8 月	
	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比
0	12 }	1.6 }	13 }	1.5 }	19 }	2.3 }
1 – 2	4 } 39	0.6 } 5.3	3 } 40	0.3 } 4.6	8 } 50	0.9 } 6.1
3 – 4	23 }	3.1 }	24 }	2.7 }	24 }	2.9 }
5	134	18.1	131	15.2	144	17.4
6 – 7	136 }	18.5 }	145 }	16.9 }	146 }	17.6 }
8 – 9	221 } 565	29.9 } 76.5	279 } 691	32.3 } 80.2	274 } 634	33.0 } 76.5
10	208 }	28.1 }	267 }	31.0 }	214 }	25.8* }
合計	738	100.0	862	100.0	828	100.0
平均數	7.5		7.7*		7.4**	
標準誤差	0.08		0.07		0.08	
總基數	777		905		860	
缺數（包括「唔知難講」）	39 (36)		43 (41)		32 (32)	

* 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.05 水平下有顯著差異。

** 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.01 水平下有顯著差異。

表十二 [Q5d] 請問你認為「捐款方法的方便程度」對你既決定有幾重要？

	2007 年 8 月		2008 年 8 月		2009 年 8 月	
	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比
0	20 }	2.8 }	35 }	4.0 }	26 }	3.2 }
1 – 2	4 } 61	0.6 } 8.3	10 } 75	1.2 } 8.6	15 } 75	1.9 } 9.1
3 – 4	37 }	5.0 }	30 }	3.5 }	33 }	4.1 }
5	181	24.5	196	22.6	150	18.4*
6 – 7	171 }	23.2 }	183 }	21.1 }	173 }	21.2 }
8 – 9	197 } 496	26.6 } 67.2	236 } 598	27.2 } 68.8	240 } 592	29.4 } 72.5
10	128 }	17.4 }	178 }	20.5 }	179 }	21.9 }
合計	738	100.0	868	100.0	816	100.0
平均數	6.9		7.0		7.1	
標準誤差	0.08		0.08		0.08	
總基數	777		905		860	
缺數（包括「唔知難講」）	39 (38)		37 (33)		44 (44)	

* 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.05 水平下有顯著差異。

表十三 [Q5e] 請問你認為「行政費用合理」對你既決定有幾重要?

	2008 年 8 月		2009 年 8 月	
	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比
0	46 }	5.5 }	41 }	5.3 }
1 – 2	23 } 99	2.8 } 11.9	20 } 117	2.6 } 15.1
3 – 4	29 }	3.5 }	56 }	7.3** }
5	195	23.4	168	21.8
6 – 7	152 }	18.3 }	128 }	16.6 }
8 – 9	196 } 538	23.6 } 64.7	198 } 487	25.7 } 63.1
10	190 }	22.9 }	160 }	20.8 }
合計	831	100.0	772	100.0
平均數	6.8		6.7	
標準誤差	0.09		0.10	
總基數	905		860	
缺數(包括「唔知 難講」)	74 (72)		88 (88)	

** 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.01 水平下有顯著差異。

表十四 [Q5f] 請問你認為「公眾人物或朋友的呼籲」對你既決定有幾重要?

	2007 年 8 月		2008 年 8 月		2009 年 8 月	
	頻數	百分比	百分比	百分比	頻數	百分比
0	70 }	9.6 }	93 }	10.7 }	86 }	10.6 }
1 – 2	34 } 206	4.6 } 28.1	49 } 256	5.6 } 29.4	47 } 246	5.7 } 30.1
3 – 4	103 }	14.0 }	114 }	13.1 }	113 }	13.8 }
5	277	37.6	345	39.7	261	31.9**
6 – 7	140 }	19.0 }	137 }	15.8 }	154 }	18.9 }
8 – 9	72 } 252	9.7 } 34.3	86 } 268	9.9 } 30.9	101 } 311	12.4 } 38.0**
10	41 }	5.5 }	45 }	5.2 }	55 }	6.7 }
合計	735	100.0	869	100.0	818	100.0
平均數	5.0		4.9		5.1	
標準誤差	0.09		0.09		0.09	
總基數	777		905		860	
缺數(包括「唔知 難講」)	42 (40)		36 (34)		42 (42)	

** 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.01 水平下有顯著差異。

表十五 [Q6] 以下邊種情況會令你考慮再次捐錢俾同一個慈善機構呢？ [訪問員讀出首 6 項答案，次序由電腦隨機排列，可選多項]

	2007 年 8 月		2008 年 8 月		2009 年 8 月		
	頻數	佔次樣本百分比（基數 =774)	頻數	佔次樣本百分比（基數 =902)	頻數	佔答案百分比（基數 =2,765)	佔次樣本百分比（基數 =860)
得悉善款被妥善運用	577	74.6	681	75.6	648	23.4	75.3
得悉受惠人的情況	500	64.6	577	64.0	523	18.9	60.9
得悉慈善項目的工作進度	415	53.6	441	48.8	429	15.5	49.9
收到／遇上慈善機構再次呼籲	405	52.3	377	41.8**	381	13.8	44.3
行政費用合理	--	--	406	45.0	372	13.5	43.3
有更方便的捐款方法	387	50.0	371	41.1**	352	12.7	41.0
沒有特別原因／只想繼續支持	31	4.0	30	3.3	29	1.1	3.4
其他（見表十六）	23	3.0	20	2.2	16	0.6	1.8
唔知／難講	15	1.9	14	1.6	16	0.6	1.8
合計	2,352		2,917		2,765	100.0	
缺數	*3*		*3*		*0*		

** 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 $p<0.01$ 水平下有顯著差異。

表十六 [Q6_others] 以下邊種情況會令你考慮再次捐錢俾同一個慈善機構呢？（其他答案）

	頻數
視乎個人能力、經濟情況	5
捐款的急切程度	4
機構信譽	4
不會再捐給同一間	2
自己受惠過	1

以下題目(Q7-Q8)只問去年「沒有捐款」的被訪者，2009 年的樣本基數為 140 人，並列出 2007 及 2008 年相關數字作比較分析。

表十七　[Q7] 基於咩原因係過去 12 個月，你冇捐錢俾慈善機構呢？[可選多項]

| | 2007 年 8 月 | | 2008 年 8 月 | | 2009 年 8 月 | | |
	頻數	佔次樣本百分比（基數=222）	頻數	佔次樣本百分比（基數=102）	頻數	佔答案百分比（基數=155）	佔次樣本百分比（基數=139）
沒有能力	98	43.9	53	52.0	66	42.5	47.5
沒有收到／遇上慈善機構的呼籲	34	15.1	10	9.7	14	9.3	10.4
不信任慈善機構	5	2.1	3	2.9	10	6.7	7.5
太多慈善機構，不清楚他們的工作	8	3.6	1	1.0	9	5.6	6.2*
沒有捐款習慣	4	1.9	2	2.4	8	5.4	6.1
沒有興趣	17	7.5	4	4.3	6	4.0	4.5
捐款方法不方便	8	3.6	7	6.8	5	3.2	3.5
不知善款有沒有被妥善運用	7	3.3	1	0.6	4	2.9	3.2
工作太忙／沒有時間	9	4.3	8	7.4	4	2.8	3.1
行政費用不合理	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	2.4	2.7
慈善工作沒有實際效用	1	0.4	0	0.0	2	1.0	1.1
慈善工作與我沒有太大關係	1	0.4	1	1.1	1	0.5	0.5
慈善工作應由政府負擔	1	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
其他原因	3	1.1	2	1.8	0	0.0	0.0
沒有任何原因	37	16.7	18	17.3	18	11.3	12.6
唔知／唔記得	4	2.0	2	1.6	4	2.3	2.5
合計	237		112		155	100.0	
缺數	7		0		1		

* 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.05 水平下有顯著差異。

表十八至二十五 [Q8] 請你用 0-10 分逐一評價以下 8 項因素對你將來決定捐助邊間慈善機構既重要性，0 分代表完全唔重要，5 分代表一半半，10 分代表非常重要。

表十八 [Q8a] 請問你認為「慈善機構信譽好」對你既決定有幾重要？

	2007 年 8 月		2008 年 8 月		2009 年 8 月	
	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比
0	9 }	4.4 }	5 }	5.4 }	1 }	1.0 }
1 – 2	1 } 13	0.5 } 6.2	0 } 8	0.0 } 10.1	1 } 4	0.6 } 3.1*
3 – 4	3 }	1.3 }	4 }	4.6 }	2 }	1.5 }
5	27	13.1	12	14.3	24	17.7
6 – 7	30 }	14.5 }	11 }	13.4 }	21 }	15.4 }
8 – 9	52 } 167	25.1 } 80.7	31 } 64	36.6 } 75.7	33 } 107	24.9 } 79.2
10	85 }	41.1 }	22 }	25.6* }	52 }	38.9* }
合計	207	100.0	84	100.0	135	100.0
平均數	7.8		7.3		7.9	
標準誤差	0.18		0.28		0.18	
總基數	229		102		140	
缺數（包括「唔知 難講」）	22 (19)		18 (14)		5 (5)	

* 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.05 水平下有顯著差異。

表十九 [Q8b] 請問你認為「慈善機構透明度高」對你既決定有幾重要？

	2007 年 8 月		2008 年 8 月		2009 年 8 月	
	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比
0	11 }	5.5 }	5 }	5.4 }	3 }	2.2 }
1 – 2	5 } 19	2.2 } 9.4	1 } 8	1.4 } 9.0	1 } 8	0.6 } 6.0
3 – 4	3 }	1.6 }	2 }	2.2 }	4 }	3.2 }
5	22	10.9	9	10.8	22	17.4
6 – 7	30 }	15.1 }	16 }	19.3 }	21 }	16.0 }
8 – 9	50 } 161	24.7 } 79.8	23 } 68	27.7 } 80.2	29 } 99	22.4 } 76.7
10	81 }	40.0 }	28 }	33.2 }	49 }	38.2 }
合計	202	100.0	84	100.0	129	100.0
平均數	7.7		7.5		7.7	
標準誤差	0.19		0.29		0.21	
總基數	229		102		140	
缺數（包括「唔知 難講」）	27 (23)		18 (14)		11 (11)	

表二十 [Q8c] 請問你認為「了解慈善機構的工作」對你既決定有幾重要？

	2007 年 8 月		2008 年 8 月		2009 年 8 月	
	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比
0	12 }	6.2 }	6 }	6.7 }	4 }	3.0 }
1－2	7 } 27	3.6 } 13.7	3 } 12	3.1 } 14.1	2 } 8	1.2 } 5.6*
3－4	8 }	3.9 }	4 }	4.3 }	2 }	1.4 }
5	42	21.6	13	15.4	28	21.3
6－7	32 }	16.4 }	21 }	25.1 }	23 }	17.9 }
8－9	47 } 127	23.8 } 64.6	25 } 58	30.9 } 70.5	44 } 95	33.4 } 73.1
10	48 }	24.4 }	12 }	14.6 }	28 }	21.8 }
合計	196	100.0	82	100.0	131	100.0
平均數	6.8		6.6		7.3	
標準誤差	0.20		0.29		0.20	
總基數	229		102		140	
缺數（包括「唔知 難講」）	33 (28)		20 (17)		9 (9)	

* 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.05 水平下有顯著差異。

表二十一 [Q8d] 請問你認為「慈善項目有助解決社會現時的急切需要」對你既決定有幾重要？

	2007 年 8 月		2008 年 8 月		2009 年 8 月	
	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比
0	10 }	4.7 }	5 }	5.7 }	3 }	2.1 }
1－2	3 } 19	1.3 } 9.4	0 } 8	0.0 } 9.6	1 } 12	0.6 } 9.0
3－4	7 }	3.4 }	3 }	3.9 }	8 }	6.3 }
5	35	17.3	18	21.4	23	17.8
6－7	38 }	18.7 }	12 }	14.7 }	26 }	19.8 }
8－9	46 } 150	22.4 } 73.3	27 } 58	31.6 } 69.0	36 } 95	27.5 } 73.2
10	66 }	32.2 }	19 }	22.7 }	34 }	26.0 }
合計	205	100.0	84	100.0	130	100.0
平均數	7.3		7.0		7.2	
標準誤差	0.19		0.29		0.20	
總基數	229		102		140	
缺數（包括「唔知 難講」）	24 (18)		18 (14)		10 (9)	

表二十二 [Q8e] 請問你認為「捐款方法的方便程度」對你既決定有幾重要？

	2007 年 8 月		2008 年 8 月		**2009 年 8 月**	
	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	**頻數**	**百分比**
0	17 }	8.6 }	5 }	6.4 }	**6 }**	**4.9 }**
1 – 2	5 } 25	2.5 } 12.5	1 } 13	1.6 } 15.4	**1 } 14**	**0.6 } 11.2**
3 – 4	3 }	1.5 }	6 }	7.3* }	**7 }**	**5.7 }**
5	53	26.5	19	22.3	**31**	**24.5**
6 – 7	38 }	19.1 }	23 }	27.5 }	**26 }**	**20.8 }**
8 – 9	34 } 122	17.0 } 60.9	16 } 53	19.1 } 62.4	**25 } 82**	**19.5 } 64.3**
10	50 }	24.8 }	13 }	15.8 }	**31 }**	**24.1 }**
合計	200	100.0	84	100.0	**127**	**100.0**
平均數	6.6		6.4		**6.8**	
標準誤差	0.21		0.29		**0.23**	
總基數	229		102		**140**	
缺數（包括「唔知 難講」）	*29 (23)*		*18 (14)*		*13 (12)*	

* 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.05 水平下有顯著差異。

表二十三 [Q8f] 請問你認為「行政費用合理」對你既決定有幾重要？

	2008 年 8 月		**2009 年 8 月**	
	頻數	百分比	**頻數**	**百分比**
0	7 }	8.7 }	**4 }**	**3.2 }**
1 – 2	1 } 15	1.5 } 19.0	**4 } 14**	**2.8 } 11.1**
3 – 4	7 }	8.8 }	**6 }**	**5.1 }**
5	9	11.3	**43**	**34.0****
6 – 7	18 }	22.2 }	**27 }**	**21.1 }**
8 – 9	17 } 55	22.0 } 69.7	**17 } 69**	**13.4 } 54.9***
10	20 }	25.4 }	**26 }**	**20.4 }**
合計	79	100.0	**126**	**100.0**
平均數	6.7		**6.5**	
標準誤差	0.34		**0.22**	
總基數	102		**140**	
缺數（包括「唔知 難講」）	*23 (19)*		*14 (13)*	

* 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.05 水平下有顯著差異。

** 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.01 水平下有顯著差異。

表二十四 [Q8g] 請問你認為「收到／遇上慈善機構的呼籲」對你既決定有幾重要？

| | 2007 年 8 月 | | 2008 年 8 月 | | 2009 年 8 月 | |
	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比
0	26 }	14.0 }	12 }	13.9 }	8 }	6.4 }
1 – 2	19 } 55	10.2 } 29.7	5 } 29	5.8 } 33.7	3 } 18	2.1 } 13.6**
3 – 4	10 }	5.5 }	12 }	14.0* }	7 }	5.2* }
5	58	31.6	30	34.4	50	38.9
6 – 7	29 }	15.6 }	10 }	11.9 }	23 }	17.7 }
8 – 9	13 } 71	7.1 } 38.7	8 } 27	9.0 } 31.9	20 } 62	15.3 } 47.5*
10	29 }	16.0 }	9 }	10.9 }	19 }	14.5 }
合計	184	100.0	86	100.0	130	100.0
平均數	5.1		4.9		6.0**	
標準誤差	0.23		0.31		0.23	
總基數	229		102		140	
缺數（包括「唔知 難講」）	45 (40)		16 (15)		10 (10)	

* 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.05 水平下有顯著差異。
** 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.01 水平下有顯著差異。

表二十五 [Q8h] 請問你認為「公眾人物或朋友的呼籲」對你既決定有幾重要？

| | 2007 年 8 月 | | 2008 年 8 月 | | 2009 年 8 月 | |
	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比
0	34 }	16.8 }	8 }	9.7 }	10 }	7.8 }
1 – 2	10 } 59	4.7 } 29.0	1 } 21	1.7 } 25.7	3 } 20	2.6 } 15.7
3 – 4	15 }	7.4 }	12 }	14.2 }	7 }	5.3* }
5	70	34.5	31	37.1	65	49.3
6 – 7	25 }	12.1 }	13 }	15.8 }	19 }	14.6 }
8 – 9	26 } 74	12.9 } 36.5	11 } 31	13.0 } 37.2	15 } 46	11.8 } 35.0
10	23 }	11.5 }	7 }	8.4 }	11 }	8.6 }
合計	203	100.0	83	100.0	131	100.0
平均數	5.1		5.3		5.5	
標準誤差	0.22		0.28		0.21	
總基數	229		102		140	
缺數（包括「唔知 難講」）	26 (21)		19 (15)		9 (9)	

* 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.05 水平下有顯著差異。

Q9 及 Q11 為 2009 年新增題目。

表二十六 [Q9]【詢問所有受訪者】請問當你一聽到「慈善機構信譽好」會令你即時諗到以下邊個意思?[讀出首 4 項答案，次序由電腦隨機排列，可選多項]

	頻數	佔答案百分比 (基數=1,799)	佔次樣本百分比 (基數=998)
機構服務質素好	661	36.7	66.2
機構歷史悠久	535	29.7	53.6
機構規模大	328	18.3	32.9
有社會知名人士參與管治既組織	181	10.0	18.1
以上皆否	38	2.1	3.8
其他 (見表二十七)	23	1.3	2.3
唔知／難講	34	1.9	3.4
合計	1,799	100.0	
缺數	2		

表二十七 [Q9_others] 請問當你一聽到「慈善機構信譽好」會令你即時諗到以下邊個意思? (其他答案)

	頻數
幫到人，有貢獻	11
透明度高	5
機構願景及目標	2
電視上的慈善捐款機構	1
機構中立	1
叫人捐錢	1
行政費用高	1
機構信用度	1
多方面	1
在稅務局登記免稅的團體	1

表二十八 [Q10]【詢問所有受訪者】你有冇為未來一年訂下慈善捐款既預算呢？

	2007 年 8 月		2008 年 8 月		**2009 年 8 月**	
	頻數	百分比 (基數 =1,002)	頻數	百分比 (基數 =1,007)	**頻數**	**百分比 (基數 =998)**
有（跳至 DM1)	57	5.7	96	9.6**	**110**	**11.0**
沒有	945	94.3	911	90.4**	**889**	**89.0**
合計	1,002	100.0	1,007	100.0	**998**	**100.0**
缺數	*4*		*0*		*2*	

** 跟上次調查相關數字比較於 p<0.01 水平下有顯著差異。

表二十九 [Q11] 【只問於 Q10 回答「沒有」的被訪者】點解冇呢？[可選多項]

	頻數	佔答案百分比 (基數=953)	佔次樣本百分比 (基數=885)
只是間中見到有需要就捐，沒有選定一個長期支持的慈善團體／項目	371	39.0	42.0
我的收入不穩定／沒有收入／沒有能力作出捐獻	247	25.9	27.9
沒有想過／沒有興趣	157	16.5	17.8
沒有需要	76	7.9	8.5
慈善機構沒有提供配套方案，助我訂下捐款預算	13	1.3	1.4
沒有時間	10	1.0	1.1
已有定期捐款習慣	4	0.4	0.4
不認同慈善機構理念及手法	2	0.2	0.2
沒有原因	59	6.2	6.7
唔知／難講	14	1.5	1.6
合計	953	100.0	
缺數	*4*		

附錄三

被訪者背景資料

被訪者個人背景資料

有關調查數字已經按照政府統計處提供之 2008 年終全港人口年齡及性別分佈初步統計數字，以「加權」方法作出調整。

表三十　性別

| | 2007 年 8 月 加權樣本 | | 2008 年 8 月 加權樣本 | | 2009 年 8 月 | | | |
| | | | | | 原始樣本 | | 加權樣本 | |
	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比
男	467	46.4	466	46.2	**378**	**37.8**	**460**	**46.0**
女	539	53.6	541	53.8	**622**	**62.2**	**540**	**54.0**
合計	1,006	100.0	1,007	100.0	**1,000**	**100.0**	**1,000**	**100.0**

表三十一　　年齡組別

| | 2007 年 8 月 加權樣本 | | 2008 年 8 月 加權樣本 | | 2009 年 8 月 | | | |
| | | | | | 原始樣本 | | 加權樣本 | |
	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比
24 至 29	115	11.8	116	11.8	**86**	**8.9**	**115**	**11.9**
30 至 39	212	21.7	209	21.4	**125**	**12.9**	**204**	**21.0**
40 至 49	247	25.3	243	24.9	**201**	**20.7**	**235**	**24.2**
50 至 59	188	19.3	190	19.5	**278**	**28.6**	**196**	**20.2**
60 或以上	215	22.0	217	22.3	**281**	**28.9**	**221**	**22.7**
合計	977	100.0	975	100.0	**971**	**100.0**	**971**	**100.0**
缺數	*29*		*32*		*29*		*29*	

表三十二　　教育程度

| | 2007 年 8 月 加權樣本 | | 2008 年 8 月 加權樣本 | | 2009 年 8 月 | | | |
| | | | | | 原始樣本 | | 加權樣本 | |
	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比
小學或以下	207	21.1	181	18.0	**212**	**21.6**	**163**	**16.7**
中學	492	50.1	539	53.6	**516**	**52.5**	**512**	**52.2**
大專或以上	284	28.9	285	28.4	**255**	**25.9**	**305**	**31.1**
合計	983	100.0	1,005	100.0	**983**	**100.0**	**980**	**100.0**
缺數	*23*		*2*		*17*		*20*	

表三十三　　職業

	2007 年 8 月 加權樣本		2008 年 8 月 加權樣本		2009 年 8 月			
					原始樣本		加權樣本	
	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比
行政及專業人員	216	22.3	254	25.6	204	21.2	255	26.5
文職及服務人員	221	22.7	246	24.8	194	20.1	229	23.8
勞動工人	124	12.8	97	9.7	79	8.2	78	8.1
學生	4	0.4	12	1.2	6	0.6	7	0.8
全職主婦	178	18.3	168	16.9	174	18.0	134	13.9
其他	229	23.6	216	21.8	307	31.8	259	27.0
合計	972	100.0	993	100.0	964	100.0	961	100.0
缺數	34		14		36		39	

表三十四　　個人每月收入 [包括花紅，但不包括政府援助、家用、利息等]

	2007 年 8 月 加權樣本		2008 年 8 月 加權樣本		2009 年 8 月			
					原始樣本		加權樣本	
	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比
HK$5,000 以下	19	3.6	38	6.6	125	26.8	155	28.3
HK$5,000 至 9,999	145	27.3	102	17.9	245	52.6	274	50.0
HK$10,000 至 19,999	209	39.3	244	42.9	52	11.2	66	12.1
HK$20,000 至 29,999	74	13.9	66	11.5	29	6.2	33	6.0
HK$30,000 至 39,999	37	7.0	55	9.6	9	1.9	12	2.2
HK$40,000 至 49,999	26	4.8	21	3.7	1	0.2	1	0.3
HK$50,000 或以上	21	4.0	44	7.8	5	1.1	6	1.2
合計	531	100.0	570	100.0	466	100.0	548	100.0
平均數	$18,246		$19,922		$9,823		$9,943	
標準誤差	$520		$549		$355		$337	
缺數	66		29		11		13	

表三十五　　婚姻狀況

	2007 年 8 月 加權樣本		2008 年 8 月 加權樣本		2009 年 8 月			
					原始樣本		加權樣本	
	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比	頻數	百分比
單身	221	22.7	258	26.1	221	22.5	269	27.4
已婚	704	72.2	691	69.9	690	70.1	657	66.8
同居	1	0.1	1	0.1	4	0.4	4	0.4
離婚／分居／喪偶	48	5.0	38	3.8	69	7.0	53	5.4
合計	976	100.0	988	100.0	984	100.0	983	100.0
缺數	30		19		16		17	

附錄四

問卷

香港大學民意研究計劃
香港社會服務聯會
合作進行

市民的慈善捐款行為意見調查 2009

調查問卷

2009 年 8 月 13 日

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                           │
│        第 一 部 分        自 我 介 紹                       │
│                                                           │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

喂，先生／小姐／太太你好，我姓＿＿＿，我係香港大學民意研究計劃既訪問員黎既，我地想訪問市民一 D 慈善捐款行為既意見，我地只會阻你幾分鐘時間。請你放心，你既電話號碼係經由我地既電腦隨機抽樣抽中既，而你提供既資料係會絕對保密既。請問可唔可以呢？

可以
唔可以 ⟶ 訪問完成，多謝合作，拜拜。（skip to end）

[S1] 請問你既電話號碼係唔係 xxxx xxxx?

係
唔係 (skip to end)

[S2]   請問你住響邊區呢？

灣仔	大埔	離島
東區	觀塘	荃灣
中西區	九龍城	葵青
南區	黃大仙	屯門
西貢	旺角	元朗
沙田	深水埗	拒答
北區	油尖	

[S3]   請問你呢伙有幾多人住呢？（入實數）

＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿
拒答

第 二 部 分　　　選 出 被 訪 者

[S4]　　請問你屋企而家有冇 **24 歲或以上**既人係度，因為我地要隨機抽樣，如果多過一位，請你叫即將生日果位黎聽電話。(訪問員可舉例說明：『即係有冇 8 月或未來三個月內生日既人係度？』)【如果戶中冇所屬年齡之對象，訪問告終；多謝合作，收線。】

有
冇　⟶　　訪問完成，多謝合作，拜拜。(skip to end)

第 三 部 分　　　問 卷 部 分

1.　係過去 12 個月，請問你有冇捐過錢俾慈善團體? 【包括任何渠道或方式，但不包括宗教奉獻，如：添香油、祈福、做法事等】

有
沒有【跳至 Q7】

2.　你通常透過乜野渠道或方式作出捐款? 【訪問員不讀答案，最多選 3 項，追問"仲有呢？"】

買旗	買獎券／電影籌款門券／餐舞會門券	義賣活動
商店內／街頭捐款箱	電視／電台籌款節目／特備節目／廣告 (無任何回贈的捐款)	慈善機構郵寄單張
定期自動捐款 (如助養)	保單捐贈	遺產捐贈
網上捐款	因特別日子而捐贈 (如生日、結婚、畢業、子女出生)	沒有受任何人或活動呼籲，自己直接捐款給慈善機構
步行／馬拉松／競技／飢饉活動籌款	透過銀行捐款 (轉賬)	學校籌款活動
透過工作機構集體捐款	直接從薪金扣除作捐款	透過教會轉交慈善團體
透過支票捐款		

其他 (請註明_____)
唔知／唔記得
拒答

3. 咁呢 D 捐款通常係用作邊類慈善項目或者捐款對象呢？【訪問員不讀答案，<u>可選多</u><u>項</u>，追問「仲有呢？」，應提醒被訪者避免回答慈善機構名稱；如回答**賑災、捐助物資等救災工作**，追問「**係捐俾邊一年同邊度發生既救災工作呢？**」】

兒童
青少年
婦女
長者
殘障 (如：智障或傷殘人士)
復康人士 (如：更新人士、戒毒或精神病康復者)
家庭及社區 (如：新來港人士、少數族裔、家庭暴力受害者等)
教育
健康與醫療
環境保護
文化藝術
體育
扶貧
人權
2008 年四川地震之救援及重建工作 (如：賑災、捐助物資)
2008 年內地雪災之救援及重建工作 (如：賑災、捐助物資)
2008 年緬甸風災之救援及重建工作 (如：賑災、捐助物資)
其他地區之災害救援及重建工作 (如：賑災、捐助物資)
中國內地社區發展項目 (如：改善基建及民生設施、提供教育等，但不包括救災及災後重建工作)
2009 年台灣風災之救援及重建工作 (如：賑災、捐助物資)
其他項目（請註明＿＿＿＿＿＿＿＿）
唔知／難講／無所謂
拒答

4. 以過去一年計，你大約總共捐左幾多錢俾慈善機構？

港幣$＿＿＿＿＿【入實數】
唔知／難講／唔記得
拒答

5. 請你用 0-10 分逐一評價以下 6 項因素對你決定捐助邊間慈善機構既重要性，0 分代表完全唔重要，5 分代表一半半，10 分代表非常重要。請問你認為【詢問員逐項讀出】對你既決定有幾重要？

i. 慈善機構信譽好
ii. 慈善機構透明度高
iii. 慈善項目有助解決社會現時的急切需要
iv. 公眾人物或朋友的呼籲
v. 捐款方法的方便程度
vi. 行政費用合理

_____【入實數】
唔知／難講
拒答

6. 以下邊種情況會令你考慮再次捐錢俾同一個慈善機構呢？【訪問員讀出首 6 項答案，次序由電腦隨機排列，可選多項，追問"仲有呢？"，然後所有答案跳至 Q9】

收到／遇上慈善機構再次呼籲
得悉善款被妥善運用
得悉受惠人的情況
得悉慈善項目的工作進度
有更方便的捐款方法
行政費用合理
其他（請註明_____）
沒有特別原因／只想繼續支持
唔知／難講
拒答

7. 【只問於 Q1 回答「沒有捐款」的被訪者】 基於咩原因係過去 12 個月，你冇捐錢俾慈善機構呢？【訪問員不讀答案，可選多項，追問"仲有呢？"】

沒有興趣
沒有收到／遇上慈善機構的呼籲
沒有能力
太多慈善機構，不清楚他們的工作
不知善款有沒有被妥善運用
行政費用不合理
慈善工作與我沒有太大關係
慈善工作應由政府負擔
慈善工作沒有實際效用
捐款方法不方便
工作太忙／沒有時間
不信任慈善機構

沒有捐款習慣
其他（請註明＿＿＿＿＿＿＿）
沒有任何原因
唔知／唔記得
拒答

8. 請你用 0-10 分逐一評價以下 8 項因素對你將來決定捐助邊間慈善機構既重要性，0 分代表完全唔重要，5 分代表一半半，10 分代表非常重要。請問你認為【詢問員逐項讀出】對你既決定有幾重要？

i.   收到／遇上慈善機構的呼籲
ii.   了解慈善機構的工作
iii. 慈善機構信譽好
iv.   慈善機構透明度高
v.   慈善項目有助解決社會現時的急切需要
vi.   公眾人物或朋友的呼籲
vii. 捐款方法的方便程度
viii. 行政費用合理

＿＿＿＿＿＿＿【入實數】
唔知／難講
拒答

9. 【詢問所有受訪者】請問當你一聽到「慈善機構信譽好」會令你即時諗到以下邊個意思？【讀出首 4 項答案，次序由電腦隨機排列，可選多項，追問「仲有冇其他意思呢？」】

機構歷史悠久
機構服務質素好
機構規模大
有社會知名人士參與管治既組織
以上皆否
其他 (請註明): ＿＿＿＿＿＿＿
唔知／難講
拒答

10. 你有冇為未來一年訂下慈善捐款既預算呢？【即係預計會捐幾多錢做善事】

有 ➔ skip to DM1
沒有 ➔ ask Q11
拒答 ➔ skip to DM1

11. 【只問於 Q10 回答「沒有」的被訪者】點解冇呢？【訪問員不讀答案，可選多項，追問「仲有呢？」】

只是間中見到有需要就捐，沒有選定一個長期支持的慈善團體/項目
慈善機構沒有提供配套方案，助我訂下捐款預算
我的收入不穩定／沒有收入／沒有能力作出捐獻
沒有時間
沒有想過／沒有興趣
沒有需要
其他 (請註明) _____
沒有原因
唔知／難講
拒答

第 四 部 分　　個 人 資 料

我想問你些少個人資料，方便分析。

[DM1]　性別

男
女

[DM2]　年齡　（入實數）

【199＝唔肯講 】

[DM3]　教育程度

小學以下
中學
預科
專上非學位
專上學位
研究院或以上
拒絕回答

[DM4]　職業

經理及行政人員
專業人員

輔助專業人員
文員
服務工作及商店銷售人員
漁農業熟練工人
手工藝及有關人員
機台及機器操作員及裝配員
非技術工人
全職學生【Skip to DM6】
全職家庭主婦【Skip to DM6】
不能辨別
其他（包括失業、已退休、及其他非在職者）【Skip to DM6】
拒答

[DM5]　個人每月收入【包括花紅，但不包括政府援助、家用、利息等】

HK$5,000 以下
HK$5,000 至 9,999
HK$10,000 至 19,999
HK$20,000 至 29,999
HK$30,000 至 39,999
HK$40,000 至 49,999
HK$50,000 或以上
拒答

[DM6]　婚姻狀況

單身
已婚
同居
離婚／分居／喪偶
拒答

多謝你接受訪問。如果你對呢個訪問有任何疑問，可以打熱線電話 xxxx-xxxx 同我地既督導員聯絡，或者係辦公時間打 xxxx-xxxx 查詢今次訪問既真確性同埋核對我既身分。拜拜！

***** **問卷完** *****

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG
PUBLIC OPINION PROGRAMME (POP)

Public Survey on Hong Kong People's Giving Behavior 2009

COMMISSIONED BY
THE HONG KONG COUNCIL OF SOCIAL SERVICE

SURVEY REPORT

Compiled by

Chung Ting-yiu Robert, Pang Ka-lai Karie,
Lee Wai-kin Frank and Cheng Man-ching Jennifer

9 October 2009

Table of Contents

Research Background

1.   For the third time since 2007 and 2008, the Public Opinion Programme (POP) at the University of Hong Kong was commissioned by the Hong Kong Council of Social Service (HKCSS) in July 2009 to conduct this "*Public Survey on Hong Kong People's Giving Behavior*" which aimed to gauge people's opinion on donation habits, choice of donation recipients and the reason of choice, and to make comparison with data of the past two years.

2.   The research instrument used in this study was designed by POP after consulting HKCSS, whilst fieldwork operations and data analysis were conducted independently by POP without interference from HKCSS or any outside party. In other words, POP was given full autonomy to design and conduct the survey, so it would take full responsibility for all the findings reported herewith.

Research Design

3.   Target respondents of the study were **Cantonese-speaking population of Hong Kong of age 24 or above**. Telephone interviews were conducted by interviewers under close supervision. All data were collected by our interviewers using a Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) system which allowed real-time data capture and consolidation. To ensure data quality, on top of on-site supervision, voice recording, screen capturing and camera surveillance were also used to monitor the interviewers' performance. To minimize sampling bias, telephone numbers were first drawn randomly from the residential telephone directories as "seed numbers", from which another set of numbers was generated using the "plus/minus one/two" method, in order to capture the unlisted numbers. Duplicated numbers were then filtered, and the remaining numbers were mixed in random order to produce the final telephone sample. When telephone contact was successfully established with a target household, one person of age 24 or above was selected.   If more than one qualified subject had been available, selection was made using the "next birthday rule" which selected the person who had his/her birthday next from all those present.

4.   This year's survey was conducted during the period of 18 to 29 August 2009. A total of **1,000** qualified respondents were successfully interviewed. The overall response rate was **65.2%** and the standard error due to sampling was no more than 1.6 percentage points. That means at 95% confidence level, the sampling error of percentage figures was less than plus/minus 3.2 percentage points. Please refer to Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix 1.

5.   The data collected have been adjusted according to provisional figures obtained from the Census and Statistics Department regarding the gender-age distribution of the Hong Kong population at the end of 2008. All analyses in this report are based on the weighted data.

6.   Statistical tests of "difference-of-proportions" and "difference-of-means" have been employed whenever applicable, in order to check for significant changes. Figures marked with single asterisk (*) denoted statistical significance at p=0.05 level whereas those with double asterisks (**) indicated that the variation has been tested to be statistically significant at p=0.01 level. Please refer to each table in Appendix 2. However, it is noteworthy that whether numerical changes are statistically valid does not equal to the actual usage and meaning of such changes.

Research Findings

7.   The questionnaire comprised 11 opinion questions, in which 9 questions were carried forward from the research done in the past two years. The remaining two questions (Q9 and Q11) were newly added this year. The demographic information of respondents is located in the last part of the questionnaire. Key findings are summarized below and cross-references can be made with the frequency tables in Appendix II.

8.   Respondents were first asked whether they had donated money to charities in the past 12 months, which could be done through any channels *except religion donation, such as money used for incense offerings, blessing and rituals*. Results indicated that 86% of respondents had donated money to charities in the past year, in which there is a drop of 4 percentage points when compared with the same period of last year. The remaining 14% answered "no", which is notably 4 percentage points higher than last year (Table 3).

9.   The questionnaire continued to ask those who had donated money the channels or methods they often made their donation. Among 858 donors, 59% said they had donated through "flag-selling", which has been the most common donation method for three consecutive years and the figure was significantly increased by 8 percentage points from last year. 35% of respondents said they would directly donate "through banks", and 26% through "donation boxes in shopping malls/on the street", with the latter dropped 6 percentage points from last year. Other common donation channels or methods included "cheque donation" (9%), "buying raffle/movie/ball tickets for fund-raising" (8%), or through "TV/radio fund-raising programmes/special feature programmes/advertisements" (6%), "regular auto-payment (e.g. child sponsorship)" (6%), "church" (4%), "fund-raising activities at school" (4%), "direct offerings made to charities" (3%) and "charitable sales" (3%), etc. For other answers, please refer to Tables 4 and 5.

10. Similar to last year, the research showed that many citizens had made donations to the relief and rebuild work of natural disasters in the past year, especially the 2008 Sichuan earthquake and the 2009 Taiwan typhoon. Among the 857 valid respondents who had donated money, 35% indicated they would still treat "relief and rebuild work for 2008 Sichuan earthquake" as their major donation recipient, significantly dropping 27 percentage points from last year. 22% chose "relief and rebuild work for 2009 Taiwan typhoon" as their donation recipient. At the same time, a respective of 20% and 16% of respondents opted for "children" and "elderly" as their donation beneficiaries, whereas 11% chose "handicapped (e.g. mentally handicapped or disabled)" as their donation recipient. 10% reported that their donation targeted at "health and medical services" projects. Other popular charitable items and donation recipients included "relief and rebuild work for other regions" (8%), "tackling poverty" (6%), "relief and rebuild work for 2008 Mainland snowstorm" (4%), "education" and "people going through rehabilitation" (both 3%). Moreover, 20% of the donors in this year's sample answered "don't know/hard to say/doesn't matter", meaning they did not know about the donation beneficiaries or the charitable projects. Such figure increased notably by 5 percentage points compared to that registered in last year (Tables 6 and 7).

11.   Respondents were then asked how much they had donated to charitable organizations in the past year. Excluding those who didn't give an definite answer, 736 respondents said they had given HK$2 to HK$360,000. The median is HK$800, the mode is HK$1,000 and the mean is $2,986 (subject to the standard error of HK$541), which is HK$420 higher than that of the same period last year and also reached the highest since 2007. Figures indicated that 6% of the respondents had donated not more than HK$99 to charities last year, 11% donated HK$100 to HK$199, 16% donated HK$200 to HK$499, 17% donated HK$500 to HK$999, 17% donated HK$1,000 to HK$1,499, 4% donated HK$1,500 to 1,999, 9% donated 2,000 to 2,999, 8% donated HK$3,000 to HK$4,999, 6% donated HK$5,000 to HK$9,999. Lastly, 5% said they had donated at least HK$10,000 in the past year (Table 8).

12.   As for the reasons for donating to a specific charity, the survey used the same method as last year, in which all donors were asked to rate the importance of 6 factors one by one using a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 being totally unimportant, 5 being half-half and 10 being very important. Results showed that, excluding those who did not give any ratings, 91% of the donors thought "**good reputation of charity**" important, which means they gave a rating from 6 to 10. Another 8% gave 5 marks, 1% gave 0 to 4 marks. The mean score was 8.5 subject to a standard error of 0.06 marks. As for "**high transparency of charity**", 86% thought it as an important factor, giving a rating of 6 to 10 marks, 10% gave 5 marks, 4% gave 0 to 4 marks. The mean score was 8.1 subject to a standard error of 0.07 marks. Moreover, 77% thought that "**charity projects can relieve urgent needs in current society**" important, meaning they gave 6 to 10 marks, 17% gave 5 marks, 6% gave 0 to 4 marks. The mean score was 7.4 subject to a standard error of 0.08 marks. At the same time, 73% of the donors thought "**convenience of donation methods**" important, giving 6 to 10 marks, 18% gave 5 marks, 9% gave 0 to 4 marks. The mean score was 7.1 subject to a standard error of 0.08 marks. Meanwhile, 63% considered "**reasonable administration fees**" important, giving 6 to 10 marks, 22% gave 5 marks, 15% gave 0 to 4 marks. The mean score was 6.7 subject to a standard error of 0.10 marks. Lastly, only 38% thought that "**calls from public figures or friends**" were important for their donation decisions, giving it 6 to 10 marks. 32% gave 5 marks, 30% gave 0 to 4 marks. The mean score was 5.1 subject to a standard error of 0.09 marks. With respect to their mean scores, the ranking of the 6 reasons according to their importance is: charity having "good reputation" (8.5 marks), "high transparency" (8.1 marks), "charitable projects can relieve urgent needs in current society" (7.4 marks), "convenience of donation methods" (7.1 marks), "reasonable administration fees" (6.7 marks) and "calls from public figures or friends" (5.1 marks). The mean score of "charitable projects can relieve urgent needs in current society" has significantly dropped from last year and back to the level in 2007. Other factors have relatively stable scores (Tables 9 to 14 and Integrated Table 1 below).

Integrated Table 1: Importance of various reasons in deciding the choice of charity, in terms of 0 to 10 marks

	8/2007			8/2008			8/2009		
	Mean	*Standard error*	*No. of raters*	*Mean*	*Standard error*	*No. of raters*	*Mean*	*Standard error*	*No. of raters*
Good reputation of charity	**7.9**	0.08	749	**8.3****	0.07	875	**8.5**	0.06	836
High transparency of charity	**8.0**	0.08	743	**8.3****	0.07	871	**8.1**	0.07	824
Charitable projects can relieve urgent needs in current society	**7.5**	0.08	738	**7.7***	0.07	862	**7.4****	0.08	828
Convenience of donation methods	**6.9**	0.08	738	**7.0**	0.08	868	**7.1**	0.08	816
Reasonable administration fees	**--**	--	--	**6.8**	0.09	831	**6.7**	0.10	772
Calls from public figures or friends	**5.0**	0.09	735	**4.9**	0.09	869	**5.1**	0.09	818

* figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.05 level as compared with previous survey.
** figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.01 level as compared with previous survey.

13. The questionnaire continued by asking the respondents under what situations they would consider donating again to the same charity. Interviewer first read out 6 options (order randomized by computer), then respondents would pick the suitable answer or provide their own opinions, and multiple responses were allowed. The results were generally similar to those obtained in the past two years. "Knowing that the donations are properly used" was still the most popular reason for the respondents, accounting for 75%. "Knowing about the situation of the beneficiaries" followed with 61%. Those who chose "know about the work progress of the charitable project", "receive/meet a repeated call from the charity", "reasonable administration fees" or "more convenient donation methods are available" amounted to 50%, 44%, 43% and 41% respectively. Besides, a respective of 3% and 2% of the respondents indicated "no special reasons/just want to continue the support" or provided other answers. Another 2% could not provide a definite answer (Tables 15 and 16).

14. For the 140 respondents who did not make any donations in the past year, the result of follow-up question revealed that about half of them (48%) had "no ability" in doing so, which is much higher than those saying they "did not receive/meet calls from charity" (10%) or "did not trust charity" (8%). Other popular answers included "too many charities, don't know about their work", and "no donation habits" (both 6%), "not interested" (5%) and "inconvenient donation methods" (4%), etc. Besides, 13% said there were "no reasons" behind (Table 17).

15. Regardless of why these respondents did not make any donations, the questionnaire still invited them to rate the importance of 8 factors in deciding which charity to donate in future, for 0 meaning totally unimportant, 5 being half-half, 10 being very important. Excluding those who did not give any ratings, 79% thought "**good reputation of charity**" important, meaning they gave 6 to 10 marks. Another 18% gave 5 marks, 3% gave 0 to 4 marks. The mean score was 7.9 subject to a standard error of 0.18 marks. "**High transparency of charity**" followed, with 77% of the respondents regarding it important,

meaning they gave 6 to 10 marks. 17% gave 5 marks, 6% gave 0 to 4 marks. The mean score was 7.7 marks subject to a standard error of 0.21 marks. Besides, 73% thought "**understanding the work of the charity**" important, giving 6 to 10 marks. 21% gave 5 marks, 6% gave 0 to 4 marks. The mean score was 7.3 marks subject to a standard error of 0.20 marks. Similarly, 73% considered "**charitable projects can relieve urgent needs in current society**" important, giving 6 to 10 marks. 18% gave 5 marks, 9% gave 0 to 4 marks. The mean score was 7.2 marks with standard error being 0.20. As for "**convenience of donation methods**", 64% thought this was important, giving 6 to 10 marks, 25% gave 5 marks, 11% gave 0 to 4 marks. The mean score was 6.8 subject to a standard error of 0.23 marks. Those who thought "**reasonable administration fees**" important amount to 55%, meaning they gave 6 to 10 marks. 34% gave 5 marks, 11% gave 0 to 4 marks. The mean score was 6.5 marks subject to a standard error of 0.22 marks. 48% of respondents believed that "**receiving charity's call**" was important, giving 6 to 10 marks. 39% gave 5 marks, 14% gave 0 to 4 marks. The mean score was 6.0 marks with standard error being 0.23. Finally, about 35% of respondents thought "**calls from public figures or friends**" important, giving 6 to 10 marks. 49% gave 5 marks, 16% gave 0 to 4 marks. The mean score was 5.5 marks subject to a standard error of 0.21 marks. All in all, in terms of mean score, "good reputation of charity" (7.9 marks) surpassed "high transparency of charity" (7.7 marks) in this year's study to become the most important factor. The third and fourth most important factor goes to "understanding the work of the charity" (7.3 marks) and "charitable projects can relieve urgent needs in current society" (7.2 marks). Other factors ranked according to the scores include "convenience of donation methods" (6.8 marks), "reasonable administration fees" (6.5 marks), "receiving charity's call" (6.0 marks) and "calls from public figures or friends" (5.5 marks). Except "reasonable administration fees", the mean scores for all other 7 factors increased when compared to those obtained last year. Among them, "receiving charity's call" registered the most significant increase (Tables 18 to 25 and Integrated Table 2 below).

Integrated Table 2: Importance of various factors in deciding which charity to donate to in future, in terms of 0 to 10 marks.

	8/2007			8/2008			8/2009		
	Mean	*Standard error*	*No. of raters*	*Mean*	*Standard error*	*No. of raters*	*Mean*	*Standard error*	*No. of raters*
Good reputation of charity	**7.8**	0.18	207	**7.3**	0.28	84	**7.9**	0.18	135
High transparency of charity	**7.7**	0.19	202	**7.5**	0.29	84	**7.7**	0.21	129
Understanding the work of the charity	**6.8**	0.20	196	**6.6**	0.29	82	**7.3**	0.20	131
Charitable projects can relieve urgent needs in current society	**7.3**	0.19	205	**7.0**	0.29	84	**7.2**	0.20	130
Convenience of donation methods	**6.6**	0.21	200	**6.4**	0.29	84	**6.8**	0.23	127
Reasonable administration fees	**--**	--	--	**6.7**	0.34	79	**6.5**	0.22	126
Receiving charity's call	**5.1**	0.23	184	**4.9**	0.31	86	**6.0****	0.23	130
Calls from public figures or friends	**5.1**	0.22	203	**5.3**	0.28	83	**5.5**	0.21	131

** figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.01 level as compared with previous survey.

16. This year, a new question was added to probe all respondents' understanding of the term "good reputation of charity". Interviewer first read out 4 options (order randomized by computer), then respondents were to select the most suitable answer or provide their own opinions. Multiple responses were allowed. Results indicated that two-thirds (66%) of the respondents answered that "good reputation of charity" made them think of "good service quality of organization", 54% said it should mean "long history of organization". There were also 33% and 18% of respondents thinking it should mean "large structure of organization" and "famous figures in society participating in administrative structure", respectively. Besides, 4% of respondents answered "none of the above" while 2% provided other answers. About 3% had no clues at all (Tables 26 to 27).

17. The last part of the questionnaire asked all respondents whether they had set a donation budget for the coming year. Results showed that 89% said "no". Only 11% reported they had already set a donation budget for the coming year. The overall situation was quite similar to that of last year, but compared with 2007 (6%) the percentage of those having donation budget has almost increased by 1 fold and reached the highest among 3 years (Table 28). When asked why respondents didn't make a budget for the future, among 885 valid respondents, 42% said it was because they "only occasionally donate and do not have a specific charitable project/group for long-term support". The second most common reason was because they had "unstable income/no income/no ability" to make donation (28%). Besides, a respective of 18% and 9% said they "had not thought about it/no interest" and "no need" to make budget. Finally, 7% answered there was "no reason" (Table 29).

Concluding Remarks

18.   The Sichuan earthquake last year and the Taiwan typhoon this year encouraged many Hong Kong citizens to participate in disaster relief and donation work. Research indicates that among Hong Kong citizens of age 24 years or above, nearly half of them have donated to support the relief and rebuild work of Sichuan earthquake. This enables the rate of donating to charities in the past year continue to stay at about 90%, which is very encouraging.

19.   As for donation channels and methods, "flag-selling" has continued to stay as the most common donation method in three consecutive years. Those who donate through the "bank" or "donations boxes in shopping malls" have reduced in number. For the amount of donation throughout the year, the average amount has increased from HK$2,600 last year to HK$3,000 this year, which is the highest in three years' time. This reflects that the financial tsunami has not reduced citizens' desire or amount of donation.

20.   Meanwhile, all three surveys indicate that the donation behaviour of Hong Kong citizens seems quite rational. For both donors and non-donors, reputation and transparency of charitable donations are quite important factors to determine whether they make donations. Whether the charitable project is urgent is only secondary in terms of consideration. The calls of other people or celebrities have an even lower priority. In other words, when promoting charitable activities, charities should release more data and information at the same time so that citizens can feel assured when answering charity calls.

21.   Lastly, the research shows that around 10% of respondents have made donation budgets for the coming year, which is similar to last year's results. As for those who have not set a budget, they are mostly "irregular donors" or those with "no ability to donate".

Appendix I
Contact Information

Table 1   Calculation of overall response rate

Overall response rate

$$= \frac{\text{Successful cases}}{\text{Successful cases + Refusal cases}^{\wedge} \text{ + Incomplete cases}^{*}}$$

$$= \frac{1,000}{1,000 + (10 + 21) + (431 + 71)}$$

$= 65.2\%$

^ Including "household-level refusal" and "known respondent refusal"
* Including "partial interview" and "interview terminated before the screening question"

Table 2   Breakdown of contact information

	Frequency	Percentage
Respondents' ineligibility confirmed	**5,934**	**50.7**
Fax/data line	588	5.0
Invalid number	4,629	39.6
Call-forwarding/mobile/pager number	77	0.7
Non-residential number	582	5.0
Special technological circumstances	32	0.3
No eligible respondents	26	0.2
Respondents' eligibility not confirmed	**1,781**	**15.2**
Line busy	104	0.9
No answer	853	7.3
Answering device	32	0.3
Call-blocking	183	1.6
Language problem	164	1.4
Interview terminated before the screening question	431	3.7
Others	14	0.1
Respondents' eligibility confirmed, but failed to complete the interview	**2,983**	**25.5**
Household-level refusal	10	0.1
Known respondent refusal	21	0.2
Appointment date beyond the end of the fieldwork period	2,861	24.5
Partial interview	71	0.6
Miscellaneous	20	0.2
Successful cases	**1,000**	**8.5**
Total	**11,698**	**100.0**

Appendix II
Frequency Tables

Table 3 [Q1] In the past 12 months, have you ever made any donation to charities? Please include any means or channels, but do not include religious donations, such as making religious offerings like contributing oil and incense money, performing ritual for blessings and performing religious ceremonies.

	8/2007		8/2008		**8/2009**	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,006)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,007)	**Frequency**	**Percentage (Base=1,000)**
Yes	777	77.2	905	89.9**	**860**	**86.0****
No (Skip to Q7)	229	22.8	102	10.1**	**140**	**14.0****
Total	1,006	100.0	1,007	100.0	**1,000**	**100.0**

** figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.01 level as compared with previous survey.

The following questions (Q2-Q6) only ask those who answered "Yes" in Q1. The sub-sample base is 860 in 2009. The results of 2007 and 2008 are also listed below for comparison.

Table 4 [Q2] Through what means or channels do you usually make such donations? (multiple answers allowed)

	8/2007		8/2008		**8/2009**		
	Freq.	% of sub-sample (Base=771)	Freq.	% of sub-sample (Base=901)	**Freq.**	**% of responses (Base=1,475)**	**% of sub-sample (Base=858)**
Flag-selling	555	72.0	461	51.2**	**502**	**34.0**	**58.5****
Donation through banks	11	1.4	336	37.3**	**304**	**20.6**	**35.4**
Donation boxes in shopping malls/on the street	97	12.6	288	31.9**	**224**	**15.2**	**26.1****
Donation via cheque	0	0.0	11	1.2	**74**	**5.0**	**8.7****
Buying raffle/movie/ball tickets for fund-raising	107	13.9	49	5.4**	**72**	**4.9**	**8.3***
TV/radio fund-raising programmes/special feature programmes/advertisements	45	5.8	36	4.0	**49**	**3.3**	**5.8**
Regular auto-payment (e.g. child sponsorship)	121	15.7	71	7.9**	**49**	**3.3**	**5.7**
Donation to charity via church	0	0.0	16	1.8	**38**	**2.6**	**4.4****
Fund-raising activities at schools	8	1.0	44	4.9**	**37**	**2.5**	**4.4**
Direct offerings made to charities without recruitment from anyone or any functions	35	4.5	32	3.6	**22**	**1.5**	**2.6**
Charitable sales	31	4.1	19	2.1*	**21**	**1.4**	**2.5**
Group donation through work organization	0	0.0	57	6.3	**20**	**1.4**	**2.4****
Leaflets mailed by charities	55	7.2	30	3.4**	**16**	**1.1**	**1.9**
Online donation	7	0.8	31	3.5**	**15**	**1.0**	**1.7***
Fund-raising walks/marathon/ competitions/fasting events	25	3.2	18	2.0	**13**	**0.9**	**1.6**
Donation directly deducted from salary	0	0.0	3	0.3	**3**	**0.2**	**0.4**
Donation via telephone	0	0.0	5	0.6	**3**	**0.2**	**0.3**
On special occasions (e.g. birthday, anniversary, graduation, birth of child)	1	0.1	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
Others (Table 5)	20	2.6	13	1.5	**7**	**0.5**	**0.8**
Don't know/forgotten	1	0.1	3	0.3	**5**	**0.3**	**0.6**
Total	1,118		1,523		**1,475**	**100.0**	
Missing	*6*		*4*		*2*		

Table 5 [Q2_others] Through what means or channels do you usually make such donations? (Others)

	Frequency
Donate with friends collectively	2
Donate through District Council	2
Donation scheme in newspaper	1
Pass on to charity through neighbours	1
My children helped to donate	1

Table 6 [Q3] Which target groups or charitable projects are these donations for? (multiple answers allowed)

	8/2007 Freq.	8/2007 % of sub-sample (Base=775)	8/2008 Freq.	8/2008 % of sub-sample (Base=902)	8/2009 Freq.	8/2009 % of responses (Base=1,509)	8/2009 % of sub-sample (Base=857)
Relief and rebuild work for 2008 Sichuan earthquake	--	--	555	61.5	**297**	**19.7**	**34.6****
Relief and rebuild work for 2009 Taiwan typhoon	--	--	--	--	**187**	**12.4**	**21.8**
Children	142	18.3	180	19.9	**170**	**11.3**	**19.8**
Elderly	173	22.4	126	14.0**	**139**	**9.2**	**16.2**
Handicapped (e.g. mentally handicapped or disabled)	104	13.4	97	10.7	**98**	**6.5**	**11.4**
Health and medical services	142	18.4	110	12.1**	**85**	**5.7**	**10.0**
Relief and rebuild work for other regions	87	11.2	36	4.0**	**67**	**4.4**	**7.8****
Tackling poverty	61	7.9	56	6.2	**53**	**3.5**	**6.2**
Relief and rebuild work for 2008 Mainland snowstorm	--	--	39	4.3	**31**	**2.0**	**3.6**
Education	38	4.9	21	2.4**	**25**	**1.6**	**2.9**
People going through rehabilitation	27	3.5	13	1.4**	**22**	**1.5**	**2.6**
Teenagers	22	2.8	20	2.2	**18**	**1.2**	**2.1**
Social development project in Mainland China	57	7.3	28	3.1**	**18**	**1.2**	**2.1**
Family and society (e.g. newly arrived immigrants, ethnical minorities, victims of family violence etc.)	18	2.3	8	0.9*	**18**	**1.2**	**2.1***
Environmental protection	16	2.1	13	1.5	**18**	**1.2**	**2.1**
Relief and rebuild work for 2008 Myanmar typhoon	--	--	20	2.2	**10**	**0.7**	**1.2**
Animal protection	14	1.8	9	1.0	**10**	**0.7**	**1.2**
Women	6	0.8	8	0.9	**6**	**0.4**	**0.8**
Human rights	4	0.5	0	0.0	**4**	**0.2**	**0.4**
Culture and arts	1	0.1	0	0.0	**1**	**0.1**	**0.2**
Other projects (Table 7)	28	3.6	41	4.5	**63**	**4.2**	**7.4***
Don't know/does not matter	261	33.7	130	14.5**	**168**	**11.1**	**19.6****
Total	1,202		1,509		**1,509**	**100.0**	
Missing	*2*		*3*		*3*		

Table 7 [Q3_others] Which target groups or charitable projects are these donations for? (Other projects)

	Frequency
Religious groups	12
The Community Chest	11
The World Vision	8
Oxfam	8
Tung Wah Group of Hospitals	7
Red Cross	7
Po Leung Kuk	7
ORBIS	6
Medecins Sans Frontieres	2
Political organizations	2
Hong Kong Correctional Services	1
Yan Chai Hospital	1
Fire department	1
Caritas Hong Kong	1

Table 8 [Q4] In the past year, how much approximately did you donate to charity?

	8/2007 #		8/2008		**8/2009**	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
$1-99	86	16.0	42	5.7**	**46**	**6.3**
$100-199	93	17.2	55	7.5**	**78**	**10.6***
$200-299	42	7.8	65	8.9	**61**	**8.3**
$300-399	41	7.6	48	6.5	**45**	**6.1**
$400-499	17	3.1	23	3.1	**14**	**1.9**
$500-999	78	14.4	134	18.1	**126**	**17.1**
$1,000-1,499	66	12.2	117	15.9	**124**	**16.8**
$1,500-1,999	13	2.5	26	3.5	**28**	**3.8**
$2,000-2,999	38	7.1	83	11.2*	**68**	**9.2**
$3,000-4,999	30	5.6	55	7.5	**61**	**8.3**
$5,000-9,999	14	2.6	52	7.1**	**46**	**6.3**
$10,000 or above	21	3.9	37	5.0	**38**	**5.2**
Total	539	100.0	737	100.0	**736**	**100.0**
Mean	$1,620		$2,569*		**$2,986**	
Standard error	$232		$309		**$541**	
Median	$400		$1,000		**$800**	
Mode	$100		$1,000		**$1,000**	
Base	777		905		**860**	
Missing (including "don't know/ hard to say/ forgotten)	*238 (226)*		*270 (167)*		*125 (123)*	

* figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.05 level as compared with previous survey.
** figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.01 level as compared with previous survey.
 # excluding the largest answer ($55,000,000) in order to minimize the effect of extreme figure. If the figure is counted, the mean amount would increase to $76,728.

Tables 9-14 [Q5] Please use a scale of 0 to 10 to rate how important the following 6 factors are when you decide which charity to donate. Among which, 0 means totally unimportant, 5 being half-half, 10 being very important.

Table 9 [Q5a] How important do you think is "good reputation of charity" for your decision?

	8/2007		8/2008		**8/2009**	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
0	13 }	1.8 }	10 }	1.1 }	**2 }**	**0.2* }**
1 – 2	4 } 28	0.5 } 3.7	2 } 14	0.3 } 1.6	**2 } 10**	**0.2 } 1.2**
3 – 4	10 }	1.4 }	2 }	0.2** }	**6 }**	**0.7 }**
5	114	15.2	97	11.1*	**63**	**7.6***
6 – 7	99 }	13.1 }	98 }	11.2 }	**117 }**	**14.0 }**
8 – 9	231 } 608	30.8 } 81.1	300 } 764	34.3 } 87.3	**310 } 763**	**37.1 } 91.2**
10	279 }	37.2 }	366 }	41.8 }	**336 }**	**40.2 }**
Total	749	100.0	875	100.0	**836**	**100.0**
Mean	7.9		8.3**		**8.5**	
Standard error	0.08		0.07		**0.06**	
Base	777		905		**860**	
Missing (including "don't know/ hard to say)	*28 (25)*		*30 (28)*		***24 (24)***	

* figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.05 level as compared with previous survey.
** figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.01 level as compared with previous survey.

Table 10 [Q5b] How important do you think is "high transparency of charity" for your decision?

	8/2007		8/2008		**8/2009**	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
0	8 }	1.1 }	9 }	1.0 }	**7 }**	**0.8 }**
1 – 2	4 } 32	0.5 } 4.4	5 } 22	0.5 } 2.5	**8 } 37**	**1.0 } 4.4**
3 – 4	21 }	2.8 }	8 }	1.0** }	**22 }**	**2.6** }**
5	94	12.6	83	9.5*	**80**	**9.7**
6 – 7	101 }	13.5 }	106 }	12.2 }	**102 }**	**12.4 }**
8 – 9	246 } 617	33.1 } 83.0	309 } 767	35.4 } 88.0	**294 } 707**	**35.7 } 85.8**
10	271 }	36.4 }	352 }	40.4 }	**311 }**	**37.8 }**
Total	743	100.0	871	100.0	**824**	**100.0**
Mean	8.0		8.3**		**8.1**	
Standard error	0.08		0.07		**0.07**	
Base	777		905		**860**	
Missing (including "don't know/ hard to say)	*34 (32)*		*34 (33)*		***36 (36)***	

* figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.05 level as compared with previous survey.
** figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.01 level as compared with previous survey.

Table 11 [Q5c] How important do you think is "charitable projects can relieve urgent needs in current society" for your decision?

	8/2007		8/2008		**8/2009**	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
0	12 }	1.6 }	13 }	1.5 }	**19 }**	**2.3 }**
1 – 2	4 } 39	0.6 } 5.3	3 } 40	0.3 } 4.6	**8 } 50**	**0.9 } 6.1**
3 – 4	23 }	3.1 }	24 }	2.7 }	**24 }**	**2.9 }**
5	134	18.1	131	15.2	**144**	**17.4**
6 – 7	136 }	18.5 }	145 }	16.9 }	**146 }**	**17.6 }**
8 – 9	221 } 565	29.9 } 76.5	279 } 691	32.3 } 80.2	**274 } 634**	**33.0 } 76.5**
10	208 }	28.1 }	267 }	31.0 }	**214 }**	**25.8* }**
Total	738	100.0	862	100.0	**828**	**100.0**
Mean	7.5		7.7*		**7.4****	
Standard error	0.08		0.07		**0.08**	
Base	777		905		**860**	
Missing (including "don't know/ hard to say)	*39 (36)*		*43 (41)*		*32 (32)*	

* figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.05 level as compared with previous survey.
** figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.01 level as compared with previous survey.

Table 12 [Q5d] How important do you think is "convenience of donation methods" for your decision?

	8/2007		8/2008		**8/2009**	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
0	20 }	2.8 }	35 }	4.0 }	**26 }**	**3.2 }**
1 – 2	4 } 61	0.6 } 8.3	10 } 75	1.2 } 8.6	**15 } 75**	**1.9 } 9.1**
3 – 4	37 }	5.0 }	30 }	3.5 }	**33 }**	**4.1 }**
5	181	24.5	196	22.6	**150**	**18.4***
6 – 7	171 }	23.2 }	183 }	21.1 }	**173 }**	**21.2 }**
8 – 9	197 } 496	26.6 } 67.2	236 } 598	27.2 } 68.8	**240 } 592**	**29.4 } 72.5**
10	128 }	17.4 }	178 }	20.5 }	**179 }**	**21.9 }**
Total	738	100.0	868	100.0	**816**	**100.0**
Mean	6.9		7.0		**7.1**	
Standard error	0.08		0.08		**0.08**	
Base	777		905		**860**	
Missing (including "don't know/ hard to say)	*39 (38)*		*37 (33)*		*44 (44)*	

* figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.05 level as compared with previous survey.

Table 13 [Q5e] How important do you think is "reasonable administration fees" for your decision?

	8/2008		**8/2009**	
	Frequency	Percentage	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
0	46 }	5.5 }	**41** }	**5.3** }
1 – 2	23 } 99	2.8 } 11.9	**20** } 117	**2.6** } 15.1
3 – 4	29 }	3.5 }	**56** }	**7.3**** }
5	195	23.4	**168**	**21.8**
6 – 7	152 }	18.3 }	**128** }	**16.6** }
8 – 9	196 } 538	23.6 } 64.7	**198** } 487	**25.7** } 63.1
10	190 }	22.9 }	**160** }	**20.8** }
Total	831	100.0	**772**	**100.0**
Mean	6.8		**6.7**	
Standard error	0.09		**0.10**	
Base	905		**860**	
Missing (including "don't know/ hard to say)	*74 (72)*		*88 (88)*	

** figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.01 level as compared with previous survey.

Table 14 [Q5f] How important do you think is "calls from public figures or friends" for your decision?

	8/2007		8/2008		**8/2009**	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
0	70 }	9.6 }	93 }	10.7 }	**86** }	**10.6** }
1 – 2	34 } 206	4.6 } 28.1	49 } 256	5.6 } 29.4	**47** } 246	**5.7** } 30.1
3 – 4	103 }	14.0 }	114 }	13.1 }	**113** }	**13.8** }
5	277	37.6	345	39.7	**261**	**31.9****
6 – 7	140 }	19.0 }	137 }	15.8 }	**154** }	**18.9** }
8 – 9	72 } 252	9.7 } 34.3	86 } 268	9.9 } 30.9	**101** } 311	**12.4** } 38.0**
10	41 }	5.5 }	45 }	5.2 }	**55** }	**6.7** }
Total	735	100.0	869	100.0	**818**	**100.0**
Mean	5.0		4.9		**5.1**	
Standard error	0.09		0.09		**0.09**	
Base	777		905		**860**	
Missing (including "don't know/ hard to say)	*42 (40)*		*36 (34)*		*42 (42)*	

** figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.01 level as compared with previous survey.

Table 15 [Q6] Which of the following situations will make you consider donating again to the same charity? (reads out 6 answers, order randomized by computer, multiple answers allowed)

	8/2007		8/2008		8/2009		
	Freq.	% of sub-sample (Base=774)	Freq.	% of sub-sample (Base=902)	**Freq.**	**% of responses (Base=2,765)**	**% of sub-sample (Base=860)**
Know that the donations are properly used	577	74.6	681	75.6	**648**	**23.4**	**75.3**
Know about the situation of the beneficiaries	500	64.6	577	64.0	**523**	**18.9**	**60.9**
Know about the work progress of the charitable project	415	53.6	441	48.8	**429**	**15.5**	**49.9**
Receive/meet a repeated call from the charity	405	52.3	377	41.8**	**381**	**13.8**	**44.3**
Reasonable administration fees	--	--	406	45.0	**372**	**13.5**	**43.3**
More convenient donation methods are available	387	50.0	371	41.1**	**352**	**12.7**	**41.0**
No specific reasons/just want to continue the support	31	4.0	30	3.3	**29**	**1.1**	**3.4**
Others Table 16	23	3.0	20	2.2	**16**	**0.6**	**1.8**
Don't know/hard to say	15	1.9	14	1.6	**16**	**0.6**	**1.8**
Total	2,352		2,917		**2,765**	**100.0**	
Missing	*3*		*3*		*0*		

*** figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.01 level as compared with previous survey.*

Table 16 [Q6_others] Which of the following situations will make you consider donating again to the same charity? (Others)

	Frequency
Depends on personal ability and financial condition	5
Level of urgency	4
Reputation of charity	4
Won't donate again to the same charity	2
Have been benefited before	1

The following questions (Q7-Q8) only ask those who answered "No" in Q1. The sub-sample base is 140 in 2009. The results of 2007 and 2008 are also listed below for comparison.

Table 17 [Q7] Based on what reasons did you make no donations to charity in the past 12 months? (multiple answers allowed)

	8/2007		8/2008		8/2009		
	Freq.	% of sub-sample (Base=222)	Freq.	% of sub-sample (Base=102)	**Freq.**	**% of responses (Base=155)**	**% of sub-sample (Base=139)**
No ability	98	43.9	53	52.0	**66**	**42.5**	**47.5**
Did not receive/meet calls from charity	34	15.1	10	9.7	**14**	**9.3**	**10.4**
Do not trust charity	5	2.1	3	2.9	**10**	**6.7**	**7.5**
Too many charities, don't know about their work	8	3.6	1	1.0	**9**	**5.6**	**6.2***
No donation habits	4	1.9	2	2.4	**8**	**5.4**	**6.1**
Not interested	17	7.5	4	4.3	**6**	**4.0**	**4.5**
Inconvenient donation methods	8	3.6	7	6.8	**5**	**3.2**	**3.5**
Don't know if donations are properly used	7	3.3	1	0.6	**4**	**2.9**	**3.2**
Work too busy/no time	9	4.3	8	7.4	**4**	**2.8**	**3.1**
Unreasonable administration fee	0	0.0	0	0.0	**4**	**2.4**	**2.7**
Charity work does not have actual effects	1	0.4	0	0.0	**2**	**1.0**	**1.1**
Charity work is not largely related to me	1	0.4	1	1.1	**1**	**0.5**	**0.5**
Charity work should be government's responsibility	1	0.5	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
Others	3	1.1	2	1.8	**0**	**0.0**	**0.0**
No reason	37	16.7	18	17.3	**18**	**11.3**	**12.6**
Don't know/forgotten	4	2.0	2	1.6	**4**	**2.3**	**2.5**
Total	237		112		**155**	**100.0**	
Missing	*7*		*0*		*1*		

* figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.05 level as compared with previous survey.

Tables 18-25 [Q8] Please use a scale of 0 to 10 to rate how important are the following 8 factors in deciding which charity to donate to in future. Among which, 0 means totally unimportant, 5 being half-half, 10 being very important.

Table 18 [Q8a] How important do you think is "good reputation of charity" for your decision?

	8/2007		8/2008		**8/2009**	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
0	9 }	4.4 }	5 }	5.4 }	**1 }**	**1.0 }**
1 – 2	1 } 13	0.5 } 6.2	0 } 8	0.0 } 10.1	**1 } 4**	**0.6 } 3.1***
3 – 4	3 }	1.3 }	4 }	4.6 }	**2 }**	**1.5 }**
5	27	13.1	12	14.3	**24**	**17.7**
6 – 7	30 }	14.5 }	11 }	13.4 }	**21 }**	**15.4 }**
8 – 9	52 } 167	25.1 } 80.7	31 } 64	36.6 } 75.7	**33 } 107**	**24.9 } 79.2**
10	85 }	41.1 }	22 }	25.6* }	**52 }**	**38.9* }**
Total	207	100.0	84	100.0	**135**	**100.0**
Mean	7.8		7.3		**7.9**	
Standard error	0.18		0.28		**0.18**	
Base	229		102		**140**	
Missing (including "don't know/ hard to say)	*22 (19)*		*18 (14)*		*5 (5)*	

* figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.05 level as compared with previous survey.

Table 19 [Q8b] How important do you think is "high transparency of charity" for your decision?

	8/2007		8/2008		**8/2009**	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
0	11 }	5.5 }	5 }	5.4 }	**3 }**	**2.2 }**
1 – 2	5 } 19	2.2 } 9.4	1 } 8	1.4 } 9.0	**1 } 8**	**0.6 } 6.0**
3 – 4	3 }	1.6 }	2 }	2.2 }	**4 }**	**3.2 }**
5	22	10.9	9	10.8	**22**	**17.4**
6 – 7	30 }	15.1 }	16 }	19.3 }	**21 }**	**16.0 }**
8 – 9	50 } 161	24.7 } 79.8	23 } 68	27.7 } 80.2	**29 } 99**	**22.4 } 76.7**
10	81 }	40.0 }	28 }	33.2 }	**49 }**	**38.2 }**
Total	202	100.0	84	100.0	**129**	**100.0**
Mean	7.7		7.5		**7.7**	
Standard error	0.19		0.29		**0.21**	
Base	229		102		**140**	
Missing (including "don't know/ hard to say)	*27 (23)*		*18 (14)*		*11 (11)*	

Table 20 [Q8c] How important do you think is "understanding the work of the charity" for your decision?

	8/2007		8/2008		**8/2009**	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
0	12 }	6.2 }	6 }	6.7 }	**4 }**	**3.0 }**
1 – 2	7 } 27	3.6 } 13.7	3 } 12	3.1 } 14.1	**2 } 8**	**1.2 } 5.6***
3 – 4	8 }	3.9 }	4 }	4.3 }	**2 }**	**1.4 }**
5	42	21.6	13	15.4	**28**	**21.3**
6 – 7	32 }	16.4 }	21 }	25.1 }	**23 }**	**17.9 }**
8 – 9	47 } 127	23.8 } 64.6	25 } 58	30.9 } 70.5	**44 } 95**	**33.4 } 73.1**
10	48 }	24.4 }	12 }	14.6 }	**28 }**	**21.8 }**
Total	196	100.0	82	100.0	**131**	**100.0**
Mean	6.8		6.6		**7.3**	
Standard error	0.20		0.29		**0.20**	
Base	229		102		**140**	
Missing (including "don't know/ hard to say)	*33 (28)*		*20 (17)*		*9 (9)*	

* figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.05 level as compared with previous survey.

Table 21 [Q8d] How important do you think is "charitable projects can relieve urgent needs in current society" for your decision?

	8/2007		8/2008		**8/2009**	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
0	10 }	4.7 }	5 }	5.7 }	**3 }**	**2.1 }**
1 – 2	3 } 19	1.3 } 9.4	0 } 8	0.0 } 9.6	**1 } 12**	**0.6 } 9.0**
3 – 4	7 }	3.4 }	3 }	3.9 }	**8 }**	**6.3 }**
5	35	17.3	18	21.4	**23**	**17.8**
6 – 7	38 }	18.7 }	12 }	14.7 }	**26 }**	**19.8 }**
8 – 9	46 } 150	22.4 } 73.3	27 } 58	31.6 } 69.0	**36 } 95**	**27.5 } 73.2**
10	66 }	32.2 }	19 }	22.7 }	**34 }**	**26.0 }**
Total	205	100.0	84	100.0	**130**	**100.0**
Mean	7.3		7.0		**7.2**	
Standard error	0.19		0.29		**0.20**	
Base	229		102		**140**	
Missing (including "don't know/ hard to say)	*24 (18)*		*18 (14)*		*10 (9)*	

Table 22 [Q8e] How important do you think is "convenience of donation methods" for your decision?

	8/2007		8/2008		**8/2009**	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
0	17 }	8.6 }	5 }	6.4 }	**6 }**	**4.9 }**
1 – 2	5 } 25	2.5 } 12.5	1 } 13	1.6 } 15.4	**1 } 14**	**0.6 } 11.2**
3 – 4	3 }	1.5 }	6 }	7.3* }	**7 }**	**5.7 }**
5	53	26.5	19	22.3	**31**	**24.5**
6 – 7	38 }	19.1 }	23 }	27.5 }	**26 }**	**20.8 }**
8 – 9	34 } 122	17.0 } 60.9	16 } 53	19.1 } 62.4	**25 } 82**	**19.5 } 64.3**
10	50 }	24.8 }	13 }	15.8 }	**31 }**	**24.1 }**
Total	200	100.0	84	100.0	**127**	**100.0**
Mean	6.6		6.4		**6.8**	
Standard error	0.21		0.29		**0.23**	
Base	229		102		**140**	
Missing (including "don't know/ hard to say)	*29 (23)*		*18 (14)*		***13 (12)***	

* figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.05 level as compared with previous survey.

Table 23 [Q8f] How important do you think is "reasonable administration fees" for your decision?

	8/2008		**8/2009**	
	Frequency	Percentage	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
0	7 }	8.7 }	**4 }**	**3.2 }**
1 – 2	1 } 15	1.5 } 19.0	**4 } 14**	**2.8 } 11.1**
3 – 4	7 }	8.8 }	**6 }**	**5.1 }**
5	9	11.3	**43**	**34.0****
6 – 7	18 }	22.2 }	**27 }**	**21.1 }**
8 – 9	17 } 55	22.0 } 69.7	**17 } 69**	**13.4 } 54.9***
10	20 }	25.4 }	**26 }**	**20.4 }**
Total	79	100.0	**126**	**100.0**
Mean	6.7		**6.5**	
Standard error	0.34		**0.22**	
Base	102		**140**	
Missing (including "don't know/ hard to say)	*23 (19)*		***14 (13)***	

* figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.05 level as compared with previous survey.
** figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.01 level as compared with previous survey.

Table 24 [Q8g] How important do you think is "receiving charity's call" for your decision?

	8/2007		8/2008		**8/2009**	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
0	26 }	14.0 }	12 }	13.9 }	**8 }**	**6.4 }**
1 – 2	19 } 55	10.2 } 29.7	5 } 29	5.8 } 33.7	**3 } 18**	**2.1 } 13.6****
3 – 4	10 }	5.5 }	12 }	14.0* }	**7 }**	**5.2* }**
5	58	31.6	30	34.4	**50**	**38.9**
6 – 7	29 }	15.6 }	10 }	11.9 }	**23 }**	**17.7 }**
8 – 9	13 } 71	7.1 } 38.7	8 } 27	9.0 } 31.9	**20 } 62**	**15.3 } 47.5***
10	29 }	16.0 }	9 }	10.9 }	**19 }**	**14.5 }**
Total	184	100.0	86	100.0	**130**	**100.0**
Mean	5.1		4.9		**6.0****	
Standard error	0.23		0.31		**0.23**	
Base	229		102		**140**	
Missing (including "don't know/ hard to say)	*45 (40)*		*16 (15)*		*10 (10)*	

* figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.05 level as compared with previous survey.
** figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.01 level as compared with previous survey.

Table 25 [Q8h] How important do you think is "calls from public figures or friends" for your decision?

	8/2007		8/2008		**8/2009**	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
0	34 }	16.8 }	8 }	9.7 }	**10 }**	**7.8 }**
1 – 2	10 } 59	4.7 } 29.0	1 } 21	1.7 } 25.7	**3 } 20**	**2.6 } 15.7**
3 – 4	15 }	7.4 }	12 }	14.2 }	**7 }**	**5.3* }**
5	70	34.5	31	37.1	**65**	**49.3**
6 – 7	25 }	12.1 }	13 }	15.8 }	**19 }**	**14.6 }**
8 – 9	26 } 74	12.9 } 36.5	11 } 31	13.0 } 37.2	**15 } 46**	**11.8 } 35.0**
10	23 }	11.5 }	7 }	8.4 }	**11 }**	**8.6 }**
Total	203	100.0	83	100.0	**131**	**100.0**
Mean	5.1		5.3		**5.5**	
Standard error	0.22		0.28		**0.21**	
Base	229		102		**140**	
Missing (including "don't know/ hard to say)	*26 (21)*		*19 (15)*		*9 (9)*	

* figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.05 level as compared with previous survey.

Q9 and Q11 are new questions in 2009.

Table 26 [Q9] [Ask all respondents] When you hear about "good reputation of charity", which of the following do you think is its meaning? (read out the 4 answers, order randomized by computer, multiple answers allowed)

	Freq.	% of responses (Base=1,799)	% of sample (Base=998)
Good service quality of organization	661	36.7	66.2
Long history of organization	535	29.7	53.6
Large structure of organization	328	18.3	32.9
Famous figures in society participating in administrative structure	181	10.0	18.1
None of the above	38	2.1	3.8
Others (Table 27)	23	1.3	2.3
Don't know/hard to say	34	1.9	3.4
Total	1,799	100.0	
Missing	*2*		

Table 27 [Q9_others] When you hear about "good reputation of charity", which of the following do you think is its meaning? (Others)

	Frequency
Can help others and make contribution	11
High transparency	5
Clear charity visions and goals	2
Charity can be seen on television	1
Neutral stand of charity	1
Ask people to donate	1
High administrative fee	1
High credibility	1
All-roundedness	1
Charity that registered as tax-free through Inland Revenue Department	1

Table 28 [Q10] Have you set a donation budget for the coming year?

	8/2007		8/2008		**8/2009**	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,002)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,007)	**Frequency**	**Percentage (Base=998)**
Yes (Skip to DM1)	57	5.7	96	9.6**	**110**	**11.0**
No	945	94.3	911	90.4**	**889**	**89.0**
Total	1,002	100.0	1,007	100.0	**998**	**100.0**
Missing	*4*		*0*		*2*	

*** figure tested to be statistically significant at p<0.01 level as compared with previous survey.*

Table 29 [Q11] [Only ask those who answered "no" in Q10] Why not (multiple answers allowed)

	Freq.	% of responses (Base=953)	% of sub-sample (Base=885)
Only occasionally donate when I see the need; do not have a specific charitable project/group for long-term support	371	39.0	42.0
Unstable income/no income/no ability to make donation	247	25.9	27.9
Have not thought about it/not interested	157	16.5	17.8
No need	76	7.9	8.5
Charity does not have supporting proposals to help me set my donation budget	13	1.3	1.4
No time	10	1.0	1.1
Adapted to the habit of regular donation already	4	0.4	0.4
Do not agree with the beliefs or mechanisms of charity	2	0.2	0.2
No reason	59	6.2	6.7
Don't know/hard to say	14	1.5	1.6
Total	953	100.0	
Missing	*4*		

Appendix III
Demographic Profile
of Respondents

Demographic Profile of Respondents

All figures obtained have been adjusted according to provisional figures obtained from the Census and Statistics Department regarding the gender-age distribution of the Hong Kong population in 2008 year-end.

Table 30   Gender

| | 8/2007 | | 8/2008 | | 8/2009 | | | |
| | Weighted sample | | Weighted sample | | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | |
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Male	467	46.4	466	46.2	378	37.8	460	46.0
Female	539	53.6	541	53.8	622	62.2	540	54.0
Total	1,006	100.0	1,007	100.0	1,000	100.0	1,000	100.0

Table 31   Age

| | 8/2007 | | 8/2008 | | 8/2009 | | | |
| | Weighted sample | | Weighted sample | | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | |
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
24 to 29	115	11.8	116	11.8	86	8.9	115	11.9
30 to 39	212	21.7	209	21.4	125	12.9	204	21.0
40 to 49	247	25.3	243	24.9	201	20.7	235	24.2
50 to 59	188	19.3	190	19.5	278	28.6	196	20.2
60 or above	215	22.0	217	22.3	281	28.9	221	22.7
Total	977	100.0	975	100.0	971	100.0	971	100.0
Missing	*29*		*32*		*29*		*29*	

Table 32   Education level

| | 8/2007 | | 8/2008 | | 8/2009 | | | |
| | Weighted sample | | Weighted sample | | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | |
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Primary or below	207	21.1	181	18.0	212	21.6	163	16.7
Secondary	492	50.1	539	53.6	516	52.5	512	52.2
Tertiary or above	284	28.9	285	28.4	255	25.9	305	31.1
Total	983	100.0	1,005	100.0	983	100.0	980	100.0
Missing	*23*		*2*		*17*		*20*	

Table 33   Occupation group

	8/2007		8/2008		8/2009			
	Weighted sample		Weighted sample		Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Executive and professionals	216	22.3	254	25.6	204	21.2	255	26.5
Clerks and service workers	221	22.7	246	24.8	194	20.1	229	23.8
Production workers	124	12.8	97	9.7	79	8.2	78	8.1
Students	4	0.4	12	1.2	6	0.6	7	0.8
Housewives	178	18.3	168	16.9	174	18.0	134	13.9
Others	229	23.6	216	21.8	307	31.8	259	27.0
Total	972	100.0	993	100.0	964	100.0	961	100.0
Missing	*34*		*14*		*36*		*39*	

Table 34   Personal monthly income [includng bonus, but excluding government subsidies, money given by family members, interests, etc.]

	8/2007		8/2008		8/2009			
	Weighted sample		Weighted sample		Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
HK$5,000 or below	19	3.6	38	6.6	125	26.8	155	28.3
HK$5,000 to 9,999	145	27.3	102	17.9	245	52.6	274	50.0
HK$10,000 to 19,999	209	39.3	244	42.9	52	11.2	66	12.1
HK$20,000 to 29,999	74	13.9	66	11.5	29	6.2	33	6.0
HK$30,000 to 39,999	37	7.0	55	9.6	9	1.9	12	2.2
HK$40,000 to 49,999	26	4.8	21	3.7	1	0.2	1	0.3
HK$50,000 or above	21	4.0	44	7.8	5	1.1	6	1.2
Total	531	100.0	570	100.0	466	100.0	548	100.0
Mean	$18,246		$19,922		$9,823		$9,943	
Standard error	$520		$549		$355		$337	
Missing	*66*		*29*		*11*		*13*	

Table 35   Marital status

	8/2007		8/2008		8/2009			
	Weighted sample		Weighted sample		Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Single	221	22.7	258	26.1	221	22.5	269	27.4
Married	704	72.2	691	69.9	690	70.1	657	66.8
Cohabited	1	0.1	1	0.1	4	0.4	4	0.4
Divorced/separated/ widowed	48	5.0	38	3.8	69	7.0	53	5.4
Total	976	100.0	988	100.0	984	100.0	983	100.0
Missing	*30*		*19*		*16*		*17*	

Appendix IV
Questionnaire

Public Survey on Hong Kong People's Giving Behavior 2009

Survey Questionnaire

13 August 2009

Part I   Self-Introduction

Hello! My name is _____. I am an interviewer at the Public Opinion Programme of the University of Hong Kong. We are conducting an opinion survey on people's giving behavior. I would like to invite you to participate in an interview which will take only a few minutes. Please rest assured that your telephone number was randomly selected by our computer and all information you provide will be kept strictly confidential and used for aggregate analysis only. Is it okay for us to start this survey?

Yes
No   ➔ skip to end

[S1]   Is your phone number xxxx xxxx?

Yes
No   ➔ skip to end

[S2]   Which district do you live in?

Wan Chai	Tai Po	Islands
Eastern	Kwun Tong	Tsuen Wan
Central Western	Kowloon City	Kwai Tsing
Southern	Wong Tai Sin	Tuen Mun
Sai Kung	Mong Kok	Yuen Long
Sha Tin	Sham Shui Po	Refuse to answer
Northern	Yau Ma Tei & Tsim Sha Tsui	

[S3]   How many people live in your house? (input exact number)

_____
Refuse to answer

Part II   Selection of Respondents

[S4]   Is there any household member aged 24 or above? Since we need to conduct random sampling, if there is more than one available, I would like to speak to the one who will have his / her birthday next. (Interviewer can give example: "Is there anyone here who will have his/her birthday in August or the coming three months?") [If no one in the household belongs to this age group, interview ends, thank you for your cooperation, bye-bye.]

Yes
No   ➔ skip to end

Part III   Survey Questions

1. In the past 12 months, have you ever made any donation to charities? Please include any means or channels, but do not include religious donations, such as making religious offerings like contributing oil and incense money, performing ritual for blessings and performing religious ceremonies.

Yes
No   ➔ Skip to Q7

2. Through what means or channels do you usually make such donations? [Do not read out answers. Maximum 3 options allowed. Probe for additional responses.]

Flag-selling	Buying raffle/ movie/ ball tickets for fund-raising	Charitable sales
Donation boxes in shopping malls/ on the street	TV/radio fund-raising programmes/special feature programmes/advertisements (donations with no rebate)	Leaflets mailed by charities
Regular auto-payment (e.g. child sponsorship)	Through insurance policy	Heritage
Online donation	On special occasions (e.g. birthday, anniversary, graduation, birth of child)	Direct offerings made to charities without recruitment from anyone or any functions
Fund-raising walks/ marathon/competitions/ fasting events	Donation through banks (transferred payments)	Fund-raising activities at schools
Group donation through work organization	Donation directly deducted from salary	Donation to charity via church
Donation via cheque		

Others (please specify)_____
Don't know/forgotten
Refuse to answer

3. Which target groups or charitable projects are these donations for? [Do not read out answer, multiple answers allowed, probe for more answers. Interviewers should remind respondents to avoid answering an organization's name; If the answer is donation for disasters, material donations for disaster relief etc., probe "in which year of the disaster relief work did you donate for?]

Children
Teenagers
Women
Elderly
Handicapped (e.g. mentally handicapped or disabled)
People going through rehabilitation (e.g. offenders going through rehabilitation, past drug addicts or patients recovering from mental diseases)
Family and society (e.g. newly arrived immigrants, ethnical minorities, victims of family violence etc.)
Education

Health and medical services
Environmental protection
Culture and arts
Sports
Tackling poverty
Human rights
Relief and rebuild work for 2008 Sichuan earthquake (e.g. donation to disaster relief, donation of materials)
Relief and rebuild work for 2008 Mainland snowstorm (e.g. donation to disaster relief, donation of materials)
Relief and rebuild work for 2008 Myanmar typhoon (e.g. donation to disaster relief, donation of materials)
Relief and rebuild work for other regions (e.g. donation to disaster relief, donation of materials)
Social development project in Mainland China (e.g. improving infrastructure and facilities for livelihood, providing education etc., but not including disaster relief and rebuild work)
Animal protection
Relief and rebuild work for 2009 Taiwan typhoon (e.g. donation to disaster relief, donation of materials)
Other projects (please specify)_____
Don't know/hard to say/does not matter
Refuse to answer

4.   In the past year, how much approximately did you donate to charity?

HK$_____[input exact number]
Don't know/hard to say/forgotten
Refuse to answer

5.   Please use a scale of 0 to 10 to rate how important the following 6 factors are when you decide which charity to donate. Among which, 0 means totally unimportant, 5 being half-half, 10 being very important. How important do you think is [Read out one by one, order randomized by computer] for your decision?

i.   Good reputation of charity
ii.   High transparency of charity
iii.   Charitable projects can relieve urgent needs in current society
iv.   Calls from public figures or friends
v.   Convenience of donation methods
vi.   Reasonable administration fees

_____ [input exact number]
Don't know/hard to say
Refuse to answer

6.   Which of the following situations will make you consider donating again to the same charity? [Read out 6 answers, order randomized by computer, multiple answers allowed, probe for more answers, then all answers skip to Q9]

Receive/meet a repeated call from the charity
Know that the donations are properly used
Know about the situation of the beneficiaries
Know about the work progress of the charitable project
More convenient donation methods are available
Reasonable administration fees
Others (please specify)_____

No special reasons/just want to continue the support
Don't know/hard to say
Refuse to answer

7. [Only ask those who answered "no donation" in Q1] Based on what reasons did you make <u>no</u> <u>donations</u> to charity in the past 12 months? [Do not read out answer, multiple answers allowed, probe for more answers]

Not interested
Did not receive/meet calls from charity
No ability
Too many charities, don't know about their work
Don't know if donations are properly used
Unreasonable administration fee
Charity work is not largely related to me
Charity work should be government's responsibility
Charity work does not have actual effects
Inconvenient donation methods
Work too busy/no time
Do not trust charity
No donation habits
Others   please specify   _____
No reason
Don't know/forgotten
Refuse to answer

8. Please use a scale of 0 to 10 to rate how important are the following 8 factors in deciding which charity to donate to in future. Among which, 0 means totally unimportant, 5 being half-half, 10 being very important. How important do you think is [Read out one by one, order randomized by computer] for your decision?

i.   Receiving charity's call
ii.   Understanding the work of the charity
iii. Good reputation of charity
iv.   High transparency of charity
vii. Charitable projects can relieve urgent needs in current society
v.   Calls from public figures or friends
vi.   Convenience of donation methods
vii. Reasonable administration fees

_____[input exact number]
Don't know/hard to say
Refuse to answer

9. [Ask all respondents] When you hear about "good reputation of charity", which of the following do you think is its meaning? [Read out the 4 answers, order randomized by computer, multiple answers allowed, probe for more answers.]

Long history of organization
Good service quality of organization
Large structure of organization
Famous figures in society participating in administrative structure
None of the above
Others (please specify): _____

Don't know/hard to say
Refuse to answer

10.   Have you set a donation budget for the coming year?

Yes ➔ skip to DM1
No ➔ ask Q11
Refuse to answer ➔ skip to DM1

11.   [Only ask those who answered "no" in Q10] Why not? [Do not read out answers, multiple answers allowed, probe more answers]

Only occasionally donate when I see the need; do not have a specific charitable project/group for
   long-term support
Charity does not have supporting proposals to help me set my donation budget
Unstable income/no income/no ability to make donation
No time
Have not thought about it/not interested
No need
Others (please specify) _____
No reason
Don't know/hard to say
Refuse to answer

Part IV   Personal Information

I'd like to know some of your personal particulars in order to facilitate our analysis.

[DM1]   Gender

Male
Female

[DM2]   Age   (input exact number)

[199 = refuse to answer]

[DM3]   Education level

Primary or below
Secondary
Matriculated
Tertiary , non-degree holder
Tertiary , degree holder
Postgraduate or above
Refuse to answer

[DM4]   Occupation

Manager and executive
Professional
Technical / Associate professional
Clerk
Service industry and retail sales
Skilled agricultural & fishery worker
Craft & related staff
Plant & machine operator / assembler
Unskilled blue collar
Students   [Skip to DM6]
Housewives   [Skip to DM6]
Unclassified
Others (including unemployed, retired or other non-working) [Skip to DM6]
Refuse to answer

[DM5]   Personal monthly income [including bonus, but excluding government subsidies, money given
          by family members, interests, etc.]

HK$5,000 or below
HK$5,000 to 9,999
HK$10,000 to 19,999
HK$20,000 to 29,999
HK$30,000 to 39,999
HK$40,000 to 49,999
HK$50,000 or above
Refuse to answer

[DM6]   Marital status

Single
Married
Cohabited
Divorced/separated/widowed
Refuse to answer

Thank you for accepting the interview. If you have any doubts about the interview, you can call our hotline XXXX-XXXX to contact our supervisor to verify the interview and my identity. Bye bye!

***** **End of survey** *****