

**香港民意研究所**  
**公眾對災難風險及防災的認知及意見調查 2018 – 2020**  
**報告摘要 (2021 年 7 月)**

香港賽馬會災難防護應變教研中心(教研中心)委託香港民意研究所於 2018 至 2020 年進行了三次《公眾對災難風險及防災的認知及意見調查》，目的在於探討市民在不同時期下對不同災難及防災措施的認知和看法。本摘要總結了我們在綜合報告全文中羅列的重要結果，而該報告透過將三次調查的若干類似題目結果並列，並進行群組深入分析，以方便讀者了解香港市民對於相關議題在不同時期的看法。

調查由真實訪問員在監督下進行隨機抽樣電話訪問，並分別於 2018 年 10 月 2 至 4 日、2019 年 6 月 17 至 28 日及 2020 年 1 月 14 至 17 日進行，每次訪問過千名 18 歲或以上操粵語的香港居民，然後將數據按照政府統計處提供的統計數字以「反覆多重加權法」作出調整，以吻合全港人口性別、年齡、教育程度及經濟活動身分統計數字。

三次調查的方向稍有不同：2018 年的調查針對颱風山竹襲港，2019 年則擴闊至一般災難，而 2020 年則集中在調查前一年內發生過的天災及人禍。2019 年的調查結果顯示，在 12 項問卷預設的災難選項當中，颱風、傳染病及火災三者為最多被訪者認為會在香港發生的災難，並影響到自己或家人。及至 2020 年，市民普遍認為一年內最令人留下深刻印象並最為擔心的三個災難為香港反修例運動相關事件、澳洲山火及武漢肺炎(後稱新型肺炎或新冠肺炎)，颱風則只有少數受訪者提及，可見結果受到社會事件和季節影響，市民對不同災難的關注度在一年之間轉變頗大。

正因如此，市民所採取的防災準備亦有所變化。針對颱風，他們的準備大多屬於短期的預防措施，如在窗門貼上膠紙，另有少部分則為長期措施，如準備糧食、食水等物資。針對傳染病，應對方法則主要是保持個人衛生、加強防疫措施、減少外出或減少到人多地方等，屬於防疫意識提高後的短期措施。至於反修例運動相關事件，市民的準備則為移民及經濟準備，如調走資產等多屬於長期的預防措施。值得注意的是，有不少市民表示並沒有為颱風或各種災難作出任何準備。

防災資訊來源方面，不論是在 2018 年問及的颱風準備或是 2019 年問及的一般防災準備，報紙、新聞或其他媒體皆是最多人提及的資訊來源。如果相關災難是指颱風，2018 年調查中有多達六成半被訪者沒有嘗試獲取防災資訊，只會依靠過往經驗、常識或純粹估計作

防災準備，或根本未能回答問題。如果是一般防災準備資訊，2019 調查中，除了傳統媒體外，表示會參考網上資訊的受訪者亦有約三成。此外，2019 的調查發現，當中有近七成被訪者認為自己對颱風應變已有足夠知識，可以推測市民對颱風的了解程度會導致他們改變對防風災資訊的需求度及其獲取防風災資訊的行為。

2018 年調查問到如果颱風山竹吹襲時導致家中停水、停電或玻璃爆裂，被訪者是否有足夠準備應付。結果顯示，較多人認為自己準備不足夠。應變意識方面，被訪者的自我評價則偏向正面。2019 年調查就問到被訪者對外遊有機會遇到的災難準備是否足夠，結果反映市民認為自己的準備似乎相當不足。當被問到為自己或家人做更多防災準備的意欲，2020 年調查的結果顯示近六成人表示有此意欲，另有兩成半表示沒有意欲，近一成半表示不知道或難以判斷。

綜合上述結果，市民對不同災難的關注度明顯隨著時事和季節改變，而部份市民心存僥倖，沒有意欲了解正確應對災難的方法。相關團體應考慮加強向市民進行防災教育，而教育上除了知識技巧的灌輸，亦需要著重改變市民的心態，培養出對不同類型災難的預防及保護意識。

**Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute**  
**Opinion Surveys on Public Awareness of Disaster Risk and Preparedness 2018 - 2020**  
**Executive Summary (July 2021)**

The Hong Kong Jockey Club Disaster Preparedness and Response Institute (HKJCDPRI) commissioned Hong Kong Public Opinion Research Institute (HKPORI) to conduct three surveys during 2018-2020 on “Public Awareness of Disaster Risk and Disaster Preparedness”, which aimed to understand people’s views towards different disasters and preparedness at different times. This summary summarizes the key results presented in our full report which has grouped the results of similar questions from these three surveys and conducted a combined analysis for the readers to understand Hong Kong people’s views towards the related issues over time.

These were random telephone surveys conducted by telephone interviewers under close supervision during the period of **2 to 4 October 2018**, **17 to 28 June 2019** and **14 to 17 January 2020** respectively. **Over a thousand Cantonese-speaking residents in Hong Kong of age 18 or above** were successfully interviewed in each survey. The raw data collected have been rim-weighted according to figures provided by the Census and Statistics Department so that the demographic profile of the sample in terms of age, gender, education and economic activity status would match with those of the general population.

The core focus of the three surveys was slightly different: the 2018 survey focused on issues related to Typhoon Mangkhut in Hong Kong, the 2019 survey expanded the scope to general disasters whereas the 2020 survey concentrated on disasters, natural and man-made, occurred within the year prior to the survey. Results of the 2019 survey showed that, among the 12 prescribed choices of disasters, typhoon, infectious disease and fire were the top three named disasters that respondents thought would occur in Hong Kong and affect themselves or their families. In 2020, respondents generally named incidents related to the Anti-Extradition Bill Movement in Hong Kong, Australian Bushfire and Wuhan Pneumonia (later known as COVID-19) as their most worrying disasters with strongest impression in the past one year, while only a minority of the respondents mentioned typhoon. It indicates that people’s attention towards different disasters changed significantly within a year under the impact of current affairs and seasons.

Because of this, people’s behavior regarding disaster preparedness also changed accordingly. In regard to typhoon, people mostly adopted short-term preventive measures, such as putting sticky tape on windows and doors, while some adopted long-term measures such as stocking up food and drinking water. For infectious disease, people mainly adopted short-term measures based on their enhanced awareness upon pandemic, such as maintaining personal hygiene, strengthening

epidemic prevention measures, staying home or avoiding crowded places, and so on. Regarding the incidents related to Anti-Extradition Bill Movement, people adopted long-term measures such as migration and financial management like moving their assets outside Hong Kong. It is worth noting that quite some respondents admitted they did not prepare for typhoon and other disasters at all.

Regarding the information sources for disaster preparedness, newspaper, news and other media were the most commonly mentioned sources identified in both the 2018 survey concerning typhoon preparation and the 2019 survey concerning general disasters. In regard to typhoon, as many as 65% of the respondents of the 2018 survey did not attempt to obtain any information for disaster preparedness but only relied on past experience, general knowledge or making guesses, while some of them could not even answer the question. On information for general disaster preparedness, the 2019 survey showed that, besides traditional media, around 30% people would also make reference from online sources. When looked further into the 2019 survey, nearly 70% of the respondents believed they had adequate knowledge in dealing with typhoons. It can be assumed that people's knowledge of typhoons will cause them to change their perceived need to seeking preparedness information for typhoons and that of their information seeking behavior for typhoons.

In the 2018 survey, the respondents were asked whether they were well-prepared for any water outage, power outage or glass breaking which was caused by Typhoon Mangkhut, and the result showed that more respondents self-perceived themselves not well-prepared. In terms of sense of preparedness, the respondents inclined to rate themselves positively. In the 2019 survey, respondents were asked about their perceptions towards preparedness for disasters that might happen during travelling, and the result indicated that their perceived preparation seemed to be rather inadequate. In the 2020 survey, respondents were asked about their intention in enhancing disaster preparedness for themselves or their families, nearly 60% of the respondents gave a positive response while 25% indicated they had no intention and 13% indicated don't know or hard to tell.

**Overall, people's attention over different disasters apparently would change along with the current affairs and seasons.** Some people have no intention of understanding the appropriate disaster-preparedness measures but only hoping for a fluke. Relevant organizations should consider strengthening public education on disaster preparedness and response, while **the education should not only focus on transferring knowledge and techniques, but also place more emphasis on changing people's mindset with the aim to cultivate a good sense of preparedness to different types of disasters.**