

# THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG PUBLIC OPINION PROGRAMME

---

## Independent Police Complaints Council Public Opinion Survey

---



### Final Report

Jointly compiled by  
CHUNG Ting-Yiu Robert, PANG Ka-Lai Karie,  
LEE Wing-Yi Winnie and TSE Hiu-Yan Cynthia

30 September 2013

*Copyright of this report is held jointly by Independent Police Complaints Council and the Public Opinion Programme (POP) at the University of Hong Kong. Everything in this publication is the work of individual researchers, and does not represent the stand of the University of Hong Kong. Dr Robert Chung is fully responsible for the work of the POP.*

## Contents

---

### *Survey Report*

I.	Preamble	2
II.	Research Design	3
III.	Research Findings	5
	A. Awareness of IPCC	5
	B. Awareness of news on complaints against the Hong Kong Police Force	6
	C. Image and confidence in IPCC	7
	D. Overall perception of IPCC	9
IV.	Conclusion	11

### *Appendices*

1.	Calculation of Response Rate and Detailed Breakdown of Contact Information
2.	Frequency Tables
3.	Demographics of the Respondents
4.	In-depth Analysis: Cross-tabulations
5.	Questionnaire (Bilingual)

## *I. Preamble*

- 1.1 The Public Opinion Programme (POP) was established in June 1991 to collect and study public opinion on topics which could be of interest to academics, journalists, policy-makers, and the general public. POP was at first under the Social Sciences Research Centre, a unit under the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Hong Kong, it was transferred to the Journalism and Media Studies Centre in the University of Hong Kong in May 2000. In January 2002, it was transferred back to the Faculty of Social Sciences in the University of Hong Kong. Since its establishment, POP has been providing quality survey services to a wide range of public and private organizations, on condition that they allow the POP Team to design and conduct the research independently, and to bear the final responsibilities. POP also insists that the data collected should be open for public consumption in the long run.
- 1.2 In December 2012, Independent Police Complaints Council (IPCC) commissioned POP to conduct a public opinion poll entitled “Independent Police Complaints Council Public Opinion Survey”. The objectives of the survey were to investigate the public knowledge and perception of IPCC after the incorporation, to understand the expectation of the public towards IPCC so as to shape a better IPCC, as well as to identify the direction of IPCC’s publicity initiatives in future.
- 1.3 The research instrument used in this study was designed entirely by the POP Team after consulting IPCC and making reference to some questionnaires previously used by IPCC for tracking their image attributes. Fieldwork operations and data analysis were also conducted independently by the POP Team, without interference from any outside party. In other words, POP was given full autonomy to design and conduct the survey, and POP would take full responsibility for all the findings reported herewith.

## II. Research Design

- 2.1 This was a random telephone survey conducted by interviewers under close supervision. 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 by computer, 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.
- 2.2 The target population of this survey was **Hong Kong residents aged 18 or above who spoke Cantonese**. When telephone contact was successfully established with a target household, one person of age 18 or above who spoke Cantonese was selected. If more than one subject had been available, selection was made using the “next birthday rule” which selected the person who had his/her birthday next.
- 2.3 Telephone interviews were conducted during the period of **5 to 12 March, 2013**. A total of **1,009 Hong Kong residents** of age 18 or above were successfully interviewed. As shown from the calculation in Appendix 1, the overall response rate of this survey was **68.4%** (Table 1), and the standard sampling error for percentages based on this sample was less than 1.6 percentage points. In other words, the sampling error for all percentages using the total sample was less than plus/minus 3.1 percentage points at 95% confidence level.
- 2.4 As shown in Table 2 of Appendix 1, among the 18,964 telephone numbers sampled for the survey, 9,162 were confirmed to be ineligible, among them 1,029 were fax or data lines, 6,814 were invalid telephone numbers, 266 were call-forwarding numbers, while another 952 were non-residential numbers. Besides, 74 of them were invalidated due to special technological reasons, while 27 cases were voided because target respondents were unavailable at the numbers provided.
- 2.5 Meanwhile, a total of 5,344 telephone numbers were invalidated before the research team could confirm their eligibility. Among them, 408 were busy lines and 3,626 were no-answer calls after making a maximum of 5 times’ recalls. 376 cases were diverted to answering devices while another 33 were blocked. Moreover, 496 cases were treated as unsuccessful because of language problems, while 398 interviews were terminated before the screening question and 7 cases were voided for other problems.

- 2.6 On the other hand, 3,449 cases failed to complete the interview. Among them 33 rejected the interview immediately after their eligibility was confirmed, 3,360 were unfinished cases with appointment dates beyond the end of fieldwork period. Besides, 34 cases were incomplete due to unexpected termination of interviews, 20 were classified as miscellaneous due to other non-contact problems, and the remaining 1,009 were successful cases (Table 2).
- 2.7 To ensure representativeness of the findings, the raw data collected have been weighted according to provisional figures obtained from the Census and Statistics Department regarding the gender-age distribution of the Hong Kong population in 2012 year-end. All figures in this report are based on the weighted sample.

### III. Research Findings

The questionnaire of this survey comprised 19 opinion questions on the respondents' awareness of IPCC, awareness of news on complaints against the Hong Kong Police Force, perceived image and confidence in IPCC, as well as their general perception on IPCC. The key findings are summarized in this section, while all frequency tables referred to in this section can be found in Appendix 2. It is noteworthy that the figures in the text are rounded up to the nearest integers after considering the second decimal place.

#### Awareness of IPCC

- 3.1 The first part of survey aimed at gauging respondent's general awareness of IPCC and its job nature. Results showed that, more than two-thirds (68%) had heard of IPCC prior to the interview, while less than one-third (31%) said they had not (Table 3).
- 3.2 The survey continued to ask those respondents who had heard of IPCC from where they had heard about it. They were first asked to name the channels they learnt about IPCC, and then they were prompted by the channels that they had not mentioned. Without prompting, television, including TV news (65%), TV interviews (3%), other TV programmes (6%) and TV series (IPCC the proper way) (3%), were mentioned by more than three quarters (77%) of respondents which was apparently the most common source of information. Followed at a large distance, newspaper, including other newspaper stories (8%), Ming Pao (The IPCC perspective) (1%) and Sharp Daily (Business of the Cops) (<1%) were mentioned by one-tenth (9%) of respondents, while radio and Internet were mentioned by 5% and 2% of respondents respectively. Less than 1% each also mentioned advertisements on public transport, annual report / brochure / website / newsletter / quarterly meeting of IPCC and magazines. Whilst after prompting, as high as 94% of respondents stated that they had heard of IPCC via television, mostly from TV news (86%), while half (50%) of respondents stated that they had heard of it from newspaper, mostly from other newspaper stories (36%). Besides, 30% of respondents recalled they had heard about IPCC on Radio and 16% learnt about it on the Internet, followed by advertisements on public transport (11%) and annual report / brochure / website / newsletter / quarterly meeting of IPCC (6%). Less than 2% each recalled seeing IPCC-related information from posters and magazines (Table 4).
- 3.3 When asked to name some IPCC's duties, just less than half of the 698 respondents (49%) who had heard of IPCC could provide at least one correct answer, among them, most could correctly point out IPCC was responsible for "monitoring CAPO's cases handling process"

(27%). “Monitoring Police’s follow-up / disciplinary actions towards officers being complained” came next and was correctly named by 14% of the sub-sample. Less than one-tenth of these respondents correctly named “identifying mal-practices in Police’s works that has led or may lead to complaints” (7%), “reviewing / verifying investigation report / results by CAPO” (5%) and “improving Police Force’s quality of service” (3%). On the other hand, as high as 38% and 16% of the sub-sample mistakenly thought that “monitoring Police’s behavior / conduct” and “investigating citizens’ complaints on Police directly” were IPCC’s duties. Meanwhile, one-tenth admitted they had no idea what IPCC’s duties were. Other less common answers are listed in Table 5 of Appendix 2.

- 3.4 As for the independence nature of IPCC, among the 698 respondents who had heard of IPCC prior to the interview, 60% were aware that IPCC was a totally independent organization and it was not under the Police. On the contrary, about one-third (35%) thought IPCC was part of the Police and 5% opted for “don’t know / hard to say” (Table 6).
- 3.5 When asked to name the most effective channel to make a complaint against members of the Police Force, “IPCC” (24%) topped the list with around a quarter of respondents mentioning it, followed by “CAPO” which was mentioned by one-fifth of respondents (20%). “Police Force” (11%) and “media” (8%) formed the next tier with around one-tenth mentioning each. Other complaint channels that came into respondents’ minds included “DC / Legco members” (3%), “office of the Ombudsman, HK” (2%), “ICAC” (1%), “internet” (1%) and “Equal Opportunities Commission” (<1%). While another 1% believed that no channel was most effective in making a complaint against the Police Force, more than a quarter of respondents admitted they did not know (27%; Table 7).

#### Awareness of news on complaints against the Hong Kong Police Force

- 3.6 The second part of the survey focused on citizen’s awareness of news related to complaints against the Hong Kong Police Force. Results revealed that a total of 74% of respondents had heard about news on such complaints in the year prior to the interview. News on “protestors complained about police’s abuse of power” received the most public attention, with over one-third (34%) of respondents naming it without any aid. Followed at a distance, one-tenth (10%) of respondents reported that they had heard about news on “HKU 8.18 dispute / Li Keqiang visited HK / dark shadow incident”, while 5% had heard about news on “Police’s misconduct” and 3% had heard about news on “rape case in Police station”. Other less commonly cited news included “media coverage arrangement by Police”, “complaints about Police’s abuse of power”, “Police’s law enforcement of the traffic regulation” and “stop and search issue / searching”, each of these were mentioned by 2% of the sample. However, one-fifth (20%) of respondents could not specify the news they had heard of, while another one-fifth (21%) claimed that they had not heard any news about this at all in the past year (Table 8).

- 3.7 The survey carried on to probe if respondents were aware of the outcomes of those complaints they had just mentioned. Of the 342 respondents who had heard of “protestors complained about Police's abuse of power”, nearly half said they had followed up on the outcomes (49%), with 44% said “yes” and 5% said “sometimes”, while another 41% said they were not aware of the results. As for the 100 respondents who had heard of “HKU 8.18 dispute / Li Keqiang visited HK / Dark shadow incident”, over 60% of them were aware of the result, with 59% said “yes” and 2% said “sometimes”, whereas 38% said they did not follow. Respondents’ awareness of the results of other less frequently mentioned news is listed in Table 9 of Appendix 2.
- 3.8 Similar to the findings on Hong Kong citizens’ most concerned news on complaints, “police officers’ abuse of power” (32%) ranked first when respondents were asked to pick one type of complaint that they would care about most, with one third of sample mentioning it. About one-seventh of respondents each said they cared about complaints on “Police handling public demonstration” (14%) and “corruption of police officers” (13%) most. Less than one-tenth each admitted their largest concerns were on “unfairness of police officers in handling cases” (8%), “police officers’ use of violence” (7%) and “working attitude of police officers” (6%), whereas 3% each opted for complaints on “media coverage arrangement” and “press releases arrangement”. Small proportions stated that they cared about complaints on “stop and search issue / searching” (2%), “officers’ law enforcement of traffic regulation” (2%) and “investigation method of police officers” most (1%; Table 10).

### Image and confidence in IPCC

- 3.9 A series of questions were asked to gauge the perceived image of IPCC in the eyes of public. As shown from the survey findings, more than half of the sample (53%) evaluated IPCC’s independence in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police positively, with 35% considering IPCC “independent” and 19% thought it was “quite independent”. About one-fifth (19%) opted for the middle ground “half-half”, while another one-fifth (19%) evaluated IPCC negatively, with 13% opting for “not quite independent” and 6% even thought it was “not independent at all”. Besides, about one-tenth of respondents (9%) answered “don’t know / hard to say” (Table 11).
- 3.10 When it comes to IPCC’s work on monitoring and reviewing CAPO’s investigation, less than half (46%) believed that IPCC was able to do so in an impartial and objective way, among which 25% considered it “impartial and objective” and 21% thought it was “quite impartial and objective”. Conversely, 13% believed it was not impartial and objective, of which 8% said “not quite impartial and objective” and 4% said “not impartial and objective



- at all”, whereas 28% evaluated its impartiality and objectivity as half-half. At the same time, more than one-eighth (13%) of respondents did not know or found it hard to say (Table 12).
- 3.11 With regards to IPCC’s efficiency in monitoring and reviewing complaints, more than one-third (35%) of respondents thought its performance was mediocre and chose half-half, while a quarter (25%) generally thought it was efficient and more than one-eighth (13%) thought the opposite. Among those who thought it was generally efficient, 11% answered “efficient” and 14% answered “quite efficient” after probing. For those who thought it was generally not efficient, 9% said it was “not quite efficient” and 4% said it was “not efficient at all”. Meanwhile, a notable amount of respondents (27%) had no idea on IPCC’s efficiency (Table 13).
- 3.12 As for IPCC’s level of transparency in complaint monitor and review, nearly two-fifths of respondents (39%) assessed it as “half-half”. Around a quarter of the sample (24%) thought IPCC’s work was of low transparency, with 13% and 11% opting for “quite low” and “low” respectively. On the contrary, over one-fifth (21%) positively appraised IPCC’s transparency, of which 13% said it was “quite high” and 8% said it was “high”. Meanwhile, 15% could not give a definite answer to this question (Table 14).
- 3.13 Overall speaking, 43% of citizens interviewed expressed confidence in IPCC, of which over 30% were “quite confident” (31%) and over 10% were “very confident” (11%). Confidence in IPCC of another 32% of respondents was just moderate who chose half-half. On the other hand, a total of 19% said that they were not confident in IPCC, of which 14% said they were “not quite confident” and 5% said they were “not confident at all”. The most commonly cited reason for no confidence in IPCC was “it’s like self-investigation” (27%). “The process and results of complaints are not released to public” (17%), “may take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases” (16%), “not clear about IPCC’s works” (12%) and “committees are appointed, not elected by citizens” (11%) formed the next tier with percentages ranging from 11% to 17%. Another 8%, 7% and 7% mentioned “both are under the Government”, “no direct investigation, monitor only, no actual authority” and “may cover up the truth to avoid unfavorable impact on Police’s image” respectively. Moreover, 5% said they were not confident in IPCC because they “didn’t think IPCC investigate or monitor complaints in citizen’s perspective”, while 4% believed that IPCC was “only responsible for monitoring and review, didn’t investigate directly” and 3% “didn’t like the image of IPCC”. Other less frequently cited reasons included “not confident in the Government, so not confident in IPCC” and “Police officers could be appointed as committee members”, with 2% each of respondents mentioning them (Tables 15 & 16).

3.14 Regarding the existing complaint system, nearly 45% of respondents (44%) were confident in the two-tier system of complaints against the Police Force, among which 32% were “quite confident” and 12% were “very confident”. Almost 30% opted for “half-half” (28%), while 13% said they were “not quite confident” and 6% said they were “not confident at all”, resulting in a total of 18% of negative appraisal of the two-tier system. Among these 185 respondents who lacked confidence in the system, more than one-third of them suggested IPCC to “increase transparency” (35%) by all means in future, while about a quarter suggested to “involve individuals from different classes in the process” (23%). Followed at a distance, around one-tenth each proposed that “IPCC should become an independent department” (10%) and “IPCC should have authorization to investigate” (9%), while another 7% and 6% believed that IPCC should have “more promotion” and “simplify the monitor and review procedures” respectively. A small amount of the sub-sample also suggested that “IPCC should have authorization to decide punitive sanctions on police officers who violated regulations” (4%), “shorten the time for investigation and review” (3%) and “IPCC should have authorization to investigate serious cases” (1%). What’s more, 2% of the sub-sample said there was nothing needed to be improved, while as high as 17% had no idea how IPCC could further improve (Tables 17 & 18).

#### Overall perception on IPCC

3.15 The last part of the survey aimed at investigating citizen’s overall perception on IPCC. Results revealed that almost 60% of respondents perceived IPCC’s image positively (57%), of which more than one-third thought it was “positive” (35%) and close to a quarter thought it was “quite positive” (23%). Another one-third (32%) evaluated IPCC’s image as half positive and half negative. At the same time, a very small proportion (4%) perceived IPCC’s image negatively, of which 2% each graded it as “quite negative” and “negative”. 6% could not give a definite answer on this (Table 19).

3.16 Why the 579 respondents perceived IPCC’s image positively? Results showed that the most popular reason was that they believed “IPCC was independent enough” (25%), followed by “IPCC’s structure gave people confidence” (17%) and “IPCC was fair enough” (17%). “IPCC members had sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review”, “IPCC provided a helpful monitoring system/mechanism” and “IPCC had high transparency” came next with corresponding percentages of 14%, 12% and 10%. Other reasons being cited included “IPCC had sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties” (6%), “IPCC’s image/name was positive” (5%), “IPCC had high efficiency” (4%) and “IPCC was appointed by the Government” (1%). At the same time, one-tenth of the sub-sample could not provide any reason for their positive perception of IPCC (12%; Table 20).

- 3.17 Survey results also revealed that among the 43 respondents who perceived IPCC's image negatively, 45% thought so because they shared the view that "IPCC had low transparency". More than one-third admitted that they "didn't trust IPCC's independence" (35%), whereas about one-seventh believed that "IPCC didn't have sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties" (14%). Meanwhile, 8% opted for the reason "IPCC might take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases", and 6% each believed that "IPCC had low efficiency" and "didn't think IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review". Another 8% did not give an answer (Table 21).
- 3.18 The survey ended by asking all respondents their expectations on IPCC. About one-fifth expressed high hopes on IPCC's effective monitoring of the Hong Kong Police Force (19%), closely followed by 17% who "hoped IPCC would handle cases in a fair, impartial and transparent manner", while over one-tenth "hoped IPCC would improve its transparency" (11%). Percentages of those who hoped IPCC could "explain more to citizens the work / complaints system of HK Police Force" (8%), "improve Police-community relation / enhance its communication" (7%), "provide a channel for complaints against police" (7%), "ensure citizens will get appropriate Police services" (6%) and "pressure HK Police Force effectively in order to improve their works" (6%) ranged from 6% to 8%. Moreover, some respondents hoped that IPCC "could become an independent organization / handle cases independently" (4%) and "would keep up with its good work" (4%), "could let different people to participate" (1%), "would have the right to investigate complaints"(1%) and "could increase the efficiency"(1%). Finally, 5% said they had no expectations on IPCC, while 17% did not have any idea (Table 22).

## IV. Conclusion

- 4.1 Nearly 70% of the Hong Kong citizens interviewed in this survey had heard of IPCC, the majority of them reportedly learnt about it from television. Close to half of these respondents could name at least one IPCC duties correctly, where “monitoring CAPO’s cases handling process” was the most visible IPCC function to the public. However, almost 40% have mistaken “monitoring Police’s behavior/conduct” as one of IPCC’s official duties. Moreover, 60% of these respondents were aware that IPCC was a totally independent organization, yet more than one-third still had confusion and thought it was part of the Police Force.
- 4.2 Three quarters of the sample said they had heard of news related to complaints against the Police in the year past. Alleged cases about Police’s abuse of power against protestors received most public attention, and was also the type of cases people most concerned with. The changing socio-political environment has apparently posted new challenges to both the Police Force and IPCC.
- 4.3 On the image profile of IPCC, about half of the respondents agreed IPCC was independent when it executed its duty of monitoring and reviewing public complaints against the Police. A similar proportion of people considered IPCC had carried out its work in an impartial and objective way. However, their assessment of its efficiency and level of transparency was only “mediocre” and less positive. Overall speaking, more than 40% were confident in IPCC while one-fifth of them were not, mainly because of their impression of “self-investigation”.
- 4.4 As for people’s confidence in the existing two-tier police complaints system, the positive group out-numbered the negative group by a large margin of 26 percentage points, and the most popular suggestion offered by the non-confident group was to increase IPCC’s transparency.
- 4.5 All in all, more than half of the respondents appraised IPCC’s corporate image positively, citing its independent structure, fairness, and members’ professional knowledge. For the very few who perceived IPCC’s image negatively, the reasons cited included “low transparency”, “no trust in IPCC’s independence” and “insufficient authorization”.
- 4.6 In terms of future expectations of IPCC, most respondents hoped that IPCC “could monitor the Police’s work effectively” and also “could handle cases in a fair, impartial and transparent manner”.

# **Appendix 1**

## **Contact Information**

**Table 1 Calculation of Overall response rate**

Response rate
= $\frac{\text{Successful cases}}{\text{Successful cases} + \text{Incomplete cases}^{\wedge} + \text{Refusal cases by eligible respondents}^*}$
= $\frac{1,009}{1,009 + (398 + 34) + (33 + 2)}$
= 68.4%

<sup>^</sup> Including “partial interview” and “Interview terminated before the screening question”

\* Including “household-level refusal” and “known respondent refusal”

**Table 2 Breakdown of contact information of the survey**

	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Respondents' ineligibility confirmed</b>	<b>9,162</b>	<b>48.3%</b>
<i>Fax / data line</i>	1,029	5.4%
<i>Invalid number</i>	6,814	35.9%
<i>Call-forwarding / mobile / pager number</i>	266	1.4%
<i>Non-residential number</i>	952	5.0%
<i>Special technological difficulties</i>	74	0.4%
<i>No eligible respondents</i>	27	0.1%
<b>Respondents' ineligibility not confirmed</b>	<b>5,344</b>	<b>28.2%</b>
<i>Line busy</i>	408	2.2%
<i>No answer</i>	3,626	19.1%
<i>Answering device</i>	376	2.0%
<i>Call-blocking</i>	33	0.2%
<i>Language problem</i>	496	2.6%
<i>Interview terminated before the screening question</i>	398	2.1%
<i>Others</i>	7	0.0%
<b>Respondents' eligibility confirmed, but failed to complete the interview</b>	<b>3,449</b>	<b>18.2%</b>
<i>Household-level refusal</i>	2	0.0%
<i>Known respondent refusal</i>	33	0.2%
<i>Appointment date beyond the end of the fieldwork period</i>	3,360	17.7%
<i>Partial interview</i>	34	0.2%
<i>Miscellaneous</i>	20	0.1%
<b>Successful cases</b>	<b>1,009</b>	<b>5.3%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>18,964</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

## **Appendix 2**

# **Frequency Tables**

**Awareness of IPCC**

Table 3 [Q1] Prior to this survey, have you heard of Independent Police Complaints Council, or IPCC?

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,009)
Yes	689	68.3%
No	311	30.8%
Don't know / hard to say	8	0.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,009</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Table 4 [Q2a] (Only ask those answered “yes” or “DK/HS” in Q1, base=698) From where have you heard of IPCC? Any other channels? [Do not read out answers, multiple choices allowed]  
 [Q2b] (Only ask those answered “yes” or “DK/HS” in Q1, base=698) Have you ever heard of IPCC from the following channels then? [Read out those channels with \* which the respondents have not mentioned in Q2a, multiple answers allowed] (\* Channels previously adopted by IPCC)

	[Q2a] First mention		[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted)		
	Freq.	% of valid sample (Base=698)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=2,117)	% of valid sample (Base=698)
<b>*Television</b>	<b>537</b>	<b>76.9%</b>	<b>658</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>94.2%</b>
<i>News</i>	450	64.5%	601	28.4%	86.1%
<i>TV interview</i>	23	3.3%	209	9.9%	30.0%
<i>Other TV programmes</i>	43	6.2%	198	9.3%	28.3%
<i>TV series (IPCC the proper way)</i>	21	2.9%	145	6.8%	20.7%
<b>*Newspaper</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>9.1%</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>50.3%</b>
<i>Other Newspaper stories (Please see below)</i>	52	7.5%	249	11.8%	35.7%
<i>Sharp Daily (Business of the Cops)</i>	2	0.3%	92	4.4%	13.2%
<i>Ming Pao (The IPCC perspective)</i>	9	1.2%	89	4.2%	12.8%
<b>*Radio</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>5.4%</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>13.9%</b>	<b>30.4%</b>
<b>*Internet</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>7.2%</b>	<b>15.8%</b>
<b>*Advertisements on public transport</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>10.7%</b>
<i>Bus</i>	1	0.2%	42	2.0%	6.1%
<i>MTR</i>	1	0.2%	41	1.9%	5.8%
<i>Ferry/Pier</i>	--	--	11	0.5%	1.6%
<b>*Annual report / Brochure / Website / Newsletter / Quarterly meeting of IPCC</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>5.7%</b>
<i>Quarterly meeting between IPCC and CAPO</i>	1	0.1%	19	0.9%	2.7%
<i>IPCC website</i>	0	0.1%	15	0.7%	2.1%
<i>Annual report of IPCC / Brochure</i>	1	0.2%	10	0.5%	1.5%
<i>IPCC newsletter</i>	--	--	10	0.5%	1.4%
<b>*Poster (please see below)</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>1.6%</b>
<b>Magazines</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>



Others	24	3.4%	58	--	8.3%
<i>Friends / Neighbours / Relatives / Schoolmates</i>	9	1.3%	24	1.1%	3.5%
<i>Work</i>	7	0.9%	7	0.3%	0.9%
<i>Community Activities</i>	2	0.3%	4	0.2%	0.6%
<i>Talks</i>	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0.2%
<i>Others (see below)</i>	5	0.8%	8	0.4%	1.1%
Don't know / can't remember	16	2.3%	1	0.1%	0.2%
Total	698	100%	2,117	100.0%	
<u>Other newspaper that cannot be grouped</u>					
Apple Daily	16	2.2%	63	3.0%	9.1%
Oriental Daily	16	2.4%	58	2.7%	8.3%
Other interviews and coverage on newspaper (no specific newspaper)	9	1.2%	47	2.2%	6.7%
Oriental Daily, Apple Daily	3	0.5%	16	0.8%	2.3%
Sing Tao Daily	--	--	13	0.6%	1.9%
Hong Kong Headline	1	0.1%	8	0.4%	1.1%
General report by Ming Pao	2	0.2%	6	0.3%	0.9%
Other interviews and coverage on newspaper (free newspaper)	1	0.2%	5	0.2%	0.7%
Metro Daily	--	--	4	0.2%	0.6%
Hong Kong Economic Times	1	0.2%	4	0.2%	0.6%
The Sun	1	0.1%	2	0.2%	0.5%
Apple Daily, Hong Kong Headline, Metro Daily	--	--	2	0.2%	0.5%
Hong Kong Economic Journal	--	--	2	0.1%	0.4%
South China Morning Post	--	--	2	0.1%	0.3%
Sky Post, AM703	--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
South China Morning Post, Ming Pao, Hong Kong Economic Times, Apple Daily	--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
Sing Tao Daily, South China Morning Post, Hong Kong Economic Times	--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
AM730	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
Metro Daily, AM703	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
Hong Kong Headline, Apple Daily	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
The Sun, Oriental Daily	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
Oriental Daily, Sing Tao Daily	1	0.2%	1	0.1%	0.2%
Hong Kong Economic Journal, Oriental Daily, Apple Daily	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
Sky Post	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
Hong Kong Daily News	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
Sing Tao Daily, Ming Pao	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Hong Kong Headline, AM730, Sky Post	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%

Apple Daily, Hong Kong Economic Times	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%
on.cc	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Sub-total	52	7.5%	249	11.8%	35.7%
<u>Place of poster</u>					
Tai Po	--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
Tsim Sha Tsui	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
Sheung Wan	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
Government	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Don't know / hard to say / can't remember	--	--	7	0.3%	1.0%
Sub-total	--	--	11	0.5%	1.6%
<u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u>					
Movie	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
Advertisement	1	0.2%	1	0.1%	0.2%
Heard of it when it was established	1	0.2%	1	0.1%	0.2%
Have complained the police	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
1823 complaint hotline	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Trade Union	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Canada has IPCC	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Knowledge	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Sub-total	5	0.8%	8	0.4%	1.1%

Table 5 [Q3] (Only ask those answered “yes” or “DK/HS” in Q1, base=698) To your knowledge, what are IPCC’s duties? Any other duties? [Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed]

	Frequency	% of total responses (Base=887)	% of valid sample (Base=698)
IPCC duties	338	--	48.5%
<i>Monitoring CAPO’s cases handling process</i>	189	21.3%	27.1%
<i>Monitoring Police’s follow-up / disciplinary actions towards officers being complained</i>	98	11.0%	14.0%
<i>Identifying mal-practices in Police’s works that has led or may lead to complaints</i>	48	5.4%	6.9%
<i>Reviewing/verifying investigation reports/results by CAPO</i>	37	4.2%	5.4%
<i>Improving Police Force’s quality of service</i>	22	2.5%	3.1%
<i>Reviewing statistics on types of Police’s behavior that citizens complained</i>	12	1.4%	1.8%
Non-IPCC duties	369	--	52.9%
<i>Monitoring Police’s behaviour/conduct</i>	268	30.2%	38.4%
<i>Investigating citizens’ complaints on Police directly</i>	114	12.9%	16.4%
<i>Improving police-community relation / enhance communication</i>	12	1.3%	1.7%
<i>Investigating Police bribing cases</i>	8	0.9%	1.2%
<i>Other wrong answers</i>	7	0.8%	1.1%
Don’t know / can’t remember	72	8.1%	10.3%
Total	887	100.0%	
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped:</u>			
Monitor (didn’t specify what to monitor)	2	0.2%	0.3%
For citizens to complain police officers	1	0.1%	0.2%
Monitor juvenile crime	1	0.1%	0.1%
Investigate everything about police	1	0.1%	0.1%
A useless department	1	0.1%	0.1%
Telephone tapping the suspects	1	0.1%	0.1%
Monitor firemen, Immigration Department and Custom and Excise Department	1	0.1%	0.1%
Maintenance of law and order	1	0.1%	0.1%
Sub-total	7	0.8%	1.1%

Table 6 [Q4] (Only ask those answered “yes” or “DK/HS” in Q1, base=698) Do you think IPCC is...? [Read out first two options, order to be randomized by computer, only one answer is allowed]

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=698)
A totally independent organization, not under the Police	420	60.2%
Part of the Police	243	34.8%
Don't know / hard to say	35	5.0%
Total	698	100.0%

Table 7 [Q5] What do you think is the most effective channel to make a complaint of Police? [Do not read out options, one answer only]

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,008)
IPCC	244	24.2%
CAPO	198	19.6%
Police Force	108	10.7%
Media	85	8.5%
DC / LegCo members	34	3.4%
Office of the Ombudsman, HK	15	1.5%
ICAC	14	1.4%
Internet	7	0.6%
Equal Opportunities Commission	3	0.3%
No channel	10	1.0%
Others (please see below)	20	2.0%
Don't know	270	26.8%
Total	1,008	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>	<i>1</i>	
<u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u>		
Complaint hotline	5	0.5%
Police Public Relations Bureau	3	0.3%
Court	2	0.2%
Commissioner of Police	2	0.2%
Any channel will be effective	1	0.1%
National People's Congress	1	0.1%
Make complaints via the third party	1	0.1%
Independent government organization	1	0.1%
When need to complain, just ask people will do	1	0.1%
Resist with actions	1	0.1%
Demonstration	1	0.1%
Lawyer, civil association	1	0.1%
Universal suffrage	1	0.1%
Sub-total	20	2.0%

**Awareness of news on complaints against the Hong Kong Police Force**

Table 8 [Q6] In the past year, did you hear any news on complaints made to the Hong Kong Police Force? If yes, can you tell me what was it about? [Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed]

	Frequency	% of total responses (Base=1,125)	% of valid sample (Base=1,009)
Yes	749	--	74.2%
<i>Protestors complained about police's abuse of power</i>	342	30.4%	33.8%
<i>HKU 8.18 dispute / Li Keqiang visited HK / dark shadow incident</i>	100	8.9%	9.9%
<i>Police's misconduct</i>	52	4.6%	5.1%
<i>Rape case in Police station</i>	34	3.0%	3.3%
<i>Media coverage arrangement by Police</i>	22	1.9%	2.1%
<i>Complaints about Police's abuse of power</i>	21	1.9%	2.1%
<i>Police's law enforcement of the traffic regulation</i>	17	1.5%	1.7%
<i>Stop and search issue / searching</i>	16	1.4%	1.6%
<i>Sex workers complained about Police's abuse of power</i>	13	1.2%	1.3%
<i>Police bribing cases</i>	8	0.8%	0.8%
<i>Police's handling of personal information</i>	6	0.5%	0.6%
<i>Police's press release arrangement</i>	2	0.2%	0.2%
<i>Police forced a boy to pretend as a cross when investigating drugs issue</i>	2	0.1%	0.2%
<i>Mechanism of complaints against police is complicated, slow statements taking</i>	1	0.1%	0.1%
<i>Others (please see below)</i>	23	2.0%	2.3%
<i>Can't remember</i>	206	18.3%	20.4%
<i>Refuse to answer</i>	1	0.1%	0.1%
No	214	19.0%	21.2%
Don't know / hard to say	46	4.1%	4.6%
Total	1,125	100.0%	
<b><u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u></b>			
Leaders of China visited HK	5	0.5%	0.5%
Legislative councilor Leung Kwok-hung surrounded by Police	3	0.3%	0.3%
Police wire tap	3	0.2%	0.3%
National education	2	0.2%	0.2%

Hong Kong Correctional Services Department urine test	2	0.2%	0.2%
Sexual assault cases of police officers	2	0.1%	0.2%
The case of police fired a gun on the mountain	2	0.1%	0.1%
A man and a woman were stopped by a police officer due to speeding, the suspect made a complaint on the police officer	1	0.1%	0.1%
The fire in Fa Yuen Street	1	0.1%	0.1%
Police officer leased an apartment to a prostitute	1	0.1%	0.1%
Unfair	1	0.1%	0.1%
Syed Kemal Bokhar's niece complaint case	1	0.1%	0.1%
Sub-total	23	2.0%	2.3%

Table 9 [Q7] (Only ask respondents who answered "yes" in Q6) Were you aware of the results of these complaints? [Interviewer repeat the answer mentioned by the respondent in Q6, only one answer allowed]

	<b>Protestors complained about Police's abuse of power</b>		<b>HKU 8.18 dispute / Li Keqiang visited HK / Dark shadow incident</b>		<b>Police's misconduct (e.g. violence, attitude)</b>	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=342)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=100)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=52)
Yes	116	44%	44	58.7%	15	28.4%
Sometimes	44	5%	5	2.1%	3	5.2%
No	156	41%	41	37.9%	33	63.2%
Don't know / hard to say	25	10%	10	1.3%	2	3.2%
Total	342	100	100	100.0%	52	100.0%
	<b>Rape case in Police station</b>		<b>Media coverage arrangement by Police (e.g. press area, taking away the reporter who asked about June 4th)</b>		<b>Complaints about Police's abuse of power</b>	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=34)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=22)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=21)
Yes	20	58.7%	8	37.1%	7	31.2%
Sometimes	1	2.1%	2	8.5%	3	15.6%
No	13	37.9%	10	45.5%	10	47.9%
Don't know / hard to say	0	1.3%	2	9.0%	1	5.4%
Total	34	100.0%	22	100.0%	21	100.0%

	<b>Police's law enforcement on traffic regulation</b>		<b>Stop and search issues / searching</b>		<b>Sex workers complained about Police's abuse of power</b>	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=17)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=16)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=13)
Yes	5	30.1%	7	46.7%	5	35.1%
Sometimes	1	5.6%	--	--	2	11.2%
No	10	56.8%	7	45.5%	7	53.6%
Don't know / hard to say	1	7.5%	1	7.8%	--	--
Total	17	100.0%	16	100.0%	13	100.0%
	<b>Police bribing cases</b>		<b>Police's handling of personal information</b>		<b>Police's press release arrangement</b>	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=8)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=6)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=2)
Yes	2	24.0%	2	25.6%	--	--
Sometimes	1	10.7%	--	--	--	--
No	6	65.3%	3	53.7%	2	100.0%
Don't know / hard to say	--	--	1	20.7%	--	--
Total	8	100.0%	6	100.0%	2	100.0%
	<b>Police forced a boy to pretend as a cross when investigating drugs issue</b>		<b>Mechanism of complaints against Police is complicated, slow statements taking</b>		<b>Others</b>	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=2)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=23)
Yes	2	100.0%	--	--	8	33.3%
Sometimes	--	--	--	--	1	4.9%
No	--	--	1	100.0%	12	54.7%
Don't know / hard to say	--	--	--	--	2	7.0%
Total	2	100.0%	1	100.0%	23	100.0%

Table 10 [Q8] Which one of the following types of complaints of the Police Force would you care about most? [Read out options, ONE answer only]

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,008)
On police officers' abuse of power	318	<b>31.5%</b>
On Police handling public demonstration	138	13.7%
On corruption of police officers	132	13.1%
On unfairness of police officers in handling cases	84	8.3%
On police officers' use of violence	70	6.9%
On working attitude of police officers	57	5.6%
On media coverage arrangement	26	2.6%
On press releases arrangement	26	2.6%
On stop and search issue / searching	25	2.5%
On officers' law enforcement of traffic regulations	16	1.6%
On investigation method of police officers	13	1.3%
Others (please see below)	8	0.8%
Don't care about any complaints against Police Force	55	5.5%
Don't know / hard to say	40	3.9%
Total	1,008	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>	<i>1</i>	
<u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u>		
All of the above	7	0.7%
Maintenance of law and order	1	0.1%
Rape cases of Police	1	0.1%
Sub-total	8	0.8%



**Image and confidence in IPCC**

Table 11 [Q9] Do you think IPCC is independent in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police?

		Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,007)
Independent	}Independent	348	34.5%
Quite independent		188	18.7%
Half-half		190	18.8%
Not quite independent	}Not independent	131	13.0%
Not independent at all		57	5.7%
Don't know / hard to say		94	9.3%
Total		1,007	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>		2	

Table 12 [Q10] Do you think IPCC is able to monitor and review CAPO's investigation in an impartial and objective way?

		Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,007)
Impartial and objective	}Impartial and objective	249	24.7%
Quite impartial and objective		211	21.0%
Half-half		286	28.4%
Not quite impartial and objective	}Not impartial and objective	89	8.8%
Not impartial and objective at all		43	4.2%
Don't know / hard to say		129	12.8%
Total		1,007	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>		2	

Table 13 [Q11] Do you think IPCC's complaint monitor and review is efficient or not ?

		Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,009)
Efficient	}Efficient	113	11.2%
Quite efficient		144	14.3%
Half-half		349	<b>34.6%</b>
Not quite efficient	}Not efficient	87	8.7%
Not efficient at all		42	4.2%
Don't know / hard to say		274	27.1%
Total		1,009	100.0%

Table 14 [Q12] What do you think of IPCC's level of transparency in complaint monitor and review?

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,009)
High	81	8.0%
Quite high	132	13.0%
Half-half	398	<b>39.5%</b>
Quite low	131	13.0%
Low	112	11.1%
Don't know / hard to say	154	15.3%
Total	1,009	100.0%

Table 15 [Q13] Overall speaking, are you confident in IPCC?

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,009)
Very confident	116	11.5%
Quite confident	316	31.3%
Half-half	318	31.5%
Not quite confident	141	14.0%
Not confident at all	51	5.1%
Don't know / hard to say	68	6.7%
Total	1,009	100.0%

Table 16 [Q14] (Only ask respondents who have answered “Not quite confident” and “Not confident at all” in Q 13, base=192) Why do you think it is “Not quite confident”/ “Not confident at all”? Any more? [Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed]

	Frequency	% of total responses (Base=248)	% of valid sample (Base=192)
It's like self-investigation	51	20.8%	26.9%
The process and results of complaints are not released to public	33	13.1%	17.0%
May take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases	30	12.0%	15.5%
Not clear about IPCC's works	24	9.6%	12.4%
Committees are appointed, not elected by citizens	21	8.3%	10.7%
Both are under the Government	16	6.3%	8.1%
No direct investigation, monitor only, no actual authority	14	5.7%	7.4%
May cover up the truth to avoid unfavorable impact on Police's image	13	5.3%	6.8%
Don't think IPCC investigate or monitor complaints in citizen's perspective	9	3.8%	4.9%
Only responsible for monitoring and review, didn't investigate directly	8	3.1%	4.0%
Don't like the image of IPCC	7	2.6%	3.4%
Not confident in the Government, so not confident in IPCC	4	1.6%	2.1%
Police officers could be appointed as committee member	4	1.5%	1.9%
Others (please see below)	6	2.6%	3.4%
Don't know / hard to say	9	3.6%	4.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped:</u>			
Radical views	2	0.7%	0.9%
Affected by Mainland	1	0.5%	0.6%
The way they handle is inappropriate	1	0.5%	0.6%
IPCC staff lose contact with the society	1	0.5%	0.6%
The investigation result has to be released after Leung Chun-ying's decision	1	0.5%	0.7%
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2.6%</b>	<b>3.4%</b>

Table 17 [Q15] Are you confident in the existing two-tier system of complaints against the Police?

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,009)
Very confident	121	12.0%
Quite confident	326	32.3%
Half-half	285	28.2%
Not quite confident	126	12.5%
Not confident at all	58	5.8%
Don't know / hard to say	94	9.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,009</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Table 18 [Q16] (Only ask respondents who have answered "Not quite confident" and "Not confident at all" in Q15, base=185) How do you think IPCC could improve this two-tier complaints system? [Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed]

	Frequency	% of total responses (Base=228)	% of valid sample (Base=185)
Increase transparency	65	28.5%	<b>35.2%</b>
Involve individuals from different classes in the process	42	18.4%	22.8%
IPCC should become an independent department	18	7.8%	9.7%
IPCC should have authorization to investigate	17	7.6%	9.4%
More promotion	13	5.6%	6.9%
Simplify the monitor and review procedures	12	5.2%	6.5%
IPCC should have authorization to decide punitive sanctions on police officers who violated regulations	7	3.2%	4.0%
Shorten the time for investigation and review	6	2.8%	3.4%
IPCC should have authorization to investigate serious cases	2	0.8%	1.0%
Others (please see below)	11	4.9%	6.1%
No area needs to be improved	4	1.8%	2.2%
Don't know / hard to say	30	13.3%	16.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
<b>Other response that cannot be grouped:</b>			
There is no way to improve	2	0.9%	1.1%
Have to be objective while handling cases	2	0.7%	0.9%
Report to the CE directly	2	0.7%	0.8%
Upload reports of demonstration and abuse of power to the website	2	0.7%	0.8%
Both organization will investigate, and then compare their reports	1	0.5%	0.6%
Have to follow the cases at work	1	0.4%	0.5%
Improve police officers' attitude	1	0.4%	0.5%
Don't believe in this system	1	0.3%	0.4%
To be monitored by independent civil association	1	0.3%	0.4%
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4.9%</b>	<b>6.1%</b>

**Overall perception on IPCC**

Table 19 [Q17] Overall speaking, do you think IPCC's image is? [Read out options, one answer only]

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,007)
Positive	350	34.7%
Quite positive	229	22.7%
Half-half	321	31.9%
Quite negative	21	2.1%
Negative	21	2.1%
Don't know / hard to say	65	6.4%
Total	1,007	100.0%
Missing	2	

Table 20 [Q18a] (Only ask respondents who have answered “Positive” and “Quite positive” in Q17, base=579) Why do you think it is “Positive” or “Quite positive”? Any more?

	Frequency	% of total responses (Base=736)	% of valid sample (Base=578)
IPCC is independent enough	143	19.4%	24.8%
IPCC’s structure gives people confidence	100	13.6%	17.3%
IPCC is fair enough	96	13.1%	16.7%
IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review	83	11.2%	14.3%
IPCC provides a helpful monitoring system/mechanism	71	9.6%	12.3%
IPCC has high transparency	59	8.0%	10.2%
IPCC has sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties	35	4.8%	6.1%
IPCC’s image/name is positive	27	3.7%	4.7%
IPCC has high efficiency	25	3.4%	4.3%
IPCC is appointed by the Government	8	1.0%	1.3%
Other positive answers (please see below)	22	3.0%	3.9%
Don’t know / hard to say	67	9.1%	11.5%
Total	736	100.0%	
<i>Missing</i>	<i>1</i>		
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped:</u>			
Under media’s monitoring	5	0.7%	0.9%
The image of police officer is good	5	0.6%	0.8%
More systematic and moral when comparing with Mainland	2	0.3%	0.4%
Think this organization is not essential	2	0.3%	0.4%
IPCC has explained its working progress, but it’s not transparent enough	2	0.2%	0.3%
Social service is good	1	0.2%	0.2%
Sometimes good	1	0.1%	0.2%
The organization has low transparency, bureaus cover up one another	1	0.1%	0.2%
As citizen make unnecessary complaints, the image of IPCC has improved and became positive	1	0.1%	0.2%
Social members are involved	1	0.1%	0.2%
It was established to monitor police. They work with a mission, so the image is positive.	1	0.1%	0.1%
The Police has high transparency, and can take in complaints	1	0.1%	0.1%
Sub-total	22	3.0%	3.9%

Table 21 [Q18b] (Only ask respondents who have answered “Negative” and “Quite negative” in Q17, base=43) Why do you think it is “Negative” and “Quite negative”? Any more?

	Frequency	% of total responses (Base=57)	% of valid sample (Base=43)
IPCC has low transparency	19	33.6%	45.0%
No trust in IPCC’s independence	15	26.5%	35.4%
IPCC doesn’t have sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties	6	10.2%	13.7%
IPCC might take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases	3	6.1%	8.2%
IPCC has low efficiency	3	4.8%	6.4%
Don’t think IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review	3	4.7%	6.2%
Other negative answers (please see below)	5	8.0%	10.7%
Don’t know / hard to say	3	6.1%	8.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped:</u>			
Don’t have much practical achievements	2	2.7%	3.5%
There are more demonstration	1	2.2%	2.9%
Because seldom come to contact with IPCC	1	1.7%	2.2%
The society is managed by unjustified people	1	1.6%	2.1%
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8.0%</b>	<b>10.7%</b>

Table 22 [Q19] ] Lastly, what are your expectations on IPCC? Any more? [Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed]

	Frequency	% of total responses (Base=1,165)	% of valid sample (Base=1,001)
Hope IPCC can monitor HK Police Force's work effectively	192	16.5%	19.2%
Hope IPCC would handle cases in a fair, impartial and transparent manner	169	14.5%	16.9%
Hope IPCC would improve its transparency	113	9.7%	11.3%
Hope IPCC can explain more to citizens the work / complaints system of HK Police Force	80	6.9%	8.0%
Hope IPCC can improve Police-community relation / enhance its communication	70	6.0%	7.0%
Hope IPCC can provide a channel for complaints against police	66	5.7%	6.6%
Hope IPCC can ensure citizens will get appropriate Police services	59	5.1%	5.9%
Hope IPCC can pressure HK Police Force effectively in order to improve their works	57	4.9%	5.7%
Hope IPCC can become an independent organization / handle cases independently	42	3.6%	4.2%
Hope IPCC will keep up with its good work	41	3.5%	4.1%
Hope IPCC can let different people to participate	15	1.3%	1.5%
Hope IPCC will have the right to investigate complaints	11	1.0%	1.1%
Hope IPCC can increase their efficiency	8	0.7%	0.8%
Others (please see below)	24	2.1%	2.4%
No expectation	47	4.0%	4.7%
Don't know / hard to say	168	14.4%	16.8%
Total	1,165	100.0%	
<i>Missing</i>	8		
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u>			
Enhance monitoring on corruption	5	0.4%	0.5%
Don't abuse power	2	0.2%	0.2%
Don't solely cases of power abuse	2	0.1%	0.1%
Solve the problem of abuse of power	2	0.1%	0.1%
Don't be too political, maintain neutrality	1	0.1%	0.1%
To think from law-enforcement official's perspective more frequently	1	0.1%	0.1%



Police doesn't have any authority, IPCC won't help the Police	1	0.1%	0.1%
To maintain human rights	1	0.1%	0.1%
To maintain a peaceful society	1	0.1%	0.1%
Have to be explicit and clear when handling cases	1	0.1%	0.1%
If it is really useful, everyone will have expectations on it	1	0.1%	0.1%
To increase citizen's confidence	1	0.1%	0.1%
Rely on themselves to improve their handling ways	1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC can protect HK's law and order	1	0.1%	0.1%
To ensure the life of police officers are stable	1	0.1%	0.1%
To properly organize big events	1	0.1%	0.1%
To maintain society's law and order	1	0.1%	0.1%
To maintain society's law	1	0.1%	0.1%
The system will be more complete under CE's ruling	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Don't check ID card of female	1	<0.1%	0.1%
To respond more to demonstration	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Sub-total	24	2.1%	2.4%

## **Appendix 3**

# **Demographics**

## Demographics

Table 23 Gender

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,009)
Male	460	45.5%
Female	549	54.5%
Total	1,009	100.0%

Table 24 Age Group

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=996)
18 - 19	28	2.8%
20 - 29	158	15.9%
30 - 39	184	18.5%
40 - 49	196	19.7%
50 - 59	196	19.7%
60 - 69	116	11.7%
70 or above	118	11.8%
Total	996	100.0%
Missing	13	

Table 25 Education Attainment

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,002)
Primary school or below	149	14.9%
<i>Not educated, pre-elementary education</i>	31	3.1%
<i>Primary</i>	118	11.8%
Secondary	474	47.3%
<i>Junior secondary (F.1-F.3)</i>	140	14.0%
<i>Senior secondary (F.4-F.5, vocational training included)</i>	260	25.9%
<i>Matriculation (F.6-F.7)</i>	74	7.4%
Tertiary or above	379	37.8%
<i>Tertiary, non-degree (Diploma / Certificate)</i>	61	6.1%
<i>Tertiary, non-degree (Associate degree)</i>	26	2.6%
<i>Tertiary, degree</i>	228	22.7%
<i>Postgraduate or above</i>	65	6.5%
Total	1,002	100.0%
Missing	7	

Table 26 Occupation

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=992)
Executives and professionals	256	25.8%
<i>Managers / administration staff</i>	83	8.3%
<i>Professional</i>	103	10.4%
<i>Associate professional</i>	70	7.1%
Clerical and service workers	216	21.8%
<i>Clerk</i>	131	13.2%
<i>Service worker and Shop &amp; market sales worker</i>	85	8.6%
Production workers	72	7.3%
<i>Skilled agricultural &amp; fishery worker</i>	1	0.1%
<i>Craft &amp; related trade worker</i>	23	2.4%
<i>Plant &amp; machine operator / assembler</i>	22	2.2%
<i>Unskilled worker</i>	25	2.6%
Students	80	8.1%
Homemakers	164	16.5%
Others	204	20.6%
<i>Retired</i>	168	16.9%
<i>Others (unemployed and non-worker included)</i>	36	3.7%
Total	992	100.0%
Missing	17	

Table 27 Monthly personal income

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=949)
No income	344	36.3%
HK\$1 – HK\$3,999	51	5.3%
HK\$4,000 – HK\$5,999	26	2.7%
HK\$6,000 – HK\$7,999	22	2.4%
HK\$8,000 – HK\$9,999	65	6.9%
HK\$10,000 – HK\$14,999	128	13.5%
HK\$15,000 – HK\$19,999	70	7.3%
HK\$20,000 – HK\$24,999	56	5.9%
HK\$25,000 – HK\$39,999	90	9.5%
HK\$40,000 or above	97	10.2%
Total	949	100.0%
Missing	60	

Table 28 Monthly household income

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=805)
HK\$3,999 or below	94	11.7%
HK\$4,000 – HK\$5,999	21	2.6%
HK\$6,000 – HK\$9,999	55	6.8%
HK\$10,000 – HK\$14,999	102	12.7%
HK\$15,000 – HK\$19,999	67	8.3%
HK\$20,000 – HK\$24,999	94	11.6%
HK\$25,000 – HK\$29,999	51	6.3%
HK\$30,000 – HK\$39,999	94	11.7%
HK\$40,000 – HK\$59,999	113	14.0%
HK\$60,000 or above	114	14.2%
Total	805	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>	<i>204</i>	

Table 29 Residential district

	Frequency	Percentage (Base=987)	
Hong Kong Island	176	17.8%	
<i>Central and Western District</i>		25	2.5%
<i>Wan Chai District</i>		13	1.3%
<i>Eastern District</i>		97	9.9%
<i>Southern District</i>		41	4.1%
Kowloon East	133	13.4%	
<i>Wong Tai Sin District</i>		56	5.6%
<i>Kwun Tong District</i>		77	7.8%
Kowloon West	131	13.3%	
<i>Sham Shui Po District</i>		41	4.2%
<i>Kowloon City District</i>		58	5.9%
<i>Yau Tsim Mong District</i>		31	3.2%
New Territories East	286	29.0%	
<i>Northern District</i>		58	5.9%
<i>Tai Po District</i>		45	4.6%
<i>Sha Tin District</i>		111	11.2%
<i>Sai Kung District</i>		72	7.3%
New Territories West	261	26.4%	
<i>Kwai Tsing District</i>		58	5.8%
<i>Tsuen Wan District</i>		35	3.5%
<i>Tuen Mun District</i>		68	6.9%
<i>Yuen Long District</i>		79	8.1%
<i>Islands District</i>		21	2.1%
Total	987	100.0%	
Missing	22		

## **Appendix 4**

### **In-depth Analysis: Cross-tabulations**

*Note: The results of in-depth analyses described heretofore should be read in conjunction with the research findings described in the main part of this research report.*

### **Highlighted Findings of Cross-tabulations**

*(The differences of the listed items are proved to be statistically significant.)*

#### **[Q1] On awareness of IPCC**

Significant differences are found between gender, age, education attainment, occupation and monthly income groups, at 99% confidence level:

- *Males are significantly more likely than females to have heard of IPCC [78% (M) vs 61% (F)];*
- *Respondents of age “30-49” are more likely than their counterparts to have heard of IPCC [77% (30-49) vs 64% (18-29) & 63% (50+)];*
- *The higher the education level, the more likely the respondents to have heard of IPCC [80% (Tertiary), 69% (Secondary), 41% (Primary)];*
- *“Executives and professionals” are more likely than their counterparts to have heard of IPCC [85% vs (55%-69%)];*
- *The higher income (both personal and household) they earn per month, the more likely the respondents to have heard of IPCC [personal: 89% (\$40k+), 85% (\$20k-\$39k), 71% (\$10k-\$19k), 59% (<\$10k)] [household: 90% (\$60k+), 78% (\$30k-\$59k), 67% (\$10k-\$29k), 51% (<\$10k)]*

#### **[Q3] On knowledge of IPCC duties**

**[Number of at least one correct answer]** Significant differences are found between gender, age, education attainment, occupation and monthly income groups, at 99% confidence level:

- *Males are significantly more likely than females to have named at least one correct duties of IPCC [53% (M) vs 44% (F)];*
- *The older they are, the more likely the respondents could name at least one correct duties of IPCC [51% (50+), 48% (30-49), 45% (18-29)];*
- *Respondents with “secondary or above” education were more likely than their counterparts to have named at least one correct duties of IPCC [53% (Secondary) vs 45% (Tertiary) & 38% (Primary)];*
- *“Workers” are significantly less likely to name any correct IPCC duties than their counterparts [39% vs (45%-52%)];*
- *Respondents earning \$40k or above are more likely to have named at least one correct duties of IPCC [52% vs (46%-48%)];*
- *Respondents with monthly household income less than \$10k are less likely to have named at least one duties of IPCC [42% vs (47%-52%)]*

**[Mean number of one correct answer]** Significant difference is found between gender groups, at 99% confidence level:

- *Males gave out significantly more correct duties of IPCC than females on average [0.7(M) vs 0.5(F)]*



**[Q4] On awareness of the independence nature of IPCC**

Significant differences are found between education attainment and occupation groups, at 99% confidence level, and monthly household income groups at 95% confidence level:

- *The higher the education attainment, the more likely the respondents were aware of the independence nature of IPCC [65% (Tertiary), 59% (Secondary), 40% (Primary)];*
- *“Executives and professionals” are more likely than their counterparts to have correctly pointed out the independence nature of IPCC [68% vs (47%-62%)];*
- *The higher the monthly household income, the more likely the respondents were aware that IPCC is an independent organization [household: 71% (\$60k+), 62% (\$30k-\$59k), 61% (\$10k-\$29k), 49% (<\$10k)]*

**[Q9] On views of IPCC’s independence in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police**

Significant differences are found between genders at 95% confidence level, and between age, education attainment, occupation, monthly income groups, as well as awareness of IPCC and its independence nature, at 99% confidence level:

- *Males are more likely than females to believe IPCC is independent in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police [55% (M) vs 51% (F)];*
- *Respondents of aged “30-49” are more likely than their counterparts to believe IPCC is independent in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police [59% (30-49) vs 47% (18-29) & 52% (50+)];*
- *Respondents with “primary or below” education level are less likely than their counterparts to believe IPCC is independent in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police [39% (primary) vs 56% (secondary) & 56% (tertiary)];*
- *“Executives and professionals” and “workers” are more likely than their counterparts to believe IPCC is independent in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police [57% (workers) & 56% (executives & professionals) vs (51%-53%)];*
- *The higher the income (both personal and household), the more likely the respondents would think IPCC is independent in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police [personal: 60% (\$40k+), 55% (\$20k-\$39k), 54% (\$10k-\$19k), 52% (<\$10k)] [household: 63% (\$60k+), 57% (\$30k-\$59k), 56% (\$10k-\$29k), 48% (<\$10k)]*
- *Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior the interviews are more likely to believe IPCC is independent in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police [57% (heard of IPCC) vs 45% (not heard of IPCC)];*
- *Respondents who are aware of IPCC’s independence nature prior the interviews are more likely to believe IPCC is independent in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police [63% (aware of independence) vs 50% (not aware of independence)]*

**[Q10] On views of impartiality and objectiveness of IPCC**

Significant differences are found between genders at 95% confidence level, and between age, education attainment, occupation, monthly household income groups, as well as awareness of IPCC and its independence nature, at 99% confidence level:

- *Males are more likely than females to think IPCC is NOT able to monitor and review CAPO's investigation in an impartial and objective way [-ve rate: 16% (M) vs 10% (F)];*
- *Respondents of aged "30-49" are more likely than their counterparts to praise IPCC's impartiality and objectiveness positively [51% (30-49) vs 44% (18-29) & 43% (50+)];*
- *The higher the education level, the more likely the respondents praise PCC's impartiality and objectiveness positively [48% (Tertiary), 46% (Secondary), 38% (Primary)];*
- *"Students" and "workers" are more likely than their counterparts to praise IPCC's impartiality and objectiveness positively [52% (students) & 51% (workers) vs (41%-49%)];*
- *Respondents with monthly household income of \$60k+ are more likely than their counterparts to praise IPCC's impartiality and objectiveness both positively and negatively [+ve rate: 60% (\$60k+) vs (40%-47%); -ve rate: 16% (\$60k+) vs (11%-13%)];*
- *Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior the interviews are more likely than their counterparts to praise IPCC's impartiality and objectiveness positively [48% (heard of IPCC) vs 40% (not heard of IPCC)];*
- *Respondents who are aware of IPCC's independence nature prior the interviews are more likely to praise IPCC's impartiality and objectiveness positively [55% (aware of independence) vs 38% (not aware of independence)]*

**[Q11] On views of efficiency of IPCC**

Significant differences are found between gender and monthly household income groups at 95% confidence level, and between age, education attainment, occupation, monthly personal income groups, as well as awareness of IPCC, at 99% confidence level:

- *Males are more likely than females to perceive IPCC's efficiency negatively [-ve rate: 15% (M) vs 11% (F)];*
- *The lower the monthly household income they have, the more likely the respondents praise IPCC's efficiency positively [29% (<\$10k), 28% (\$10k-\$29k), 22% (\$30k-\$59k), 21% (\$60k+)];*
- *The older the respondents are, the more likely they praise IPCC's efficiency positively [30% (50+), 23% (30-49), 21% (18-29)];*
- *Respondents with "tertiary education or above" are less likely than their counterparts to praise IPCC's efficiency positively [28% (primary), 29% (secondary), 20% (tertiary)];*
- *"Executives and professionals" are less likely than their counterparts to praise IPCC's efficiency positively [19% (executives & professionals) vs (22%-33%)];*
- *Respondents earning less than \$10k per month are more likely to praise IPCC's efficiency positively [29% (<\$10k) vs (19%-22%)];*
- *Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior to the interviewers are more likely to think IPCC' works are inefficient [-ve rate: 14% (heard of) vs 11% (not heard of)]*

**[Q12] On views of transparency of IPCC**

Significant differences are found between monthly household income groups at 95% confidence level, and between age, education attainment, occupation, as well as awareness of IPCC and its independence nature, at 99% confidence level:

- Respondents with monthly household income at \$60k or above are more likely to think IPCC's level of transparency is high [27% (\$60k+) vs (19%-21%)];
- The younger the respondents, the more likely they think IPCC's level of transparency is low [-ve rate: 37% (18-29), 26% (30-49), 17% (50+)];
- The higher the education level the respondents attained, the more likely they think IPCC's level of transparency is low [-ve rate: 31% (tertiary), 22% (secondary), 16% (primary)];
- "Students" are more likely than their counterparts to think IPCC's level of transparency is low [-ve rate: 49% (students) vs (15%-29%)];
- Respondents who have not heard of IPCC prior to the interview are more likely to opt for "don't know / hard to say" in regard to IPCC's transparency [DK rate: 22% (not heard of) vs 12% (heard of)];
- Respondents who are aware of IPCC's independence nature prior to the interviewers are more likely to think IPCC's level of transparency is high [26% (aware of independence) vs 17% (not aware of independence)]

**[Q13] On confidence in IPCC**

Significant differences are found between genders at 95% confidence level, and between age, education attainment, occupation, monthly income groups, as well as awareness of IPCC and its independence nature, at 99% confidence level:

- Males are more likely than females to have no confidence in IPCC [-ve rate: 23% (M) vs 16% (F)];
- The older the respondents, the more likely they have confidence in IPCC [48% (50+), 40% (30-49), 37% (18-29)];
- Respondents with tertiary or above education level are more likely than their counterparts to have no confidence in IPCC [-ve rate: 22% (tertiary) vs 17% (secondary) and 18% (primary)];
- "Workers" and people working in "other" occupation are more likely than their counterparts to have confidence in IPCC [49% (workers) and 50% (others) vs (36%-45%)];
- Respondents earning \$40k or above are more likely than their counterparts to have confidence in IPCC [52% (\$40k+) vs (35%-44%)];
- Similarly, respondents with household income at \$60k or above are more likely than their counterparts to have confidence in IPCC [51% (\$60k+) vs (39%-46%)];
- Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior the interviews are more likely than their counterparts to have confidence in IPCC [45% (heard of IPCC) vs 38% (not heard of IPCC)];
- Respondents who are aware of IPCC's independence nature prior the interviews are more likely to have confidence in IPCC [54% (aware of independence) vs 32% (not aware of independence)]

**[Q15] On confidence in two-tier complaint system**

Significant differences are found between genders at 95% confidence level, and between age, education attainment, occupation, monthly income groups, as well as awareness of IPCC and its independence nature, at 99% confidence level:

- *Males are more likely than females to have no confidence in the two-tier complaint system [-ve rate: 20% (M) vs 16% (F)];*
- *The older the respondents, the more likely they have confidence in the two-tier complaint system [47% (50+), 45% (30-49), 38% (18-29)];*
- *The higher the education level, the more likely the respondents have no confidence in the two-tier complaint system [-ve rate: 22% (tertiary) vs 17% (secondary) and 14% (primary)];*
- *“Workers” are more likely than their counterparts to have confidence in the two-tier complaint system [55% (workers) vs (38%-48%)];*
- *Respondents earning \$40k or above are more likely than their counterparts to have confidence in the two-tier complaint system [55% (\$40k+) vs (36%-45%)];*
- *Similarly, respondents with household income at \$60k or above are more likely than their counterparts to have confidence in the two-tier complaint system [55% (\$60k+) vs (42%-44%)];*
- *Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior the interviews are more likely than their counterparts to have confidence in the two-tier complaint system [47% (heard of IPCC) vs 39% (not heard of IPCC)];*
- *Respondents who are aware of IPCC’s independence nature prior the interviews are more likely to have confidence in the two-tier complaint system [52% (aware of independence) vs 38% (not aware of independence)]*

**[Q17] On overall image of IPCC**

Significant differences are found between gender, age, education attainment, occupation, monthly income groups, as well as awareness of IPCC and its independence nature, at 99% confidence level:

- *Males are more likely than females to perceive IPCC’s overall image negatively [-ve rate: 6% (M) vs 3% (F)];*
- *Respondents of age “30-49” are more likely to perceive IPCC’s overall image positively [61% (30-49) vs (55%-58%)];*
- *Respondents with secondary or above education level are more likely to perceive IPCC’s overall image positively [61% (secondary) & 60% (tertiary) vs 40% (primary)];*
- *“Workers” & “students” are more likely than their counterparts to perceive IPCC’s overall image positively [64% (workers) & 64% (students) vs (51%-61%)];*
- *Respondents earning \$40k or above are more likely than their counterparts to perceive IPCC’s overall image positively [68% (\$40k+) vs (55%-57%)];*
- *Similarly, respondents with household income at \$60k or above are more likely than their counterparts to perceive IPCC’s overall image positively [68% (\$60k+) vs (42%-64%)];*

- 
- Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior the interviews are more likely than their counterparts to perceive IPCC's overall image positively [62% (heard of IPCC) vs 47% (not heard of IPCC)];
  - Respondents who are aware of IPCC's independence nature prior the interviews are more likely to perceive IPCC's overall image positively [69% (aware of independence) vs 52% (not aware of independence)]

### **[Q9-Q12] Total number of positively appraised image attributes**

Significant differences are found between age groups and awareness of IPCC, at 95% confidence level, and between respondents with different education attainment, and awareness of IPCC's independence nature, at 99% confidence level:

- The younger they are, the more likely the respondents appraise all aspects negatively [% of 0 positive aspect: 38% (18-29), 33% (30-49), 32% (50+)];
- Respondents who had heard of IPCC prior to the interviews are more likely to appraise all four attributes positively [11% (heard of IPCC) vs 5% (not heard of IPCC)];
- Respondents with secondary education attainment are more likely than their counterparts to appraise all four aspects positively [12% (secondary) vs 7% (tertiary) & 4% (primary)];
- Respondents who were aware of IPCC's independence nature prior the interviews are more likely to appraise all four aspects positively [13% (aware of independence) vs 6% (not aware of independence)]

# **Appendix 5**

## **Bilingual Questionnaires**

**Public Opinion Programme, HKU**  
**Independent Police Complaints Council**  
**香港大學民意研究計劃**  
**獨立監察警方處理投訴委員會**

Jointly conduct

合作進行

*Independent Police Complaints Council*  
*Public Opinion Survey*  
**獨立監察警方處理投訴委員會(監警會)**  
**意見調查**

---

Questionnaire (Final)

調查問卷 (定稿)

February 21, 2013

2013年2月21日

## Part I Introduction

### 第一部分 自我介紹

Good evening! My name is X. I'm an interviewer from the Public Opinion Programme of the University of Hong Kong. We would like to ask for your opinion on the works of Independent Police Complaints Council (IPCC) which would only take you a few minutes, and you can choose to terminate the interview any time. Please rest assured that your phone number is randomly selected by our computer and your information provided will be kept strictly confidential and used for aggregate analysis only. If you have any questions about the research, you can call xxxx-xxxx to talk to our supervisor. If you want to know more about the rights as a participant, please contact the University of Hong Kong (full name: Human Research Ethics Committee for Non-Clinical Faculties of the University of Hong Kong) at xxxx-xxxx during office hours. For quality control purpose, our conversation may be recorded but will be destroyed shortly after our quality control process is complete. Is it okay for us to start this survey?

喂，先生／小姐／太太你好，我姓 X，我係香港大學民意研究計劃既訪問員黎既，我地而家受獨立監察警方處理投訴委員會(簡稱“監警會”)委託進行緊一項全港性抽樣意見調查，想阻你幾分鐘時間，同我地做一份有關監警會工作既問卷調查。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。如果你對今次既訪問有任何疑問，你可以打去熱線電話 xxxx-xxxx 同我地既督導員郭先生聯絡。如果你想知多 D 關於參與研究既權利，你可以喺辦公時間致電 xxxx-xxxx 向香港大學(全名為：香港大學非臨床研究操守委員會)查詢。為左保障數據既真確性，我地既訪問可能會被錄音，但只會用作內部參考，並會係短期內銷毀。請問可唔可以開始訪問呢?

Yes 可以

No 唔可以 → 訪問完成，多謝合作，拜拜。(Interview ends, thank you for your cooperation, bye-bye)

[S1] Is the telephone number here xxxx-xxxx? 請問你既住宅電話號碼係唔係 xxxx xxxx?

Yes 係

No 唔係 (skip to end)



## Part II Selection of Respondents

### 第二部分 選出被訪者

[S2] Are there any Hong Kong residents aged 18 or above in your household? (If no one is eligible, interview ends: thank you for your cooperation, bye-bye)

呢份問卷既訪問對象係 **18 歲或以上香港居民**，同埋要每星期住係呢度最少 **5 晚**既，請問你屋企宜家有幾多位屬於呢個組別既呢？【如果戶中有合資格既被訪者，訪問告終；多謝合作，收線】

Yes → Interview begins [If the qualified family member is not at home, interviewer please arrange another time for interview]

Yes, more than one, \_\_\_\_\_ (exact number) → S3

No → Interview ends, thank you for your cooperation, bye-bye.

Refuse to answer → Interview ends, thank you for your cooperation, bye-bye.

有一位 → 開始訪問 [如合資格家庭成員不是接聽電話者，請邀請合資格家庭成員聽電話並重覆自我介紹]

有多過一位，\_\_\_\_位 【入實數】 → S3

冇 → 訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜

訪者拒絕回答 → 訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜

[S3] Since there is more than one available, we hope that all qualified family members have the equal chance to be interviewed, I would like to speak to the one who will have his / her birthday next. (Interviewer can ask: “is there anyone whose birthday is in February or the coming three months?”) Is it okay for us to start now?

因為多過一位，我地希望所有合資格既家庭成員都有同等機會接受訪問，所以想請即將生日果位黎聽電話。(訪問員可舉例說明：『即係有冇 2 月或未來三個月內生日既人係度？』)【開始訪問前，訪問員必須讀出：為左保障數據既真確性，訪問可能會被錄音，但只會用作內部參考。】

請問可唔可以呢？

Yes - The one answered the phone is the respondent → Start the interview

Yes - Another family member is the respondent 【interviewer please repeat the self-introduction】  
→ Start the interview

The qualified family member is not at home / not available 【interviewer please arrange another time for interview】

No - Family member refuses to answer → Interview ends, thank you for your cooperation, bye-bye.

No - Respondent refuses to answer → Interview ends, thank you for your cooperation, bye-bye.

可以 - 接聽電話的人士是被訪者 → 開始訪問

可以 - 其他家人是被訪者 【訪問員請重覆自我介紹】 → 開始訪問

被選中的家庭成員不在家／沒空 【訪問員請另約時間再致電】

唔可以 - 家人拒絕回答 → 訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜

唔可以 - 訪者拒絕回答 → 訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜

## Part III Opinion Questions

### 第三部分 問卷主體部分

#### Awareness of IPCC 對「監警會」的認知

[Q1] Prior to this survey, have you heard of Independent Police Complaints Council, or IPCC?  
 喺呢個電話訪問前，請問你有冇聽過「獨立監察警方處理投訴委員會<sup>1</sup>」，或者簡稱「監警會 (IPCC)」呢一個機構呢？

Yes → Continue to Q2a

No → Skip to Q5

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

有 → 續問 Q2a

冇 → 跳至 Q5

唔知道 / 難講

拒答

[Q2a] From where have you heard of IPCC? Any other channels? (Do not read out answers, multiple choices allowed)

請問你係從乜野途徑聽過「監警會」呢？仲有呢？（不讀答案，可選多項）

[Q2b] Have you ever heard of IPCC from the following channels then? (Read out those channels with \* which the respondents have not mentioned in Q2a) (\* Channels previously adopted by IPCC) [Read out options, multiple answers allowed]

咁你有冇從下面既途徑聽過「監警會」呢？（請讀出“\*”號而被訪者在 Q2a 沒有提及的途徑）（“\*”號是「監警會」曾經推出或沿用的宣傳途徑）（讀出答案，可選多項）

	Q2a		Q2b
	First mentioned 第一提及	Other mentioned 其他提及	Have no mentioned 沒有提及
*Television 電視			
TV series (IPCC the proper way) 電視特輯 (監警有道)			
TV interview 電視訪問			
News 電視新聞			
Other TV programmes 其他電視節目			
*Radio 電台			
* Newspaper (Probe: Which newspaper?) 報紙 (追問:咁係邊一份?)			
Ming Pao (The IPCC perspective) 明報 (監警透視)			
Sharp Daily (Business of the Cops) 爽報 (關人差事)			

<sup>1</sup> 問卷原文誤用監警會舊名稱「投訴警方獨立監察委員會」，及後民研計劃再以電話隨機抽樣 1,039 名香港市民隨機分半各就監警會的新舊全名訪問市民對監警會的認知，統計學測試結果顯示，兩者沒有存在明顯分別。Previous full name of IPCC, 「投訴警方獨立監察委員會」, was used inadvertently in the original questionnaire. POP then conducted a random telephone survey with 1,039 HK citizens, splitting half randomly, respondents were asked if they have heard of IPCC in its current and previous full names. Statistical testing showed no evidence of significant difference between groups.

Other Newspaper stories (Please specify: _____) 其他報紙訪問及報導 (請註明: _____)			
Magazines 雜誌			
* Internet 互聯網			
* Advertisements on Public transport (Probe: Which public transport?) 公共交通廣告 (追問:咁係邊一類交通工具?)			
MTR 港鐵			
Light Rail 輕鐵			
Bus 巴士			
Tram 電車			
Ferry/Pier 渡海小輪 / 碼頭			
Others (Please specify: _____) 其他 (請註明: _____)			
* Poster (Probe: Where did you see the poster?) Place (Please specify: _____) 海報 (追問:係邊度見到海報?) 地點 (請註明: _____)			
* Annual report of IPCC / Brochure「監警會」年報 / 小冊子			
* IPCC website「監警會」網站			
* IPCC newsletter「監警會」通訊			
* Quarterly meeting between IPCC and CAPO 「監警會」同警察投訴課的季度聯席會議			
Talks 講座			
Community Activities 社區活動			
Friends/Neighbours/Relatives/Schoolmates 朋友 / 鄰居 / 親戚 / 同學			
Others (Please specify: _____) 其他 (請註明: _____)			
Don't know / can't remember 唔知道 / 唔記得			
Refuse to answer 拒答			

[Q3] To your knowledge, what are IPCC's duties? Any other duties? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

據你了解，「監警會」既主要工作係D乜呢？仲有呢？（不讀答案，可選多項）

#### Correct answers

- Monitor CAPO's cases handling process
- Review/verify investigation reports/results by CAPO
- Review statistics on types of Police's behavior that citizens complained
- Identify mal-practices in Police's works that has led or may lead to complaints
- Monitor Police's follow-up/disciplinary actions towards officers being complained
- Improve Police Force's quality of service

#### Incorrect answers

- Investigate citizen's complaints on Police directly
- Monitor Police's behavior/conduct
- Investigate Police bribing cases
- Improve police-community relation / enhance communication
- Others (Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)
- Don't know / can't remember
- Refuse to answer

#### 正確答案

監察「投訴警察課」所處理個案既程序  
 審閱 / 覆檢「投訴警察課」所處理個案既調查報告 / 結果  
 覆檢導致市民投訴既警務人員各類行為既統計數字 找出警方既工作程序中，引起投訴或可能引起投訴既不當之處  
 監察警方對被投訴警務人員採取跟進及紀律行動  
 改善警隊的服務質素

錯誤答案

直接處理 / 調查市民投訴警察個案  
 監察警務人員行為 / 操守  
 調查警務人員貪污個案  
 改善警民關係 / 加強警民溝通

其他 (請註明: \_\_\_\_\_)

唔知道 / 唔記得

拒答

[Q4] Do you think IPCC is...? (Read out first two options, order to be randomized by computer, only one answer is allowed)

你認為「監警會」係...? (讀出首兩項答案，次序由電腦隨機排列，只選一項)

A totally independent organization, not under the Police	完全獨立，唔隸屬於警隊既
Part of the Police	屬於警隊既一部份
Don't know	唔知道
Refuse to answer	拒答

[Q5] What do you think is the most direct channel to make a complaint of Police? (Do not read out options, ONE answers only)

你認為市民投訴警察最有效係經邊個渠道呢? (不讀答案，只選一項)

CAPO	投訴警察課
IPCC	監警會
Police Force (no specified division)	警署 (沒有註明部門)
Office of the Ombudsman, HK	香港申訴專員公署
Equal Opportunities Commission	平等機會委員會
ICAC	廉政公署
DC/Legco members	區議會 / 立法會議員
Media	傳播媒介
Others(Please specify: _____)	其他 (請註明: _____)
Don't know	唔知道
Refuse to answer	拒答

**Awareness of news on complaints against the Hong Kong Police Force****對過去有關投訴香港警察新聞的認知**

[Q6] In the past year, did you hear any news on complaints made to the Hong Kong Police Force?

If yes, can you tell me what was it about? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

係過去一年，你有冇聽聞過有關投訴警務人員既新聞？如有，你可唔可以講俾我知係關於乜野？(不讀答案，可選多項)

Yes

HKU 8.18 dispute / Li Keqiang visited HK / dark shadow incident

Sex workers complained about police's abuse of power

Protestors complained about police's abuse of power

Mechanism of complaints against police is complicated, slow statements taking

Police forced a boy to pretend as a cross when investigating drugs issue

Rape case in Police station

Stop and search issue / searching

Police's law enforcement of the traffic regulation

Media coverage arrangement by Police

Police and media coverage arrangement like press area, taking away the reporter who asked about June 4<sup>th</sup>

Others, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

Heard of, but can't remember the content

Refuse to answer

No → Skip to Q8

Don't know / hard to say → Skip to Q8

Refuse to answer → Skip to Q8

有

港大 8.18 風波 / 李克強訪港 / 黑影論事件

性工作者投訴警員濫權

遊行/ 集會人士控訴惡警濫權

香港投訴警察機制繁複 錄口供慢

警查毒逼男生扮十字架

警署強姦案

截停搜查事宜 / 搜身

警方交通方面的執法

警方發放新聞的安排

警方和傳媒採訪的安排如設立採訪區、帶走提問六四問題的記者等

其他，請註明：\_\_\_\_\_

唔記得

拒答

冇 → 跳至 Q8

唔知道 / 難講 → 跳至 Q8

拒答 → 跳至 Q8

[Q7] (Only ask respondents who answered “yes” in Q6) Were you aware of the results of these complaints? (Interviewer repeats the answer mentioned by the respondent in Q6, only one answer allowed)

[只問 Q6 答有者] 咁你有冇留意呢 D 投訴既最後調查結果? (訪員重複被訪者於 Q6 提及的答案, 每項只選一個答案)

	Yes 有	Sometimes 一時時	No 冇	Don't know/ hard to say 唔知道 / 難講	Refuse to answer 拒答
HKU 8.18 dispute / Li Keqiang visited HK / dark shadow incident 8.18 風波 / 李克強訪港 / 黑影論事件					
Sex workers complained about police's abuse of power 性工作者投訴警員濫權					
Protestors complained about police's abuse of power 遊行/ 集會人士控訴警員濫權					
Mechanism of complaints against police is complicated, slow statements taking 香港投訴警察機制繁複 錄口供慢					
Police forced a boy to pretend as a cross when investigating drugs issue 警員查毒逼男生扮十字架					
Rape case in Police station 警署強姦案					
Stop and search issue / searching 截停搜查事宜 / 搜身					
Police's law enforcement of the traffic regulation 警方交通方面的執法					
Media coverage arrangement by Police 警方發放新聞的安排					
Police and media coverage arrangement like press area, taking away the reporter who asked about June 4 <sup>th</sup> 警方和傳媒採訪的安排如設立採訪區、 帶走提問六四問題的記者等					
Others 其他 (1)					
Others 其他 (2)					

[Q8] Which one of the following types of complaints of the Police Force would you care about most? (Read out options, ONE answer only)

就以下各 類對警員既投訴黎講，你自己會最關注邊一類投訴？(讀出答案，只選一項)

On the abuse of power by the police officers

On how the police dealt with the demonstration

On press releases arrangement

On media coverage arrangement

On the stop and search issue / searching

On the law enforcement of the traffic regulation by the police officers

On the usage of violence of the police officers

On corruption of the police officers

On investigation method of the police officers

On the unfairness of the police officers / fair to handle cases

On the working attitude of the police officers

Don't care about any complaints made to the Police Force

Others, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

有關警員濫權

有關警員處理遊行示威

有關警方發放新聞的安排

有關警方和傳媒採訪的安排

有關警員截停搜查事宜 / 搜身

有關警員交通方面的執法

有關警員使用暴力

有關警員貪污

有關警員查案方法

有關警員不公平 / 公正處理案件

有關警員工作態度

唔關注任何投訴警察的事情

其他，請註明：\_\_\_\_\_

唔知道 / 難講

拒答

**Image and confidence in IPCC 對「監警會」的看法**

(Interviewers read out): I will now briefly introduce to you the work of IPCC, and please answer some questions based on the impression you have for IPCC.

[訪問員請讀出]: 而家我會向你簡單介紹「監警會」既工作，之後請你就你對「監警會」既印象回答一 D 問題。

**IPCC is an independent organization from the Hong Kong Police Force, members to be appointed by the Chief Executive. It is an important part of the “two-tier” complaints system of the Hong Kong Police Force, specifying in monitoring and reviewing public complaints made to the police force via the CAPO. Although public complaints made to the police force are processed through the CAPO, results must be passed by the IPCC in order to make sure the investigation is impartial, objective and transparent.**

「監警會」係一個完全獨立於香港警務處既機構，委員由行政長官委任，係香港投訴警察制度「兩層架構」既一個主要部份，專門負責監察同覆檢「投訴警察課」調查市民投訴警察個案既工作。雖然市民投訴警察都係由警方既投訴警察課調查，但調查結果必須要得到「監警會」既通過，確保調查係公平、公正同透徹既。

[Q9] Do you think IPCC is independent in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police? (Read out options, only one answer is allowed)

你覺得「監警會」能唔能夠以一個獨立既身份去監察同覆檢市民投訴警察既個案? (讀出答案，只選一項)

Independent	獨立
Quite independent	頗獨立
Half-half	一般
Not quite independent	唔太獨立
Not independent at all	唔獨立
Don't know / hard to say (do not read out)	唔知道 / 冇意見 [不要讀出]
Refuse to answer	拒答

[Q10] Do you think IPCC is able to monitor and review CAPO's investigation in an impartial and objective way? (Read out options, only one answer is allowed)

你覺得「監警會」能唔能夠公平公正咁監察同覆檢「投訴警察課」既調查工作呢? (讀出答案，只選一項)

Impartial and objective	公平公正
Quite impartial and objective	頗公平公正
Half-half	一般
Not quite impartial and objective	唔太公平公正
Not impartial and objective at all	唔公平公正
Don't know / hard to say (do not read out)	唔知道 / 冇意見 [不要讀出]
Refuse to answer	拒答



[Q11] Do you think IPCC's complaint monitor and review is efficient? (Read out options, only one answer is allowed)

你覺得「監警會」監察同覆檢投訴個案既效率係點? (讀出答案, 只選一項)

Efficient	有效率
Quite efficient	頗有效率
Half-half	一般
Not quite efficient	唔太有效率
Not efficient at all	有效率
Don't know / hard to say (do not read out)	唔知道 / 冇意見 [不要讀出]
Refuse to answer	拒答

[Q12] What do you think of IPCC's level of transparency in complaint monitor and review? (Read out options, only one answer is allowed)

你覺得「監警會」既監察同覆檢投訴個案既透明度係點? (讀出答案, 只選一項)

High	高
Quite high	頗高
Half-half	一般
Quite low	頗低
Low	低
Don't know / hard to say (do not read out)	唔知道 / 冇意見 [不要讀出]
Refuse to answer	拒答

[Q13] Overall speaking, are you confident in IPCC? (Interviewer probe intensity)

請問你對監警會有冇信心? (訪員追問程度)

Very confident	好有信心
Quite confident	幾有信心
Half-half	一半半
Not quite confident	唔係幾有信心 / 幾冇信心
Not confident at all	好有信心
Don't know / hard to say (do not read out)	唔知道 / 冇意見 [不要讀出]
Refuse to answer	拒答

[Q14] (Only ask respondents who have answered “Not quite confident” and “Not confident at all” in Q 13) Why do you think it is “Not quite confident”/ “Not confident at all”? Any more? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

(只問 Q13 答「唔係幾有信心 / 幾冇信心」或「好冇信心」的受訪者) 點解你對監警會冇信心呢?仲有呢?(不讀答案，可選多項)

Committees are appointed, not elected by citizens

Both are under the Government

May take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases

It's like self-investigation

Police officers could be appointed as committees

The process and results of complaints are not released to public

Don't think IPCC investigate or monitor complaints in citizen's perspective

No direct investigation, monitor only, no actual authority

Only responsible for monitoring and review, didn't investigate directly

May cover up the truth to avoid unfavorable impact on Police's image

Not clear about IPCC's works

Other (Please specify :\_\_\_\_\_)

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

委員都係委任而非民選

覺得兩者同屬政府人員 / 機構

監察或覆檢個案時可能會偏袒警務人員

好似自己人查自己人

警員都可以被委任為委員之一

投訴既過程同結果都唔會公開

唔覺得佢地會站在市民既立場 / 角度調查或者監察投訴

佢地唔會直接處理投訴，只係監察 / 冇實權

只負責監察同覆檢工作，冇直接參與調查

為避免不利消息影響警方形象，可能會隱瞞事實真相

唔係好清楚監警會既工作 / 運作

其他 (請註明:\_\_\_\_\_)

唔知道 / 難講

拒答

[Q15] Are you confident in the existing two-tier system of complaints made to the police?  
(Interviewer probe intensity)

請問你對現時兩層架構既投訴警察有冇信心？(訪員追問程度)

Very confident → Skip to Q17

好有信心 → 跳至 Q17

Quite confident → Skip to Q17

幾有信心 → 跳至 Q17

Half-half → Skip to Q17

一半半 → 跳至 Q17

Not quite confident (continue to Q16)

唔係幾有信心/幾冇信心 → 續問 Q16

Not confident at all (continue to Q16)

好有信心 → 續問 Q16

Don't know / hard to say (do not read out) → Skip to Q17

唔知道/冇意見[不要讀出] → 跳至 Q17

Refuse to answer → Skip to Q17

拒答 → 跳至 Q17

[Q16] (Only ask respondents who have answered "Not quite confident" and "Not confident at all" in Q15) How do you think IPCC could improve this two-tier complaints system? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

(只問 Q15 答「唔係幾有信心 / 幾冇信心」或「好有信心」的受訪者)你認為監警會可以點樣改善呢個兩層架構既投訴制度？(不讀答案，可選多項)

IPCC should have authorization to investigate

IPCC should have authorization to investigate serious cases

IPCC should have authorization to decide punitive sanctions on police officers who violated regulations

Shorten the time for investigation and review

Simplify the monitor and review procedures

Increase transparency

More promotion

Involve individuals from different classes in the process

Others (Please specify : \_\_\_\_\_)

No area needs to be improved

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

監警會應該要有調查權

監警會應該要有調查嚴重個案既權利

監警會應該有權決定對違規警員既懲罰

縮短調查及覆檢既時間

簡化調查及覆檢既程序

提高透明度

增加宣傳

讓不同階層人士都可參與其中

其他 (請註明: \_\_\_\_\_)

沒有需要改善的地方

唔知道 / 難講

拒答

**Overall perception on IPCC 對「監警會」的整體意見**

[Q17] Overall speaking, do you think IPCC's image is? (Read out options, only one answer is allowed)

整體黎講，你覺得「監警會」既形象係? (讀出答案，只選一項)

Positive (continue to Q18)	正面 → 續問 Q18
Quite positive (continue to Q18)	頗正面 → 續問 Q18
Half-half → Skip to Q19	一般 → 跳至 Q19
Quite negative (continue to Q18)	頗負面 → 續問 Q18
Negative (continue to Q18)	負面 → 續問 Q18
Don't know / hard to say (do not read out) → Skip to Q19	唔知道/冇意見[不要讀出] → 跳至 Q19
Refuse to answer → Skip to Q19	拒答 → 跳至 Q19

[Q18] (Only ask respondents who have answered "Positive" and "Quite positive" in Q17) Why do you think it is "Positive" or "Quite positive" or "Quite negative" or "negative"? Any more? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

[只問 Q17 答「正面」或「頗正面」或「頗負面」或「負面」的受訪者] 點解你覺得[讀出 Q17 的答案]呢? 仲有呢? (不讀答案，可選多項)

**Positive answers**

- IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review
- IPCC is independent enough
- IPCC is fair enough
- IPCC has high transparency
- IPCC has high efficiency
- IPCC has sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties
- IPCC provides a helpful monitoring system/mechanism
- IPCC's structure gives people confidence
- Other positive answers (Please specify : \_\_\_\_\_)

**Negative answers**

- Don't think IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review
- No trust in IPCC's independence
- IPCC might take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases
- IPCC has low transparency
- IPCC has low efficiency
- IPCC doesn't have sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties
- Other negative answers (Please specify : \_\_\_\_\_)

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

正面答案

- 監警會人員有足夠及專業知識去做監察同覆檢既工作
- 監警會夠獨立
- 監警會夠公正
- 監警會既透明度好高
- 監警會既效率好高
- 監警會有足夠既權力去履行職責
- 監警會提供監察系統 / 機制有助監察
- 監警會架構使人安心 / 有信心
- 其他正面答案 (請註明: \_\_\_\_\_)

負面答案

- 不相信監警會人員有足夠及專業知識去做監察同覆檢既工作
- 不相信監警會既獨立性
- 監警會係監察 / 覆檢個案時可能會偏袒警務人員
- 監警會既透明度好低
- 監警會既效率好低
- 監警會有足夠權力去履行職責
- 其他負面答案 (請註明: \_\_\_\_\_)

唔知道 / 難講

拒答

[Q19] Lastly, what are your expectations on IPCC? Any more? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

最後，整體而言你對「監警會」有乜野期望? (不讀答案，可選多項)

Hope IPCC can improve Police-community relation / enhance its communication

Hope IPCC can monitor HK Police Force's work effectively

Hope IPCC can pressure HK police effectively in order to improve their works

Hope IPCC can explain more to citizens the work / complaints system of HK Police Force

Hope IPCC can ensure citizens will get appropriate Police services

Hope IPCC can provide a channel for complaints against police

Others (Please specify : \_\_\_\_\_)

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

希望監警會可以改善警民關係 / 加強警民溝通

希望監警會可以有效監察香港警察既工作

希望監警會可以有效俾香港警察適當壓力令工作做得更好

希望監警會可以向市民多解釋香港警察既工作 / 投訴機制

希望監警會可以保障市民得到適當既警察服務

希望監警會可以提供投訴香港警察既渠道

其他 (請註明: \_\_\_\_\_)

唔知道 / 難講

拒答

## Part IV Demographics

### 第四部分 個人資料

We would like to ask you some personal information for aggregate analyses. Please rest assured that your information provided will be kept strictly confidential.

我地想請問您一 d 簡單既個人資料以作綜合分析，你所提供既資料係會絕對保密，請放心。

[DM1] Gender 性別

Male	男
Female	女

[DM2a] Age 年齡

_____ (Exact age)	_____ (準確數字)
Do not want to tell	唔肯講

[DM2b] 【For those who do not want to tell their exact age】Age interval (Interviewer can read out the intervals) 【只問不肯透露準確年齡被訪者】年齡 (範圍)[訪問員可讀出範圍]

18 - 19	18 - 19 歲
20 - 24	20 - 24 歲
25 - 29	25 - 29 歲
30 - 34	30 - 34 歲
35 - 39	35 - 39 歲
40 - 44	40 - 44 歲
45 - 49	45 - 49 歲
50 - 54	50 - 54 歲
55 - 59	55 - 59 歲
60 - 64	60 - 64 歲
65 - 69	65 - 69 歲
70 or above	70 歲或以上
Refuse to answer	拒答

[DM3] Education Attainment 教育程度

Non-educated / pre-elementary education	未受教育 / 學前教育
Primary	小學
Junior secondary (F.1 - F.3)	初中(中一至中三)
Senior secondary (F.4 - F.5, vocational training included)	高中(中四至中五包括工藝程度)
Matriculation	預科(中六至中七)
Tertiary, non-degree (Diploma / Certificate)	專上非學位 (文憑 / 證書課程)
Tertiary, non-degree (Associate degree)	專上非學位 (副學士課程)
Tertiary, degree	專上學位
Postgraduate or above	研究院或以上
Refuse to answer	拒答

## [DM4] Occupation 職業

Managers / administration staff	經理及行政人員
Professional	專業人員
Associate professional	輔助專業人員
Clerk	文員
Service worker and Shop & market sales worker	服務工作及商店銷售人員
Skilled agricultural & fishery worker	漁農業熟練工人
Craft & related trade worker	手工藝及有關人員
Plant & machine operator / assembler	機台及機器操作員及裝配員
Unskilled worker	非技術工人
Students	學生
Homemakers	料理家務者
Retired	已退休
Unclassified	不能辨別
Others (Unemployed and non-workers included)	其他 (包括失業及其他非在職者)
Refuse to answer	拒答

## [DM5] Personal monthly income (including all income source)

每月個人收入 (請包括所有收入來源)

No income	沒有收入
HK\$1 – HK\$3,999	HK\$1 – HK\$3,999
HK\$4,000 – HK\$5,999	HK\$4,000 – HK\$5,999
HK\$6,000 – HK\$7,999	HK\$6,000 – HK\$7,999
HK\$8,000 – HK\$9,999	HK\$8,000 – HK\$9,999
HK\$10,000 – HK\$14,999	HK\$10,000 – HK\$14,999
HK\$15,000 – HK\$19,999	HK\$15,000 – HK\$19,999
HK\$20,000 – HK\$24,999	HK\$20,000 – HK\$24,999
HK\$25,000 – HK\$39,999	HK\$25,000 – HK\$39,999
HK\$40,000 or above	HK\$40,000或以上
Refuse to answer	拒答

## [DM6] Family monthly income (including all income source)

每月家庭收入 (請包括所有收入來源)

HK\$3,999 or below	HK\$3,999 或以下
HK\$4,000 – HK\$5,999	HK\$4,000 – HK\$5,999
HK\$6,000 – HK\$9,999	HK\$6,000 – HK\$9,999
HK\$10,000 – HK\$14,999	HK\$10,000 – HK\$14,999
HK\$15,000 – HK\$19,999	HK\$15,000 – HK\$19,999
HK\$20,000 – HK\$24,999	HK\$20,000 – HK\$24,999
HK\$25,000 – HK\$29,999	HK\$25,000 – HK\$29,999
HK\$30,000 – HK\$39,999	HK\$30,000 – HK\$39,999
HK\$40,000 – HK\$59,999	HK\$40,000 – HK\$59,999
HK\$60,000 or above	HK\$60,000 或以上
Refuse to answer	拒答

## [DM7] Residential District 居住地區

Central and Western District	中西區
Wan Chai District	灣仔區
Eastern District	東區
Southern District	南區
Sham Shui Po District	深水埗區
Kowloon City District	九龍城區
Wong Tai Sin District	黃大仙區
Kwun Tong District	觀塘區
Yau Tsim Mong District	油尖旺區
Kwai Tsing District	葵青區
Tsuen Wan District	荃灣區
Tuen Mun District	屯門區
Yuen Long District	元朗區
Northern District	北區
Tai Po District	大埔區
Sha Tin District	沙田區
Sai Kung District	西貢區
Islands District	離島區

*Thank you for your time. If you have any questions regarding this interview, you can call xxxx-xxxx to talk to our supervisor, or the Human Research Ethics Committee for Non-Clinical Faculties of the University of Hong Kong at xxxx-xxxx during office hours to verify this interview's authenticity and confirm my identity. Good-bye!*

問卷已經完成，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 向香港大學操守委員會查詢今次訪問既真確性同埋核對我既身分。拜拜！

\*\*\*\*\* End of questionnaire \*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*問卷完\*\*\*\*\*