

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG
PUBLIC OPINION PROGRAMME

Independent Police Complaints Council
Public Opinion Survey 2017



Final Report

Jointly compiled by
CHUNG Ting-Yiu Robert, PANG Ka-Lai Karie,
LEE Wing-Yi Winnie and CHU Cho-Leung Stanley

September 2017

Copyright of this report is held jointly by Independent Police Complaints Council (IPCC) and the Public Opinion Programme (POP) at The University of Hong Kong (HKU). Everything in this publication is the work of individual researchers, and does not represent the stand of HKU. 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 the IPCC | 5 |
| B. Awareness of news on complaints against the Hong Kong Police Force and the IPCC | 7 |
| C. Image and confidence in the IPCC | 8 |
| D. Overall perception on the IPCC | 10 |
| IV. Conclusion | 12 |

Appendices

| | |
|-----------------------------|----|
| 1. Contact Information | 14 |
| 2. Frequency Tables | 16 |
| 3. Demographics | 53 |
| 4. Bilingual Questionnaires | 57 |

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, the Independent Police Complaints Council (IPCC) commissioned POP, for the first time, to conduct a public opinion poll entitled “Independent Police Complaints Council Public Opinion Survey 2013”. The objectives of the survey were to investigate the public knowledge and perception of the IPCC, to understand the expectations of the public towards the IPCC so as to shape a better IPCC, to identify the direction of IPCC’s publicity initiatives in future, and to track the people’s opinion changes towards the IPCC, if any. In order to monitor the change of people’s perceptions towards the IPCC and their expectations, the IPCC again commissioned POP in 2014, 2015, 2016 and then this year to repeat the survey using similar research design and opinion questions. This “Independent Police Complaints Council Public Opinion Survey 2017” was the 5th survey in the row. This year, the telephone survey is supplemented by a focus group study for the first time to obtain people’s more in-depth opinions and suggestions towards some important aspects of the IPCC. The findings of the focus group study are documented in another report.
- 1.3 The research instrument used in this study was designed entirely by the POP Team after consulting the IPCC and making reference to the previous questionnaires, including those used by the IPCC for tracking their image attributes before POP came in the picture. Fieldwork operations and data analysis were also conducted independently by the POP Team, without interference from any outside parties. 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 randomly generated using known prefixes assigned to telecommunication services providers under the Numbering Plan provided by the Office of the Communications Authority (OFCA). Invalid numbers were then eliminated according to computer and manual dialing records to produce the final 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 **6 to 17 March, 2017**. A total of **1,010 Hong Kong residents** of age 18 or above were successfully interviewed. As shown in the calculation of Appendix 1, the overall response rate of this survey was **70.7%** (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 22,200 telephone numbers sampled for the survey, 3,235 were confirmed to be ineligible. Among them, 338 were fax or data lines, 2,427 were invalid telephone numbers, 79 were call-forwarding numbers while another 339 were non-residential numbers. Besides, 35 of them were invalidated due to special technological reasons while 17 cases were voided because no target respondents were available at the numbers provided.
- 2.5 Meanwhile, a total of 11,631 telephone numbers were invalidated before the research team could confirm their eligibility. Among them, 760 were busy lines, 9,209 were no-answer calls after making a maximum of 5 times’ recalls, 899 cases were diverted to answering devices while another 14 were blocked. Moreover, 380 cases were treated as unsuccessful because of language problems, 357 interviews were terminated before the screening question while 12 cases were voided for other problems.

- 2.6 On the other hand, 6,324 cases failed to complete the interview. Among them, 4 rejected the interview on behalf of the household and 1 rejected the interview immediately after eligibility was confirmed. Besides, 6,258 were unfinished cases with appointment dates beyond the end of fieldwork period. Another 56 cases were incomplete due to unexpected termination of interviews, 5 were classified as miscellaneous due to other non-contact problems, and the remaining 1,010 were successful cases (Table 2).
- 2.7 To ensure representativeness of the findings, the raw data collected have been rim-weighted according to provisional figures obtained from the Census and Statistics Department regarding the gender-age distribution of the Hong Kong population in 2016 mid-year and the educational attainment (highest level attended) distribution collected in the 2011 Census. All figures in this report are based on the weighted sample.
- 2.8 Statistical tests of “difference-of-proportions” and “difference-of-means” have been employed whenever applicable, so as to identify any significant difference between consecutive surveys. Figures marked with double asterisks (**) indicate that the difference has been tested to be statistically significant at $p < 0.01$ level under the same weighting method, whereas those with single asterisk (*) denote statistical significance at $p < 0.05$ level.

III. Research Findings

The questionnaire of this survey comprises 21 opinion questions which cover the respondents' awareness of the IPCC, awareness of news on complaints against the Hong Kong Police Force, perceived image and confidence in the IPCC as well as their general perception of the IPCC. The key findings are summarized in this section alongside with the comparison with the 2016 survey wherever applicable, while all frequency tables referred to in this section can be found in Appendix 2. It should be noted that the figures in the main text of this report have been rounded up to the nearest integers after considering the second decimal place.

A. Awareness of the IPCC

- 3.1 Same as the previous surveys, the first part of survey aimed at gauging respondent's general awareness of the IPCC and its job nature. This year, close to 80% of the respondents (79%) had heard of the IPCC prior to the interview, whereas one-fifth (20%) said they had not. All in all, the IPCC maintained a high level of public awareness over the past three years compared with that in 2013 when the survey series began, where just two-thirds of the sample had heard of the IPCC (Table 3).
- 3.2 The survey continued to ask those respondents who were aware of the IPCC from where they had heard about it. They were first asked to name the channels they learnt about the IPCC, and then prompted with the channels they had not mentioned. The results were similar to that of last year. Without prompting, three-quarters (75%) of the sub-sample immediately mentioned television, which was apparently the most common source of information. It included TV news (69%), TV interviews (1%), TV series ("IPCC Files") (<1%) and other TV programmes (4%). Followed at a large distance, newspapers, including Ming Pao ("The IPCC Perspective") (1%) and other newspaper stories (11%), came next with a total of 12% mentioning it. Another 4% each said that they had heard of the IPCC from the Internet and from radio. Whilst after prompting, more than 90% (94%) of the respondents stated that they had learnt about the IPCC from television, mostly from TV news (91%). More than half (53%) of the respondents stated that they had read about the IPCC from newspapers, mostly from newspaper stories (49%) other than "The IPCC Perspective" and "Business of the Cops". Nearly 40% (38%) of the respondents had learnt about the IPCC through the Internet, with social media (23%) being the most popular online channel. Besides, another one-third (34%) of the respondents recalled that they had heard about the IPCC on radio after prompting, followed by advertisements on public transport (16%), District Fight Crime Committee (8%) and annual report / brochure / newsletter / YouTube channel / quarterly meeting of the IPCC (5%). Lastly, 4% recalled coming across

IPCC-related information from posters. Only 2% recalled hearing of the IPCC from friends, neighbours, relatives or schoolmates (Table 4).

- 3.3 This year, the respondents were then asked to suggest channels through which they would like to know more about the IPCC. Over half of them said that they preferred learning about the IPCC through TV programmes (52%). The second most preferred choice, newspaper columns, was suggested by only 13% of the respondents, followed by radio programmes, which was named by 9%. The next five preferred channels are all online channels. They are the Internet (6%), the IPCC page on Facebook (5%), the IPCC website (5%), the IPCC channel on YouTube (3%) and online news (3%). Meanwhile, 11% of the respondents could not provide any specific channel while 9% of the respondents expressly said that they were not interested to know more about the IPCC (Table 5).
- 3.4 Same as the 2016 survey, when the respondents were asked to name the IPCC's duties that they were aware of, 45% of those who had heard of the IPCC could provide at least one correct answer, among which most could correctly cite that the IPCC was responsible for "monitoring CAPO's cases handling process / monitoring how Police handle complaints" (29%), despite having a significant drop of 8 percentage points compared with last year's 37%. "Monitoring Police's follow-up / disciplinary actions towards officers being complained" (15%) came second with a close-to-a-double jump when compared with last year's 8%. "Identifying mal-practices in Police's works that has led or may lead to complaints" and "reviewing / verifying investigation report / results by CAPO" formed the next tier and were correctly named by 6% and 5% of the sub-sample respectively. Only 1% each could correctly name "improving Police Force's quality of service" and "reviewing statistics on types of Police's behavior that citizens complained". On the other hand, nearly two-thirds of the respondents (65%) named at least one duty incorrectly. Around half of this sub-sample (51%) mistakenly thought that "monitoring Police's behavior / conduct" was one of IPCC's duties while another 16% mistook "receiving / investigating citizens' complaints on Police directly" as a duty of the IPCC. Meanwhile, 8% admitted that they had no idea what the IPCC's duties were. Other less common answers are listed in Table 6 of Appendix 2.
- 3.5 As for the independent nature of the IPCC, among the 800 respondents who had heard of the IPCC prior to the interview, two-thirds (67%) were aware that the IPCC was a totally independent organization that was not under the Police. On the contrary, 30% thought the IPCC was part of the Police, and 3% opted for "don't know / hard to say". These figures remained stable over the past few years (Table 7).
- 3.6 When the respondents were asked to name the most effective channel to make a complaint against members of the Police Force, the IPCC topped the list once again as named by 30% of the overall sample. CAPO, which was mentioned by one-fifth (20%) of the respondents,

came next, whereas just over one-tenth (11%) of the sample mentioned Police Force in general. Another 7% mentioned the media, and other complaint channels that came to the respondents' mind included the ICAC (2%), DC/LegCo members (2%), the Internet (1%), the Office of the Ombudsman (1%), and so on. Meanwhile, 6% expressed that no channel was effective in making complaints against the Police Force, a drop of 3 percentage points from that of last year. Besides, the percentage of respondents who said they did not know which channel was the most effective remained more or less the same at 17% (Table 8).

- 3.7 This year, the respondents were asked to pick one or more types of IPCC-related information which they would be interested to learn more from a list of six. Results showed that the respondents were most interested in “statistics, progress and results of complaints” (43%) and “observations and suggestions on Police’s quality improvement” (40%). However, even the other four types of information were not as popular, percentages of those who were interested to learn more about “system and procedures of handling complaints” (37%), “complaint cases sharing” (33%), “functions of IPCC and its work” (28%) and “members and structure of IPCC” (25%) ranged from a quarter to over one-third. Still, 12% said that they were not interested to know more about IPCC at all whilst 6% said they were equally interested in all items (2%) or could not make a choice among them (4%; Table 9).

B. Awareness of news on complaints against the Hong Kong Police Force

- 3.8 The second part of the survey focused on citizens' awareness of news related to complaints against the Hong Kong Police Force. Close to 90% of the respondents (89%) had heard about news on such complaints in the past year. In the latest survey, the “seven police officers / dark corner / Ken Tsang Kin-chiu case” topped the list with 51% recalling it, which is substantially higher than the percentage in 2016 (28%). The next was formed by news related to “assault”, as named by a quarter (25%) of the respondents. “News related to the Occupy Movement” which topped the lists in the previous two years came third this time with 24% respondents naming it, presenting an 8-percentage-point drop from that of 2016. Followed at a distance, 13% and 11% of the respondents reported that they had heard about news on the “Franklin Chu King-wai police baton assault case” and “use of excessive and unnecessary force” respectively. Other less popular items included news on “conflicts between Police and citizens during processions, gathers and demonstrations” (7%), “Police’s misconduct / bad attitude / abusive language” (6%) and “Police’s abuse of power” (5%). Other answers mentioned by less than 5% of the respondents are listed in Table 10 of Appendix 2. Meanwhile, 10% of the respondents could not specify the news of which they had heard. Another 10% said that they had not heard of any relevant news in the past year, higher than the 6% registered in the 2016 survey (Table 10).
- 3.9 As for the types of complaints that the respondents would care about most, “police officers’ abuse of power” ranked first for five consecutive times, taking up close to a quarter (24%)

of the sample. “Corruption of police officers” came second as nearly one-fifth (19%) of the respondents said that they cared about it most. About one in seven (15%) said that they cared about complaints on “police officers’ use of violence” most, followed by complaints on “unfairness of police officers in handling cases” (14%). Other types of complaints that were less commonly opted for included “working attitude of police officers” (5%) and “Police handling public demonstration” (5%). There were 4% of respondents who claimed they did not care about any complaints against the Police, while another 4% did not give any definite answers (Table 11).

C. Image and confidence in the IPCC

- 3.10 A series of questions were then administered to gauge the perceived image of the IPCC in the eyes of the public. Results of this year showed that half of the sample (50%) evaluated the IPCC’s independence in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police positively, in which 34% and 15% considered the IPCC “independent” and “quite independent” respectively. More than one-fifths (21%) opted for the middle ground “half-half”. On the other hand, 22% gave a negative assessment to this aspect of the IPCC, with 13% thinking it “not quite independent” and 10% even opting for “not independent at all”. Overall, fewer respondents evaluated the IPCC’s independence negatively compared with last year’s result. Besides, 7% answered “don’t know / hard to say” (Table 12).
- 3.11 When it came to the IPCC’s work in monitoring and reviewing CAPO’s investigations, 45% believed that the IPCC was able to do so in an impartial and objective way, including 27% who considered it “impartial and objective” and 18% “quite impartial and objective”. On the contrary, 17% believed it was not, in which 10% opting for “not quite impartial and objective” and 7% choosing “not impartial and objective at all”. The percentage of respondents who assessed the IPCC’s impartiality and objectivity positively has increased significantly by 5 percentage points and returned to the level registered two years ago, while those who held negative perception have decreased significantly by 9 percentage points. Meanwhile, 30% opted for “half-half”, and 8% did not know or found it hard to say (Table 13).
- 3.12 With regard to the IPCC’s efficiency in monitoring and reviewing complaints, 36% thought its performance was average and chose “half-half”. Meanwhile, a quarter (25%) thought it was efficient, while one-fifth (20%) thought the opposite which dropped significantly from last year’s 29%. Among those who evaluated this aspect positively, 13% answered “efficient” and 12% answered “quite efficient” after probing. As for those who gave negative assessment, 13% said that it was “not quite efficient” while 8% said it was “not efficient at all”. At the same time, close to one-fifth of the respondents (18%) failed to provide definite answers to this question (Table 14).

- 3.13 On the IPCC's level of transparency in complaint monitor and review, nearly 40% of the respondents (39%) chose "half-half". More than a quarter of the sample (26%) thought that the IPCC's work was of low transparency, with 13% each opting for "quite low" and "low" respectively. On the contrary, more than one-fifth (22%) appraised the IPCC's transparency positively, with 12% saying "high" and 11% saying "quite high". Similar to other aspects, compared to last year, significantly fewer respondents gave negative feedbacks whereas significantly more respondents gave positive responses to the IPCC's transparency. Meanwhile, 13% could not give definite answers to this question (Table 15).
- 3.14 The survey continued to ask if the respondents were confident in the IPCC in general. This year's results showed that a total of 45% expressed confidence in the IPCC, with 12% being "very confident" and 34% being "quite confident", representing an overall significant increase of 6 percentage points from 39% in 2016. Less than a quarter (24%) opted for the middle ground "half-half" while 26% said that they were not confident in the IPCC, down from 34% in the last survey, which included 16% who said "not quite confident" and 11% "not confident at all". The most common reason for no confidence this year was again the fact that "committees are appointed, not elected by citizens", which accounted for 28% of the "not confident" sub-sample. Other reasons that were frequently cited included the perception that the IPCC was "not fair and impartial" (19%), "it's like self-investigation" (18%), that the IPCC "may take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases" (17%), "the process and results of complaints are not released to public" (14%), that the IPCC was "not independent enough" (12%) and that "it takes too long to handle complaints / no result of investigation after a long time / cases go unattended" (11%). Moreover, 7% said that the IPCC "brings little to no effect / Police's misconduct continues" while 6% each said that they were not confident in the IPCC because they were "not clear about IPCC's works", that there was "no direct investigation, only responsible for monitoring and review, no actual authority", that "both are under the Government" and that they "have little confidence in some IPCC members". Meanwhile, 3% could not explain why they were not confident in the IPCC (Tables 16 & 17).
- 3.15 Regarding the existing complaint system, the percentage of respondents who expressed confidence in the two-tier system rebounded this year. Specifically, nearly half of the respondents (47%) were confident in the two-tier system, with 12% being "very confident" and 36% being "quite confident". Close to one-fifth (18%) opted for "half-half"; 17% said that they were "not quite confident" and 10% even said "not confident at all", meaning more than a quarter (27%) appraised the two-tier system negatively but this figure is significantly lower than the 32% registered a year ago. Among those who lacked confidence in the system, nearly a quarter suggested the IPCC to "increase transparency" (24%) while around one-fifth each thought "IPCC should become an independent department" (21%), suggested "changing the method for forming the Council" (20%), and "involving individuals from different classes in the process" (19%). Besides, 12% urged the IPCC to "handle complaints

fairly and impartially” while 8% were of the view that “IPCC should have authorization to investigate so that it can receive complaints and investigate directly”. Only 1% of the sub-sample said that nothing needed to be improved while 21% had no idea how the IPCC could improve further (Tables 18 & 19).

D. Overall perception on the IPCC

- 3.16 The last part of the survey was set out to investigate citizens’ overall perception of the IPCC. This year’s results were quite similar to those registered in 2016, revealing that over half of the respondents (55%) perceived the IPCC’s image positively, with 36% opting for “positive” and 19% choosing “quite positive”. Almost 30% (29%) evaluated the IPCC’s image as half positive and half negative. At the same time, one-eighth (12%) perceived the IPCC’s image negatively, of which 7% opting for “quite negative” and 5% “negative”. The remaining 4% could not give definite answers to the question (Table 20).
- 3.17 As to what made the 552 respondents perceive the IPCC’s image positively, the most popular reason this year was once again that they believed “IPCC is fair enough” (18%), closely followed by “intuition / impression / personal feeling” (15%) and also “IPCC is independent enough” (14%). Around one-tenth each said that “IPCC fulfills its duties” (10%), that “IPCC’s image / name is positive” (10%), that “IPCC provides a helpful monitoring system / mechanism” (9%) and “IPCC has high transparency” (9%). Other less commonly cited reasons included “IPCC’s structure gives people confidence” (7%), “there was no / little bad news about IPCC” (6%), “IPCC’s work brings an impact” (6%), “IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review” (6%) and so on. At the same time, 9% of the sub-sample could not provide any reason for their positive perception of the IPCC (Table 21).
- 3.18 On the other hand, among the 122 respondents who perceived the IPCC’s image negatively, more than a quarter (27%) thought so because they were of the view that “IPCC is not fair and impartial”. Around 20% each attributed their negative perception to their views that “IPCC might take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases” (20%), that “IPCC has low transparency” (20%), that “IPCC has low efficiency” (18%) and that “IPCC’s work does not bring an impact” (18%). At the same time, 13% had “no trust in IPCC’s independence”. Other reasons mentioned by less than 10% of the sub-sample included “comments / reports about IPCC are negative” (7%), “don’t think IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review” (7%) and so on. Besides, 5% did not give definite answers (Table 22).
- 3.19 The survey then went on to gauge citizen’s satisfaction with the IPCC’s overall performance. On a scale of 0 to 100, with 0 indicating very dissatisfied, 100 indicating very satisfied and 50 indicating half-half, the mean score obtained this year was 60.5 marks with a standard

error of 0.6 marks, representing a significant increase of 4.4 marks from the 56.1 marks registered a year ago (Table 23).

- 3.20 The survey ended by asking all respondents their expectations on the IPCC. Similar to last year's results, more than one-third of the respondents (35%) hoped that the IPCC could "handle cases in a fair, impartial and transparent manner" while close to one-fifth (18%) hoped that the IPCC could "improve its transparency". Those who hoped that the IPCC could "do better", "increase its efficiency" and "become an independent organization / handle complaint cases directly" formed the next tier with 11%, 9% and 8% respectively. Besides, 6% hoped that the IPCC would "keep up with its good work" while 4% hoped that it could "monitor HK Police Force's work effectively", 3% each hoped that it would "not be swayed by external influence", "have more promotion of its work", "broaden its member base" and "change the method for selecting its members". Other less frequently mentioned expectations are listed in Table 24 of Appendix 2. Meanwhile, 24% said they had no expectation or did not know what to expect from the IPCC (Table 24).

IV. Conclusion

- 4.1 This year, 79% of the respondents had heard of the IPCC, the majority of whom learnt about it from television. Television programmes was also the most popular channel through which they would like to know more about the IPCC. Regarding people's current understanding of the IPCC and its duties, however, only two-fifths or so (45%) could correctly name at least one IPCC duty, while nearly two-thirds (65%) misunderstood the IPCC's duties in one way or another. "Monitoring CAPO's cases handling process / monitoring how Police handle complaints" was the IPCC's most visible function again, but over half (51%) incorrectly thought that "monitoring Police's behavior / conduct" was one of the IPCC's duties. Meanwhile, more than two-thirds (67%) of those who had heard of the IPCC were aware that the IPCC was a totally independent organization while 30% mistakenly thought that it was part of the Police Force.
- 4.2 Majority of the respondents (89%) claimed that they had heard of news related to complaints against the Police in the past year. News related to the Occupy Movement, and in particular the "seven police officers case / dark corner case / Ken Tsang Kin-chiu case" and the "Franklin Chu King-wai police baton assault case", continued to receive most public attention even though they happened years ago. Assault by police officers, their use of excessive and unnecessary force as well as conflicts between Police and citizens during processions, gatherings and demonstrations were also named by quite a number of respondents as news on complaints they had heard about. Police officers' abuse of power was the issue the respondents cared the most, continuing to top the list of complaints, followed by corruption and the use of violence.
- 4.3 As for people's confidence in the existing two-tier police complaints system, the positive group continued to out-number the negative group in this year's survey. Close to half of the sample (47%) expressed confidence in the system, and the most popular suggestions for improvement offered by the non-confident group were increasing the IPCC's transparency and the IPCC to become an independent department. Regarding the effectiveness of complaint channels against Police, similar to last year, 30% of the respondents believed the IPCC was most effective, while another one-fifth (20%) chose CAPO.

- 4.4 Overall speaking, respondents' evaluation of the IPCC's performance has improved since last year, now back to the level registered in 2015. The satisfaction rating now stood at 60.5 on a scale of 0 to 100. As for people's confidence in the IPCC, 45% expressed confidence, while 26% did not, representing an increased net confidence from 5 to 19 percentage points.
- 4.5 On people's general perception of the IPCC, more than half (55%) thought that the IPCC's image was positive. On the contrary, 12% thought the opposite, giving a net positive value of 42 percentage points. Image profile analysis shows that the IPCC is perceived as quite independent, impartial/objective organization, somewhat efficient, but not very transparent in complaint monitor and review. On a positive note, public opinion towards the IPCC has turned significantly more positive in all four image aspects this year.
- 4.6 As for the reasons behind their perception, those who evaluated the IPCC's image positively thought that the IPCC was fair and independent enough or simply their own impression without a specific reasoning, while those who held opposite views thought that the IPCC was not fair and impartial and might take sides with the police officers.
- 4.7 In terms of future expectations on the IPCC, "handling cases in a fair, impartial and transparent manner" continues to top the list for five consecutive times, with more than one-third of the sample mentioning it.
- 4.8 The annual survey this year was conducted at a time when many public debates and protests on constitutional development have subsided. Emergence of a new Chief Executive was confirmed, and the socio-political environment has become less turbulent. Almost all social indicators were recovering from their record lows. Against this background, the IPCC's corporate image has also improved as reflected in the rebound of all image indicators, roughly returning to the level registered two years ago. If the IPCC can ride on this new wave of development and work hard and fast to publicize its independence and impartiality, the year ahead would be a very challenging and rewarding one.

Appendix 1

Contact Information

Table 1. Calculation of response rate

| |
|--|
| Response rate |
| = $\frac{\text{Successful cases}}{\text{Successful cases} + \text{Incomplete cases}^{\wedge} + \text{Refusal cases by eligible respondents}^{\#}}$ |
| = $\frac{1,010}{1,010 + (56 + 357) + (4 + 1)}$ |
| = 70.7% |

[^] Including “partial interview” and “interview terminated before the screening question”

[#] Including “household-level refusal” and “known respondent refusal”

Table 2. Breakdown of contact information

| | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| Respondents' ineligibility confirmed | 3,235 | 14.6% |
| <i>Fax / data line</i> | 338 | 1.5% |
| <i>Invalid number</i> | 2,427 | 10.9% |
| <i>Call-forwarding / mobile / pager number</i> | 79 | 0.4% |
| <i>Non-residential number</i> | 339 | 1.5% |
| <i>Special technological difficulties</i> | 35 | 0.2% |
| <i>No eligible respondents</i> | 17 | 0.1% |
| Respondents' ineligibility not confirmed | 11,631 | 52.4% |
| <i>Line busy</i> | 760 | 3.4% |
| <i>No answer</i> | 9,209 | 41.5% |
| <i>Answering device</i> | 899 | 4.0% |
| <i>Call-blocking</i> | 14 | 0.1% |
| <i>Language problem</i> | 380 | 1.7% |
| <i>Interview terminated before the screening question</i> | 357 | 1.6% |
| <i>Others</i> | 12 | 0.1% |
| Respondents' eligibility confirmed, but failed to complete the interview | 6,324 | 28.5% |
| <i>Household-level refusal</i> | 4 | <0.1% |
| <i>Known respondent refusal</i> | 1 | <0.1% |
| <i>Appointment date beyond the end of the fieldwork period</i> | 6,258 | 28.2% |
| <i>Partial interview</i> | 56 | 0.3% |
| <i>Miscellaneous</i> | 5 | <0.1% |
| Successful cases | 1,010 | 4.5% |
| Total | 22,200 | 100.0% |

Appendix 2

Frequency Tables

Note: Figures marked with double asterisks () in this section indicate that the variation has been tested to be statistically significant at $p < 0.01$ level, whereas those with single asterisk (*) denote statistical significance at $p < 0.05$ level.**

Awareness of the IPCC

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

| | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|
| | Percentage (Base=1,009) | Percentage (Base=1,039) | Percentage (Base=1,014) | Percentage (Base=1,002) | Frequency | Percentage (Base=1,010) |
| Yes | 68.3% | 66.9% | 85.5%** | 81.3%* | 801 | 79.3% |
| No | 30.8% | 32.0% | 14.2%** | 17.8%* | 204 | 20.2% |
| Don't know / hard to say | 0.8% | 1.1% | 0.3%* | 0.9% | 5 | 0.5% |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 1,010 | 100.0% |

Table 4. [Q2a] (Only ask respondents who have answered “yes” in Q1) From where have you heard of IPCC? Any other channels? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

[Q2b] (Only ask respondents who have answered “yes” in Q1) 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)

| | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | | 2017 | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | [Q2a+Q2b] | [Q2a+Q2b] | [Q2a+Q2b] | [Q2a+Q2b] | [Q2a] First mention | [Q2a+Q2b] Overall | (prompted and unprompted) | | |
| | % of valid sample (Base=698) | % of valid sample (Base=700) | % of valid sample (Base=864) | % of valid sample (Base=815) | Frequency | % of valid sample (Base=800) | Frequency | % of total responses (Base=2,990) | % of valid sample (Base=801) |
| ^Television | 94.2% | 93.2% | 95.1% | 93.3% | 602 | 75.3% | 752 | -- | 93.9% |
| <i>News</i> | 86.1% | 85.1% | 91.2%** | 89.3% | 555 | 69.3% | 725 | 24.3% | 90.6% |
| <i>TV interview</i> | 30.0% | 26.7% | 31.3%* | 22.8%** | 10 | 1.2% | 227 | 7.6% | 28.3%* |
| <i>TV series (IPCC Files)[#]</i> | 20.7% | 15.6%* | 16.8% | 20.6%* | 4 | 0.5% | 148 | 5.0% | 18.5% |
| <i>Now TV programme preview (The IPCC Perspective)</i> | -- | 3.5% | 3.6% | 4.6% | -- | -- | 27 | 0.9% | 3.4% |
| <i>Other TV programmes</i> | 28.3% | 18.0%** | 21.9% | 14.5%** | 34 | 4.2% | 181 | 6.1% | 22.6%** |
| ^Newspaper | 50.3% | 47.9% | 47.6% | 50.4% | 94 | 11.8% | 423 | -- | 52.8% |
| <i>Ming Pao (The IPCC perspective)</i> | 12.8% | 7.2%** | 10.5%* | 9.5% | 8 | 0.9% | 68 | 2.3% | 8.6% |
| <i>Sharp Daily (Business of the Cops)</i> | 13.2% | 6.2%** | 5.5% | 4.5% | 1 | 0.1% | 31 | 1.0% | 3.9% |
| <i>Other newspaper stories (see below)</i> | 35.7% | 40.4%* | 39.1% | 43.9%* | 86 | 10.8%* | 389 | 13.0% | 48.6% |
| ^Internet^{##} | 15.8% | 22.3%** | 32.9%** | 35.6% | 36 | 4.4% | 305 | -- | 38.1% |
| <i>Social media</i> | -- | -- | 15.5% | 19.2%* | 7 | 0.9% | 187 | 6.2% | 23.3%* |
| <i>News aggregation website / app</i> | -- | -- | 13.8% | 12.7% | 14 | 1.8% | 127 | 4.2% | 15.9% |
| <i>Forum</i> | -- | -- | 11.2% | 11.4% | 1 | 0.1%* | 104 | 3.5% | 12.9% |
| <i>Website / app of a particular media</i> | -- | -- | 7.6% | 6.9% | 7 | 0.8% | 78 | 2.6% | 9.7%* |
| <i>IPCC website</i> | 2.1% | 1.4% | 4.3%** | 1.8%** | 3 | 0.4% | 30 | 1.0% | 3.8%* |
| <i>Banner</i> | -- | -- | -- | 3.1% | -- | -- | 26 | 0.9% | 3.2% |
| <i>Other online channels (see below)</i> | -- | -- | 2.7% | 2.4% | 4 | 0.5% | 25 | 0.8% | 3.2% |
| ^Radio | 30.4% | 30.5% | 32.8% | 32.5% | 34 | 4.2% | 272 | 9.1% | 34.0% |

| | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | [Q2a] First mention | | 2017 | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|--|---------------------------------|
| | [Q2a+Q2b] % of valid sample (Base=698) | [Q2a+Q2b] % of valid sample (Base=700) | [Q2a+Q2b] % of valid sample (Base=864) | [Q2a+Q2b] % of valid sample (Base=815) | Frequency | % of valid sample (Base=800) | Frequency | [Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted) % of total responses (Base=2,990) | % of valid sample (Base=801) |
| ^Advertisements on public transport | 10.7% | 12.5% | 15.3% | 12.6% | -- | -- | 124 | -- | 15.6% |
| <i>MTR</i> | 5.8% | 6.7% | 10.2%* | 8.8% | -- | -- | 85 | 2.9% | 10.7% |
| <i>Bus</i> | 6.1% | 6.8% | 6.8% | 6.7% | -- | -- | 59 | 2.0% | 7.4% |
| <i>Light rail</i> | -- | 1.9%** | 1.6% | 0.9% | -- | -- | 8 | 0.3% | 1.0% |
| <i>Ferry / Pier</i> | 1.6% | 1.2% | 1.3% | 0.8% | -- | -- | 3 | 0.1% | 0.3% |
| <i>Tram</i> | -- | 0.8%* | 1.1% | 0.8% | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1%* |
| <i>Others (see below)</i> | -- | 0.6% | 0.3% | 0.1% | -- | -- | 3 | 0.1% | 0.4% |
| ^Annual report / Brochure / Newsletter / YouTube channel / Quarterly meeting of IPCC#### | 5.7% | 7.8% | 6.2% | 7.0% | -- | -- | 40 | -- | 5.0% |
| <i>Quarterly meeting between IPCC and CAPO</i> | 2.7% | 3.7% | 3.4% | 4.1% | -- | -- | 24 | 0.8% | 3.0% |
| <i>IPCC channel on YouTube</i> | -- | 1.9% | 2.1% | 1.4% | -- | -- | 11 | 0.4% | 1.4% |
| <i>Annual report of IPCC / brochure</i> | 1.5% | 2.3% | 1.3% | 2.4% | -- | -- | 7 | 0.2% | 0.9%* |
| <i>IPCC newsletter</i> | 1.4% | 1.0% | 0.6% | 0.4% | -- | -- | 3 | 0.1% | 0.3% |
| ^Poster (see below) | 1.6% | 2.0% | 3.5% | 2.5% | -- | -- | 30 | 1.0% | 3.7% |
| Magazines | 1.2% | 0.8% | 1.6% | 0.4%* | 1 | 0.1% | 5 | 0.2% | 0.6% |
| Others | 8.3% | 7.5% | 5.9% | 14.0%** | 20 | 2.6% | 97 | -- | 12.2% |
| ^District Fight Crime Committee | -- | -- | -- | 9.1% | -- | -- | 64 | 2.1% | 8.0% |
| <i>Friends / neighbours / relatives / schoolmates</i> | 3.5% | 3.5% | 4.5% | 4.1% | 7 | 0.9% | 18 | 0.6% | 2.3%* |
| <i>Talks</i> | 0.2% | 0.6% | 0.1% | 0.5% | -- | -- | -- | -- | --* |
| <i>Community activities</i> | 0.6% | 0.5% | 0.2% | 0.2% | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| <i>IPCC symposium</i> | -- | -- | <0.1% | 0.2% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Others (see below)#####</i> | 2.0% | 2.8% | 1.3%* | 1.5% | 13 | 1.6% | 20 | 0.7% | 2.5% |
| Don't know / can't remember | 0.2% | 0.6% | 0.8% | 0.4% | 13 | 1.6% | 2 | 0.1% | 0.3% |
| Total | | | | | 800 | 100.0% | 2,990 | 100.0% | |
| Missing | -- | 6 | 2 | -- | 1 | | -- | | |

| | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | [Q2a] First mention | | 2017 | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | [Q2a+Q2b] | [Q2a+Q2b] | [Q2a+Q2b] | [Q2a+Q2b] | Frequency | % of valid sample | [Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted) | | |
| | % of valid sample (Base=698) | % of valid sample (Base=700) | % of valid sample (Base=864) | % of valid sample (Base=815) | | (Base=800) | Frequency | % of total responses (Base=2,990) | % of valid sample (Base=801) |
| <u>Other newspaper that cannot be grouped</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| Apple Daily | | | | | 20 | 2.4% | 101 | 3.4% | 12.7% |
| Oriental Daily | | | | | 17 | 2.1% | 74 | 2.5% | 9.2% |
| Can't remember / not specified | | | | | 23 | 2.9% | 64 | 2.1% | 8.0% |
| Headline Daily | | | | | 6 | 0.8% | 35 | 1.2% | 4.4% |
| Apple Daily, Oriental Daily | | | | | 3 | 0.4% | 23 | 0.8% | 2.9% |
| Oriental Daily, Headline Daily | | | | | -- | -- | 11 | 0.4% | 1.4% |
| Sing Tao Daily | | | | | 2 | 0.3% | 8 | 0.3% | 1.0% |
| HK Economic Journal | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 6 | 0.2% | 0.7% |
| Headline Daily, AM730 | | | | | -- | -- | 5 | 0.2% | 0.6% |
| AM730 | | | | | 3 | 0.3% | 5 | 0.2% | 0.6% |
| HK Economic Times | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 4 | 0.1% | 0.5% |
| Apple Daily, Ming Pao | | | | | -- | -- | 4 | 0.1% | 0.4% |
| Apple Daily, South China Morning Post | | | | | 3 | 0.3% | 3 | 0.1% | 0.4% |
| Free newspaper | | | | | -- | -- | 3 | 0.1% | 0.4% |
| Headline Daily, Sky Post | | | | | -- | -- | 3 | 0.1% | 0.4% |
| Oriental Daily, Sing Tao Daily | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 3 | 0.1% | 0.4% |
| Sing Pao | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 3 | 0.1% | 0.3% |
| Ming Pao | | | | | -- | -- | 3 | 0.1% | 0.3% |
| Headline Daily, Sing Tao Daily | | | | | -- | -- | 2 | 0.1% | 0.3% |
| Metro Daily | | | | | -- | -- | 2 | 0.1% | 0.3% |
| Headline Daily, AM730, Sky Post | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Apple Daily, Oriental Daily, Ming Pao | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Apple Daily, Headline Daily | | | | | -- | -- | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Sing Tao Daily, Ming Pao | | | | | -- | -- | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Apple Daily, Headline Daily, AM730, Sky Post, Wen Wei Po | | | | | -- | -- | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Apple Daily, HK Economic Times | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.2% |

| | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|
| | [Q2a+Q2b] | [Q2a+Q2b] | [Q2a+Q2b] | [Q2a+Q2b] | [Q2a] First mention | | [Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted) | | |
| | % of valid sample (Base=698) | % of valid sample (Base=700) | % of valid sample (Base=864) | % of valid sample (Base=815) | Frequency | % of valid sample (Base=800) | Frequency | % of total responses (Base=2,990) | % of valid sample (Base=801) |
| AM730, Metro Daily | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Apple Daily, Oriental Daily, Sing Tao Daily | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Free newspaper, Sky Post | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Apple Daily, Oriental Daily, Headline Daily | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Apple Daily, Sing Tao Daily, Ming Pao | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| South China Morning Post | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Apple Daily, Ming Pao, Sing Pao | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Apple Daily, Ming Pao, HK01 | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Apple Daily, Sing Tao Daily | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Ta Kung Pao, Wen Wei Po | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Sky Post | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| AM730, Sky Post | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Oriental Daily, Ta Kung Pao | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Oriental Daily, Headline Daily, Sing Tao Daily, Ming Pao | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Headline Daily, AM730, HK Economic Times | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Ming Pao, HK Economic Journal | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Ming Pao, South China Morning Post | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Headline Daily, Free newspaper | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Apple Daily, HK Economic Journal | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Oriental Daily, AM730 | | | | | -- | -- | <1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Apple Daily, Headline Daily, Sing Tao Daily | | | | | -- | -- | <1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Apple Daily, Oriental Daily, Ming Pao, Ta Kung Pao | | | | | -- | -- | <1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Headline Daily, Sky Post, Metro Daily | | | | | -- | -- | <1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Sing Tao Daily, HK Economic Journal | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% |
| Apple Daily, Sing Pao | | | | | -- | -- | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% |
| Apple Daily, Ming Pao, HK Economic Journal | | | | | -- | -- | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% |
| Ming Pao, Sing Pao | | | | | -- | -- | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% |
| | | | | Sub-total | 86 | 10.8% | 389 | 13.0% | 48.6% |

| | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|--|
| | [Q2a+Q2b] | [Q2a+Q2b] | [Q2a+Q2b] | [Q2a+Q2b] | [Q2a] First mention | | [Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted) | | | |
| | % of valid sample (Base=698) | % of valid sample (Base=700) | % of valid sample (Base=864) | % of valid sample (Base=815) | Frequency | % of valid sample (Base=800) | Frequency | % of total responses (Base=2,990) | % of valid sample (Base=801) | |
| <u>Other online channels that cannot be grouped</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Can't remember / not specified | | | | | 3 | 0.4% | 12 | 0.4% | 1.5% | |
| YouTube | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 8 | 0.3% | 1.0% | |
| Online news | | | | | -- | -- | 4 | 0.1% | 0.5% | |
| Blog | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.2% | |
| jobsDB | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% | |
| | | | | Sub-total | 4 | 0.5% | 25 | 0.8% | 3.2% | |
| <u>Other advertisements on public transport that cannot be grouped</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Minibus | | | | | -- | -- | 3 | 0.1% | 0.3% | |
| Can't remember / not specified | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| | | | | Sub-total | -- | -- | 3 | 0.1% | 0.4% | |
| <u>Place of poster</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Can't remember / not specified | | | | | -- | -- | 9 | 0.3% | 1.1% | |
| Bus stop | | | | | -- | -- | 7 | 0.2% | 0.8% | |
| On the street | | | | | -- | -- | 2 | 0.1% | 0.3% | |
| Outside police station | | | | | -- | -- | 2 | 0.1% | 0.3% | |
| Lobby of housing estate | | | | | -- | -- | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% | |
| Kwun Tong | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.2% | |
| District Office | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Police Training School | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Shopping mall | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Tsim Sha Tsui | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Government property | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Pier | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Housing estate | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Police station | | | | | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |

| | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|--|
| | [Q2a+Q2b] | [Q2a+Q2b] | [Q2a+Q2b] | [Q2a+Q2b] | [Q2a] First mention | | [Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted) | | | |
| | % of valid sample (Base=698) | % of valid sample (Base=700) | % of valid sample (Base=864) | % of valid sample (Base=815) | Frequency | % of valid sample (Base=800) | Frequency | % of total responses (Base=2,990) | % of valid sample (Base=801) | |
| Kowloon | | | | | -- | -- | <1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Tuen Mun | | | | | -- | -- | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% | |
| | | | | Sub-total | -- | -- | 30 | 1.0% | 3.7% | |
| <u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| School | | | | | 6 | 0.7% | 9 | 0.3% | 1.2% | |
| Police station | | | | | 2 | 0.3% | 2 | 0.1% | 0.3% | |
| Democrats | | | | | -- | -- | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% | |
| Work | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% | |
| Elderly center | | | | | 2 | 0.2% | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% | |
| Stranger | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Movie | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Have made complaints | | | | | <1 | 0.1% | <1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Processions, gatherings and demonstrations | | | | | -- | -- | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% | |
| | | | | Sub-total | 13 | 1.6% | 20 | 0.7% | 2.5% | |

The wording of this item was "TV series (IPCC the proper way)" in 2013's survey.

IPCC website was grouped under another category in 2013's and 2014's surveys.

The wording of this item was "Annual report / Brochure / Website / Newsletter / Quarterly meeting of IPCC" in 2013's survey and "Annual report / Brochure / Website / Newsletter / YouTube channel / Quarterly meeting of IPCC" in 2014's survey.

Include "Work" before 2016's survey.

Table 5. [Q3] If given a free choice, through which channels would you like to know more about IPCC? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

| | 2017 | | |
|---|----------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | Frequency | Percentage of responses (Base=1,389) | Percentage of sample (Base=1,008) |
| TV programmes | 529 | 38.1% | 52.5% |
| Newspaper columns | 133 | 9.6% | 13.2% |
| Radio programmes | 86 | 6.2% | 8.5% |
| Internet | 61 | 4.4% | 6.1% |
| IPCC page on Facebook | 54 | 3.9% | 5.4% |
| IPCC website | 52 | 3.8% | 5.2% |
| IPCC channel on YouTube | 32 | 2.3% | 3.2% |
| Online news | 27 | 2.0% | 2.7% |
| IPCC publications | 24 | 1.8% | 2.4% |
| Social media | 23 | 1.7% | 2.3% |
| Newspaper | 22 | 1.6% | 2.2% |
| TV programmes on public transport (e.g. Roadshow) | 17 | 1.2% | 1.6% |
| Newspaper stories | 14 | 1.0% | 1.4% |
| News (channel not specified) | 14 | 1.0% | 1.4% |
| Community activities | 13 | 0.9% | 1.3% |
| Mobile apps | 11 | 0.8% | 1.1% |
| Advertisements on public transport | 11 | 0.8% | 1.1% |
| Symposium / Talks | 7 | 0.5% | 0.7% |
| School activities | 6 | 0.4% | 0.6% |
| Others (see below) | 55 | 4.0% | 5.5% |
| Not interested to know more about IPCC | 89 | 6.4% | 8.9% |
| Don't know / hard to say | 107 | 7.7% | 10.6% |
| | Total | 1,389 | 100.0% |
| | <i>Missing</i> | 2 | |

| | 2017 | | |
|--|-----------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | Frequency | Percentage of responses (Base=1,389) | Percentage of sample (Base=1,008) |
| <u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u> | | | |
| Poster | 9 | 0.6% | 0.9% |
| TV advertisements | 6 | 0.4% | 0.6% |
| Search engine | 5 | 0.4% | 0.5% |
| Via other people | 5 | 0.4% | 0.5% |
| Advertisements (channel not specified) | 4 | 0.3% | 0.4% |
| Forum | 4 | 0.3% | 0.4% |
| Government website | 4 | 0.3% | 0.4% |
| YouTube | 3 | 0.2% | 0.3% |
| Email | 2 | 0.2% | 0.2% |
| Internet radio | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| District Council | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Notice board in housing estate | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| Government advertisements | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| Forum, government website | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| District Fight Crime Committee | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| Article | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| By person, telephone enquiry | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| Movie | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| Official channel | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Police | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| By person | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% |
| Search engine, police | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% |
| Magazine | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% |
| Sub-total | 55 | 4.0% | 5.5% |

Table 6. [Q4] (Only ask respondents who have answered “yes” in Q1) To your knowledge, what are IPCC’s duties? Any other duties? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed, interviewer to probe “any more?”)

| | 2013 % of valid sample (Base=698) | 2014 % of valid sample (Base=697) | 2015 % of valid sample (Base=865) | 2016 % of valid sample (Base=813) | Frequency | 2017 % of total responses (Base=1,111) | % of valid sample (Base=800) |
|---|--|--|--|--|-----------|---|------------------------------------|
| IPCC duties | 48.5% | 39.7%** | 49.4%** | 49.5% | 357 | -- | 44.7% |
| <i>Monitor CAPO’s cases handling process / Monitor how Police handle complaints[^]</i> | 27.1% | 22.5%* | 22.7% | 36.9%** | 233 | 20.9% | 29.1%** |
| <i>Monitor Police’s follow-up / disciplinary actions towards officers being complained</i> | 14.0% | 10.8% | 16.8%** | 7.8%** | 120 | 10.8% | 15.0%** |
| <i>Identify mal-practices in Police’s works that has led or may lead to complaints</i> | 6.9% | 2.9%** | 8.3%** | 6.1% | 46 | 4.1% | 5.7% |
| <i>Review / verify investigation reports / results by CAPO</i> | 5.4% | 4.9% | 5.8% | 5.0% | 38 | 3.4% | 4.7% |
| <i>Improve Police Force’s quality of service</i> | 3.1% | 2.5% | 2.3% | 0.9%* | 10 | 0.9% | 1.2% |
| <i>Review statistics on types of Police’s behavior that citizens complained</i> | 1.8% | 3.0% | 1.2%* | 1.3% | 6 | 0.5% | 0.7% |
| Non-IPCC duties | 52.9% | 58.9%** | 54.5% | 54.5% | 520 | -- | 65.0%** |
| <i>Monitor Police’s behavior / conduct</i> | 38.4% | 47.0%** | 39.4%** | 43.3% | 409 | 36.8% | 51.1%** |
| <i>Receive / investigate citizen’s complaints on Police directly^{^^}</i> | 16.4% | 13.9% | 17.2% | 12.8%* | 129 | 11.6% | 16.1% |
| <i>Investigate Police bribing cases</i> | 1.2% | 1.7% | 0.8% | 0.6% | 18 | 1.6% | 2.2%** |
| <i>Improve police-community relation / enhance communication</i> | 1.7% | 0.8% | 0.4% | 0.7% | 9 | 0.8% | 1.1% |
| <i>Other wrong answers (see below)</i> | 1.1% | 1.5% | 2.3% | 2.6% | 32 | 2.9% | 4.0% |
| Don’t know / can’t remember | 10.3% | 14.5% | 11.1%* | 8.4% | 63 | 5.7% | 7.9% |
| Total | | | | | 1,111 | 100.0% | |
| Missing | -- | 9 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | |
| <u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u> | | | | | | | |
| Monitor complaints | | | | | 7 | 0.6% | 0.8% |
| Monitor TV programmes | | | | | 3 | 0.3% | 0.4% |

| | 2013 % of valid sample (Base=698) | 2014 % of valid sample (Base=697) | 2015 % of valid sample (Base=865) | 2016 % of valid sample (Base=813) | 2017 Frequency | 2017 % of total responses (Base=1,111) | 2017 % of valid sample (Base=800) | |
|--|--|--|--|--|-------------------|---|--|------|
| Monitor processions and demonstrations | | | | | 2 | 0.2% | 0.3% | |
| Provide welfare to police officers | | | | | 2 | 0.2% | 0.3% | |
| Provide discipline training | | | | | 2 | 0.2% | 0.3% | |
| Make complaints of Police | | | | | 2 | 0.2% | 0.2% | |
| Maintain order | | | | | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% | |
| Promote | | | | | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% | |
| Monitor bribery case of governmental departments | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Evaluate performance of police officers | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Enhance credibility of Police | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Similar to ICAC | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Safeguard Police | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Fight against crime | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Help the government | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Provide unbiased information | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Monitor and review complaints | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Be neutral | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Help police officers | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Monitor bad guys | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Monitor the government | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Comment on cases | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Obstruct Police in their work | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Formulate guidelines for police officers | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% | |
| Enhance transparency of Police | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% | |
| | | | | | Sub-total | 32 | 2.9% | 4.0% |

^ The wording of this item was "Monitor CAPO's cases handling process" before 2016's survey.

^^ The wording of this item was "Investigate citizen's complaints on Police directly" before 2016's survey.

Table 7. [Q5] (Only ask respondents who have answered “yes” in Q1) Do you think IPCC is...? (Read out first two options, order to be randomized by computer, one answer only)

| | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| | Percentage (Base=698) | Percentage (Base=700) | Percentage (Base=865) | Percentage (Base=815) | Frequency | Percentage (Base=800) |
| A totally independent organization, not under the Police | 60.2% | 63.0% | 67.5% | 63.5% | 537 | 67.2% |
| Part of the Police | 34.8% | 30.8% | 25.2%* | 28.8% | 236 | 29.5% |
| Don't know / hard to say | 5.0% | 6.2% | 7.4% | 7.7% | 27 | 3.3%** |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 800 | 100.0% |
| Missing | -- | 6 | 2 | -- | 1 | |

Table 8. [Q6] What do you think is the most effective channel to make a complaint of Police? (Do not read out options, one answer only)

| | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|
| | Percentage (Base=1,008) | Percentage (Base=1,037) | Percentage (Base=1,007) | Percentage (Base=996) | Frequency | Percentage (Base=1,010) |
| IPCC | 24.2% | 24.1% | 35.4%** | 30.2%* | 303 | 30.0% |
| CAPO | 19.6% | 20.7% | 19.7% | 15.7%* | 204 | 20.2%** |
| Police Force (no specified division) | 10.7% | 11.0% | 8.4% | 7.0% | 110 | 10.9%** |
| Media | 8.5% | 8.1% | 9.2% | 10.8% | 72 | 7.1%** |
| ICAC | 1.4% | 1.8% | 1.4% | 2.0% | 25 | 2.5% |
| DC / LegCo members | 3.4% | 2.8% | 1.9% | 3.8%* | 20 | 2.0%* |
| Internet | 0.6% | 0.6% | 0.1%* | 1.2%** | 12 | 1.2% |
| Office of the Ombudsman, HK | 1.5% | 0.7% | 1.2% | 0.5% | 6 | 0.6% |
| Equal Opportunities Commission | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.1% | 0.1% | 1 | 0.1% |
| Others (see below) | 2.0% | 2.8% | 1.7% | 1.4% | 25 | 2.5% |
| No channel | 1.0% | 0.2% | 1.9%** | 8.8%** | 62 | 6.1%* |
| Don't know | 26.8% | 27.0% | 18.9%** | 18.4% | 169 | 16.7% |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 1,010 | 100.0% |
| <i>Missing</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>2</i> | <i>7</i> | <i>6</i> | -- | |
| <u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u> | | | | | | |
| Police Public Relations Bureau | | | | | 5 | 0.5% |
| 1823 | | | | | 5 | 0.5% |
| Telephone hotline | | | | | 4 | 0.4% |
| Chief Executive | | | | | 3 | 0.3% |
| District Office | | | | | 3 | 0.3% |
| Letter of complaint | | | | | 1 | 0.1% |
| Independent department with professional representatives | | | | | 1 | 0.1% |
| Demonstrations | | | | | 1 | 0.1% |
| Publicize the information | | | | | 1 | 0.1% |
| Department to make a complaint of Police | | | | | 1 | 0.1% |
| Investigation by members of the public | | | | | 1 | 0.1% |
| Independent inquiry committee | | | | | 1 | 0.1% |
| Independent group formed by credible people | | | | | <1 | <0.1% |
| | | | | Sub-total | 25 | 2.5% |

Table 9. [Q7] Which of the following IPCC-related information would you be interested to learn more? (Read out options, order to be randomized by computer, multiple answers allowed)

| | Frequency | 2017 Percentage of responses (Base=2,258) | Percentage of sample (Base=1,010) |
|--|------------------|--|---|
| Statistics, progress and results of complaints | 437 | 19.3% | 43.3% |
| Observations and suggestions on Police's quality improvement | 402 | 17.8% | 39.8% |
| System and procedures of handling complaints | 369 | 16.3% | 36.5% |
| Complaint cases sharing | 338 | 15.0% | 33.5% |
| Functions of IPCC and its work | 278 | 12.3% | 27.6% |
| Members and structure of IPCC | 251 | 11.1% | 24.9% |
| Others (see below) | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Not interested to know more about IPCC | 123 | 5.4% | 12.2% |
| Equally interested in all kinds | 20 | 0.9% | 2.0% |
| Don't know / hard to say | 39 | 1.7% | 3.9% |
| | Total | 2,258 | 100.0% |
| | <i>Missing</i> | <i>1</i> | |
| <u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u> | | | |
| Minutes of IPCC meetings | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| | Sub-total | 1 | <0.1% |

Awareness of news on complaints against the Hong Kong Police Force

Table 10.[Q8] 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)

| | 2013 % of valid sample (Base=1,009) | 2014 % of valid sample (Base=1,035) | 2015 % of valid sample (Base=1,014) | 2016 % of valid sample (Base=1,000) | Frequency | 2017 % of total responses (Base=1,805) | % of valid sample (Base=1,009) |
|--|--|--|--|--|-----------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Yes | 74.2% | 76.7%* | 91.5%** | 92.7% | 902 | -- | 89.4%* |
| <i>Seven police officers case / dark corner case / Ken Tsang Kin-chiu case^</i> | -- | -- | 13.9% | 28.4%** | 519 | 28.8% | 51.5%** |
| <i>Assault^^</i> | -- | -- | 13.7% | 18.1%** | 251 | 13.9% | 24.8%** |
| <i>News related to the Occupy Movement</i> | -- | -- | 54.9% | 32.0%** | 242 | 13.4% | 24.0%** |
| <i>Franklin Chu King-wai police baton assault case^^^</i> | -- | -- | 1.9% | 11.1%** | 126 | 7.0% | 12.5% |
| <i>Use of excessive and unnecessary force</i> | -- | -- | 17.3% | 6.2%** | 107 | 6.0% | 10.6%** |
| <i>Conflicts between Police and citizens during processions, gatherings and demonstrations^^^^</i> | 33.8% | 31.6% | 14.6%** | 18.4%* | 75 | 4.1% | 7.4%** |
| <i>Police's misconduct / bad attitude / abusive language^^^^^</i> | 5.1% | 11.3%** | 4.8%** | 4.8% | 65 | 3.6% | 6.5% |
| <i>Police's abuse of power</i> | 2.1% | 1.6% | 2.3% | 4.8%** | 50 | 2.8% | 4.9% |
| <i>Sexual harassment / indecent assault</i> | -- | -- | 1.6% | 3.3%* | 42 | 2.4% | 4.2% |
| <i>News related to the Mong Kok conflict</i> | -- | -- | -- | 21.9% | 40 | 2.2% | 4.0%** |
| <i>Police's neglect of duty</i> | -- | 2.3% | 1.0%* | 0.6% | 12 | 0.7% | 1.2% |
| <i>Police's law enforcement of the traffic regulation</i> | 1.7% | -- | 0.4% | 0.5% | 11 | 0.6% | 1.1% |
| <i>Police bribing cases</i> | 0.8% | 0.7% | 0.1% | 0.1% | 9 | 0.5% | 0.9%** |
| <i>Mistaken arrest of / Taking statements from a man with intellectual disability</i> | -- | -- | -- | 0.4% | 4 | 0.2% | 0.4% |
| <i>Stop and search issue / searching</i> | 1.6% | 0.4%** | 0.1% | 0.4% | 4 | 0.2% | 0.4% |
| <i>Police's unfair / inappropriate law enforcement</i> | -- | 0.7% | 0.6% | 0.4% | 4 | 0.2% | 0.4% |
| <i>Police's false testimony / fabrication of evidence</i> | -- | -- | -- | 0.4% | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| <i>Protests against parallel traders / Reclaim Movements^^^^^^</i> | -- | -- | 1.6% | 0.4%** | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| <i>Police officers involved in Tarlac State University forgery case</i> | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |

| | 2013 % of valid sample (Base=1,009) | 2014 % of valid sample (Base=1,035) | 2015 % of valid sample (Base=1,014) | 2016 % of valid sample (Base=1,000) | Frequency | 2017 % of total responses (Base=1,805) | % of valid sample (Base=1,009) |
|--|--|--|--|--|-----------|---|--------------------------------------|
| <i>The dispute between teacher Lam Wai-sze and Police at Mong Kok pedestrian street on July 14, 2013</i> | -- | 4.7% | -- | -- | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% |
| <i>Detention of reporters pursuing Eddie Ng Hak-kim</i> | -- | -- | -- | 0.1% | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>HKU 8.18 dispute / Li Keqiang visited HK / dark shadow incident</i> | 9.9% | 1.3%** | -- | 0.1% | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Use of tear gas grenades to disperse protesters</i> | -- | -- | 3.4% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Inappropriate use of pepper spray</i> | -- | -- | 2.8% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Inappropriate use of police batons</i> | -- | -- | 2.4% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Use of tear gas spray to disperse protesters</i> | -- | -- | 1.6% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>A plain-clothes officer threatened a female protester to "shut up or I'll take you back to the police station and rape you"</i> | -- | -- | 1.4% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Rape case in Police station</i> | 3.3% | 0.2%** | 1.3%** | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Not arresting or stopping anti-Occupy protesters who used violence</i> | -- | -- | 1.2% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Police's mishandling of sexual violence case</i> | -- | 2.9% | 1.1%** | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Arrest protesters selectively</i> | -- | -- | 1.1% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Use of police batons to strike heads and joints of protesters</i> | -- | -- | 0.9% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Tapping a protester on his shoulder and pepper spraying him in the face when he turned around</i> | -- | -- | 0.7% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Unreasonable arrest of protesters</i> | -- | -- | 0.6% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Doubt on Police's political neutrality</i> | -- | 0.9% | 0.5% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Ill-treatment towards a hotel staff who complained about an idling police coach bus with running engine</i> | -- | -- | 0.4% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Showing of the "disperse or we fire" warning banner to protesters</i> | -- | -- | 0.3% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Use of pepper spray on protesters behind the gate at Mongkok Police Station</i> | -- | -- | 0.3% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Unreasonable checking of ID cards and registration of personal data</i> | -- | -- | 0.2% | -- | -- | -- | -- |

| | 2013 % of valid sample (Base=1,009) | 2014 % of valid sample (Base=1,035) | 2015 % of valid sample (Base=1,014) | 2016 % of valid sample (Base=1,000) | Frequency | 2017 % of total responses (Base=1,805) | % of valid sample (Base=1,009) |
|---|--|--|--|--|-----------|---|--------------------------------------|
| <i>Dragging protesters along the ground</i> | -- | -- | 0.2% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Wearing blue ribbons while on duty</i> | -- | -- | 0.1% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Unsatisfactory arrangement of bail</i> | -- | 0.2% | 0.1% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Police's handling of personal information</i> | 0.6% | -- | 0.1% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Assaulting or arresting medical personnel</i> | -- | -- | 0.1% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Inappropriate treatment / Ill-treatment of arrested persons</i> | -- | -- | 0.1% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Plain-clothes officers among protesters tried to provoke violence</i> | -- | -- | <0.1% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Police officers on duty took group photos after clearance</i> | -- | -- | <0.1% | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>The public gathering of Police supporters at Mong Kok pedestrian street on August 4, 2013</i> | -- | 1.3% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Central and Western District Councilor was prevented from attending the meeting by Police</i> | -- | 1.2% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>A couple was accused of stealing after they reported the money they found to the Police</i> | -- | 0.9% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Police officer gave a female protestor a bear-hug</i> | -- | 0.6% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Members of Scholarism were prevented from attending the National Day flag-raising ceremony</i> | -- | 0.1% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Media coverage arrangement by Police</i> | 2.1% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Sex workers complained about Police's abuse of power</i> | 1.3% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Police's press release arrangement</i> | 0.2% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Police forced a boy to pretend as a cross when investigating drugs issue</i> | 0.2% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Mechanism of complaints against police is complicated, slow statements taking</i> | 0.1% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| <i>Others (see below)</i> | 2.3% | 2.3% | 3.7% | 1.5%** | 31 | 1.7% | 3.1%* |
| <i>Can't remember</i> | 20.4% | 23.9%* | 4.4%** | 7.4%** | 97 | 5.4% | 9.6% |
| <i>Refuse to answer</i> | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.4% | 0.7% | 6 | 0.3% | 0.6% |

| | 2013 % of valid sample (Base=1,009) | 2014 % of valid sample (Base=1,035) | 2015 % of valid sample (Base=1,014) | 2016 % of valid sample (Base=1,000) | Frequency | 2017 % of total responses (Base=1,805) | % of valid sample (Base=1,009) |
|---|--|--|--|--|--------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| No | 21.2% | 15.3%** | 6.1%** | 6.4% | 100 | 5.5% | 9.9%** |
| Don't know / hard to say | 4.6% | 8.0%* | 2.4%** | 0.9%** | 7 | 0.4% | 0.7% |
| Total | | | | | 1,805 | 100.0% | |
| <i>Missing</i> | -- | -- | -- | 2 | 1 | | |
| <u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u> | | | | | | | |
| Theft case | | | | | 7 | 0.4% | 0.7% |
| Arrest of people who obstructed police officers | | | | | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Online sale of counterfeit watch | | | | | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Black cops | | | | | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| News related to the Tuen Mun Leung King Market conflict | | | | | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Police officers received free sex service | | | | | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| News of off-duty police officers committing crimes | | | | | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Police officers committed crimes | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| Police officers were bribed and helped a nightclub | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| Drunk female police officer assault case | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| Rape case | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| Police Force refused to apologize for officers' neglect of duty | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| Accidental discharge of police firearm | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| Storming of the Legislative Council Complex | | | | | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% |
| Independence of Hong Kong | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% |
| Theft case; police officers received free sex service | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% |
| Mistaken arrest | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% |
| Off-duty police officer who helped people was complained | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% |
| Police officers received free service | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% |
| | | | | Sub-total | 31 | 1.7% | 3.1% |

^ The wording of this item was "Seven police officers beat up Ken Tsang Kin-chiu / a protestor on a street corner" in 2015's survey.

^^ Combined from "Assaulting protesters", "Assaulting citizens", "Ill-treatment of protesters" and "Assaulting protesters inside police vehicles or other places" in 2015's survey.

^^^ The wording of this item was "Franklin Chu King-wai / an officer used his police baton to strike the neck of a protestor from behind" in 2015's survey.

^^^^ The wording of this item was "Protestors complained about police's abuse of power" in 2013's survey.

^^^^^ The wording of this item was "Police's misconduct" in 2013's survey.

^^^^^^ The wording of this item was "Protests against parallel traders" in 2015's survey.

Table 11.[Q9] Which one of the following types of complaints of the Police Force would you care about most? (Read out options, order to be randomized by computer, one answer only)

| | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|
| | Percentage (Base=1,008) | Percentage (Base=1,038) | Percentage (Base=1,014) | Percentage (Base=1,001) | Frequency | Percentage (Base=1,005) |
| On police officers' abuse of power | 31.5% | 19.0%** | 22.0% | 22.0% | 244 | 24.3% |
| On corruption of police officers | 13.1% | 15.2% | 12.2%* | 13.4% | 188 | 18.7%** |
| On police officers' use of violence | 6.9% | 7.3% | 19.1%** | 16.9% | 146 | 14.5% |
| On unfairness of police officers in handling cases | 8.3% | 13.1%** | 15.3% | 14.9% | 137 | 13.6% |
| On working attitude of police officers | 5.6% | 6.4% | 4.7% | 4.1% | 53 | 5.2% |
| On Police handling public demonstration | 13.7% | 12.2% | 7.7%** | 5.9% | 52 | 5.1% |
| On officers' law enforcement of traffic regulations | 1.6% | 4.0%** | 1.8%** | 2.0% | 32 | 3.2% |
| On investigation method of police officers | 1.3% | 1.5% | 1.2% | 2.1% | 27 | 2.7% |
| On press releases arrangement | 2.6% | 1.6%* | 0.8% | 0.6% | 17 | 1.7%* |
| On media coverage arrangement | 2.6% | 3.1% | 1.5%* | 1.2% | 14 | 1.4% |
| On stop and search issue / searching | 2.5% | 2.9% | 2.7% | 1.4%* | 12 | 1.2% |
| Others (see below) | 0.8% | 0.9% | 0.5% | 0.6% | 1 | 0.1% |
| Don't care about any complaints against Police Force | 5.5% | 5.0% | 4.8% | 8.5%** | 45 | 4.5%** |
| Don't know / hard to say | 3.9% | 7.7%** | 5.7% | 6.4% | 38 | 3.8%** |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 1,005 | 100.0% |
| Missing | <i>1</i> | <i>1</i> | -- | <i>1</i> | 5 | |
| <u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u> | | | | | | |
| On police officers' indecent assault | | | | | 1 | 0.1% |
| | | | | Sub-total | 1 | 0.1% |

Image and confidence in the IPCC

Table 12.[Q10] Do you think IPCC is independent in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police? (Read out options, one answer only)

| | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2017 | | |
|---|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|----------------|-----------|----------------------------|--------------|
| | Percentage (Base=1,007) | | Percentage (Base=1,037) | | Percentage (Base=1,012) | | Percentage (Base=1,002) | | Frequency | Percentage (Base=1,010) | |
| Independent } Independent | 34.5% | 53.2% | 34.3% | 53.3% | 34.5% | 52.3% | 29.2%* | 45.7%** | 346 | 34.3%* | 49.7% |
| Quite independent | 18.7% | | 19.0% | | 17.8% | | 16.5% | | 156 | 15.4% | |
| Half-half | 18.8% | | 18.6% | | 18.4% | | 16.0% | | 215 | 21.2%** | |
| Not quite independent } Not independent | 13.0% | 18.6% | 12.0% | 17.1% | 13.0% | 22.0%** | 16.7%* | 29.3%** | 128 | 12.6%** | 22.5%** |
| Not independent at all | 5.7% | | 5.2% | | 9.0%** | | 12.6%** | | 100 | 9.9% | |
| Don't know / hard to say | 9.3% | | 11.0% | | 7.3%** | | 9.0% | | 66 | 6.5%* | |
| Total | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 1,010 | 100.0% | |
| Missing | 2 | | 2 | | 2 | | -- | | -- | | |

Table 13.[Q11] Do you think IPCC is able to monitor and review CAPO's investigations in an impartial and objective way? (Read out options, one answer only)

| | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2017 | | |
|---|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------|
| | Percentage (Base=1,007) | | Percentage (Base=1,039) | | Percentage (Base=1,013) | | Percentage (Base=997) | | Frequency | Percentage (Base=1,010) | |
| Impartial and objective } Impartial and objective | 24.7% | 45.7% | 27.1% | 46.7% | 23.9% | 43.8% | 21.6% | 39.8% | 272 | 26.9%** | 44.9%* |
| Quite impartial and objective | 21.0% | | 19.6% | | 19.9% | | 18.2% | | 182 | 18.0% | |
| Half-half | 28.4% | | 26.5% | | 27.1% | | 23.3% | | 304 | 30.1%** | |
| Not quite impartial and objective } Not impartial and objective | 8.8% | 13.1% | 9.5% | 13.7% | 11.1% | 19.4%** | 14.2%* | 26.3%** | 100 | 9.9%** | 16.8%** |
| Not impartial and objective at all | 4.2% | | 4.2% | | 8.2%** | | 12.0%** | | 70 | 6.9%** | |
| Don't know / hard to say | 12.8% | | 13.1% | | 9.8%* | | 10.7% | | 83 | 8.2% | |
| Total | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 1,010 | 100.0% | |
| Missing | 2 | | -- | | 1 | | 5 | | -- | | |

Table 14.[Q12] Do you think IPCC's complaint monitor and review is efficient or not? (Read out options, one answer only)

| | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2017 | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------|----------------------------|--------|----------------------------|---------|--------------------------|----------|-----------|----------------------------|
| | Percentage (Base=1,009) | | Percentage (Base=1,038) | | Percentage (Base=1,013) | | Percentage (Base=999) | | Frequency | Percentage (Base=1,009) |
| Efficient | 11.2% | | 14.0% | | 13.4% | | 11.9% | | 134 | 13.2% |
| Quite efficient | 14.3% | }25.5% | 12.9% | }26.8% | 14.1% | }27.4% | 10.0%** | }21.9%** | 117 | 11.6% |
| Half-half | 34.6% | | 31.7% | | 31.9% | | 29.5% | | 367 | 36.4%** |
| Not quite efficient | 8.7% | | 9.8% | | 12.3% | }20.4%* | 15.9%* | | 130 | 12.8%* |
| Not efficient at all | 4.2% | }12.8% | 3.0% | }12.7% | 8.1%** * | | 13.0%** | }28.9%** | 77 | 7.6%** |
| Don't know / hard to say | 27.1% | | 28.7% | | 20.2%** | | 19.7% | | 185 | 18.3% |
| Total | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 1,009 | 100.0% |
| Missing | -- | | 1 | | 1 | | 3 | | 1 | |

Table 15.[Q13] What do you think of IPCC's level of transparency in complaint monitor and review? (Read out options, one answer only)

| | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2017 | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------|----------------------------|--------|----------------------------|--------|----------------------------|----------|-----------|----------------------------|
| | Percentage (Base=1,009) | | Percentage (Base=1,038) | | Percentage (Base=1,014) | | Percentage (Base=1,002) | | Frequency | Percentage (Base=1,009) |
| High | 8.0% | | 9.7% | | 10.7% | | 9.6% | | 116 | 11.5% |
| Quite high | 13.0% | }21.1% | 9.8% | }19.5% | 11.7% | }22.4% | 8.5%* | }18.1%* | 108 | 10.7% |
| Half-half | 39.5% | | 38.6% | | 37.3% | | 35.6% | | 392 | 38.9% |
| Quite low | 13.0% | | 12.8% | | 11.6% | | 14.2% | | 132 | 13.1% |
| Low | 11.1% | }24.2% | 11.5% | }24.4% | 15.7%** | }27.2% | 20.0%* | }34.2%** | 132 | 13.1%** |
| Don't know / hard to say | 15.3% | | 17.5% | | 13.0%** | | 12.1% | | 129 | 12.8% |
| Total | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 1,009 | 100.0% |
| Missing | -- | | 1 | | -- | | -- | | 1 | |

Table 16.[Q14] Overall speaking, are you confident in IPCC? (Interviewer to probe intensity)

| | | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2017 | |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|---------------|-----------|----------------------------|
| | | Percentage (Base=1,009) | | Percentage (Base=1,039) | | Percentage (Base=1,014) | | Percentage (Base=1,002) | | Frequency | Percentage (Base=1,010) |
| Very confident | }Confident | 11.5% | | 12.1% | | 12.7% | | 11.4% | | 118 | 11.7% |
| Quite confident | | 31.3% | 42.7% | 35.8%* | 47.9%** | 31.3%* | 44.0% | 27.2%* | 38.6%* | 340 | 33.7%** |
| Half-half | | 31.5% | | 25.7%** | | 27.1% | | 22.3%* | | 238 | 23.6% |
| Not quite confident | }Not confident | 14.0% | | 14.4% | | 13.4% | | 17.4%* | | 158 | 15.6% |
| Not confident at all | | 5.1% | 19.0% | 5.7% | 20.1% | 10.8%** | 24.1%* | 16.5%** | 33.9%** | 109 | 10.8%** |
| Don't know / hard to say | | 6.7% | | 6.3% | | 4.8% | | 5.2% | | 46 | 4.5% |
| | Total | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 1,010 | 100.0% |
| | Missing | -- | | -- | | -- | | <1 | | <1 | |

Table 17.[Q15] (Only ask respondents who have answered “not quite confident” and “not confident at all” in Q14) Why do you think it is “not quite confident” / “not confident at all”? Any more? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

| | 2013 % of valid sample (Base=192) | 2014 % of valid sample (Base=209) | 2015 % of valid sample (Base=245) | 2016 % of valid sample (Base=338) | Frequency | 2017 % of total responses (Base=456) | % of valid sample (Base=265) |
|---|--|--|--|--|-----------|---|------------------------------------|
| Committees are appointed, not elected by citizens | 10.7% | 14.0% | 19.7% | 21.4% | 74 | 16.2% | 27.9% |
| Not fair and impartial^ | -- | 2.3% | 3.5% | 16.3%** | 51 | 11.2% | 19.2% |
| It's like self-investigation | 26.9% | 15.0%** | 18.9% | 9.8%** | 47 | 10.3% | 17.7%** |
| May take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases | 15.5% | 12.1% | 20.2%* | 11.4%** | 46 | 10.0% | 17.3%* |
| The process and results of complaints are not released to public | 17.0% | 18.4% | 17.9% | 8.1%** | 38 | 8.3% | 14.4%* |
| Not independent enough | -- | 1.4% | 1.5% | 14.7%** | 32 | 7.0% | 12.0% |
| It takes too long to handle complaints / No result of investigation after a long time / Cases go unattended | -- | -- | 4.2% | 17.9%** | 29 | 6.3% | 10.9%* |
| Brings little to no effect / Police's misconduct continues^^ | -- | 9.9% | 4.5%* | 14.2%** | 20 | 4.3% | 7.4%** |
| Not clear about IPCC's works | 12.4% | 8.2% | 7.4% | 7.1% | 17 | 3.7% | 6.3% |
| No direct investigation, only responsible for monitoring and review, no actual authority^^^ | 10.4% | 5.4% | 6.8% | 4.1% | 17 | 3.6% | 6.3% |
| Both are under the Government | 8.1% | 11.3% | 13.5% | 6.2%** | 16 | 3.5% | 6.0% |
| Have little confidence in some IPCC members | -- | -- | 4.2% | 2.8% | 16 | 3.4% | 5.9% |
| Police officers could be appointed as committee member | 1.9% | 1.8% | 1.8% | 2.6% | 13 | 2.8% | 4.8% |
| May cover up the truth to avoid unfavorable impact on Police's image | 6.8% | 2.9%* | 2.5% | 1.7% | 5 | 1.0% | 1.8% |
| Don't think IPCC investigate or monitor complaints in citizen's perspective | 4.9% | 3.4% | 3.5% | 3.0% | 3 | 0.7% | 1.3% |
| Affected by political factors | -- | 2.2% | -- | -- | 3 | 0.6% | 1.0% |
| May be unfair to police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases | -- | 2.0% | -- | 0.3% | 2 | 0.5% | 0.9% |

| | 2013 % of valid sample (Base=192) | 2014 % of valid sample (Base=209) | 2015 % of valid sample (Base=245) | 2016 % of valid sample (Base=338) | Frequency | 2017 % of total responses (Base=456) | % of valid sample (Base=265) |
|---|--|--|--|--|-----------|---|------------------------------------|
| Have little confidence in the Chairman of IPCC Mr Larry Kwok Lam-kwong | -- | -- | 1.3% | 0.8% | 2 | 0.5% | 0.8% |
| Not confident in the Government, so not confident in IPCC | 2.1% | -- | 0.2% | 1.1% | 2 | 0.5% | 0.8% |
| Not enough public engagement | -- | 1.0% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Don't like the image of IPCC | 3.4% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Others (see below) | 3.4% | 5.0% | 8.8% | 8.9% | 16 | 3.5% | 6.1% |
| Don't know / hard to say | 4.7% | 10.4% | 4.3%* | 3.8% | 9 | 1.9% | 3.3% |
| Total | | | | | 456 | 100.0% | |
| <i>Missing</i> | -- | -- | -- | 2 | 2 | | |
| <u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u> | | | | | | | |
| News in the past | | | | | 7 | 1.6% | 2.7% |
| Not proactive enough | | | | | 3 | 0.6% | 1.0% |
| IPCC did not fulfill its duties | | | | | 2 | 0.3% | 0.6% |
| Irresponsible | | | | | 1 | 0.3% | 0.5% |
| Not similar to ICAC | | | | | 1 | 0.2% | 0.4% |
| Not credible enough | | | | | 1 | 0.2% | 0.4% |
| IPCC's role is sensitive | | | | | 1 | 0.2% | 0.4% |
| IPCC is unnecessary | | | | | <1 | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| | | | | Sub-total | 16 | 3.5% | 6.1% |

^ The wording of this item was "Handle cases unfairly" in 2014's survey.

^^ The wording of this item was "Inconspicuous / bad performance" in 2014's survey.

^^^ Combined from "No direct investigation, monitor only, no actual authority" and "Only responsible for monitoring and review, didn't investigate directly" before 2016's survey.

Table 18.[Q16] Are you confident in the existing two-tier system of complaints against the Police? (Interviewer to probe intensity)

| | | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2017 | |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|----------------|-----------|----------------------------|
| | | Percentage (Base=1,009) | | Percentage (Base=1,036) | | Percentage (Base=1,012) | | Percentage (Base=1,001) | | Frequency | Percentage (Base=1,009) |
| Very confident | }Confident | 12.0% | | 11.1% | | 13.4% | | 11.4% | | 118 | 11.7% |
| Quite confident | | 32.3% | 44.2% | 40.7%** | 51.9%** | 30.9%** | 44.3%** | 27.1% | 38.5%** | 360 | 35.7%** |
| Half-half | | 28.2% | | 21.9%** | | 25.2% | | 20.1%** | | 177 | 17.5% |
| Not quite confident | }Not confident | 12.5% | | 12.5% | | 14.6% | | 16.9% | | 174 | 17.2% |
| Not confident at all | | 5.8% | 18.3% | 6.2% | 18.8% | 9.3%** | 23.9%** | 15.3%** | 32.2%** | 102 | 10.2%** |
| Don't know / hard to say | | 9.3% | | 7.4%* | | 6.7% | | 9.1%* | | 78 | 7.7% |
| | Total | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 1,009 | 100.0% |
| | Missing | -- | | 3 | | 2 | | 1 | | 1 | |

Table 19.[Q17] (Only ask respondents who have answered “not quite confident” and “not confident at all” in Q16) How do you think IPCC could improve this two-tier complaints system? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

| | 2013 % of valid sample (Base=185) | 2014 % of valid sample (Base=195) | 2015 % of valid sample (Base=228) | 2016 % of valid sample (Base=321) | Frequency | 2017 % of total responses (Base=401) | % of valid sample (Base=276) |
|--|--|--|--|--|-----------|---|------------------------------------|
| Increase transparency | 35.2% | 24.7% | 22.4% | 22.1% | 65 | 16.3% | 23.7% |
| IPCC should become an independent department | 9.7% | 10.1% | 5.4% | 17.9%** | 58 | 14.3% | 20.9% |
| Change the method for forming the Council [^] | -- | -- | 11.2% | 25.2%** | 54 | 13.5% | 19.6% |
| Involve individuals from different classes in the process | 22.8% | 23.0% | 15.5%* | 10.2% | 54 | 13.4% | 19.5%** |
| Handle complaints fairly and impartially | -- | 3.7% | 4.1% | 18.1%** | 32 | 8.0% | 11.6%* |
| IPCC should have authorization to investigate so that it can receive complaints and investigate directly ^{^^} | 9.4% | 12.4% | 16.5% | 6.9%** | 23 | 5.7% | 8.3% |
| Improve work efficiency | -- | 3.5% | 3.7% | 6.6% | 11 | 2.8% | 4.1% |
| IPCC should have authorization to decide punitive sanctions on police officers who violated regulations | 4.0% | 1.9% | 3.6% | 4.0% | 9 | 2.3% | 3.3% |
| Shorten the time for investigation and review | 3.4% | 1.9% | 4.5% | --** | 5 | 1.2% | 1.8%* |
| Simplify the monitor and review procedures | 6.5% | 2.0%* | 1.7% | 0.2% | 4 | 1.1% | 1.6% |
| IPCC should have authorization to investigate serious cases | 1.0% | 0.9% | 5.3%* | 2.2% | 3 | 0.8% | 1.1% |
| More promotion | 6.9% | 3.4% | 2.4% | 3.7% | 2 | 0.4% | 0.6%* |
| Others (see below) | 6.1% | 4.7% | 13.6%** | 8.5% | 20 | 5.0% | 7.2% |
| No area needs to be improved | 2.2% | 1.5% | 1.8% | 0.6% | 4 | 0.9% | 1.3% |
| Don't know / hard to say | 16.5% | 26.4%* | 26.0% | 17.1%* | 58 | 14.4% | 20.9% |
| Total | | | | | 401 | 100.0% | |
| Missing | -- | -- | 14 | 2 | 1 | | |

| | 2013 % of valid sample (Base=185) | 2014 % of valid sample (Base=195) | 2015 % of valid sample (Base=228) | 2016 % of valid sample (Base=321) | 2017 Frequency | 2017 % of total responses (Base=401) | 2017 % of valid sample (Base=276) |
|---|--|--|--|--|-------------------|---|--|
| <u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u> | | | | | | | |
| There is no way to improve | | | | | 7 | 1.8% | 2.6% |
| IPCC should not exist | | | | | 2 | 0.6% | 0.8% |
| Improve the notification mechanism | | | | | 2 | 0.5% | 0.8% |
| Abolish the two-tier complaints system | | | | | 2 | 0.5% | 0.7% |
| Police officers need to apologize if they did something wrong | | | | | 2 | 0.4% | 0.6% |
| Set up a reporting system for members | | | | | 1 | 0.2% | 0.3% |
| Enhance training for IPCC members | | | | | 1 | 0.2% | 0.3% |
| Members need to know the law | | | | | 1 | 0.2% | 0.3% |
| Anonymous investigation | | | | | 1 | 0.2% | 0.2% |
| Government monitoring | | | | | 1 | 0.2% | 0.2% |
| Let fair and impartial people be members | | | | | 1 | 0.2% | 0.2% |
| | | | | Sub-total | 20 | 5.0% | 7.2% |

[^] The wording of this item was "Change the method for selecting IPCC members" in 2015's survey.

^{^^} The wording of this item was "IPCC should have authorization to investigate" in surveys of 2013-2015. It also included "IPCC should receive complaints and investigate directly" in 2015's survey and "Doesn't need the two-tier system" in 2014's survey.

Overall perception on the IPCC

Table 20.[Q18] Overall speaking, do you think IPCC's image is? (Read out options, one answer only)

| | 2013 | | 2014 | | 2015 | | 2016 | | 2017 | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------|----------------------------|---------|----------------------------|----------|----------------------------|---------|-----------|----------------------------|
| | Percentage (Base=1,007) | | Percentage (Base=1,037) | | Percentage (Base=1,013) | | Percentage (Base=1,002) | | Frequency | Percentage (Base=1,010) |
| Positive | 34.7% | }57.4% | 35.7% | }60.4%* | 34.4% | }56.4% | 35.5% | }51.6%* | 360 | 35.7% |
| Quite positive | 22.7% | | 24.7% | | 22.0% | | 16.1%** | | 192 | 19.0% |
| Half-half | 31.9% | | 25.6%** | | 28.5% | | 28.0% | 289 | 28.6% | |
| Quite negative | 2.1% | }4.2% | 3.0% | }6.1% | 5.3%* | }10.4%** | 5.8% | }13.3%* | 71 | 7.0% |
| Negative | 2.1% | | 3.1% | | 5.1%* | | 7.5%* | | 54 | 5.3%* |
| Don't know / hard to say | 6.4% | | 7.9% | | 4.8%** | | 7.2%* | 44 | 4.4%** | |
| Total | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | | 100.0% | 1,010 | 100.0% | |
| Missing | 2 | | 2 | | 1 | | -- | -- | | |

Table 21.[Q19a] (Only ask respondents who have answered “positive” and “quite positive” in Q18) Why do you think it is “positive” or “quite positive”? Any more? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

| | 2013 % of valid sample (Base=578) | 2014 % of valid sample (Base=623) | 2015 % of valid sample (Base=569) | 2016 % of valid sample (Base=515) | Frequency | 2017 % of total responses (Base=728) | % of valid sample (Base=552) |
|--|--|--|--|--|-----------|---|------------------------------------|
| IPCC is fair enough | 16.7% | 18.1% | 21.2% | 17.4% | 97 | 13.3% | 17.6% |
| Intuition / Impression / Personal feeling | -- | -- | 2.7% | 12.9%** | 80 | 11.0% | 14.6% |
| IPCC is independent enough | 24.8% | 20.8% | 20.2% | 16.3% | 79 | 10.8% | 14.3% |
| IPCC fulfills its duties | -- | -- | 2.4% | 9.7%** | 54 | 7.4% | 9.8% |
| IPCC's image / name is positive | 4.7% | 8.4%* | 1.3%** | 9.5%** | 53 | 7.3% | 9.6% |
| IPCC provides a helpful monitoring system / mechanism | 12.3% | 11.0% | 8.6% | 7.8% | 52 | 7.2% | 9.5% |
| IPCC has high transparency | 10.2% | 11.2% | 7.7%* | 8.6% | 49 | 6.8% | 9.0% |
| IPCC's structure gives people confidence | 17.3% | 13.1%* | 12.5% | 5.6%** | 36 | 5.0% | 6.5% |
| No / Little bad news about IPCC | -- | -- | 4.0% | 8.7%** | 34 | 4.7% | 6.2% |
| IPCC's work brings an impact | -- | -- | 1.4% | 6.9%** | 34 | 4.7% | 6.2% |
| IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review | 14.3% | 12.5% | 12.4% | 9.8% | 33 | 4.6% | 6.1%* |
| IPCC has high efficiency | 4.3% | 4.8% | 3.7% | 1.4%* | 18 | 2.5% | 3.2%* |
| IPCC has sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties | 6.1% | 6.5% | 5.9% | 2.8%* | 13 | 1.8% | 2.4% |
| IPCC is appointed by the Government | 1.3% | 1.6% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Other positive answers (see below) | 3.9% | 2.2% | 4.6%* | 4.2% | 47 | 6.4% | 8.5%** |
| Don't know / hard to say | 11.5% | 11.3% | 13.3% | 5.2%** | 48 | 6.6% | 8.7%* |
| Total | | | | | 728 | 100.0% | |
| Missing | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | |

| | 2013 % of valid sample (Base=578) | 2014 % of valid sample (Base=623) | 2015 % of valid sample (Base=569) | 2016 % of valid sample (Base=515) | 2017 Frequency | % of total responses (Base=728) | % of valid sample (Base=552) | |
|---|--|--|--|--|-------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------|
| <u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u> | | | | | | | | |
| IPCC members are appointed by the CE | | | | | 15 | 2.0% | 2.7% | |
| Confident in the Police Force / image of the Police Force is positive | | | | | 5 | 0.7% | 0.9% | |
| IPCC represents the general public | | | | | 3 | 0.4% | 0.5% | |
| IPCC members' public remarks are not bad | | | | | 2 | 0.3% | 0.4% | |
| IPCC has low efficiency | | | | | 2 | 0.3% | 0.4% | |
| IPCC is monitored by media | | | | | 2 | 0.3% | 0.4% | |
| IPCC is monitored | | | | | 2 | 0.3% | 0.4% | |
| Help maintain social order | | | | | 2 | 0.3% | 0.3% | |
| Image of IPCC Chairman is positive | | | | | 2 | 0.2% | 0.3% | |
| IPCC is part of the government | | | | | 2 | 0.2% | 0.3% | |
| IPCC has a legal team | | | | | 1 | 0.2% | 0.2% | |
| Able to prevent corruption | | | | | 1 | 0.2% | 0.2% | |
| There are police officers among members | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.2% | |
| Some members are radical | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.2% | |
| Image of IPCC members is positive | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.2% | |
| IPCC is affected by political factors | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.2% | |
| IPCC has a long history | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.2% | |
| IPCC can monitor itself | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.2% | |
| Public order in Hong Kong is good | | | | | <1 | 0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Trust the judicial system | | | | | <1 | 0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Government's arrangement is appropriate | | | | | <1 | 0.1% | 0.1% | |
| IPCC members are appointed by the CE; IPCC has a long history | | | | | <1 | 0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Positive because there is negative news | | | | | <1 | 0.1% | 0.1% | |
| There are people who support IPCC | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% | |
| | | | | | Sub-total | 47 | 6.4% | 8.5% |

Table 22.[Q19b] (Only ask respondents who have answered “negative” and “quite negative” in Q18) Why do you think it is “negative” and “quite negative”? Any more? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

| | 2013 % of valid sample (Base=43) | 2014 % of valid sample (Base=64) | 2015 % of valid sample (Base=105) | 2016 % of valid sample (Base=133) | Frequency | 2017 % of total responses (Base=187) | % of valid sample (Base=122) |
|---|---|---|--|--|-----------|---|------------------------------------|
| IPCC is not fair and impartial | -- | -- | 8.9% | 31.4%** | 33 | 17.8% | 27.3% |
| IPCC might take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases | 8.2% | 6.8% | 27.6%** | 15.1%* | 25 | 13.2% | 20.2% |
| IPCC has low transparency | 45.0% | 38.0% | 20.8%* | 17.6% | 24 | 13.0% | 19.9% |
| IPCC has low efficiency | 6.4% | 14.2% | 17.9% | 28.5% | 22 | 11.9% | 18.1% |
| IPCC’s work does not bring an impact | -- | -- | 7.8% | 23.9%** | 22 | 11.5% | 17.7% |
| No trust in IPCC’s independence | 35.4% | 20.2% | 19.1% | 13.7% | 16 | 8.5% | 13.1% |
| Comments / reports about IPCC are negative | -- | -- | -- | 3.2% | 9 | 4.6% | 7.0% |
| Don’t think IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review | 6.2% | 5.5% | 10.1% | 1.2%** | 8 | 4.3% | 6.6%* |
| IPCC doesn’t have sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties | 13.7% | 3.2%* | 14.8%* | 5.8%* | 4 | 2.1% | 3.3% |
| Other negative answers (see below) | 10.7% | 26.3%* | 16.6% | 9.4% | 18 | 9.5% | 14.5% |
| Don’t know / hard to say | 8.1% | 11.4% | 4.9% | 1.0% | 6 | 3.5% | 5.3%* |
| Total | | | | | 187 | 100.0% | |
| Missing | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | | |
| <u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u> | | | | | | | |
| Committees are appointed, not elected by citizens | | | | | 6 | 3.0% | 4.6% |
| IPCC affects the work of police officers | | | | | 1 | 0.7% | 1.1% |
| IPCC is not fair with police officers | | | | | 1 | 0.6% | 0.9% |
| Affected by the Occupy Movement and the seven police officers case | | | | | 1 | 0.6% | 0.9% |
| IPCC’s name contain the word “police” | | | | | 1 | 0.6% | 0.9% |
| No trust in IPCC | | | | | 1 | 0.5% | 0.8% |
| IPCC does not carry out its work seriously | | | | | 1 | 0.5% | 0.8% |

| | 2013 % of valid sample (Base=43) | 2014 % of valid sample (Base=64) | 2015 % of valid sample (Base=105) | 2016 % of valid sample (Base=133) | 2017 Frequency | 2017 % of total responses (Base=187) | 2017 % of valid sample (Base=122) |
|---|---|---|--|--|-------------------|---|--|
| IPCC members raise fund to help the seven police officers | | | | | 1 | 0.5% | 0.8% |
| Lack promotion | | | | | 1 | 0.5% | 0.8% |
| IPCC members donate to the seven police officers | | | | | 1 | 0.5% | 0.8% |
| IPCC members have political inclinations | | | | | 1 | 0.3% | 0.5% |
| Investigation results are too simple | | | | | 1 | 0.3% | 0.5% |
| Personal feeling | | | | | <1 | 0.2% | 0.4% |
| The method for forming the Council | | | | | <1 | 0.2% | 0.4% |
| IPCC lacks credibility | | | | | <1 | 0.2% | 0.4% |
| | | | | Sub-total | 18 | 9.5% | 14.5% |

Table 23.[Q20] Please rate on a scale of 0-100 your satisfaction with IPCC's performance. 0 stands for very dissatisfied, 100 stands for very satisfied, 50 stands for half-half. How would you rate it?

| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|
| | % of valid sample (Base=952) | % of valid sample (Base=954) | % of valid sample (Base=949) | Frequency | % of valid sample (Base=960) |
| 0 | 1.1% | 2.8% ** | 3.8% | 19 | 2.0% * |
| 1-9 | 0.5% | 0.4% | 1.1% | 2 | 0.2% * |
| 10-19 | 0.6% | 1.0% | 2.0% | 10 | 1.1% |
| 20-29 | 0.9% | 2.9% ** | 2.7% | 19 | 2.0% |
| 30-39 | 2.3% | 2.9% | 6.1% ** | 31 | 3.2% ** |
| 40-49 | 4.9% | 7.7% ** | 9.7% | 60 | 6.3% ** |
| 50 | 25.2% | 22.6% | 22.1% | 251 | 26.1%* |
| 51-60 | 16.6% | 14.9% | 14.9% | 159 | 16.6% |
| 61-70 | 20.7% | 15.7% ** | 15.1% | 145 | 15.1% |
| 71-80 | 17.3% | 18.1% | 13.6% ** | 171 | 17.8% * |
| 81-90 | 6.6% | 6.3% | 4.9% | 54 | 5.6% |
| 91-99 | 1.0% | 1.5% | 1.0% | 13 | 1.4% |
| 100 | 2.2% | 3.2% | 3.0% | 25 | 2.6% |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 960 | 100.0% |
| <i>Missing (including "don't know / hard to say")</i> | 87 | 60 | 53 | 50 | |
| Mean score | 62.5 | 60.3* | 56.1** | 60.5** | |
| Standard error | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | |
| Base | 952 | 954 | 949 | 960 | |

Table 24.[Q21] Lastly, what are your expectations on IPCC? Any more? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

| | 2013 % of valid sample (Base=1,001) | 2014 % of valid sample (Base=1,028) | 2015 % of valid sample (Base=1,005) | 2016 % of valid sample (Base=1,002) | Frequency | 2017 % of total responses (Base=1,416) | % of valid sample (Base=1,010) |
|--|--|--|--|--|-----------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Hope IPCC can handle cases in a fair, impartial and transparent manner | 16.9% | 24.0%** | 37.5%** | 35.9% | 357 | 25.2% | 35.3% |
| Hope IPCC can improve its transparency | 11.3% | 14.9%** | 18.7%* | 20.1% | 179 | 12.6% | 17.7% |
| Hope IPCC can do better | -- | -- | 1.5% | 10.8%** | 112 | 7.9% | 11.1% |
| Hope IPCC can increase its efficiency | 0.8% | 4.1%** | 8.9%** | 8.9% | 94 | 6.6% | 9.3% |
| Hope IPCC can become an independent organization / handle complaint cases directly^ | 4.2% | 5.1% | 11.0%** | 9.6% | 78 | 5.5% | 7.8% |
| Hope IPCC will keep up with its good work | 4.1% | 3.9% | 9.8%** | 5.3%** | 59 | 4.2% | 5.9% |
| Hope IPCC can monitor HK Police Force's work effectively | 19.2% | 16.5% | 6.9%** | 5.6% | 44 | 3.1% | 4.3% |
| Hope IPCC is not swayed by external influence | -- | -- | 0.9% | 3.2%** | 33 | 2.3% | 3.2% |
| Hope IPCC can have more promotion of its work | -- | 3.7% | 4.5% | 4.1% | 31 | 2.2% | 3.1% |
| Hope IPCC can broaden its member base^^ | 1.5% | 2.9%* | 3.8% | 3.2% | 29 | 2.1% | 2.9% |
| Hope IPCC can change the method for selecting its members | -- | -- | 1.7% | 4.0%** | 28 | 2.0% | 2.8% |
| Hope IPCC can ensure citizens will get appropriate Police services | 5.9% | 4.5% | 3.2% | 1.4%** | 20 | 1.4% | 1.9% |
| Hope IPCC can explain more to citizens the work / complaints system of HK Police Force | 8.0% | 5.9% | 2.3%** | 1.6% | 17 | 1.2% | 1.7% |
| Hope IPCC can improve Police-community relation / enhance its communication | 7.0% | 4.8%* | 1.9%** | 2.0% | 16 | 1.1% | 1.6% |
| Hope IPCC can expand its mandated functions | -- | -- | 1.3% | 1.5% | 16 | 1.1% | 1.6% |
| Hope IPCC can provide a channel for complaints against police | 6.6% | 4.1%** | 1.8%** | 0.7%* | 7 | 0.5% | 0.7% |
| Hope IPCC can pressure HK Police Force effectively in order to improve their work | 5.7% | 2.9%** | 2.0% | 0.6%** | 7 | 0.5% | 0.6% |
| Hope IPCC can serve citizens | -- | 1.3% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

| | 2013 % of valid sample (Base=1,001) | 2014 % of valid sample (Base=1,028) | 2015 % of valid sample (Base=1,005) | 2016 % of valid sample (Base=1,002) | 2017 Frequency | % of total responses (Base=1,416) | % of valid sample (Base=1,010) |
|--|--|--|--|--|-------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Hope IPCC will have the right to investigate complaints | 1.1% | 1.2% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Hope IPCC will be authorized for law enforcement / have actual authority | -- | 1.1% | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Others (see below) | 2.4% | 1.8% | 4.9%** | 3.8% | 41 | 2.9% | 4.1% |
| No expectation / don't know / hard to say | 21.5% | 22.6% | 21.1% | 22.4% | 247 | 17.4% | 24.5% |
| <i>No expectation</i> | 4.7% | 4.2% | 5.5% | 19.8%** | 204 | 14.4% | 20.2% |
| <i>Don't know / hard to say</i> | 16.8% | 18.3% | 15.6% | 2.6%** | 43 | 3.1% | 4.3% |
| Total | | | | | 1,416 | 100.0% | |
| Missing | 8 | 11 | 9 | -- | 1 | | |
| <u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u> | | | | | | | |
| Hope IPCC be corruption free | | | | | 4 | 0.3% | 0.4% |
| Hope IPCC can safeguard justice | | | | | 3 | 0.2% | 0.3% |
| Hope IPCC can change the system or the tiers | | | | | 3 | 0.2% | 0.3% |
| Hope there will be clear results for complaints | | | | | 2 | 0.2% | 0.2% |
| Hope IPCC can keep information about complaints confidential | | | | | 2 | 0.2% | 0.2% |
| Hope IPCC can improve working attitude | | | | | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Hope IPCC be dissolved | | | | | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Hope that an organization be established to monitor IPCC | | | | | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Hope IPCC can be less harsh toward police officers | | | | | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Hope IPCC can make people confident | | | | | 2 | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Hope IPCC can accept public opinion | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| Hope IPCC can be credible | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| Hope IPCC can have a legal team | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| Hope that complaints be handled by law | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| Hope IPCC does not handle cases that abuse the complaints system | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |
| Hope IPCC can lead Hong Kong society well | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% |

| | 2013 % of valid sample (Base=1,001) | 2014 % of valid sample (Base=1,028) | 2015 % of valid sample (Base=1,005) | 2016 % of valid sample (Base=1,002) | 2017 Frequency | % of total responses (Base=1,416) | % of valid sample (Base=1,010) | |
|---|--|--|--|--|-------------------|---|--------------------------------------|------|
| Hope IPCC can handle cases seriously | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Hope IPCC can handle other social issues | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Hope IPCC can abolish the two-tier complaints system | | | | | 1 | 0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Hope that another police monitoring organization be established | | | | | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Hope the government can monitor IPCC | | | | | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Hope IPCC can meet people's expectations | | | | | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Hope an impartial person can become IPCC Chairman | | | | | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Hope IPCC can be supported by people | | | | | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Hope IPCC can change its Chairman and its members | | | | | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Hope IPCC can investigate complaints abuse cases | | | | | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Hope IPCC can increase its manpower and resources; hope that an organization be established to monitor IPCC | | | | | 1 | <0.1% | 0.1% | |
| Hope that there are police officers in IPCC | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% | |
| Hope IPCC can be accountable to the people | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% | |
| Hope IPCC can maintain its good image | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% | |
| Hope IPCC can remain unchanged | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% | |
| Hope IPCC can make improvements continuously | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% | |
| Hope IPCC can speak up for the people | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% | |
| Hope IPCC members have higher integrity | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% | |
| Hope IPCC can report the case to complainants in detail | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% | |
| Hope that the work of IPCC is not simply guided by complainants | | | | | <1 | <0.1% | <0.1% | |
| | | | | | Sub-total | 41 | 2.9% | 4.1% |

[^]The wording of this item was "Hope IPCC can become an independent organization / handle cases independently" in 2013's and 2014's surveys.

^{^^}The wording of this item was "Hope IPCC can let different people to participate" in 2013's and 2014's surveys.

Appendix 3

Demographics

Table 25. Gender

| | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | |
|--------|------------|----------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| | Frequency | Percentage (Base=1,010) | Frequency | Percentage (Base=1,010) |
| Male | 469 | 46.4% | 455 | 45.0% |
| Female | 541 | 53.6% | 555 | 55.0% |
| Total | 1,010 | 100.0% | 1,010 | 100.0% |

Table 26. Age Group

| | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | |
|-------------|------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| | Frequency | Percentage (Base=999) | Frequency | Percentage (Base=999) |
| 18 – 29 | 125 | 12.5% | 172 | 17.2% |
| 30 – 39 | 112 | 11.2% | 183 | 18.3% |
| 40 – 49 | 202 | 20.2% | 180 | 18.1% |
| 50 – 59 | 226 | 22.6% | 201 | 20.1% |
| 60 – 69 | 207 | 20.7% | 141 | 14.1% |
| 70 or above | 127 | 12.7% | 122 | 12.2% |
| Total | 999 | 100.0% | 999 | 100.0% |
| Missing | 11 | | 11 | |

Table 27. Education Attainment

| | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | |
|---|------------|----------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| | Frequency | Percentage (Base=1,003) | Frequency | Percentage (Base=1,003) |
| Primary school or below | 132 | 13.2% | 237 | 23.7% |
| <i>Not educated, pre-elementary education</i> | 26 | 2.6% | 43 | 4.2% |
| <i>Primary</i> | 106 | 10.6% | 195 | 19.4% |
| Secondary | 458 | 45.7% | 482 | 48.1% |
| <i>Junior secondary (F.1-F.3)</i> | 133 | 13.3% | 115 | 11.4% |
| <i>Senior secondary (F.4-F.5, vocational training included)</i> | 260 | 25.9% | 274 | 27.3% |
| <i>Matriculation (F.6-F.7)</i> | 65 | 6.5% | 93 | 9.3% |
| Tertiary or above | 413 | 41.2% | 283 | 28.3% |
| <i>Tertiary, non-degree (Diploma / Certificate)</i> | 74 | 7.4% | 51 | 5.1% |
| <i>Tertiary, non-degree (Associate degree)</i> | 20 | 2.0% | 15 | 1.5% |
| <i>Tertiary, degree</i> | 265 | 26.4% | 184 | 18.4% |
| <i>Postgraduate or above</i> | 54 | 5.4% | 32 | 3.2% |
| Total | 1,003 | 100.0% | 1,003 | 100.0% |
| Missing | 7 | | 7 | |

Table 28. Occupation

| | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | |
|--|------------|----------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| | Frequency | Percentage (Base=1,002) | Frequency | Percentage (Base=1,005) |
| Executives and professionals | 285 | 28.4% | 238 | 23.7% |
| <i>Managers / administration staff</i> | 131 | 13.1% | 105 | 10.5% |
| <i>Professional</i> | 121 | 12.1% | 98 | 9.8% |
| <i>Associate professional</i> | 33 | 3.3% | 34 | 3.4% |
| Clerical and service workers | 179 | 17.9% | 211 | 21.0% |
| <i>Clerk</i> | 92 | 9.2% | 108 | 10.7% |
| <i>Service worker and Shop & market sales worker</i> | 87 | 8.7% | 103 | 10.3% |
| Production workers | 60 | 6.0% | 77 | 7.7% |
| <i>Craft & related trade worker</i> | 18 | 1.8% | 22 | 2.2% |
| <i>Plant & machine operator / assembler</i> | 19 | 1.9% | 23 | 2.3% |
| <i>Unskilled worker</i> | 23 | 2.3% | 32 | 3.2% |
| Students | 60 | 6.0% | 87 | 8.7% |
| Homemakers | 148 | 14.8% | 169 | 16.8% |
| Others | 270 | 26.9% | 222 | 22.1% |
| <i>Retired</i> | 227 | 22.7% | 177 | 17.7% |
| <i>Unidentified</i> | 2 | 0.2% | 2 | 0.2% |
| <i>Others (unemployed and non-worker included)</i> | 41 | 4.1% | 43 | 4.3% |
| Total | 1,002 | 100.0% | 1,005 | 100.0% |
| Missing | 8 | | 5 | |

Table 29. Residential District

| | Raw sample | | Weighted sample | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| | Frequency | Percentage (Base=994) | Frequency | Percentage (Base=994) |
| Hong Kong Island | 181 | 18.2% | 156 | 15.7% |
| <i>Central and Western District</i> | 27 | 2.7% | 25 | 2.5% |
| <i>Wan Chai District</i> | 8 | 0.8% | 5 | 0.5% |
| <i>Eastern District</i> | 108 | 10.9% | 89 | 8.9% |
| <i>Southern District</i> | 38 | 3.8% | 38 | 3.8% |
| Kowloon East | 97 | 9.8% | 103 | 10.3% |
| <i>Wong Tai Sin District</i> | 52 | 5.2% | 58 | 5.8% |
| <i>Kwun Tong District</i> | 101 | 10.2% | 108 | 10.9% |
| Kowloon West | 246 | 24.7% | 247 | 24.8% |
| <i>Sham Shui Po District</i> | 45 | 4.5% | 45 | 4.5% |
| <i>Kowloon City District</i> | 51 | 5.1% | 47 | 4.8% |
| <i>Yau Tsim Mong District</i> | 34 | 3.4% | 28 | 2.8% |
| New Territories East | 131 | 13.2% | 132 | 13.3% |
| <i>Northern District</i> | 62 | 6.2% | 68 | 6.8% |
| <i>Tai Po District</i> | 39 | 3.9% | 46 | 4.6% |
| <i>Sha Tin District</i> | 95 | 9.6% | 89 | 8.9% |
| <i>Sai Kung District</i> | 68 | 6.8% | 76 | 7.6% |
| New Territories West | 339 | 34.1% | 357 | 35.9% |
| <i>Kwai Tsing District</i> | 60 | 6.0% | 63 | 6.4% |
| <i>Tsuen Wan District</i> | 46 | 4.6% | 43 | 4.3% |
| <i>Tuen Mun District</i> | 69 | 6.9% | 70 | 7.0% |
| <i>Yuen Long District</i> | 75 | 7.5% | 79 | 7.9% |
| <i>Islands District</i> | 16 | 1.6% | 19 | 2.0% |
| Total | 994 | 100.0% | 994 | 100.0% |
| Missing | 16 | | 16 | |

Appendix 4

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 2017
獨立監察警方處理投訴委員會(監警會)
意見調查 2017

Questionnaire
調查問卷

February 22, 2017
2017 年 2 月 22 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 have been commissioned by the Independent Police Complaints Council (IPCC) to conduct a territory-wide random telephone survey, and would like to ask for your opinion on the works of IPCC. This will only take you a few minutes. Please rest assured that your phone number is randomly selected by our computer and your information provided will be kept strictly confidential. 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 of the University of Hong Kong) at xxxx-xxxx during office hours. For quality control purpose, our conversation may be recorded for internal reference, and will be destroyed within six months. 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嘅訪問員嚟嘅，我哋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，同我哋做一份有關監警會工作嘅問卷調查。請你放心，你嘅電話號碼係經由我哋嘅電腦隨機抽樣抽中嘅，而你提供嘅資料係會絕對保密嘅。如果你對今次嘅訪問有任何疑問，你可以打去熱線電話 xxxx-xxxx 同我哋嘅督導員聯絡。如果你想知多啲關於參與研究嘅權利，你可以喺辦公時間致電 xxxx-xxxx 向香港大學（全名為：香港大學研究操守委員會）查詢。為咗保障數據嘅真確性，我哋嘅訪問可能會被錄音，但只會用作內部參考，並會喺六個月內銷毀。請問可唔可以開始訪問呢？

Yes

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

可以

唔可以 → 訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜

[S1] Is the telephone number here xxxx-xxxx?

請問你嘅住宅電話號碼係唔係 xxxx-xxxx？

Yes

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

係

唔係 → 訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜

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 who live here at least 5 nights a week? How many such persons are there right now? (If no one is eligible, interview ends, thank you for your cooperation, bye-bye)

呢份問卷嘅訪問對象係 18 歲或以上香港居民，同埋要每星期住喺呢度最少 5 晚嘅，請問你屋企而家有幾多位屬於呢個組別嘅成員呢？(如果戶中有合資格嘅被訪者，訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜)

- Yes → Interview begins (If the qualified family member is not the one who answered the phone, invite him/her to the phone and repeat the introduction)
- 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
- 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 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 March or the coming three months?”) **Is it okay?** (If another family member is the respondent, before interview begins, interviewer must read out: For quality control purpose, our conversation may be recorded for internal reference, and will be destroyed within six months.)

因為多過一位，我哋希望所有合資格嘅家庭成員都有同等機會接受訪問，所以想請最快生日嗰位嚟聽電話。(訪問員可舉例說明：『即係有冇 3 月或未來三個月內生日嘅人喺度?』) 請問可唔可以呢？(如其他家人是被訪者，開始訪問前，訪問員必須讀出：為咗保障數據嘅真確性，我哋嘅訪問可能會被錄音，但只會用作內部參考，並會喺六個月內銷毀。)

- Yes – The one answered the phone is the respondent → Interview begins
- Yes – Another family member is the respondent → Interview begins
(interviewer please repeat the introduction)
- 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 「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」，或者簡稱「監警會 (IPCC)」呢一個機構呢？

Yes → Continue to Q2a

有 → 續問 Q2a

No → Skip to Q3, then skip to Q6

冇 → 跳至 Q3，然後跳至 Q6

Don't know / hard to say

唔知道／難講

Refuse to answer

拒答

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

請問你係從乜野途徑聽過「監警會」呢？仲有呢？(不讀答案，可答多項)

[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, multiple answers allowed) (* Channels previously adopted by IPCC)

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

| | 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 Files) 電視特輯 (監警有道) | | | |
| TV interview 電視訪問 | | | |
| News 電視新聞 | | | |
| Now TV programme preview (The IPCC Perspective) Now TV 監警會節目預告 (監警透視) | | | |
| 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) | | | |
| Other newspaper stories (Please specify: _____) 其他報紙訪問及報導 (請註明：_____) | | | |
| Magazines 雜誌 | | | |

| | Q2a | | Q2b |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| | First mentioned 第一提及 | Other mentioned 其他提及 | Have no mentioned 沒有提及 |
| * Internet (Probe: Which website or app?) 互聯網 (追問: 咁係邊個網站或 app?) | | | |
| IPCC website 「監警會」網站 | | | |
| Website / app of a particular media 媒體專屬網頁/app | | | |
| News aggregation website / app 新聞整合網站/app | | | |
| Social media 社交媒體 | | | |
| Forum 討論區 | | | |
| Banner 廣告 | | | |
| Other online channels (Please specify: _____) 其他網上途徑 (請註明: _____) | | | |
| * 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: 喺邊度見到海報?) 地點 (請註明: _____) | | | |
| * Annual report of IPCC / brochure 「監警會」年報/小冊子 | | | |
| * IPCC newsletter 「監警會」通訊 | | | |
| * IPCC channel on YouTube YouTube 「監警會頻道」 | | | |
| * Quarterly meeting between IPCC and CAPO 「監警會」同警察投訴課的季度聯席會議 | | | |
| * District Fight Crime Committee 分區撲滅罪行委員會 | | | |
| IPCC symposium 監警有道研討會 | | | |
| 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]If given a free choice, through which channels would you like to know more about IPCC? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

如果任你選擇，你會比較鍾意從乜野途徑認識「監警會」呢？(不讀答案，可答多項)

| | |
|---|---------------------------|
| TV programmes | 電視節目 |
| Radio programmes | 電台節目 |
| Newspaper columns | 報紙專欄 |
| TV programmes on public transport (e.g. Roadshow) | 公共交通工具嘅電視節目 (例如 RoadShow) |
| IPCC website | 「監警會」網站 |
| IPCC page on Facebook | Facebook「監警會專頁」 |
| IPCC channel on YouTube | YouTube「監警會頻道」 |
| IPCC publications | 「監警會」刊物 |
| Symposium / Talks | 研討會／講座 |
| School activities | 學校活動 |
| Community activities | 社區活動 |
| Others (Please specify: _____) | 其他 (請註明: _____) |
| Not interested to know more about IPCC | 冇興趣認識「監警會」 |
| Don't know / hard to say | 唔知道／難講 |
| Refuse to answer | 拒答 |

[Q4]To your knowledge, what are IPCC's duties? Any other duties? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed, interviewer to probe "any more?", select ALL suitable options. If what the respondents said is NOT equivalent to an option, do NOT ask if he means that. Instead, record his response in "Others".)

據你了解，「監警會」嘅主要工作係啲乜呢？(不讀答案，可答多項，追問「仲有呢？」，選擇所有適用答案。如果被訪者所述答案不等同選項，不要詢問被訪者他的意思是否某一選項，而是將被訪者所述答案記錄於「其他」。))

Correct answers

- Monitor CAPO's cases handling process / Monitor how Police handle complaints
- 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

- Receive / 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」所處理個案嘅程序 / 監察警方處理投訴
審閱／覆檢「投訴警察課」所處理個案嘅調查報告／結果
覆檢導致市民投訴嘅警務人員各類行為嘅統計數字
找出警方嘅工作程序中，引起投訴或可能引起投訴嘅不當之處
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

直接接受／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

[Q5]Do you think IPCC is ...? (Read out first two options, order to be randomized by computer, one answer only)

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，唔隸屬於警隊嘅 |
| Part of the Police | 屬於警隊嘅一部份 |
| Don't know | 唔知道 |
| Refuse to answer | 拒答 |

[Q6]What do you think is the most direct channel to make a complaint of Police? (Do not read out options, one answer 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 | 傳媒 |
| Internet | 互聯網 |
| Others (Please specify: _____) | 其他 (請註明：_____) |
| No channel | 沒有有效渠道 |
| Don't know | 唔知道 |
| Refuse to answer | 拒答 |

[Q7]Which of the following IPCC-related information would you be interested to learn more?

(Read out options, order to be randomized by computer, multiple answers allowed)

你對以下邊啲關於「監警會」嘅資訊比較有興趣呢?(讀出答案,次序由電腦隨機排列,可答多項)

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Functions of IPCC and its work | 「監警會」職能同工作 |
| Members and structure of IPCC | 「監警會」成員同架構 |
| System and procedures of handling complaints | 投訴警察嘅制度同程序 |
| Statistics, progress and results of complaints | 投訴個案嘅進度、結果同統計數字 |
| Complaint cases sharing | 投訴個案分享 |
| Observations and suggestions on Police's quality improvement | 就改善警隊服務質素嘅觀察及建議 |
| Others (Please specify: _____) | 其他(請註明:_____) |
| Not interested to know more about IPCC | 冇興趣認識「監警會」 |
| Equally interested in all kinds | 全部一樣咁有興趣 |
| Don't know / hard to say | 唔知道/難講 |
| 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

[Q8]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, select ALL suitable options. If what the respondents said is NOT equivalent to an option, do NOT ask if he means that. Instead, record his response in "Others".)

喺過去一年,你有冇聽聞過有關投訴警務人員嘅新聞?如有,你可唔可以講俾我知係關於乜野?(不讀答案,可答多項,選擇所有適用答案。如果被訪者所述答案不等同選項,不要詢問被訪者他的意思是否某一選項,而是將被訪者所述答案記錄於「其他」。)

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Yes | 有 |
| Conflicts between Police and citizens during processions, gatherings and demonstrations | 遊行/集會示威發生警民衝突 |
| News related to the Occupy Movement | 佔領運動相關新聞 |
| Use of excessive and unnecessary force | 使用過度及不必要武力 |
| Assault | 毆打/襲擊 |
| Franklin Chu King-wai police baton assault case | 朱經緯警棍毆打案 |
| Seven police officers case / dark corner case / Ken Tsang Kin-chiu case | 暗角七警案/曾健超案 |
| News related to the Mong Kok conflict | 年初一旺角衝突相關新聞 |
| Mistaken arrest of / Taking statements from a man with intellectual disability | 誤拘智障男子/錄口供事件 |
| News related to National People's Congress Standing Committee Chairman Zhang Dejiang's visit to Hong Kong | 全國人大常委會委員長張德江訪港相關新聞 |
| Suspects wearing masks and shower caps in identity parades | 認人手續疑犯戴口罩浴帽 |
| Detention of reporters pursuing Eddie Ng Hak-kim | 記者追訪吳克儉被扣留 |
| Police officers involved in Tarlac State University forgery case | 警員涉及國力書院偽造文件案 |
| Police's misconduct / bad attitude / abusive language | 警員行為不當/態度欠佳/粗言穢語 |

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Police's neglect of duty | 警員疏忽職守 |
| Sexual harassment / indecent assault | 性騷擾／非禮 |
| Police's abuse of power | 警員濫權 |
| Others (Please specify: _____) | 其他(請註明: _____) |
| Heard of, but can't remember the content | 唔記得 |
| Refuse to answer | 拒答 |
| No | 冇 |
| Don't know / hard to say | 唔知道／難講 |
| Refuse to answer | 拒答 |

[Q9] Which one of the following types of complaints of the Police Force would you care about most?

(Read out options, order to be randomized by computer, one answer only)

就以下各類對警員嘅投訴嚟講，你自己會最關注邊一類投訴？(讀出答案，次序由電腦隨機排列，只選一項)

| | |
|--|----------------|
| On police officers' abuse of power | 有關警員濫權 |
| On Police handling public demonstration | 有關警員處理遊行示威 |
| On press releases arrangement | 有關警方發放新聞的安排 |
| On media coverage arrangement | 有關警方和傳媒採訪的安排 |
| On stop and search issue / searching | 有關警員截停搜查事宜／搜身 |
| On officers' law enforcement of traffic regulations | 有關警員交通方面的執法 |
| On police officers' use of violence | 有關警員使用暴力 |
| On corruption of police officers | 有關警員貪污 |
| On investigation method of police officers | 有關警員查案方法 |
| On unfairness of police officers in handling cases | 有關警員不公平／公正處理案件 |
| On working attitude of police officers | 有關警員工作態度 |
| Don't care about any complaints against Police Force | 唔關注任何投訴警察的事情 |
| Others (Please specify: _____) | 其他(請註明: _____) |
| Don't know / hard to say | 唔知道／難講 |
| Refuse to answer | 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」嘅工作，之後請你就你對「監警會」嘅印象回答一啲問題。

The IPCC is an organisation independent from the Hong Kong Police Force and its Members are appointed by the Chief Executive. It is an important part of the two-tier police complaints system in Hong Kong, specialising in observing, monitoring and reviewing complaints made by the public against the police force via CAPO. Although the complaints are made through CAPO, the investigation results must be endorsed by the IPCC to ensure that the investigation is fair, impartial and transparent.

「監警會」係一個完全獨立於香港警務處嘅機構，委員由行政長官委任，係香港投訴警察制度「兩層架構」嘅一個主要部份，專門負責觀察、監察同覆檢「投訴警察課」調查市民投訴警察個案嘅工作。雖然市民投訴警察都係由警方嘅投訴警察課調查，但調查結果必須要得到「監警會」嘅通過，確保調查係公平、公正同透徹嘅。

[Q10]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嘅身份去監察同覆檢市民投訴警察嘅個案？(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 |

[Q11]Do you think IPCC is able to monitor and review CAPO's investigations 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」嘅調查工作呢？(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 |

[Q12]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嘅效率係點？(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 | 冇效率 |
| 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 |

[Q13]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」嘅監察同覆檢投訴個案嘅透明度係點？(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 |

[Q14]Overall speaking, are you confident in IPCC? (Interviewer to probe intensity)

請問你對監警會有冇信心？(訪員追問程度)

Very confident → Skip to Q16

好有信心 → 跳至 Q16

Quite confident → Skip to Q16

幾有信心 → 跳至 Q16

Half-half → Skip to Q16

一半半 → 跳至 Q16

Not quite confident → Continue to Q15

唔係幾有信心／幾有信心 → 續問 Q15

Not confident at all → Continue to Q15

好有信心 → 續問 Q15

Don't know / hard to say (do not read out) → Skip to Q16

唔知道／冇意見 (不要讀出) → 跳至 Q16

Refuse to answer → Skip to Q16

拒答 → 跳至 Q16

[Q15][Only ask respondents who have answered “not quite confident” and “not confident at all” in Q14]

Why do you think it is “not quite confident” / “not confident at all”? Any more? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed, select ALL suitable options. If what the respondents said is NOT equivalent to an option, do NOT ask if he means that. Instead, record his response in “Others”.)

[只問 Q14 答「唔係幾有信心／幾有信心」或「好有信心」的受訪者] 點解你對監警會有信心呢？仲有呢？(不讀答案，可答多項，選擇所有適用答案。如果被訪者所述答案不等同選項，不要詢問被訪者他的意思是否某一選項，而是將被訪者所述答案記錄於「其他」。)

Committees are appointed, not elected by citizens

委員都係委任而非民選

Police officers could be appointed as committee member

警員都可以被委任為委員之一

Both are under the Government

覺得兩者同屬政府人員／機構

It's like self-investigation

好似自己人查自己人

Not independent enough

不夠獨立

May take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases

監察或覆檢個案時可能會偏袒警務人員

Not fair and impartial (without indicating which side IPCC takes side with)

不公平／不公正 (不指明偏向哪一方)

The process and results of complaints are not released to public

投訴嘅過程同結果都唔會公開

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

唔覺得佢哋會站在市民嘅立場／角度調查或者監察投訴

No direct investigation, only responsible for monitoring and review, no actual authority

佢哋唔會直接處理投訴，只係負責監察同覆檢工作，冇實權

Brings little to no effect / Police's misconduct continues

沒有效用／效用小／警察依然做錯

It takes too long to handle complaints / No result of investigation after a long time / Cases go unattended

處理投訴時間太長／遲遲未有調查結果／案件不了了之

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

為避免不利消息影響警方形象，可能會隱瞞事實真相

Have little confidence in the Chairman of IPCC Mr Larry Kwok Lam-kwong

不信任監警會主席郭琳廣先生

Have little confidence in some IPCC members

不信任監警會部分委員

Not clear about IPCC's works

唔係好清楚監警會嘅工作／運作

Other (Please specify: _____)

其他 (請註明: _____)

Don't know / hard to say

唔知道／難講

Refuse to answer

拒答

[Q16] Are you confident in the existing two-tier system of complaints made to the police?
(Interviewer to probe intensity)

請問你對現時兩層架構嘅投訴警察制度有冇信心？(訪員追問程度)

Very confident → Skip to Q18

好有信心 → 跳至 Q18

Quite confident → Skip to Q18

幾有信心 → 跳至 Q18

Half-half → Skip to Q18

一半半 → 跳至 Q18

Not quite confident → Continue to Q17

唔係幾有信心／幾有信心 → 續問 Q17

Not confident at all → Continue to Q17

好有信心 → 續問 Q17

Don't know / hard to say (do not read out) → Skip to Q18

唔知道／冇意見 (不要讀出) → 跳至 Q18

Refuse to answer → Skip to Q18

拒答 → 跳至 Q18

[Q17] [Only ask respondents who have answered “not quite confident” and “not confident at all” in Q16]

How do you think IPCC could improve this two-tier complaints system? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed, select ALL suitable options. If what the respondents said is NOT equivalent to an option, do NOT ask if he means that. Instead, record his response in “Others”.)

[只問 Q16 答「唔係幾有信心／幾有信心」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嘅投訴制度？(不讀答案，可答多項，選擇所有適用答案。如果被訪者所述答案不等同選項，不要詢問被訪者他的意思是否某一選項，而是將被訪者所述答案記錄於「其他」。)

IPCC should have authorization to investigate so that it can receive complaints and investigate directly

監警會應該要有調查權，直接接受投訴並直接調查

IPCC should have authorization to investigate serious cases

監警會應該要有調查嚴重個案嘅權利

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

監警會應該有權決定對違規警員嘅懲罰

Shorten the time for investigation and review

縮短調查及覆檢嘅時間

Simplify the monitor and review procedures

簡化調查及覆檢嘅程序

Increase transparency

提高透明度

More promotion

增加宣傳

Change the method for forming the Council

改變委員會組成嘅方法

Involve individuals from different classes in the process

讓不同階層人士都可參與其中

IPCC should become an independent department

監警會要成為一個獨立部門

Handle complaints fairly and impartially

公平公正處理投訴

Improve work efficiency

加強工作效率

Others (Please specify: _____)

其他 (請註明: _____)

No area needs to be improved

沒有需要改善嘅地方

Don't know / hard to say

唔知道／難講

Refuse to answer

拒答

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

[Q18]Overall speaking, do you think IPCC's image is? (Read out options, only one answer is allowed)
整體嚟講，你覺得「監警會」嘅形象係？(讀出答案，只選一項)

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| Positive → Continue to Q19 | 正面 → 續問 Q19 |
| Quite positive → Continue to Q19 | 頗正面 → 續問 Q19 |
| Half-half → Skip to Q20 | 一般 → 跳至 Q20 |
| Quite negative → Continue to Q19 | 頗負面 → 續問 Q19 |
| Negative → Continue to Q19 | 負面 → 續問 Q19 |
| Don't know / hard to say (do not read out) → Skip to Q20 | 唔知道/冇意見 (不要讀出) → 跳至 Q20 |
| Refuse to answer → Skip to Q20 | 拒答 → 跳至 Q20 |

[Q19][Only ask respondents who have answered “positive” and “quite positive” in Q18] **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, select ALL suitable options. If what the respondents said is NOT equivalent to an option, do NOT ask if he means that. Instead, record his response in “Others”.)

[只問 Q18 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 Q18 的答案]呢？仲有呢？(不讀答案，可答多項，選擇所有適用答案。如果被訪者所述答案不同選項，不要詢問被訪者他的意思是否某一選項，而是將被訪者所述答案記錄於「其他」。)

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
IPCC fulfills its duties
IPCC's work brings an impact
IPCC's image / name is positive
No / Little bad news about IPCC
Intuition / Impression / Personal feeling
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 is not fair and impartial (without indicating which side IPCC takes side with)
IPCC has low transparency
IPCC has low efficiency
IPCC doesn't have sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties
IPCC's work does not bring an impact
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嘅工作
- 監警會夠獨立
- 監警會夠公正
- 監警會嘅透明度好高
- 監警會嘅效率好高
- 監警會有足夠嘅權力去履行職責
- 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
- 監警會有履行職責
- 監警會工作有成效
- 監警會形象／名稱正面
- 監警會沒有／少負面新聞
- 直覺／印象／個人感覺
- 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嘅工作
- 不相信監警會嘅獨立性
- 監警會係監察／覆檢個案時可能會偏袒警務人員
- 監警會不公平／不公正 (不指明偏向哪一方)
- 監警會嘅透明度好低
- 監警會嘅效率好低
- 監警會有足夠權力去履行職責
- 監警會工作沒有成效
- 其他負面答案 (請註明：_____)

唔知道／難講

拒答

[Q20] Please rate on a scale of 0-100 your satisfaction with IPCC's performance. 0 stands for very dissatisfied, 100 stands for very satisfied, 50 stands for half-half. How would you rate it?

請你用 0 至 100 分評價你對「監警會」表現嘅滿意程度，0 分代表非常唔滿意，100 分代表非常滿意，50 分代表一半半，你會俾幾多分佢呢？

____ (Input exact figure)

Don't know

Refuse to answer

____ (入實數)

唔知道／難講

拒答

[Q21] Lastly, what are your expectations on IPCC? Any more? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed, select ALL suitable options. If what the respondents said is NOT equivalent to an option, do NOT ask if he means that. Instead, record his response in "Others".)

最後，整體而言你對「監警會」有乜野期望？(不讀答案，可答多項，選擇所有適用答案。如果被訪者所述答案不等同選項，不要詢問被訪者他的意思是否某一選項，而是將被訪者所述答案記錄於「其他」。)

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Hope IPCC can improve Police-community relation / enhance its communication | 希望監警會可以改善警民關係／加強警民溝通 |
| Hope IPCC can monitor HK Police Force's work effectively | 希望監警會可以有效監察香港警察嘅工作 |
| Hope IPCC can pressure HK Police Force effectively in order to improve their work | 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 |
| Hope IPCC can explain more to citizens the work / complaints system of HK Police Force | 希望監警會可以向市民多解釋香港警察嘅工作／投訴機制 |
| Hope IPCC can ensure citizens will get appropriate Police services | 希望監警會可以保障市民得到適當嘅警察服務 |
| Hope IPCC can provide a channel for complaints against police | 希望監警會可以提供投訴香港警察嘅渠道 |
| Hope IPCC can handle cases in a fair, impartial and transparent manner | 希望監警會處事公平公正公開 |
| Hope IPCC can improve its transparency | 希望監警會提高透明度 |
| Hope IPCC can become an independent organization / handle complaint cases directly | 希望監警會可以成為獨立機構／直接處理投訴個案 |
| Hope IPCC can increase its efficiency | 希望監警會提高效率 |
| Hope IPCC will keep up with its good work | 希望監警會繼續做好現時工作 |
| Hope IPCC can do better | 希望監警會做得更好 |
| Hope IPCC can have more promotion of its work | 希望監警會加強宣傳其工作 |
| Hope IPCC can change the method for selecting its members | 希望監警會改變組成委員的方法 |
| Hope IPCC can broaden its member base | 希望監警會讓不同人士成為委員 |
| Hope IPCC can expand its mandated functions | 希望可以擴大監警會嘅法定職能 |
| Hope IPCC is not swayed by external influence | 希望監警會不受外界影響 |
| Others (Please specify: _____) | 其他 (請註明: _____) |
| No expectation | 沒有期望 |
| Don't know / hard to say | 唔知道／難講 |
| Refuse to answer | 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. Your information provided will be kept strictly confidential. You may also refuse to answer any question.

我哋想請問您一啲簡單嘅個人資料以作綜合分析，你所提供嘅資料係會絕對保密，你亦有權拒絕回答任何問題。

[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的被訪者] **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

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Not 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 (F.6-F.7) | 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 |
| Unidentified | 不能辨別 |
| Others (unemployed and non-worker included) | 其他 (包括失業及其他非在職者) |
| Refuse to answer | 拒答 |

[DM5] 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 |
| Refuse to answer | 拒答 |

Part V Recruitment of Focus Group Participants 第五部分 招募意見交流會參加者

[R1] Finally, we would like to invite you to participate in a focus group about the IPCC, which will take around 1.5 hours. As a token of appreciation, each participant will be given HK\$150 cash or coupon at the end of the focus group. Would you be interested to join?

最後，我哋想邀請你遲啲參加一個有關監警會嘅意見交流會，大約需時一個半小時。交流會完結後我哋會送返\$150 現金或禮券以答謝出席者嘅參與。唔知你會唔會有興趣參加呢？

Yes, interested

有興趣

No, not interested → Skip to end

冇興趣 → 問卷完

Don't know / hard to say

唔知／難講

Refuse to answer → Skip to end

拒答 → 問卷完

[R2][Only ask those answered “yes, interested” or “don't know / hard to say” in R1] Would you mind leaving a name and contact for future communication when the details of the focus group are fixed?

[只問 R1 答「有興趣」或「唔知／難講」者] 介唔介意留低稱呼同聯絡資料，俾我哋之後再通知你交流會嘅詳情呢？

Name: _____

稱呼: _____

Tel.: _____

電話: _____

Email: _____

電郵地址: _____

Refuse to provide

唔願意提供聯絡資料

End of Questionnaire 問卷完成

This is the end of the interview. Thank you for your time.

問卷已經完成，多謝你接受訪問。