

# THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG PUBLIC OPINION PROGRAMME

---

## Independent Police Complaints Council Public Opinion Survey 2014

---



### Final Report

Jointly compiled by

CHUNG Ting-Yiu Robert, PANG Ka-Lai Karie,

LEE Wing-Yi Winnie and TSE Hiu-Yan Cynthia

17 December 2014

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

## Contents

---

### *Survey Report*

I.	Preamble	2
II.	Research Design	3
III.	Research Findings	5
	A. Awareness of the IPCC	5
	B. Awareness of news on complaints against the Hong Kong Police Force	7
	C. Image and confidence in the IPCC	8
	D. Overall perception of the IPCC	10
IV.	Conclusion	12

### *Appendices*

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

## *I. Preamble*

- 1.1 The Public Opinion Programme (POP) was established in June 1991 to collect and study public opinion on topics which could be of interest to academics, journalists, policy-makers, and the general public. POP was at first under the Social Sciences Research Centre, a unit under the Faculty of Social Sciences of The University of Hong Kong, it was transferred to the Journalism and Media Studies Centre in The University of Hong Kong in May 2000. In January 2002, it was transferred back to the Faculty of Social Sciences in The University of Hong Kong. Since its establishment, POP has been providing quality survey services to a wide range of public and private organizations, on condition that they allow the POP Team to design and conduct the research independently, and to bear the final responsibilities. POP also insists that the data collected should be open for public consumption in the long run.
- 1.2 In December 2012, the Independent Police Complaints Council (IPCC) commissioned POP to conduct a public opinion poll entitled “Independent Police Complaints Council Public Opinion Survey”. In December 2013, IPCC commissioned POP again to conduct this “Independent Police Complaints Council Public Opinion Survey 2014” using comparable research design and opinion questions. The objectives of the survey are 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 the IPCC’s publicity initiatives in future, and to track the people’s opinion changes towards the IPCC, if any.
- 1.3 The research instrument used in this study was designed entirely by the POP Team after consulting with the IPCC and making reference to the last survey and some questionnaires previously used by the IPCC for tracking their image attributes. 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 **3 to 14 March, 2014**. A total of **1,039 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 **66.9%** (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 15,617 telephone numbers sampled for the survey, 4,068 were confirmed to be ineligible, among them 926 were fax or data lines, 2,107 were invalid telephone numbers, 62 were call-forwarding numbers, while another 892 were non-residential numbers. Besides, 32 of them were invalidated due to special technological reasons, while 49 cases were voided because target respondents were unavailable at the numbers provided.
- 2.5 Meanwhile, a total of 6,967 telephone numbers were invalidated before the research team could confirm their eligibility. Among them, 1,132 were busy lines and 4,566 were no-answer calls after making a maximum of 5 times’ recalls. 449 cases were diverted to answering devices while another 28 were blocked. Moreover, 315 cases were treated as unsuccessful because of language problems, while 475 interviews were terminated before the screening question and 2 cases were voided for other problems.

- 2.6 On the other hand, 3,543 cases failed to complete the interview. Among them 12 rejected the interview immediately after their eligibility was confirmed, 3,501 were unfinished cases with appointment dates beyond the end of fieldwork period. Besides, 28 cases were incomplete due to unexpected termination of interviews, 2 were classified as miscellaneous due to other non-contact problems, and the remaining 1,039 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 2013 year-end 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 the 2013 and 2014 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 comprised 21 opinion questions on 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 2013 survey wherever applicable, while all frequency tables referred to in this section can be found in Appendix 2. It is noteworthy that the figures in the text are rounded up to the nearest integers after considering the second decimal place.

#### Awareness of the IPCC

- 3.1 The first part of survey aimed at gauging respondent's general awareness of the IPCC and its job nature. Very similar to last year's survey, more than two-thirds (67%) had heard of the IPCC prior to the interview, while less than one-third (32%) said they had not (Table 3).
- 3.2 The survey continued to ask those respondents who had heard 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 they were prompted by the channels that they had not mentioned. Without prompting, almost three-quarters (74%) of these respondents mentioned television, including TV news (64%), TV interviews (4%), TV series ("IPCC the Proper Way") (3%) and other TV programmes (4%), which was apparently the most common source of information. Followed at a large distance, newspapers, including Ming Pao ("The IPCC Perspective") (1%), Sharp Daily ("Business of the Cops") (<1%) and other newspaper stories (10%) were mentioned by more than one-tenth (12%) of respondents, while radio and Internet were mentioned by 6% and 2% of respondents respectively, and less than 1% mentioned magazines. Whilst after prompting, more than 90% (93%) of respondents stated that they had heard of the IPCC from television, mostly from TV news (85%), while less than half (48%) of respondents stated that they had read about the IPCC from newspapers, mostly from newspaper stories (40%) other than "The IPCC Perspective" and "Business of the Cops". Besides, 30% of respondents recalled they had heard about the IPCC on Radio and 22% learnt about it on the Internet, followed by advertisements on public transport (12%) and annual report / brochure / website / newsletter / Youtube channel / quarterly meeting of the IPCC (8%). What's more, 2% recalled seeing IPCC-related information from posters while 1% saw it from magazines. It is worth noting that the percentage of respondents who recalled they had learnt about the IPCC from the Internet has risen by 6 percentage points as compared to last year (Table 4).

- 3.3 When asked to name the IPCC's duties that they were aware of, only 40% of the 706 respondents who had heard of the IPCC could provide at least one correct answer, the percentage is significantly lower than last year's 48%. Among them, most could correctly point out the IPCC was responsible for "monitoring CAPO's cases handling process" (23%). "Monitoring Police's follow-up/disciplinary actions towards officers being complained" came next and was correctly named by more than one-tenth (11%) of the sub-sample. Less than 5% of these respondents correctly named "reviewing/verifying investigation report/results by CAPO" (5%), "reviewing statistics on types of Police's behavior that citizens complained" (3%), "identifying mal-practices in Police's works that has led or may lead to complaints" (3%) and "improving Police Force's quality of service" (2%). On the other hand, the percentage of those who misunderstood at least one IPCC's duty has significantly increased by 6 percentage points, as compared to one year ago. As high as 47% of the sub-sample mistakenly thought that "monitoring Police's behavior/conduct" was the IPCC's duty, representing a 9 percentage-point increase from a year ago. Another 14% of the sub-sample mistakenly thought that "investigating citizens' complaints on Police directly" was the IPCC's duty. Meanwhile, about one-seventh (14%) admitted they had no idea what the IPCC's duties were. Other less common answers are listed in Table 5 of Appendix 2.
- 3.4 As for the independent nature of the IPCC, among the 706 respondents who had heard of the IPCC prior to the interview, 63% were aware that the IPCC was a totally independent organization that was not under the Police. On the contrary, less than one-third (31%) thought the IPCC was part of the Police and 6% opted for "don't know / hard to say". All three figures remained stable over the past year (Table 6).
- 3.5 When asked to name the most effective channel to make a complaint against members of the Police Force, the top five most frequently mentioned channels remained exactly the same as last year's. "IPCC" (24%) topped the list again with a quarter of respondents mentioning it, followed by "CAPO" which was mentioned by about one-fifth of respondents (21%). "Police Force" (11%) and "media" (8%) formed the next tier with around one-tenth mentioning each. Other complaint channels that came to respondents' minds were "DC/Legco members" (3%), "ICAC" (2%), "Office of the Ombudsman, HK" (1%), "Internet" (1%) and "Equal Opportunities Commission" (<1%). While less than 1% believed that no single channel was most effective in making complaints against the Police Force, more than a quarter of respondents admitted they did not know (27%). All figures remained very stable over the past year (Table 7).

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

- 3.6 The second part of the survey focused on citizen's awareness of news related to complaints against the Hong Kong Police Force. Similar to last year's result, more than three quarters (77%) of respondents had heard about news on such complaints in the year prior to the interview. News on "conflicts between Police and citizens during processions, gatherings and demonstrations" received the most public attention, with about one-third (32%) naming it without being aided. Followed at a distance, about one-tenth (11%) of respondents reported that they had heard about news on "police's misconduct / bad attitude / abusive language", representing a significant increase of 6 percentage point from that of last year. Then, 5% had heard about news on "the dispute between teacher Lam Wai-sze and Police at Mong Kok pedestrian street on July 14, 2013", while 3% had heard about news on "police's mishandling of sexual violence case". Other less commonly cited news included "police's neglect of duty" and "complaints about Police's abuse of power", each were mentioned by 2% of the sample. However, when compared to previous findings, a larger percentage of respondents could not specify the news they had heard of (24%), while a smaller percentage of respondents claimed that they had not heard any news about this at all in the past year (15%; Table 8).
- 3.7 The survey carried on to probe if respondents were aware of the outcomes of those complaints they had just mentioned. Of the 328 respondents who had heard of "conflicts between Police and citizens during processions, gatherings and demonstrations", about one-third said they had followed up on the outcomes (34%), including 25% who said "yes" and 9% "sometimes", while another 60% said they were not aware of the results. The percentage of those who answered "yes" went up as compared to the 2013 survey while that of those who did not follow up dropped, both changes were tested to be statistically significant. As for the 117 respondents who had heard of "police's misconduct / bad attitude / abusive language", 37% of them were aware of the result, with 22% said "yes" and 15% said "sometimes", whereas 60% said they did not follow. Respondents' awareness of the results of other news are listed in Table 9 of Appendix 2.
- 3.8 As for the type of complaint that the respondents would care about most, "police officers' abuse of power" (19%) ranked first again, but the percentage of respondents mentioning it significantly dropped by 13 percentage points from last year's 32%. About one-seventh of respondents said they cared about complaints on "corruption of police officers" (15%) most, while about one-eighth each opted for "unfairness of police officers in handling cases" (13%) and "Police's handling public demonstration" (12%). Less than one-tenth respectively said their largest concerns were on "police officers' use of violence" (7%) and "working attitude of police officers" (6%), whereas less than 5% each opted for complaints on "officers' law enforcement of traffic regulations" (4%), "media coverage arrangement"



(3%) and “stop and search issue / searching” (3%). There were significantly more people who cared most about “unfairness of police officers in handling cases” and “officers’ law enforcement of traffic regulations”, which have increased by 5 and 2 percentage points respectively (Table 10).

### Image and confidence in the IPCC

- 3.9 A series of questions were asked to gauge the perceived image of the IPCC in the public’s eyes. The results were pretty much the same as that of last survey. More than half of the sample (53%) evaluated IPCC’s independence positively in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police, with 34% considering the IPCC “independent” and 19% thought it was “quite independent”. About one-fifth (19%) opted for the middle ground “half-half”, while 17% evaluated this aspect of the IPCC negatively, with 12% opting for “not quite independent” and 5% even thought it was “not independent at all”. Besides, around one-tenth of respondents (11%) answered “don’t know / hard to say” (Table 11).
- 3.10 Respondents’ opinions were similar to that of last survey when it came to IPCC’s work on monitoring and reviewing CAPO’s investigations. Nearly half (47%) believed that the IPCC was able to do so in an impartial and objective way, among which 27% considered it “impartial and objective” and 20% thought it was “quite impartial and objective”. On the contrary, 14% believed it was not, of which 9% opted for “not quite impartial and objective” and 4% even said “not impartial and objective at all”, whereas 27% opted for “half-half”. At the same time, about one-eighth (13%) of respondents did not know or found it hard to say (Table 12).
- 3.11 With regards to IPCC’s efficiency in monitoring and reviewing complaints, similar to last year, about one-third (32%) thought its performance was mediocre and chose “half-half”. Meanwhile, more than a quarter (27%) generally thought it was efficient and one-eighth (13%) thought the opposite. Among those who thought it was generally efficient, 14% answered “efficient” and 13% answered “quite efficient” after probing. For those who thought it was generally not efficient, 10% said it was “not quite efficient” and 3% said it was “not efficient at all”. At the same time, a notable amount of respondents (29%) had no idea and failed to judge on IPCC’s efficiency. (Table 13).
- 3.12 Similarly, respondents’ views on IPCC’s level of transparency in monitoring and reviewing complaints did not change much from the last survey. Nearly two-fifths of respondents (39%) assessed IPCC’s level of transparency as “half-half”. About a quarter of the sample (24%) thought IPCC’s work was of low transparency, with 13% and 12% opting for “quite low” and “low” respectively. On the contrary, one-fifth (20%) positively appraised IPCC’s transparency, of which half of them said it was “quite high” (10%) and the other half said it

was “high” (10%). Meanwhile, 17% could not give a definite answer to this question (Table 14).

- 3.13 When compared to last year’s results, significantly more citizens interviewed expressed confidence in the IPCC in general, of which 36% were “quite confident” and 12% were “very confident”, giving a total of nearly half said they were confident (48%). Besides, around a quarter of respondents opted for “half-half” (26%), representing a significant drop of 6 percentage points. On the other hand, one-fifth said that they were not confident in the IPCC (20%), which included 14% who said “not quite confident” and 6% who said “not confident at all”. The most commonly cited reason for no confidence in the IPCC was “the process and results of complaints are not released to public” (18%). The percentage of respondents who thought the IPCC “is like self-investigation” was significantly lower this year, at 15%. “Committees are appointed, not elected by citizens” (14%), “may take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases” (12%), “both are under the Government” (11%), “inconspicuous / bad performance” (10%) and “not clear about IPCC’s works” (8%) closely followed with percentages ranging from 8% to 14%. Moreover, 4% said they were not confident in the IPCC because there were “no direct investigation, monitor only, no actual authority”, while 3% each “did not think the IPCC investigates or monitors complaints from a citizen’s perspective” and they thought the IPCC “might cover up the truth to avoid unfavorable impact on Police’s image”. Other less frequently cited reasons included “handle cases unfairly”, “only responsible for monitoring and review, doesn’t investigate directly”, “affected by political factors”, “may be unfair to police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases” and “Police officers could be appointed as committee members” with 2% respondents mentioning each of them. Meanwhile, one-tenth could not explain why they were not confident in the IPCC (10%; Tables 15 & 16).
- 3.14 Regarding the existing complaints system, significantly more respondents were confident in the two-tier system this year, while the “half-half” percentage dropped. Specifically, more than half of respondents (52%) expressed confidence in the two-tier system, among which 41% were “quite confident” and 11% were “very confident”. Less than a quarter opted for “half-half” (22%), while 13% said they were “not quite confident” and 6% said they were “not confident at all”, giving a total of 19% negative appraisal of the two-tier system. Among those 195 respondents who lacked confidence in the system, a quarter of them suggested the IPCC to “increase transparency” (25%) by all means in the future, while nearly a quarter suggested the IPCC to “involve individuals from different classes in the process” (23%). Followed at a distance, around one-tenth each proposed that “the IPCC should have authorization to investigate” (11%) and “the IPCC should become an independent department” (10%), while less than 5% each believed that the IPCC should “handle complaints fairly and impartially” (4%), “improve work efficiency” (4%) and have

“more promotion” (3%). Also, 2% each of the sub-sample suggested that the IPCC “did not need the two-tier system”, “to simplify the monitor and review procedures”, “to shorten the time for investigation and review” and “the IPCC should have authorization to decide punitive sanctions on police officers who violated regulations”. Another 2% of the sub-sample said there was nothing needed to be improved, while as high as 26% had no idea how the IPCC could further improve (Tables 17 & 18).

### Overall perception on the IPCC

- 3.15 The last part of the survey aimed at investigating citizens’ overall perception on the IPCC. Compared with the last survey, this year’s results revealed that significantly more respondents perceived IPCC’s image positively (60%), of which more than one-third thought it was “positive” (36%) and a quarter thought it was “quite positive” (25%). Over a quarter (26%) evaluated IPCC’s image as half positive and half negative. At the same time, only a very small proportion (6%) perceived IPCC’s image negatively, of which 3% each regarded it as “quite negative” and “negative”, while the remaining 8% could not give a definite answer on this (Table 19).
- 3.16 Why did the 626 respondents perceive IPCC’s image positively? Similar to last survey, results showed that the most popular reason was that they believed “the IPCC was independent enough” (21%). It was followed by “the IPCC was fair enough” (18%) and “IPCC’s structure gave people confidence” (13%) which have swapped their position on the list. “IPCC members had sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review”, “the IPCC had high transparency” and “the IPCC provided a helpful monitoring system/mechanism” came next with corresponding percentages of 13%, 11% and 11%. Other reasons being cited included “IPCC’s image/name was positive” (8%), “the IPCC had sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties” (6%), “the IPCC had high efficiency” (5%) and “the IPCC was appointed by the Government” (2%). At the same time, more than one-tenth of the sub-sample could not provide any reason for their positive perception of the IPCC (11%; Table 20).
- 3.17 The survey results also revealed that among the 64 respondents who perceived IPCC’s image negatively, 38% thought so because they shared the view that “the IPCC had low transparency”. This was also the most frequently mentioned reason in the last survey. One-fifth admitted that they “didn’t trust IPCC’s independence” (20%), whereas about one-seventh believed that “the IPCC had low efficiency” (14%). Meanwhile, 7% believed that “the IPCC might take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases”, and 5% “didn’t think IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review”. A small proportion of the sub-sample thought “the IPCC didn’t have sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties” (3%). Another one-tenth did not give a definite answer (11%, Table 21).

- 3.18 Two new questions were added in this year's survey to gauge citizen's satisfaction with the performance of the IPCC. Results showed that almost 40% were satisfied (39%), with 32% opting for "quite satisfied" and 7% opting for "very much satisfied" respectively. About one-third evaluated IPCC's performance as "half-half" (31%). On the other hand, less than one-tenth said they were not satisfied with IPCC's performance (9%), with 7% said they were "quite dissatisfied" and 2% said they were "very much dissatisfied". Meanwhile, more than one-fifth could not give a definite answer to this question (21%). Another new question asked the respondents to rate their satisfaction with IPCC's performance on a scale of 0-100, with 0 indicating very dissatisfied, 100 indicating very satisfied and 50 indicating half-half. The average score was 62.5 marks with a standard error of 0.6 marks (Table 22 & 23).
- 3.19 The survey ended by asking all respondents their expectations on the IPCC. A quarter of the respondents "hoped the IPCC would handle cases in a fair, impartial and transparent manner", representing a significant increase from a year ago. Those who "hoped IPCC can monitor HK Police Force's work effectively" and "hoped the IPCC would improve its transparency" formed the next tier with 16% and 15% mentioning these respectively. Besides, 6% "hoped the IPCC could explain more to citizens the work / complaints system of HK Police Force", while 5% each hoped the IPCC "could become an independent organization / handle cases independently", "improve Police-community relation / enhance its communication", and "ensure citizens would get appropriate Police services". Moreover, 4% each hoped that the IPCC "could increase their efficiency", "provide a channel for complaints against police", "would keep up with its good work" and "could have more promotion of its work", while a small proportion "hoped the IPCC could pressure HK Police Force effectively in order to improve their work" (3%), "let different people to participate" (3%), "serve citizens" (1%), "would have the right to investigate complaints" (1%) and "would be authorized for law enforcement / have actual authority" (1%). Finally, 4% said they had no expectations on the IPCC, whereas 18% did not have any idea (Table 24).

## IV. Conclusion

- 4.1 Similar to 2013's survey result, almost 70% had heard of the IPCC and majority of them learnt about it from television. However, only 40% of these respondents could name at least one IPCC duty correctly, significantly down by 9 percentage points from last year. "Monitoring CAPO's cases handling process" was IPCC's most visible function again, but almost half has mistaken "monitoring Police's behavior/conduct" as one of IPCC's duties. Moreover, 63% of those heard of the IPCC were aware that the IPCC was a totally independent organization, while 31% thought it is part of the Police Force. Both figures remained stable over the year past.
- 4.2 Again, about three-quarters of respondents said they had heard of news related to complaints against the Police in the year past. Conflicts between Police and citizens during processions, gatherings and demonstrations continued to receive most public attention. At the same time, the percentage of citizens who recalled complaints on Police's misconduct / bad attitude / abusive language significantly has increased by 6 percentage points from last year. Police officers' abuse of power topped the list of complaints that the respondents cared most, despite a significant 13-percentage-point drop from last year.
- 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, by a larger margin this year of 33 percentage points. Over half of the sample showed confidence in the system, and the most popular suggestion for improvement offered by the non-confident group was the same as the last survey, which was to increase transparency. Again, regarding the effectiveness of complaint channels against Police, one-quarter believed the IPCC was the most effective, while another one-fifth chose CAPO.
- 4.4 Overall speaking, just like last year, almost half of the sample was confident in the IPCC, especially in terms of "independence", "impartiality and objectiveness", but people were less positive in IPCC's "efficiency" and "transparency". Meanwhile, one-fifth were not confident in the IPCC, mainly because they thought the process and results of complaints were not publicly released.
- 4.5 Results of two new questions on satisfaction with the performance revealed that two-fifths were satisfied with IPCC's performance, with a mean satisfaction rating of 62.5 marks on a scale of 0 to 100.
- 4.6 In terms of future expectations of the IPCC, "handling cases in a fair, impartial and transparent manner" and "monitoring the Police's work effectively" topped the list again this year but with their positions swapped.

# **Appendix 1**

## **Contact Information**

**Table 1. Calculation of Overall response rate**

Response rate	
=	$\frac{\text{Successful cases}}{\text{Successful cases} + \text{Incomplete cases}^{\wedge} + \text{Refusal cases by eligible respondents}}$
=	$\frac{1,039}{1,039 + (28 + 475) + 12}$
=	66.9%

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

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

	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Respondents' ineligibility confirmed</b>	<b>4,068</b>	<b>26.0%</b>
<i>Fax / data line</i>	926	5.9%
<i>Invalid number</i>	2,107	13.5%
<i>Call-forwarding / mobile / pager number</i>	62	0.4%
<i>Non-residential number</i>	892	5.7%
<i>Special technological difficulties</i>	32	0.2%
<i>No eligible respondents</i>	49	0.3%
<b>Respondents' ineligibility not confirmed</b>	<b>6,967</b>	<b>44.6%</b>
<i>Line busy</i>	1,132	7.2%
<i>No answer</i>	4,566	29.2%
<i>Answering device</i>	449	2.9%
<i>Call-blocking</i>	28	0.2%
<i>Language problem</i>	315	2.0%
<i>Interview terminated before the screening question</i>	475	3.0%
<i>Others</i>	2	<0.1%
<b>Respondents' eligibility confirmed, but failed to complete the interview</b>	<b>3,543</b>	<b>22.7%</b>
<i>Known respondent refusal</i>	12	0.1%
<i>Appointment date beyond the end of the fieldwork period</i>	3,501	22.4%
<i>Partial interview</i>	28	0.2%
<i>Miscellaneous</i>	2	<0.1%
<b>Successful cases</b>	<b>1,039</b>	<b>6.7%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>15,617</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

## **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 IPCC

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

	2013		2014	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,009)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,039)
Yes	689	68.3%	695	66.9%
No	311	30.8%	333	32.0%
Don't know / hard to say	8	0.8%	11	1.1%
Total	1,009	100.0%	1,039	100.0%

Table 4. [Q2a] (Only ask those answered "yes" or "DK/HS" in Q1, base=706) From where have you heard of IPCC? Any other channels? [Do not read out answers, multiple choices allowed]

[Q2b] (Only ask those answered "yes" or "DK/HS" in Q1, base=706) 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				
	[Q2a] First mention		[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted)			[Q2a] First mention		[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted)		
	Freq.	% of valid sample (Base=698)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=2,117)	% of valid sample (Base=698)	Freq.	% of valid sample (Base=700)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=2,061)	% of valid sample (Base=700)
^Television	537	76.9%	658	--	94.2%	519	<b>74.1%</b>	652	--	<b>93.2%</b>
<i>News</i>	450	64.5%	601	28.4%	86.1%	449	64.1%	595	28.9%	85.1%
<i>TV interview</i>	23	3.3%	209	9.9%	30.0%	25	3.5%	187	9.1%	26.7%
<i>TV series (IPCC Files)<sup>#</sup></i>	21	2.9%	145	6.8%	20.7%	18	2.6%	109	5.3%	15.6%*
<i>Now TV programme preview (The IPCC Perspective)</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	25	1.2%	3.5%**
<i>Other TV programmes</i>	43	6.2%	198	9.3%	28.3%	27	3.9%*	126	6.1%	18.0%**
^Newspaper	63	9.1%	351	--	50.3%	83	11.9%	335	--	47.9%
<i>Ming Pao (The IPCC perspective)</i>	9	1.2%	89	4.2%	12.8%	10	1.5%	50	2.4%	7.2%**
<i>Sharp Daily (Business of the Cops)</i>	2	0.3%	92	4.4%	13.2%	1	0.2%	43	2.1%	6.2%**
<i>Other Newspaper stories (Please see below)</i>	52	7.5%	249	11.8%	35.7%	72	10.2%	282	13.7%	40.4%*
^Radio	38	5.4%	212	13.9%	30.4%	45	6.4%	213	10.3%	30.5%
^Internet	14	2.0%	110	7.2%	15.8%	13	1.8%	156	7.6%	22.3%**
^Advertisements on public transport	2	0.3%	75	--	10.7%	--	--	87	--	12.5%

	2013					2014				
	[Q2a] First mention		[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted)			[Q2a] First mention		[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted)		
	Freq.	% of valid sample (Base=698)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=2,117)	% of valid sample (Base=698)	Freq.	% of valid sample (Base=700)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=2,061)	% of valid sample (Base=700)
<i>Bus</i>	1	0.2%	42	2.0%	6.1%	--	--	48	2.3%	6.8%
<i>MTR</i>	1	0.2%	41	1.9%	5.8%	--	--	47	2.3%	6.7%
<i>Light Rail</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	13	0.6%	1.9%**
<i>Ferry/Pier</i>	--	--	11	0.5%	1.6%	--	--	8	0.4%	1.2%
<i>Tram</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5	0.3%	0.8%*
<i>Others (Please see below)</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	0.2%	0.6%
^Annual report / Brochure / Website / Newsletter / Youtube channel / Quarterly meeting of IPCC <sup>##</sup>	2	0.3%	40	--	5.7%	--	--	54	--	7.8%
<i>Quarterly meeting between IPCC and CAPO</i>	1	0.1%	19	0.9%	2.7%	--	--	26	1.3%	3.7%
<i>Annual report of IPCC / Brochure IPCC Channel on Youtube</i>	1	0.2%	10	0.5%	1.5%	--	--	16	0.8%	2.3%
<i>IPCC website</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	13	0.6%	1.9%**
<i>IPCC newsletter</i>	0	0.1%	15	0.7%	2.1%	--	--	10	0.5%	1.4%
	--	--	10	0.5%	1.4%	--	--	7	0.3%	1.0%
^Poster (please see below)	--	--	11	0.5%	1.6%	--	--	14	0.7%	2.0%
Magazines	1	0.1%	8	0.4%	1.2%	2	0.3%	6	0.3%	0.8%
Others	24	3.4%	58	--	8.3%	28	4.0%	53	--	7.5%
<i>Friend/Neighbours/Relatives/Schoolmates</i>	9	1.3%	24	1.1%	3.5%	12	1.7%	25	1.2%	3.5%
<i>Talks</i>	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0.2%	3	0.5%	4	0.2%	0.6%
<i>Community Activities</i>	2	0.3%	4	0.2%	0.6%	--	--	4	0.2%	0.5%
<i>Work</i>	7	0.9%	7	0.3%	0.9%	2	0.3%	3	0.2%	0.5%
<i>Others (see below)</i>	5	0.8%	8	0.4%	1.1%	11	1.5%	16	0.8%	2.3%*
Don't know / can't remember	16	2.3%	1	0.1%	0.2%	10	1.5%	5	0.2%	0.6%
Total	698	100.0%	2,117	100.0%		700	100.0%	2,061	100.0%	
Missing	0		0			6		6		
<b>Other newspaper that cannot be grouped</b>										
Apple Daily	16	2.2%	63	3.0%	9.1%	21	3.0%	73	3.5%	10.4%
Oriental Daily	16	2.4%	58	2.7%	8.3%	17	2.4%	63	3.0%	8.9%
Other interviews and coverage on newspaper (no specific newspaper)	9	1.2%	47	2.2%	6.7%	10	1.5%	38	1.8%	5.4%
HK Headline	1	0.1%	8	0.4%	1.1%	6	0.8%	26	1.3%	3.7%
Oriental Daily, Apple Daily	3	0.5%	16	0.8%	2.3%	1	0.1%	16	0.8%	2.3%
AM730	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%	2	0.3%	8	0.4%	1.1%
Sing Tao Daily	--	--	13	0.6%	1.9%	3	0.5%	6	0.3%	0.9%

	2013					2014				
	[Q2a] First mention		[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted)			[Q2a] First mention		[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted)		
	Freq.	% of valid sample (Base=698)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=2,117)	% of valid sample (Base=698)	Freq.	% of valid sample (Base=700)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=2,061)	% of valid sample (Base=700)
General report by Ming Pao	2	0.2%	6	0.3%	0.9%	3	0.4%	6	0.3%	0.8%
The Sun	1	0.1%	2	0.2%	0.5%	2	0.3%	4	0.2%	0.6%
Metro Daily	--	--	4	0.2%	0.6%	--	--	4	0.2%	0.6%
Other interviews and coverage on newspaper (free newspaper)	1	0.2%	5	0.2%	0.7%	--	--	3	0.1%	0.4%
HK Headline, Apple Daily	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	3	0.1%	0.4%
Apple Daily, HK Economic Journal	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	0.1%	0.4%
HK Economic Journal	--	--	2	0.1%	0.4%	1	0.1%	3	0.1%	0.4%
AM730, HK Headline	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	0.1%	0.3%
Sky Post, AM730	--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	2	0.1%	0.3%
Oriental Daily, Metro Daily	--	--	--	--	--	2	0.2%	2	0.1%	0.2%
AM730, Oriental Daily	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
Ming Pao, Apple Daily	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
Apple Daily, Oriental Daily, Sing Tao Daily	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
Oriental Daily, Sing Tao Daily	1	0.2%	1	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
Oriental Daily, Free Newspaper (no specific newspaper)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
Ming Pao, Metro Daily	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
Oriental Daily, South China Morning Post	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.2%	1	0.1%	0.2%
HK Daily News	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
HK Headline, Oriental Daily	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
Ming Pao, The Sun, Apple Daily, Oriental Daily	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Sing Tao Daily, HK Economic Times, Apple Daily	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Metro Daily, AM730, Oriental Daily	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
HK Headline, Metro Daily	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
All free newspaper	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Sing Tao Daily, HK Daily News	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Apple Daily, HK Headline, Metro Daily, Sky Post	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
The Sun, Oriental Daily	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Sky Post	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Sing Pao	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%

	2013					2014				
	[Q2a] First mention		[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted)			[Q2a] First mention		[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted)		
	Freq.	% of valid sample (Base=698)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=2,117)	% of valid sample (Base=698)	Freq.	% of valid sample (Base=700)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=2,061)	% of valid sample (Base=700)
Sing Tao Daily, AM730, HK Headline	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	<1	<0.1%	0.1%
Publication for retired police officer	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	<1	<0.1%	0.1%
HK Economic Journal, HK Economic Times	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	<1	<0.1%	0.1%
HK Economic Journal, Apple Daily, Sing Tao Daily	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	<1	<0.1%	0.1%
HK Economic Times	1	0.2%	4	0.2%	0.6%	<1	<0.1%	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Apple Daily, Sing Tao Daily	--	--	--	--	--	<1	<0.1%	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Apple Daily, HK Economic Times	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%	--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Metro Daily, AM730	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%	1	0.1%	--	--	--
Apple Daily, HK Headline, Metro Daily	--	--	2	0.2%	0.5%	--	--	--	--	--
South China Morning Post	--	--	2	0.1%	0.3%	--	--	--	--	--
South China Morning Post, Ming Pao, HK Economic Times, Apple Daily	--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	--	--	--
Sing Tao Daily, South China Morning Post, HK Economic Times	--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	--	--	--
HK Economic Journal, Oriental Daily, Apple Daily	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	--	--	--
on.cc	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--	--	--
Sing Tao Daily, Ming Pao	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--	--	--
HK Headline, AM730, Sky Post	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--	--	--
Sub-total	52	7.5%	249	11.8%	35.7%	72	10.2%	282	13.7%	40.4%
<b>Other advertisements on public transport that cannot be grouped</b>										
Other advertisements on public transport (no specific public transport)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	0.1%	0.3%
Minibus	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Minibus and Taxi	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Sub-total	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	0.2%	0.6%
<b>Place of poster</b>										
(Outside) Police station	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	0.2%	0.5%
Tsim Sha Tsui	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	2	0.1%	0.3%
Kwun Tong	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	0.1%	0.3%
By the road / public area	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%

	2013					2014				
	[Q2a] First mention		[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted)			[Q2a] First mention		[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted)		
	Freq.	% of valid sample (Base=698)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=2,117)	% of valid sample (Base=698)	Freq.	% of valid sample (Base=700)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=2,061)	% of valid sample (Base=700)
Housing estate	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
Home Affairs Department	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Wong Tai Sin	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Sham Shui Po	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
No specific place	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Shatin (New Town Plaza)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Tai Po	--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	--	--	--
Sheung Wan	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	--	--	--
Government	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--	--	--
Don't know / hard to say / can't remember	--	--	7	0.3%	1.0%	--	--	--	--	--
Sub-total	--	--	11	0.5%	1.6%	--	--	14	0.7%	2.0%
<b>Other responses that cannot be grouped</b>										
Respondent was a police	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.1%	2	0.1%	0.3%
TV advertisement	--	--	--	--	--	2	0.2%	2	0.1%	0.3%
Banner	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
Internal department of Police Force	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
Heard of it at the park when other people mentioned it	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.2%	1	0.1%	0.2%
Movie	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%	1	0.2%	1	0.1%	0.2%
Lawyer	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Disciplinary force	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Yellow Page	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Respondent has a friend who works at IPCC	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%
School	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Respondent was an ICAC staff	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Police station	--	--	--	--	--	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Advertisement	1	0.2%	1	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	--	--	--
Heard of it when it was established	1	0.2%	1	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	--	--	--
Have complained the police	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%	<1	0.1%	<1	<0.1%	0.1%
1823 complaint hotline	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--	--	--
Trade Union	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--	--	--
Canada has IPCC	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--	--	--
Knowledge	1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--	--	--
Sub-total	5	0.8%	8	0.4%	1.1%	11	1.5%	16	0.8%	2.3%

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

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

\*\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level

\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  level

Table 5. [Q3] (Only ask those answered “yes” or “DK/HS” in Q1, base=706) To your knowledge, what are IPCC’s duties? Any other duties? [Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed]

	2013			2014		
	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=887)	% of valid sample (Base=698)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=879)	% of valid sample (Base=697)
IPCC duties	338	--	48.5%	277	--	39.7%**
<i>Monitoring CAPO’s cases handling process</i>	189	21.3%	27.1%	157	17.9%	22.5%*
<i>Monitoring Police’s follow-up/disciplinary actions towards officers being complained</i>	98	11.0%	14.0%	75	8.6%	10.8%
<i>Reviewing/verifying investigation reports/results by CAPO</i>	37	4.2%	5.4%	34	3.9%	4.9%
<i>Reviewing statistics on types of Police’s behavior that citizens complained</i>	12	1.4%	1.8%	21	2.4%	3.0%
<i>Identifying mal-practices in Police’s works that has led or may lead to complaints</i>	48	5.4%	6.9%	20	2.3%	2.9%**
<i>Improving Police Force’s quality of service</i>	22	2.5%	3.1%	17	2.0%	2.5%
Non-IPCC duties	369	--	52.9%	410	--	58.9%**
<i>Monitoring Police’s behaviour/conduct</i>	268	30.2%	38.4%	327	37.2%	47.0%**
<i>Investigating citizens’ complaints on Police directly</i>	114	12.9%	16.4%	97	11.0%	13.9%
<i>Investigating Police bribing cases</i>	8	0.9%	1.2%	12	1.4%	1.7%
<i>Improving police-community relation / enhance communication</i>	12	1.3%	1.7%	6	0.7%	0.8%
<i>Other wrong answers</i>	7	0.8%	1.1%	11	1.2%	1.5%
Don’t know / can’t remember	72	8.1%	10.3%	101	11.5%	14.5%
Total	887	100.0%		879	100.0%	
Missing	--			9		
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped:</u>						
Monitor Police, Hong Kong organizations and business organizations	--	--	--	3	0.3%	0.4%
Investigate confidential cases	--	--	--	3	0.3%	0.4%
Investigate internal problems of Police Force	--	--	--	2	0.2%	0.3%
Monitor Police Force’s expenses	--	--	--	2	0.2%	0.3%
Monitor (didn’t specify what to monitor)	2	0.2%	0.3%	1	0.2%	0.2%
Handle illegal behavior (same as Police)	--	--	--	<1	<0.1%	0.1%
For citizens to complain police officers	1	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	--
Monitor juvenile crime	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
Investigate everything about police	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
A useless department	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
Telephone tapping the suspects	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
Monitor firemen, Immigration Department and Custom and Excise Department	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
Maintenance of law and order	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
Sub-total	7	0.8%	1.1%	11	1.2%	1.5%

\*\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  level

Table 6. [Q4] (Only ask those answered “yes” or “DK/HS” in Q1, base=706) Do you think IPCC is...?  
[Read out first two options, order to be randomized by computer, only one answer is allowed]

	2013		2014	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=698)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=700)
A totally independent organization, not under the Police	420	60.2%	441	63.0%
Part of the Police	243	34.8%	215	30.8%
Don't know / hard to say	35	5.0%	43	6.2%
Total	698	100.0%	700	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>	--		6	

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

	2013		2014	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,008)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,037)
IPCC	244	24.2%	250	24.1%
CAPO	198	19.6%	214	20.7%
Police Force	108	10.7%	114	11.0%
Media	85	8.5%	83	8.1%
DC/LegCo members	34	3.4%	29	2.8%
ICAC	14	1.4%	19	1.8%
Office of the Ombudsman, HK	15	1.5%	7	0.7%
Internet	7	0.6%	6	0.6%
Equal Opportunities Commission	3	0.3%	3	0.3%
No channel	10	1.0%	3	0.2%
Others (please see below)	20	2.0%	29	2.8%
Don't know	270	26.8%	280	27.0%
Total	1,008	100.0%	1,037	100.0%
Missing	1		2	
<u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u>				
Call the 999 emergency line	--	--	8	0.7%
Police Public Relations Bureau	3	0.3%	4	0.4%
Phone	--	--	4	0.3%
Lawyer	--	--	2	0.2%
Consumer Council	--	--	2	0.2%
Court	2	0.2%	2	0.2%
Depends on the situation	--	--	1	0.1%
Government department that is responsible for Police's discipline	--	--	1	0.1%
Phone, complain on the site	--	--	1	0.1%
Police Community Monitoring Office	--	--	1	0.1%
Police Community Relations Office	--	--	1	0.1%
Through associations that are not related to the government	--	--	1	0.1%
Legal channel	--	--	1	0.1%
Security Bureau	--	--	1	0.1%
Popular members of society	--	--	<1	<0.1%
Call the Authority	--	--	<1	<0.1%
Complaint hotline	5	0.5%	--	--
Commissioner of Police	2	0.2%	--	--
Any channel will be effective	1	0.1%	--	--
National People's Congress	1	0.1%	--	--
Make complaints via the third party	1	0.1%	--	--
Independent government organization	1	0.1%	--	--
When need to complain, just ask people will do	1	0.1%	--	--
Resist with actions	1	0.1%	--	--
Demonstration	1	0.1%	--	--
Lawyer, civil association	1	0.1%	--	--
Universal suffrage	1	0.1%	--	--
Sub-total	20	2.0%	29	2.8%



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

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

	2013			2014		
	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=1,125)	% of valid sample (Base=1,009)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=1,165)	% of valid sample (Base=1,035)
Yes	749	--	74.2%	794	--	76.7%*
<i>Conflicts between Police and citizens during processions, gatherings and demonstrations^</i>	342	30.4%	33.8%	328	28.1%	31.6%
<i>Police's misconduct / bad attitude / abusive language^^</i>	52	4.6%	5.1%	117	10.0%	11.3%**
<i>The dispute between teacher Lam Wai-sze and Police at Mong Kok pedestrian street on July 14, 2013</i>	--	--	--	49	4.2%	4.7%
<i>Police's mishandling of sexual violence case</i>	--	--	--	31	2.6%	2.9%**
<i>Police's neglect of duty</i>	--	--	--	24	2.1%	2.3%**
<i>Complaints about Police's abuse of power</i>	21	1.9%	2.1%	17	1.5%	1.6%
<i>HKU 8.18 dispute / Li Keqiang visited HK / dark shadow incident</i>	100	8.9%	9.9%	14	1.2%	1.3%**
<i>The public gathering of Police supporters at Mong Kok pedestrian street on August 4, 2013</i>	--	--	--	14	1.2%	1.3%
<i>Central and Western District Councilor was prevented from attending the meeting by Police</i>	--	--	--	12	1.1%	1.2%
<i>Doubt on Police's political neutrality</i>	--	--	--	9	0.8%	0.9%**
<i>A couple was accused of stealing after they reported the money they found to the Police</i>	--	--	--	9	0.8%	0.9%
<i>Police's unfair / inappropriate law enforcement</i>	--	--	--	7	0.6%	0.7%*
<i>Police bribing cases</i>	8	0.8%	0.8%	7	0.6%	0.7%
<i>Police officer gave a female protestor a bear-hug</i>	--	--	--	6	0.5%	0.6%*
<i>Stop and search issue / searching</i>	16	1.4%	1.6%	4	0.4%	0.4%**
<i>Rape case in Police station</i>	34	3.0%	3.3%	2	0.2%	0.2%**
<i>Unsatisfactory arrangement of bail</i>	--	--	--	2	0.2%	0.2%
<i>Members of Scholarism were prevented from attending the National Day flag-raising ceremony</i>	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
<i>Media coverage arrangement by Police</i>	22	1.9%	2.1%	--	--	--**
<i>Police's law enforcement of the traffic regulation</i>	17	1.5%	1.7%	--	--	--**
<i>Sex workers complained about Police's abuse of power</i>	13	1.2%	1.3%	--	--	--**
<i>Police's handling of personal information</i>	6	0.5%	0.6%	--	--	--*
<i>Police's press release arrangement</i>	2	0.2%	0.2%	--	--	--
<i>Police forced a boy to pretend as a cross when investigating drugs issue</i>	2	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	--
<i>Mechanism of complaints against police is complicated, slow statements taking</i>	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
<i>Others (please see below)</i>	23	2.0%	2.3%	24	2.0%	2.3%
<i>Can't remember</i>	206	18.3%	20.4%	248	21.3%	23.9%*
<i>Refuse to answer</i>	1	0.1%	0.1%	1	0.1%	0.1%

	2013			2014		
	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=1,125)	% of valid sample (Base=1,009)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=1,165)	% of valid sample (Base=1,035)
No	214	19.0%	21.2%	158	13.6%	15.3%**
Don't know / hard to say	46	4.1%	4.6%	83	7.1%	8.0%*
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,125</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>1,165</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
<b>Other responses that cannot be grouped</b>						
Police officer treated citizen unjustly	--	--	--	3	0.2%	0.2%
Sexual assault cases of police officers / at police station	2	0.1%	0.2%	2	0.2%	0.2%
Legislative councilor was prevented from attending the legislative council meeting	--	--	--	2	0.2%	0.2%
Car accident	--	--	--	2	0.2%	0.2%
The fee of transferring legal documents	--	--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
Police officer intervened in a dispute between a hawker and FEHD staff	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
Police handling a case of a woman who got complained	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
The incident of a Hong Kong woman getting a penalty ticket on parking	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
Police reported a smaller number for rally headcounts.	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
Police officer's transexual behavior	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
Media were being censored	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
Child was attacked, the matter was not taken seriously by 999 emergency line	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
Sexual assault	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
Assault on Kevin Lau	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
The incident of Falun Gong in Causeway Bay	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
Police station did not report the lost property.	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
A female reporter was arrested half a year ago.	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
Traffic accident of a couple in Wan Chai	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
Don't understand Police's law enforcement procedures	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
The dispute with media	--	--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Tang Wai-hung's speech	--	--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Leaders of China visited HK	5	0.5%	0.5%	--	--	--
Legislative councilor Leung Kwok-hung surrounded by Police	3	0.3%	0.3%	--	--	--
Police wire tap	3	0.2%	0.3%	--	--	--
National education	2	0.2%	0.2%	--	--	--
Hong Kong Correctional Services Department urine test	2	0.2%	0.2%	--	--	--
The case of police fired a gun on the mountain	2	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
A man and a woman were stopped by a police officer due to speeding, the suspect made a complaint on the police officer	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
The fire in Fa Yuen Street	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
Police officer leased an apartment to a prostitute	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
Unfair	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
Syed Kemal Bokhar's niece complaint case	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>2.3%</b>

^ 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.

\*\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level

\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  level

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

	Conflicts between Police and citizens during processions, gatherings and demonstrations <sup>^</sup>				Police's misconduct / bad attitude / abusive language <sup>^^</sup>				The dispute between teacher Lam Wai-size and Police at Mong Kok pedestrian street on July 14, 2013			
	2013		2014		2013		2014		2013		2014	
	Freq.	% (Base=342)	Freq.	% (Base=323)	Freq.	% (Base=52)	Freq.	% (Base=113)	Freq.	%	Freq.	% (Base=49)
Yes	116	34.0%	81	25.0%*	15	28.4%	25	22.1%	--	--	22	44.0%
Sometimes	44	12.8%	28	8.8%	3	5.2%	17	14.6%	--	--	1	1.2%
No	156	45.8%	194	60.0%**	33	63.2%	67	59.7%	--	--	23	47.1%
Don't know / hard to say	25	7.4%	20	6.2%	2	3.2%	4	3.6%	--	--	4	7.7%
Total	342	100.0%	323	100.0%	52	100.0%	113	100.0%	--	--	49	100.0%
Missing	--	--	5	--	--	--	4	--	--	--	--	--
	Police's mishandling of sexual violence case				Police's neglect of duty				Complaints about Police's abuse of power			
	2013		2014		2013		2014		2013		2014	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	% (Base=31)	Freq.	%	Freq.	% (Base=24)	Freq.	% (Base=21)	Freq.	% (Base=15)
Yes	--	--	10	33.4%	--	--	11	45.8%	7	31.2%	3	18.6%
Sometimes	--	--	2	7.6%	--	--	3	11.5%	3	15.6%	1	6.7%
No	--	--	16	52.3%	--	--	8	32.6%	10	47.9%	10	68.0%
Don't know / hard to say	--	--	2	6.7%	--	--	2	10.1%	1	5.4%	1	6.7%
Total	--	--	31	100.0%	--	--	24	100.0%	21	100.0%	15	100.0%
Missing	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--
	HKU 8.18 dispute / Li Keqiang visited HK / dark shadow incident				The public gathering of Police supporters at Mong Kok pedestrian street on August 4, 2013				Central and Western District Councilor was prevented from attending the meeting by Police			
	2013		2014		2013		2014		2013		2014	
	Freq.	% (Base=100)	Freq.	% (Base=12)	Freq.	%	Freq.	% (Base=14)	Freq.	%	Freq.	% (Base=12)
Yes	44	58.7%	5	42.3%	--	--	4	29.8%	--	--	3	23.3%
Sometimes	5	2.1%	--	--	--	--	1	7.8%	--	--	3	21.8%
No	41	37.9%	7	57.7%	--	--	8	62.4%	--	--	5	43.9%
Don't know / hard to say	10	1.3%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	11.0%
Total	100	100.0%	12	100.0%	--	--	14	100.0%	--	--	12	100.0%
Missing	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Doubt on Police's political neutrality				A couple was accused of stealing after they reported the money they found to the Police				Police's unfair / inappropriate law enforcement			
	2013		2014		2013		2014		2013		2014	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	% (Base=9)	Freq.	%	Freq.	% (Base=9)	Freq.	%	Freq.	% (Base=7)
Yes	--	--	5	60.4%	--	--	5	58.2%	--	--	3	45.8%
Sometimes	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No	--	--	3	35.9%	--	--	4	41.8%	--	--	4	54.2%
Don't know / hard to say	--	--	<1	3.7%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	--	--	9	100.0%	--	--	9	100.0%	--	--	7	100.0%
Missing	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	Police bribing cases				Police officer gave a female protestor a bear-hug				Stop and search issue / searching			
	2013		2014		2013		2014		2013		2014	
	Freq.	% (Base=8)	Freq.	% (Base=7)	Freq.	%	Freq.	% (Base=6)	Freq.	% (Base=16)	Freq.	% (Base=3)
Yes	2	24.0%	1	12.1%	--	--	--	--	7	46.7%	--	--
Sometimes	1	10.7%	2	30.4%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No	6	65.3%	4	57.4%	--	--	6	100.0%	7	45.5%	3	100.0%
Don't know / hard to say	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	7.8%	--	--
Total	8	100.0%	7	100.0%	--	--	6	100.0%	16	100.0%	3	100.0%
Missing	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--
	Rape case in Police station				Unsatisfactory arrangement of bail				Members of Scholarship were prevented from attending the National Day flag-raising Ceremony			
	2013		2014		2013		2014		2013		2014	
	Freq.	% (Base=34)	Freq.	% (Base=2)	Freq.	%	Freq.	% (Base=2)	Freq.	%	Freq.	% (Base=1)
Yes	20	58.7%	2	89.0%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Sometimes	1	2.1%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
No	13	37.9%	<1	11.0%	--	--	2	100.0%	--	--	1	100.0%
Don't know / hard to say	<1	1.3%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	34	100.0%	2	100.0%	--	--	2	100.0%	--	--	1	100.0%
Missing	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Others				Can't remember what was the news about				Refuse to answer what was the news about			
	2013		2014		2013		2014		2013		2014	
	Freq.	% (Base=23)	Freq.	% (Base=24)	Freq.	%	Freq.	% (Base=245)	Freq.	%	Freq.	% (Base=1)
Yes	8	33.3%	5	19.6%	--	--	38	15.3%	--	--	--	--
Sometimes	1	4.9%	3	10.7%	--	--	17	6.8%	--	--	1	100.0%
No	12	54.7%	16	67.1%	--	--	164	67.0%	--	--	--	--
Don't know / hard to say	2	7.0%	1	2.6%	--	--	27	10.9%	--	--	--	--
Total	23	100.0%	24	100.0%	--	--	245	100.0%	--	--	1	100.0%
Missing	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	--	--	--	--	--

^ 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.

\*\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level

\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  level

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

	2013		2014	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,008)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,038)
On police officers' abuse of power	318	31.5%	197	<b>19.0%**</b>
On corruption of police officers	132	13.1%	158	15.2%
On unfairness of police officers in handling cases	84	8.3%	136	13.1%**
On Police's handling of public demonstration	138	13.7%	127	12.2%
On police officers' use of violence	70	6.9%	76	7.3%
On working attitude of police officers	57	5.6%	67	6.4%
On officers' law enforcement of traffic regulations	16	1.6%	41	4.0%**
On media coverage arrangement	26	2.6%	33	3.1%
On stop and search issue / searching	25	2.5%	30	2.9%
On press releases arrangement	26	2.6%	16	1.6%*
On investigation method of police officers	13	1.3%	15	1.5%
Others (please see below)	8	0.8%	10	0.9%
Don't care about any complaints against Police Force	55	5.5%	52	5.0%
Don't know / hard to say	40	3.9%	80	7.7%**
Total	1,008	100.0%	1,038	100.0%
Missing	1		1	
<u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u>				
All of the above	7	0.7%	4	0.4%
On police officer's behavior	--	--	1	0.1%
On police officer's gambling behavior	--	--	1	0.1%
All of the above, except "on investigation method of police officers"	--	--	1	0.1%
On police officer's personal conduct	--	--	1	0.1%
On contact between police officer and citizens	--	--	1	0.1%
Would care about those reported on news	--	--	<1	<0.1%
Support police officer, would not complaint	--	--	<1	<0.1%
Citizens overly complained police officer	--	--	<1	<0.1%
Maintenance of law and order	1	0.1%	--	--
Rape cases of Police	1	0.1%	--	--
Sub-total	8	0.8%	10	0.9%

\*\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  level

**Image and confidence in IPCC**

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

	2013		2014	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,007)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,037)
Independent } Independent	348	34.5%	356	34.3%
Quite independent } Independent	188 } 536	18.7% } 53.2%	197 } 553	19.0% } <b>53.3%</b>
Half-half	190	18.8%	193	18.6%
Not quite independent } Not independent	131	13.0%	124	12.0%
Not independent } Not independent	57 } 188	5.7% } 18.6%	54 } 178	5.2% } 17.1%
at all				
Don't know / hard to say	94	9.3%	114	11.0%
Total	1,007	100.0%	1,037	100.0%
Missing	2		2	

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

	2013		2014	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,007)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,039)
Impartial and objective } Impartial and objective	249	24.7%	281	27.1%
Quite impartial and objective } Impartial and objective	211 } 460	21.0% } 45.7%	203 } 485	19.6% } <b>46.7%</b>
Half-half	286	28.4%	276	26.5%
Not quite impartial and objective } Not impartial and objective	89	8.8%	99	9.5%
Not impartial and objective } Not impartial and objective	43 } 132	4.2% } 13.1%	44 } 142	4.2% } 13.7%
at all				
Don't know / hard to say	129	12.8%	136	13.1%
Total	1,007	100.0%	1,039	100.0
Missing	2		--	

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

	2013		2014	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,009)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,038)
Efficient } Efficient	113	11.2%	145	14.0%
Quite efficient } Efficient	144 } 257	14.3% } 25.5%	134 } 279	12.9% } 26.8%
Half-half	349	34.6%	329	<b>31.7%</b>
Not quite efficient } Not efficient	87	8.7%	101	9.8%
Not efficient at all } Not efficient	42 } 130	4.2% } 12.8%	31 } 132	3.0% } 12.7%
Don't know / hard to say	274	27.1%	298	28.7%
Total	1,009	100.0%	1,038	100.0
Missing	--		1	

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

	2013		2014	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,009)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,038)
High } High	81	8.0%	101	9.7%
Quite high } High	132 } 213	13.0% } 21.1%	102 } 203	9.8% } 19.5%
Half-half	398	39.5%	401	<b>38.6%</b>
Quite low } Low	131	13.0%	133	12.8%
Low } Low	112 } 244	11.1% } 24.2%	120 } 253	11.5% } 24.4%
Don't know / hard to say	154	15.3%	182	17.5%
Total	1,009	100.0%	1,038	100.0%
Missing	--		1	

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

	2013		2014	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,009)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,039)
Very confident } Confident	116	11.5%	126	12.1%
Quite confident } Confident	316 } 431	31.3% } 42.7%	372 } 498	35.8%* } <b>47.9%**</b>
Half-half	318	31.5%	267	25.7%**
Not quite confident } Not confident	141	14.0%	150	14.4%
Not confident at all } Not confident	51 } 192	5.1% } 19.0%	59 } 209	5.7% } 20.1%
Don't know / hard to say	68	6.7%	65	6.3%
Total	1,009	100.0%	1,039	100.0%
Missing	--		--	

\*\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  level



Table 16.[Q14] (Only ask respondents who have answered “not quite confident” and “not confident at all” in Q13, base=209) Why do you think it is “not quite confident”/ “not confident at all”? Any more? [Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed]

	2013			2014		
	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=248)	% of valid sample (Base=192)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=266)	% of valid sample (Base=209)
The process and results of complaints are not released to public	33	13.1%	17.0%	39	14.5%	18.4%
It's like self-investigation	51	20.8%	26.9%	31	11.8%	15.0%**
Committees are appointed, not elected by citizens	21	8.3%	10.7%	29	11.0%	14.0%
May take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases	30	12.0%	15.5%	25	9.5%	12.1%
Both are under the Government	16	6.3%	8.1%	24	8.9%	11.3%
Inconspicuous/bad performance	--	--	--	21	7.8%	9.9%**
Not clear about IPCC's works	24	9.6%	12.4%	17	6.5%	8.2%
No direct investigation, monitor only, no actual authority	14	5.7%	7.4%	8	2.9%	3.7%
Don't think IPCC investigate or monitor complaints in citizen's perspective	9	3.8%	4.9%	7	2.7%	3.4%
May cover up the truth to avoid unfavorable impact on Police's image	13	5.3%	6.8%	6	2.3%	2.9%*
Handle cases unfairly	--	--	--	5	1.8%	2.3%*
Only responsible for monitoring and review, didn't investigate directly	8	3.1%	4.0%	5	1.8%	2.3%
Affected by political factors	--	--	--	5	1.8%	2.2%*
May be unfair to police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases	--	--	--	4	1.5%	2.0%
Police officers could be appointed as committee member	4	1.5%	1.9%	4	1.4%	1.8%
Not independent enough	--	--	--	3	1.1%	1.4%
Not enough public engagement	--	--	--	2	0.8%	1.0%
Don't like the image of IPCC	7	2.6%	3.4%	--	--	--
Not confident in the Government, so not confident in IPCC	4	1.6%	2.1%	--	--	--
Others (please see below)	6	2.6%	3.4%	10	3.9%	5.0%
Don't know / hard to say	9	3.6%	4.7%	22	8.2%	10.4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>266</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped:</u>						
IPCC has too much power	--	--	--	3	1.0%	1.3%
IPCC's senior executives don't stand firm on their stances, the complaint procedures are trivial and tedious	--	--	--	1	0.6%	0.7%
Power is not evenly distributed in the two-tier system policy	--	--	--	1	0.4%	0.5%
Don't feel good about IPCC's image	--	--	--	1	0.4%	0.5%



Citizens and police have different ways in handling matters which leads to communication problems	--	--	--	1	0.4%	0.5%
Not independent and confidential enough	--	--	--	1	0.4%	0.5%
Legal appointees may not be binding enough	--	--	--	1	0.3%	0.4%
Most of the investigation results are not reported by media	--	--	--	1	0.3%	0.4%
Provide the information of complainant to other parties	--	--	--	<1	0.2%	0.2%
Radical views	2	0.7%	0.9%	--	--	--
Affected by Mainland	1	0.5%	0.6%	--	--	--
The way they handle is inappropriate	1	0.5%	0.6%	--	--	--
IPCC staff lose contact with the society	1	0.5%	0.6%	--	--	--
The investigation result has to be released after Leung Chun-ying's decision	1	0.5%	0.7%	--	--	--
Sub-total	6	2.6%	3.4%	10	3.9%	5.0%

\*\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level

\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  level

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

	2013		2014	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,009)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,036)
Very confident } Confident	121	12.0%	116	11.1%
Quite confident } Confident	326	32.3%	422	40.7%**
Half-half	285	28.2%	227	21.9%**
Not quite confident } Not confident	126	12.5%	130	12.5%
Not confident at all } Not confident	58	5.8%	65	6.2%
Don't know / hard to say	94	9.3%	77	7.4%*
Total	1,009	100.0%	1,036	100.0%
Missing	--		3	

\*\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level

\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  level

Table 18.[Q16] (Only ask respondents who have answered “not quite confident” and “not confident at all” in Q15, base=195) How do you think IPCC could improve this two-tier complaints system? [Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed]

	2013			2014		
	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=228)	% of valid sample (Base=185)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=236)	% of valid sample (Base=195)
Increase transparency	65	28.5%	35.2%	48	20.4%	<b>24.7%</b>
Involve individuals from different classes in the process	42	18.4%	22.8%	45	19.0%	23.0%
IPCC should have authorization to investigate	17	7.6%	9.4%	22	9.1%	11.1%
IPCC should become an independent department	18	7.8%	9.7%	20	8.3%	10.1%
Handle complaints fairly and impartially	--	--	--	7	3.1%	3.7%**
Improve work efficiency	--	--	--	7	2.9%	3.5%*
More promotion	13	5.6%	6.9%	7	2.8%	3.4%
Doesn't need the two-tier system				5	2.0%	2.4%*
Simplify the monitor and review procedures	12	5.2%	6.5%	4	1.6%	2.0%*
Shorten the time for investigation and review	6	2.8%	3.4%	4	1.6%	1.9%
IPCC should have authorization to decide punitive sanctions on police officers who violated regulations	7	3.2%	4.0%	4	1.5%	1.9%
IPCC should have authorization to investigate serious cases	2	0.8%	1.0%	2	0.8%	0.9%
Others (please see below)	11	4.9%	6.1%	9	3.8%	4.7%
No area needs to be improved	4	1.8%	2.2%	3	1.2%	1.5%
Don't know / hard to say	30	13.3%	16.5%	51	21.8%	26.4%*
<b>Total</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>100.0%</b>		<b>236</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
<b>Other response that cannot be grouped:</b>						
To be controlled by the Government	--	--	--	2	0.9%	1.1%
Making the decision too easily, low credibility	--	--	--	1	0.6%	0.7%
There is no way to improve	2	0.9%	1.1%	1	0.5%	0.6%
Hope the two-tier system work separately, and checks and balances each other	--	--	--	1	0.4%	0.5%
Independent organization to investigate citizens' complaints on police	--	--	--	1	0.4%	0.5%
Re-construct the system	--	--	--	1	0.4%	0.5%
All Chinese have to be righteous	--	--	--	1	0.3%	0.3%
CY Leung to step down	--	--	--	1	0.3%	0.3%
Have to be objective while handling cases	2	0.7%	0.9%	--	--	--
Report to the CE directly	2	0.7%	0.8%	--	--	--
Upload reports of demonstration and abuse of power to the website	2	0.7%	0.8%	--	--	--
Both organization will investigate, and then compare their reports	1	0.5%	0.6%	--	--	--
Have to follow the cases at work	1	0.4%	0.5%	--	--	--
Improve police officers' attitude	1	0.4%	0.5%	--	--	--
Don't believe in this system	1	0.3%	0.4%	--	--	--
To be monitored by independent civil association	1	0.3%	0.4%	--	--	--
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4.9%</b>	<b>6.1%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>4.7%</b>

\*\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level

\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  level

**Overall perception on IPCC**

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

	2013		2014	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,007)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,037)
Positive	350	34.7%	370	35.7%
Quite positive } Positive	229 } 579	22.7% } 57.4%	256 } 626	24.7% } <b>60.4%*</b>
Half-half	321	31.9%	265	25.6%**
Quite negative	21	2.1%	31	3.0%
Negative } Negative	21 } 43	2.1% } 4.2%	32 } 64	3.1% } 6.1%
Don't know / hard to say	65	6.4%	82	7.9%
Total	1,007	100.0%	1,037	100.0%
Missing	2		2	

\*\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  level

Table 20. [Q18a] (Only ask respondents who have answered “positive” and “quite positive” in Q17, base=626) Why do you think it is “positive” or “quite positive”? Any more?

	2013			2014		
	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=736)	% of valid sample (Base=578)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=757)	% of valid sample (Base=623)
IPCC is independent enough	143	19.4%	24.8%	129	17.1%	20.8%
IPCC is fair enough	96	13.1%	16.7%	113	14.9%	18.1%
IPCC's structure gives people confidence	100	13.6%	17.3%	82	10.8%	13.1%*
IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review	83	11.2%	14.3%	78	10.3%	12.5%
IPCC has high transparency	59	8.0%	10.2%	70	9.2%	11.2%
IPCC provides a helpful monitoring system/mechanism	71	9.6%	12.3%	69	9.1%	11.0%
IPCC's image/name is positive	27	3.7%	4.7%	52	6.9%	8.4%*
IPCC has sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties	35	4.8%	6.1%	40	5.3%	6.5%
IPCC has high efficiency	25	3.4%	4.3%	30	3.9%	4.8%
IPCC is appointed by the Government	8	1.0%	1.3%	10	1.3%	1.6%
Other positive answers (please see below)	22	3.0%	3.9%	14	1.8%	2.2%
Don't know / hard to say	67	9.1%	11.5%	71	9.3%	11.3%
Total	736	100.0%		757	100.0%	
Missing	1			3		
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped:</u>						
IPCC did good in past works	--	--	--	5	0.6%	0.7%
Not transparent enough / IPCC has explained its working progress, but it's not transparent enough	2	0.2%	0.3%	1	0.2%	0.2%
IPCC doesn't have sufficient authorization	--	--	--	1	0.2%	0.2%
Normal	--	--	--	1	0.2%	0.2%
It can't carry out its duties if it's not positive	--	--	--	1	0.2%	0.2%
Although the results are not as expected, it's still acceptable	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
Very disciplined	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.2%
Legislative Council monitored well	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
It's similar to ICAC	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
IPCC is competent, but it begins well but ends poorly	--	--	--	<1	<0.1%	0.1%
Under media's monitoring	5	0.7%	0.9%	--	--	--
The image of police officer is good	5	0.6%	0.8%	--	--	--
More systematic and moral when comparing with Mainland	2	0.3%	0.4%	--	--	--
Think this organization is not essential	2	0.3%	0.4%	--	--	--
Social service is good	1	0.2%	0.2%	--	--	--
Sometimes good	1	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	--
The organization has low transparency, bureaus cover up one another	1	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	--
As citizen make unnecessary complaints, the image of IPCC has improved and became positive	1	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	--
Social members are involved	1	0.1%	0.2%	--	--	--
It was established to monitor police. They work with a mission, so the image is positive.	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
The Police has high transparency, and can take in complaints	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
Sub-total	22	3.0%	3.9%	14	1.8%	2.2%

\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  level

Table 21. [Q18b] (Only ask respondents who have answered “negative” and “quite negative” in Q17, base=64) Why do you think it is “negative” and “quite negative”? Any more?

	2013			2014		
	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=57)	% of valid sample (Base=43)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=80)	% of valid sample (Base=64)
IPCC has low transparency	19	33.6%	45.0%	24	30.3%	38.0%
No trust in IPCC's independence	15	26.5%	35.4%	13	16.1%	20.2%
IPCC has low efficiency	3	4.8%	6.4%	9	11.3%	14.2%
IPCC might take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases	3	6.1%	8.2%	4	5.4%	6.8%
Don't think IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review	3	4.7%	6.2%	3	4.4%	5.5%
IPCC doesn't have sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties	6	10.2%	13.7%	2	2.5%	3.2%*
Other negative answers (please see below)	5	8.0%	10.7%	17	21.0%	26.3%*
Don't know / hard to say	3	6.1%	8.1%	7	9.1%	11.4%
Total	57	100.0%		80	100.0%	
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped:</u>						
Don't have much practical achievements	2	2.7%	3.5%	4	5.5%	7.0%
IPCC is not fair enough	--	--	--	4	4.6%	5.8%
IPCC's image/name is negative	--	--	--	2	2.0%	2.6%
Hope IPCC's senior executives have a mild stance	--	--	--	1	1.8%	2.3%
Just an ordinary department	--	--	--	1	1.8%	2.3%
IPCC is not being serious	--	--	--	1	1.6%	2.0%
Complaints are useless	--	--	--	1	1.4%	1.7%
IPCC may take sides with celebrities when monitoring or reviewing cases	--	--	--	1	1.2%	1.6%
Don't understand IPCC's works	--	--	--	1	0.8%	1.0%
There are more demonstration	1	2.2%	2.9%	--	--	--
Because seldom come to contact with IPCC	1	1.7%	2.2%	--	--	--
The society is managed by unjustified people	1	1.6%	2.1%	--	--	--
Sub-total	5	8.0%	10.7%	17	21.0%	26.3%

\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  level

Table 22. [Q19] Are you satisfied with the performance of IPCC?

		2014	
		Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,033)
Very much satisfied	}Satisfied	72	7.0%
Quite satisfied		328	31.8%
Half-half		316	30.6%
Quite dissatisfied	}Dissatisfied	72	6.9%
Very much dissatisfied		23	2.3%
Don't know / hard to say		221	21.4%
Total		1,033	100.0%
Missing		6	

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

		2014	
		Frequency	% of valid sample (Base=952)
0		11	1.1%
1-9		5	0.5%
10-19		5	0.6%
20-29		8	0.9%
30-39		22	2.3%
40-49		46	4.9%
50		240	25.2%
51-60		158	16.6%
61-70		197	20.7%
71-80		165	17.3%
81-90		63	6.6%
91-99		10	1.0%
100		21	2.2%
Total		952	100.0%
Missing (including "don't know / hard to say")		87	
Mean score		62.5	
Standard error		0.6	
Base		952	

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

	2013			2014		
	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=1,165)	% of valid sample (Base=1,001)	Freq.	% of total responses (Base=1,288)	% of valid sample (Base=1,028)
Hope IPCC would handle cases in a fair, impartial and transparent manner	169	14.5%	16.9%	247	19.2%	24.0%**
Hope IPCC can monitor HK Police Force's work effectively	192	16.5%	19.2%	169	13.2%	16.5%
Hope IPCC would improve its transparency	113	9.7%	11.3%	153	11.9%	14.9%**
Hope IPCC can explain more to citizens the work / complaints system of HK Police Force	80	6.9%	8.0%	61	4.7%	5.9%
Hope IPCC can become an independent organization / handle cases independently	42	3.6%	4.2%	52	4.0%	5.1%
Hope IPCC can improve Police-community relation / enhance its communication	70	6.0%	7.0%	49	3.8%	4.8%*
Hope IPCC can ensure citizens will get appropriate Police services	59	5.1%	5.9%	47	3.6%	4.5%
Hope IPCC can increase their efficiency	8	0.7%	0.8%	43	3.3%	4.1%**
Hope IPCC can provide a channel for complaints against police	66	5.7%	6.6%	42	3.3%	4.1%**
Hope IPCC will keep up with its good work	41	3.5%	4.1%	40	3.1%	3.9%
Hope IPCC can have more promotion of its work	--	--	--	38	2.9%	3.7%**
Hope IPCC can pressure HK Police Force effectively in order to improve their work	57	4.9%	5.7%	30	2.3%	2.9%**
Hope IPCC can let different people to participate	15	1.3%	1.5%	30	2.3%	2.9%*
Hope IPCC can serve citizens	--	--	--	13	1.0%	1.3%**
Hope IPCC will have the right to investigate complaints	11	1.0%	1.1%	12	0.9%	1.2%
Hope IPCC will be authorized for law enforcement / have actual authority	--	--	--	12	0.9%	1.1%**
Others (please see below)	24	2.1%	2.4%	19	1.5%	1.8%
No expectation	47	4.0%	4.7%	44	3.4%	4.2%
Don't know / hard to say	168	14.4%	16.8%	189	14.6%	18.3%
Total	1,165	100.0%		1,288	100.0%	
Missing	8			11		
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u>						
Enhance monitoring on corruption	5	0.4%	0.5%	4	0.3%	0.4%
To maintain society's law and order	1	0.1%	0.1%	3	0.2%	0.3%
Hope IPCC can enhance computer's security, prevent from hackers and ensure that complainants' information will not be disclosed.	--	--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
Have to follow up the cases if citizens are not satisfied	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
Under the court	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%

Understand internal punitive sanctions	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC can maintain the balance of society	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope online channels for contacting citizens can be increased	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
Facing up to the grey areas	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
More police to patrol	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
All Chinese have to be righteous	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
There are too many monitoring associations, police cannot function	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
Can work if the CE has changed	--	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC can handle their work peacefully	--	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Ignore those unreasonable complaints	--	--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Don't abuse power	2	0.2%	0.2%	--	--	--
Don't solely cases of power abuse	2	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
Solve the problem of abuse of power	2	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
Don't be too political, maintain neutrality	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
To think from law-enforcement official's perspective more frequently	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
Police doesn't have any authority, IPCC won't help the Police	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
To maintain human rights	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
To maintain a peaceful society	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
Have to be explicit and clear when handling cases	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
If it is really useful, everyone will have expectations on it	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
To increase citizen's confidence	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
Rely on themselves to improve their handling ways	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
Hope IPCC can protect HK's law and order	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
To ensure the life of police officers are stable	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
To properly organize big events	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
To maintain society's law	1	0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
The system will be more complete under CE's ruling	1	<0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
Don't check ID card of female	1	<0.1%	0.1%	--	--	--
To respond more to demonstration	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%	--	--	--
Sub-total	24	2.1%	2.4%	19	1.5%	1.8%

\*\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.01$  level

\*Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$  level



## **Appendix 3**

# **Demographics**

Table 25. Gender

	2013		2014	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,009)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,039)
Male	460	45.5%	472	45.4%
Female	549	54.5%	567	54.6%
Total	1,009	100.0%	1,039	100.0%

Table 26. Age Group

	2013		2014	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=996)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,030)
18 - 19	28	2.8%	41	4.0%
20 - 29	158	15.9%	148	14.3%
30 - 39	184	18.5%	190	18.4%
40 - 49	196	19.7%	196	19.0%
50 - 59	196	19.7%	206	20.0%
60 - 69	116	11.7%	127	12.3%
70 or above	118	11.8%	123	11.9%
Total	996	100.0%	1,030	100.0%
Missing	13		9	

Table 27. Education Attainment

	2013		2014	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,002)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,028)
Primary school or below	149	14.9%	243	23.7%
<i>Not educated, pre-elementary education</i>	31	3.1%	64	6.2%
<i>Primary</i>	118	11.8%	180	17.5%
Secondary	474	47.3%	494	48.1%
<i>Junior secondary (F.1-F.3)</i>	140	14.0%	122	11.8%
<i>Senior secondary (F.4-F.5, vocational training included)</i>	260	25.9%	283	27.5%
<i>Matriculation (F.6-F.7)</i>	74	7.4%	90	8.7%
Tertiary or above	379	37.8%	290	28.3%
<i>Tertiary, non-degree (Diploma / Certificate)</i>	61	6.1%	33	3.2%
<i>Tertiary, non-degree (Associate degree)</i>	26	2.6%	40	3.9%
<i>Tertiary, degree</i>	228	22.7%	178	17.4%
<i>Postgraduate or above</i>	65	6.5%	39	3.8%
Total	1,002	100.0%	1,028	100.0%
Missing	7		11	

Table 28. Occupation

	2013		2014	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=992)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,027)
Executives and professionals	256	25.8%	219	21.3%
<i>Managers / administration staff</i>	83	8.3%	97	9.4%
<i>Professional</i>	103	10.4%	87	8.4%
<i>Associate professional</i>	70	7.1%	36	3.5%
Clerical and service workers	216	21.8%	212	20.7%
<i>Clerk</i>	131	13.2%	112	10.9%
<i>Service worker and Shop &amp; market sales worker</i>	85	8.6%	100	9.7%
Production workers	72	7.3%	101	9.8%
<i>Skilled agricultural &amp; fishery worker</i>	1	0.1%	2	0.2%
<i>Craft &amp; related trade worker</i>	23	2.4%	27	2.7%
<i>Plant &amp; machine operator / assembler</i>	22	2.2%	28	2.7%
<i>Unskilled worker</i>	25	2.6%	43	4.2%
Students	80	8.1%	77	7.5%
Homemakers	164	16.5%	149	14.5%
Others	204	20.6%	269	26.2%
<i>Retired</i>	168	16.9%	207	20.2%
<i>Unidentified</i>	--	--	7	0.6%
<i>Others (unemployed and non-worker included)</i>	36	3.7%	56	5.4%
Total	992	100.0%	1,027	100.0%
Missing	17		12	

Table 29. Monthly personal income

	2013		2014	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=949)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=977)
No income	344	36.3%	378	38.7%
HK\$1 – HK\$3,999	51	5.3%	57	5.8%
HK\$4,000 – HK\$5,999	26	2.7%	28	2.9%
HK\$6,000 – HK\$7,999	22	2.4%	34	3.5%
HK\$8,000 – HK\$9,999	65	6.9%	60	6.2%
HK\$10,000 – HK\$14,999	128	13.5%	136	13.9%
HK\$15,000 – HK\$19,999	70	7.3%	85	8.7%
HK\$20,000 – HK\$24,999	56	5.9%	64	6.5%
HK\$25,000 – HK\$39,999	90	9.5%	72	7.4%
HK\$40,000 or above	97	10.2%	63	6.4%
Total	949	100.0%	977	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>	60		62	

Table 30. Monthly household income

	2013		2014	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=805)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=822)
HK\$3,999 or below	94	11.7%	82	9.9%
HK\$4,000 – HK\$5,999	21	2.6%	35	4.3%
HK\$6,000 – HK\$9,999	55	6.8%	58	7.1%
HK\$10,000 – HK\$14,999	102	12.7%	105	12.8%
HK\$15,000 – HK\$19,999	67	8.3%	78	9.6%
HK\$20,000 – HK\$24,999	94	11.6%	100	12.2%
HK\$25,000 – HK\$29,999	51	6.3%	67	8.1%
HK\$30,000 – HK\$39,999	94	11.7%	91	11.0%
HK\$40,000 – HK\$59,999	113	14.0%	93	11.3%
HK\$60,000 or above	114	14.2%	111	13.6%
Total	805	100.0%	822	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>	204		217	

Table 31. Residential district

	2013		2014	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=987)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,017)
Hong Kong Island	176	17.8%	165	16.2%
<i>Central and Western District</i>	25	2.5%	17	1.7%
<i>Wan Chai District</i>	13	1.3%	11	1.1%
<i>Eastern District</i>	97	9.9%	82	8.1%
<i>Southern District</i>	41	4.1%	55	5.4%
Kowloon East	133	13.4%	168	16.5%
<i>Wong Tai Sin District</i>	56	5.6%	52	5.1%
<i>Kwun Tong District</i>	77	7.8%	116	11.4%
Kowloon West	131	13.3%	134	13.2%
<i>Sham Shui Po District</i>	41	4.2%	47	4.6%
<i>Kowloon City District</i>	58	5.9%	49	4.8%
<i>Yau Tsim Mong District</i>	31	3.2%	38	3.7%
New Territories East	286	29.0%	237	23.3%
<i>Northern District</i>	58	5.9%	39	3.9%
<i>Tai Po District</i>	45	4.6%	37	3.6%
<i>Sha Tin District</i>	111	11.2%	102	10.0%
<i>Sai Kung District</i>	72	7.3%	58	5.8%
New Territories West	261	26.4%	313	30.8%
<i>Kwai Tsing District</i>	58	5.8%	80	7.9%
<i>Tsuen Wan District</i>	35	3.5%	27	2.7%
<i>Tuen Mun District</i>	68	6.9%	67	6.6%
<i>Yuen Long District</i>	79	8.1%	106	10.4%
<i>Islands District</i>	21	2.1%	32	3.2%
Total	987	100.0%	1,017	100.0%
Missing	22		22	

## **Appendix 4**

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

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

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

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

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

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

- *Males are significantly more likely than females to have heard of IPCC [79% (M) vs 58% (F)];*
- *The younger the respondents, the more likely they have heard of IPCC [74% (18-29), 71% (30-49), 63% (50+)];*
- *The higher the education level, the more likely the respondents to have heard of IPCC [81% (tertiary), 71% (secondary), 47% (primary)];*
- *“Executives and professionals” are more likely than their counterparts to have heard of IPCC [84% (executives and professionals) vs (56%-76%)];*
- *The higher income (both personal and household) they earn per month, the more likely the respondents to have heard of IPCC [personal: 88% (\$40k+), 87% (\$20k-\$39k), 79% (\$10k-\$19k), 57% (<\$10k)] [household: 87% (\$60k+), 79% (\$30k-\$59k), 73% (\$10k-\$29k), 46% (<\$10k)]*

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

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

- *Males are significantly more likely than females to have named at least one correct duty of IPCC [43% (M) vs 36% (F)];*
- *The older they are, the more likely the respondents could name at least one correct duty of IPCC [44% (50+), 40% (30-49), 30% (18-29)];*
- *The higher education they attained, the more likely they respondents could name at least one correct duty of IPCC [42% (tertiary) vs 41% (secondary) & 30% (primary)];*
- *“Students” are significantly less likely to name any correct IPCC duties than their counterparts [27% (students) vs (32%-46%)];*
- *The higher income (both personal and household) they earn per month, the more likely the respondents could name at least one correct duty of IPCC [personal: 53% (\$40k+), 46% (\$20k-\$39k), 43% (\$10k-\$19k), 34% (<\$10k)] [household: 51% (\$60k+), 42% (\$30k-\$59k), 40% (\$10k-\$29k), 30% (<\$10k)]*

**[Mean number of one correct answer]** Significant differences are found between monthly personal income groups at 99% confidence level, and between gender groups, education attainment, as well as monthly household income groups at 95% confidence level:

- *The higher monthly personal income they earn per month, the more correct duties of IPCC the respondents could name [0.7(\$40k+), 0.5(0.53; \$20k-\$39k), 0.5(0.49; \$10k-\$19k), 0.4 (<\$10k)];*
- *Males gave out significantly more correct duties of IPCC than females on average [0.5(M) vs 0.4(F)];*
- *The higher education the respondents attained, the more correct duties of IPCC they could name [0.5 (0.50; tertiary), 0.5 (0.48; secondary), 0.3 (primary)];*
- *The higher monthly household income the respondents have per month, the more correct duties of IPCC they could name [0.6 (\$60k+), 0.5 (\$30k-\$59k), 0.4 (\$10k-\$29k), 0.3 (<\$10k)]*

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

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

- *The younger the respondents, the more likely they were aware of the independence nature of IPCC [71% (18-29), 61% (61.2%; 30-49), 61% (60.6%; 50+)];*
- *The higher the education respondents attained, the more likely they were aware of the independence nature of IPCC [72% (tertiary), 61% (secondary), 52% (primary)];*
- *“Housewives” are less likely than their counterparts to have correctly pointed out the independence nature of IPCC [50% (housewives) vs (58%-73%)];*
- *Males are significantly more likely than females to have correctly pointed out the independence nature of IPCC [68% (M) vs 58% (F)];*
- *Respondents earning \$40k or above per month are more likely than their counterparts to have correctly pointed out the independence nature of IPCC [75% (\$40k+) vs (60%-70%)]*

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

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

- *The older the respondents are, the more likely they are to believe IPCC is independent in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police [57% (50+), 56% (30-49), 41% (18-29)];*
- *The higher education the respondents attained, the more likely they are to believe IPCC is independent in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police [56% (tertiary), 54% (secondary), 49% (primary)];*
- *“Workers” are more likely than their counterparts to believe IPCC is independent in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police [66% (workers) vs (46%-59%)];*
- *The higher the monthly personal income, the more likely the respondents would think IPCC is independent in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police [64% (\$40k+), 58% (\$20k-\$39k), 55% (\$10k-\$19k), 51% (<\$10k)];*
- *Respondents with monthly household income less than \$10K are less likely than their counterparts to believe IPCC is independent in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police [48% (<\$10k) vs (54%-58%)];*
- *Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior to the interviews are more likely to believe IPCC is independent in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police [57% (heard of IPCC) vs 45% (not heard of IPCC)];*
- *Respondents who are aware of IPCC’s independence nature prior to the interviews are more likely to believe IPCC is independent in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police [60% (aware of independence) vs 52% (not aware of independence)];*
- *Males are more likely than females to believe IPCC is independent in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police [56% (M) vs 51% (F)];*

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

Significant differences are found between gender, age, occupation groups, as well as awareness of IPCC and its independence nature, at 99% confidence level, and between respondents with different education attainment at 95% confidence level:

- *Males are more likely than females to think IPCC is able to monitor and review CAPO’s investigations in an impartial and objective way [50% (M) vs 44% (F)];*
- *Respondents aged “30-49” are more likely than their counterparts to view IPCC’s impartiality and objectiveness positively [49% (30-49) vs 45% (18-29) & 46% (50+)];*



- “Workers” and “students” are more likely than their counterparts to view IPCC’s impartiality and objectiveness positively [53% (workers) & 52% (students) vs (42%-50%)];
- Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior to the interviews are more likely than their counterparts to view IPCC’s impartiality and objectiveness positively [50% (heard of IPCC) vs 40% (not heard of IPCC)];
- Respondents who are aware of IPCC’s independence nature prior to the interviews are more likely to view IPCC’s impartiality and objectiveness positively [55% (aware of independence) vs 40% (not aware of independence)];
- The higher education the respondents attained, the more likely they viewed IPCC’s impartiality and objectiveness positively [49% (tertiary), 47% (secondary), 43% (primary)]

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

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

- The older the respondents are, the more likely they praise IPCC’s efficiency positively [34% (50+), 25% (30-49), 13% (18-29)];
- “Students” are less likely than their counterparts to praise IPCC’s efficiency positively [14% (students) vs (23%-32%)];
- Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior to the interviews are more likely to think IPCC’s works are inefficient [-ve rate: 15% (heard of) vs 8% (not heard of)];
- Males are more likely than females to perceive IPCC’s efficiency positively [30% (M) vs 24% (F)];
- The lower education the respondents attained, the more likely they think IPCC’s works are efficient [33% (primary), 26% (secondary), 22% (tertiary)]

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

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

- Males are more likely than females to regard IPCC’s transparency level as high [24% (M) vs 16% (F)];
- The younger the respondents, the more likely they regard the transparency of IPCC as low [-ve rate: 41% (18-29), 25% (30-49), 17% (50+)];
- The higher the education level the respondents attained, the more likely they think IPCC has a low level of transparency [-ve rate: 31% (tertiary), 25% (secondary), 15% (primary)];
- “Students” and “executives and professionals” are more likely than their counterparts to evaluate the transparency of IPCC negatively [-ve rate: 33% (students) & 32% (executives and professionals) vs (16%-30%)];
- Respondents with monthly household income less than \$10k are more likely to regard IPCC’s transparency level as low [14% (<\$10k) vs (27%-33%)];
- Respondents who have not heard of IPCC prior to the interviews are more likely to opt for “don’t know / hard to say” in regards to IPCC’s transparency [DK rate: 28% (not heard of) vs 12% (heard of)];
- Respondents who are not aware of IPCC’s independence nature prior to the interviews are more likely to think IPCC’s level of transparency is low [-ve rate: 34% (not aware of independence) vs 23% (aware of independence)]
- Respondents who earned \$40k or above per month are more likely than their counterparts to regard the transparency of IPCC as high [27% (\$40k+) vs (13%-21%)]

**[Q13] On confidence in IPCC**

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

- *Females are more likely than males to opt for “half-half” in regards to their confidence in IPCC [Half-half rate: 30% (F) vs 20% (M)];*
- *The older the respondents, the more likely they have confidence in IPCC [53% (50+), 47% (30-49), 39% (18-29)];*
- *“Workers” are more likely than their counterparts to have confidence in IPCC [63% (workers) vs (42%-49%)];*
- *Respondents earning \$40k or above per month are more likely than their counterparts to have confidence in IPCC [59% (\$40k+) vs (45%-50%)];*
- *Respondents who have not heard of IPCC prior to the interviews are more likely than their counterparts to opt for “don’t know / hard to say” in regards to their confidence in IPCC [DK rate: 11% (not heard of IPCC) vs 4% (heard of IPCC)];*
- *Respondents who are aware of IPCC’s independence nature prior to the interviews are more likely to have confidence in IPCC [53% (aware of independence) vs 36% (not aware of independence)];*
- *The lower education respondents attained, the more likely they have confidence in IPCC [52% (primary), 49% (secondary), 44% (tertiary)]*
- *Respondents with household income less than \$10k are more likely than their counterparts to have confidence in IPCC [54% (<\$10k) vs (44%-51%)];*

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

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

- *Males are more likely than females to have no confidence in the two-tier complaints system [-ve rate: 22% (M) vs 16% (F)];*
- *The older the respondents, the more likely they have confidence in the two-tier complaints system [57% (50+), 51% (30-49), 41% (18-29)];*
- *The lower the education level, the more likely the respondents have confidence in the two-tier complaints system [61% (primary) vs 50% (secondary) and 48% (tertiary)];*
- *“Workers” are more likely than their counterparts to have confidence in the two-tier complaints system [59% (workers) vs (47%-53%)];*
- *Respondents with household income at \$30k-59k are more likely than their counterparts to have no confidence in the two-tier complaints system [-ve rate: 27% (\$30k-59k) vs (14%-20%)];*
- *Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior to the interviews are more likely than their counterparts to have no confidence in the two-tier complaints system [-ve rate: 22% (heard of IPCC) vs 13% (not heard of IPCC)];*
- *Respondents earning \$40k or above are more likely than their counterparts to have confidence in the two-tier complaints system [62% (\$40k+) vs (46%-53%)];*
- *Respondents who are aware of IPCC’s independence nature prior to the interviews are more likely to have confidence in the two-tier complaints system [54% (aware of independence) vs 45% (not aware of independence)]*

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

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

- Respondents of age “30-49” are more likely to perceive IPCC’s overall image positively [64% (30-49) vs (55%-60%)];
- Respondents with secondary or above education level are more likely to perceive IPCC’s overall image positively [65% (secondary) & 63% (tertiary) vs 48% (primary)];
- “Workers” & “clerical and service workers” are more likely than their counterparts to perceive IPCC’s overall image positively [68% (68.2%; workers) & 68% (67.6%; clerical and service workers) vs (49%-64%)];
- The more respondents earn per month, the more likely they perceive IPCC’s overall image positively [74% (\$40k+), 69% (\$20-39k), 63% (\$10k-19k), 56% (<\$10k)];
- Respondents with household income less than \$10k are less likely than their counterparts to perceive IPCC’s overall image positively [51% (<\$10k) vs (63%-66%)];
- Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior to the interviews are more likely than their counterparts to perceive IPCC’s overall image positively [65% (heard of IPCC) vs 52% (not heard of IPCC)];
- Respondents who are aware of IPCC’s independence nature prior to the interviews are more likely to perceive IPCC’s overall image positively [70% (aware of independence) vs 55% (not aware of independence)];
- Males are more likely than females to perceive IPCC’s overall image positively [64% (M) vs 57% (F)]

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

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

- The younger they are, the more likely the respondents appraise all aspects negatively [% of 0 positive aspect: 39% (18-29), 31% (31.5%; 30-49), 31% (31.0%; 50+)];
- Males are more likely than females to appraise all four aspects positively [13% (M) vs 7% (F)]
- Respondents who earn \$40k or above are less likely to appraise all aspects negatively [% of 0 positive aspect: 26% (\$40k+) vs (33%-34%)]
- Respondents who had not heard of IPCC prior to the interviews are more likely to appraise all four attributes negatively [% of 0 positive aspect: 40% (not heard of IPCC) vs 30% (heard of IPCC)];
- Respondents who were not aware of IPCC’s independence nature prior to the interviews are more likely to appraise all four aspects negatively [% of 0 positive aspect: 37% (not aware of independence) vs 25% (aware of independence)]

## **Appendix 5**

# **Bilingual Questionnaires**



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

Jointly conduct  
合作進行

*Independent Police Complaints Council*  
*Public Opinion Survey 2014*  
**獨立監察警方處理投訴委員會(監警會)**  
**意見調查 2014**

Questionnaire (Final)  
調查問卷 (定稿)

February 24, 2014  
2014 年 2 月 24 日

## Part I Introduction

### 第一部分 自我介紹

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

喂，先生 / 小姐 / 太太你好，我姓 X，我係香港大學民意研究計劃既訪問員黎既，我地而家受獨立監察警方處理投訴委員會（簡稱“監警會”）委託進行緊一項全港性抽樣意見調查，想阻你幾分鐘時間，同我地做一份有關監警會工作既問卷調查。請你放心，你既電話號碼係經由我地既電腦隨機抽樣抽中既，而你提供既資料係會絕對保密既。如果你對今次既訪問有任何疑問，你可以打去熱線電話 xxxx-xxxx 同我地既督導員黃先生或陳小姐聯絡。如果你想知多 D 關於參與研究既權利，你可以喺辦公時間致電 xxxx-xxxx 向香港大學（全名為：香港大學非臨床研究操守委員會）查詢。為左保障數據既真確性，我地既訪問可能會被錄音，但只會用作內部參考，並會係六個月內銷毀。請問可唔可以開始訪問呢？

Yes 可以

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

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

Yes 係

No 唔係 (skip to end)

## Part II Selection of Respondents 第二部分 選出被訪者

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

有多過一位，\_\_\_\_位 **【入實數】** → S3

冇 → 訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜

訪者拒絕回答 → 訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜

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

因為多過一位，我地希望所有合資格既家庭成員都有同等機會接受訪問，所以想請即將生日果位黎聽電話。(訪問員可舉例說明：『即係有冇 3 月或未來三個月內生日既人係度?』)**【開始訪問前，訪問員必須讀出：為左保障數據既真確性，訪問可能會被錄音，但只會用作內部參考。】**

請問可唔可以呢?

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

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

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

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

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

可以 - 接聽電話的人士是被訪者 → 開始訪問

可以 - 其他家人是被訪者 **【訪問員請重覆自我介紹】** → 開始訪問

被選中的家庭成員不在家/沒空 **【訪問員請另約時間再致電】**

唔可以 - 家人拒絕回答 → 訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜

唔可以 - 訪者拒絕回答 → 訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜

## Part III Opinion Questions 第三部分 問卷主體部分

### Awareness of IPCC 「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  
No → Skip to Q5  
Don't know / hard to say  
Refuse to answer  
有 → 續問 Q2a  
冇 → 跳至 Q5  
唔知道 / 難講  
拒答

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

請問你係從乜野途徑聽過「監警會」呢？仲有呢？(不讀答案，可選多項)

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

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

	Q2a		Q2b
	First mentioned 第一提及	Other mentioned 其他提及	Have no mentioned 沒有提及
*Television 電視			
TV series (IPCC the proper way) 電視特輯 (監警有道)			
TV interview 電視訪問			
News 電視新聞			
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			
*Internet 互聯網			
* Advertisements on Public transport (Probe: Which public transport?) 公共交通廣告 (追問:咁係邊一類交通工具?)			
MTR 港鐵			
Light Rail 輕鐵			
Bus 巴士			
Tram 電車			
Ferry / Pier 渡海小輪 / 碼頭			
Others (Please specify: _____) 其他 (請註明: _____)			
* Poster (Probe: Where did you see the poster?) Place (Please specify: _____) 海報 (追問:係邊度見到海報?) 地點 (請註明: _____)			
* Annual report of IPCC / Brochure 「監警會」年報 / 小冊子			
* IPCC website 「監警會」網站			
* IPCC newsletter 「監警會」通訊			
* 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			
Talks 講座			
Community Activities 社區活動			
Friends / Neighbours / Relatives / Schoolmates 朋友 / 鄰居 / 親戚 / 同學			
Others (Please specify: _____) 其他 (請註明: _____)			
Don't know / can't remember 唔知道 / 唔記得			
Refuse to answer 拒答			

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

據你了解,「監警會」既主要工作係 D 乜呢? (不讀答案,可選多項,追問「仲有呢?」)

Correct answers

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

Incorrect answers

- Investigate citizen's complaints on Police directly
- Monitor Police's behavior/conduct
- Investigate Police bribing cases
- Improve police-community relation / enhance communication

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

Don't know / can't remember

Refuse to answer

正確答案

監察「投訴警察課」所處理個案既程序

審閱 / 覆檢「投訴警察課」所處理個案既調查報告 / 結果

覆檢導致市民投訴既警務人員各類行為既統計數字

找出警方既工作程序中，引起投訴或可能引起投訴既不當之處

監察警方對被投訴警務人員採取跟進及紀律行動

改善警隊的服務質素

錯誤答案

直接處理 / 調查市民投訴警察個案

監察警務人員行為 / 操守

調查警務人員貪污個案

改善警民關係 / 加強警民溝通

其他 (請註明: \_\_\_\_\_ )

唔知道 / 唔記得

拒答

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

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

A totally independent organization, not under the Police 完全獨立，唔隸屬於警隊既

Part of the Police 屬於警隊既一部份

Don't know 唔知道

Refuse to answer 拒答

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

你認為市民投訴警察最有效係經邊個渠道呢? (不讀答案，只選一項)

CAPO 投訴警察課

IPCC 監警會

Police Force (no specified division) 警署 (沒有註明部門)

Office of the Ombudsman, HK 香港申訴專員公署

Equal Opportunities Commission 平等機會委員會

ICAC 廉政公署

DC/Legco members 區議會 / 立法會議員

Media 傳播媒介

Others(Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_) 其他 (請註明: \_\_\_\_\_ )

Don't know 唔知道

Refuse to answer 拒答

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

### **對過去有關投訴香港警察新聞的認知**

[Q6] In the past year, did you hear any news on complaints made to the Hong Kong Police Force? If yes, can you tell me what was it about? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed) 係過去一年，你有冇聽聞過有關投訴警務人員既新聞？如有，你可唔可以講俾我知係關於乜野？(不讀答案，可選多項)

Yes

Conflicts between Police and citizens during processions / gatherings and demonstrations  
The dispute between teacher Lam Wai-size and Police at Mong Kok pedestrian street on July 14, 2013  
The public gathering of Police supporters at Mong Kok pedestrian street on August 4, 2013  
Doubt on Police's political neutrality  
Police officers bear hug female protestors  
"Low profile arrest" of the OCLP Secretariat volunteer Melody Chan  
Dissatisfaction with bail arrangements  
Police's misconduct / bad attitude / abusive language  
Police's neglect of duty  
Members of Scholarism were prevented from attending the National Day flag-raising ceremony  
Police's mishandling of sexual violence case  
Others, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_  
Heard of, but can't remember the content  
Refuse to answer

No→Skip to Q8

Don't know / hard to say→Skip to Q8

Refuse to answer→Skip to Q8

冇

遊行 / 集會示威發生警民衝突  
2013 年 7 月 14 日林慧思老師於旺角行人專用區與當值警員的爭端  
2013 年 8 月 4 日旺角行人專用區支持警察執法的集會  
質疑警員的政治中立性  
警察熊抱女示威者  
「低調通緝」和平佔中秘書處義工陳玉峰  
不滿保釋安排  
警員行為不當 / 態度欠佳 / 粗言穢語  
警員疏忽職守  
十·一升旗禮學民思潮成員被不明人士抬走事件  
警被指失當處理性暴力案  
其他，請註明： \_\_\_\_\_  
唔記得  
拒答

冇→跳至 Q8

唔知道 / 難講→跳至 Q8

拒答→跳至 Q8

[Q7] (Only ask respondents who answered “yes” in Q6) Were you aware of the results of these complaints? (Interviewer repeats the answer mentioned by the respondent in Q6, only one answer allowed)  
[只問 Q6 答有者] 咁你有冇留意呢 D 投訴既最後調查結果? (訪員重複被訪者於 Q6 提及的答案, 每項只選一個答案)

	Yes 有	Sometimes 一時事	No 冇	Don't know / hard to say 唔知道 / 難講	Refuse to answer 拒答
Conflicts between Police and citizens during processions / gatherings and demonstrations 遊行 / 集會示威發生警民衝突					
The dispute between teacher Lam Wai-sze and Police at Mong Kok pedestrian street on July 14, 2013 2013 年 7 月 14 日林慧思老師於旺角行人專用區與當值警員的爭端					
The public gathering of Police supporters at Mong Kok pedestrian street on August 4, 2013 2013 年 8 月 4 日旺角行人專用區支持警察執法的集會					
Doubt on Police's political neutrality 質疑警員的政治中立性					
Police officers bear hug female protestors 警察熊抱女示威者					
“Low profile arrest” of the OCLP Secretariat volunteer Melody Chan 「低調通緝」和平佔中秘書處義工陳玉峰					
Dissatisfaction with bail arrangements 不滿保釋安排					
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					
Members of Scholarism were prevented from attending the National Day flag-raising ceremony 十·一升旗禮學民思潮成員被不明人士抬走事件					
Police's mishandling of sexual violence case 警被指失當處理性暴力案					
Others 其他 (1)					
Others 其他 (2)					

[Q8] Which one of the following types of complaints of the Police Force would you care about most? (Read out options, order to be randomized by computer, ONE answer only) 就以下各類對警員既投訴黎講，你自己會最關注邊一類投訴？(讀出答案，次序由電腦隨機排列，只選一項)

- On the abuse of power by the Police officers
- On how the police dealt with the demonstration
- On press releases arrangement
- On media coverage arrangement
- On the stop and search issue / searching
- On the law enforcement of the traffic regulation by the police officers
- On the usage of violence of the police officers
- On corruption of the police officers
- On investigation method of the police officers
- On the unfairness of the police officers / fair to handle cases
- On the working attitude of the police officers
- Don't care about any complaints made to the Police Force
- Others, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
- Don't know / hard to say
- Refuse to answer
- 有關警員濫權
- 有關警員處理遊行示威
- 有關警方發放新聞的安排
- 有關警方和傳媒採訪的安排
- 有關警員截停搜查事宜 / 搜身
- 有關警員交通方面的執法
- 有關警員使用暴力
- 有關警員貪污
- 有關警員查案方法
- 有關警員不公平 / 公正處理案件
- 有關警員工作態度
- 唔關注任何投訴警察的事情
- 其他，請註明：\_\_\_\_\_
- 唔知道 / 難講
- 拒答

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Q10] Do you think IPCC is able to monitor and review CAPO's 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」既調查工作呢? (讀出答案，只選一項)

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

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

你覺得「監警會」監察同覆檢投訴個案既效率係點? (讀出答案，只選一項)

Efficient	有效率
Quite efficient	頗有效率
Half-half	一般
Not quite efficient	唔太有效率
Not efficient at all	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

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

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

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

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

請問你對監警會有冇信心? (訪員追問程度)

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

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

(只問 Q13 答「唔係幾有信心 / 幾有信心」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, 可選多項)

Committees are appointed, not elected by citizens  
Both are under the Government  
May take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases  
It's like self-investigation  
Police officers could be appointed as committees  
The process and results of complaints are not released to public  
Don't think IPCC investigate or monitor complaints in citizen's perspective  
No direct investigation, monitor only, no actual authority  
Only responsible for monitoring and review, didn't investigate directly  
May cover up the truth to avoid unfavorable impact on Police's image  
Not clear about IPCC's works  
Other (Please specify : \_\_\_\_\_)  
Don't know / hard to say  
Refuse to answer  
委員都係委任而非民選  
覺得兩者同屬政府人員 / 機構  
監察或覆檢個案時可能會偏袒警務人員

好似自己人查自己人  
警員都可以被委任為委員之一  
投訴既過程同結果都唔會公開  
唔覺得佢地會站在市民既立場 / 角度調查或者監察投訴  
佢地唔會直接處理投訴，只係監察 / 冇實權  
只負責監察同覆檢工作，冇直接參與調查  
為避免不利消息影響警方形象，可能會隱瞞事實真相  
唔係好清楚監警會既工作 / 運作  
其他 (請註明: \_\_\_\_\_)  
唔知道 / 難講  
拒答

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

請問你對現時兩層架構既投訴警察有冇信心？(訪員追問程度)

Very confident → Skip to Q17	好有信心 → 跳至 Q17
Quite confident → Skip to Q17	幾有信心 → 跳至 Q17
Half-half → Skip to Q17	一半半 → 跳至 Q17
Not quite confident (continue to Q16)	唔係幾有信心/幾有信心 → 續問 Q16
Not confident at all (continue to Q16)	好有信心 → 續問 Q16
Don't know / hard to say (do not read out) → Skip to Q17	唔知道/冇意見[不要讀出] → 跳至 Q17
Refuse to answer → Skip to Q17	拒答 → 跳至 Q17

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

(只問 Q15 答「唔係幾有信心 / 幾有信心」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既投訴制度？(不讀答案，可選多項)

IPCC should have authorization to investigate  
IPCC should have authorization to investigate serious cases  
IPCC should have authorization to decide punitive sanctions on police officers who violated regulations  
Shorten the time for investigation and review  
Simplify the monitor and review procedures  
Increase transparency  
More promotion  
Involve individuals from different classes in the process  
Others (Please specify : \_\_\_\_\_)  
No area needs to be improved  
Don't know / hard to say  
Refuse to answer  
監警會應該要有調查權  
監警會應該要有調查嚴重個案既權利  
監警會應該有權決定對違規警員既懲罰  
縮短調查及覆檢既時間  
簡化調查及覆檢既程序



提高透明度  
增加宣傳  
讓不同階層人士都可參與其中  
其他 (請註明: \_\_\_\_\_)  
沒有需要改善的地方  
唔知道 / 難講  
拒答

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

[Q17] Overall speaking, do you think IPCC's image is? (Read out options, only one answer is allowed)  
整體黎講，你覺得「監警會」既形象係? (讀出答案，只選一項)

Positive (continue to Q18)	正面 → 續問 Q18
Quite positive (continue to Q18)	頗正面 → 續問 Q18
Half-half → Skip to Q19	一半半 → 跳至 Q19
Quite negative (continue to Q18)	頗負面 → 續問 Q18
Negative (continue to Q18)	負面 → 續問 Q18
Don't know / hard to say (do not read out) → Skip to Q19	唔知道/冇意見[不要讀出] → 跳至 Q19
Refuse to answer → Skip to Q19	拒答 → 跳至 Q19

[Q18] (Only ask respondents who have answered "positive" and "quite positive" in Q17) Why do you think it is "positive" or "quite positive" or "quite negative" or "negative"? Any more? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)  
[只問 Q17 答「正面」或「頗正面」或「頗負面」或「負面」的受訪者] 點解你覺得[讀出 Q17 的答案]呢?仲有呢? (不讀答案，可選多項)

#### Positive answers

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

#### Negative answers

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

正面答案

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

負面答案

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

唔知道 / 難講

拒答

[Q19] Are you satisfied with the performance of IPCC? (Interviewer to probe intensity) 咁你對「監警會」既表現滿唔滿意? (訪員追問程度)

Very much satisfied	非常滿意
Quite satisfied	幾滿意
Half-half	一半半
Quite dissatisfied	幾唔滿意
Very much dissatisfied	非常不滿
Don't know / hard to say	唔知道 / 難講
Refuse to answer	拒答

[Q20] Please rate on a scale of 0-100 your satisfaction with the 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」表現既滿意程度, 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]	_____ [入實數]
Don't know	唔知道 / 難講
Refuse to answer	拒答

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

最後，整體而言你對「監警會」有乜野期望?(不讀答案，可選多項)

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

Hope IPCC can monitor HK Police Force's work effectively

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

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

Hope IPCC can ensure citizens will get appropriate Police services

Hope IPCC can provide a channel for complaints against police

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

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

希望監警會可以改善警民關係 / 加強警民溝通

希望監警會可以有效監察香港警察既工作

希望監警會可以有效俾香港警察適當壓力令工作做得更好

希望監警會可以向市民多解釋香港警察既工作 / 投訴機制

希望監警會可以保障市民得到適當既警察服務

希望監警會可以提供投訴香港警察既渠道

其他 (請註明: \_\_\_\_\_)

唔知道 / 難講

拒答

## Part IV Demographics 第四部分 個人資料

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

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

[DM1] Gender 性別

Male	男
Female	女

[DM2a] Age 年齡

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

[DM2b] 【For those who do not want to tell their exact age】 Age interval (Interviewer can read out the intervals)

【只問不肯透露準確年齡被訪者】年齡 (範圍)[訪問員可讀出範圍]

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

[DM3] Education Attainment 教育程度

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

[DM4] Occupation 職業

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

[DM5] Personal monthly income (including all income source)  
每月個人收入 (請包括所有收入來源)

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

[DM6] Family monthly income (including all income source)  
每月家庭收入 (請包括所有收入來源)

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

[DM7] Residential District 居住地區

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

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

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

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

\*\*\*\*\* 問卷完 \*\*\*\*\*