

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG
PUBLIC OPINION PROGRAMME

Independent Police Complaints Council
Public Opinion Survey 2016



Final Report

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

August 2016

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

Contents

Survey Report

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

Appendices

1. Contact Information	14
2. Frequency Tables	16
3. Demographics	51
4. Bilingual Questionnaires	55

I. Preamble

- 1.1 The Public Opinion Programme (POP) was established in June 1991 to collect and study public opinion on topics which could be of interest to academics, journalists, policy-makers, and the general public. POP was at first under the Social Sciences Research Centre, a unit under the Faculty of Social Sciences of The University of Hong Kong, it was transferred to the Journalism and Media Studies Centre in The University of Hong Kong in May 2000. In January 2002, it was transferred back to the Faculty of Social Sciences in The University of Hong Kong. Since its establishment, POP has been providing quality survey services to a wide range of public and private organizations, on condition that they allow the POP Team to design and conduct the research independently, and to bear the final responsibilities. POP also insists that the data collected should be open for public consumption in the long run.
- 1.2 In December 2012, the Independent Police Complaints Council (IPCC) commissioned POP, for the first time, to conduct a public opinion poll entitled “Independent Police Complaints Council Public Opinion Survey 2013”. The objectives of the survey were to investigate the public knowledge and perception of the IPCC, to understand the expectations of the public towards the IPCC so as to shape a better IPCC, to identify the direction of IPCC’s publicity initiatives in future, and to track the people’s opinion changes towards the IPCC, if any. In order to monitor the change of people’s perceptions towards the IPCC and their expectations, the IPCC again commissioned POP in 2014, 2015 and then this year to repeat the survey using similar research design and opinion questions. This “Independent Police Complaints Council Public Opinion Survey 2016” was the 4th survey in the row.
- 1.3 The research instrument used in this study was designed entirely by the POP Team after consulting the IPCC and making reference to the previous questionnaires, including those used by the IPCC for tracking their image attributes before POP came in the picture. Fieldwork operations and data analysis were also conducted independently by the POP Team, without interference from any outside parties. In other words, POP was given full autonomy to design and conduct the survey, and POP would take full responsibility for all the findings reported herewith.

II. Research Design

- 2.1 This was a random telephone survey conducted by interviewers under close supervision. To minimize sampling bias, telephone numbers were randomly generated using known prefixes assigned to telecommunication services providers under the Numbering Plan provided by the Office of the Communications Authority (OFCA). Invalid numbers were then eliminated according to computer and manual dialing records to produce the final sample.
- 2.2 The target population of this survey was **Hong Kong residents aged 18 or above who spoke Cantonese**. When telephone contact was successfully established with a target household, one person of age 18 or above who spoke Cantonese was selected. If more than one subject had been available, selection was made using the “next birthday rule” which selected the person who had his/her birthday next.
- 2.3 Telephone interviews were conducted during the period of **7 to 17 March, 2016**. A total of **1,002 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 **67.1%** (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 3.2 percentage points at 95% confidence level.
- 2.4 As shown in Table 2 of Appendix 1, among the 26,259 telephone numbers sampled for the survey, 3,783 were confirmed to be ineligible, among them 428 were fax or data lines, 2,808 were invalid telephone numbers, 137 were call-forwarding numbers, while another 357 were non-residential numbers. Besides, 43 of them were invalidated due to special technological reasons, while 10 cases were voided because target respondents were unavailable at the numbers provided.
- 2.5 Meanwhile, a total of 12,798 telephone numbers were invalidated before the research team could confirm their eligibility. Among them, 940 were busy lines and 9,738 were no-answer calls after making a maximum of 5 times’ recalls. 1,298 cases were diverted to answering devices while another 57 were blocked. Moreover, 330 cases were treated as unsuccessful because of language problems, while 432 interviews were terminated before the screening question and 3 cases were voided for other problems.

- 2.6 On the other hand, 8,676 cases failed to complete the interview. Among them 2 rejected the interview on behalf of the household and 7 rejected the interview immediately after their eligibility was confirmed. Besides, 8,616 were unfinished cases with appointment dates beyond the end of fieldwork period. Another 50 cases were incomplete due to unexpected termination of interviews, 1 was classified as miscellaneous due to other non-contact problems, and the remaining 1,002 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 2015 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 consecutive surveys. Figures marked with double asterisks (**) indicate that the difference has been tested to be statistically significant at $p < 0.01$ level under the same weighting method, whereas those with single asterisk (*) denote statistical significance at $p < 0.05$ level.

III. Research Findings

The questionnaire of this survey comprises 21 opinion questions which cover the respondents' awareness of the IPCC, awareness of news on complaints against the Hong Kong Police Force and the IPCC, 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 2015 survey wherever applicable, while all frequency tables referred to in this section can be found in Appendix 2. It should be noted that the figures in the main text of this report have been rounded up to the nearest integers after considering the second decimal place.

A. Awareness of the IPCC

- 3.1 Same as the previous surveys, the first part of survey aimed at gauging respondent's general awareness of the IPCC and its job nature. This year, over 80% of the respondents (81%) had heard of the IPCC prior to the interview, whereas less than one in five (18%) said they had not, indicating a slight drop in awareness of the IPCC. Yet, all in all, the IPCC maintained a high level of public awareness over the past two years as compared to that in 2013 when the survey series began, where just two-thirds of the sample had heard of the IPCC (Table 3).
- 3.2 The survey continued to ask those respondents who were aware of the IPCC from where they had heard about it. They were first asked to name the channels they learnt about the IPCC, and then they were prompted with the channels that they had not mentioned. The results were similar to that of last year. Without prompting, more than three-quarters (77%) of these respondents immediately mentioned television, including TV news (71%), TV interviews (2%), TV series ("IPCC Files") (1%) and other TV programmes (2%), which was apparently the most common source of information. Followed at a large distance, newspapers, including Ming Pao ("The IPCC Perspective") (2%) and other newspaper stories (7%), came next with a total of 9% mentioning it. Another 4% each said they had heard of the IPCC from the Internet and from radio. Only less than 1% each mentioned advertisements on public transport, annual report / brochure / newsletter / YouTube channel / quarterly meeting of IPCC, and poster. Whilst after prompting, more than 90% (93%) of the respondents stated that they had learnt about the IPCC from television, mostly from TV news (89%), while half (50%) of the respondents stated that they had read about the IPCC from newspapers, mostly from newspaper stories (44%) other than "The IPCC Perspective" and "Business of the Cops". More than one-third (36%) of the respondents had learnt about the IPCC through the Internet, with social media (19%) being the most popular online channel. Besides, another one-third (32%) of the respondents recalled they had heard about the IPCC on radio after prompting, followed by advertisements on public transport (13%), District Fight Crime Committee (9%) and annual report / brochure / newsletter / YouTube

channel / quarterly meeting of the IPCC (7%). Lastly, 4% recalled hearing of the IPCC from friends, neighbours, relatives or schoolmates. Only 2% recalled seeing IPCC-related information from posters (Table 4).

- 3.3 Same as the 2015 survey, when asked to name the IPCC's duties that they were aware of, half (49%) of the respondents who had heard of the IPCC could provide at least one correct answer, among which, most correctly cited that the IPCC was responsible for "monitoring CAPO's cases handling process / monitoring how Police handle complaints" (37%), significantly up 14 percentage points from last year's 23%. "Monitoring Police's follow-up / disciplinary actions towards officers being complained", "identifying mal-practices in Police's works that has led or may lead to complaints" and "reviewing / verifying investigation report / results by CAPO" (5%) formed the next tier and were correctly named by 8%, 6% and 5% of the sub-sample respectively, whereas only 1% each could correctly name "reviewing statistics on types of Police's behavior that citizens complained" and "improving Police Force's quality of service". On the other hand, there were still more than half of the respondents (55%) who named at least one duty incorrectly. More than two-fifths of the sub-sample (43%) mistakenly thought that "monitoring Police's behavior / conduct" was one of IPCC's duties, while another 13% of the sub-sample mistook "receiving / investigating citizens' complaints on Police directly" as a duty of the IPCC. Meanwhile, 8% 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 815 respondents who had heard of the IPCC prior to the interview, more than three-fifths (63%) were aware that the IPCC was a totally independent organization that was not under the Police. On the contrary, 29% thought the IPCC was part of the Police and 8% opted for "don't know / hard to say". These figures remained stable over the year past (Table 6).
- 3.5 When asked to name the most effective channel to make a complaint against members of the Police Force, the IPCC topped the list again with 30% of the respondents mentioning it, although it went down significantly by 5 percentage points from 35% last year. It is followed by the CAPO which was mentioned by one-sixth of the respondents (16%). The media (11%) and the Police Force (7%) formed the next tier with around one-tenth mentioning each. Other complaint channels that came to the respondents' minds were DC/LegCo members (4%), the ICAC (2%), the Internet (1%) and the Office of the Ombudsman, HK (1%). Meanwhile, 9% expressed that no channel was effective in making complaints against the Police Force, significantly up 7 percentage points from 2% in 2015. Besides, the percentage of respondents who said they did not know which channel was the most effective remained more or less the same at 18% (Table 7).

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

- 3.6 The second part of the survey focused on citizens' awareness of news related to complaints against the Hong Kong Police Force. Similar to last year, more than 90% of the respondents (93%) had heard about news on such complaints in the year prior to the interview. "News related to the Occupy Movement" continued to attract the most public attention, with one-third (32%) naming it without being prompted. Closely following it was the "seven police officers case / dark corner case / Ken Tsang Kin-chiu case" during the Occupy Movement, with more than a quarter (28%) mentioning it, which is more than double that of last year. "News related to the Mong Kok conflict" ranked third with 22% heard about it at the beginning of this year. "Conflicts between Police and citizens during processions, gatherings and demonstrations" and "assault" came next with 18% each citing them. Followed at a distance, one in nine respondents (11%) reported that they had heard about the "Franklin Chu King-wai police baton assault case". Other less popular items included news on Police's "use of excessive and unnecessary force" (6%), "Police's misconduct / bad attitude / abusive language" (5%), "Police's abuse of power" (5%) and news on "sexual harassment / indecent assault" involving police officers (3%). Other answers mentioned by less than 1% of the respondents are listed in Table 8 of Appendix 2. When compared to previous findings, more respondents (7%, up from 4% in 2015) could not specify the news they had heard of. At the same time, those who claimed that they had not heard of any relevant news in the past year accounted for 6% of the respondents, same as the figure registered in the 2015 survey (Table 8).
- 3.7 As for the type of complaint that the respondents would care about most, "police officers' abuse of power" ranked first for the fourth consecutive time, taking up more than one-fifth (22%) of the sample. "Police officers' use of violence" came second, as one-sixth (17%) of the respondents said they cared about it most. About one-seventh (15%) of the respondents said they cared about complaints on "unfairness of police officers in handling cases" most, followed by "corruption of police officers" (13%). Other types of complaints that were less commonly mentioned included "Police handling public demonstration" (6%), "working attitude of police officers" (4%), "investigation method of police officers" (2%) and "officers' law enforcement of traffic regulations" (2%). There were also 8% of the respondents who stated that they did not care about any complaints against the Police and 6% did not give a definite answer (Table 9).
- 3.8 Respondents were then asked if they had heard of any news on complaints made against the IPCC. Over half (52%) said no, whereas over two-fifths (43%) replied yes, up from 35% in 2015. Of the 43% who said yes, 15% could not recall the news they had heard of. The most frequently cited news item was "IPCC handles complaints unfairly / has a bias in favour of the police or protesters", which was mentioned by 10% of the respondents. Next, 5% simply

mentioned that it was “about the Occupy Movement” and 4% recalled news that said “it takes too long to handle complaints / no result of investigation after a long time / cases go unattended”. Other less commonly mentioned items included news “about Franklin Chu King-wai police baton assault case” (3%), “IPCC’s monitoring is ineffective” (3%), “some IPCC members are not politically neutral / handle complaints unfairly” (2%) and news “about seven police officers case / dark corner case / Ken Tsang Kin-chiu case” (2%; Table 10).

C. Image and confidence in the IPCC

- 3.9 A series of questions were then asked to gauge the perceived image of the IPCC in the public’s eyes. Results of this year showed that less than half of the sample (46%) evaluated the IPCC’s independence in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police positively, which included 29% who considered the IPCC “independent” and 16% “quite independent”. About one-sixth (16%) opted for the middle ground “half-half”. On the other hand, almost 30% (29%) gave a negative assessment to this aspect of the IPCC, with 17% thinking it “not quite independent” and 13% even opting for “not independent at all”. Overall, the number of respondents who evaluated the IPCC’s independence positively had dropped significantly while more had evaluated it negatively as compared to one year ago. Besides, 9% answered “don’t know / hard to say” (Table 11).
- 3.10 When it came to the IPCC’s work on monitoring and reviewing CAPO’s investigations, two-fifths (40%) believed that the IPCC was able to do so in an impartial and objective way, among which 22% considered it “impartial and objective” and 18% thought it was “quite impartial and objective”. On the contrary, 26% believed it was not, including 14% who opted for “not quite impartial and objective” and 12% “not impartial and objective at all”. The percentage of respondents who assessed the IPCC’s impartiality and objectivity negatively has increased significantly by 7 percentage points this year. Meanwhile, nearly a quarter (23%) opted for “half-half” and one-tenth (11%) did not know or found it hard to say (Table 12).
- 3.11 With regards to the IPCC’s efficiency in monitoring and reviewing complaints, 29% thought its performance was mediocre and chose “half-half”. Meanwhile, more than one-fifth (22%) thought it was efficient, but the figure was down by 5 percentage points from 27% in 2015. Another 29% thought the opposite, up from 20% of last year. Both changes are tested to be statistically significant. This was the first time in four years that more respondents found the IPCC to be inefficient than efficient. Among those who thought it was generally efficient, 12% answered “efficient” and 10% answered “quite efficient” after probing. As for those who thought it was generally not efficient, 16% said it was “not quite efficient”, while 13% said it was “not efficient at all”. At the same time, one-fifth of the respondents (20%) failed to provide a definite answer to this question (Table 13).

- 3.12 On the IPCC's level of transparency in monitoring and reviewing complaints, more than one-third of the respondents (36%) chose "half-half". Another one-third of the sample (34%) thought the IPCC's work was of low transparency, with 14% opting for "quite low" and 20% opting for "low". On the contrary, less than one-fifth (18%) positively appraised the IPCC's transparency, including 10% who said it was "high" and 8% who said it was "quite high". Similar to other aspects, compared to last year, significantly more respondents gave negative feedbacks and fewer respondents gave positive responses to the IPCC's transparency. Meanwhile, 12% could not give a definite answer to this question (Table 14).
- 3.13 The survey then continued to ask if the respondents were confident in the IPCC in general. The latest results showed that a total of 39% expressed confidence in the IPCC, including 11% who were "very confident" and 27% who were "quite confident", representing a significant drop of 4 percentage points from 44% in 2015. This year, less than a quarter (22%) opted for the middle ground "half-half", significantly less than the figure registered last year (27%). Meanwhile, a third of the respondents said that they were not confident in the IPCC (34%), significantly up by 10 percentage points since the last survey, and of which, 17% each said "not quite confident" and "not confident at all". The most common reason for no confidence this year was due to the fact that "committees are appointed, not elected by citizens", which accounted for 21% of the "not confident" sub-sample. Other reasons that were frequently cited included "it takes too long to handle complaints / no result of investigation after a long time / cases go unattended" (18%), that the IPCC was "not fair and impartial" (16%), "not independent enough" (15%), "brings little to no effect / Police's misconduct continues" (14%) and "may take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases" (11%). Moreover, 10% said they were not confident in the IPCC because they thought "it's like self-investigation", while others said "the process and results of complaints are not released to public" (8%), that they were "not clear about IPCC's works" (7%), "both are under the Government" (6%) and "no direct investigation, only responsible for monitoring and review, no actual authority" (4%). Meanwhile, 4% could not explain why they were not confident in the IPCC (Tables 15 & 16).
- 3.14 Regarding the existing complaints system, percentage of respondents who expressed confidence in the two-tier system significantly dropped further this year. Specifically, less than two-fifths of the respondents (39%) were confident in the two-tier system, including 11% who were "very confident" and 27% "quite confident". One-fifth (20%) opted for "half-half", 17% said they were "not quite confident" and 15% even said "not confident at all", meaning that nearly one-third of the respondents (32%) appraised the two-tier system negatively. This figure is significantly higher than the 24% registered a year ago. Among those who lacked confidence in the system, a quarter suggested to "change the method for forming the Council" (25%), while 22% suggested the IPCC to "increase transparency". Other popular suggestions included to "handle complaints fairly and impartially" (18%),

“IPCC should become an independent department” (18%) and to “involve individuals from different classes in the process” (10%). Besides, less than one-tenth each proposed that “IPCC should have authorization to investigate so that it can receive complaints and investigate directly” (7%) and that the IPCC should “improve work efficiency” (7%), while 4% each believed “IPCC should have authorization to decide punitive sanctions on police officers who violated regulations” and that there should be “more promotion”. Only less than 1% of the sub-sample said nothing needed to be improved, while as high as 17% had no idea how the IPCC could improve further (Tables 17 & 18).

D. Overall perception on the IPCC

- 3.15 The last part of the survey aimed at investigating citizens’ overall perception of the IPCC. Compared with the 2015 survey, this year’s results revealed that half of the respondents (52%) perceived the IPCC’s image positively, with 36% opting for “positive” and 16% “quite positive”, representing an overall 4-percentage-point decrease from 56% last year which is tested to be statistically significant. More than a quarter (28%) evaluated the IPCC’s image as half positive and half negative. At the same time, more than one-eighth (13%) perceived the IPCC’s image negatively, including 6% who said “quite negative” and 7% “negative”. Overall, the percentage of respondents who perceived the IPCC’s image negatively has significantly increased by 3 percentage points from 10% last year. The remaining 7% could not give a definite answer to the question (Table 19).
- 3.16 As for what made the 517 respondents perceive the IPCC’s image positively, results showed that the most popular reason this year was that they believed “IPCC is fair enough” (17%), which was closely followed by “IPCC is independent enough” (16%). Another popular reason was simply “intuition / impression / personal feeling” (13%). One-tenth (10%) each said “IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review”, “IPCC fulfills its duties” and “IPCC’s image / name is positive”, while those who have heard of “no / little bad news about IPCC” and believed “IPCC has high transparency” accounted for 9% each. Other less commonly cited reasons included “IPCC provides a helpful monitoring system / mechanism” (8%), “IPCC’s work brings an impact” (7%), “IPCC’s structure gives people confidence” (6%) and so on. At the same time, 5% of the sub-sample could not provide any reason for their positive perception of the IPCC (Table 20).
- 3.17 On the other hand, among the 133 respondents who perceived the IPCC’s image negatively, close to one-third (31%) thought so because they were of the view that “IPCC is not fair and impartial” while 29% attributed their negative perception to the IPCC’s “low efficiency”. At the same time, about a quarter (24%) said “IPCC’s work does not bring an impact”, 18% said “IPCC has low transparency”, 15% said “IPCC might take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases” and 14% had “no trust in IPCC’s independence”.

Other reasons mentioned by less than 10% of the sub-sample each included “IPCC doesn’t have sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties” (6%), “comments / reports about IPCC are negative” (3%), “committees are appointed, not elected by citizens” (3%) and so on, whereas 1% did not give a definite answer (Table 21).

- 3.18 The survey then went on to gauge citizen’s satisfaction with the performance of the IPCC. Results showed that one-third of the respondents were satisfied (34%), with 6% opting for “very much satisfied” and 28% “quite satisfied”. More than a quarter (28%) evaluated the IPCC’s performance as “half-half”. On the other hand, 24% said they were not satisfied with the IPCC’s performance, with 15% being “quite dissatisfied” and 9% “very much dissatisfied”. Overall, significantly fewer respondents evaluated the IPCC’s performance positively and more evaluated it negatively when compared to last year’s results. Meanwhile, 15% could not give a definite answer to this question. When it came to their satisfaction rating with the IPCC’s performance on a scale of 0-100, with 0 indicating very dissatisfied, 100 indicating very satisfied and 50 indicating half-half, the mean score obtained was 56.1 marks with a standard error of 0.7 marks, representing a significant decrease of 4.2 marks from the 60.3 marks registered a year ago (Tables 22 & 23).
- 3.19 The survey ended by asking all respondents their expectations on the IPCC. Similar to last year’s results, more than one-third of the respondents (36%) hoped the IPCC could “handle cases in a fair, impartial and transparent manner” and one-fifth (20%) hoped the IPCC could “improve its transparency”. Those who hoped the IPCC could “do better”, “become an independent organization / handle complaint cases directly” and “increase its efficiency” formed the next tier with 11%, 10% and 9% mentioning these respectively. Besides, 6% hoped the IPCC could “monitor HK Police Force’s work effectively”, 5% hoped it would “keep up with its good work”, 4% each hoped it could “have more promotion of its work” and “change the method for selecting its members”, 3% each hoped it would “not be swayed by external influence” and could “broaden its member base”. Other less frequently mentioned expectations are listed in Table 24 of Appendix 2. There were also 22% who said they had no expectation or did not know what to expect from the IPCC (Table 24).

IV. Conclusion

- 4.1 This year, 81% of the respondents had heard of the IPCC, indicating a slight drop in awareness of the IPCC when compared to last year's 85%. The majority of them learnt about it from television. However, just about half of these respondents (49%) could correctly name at least one IPCC duty, while more (55%) misunderstood the IPCC's duties in one way or another. "Monitoring CAPO's cases handling process / monitoring how Police handle complaints" was the IPCC's most visible function again, but still more than two-fifths (43%) incorrectly thought "monitoring Police's behavior / conduct" was one of the IPCC's duties. Meanwhile, more than three-fifths (63%) of those heard of the IPCC were aware that the IPCC was a totally independent organization, while more than a quarter (29%) mistakenly thought it was part of the Police Force.
- 4.2 Majority of the respondents (93%) claimed they had heard of news related to complaints against the Police in the year past. News related to the Occupy Movement, and in particular the "seven police officers case / dark corner case / Ken Tsang Kin-chiu case", continued to receive the most public attention even when it had ended more than a year ago. News related to the Mong Kok conflict, conflicts between Police and citizens during processions, gatherings and demonstrations as well as assault cases formed the next tier in terms of public attention. Police officers' abuse of power and their use of violence continued to top the list of complaints which respondents cared most. When it came to news on complaints against the IPCC, only about two-fifths (43%) had heard of it, however, many of them could not recall the content of the news.
- 4.3 As for people's confidence in the existing two-tier police complaints system, the positive group continued to out-number the negative group in this year's survey, but the margin has further narrowed down from 20 to 6 percentage points this year. Slightly less than two-fifths of the sample (39%) expressed confidence in the system, and the most popular suggestion for improvement offered by the non-confident group was to change the method for forming the Council, followed by increasing its transparency. Regarding the effectiveness of complaint channels against Police, slightly fewer respondents this year (30%) believed the IPCC was most effective, while another one-sixth (16%) chose CAPO.

- 4.4 Overall speaking, respondents' net satisfaction of the IPCC's performance has dropped from 25 to 10 percentage points, while satisfaction rating dropped from 60.3 to 56.1 on a scale of 0 to 100. As for people's confidence in the IPCC, 39% expressed confidence while 34% did not, resulting in a declined net confidence from 20 to 5 percentage points.
- 4.5 On people's general perception of the IPCC, more than half (52%) thought the IPCC's image was positive, 13% thought the opposite, giving a net positive value of 38 percentage points, also representing an 8-percentage-point drop from last year. Image profile analysis shows that the IPCC is perceived as an independent and impartial/objective organization, but not that efficient nor transparent. Public opinion towards the IPCC has turned more negative in all four aspects over the year past.
- 4.6 As for the reasons behind their perception, those who evaluated the IPCC's image positively thought the IPCC was fair and independent enough, while those who held opposite views thought that the IPCC was not fair and impartial and their work efficiency was low.
- 4.7 In terms of future expectations on the IPCC, "handling cases in a fair, impartial and transparent manner" continues to top the list for the fourth year, with more than one-third of the sample mentioning this.
- 4.8 All in all, the IPCC still maintains a fairly positive public image, but compared to one year ago, the positive feedbacks have dropped. As society continues to become polarized and attitudes towards the Hong Kong Police Force politicized, the monitoring and reviewing of complaints against the Police will continue to pose big challenges to the IPCC in the years to come.

Appendix 1

Contact Information

Table 1 Calculation of response rate

Response rate
= $\frac{\text{Successful cases}}{\text{Successful cases} + \text{Incomplete cases}^{\wedge} + \text{Refusal cases by eligible respondents}^{\#}}$
= $\frac{1,002}{1,002 + (50 + 432) + (2 + 7)}$
= 67.1%

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

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

Table 2 Breakdown of contact information

	Frequency	Percentage
Respondents' ineligibility confirmed	3,783	14.4%
<i>Fax / data line</i>	428	1.6%
<i>Invalid number</i>	2,808	10.7%
<i>Call-forwarding / mobile / pager number</i>	137	0.5%
<i>Non-residential number</i>	357	1.4%
<i>Special technological difficulties</i>	43	0.2%
<i>No eligible respondents</i>	10	<0.1%
Respondents' ineligibility not confirmed	12,798	48.7%
<i>Line busy</i>	940	3.6%
<i>No answer</i>	9,738	37.1%
<i>Answering device</i>	1,298	4.9%
<i>Call-blocking</i>	57	0.2%
<i>Language problem</i>	330	1.3%
<i>Interview terminated before the screening question</i>	432	1.6%
<i>Others</i>	3	<0.1%
Respondents' eligibility confirmed, but failed to complete the interview	8,676	33.0%
<i>Household-level refusal</i>	2	<0.1%
<i>Known respondent refusal</i>	7	<0.1%
<i>Appointment date beyond the end of the fieldwork period</i>	8,616	32.8%
<i>Partial interview</i>	50	0.2%
<i>Miscellaneous</i>	1	<0.1%
Successful cases	1,002	3.8%
Total	26,259	100.0%

Appendix 2

Frequency Tables

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

Awareness of the IPCC

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

	2013	2014	2015	2016	
	Percentage (Base=1,009)	Percentage (Base=1,039)	Percentage (Base=1,014)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,002)
Yes	68.3%	66.9%	85.5%**	815	81.3%*
No	30.8%	32.0%	14.2%**	178	17.8%*
Don't know / hard to say	0.8%	1.1%	0.3%*	9	0.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	1,002	100.0%

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

[Q2b] (Only ask respondents who have answered “yes” in Q1) Have you ever heard of IPCC from the following channels then? (Read out those channels with ^ which the respondents have not mentioned in Q2a, multiple answers allowed) (^ Channels previously adopted by IPCC)

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2016		
	[Q2a]	[Q2a+Q2b]	[Q2a]	[Q2a+Q2b]	[Q2a]	[Q2a+Q2b]	[Q2a] First mention	[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted)			
	% of valid sample (Base=698)	% of valid sample (Base=698)	% of valid sample (Base=700)	% of valid sample (Base=700)	% of valid sample (Base=860)	% of valid sample (Base=864)	Frequency	% of valid sample (Base=815)	Frequency	% of total responses (Base=2,811)	% of valid sample (Base=815)
^Television	76.9%	94.2%	74.1%	93.2%	78.4%*	95.1%	628	77.1%	760	--	93.3%
<i>News</i>	64.5%	86.1%	64.1%	85.1%	70.6%**	91.2%**	577	70.7%	728	25.9%	89.3%
<i>TV interview</i>	3.3%	30.0%	3.5%	26.7%	2.6%	31.3%*	20	2.4%	186	6.6%	22.8%**
<i>TV series (IPCC Files)[#]</i>	2.9%	20.7%	2.6%	15.6%*	2.0%	16.8%	11	1.3%	168	6.0%	20.6%*
<i>Now TV programme preview (The IPCC Perspective)</i>	--	--	--	3.5%	0.1%	3.6%	1	0.1%	37	1.3%	4.6%
<i>Other TV programmes</i>	6.2%	28.3%	3.9%*	18.0%**	3.1%	21.9%	20	2.5%	118	4.2%	14.5%**
^Newspaper	9.1%	50.3%	11.9%	47.9%	7.3%**	47.6%	76	9.3%	411	--	50.4%
<i>Ming Pao (The IPCC perspective)</i>	1.2%	12.8%	1.5%	7.2%**	1.4%	10.5%*	16	1.9%	78	2.8%	9.5%
<i>Sharp Daily (Business of the Cops)</i>	0.3%	13.2%	0.2%	6.2%**	--	5.5%	<1	0.1%	37	1.3%	4.5%
<i>Other newspaper stories (see below)</i>	7.5%	35.7%	10.2%	40.4%*	5.9%**	39.1%	60	7.3%	358	12.7%	43.9%*
^Internet^{##}	2.0%	15.8%	1.8%	22.3%**	2.2%	32.9%**	36	4.4%*	290	--	35.6%
<i>Social media</i>	--	--	--	--	0.9%	15.5%	13	1.5%	157	5.6%	19.2%*
<i>News aggregation website / app</i>	--	--	--	--	0.4%	13.8%	8	0.9%	103	3.7%	12.7%
<i>Forum</i>	--	--	--	--	--	11.2%	7	0.9%**	93	3.3%	11.4%
<i>Website / app of a particular media</i>	--	--	--	--	0.2%	7.6%	6	0.7%	56	2.0%	6.9%
<i>Banner</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	26	0.9%	3.1%
<i>IPCC website</i>	0.1%	2.1%	--	1.4%	0.2%	4.3%**	1	0.1%	14	0.5%	1.8%**
<i>Other online channels (see below)</i>	--	--	--	--	0.5%	2.7%	2	0.2%	20	0.7%	2.4%
^Radio	5.4%	30.4%	6.4%	30.5%	6.5%	32.8%	32	3.9%*	265	9.4%	32.5%

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2016		
	[Q2a]	[Q2a+Q2b]	[Q2a]	[Q2a+Q2b]	[Q2a]	[Q2a+Q2b]	[Q2a] First mention	[Q2a+Q2b] Overall	(prompted and unprompted)		
	% of valid sample (Base=698)	% of valid sample (Base=698)	% of valid sample (Base=700)	% of valid sample (Base=700)	% of valid sample (Base=860)	% of valid sample (Base=864)	Frequency	% of valid sample (Base=815)	Frequency	% of total responses (Base=2,811)	% of valid sample (Base=815)
Advertisements on public transport	0.3%	10.7%	--	12.5%	--	15.3%	1	0.2%	103	--	12.6%
<i>MTR</i>	0.2%	5.8%	--	6.7%	--	10.2%*	--	--	71	2.5%	8.8%
<i>Bus</i>	0.2%	6.1%	--	6.8%	--	6.8%	1	0.2%	55	2.0%	6.7%
<i>Light rail</i>	--	--	--	1.9%**	--	1.6%	--	--	8	0.3%	0.9%
<i>Tram</i>	--	--	--	0.8%*	--	1.1%	--	--	7	0.2%	0.8%
<i>Ferry / Pier</i>	--	1.6%	--	1.2%	--	1.3%	--	--	7	0.2%	0.8%
<i>Others (see below)</i>	--	--	--	0.6%	--	0.3%	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
^Annual report / Brochure / Newsletter / YouTube channel / Quarterly meeting of IPCC ^{###}	0.3%	5.7%	--	7.8%	--	6.2%	1	0.1%	57	--	7.0%
<i>Quarterly meeting between IPCC and CAPO</i>	0.1%	2.7%	--	3.7%	--	3.4%	--	--	33	1.2%	4.1%
<i>Annual report of IPCC / brochure</i>	0.2%	1.5%	--	2.3%	--	1.3%	1	0.1%	19	0.7%	2.4%
<i>IPCC channel on YouTube</i>	--	--	--	1.9%	--	2.1%	--	--	12	0.4%	1.4%
<i>IPCC newsletter</i>	--	1.4%	--	1.0%	--	0.6%	--	--	3	0.1%	0.4%
^Poster (see below)	--	1.6%	--	2.0%	--	3.5%	1	0.2%	20	0.7%	2.5%
Magazines	0.1%	1.2%	0.3%	0.8%	0.6%	1.6%	--	--*	3	0.1%	0.4%*
Others	3.4%	8.3%	4.0%	7.5%	3.4%	5.9%	19	2.3%	114	--	14.0%**
^District Fight Crime Committee <i>Friends / neighbours / relatives / schoolmates</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	74	2.6%	9.1%
<i>Talks</i>	1.3%	3.5%	1.7%	3.5%	2.0%	4.5%	6	0.8%*	34	1.2%	4.1%
<i>Community activities</i>	0.1%	0.2%	0.5%	0.6%	--*	0.1%	2	0.3%	4	0.1%	0.5%
<i>IPCC symposium</i>	0.3%	0.6%	--	0.5%	--	0.2%	--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
<i>Others (see below)^{####}</i>	--	--	--	--	--	<0.1%	1	0.1%	2	0.1%	0.2%
<i>Others (see below)^{####}</i>	1.7%	2.0%	1.8%	2.8%	1.4%	1.3%*	9	1.2%	12	0.4%	1.5%
Don't know / can't remember	2.3%	0.2%	1.5%	0.6%	1.5%	0.8%	21	2.5%	3	0.1%	0.4%
Total	100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		815	100.0%	2,811	100.0%	

	2013		2014		2015		[Q2a] First mention Frequency	2016			
	[Q2a] % of valid sample (Base=698)	[Q2a+Q2b] % of valid sample (Base=698)	[Q2a] % of valid sample (Base=700)	[Q2a+Q2b] % of valid sample (Base=700)	[Q2a] % of valid sample (Base=860)	[Q2a+Q2b] % of valid sample (Base=864)		% of valid sample (Base=815)	[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted) Frequency	% of total responses (Base=2,811)	% of valid sample (Base=815)
<i>Missing</i>	--	--	6	6	7	2	--	--	--	--	
<u>Other newspaper that cannot be grouped</u>											
Apple Daily							21	2.6%	115	4.1%	14.1%
Oriental Daily							13	1.7%	64	2.3%	7.9%
Can't remember / not specified							14	1.7%	51	1.8%	6.3%
Headline Daily							1	0.2%	19	0.7%	2.4%
Apple Daily, Oriental Daily							2	0.2%	16	0.6%	1.9%
Sing Tao Daily							<1	<0.1%	9	0.3%	1.1%
The Sun							--	--	8	0.3%	1.0%
AM730							1	0.1%	6	0.2%	0.7%
Free newspaper							--	--	5	0.2%	0.7%
Ming Pao							1	0.2%	5	0.2%	0.6%
Oriental Daily, Headline Daily							--	--	4	0.2%	0.5%
Apple Daily, The Sun							--	--	4	0.1%	0.4%
Apple Daily, Oriental Daily, Headline Daily							<1	0.1%	4	0.1%	0.4%
Sky Post							--	--	3	0.1%	0.4%
HK Economic Journal							1	0.1%	3	0.1%	0.3%
Headline Daily, AM730							--	--	3	0.1%	0.3%
Oriental Daily, Sing Tao Daily							2	0.2%	3	0.1%	0.3%
Metro Daily							1	0.1%	3	0.1%	0.3%
Apple Daily, Ming Pao							1	0.1%	3	0.1%	0.3%
Headline Daily, The Sun							--	--	2	0.1%	0.3%
Headline Daily, Sky Post							--	--	2	0.1%	0.3%
Apple Daily, Oriental Daily, Sing Tao Daily							--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2016		
	[Q2a]	[Q2a+Q2b]	[Q2a]	[Q2a+Q2b]	[Q2a]	[Q2a+Q2b]	[Q2a] First mention	[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted)			
	% of valid sample (Base=698)	% of valid sample (Base=698)	% of valid sample (Base=700)	% of valid sample (Base=700)	% of valid sample (Base=860)	% of valid sample (Base=864)	Frequency	% of valid sample (Base=815)	Frequency	% of total responses (Base=2,811)	% of valid sample (Base=815)
The Standard							--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
Sing Tao Daily, Ming Pao							--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
Sing Tao Daily, HK Economic Times							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.2%
Apple Daily, HK Economic Times							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.2%
Apple Daily, Headline Daily							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.2%
Oriental Daily, Wen Wei Po							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Hong Kong Daily News							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Oriental Daily, HK Economic Times, South China Morning Post							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Apple Daily, Oriental Daily, The Sun, Sky Post							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
HK Economic Times							<1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Headline Daily, AM730, Sky Post							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Sing Pao							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Headline Daily, AM730, Sing Pao							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Headline Daily, AM730, Sky Post, Metro Daily							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Headline Daily, Sky Post, Metro Daily							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Apple Daily, Headline Daily, AM730							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Sing Tao Daily, South China Morning Post							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Apple Daily, Metro Daily							1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Oriental Daily, Headline Daily, AM730							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Oriental Daily, Headline Daily, Sing Tao Daily, Ming Pao, Sky Post, South China Morning Post							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Oriental Daily, Headline Daily, Metro Daily							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Headline Daily, Sing Tao Daily, AM730, Sky Post, HK Economic Times							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Apple Daily, AM730, Sky Post							--	--	<1	<0.1%	0.1%
Apple Daily, Oriental Daily, Headline Daily, AM730							--	--	<1	<0.1%	0.1%
Headline Daily, Sing Tao Daily							<1	0.1%	<1	<0.1%	0.1%

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2016			
	[Q2a]	[Q2a+Q2b]	[Q2a]	[Q2a+Q2b]	[Q2a]	[Q2a+Q2b]	[Q2a] First mention	[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted)				
	% of valid sample (Base=698)	% of valid sample (Base=698)	% of valid sample (Base=700)	% of valid sample (Base=700)	% of valid sample (Base=860)	% of valid sample (Base=864)	Frequency % of valid sample (Base=815)	Frequency % of total responses (Base=2,811)	% of valid sample (Base=815)			
Oriental Daily, Headline Daily, Ming Pao	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	<1	<0.1%	0.1%		
Oriental Daily, Hong Kong Daily News	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%		
Apple Daily, HK Economic Journal	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%		
Apple Daily, Headline Daily, Metro Daily	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%		
South China Morning Post	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%		
Apple Daily, Sing Tao Daily	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%		
Headline Daily, Ming Pao	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%		
							Sub-total	60	7.3%	358	12.7%	43.9%
<u>Other online channels that cannot be grouped</u>												
Online news								2	0.2%	9	0.3%	1.1%
YouTube								--	--	4	0.1%	0.5%
Can't remember / not specified								--	--	3	0.1%	0.4%
Government website								--	--	2	0.1%	0.3%
Website of the Hong Kong Police Force								--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Website of the Legislative Council								--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
							Sub-total	2	0.2%	20	0.7%	2.4%
<u>Other advertisements on public transport that cannot be grouped</u>												
Can't remember / not specified								--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
							Sub-total	--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
<u>Place of poster</u>												
Can't remember / not specified								--	--	9	0.3%	1.1%
Wan Chai Police Headquarters								--	--	3	0.1%	0.4%
On the street								--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2016			
	[Q2a]	[Q2a+Q2b]	[Q2a]	[Q2a+Q2b]	[Q2a]	[Q2a+Q2b]	[Q2a] First mention	[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted)				
	% of valid sample (Base=698)	% of valid sample (Base=698)	% of valid sample (Base=700)	% of valid sample (Base=700)	% of valid sample (Base=860)	% of valid sample (Base=864)	Frequency	% of valid sample (Base=815)	Frequency	% of total responses (Base=2,811)	% of valid sample (Base=815)	
Wan Chai							1	0.2%	1	<0.1%	0.2%	
Police station							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.2%	
New Territories							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%	
Wan Chai Police Station							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%	
Government facilities							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%	
Immigration Department							--	--	<1	<0.1%	0.1%	
Building							--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%	
Bus stop							--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%	
Central, Tsim Sha Tsui, Admiralty							--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%	
							Sub-total	1	0.2%	20	0.7%	2.5%
<u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u>												
School							2	0.3%	4	0.1%	0.5%	
Work							3	0.4%	3	0.1%	0.4%	
Police							2	0.2%	2	0.1%	0.2%	
District Councils Election forum							--	--	1	<0.1%	0.2%	
Have had contact with IPCC							1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%	
Have made complaints							1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%	
Book							<1	0.1%	<1	<0.1%	0.1%	
							Sub-total	9	1.2%	12	0.4%	1.5%

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

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

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

Include "Work" before 2016's survey.

Table 5 [Q3] (Only ask respondents who have answered “yes” in Q1) To your knowledge, what are IPCC’s duties? Any other duties? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed, interviewer to probe “any more?”)

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=698)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=697)	2015 % of valid sample (Base=865)	2016 Frequency	% of total responses (Base=1,027)	% of valid sample (Base=813)
IPCC duties	48.5%	39.7%**	49.4%**	402	--	49.5%
<i>Monitor CAPO’s cases handling process / Monitor how Police handle complaints[^]</i>	27.1%	22.5%*	22.7%	300	29.2%	36.9%**
<i>Monitor Police’s follow-up / disciplinary actions towards officers being complained</i>	14.0%	10.8%	16.8%**	64	6.2%	7.8%**
<i>Identify mal-practices in Police’s works that has led or may lead to complaints</i>	6.9%	2.9%**	8.3%**	50	4.9%	6.1%
<i>Review / verify investigation reports / results by CAPO</i>	5.4%	4.9%	5.8%	40	3.9%	5.0%
<i>Review statistics on types of Police’s behavior that citizens complained</i>	1.8%	3.0%	1.2%*	11	1.0%	1.3%
<i>Improve Police Force’s quality of service</i>	3.1%	2.5%	2.3%	7	0.7%	0.9%*
Non-IPCC duties	52.9%	58.9%**	54.5%	443	--	54.5%
<i>Monitor Police’s behavior / conduct</i>	38.4%	47.0%**	39.4%**	352	34.2%	43.3%
<i>Receive / investigate citizen’s complaints on Police directly^{^^}</i>	16.4%	13.9%	17.2%	104	10.1%	12.8%*
<i>Improve police-community relation / enhance communication</i>	1.7%	0.8%	0.4%	6	0.5%	0.7%
<i>Investigate Police bribing cases</i>	1.2%	1.7%	0.8%	5	0.5%	0.6%
<i>Other wrong answers</i>	1.1%	1.5%	2.3%	21	2.1%	2.6%
Don’t know / can’t remember	10.3%	14.5%	11.1%*	68	6.6%	8.4%
Total				1,027	100.0%	
<i>Missing</i>	--	9	2	2		
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u>						
Monitor complaints				4	0.4%	0.5%
Make complaints of Police				3	0.3%	0.4%
Maintain the work of Police				3	0.3%	0.4%
Safeguard Police				2	0.2%	0.2%

	2013	2014	2015	2016		
	% of valid sample (Base=698)	% of valid sample (Base=697)	% of valid sample (Base=865)	Frequency	% of total responses (Base=1,027)	% of valid sample (Base=813)
Monitor police powers				1	0.1%	0.1%
Manage order within Police				1	0.1%	0.1%
Monitor Police administration				1	0.1%	0.1%
Monitor civil servants' behavior / conduct				1	0.1%	0.1%
Initiate prosecutions				1	0.1%	0.1%
Adjudicate police complaint cases				1	0.1%	0.1%
Deal with conflicts between Police and citizens				1	0.1%	0.1%
Give advice				1	0.1%	0.1%
Monitor students				1	0.1%	0.1%
Monitor complaints and maintain justice				1	0.1%	0.1%
Monitor police-community relation				1	0.1%	0.1%
Maintain justice				<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Deal with livelihood issues				<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
			Sub-total	21	2.1%	2.6%

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

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

Table 6 [Q4] (Only ask respondents who have answered "yes" in Q1) Do you think IPCC is...? (Read out first two options, order to be randomized by computer, one answer only)

	2013	2014	2015	2016	
	Percentage (Base=698)	Percentage (Base=700)	Percentage (Base=865)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=815)
A totally independent organization, not under the Police	60.2%	63.0%	67.5%	517	63.5%
Part of the Police	34.8%	30.8%	25.2%*	235	28.8%
Don't know / hard to say	5.0%	6.2%	7.4%	63	7.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	815	100.0%
Missing	--	6	2	--	

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	2015	2016	
	Percentage (Base=1,008)	Percentage (Base=1,037)	Percentage (Base=1,007)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=996)
IPCC	24.2%	24.1%	35.4%**	301	30.2%*
CAPO	19.6%	20.7%	19.7%	156	15.7%*
Media	8.5%	8.1%	9.2%	108	10.8%
Police Force (no specified division)	10.7%	11.0%	8.4%	70	7.0%
DC / LegCo members	3.4%	2.8%	1.9%	38	3.8%*
ICAC	1.4%	1.8%	1.4%	20	2.0%
Internet	0.6%	0.6%	0.1%*	12	1.2%**
Office of the Ombudsman, HK	1.5%	0.7%	1.2%	5	0.5%
Equal Opportunities Commission	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%	1	0.1%
Others (see below)	2.0%	2.8%	1.7%	14	1.4%
No channel	1.0%	0.2%	1.9%**	88	8.8%**
Don't know	26.8%	27.0%	18.9%**	184	18.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	996	100.0%
Missing	1	2	7	6	
<u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u>					
Law				4	0.4%
Procession				2	0.2%
Independent department				2	0.2%
No need to make a complaint				1	0.1%
Use of force				1	0.1%
Political party				1	0.1%
Government department				1	0.1%
Police Public Relations Bureau				1	0.1%
1823				1	0.1%
Website of the Hong Kong Police Force				1	0.1%
District Office				<1	<0.1%
Demonstration				<1	<0.1%
			Sub-total	14	1.4%

Awareness of news on complaints against the Hong Kong Police Force and the IPCC

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 % of valid sample (Base=1,009)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=1,035)	2015 % of valid sample (Base=1,014)	Frequency	2016 % of total responses (Base=1,695)	% of valid sample (Base=1,000)
Yes	74.2%	76.7%*	91.5%**	927	--	92.7%
<i>News related to the Occupy Movement</i>	--	--	54.9%	320	18.9%	32.0%**
<i>Seven police officers case / dark corner case / Ken Tsang Kin-chiu case[^]</i>	--	--	13.9%	284	16.7%	28.4%**
<i>News related to the Mong Kok conflict</i>	--	--	--	219	12.9%	21.9%
<i>Conflicts between Police and citizens during processions, gatherings and demonstrations^{^^}</i>	33.8%	31.6%	14.6%**	184	10.9%	18.4%*
<i>Assault^{^^^}</i>	--	--	13.7%	182	10.7%	18.1%**
<i>Franklin Chu King-wai police baton assault case^{^^^}</i>	--	--	1.9%	111	6.5%	11.1%**
<i>Use of excessive and unnecessary force</i>	--	--	17.3%	62	3.7%	6.2%**
<i>Police's misconduct / bad attitude / abusive language^{^^^}</i>	5.1%	11.3%**	4.8%**	48	2.9%	4.8%
<i>Police's abuse of power</i>	2.1%	1.6%	2.3%	48	2.8%	4.8%**
<i>Sexual harassment / indecent assault</i>	--	--	1.6%	33	2.0%	3.3%*
<i>Police's neglect of duty</i>	--	2.3%	1.0%*	6	0.3%	0.6%
<i>Police's law enforcement of the traffic regulation</i>	1.7%	--	0.4%	5	0.3%	0.5%
<i>Police's false testimony / fabrication of evidence</i>	--	--	--	4	0.3%	0.4%
<i>Protests against parallel traders / Reclaim Movements^{^^^}</i>	--	--	1.6%	4	0.3%	0.4%**
<i>Police's unfair / inappropriate law enforcement</i>	--	0.7%	0.6%	4	0.2%	0.4%
<i>Mistaken arrest of / Taking statements from a man with intellectual disability</i>	--	--	--	4	0.2%	0.4%
<i>Stop and search issue / searching</i>	1.6%	0.4%**	0.1%	4	0.2%	0.4%
<i>Detention of reporters pursuing Eddie Ng Hak-kim</i>	--	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
<i>Police bribing cases</i>	0.8%	0.7%	0.1%	1	0.1%	0.1%
<i>HKU 8.18 dispute / Li Keqiang visited HK / dark shadow incident</i>	9.9%	1.3%**	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%

	2013	2014	2015	Frequency	2016	
	% of valid sample (Base=1,009)	% of valid sample (Base=1,035)	% of valid sample (Base=1,014)		% of total responses (Base=1,695)	% of valid sample (Base=1,000)
<i>Use of tear gas grenades to disperse protesters</i>	--	--	3.4%	--	--	--
<i>Inappropriate use of pepper spray</i>	--	--	2.8%	--	--	--
<i>Inappropriate use of police batons</i>	--	--	2.4%	--	--	--
<i>Use of tear gas spray to disperse protesters</i>	--	--	1.6%	--	--	--
<i>A plain-clothes officer threatened a female protester to “shut up or I’ll take you back to the police station and rape you”</i>	--	--	1.4%	--	--	--
<i>Rape case in Police station</i>	3.3%	0.2%**	1.3%**	--	--	--
<i>Not arresting or stopping anti-Occupy protesters who used violence</i>	--	--	1.2%	--	--	--
<i>Police’s mishandling of sexual violence case</i>	--	2.9%	1.1%**	--	--	--
<i>Arrest protesters selectively</i>	--	--	1.1%	--	--	--
<i>Use of police batons to strike heads and joints of protesters</i>	--	--	0.9%	--	--	--
<i>Tapping a protester on his shoulder and pepper spraying him in the face when he turned around</i>	--	--	0.7%	--	--	--
<i>Unreasonable arrest of protesters</i>	--	--	0.6%	--	--	--
<i>Doubt on Police’s political neutrality</i>	--	0.9%	0.5%	--	--	--
<i>Ill-treatment towards a hotel staff who complained about an idling police coach bus with running engine</i>	--	--	0.4%	--	--	--
<i>Showing of the “disperse or we fire” warning banner to protesters</i>	--	--	0.3%	--	--	--
<i>Use of pepper spray on protesters behind the gate at Mongkok Police Station</i>	--	--	0.3%	--	--	--
<i>Unreasonable checking of ID cards and registration of personal data</i>	--	--	0.2%	--	--	--
<i>Dragging protesters along the ground</i>	--	--	0.2%	--	--	--
<i>Wearing blue ribbons while on duty</i>	--	--	0.1%	--	--	--
<i>Unsatisfactory arrangement of bail</i>	--	0.2%	0.1%	--	--	--
<i>Police’s handling of personal information</i>	0.6%	--	0.1%	--	--	--
<i>Assaulting or arresting medical personnel</i>	--	--	0.1%	--	--	--
<i>Inappropriate treatment / Ill-treatment of arrested persons</i>	--	--	0.1%	--	--	--

	2013	2014	2015	Frequency	2016	
	% of valid sample (Base=1,009)	% of valid sample (Base=1,035)	% of valid sample (Base=1,014)		% of total responses (Base=1,695)	% of valid sample (Base=1,000)
<i>Plain-clothes officers among protesters tried to provoke violence</i>	--	--	<0.1%	--	--	--
<i>Police officers on duty took group photos after clearance</i>	--	--	<0.1%	--	--	--
<i>The dispute between teacher Lam Wai-sze and Police at Mong Kok pedestrian street on July 14, 2013</i>	--	4.7%	--	--	--	--
<i>The public gathering of Police supporters at Mong Kok pedestrian street on August 4, 2013</i>	--	1.3%	--	--	--	--
<i>Central and Western District Councilor was prevented from attending the meeting by Police</i>	--	1.2%	--	--	--	--
<i>A couple was accused of stealing after they reported the money they found to the Police</i>	--	0.9%	--	--	--	--
<i>Police officer gave a female protestor a bear-hug</i>	--	0.6%	--	--	--	--
<i>Members of Scholarism were prevented from attending the National Day flag-raising ceremony</i>	--	0.1%	--	--	--	--
<i>Media coverage arrangement by Police</i>	2.1%	--	--	--	--	--
<i>Sex workers complained about Police's abuse of power</i>	1.3%	--	--	--	--	--
<i>Police's press release arrangement</i>	0.2%	--	--	--	--	--
<i>Police forced a boy to pretend as a cross when investigating drugs issue</i>	0.2%	--	--	--	--	--
<i>Mechanism of complaints against police is complicated, slow statements taking</i>	0.1%	--	--	--	--	--
<i>Others (see below)</i>	2.3%	2.3%	3.7%	15	0.9%	1.5%**
<i>Can't remember</i>	20.4%	23.9%*	4.4%**	74	4.4%	7.4%**
<i>Refuse to answer</i>	0.1%	0.1%	0.4%	7	0.4%	0.7%
No	21.2%	15.3%**	6.1%**	65	3.8%	6.4%
Don't know / hard to say	4.6%	8.0%*	2.4%**	9	0.5%	0.9%**
Total				1,695	100.0%	
Missing	--	--	--	2		

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=1,009)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=1,035)	2015 % of valid sample (Base=1,014)	2016 Frequency % of total responses (Base=1,695)	% of valid sample (Base=1,000)
<u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u>					
Police officers' financial problems				4	0.2% 0.4%
Poor handling of a case involving a lady in Yuen Long				2	0.1% 0.2%
Rallies and demonstrations involving Joshua Wong				1	0.1% 0.1%
Rape case				1	0.1% 0.1%
Corrupt police				1	0.1% 0.1%
Theft case				1	0.1% 0.1%
Racial issue				1	0.1% 0.1%
Choi Yuen Village and Express Rail Link				1	<0.1% 0.1%
Police officers not working according to guidelines				1	<0.1% 0.1%
Slow investigation of complaint cases				1	<0.1% 0.1%
Police-triad collusion; inappropriately treated in report rooms				1	<0.1% 0.1%
Police's handling of illegal hawkers				1	<0.1% 0.1%
Police's incompetence				1	<0.1% 0.1%
Conflicts between Police and citizens during evidence collection and investigation				<1	<0.1% <0.1%
			Sub-total	15	0.9% 1.5%

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 9 [Q7] Which one of the following types of complaints of the Police Force would you care about most? (Read out options, order to be randomized by computer, one answer only)

	2013	2014	2015	2016	
	Percentage (Base=1,008)	Percentage (Base=1,038)	Percentage (Base=1,014)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,001)
On police officers' abuse of power	31.5%	19.0%**	22.0%	220	22.0%
On police officers' use of violence	6.9%	7.3%	19.1%**	169	16.9%
On unfairness of police officers in handling cases	8.3%	13.1%**	15.3%	150	14.9%
On corruption of police officers	13.1%	15.2%	12.2%*	134	13.4%
On Police handling public demonstration	13.7%	12.2%	7.7%**	59	5.9%
On working attitude of police officers	5.6%	6.4%	4.7%	41	4.1%
On investigation method of police officers	1.3%	1.5%	1.2%	21	2.1%
On officers' law enforcement of traffic regulations	1.6%	4.0%**	1.8%**	20	2.0%
On stop and search issue / searching	2.5%	2.9%	2.7%	14	1.4%*
On media coverage arrangement	2.6%	3.1%	1.5%*	12	1.2%
On press releases arrangement	2.6%	1.6%*	0.8%	6	0.6%
Others (see below)	0.8%	0.9%	0.5%	6	0.6%
Don't care about any complaints against Police Force	5.5%	5.0%	4.8%	85	8.5%**
Don't know / hard to say	3.9%	7.7%**	5.7%	64	6.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	1,001	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>--</i>	<i>1</i>	
<u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u>					
On police officers' conduct and ethics				2	0.2%
On IPCC's stance				2	0.2%
On abusing the complaints system				1	0.1%
On incidents involving police officers and citizens				1	0.1%
On police officers' indecent assault				<1	<0.1%
On police's relation with the public				<1	<0.1%
			Sub-total	6	0.6%

Table 10 [Q8] In the past year, did you hear any news on complaints made to IPCC? If yes, can you tell me what was it about? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

	2015 % of valid sample (Base=1,013)	Frequency	2016 % of total responses (Base=1,061)	% of valid sample (Base=1,002)
Yes	35.3%	427	--	42.6%**
<i>IPCC handles complaints unfairly / has a bias in favour of the police or protesters</i>	1.5%	104	9.8%	10.3%**
<i>About the Occupy Movement (no specific incident)</i>	1.2%	54	5.1%	5.4%**
<i>It takes too long to handle complaints / No result of investigation after a long time / Cases go unattended</i>	0.6%	43	4.0%	4.3%**
<i>About Franklin Chu King-wai police baton assault case</i>	--	30	2.9%	3.0%
<i>IPCC's monitoring is ineffective</i>	0.8%	26	2.5%	2.6%**
<i>Some IPCC members are not politically neutral / handle complaints unfairly</i>	7.7%	17	1.6%	1.7%**
<i>About seven police officers case / dark corner case / Ken Tsang Kin-chiu case</i>	--	17	1.6%	1.7%
<i>IPCC does not conduct on-site observation during occupy or assemble events</i>	8.0%	11	1.1%	1.1%**
<i>The Chairman of IPCC Mr. Larry Kwok Lam-kwong is not politically neutral / handles complaints unfairly</i>	2.3%	9	0.9%	0.9%*
<i>Others (see below)</i>	2.3%	14	1.3%	1.4%
<i>Can't remember</i>	12.0%	149	14.1%	14.9%
<i>Refuse to answer</i>	0.6%	11	1.0%	1.1%
Respondents talked about complaints made to the Hong Kong Police Force	1.1%	16	1.5%	1.6%
No	60.0%	525	49.5%	52.4%**
Don't know / hard to say	3.5%	34	3.2%	3.4%
Total		1,061	100.0%	
Missing	1	--		
<u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u>				
IPCC is not independent enough		5	0.5%	0.5%
About the Mong Kok conflict		3	0.3%	0.3%
IPCC's procedure of referring complaints		1	0.1%	0.1%

	2015	2016		
	% of valid sample (Base=1,013)	Frequency	% of total responses (Base=1,061)	% of valid sample (Base=1,002)
Complaints made by LegCo members		1	0.1%	0.1%
Corruption of IPCC		1	0.1%	0.1%
About processions and demonstrations		1	0.1%	0.1%
IPCC does not accept complaints about itself		1	0.1%	0.1%
Problem with the method for forming IPCC		1	0.1%	0.1%
IPCC only has limited authorization		<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
About having another Chairman		<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
About its relation with the public		<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
	Sub-total	14	1.3%	1.4%

Image and confidence in the IPCC

Table 11 [Q9] Do you think IPCC is independent in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police? (Read out options, one answer only)

	2013		2014		2015		2016	
	Percentage (Base=1,007)		Percentage (Base=1,037)		Percentage (Base=1,012)		Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,002)
Independent	34.5%	}Independent	34.3%	}53.3%	34.5%	}52.3%	293	29.2%*
Quite independent	18.7%		19.0%		17.8%		165	
Half-half	18.8%		18.6%		18.4%		160	16.0%
Not quite independent	13.0%	}Not independent	12.0%	}17.1%	13.0%	}22.0%**	168	16.7%*
Not independent at all	5.7%		5.2%		9.0%**		126	
Don't know / hard to say	9.3%		11.0%		7.3%**		90	9.0%
Total	100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		1,002	100.0%
Missing	2		2		2		--	

Table 12 [Q10] Do you think IPCC is able to monitor and review CAPO's investigations in an impartial and objective way? (Read out options, one answer only)

	2013		2014		2015		2016	
	Percentage (Base=1,007)		Percentage (Base=1,039)		Percentage (Base=1,013)		Frequency	Percentage (Base=997)
Impartial and objective	24.7%	}Impartial and objective	27.1%	}46.7%	23.9%	}43.8%	215	21.6%
Quite impartial and objective	21.0%		19.6%		19.9%		181	
Half-half	28.4%		26.5%		27.1%		232	23.3%
Not quite impartial and objective	8.8%	}Not impartial and objective	9.5%	}13.7%	11.1%	}19.4%**	142	14.2%*
Not impartial and objective at all	4.2%		4.2%		8.2%**		120	
Don't know / hard to say	12.8%		13.1%		9.8%*		106	10.7%
Total	100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		997	100.0%
Missing	2		--		1		5	

Table 13 [Q11] Do you think IPCC's complaint monitor and review is efficient or not? (Read out options, one answer only)

		2013	2014	2015	2016	
		Percentage (Base=1,009)	Percentage (Base=1,038)	Percentage (Base=1,013)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=999)
Efficient	}Efficient	11.2%	14.0%	13.4%	119	11.9%
Quite efficient		14.3%	12.9%	14.1%	100	10.0%**
Half-half		34.6%	31.7%	31.9%	294	29.5%
Not quite efficient	}Not efficient	8.7%	9.8%	12.3%	159	15.9%*
Not efficient at all		4.2%	3.0%	8.1%**	129	13.0%**
Don't know / hard to say		27.1%	28.7%	20.2%**	197	19.7%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	999	100.0%
	Missing	--	1	1	3	

Table 14 [Q12] What do you think of IPCC's level of transparency in complaint monitor and review? (Read out options, one answer only)

		2013	2014	2015	2016	
		Percentage (Base=1,009)	Percentage (Base=1,038)	Percentage (Base=1,014)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,002)
High	}High	8.0%	9.7%	10.7%	96	9.6%
Quite high		13.0%	9.8%	11.7%	85	8.5%*
Half-half		39.5%	38.6%	37.3%	357	35.6%
Quite low	}Low	13.0%	12.8%	11.6%	142	14.2%
Low		11.1%	11.5%	15.7%**	201	20.0%*
Don't know / hard to say		15.3%	17.5%	13.0%**	121	12.1%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	1,002	100.0%
	Missing	--	1	--	--	

Table 15 [Q13] Overall speaking, are you confident in IPCC? (Interviewer to probe intensity)

		2013 Percentage (Base=1,009)	2014 Percentage (Base=1,039)	2015 Percentage (Base=1,014)	2016	
					Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,002)
Very confident	}Confident	11.5%	12.1%	12.7%	114	11.4%
Quite confident		31.3% } 42.7%	35.8%* } 47.9%**	31.3%* } 44.0%	273 }387	27.2%* } 38.6%*
Half-half		31.5%	25.7%**	27.1%	223	22.3%*
Not quite confident	}Not confident	14.0%	14.4%	13.4%	174	17.4%*
Not confident at all		5.1% }19.0%	5.7% }20.1%	10.8%** }24.1%*	165 }340	16.5%** }33.9%**
Don't know / hard to say		6.7%	6.3%	4.8%	52	5.2%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	1,002	100.0%
Missing		--	--	--	<1	

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

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=192)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=209)	2015 % of valid sample (Base=245)	Frequency	2016 % of total responses (Base=528)	% of valid sample (Base=338)
Committees are appointed, not elected by citizens	10.7%	14.0%	19.7%	72	13.7%	21.4%
It takes too long to handle complaints / No result of investigation after a long time / Cases go unattended	--	--	4.2%	61	11.5%	17.9%**
Not fair and impartial^	--	2.3%	3.5%	55	10.4%	16.3%**
Not independent enough	--	1.4%	1.5%	50	9.4%	14.7%**
Brings little to no effect / Police’s misconduct continues^^	--	9.9%	4.5%*	48	9.1%	14.2%**
May take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases	15.5%	12.1%	20.2%*	39	7.3%	11.4%**
It’s like self-investigation	26.9%	15.0%**	18.9%	33	6.3%	9.8%**
The process and results of complaints are not released to public	17.0%	18.4%	17.9%	27	5.2%	8.1%**
Not clear about IPCC’s works	12.4%	8.2%	7.4%	24	4.5%	7.1%
Both are under the Government	8.1%	11.3%	13.5%	21	4.0%	6.2%**
No direct investigation, only responsible for monitoring and review, no actual authority^^^	10.4%	5.4%	6.8%	14	2.6%	4.1%
Don’t think IPCC investigate or monitor complaints in citizen’s perspective	4.9%	3.4%	3.5%	10	1.9%	3.0%
Have little confidence in some IPCC members	--	--	4.2%	9	1.8%	2.8%
Police officers could be appointed as committee member	1.9%	1.8%	1.8%	9	1.6%	2.6%
May cover up the truth to avoid unfavorable impact on Police’s image	6.8%	2.9%*	2.5%	6	1.1%	1.7%
Not confident in the Government, so not confident in IPCC	2.1%	--	0.2%	4	0.7%	1.1%
Have little confidence in the Chairman of IPCC Mr Larry Kwok Lam-kwong	--	--	1.3%	3	0.5%	0.8%
May be unfair to police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases	--	2.0%	--	1	0.2%	0.3%
Affected by political factors	--	2.2%	--	--	--	--

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=192)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=209)	2015 % of valid sample (Base=245)	Frequency	2016 % of total responses (Base=528)	% of valid sample (Base=338)
Not enough public engagement	--	1.0%	--	--	--	--
Don't like the image of IPCC	3.4%	--	--	--	--	--
Others (see below)	3.4%	5.0%	8.8%	30	5.7%	8.9%
Don't know / hard to say	4.7%	10.4%	4.3%*	13	2.4%	3.8%
Total				528	100.0%	
<i>Missing</i>	--	--	--	2		
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u>						
News in the past				11	2.1%	3.2%
Dissatisfied with the result of complaints				3	0.6%	0.9%
Don't know much about IPCC members				2	0.3%	0.5%
Past first-hand experience				1	0.2%	0.4%
IPCC members are too busy				1	0.2%	0.4%
Rule by man rather than rule of law				1	0.2%	0.3%
No standard for its work				1	0.2%	0.3%
Selective enforcement of the law				1	0.2%	0.3%
Not proactive				1	0.1%	0.2%
Citizens cannot monitor IPCC				1	0.1%	0.2%
Negative image				1	0.1%	0.2%
IPCC does not put enough effort into cases				1	0.1%	0.2%
Not enough promotion				1	0.1%	0.2%
Not enough resources				1	0.1%	0.2%
IPCC should not exist				1	0.1%	0.2%
Ordinary citizens are not appointed into IPCC				1	0.1%	0.2%
Worried about processions and demonstrations				1	0.1%	0.2%
News in the past; IPCC's public statement				1	0.1%	0.2%
IPCC does not work within the system				<1	0.1%	0.1%

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=192)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=209)	2015 % of valid sample (Base=245)	2016 Frequency % of total responses (Base=528)	% of valid sample (Base=338)
IPCC is swayed by public opinion				<1	0.1%
Choice of IPCC's membership				<1	0.1%
IPCC does not handle cases seriously				<1	0.1%
IPCC's public statement				<1	0.1%
			Sub-total	30	5.7%
					8.9%

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

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

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

Table 17 [Q15] Are you confident in the existing two-tier system of complaints against the Police? (Interviewer to probe intensity)

		2013 Percentage (Base=1,009)	2014 Percentage (Base=1,036)	2015 Percentage (Base=1,012)	2016 Frequency		2016 Percentage (Base=1,001)
Very confident	}Confident	12.0%	11.1%	13.4%	114	}386	11.4%
Quite confident		32.3%	40.7%**	30.9%**	272		27.1%
Half-half		28.2%	21.9%**	25.2%	201		20.1%**
Not quite confident	}Not confident	12.5%	12.5%	14.6%	169	}323	16.9%
Not confident at all		5.8%	6.2%	9.3%**	153		15.3%**
Don't know / hard to say		9.3%	7.4%*	6.7%	91		9.1%*
Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	1,001		100.0%
<i>Missing</i>		--	3	2	1		

Table 18 [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)

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=185)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=195)	2015 % of valid sample (Base=228)	Frequency	2016 % of total responses (Base=460)	% of valid sample (Base=321)
Change the method for forming the Council [^]	--	--	11.2%	81	17.6%	25.2%**
Increase transparency	35.2%	24.7%	22.4%	71	15.4%	22.1%
Handle complaints fairly and impartially	--	3.7%	4.1%	58	12.6%	18.1%**
IPCC should become an independent department	9.7%	10.1%	5.4%	57	12.5%	17.9%**
Involve individuals from different classes in the process	22.8%	23.0%	15.5%*	33	7.1%	10.2%
IPCC should have authorization to investigate so that it can receive complaints and investigate directly ^{^^}	9.4%	12.4%	16.5%	22	4.8%	6.9%**
Improve work efficiency	--	3.5%	3.7%	21	4.6%	6.6%
IPCC should have authorization to decide punitive sanctions on police officers who violated regulations	4.0%	1.9%	3.6%	13	2.8%	4.0%
More promotion	6.9%	3.4%	2.4%	12	2.6%	3.7%
IPCC should have authorization to investigate serious cases	1.0%	0.9%	5.3%*	7	1.5%	2.2%
Simplify the monitor and review procedures	6.5%	2.0%*	1.7%	1	0.1%	0.2%
Shorten the time for investigation and review	3.4%	1.9%	4.5%	--	--	--**
Others (see below)	6.1%	4.7%	13.6%**	27	6.0%	8.5%
No area needs to be improved	2.2%	1.5%	1.8%	2	0.4%	0.6%
Don't know / hard to say	16.5%	26.4%*	26.0%	55	11.9%	17.1%*
Total				460	100.0%	
Missing	--	--	14	2		
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u>						
Handle complaints seriously				5	1.0%	1.5%
There is no way to improve				5	1.0%	1.5%
IPCC should be credible				2	0.5%	0.7%
Increase legal support				2	0.5%	0.7%

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=185)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=195)	2015 % of valid sample (Base=228)	2016 Frequency % of total responses (Base=460)	% of valid sample (Base=321)
CAPO should become an independent department				2	0.3%
Pay attention to each and every complaints				2	0.3%
Let the court handle complaints directly				1	0.3%
Start with schools				1	0.3%
Boldness comes when government officials desire nothing				1	0.3%
Improve responses to public enquiries				1	0.2%
Set up a three-tier complaints system, allowing re-investigation of cases				1	0.2%
Increase people's confidence towards the first tier (when police handle complaints)				1	0.2%
IPCC should have authorization to initiate prosecutions				1	0.2%
Be neutral				1	0.1%
IPCC should not exist				1	0.1%
IPCC's power should be separated from the "central government"				1	0.1%
Implement true universal suffrage, change the CE				1	0.1%
Establish an independent monitoring group to monitor IPCC's work performance				<1	0.1%
			Sub-total	27	6.0%
					8.5%

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

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

Overall perception on the IPCC

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

	2013		2014		2015		2016	
	Percentage (Base=1,007)		Percentage (Base=1,037)		Percentage (Base=1,013)		Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,002)
Positive	34.7%	}57.4%	35.7%	}60.4%*	34.4%	}56.4%	356	35.5%
Quite positive	22.7%		24.7%		22.0%		161	16.1%**
Half-half	31.9%		25.6%**		28.5%		280	28.0%
Quite negative	2.1%	}4.2%	3.0%	}6.1%	5.3%*	}10.4%**	58	5.8%
Negative	2.1%		3.1%		5.1%*		75	7.5%*
Don't know / hard to say	6.4%		7.9%		4.8%**		72	7.2%*
Total	100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		1,002	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>	2		2		1		--	

Table 20 [Q18a] (Only ask respondents who have answered “positive” and “quite positive” in Q17) Why do you think it is “positive” or “quite positive”? Any more? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=578)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=623)	2015 % of valid sample (Base=569)	Frequency	2016 % of total responses (Base=654)	% of valid sample (Base=515)
IPCC is fair enough	16.7%	18.1%	21.2%	90	13.7%	17.4%
IPCC is independent enough	24.8%	20.8%	20.2%	84	12.8%	16.3%
Intuition / Impression / Personal feeling	--	--	2.7%	66	10.2%	12.9%**
IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review	14.3%	12.5%	12.4%	51	7.8%	9.8%
IPCC fulfills its duties	--	--	2.4%	50	7.7%	9.7%**
IPCC’s image / name is positive	4.7%	8.4%*	1.3%**	49	7.5%	9.5%**
No / Little bad news about IPCC	--	--	4.0%	45	6.9%	8.7%**
IPCC has high transparency	10.2%	11.2%	7.7%*	44	6.8%	8.6%
IPCC provides a helpful monitoring system / mechanism	12.3%	11.0%	8.6%	40	6.2%	7.8%
IPCC’s work brings an impact	--	--	1.4%	35	5.4%	6.9%**
IPCC’s structure gives people confidence	17.3%	13.1%*	12.5%	29	4.4%	5.6%**
IPCC has sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties	6.1%	6.5%	5.9%	14	2.2%	2.8%*
IPCC has high efficiency	4.3%	4.8%	3.7%	7	1.1%	1.4%*
IPCC is appointed by the Government	1.3%	1.6%	--	--	--	--
Other positive answers (see below)	3.9%	2.2%	4.6%*	22	3.3%	4.2%
Don’t know / hard to say	11.5%	11.3%	13.3%	27	4.1%	5.2%**
Total				654	100.0%	
<i>Missing</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>		
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u>						
IPCC members’ public remarks are not bad				3	0.4%	0.6%
IPCC members are appointed by the CE				2	0.2%	0.3%
IPCC collects people’s opinions				1	0.2%	0.3%
Confident in the Hong Kong Police Force				1	0.2%	0.2%

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=578)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=623)	2015 % of valid sample (Base=569)	2016 Frequency % of total responses (Base=654)	% of valid sample (Base=515)
IPCC listens to people's opinions				1	0.2%
IPCC has to report results of its work				1	0.2%
Images of Police Force and ICAC are positive				1	0.2%
Image of Police Force is positive				1	0.2%
Better than the system in mainland				1	0.2%
Quality of police officers is higher than that of other countries				1	0.2%
Environment of Hong Kong is positive				1	0.1%
IPCC works according to principles				1	0.1%
Content of IPCC's work is positive				1	0.1%
Trust the judicial system				1	0.1%
IPCC is under the government				1	0.1%
Due to confidentiality issue, only the government can monitor the government				1	0.1%
Political parties				1	0.1%
IPCC members come from different sectors				1	0.1%
IPCC members are credible				1	0.1%
IPCC is monitored by media				<1	0.1%
Better than other places				<1	0.1%
IPCC members are appointed by the government				<1	0.1%
People should support the work of IPCC				<1	0.1%
			Sub-total	22	3.3%

Table 21 [Q18b] (Only ask respondents who have answered “negative” and “quite negative” in Q17) Why do you think it is “negative” and “quite negative”? Any more? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=43)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=64)	2015 % of valid sample (Base=105)	Frequency	2016 % of total responses (Base=201)	% of valid sample (Base=133)
IPCC is not fair and impartial	--	--	8.9%	42	20.8%	31.4%**
IPCC has low efficiency	6.4%	14.2%	17.9%	38	18.9%	28.5%
IPCC’s work does not bring an impact	--	--	7.8%	32	15.9%	23.9%**
IPCC has low transparency	45.0%	38.0%	20.8%*	23	11.7%	17.6%
IPCC might take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases	8.2%	6.8%	27.6%**	20	10.0%	15.1%*
No trust in IPCC’s independence	35.4%	20.2%	19.1%	18	9.1%	13.7%
IPCC doesn’t have sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties	13.7%	3.2%*	14.8%*	8	3.9%	5.8%*
Comments / reports about IPCC are negative	--	--	--	4	2.1%	3.2%
Don’t think IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review	6.2%	5.5%	10.1%	2	0.8%	1.2%**
Other negative answers (see below)	10.7%	26.3%*	16.6%	13	6.2%	9.4%
Don’t know / hard to say	8.1%	11.4%	4.9%	1	0.7%	1.0%
Total				201	100.0%	
Other response that cannot be grouped						
Committees are appointed, not elected by citizens				4	2.0%	3.1%
IPCC members all come from similar background				2	0.9%	1.4%
IPCC abuses its power				1	0.7%	1.0%
IPCC is not fair with police officers				1	0.5%	0.7%
Intuition				1	0.5%	0.7%
IPCC members have political background				1	0.4%	0.6%
No trust in IPCC				1	0.4%	0.5%
IPCC’s past performance				1	0.3%	0.4%
Because of the government				<1	0.2%	0.4%
No trust in certain IPCC members				<1	0.2%	0.3%
IPCC is not conscientious				<1	0.2%	0.3%
			Sub-total	13	6.2%	9.4%

Table 22 [Q19] Are you satisfied with the performance of IPCC? (Interviewer to probe intensity)

		2014		2015		2016	
		Percentage (Base=1,033)		Percentage (Base=1,012)		Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,000)
Very much satisfied	}Satisfied	7.0%	}38.8%	6.3%	}39.8%	61	6.1%
Quite satisfied		31.8%		33.5%		278	27.8%**
Half-half		30.6%		31.8%		280	28.0%
Quite dissatisfied	}Dissatisfied	6.9%	}9.2%	10.0%*	}15.0%**	148	14.8%**
Very much dissatisfied		2.3%		4.9%**		88	8.8%**
Don't know / hard to say		21.4%		13.4%**		145	14.5%
	Total	100.0%		100.0%		1,000	100.0%
	Missing	6		2		2	

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

	2014	2015	2016	
	% of valid sample (Base=952)	% of valid sample (Base=954)	Frequency	% of valid sample (Base=949)
0	1.1%	2.8%**	36	3.8%
1-9	0.5%	0.4%	11	1.1%
10-19	0.6%	1.0%	19	2.0%
20-29	0.9%	2.9%**	25	2.7%
30-39	2.3%	2.9%	58	6.1%**
40-49	4.9%	7.7%**	92	9.7%
50	25.2%	22.6%	209	22.1%
51-60	16.6%	14.9%	141	14.9%
61-70	20.7%	15.7%**	143	15.1%
71-80	17.3%	18.1%	129	13.6%**
81-90	6.6%	6.3%	47	4.9%
91-99	1.0%	1.5%	10	1.0%
100	2.2%	3.2%	28	3.0%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	949	100.0%
<i>Missing (including "don't know / hard to say")</i>	87	60	53	
Mean score	62.5	60.3*	56.1**	
Standard error	0.6	0.7	0.7	
Base	952	954	949	

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

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=1,001)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=1,028)	2015 % of valid sample (Base=1,005)	Frequency	2016 % of total responses (Base=1,453)	% of valid sample (Base=1,002)
Hope IPCC can handle cases in a fair, impartial and transparent manner	16.9%	24.0%**	37.5%**	360	24.8%	35.9%
Hope IPCC can improve its transparency	11.3%	14.9%**	18.7%*	201	13.9%	20.1%
Hope IPCC can do better	--	--	1.5%	108	7.4%	10.8%**
Hope IPCC can become an independent organization / handle complaint cases directly^	4.2%	5.1%	11.0%**	96	6.6%	9.6%
Hope IPCC can increase its efficiency	0.8%	4.1%**	8.9%**	89	6.2%	8.9%
Hope IPCC can monitor HK Police Force's work effectively	19.2%	16.5%	6.9%**	56	3.9%	5.6%
Hope IPCC will keep up with its good work	4.1%	3.9%	9.8%**	53	3.7%	5.3%**
Hope IPCC can have more promotion of its work	--	3.7%	4.5%	41	2.8%	4.1%
Hope IPCC can change the method for selecting its members	--	--	1.7%	41	2.8%	4.0%**
Hope IPCC is not swayed by external influence	--	--	0.9%	32	2.2%	3.2%**
Hope IPCC can broaden its member base^^	1.5%	2.9%*	3.8%	32	2.2%	3.2%
Hope IPCC can improve Police-community relation / enhance its communication	7.0%	4.8%*	1.9%**	21	1.4%	2.0%
Hope IPCC can explain more to citizens the work / complaints system of HK Police Force	8.0%	5.9%	2.3%**	16	1.1%	1.6%
Hope IPCC can expand its mandated functions	--	--	1.3%	15	1.0%	1.5%
Hope IPCC can ensure citizens will get appropriate Police services	5.9%	4.5%	3.2%	14	1.0%	1.4%**
Hope IPCC can provide a channel for complaints against police	6.6%	4.1%**	1.8%**	7	0.5%	0.7%*
Hope IPCC can pressure HK Police Force effectively in order to improve their work	5.7%	2.9%**	2.0%	6	0.4%	0.6%**
Hope IPCC can serve citizens	--	1.3%	--	--	--	--
Hope IPCC will have the right to investigate complaints	1.1%	1.2%	--	--	--	--
Hope IPCC will be authorized for law enforcement / have actual authority	--	1.1%	--	--	--	--
Others (see below)	2.4%	1.8%	4.9%**	38	2.6%	3.8%

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=1,001)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=1,028)	2015 % of valid sample (Base=1,005)	2016 Frequency	% of total responses (Base=1,453)	% of valid sample (Base=1,002)
No expectation / don't know / hard to say	21.5%	22.6%	21.1%	225	15.5%	22.4%
<i>No expectation</i>	4.7%	4.2%	5.5%	198	13.7%	19.8%**
<i>Don't know / hard to say</i>	16.8%	18.3%	15.6%	26	1.8%	2.6%**
Total				1,453	100.0%	
Missing	8	11	9	--		
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u>						
Hope IPCC can handle cases seriously				9	0.6%	0.9%
Hope IPCC be dissolved				7	0.5%	0.7%
Hope IPCC can work according to law				2	0.2%	0.2%
Hope IPCC members are credible people				2	0.2%	0.2%
Hope IPCC can accurately respond to citizens' complaints				2	0.2%	0.2%
Hope IPCC be corruption free				2	0.1%	0.2%
Hope IPCC can increase its manpower				2	0.1%	0.2%
Hope nobody makes complaints				2	0.1%	0.2%
Hope IPCC can pay attention to each and every complaints				2	0.1%	0.2%
Hope IPCC can increase people's confidence				1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC can work on public order problem in Hong Kong				1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC be more stringent				1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC can impose heavier sanctions				1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC can deal with the Mong Kok conflict				1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC can increase the number of members				1	<0.1%	0.1%
Hope all IPCC members are not police officers				1	<0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC be reformed				<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Hope IPCC members are capable people				<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Hope IPCC can have a clearer guideline for handling complaints				<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Hope IPCC can have higher integrity				<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
			Sub-total	38	2.6%	3.8%

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

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

Appendix 3

Demographics

Table 25 Gender

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,002)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,002)
Male	499	49.8%	452	45.1%
Female	503	50.2%	550	54.9%
Total	1,002	100.0%	1,002	100.0%

Table 26 Age Group

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=992)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=992)
18 – 19	38	3.8%	53	5.4%
20 – 29	123	12.4%	121	12.2%
30 – 39	120	12.1%	181	18.2%
40 – 49	181	18.2%	180	18.2%
50 – 59	231	23.3%	200	20.1%
60 – 69	165	16.6%	136	13.7%
70 or above	134	13.5%	121	12.2%
Total	992	100.0%	992	100.0%
Missing	10		10	

Table 27 Education Attainment

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=995)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=995)
Primary school or below	136	13.7%	235	23.7%
<i>Not educated, pre-elementary education</i>	26	2.6%	44	4.5%
<i>Primary</i>	110	11.1%	191	19.2%
Secondary	436	43.8%	478	48.1%
<i>Junior secondary (F.1-F.3)</i>	120	12.1%	110	11.0%
<i>Senior secondary (F.4-F.5, vocational training included)</i>	258	25.9%	289	29.1%
<i>Matriculation (F.6-F.7)</i>	58	5.8%	80	8.0%
Tertiary or above	423	42.5%	281	28.3%
<i>Tertiary, non-degree (Diploma / Certificate)</i>	73	7.3%	49	4.9%
<i>Tertiary, non-degree (Associate degree)</i>	39	3.9%	25	2.6%
<i>Tertiary, degree</i>	261	26.2%	176	17.7%
<i>Postgraduate or above</i>	50	5.0%	31	3.1%
Total	995	100.0%	995	100.0%
Missing	7		7	

Table 28 Occupation

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=995)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=992)
Executives and professionals	277	27.8%	226	22.8%
<i>Managers / administration staff</i>	115	11.6%	92	9.3%
<i>Professional</i>	121	12.2%	94	9.5%
<i>Associate professional</i>	41	4.1%	40	4.0%
Clerical and service workers	180	18.1%	211	21.3%
<i>Clerk</i>	105	10.6%	117	11.7%
<i>Service worker and Shop & market sales worker</i>	75	7.5%	94	9.5%
Production workers	58	5.8%	82	8.2%
<i>Skilled agricultural & fishery worker</i>	1	0.1%	1	0.1%
<i>Craft & related trade worker</i>	13	1.3%	20	2.0%
<i>Plant & machine operator / assembler</i>	15	1.5%	18	1.8%
<i>Unskilled worker</i>	29	2.9%	42	4.3%
Students	75	7.5%	80	8.1%
Homemakers	113	11.4%	127	12.8%
Others	292	29.3%	266	26.8%
<i>Retired</i>	256	25.7%	217	21.8%
<i>Unidentified</i>	6	0.6%	8	0.8%
<i>Others (unemployed and non-worker included)</i>	30	3.0%	41	4.2%
Total	995	100.0%	992	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>	7		10	

Table 29 Monthly personal income

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=910)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=916)
No income	237	26.0%	248	27.0%
HK\$1 – HK\$3,999	92	10.1%	95	10.4%
HK\$4,000 – HK\$5,999	33	3.6%	41	4.4%
HK\$6,000 – HK\$7,999	26	2.9%	29	3.2%
HK\$8,000 – HK\$9,999	31	3.4%	39	4.3%
HK\$10,000 – HK\$14,999	96	10.5%	107	11.7%
HK\$15,000 – HK\$19,999	111	12.2%	119	13.0%
HK\$20,000 – HK\$24,999	82	9.0%	78	8.6%
HK\$25,000 – HK\$39,999	90	9.9%	83	9.1%
HK\$40,000 or above	112	12.3%	76	8.3%
Total	910	100.0%	916	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>	92		86	

Table 30 Monthly household income

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=773)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=769)
HK\$3,999 or below	54	7.0%	53	6.8%
HK\$4,000 – HK\$5,999	26	3.4%	29	3.7%
HK\$6,000 – HK\$9,999	39	5.0%	37	4.7%
HK\$10,000 – HK\$14,999	74	9.6%	93	12.1%
HK\$15,000 – HK\$19,999	63	8.2%	79	10.3%
HK\$20,000 – HK\$24,999	70	9.1%	75	9.7%
HK\$25,000 – HK\$29,999	58	7.5%	60	7.8%
HK\$30,000 – HK\$39,999	101	13.1%	100	13.0%
HK\$40,000 – HK\$59,999	123	15.9%	111	14.5%
HK\$60,000 or above	165	21.3%	132	17.2%
Total	773	100.0%	769	100.0%
Missing	229		233	

Table 31 Residential district

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=986)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=985)
Hong Kong Island	204	20.7%	181	18.4%
<i>Central and Western District</i>	35	3.5%	30	3.0%
<i>Wan Chai District</i>	7	0.7%	3	0.3%
<i>Eastern District</i>	115	11.7%	107	10.9%
<i>Southern District</i>	47	4.8%	42	4.2%
Kowloon East	128	13.0%	137	14.0%
<i>Wong Tai Sin District</i>	41	4.2%	46	4.6%
<i>Kwun Tong District</i>	87	8.8%	92	9.3%
Kowloon West	145	14.7%	142	14.4%
<i>Sham Shui Po District</i>	52	5.3%	52	5.3%
<i>Kowloon City District</i>	64	6.5%	59	6.0%
<i>Yau Tsim Mong District</i>	29	2.9%	30	3.1%
New Territories East	233	23.6%	231	23.5%
<i>Northern District</i>	31	3.1%	30	3.1%
<i>Tai Po District</i>	29	2.9%	27	2.8%
<i>Sha Tin District</i>	97	9.8%	101	10.2%
<i>Sai Kung District</i>	76	7.7%	73	7.4%
New Territories West	276	28.0%	293	29.7%
<i>Kwai Tsing District</i>	58	5.9%	51	5.1%
<i>Tsuen Wan District</i>	41	4.2%	50	5.1%
<i>Tuen Mun District</i>	77	7.8%	85	8.6%
<i>Yuen Long District</i>	82	8.3%	86	8.8%
<i>Islands District</i>	18	1.8%	21	2.1%
Total	986	100.0%	985	100.0%
Missing	16		17	

Appendix 4

Bilingual Questionnaires



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

Jointly conduct
合作進行

Independent Police Complaints Council
Public Opinion Survey 2016
獨立監察警方處理投訴委員會(監警會)
意見調查 2016

Questionnaire (Final)
調查問卷 (定稿)

March 7, 2016
2016 年 3 月 7 日

Part I Introduction 第一部分 自我介紹

Good evening! My name is X. I'm an interviewer from the Public Opinion Programme of The University of Hong Kong. We would like to ask for your opinion on the works of Independent Police Complaints Council (IPCC) which would only take you a few minutes, and you can choose to terminate the interview any time. Please rest assured that your phone number is randomly selected by our computer and your information provided will be kept strictly confidential and used for aggregate analysis only. If you have any questions about the research, you can call xxxx-xxxx to talk to our supervisor. If you want to know more about the rights as a participant, please contact the University of Hong Kong (full name: Human Research Ethics Committee 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嘅訪問員嚟嘅，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嘅問卷調查。請你放心，你嘅電話號碼係經由我地嘅電腦隨機抽樣抽中嘅，而你提供嘅資料係會絕對保密嘅。如果你對今次嘅訪問有任何疑問，你可以打去熱線電話 xxxx-xxxx 同我地嘅督導員聯絡。如果你想知多啲關於參與研究嘅權利，你可以喺辦公時間致電 xxxx-xxxx 向香港大學（全名為：香港大學研究操守委員會）查詢。為左保障數據嘅真確性，我地嘅訪問可能會被錄音，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? 請問你嘅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)

呢份問卷嘅訪問對象係 **18 歲或以上香港居民**，同埋要每星期住係呢度最少 5 晚嘅，請問你屋企宜家幾多位屬於呢個組別嘅成員呢？【如果戶中有合資格嘅被訪者，訪問告終；多謝合作，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嘅家庭成員都有同等機會接受訪問，所以想請即將生日嗰位嚟聽電話。(訪問員可舉例說明：『即係有冇 3 月或未來三個月內生日嘅人係度?』)【開始訪問前，訪問員必須讀出：為左保障數據嘅真確性，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 → Start the interview

【interviewer please repeat the self-introduction】

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

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

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

可以 – 接聽電話的人士是被訪者 → 開始訪問

可以 – 其他家人是被訪者【訪問員請重覆自我介紹】 → 開始訪問

被選中的家庭成員不在家 / 沒空【訪問員請另約時間再致電】

唔可以 – 家人拒絕回答 → 訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜

唔可以 – 訪者拒絕回答 → 訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜

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

Awareness of IPCC 「監警會」的認知

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

Yes → Continue to Q2a	有 → 續問 Q2a
No → Skip to Q5	冇 → 跳至 Q5
Don't know / hard to say	唔知道 / 難講
Refuse to answer	拒答

[Q2a] From where have you heard of IPCC? Any other channels? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)
請問你係從乜野途徑聽過「監警會」呢？仲有呢？(不讀答案，可答多項)

[Q2b] Have you ever heard of IPCC from the following channels then? (Read out those channels with * which the respondents have not mentioned in Q2a, multiple answers allowed) (* Channels previously adopted by IPCC)
咁你有冇從下面嘅途徑聽過「監警會」呢？(請讀出“*”號而被訪者在 Q2a 沒有提及的途徑，可答多項) (“*”號是「監警會」曾經推出或沿用的宣傳途徑)

	Q2a		Q2b
	First mentioned 第一提及	Other mentioned 其他提及	Have no mentioned 沒有提及
* Television 電視			
TV series (IPCC Files) 電視特輯 (監警有道)			
TV interview 電視訪問			
News 電視新聞			
Now TV programme preview (The IPCC Perspective) Now TV 監警會節目預告 (監警透視)			
Other TV programmes 其他電視節目			
* Radio 電台			
* Newspaper (Probe: Which newspaper?) 報紙 (追問：咁係邊一份?)			
Ming Pao (The IPCC perspective) 明報 (監警透視)			
Sharp Daily (Business of the Cops) 爽報 (關人差事)			
Other newspaper stories (Please specify: _____) 其他報紙訪問及報導 (請註明：_____)			
Magazines 雜誌			

	Q2a		Q2b
	First mentioned 第一提及	Other mentioned 其他提及	Have no mentioned 沒有提及
* Internet (Probe: Which website or app?) 互聯網 (追問: 咁係邊個網站或 app?)			
IPCC website 「監警會」網站			
Website / app of a particular media 媒體專屬網頁 / app			
News aggregation website / app 新聞整合網站 / app			
Social media 社交媒體			
Forum 討論區			
Banner 廣告			
Other online channels (Please specify: _____) 其他網上途徑 (請註明: _____)			
* Advertisements on public transport (Probe: Which public transport?) 公共交通廣告 (追問: 咁係邊一類交通工具?)			
MTR 港鐵			
Light rail 輕鐵			
Bus 巴士			
Tram 電車			
Ferry / Pier 渡海小輪 / 碼頭			
Others (Please specify: _____) 其他 (請註明: _____)			
* Poster (Probe: Where did you see the poster?) Place (Please specify: _____) 海報 (追問: 喺邊度見到海報?) 地點 (請註明: _____)			
* Annual report of IPCC / brochure 「監警會」年報 / 小冊子			
* IPCC newsletter 「監警會」通訊			
* IPCC channel on YouTube YouTube 「監警會頻道」			
* Quarterly meeting between IPCC and CAPO 「監警會」同警察投訴課的季度聯席會議			
* District Fight Crime Committee 分區撲滅罪行委員會			
IPCC symposium 監警有道研討會			
Talks 講座			
Community activities 社區活動			
Friends / neighbours / relatives / schoolmates 朋友 / 鄰居 / 親戚 / 同學			
Others (Please specify: _____) 其他 (請註明: _____)			
Don't know / can't remember 唔知道 / 唔記得			
Refuse to answer 拒答			

[Q3] To your knowledge, what are IPCC's duties? Any other duties? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed, interviewer to probe "any more?", select ALL suitable options. If what the respondents said is NOT equivalent to an option, do NOT ask if he means that. Instead, record his response in "Others".)

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

Correct answers

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

Incorrect answers

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

Others (Please specify: _____)

Don't know / can't remember

Refuse to answer

正確答案

監察「投訴警察課」所處理個案嘅程序 / 監察警方處理投訴
審閱 / 覆檢「投訴警察課」所處理個案嘅調查報告 / 結果
覆檢導致市民投訴嘅警務人員各類行為嘅統計數字
找出警方嘅工作程序中,引起投訴或可能引起投訴嘅不當之處
監察警方對被投訴警務人員採取跟進及紀律行動
改善警隊的**服務質素**

錯誤答案

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

其他 (請註明: _____)

唔知道 / 唔記得

拒答

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

你認為「監警會」係...?(讀出首兩項答案,次序由電腦隨機排列,只選一項)

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

Part of the Police 屬於警隊嘅一部份

Don't know 唔知道

Refuse to answer 拒答

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

你認為市民投訴警察最有效係經邊個渠道呢？(不讀答案，只選一項)

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

Awareness of news on complaints against the Hong Kong Police Force and IPCC

對過去有關投訴香港警察及監警會新聞的認知

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

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

Yes

- Conflicts between Police and citizens during processions, gatherings and demonstrations
- News related to the Occupy Movement
- Use of excessive and unnecessary force
- Assault
- Franklin Chu King-wai police baton assault case
- Seven police officers case / dark corner case / Ken Tsang Kin-chiu case
- Protests against parallel traders / Reclaim Movements
- News related to the Mong Kok conflict
- Mistaken arrest of / Taking statements from a man with intellectual disability
- Police's false testimony / fabrication of evidence
- Suspects wearing masks and shower caps in identity parades
- Detention of reporters pursuing Eddie Ng Hak-kim
- Police officers involved in Tarlac State University forgery case
- Police's misconduct / bad attitude / abusive language
- Police's neglect of duty
- Sexual harassment / indecent assault
- Police's abuse of power
- Others, please specify: _____
- Heard of, but can't remember the content
- Refuse to answer

No

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

有

遊行 / 集會示威發生警民衝突
佔領運動相關新聞
使用過度及不必要武力
毆打 / 襲擊
朱經緯警棍毆打案
暗角七警案 / 曾健超案
反水貨客示威 / 光復行動
年初一旺角衝突相關新聞
誤拘智障男子 / 錄口供事件
警員作假證供 / 捏造證據
認人手續疑犯戴口罩浴帽
記者追訪吳克儉被扣留
警員涉及國力書院偽造文件案
警員行為不當 / 態度欠佳 / 粗言穢語
警員疏忽職守
性騷擾 / 非禮
警員濫權
其他，請註明： _____
唔記得
拒答

冇

唔知道 / 難講
拒答

[Q7] Which one of the following types of complaints of the Police Force would you care about most?
(Read out options, order to be randomized by computer, one answer only)

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

On police officers' abuse of power
On Police handling public demonstration
On press releases arrangement
On media coverage arrangement
On stop and search issue / searching
On officers' law enforcement of traffic regulations
On police officers' use of violence
On corruption of police officers
On investigation method of police officers
On unfairness of police officers in handling cases
On working attitude of police officers
Don't care about any complaints against 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

[Q8] In the past year, did you hear any news on complaints made to IPCC? 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監警會嘅新聞？如有，可唔可以講俾我知係關於乜野？(不讀答案，可答多項，選擇**所有**適用答案。如果被訪者所述答案**不等同**選項，**不要**詢問被訪者他的意思是否某一選項，而是將被訪者所述答案記錄於「其他」。)

Yes

IPCC does not conduct on-site observation during occupy or assemble events
The Chairman of IPCC Mr. Larry Kwok Lam-kwong is not politically neutral / handles complaints unfairly
Some IPCC members are not politically neutral / handle complaints unfairly
IPCC handles complaints unfairly / has a bias in favour of the police or protesters
About the Occupy Movement (no specific incident)
About Franklin Chu King-wai police baton assault case
IPCC's monitoring is ineffective
It takes too long to handle complaints / No result of investigation after a long time / Cases go unattended
Others, please specify: _____
Heard of, but can't remember the content
Refuse to answer

No

Don't know / hard to say
Refuse to answer

冇

於佔領或集會期間不派人到場實地監察警方行動
監警會主席郭琳廣先生政治不中立 / 不公平處理投訴
監警會部分委員政治不中立 / 不公平處理投訴
監警會不公平處理投訴 / 偏幫警察或示威人士
關於佔領運動(不註明具體事項)
關於朱經緯警棍毆打案
監察不力
處理投訴時間太長 / 遲遲未有調查結果 / 案件不了了之
其他，請註明： _____
唔記得
拒答

冇

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」嘅工作，之後請你就你對「監警會」嘅印象回答一啲問題。

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

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

[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嘅身份去監察同覆檢市民投訴警察嘅個案？(讀出答案，只選一項)

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

[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」嘅調查工作呢？(讀出答案，只選一項)

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

[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嘅效率係點？(讀出答案，只選一項)

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

[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」嘅監察同覆檢投訴個案嘅透明度係點？(讀出答案，只選一項)

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

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

請問你對監警會有冇信心？(訪員追問程度)

Very confident → Skip to Q15	好有信心 → 跳至 Q15
Quite confident → Skip to Q15	幾有信心 → 跳至 Q15
Half-half → Skip to Q15	一半半 → 跳至 Q15
Not quite confident (continue to Q14)	唔係幾有信心 / 幾冇信心 → 續問 Q14
Not confident at all (continue to Q14)	好有信心 → 續問 Q14
Don't know / hard to say (do not read out) → Skip to Q15	唔知道 / 冇意見 (不要讀出) → 跳至 Q15
Refuse to answer → Skip to Q15	拒答 → 跳至 Q15

[Q14] (Only ask respondents who have answered "not quite confident" and "not confident at all" in Q13) Why do you think it is "not quite confident" / "not confident at all"? Any more? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed, select ALL suitable options. If what the respondents said is NOT equivalent to an option, do NOT ask if he means that. Instead, record his response in "Others".)

(只問 Q13 答「唔係幾有信心 / 幾冇信心」或「好有信心」的受訪者) 點解你對監警會有信心呢？仲有呢？(不讀答案，可答多項，選擇**所有**適用答案。如果被訪者所述答案**不等同**選項，**不要**詢問被訪者他的意思是否某一選項，而是將被訪者所述答案記錄於「其他」。)

Committees are appointed, not elected by citizens
Police officers could be appointed as committee member
Both are under the Government
It's like self-investigation
Not independent enough

May take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases
Not fair and impartial (without indicating which side IPCC takes side with)
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, only responsible for monitoring and review, no actual authority
Brings little to no effect / Police's misconduct continues
It takes too long to handle complaints / No result of investigation after a long time / Cases go unattended
May cover up the truth to avoid unfavorable impact on Police's image
Have little confidence in the Chairman of IPCC Mr Larry Kwok Lam-kwong
Have little confidence in some IPCC members
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
警員都可以被委任為委員之一
覺得兩者同屬政府人員 / 機構
好似自己人查自己人
不夠獨立
監察或覆檢個案時可能會偏袒警務人員
不公平 / 不公正 (不指明偏向哪一方)
投訴嘅過程同結果都唔會公開
唔覺得佢地會站在市民嘅立場 / 角度調查或者監察投訴
佢地唔會直接處理投訴, 只係負責監察同覆檢工作, 冇實權
沒有效用 / 效用小 / 警察依然做錯
處理投訴時間太長 / 遲遲未有調查結果 / 案件不了了之
為避免不利消息影響警方形象, 可能會隱瞞事實真相
不信任監警會主席郭琳廣先生
不信任監警會部分委員
唔係好清楚監警會嘅工作 / 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 to probe intensity)

請問你對現時兩層架構嘅投訴警察制度有冇信心?(訪員追問程度)

Very confident → Skip to Q17

好有信心 → 跳至 Q17

Quite confident → Skip to Q17

幾有信心 → 跳至 Q17

Half-half → Skip to Q17

一半半 → 跳至 Q17

Not quite confident (continue to Q16)

唔係幾有信心 / 幾冇信心 → 續問 Q16

Not confident at all (continue to Q16)

好冇信心 → 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, select ALL suitable options. If what the respondents said is NOT equivalent to an option, do NOT ask if he means that. Instead, record his response in “Others”.)

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

IPCC should have authorization to investigate so that it can receive complaints and investigate directly
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
Change the method for forming the Council
Involve individuals from different classes in the process
IPCC should become an independent department
Handle complaints fairly and impartially
Improve work efficiency
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, 直接接受投訴並直接調查

監警會應該要有調查嚴重個案嘅權利

監警會應該有權決定對違規警員嘅懲罰

縮短調查及覆檢嘅時間

簡化調查及覆檢嘅程序

提高透明度

增加宣傳

改變委員會組成嘅方法

讓不同階層人士都可參與其中

監警會要成為一個獨立部門

公平公正處理投訴

加強工作效率

其他 (請註明: _____)

沒有需要改善嘅地方

唔知道 / 難講

拒答

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

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

Positive (continue to Q18)

正面 → 續問 Q18

Quite positive (continue to Q18)

頗正面 → 續問 Q18

Half-half → Skip to Q19

一般 → 跳至 Q19

Quite negative (continue to Q18)

頗負面 → 續問 Q18

Negative (continue to Q18)

負面 → 續問 Q18

Don't know / hard to say (do not read out) → Skip to Q19

唔知道 / 冇意見 (不要讀出) → 跳至 Q19

Refuse to answer → Skip to Q19

拒答 → 跳至 Q19

[Q18] (Only ask respondents who have answered “positive” and “quite positive” in Q17) Why do you think it is “positive” or “quite positive” or “quite negative” or “negative”? Any more? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed, select ALL suitable options. If what the respondents said is NOT equivalent to an option, do NOT ask if he means that. Instead, record his response in “Others”.)

(只問 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, 可答多項, 選擇所有適用答案。如果被訪者所述答案不等同選項, 不要詢問被訪者他的意思是否某一選項, 而是將被訪者所述答案記錄於「其他」。)

Positive answers

- IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review
- IPCC is independent enough
- IPCC is fair enough
- IPCC has high transparency
- IPCC has high efficiency
- IPCC has sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties
- IPCC provides a helpful monitoring system / mechanism
- IPCC's structure gives people confidence
- IPCC fulfills its duties
- IPCC's work brings an impact
- IPCC's image / name is positive
- No / Little bad news about IPCC
- Intuition / Impression / Personal feeling
- Other positive answers (Please specify: _____)

Negative answers

- Don't think IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review
- No trust in IPCC's independence
- IPCC might take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases
- IPCC is not fair and impartial (without indicating which side IPCC takes side with)
- IPCC has low transparency
- IPCC has low efficiency
- IPCC doesn't have sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties
- IPCC's work does not bring an impact
- Other negative answers (Please specify: _____)

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

正面答案

- 監警會人員有足夠及專業知識去做監察同覆檢嘅工作
- 監警會夠獨立
- 監警會夠公正
- 監警會嘅透明度好高
- 監警會嘅效率好高
- 監警會有足夠嘅權力去履行職責
- 監警會提供監察系統 / 機制有助監察
- 監警會架構使人安心 / 有信心
- 監警會有履行職責
- 監警會工作有成效
- 監警會形象 / 名稱正面
- 監警會沒有 / 少負面新聞
- 直覺 / 印象 / 個人感覺
- 其他正面答案 (請註明: _____)

負面答案

不相信監警會人員有足夠及專業知識去做監察同覆檢嘅工作

不相信監警會嘅獨立性

監警會係監察 / 覆檢個案時可能會偏袒警務人員

監警會不公平 / 不公正 (不指明偏向哪一方)

監警會嘅透明度好低

監警會嘅效率好低

監警會有足夠權力去履行職責

監警會工作沒有成效

其他負面答案 (請註明: _____)

唔知道 / 難講

拒答

[Q19] Are you satisfied with the performance of IPCC? (Interviewer to probe intensity)

咁你對「監警會」嘅表現滿唔滿意?(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 IPCC's performance. 0 stands for very dissatisfied, 100 stands for very satisfied, 50 stands for half-half. How would you rate it?

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

_____ (Input exact figure)

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

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

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

Hope IPCC can monitor HK Police Force's work effectively

Hope IPCC can pressure HK Police Force 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

Hope IPCC can handle cases in a fair, impartial and transparent manner

Hope IPCC can improve its transparency

Hope IPCC can become an independent organization / handle complaint cases directly

Hope IPCC can increase its efficiency

Hope IPCC will keep up with its good work

Hope IPCC can do better

Hope IPCC can have more promotion of its work

Hope IPCC can change the method for selecting its members

Hope IPCC can broaden its member base

Hope IPCC can expand its mandated functions

Hope IPCC is not swayed by external influence

Others (Please specify: _____)

No expectation

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嘅工作

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嘅工作 / 投訴機制

希望監警會可以保障市民得到適當嘅警察服務

希望監警會可以提供投訴香港警察嘅渠道

希望監警會處事公平公正公開

希望監警會提高透明度

希望監警會可以成為獨立機構 / 直接處理投訴個案

希望監警會提高效率

希望監警會繼續做好現時工作

希望監警會做得更好

希望監警會加強宣傳其工作

希望監警會改變組成委員的方法

希望監警會讓不同人士成為委員

希望可以擴大監警會嘅法定職能

希望監警會不受外界影響

其他 (請註明: _____)

沒有期望

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.

我地想請問您一啲簡單嘅個人資料以作綜合分析，你所提供嘅資料係會絕對保密，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的被訪者) 年齡範圍 (訪問員可讀出範圍)

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

[DM3] Education Attainment 教育程度

Not educated, pre-elementary education	未受教育 / 學前教育
Primary	小學
Junior secondary (F.1-F.3)	初中 (中一至中三)
Senior secondary (F.4-F.5, vocational training included)	高中 (中四至中五包括工藝程度)
Matriculation (F.6-F.7)	預科 (中六至中七)
Tertiary, non-degree (Diploma / Certificate)	專上非學位 (文憑 / 證書課程)
Tertiary, non-degree (Associate degree)	專上非學位 (副學士課程)
Tertiary, degree	專上學位
Postgraduate or above	研究院或以上
Refuse to answer	拒答

[DM4] Occupation 職業

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

[DM5] 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 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 同我地嘅督導員聯絡，或者喺辦公時間打 xxxx-xxxx 向香港大學研究操守委員會查詢今次訪問嘅真確性同埋核對我嘅身分。拜拜！

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

***** 問卷完 *****