

THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG
PUBLIC OPINION PROGRAMME

Independent Police Complaints Council
Public Opinion Survey 2015



Final Report

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

7 July 2015

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 of the IPCC	10
IV.	Conclusion	13

Appendices

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

I. Preamble

- 1.1 The Public Opinion Programme (POP) was established in June 1991 to collect and study public opinion on topics which could be of interest to academics, journalists, policy-makers, and the general public. POP was at first under the Social Sciences Research Centre, a unit under the Faculty of Social Sciences of The University of Hong Kong, it was transferred to the Journalism and Media Studies Centre in The University of Hong Kong in May 2000. In January 2002, it was transferred back to the Faculty of Social Sciences in The University of Hong Kong. Since its establishment, POP has been providing quality survey services to a wide range of public and private organizations, on condition that they allow the POP Team to design and conduct the research independently, and to bear the final responsibilities. POP also insists that the data collected should be open for public consumption in the long run.
- 1.2 In December 2012, the Independent Police Complaints Council (IPCC) commissioned POP, 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 and then this year to repeat the survey using similar research designs and opinion questions. This “Independent Police Complaints Council Public Opinion Survey 2015” was the 3rd survey in the row.
- 1.3 The research instrument used in this study was designed entirely by the POP Team after consulting with the IPCC and making reference to the last survey and some questionnaires previously used by the IPCC for tracking their image attributes. Fieldwork operations and data analysis were also conducted independently by the POP Team, without interference from any outside parties. In other words, POP was given full autonomy to design and conduct the survey, and POP would take full responsibility for all the findings reported herewith.

II. Research Design

- 2.1 This was a random telephone survey conducted by interviewers under close supervision. To minimize sampling bias, telephone numbers were randomly generated using known prefixes assigned to telecommunication services providers under the Numbering Plan provided by the Office of the Communications Authority (OFCA). Invalid numbers were then eliminated according to computer and manual dialing records to produce the final sample.
- 2.2 The target population of this survey was **Hong Kong residents aged 18 or above who spoke Cantonese**. When telephone contact was successfully established with a target household, one person of age 18 or above who spoke Cantonese was selected. If more than one subject had been available, selection was made using the “next birthday rule” which selected the person who had his/her birthday next.
- 2.3 Telephone interviews were conducted during the period of **3 to 13 March, 2015**. A total of **1,014 Hong Kong residents** of age 18 or above were successfully interviewed. As shown in the calculation of Appendix 1, the overall response rate of this survey was **66.4%** (Table 1), and the standard sampling error for percentages based on this sample was less than 1.6 percentage points. In other words, the sampling error for all percentages using the total sample was less than plus/minus 3.1 percentage points at 95% confidence level.
- 2.4 As shown in Table 2 of Appendix 1, among the 17,266 telephone numbers sampled for the survey, 3,075 were confirmed to be ineligible, among them 860 were fax or data lines, 1,458 were invalid telephone numbers, 95 were call-forwarding numbers, while another 585 were non-residential numbers. Besides, 63 of them were invalidated due to special technological reasons, while 14 cases were voided because target respondents were unavailable at the numbers provided.
- 2.5 Meanwhile, a total of 7,766 telephone numbers were invalidated before the research team could confirm their eligibility. Among them, 564 were busy lines and 5,733 were no-answer calls after making a maximum of 5 times’ recalls. 665 cases were diverted to answering devices while another 29 were blocked. Moreover, 321 cases were treated as unsuccessful because of language problems, while 449 interviews were terminated before the screening question and 5 cases were voided for other problems.

- 2.6 On the other hand, 5,411 cases failed to complete the interview. Among them 8 rejected the interview on behalf of the household and 6 rejected the interview immediately after their eligibility was confirmed. Besides, 5,340 were unfinished cases with appointment dates beyond the end of fieldwork period. Another 50 cases were incomplete due to unexpected termination of interviews, 7 were classified as miscellaneous due to other non-contact problems, and the remaining 1,014 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 2014 year-end and the educational attainment (highest level attended) distribution collected in the 2011 Census. All figures in this report are based on the weighted sample.
- 2.8 Statistical tests of “difference-of-proportions” and “difference-of-means” have been employed whenever applicable, so as to identify any significant difference between the 2014 and 2015 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 on 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 2014 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.

Awareness of the IPCC

- 3.1 The first part of survey aimed at gauging respondent's general awareness of the IPCC and its job nature. This year, over 80% of the respondents (85%) had heard of the IPCC prior to the interview, representing an 18-percentage-point significant increase from last year, whereas only about one in seven (14%) said they had not (Table 3).

- 3.2 The survey continued to ask those respondents who had heard of the IPCC from where they had heard about it. They were first asked to name the channels they learnt about the IPCC, and then they were prompted with the channels that they had not mentioned. Without prompting, more than three-quarters (78%) of these respondents immediately mentioned television, including TV news (71%), TV interviews (3%), TV series ("IPCC Files") (2%) and other TV programmes (3%), which was apparently the most common source of information. Followed at a large distance, newspapers, including Ming Pao ("The IPCC Perspective") (1%) and other newspaper stories (6%), were mentioned by 7% of the respondents. Another 6% mentioned radio, while 2% each said they had heard of the IPCC from the Internet and from friends, neighbours, relatives or schoolmates. Only less than 1% mentioned magazines. Whilst after prompting, more than 90% (95%) of the respondents stated that they had heard of the IPCC from television, mostly from TV news (91%), while less than half (48%) of the respondents stated that they had read about the IPCC from newspapers, mostly from newspaper stories (39%) other than "The IPCC Perspective" and "Business of the Cops". The Internet has been an increasingly common way through which respondents heard about the IPCC, as about one-third (33%) of the respondents had heard of the IPCC through the Internet, up 11 percentage points from last year. Besides, another one-third (33%) of respondents recalled they had heard about the IPCC on radio, followed by advertisements on public transport (15%) and annual report / brochure / newsletter / YouTube channel / quarterly meeting of the IPCC (6%). Moreover, 4% recalled hearing of the IPCC from friends, neighbours, relatives or schoolmates and 3% recalled seeing IPCC-related information from posters. Only 2% read about the IPCC from magazines (Table 4).

- 3.3 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. The percentage is significantly higher than last year's 40%, and is similar to the figure in 2013's survey (48%). Among them, most correctly pointed out that IPCC was responsible for "monitoring CAPO's cases handling process" (23%). "Monitoring Police's follow-up / disciplinary actions towards officers being complained" came next and was correctly named by one-sixth (17%) of the sub-sample. Less than 10% of these respondents correctly named "identifying mal-practices in Police's works that has led or may lead to complaints" (8%), "reviewing / verifying investigation report / results by CAPO" (6%), "improving Police Force's quality of service" (2%) and "reviewing statistics on types of Police's behavior that citizens complained" (1%). On the other hand, more than half of the respondents (54%) misunderstood at least one IPCC's duty. Two-fifths of the sub-sample (39%) mistakenly thought that "monitoring Police's behavior / conduct" was one of IPCC's duties, representing an 8 percentage-point decrease from a year ago. Another 17% of the sub-sample mistakenly thought that "investigating citizens' complaints on Police directly" was IPCC's duty. Meanwhile, about one-ninth (11%) admitted they had no idea what IPCC's duties were. Other less common answers are listed in Table 5 of Appendix 2.
- 3.4 As for the independent nature of the IPCC, among the 867 respondents who had heard of the IPCC prior to the interview, two-thirds (67%) were aware that the IPCC was a totally independent organization that was not under the Police. On the contrary, a quarter (25%) thought the IPCC was part of the Police and 7% opted for "don't know / hard to say". Over the years, more people have come to know that the IPCC is not under the Police (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 more than a third of the respondents (35%) mentioning it, which is significantly more than that in the previous two years. It is followed by the CAPO which was mentioned by one-fifth of the respondents (20%). The media (9%) and the Police Force (8%) formed the next tier with close to one-tenth mentioning each. Other complaint channels that came to respondents' minds were DC/LegCo members (2%), the ICAC (1%) and the Office of the Ombudsman, HK (1%). Meanwhile, 2% expressed that no channel was effective in making complaints against the Police Force. The increase, when compared to the last year's figure (<1%), is statistically significant. Besides, the percentage of respondents who said they did not know which channel was the most effective dropped from 27% to 19% (Table 7).

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. This year, more than 90% of the respondents (91%) had heard about news on such complaints in the year prior to the interview, significantly up 14 percentage points from 77% in 2014. "News related to the Occupy Movement" attracted the most public attention, with more than half (55%) naming it without being prompted. Followed at a distance, about one-sixth (17%) of the respondents reported that they had heard about news on Police's "use of excessive and unnecessary force". "Conflicts between Police and citizens during processions, gatherings and demonstrations" continued to be a popular item, but the percentage of the respondents mentioning it has reduced by half to 15% this year. On the other hand, one-seventh of the respondents (14%) talked about the incident of "seven police officers beat up Ken Tsang Kin-chiu / a protester on a street corner". Other less commonly cited news included "ill-treatment of protesters" (6%), "assaulting protesters" (5%), "Police's misconduct / bad attitude / abusive language" (5%), "use of tear gas grenades to disperse protesters" (3%) and "inappropriate use of pepper spray" (3%). Other answers mentioned by 2% of the respondents or less are listed in Table 8 of Appendix 2. When compared to previous findings, significantly fewer respondents (4%, down from 24% in 2014) 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, representing a significant drop of 9 percentage points from the 15% registered in the 2014 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 third consecutive time, with about one-fifth (22%) opting for it. "Police officers' use of violence" came next, as close to one-fifth (19%) of the respondents said they cared about it most, representing a significant 12-percentage-point jump from last year's 7%. About one-seventh (15%) of the respondents said they cared about complaints on "unfairness of police officers in handling cases" most, while about one-eighth opted for "corruption of police officers" (12%). Other types of complaints that less commonly be regarded as the respondents' largest concerns included "Police handling public demonstration" (8%), "working attitude of police officers" (5%), "stop and search issue / searching" (3%) and "officers' law enforcement of traffic regulations" (2%). There were also 5% 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 A new question was introduced in this year's survey to ask the respondents if they had heard of any news on complaints made against the IPCC. A majority of 60% said they had not heard any, whereas slightly over one-third (35%) replied yes, among whom 12% could not specify the news they had heard of. The two most frequently cited news items were "IPCC did not conduct on-site observation during occupy or assemble events" and "some IPCC members were not politically neutral / handled complaints unfairly", both were mentioned by 8% of the respondents. Moreover, 2% of the respondents specifically mentioned "Mr. Larry Kwok Lam-kwong as the Chairman of the IPCC was not politically neutral / handled complaints unfairly", while 1% said they heard about "IPCC handled complaints unfairly / had a bias in favour of the police or protesters" (Table 10).

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. More than half of the sample (52%) evaluated IPCC's independence positively in monitoring and reviewing public complaints of the Police, with 35% considering the IPCC "independent" and 18% thought it was "quite independent". About one-fifth (18%) opted for the middle ground "half-half". On the other hand, more than one-fifth (22%) evaluated this aspect of the IPCC negatively, with 13% opting for "not quite independent" and 9% even thought it was "not independent at all". It should be noted that significantly more respondents opted for "not independent at all" this year, up 4 percentage points from 5% last year. Besides, 7% of the respondents answered "don't know / hard to say" (Table 11).
- 3.10 When it came to IPCC's work on monitoring and reviewing CAPO's investigations, more than two-fifths (44%) believed that the IPCC was able to do so in an impartial and objective way, among which 24% considered it "impartial and objective" and 20% thought it was "quite impartial and objective". On the contrary, 19% believed it was not, including 11% opted for "not quite impartial and objective" and 8% even said "not impartial and objective at all". The percentage of the respondents who opted for "not impartial and objective at all" has doubled this year and the increase is statistically significant. Meanwhile, more than a quarter (27%) opted for "half-half" and one-tenth (10%) of the respondents did not know or found it hard to say (Table 12).
- 3.11 With regards to IPCC's efficiency in monitoring and reviewing complaints, close to one-third (32%) thought its performance was mediocre and chose "half-half". Meanwhile, more than a quarter (27%) generally thought it was efficient and one-fifth (20%) thought the opposite. Among those who thought it was generally efficient, 13% answered "efficient" and

14% answered “quite efficient” after probing. As for those who thought it was generally not efficient, 12% said it was “not quite efficient”, while 8% said it was “not efficient at all”, up from only 3% last year. At the same time, one-fifth of the respondents (20%) said they did not know or found it hard to say, representing a significant drop of 9 percentage points from that of last year (Table 13).

3.12 On IPCC’s level of transparency in monitoring and reviewing complaints, nearly two-fifths of respondents (37%) assessed it as “half-half”. More than a quarter of the sample (27%) thought IPCC’s work was of low transparency, with 12% opting for “quite low” and 16% opting for “low”. The latter figure has increased significantly by 4 percentage points as compared to last year. On the contrary, more than one-fifth (22%) positively appraised IPCC’s transparency, including 12% who said it was “quite high” and 11% said it was “high”. Meanwhile, 13% could not give a definite answer to this question, representing a significant 4-percentage-point drop from last year (Table 14).

3.13 The survey then asked if the respondents are confident in the IPCC in general. The results showed that a total of 44% who expressed confidence in the IPCC including one-eighth (13%) who were “very confident” and just less than one-third (31%) who were “quite confident”, the latter has significantly dropped by 5 percentage points from last year. Similar to last year, around a quarter of the respondents opted for “half-half” (27%). Meanwhile, another quarter of the respondents said that they were not confident about the IPCC (24%), including 13% who said “not quite confident” and 11% who said “not confident at all”, a significant increase from just 6% last year. The most commonly cited reason for no confidence this year was that the IPCC “may take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases”, accounted for 20% of the “not confident” sub-sample, up 8 percentage points from the 12% last year. In terms of relative rankings, this reason only ranked the fourth in 2014. Other reasons that were frequently cited included “committees are appointed, not elected by citizens” (20%), “it’s like self-investigation” (19%), “the process and results of complaints are not released to public” (18%) and “both are under the Government” (14%). Moreover, 7% said they were not confident in the IPCC because they were “not clear about IPCC’s works”, while 6% said there was “no direct investigation”, that the IPCC could “monitor only” and had “no actual authority”. Other less frequently cited reasons included “brings little to no effect / Police’s misconduct continues”, “have little confidence in some IPCC members”, “it takes too long to handle complaints / no result of investigation after a long time / cases go unattended” and “don’t think the IPCC investigates or monitors complaints in citizen’s perspective”, with 4% of the sub-sample mentioning each of these four. Meanwhile, 4% could not explain why they were not confident in the IPCC (Tables 15 & 16).

3.14 Regarding the existing complaints system, significantly fewer respondents expressed confidence in the two-tier system this year. Specifically, more than two-fifths of the respondents (44%) expressed confidence in the two-tier system, including 13% opted for “very confident” and 31% opted for “quite confident”. A quarter (25%) opted for “half-half”, 15% said they were “not quite confident” and 9% even said they were “not confident at all”, meaning that nearly a quarter of the respondents (24%) appraised the two-tier system negatively. This figure is significantly higher than the 19% registered a year ago. Among those who lacked confidence in the system, a fifth of them suggested the IPCC to “increase transparency” (22%) in the future, while 15% suggested the IPCC to “involve individuals from different classes in the process” and one-tenth (11%) suggested “changing the method for selecting IPCC members”. This year, significantly more people suggested that “the IPCC should receive complaints and investigate directly”, up from just 2% last year to 11%. Then, less than one-tenth each proposed that “the IPCC should have authorization to investigate” (7%), “the IPCC should become an independent department” (5%) and “the IPCC should have authorization to investigate serious cases” (5%), while 4% each believed that the IPCC should “shorten the time for investigation and review”, “handle complaints fairly and impartially”, “improve work efficiency” and that “the IPCC should have authorization to decide punitive sanctions on police officers who violated regulations”. Another 2% of the sub-sample said nothing needed to be improved, while as high as 26% had no idea how the IPCC could further improve (Tables 17 & 18).

Overall perception on the IPCC

3.15 The last part of the survey aimed at investigating citizens’ overall perception of the IPCC. Compared with the last survey, this year’s results revealed that one-tenth of the respondents perceived IPCC’s image negatively (10%), with 5% each thinking it was “negative” and “quite negative”, representing an overall 4-percentage-point significant increase from last year. Nearly 30% (28%) evaluated IPCC’s image as half positive and half negative. Still, more than half of the respondents (56%) perceived IPCC’s image positively, including 34% who regarded it as “positive” and 22% as “quite positive”. The remaining 5% could not give a definite answer to the question (Table 19).

3.16 So, what made the 571 respondents perceive IPCC’s image positively? Results showed that the most popular reason this year was that they believed “the IPCC was fair enough” (21%), which was closely followed by “the IPCC was independent enough” (20%). One-eighth each said “IPCC’s structure gave people confidence” (12%) and “IPCC members had sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review”. Those who believed “the IPCC provided a helpful monitoring system / mechanism” and “the IPCC had high transparency”

accounted for 9% and 8% of the sub-sample. Other less commonly cited reasons included “the IPCC had sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties” (6%), “no / little bad news about the IPCC” (4%), “the IPCC had high efficiency” (4%), simply “intuition / impression / personal feeling” (3%), and so on. At the same time, more than one-tenth of the sub-sample could not provide any reason for their positive perception of the IPCC (13%; Table 20).

- 3.17 The survey results also revealed that among the 105 respondents who perceived IPCC’s image negatively, significantly more thought so this year because they were of the view that “the IPCC might take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases”. The figure surged from just 7% of the sub-sample last year to 28% this year. At the same time, notably fewer respondents said “the IPCC had low transparency” (21%), which was the most frequently mentioned reason in previous two years. About one-fifth each said they “didn’t trust IPCC’s independence” (19%) and “the IPCC had low efficiency” (18%). Meanwhile, much more respondents believed that “the IPCC didn’t have sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties” (15%), up from 3% last year. Other reasons mentioned by about one-tenth of the sub-sample each included “didn’t think IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review” (10%), “the IPCC was not fair and impartial” (9%) and “IPCC’s work did not bring an impact” (8%), whereas another 5% did not give a definite answer (Table 21).
- 3.18 The survey then tried to gauge citizen’s satisfaction with the performance of the IPCC. Results showed that two-fifths of the respondents were satisfied (40%), with 34% opting for “quite satisfied” and 6% opting for “very much satisfied” respectively. About one-third evaluated IPCC’s performance as “half-half” (32%). On the other hand, 15% said they were not satisfied with IPCC’s performance, with 10% said they were “quite dissatisfied” and 5% said they were “very much dissatisfied”. All three figures have increased significantly when compared to last year’s results. Meanwhile, 13% could not give a definite answer to this question, significantly down by 8 percentage points from 21% last year. Another question asked the respondents to rate their satisfaction with IPCC’s performance on a scale of 0-100, with 0 indicating very dissatisfied, 100 indicating very satisfied and 50 indicating half-half. The mean score was 60.3 marks with a standard error of 0.7 marks, representing a significant decrease of 2.2 marks from the 62.5 marks registered in 2014 (Tables 22 & 23).
- 3.19 The survey ended by asking all respondents their expectations on the IPCC. More than one-third of the respondents (37%) hoped “the IPCC would handle cases in a fair, impartial and transparent manner”, representing a significant increase of 13 percentage points from one year ago. Meanwhile, close to one-fifth (19%) hoped “the IPCC would improve its transparency”, up 4 percentage points from 15% last year. Those who hoped the IPCC “could become an independent organization / handle cases independently”, “would keep up with its good work” and “could increase their efficiency” formed the next tier with 11%,

10% and 9% mentioning these respectively. All three figures have registered significant increase this year. On the other hand, the percentage of those who hoped “the IPCC could monitor HK Police Force’s work effectively” decreased from 16% to 7% this year. Besides, 5% hoped the IPCC “could have more promotion of its work”, 4% hoped it “could broaden its member base” and 3% hoped it “could ensure citizens would get appropriate Police services”. Other less frequently mentioned expectations are listed in Table 24 of Appendix 2. There were also 5% who said they had no expectations on the IPCC, whereas 16% did not know what to expect from the IPCC (Table 24).

IV. Conclusion

- 4.1 This year, 85% of the respondents had heard of the IPCC, which is a visible 18-percentage-point improvement when compared to last year's 67%. 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 (54%) misunderstood IPCC's duties in one way or another. "Monitoring CAPO's cases handling process" was IPCC's most visible function again, and still two-fifths (39%) incorrectly thought "monitoring Police's behavior / conduct" was one of IPCC's duties. Moreover, two-thirds (67%) of those heard of the IPCC were aware that the IPCC was a totally independent organization, while a quarter (25%) thought it was part of the Police Force. More people have learnt over the years that IPCC is not a unit under the Police, and more people have come to think that the IPCC is the most effective channel to lodge complaints against the Police.
- 4.2 The survey this year was conducted three months after the Occupy Movement ended. Most of the respondents (91%) said they had heard of news related to complaints against the Police in the year past. News related to the Occupy Movement have received most public attention, while Police's use of excessive and unnecessary force, conflicts between Police and citizens during processions, gatherings and demonstrations, as well as the incident of "seven police officers beating up Ken Tsang Kin-chiu / a protestor on a street corner" came next. Police officers' abuse of power continued to top the list of complaints which respondents cared most, while police officers' use of violence quickly rose to the second place this year. When it came to the IPCC, however, only one-third (35%) had heard of news on complaints against the IPCC, and most of them could not recall the content.
- 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, but the margin has narrowed to 20 percentage points this year. Over two-fifths of the sample (44%) expressed confidence in the system, and the most popular suggestion for improvement offered by the non-confident group remained the same in three annual surveys - to increase transparency. Regarding the effectiveness of complaint channels against Police, significantly more respondents this year (35%) believed the IPCC was most effective, another one-fifth chose CAPO.

- 4.4 Overall speaking, respondents' net satisfaction of the IPCC's performance has dropped from 30 to 25 percentage points, while satisfaction rating dropped from 62.5 to 60.3 on a scale of 0 to 100. As for people's confidence in the IPCC, 44% expressed confidence in it while 24% was not, giving a net confidence of 20 percentage points.
- 4.5 On people's general perception of the IPCC, more than half (56%) thought IPCC's image was positive, 10% chose negative, giving a net positive value of 46 percentage points. Image profile analysis shows that IPCC is consistently perceived as an independent and impartial/objective organization, somewhat efficient, but not very transparent. Significantly more people gave very negative opinions to these questions this year.
- 4.6 As for the reasons of the respondents' views, those who found IPCC's image positive thought the IPCC was fair and independent enough, while those who thought the opposite were worried that IPCC might take side with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases.
- 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 three consecutive years, with more than one-third mentioning this wish.
- 4.8 All in all, IPCC has become more well-known to the public, probably due to its work related to the Occupy Movement. However, the polarizing political environment and the hardship faced by the Hong Kong Police Force has also posted new challenges to the IPCC, the remit of which is to monitor and review the police' handling of complain cases.

Appendix 1

Contact Information

Table 1. Calculation of Overall response rate

Response rate
= $\frac{\text{Successful cases}}{\text{Successful cases} + \text{Incomplete cases}^{\wedge} + \text{Refusal cases by eligible respondents}^{\#}}$
= $\frac{1,014}{1,014 + (50 + 449) + (8 + 6)}$
= 66.4%

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

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

Table 2. Breakdown of contact information of the survey

	Frequency	Percentage
Respondents' ineligibility confirmed	3,075	17.8%
<i>Fax / data line</i>	860	5.0%
<i>Invalid number</i>	1,458	8.4%
<i>Call-forwarding / mobile / pager number</i>	95	0.6%
<i>Non-residential number</i>	585	3.4%
<i>Special technological difficulties</i>	63	0.4%
<i>No eligible respondents</i>	14	0.1%
Respondents' ineligibility not confirmed	7,766	45.0%
<i>Line busy</i>	564	3.3%
<i>No answer</i>	5,733	33.2%
<i>Answering device</i>	665	3.9%
<i>Call-blocking</i>	29	0.2%
<i>Language problem</i>	321	1.9%
<i>Interview terminated before the screening question</i>	449	2.6%
<i>Others</i>	5	<0.1%
Respondents' eligibility confirmed, but failed to complete the interview	5,411	31.3%
<i>Household-level refusal</i>	8	<0.1%
<i>Known respondent refusal</i>	6	<0.1%
<i>Appointment date beyond the end of the fieldwork period</i>	5,340	30.9%
<i>Partial interview</i>	50	0.3%
<i>Miscellaneous</i>	7	<0.1%
Successful cases	1,014	5.9%
Total	17,266	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 IPCC

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

	2013	2014	2015	
	Percentage (Base=1,009)	Percentage (Base=1,039)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,014)
Yes	68.3%	66.9%	867	85.5%**
No	30.8%	32.0%	144	14.2%**
Don't know / hard to say	0.8%	1.1%	3	0.3%*
Total	100.0%	100.0%	1,014	100.0%

Table 4. [Q2a] (Only ask those answered “yes” in Q1, base=867) From where have you heard of IPCC? Any other channels? (Do not read out answers, multiple choices allowed)

[Q2b] (Only ask those answered “yes” in Q1, base=867) 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		2015		
	[Q2a]	[Q2a+Q2b]	[Q2a]	[Q2a+Q2b]	[Q2a] First mention	[Q2a+Q2b] Overall			
	% of valid sample (Base=698)	% of valid sample (Base=698)	% of valid sample (Base=700)	% of valid sample (Base=700)	Frequency	% of valid sample (Base=860)	Frequency	% of total responses (Base=3,010)	% of valid sample (Base=864)
^Television	76.9%	94.2%	74.1%	93.2%	674	78.4%*	822	--	95.1%
<i>News</i>	64.5%	86.1%	64.1%	85.1%	607	70.6%**	788	26.2%	91.2%**
<i>TV interview</i>	3.3%	30.0%	3.5%	26.7%	22	2.6%	271	9.0%	31.3%*
<i>TV series (IPCC Files)[#]</i>	2.9%	20.7%	2.6%	15.6%*	17	2.0%	145	4.8%	16.8%
<i>Now TV programme preview (The IPCC Perspective)</i>	--	--	--	3.5%**	1	0.1%	31	1.0%	3.6%
<i>Other TV programmes</i>	6.2%	28.3%	3.9%*	18.0%**	27	3.1%	189	6.3%	21.9%
^Newspaper	9.1%	50.3%	11.9%	47.9%	63	7.3%**	411	--	47.6%
<i>Ming Pao (The IPCC perspective)</i>	1.2%	12.8%	1.5%	7.2%**	12	1.4%	91	3.0%	10.5%*
<i>Sharp Daily (Business of the Cops)</i>	0.3%	13.2%	0.2%	6.2%**	--	--	47	1.6%	5.5%
<i>Other newspaper stories (see below)</i>	7.5%	35.7%	10.2%	40.4%*	51	5.9%**	338	11.2%	39.1%
^Internet^{##}	2.0%	15.8%	1.8%	22.3%**	19	2.2%	284	--	32.9%**
<i>Social media</i>	--	--	--	--	8	0.9%	134	4.5%	15.5%
<i>News aggregation website / app</i>	--	--	--	--	3	0.4%	119	4.0%	13.8%
<i>Forum</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	97	3.2%	11.2%
<i>Website / app of a particular media</i>	--	--	--	--	2	0.2%	65	2.2%	7.6%
<i>^IPCC website</i>	0.1%	2.1%	--	1.4%	2	0.2%	38	1.2%	4.3%**
<i>Other online channels (see below)</i>	--	--	--	--	4	0.5%	23	0.8%	2.7%
^Radio	5.4%	30.4%	6.4%	30.5%	55	6.5%	283	9.4%	32.8%

	2013		2014		2015		2015		
	[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] First mention Frequency	% of valid sample (Base=860)	[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted) Frequency	% of total responses (Base=3,010)	% of valid sample (Base=864)
^Advertisements on public transport	0.3%	10.7%	--	12.5%	--	--	132	--	15.3%
<i>MTR</i>	0.2%	5.8%	--	6.7%	--	--	88	2.9%	10.2%*
<i>Bus</i>	0.2%	6.1%	--	6.8%	--	--	58	1.9%	6.8%
<i>Light rail</i>	--	--	--	1.9%**	--	--	14	0.5%	1.6%
<i>Ferry / Pier</i>	--	1.6%	--	1.2%	--	--	11	0.4%	1.3%
<i>Tram</i>	--	--	--	0.8%*	--	--	9	0.3%	1.1%
<i>Others (see below)</i>	--	--	--	0.6%	--	--	3	0.1%	0.3%
^Annual report / Brochure / Newsletter / YouTube channel / Quarterly meeting of IPCC###	0.3%	5.7%	--	7.8%	--	--	54	--	6.2%
<i>Quarterly meeting between IPCC and CAPO</i>	0.1%	2.7%	--	3.7%	--	--	30	1.0%	3.4%
<i>IPCC channel on YouTube</i>	--	--	--	1.9%**	--	--	18	0.6%	2.1%
<i>Annual report of IPCC / brochure</i>	0.2%	1.5%	--	2.3%	--	--	11	0.4%	1.3%
<i>IPCC newsletter</i>	--	1.4%	--	1.0%	--	--	5	0.2%	0.6%
^Poster (see below)	--	1.6%	--	2.0%	--	--	30	1.0%	3.5%
Magazines	0.1%	1.2%	0.3%	0.8%	5	0.6%	14	0.5%	1.6%
Others	3.4%	8.3%	4.0%	7.5%	29	3.4%	51	--	5.9%
<i>Friends / neighbours / relatives / schoolmates</i>	1.3%	3.5%	1.7%	3.5%	17	2.0%	39	1.3%	4.5%
<i>Community activities</i>	0.3%	0.6%	--	0.5%	--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
<i>Talks</i>	0.1%	0.2%	0.5%	0.6%	--	--*	1	<0.1%	0.1%
<i>Work</i>	0.9%	0.9%	0.3%	0.5%	<1	<0.1%	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%

	2013		2014		2015		2015		
	[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] First mention Frequency	% of valid sample (Base=860)	[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted) Frequency	% of total responses (Base=3,010)	% of valid sample (Base=864)
<i>IPCC symposium</i>	--	--	--	--	--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
<i>Others (see below)</i>	0.8%	1.1%	1.5%	2.3%*	12	1.4%	11	0.4%	1.3%
Don't know / can't remember	2.3%	0.2%	1.5%	0.6%	13	1.5%	7	0.2%	0.8%
Total	100.0%		100.0%		860	100.0%	3,010	100.0%	
Missing	--	--	6	6	7		2		
<u>Other newspaper that cannot be grouped</u>									
Apple Daily					23	2.7%	107	3.6%	12.4%
Can't remember / not specified					11	1.3%	63	2.1%	7.2%
Oriental Daily					10	1.2%	49	1.6%	5.7%
Apple Daily, Oriental Daily					--	--	16	0.5%	1.9%
HK Headline					1	0.1%	11	0.4%	1.2%
General report by Ming Pao					1	0.1%	9	0.3%	1.1%
Sing Tao Daily					<1	<0.1%	7	0.2%	0.9%
Apple Daily, Ming Pao					--	--	6	0.2%	0.7%
AM730					<1	0.1%	6	0.2%	0.7%
Ta Kung Pao					--	--	5	0.2%	0.6%
HK Economic Journal					2	0.2%	5	0.2%	0.5%
Metro Daily					--	--	5	0.2%	0.5%
The Sun					1	0.1%	4	0.1%	0.5%
Oriental Daily, HK Headline					--	--	4	0.1%	0.4%
Free newspaper					--	--	3	0.1%	0.4%
HK Economic Times					1	0.1%	3	0.1%	0.4%
Apple Daily, Oriental Daily, Sing Pao					--	--	3	0.1%	0.4%
AM730, Sky Post					--	--	2	0.1%	0.3%

	2013		2014		2015		2015		
	[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] First mention Frequency	% of valid sample (Base=860)	[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted) Frequency	% of total responses (Base=3,010)	% of valid sample (Base=864)
Oriental Daily, Sing Tao Daily					--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
HK Headline, Metro Daily					--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
Apple Daily, AM730					--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
Apple Daily, Oriental Daily, HK Headline					--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
Apple Daily, HK Headline					--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
HK Headline, AM730					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.2%
HK Headline, Sing Tao Daily					1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.2%
Apple Daily, Oriental Daily, Sing Tao Daily					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.2%
Apple Daily, HK Headline, AM730					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.2%
AM730, The Sun					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Sky Post					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
HK Headline, Sky Post					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Ming Pao, Sing Tao Daily					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Sing Pao					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
HK Headline, AM730, HK Economic Journal					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Oriental Daily, The Sun					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Apple Daily, HK Headline, Sky Post					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
AM730, The Standard					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Apple Daily, Sing Tao Daily					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
South China Morning Post					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Apple Daily, AM730, Sing Tao Daily					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
HK Headline, AM730, South China Morning Post					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
AM730, Sing Pao					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Apple Daily, Oriental Daily, HK Headline, Ming Pao					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Apple Daily, free newspaper					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
HK Headline, AM730, Sky Post					--	--	<1	<0.1%	0.1%

	2013		2014		2015		2015		
	[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] First mention Frequency	% of valid sample (Base=860)	[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted) Frequency	% of total responses (Base=3,010)	% of valid sample (Base=864)
Apple Daily, AM730, Sing Tao Daily, Metro Daily					--	--	<1	<0.1%	0.1%
Oriental Daily, HK Economic Times					--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Oriental Daily, HK Headline, Sing Pao					--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Apple Daily, Oriental Daily, HK Headline, AM730, Sing Tao Daily, HK Economic Times					--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Apple Daily, Oriental Daily, Ming Pao					--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Apple Daily, HK Economic Journal					--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Sub-total					51	5.9%	338	11.2%	39.1%
<u>Other online channels that cannot be grouped</u>									
Can't remember / not specified					4	0.5%	10	0.3%	1.2%
Online news					--	--	5	0.2%	0.6%
Website of the Hong Kong Police					--	--	3	0.1%	0.4%
Interview					--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
Government website					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.2%
YouTube					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Search engine					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Sub-total					4	0.5%	23	0.8%	2.7%
<u>Other advertisements on public transport that cannot be grouped</u>									
Can't remember / not specified					--	--	3	0.1%	0.3%
Sub-total					--	--	3	0.1%	0.3%
<u>Place of poster</u>									
Can't remember / not specified					--	--	12	0.4%	1.4%
By the road / public area					--	--	7	0.2%	0.8%
Police station					--	--	3	0.1%	0.4%
Kowloon City					--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%

	2013		2014		2015		2015		
	[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] First mention Frequency	% of valid sample (Base=860)	[Q2a+Q2b] Overall (prompted and unprompted) Frequency	% of total responses (Base=3,010)	% of valid sample (Base=864)
Mongkok					--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
Wall of building					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Bus stop					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Sai Ying Pun					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Police station, university					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Lok Fu Plaza					--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Central, Wan Chai					--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Central					--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
				Sub-total	--	--	30	1.0%	3.5%
<u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u>									
Have complained the police					2	0.3%	2	0.1%	0.3%
School					--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
CAPO					2	0.2%	2	0.1%	0.2%
Research					1	0.2%	1	<0.1%	0.2%
News on Occupy Central					1	0.1%	1	<0.1%	0.1%
Book					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
The Law					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
IPCC counter at the Immigration Department					--	--	1	<0.1%	0.1%
1083 hotline					<1	0.1%	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Can't remember / not specified					5	0.5%	--	--	--
				Sub-total	12	1.4%	11	0.4%	1.3%

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.

Table 5. [Q3] (Only ask those answered “yes” in Q1, base=867) To your knowledge, what are IPCC’s duties? Any other duties? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=698)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=697)	Frequency	2015 % of total responses (Base=1,109)	% of valid sample (Base=865)
IPCC duties	48.5%	39.7%**	427	--	49.4%**
<i>Monitoring CAPO’s cases handling process</i>	27.1%	22.5%*	196	17.7%	22.7%
<i>Monitoring Police’s follow-up / disciplinary actions towards officers being complained</i>	14.0%	10.8%	145	13.1%	16.8%**
<i>Identifying mal-practices in Police’s works that has led or may lead to complaints</i>	6.9%	2.9%**	72	6.5%	8.3%**
<i>Reviewing / verifying investigation reports / results by CAPO</i>	5.4%	4.9%	50	4.5%	5.8%
<i>Improving Police Force’s quality of service</i>	3.1%	2.5%	20	1.8%	2.3%
<i>Reviewing statistics on types of Police’s behavior that citizens complained</i>	1.8%	3.0%	11	1.0%	1.2%*
Non-IPCC duties	52.9%	58.9%**	471	--	54.5%
<i>Monitoring Police’s behaviour / conduct</i>	38.4%	47.0%**	341	30.7%	39.4%**
<i>Investigating citizens’ complaints on Police directly</i>	16.4%	13.9%	148	13.4%	17.2%
<i>Investigating Police bribing cases</i>	1.2%	1.7%	7	0.6%	0.8%
<i>Improving police-community relation / enhance communication</i>	1.7%	0.8%	3	0.3%	0.4%
<i>Other wrong answers</i>	1.1%	1.5%	20	1.8%	2.3%
Don’t know / can’t remember	10.3%	14.5%	96	8.7%	11.1%*
Total			1,109	100.0%	
Missing	--	9	2		
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u>					
Monitor police powers			3	0.3%	0.4%
Monitor the citizens			3	0.3%	0.3%
Watch people living their daily lives			2	0.2%	0.2%

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=698)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=697)	Frequency	2015 % of total responses (Base=1,109)	% of valid sample (Base=865)
Receive complaints from government departments			2	0.1%	0.2%
Monitor demonstrations and whether people are polite towards police			2	0.1%	0.2%
Help police be acquitted			1	0.1%	0.1%
Increase transparency			1	0.1%	0.1%
Let people voice their opinions			1	0.1%	0.1%
Same as Inspectors of Police			1	0.1%	0.1%
Monitor the government			1	0.1%	0.1%
Organize large-scale events			1	0.1%	0.1%
Maintenance of law and order			1	0.1%	0.1%
Monitor police-community relation			1	0.1%	0.1%
Help large-scale events run smoothly			1	<0.1%	0.1%
Prohibit excessive police powers			1	<0.1%	0.1%
Handle complaints from police			<1	<0.1%	0.1%
Monitor police workload			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Handle Occupy Central			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
		Sub-total	20	1.8%	2.3%

Table 6. [Q4] (Only ask those answered “yes” in Q1, base=867) Do you think IPCC is...? (Read out first two options, order to be randomized by computer, only one answer is allowed)

	2013 Percentage (Base=698)	2014 Percentage (Base=700)	2015	
			Frequency	Percentage (Base=865)
A totally independent organization, not under the Police	60.2%	63.0%	583	67.5%
Part of the Police	34.8%	30.8%	218	25.2%*
Don't know / hard to say	5.0%	6.2%	64	7.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	865	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	
	Percentage (Base=1,008)	Percentage (Base=1,037)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,007)
IPCC	24.2%	24.1%	356	35.4%**
CAPO	19.6%	20.7%	199	19.7%
Media	8.5%	8.1%	93	9.2%
Police Force	10.7%	11.0%	85	8.4%
DC / LegCo members	3.4%	2.8%	19	1.9%
ICAC	1.4%	1.8%	14	1.4%
Office of the Ombudsman, HK	1.5%	0.7%	13	1.2%
Equal Opportunities Commission	0.3%	0.3%	1	0.1%
Internet	0.6%	0.6%	1	0.1%*
Others (see below)	2.0%	2.8%	17	1.7%
No channel	1.0%	0.2%	20	1.9%**
Don't know	26.8%	27.0%	190	18.9%**
Total	100.0%	100.0%	1,007	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>7</i>	
<u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u>				
Call the 999 emergency line			5	0.5%
Lawyer			4	0.4%
Office of the Privacy Commissioner for Personal Data			1	0.1%
Email			1	0.1%
1083			1	0.1%
1823			1	0.1%
Demonstration			1	0.1%
Police Public Relations Bureau			1	0.1%
Consumer Council, ask relatives			1	0.1%
Phone			<1	<0.1%
No need to make a complaint			<1	<0.1%
		Sub-total	17	1.7%

Awareness of news on complaints against the Hong Kong Police Force and 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)	Frequency	2015 % of total responses (Base=1,701)	% of valid sample (Base=1,014)
Yes	74.2%	76.7%*	928	--	91.5%**
<i>News related to the Occupy Movement</i>	--	--	557	32.7%	54.9%
<i>Use of excessive and unnecessary force</i>	--	--	175	10.3%	17.3%
<i>Conflicts between Police and citizens during processions, gatherings and demonstrations[^]</i>	33.8%	31.6%	148	8.7%	14.6%**
<i>Seven police officers beat up Ken Tsang Kin-chiu / a protestor on a street corner</i>	--	--	141	8.3%	13.9%
<i>Ill-treatment of protesters</i>	--	--	66	3.9%	6.5%
<i>Assaulting protesters</i>	--	--	50	3.0%	5.0%
<i>Police's misconduct / bad attitude / abusive language^{^^}</i>	5.1%	11.3%**	49	2.9%	4.8%**
<i>Use of tear gas grenades to disperse protesters</i>	--	--	34	2.0%	3.4%
<i>Inappropriate use of pepper spray</i>	--	--	29	1.7%	2.8%
<i>Inappropriate use of police batons</i>	--	--	24	1.4%	2.4%
<i>Complaints about Police's abuse of power</i>	2.1%	1.6%	24	1.4%	2.3%
<i>Assaulting citizens</i>	--	--	22	1.3%	2.2%
<i>Franklin Chu King-wai / an officer used his police baton to strike the neck of a protestor from behind</i>	--	--	19	1.1%	1.9%
<i>Protests against parallel traders</i>	--	--	16	1.0%	1.6%
<i>Sexual harassment / indecent assault</i>	--	--	16	0.9%	1.6%
<i>Use of tear gas spray to disperse protesters</i>	--	--	16	0.9%	1.6%
<i>A plain-clothes officer threatened a female protestor to "shut up or I'll take you back to the police station and rape you"</i>	--	--	14	0.8%	1.4%
<i>Rape case in Police station</i>	3.3%	0.2%**	14	0.8%	1.3%**

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=1,009)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=1,035)	Frequency	2015 % of total responses (Base=1,701)	% of valid sample (Base=1,014)
<i>Not arresting or stopping anti-Occupy protesters who used violence</i>	--	--	12	0.7%	1.2%
<i>Police's mishandling of sexual violence case</i>	--	2.9%**	11	0.7%	1.1%**
<i>Arrest protesters selectively</i>	--	--	11	0.7%	1.1%
<i>Police's neglect of duty</i>	--	2.3%**	10	0.6%	1.0%*
<i>Use of police batons to strike heads and joints of protesters</i>	--	--	9	0.6%	0.9%
<i>Tapping a protester on his shoulder and pepper spraying him in the face when he turned around</i>	--	--	7	0.4%	0.7%
<i>Unreasonable arrest of protesters</i>	--	--	7	0.4%	0.6%
<i>Police's unfair / inappropriate law enforcement</i>	--	0.7%*	6	0.4%	0.6%
<i>Assaulting protesters inside police vehicles or other places</i>	--	--	6	0.3%	0.6%
<i>Doubt on Police's political neutrality</i>	--	0.9%**	5	0.3%	0.5%
<i>Ill-treatment towards a hotel staff who complained about an idling police coach bus with running engine</i>	--	--	4	0.3%	0.4%
<i>Police's law enforcement of the traffic regulation</i>	1.7%	--**	4	0.2%	0.4%
<i>Showing of the "disperse or we fire" warning banner to protesters</i>	--	--	3	0.2%	0.3%
<i>Use of pepper spray on protesters behind the gate at Mongkok Police Station</i>	--	--	3	0.2%	0.3%
<i>Unreasonable checking of ID cards and registration of personal data</i>	--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
<i>Dragging protesters along the ground</i>	--	--	2	0.1%	0.2%
<i>Wearing blue ribbons while on duty</i>	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
<i>Unsatisfactory arrangement of bail</i>	--	0.2%	1	0.1%	0.1%
<i>Police's handling of personal information</i>	0.6%	--*	1	0.1%	0.1%
<i>Stop and search issue / searching</i>	1.6%	0.4%**	1	0.1%	0.1%
<i>Police bribing cases</i>	0.8%	0.7%	1	0.1%	0.1%
<i>Assaulting or arresting medical personnel</i>	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=1,009)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=1,035)	Frequency	2015 % of total responses (Base=1,701)	% of valid sample (Base=1,014)
<i>Inappropriate treatment / Ill-treatment of arrested persons</i>	--	--	1	0.1%	0.1%
<i>Plain-clothes officers among protesters tried to provoke violence</i>	--	--	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
<i>Police officers on duty took group photos after clearance</i>	--	--	<1	<0.1%	<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>HKU 8.18 dispute / Li Keqiang visited HK / dark shadow incident</i>	9.9%	1.3%**	--	--	--
<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%	37	2.2%	3.7%
<i>Can't remember</i>	20.4%	23.9%*	45	2.6%	4.4%**
<i>Refuse to answer</i>	0.1%	0.1%	4	0.2%	0.4%
No	21.2%	15.3%**	62	3.7%	6.1%**
Don't know / hard to say	4.6%	8.0%*	24	1.4%	2.4%**
Total			1,701	100.0%	

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=1,009)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=1,035)	Frequency	2015 % of total responses (Base=1,701)	% of valid sample (Base=1,014)
<u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u>					
Handling of the parallel traders problem			6	0.4%	0.6%
Assaulting reporters			3	0.2%	0.3%
Police officers were tolerant			3	0.1%	0.2%
Citizens made complaints to the Police through mass media			2	0.1%	0.2%
Police officers had too much power			2	0.1%	0.2%
Handling cases very slowly			2	0.1%	0.2%
Buying batteries while on duty			1	0.1%	0.1%
Not paying for the sexual service provided after an anti-vice raid			1	0.1%	0.1%
Use of violence on a District Councilor			1	0.1%	0.1%
Suicide of a police officer			1	0.1%	0.1%
Facebook blog			1	0.1%	0.1%
Charcoal-burning suicide of mother and sons			1	0.1%	0.1%
Press conference of HKPF / IPCC			1	0.1%	0.1%
July 1st rally			1	0.1%	0.1%
Unfair treatment of street performers			1	0.1%	0.1%
Democratic Party made complaints to the Police about rally arrangement			1	0.1%	0.1%
Arresting the girl who drew flowers on the Lennon Wall			1	<0.1%	0.1%
Loafing on the job			1	<0.1%	0.1%
Citizens filed complaints collectively			1	<0.1%	0.1%
Family disputes			1	<0.1%	0.1%
Officers gambling			1	<0.1%	0.1%
Mongkok “shopping” protest			1	<0.1%	0.1%
Officers borrowing money			1	<0.1%	0.1%
Searching Joshua Wong’s home, arresting the girl who drew flowers on the Lennon Wall, delayed prosecution			1	<0.1%	0.1%

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=1,009)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=1,035)	Frequency	2015 % of total responses (Base=1,701)	% of valid sample (Base=1,014)
Inappropriate handling when Falun Gong members were surrounded			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Officers not following the law			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Crime reporting concerning Franklin Chu case was treated merely as a complaint			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Larry Kwok observing the protest			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Passing narcotics to citizens to shift the blame			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Obstructing reporters from taking photos / videos			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Taking photos while on duty, buying groceries in uniform			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Accepting advantages when handling application for a liquor license			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Unreasonably stopping citizens from leaving			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
		Sub-total	37	2.2%	3.7%

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

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

Table 9. [Q7] Which one of the following types of complaints of the Police Force would you care about most? (Read out options, ONE answer only)

	2013	2014	2015	
	Percentage (Base=1,008)	Percentage (Base=1,038)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,014)
On police officers' abuse of power	31.5%	19.0%**	223	22.0%
On police officers' use of violence	6.9%	7.3%	194	19.1%**
On unfairness of police officers in handling cases	8.3%	13.1%**	155	15.3%
On corruption of police officers	13.1%	15.2%	124	12.2%*
On Police handling public demonstration	13.7%	12.2%	78	7.7%**
On working attitude of police officers	5.6%	6.4%	48	4.7%
On stop and search issue / searching	2.5%	2.9%	27	2.7%
On officers' law enforcement of traffic regulations	1.6%	4.0%**	18	1.8%**
On media coverage arrangement	2.6%	3.1%	15	1.5%*
On investigation method of police officers	1.3%	1.5%	12	1.2%
On press releases arrangement	2.6%	1.6%*	8	0.8%
Others (see below)	0.8%	0.9%	5	0.5%
Don't care about any complaints against Police Force	5.5%	5.0%	49	4.8%
Don't know / hard to say	3.9%	7.7%**	58	5.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	1,014	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	--	
<u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u>				
On Police only taking action after something has happened			1	0.1%
On sexual harassment			1	0.1%
On citizens' assaulting police officers			1	0.1%
On Police not doing what they should do, but doing what they should not do			1	0.1%
On Police handling spontaneous events			1	0.1%
On Police's personal characters			1	<0.1%
Sub-total			5	0.5%

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]

	Frequency	% of total responses (Base=1,031)	% of valid sample (Base=1,013)
Yes	358	--	35.3%
<i>IPCC does not conduct on-site observation during occupy or assemble events</i>	81	7.9%	8.0%
<i>Some IPCC members are not politically neutral / handle complaints unfairly</i>	78	7.5%	7.7%
<i>The Chairman of IPCC Mr. Larry Kwok Lam-kwong is not politically neutral / handles complaints unfairly</i>	24	2.3%	2.3%
<i>IPCC handles complaints unfairly / has a bias in favour of the police or protesters</i>	15	1.5%	1.5%
<i>About the Occupy Movement</i>	13	1.2%	1.2%
<i>IPCC's monitoring is ineffective</i>	8	0.8%	0.8%
<i>It takes too long to handle complaints / No result of investigation after a long time / Cases go unattended</i>	6	0.6%	0.6%
<i>Others (see below)</i>	23	2.2%	2.3%
<i>Can't remember</i>	122	11.8%	12.0%
<i>Refuse to answer</i>	6	0.6%	0.6%
Respondents talked about complaints made to the Hong Kong Police Force	12	1.1%	1.1%
No	608	59.0%	60.0%
Don't know / hard to say	36	3.5%	3.5%
Total	1,031	100.0%	
<i>Missing</i>	1		
<u>Other responses that cannot be grouped</u>			
IPCC is not independent enough	4	0.4%	0.4%
About processions and demonstrations	3	0.3%	0.3%
Citizens are not involved in the monitoring process	2	0.2%	0.2%
Abuse of power and corruption	2	0.2%	0.2%
About Mr. Larry Kwok Lam-kwong becoming the Chairman	1	0.1%	0.1%
There is no one to handle complaints during the Occupy Movement	1	0.1%	0.1%

	Frequency	% of total responses (Base=1,031)	% of valid sample (Base=1,013)
IPCC members are not representative of the people	1	0.1%	0.1%
IPCC cannot fulfil its duties	1	0.1%	0.1%
Not following the law	1	0.1%	0.1%
Complaints made by a LegCo member	1	0.1%	0.1%
About traffic problems	1	0.1%	0.1%
About how IPCC deals with police officers	1	0.1%	0.1%
Inappropriate handling	1	0.1%	0.1%
IPCC's abuse of power	1	0.1%	0.1%
Some IPCC members say / do something improper and are impolite to citizens	1	0.1%	0.1%
IPCC does not have enough powers	1	0.1%	0.1%
IPCC offends the Police	1	0.1%	0.1%
On-site observation is not effective, IPCC's statements are biased	<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Sub-total	23	2.2%	2.3%

Image and confidence in IPCC

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

	2013		2014		2015	
	Percentage (Base=1,007)		Percentage (Base=1,037)		Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,012)
Independent }Independent	34.5%		34.3%		349	34.5%
Quite independent }Independent	18.7%	53.2%	19.0%	53.3%	180	17.8%
Half-half	18.8%		18.6%		186	18.4%
Not quite independent }Not independent	13.0%		12.0%		132	13.0%
Not independent at all }Not independent	5.7%	18.6%	5.2%	17.1%	91	9.0%**
Don't know / hard to say	9.3%		11.0%		74	7.3%**
Total	100.0%		100.0%		1,012	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, only one answer is allowed)

	2013		2014		2015	
	Percentage (Base=1,007)		Percentage (Base=1,039)		Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,013)
Impartial and objective }Impartial and objective	24.7%		27.1%		242	23.9%
Quite impartial and objective }Impartial and objective	21.0%	45.7%	19.6%	46.7%	201	19.9%
Half-half	28.4%		26.5%		274	27.1%
Not quite impartial and objective }Not impartial and objective	8.8%		9.5%		113	11.1%
Not impartial and objective at all }Not impartial and objective	4.2%	13.1%	4.2%	13.7%	84	8.2%**
Don't know / hard to say	12.8%		13.1%		99	9.8%*
Total	100.0%		100.0		1,013	100.0%
Missing	2		--		1	

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

	2013		2014		2015	
	Percentage (Base=1,009)		Percentage (Base=1,038)		Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,013)
Efficient	11.2%	}Efficient	14.0%	}26.8%	136	13.4%
Quite efficient	14.3%		12.9%		142	14.1%
Half-half	34.6%		31.7%		323	31.9%
Not quite efficient	8.7%	}Not efficient	9.8%	}12.7%	125	12.3%
Not efficient at all	4.2%		3.0%		82	8.1%**
Don't know / hard to say	27.1%		28.7%		205	20.2%**
Total	100.0%		100.0		1,013	100.0%
Missing	--		1		1	

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

	2013		2014		2015	
	Percentage (Base=1,009)		Percentage (Base=1,038)		Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,014)
High	8.0%	}High	9.7%	}19.5%	109	10.7%
Quite high	13.0%		9.8%		118	11.7%
Half-half	39.5%		38.6%		378	37.3%
Quite low	13.0%	}Low	12.8%	}24.4%	117	11.6%
Low	11.1%		11.5%		159	15.7%**
Don't know / hard to say	15.3%		17.5%		132	13.0%**
Total	100.0%		100.0%		1,014	100.0%
Missing	--		1		--	

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

		2013	2014	2015	
		Percentage (Base=1,009)	Percentage (Base=1,039)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,014)
Very confident	}Confident	11.5%	12.1%	129	12.7%
Quite confident		31.3%	35.8%*	317	31.3%*
Half-half		31.5%	25.7%**	275	27.1%
Not quite confident	}Not confident	14.0%	14.4%	135	13.4%
Not confident at all		5.1%	5.7%	109	10.8%**
Don't know / hard to say		6.7%	6.3%	49	4.8%
Total		100.0%	100.0%	1,014	100.0%

Table 16. [Q14] (Only ask respondents who have answered “not quite confident” and “not confident at all” in Q13, base=245) 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)	Frequency	2015 % of total responses (Base=360)	% of valid sample (Base=245)
May take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases	15.5%	12.1%	49	13.7%	20.2%*
Committees are appointed, not elected by citizens	10.7%	14.0%	48	13.4%	19.7%
It's like self-investigation	26.9%	15.0%**	46	12.8%	18.9%
The process and results of complaints are not released to public	17.0%	18.4%	44	12.1%	17.9%
Both are under the Government	8.1%	11.3%	33	9.2%	13.5%
Not clear about IPCC's works	12.4%	8.2%	18	5.0%	7.4%
No direct investigation, monitor only, no actual authority	7.4%	3.7%	15	4.2%	6.2%
Brings little to no effect / Police's misconduct continues	--	--	11	3.1%	4.5%
Have little confidence in some IPCC members	--	--	10	2.9%	4.2%
It takes too long to handle complaints / No result of investigation after a long time / Cases go unattended	--	--	10	2.8%	4.2%
Don't think IPCC investigate or monitor complaints in citizen's perspective	4.9%	3.4%	9	2.4%	3.5%
Not fair and impartial^	--	2.3%*	8	2.3%	3.5%
Only responsible for monitoring and review, didn't investigate directly	4.0%	2.3%	8	2.3%	3.4%
May cover up the truth to avoid unfavorable impact on Police's image	6.8%	2.9%*	6	1.7%	2.5%
Police officers could be appointed as committee member	1.9%	1.8%	4	1.2%	1.8%
Not independent enough	--	1.4%	4	1.0%	1.5%
Have little confidence in the Chairman of IPCC Mr Larry Kwok Lam-kwong	--	--	3	0.9%	1.3%
Not confident in the Government, so not confident in IPCC	2.1%	--	<1	0.1%	0.2%
Inconspicuous / bad performance	--	9.9%**	--	--	--
Affected by political factors	--	2.2%*	--	--	--

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=192)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=209)	Frequency	2015 % of total responses (Base=360)	% of valid sample (Base=245)
May be unfair to police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases	--	2.0%	--	--	--
Not enough public engagement	--	1.0%	--	--	--
Don't like the image of IPCC	3.4%	--	--	--	--
Others (see below)	3.4%	5.0%	22	6.0%	8.8%
Don't know / hard to say	4.7%	10.4%	11	2.9%	4.3%*
Total			360	100.0%	
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u>					
News in the past			5	1.3%	2.0%
Do not handle some complaints			3	0.9%	1.4%
Not proactive			3	0.8%	1.2%
IPCC members are not police officers and lack the relevant knowledge. They just take the citizen's perspective and handle cases unfairly.			1	0.4%	0.5%
Not specified			1	0.3%	0.5%
IPCC itself is not monitored			1	0.3%	0.5%
Biased towards CY Leung's group			1	0.3%	0.5%
Biased towards the complainants			1	0.3%	0.4%
It depends on the situation			1	0.2%	0.3%
Few complaints are classified as substantiated			1	0.2%	0.3%
No IPCC staff at public assemblies to coordinate and help citizens lodge complaints			1	0.2%	0.3%
Do not handle some complaints, News in the past			1	0.2%	0.3%
Institutional defects			1	0.1%	0.2%
Cannot decide punitive sanctions on police officers who violated regulations			<1	0.1%	0.2%
Easily swayed by public opinion			<1	0.1%	0.2%
No follow-up			<1	0.1%	0.1%
		Sub-total	22	6.0%	8.8%

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

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

		2013		2014		2015		
		Percentage (Base=1,009)		Percentage (Base=1,036)		Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,012)	
Very confident	}Confident	12.0%		11.1%		136	13.4%	
Quite confident		32.3%	}44.2%	40.7%**	}51.9%**	312	30.9%**	}44.3%**
Half-half		28.2%		21.9%**		254	25.2%	
Not quite confident	}Not confident	12.5%		12.5%		148	14.6%	
Not confident at all		5.8%	}18.3%	6.2%	}18.8%	94	9.3%**	}23.9%**
Don't know / hard to say		9.3%		7.4%*		68	6.7%	
	Total	100.0%		100.0%		1,012	100.0%	
	Missing	--		3		2		

Table 18. [Q16] (Only ask respondents who have answered “not quite confident” and “not confident at all” in Q15, base=242) 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)	Frequency	2015 % of total responses (Base=317)	% of valid sample (Base=228)
Increase transparency	35.2%	24.7%	51	16.1%	22.4%
Involve individuals from different classes in the process	22.8%	23.0%	35	11.1%	15.5%*
Change the method for selecting IPCC members	--	--	25	8.0%	11.2%
IPCC should receive complaints and investigate directly^	--	2.4%*	25	7.8%	10.9%**
IPCC should have authorization to investigate	9.4%	11.1%	17	5.2%	7.3%
IPCC should become an independent department	9.7%	10.1%	12	3.9%	5.4%
IPCC should have authorization to investigate serious cases	1.0%	0.9%	12	3.8%	5.3%*
Shorten the time for investigation and review	3.4%	1.9%	10	3.2%	4.5%
Handle complaints fairly and impartially	--	3.7%**	9	2.9%	4.1%
Improve work efficiency	--	3.5%*	8	2.6%	3.7%
IPCC should have authorization to decide punitive sanctions on police officers who violated regulations	4.0%	1.9%	8	2.6%	3.6%
More promotion	6.9%	3.4%	5	1.7%	2.4%
Simplify the monitor and review procedures	6.5%	2.0%*	4	1.3%	1.7%
Others (see below)	6.1%	4.7%	31	9.8%	13.6%**
No area needs to be improved	2.2%	1.5%	4	1.3%	1.8%
Don't know / hard to say	16.5%	26.4%*	59	18.7%	26.0%
Total			317	100.0%	
<i>Missing</i>	--	--	14		
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u>					
Have a new CE			3	0.9%	1.2%
There is no way to improve			2	0.8%	1.1%
More manpower			2	0.7%	0.9%
Have juries to assist in handling complaints			2	0.6%	0.8%
Change everything			2	0.6%	0.8%

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=185)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=195)	Frequency	2015 % of total responses (Base=317)	% of valid sample (Base=228)
More legal personnel			2	0.6%	0.8%
Not be biased towards complainants or police officers			1	0.4%	0.6%
Set clear guidelines			1	0.4%	0.6%
Change the government			1	0.4%	0.6%
Include other independent organizations, such as LegCo, in the monitoring process			1	0.4%	0.5%
Independent from the CE			1	0.4%	0.5%
Process to be reported by the media			1	0.3%	0.4%
Promptly and proactively handle complaints that the public care about to make people confident in the system			1	0.3%	0.4%
Completely independent from the government			1	0.3%	0.4%
Accountable to the public			1	0.3%	0.4%
Complainants and the police officers can cross examine each other			1	0.3%	0.4%
IPCC should support the police			1	0.3%	0.4%
Pay closer attention to complaints			1	0.2%	0.3%
Report to the CE directly			1	0.2%	0.3%
Send more people to conduct on-site observation during processions and assemblies			1	0.2%	0.3%
Increase legitimacy			1	0.2%	0.3%
Make sure complaints are concluded			1	0.2%	0.3%
IPCC should be able to prosecute			1	0.2%	0.3%
Appoint independent people as members			<1	0.1%	0.2%
Police should be independent from the government			<1	0.1%	0.2%
IPCC should be abolished			<1	0.1%	0.2%
Have LegCo rather than the CE manage it			<1	0.1%	0.1%
		Sub-total	31	9.8%	13.6%

[^]The wording of this item was "Doesn't need the two-tier system" in 2014's survey.

Overall perception on IPCC

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

	2013		2014		2015	
	Percentage (Base=1,007)		Percentage (Base=1,037)		Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,013)
Positive	34.7%	}57.4%	35.7%	}60.4%*	348	34.4%
Quite positive	22.7%		24.7%		223	22.0%
Half-half	31.9%		25.6%**		288	28.5%
Quite negative	2.1%	}4.2%	3.0%	}6.1%	53	5.3%*
Negative	2.1%		3.1%		52	5.1%*
Don't know / hard to say	6.4%		7.9%		48	4.8%**
Total	100.0%		100.0%		1,013	100.0%
Missing	2		2		1	

Table 20. [Q18a](Only ask respondents who have answered “positive” and “quite positive” in Q17, base=571) 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)	Frequency	2015 % of total responses (Base=693)	% of valid sample (Base=569)
IPCC is fair enough	16.7%	18.1%	120	17.4%	21.2%
IPCC is independent enough	24.8%	20.8%	115	16.6%	20.2%
IPCC’s structure gives people confidence	17.3%	13.1%*	71	10.2%	12.5%
IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review	14.3%	12.5%	71	10.2%	12.4%
IPCC provides a helpful monitoring system / mechanism	12.3%	11.0%	49	7.1%	8.6%
IPCC has high transparency	10.2%	11.2%	44	6.3%	7.7%*
IPCC has sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties	6.1%	6.5%	34	4.9%	5.9%
No / Little bad news about IPCC	--	--	23	3.3%	4.0%
IPCC has high efficiency	4.3%	4.8%	21	3.0%	3.7%
Intuition / Impression / Personal feeling	--	--	16	2.2%	2.7%
IPCC fulfills its duties	--	--	14	2.0%	2.4%
IPCC’s work brings an impact	--	--	8	1.1%	1.4%
IPCC’s image / name is positive	4.7%	8.4%*	7	1.0%	1.3%**
IPCC is appointed by the Government	1.3%	1.6%	--	--	--
Other positive answers (see below)	3.9%	2.2%	26	3.8%	4.6%*
Don’t know / hard to say	11.5%	11.3%	76	10.9%	13.3%
Total			693	100.0%	
<i>Missing</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>		
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u>					
Confident in the judicial system in Hong Kong			3	0.5%	0.6%
IPCC’s public statements are good			3	0.4%	0.5%
Hong Kong is good			2	0.3%	0.4%

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=578)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=623)	Frequency	2015 % of total responses (Base=693)	% of valid sample (Base=569)
Confident in the police			2	0.3%	0.3%
Confident in IPCC members			1	0.2%	0.2%
IPCC is a government department			1	0.2%	0.2%
Trust the police			1	0.2%	0.2%
Better than other countries			1	0.2%	0.2%
Hong Kong is a safe city			1	0.1%	0.2%
IPCC members are well-known, impartial and objective			1	0.1%	0.2%
Confident in IPCC			1	0.1%	0.2%
Trust CY Leung			1	0.1%	0.1%
Hong Kong is doing very well			1	0.1%	0.1%
News reports on the Occupy Movement do not show the full picture and are not entirely correct			1	0.1%	0.1%
IPCC members are not police officers			1	0.1%	0.1%
IPCC is not very transparent			1	0.1%	0.1%
IPCC can keep a balance between police officers and the public			1	0.1%	0.1%
No other better alternative			1	0.1%	0.1%
It is a civilized society and there is no need to worry			1	0.1%	0.1%
IPCC's articles are acceptable			1	0.1%	0.1%
IPCC members are appointed by the CE			<1	0.1%	0.1%
Police-community relation has been good			<1	0.1%	0.1%
IPCC is justified in what it does			<1	0.1%	0.1%
Confident in the government			<1	0.1%	0.1%
IPCC members include pan-democrats			<1	<0.1%	0.1%
Different people can express their opinions			<1	<0.1%	0.1%
IPCC is introduced in TV programmes			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
		Sub-total	26	3.8%	4.6%

Table 21. [Q18b](Only ask respondents who have answered “negative” and “quite negative” in Q17, base=105) 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)	Frequency	2015 % of total responses (Base=156)	% of valid sample (Base=105)
IPCC might take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases	8.2%	6.8%	29	18.6%	27.6%**
IPCC has low transparency	45.0%	38.0%	22	14.0%	20.8%*
No trust in IPCC’s independence	35.4%	20.2%	20	12.9%	19.1%
IPCC has low efficiency	6.4%	14.2%	19	12.0%	17.9%
IPCC doesn’t have sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties	13.7%	3.2%*	16	9.9%	14.8%*
Don’t think IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review	6.2%	5.5%	11	6.8%	10.1%
IPCC is not fair and impartial	--	--	9	6.0%	8.9%
IPCC’s work does not bring an impact	--	--	8	5.3%	7.8%
Other negative answers (see below)	10.7%	26.3%*	18	11.2%	16.6%
Don’t know / hard to say	8.1%	11.4%	5	3.3%	4.9%
Total			156	100.0%	
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u>					
Committees are appointed, not elected by citizens			3	1.7%	2.6%
IPCC may not care about the citizens			2	1.2%	1.8%
IPCC is not proactive			2	1.2%	1.7%
Not confident in IPCC			1	0.9%	1.3%
Don’t know about IPCC			1	0.8%	1.2%
News on IPCC is negative			1	0.7%	1.1%
IPCC’s image is negative, Don’t know about IPCC			1	0.7%	1.0%
IPCC is not accountable			1	0.6%	0.9%
IPCC handles complaints selectively			1	0.6%	0.9%
IPCC members are not impartial			1	0.6%	0.9%

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=43)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=64)	Frequency	2015 % of total responses (Base=156)	% of valid sample (Base=105)
IPCC does not fulfill its duties			1	0.5%	0.7%
Intuition			1	0.4%	0.6%
IPCC is corrupt			1	0.4%	0.6%
IPCC does not listen to both sides			1	0.3%	0.5%
Chairman of IPCC did a bad job and has a negative image			<1	0.3%	0.4%
IPCC takes the wrong stance			<1	0.2%	0.3%
		Sub-total	18	11.2%	16.6%

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

		2014	2015	
		Percentage (Base=1,033)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,012)
Very much satisfied	}Satisfied	7.0%	64	6.3%
Quite satisfied		31.8%	339	33.5%
Half-half		30.6%	322	31.8%
Quite dissatisfied	}Dissatisfied	6.9%	101	10.0%*
Very much dissatisfied		9.2%	50	4.9%**
Don't know / hard to say		21.4%	136	13.4%**
	Total	100.0%	1,012	100.0%
	Missing	6	2	

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

	2014	2015	
	% of valid sample (Base=952)	Frequency	% of valid sample (Base=954)
0	1.1%	27	2.8%**
1-9	0.5%	4	0.4%
10-19	0.6%	10	1.0%
20-29	0.9%	27	2.9%**
30-39	2.3%	28	2.9%
40-49	4.9%	74	7.7%**
50	25.2%	215	22.6%
51-60	16.6%	143	14.9%
61-70	20.7%	150	15.7%**
71-80	17.3%	173	18.1%
81-90	6.6%	60	6.3%
91-99	1.0%	14	1.5%
100	2.2%	30	3.2%
Total	100.0%	954	100.0%
<i>Missing (including "don't know / hard to say")</i>	87	60	
Mean score	62.5	60.3*	
Standard error	0.6	0.7	
Base	952	954	

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)	Frequency	2015 % of total responses (Base=1,446)	% of valid sample (Base=1,005)
Hope IPCC would handle cases in a fair, impartial and transparent manner	16.9%	24.0%**	377	26.1%	37.5%**
Hope IPCC would improve its transparency	11.3%	14.9%**	188	13.0%	18.7%*
Hope IPCC can become an independent organization / handle complaint cases directly^	4.2%	5.1%	111	7.6%	11.0%**
Hope IPCC will keep up with its good work	4.1%	3.9%	99	6.8%	9.8%**
Hope IPCC can increase its efficiency	0.8%	4.1%**	89	6.2%	8.9%**
Hope IPCC can monitor HK Police Force's work effectively	19.2%	16.5%	69	4.8%	6.9%**
Hope IPCC can have more promotion of its work	--	3.7%**	45	3.1%	4.5%
Hope IPCC can broaden its member base^^	1.5%	2.9%*	38	2.6%	3.8%
Hope IPCC can ensure citizens will get appropriate Police services	5.9%	4.5%	32	2.2%	3.2%
Hope IPCC can explain more to citizens the work / complaints system of HK Police Force	8.0%	5.9%	24	1.6%	2.3%**
Hope IPCC can pressure HK Police Force effectively in order to improve their work	5.7%	2.9%**	20	1.4%	2.0%
Hope IPCC can improve Police-community relation / enhance its communication	7.0%	4.8%*	19	1.3%	1.9%**
Hope IPCC can provide a channel for complaints against police	6.6%	4.1%**	18	1.2%	1.8%**
Change the method for selecting IPCC members	--	--	18	1.2%	1.7%
Hope IPCC can do better	--	--	15	1.0%	1.5%
Hope IPCC can expand its mandated functions	--	--	13	0.9%	1.3%
Hope IPCC is not swayed by external influence	--	--	9	0.6%	0.9%
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%	49	3.4%	4.9%**

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=1,001)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=1,028)	Frequency	2015 % of total responses (Base=1,446)	% of valid sample (Base=1,005)
No expectation	4.7%	4.2%	55	3.8%	5.5%
Don't know / hard to say	16.8%	18.3%	157	10.9%	15.6%
Total			1,446	100.0%	
<i>Missing</i>	8	11	9		
<u>Other response that cannot be grouped</u>					
Hope IPCC will make the public feel confident			5	0.3%	0.5%
Hope IPCC is free of corruption			3	0.2%	0.3%
Hope complaints are concluded			2	0.2%	0.2%
Hope IPCC members remain independent			2	0.2%	0.2%
Hope IPCC is monitored by another organization			2	0.1%	0.2%
Hope IPCC will listen to opinions from people of different social strata			2	0.1%	0.2%
Hope IPCC will expand its area of concern over complaint cases			2	0.1%	0.2%
Hope IPCC will hire more people			2	0.1%	0.2%
Hope IPCC will care about the people			2	0.1%	0.2%
Hope IPCC will work hard			2	0.1%	0.2%
Hope IPCC will conduct more on-site observation			1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC will ignore unreasonable complaints			1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC will follow up with complaints			1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC will send people to processions and assemblies to conduct observation			1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC will report to the LegCo			1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC will be dismissed			1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC will admit it if police officers commit mistakes and will clarify if there are misunderstandings			1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC members will receive more training			1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC will learn about the complaints in details			1	0.1%	0.1%
It depends on the situation			1	0.1%	0.1%

	2013 % of valid sample (Base=1,001)	2014 % of valid sample (Base=1,028)	Frequency	2015 % of total responses (Base=1,446)	% of valid sample (Base=1,005)
Hope IPCC will act according to conscience			1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC will handle complaints in the people's perspective			1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC will have an accountability system			1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC's recruitment process is more transparent			1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC is managed by smart people			1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC will truly understand the complaints			1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC will maintain social justice			1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC will handle complaints about Occupy Central better			1	0.1%	0.1%
Better than no monitoring at all			1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC will send more people to processions and assemblies to conduct observation			1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC will handle all complaints seriously			1	0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC will improve the institution			1	<0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC members are people who do not hate the police			1	<0.1%	0.1%
Hope IPCC can perform self-monitoring			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Hope IPCC will increase the number of members			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Hope there will be police officers as IPCC members			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Hope IPCC members are elites in the legal sector			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Hope it is easier to get through the complaint hotline			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Hope IPCC will do its best for the people			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Hope IPCC will be more empathetic			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Hope Chairman of IPCC be a retired judicial officer			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Hope IPCC will only take action if there is real evidence			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
Hope IPCC members remain independent and know the law			<1	<0.1%	<0.1%
		Sub-total	49	3.4%	4.9%

[^]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=1,014)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,014)
Male	494	48.7%	459	45.3%
Female	520	51.3%	555	54.7%
Total	1,014	100.0%	1,014	100.0%

Table 26. Age Group

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,012)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,012)
18 - 19	44	4.3%	56	5.5%
20 - 29	117	11.6%	126	12.4%
30 - 39	123	12.2%	185	18.2%
40 - 49	182	18.0%	188	18.6%
50 - 59	240	23.7%	204	20.2%
60 - 69	198	19.6%	131	13.0%
70 or above	108	10.7%	122	12.0%
Total	1,012	100.0%	1,012	100.0%
Missing	2		2	

Table 27. Education Attainment

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,008)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,008)
Primary school or below	107	10.6%	238	23.7%
<i>Not educated, pre-elementary education</i>	20	2.0%	41	4.1%
<i>Primary</i>	87	8.6%	198	19.6%
Secondary	501	49.7%	485	48.1%
<i>Junior secondary (F.1-F.3)</i>	153	15.2%	114	11.3%
<i>Senior secondary (F.4-F.5, vocational training included)</i>	282	28.0%	282	28.0%
<i>Matriculation (F.6-F.7)</i>	66	6.5%	88	8.8%
Tertiary or above	400	39.7%	285	28.3%
<i>Tertiary, non-degree (Diploma / Certificate)</i>	69	6.8%	46	4.6%
<i>Tertiary, non-degree (Associate degree)</i>	29	2.9%	21	2.1%
<i>Tertiary, degree</i>	259	25.7%	185	18.3%
<i>Postgraduate or above</i>	43	4.3%	33	3.2%
Total	1,008	100.0%	1,008	100.0%
Missing	6		6	

Table 28. Occupation

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,009)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,010)
Executives and professionals	263	26.1%	230	22.7%
<i>Managers / administration staff</i>	105	10.4%	92	9.1%
<i>Professional</i>	117	11.6%	99	9.8%
<i>Associate professional</i>	41	4.1%	39	3.9%
Clerical and service workers	197	19.5%	229	22.7%
<i>Clerk</i>	125	12.4%	134	13.2%
<i>Service worker and Shop & market sales worker</i>	72	7.1%	96	9.5%
Production workers	69	6.8%	77	7.6%
<i>Skilled agricultural & fishery worker</i>	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
<i>Craft & related trade worker</i>	20	2.0%	21	2.0%
<i>Plant & machine operator / assembler</i>	13	1.3%	12	1.1%
<i>Unskilled worker</i>	36	3.6%	45	4.4%
Students	73	7.2%	83	8.2%
Homemakers	120	11.9%	146	14.4%
Others	287	28.4%	246	24.3%
<i>Retired</i>	242	24.0%	201	19.9%
<i>Unidentified</i>	12	1.2%	10	1.0%
<i>Others (unemployed and non-worker included)</i>	33	3.3%	34	3.4%
Total	1,009	100.0%	1,010	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>	5		4	

Table 29. Monthly personal income

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=943)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=945)
No income	261	27.7%	272	28.8%
HK\$1 – HK\$3,999	66	7.0%	78	8.3%
HK\$4,000 – HK\$5,999	43	4.6%	47	4.9%
HK\$6,000 – HK\$7,999	24	2.5%	27	2.8%
HK\$8,000 – HK\$9,999	43	4.6%	50	5.3%
HK\$10,000 – HK\$14,999	134	14.2%	146	15.5%
HK\$15,000 – HK\$19,999	87	9.2%	85	9.0%
HK\$20,000 – HK\$24,999	69	7.3%	67	7.1%
HK\$25,000 – HK\$39,999	108	11.5%	97	10.2%
HK\$40,000 or above	108	11.5%	76	8.1%
Total	943	100.0%	945	100.0%
<i>Missing</i>	71		69	

Table 30. Monthly household income

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=808)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=801)
HK\$3,999 or below	58	7.2%	62	7.8%
HK\$4,000 – HK\$5,999	26	3.2%	34	4.3%
HK\$6,000 – HK\$9,999	38	4.7%	35	4.4%
HK\$10,000 – HK\$14,999	81	10.0%	94	11.7%
HK\$15,000 – HK\$19,999	65	8.0%	84	10.5%
HK\$20,000 – HK\$24,999	83	10.3%	84	10.5%
HK\$25,000 – HK\$29,999	55	6.8%	53	6.6%
HK\$30,000 – HK\$39,999	110	13.6%	109	13.7%
HK\$40,000 – HK\$59,999	125	15.5%	114	14.3%
HK\$60,000 or above	167	20.7%	131	16.4%
Total	808	100.0%	801	100.0%
Missing	206		213	

Table 31. Residential district

	Raw sample		Weighted sample	
	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,008)	Frequency	Percentage (Base=1,006)
Hong Kong Island	215	21.3%	189	18.8%
<i>Central and Western District</i>	25	2.5%	22	2.2%
<i>Wan Chai District</i>	4	0.4%	2	0.2%
<i>Eastern District</i>	137	13.6%	117	11.6%
<i>Southern District</i>	49	4.9%	48	4.8%
Kowloon East	135	13.4%	138	13.7%
<i>Wong Tai Sin District</i>	51	5.1%	55	5.4%
<i>Kwun Tong District</i>	84	8.3%	83	8.3%
Kowloon West	138	13.7%	125	12.4%
<i>Sham Shui Po District</i>	50	5.0%	52	5.1%
<i>Kowloon City District</i>	54	5.4%	42	4.1%
<i>Yau Tsim Mong District</i>	34	3.4%	32	3.2%
New Territories East	245	24.3%	244	24.3%
<i>Northern District</i>	33	3.3%	36	3.6%
<i>Tai Po District</i>	42	4.2%	44	4.3%
<i>Sha Tin District</i>	92	9.1%	90	8.9%
<i>Sai Kung District</i>	78	7.7%	75	7.5%
New Territories West	275	27.3%	310	30.8%
<i>Kwai Tsing District</i>	63	6.3%	74	7.3%
<i>Tsuen Wan District</i>	41	4.1%	38	3.8%
<i>Tuen Mun District</i>	69	6.8%	86	8.6%
<i>Yuen Long District</i>	84	8.3%	90	9.0%
<i>Islands District</i>	18	1.8%	22	2.1%
Total	1,008	100.0%	1,006	100.0%
Missing	6		8	

Appendix 4

In-depth Analysis: Cross-tabulations

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

Highlighted Findings of Cross-tabulations

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

[Q1] On awareness of IPCC

After excluding those who answered “don’t know / hard to say”, significant differences are found between gender, age, education attainment, occupation and monthly income groups at 99% confidence level, and between residential district groups at 95% confidence level:

- *Males are more likely than females to have heard of IPCC [92% (M) vs 81% (F)];*
- *Respondents aged 30-49 are more likely than their counterparts to have heard of IPCC [91% (30-49) vs 81% (18-29) & 84% (50+)];*
- *The higher the education level, the more likely the respondents to have heard of IPCC [90% (tertiary), 86% (secondary), 79% (primary)];*
- *Executives and professionals are more likely than their counterparts to have heard of IPCC [93% (executives and professionals) vs (79%-87%)];*
- *The higher the monthly personal income, the more likely the respondents to have heard of IPCC [96% (\$40k+), 94% (\$20k-\$39k), 84% (\$10k-\$19k), 83% (<\$10k)];*
- *Respondents with monthly household income more than \$60k are more likely than their counterparts to have heard of IPCC [97% (\$60k+) vs (81%-88%)];*
- *Respondents live in Hong Kong Island and Kowloon West are more likely than their counterparts to have heard of IPCC [91% (Hong Kong Island) and 91% (Kowloon West) vs (83%-84%)]*

[Q3] On knowledge of IPCC duties

[At least one correct answer] Significant differences are found between gender, education attainment, occupation and monthly personal income groups at 99% confidence level, and between monthly household income groups at 95% confidence level:

- *Males are more likely than females to have named at least one correct duty of IPCC [52% (M) vs 47% (F)];*
- *The higher the education level, the more likely the respondents could name at least one correct duty of IPCC [53% (tertiary), 49% (secondary), 46% (primary)];*
- *Executives and professionals are more likely than their counterparts to have named any correct IPCC duties [56% (executives and professionals) vs (45%-49%)];*
- *The higher the monthly income (both personal and household), the more likely the respondents could name at least one correct duty of IPCC [personal: 57% (\$40k+), 54% (\$20k-\$39k), 49% (\$10k-\$19k), 49% (<\$10k)] [household: 55% (\$60k+), 55% (\$30k-\$59k), 49% (\$10k-\$29k), 47% (<\$10k)]*

[Mean number of correct answers] Significant differences are found between people with different education attainments at 95% confidence level:

- *The higher the education level, the more correct duties of IPCC they could name [0.7 (tertiary), 0.6 (secondary), 0.5 (primary)]*

[Q4] On awareness of the independent nature of the IPCC

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

- *Males are more likely than females to be aware of the independent nature of IPCC [75% (M) vs 61% (F)];*
- *Respondents aged 50 or above are less likely than their counterparts to be aware of the independent nature of IPCC [65% (50+) vs 69% (18-29) & 69% (30-49)];*
- *The higher the education level, the more likely the respondents would be aware of the independent nature of IPCC [77% (tertiary), 68% (secondary), 54% (primary)];*
- *Homemakers are less likely than their counterparts to be aware of the independent nature of IPCC [50% (homemakers) vs (64%-81%)];*
- *The higher the monthly income (both personal and household), the more likely the respondents would be*

aware of the independent nature of IPCC [personal: 83% (\$40k+), 75% (\$20k-\$39k), 70% (\$10k-\$19k), 61% (<\$10k)] [household: 76% (\$60k+), 74% (\$30k-\$59k), 66% (\$10k-\$29k), 58% (<\$10k)]

[Q9] On views of IPCC's independence

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

- *The older the respondents, the more likely they would view IPCC's independence positively [55% (50+), 53% (30-49), 42% (18-29)];*
- *Respondents with tertiary education or above are less likely than their counterparts to view IPCC's independence positively [44% (tertiary) vs 50% (primary) & 59% (secondary)];*
- *Students are more likely than their counterparts to view IPCC's independence negatively [-ve rate: 33% (students) vs (16%-25%)];*
- *The higher the monthly household income, the more likely the respondents would view IPCC's independence negatively [-ve rate: 30% (\$60k+), 24% (\$30k-\$59k), 21% (\$10k-\$29k), 18% (<\$10k)]*
- *Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior to the interviews are less likely than their counterparts to opt for "don't know / hard to say" [DK / HS rate: 5% (heard of IPCC) vs 19% (not heard of IPCC)];*
- *Respondents who are aware of IPCC's independent nature prior to the interviews are more likely than their counterparts to view IPCC's independence positively [57% (aware of independence) vs 42% (not aware of independence)];*
- *Respondents with monthly personal income at \$20k-\$39k are less likely than their counterparts to view IPCC's independence positively [47% (\$20k-\$39k) vs (49%-55%)]*

[Q10] On views of IPCC's impartiality and objectivity

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

- *The higher the education level, the more likely the respondents would view IPCC's impartiality and objectivity negatively [-ve rate: 24% (tertiary), 19% (secondary), 15% (primary)];*
- *Respondents who are aware of IPCC's independent nature prior to the interviews are more likely than their counterparts to view IPCC's impartiality and objectivity positively [49% (aware of independence) vs 36% (not aware of independence)];*
- *The younger the respondents, the more likely they would view IPCC's impartiality and objectivity negatively [-ve rate: 25% (18-29), 19% (30-49), 17% (50+)];*
- *Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior to the interviews are less likely than their counterparts to opt for "don't know / hard to say" [DK / HS rate: 9% (heard of IPCC) vs 17% (not heard of IPCC)];*
- *Respondents live in Hong Kong Island, Kowloon East and Kowloon West are more likely than their counterparts to view IPCC's impartiality and objectivity positively [45% (Hong Kong Island, Kowloon East and Kowloon West) vs 43% (NT West) and 42% (NT East)]*

[Q11] On views of IPCC's efficiency

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

- *The older the respondents, the more likely they would view IPCC's efficiency positively [34% (50+), 24% (30-49), 17% (18-29)];*
- *The higher the education level, the less likely the respondents would view IPCC's efficiency positively [17% (tertiary), 29% (secondary), 38% (primary)];*
- *Students, executives and professionals are more likely to view IPCC's efficiency negatively, while homemakers are less likely to do the same [-ve rate: 33% (students) & 26% (executives and professionals) vs (18%-20%) vs 10% (homemakers)];*
- *The higher the monthly personal income, the less likely the respondents would view IPCC's efficiency*

positively [18% (\$40k+), 23% (\$20k-\$39k), 24% (\$10k-\$19k), 34% (<\$10k)];

- Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior to the interviews are less likely than their counterparts to opt for “don’t know / hard to say” [DK / HS rate: 19% (heard of IPCC) vs 29% (not heard of IPCC)];
- Respondents who are aware of IPCC’s independent nature prior to the interviews are less likely than their counterparts to opt for the middle ground “half-half” [“half-half” rate: 30% (aware of independence) vs 33% (not aware of independence)];
- Respondents with monthly household income more than \$60k are less likely than their counterparts to view IPCC’s efficiency positively [19% (\$60k+) vs (26%-34%)]

[Q12] On views of IPCC’s transparency

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

- The older the respondents, the more likely they would view IPCC’s transparency positively [27% (50+), 21% (30-49), 13% (18-29)];
- The higher the education level, the less likely the respondents would view IPCC’s transparency positively [15% (tertiary), 24% (secondary), 28% (primary)];
- Students, executives and professionals are more likely than their counterparts to view IPCC’s transparency negatively [-ve rate: 38% (students) & 35% (executives and professionals) vs (20%-28%)];
- Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior to the interviews are less likely than their counterparts to opt for “don’t know / hard to say” [DK / HS rate: 10% (heard of IPCC) vs 29% (not heard of IPCC)];
- Respondents who are aware of IPCC’s independent nature prior to the interviews are more likely than their counterparts to view IPCC’s transparency positively [25% (aware of independence) vs 18% (not aware of independence)];
- Males are more likely than females to view IPCC’s transparency positively [26% (M) vs 20% (F)];
- Respondents with monthly personal income more than \$20k are more likely than their counterparts to view IPCC’s transparency negatively [-ve rate: 37% (\$20k-\$39k) & 34% (\$40k+) vs (24%-27%)];
- The higher the monthly household income, the more likely the respondents would view IPCC’s transparency negatively [-ve rate: 35% (\$60k+), 34% (\$30k-\$59k), 23% (\$10k-\$29k), 20% (<\$10k)]

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

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

- The younger the respondents, the more likely they would appraise none of the four aspects positively [% of 0 positive attribute: 45% (18-29), 38% (30-49), 31% (50+)];
- The higher the education level, the more likely the respondents would appraise none of the four aspects positively [% of 0 positive attribute: 47% (tertiary), 32% (secondary), 31% (primary)];
- The higher the monthly household income, the more likely the respondents would appraise none of the four aspects positively [% of 0 positive attribute: 42% (\$60k+), 42% (\$30k-\$59k), 30% (\$10k-\$29k), 25% (<\$10k)];
- Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior to the interviews are more likely than their counterparts to appraise all four aspects positively [% of 4 positive attributes: 13% (heard of IPCC) vs 5% (not heard of IPCC)];
- Respondents who are aware of IPCC’s independent nature prior to the interviews are less likely than their counterparts to appraise none of the four aspects positively [% of 0 positive attribute: 32% (aware of independence) vs 46% (not aware of independence)];
- Females are more likely than males to appraise none of the four aspects positively [% of 0 positive attribute: 40% (F) vs 31% (M)];
- Students, executives and professionals and clerical and service workers are more likely than their counterparts to appraise none of the four aspects positively [% of 0 positive attribute: 42% (students) & 40% (executives and professionals) & 40% (clerical and service workers) vs (31%-32%)]

[Q13] On confidence in IPCC

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

- Males are more likely than females to be confident in IPCC [50% (M) vs 39% (F)];
- The older the respondents, the more likely they would be confident in IPCC [51% (50+), 43% (30-49), 26% (18-29)];
- The higher the education level, the less likely the respondents would be confident in IPCC [35% (tertiary), 46% (secondary), 52% (primary)];
- Students are less likely than their counterparts to be confident in IPCC [33% (students) vs (39%-55%)];
- Respondents live in New Territories East are less likely than their counterparts to express their confidence in IPCC [33% (NT East) vs (44%-55%)];
- Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior to the interviews are less likely than their counterparts to opt for “don’t know / hard to say” [DK / HS rate: 3% (heard of IPCC) vs 13% (not heard of IPCC)];
- Respondents who are aware of IPCC’s independent nature prior to the interviews are more likely than their counterparts to be confident in IPCC [47% (aware of independence) vs 35% (not aware of independence)];
- The higher the monthly household income, the more likely the respondents admitted they are not confident in IPCC [-ve rate: 33% (\$60k+), 24% (\$30k-\$59k), 22% (\$10k-\$29k), 21% (<\$10k)]

[Q15] On confidence in two-tier complaints system

Significant differences are found between age, education attainment, occupation groups, as well as awareness of IPCC and its independent nature at 99% confidence level, and between males and females at 95% confidence level:

- The older the respondents, the more likely they would be confident in the two-tier complaints system [50% (50+), 46% (30-49), 25% (18-29)];
- The higher the education level, the more likely the respondents would be not confident in the two-tier complaints system [-ve rate: 28% (tertiary), 25% (secondary), 16% (primary)];
- Students are less likely than their counterparts to be confident in the two-tier complaints system [31% (students) vs (38%-51%)];
- Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior to the interviews are less likely than their counterparts to opt for “don’t know / hard to say” [DK / HS rate: 4% (heard of IPCC) vs 20% (not heard of IPCC)];
- Respondents who are aware of IPCC’s independent nature prior to the interviews are more likely than their counterparts to be confident in the two-tier complaints system [49% (aware of independence) vs 37% (not aware of independence)];
- Males are more likely than females to be confident in the two-tier complaints system [47% (M) vs 42% (F)]

[Q17] On overall image of IPCC

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

- The younger the respondents, the more likely they would perceive IPCC’s overall image negatively [-ve rate: 16% (18-29), 11% (30-49), 8% (50+)];
- The higher the education level, the more likely the respondents would perceive IPCC’s overall image negatively [-ve rate: 14% (tertiary), 10% (secondary), 6% (primary)];
- Students are less likely than their counterparts to perceive IPCC’s overall image positively [44% (students) vs (53%-60%)];
- The higher the monthly household income, the more likely the respondents would perceive IPCC’s overall image negatively [-ve rate: 18% (\$60k+), 12% (\$30k-\$59k), 8% (\$10k-\$29k), 6% (<\$10k)];
- Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior to the interviews are less likely than their counterparts to

- opt for “don’t know / hard to say” [DK / HS rate: 3% (heard of IPCC) vs 17% (not heard of IPCC)];
- Respondents who are aware of IPCC’s independent nature prior to the interviews are more likely than their counterparts to perceive IPCC’s overall image positively [62% (aware of independence) vs 47% (not aware of independence)];
 - Females are more likely than males to opt for “don’t know / hard to say” [DK / HS rate: 6% (F) vs 3% (M)];
 - Respondents with monthly personal income at \$20k-\$39k are more likely than their counterparts to perceive IPCC’s overall image negatively [-ve rate: 16% (\$20k-\$39k) vs (8%-12%)]

[Q19] On satisfaction with IPCC’s performance

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

- Males are more likely than females to be satisfied with IPCC’s performance [45% (M) vs 36% (F)];
- The older the respondents, the more likely they would be satisfied with IPCC’s performance [47% (50+), 38% (30-49), 25% (18-29)];
- The higher the education level, the less likely the respondents to be satisfied with IPCC’s performance [27% (tertiary), 43% (secondary), 49% (primary)];
- Students, executives and professionals are more likely than their counterparts to be dissatisfied with IPCC’s performance [-ve rate: 25% (students) & 21% (executives and professionals) vs (7%-14%)];
- The higher the monthly personal income, the more likely the respondents would be dissatisfied with IPCC’s performance [-ve rate: 22% (\$40k+), 21% (\$20k-\$39k), 15% (\$10k-\$19k), 12% (<\$10k)];
- Respondents with monthly household income more than \$30k are less likely than their counterparts to be satisfied with IPCC’s performance [39% (\$30k-\$59k) & 39% (\$60k+) vs (45%-48%)];
- Respondents live in New Territories East are less likely than their counterparts to be satisfied with IPCC’s performance [29% (NT East) vs (39%-49%)];
- Respondents who have heard of IPCC prior to the interviews are less likely than their counterparts to opt for “don’t know / hard to say” [DK / HS rate: 11% (heard of IPCC) vs 28% (not heard of IPCC)];
- Respondents who are aware of IPCC’s independent nature prior to the interviews are more likely than their counterparts to be satisfied with IPCC’s performance [43% (aware of independence) vs 36% (not aware of independence)]

Appendix 5

Bilingual Questionnaires



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

Jointly conduct
合作進行

Independent Police Complaints Council
Public Opinion Survey 2015
獨立監察警方處理投訴委員會(監警會)
意見調查 2015

Questionnaire (Final)
調查問卷 (定稿)

February 27, 2015
2015 年 2 月 27 日

Part I Introduction

第一部分 自我介紹

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

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

Yes 可以

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

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

Yes 係

No 唔係 (skip to end)

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

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

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

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

Yes, more than one, _____ (exact number) → S3

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

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

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

有多過一位，_____位 【入實數】 → S3

有 → 訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜

訪者拒絕回答 → 訪問告終，多謝合作，拜拜

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

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

請問可唔可以呢？

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

Yes - Another family member is the respondent → 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

No → Skip to Q5

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

有 → 續問 Q2a

冇 → 跳至 Q5

唔知道 / 難講

拒答

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

請問你係從乜野途徑聽過「監警會」呢？仲有呢？（不讀答案，可選多項）

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

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

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

Magazines 雜誌			
*Internet (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			
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: 係邊度見到海報?) 地點 (請註明: _____)			
* Annual report of IPCC / Brochure 「監警會」年報 / 小冊子			
* IPCC 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			
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?")

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

Correct answers

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

Incorrect answers

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

Others (Please specify: _____)

Don't know / can't remember

Refuse to answer

正確答案

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

錯誤答案

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

其他 (請註明: _____)

唔知道 / 唔記得

拒答

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

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

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

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

你認為市民投訴警察最有效係經邊個渠道呢? (不讀答案，只選一項)

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

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

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

Yes

- Conflicts between Police and citizens during processions / gatherings and demonstrations
- News related to the Occupy Movement
- Use of excessive and unnecessary force
- Use of tear gas grenades to disperse protesters
- Use of tear gas spray to disperse protesters
- Showing of the “disperse or we fire” warning banner to protesters
- Inappropriate use of pepper spray
- Use of pepper spray on protesters behind the gate at Mongkok Police Station
- Tapping a protester on his shoulder and pepper spraying him in the face when he turned around
- Inappropriate use of police batons
- Use of police batons to strike heads and joints of protesters
- Franklin Chu King-wai / an officer used his police baton to strike the neck of a protester from behind
- Assaulting protesters
- Seven police officers beat up Ken Tsang Kin-chiu / a protestor on a street corner
- Assaulting protesters inside police vehicles or other places
- Assaulting or arresting medical personnel
- Ill-treatment of protesters
- Dragging protesters along the ground
- Unreasonable arrest of protesters
- Inappropriate treatment / Ill-treatment of arrested persons
- Unreasonable checking of ID cards and registration of personal data
- Plain-clothes officers among protesters tried to provoke violence
- Doubt on Police’s political neutrality
- Wearing blue ribbons while on duty
- Arrest protesters selectively
- Dissatisfaction with bail arrangements
- Police’s misconduct / bad attitude / abusive language
- Raising the middle finger towards protesters
- A plain-clothes officer threatened a female protester to “shut up or I’ll take you back to the police station and rape you”
- Ill-treatment towards a hotel staff who complained about an idling police coach bus with running engine
- Police officers told protesters who blocked the building of Next Media that they can choose not to receive the injunction order
- Police officers concealing or not showing their badge numbers
- Plain-clothes officers refused to produce their Police Warrant Cards
- Police officers on duty took group photos after clearance
- Police’s neglect of duty
- Not arresting or stopping anti-Occupy protesters who used violence
- Police’s mishandling of sexual violent case
- 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

使用催淚彈驅散示威者

使用催淚噴劑驅散示威者

向示威者展示「速離否則開槍」橙底黑字警告旗

不適當使用胡椒噴霧

警員於旺角警處隔着大閘對市民施放胡椒噴霧

警員從後拍示威者膊頭後正面噴胡椒噴霧

不適當使用警棍

使用警棍攻擊市民頭部或關節

朱經緯 / 警員揮警棍從後擊打市民後頸

襲擊示威者

七名警員於暗角拳打腳踢曾健超 / 示威者

於警車上或其他地方襲擊示威者

襲擊或拘捕醫護人員

粗暴對待示威者

將示威者放在地上拖行

無理拘捕示威者

拘留期間不適當 / 不人道對待被捕人士

無理要求市民出示身份證及登記個人資料

便衣警員假扮示威者鬧事

質疑警員的政治中立性

警員執勤時佩戴藍絲帶

選擇性拘捕示威者

不滿保釋安排

警員行為不當 / 態度欠佳 / 粗言穢語

向示威者豎中指

便衣警員恐嚇女士「再嘈捉你返差館強姦」

警員不禮貌 / 粗暴對待不滿警方租用旅遊巴沒有熄匙的酒店職員

警員向堵塞壹傳媒大樓示威者表示可以不接禁制令

遮掩或不展示警員編號

便衣警員拒絕出示委任證

清場後執勤警員在現場拍攝大合照

警員疏忽職守

不拘捕或制止使用暴力的反佔中人士

警被指失當處理性暴力案

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)

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

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

[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既新聞？如有，可唔可以講俾我知係關於乜野？(不讀答案，可選多項)

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
- 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
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」既工作，之後請你就你對「監警會」既印象回答一 D 問題。

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

你覺得「監警會」監察同覆檢投訴個案既效率係點？(讀出答案，只選一項)

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

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

你覺得「監警會」既監察同覆檢投訴個案既透明度係點？(讀出答案，只選一項)

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

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

請問你對監警會有冇信心？(訪員追問程度)

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

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

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

Committees are appointed, not elected by citizens

Both are under the Government

May take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases

It's like self-investigation

Police officers could be appointed as committees

The process and results of complaints are not released to public

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

No direct investigation, monitor only, no actual authority

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

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

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

覺得兩者同屬政府人員 / 機構

監察或覆檢個案時可能會偏袒警務人員

好似自己人查自己人

警員都可以被委任為委員之一

投訴既過程同結果都唔會公開

唔覺得佢地會站在市民既立場 / 角度調查或者監察投訴

佢地唔會直接處理投訴, 只係監察 / 冇實權

只負責監察同覆檢工作, 冇直接參與調查

為避免不利消息影響警方形象, 可能會隱瞞事實真相

不信任監警會主席郭琳廣先生

不信任監警會部分委員

唔係好清楚監警會既工作 / 運作

其他 (請註明: _____)

唔知道 / 難講

拒答

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

請問你對現時兩層架構既投訴警察有冇信心?(訪員追問程度)

Very confident → Skip to Q17

Quite confident → Skip to Q17

Half-half → Skip to Q17

Not quite confident (continue to Q16)

Not confident at all (continue to Q16)

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

Refuse to answer → Skip to Q17

好有信心 → 跳至 Q17

幾有信心 → 跳至 Q17

一半半 → 跳至 Q17

唔係幾有信心 / 幾有信心 → 續問 Q16

好有信心 → 續問 Q16

唔知道 / 冇意見[不要讀出] → 跳至 Q17

拒答 → 跳至 Q17

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

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

IPCC should have authorization to investigate

IPCC should have authorization to investigate serious cases

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

Shorten the time for investigation and review

Simplify the monitor and review procedures

Increase transparency

More promotion

Involve individuals from different classes in the process

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

監警會應該要有調查嚴重個案既權利

監警會應該有權決定對違規警員既懲罰

縮短調查及覆檢既時間

簡化調查及覆檢既程序

提高透明度

增加宣傳

讓不同階層人士都可參與其中

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 : _____)

沒有需要改善的地方

唔知道 / 難講

拒答

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

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

Positive (continue to Q18)

正面 → 續問 Q18

Quite positive (continue to Q18)

頗正面 → 續問 Q18

Half-half → Skip to Q19

一半半 → 跳至 Q19

Quite negative (continue to Q18)

頗負面 → 續問 Q18

Negative (continue to Q18)

負面 → 續問 Q18

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

唔知道 / 冇意見[不要讀出] → 跳至 Q19

Refuse to answer → Skip to Q19

拒答 → 跳至 Q19

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

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

Positive answers

IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review

IPCC is independent enough

IPCC is fair enough

IPCC has high transparency

IPCC has high efficiency

IPCC has sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties

IPCC provides a helpful monitoring system / mechanism

IPCC's structure gives people confidence

Other positive answers (Please specify : _____)

Negative answers

Don't think IPCC members have sufficient and professional knowledge to monitor and review

No trust in IPCC's independence

IPCC might take sides with police officers when monitoring or reviewing cases

IPCC has low transparency

IPCC has low efficiency

IPCC doesn't have sufficient authorization to fulfill its duties

Other negative answers (Please specify : _____)

Don't know / hard to say

Refuse to answer

正面答案

監警會人員有足夠及專業知識去做監察同覆檢既工作

監警會夠獨立

監警會夠公正

監警會既透明度好高

監警會既效率好高

監警會有足夠既權力去履行職責

監警會提供監察系統 / 機制有助監察

監警會架構使人安心 / 有信心

其他正面答案 (請註明 : _____)

負面答案

不相信監警會人員有足夠及專業知識去做監察同覆檢既工作

不相信監警會既獨立性

監警會係監察 / 覆檢個案時可能會偏袒警務人員

監警會既透明度好低

監警會既效率好低

監警會有足夠權力去履行職責

其他負面答案 (請註明 : _____)

唔知道 / 難講

拒答

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

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

[Q20] Please rate on a scale of 0-100 your satisfaction with the IPCC's performance. 0 stands for very dissatisfied, 100 stands for very satisfied, 50 stands for half-half. How would you rate it?
請你用 0 至 100 分評價你對「監警會」表現既滿意程度, 0 分代表非常唔滿意, 100 分代表非常滿意, 50 分代表一半半, 你會俾幾多分佢呢?

_____ [Input exact figure] _____ [入實數]
Don't know 唔知道 / 難講
Refuse to answer 拒答

[Q21] Lastly, what are your expectations on IPCC? Any more? (Do not read out options, multiple answers allowed)
最後, 整體而言你對「監警會」有乜野期望?(不讀答案, 可選多項)

Hope IPCC can improve Police-community relation / enhance its communication
Hope IPCC can monitor HK Police Force's work effectively
Hope IPCC can pressure HK police effectively in order to improve their work
Hope IPCC can explain more to citizens the work / complaints system of HK Police Force
Hope IPCC can ensure citizens will get appropriate Police services
Hope IPCC can provide a channel for complaints against police
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 compliant cases directly
Hope IPCC can increase its efficiency
Hope IPCC will keep up with its good work
Hope IPCC can have more promotion of its work
Hope IPCC can broaden its member base
Hope IPCC can expand its mandated functions
Others (Please specify: _____)
Don't know / hard to say
Refuse to answer
希望監警會可以改善警民關係 / 加強警民溝通
希望監警會可以有效監察香港警察既工作
希望監警會可以有效俾香港警察適當壓力令工作做得更好
希望監警會可以向市民多解釋香港警察既工作 / 投訴機制
希望監警會可以保障市民得到適當既警察服務
希望監警會可以提供投訴香港警察既渠道
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

希望監警會加強宣傳其工作

希望監警會讓不同人士成為委員

希望可以擴大監警會既法定職能

其他 (請註明: _____)

唔知道 / 難講

拒答

Part IV Demographics 第四部分 個人資料

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

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

[DM1] Gender 性別

Male	男
Female	女

[DM2a] Age 年齡

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

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

【只問不肯透露準確年齡被訪者】年齡 (範圍)[訪問員可讀出範圍]

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

[DM3] Education Attainment 教育程度

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

[DM4] Occupation 職業

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

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

每月個人收入 (請包括所有收入來源)

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

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

每月家庭收入 (請包括所有收入來源)

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

[DM7] Residential District 居住地區

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

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

Good-bye!

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

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

***** 問卷完 *****