

Report on the Key Findings of the Public Opinion Survey on 2012 Anti-drug Publicity Measures

Purpose

This paper presents the key findings of the Public Opinion Survey on 2012 Anti-drug Publicity Measures (the survey) and our observations on the key findings.

Objectives of the survey

2. The objectives of this annual survey are -
 - (a) to gauge public perception on the key anti-drug publicity messages under the territory-wide publicity campaign – “Stand Firm! Knock Drugs Out (企硬! 唔 take 嘢)” – which had been launched for around 30 months before the survey, as well as various Announcements in the Public Interest (APIs); and
 - (b) to assess the extent of penetration of the publicity messages through different media channels such as television (TV), radio and the internet.

Background of the survey

3. The Narcotics Division has since 2007 commissioned a public opinion survey every year on anti-drug publicity initiatives in the year. The Statistics Unit of the Security Bureau designs the survey questionnaire and engages an outsider contractor to collect and validate data which form the basis of the analyses and compilation of relevant reports.

4. The methodology for the 2012 survey was similar to those of previous exercises. The 2012 survey was conducted from 21 November to 19 December 2012 mainly during the time slots between 6:30 pm and 10:00 pm on weekdays and between 2:00 pm to 10:00 pm on weekends. The survey covered Hong Kong residents aged between 11 and 60 (both ages inclusive but exclude foreign domestic helpers) who were able to speak and communicate in Chinese and belonged to households with a domestic telephone line. Through random sampling, the outside contractor successfully enumerated 1 005 respondents aged between 11 and 60 by telephone interviews, with a

cooperation rate of about 55%. The sample size and cooperation rate were considered statistically sufficient for meaningful analyses.

5. To facilitate future planning for publicity measures, we have specifically analysed the views of the following three categories of respondents¹ -

- (a) 152 sets of responses from general youngsters (i.e. those aged from 11 to 20), including high-risk youngsters [(b) below];
- (b) 66 sets of responses from the “high-risk” group (i.e. those who knew someone who were drug abusers and/or who had been offered drugs before); and
- (c) 518 sets of responses from parents.

Key findings of the survey & observations

(a) Campaign slogan

Findings

6. The awareness rates on the current anti-drug slogan “Stand Firm! Knock Drugs Out (企硬!唔take嘢)” and the corresponding findings in the previous surveys conducted from 2008 to 2011 are as follows-

¹ The total sets of responses from the three categories of respondents do not add up to 1 005 because a “high-risk” respondent can be a youngster, a parent, or neither of the two. Also, some of the respondents do not fall under any of the three categories.

	Not Now, Not Ever (不可一·不可再)		Stand Firm! Knock Drugs Out (企硬!唔take嘢)		
	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
<i>(Launched for around)</i>	<i>(6 months)</i>	<i>(18 months)</i>	<i>(6 months)</i>	<i>(18 months)</i>	<i>(30 months)</i>
All respondents	74%	93%	67%	85%	91%
General youngster	87%	96%	68%	88%	91%
High risk group	84%	98%	69%	85%	83%
Parents	70%	92%	64%	83%	87%

7. The overall awareness rate of the slogan “Stand Firm! Knock Drugs Out (企硬!唔take嘢)” in 2012 had continued to grow to 91%, while the awareness rate for the high risk group was slightly lower at 83%.

8. In respect of respondents’ opinions on the current anti-drug slogan “Stand Firm! Knock Drugs Out (企硬!唔take嘢)”, the majority (84%) indicated no difficulty in understanding it; 68% found the slogan “permeated through the people (深入民心)”; and 77% found it “pandered to youth taste (迎合年青人口味)”. Details are set out in the following table² -

	Not difficult to understand	Difficult to understand	Permeated through the people (深入民心)	Pandered to youth taste (迎合年青人口味)
All respondents	84% (77%)	15% (20%)	68% (65%)	77% (71%)
General youngster	95% (91%)	4% (7%)	79% (75%)	82% (75%)
High risk group	81% (82%)	17% (16%)	56% (67%)	74% (73%)
Parents	79% (71%)	20% (14%)	68% (62%)	79% (68%)

Observations

9. Among the three groups of respondents, the high risk group has a relatively lower awareness rate of the anti-drug slogan. This supports arguments for enhancing efforts in high risk group education in our fight against drug abuse in the territory.

² Figures in 2011 are shown in bracket for comparison.

10. The survey findings also show that general youngsters have a higher level of acceptance of the current slogan, with 95% of the relevant respondents indicating no difficulty in understanding it. Besides, 79% and 82% of them found it “permeated through the people” and “pandered to youth taste” respectively. This suggests that the slogan could serve its intended purpose in reaching out to the general youngsters.

11. The awareness rate of the campaign themed “Stand Firm! Knock Drugs Out (企硬!唔take嘢)” reached 91% after 30 months from its launch which was higher than 85% when the last survey was conducted after the launch of the campaign for 18 months. This confirms that the awareness of the campaign has built up over time. We see a strong case to continue to leverage on this theme as “umbrella theme” for our anti-drug publicity.

12. In respect of the group of parents, consistent with outcome of the 2011 survey, the level of awareness and understanding of the theme is generally lower than that of the young people. The awareness of the group (87%) in 2012, however, has surpassed the high risk group (83%). In addition, the group has shown a more positive attitude towards the slogan, with 79% indicating that it is not difficult to understand (71% in 2011), 68% considering it permeated through the people, and 79% considering it pandered to youth taste. The corresponding figures in 2011 were 62% and 68% respectively.

(b) Anti-drug messages

Findings

13. The respondents were asked whether they had seen or heard of the following seven key anti-drug messages conveyed through various anti-drug publicity initiatives -

<i>Drug Harms</i>	<i>Promulgated since</i>
A. Ketamine can be addictive and harmful to your body (索 K 會上癮同埋對身體造成禍害)	(Dec 2011)
B. Harm of abusing ice and cocaine (吸食冰毒和可卡因的禍害)	(Jun 2011)
C. Harm of abusing thinner and cough medicine (吸天拿水和亂喝咳藥水的禍害)	(Dec 2010)

Help seeking/ services*Promulgated since*

- D. Drug abusers should seek for help as soon as possible (吸毒者應盡早求助) (Ongoing)
- E. Drug abusers can call “186 186” for help (吸毒者可以打 186 186 尋求協助) (Jun 2012³)
- F. Parents, families or the public can call “186 186” to help drug abusers seeking treatment and rehabilitation (T&R) (父母、家人或公眾人士可以打 186 186 協助吸毒者戒毒) (Jul 2012³)

Community support for T&R services

- G. Support and accept drug T&R services (支持及接納戒毒及康復設施) (Jul 2011)

14. The awareness rates of the above seven messages were as follows -

	Anti-drug Message						
	A ketamine	B ice & cocaine	C thinner & cough medicine	D seek help	E 186 186	F parents	G community support
All respondents	93%	84%	82%	80%	47%	40%	53%
General youngster	94%	82%	86%	91%	60%	51%	54%
High risk group	84%	75%	78%	66%	35%	26%	49%
Parents	92%	84%	82%	79%	45%	40%	59%

15. In descending order, the awareness rates for messages A to C on drug harms were 93%, 84% and 82% respectively and that for message D on help seeking was 80%. On the other hand, the awareness rates for messages E and F on the “186 186 hotline” and G on community support for T&R services were relatively lower at 47%, 40% and 53% respectively. A similar pattern was observed among different categories of respondents.

³ Help-seeking through the telephone service of “186 186” has been publicised through various publicity initiatives such as APIs, anti-drug posters and leaflets, etc. To address the hidden youth drug abuse problem, commencing from 22 June 2012, the “186 186” telephone service has been enhanced to operate on a 24-hour basis with the support of social workers. Two sets of TV and radio APIs were produced in mid-2012 to encourage drug abusers to seek help early through “186 186” and to highlight the importance of parents and the public playing a more active role in prevention of drug abuse, early identification and intervention.

16. The following are the six APIs broadcast recently -

<i>Drug Harms</i>	<i>Broadcast since</i>	<i>Duration of airing in 2012</i>
A. Anti-drug 2011 (Harm of abusing ketamine) 企硬 2011 (吸食氯胺酮的禍害)	(Dec 2011)	(7 months)
B. Anti-drug 2011 (Harm of abusing ice and cocaine) 企硬 2011 (吸食冰毒和可卡因的禍害)	(Jun 2011)	(7 months)
C. Anti-drug 2010 (Harm of abusing thinner and cough medicine) 企硬 2010 (吸天拿水和亂喝咳藥水的禍害)	(Dec 2010)	(4 months)

Help seeking/ services

D. Anti-drug 2012 (Youngsters) 企硬 2012 (青少年篇)	(Jun 2012)	(5 months)
E. Anti-drug 2012 (Public and Parents) 企硬 2012 (公眾及家長篇)	(Jul 2012)	(4.5 months)

Community support for T&R services

F. Anti-drug 2011 (Drug T&R services) 企硬 2011 (戒毒治療和康復服務)	(Jul 2011)	(4 months)
--	------------	------------

17. The respondents were asked about their impression on the six APIs and whether the APIs could convey the corresponding anti-drug messages. Among those who affirmed reception of anti-drug messages from the APIs, they were also asked whether they agreed with the messages.

18. The awareness rates, reception rates and acceptance rates for the six APIs were set out below-

	Anti-drug APIs					
	A ketamine	B ice & cocaine	C thinner & cough medicine	D help seeking (youngsters)	E help seeking (public & parents)	F community support
Awareness rate						
All respondents	85%	75%	83%	61%	61%	52%
General youngster	88%	70%	88%	70%	63%	50%
High risk group	85%	77%	75%	42%	43%	48%
Parents	87%	78%	84%	60%	62%	59%
Reception rate						
All respondents	93%	91%	87%	67%	64%	63%
General youngster	95%	95%	88%	83%	73%	69%
High risk group	87%	80%	81%	57%	58%	54%
Parents	92%	90%	86%	67%	65%	68%
Acceptance rate						
All respondents	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	99%
General youngster	100%	100%	100%	99%	99%	100%
High risk group	100%	91%	97%	100%	100%	97%
Parents	99%	100%	100%	100%	99%	99%

19. Awareness rates of 85%, 75% and 83% were achieved for the three APIs on drug harms A, B and C respectively. In addition, 93%, 91% and 87% of respondents affirmed their reception of the corresponding messages. The awareness rates on the APIs D, E and F were lower at 61%, 61% and 52% and with a relatively lower proportion of respondents affirmed their reception of the contained messages (67%, 64% and 63%).

20. Among those who affirmed reception of anti-drug messages from the APIs, almost all of them (99% or above) agreed to the anti-drug messages promulgated.

Observations

21. The anti-drug messages and APIs on drug harms of specific drugs, including ketamine, ice, cocaine, thinner and cough medicine, appear to have effectively conveyed the messages to the target audience, as evident in their high awareness / reception rate.

22. As regards the “186 186” hotline and community support for T&R services, the awareness / reception rates are relatively lower. This is understandable since the two APIs relating to the “186 186” service were launched in the second half of 2012. Earlier monitoring of the effects of the two APIs in terms of the calls to the 186 186 hotline, with an average of around 87 calls resulting in referrals to non-government organizations (NGOs) for follow-up assistance per month in the first 5 months after the launch of these APIs, suggested satisfactory progress.

23. Since the two APIs have been launched for about half a year only and are part and parcel of the efforts to promote the 186 186 hotline to encourage early help seeking against the growing problem of hidden drug abuse, we will continue to step up the efforts to publicise the “186 186” hotline, e.g. by making use of popular social media platform, sending out SMS alerts, and producing promotion poster on the subject for displaying at suitable locations (e.g. Integrated Family Services Centre). (Details of initiatives to step up promotion of the “186 186” service are set out in the paper “*Progress Report on Preventive Education and Publicity Activities*” (Paper No. PE&P 2/13)).

24. On enhancing public's understanding on community support for T&R services, unlike many other APIs, the awareness of the API and reception of the message behind had not improved over time. This appears to confirm the view that for an issue with more complex messages like this, it may be more fruitful to identify other means to promote such messages.

25. It takes persistent efforts to promote an atmosphere in the community which is supportive of drug treatment facilities and those who quit drugs. The publicity project by Roadshow supported by the Beat Drugs Fund was launched in December 2012, with 18 episodes of programmes broadcast through the network of Roadshow and Cable TV News Channel. It represented a more structured approach to present to the public how current T&R programmes could bring changes to life of young people once plagued by the drug problem. To maximise the publicity impact, we will explore further means to fully utilize the series of programmes, including uploading to the ND website and internet, producing DVDs of the series and arranging broadcast at different platforms. We will continue to explore various avenues and means to continue to promote the message.

(c) Penetration rate of anti-drug messages in different media channels

Findings

26. The penetration rates of anti-drug messages in different media channels were as follows -

	Ranking of the five most popular media channels of anti-drug messages				
	1	2	3	4	5
All respondents	TV advertisement (87%)	TV program (55%)	MTR stations (54%)	bus stations/ bus body (54%)	schools/ housing estates/ govt. buildings (53%)
General youngster	TV advertisement (87%)	schools/ housing estates/ govt. buildings (77%)	internet (74%)	bus stations/ bus body (63%)	MTR stations (60%)
High risk group	TV advertisement (84%)	TV program (57%)	schools/ housing estates/ govt. buildings (45%)	MTR stations (44%)	bus stations/ bus body (40%)
Parents	TV advertisement (86%)	TV program (60%)	bus stations/ bus body (51%)	MTR stations (49%)	newspaper/ magazine (48%)

27. TV advertisement was universally the most popular media channel in receiving anti-drug messages. High risk group and parents ranked TV programs as the second, while general youngsters preferred publicity materials located at schools/housing estates/government buildings, as well as internet. Public transport facilities, such as MTR stations and bus stations / bus bodies, feature among the popular channels in all categories of respondents.

Observations

28. TV remained the most popular channel for both young people and adults. In view of the general better receptiveness of this channel among different target groups, we shall continue to disseminate key anti-drug messages through this platform.

29. Specific to the general youngsters, school and internet seemed to be effective channels although they may not be best suited for us to reach out to other target groups. For parents, it is worth noting that public transport facilities, and more traditional media (newspaper / magazine) may also be effective means to reach this target group.

Narcotics Division
Security Bureau
March 2013