Public Opinion Survey  
on 2010 Anti-drug Publicity Measures

Major Findings

Purpose

This paper presents the major findings of the Public Opinion Survey on 2010 Anti-drug Publicity Measures (the survey).

Objectives of the survey

2. The objectives of the survey are to gauge public awareness of the anti-drug messages and Announcements in the Public Interest (APIs) with the theme “Stand Firm! Knock Drugs Out (企硬！唔take嘢)”, and gauge the reach of different publicity channels.

Major findings

(a) Awareness of slogan

3. The overall awareness rate of the theme “Stand Firm! Knock Drugs Out (企硬！唔take嘢)” was 67%. Meanwhile, the awareness rate of the general youngsters, (68%), and the high-risk group, (69%) were slightly higher than the overall rate.

4. 55% of the respondents found no difficulty in understanding the slogan, while 28% of them did find difficulties. 46% found the slogan “permeated through the people (深入人心)”, while 24% found it not. 49% found the slogan “liked by the general public (通俗)”, while 24% found it not. 59% found the slogan “pandered to youth taste (迎合年青人口味)”, while 11% found it not.

5. For the high-risk group, they have a higher acceptance of the slogan. 56% found it “permeated through the people”, 53% found it “liked by the general public”, and 63% found it “pandered to youth taste”.

(b) Awareness of three key anti-drug messages

6. The respondents were asked whether they had seen or heard of the three key anti-drug messages conveyed through various anti-drug publicity initiatives. The overall awareness rates were as follows-

I Drug abusing causes damage and is harmful to health 82%
(吸毒的禍害和對身體造成的傷害)

II Youth should say “no” to temptation from drugs 79%
(青少年面對毒品引誘時，應堅拒毒品)

III Family support is very important for youth to resist drugs 77%
(家庭支持對青少年抗毒很重要)

7. For the high-risk group, their awareness rate (79%) for message III was higher than those of general youngsters and parents. For message I, parents displayed higher awareness (82%). Meanwhile, the general youngsters showed relatively lower awareness for all the three messages (77% for message I, 75% for message II and 67% for message III).

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

8. The most popular media channel was TV (80%), followed by radio (35%), bus stations/bus body (21%) and MTR stations (19%).

9. The four most popular channels of anti-drug messages were the same among all three categories of interviewees under analysis. However, the fifth popular channel varied: karaoke/bars for the high-risk group, internet for the general youngsters; and anti-drug activities/posters for parents and all respondents.

(d) Impression on three APIs

10. The respondents were asked about their impression on the following three APIs. The overall awareness rates were set out below-

   A. “Stand Firm! Knock Drugs Out!” Anti-drug 2010 (Stand) 76%
      「企硬！Take嘔衰硬」企硬2010 (企篇)\(^1\)

\(^1\) The API repeatedly showed different people falling down after drug taking. Then, slogan “Stand Firm! Knock Drugs Out!” displayed at the end.
B. “Stand Firm! Knock Drugs Out!” Anti-drug 2010 (Run) 75%
企硬！Take野衰硬 企硬2010 (走篇)

C. “With your support, I can stand firm and knock drugs out!” Anti-drug 2010 (Hands)
有你嘅支持，我先可以企硬唔掂毒品
企硬2010 (扶篇)

Among the different categories of interviewees under analysis, their awareness rates were similar.

(e) Key anti-drug messages in the APIs

11. After being asked to recall the three APIs, the respondents were also asked whether the APIs could convey the following key anti-drug messages. The percentages of respondents affirming reception of the messages were as follows-

I Drug abusing causes damage and is harmful to health 82%
吸毒的禍害和對身體造成的傷害

II Youth should say “no” to temptation from drugs 80%
青少年面對毒品引誘時，應堅拒毒品

III Family support is very important for youth to resist drugs 78%
家庭支持對青少年抗毒很重要

12. Compared with others, a higher percentage of high-risk group affirmed the reception of message II (86%) and message III (88%).

(f) Acceptance of the three key anti-drug messages

13. Among those who affirmed reception of anti-drug messages from APIs, they were then asked whether they agreed with the messages. The percentages of respondents agreeing with those messages were as follows-

I Drug abusing causes damage and is harmful to health 97%
吸毒的禍害和對身體造成的傷害

---

2 The API screened two students trying to escape from drugs, who successfully rejected the drugs finally. The slogan “Stand Firm! Knock Drugs Out!” displayed at the end.

3 The API alternatively showed several scenes of having quarrel and giving supports between parents and kids. The slogan “With your support, I can stand firm and knock drugs out!” displayed at the end.
II Youth should say “no” to temptation from drugs  
(青少年面對毒品引誘時，應堅拒毒品)  
95%

III Family support is very important for youth to resist 
 drugs  
(家庭支持對青少年抗毒很重要)  
95%

The percentages of respondents in general youngsters, high-risk groups and 
parents agreeing with the three messages were similar.

14. Members may note the above major findings of the opinion survey.

Background

(a) Survey methodology

15. The survey questionnaire was designed by the Statistics Unit of the 
Security Bureau in consultation with the Narcotics Division. Data collection 
and validation was performed by an outside contractor. Data analysis and report 
compilation were undertaken by the Statistics Unit.

16. The survey was conducted from 14 to 27 February 2011 mainly 
during the time slots between 6:00 pm and 10:00 pm.

(b) Coverage

17. The survey sampled Hong Kong residents aged 11 or above who were 
able to speak and communicate in Cantonese or Putonghua and were staying in 
households with a domestic telephone line during the survey period.

18. 1,023 persons aged 11 and above were successfully enumerated by 
telephone interviews during the period from 14 to 27 February 2011.

19. To better understand the impact of the publicity on various 
stakeholders, specific analysis on the following three categories of interviewees 
were also performed -

(a) general youngsters (i.e. aged from 11 to 20);
(b) high-risk group (i.e. those who knew someone who were drug 
abusers or/and who had been offered drugs before); and
(c) parents.
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