

Key Findings of the Public Opinion Survey on 2013 Anti-drug Publicity Measures

Objectives of the survey

The objectives of the 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 42 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 as reference for future publicity initiatives.

Background of the survey

2. The Narcotics Division has since 2007 commissioned annual public opinion surveys on anti-drug publicity messages. The Statistics Unit of the Security Bureau designs the survey questionnaire and engages an outside contractor to collect and validate data which form the basis of the Statistics Unit’s analyses and compilation of relevant reports.

3. The methodology for the 2013 survey was similar to those of previous exercises. The 2013 survey was conducted from 2 to 23 December 2013 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 1 001 respondents aged between 11 and 60 by telephone interviews, with a cooperation rate of about 51%. The sample size and cooperation rate were considered statistically sufficient for meaningful analyses.

4. Similar to previous exercises, views of the following three categories of respondents¹ have been specifically analysed to facilitate our planning of publicity measures in future –

¹ The total sets of responses from the three categories of respondents do not add up to 1001 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.

- (a) 146 sets of responses from general youngsters (i.e. those aged from 11 to 20);
- (b) 58 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) 488 sets of responses from parents.

Key findings of the survey

(a) Campaign slogan

5. The awareness rates on the current anti-drug slogan “Stand Firm! Knock Drugs Out (企硬!唔take嘢)” obtained from the surveys conducted from 2010 to 2013 were as follows –

	Stand Firm! Knock Drugs Out (企硬!唔take嘢)			
	2010 <i>(6 months)</i>	2011 <i>(18 months)</i>	2012 <i>(30 months)</i>	2013 <i>(42 months)</i>
<i>(Launched for around)</i>				
All respondents	67%	85%	91%	90%
General youngster	68%	88%	91%	92%
High risk group	69%	85%	83%	94%
Parents	64%	83%	87%	88%

6. The overall awareness rate of the slogan “Stand Firm! Knock Drugs Out (企硬!唔take嘢)” in 2013 maintained at a high level of 90%. Although a numerical drop of 1% was noted when compared to the overall awareness rate of the slogan in 2012, this is likely due to sampling fluctuation and not considered as statistically significant.

7. Apart from overall awareness rate, we have also gauged the opinion of respondents on whether they considered “Stand Firm! Knock Drugs Out (企硬! 唔 take 嘢)” as a suitable slogan for anti-drug publicity. All respondents were asked these questions, regardless of whether they were aware of the slogan in the first place. Their views are set out as follows –

	All respondents	General youngster	High risk group	Parents
The slogan suitable for anti-drug publicity	87%	91%	83%	84%
<i>Reasons:</i>				
Easy to understand (容易明白)	95%	94%	97%	95%
Delivered anti-drug message directly (直接帶出抗毒信息)	89%	92%	90%	88%
Pandered to youth taste (迎合年青人口味)	81%	77%	85%	83%
Permeated through the people (深入民心)	71%	73%	69%	73%

	All respondents	General youngster	High risk group	Parents
The slogan not suitable for anti-drug publicity	9%	8%	10%	9%
<i>Reasons:</i>				
Not delivered anti-drug message directly (不直接帶出抗毒信息)	72%	56%	100%	73%
Not easy to understand (不容易明白)	69%	70%	41%	66%
Not permeated through the people (不深入民心)	57%	29%	61%	60%
Not pandered to youth taste (不迎合年青人口味)	45%	37%	36%	51%

8. A majority (i.e. 87%) of the respondents agreed that it was a suitable slogan for anti-drug publicity, with only 9% found it not suitable. Similar patterns were observed among different categories of respondents.

9. Among those who found the slogan suitable, the reasons most commonly quoted were “easy to understand (容易明白)” (95%) and “delivered anti-drug message directly (直接帶出抗毒信息)” (89%). However, among those who found the slogan not suitable, the main reasons were “not delivered anti-drug message directly (不直接帶出抗毒信息)” (72%) and “not easy to understand (不容易明白)” (69%).

(b) Anti-drug messages

10. All respondents were asked whether they had seen or heard about the following anti-drug messages conveyed through various channels and 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)
186 186 Hotline	
C. Drug abusers can call “186 186” for help (吸毒者可以打 186 186 尋求協助)	(Jun 2012)
D. Parents, families or the public can call “186 186” to help drug abusers seek treatment and rehabilitation (父母、家人或公眾人士可以打 186 186 協助吸毒者戒毒)	(Jul 2012)
Friendship	
E. Friendship and love should not be proved by taking drugs together (友情、愛情唔需要一齊吸毒去證明)	(Jun 2013)
RESCUE Drug Testing (RDT)	
F. Early engagement can help to reduce the damage to children. Parents can express their views on RDT (及早介入有助減低毒品對子女嘅傷害，家長可就「驗毒助康復計劃」提出意見)	(Sep 2013)
G. Early engagement can help to reduce the damage to abusers. The public can express their views on RDT (及早接觸吸毒者幫佢哋戒毒，可減低毒品對佢哋身體嘅損害，公眾可就「驗毒助康復計劃」提出意見)	(Sep 2013)

11. The awareness rates of the above seven messages were as follows –

	Anti-drug Message						
	A Ketamine	B Ice & cocaine	C 186 186 (drug abusers)	D 186 186 (parents)	E Friendship	F RDT (parents)	G RDT (bodily harms)
All respondents	90%	87%	49%	42%	53%	64%	68%
General youngster	93%	92%	66%	58%	71%	60%	67%
High risk group	91%	88%	61%	49%	50%	60%	60%
Parents	89%	85%	48%	42%	47%	64%	67%

12. In descending order, the awareness rates for messages A and B on drug harms were 90% and 87%, that for messages E, F and G on friendship and RDT were 53%, 64% and 68%, and that for messages C and D on the 186 186 hotline were 49% and 42% respectively. Similar pattern was observed among different categories of respondents.

13. The following are the seven APIs broadcasted recently –

<i>Drug Harms</i>	<i>Broadcasted since</i>	<i>Aired period in 2013</i>
A. Anti-drug 2011 (Harm of abusing ketamine) 企硬 2011 (吸食氯胺酮的禍害)	(Dec 2011)	(6 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)	(6 months)
<i>186 186 Hotline</i>		
C. Anti-drug 2012 (Youngsters) 企硬 2012 (青少年篇)	(Jun 2012)	(12 months)
D. Anti-drug 2012 (Public and Parents) 企硬 2012 (公眾及家長篇)	(Jul 2012)	(12 months)
<i>Friendship</i>		
E. Anti-drug 2013 (Friends) 企硬 2013 (朋友篇)	(Jun 2013)	(6.3 months)
<i>RDT</i>		
F. RDT Testing Scheme 2013 (Parents) 驗毒助康復計劃 (家長篇)	(Sep 2013)	(3.2 months)
G. RDT Scheme 2013 (Bodily harms) 驗毒助康復計劃 (吸毒禍害篇)	(Sep 2013)	(3.2 months)

14. All respondents were asked about their impression on the seven APIs. Among those who were aware of the APIs, they were asked whether the APIs could convey the corresponding anti-drug messages. For those who affirmed reception of anti-drug messages from the APIs, they were asked whether they agreed with the messages.

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

	Anti-drug APIs						
	A Ketamine	B Ice & cocaine	C 186 186 (drug abusers)	D 186 186 (parents)	E Friendship	F RDT (parents)	G RDT (bodily harms)
Awareness rate among those responded							
All	83%	79%	67%	69%	76%	60%	49%
General youngster	87%	79%	77%	76%	77%	62%	53%
High risk group	91%	84%	68%	79%	73%	60%	55%
Parents	80%	79%	66%	69%	74%	64%	51%
Reception rate among those aware of the API							
All	98%	98%	86%	86%	90%	92%	92%
General youngster	98%	99%	89%	85%	95%	90%	95%
High risk group	95%	100%	77%	90%	98%	88%	93%
Parents	99%	97%	89%	87%	88%	94%	91%
Acceptance rate among those who affirmed reception of anti-drug messages from the API							
All	100%	100%	99%	99%	100%	99%	99%
General youngster	100%	99%	99%	100%	100%	98%	100%
High risk group	100%	100%	100%	97%	100%	100%	95%
Parents	100%	100%	99%	100%	99%	100%	100%

16. Awareness rates of 83% and, 79% and 76% were achieved for the three APIs on A, B and E respectively. The awareness rates on the APIs C, D, F and G were relatively lower at 67%, 69%, 60% and 49%.

17. Among those who were aware of the various APIs, there were very high reception rates of the messages promoted, ranging from 86% to 98%. Specifically, this group also expressed a very high acceptance rate of the messages promulgated by all the APIs. While there was 100% acceptance rate for the APIs on drug harms, as well as the one promulgating that friendship

needed not be proved by taking drugs together, the remaining four APIs also achieved 99% acceptance rate.

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

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

	Ranking of the top five most common media channels for receiving anti-drug messages				
	1	2	3	4	5
All responded	TV advertisement (91%)	TV program (82%)	newspaper/ magazine (60%)	schools/ housing estates/ govt. buildings (58%)	bus stations/ bus body (57%)
General youngster	TV advertisement (96%)	schools/ housing estates/ govt. buildings (88%)	TV program (84%)	newspaper/ magazine (67%)	MTR stations (66%)
High risk group	TV advertisement (94%)	TV program (81%)	schools/ housing estates/ govt. buildings (72%)	bus stations/ bus body (71%)	newspaper/ magazine (63%)
Parents	TV advertisement (88%)	TV program (81%)	newspaper/ magazine (60%)	radio program (56%)	radio advertisement (55%)

19. TV advertisement was universally the most common 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.

**Narcotics Division
Security Bureau
March 2014**