

## ICAC Annual Survey 2016

### **A. Public Attitude towards Corruption**

	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>
<b>Tolerance of corruption in Hong Kong</b> (0: Total intolerance; 10: Total tolerance)				
Mean score :	0.8	1.0	0.6	0.7
<b>Willingness to report corruption</b>				
— Willing	80.6%	76.7%	78.8%	78.1%
— Unwilling	4.9%	6.7%	5.7%	5.1%
— Depending on circumstances	12.5%	13.6%	14.0%	14.8%
— Don't know/no opinion	2.0%	3.1%	1.6%	2.0%

Different corrupt behaviour	Acceptance level				Whether the act is illegal		
	Acceptable	Depend on circumstances	Unacceptable	Don't know/no comment	Yes	No	Don't know/no comment
(i) A District Council election candidate asks his/her voters to vote for him/her when providing the service of blood pressure checking free of charge.	18.3%	1.5%	77.0%	3.2%	70.3%	21.5%	8.3%
(ii) A company's employee exaggerates his/her entertainment expenses when making claims from the company.	2.8%	2.1%	93.8%	1.3%	90.2%	6.5%	3.3%
(iii) A fast food shop buyer accepts rebates from food suppliers without the knowledge of the shop proprietor.	1.4%	0.7%	96.9%	1.0%	93.8%	3.7%	2.5%
(iv) A civil servant helps his/her relative to bid the department's works project tender by providing him/her with internal information.	1.0%	0.5%	97.3%	1.3%	95.8%	1.8%	2.4%
(v) A frontline law enforcement officer of the government solicits festive 'laises' from shop owners.	0.9%	0.1%	98.5%	0.5%	96.6%	2.3%	1.1%
(vi) A pub proprietor offers advantages to government officers for lax inspection of fire safety facilities.	0.1%	0.3%	99.4%	0.3%	99.1%	0.4%	0.5%
(vii) A member of an owners' incorporation accepts gifts from the maintenance contractor in return for agreeing to consider using materials which do not conform with the tender specifications.	—	0.2%	99.4%	0.4%	98.6%	0.5%	1.0%

	2013	2014	2015	2016
<b>Perceived prevalence of corruption in Hong Kong</b>				
– Not quite common/very uncommon	64.9%	64.5%	65.5%	64.4%
– Very common/quite common	29.1%	27.6%	28.1%	29.6%
– Don't know/no opinion	5.9%	7.9%	6.5%	6.0%

## B. Public Concern over Corruption Problem

	2013	2014	2015	2016
<b>Perceived importance of keeping Hong Kong corruption-free to overall development of Hong Kong</b>				
– Very important/quite important	99.1%	98.7%	99.0%	99.2%
– Not quite important/very unimportant	0.1%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%
– Don't know/no opinion	0.9%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%
<b>Perceived changes in the level of corruption next year</b>				
– Will increase	17.0%	20.1%	16.8%	18.5%
– Will decrease	8.6%	9.6%	8.3%	8.9%
– More or less the same as at present	66.2%	61.5%	62.6%	63.5%
– Don't know/no opinion	8.2%	8.9%	12.3%	9.1%

### *Perception of corruption problem in different sectors*

With regard to corruption problem in different sectors in Hong Kong, “government officials/civil servants” (21.9%) topped the list as the area of greatest concern, followed by “construction and engineering industry” (20.0%) and “real estate” (6.8%). 16.5% of the respondents did not express any opinion.

Among those who opted “government officials/civil servants” as the sector of greatest concern, the main reason cited was “it affected people’s livelihood/interest of the public” (64.0%). Other reasons were “they were in high position and had much power in the society” (21.3%) and “it set a bad example to the public” (14.3%).

Among the respondents who thought that corruption in “construction and engineering industry” was their greatest concern, the most common reason cited was “it affected people’s livelihood/interest of the public” (66.9%), followed by “corruption would result in substandard works or materials/it affected the quality of construction works” (45.9%) and “large amount of money involved was conducive to corruption” (19.4%).

Among the respondents who thought that corruption in “real estate” was their greatest concern, the key reasons mentioned were “it affected people’s livelihood/interest of the public” (52.8%), “high property prices and rental caused by developers” (51.7%) and “large amount of money involved was conducive to corruption” (22.7%).

**C. Public Opinion towards the Work of the ICAC**

	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>
<b>Effectiveness of ICAC’s anti-corruption work</b>				
– Very effective/quite effective	79.9%	80.6%	80.3%	80.1%
– Not quite effective/very ineffective	14.2%	12.4%	12.4%	12.7%
– Don’t know/no opinion	5.9%	7.0%	7.4%	7.2%
<b>Support for the ICAC</b>				
– Deserved	95.6%	96.9%	97.0%	96.2%
– Not deserved	1.8%	1.4%	1.0%	1.7%
– Don’t know/no opinion	2.6%	1.8%	2.0%	2.2%
<b>Whether respondents had received any information concerning the ICAC in the past 12 months</b>				
– Yes				72.8%
– No				23.7%
– Can’t remember/no opinion				3.5%

## D. Public Behaviour on Reporting Corruption

	2013	2014	2015	2016
<b>Whether respondents had come across corruption in the past 12 months</b>				
– Yes	1.2%	1.5%	1.3%	1.2%
	(17 persons)	(23 persons)	(19 persons)	(18 persons)
– No	98.8%	97.8%	98.1%	98.5%
	(1464 persons)	(1465 persons)	(1406 persons)	(1506 persons)
– Don't know/no opinion	0.1%	0.7%	0.5%	0.3%
	(1 person)	(10 persons)	(8 persons)	(4 persons)

<b>Whether respondents who had come across corruption in the past 12 months had reported to the ICAC*</b>				
– Yes	22.6%	11.7%	12.3%	11.2%
	(4 persons)	(3 persons)	(2 persons)	(2 persons)
– No	77.4%	88.3%	87.7%	88.8%
	(13 persons)	(20 persons)	(17 persons)	(16 persons)

<b>Whether friends and relatives of respondents had come across corruption in the past 12 months</b>				
– Yes	0.7%	1.2%	1.0%	0.9%
	(10 persons)	(18 persons)	(14 persons)	(14 persons)
– No	96.6%	95.5%	95.1%	95.0%
	(1431 persons)	(1430 persons)	(1363 persons)	(1452 persons)
– Don't know/no opinion	2.8%	3.4%	3.9%	4.0%
	(41 persons)	(50 persons)	(56 persons)	(62 persons)

<b>Whether respondents' friends and relatives who had come across corruption in the past 12 months had reported to the ICAC*</b>				
– Yes	16.3%	33.3%	39.2%	20.2%
	(2 persons)	(6 persons)	(6 persons)	(3 persons)
– No	83.7%	52.8%	33.3%	38.9%
	(8 persons)	(9 persons)	(5 persons)	(5 persons)
– Don't know/no opinion	–	13.9%	27.5%	40.9%
	(–)	(3 persons)	(3 persons)	(6 persons)

\* The estimates should be interpreted with caution owing to a small base.