

Survey on Public Attitudes towards Homosexuals

Report

Prepared for



Home Affairs Bureau

The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region

Prepared by

MVA Hong Kong Limited



March 2006

Survey on Public Attitudes towards Homosexuals

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
1. BACKGROUND	1
2. SURVEY METHODOLOGY	2
2.1 Objectives	2
2.2 Coverage	2
2.3 Sample Design and Data Collection Method.....	2
2.4 Questionnaire	3
2.5 Pilot Survey.....	3
2.6 Fieldwork Period, Sample Size and Response Rate	4
2.7 Weighting.....	4
2.8 Reliability of Survey Findings.....	4
2.9 Rounding of Figures	5
3. KEY SURVEY FINDINGS	6
3.1 Public Awareness of Homosexuality	6
3.2 Public Attitudes towards Homosexuality.....	8
3.3 Public Acceptance of Homosexuals.....	12
3.4 Discrimination Faced by Homosexuals	17
3.5 Ways to Address the Problem of Discrimination Faced by Homosexuals	21
3.6 Social Impact of Introducing Legislation to Outlaw Discrimination.....	27
4. PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS.....	30
4.1 Sex and Age	30
4.2 Ethnic Origin.....	31
4.3 Occupation	31
4.4 Monthly Personal Income	32
4.5 Education	32
4.6 Marital Status	33
4.7 Whether had children	33
4.8 Religion.....	34
4.9 Whether had lived outside Hong Kong for more than one year continuously...	35
APPENDIX A – QUESTIONNAIRE.....	36
APPENDIX B – STATISTICAL TABLES	42

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Survey Objectives

The objectives of the Survey on Public Attitudes towards Homosexuals (the Survey) commissioned by the Home Affairs Bureau are:

- to assess public awareness of homosexuality;
- to assess public attitudes towards homosexuality;
- to assess public acceptance of homosexuals in different contexts and situations;
- to assess the extent of the problem of discrimination faced by homosexuals; and
- to examine what can be done to address the problem of discrimination faced by homosexuals.

Survey Methodology and Sample Size

The telephone survey was conducted during 22-31 October 2005. A sample of 5 000 telephone numbers were randomly drawn, and 2 068 respondents aged between 18 and 64 residing in Hong Kong were successfully contacted for telephone interviews. As 28 of these respondents indicated that they did not know what homosexuality is, only 2 040 respondents were enumerated. The response rate of the Survey was 50.1%.

Survey Findings

Public Awareness of Homosexuality

On public awareness of homosexuality, only a very small number of the respondents (28 out of 2 068) were not aware of what homosexuality is.

Of the 2 040 respondents successfully enumerated, the majority (76.5%) had no contact with homosexuals. 17.2% had infrequent contact with homosexuals, while only 4.8% had frequent contact.

Public Attitudes towards Homosexuality

The Survey gauged respondents' attitudes towards homosexuality. An overwhelming majority (88.8%) of the respondents considered there is no direct relationship between homosexuality and work ability, while 61.1% shared the same view with regard to the relationship between homosexuality and promiscuity. There were however divided views on whether homosexuals are psychologically normal people. 47.0% of the respondents considered homosexuals are psychologically normal people, while 41.9% thought otherwise. Similarly, divergent views emerged on whether there is conflict between homosexuality and family values. 49.1% of the respondents considered there is conflict between homosexuality and family values, while 41.2% thought otherwise. 38.9% opined that homosexuality contradicts the morals of the community, while 49.0% thought otherwise.

Public Acceptance of Homosexuals

On the acceptance level of homosexuals, it is observed that the respondents tended to accept homosexuals more as colleagues (79.9%), neighbours (78.0%), superiors in office (77.5%), friends (76.1%) than as teachers (60.2%) and family members (40.0%).

Acceptance of Homosexuals in Specific Situations

<i>Acceptance of a homosexual as one's</i>	<i>% of respondents indicating strong acceptance / acceptance</i>
<i>Colleague</i>	79.9
<i>Neighbour</i>	78.0
<i>Superior in office</i>	77.5
<i>Friend</i>	76.1
<i>Teacher</i>	60.2
<i>Family member</i>	40.0

Discrimination Faced by Homosexuals

The survey sought the views of the respondents on their perception of the seriousness of discrimination faced by homosexuals in Hong Kong. 29.7% of the respondents considered that at present, discrimination against homosexuals because of their sexual orientation was “very serious/serious” in Hong Kong, while about a quarter (25.2%) found the situation “posed little problem/no problem at all”. By way of comparison, about two-fifths (41.1%) of the respondents who had frequent contact with homosexuals found the problem “very serious/serious”.

29.7% of the respondents considered discrimination against homosexual students at school “very serious/serious”, while 30.3% considered it “posed little problem/no problem at all”. Less than one-fifth (13.2%-17.6%) of the respondents considered discrimination against homosexuals with regard to job application, flat rental and club membership “very serious/serious”. On the other hand, at least 30% (30.4%-39.3%) of the respondents opined that the situation “posed little problem/no problem at all”.

Discrimination Faced by Homosexuals

<i>Area</i>	<i>Situation</i>	<i>% of respondents who considered the situation</i>		
		<i>very serious/ serious</i>	<i>average</i>	<i>posed little problem/ no problem at all</i>
<i>School</i>	A homosexual student is discriminated against at school	29.7	29.0	30.3
<i>Employment</i>	An employer refuses to employ a person qualified for the job because he/she is a homosexual	17.6	39.9	30.4
<i>Renting accommodation</i>	A landlord refuses to let his/her flat to a homosexual	15.4	32.8	39.3
<i>Club membership</i>	A club/association refuses to admit a homosexual as its member	13.2	36.4	37.4
<i>Overall</i>	At present, homosexuals are discriminated against in Hong Kong because of their sexual orientation	29.7	41.7	25.2

Ways to Address the Problem of Discrimination Faced by Homosexuals

On the ways to address the problem of discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation, more than half (54.2%) of the respondents considered that the community should ensure equal opportunities for homosexuals. The majority (75.4%) of the respondents who had frequent contact with homosexuals supported such an approach.

When asked whether the existing arrangement of addressing the problem of discrimination by means of public education is already sufficient, only 23.5% of the respondents indicated agreement.

Respondents' views were sought on the introduction of legislation to outlaw discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation. 34.5% of the respondents considered that the Government should not legislate at this stage, while 28.7% thought

otherwise. 45.5% of the respondents who had frequent contact with homosexuals objected to the Government not legislating at this stage.

As regards the scope of such anti-discrimination legislation, 41.6% of the respondents supported legislating in the field of employment, 37.3% with regard to education and 37.2% on the provision of services, facilities or goods. It is observed that more than half of the respondents who had frequent contact with homosexuals supported legislating in employment (65.1%), education (55.7%) and the provision of services, facilities or goods (51.4%).

Ways to address the Problem of Discrimination Faced by Homosexuals

	<i>% of respondents who</i>		
	<i>strongly agreed/ agreed</i>	<i>stood neutral</i>	<i>strongly disagreed/ disagreed</i>
The community should ensure equal opportunities for homosexuals	54.2	34.1	10.2
At present, addressing the problem of discrimination by means of public education is already sufficient	23.5	31.4	41.6
Should not introduce legislation at this stage	34.5	33.7	28.7
Legislating in the field of employment	41.6	30.1	24.9
Legislating in the field of education	37.3	35.8	22.4
Legislating in the provision of services, facilities or goods	37.2	30.1	29.2

It is observed that the respondents who considered that the Government should not introduce anti-discrimination legislation at this stage were, in general, those who had positive attitudes towards homosexuality, accepted homosexuals readily, or considered the problem of discrimination against homosexuals in Hong Kong “average” or “posed little problem/no problem at all”.

Social Impact of Introducing Legislation

When asked about the impact of introducing legislation to outlaw discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation, about a quarter (27.9%) of the respondents considered that legislating would encourage homosexual behaviour, while about half (47.8%) opined that by legislating, Hong Kong would become a more harmonious and accommodating society.

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 A telephone survey was conducted in 1995 to gauge the public's perception of different forms of sexual orientation, their acceptance of homosexuals/bisexuals in different contexts and situations, and their views on the measures the Government should adopt in addressing the problem of discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation in Hong Kong. The survey found that public acceptance of homosexuality and bisexuality was on the low side. Public education and publicity were considered to be the most effective means in tackling the problem of discrimination. Following public consultation on sexual orientation in 1996, the Government decided to pursue non-legislative measures to enhance public understanding and acceptance of different forms of sexual orientation.

1.2 Social values change as the society develops. It has been ten years since the Government last conducted a survey on sexual orientation. The Government considered it high time to conduct another survey on public attitudes towards sexual orientation.

1.3 MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) was commissioned by the Home Affairs Bureau in November 2004 to conduct the Survey on Public Attitudes towards Homosexuals.

2. SURVEY METHODOLOGY

2.1 Objectives

The objectives of the Survey on Public Attitudes towards Homosexuals are to:

- assess public awareness of homosexuality;
- assess public attitudes towards homosexuality;
- assess public acceptance of homosexuals in different contexts and situations;
- assess the extent of the problem of discrimination faced by homosexuals; and
- examine what can be done to address the problem of discrimination faced by homosexuals.

2.2 Coverage

The survey covered all residents in Hong Kong aged 18-64, including domestic helpers.

2.3 Sample Design and Data Collection Method

A sample of 5 000 telephone numbers were drawn randomly from the latest residential telephone directories published by PCCW. The telephone numbers were then assigned to the interviewers for approaching target respondents using the “last birthday” approach (i.e. a respondent aged 18-64 in a household who just had his/her birthday would be selected to participate in the telephone interview).

2.4 Questionnaire

2.4.1 To ensure that the survey questionnaire would be fair and impartial, an independent Advisory Group, comprising Mr. Christopher Chan Yiu-chong, Professor Fanny Cheung Mui-ching and Dr. Priscilla Leung Mei-fun, was appointed in February 2005 to advise on the questionnaire design.

2.4.2 HAB also conducted several rounds of discussions with the various concern groups (including the sexual minorities, NGOs and religious groups) on the structure and design of the questionnaire. The views of the various concern groups have been taken into account by the Advisory Group in finalising the questionnaire.

2.4.3 The questionnaire *at Appendix A* covering the following areas was used for data collection:

- Awareness of homosexuality;
- Acceptance level of homosexuals;
- Discrimination faced by homosexuals;
- Ways to address the problem of discrimination faced by homosexuals;
- Social impact of introducing legislation to outlaw discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation;
- Attitudes towards homosexuality; and
- Demographics of respondent.

2.5 Pilot Survey

Before the commencement of the main fieldwork, a pilot survey covering some 50 respondents was conducted on 17 October 2005 to test the survey logistics and flow of the questionnaire. The pilot survey was conducted in a smooth and efficient manner and the results revealed that there was no need to modify the questionnaire design.

2.6 Fieldwork Period, Sample Size and Response Rate

2.6.1 The main fieldwork of the telephone survey was conducted during the period 22 - 31 October 2005 from 18:30 to 22:30 hours for Monday-Friday, and from 14:00 to 18:00 hours for Saturday and Sunday. The details of the fieldwork results are as follows:

1. Telephone numbers sampled	5 000
2. Business lines, fax lines or telephone numbers requiring password	856
3. Cannot be contacted despite 6 or more attempts	58
4. Respondent refused to be interviewed or cannot be interviewed due to language barrier	1 930
5. Uncompleted cases	42
6. No target respondent aged 18 to 64	46
7. Respondent did not know what homosexuality is	28
8. Number of successful cases	2 040
<i>Response Rate*</i>	50.1%

**Response rate is derived by dividing the number of successfully enumerated cases (i.e. (8)) by the total number of valid cases (i.e. (3)+(4)+(5)+(8)).*

2.6.2 The effective sample size was 2 040, with a response rate of 50.1%.

2.7 Weighting

The sample data were weighted by mid-2005 population data (by sex and age group) published by the Census and Statistics Department.

2.8 Reliability of Survey Findings

2.8.1 Results of this Survey are subject to sampling error. It is estimated that the key statistics of this Survey are subject to a maximum deviation of plus or minus 2.2 percentage points from the true values at 95% confidence level.

2.8.2 Non-sampling errors, on the other hand, may stem from the questionnaire design (e.g. whether there are terms which are not clear to the respondents), the process of interviewing, editing, coding and data entry. With the launch of the pilot survey, proper training of interviewers, quality checkings by means of callbacks to the respondents, data validation and double data entry, the possible sources of non-sampling errors have been greatly minimized.

2.9 Rounding of Figures

There may be a slight discrepancy between the sum of individual items and the sub-total / total as shown in the tables / charts of this report owing to rounding.


3. KEY SURVEY FINDINGS

3.1 Public Awareness of Homosexuality

3.1.1 On public awareness of homosexuality, all respondents were first asked whether they knew what homosexuality is. The interview would not proceed if a respondent gave a negative answer. The survey results revealed that only a very small number of the target respondents (28 out of 2 068) were not aware of what homosexuality is. In this connection, a total of 2 040 respondents who know what homosexuality is were successfully enumerated. Please refer to Chapter 4 for the profile of the respondents.

3.1.2 Of the 2 040 respondents successfully enumerated, the majority (76.5%) of the respondents had no contact with homosexuals. 17.2% of the respondents had infrequent contact with homosexuals, while only 4.8% had frequent contact with homosexuals. (*Figure 3.1*)

Figure 3.1 Contact with Homosexuals



Sub-group Analysis


3.1.3 When analysed by the demographics of the respondents, it is observed that the following groups of respondents had more frequent contact with homosexuals (*Appendix B – Table 1*):

- Aged 18-24 (43.1%), aged 25-34 (30.2%) (compared to 20.1% for those aged 35-44, 9.6%-12.1% for those aged 45-64);
- With post-secondary education level or above (40.3%) (compared to 11.7%-19.1% for those with secondary education level, 5.8% for those with primary education level or below);
- Students (39.7%), the employed (25.4%) (compared to 8.9%-13.6% for the retired, homemakers, the unemployed);
- Single (37.2%) (compared to 14.4% for those who are married);
- Without children (33.6%) (compared to 14.2% for those with children).

3.2 Public Attitudes towards Homosexuality

3.2.1 The Survey gauged the respondents’ attitudes towards homosexuality. An overwhelming majority (88.8%) of the respondents “strongly agreed/agreed” that there is no direct relationship between homosexuality and work ability, with only 8.5% indicating strong disagreement/disagreement. 61.1% of the respondents “strongly agreed/agreed” that there is no direct relationship between homosexuality and promiscuity, while 29.4% held the opposite view. There were however divided views on whether homosexuals are psychologically normal people. 47.0% of the respondents “strongly agreed/agreed” that homosexuals are psychologically normal people, while 41.9% thought otherwise. Similarly, divergent views emerged on whether there is conflict between homosexuality and family values. 49.1% of the respondents “strongly agreed/agreed” that there is conflict between homosexuality and family values, as against 41.2% who held the opposite view. 38.9% “strongly agreed/agreed” that homosexuality contradicts the morals of the community, while 49.0% thought otherwise. (Figure 3.2)

Figure 3.2 Public Attitudes towards Homosexuality



Sub-group Analysis

3.2.2 When analyzed by the demographics of the respondents, it is observed that the following groups of respondents indicated a comparatively higher level of support (strongly agreed/agreed) to the following statements (*Appendix B – Tables 2-6*):

Statement	Sub-group Analysis
<p><i>Work ability is not directly related to homosexuality</i> (Table 2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had contact with homosexuals (94.0%-96.8%) (compared to 87.2% for those with no contact); • Aged 18-34 (92.4%-94.7%) (compared to 86.5%-89.0% for those aged 35-54, 79.3% for those aged 55-64); • With upper secondary education level or above (91.0%-94.5%) (compared to 74.1%-85.9% for those with lower secondary education level or below); • Students, the employed, homemakers (88.9%-91.3%) (compared to 76.2%-81.5% for the retired, the unemployed); • Without children (91.6%) (compared to 86.9% for those with children).
<p><i>Promiscuity is not directly related to homosexuality</i> (Table 3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had contact with homosexuals (70.2%-72.6%) (compared to 58.2% for those with no contact); • Male (63.7%) (compared to 58.8% for female); • Aged 18-34 (69.1%-71.6%) (compared to 57.0%-60.8% for those aged 35-54, 45.7% for those aged 55-64); • With post-secondary education level or above (72.9%) (compared to 56.4%-63.4% for those with secondary education level, 35.5% for those with primary education level or below); • Students (69.5%); the employed, the unemployed (62.6%-64.1%) (compared to 55.2% for homemakers, 46.1% for the retired); • Single (72.3%) (compared to 55.4% for those who are married); • Without children (70.6%) (compared to 54.7% for those with children); • Without religious belief (63.8%) (compared to 54.9% for those with religious belief).

<i>Statement</i>	<i>Sub-group Analysis</i>
<p><i>Homosexuals are psychologically normal people</i> (Table 4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had frequent contact (67.4%) and infrequent contact (51.6%) with homosexuals (compared to 44.5% for those with no contact); • Aged 18-24 (69.0%), aged 25-34 (54.0%) (compared to 45.9% for those aged 35-44, 35.9%-36.0% for those aged 45-64); • With post-secondary education level or above (52.0%) (compared to 44.0%-48.2% for those with secondary education level, 36.8% for those with primary education level or below); • Students (69.5%) (compared to 44.7%-46.9% for the unemployed, homemakers, the employed; 28.7% for the retired); • Single (60.6%) (compared to 40.1% for those who are married); • Without children (58.3%) (compared to 39.4% for those with children); • Without religious belief (50.2%) (compared to 39.5% for those with religious belief).
<p><i>There is no conflict between homosexuality and family values</i> (Table 5)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had frequent contact (49.3%) and infrequent contact (43.6%) with homosexuals (compared to 40.6% for those with no contact); • Aged 18-34, aged 55-64 (43.2%-45.3%) (compared to 38.3%-39.7% for those aged 35-54); • With lower secondary education level (46.5%) (compared to 39.9%-42.8% for those with upper secondary education level or above, 32.4% for those with primary education level or below); • Students (45.2%) (compared to 37.0%-41.7% for the unemployed, the retired, homemakers, the employed); • Single (47.3%) (compared to 38.2% for those who are married); • Without children (46.7%) (compared to 37.7% for those with children); • Without religious belief (45.1%) (compared to 32.5% for those with religious belief).

<i>Statement</i>	<i>Sub-group Analysis</i>
<p><i>Homosexuality contradicts the morals of the community</i> (Table 6)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had no contact with homosexuals (40.5%) (compared to 29.9%-34.9% for those with contact); • Male (41.9%) (compared to 36.1% for female); • Aged 55-64 (48.2%) (compared to 39.0%-40.9% for those aged 25-54, 24.1% for those aged 18-24); • With lower secondary education level or below (41.3%-41.8%) (compared to 37.2%-38.1% for those with upper secondary education level or above); • The retired (51.9%) (compared to 37.5%-39.3% for homemakers, the unemployed, the employed; 25.6% for students); • Married (41.8%) (compared to 32.4% for those who are single); • With children (43.2%) (compared to 32.4% for those without children); • With religious belief (49.2%) (compared to 34.3% for those without religious belief).


3.2.3 In general, respondents with frequent contact with homosexuals, those aged 18-24 and students tended to view homosexuality more positively. Their enlightened attitudes were reflected in their higher level of acceptance of homosexuality even in the context of family values and community morals. The attitudes of respondents with primary education level or below, respondents aged 55-64, and the retired towards homosexuality were in general far more conservative. Among the respondents, those with religious belief in particular were the least receptive with regard to the impact of homosexuality on family values and community morals.

3.3 Public Acceptance of Homosexuals

3.3.1 On public acceptance of homosexuals in specific situations, the respondents tended to accept homosexuals more as colleagues, neighbours, superiors in office, friends than as teachers and family members.

3.3.2 The majority of the respondents considered it “strongly acceptable/ acceptable” to work with homosexuals (79.9%), have homosexual neighbours (78.0%), have homosexuals holding senior positions in the office (77.5%), and make friends with homosexuals (76.1%). The corresponding percentages of respondents who considered the situations “strongly unacceptable/unacceptable” were 6.9%, 8.2%, 8.6% and 13.7%. On the other hand, 60.2% of the respondents found it “strongly acceptable/acceptable” to have homosexual teachers, while 28.3% considered it “strongly unacceptable/unacceptable”. Only 40.0% of the respondents found it “strongly acceptable/acceptable” to have homosexuals as family members, and more than half (51.4%) considered it “strongly unacceptable/unacceptable”. (Figure 3.3)

Figure 3.3 Acceptance Level of Homosexuals



Sub-group Analysis

3.3.3 When analyzed by the demographics of the respondents, it is observed that the following groups of respondents indicated a comparatively higher level of acceptance (strongly acceptable/acceptable) to the following situations (*Appendix B – Tables 7-12*):

Situation	Sub-group Analysis
<p><i>You work with a homosexual</i> (Table 7)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had contact with homosexuals (88.0%-91.5%) (compared to 76.7% for those with no contact); • Aged 18-44 (84.1%-90.9%) (compared to 74.9% for those aged 45-54, 54.5% for those aged 55-64); • With upper secondary education level or above (84.4%-92.1%) (compared to 71.9% for those with lower secondary education level, 52.2% for those with primary education level or below); • Students (93.6%), the employed (83.4%) (compared to 74.7%-75.3% for homemakers, the unemployed; 50.3% for the retired); • Single (88.6%) (compared to 75.4% for those who are married); • Without children (88.7%) (compared to 74.1% for those with children).
<p><i>Your neighbour is a homosexual</i> (Table 8)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had contact with homosexuals (87.8%-89.0%) (compared to 74.9% for those with no contact); • Aged 18-34 (86.6%-89.9%) (compared to 74.9%-80.5% for those aged 35-54, 52.1% for those aged 55-64); • With upper secondary education level or above (82.5%-87.7%) (compared to 71.5% for those with lower secondary education level, 53.0% for those with primary education level or below); • Students (93.0%), the employed (81.7%) (compared to 72.6%-75.0% for homemakers, the unemployed; 43.6% for the retired); • Single (87.8%) (compared to 73.6% for those who are married); • Without children (85.1%) (compared to 73.2% for those with children).

<i>Situation</i>	<i>Sub-group Analysis</i>
<p><i>A homosexual holds a senior position in the organization you work for</i> (Table 9)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had contact with homosexuals (88.8%-90.0%) (compared to 74.2% for those with no contact); • Aged 18-34 (87.5%-88.6%) (compared to 73.4%-81.1% for those aged 35-54, 50.0% for those aged 55-64); • With upper secondary education level or above (82.1%-87.8%) (compared to 70.6% for those with lower secondary education level, 51.8% for those with primary education level or below); • Students, the employed (82.5%-90.0%) (compared to 68.8%-71.4% for the unemployed, homemakers; 43.1% for the retired); • Single (87.7%) (compared to 72.5% for those who are married); • Without children (87.2%) (compared to 71.1% for those with children); • Without religious belief (79.0%) (compared to 74.1% for those with religious belief).
<p><i>You make friends with a homosexual</i> (Table 10)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had contact with homosexuals (90.1%-91.4%) (compared to 71.8% for those with no contact); • Aged 18-34 (84.7%-89.4%) (compared to 71.8%-78.7% for those aged 35-54, 51.4% for those aged 55-64); • With post-secondary education level or above (87.4%) (compared to 69.7%-78.5% for those with secondary education level, 54.2% for those with primary education level or below); • Students, the employed (81.2%-89.6%) (compared to 67.9%-68.7% for homemakers, the unemployed; 45.5% for the retired); • Single (86.9%) (compared to 71.0% who are married); • Without children (86.6%) (compared to 69.2% for those with children).

<i>Situation</i>	<i>Sub-group Analysis</i>
<p><i>A teacher who is a homosexual</i> (Table 11)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had frequent contact (81.9%) and infrequent contact (71.9%) with homosexuals (compared to 55.9% for those with no contact); • Aged 18-34 (69.7%-78.6%) (compared to 52.5%-62.1% for those aged 35-54, 36.5% for those aged 55-64); • With post-secondary education level or above (74.3%) (compared to 63.0% for those with upper secondary education level, 51.0% for those with lower secondary education level, 34.9% for those with primary education level or below); • Students (79.8%), the employed (63.9%) (compared to 51.7%-57.6% for homemakers, the unemployed; 30.9% for the retired); • Single (75.3%) (compared to 53.0% for those who are married); • Without children (73.5%) (compared to 51.4% for those with children). • Without religious belief (63.9%) (compared to 51.8% for those with religious belief).
<p><i>Your family member is a homosexual</i> (Table 12)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had frequent contact with homosexuals (66.4%) (compared to 47.4% for those with infrequent contact, 36.4% for those with no contact); • Aged 18-34 (46.3%-54.3%) (compared to 40.4% for those aged 35-44, 25.3%-34.0% for those aged 45-64); • With post secondary education level or above (51.4%) (compared to 30.8%-42.8% for those with secondary education level, 20.3% for those with primary education level or below); • Students (56.2%), the employed (42.5%) (compared to 33.4%-34.8% for homemakers, the unemployed; 21.5% for the retired); • Single (53.3%) (compared to 33.0% for those who are married); • Without children (52.1%) (compared to 31.8% for those with children); • Without religious belief (43.8%) (compared to 31.2% for those with religious belief).

3.3.4 In general, respondents who had contact with homosexuals, respondents aged 18-34 (those aged 18-24 in particular), respondents with post-secondary education level or above, and students had a significantly higher degree of acceptance of homosexuals. On the other hand, respondents aged 55-64, respondents with primary education level or below, and the retired were the least receptive of homosexuals among all respondents.


3.4 Discrimination Faced by Homosexuals

3.4.1 The Survey sought the views of the respondents on their perception of the seriousness of discrimination faced by homosexuals. 29.7% of the respondents perceived that at present, discrimination against homosexuals because of their sexual orientation was “very serious/serious” in Hong Kong, 41.7% considered the situation “average”, while 25.2% found the situation “posed little problem/no problem at all”. By way of comparison, 41.1% of the respondents with frequent contact with homosexuals considered the problem of discrimination in Hong Kong “very serious/serious”. (*Figure 3.4*)

3.4.2 As regards the public’s perception of the seriousness of discrimination faced by homosexuals in specific situations, the discrimination faced by homosexual students at school appeared to be the most problematic: 29.7% of the respondents considered the problem “very serious/serious” in Hong Kong. Only 17.6% considered discrimination faced by homosexual job applicants “very serious/serious”, 15.4% held the same view with regard to discrimination against homosexuals on flat rental, while 13.2% considered the problem “very serious/serious” in the case of club membership. The corresponding percentages of respondents who found such discriminatory situations “posed little problem/no problem at all” were 30.3%, 30.4%, 39.3% and 37.4%. Those who considered the discriminatory situations “average” ranged from 29.0% to 39.9%. (*Figure 3.4*)

3.4.3 It is observed that those who had frequent contact with homosexuals in general considered the discrimination faced by homosexuals more serious, in particular with regard to discrimination at school and in renting a flat. (*Figure 3.4*)

Figure 3.4 Discrimination Faced by Homosexuals in Hong Kong



Base: Respondents with frequent contact with homosexuals (n = 98)
 All respondents (n = 2 040)

Sub-group Analysis

3.4.4 When analyzed by the demographics of the respondents, it is observed that the following groups of respondents perceived the extent of the problem with regard to the following discriminatory situations in Hong Kong comparatively more acute (“very serious / serious”) (*Appendix B – Tables 13-17*):

<i>Situation</i>	<i>Sub-group Analysis</i>
<p><i>A homosexual student is discriminated against at school</i> (<i>Table 13</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had contact with homosexuals (34.7%-35.2%) (compared to 28.3% for those with no contact); • Aged 18-34 (34.0%-35.2%) (compared to 31.3% for those aged 35-44, 20.9%-25.8% for those aged 45-64); • With secondary education level (30.3%-31.7%) (compared to 27.0%-27.9% for those with primary education level or below, with post-secondary education level or above); • Students, homemakers, the employed (30.1%-32.7%) (compared to 23.2%-25.2% for the unemployed, the retired); • Single (31.9%) (compared to 28.7% for those who are married); • Without children (31.4%) (compared to 28.6% for those with children); • Without religious belief (31.4%) (compared to 25.7% for those with religious belief).
<p><i>An employer refuses to employ a person qualified for the job because he/she is a homosexual</i> (<i>Table 14</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged 18-34 (19.4%-21.2%) (compared to 13.9%-18.1% for those aged 35-64); • The unemployed, students (19.7%-19.8%) (compared to 16.8%-17.6% for homemakers, the retired, the employed).

<i>Situation</i>	<i>Sub-group Analysis</i>
<p><i>A landlord refuses to let his/her flat to a homosexual</i> (Table 15)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had contact with homosexuals (18.0%-21.4%) (compared to 14.4% for those with no contact); • Aged 25-34 (24.0%), aged 18-24 (17.7%) (compared to 8.5%-13.5% for those aged 35-64); • With upper secondary education level or above (16.2%-16.5%) (compared to 12.9%-13.7% for those with lower secondary education level or below); • Students (18.2%) (compared to 16.1% for the employed, the unemployed; 9.2%-14.4% for the retired, homemakers); • Single (20.1%) (compared to 12.8% for those who are married); • Without children (18.5%) (compared to 13.3% for those with children).
<p><i>A club/association refuses to admit a homosexual as its members</i> (Table 16)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had contact with homosexuals (14.4%-14.7%) (compared to 12.9% for those with no contact); • Aged 18-34 (14.4%-17.6%) (compared to 10.4%-11.9% for those aged 35-64); • The unemployed, students (16.8%-17.5%) (compared to 12.4%-14.5% for the employed, homemakers, the retired); • Single (14.7%) (compared to 12.5% for those who are married).
<p><i>At present, homosexuals are discriminated against in Hong Kong because of their sexual orientation</i> (Table 17)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had frequent contact (41.1%) and infrequent contact (35.3%) with homosexuals (compared to 27.9% for those with no contact); • Aged 18-24 (38.5%) (compared to 29.9%-31.3% for those aged 25-44, 20.8%-27.9% for those aged 45-64); • With secondary education level or above (30.2%-32.2%) (compared to 21.2% for those with primary education level or below); • Students (34.9%) (compared to 30.6% for the employed, 25.0%-27.7% for the retired, the unemployed, homemakers); • Single (34.5%) (compared to 27.5% for those who are married); • Without children (33.0%) (compared to 27.4% for those with children); • Without religious belief (30.7%) (compared to 27.3% for those with religious belief).

3.5 Ways to Address the Problem of Discrimination Faced by Homosexuals

3.5.1 More than half (54.2%) of the respondents “strongly agreed/agreed” that the community should ensure equal opportunities for homosexuals, while 10.2% thought otherwise, and 34.1% stood “neutral”. (*Figure 3.5.1*) On the other hand, 75.4% of the respondents who had frequent contact with homosexuals considered that the community should ensure equal opportunities for homosexuals. (*Appendix B – Table 18*)

3.5.2 When asked whether the existing arrangement of addressing the problem of sexual orientation discrimination by means of public education is already sufficient, only 23.5% of the respondents indicated agreement (“strongly agreed/agreed”), 41.6% considered otherwise, while 31.4% stood “neutral”. (*Figure 3.5.1*)


3.5.3 34.5% of the respondents “strongly agreed/agreed” that the Government should not introduce legislation to outlaw discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation at this stage, while 28.7% “strongly disagreed/disagreed”, and 33.7% stood “neutral”. (*Figure 3.5.1*) On the other hand, 45.5% of the respondents who had frequent contact with homosexuals indicated objection to the Government not legislating at this stage. (*Appendix B – Table 23*)

3.5.4 It is observed that respondents who considered that the Government should not introduce legislation to outlaw discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation at this stage were, in general, those who had positive attitudes towards homosexuality, accepted homosexuals readily or considered the problem of discrimination against homosexuals in Hong Kong “average” or “posed little problem/no problem at all”.

3.5.5 As regards the scope of anti-discrimination legislation against sexual orientation, 41.6% of the respondents “strongly agreed/agreed” that the Government should legislate in the field of employment, 37.3% and 37.2% supported legislating in the field of education, and in the provision of services, facilities or goods respectively. About a quarter (24.9%) of the respondents “strongly disagreed/disagreed” on


legislating in employment. The corresponding figures for education and the provision of services, facilities or goods were 22.4% and 29.2%. 30.1%, 35.8% and 30.1% of the respondents stood “neutral” with regard to legislating in employment, education and the provision of services, facilities or goods respectively. (Figure 3.5.1) It is observed that more than half of the respondents who had frequent contact with homosexuals supported legislating in employment (65.1%), education (55.7%) and the provision of services, facilities or goods (51.4%). (Appendix B – Tables 20-22)

Figure 3.5.1 Ways to Address the Problem of Discrimination Faced by Homosexuals



3.5.6 Of those respondents who “strongly disagreed/disagreed” that the existing arrangement of addressing the problem of sexual orientation discrimination by means of public education is already sufficient, only 38.8% “strongly disagreed/disagreed” that the Government should not introduce legislation to outlaw discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation at this stage. (Figure 3.5.2)

Figure 3.5.2 Whether Should Introduce Legislation analyzed by “Public Education is Already Sufficient to Address the Problem”



Sub-group Analysis

3.5.7 When analyzed by the demographics of the respondents, it is observed that the following groups of respondents indicated a comparatively higher level of support (strongly agreed/agreed) to the following approaches in addressing the problem of discrimination faced by homosexuals (*Appendix B – Tables 18-23*):

Approach	Sub-group Analysis
<p><i>The community should ensure equal opportunities for homosexuals</i> (Table 18)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had frequent contact (75.4%) and infrequent contact (63.2%) with homosexuals (compared to 50.8% for those with no contact); • Aged 18-24 (66.9%), aged 25-34 (58.8%) (compared to 54.4% for those aged 35-44, 43.8%-48.5% for those aged 45-64); • With post-secondary education level or above (64.4%) (compared to 55.2% for those with upper secondary education level, 38.2%-47.5% for those with lower secondary education level or below); • Students (67.2%) (compared to 53.9%-55.7% for the unemployed, the employed; 40.8%-49.3% for the retired, homemakers); • Single (64.1%) (compared to 49.4% for those who are married); • Without children (61.8%) (compared to 49.0% for those with children); • Without religious belief (56.8%) (compared to 48.1% for those with religious belief).
<p><i>At present, addressing the problem of discrimination by means of public education is already sufficient</i> (Table 19)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had no contact with homosexuals (24.4%) (compared to 22.0% for those with infrequent contact, 15.2% for those with frequent contact with homosexuals); • Male (26.3%) (compared to 21.0% for female); • Aged 35-64 (24.3%-25.1%) (compared to 20.4%-21.5% for those aged 18-34); • With upper secondary education level or below (24.9%-28.8%) (compared to 17.4% for those with post-secondary education level or above); • Homemakers, the retired, the unemployed (25.0%-25.8%) (compared to 23.3% for the employed, 19.6% for students); • Married (25.2%) (compared to 20.2% for those who are single); • With children (24.9%) (compared to 21.4% for those without children); • With religious belief (25.8%) (compared to 22.5% for those without religious belief).

Approach

Sub-group Analysis

The Government should introduce legislation to outlaw discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation in the field of employment

(Table 20)

- Had frequent contact (65.1%) and infrequent contact (49.1%) with homosexuals (compared to 38.4% for those with no contact);
- Aged 18-24 (57.5%), aged 25-44 (43.6%-45.4%) (compared to 28.6%-34.6% for those aged 45-64);
- With post-secondary education level or above (54.7%) (compared to 34.0%-40.9% for those with secondary education level, 26.8% for those with primary education level or below);
- Students (60.5%); the employed, the unemployed (42.2%-43.7%) (compared to 26.5%-32.7% for the retired, homemakers);
- Single (53.4%) (compared to 35.8% for those who are married);
- Without children (51.2%) (compared to 35.3% for those with children);
- Without religious belief (43.1%) (compared to 38.3% for those with religious belief).

The Government should introduce legislation to outlaw discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation in the field of education

(Table 21)


- Had frequent contact (55.7%) and infrequent contact (41.5%) with homosexuals (compared to 35.2% for those with no contact);
- Male (41.0%) (compared to 34.0% for female);
- Aged 18-34 (40.1%-44.3%) (compared to 37.7% for those aged 35-44, 29.9%-34.5% for those aged 45-64);
- With post-secondary education level or above (44.5%) (compared to 32.7%-35.4% for those with upper secondary education level or below);
- Students, the unemployed (44.3%-46.0%) (compared to 38.0% for the employed; 30.1%-32.6% for the retired, homemakers);
- Single (42.9%) (compared to 34.5% for those who are married);
- Without children (43.7%) (compared to 33.0% for those with children);
- Without religious belief (38.7%) (compared to 34.0% for those with religious belief).

<i>Approach</i>	<i>Sub-group Analysis</i>
<p><i>The Government should introduce legislation to outlaw discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation in the provision of services, facilities or goods</i></p> <p>(Table 22)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had contact with homosexuals (46.8%-51.4%) (compared to 34.0% for those with no contact); • Male (39.2%) (compared to 35.4% for female); • Aged 18-34 (43.2%-46.3%) (compared to 37.9% for those aged 35-44, 25.6%-32.5% for those aged 45-64); • With post-secondary education level or above (47.1%) (compared to 31.2%-36.7% for those with secondary education level, 26.1% for those with primary education level or below); • Students, the unemployed (43.5%-49.7%) (compared to 38.1% for the employed; 21.0%-32.2% for the retired, homemakers); • Single (44.9%) (compared to 33.2% for those who are married); • Without children (44.1%) (compared to 32.7% for those with children); • Without religious belief (39.0%) (compared to 33.3% for those with religious belief).
<p><i>At this stage, the Government should not introduce legislation to outlaw discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation</i></p> <p>(Table 23)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had infrequent contact (36.3%) and no contact (34.6%) with homosexuals (compared to 28.9% for those with frequent contact with homosexuals); • Male (37.2%) (compared to 32.2% for female); • Aged 35-44 (37.3%) (compared to 31.7%-34.3% for those aged 18-34, aged 45-64); • With secondary education level or above (35.5%-37.3%) (compared to 22.3% for those with primary education level or below); • The employed, homemakers (35.6%-35.9%) (compared to 27.4%-30.4% for the unemployed, students, the retired); • With religious belief (36.5%) (compared to 33.7% for those without religious belief).

3.6 Social Impact of Introducing Legislation to Outlaw Discrimination on the Ground of Sexual Orientation


3.6.1 Respondents' views were sought on the impact of introducing legislation to outlaw sexual orientation discrimination in Hong Kong. More than half (61.6%) of the respondents "strongly disagreed/disagreed" that the introduction of such legislation would encourage homosexual behaviour, 27.9% considered otherwise and 7.0% stood "neutral". About half (47.8%) of the respondents "strongly agreed/agreed" that legislating would make Hong Kong a more harmonious and accommodating society, as against 38.4% who held the opposite view, and 9.9% holding a neutral stand. (Figure 3.6.1)

Figure 3.6.1 Social Impact of Introducing Legislation to Outlaw Discrimination on the Ground of Sexual Orientation



3.6.2 Of those respondents who “strongly agreed/agreed” that the Government should not introduce legislation to outlaw discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation at this stage, 37.5% “strongly agreed/agreed” that homosexual behaviour would be encouraged upon legislating, and 49.5% “strongly disagreed/disagreed” that Hong Kong would become more harmonious and accommodating by legislating. (Figure 3.6.2)

Figure 3.6.2 Social Impact of Introducing Legislation analyzed by Whether Should Introduce Legislation



Sub-group Analysis

3.6.3 When analyzed by the demographics of the respondents, it is observed that the following groups of respondents indicated a comparatively higher level of support (strongly agreed/agreed) to the following statements (*Appendix B – Tables 24-25*):


Statement	Sub-group Analysis
<p><i>If the Government introduces legislation to outlaw discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation, homosexual behaviour would be encouraged</i> (Table 24)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had infrequent contact or no contact with homosexuals (28.3%-29.2%) (compared to 19.2% for those with frequent contact with homosexuals); • Aged 25-54 (27.9%-31.4%) (compared to 22.0%-22.5% for those aged 18-24, aged 55-64); • With post-secondary education level or above (29.6%) (compared to 26.1%-27.8% for those with upper secondary education level or below); • The employed, the retired (28.6%-29.1%) (compared to 23.5%-25.7% for the unemployed, students, homemakers); • Married (30.0%) (compared to 24.8% for those who are single); • With children (29.3%) (compared to 25.9% for those without children); • With religious belief (34.1%) (compared to 25.2% for those without religious belief).
<p><i>If the Government introduces legislation to outlaw discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation, the community of Hong Kong would become more harmonious and accommodating</i> (Table 25)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Had frequent contact with homosexuals (56.0%) (compared to 45.3%-48.1% for those with infrequent contact, those with no contact with homosexuals); • Aged 18-24, aged 35-64 (48.5%-50.2%) (compared to 43.7% for those aged 25-34); • With upper secondary education level or below (47.5%-53.5%) (compared to 41.0% for those with post-secondary education level or above); • Homemakers (52.8%) (compared to 44.7%-48.8% for the retired, the employed, students, the unemployed); • Without religious belief (49.8%) (compared to 43.2% for those with religious belief).

4. PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

4.1 Sex and Age


4.1.1 58.0% of the respondents were female and 42.0% were male. (Figure 4.1.1)

Figure 4.1.1 Sex of Respondents



4.1.2 Almost half of the respondents (45.0%) were aged 25-44. About one quarter (24.5%) belonged to the younger generation (aged 18-24), whereas 30.5% of the respondents were aged 45-64. (Figure 4.1.2)


Figure 4.1.2 Age of Respondents



4.2 Ethnic Origin

An overwhelming majority (99.3%) of the respondents were Chinese. The remainder comprised Southeast Asians (0.4%), Caucasians (0.1%) and South Asians (0.1%). (Figure 4.2)

Figure 4.2 Ethnic Origin of Respondents




* less than 0.05%

4.3 Occupation

Owners / employees accounted for more than half (53.0%) of the respondents, followed by homemakers (19.5%), students (16.9%), the retired (5.1%) and the unemployed (4.0%). (Figure 4.3)


Figure 4.3 Occupation of Respondents



4.4 Monthly Personal Income

About one-third (34.5%) of the respondents had monthly personal income of less than HK\$4,000, 25.0% earned HK\$10,000-19,999 per month and 20.5% earned HK\$4,000-9,999 a month. (Figure 4.4)


Figure 4.4 Monthly Personal Income of Respondents



4.5 Education

Less than half (43.2%) of the respondents had upper secondary education, 27.1% had post-secondary education or above, and 17.7% had lower secondary education. Around one-tenth (12.0%) of the respondents had primary education or below. (Figure 4.5)


Figure 4.5 Education of Respondents



4.6 Marital Status

More than half (57.3%) of the respondents were married while 40.1% were single. (Figure 4.6)


Figure 4.6 Marital Status of Respondents



4.7 Whether had children

More than half (53.7%) of the respondents had children, including adopted children. (Figure 4.7)


Figure 4.7 Whether had children



4.8 Religion


4.8.1 30.0% of the respondents had religious belief. (Figure 4.8.1)

Figure 4.8.1 Religion of Respondents



4.8.2 Of those respondents who had religious belief, Protestants and Catholics accounted for 48.7% and 14.2% respectively, while about one-third (35.1%) of the respondents were Buddhists. (Figure 4.8.2)


Figure 4.8.2 Religion Breakdown of Respondents



4.9 Whether had lived outside Hong Kong for more than one year continuously


4.9.1 The majority (78.9%) of the respondents had not lived outside Hong Kong for more than one year continuously. (Figure 4.9.1)

Figure 4.9.1 Whether had lived outside HK for more than one year continuously



4.9.2 Of those respondents who had lived outside Hong Kong for more than one year continuously, more than half (57.7%) previously lived in Mainland China. (Figure 4.9.2)

Figure 4.9.2 Previous place of residence



APPENDIX A – QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX B – STATISTICAL TABLES