

**Notes of Discussion of the  
Special meeting of the Sexual Minorities Forum  
on the Draft Questionnaire of the  
Survey on Public Attitudes towards Homosexuals  
held on 24 June 2005 at 3:30 p.m.  
in the Conference Room, 30/F, Southorn Centre, Wanchai**

**Present**

Home Affairs Bureau (HAB)

Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs (Chairman)	Mr Stephen FISHER
Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs	Mrs Hedy CHU
Principal Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs	Miss Joanna CHOI
Assistant Secretary for Home Affairs	Miss Vivian CHAN
Senior Stat	Miss Julia HUI
Unit Manager	Mr LAI Wing-yiu
Unit Officer	Miss Kate CHOY
MVA Hong Kong Ltd	Mr Wayne YEH
MVA Hong Kong Ltd	Miss Teresa LEE

Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs)

Amnesty International Hong Kong Section	Ms Sandra WONG
	Mr Peter MOK
Chi Heng Foundation/The Satsanga	Mr Albert LUK
Civil Human Rights Front	Mr CHONG Yiu-kong
Civil Rights for Sexual Diversities	Mr Mike KWAN
Equal Opportunities Commission	Mr Ferrick CHU
	Ms Esther CHAN
Hong Kong Human Rights Monitor	Ms Baig Raees BEGUM
Hong Kong Ten Percent Club	Mr CHO Man-kit
Horizons	Mr Reggie HO
Lazy Workshop	Mr Jerry CHAN
Office of Hon. Emily LAU	Ms LAM Chung-yan
	Mr LI Wing-shing
Office of Hon. Fernando CHEUNG	Ms LAI Yuen-ki
Rainbow Action	Ms YEUNG Wai-wai

The Transgender Equality and Acceptance  
Movement (TEAM)  
Gender Rights Research Group  
Transgender Asia Research, Education &  
Advocacy Centre  
Women Coalition of HK

Ms Robin BRADBEER

Mr Mark KING  
Dr Sam WINTER

Ms WEI Siu-lik

### **Welcoming remarks**

1. The Chairman welcomed all participants to attend the special meeting of the Sexual Minorities Forum to discuss the draft questionnaire of the Survey on Public Attitudes towards Homosexuals.

### **Discussion on the draft questionnaire**

2. The Chairman briefed members on the sequence of events leading to the conduct of the Survey on Public Attitudes towards Homosexuals. He added that the results of the survey would guide the Government's thinking on the issue but would not be the sole factor for determining the way forward in legislating against sexual orientation discrimination.

3. The Chairman said that MVA Hong Kong Ltd was commissioned to conduct the survey, including questionnaire design. MVA had taken into account the comments of the Advisory Group in preparing the draft questionnaire. Members' views expressed at the meeting as well as written comments received after the meeting would

be submitted to the Advisory Group for consideration for the purpose of finalizing survey questionnaire. The decision of the Advisory Group on the questionnaire would be final.

4. A member asked whether the Advisory Group would give reasons for rejecting the suggestions proposed by members on the draft questionnaire. The Chairman said that while the Advisory Group would provide a written reply, they would have full discretion in deciding how detailed the reply would be.

5. The Chairman introduced Mr. Wayne Yeh and Miss Teresa Lee of the MVA Hong Kong Ltd and invited Mr. Yeh to introduce the draft questionnaire.

6. Views and suggestions expressed by members on the draft questionnaire were summarized at **Annex A**.

7. The meeting ended at 7:15pm.

HOME AFFAIRS BUREAU

September 2005

## Survey on Public Attitudes towards Homosexuals

### Summary of views expressed at Sexual Minorities Forum meeting held on 24 June 2005

<u>Topics</u>	<u>Concerns / Suggestions</u>
<b>(I) Methodology</b>	
1. Target population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Queried the age of target respondents from 18 to 64. Suggested to lower the age to 13/14 and extend age limit beyond 64.</li></ul>
2. Sampling method	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Enquired into the random sampling arrangement.</li></ul>
3. Data collection method	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Enquired into the use of Cantonese and English in the telephone interviews.</li></ul>
4. Response rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Concerned whether the response rate might be affected by the gender of the interviewers.</li></ul>
<b>(II) Questionnaire</b>	
<b>Design</b> Overall Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Questioned the need to ask for the name of respondents.</li><li>• Background information of the survey should be provided to the respondents to enhance their understanding.</li><li>• It would be confusing to ask questions on both sexual orientation and homosexuality. The design of questionnaire should not be based on “heterosexual standard”.</li></ul>

## Topics

## Concerns / Suggestions

### Overall Design

- Questions on attitudes towards homosexual behaviours, instead of homosexuals, should be asked.
- The questions were severely discriminatory / prejudiced against homosexuals.
- Should avoid using 5-point scale questions throughout the survey. Suggested to use “Yes / No” questions and 5-point scale questions alternately.

### Introduction

- Suggested to replace “代表” by “受委託”.
- Suggested to replace “market research firm (市場研究公司)” by “opinion survey firm (民意調查公司)”.

### Section A

#### *Awareness of homosexuality*

- Definition of the terms relating to sexual orientation (i.e. heterosexuality, homosexuality, bisexuality) of QA1 should cover both “感情” and “性”.
- Definition of the terms on sexual orientation in QA1 should reflect that heterosexuals differ from homosexuals not in terms of who they are attracted to, but in terms of whom they are *currently primarily* attracted to.
- The terms relating to sexual orientation should not be defined in terms of the individual having such sexual orientation (i.e. homosexuals, bisexuals and heterosexuals) as appropriate.

## Topics

### Section A

#### *Awareness of homosexuality*

## Concerns / Suggestions

- The survey is on homosexuality. QA1 should not cover heterosexuality.
- Should ask respondents directly what they think the definition of different sexual orientation should be.
- To ensure all respondents have a common understanding on the various sexual orientation terms, should read out the definitions to the respondents irrespective of whether the respondents indicated that they understood the terms.
- Should jot down comments made by those respondents who did not agree with the definitions provided in QA1.
- Doubted why “bisexuals” were covered in Section A.
- Should add “Insofar as you know (以你所知)” at the beginning of QA2.
- Suggested to define “frequent” in QA2.
- Should add a question on whether the respondent or his friends/relatives had the experience of being discriminated because of their sexual orientation so as to ascertain the extent of discrimination in the society. This question should be asked before Section D and E.

## Topics

## Concerns / Suggestions

### Section B

#### *Acceptance level of homosexuals*

- Randomization (rotation) of the order of the questions, in particular for QB6-8.
- Suggested to use “comfort level” instead of “acceptance level”.
- Suggested to delete QB3 “a homosexual occupies a senior position ”.
- For QB3, “senior position” should be defined clearly.
- For QB5, queried why the teaching profession was targeted. Why not cover other professions such as doctors, nurses and artistes? Following this logic, domestic helpers should also be covered.
- Should include a question on the acceptance level of one’s relatives being homosexuals.
- Should replace “親暱” by “親密” in QB6-8.
- Should provide example on “親密” like embracing each other, kissing.
- On order of questions, QB7-8 should be asked before QB6.
- QB9-11 were related to the rights of homosexuals and should be moved to Section E.
- For QB12, should replace the word “admit” by “inform”.
- QB12 should be asked as the first question in Section B.

## Topics

## Concerns / Suggestions

### Section C

#### *Attitudes towards homosexuality*

- The questions were not concerning attitudes, but belief.
- Randomization (rotation) of the order of the questions.
- Suggested to delete this section as many questions are too biased and negative. In addition, questions of this kind cannot demonstrate the extent of discrimination faced by homosexuals. If they have to be asked, they should only be asked after Section E in order not to influence the response of interviewees to other questions. Also the questions have to be re-phrased.
- QC1-4 are all leading questions and should be removed. Suggested to add more positive questions.
- QC1 on whether “homosexuality is a psychological disorder” was nonsense.
- If QC1 was to be asked, it should be qualified by the statement that “homosexuality need to be cured (需要治療)”.
- Should rephrase QC1 as “homosexuals are psychologically and physically normal with a sexual preference for the same sex (同性戀者係心理、生理正常人士，他們選擇相同性別人士為性伴侶)”.
- Need to specify what traditional family values (i.e. Chinese, Western or Christian) were referred to in QC2.



## Topics

## Concerns / Suggestions

### Section C

#### *Attitudes towards homosexuality*

- Doubted who set the standards of morals and ethics of the community (QC3).
- Queried why QC4 was asked as homosexual sex was no longer a criminal act. Could replace by “Are you aware that homosexuality is not a criminal act in Hong Kong?”.
- Should avoid double negative questions such as QC5.
- Should rephrase QC7 as “homosexuals should be accepted as equals in society (社會應平等地接納同性戀者)”.

## Topics

### Section D

#### *Attitudes towards the right of homosexuals*

## Concerns / Suggestions

- Should replace the heading of Section D by “Attitudes towards the rights of heterosexual co-habiting couples and homosexuals”.
- QD1-4 carry resource implications. Should re-arrange the sequence of questions.
- Randomization (rotation) of the order of the questions.
- Should include same-sex marriage and adoption of children.
- Should include questions related to education instead of only focusing on the aspect of seeking social benefits / support from the community.
- Queried the inclusion of heterosexual co-habiting couple which only complicated the issue.
- Should delete Section D as questions were related to civil partnership (伴侶法). People might take that the homosexuals were fighting for same-sex marriage.
- Suggested to use positive statements, similar to the questions relating to heterosexuals such as “And a homosexual couple should too” for QD2, 4, 6 instead of asking the question “What about a homosexual couple?”

## Topics

## Concerns / Suggestions

Section E

*Addressing the  
problem of  
discrimination faced  
by homosexuals*

- Should re-arrange the sequence of questions.
- “At present” was redundant in the English version of QE1.
- Suggested to ask whether public education was adequate to address the problem of discrimination before asking whether it was the most appropriate measure.
- QE1 should be asked after QE4.
- Suggested to include a question on whether legislation is the most appropriate measure to address the problem of discrimination.
- Similar to QE4, suggested to add examples such as joining student organizations for QE2 and promotion or dismissal of staff for QE3.
- Suggested to replace “swimming pools” by “tennis courts” as one of the examples for QE4.
- Suggested to use positive statements for QE3-4 instead of in the form of questions.

## Topics

## Concerns / Suggestions

### Section E

*Addressing the problem of discrimination faced by homosexuals*

- Should add another question on introducing legislation to outlaw discrimination in participation of religious ritual (參加宗教儀式).
- To make QE6 more positive, add “not” before tantamount.
- QE6 is irrelevant in addressing the problem of discrimination.
- Should include a question on “If the Government introduces legislation to outlaw discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation, this would improve the international image of Hong Kong (可提昇香港的國際形象).”
- QE2-4 covered discrimination in the private sector, without touching on the Government’s own discriminatory practices. Suggested to include a question on “The HK Government should change legislation to allow homosexuals the same rights to marry that heterosexuals have”.
- Should revise QE6 as “If the Government allows discrimination against homosexuals, it is tantamount to discouraging homosexual behaviour”.

## Topics

## Concerns / Suggestions

### Section F

#### *Demographics of respondent*

- Suggested to replace “中國人” by “華人” in QF4 and further ask whether the respondents were Hong Kong Chinese, Malaysia Chinese, etc.
- Doubted the usefulness of QF5 on whether the respondents had stayed outside Hong Kong and QF8 on respondents’ religious belief.
- “Christianity” of QF8a should be replaced by “Protestantism”.
- Questioned the usefulness of asking the degree of devoutness in one’s religious belief (QF8b).
- Queried the meaning of 公援.

### **(III) Other issues**

- Questioned whether there were anti-discrimination policies in MVA.
- Concerned whether MVA, a transport planning and market research company, would be capable of conducting the survey, and asked whether MVA would provide training to the interviewers for this very special social thematic survey.