香 港 中 文 大 學

社 會 研 究 中 心

Community Programme Evaluation:
A Study of the Demand and
Existing Practice of Evaluation in the
Summer Youth Programme in Hong Kong

Bong-ho Mok

SOCIAL RESEARCH CENTRE

THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY
OF HONG KONG

THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

SOCIAL RESEARCH CENTRE

COMMUNITY PROGRAMME EVALUATION: A STUDY OF
THE DEMAND AND EXISTING PRACTICE OF
EVALUATION IN THE SUMMER YOUTH
PROGRAMME IN HONG KONG

by

Bong-ho Mok

(Not to be quoted or reproduced without permission)

October, 1979

All manuscripts are processed through the Editorial subcommitte
and evaluated and approved by its members in collaboration with invited
reviewers of relevant specialties.

Members of the Editorial Subcommittee:

Copyright remains with the author.

Mr. B.H. Mok (1949-   ) received his B.S.Sc. from the Chinese
University of Hong Kong in 1972 and M.S.W. from the University of
Hawaii in 1976. Currently he is Assistant Lecturer in Social Work,
Chung Chi College, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The year of 1978 marked the 10th anniversary of the summer youth programme. First organized on a Hong Kong wide scale and co-ordinated by the Central Coordinating Committee for Youth Recreation in 1969, today, it has become a significant annual event for most, if not all, children and youth in Hong Kong. In 1977, the number of participants in the summer youth programme was estimated to amount to 2.0 million, an increase of 60% compared to the 1.25 million in 1969. Funds spent on the programme, principally coming from the Royal Hong Kong Jockey Club, Hong Kong Government, Urban Council, participant fees and private donations, also went up substantially from about $1.3 million in 1969 to about $4.5 million in 1977, a total of 246% increase in nine years. At the same time, the organizing bodies such as the voluntary social welfare agencies, Education Department, Social Welfare Department, British Forces and Urban Services Department are heavily involved in the planning and implementation of such programme each year. They have looked upon the summer youth programme as an annual exercise in their respective organization. The Government, convinced of the high value of this programme for young people, lends its full support in almost every possible way. Every year, without exception, the Governor or a high ranking official officiates at its opening ceremony or delivers a message upon its close.

Indeed, the summer youth programme in Hong Kong has grown

tremendously in number, in diversity and also in the amount of support
from both the Government and the voluntary agencies. There is a
general feeling, if not consensus, that this programme is doing well
and it is going in the desired direction. But what is more important
for us to know about and yet we know very little of it how well it is
done. For example, are its objectives achieved? If so, how well are
the objectives being fulfilled? What programme ought to be added or
dropped to meet the needs of the young people? Can the programme be
extended to all seasons from the summer time? There is, of course,
the question of who benefits in what and by whom in the summer youth
programme. Does the programme serve as many young workers as students?
Do older youth enjoy as much as the younger youth? Are young people
being helped in the best possible way to develop their potentials?
Who are the more appropriate persons to carry out the programme? Are
social workers or education officers more able than the laymen or
volunteers to serve the summer youth programme participants? Organizing
agencies of summer youth programme are held accountable to those who
have contributed financially to their programme. Are the subsidies
appropriated properly? Is there any indication of misuse of funds,
such as unnecessary spending on glamorous ceremonies? At the inter-
organizational level, how effective is the present coordinating system
in avoiding overlapping of services and maximizing resources?

The summer youth programme, supported and financed by the
community, has an obligation to be answerable and responsive to all
these questions. It is often easy for the programme administrator to

provide answers, but hard to make their answers convincing simply because they lack facts or concrete outcomes to support their claims. Programme administrators may find it easier to address the above questions if they constantly assess, appraise or judge their programme. Thus, purposeful and systematic evaluation becomes an effective weapon in supplying information to improve the programme; in providing evidence to justify the programme existence or continuation; and in getting the public support. This study does not aim at finding answers for all the above questions, a task too big for this pilot project. Its main objective is to explore the general situation of summer youth programme evaluation in Hong Kong, with focuses on the following three areas:
1) to ascertain community demand for accountability of the summer youth programme; 2) to assess the existing machinery for summer youth programme evaluation; 3) to study the attitudes of administrators and field workers towards evaluation.

CHAPTER TWO

A REVIEW OF THE SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAMME IN HONG KONG

1. Historical Development

It is often taken for granted that the summer youth programme

was started in 1969 when the Central Coordinating Committee for Youth

Recreation was set up by the Government to coordinate recreational

activities during the summer vacation. This is only partly true. The

seeds of the summer youth programme, in fact, was sown in the early

sixties[1] by the voluntary agencies.[2] It was not until 1969 that the

efforts of the Government and the voluntary sector were, for the first

time, pulled together by the Central Coordinating Committee for Youth

Recreation to promote and coordinate the summer youth activities,

which were previously organized separately by individual agencies and

government departments. The programme was expanded greatly and grew

in gigantic proportions in the subsequent years. This dramatic

expansion is, directly or indirectly, related to a few significant

events and developments in the sixties. First is the rapid growth of

the youth population. The total number of the 10-24 age group was

718,819 in 1961, it amounted to 1,287,797 in 1971, an increase of 79.2%

in 10 years.[3] Secondly, the increasing free time among students and

young workers. With the present trend of automation and mechanization,

the working youth of Hong Kong are increasingly enjoying more leisure

time. Leisure is no longer a luxury or privilege, but a way of life

for all. These two phenomena have a strong implication for the need

of recreational activities on the part of the young people. But perhaps

- 4 -

the most significant incident that has a great impact on the rapid

growth of the summer youth programme was the riots of 1966 and 1967.

The fact that "the prominence in the disturbances of youths between

the age of 15-25"[4] aroused much public concern over the "youth problem"

and the Government seemed to be convinced that the problem was "simply

one of youthful animal spirits with inadequate outlets for their

energy and emotions,"[5] and that there was the demand for "more

facilities for healthy recreation and constructive activity."[6] This

pointed to the need to provide more recreational opportunities and to

teach the youth to use their leisure constructively.

In 1969, the Central Coordinating Committee for Youth

Recreation was established to formulate policy guidelines and to

coordinate all the summer youth activities organized by both Government

and non-Government bodies as part of an overall programme.

A year later, the District Youth Recreation Coordinating Committee,

a local machinery for planning and coordinating the summer youth activities

was formed in various districts to envisage greater participation at

the grassroot level.

The objectives of the summer youth programme set forth by the

Central Coordinating Committee for Youth Recreation generally have

three broad areas of concern:

(A)   to provide more recreational opportunities for as many young

      people as possible from all walks of life;

(B)   to widen the participants' knowledge, and develop their potential,

self-confidence, skills and interests; and

(C) to provide them with the opportunity to use their initiative and

to encourage them to serve the community in different ways.

These objectives have remained much the same since 1969; but in recent

years more emphasis has been placed on developing participants'

leadership and community consciousness rather than just providing

recreation and fun for the young people.

In terms of the number of events, participants and volunteers,

and the total cost of the summer youth programme, although there are

fluctuations in some years, a generally increasing trend can be detected.

The following table provides a statistical summary:

Table 1. <u>No. of Events, Participants and Volunteers and</u>

<u>Total Cost of Summer Youth Programme by Year</u>

	No. of Events	No. of Participants (million)		No. of Volunteers		Total Cost (million)
1969	---*		0.75		32,768	$1.3
1970	---*		0.80		30,000	$1.6**
1971	---*	over	0.80		30,000	$1.8**
1972	---*		0.90		30,000	$2.0
1973	5,400		1.50		36,864	$2.0**
1974	---*		2.00	over	30,000	$3.0
1975	5,000		2.00		50,000	$3.0
1976	8,000		2.00	over	65,000	$3.0**
1977	6,800		2.00	over	45,000	$4.5

* Figures not available

** Figures derived from the amount of the Hong Kong Jockey Club donation plus the matching sums of money from public funds

Source : Summer Youth Programme Reports, Central Coordinating Committee for Youth Recreation, 1969-77.

In brief, four pertinent features can be speculated in the development of the summer youth programme in Hong Kong:

(i)   that the summer youth activities were pioneered by the voluntary agencies in the early sixties and later expanded by the Government in a social context where there is a growing youth population, an increase in leisure time, and the recognition of the "youth problem" after the 1966-67 riots, all of which pointed to the need for more recreational facilities and opportunities;

(ii) that the summer youth programme has become a significant annual event in the community, jointly sponsored and conducted by Government and non-Government bodies;

(iii) that the summer youth programme is coordinated by the Central Coordinating Committee for Youth Recreation at the Hong Kong wide level and by the District Youth Coordinating Committees at the district level; and

(iv) that the summer youth programme continues to provide a wide range of activities for a vast number of youth participants with increasing costs.

2. Concerns and Problems

There was great concern over the actual number of young people benefited from the summer youth programme when the recent survey conducted by the Census & Statistics Department[7] disclosed that only 135,000 youth aged 6-24 were estimated to have taken part in the summer youth activities in 1978. This figure is too far away from the one claimed by the Central Coordinating Committee for Youth Recreation, which is approximately two million. If the 135,000 youth participants are assumed to have taken part in more than one activity, then each of them has to have participated in at least 14 activities to add up to the figure of two million. This, however, does not appear to be reasonable. As a matter of fact, the Central Coordinating Committee for Youth Recreation had once made a careful estimation of the number of summer youth programme participants in 1970 and 1971, taking into consideration those participants who might have joined more than one activity. The Committee stated that it "...... has had difficulty in assessing the extent to which the same participants might have taken part in more than one activity. Allowing for this, the Committee estimates that at least 800,000 children and young persons have benefited in each of the two (1970, 1971) summer youth programmes."[8] The number of participants in 1970 and 1971 were 1,398,913 and 1,368,356 respectively. These two figures against the 800,000 indicated the Central Coordinating Committee for Youth Recreation estimated that each participant should have taken part in less than two activities.

The discrepancy in the number of beneficiaries of the summer youth programme reported by the Central Coordinating Committee for Youth Recreation and that estimated by the Census & Statistics Department deserves further investigation. Immediate action should be taken by the summer youth programme administrators to ensure that a maximum possible number of youth will be reached and served in the years to come.

Another concern has to do with the objectives and direction of the summer youth programme in the future. The original emphasis of the programme is to provide fun for young people during the summer; and gradually, an important element has been added, i.e., to promote young people's social consciousness through community service activities. At the same time, studies[9] on the summer youth programme revealed that many young people who did not participate in the programme simply because they did not have time or they had to work to earn money. In this respect, is it feasible, on top of providing fun for and promoting social consciousness of young people, to make the summer youth programme a project that can provide summer job opportunities for all those who so desired? A significant number of non-participants pointed out that they did not participate because of their parents' objection.[10] It seems reasonable that parents may fear that allowing their children to join the summer youth activity without their close supervision would lead their children to associate with "bad" youths or even "gangsters". The summer youth programme, designed purely for children and youth,

tend to separate the child from his parents at a time when parents and their children should get together more. Although not empirically tested, this situation could result in a wider generation gap between parents and their children. In order to avoid parents objecting their children to participate in the summer youth programme and to provide more opportunities for parent-child interaction, perhaps organizing agencies should consider involving parents in the programme in one way or another. Some studies[11] also disclosed that the summer youth participants were mostly students. Then, what should be done to attract more non-students, especially the industrial workers? Some agencies[12] felt that it seemed more sensible and economical to extend the summer youth programme to the other months of the year. Thus, is it possible to make the summer youth programme a year-round activity?

The voluntary social agencies sponsoring summer youth activities are generally unhappy about the way the Jockey Club's donation to the summer youth programme is handled. The existing pattern of allocation of the Jockey Club fund is that the Education Department, Social Welfare Department and the voluntary social agencies obtain certain amount for their respective summer youth activities. However, the voluntary social agencies are of the opinion that government department's expenditure on summer youth activities should have come from the public funds, and that the allocation of donated funds to the two departments concerned can only be construed as the Jockey Club subventing government for discharging its responsibilities.[13]

In terms of the summer youth programme coordination, the co-

ordinating bodies are not immune from criticism. The Central
Coordinating Committee for Youth Recreation has been charged as
failing to address itself to the more important and relevant matters
affecting the summer youth programme and that the name of the Committee
is a misnomer and, its work lacks in policy direction.[14] The role and
functions of the District Youth Coordinating Committee are also
questioned by agencies and organizations involved in the district
summer youth activities. A study on the summer youth programme even
came to the conclusion that coordination and cooperation was rare at
the district level, and that this might be due to the mal-functioning
of the district coordinating body. It was proposed that sub-committees
on coordinating and planning for each category of summer activities
should be set up.[15] In other words, the district coordinating committee
should be replaced by another machinery to facilitate genuine district
coordination of summer youth activities.

All these concerns and problems pointed to the need for a
comprehensive evaluation of the summer youth programme to make
improvements and to conquer difficulties. But again the evaluation
activity itself may become a problem for the agencies because it
would mean additional manpower, expertise and financial resources, or
it would at least take away some of the agency staff time in the course
of conducting the evaluation. The feasibility of evaluation activities
will depend very much on the attitudes and determination of the summer
youth programme administrators, field workers and all those concerned.

People want good programmes and a sound evaluation system is a pre-
requisite for any programme success.

CHAPTER THREE

AN EMPRIRICAL STUDY OF THE SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAMME EVALUATION IN HONG KONG

1. <u>Purpose and Method</u>

The primary purpose of this study, as stated in the first chapter,
is to explore the general situation of summer youth programme evaluation
in Hong Kong focusing on three areas:

    (A) to ascertain community demand for <u>accountability</u> of the

        summer youth programme;

    (B) to assess the existing machinery for summer youth programme

        evaluation; and

    (C) to study the attitudes of <u>administrators</u> and <u>field workers</u>

        towards evaluation.

<u>Accountability</u> is an umbrella term which can be interpreted in
many different ways with various conceptions. It is used in this study
simply to mean to be required to provide someone else with an explanation
or analysis which justifies an action taken.[16]

<u>Administrators</u> are used to refer to those persons who are
administratively responsible for planning and overseeing the development
of the summer youth programme. They include the agency staff at the
head-quarters level, for example, the principal social welfare officer
of the Social Welfare Department, the education officer of the Education
Department, and the general, executive and programme secretaries of the
voluntary social agencies. In case the agency is a small one, the
centre-in-charge, who has similar responsibilities with those agency

- 13 -

staff at the headquarters level will also be put under this category.

Field workers are those front-line staff who are directly involved in the planning, implementation and follow up of the summer youth programme. They are always in the field and work closely with summer youth programme participants, volunteers and staff of other agencies.

The sample in this study included all 43 member agencies of the Hong Kong Council of Social Service operating summer youth activities in 1978, the Social Welfare Department, and the Education Department (the Physical Education Section and the Science Section). A structured questionnaire (the administrator's questionnaire) was sent to the administrators of all agencies concerned. Another questionnaire (the field worker's questionnaire) was sent to the field workers of the same agencies. A total of 46 copies of the administrator's questionnaire and 82 copies of the field worker's questionnaire were sent out. One administrator from each agency was asked to complete the administrator's questionnaire. The number of field workers selected from the agencies was determined arbitrarily; but the basic idea was to select one or two from smaller agencies and four or five from larger organizations. The norm was two from each agency. The response rate of the administrators (82.6%) was not low but it could have been higher. There was a turnover of staff responsible for the summer youth programme in some agencies leaving no one in the proper position to fill out the questionnaire. Two administrators, after many attempts to contact them in vain were

dropped from the sample. On the other hand, the response rate of the
field worker was much lower (67.2%) mainly because there was no control
over the return of the questionnaires which were sent back voluntarily.

The instruments adopted in this study were two structured
questionnaires, one for administrators consisting of 35 questions and
the other for field workers which composed of 30 questions. Some of
the questions in both questionnaires are of the same nature and compari-
sons between the two groups of respondent can be made. Both instruments
were pretested and finalized with minor modifications.

This study employed a combination of postal and interviewing
techniques. The administrators' questionnaire was first sent to various
agencies concerned together with a letter explaining the purpose of the
study. A follow up telephone call was made three or four days later to
confirm that the questionnaire had been received, and to make arrange-
ment for an interview. The purpose of the interview were: (i) to
ensure that all questions were understood and filled out by the
administrator; (ii) to request the administrator to distribute the
field worker's questionnaire to their field staff who were expected
to send the questionnaires back to the investigator by mail. The
process of data collection was carried out from August to October, 1978
with the assistance of one graduate and four undergraduate students.

2. Findings and Interpretation

The major findings of this study are grouped into five parts.
Part A is the general information about the responding agencies as

well as their summer youth activities. Parts B, and C relate to the

demand for accountability, and the method and content of evaluation

in the summer youth programme. The last two parts are concerned with

the attitudes and feelings of the respondents towards the present

system of summer youth programme evaluation and evaluation in general.

Since this study consists of two groups of respondents, i.e.,

the administrators and the field workers, all their responses are

presented in parts A, D and E. In parts B and C, only the administrators'

answers are put forward for discussion. The assumption is that the

administrators are in a better position to understand more comprehen-

sively about the demand for accountability, and the method and content

of summer youth programme evaluation as they are involved in planning

and overseeing the implementation of the programme. On the other hand,

the field workers who are engaged in only one or a few summer youth

activities may have a less objective or even a biased perception of

the above areas of concern. Thus, the administrators' responses to

questions in these two parts are considered more representative of

their respective agency.

A. General Information

The general information about the respondents' agencies and summer

youth programme are summarized as follows. 7.9% responding administrators

came from the Government - the Social Welfare Department and the Education

Department; 92.1% came from the voluntary agencies. Correspondingly,

9.1% of the field workers were from the same Government Departments;

87.3% were from the voluntary sector. One respondent who belonged to neither a Government department nor a voluntary agency was from a school operating summer youth activities.

Referring to the responses of administrators to nine general questions, it is interesting to note that the summer youth programme is run not only by children and youth agencies, but also by agencies serving people of other age groups (39.5%) and people with various needs (23.7%) (Q.1). It indicates that the summer youth programme has become significant to the extent that a variety of agencies are willing to play a role in it. Questions two and three showed that a majority of agencies (57.9%) started running summer youth programme in or after 1968 and once they began doing so, have continued to do so annually. Apparently, the encouragement of the government given to youth work after the 1967 riots and the establishment of the Central Coordinating Committee in 1969 are the main factors leading to the increasing involvement of agencies in the summer youth programme. Of course, without the continous support of the general public, for example, parents, teachers, and members of the Jockey Club, the summer youth programme would not have come to its present stage of development and achievement. Questions four and five show that six agencies (15.8%) had a full-time research worker while three agencies (7.9%) had a part-time worker responsible for research. Those agencies that did not have a full-time or part-time research worker seemed to be more in favour of a part-time than full-time research worker. 31.6% agencies said that they did not have a full-time research worker but it was necessary to have one (Q.4); 55.3% agencies said they did not have a

part-time research worker but they felt the need to have such a worker
(Q.5). It is not known whether this is a real indication of a greater
need for part-time researcher or a reflection of the less favourable
attitudes towards research on the part of the administrator. A contrary
interpretation is that the administrators are in fact serious about
research, but they cannot afford a full-time research worker as far as
their existing resources are concerned. That the answers to questions
six and seven which showing a big majority of agencies (78.9%) having
evaluated their summer youth programme is encouraging. But care must be
taken in analysing these answers because the administrators may define
evaluation in a very loose sense. Questions eight and nine reveal the
size of agencies and the number of trained social work staff. It was
found that quite a number of the agencies (47.4%) were rather small,
having only one to five full-time social workers. The three agencies
that did not have full-time social workers ran their summer youth
programme with part-time staff or volunteers (Q.8). In question nine,
an overwhelming majority of agencies (81.6%) had trained social work
staff. This information, however, should be understood with caution
because it does not reflect the actual portion of trained social workers.
For example, an agency could have 49 trained social workers among its
50 staff but this cannot be shown or proved by existing data in questions
eight and nine.

On the agencies' sources of income for their summer youth
programme, 97.4% of them obtained funds from the Royal Hong Kong Jockey
Club, which has given the biggest single donation every year since 1969.

44.7% of the agencies received money from the Social Welfare Department; and 13.2% from the Education Department. Still there are some agencies whose finances for summer youth programme came from the district youth coordinating committee (7.9%); private donations (21.1%) or other sources (26.3%).

B. Demand for Accountability

The demand for accountability of the summer youth programme comes from two main sources: the agency itself and the coordinating/ funding bodies. Two questions in Table 2 indicate that the agency's demand for accountability was relatively high. 89.5% of the agencies required their workers to submit summer youth programme reports in the past three years; 10.5% did not. To the question on whether they have. ever evaluated their summer youth programmes, 78.9% of the administrators said yes; 18.4% said no.

Table 2. Agencies' Demand for Accountability

	Total		Yes		No		No Answer	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Did your agency require the workers to submit summer youth programme reports in the past three years?	38	100	34	89.5	4	10.5	0	0
Has your agency ever evaluated summer youth programme?	38	100	30	78.9	7	18.4	1	2.6

Table 3. _Coordinating/Funding Bodies' Demand for Accountability_

	Have these coordinating bodies ever requested you to submit summer youth programme reports?						Are these reports concerned with evaluation?									
	Total		Yes		Not Applicable		Total		Concerned		Not Concerned		Don't Know		Not Applicable	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Central Coordinating Committee	38	100	3	7.9	35	92.1	38	100	3	7.9	0	0	0	0	35	92.1
Social Welfare Department	38	100	10	26.3	28	73.7	38	100	3	7.9	7	18.4	0	0	28	73.7
Hong Kong Council of Social Service	38	100	35	92.1	3	7.9	38	100	16	42.1	18	47.4	1	2.6	3	7.9
District Youth Recreation Coordinating Committee	38	100	6	15.8	32	84.2	38	100	2	5.3	3	7.9	0	0	33	86.8
Education Department	38	100	1	2.6	37	97.4	38	100	0	0	0	0	1	2.6	37	97.4
Others	38	100	4	10.5	34	89.5	38	100	4	10.5	0	0	0	0	34	89.5

Table 3 shows the coordinating/funding bodies' demand for accountability. It was found that not all coordinating/funding bodies had a high demand for accountability in terms of evaluation. Except the agencies directly under the coordination of the Central Coordinating Committee, quite a number of agencies felt that the reports requested by their coordinating/funding bodies were not concerned with evaluation. Seven out of ten agencies requested to submit summer youth programme reports by the Social Welfare Department said that the reports were not concerned with evaluation. The same feeling was expressed by 18 out of 35 agencies coordinated by the Hong Kong Council of Social Service; two out of six agencies coordinated by the District Youth Recreation Coordinating Committee. Some of the respondents pointed out that those were mainly statistical reports without comments or interpretation by the programme staff.

In response to a question asked about the extent the administrators think their agencies' application for funds for the summer youth programme was affected by the results of their agencies' summer youth programme the year before, 39.4% of the respondents replied with "very much affected" or "affected"; but 58; said "not affected", "not affected at all" or "don't know". The finding that so many respondents were not sure about or thought that their application for funds for the summer youth programme was not affected by their performance the previous year may have special implications. It could mean that no matter whether the summer youth programme is good or bad, the agencies will still get the money. Or put it in another way, that no matter whether the summer youth

programme is successful or not, the funding organizations will continue
to support it financially.

The information derived from the above questions gives an
impression that the agencies operating summer youth programmes were
very much aware of the need for accountability. As a result, most
of them required their staff to submit reports and to conduct evaluation.
("Evaluation" is interpreted by the respondents in whatever way they
perceived the term) It also disclosed that there was a lesser demand
for accountability on the part of the coordinating/funding bodies.
For example, the Social Welfare Department, one of the coordinating/
funding bodies, did request those agencies under its coordination to
submit summer youth programme reports, but these reports were perceived
by most agencies as being unrelated to evaluation. Doubts are raised
as to whether the Social Welfare Department actually required
evaluation of the summer youth programme, or there are reasons for not
doing so. Professor John F. Jones, in discussing the Government audit,
evaluation and control of voluntary agencies, observed that "The Social
Welfare Department does not possess the means -- or even, as far as can
be ascertained the methodology -- to evaluate programmes".[17] This
comment is verified at least partially when examining the guidelines
for summer youth programme provided by the Social Welfare Department,
which is mainly a statistical report concerning the number of participants
and staff, and the expenditure of the summer youth activities. The
Hong Kong Council of Social Service, another coordinating organization
of the summer youth programme, had the same problem. The voluntary

agencies under its coordination generally felt that the evaluation
guideline provided by it in and before 1977 were concerned primarily
with statistics. However, some agencies said that the one designed
for 1978 had improved a lot, with a concrete outline for evaluation.
The Central Coordinating Committee for Youth Recreation, though it
requested evaluation reports from other coordinating bodies, did not
suggest concrete evaluation guidelines or procedures. This is unfair
not only to those coordinating bodies, but also to the agencies directly
organizing summer youth activities, because the Central Coordinating
Committee for Youth Recreation could challenge their summer youth
programme reports purely on the basis of personal judgement, and not
by pre-determined standards.

The Royal Hong Kong Jockey Club and the Hong Kong Government
are the major contributors to the summer youth programme in terms of
finance. It is unclear to what extent the Jockey Club has demanded
accountability for the programme in the past. After all, the Jockey
Club is a private organization whose role in the summer youth programme
is merely a donor, it is not realistic to expect it to perform a watch
dog function. At this point, the Government -- being the funding body
and operating organization, should assume more responsibility in ensuring
a certain standard of performance of the programme. What has been done
by the Government is disappointing. For instance, the Social Welfare
Department requested only a programme statistical report from agencies,
which did not suffice to reflect the actual performance of the programme.
More systematic evaluation must be conducted if a clear picture about

how well the programme is done is to be obtained.

C. Method and Content of Evaluation

The Central Coordinating Committee for Youth Recreation classified the summer youth programme into 12 activities, each was given certain examples to illustrate its nature. It was assumed that these activities may employ different methods of evaluation; therefore, the respondents were asked about how they evaluate each of these 12 summer youth activities. Surprisingly, the answers turned out to be quite uniform. Among those agencies that have evaluated their summer youth programme, a large number of them used staff evaluation conference, discussion with volunteers, and discussion with participants as the methods in evaluating all the 12 activities. For example, 39.5% of the respondents reported that in evaluating the community service activity they used any two of the three methods -- staff evaluation conference, discussion with volunteers, discussion with participants;while 10.5% said they employed staff evaluation conference only. The methods in evaluating other activities also followed this pattern.

The popularity of these three methods had its roots in the youth programmes of the 1960's. Youth workers at that time had already begun to use meetings among staff members, with volunteers or with youth participants to discuss and appraise the youth programmes after they are over. In case the programmes such as work camps and training courses that last for a few days or over a couple of weeks, these meetings may be held every evening. The advantages of using such

meetings mainly are that they are easy and convenient to be conducted;
that they can provide assessment as to where the programme is, what
needs to be improved, etc. The major limitation is that opinions
expressed in these meetings tend to be subjective and sometimes con-
tradicting. The sole dependence on these meetings in assessing programmes
could end up with free discussion without coming to any conclusions or
recommendations. In order to make these meetings more meaningful and
successful in evaluating programmes, it is necessary to establish clear
guidelines with objective criteria to measure the outcomes of the pro-
gramme. Guidelines as such will provide the content as well as the
direction for programme evaluation.

It was also found that a questionnaire was rarely used in assess-
ing the summer youth activities. This could be related to the attitudes
of the programme staff who may look upon a questionnaire as something
that is impersonal, lacking flexibility or not inclusive enough to
provide feedback from volunteers and participants. Another important
factor could be the lack of manpower and resources. The design of the
questionnaire, the collection and analysis of data from the questionnaire
are often time consuming and require certain research skills which most
programme staff are not familiar with. This can be part of the difficulty
that the programme staff face even if they desire to evaluate their
programmes.

73.7% of the agencies said that they provided guidelines to the
workers in writing summer youth programme reports in the past three years.

An examination of these guidelines reveals some interesting information. Most of the guidelines include only basic information such as the number or participants and volunteers, the content of activity, working schedule, facilities utilized, preparation made before hand, and budgeting. Some guidelines do request comments from the programme staff on the responses of participants, problems and difficulties encountered, and suggestions for future action. A statement of objectives was found in only a few agencies' guidelines for summer youth programme reports.

Regardless of the methods the administrators used to evaluate their summer youth activities -- staff conference, questionnaire or conference with participants or volunteers - the content of the evaluation included mostly the procedures involved and the progress of the activity, for example, the programming of the activity, the division of labour, propaganda, safety measures, etc. The impact of the activities, the degree of participation, the evaluation of problems and suggestions for improvement were also the concern to the programme staff. However, the number of agencies that were concerned with the attainment of objectives in the programme was discouraging. 14 out of the 30 agencies utilizing a staff conference to evaluate summer youth programmes mentioned that the content of the conference asked about the achievement of objectives; 6 out of the 15 agencies using a questionnaire, and 10 out of the 24 agencies using a conference with volunteers and participants indicated that they included discussion on the attainment of objectives in the evaluation.

The finding that less than half of the agencies mentioned that they assessed the attainment of their programme objectives is rather disturbing. In all programme evaluation, it is almost a must to have the programme objectives clearly stated in measurable terms, so that evaluation can be done accordingly. Whether objectives are outcome or process oriented, their absence results in no direction for evaluation. The finding in this study is either an indication that many agencies are not aware of the importance of objective writing to programme evaluation; or that the goals of the summer youth programme as stated by the Central Coordinating Committee for Youth Recreation are so totally understood that it is not necessary to mention them at all. The latter explanation, however, seems less convincing.

D. Feelings About the Present System of Evaluation

Eight questions were asked concerning the feelings of both the administrators and field workers about the present system of evaluation in the summer youth programme. A small majority of the administrators and field workers responded favourably to the question on whether they are satisfied with their agency's/centre's existing methods for evaluating the summer youth programme. Among those who responded to this question, 53.4% of the administrators and 53.2% of the field workers said they were satisfied; 23.3% of the administrators and 29.8% of the field workers expressed that they were not satisfied; the rest had no opinion.

Although many of the respondents opined satisfaction with their existing methods for evaluating the summer youth programme, they felt that there was room for improvement. A large number of administrators

and field workers who responded to one question pointed out some areas
of evaluation on the summer youth programme need to be improved; 16% of
the administrators and 21.9% of the field workers said that there was no
need for improvement. In particular, 33.3% of the administrators and 53.8%
of the field workers pinpointed the need to bring forward practical ways
and methods for evaluation, such as to provide or refine evaluation
guidelines.

A high percentage of administrators (67.9%) and field workers
(76.2%) indicated that they had done satisfactory evaluation in the summer
youth programme. When they were asked to list summer youth activities on
which they felt the evaluation had been done most satisfactorily, many
of them -- 57.9% of the administrators and 53.3% of the field workers --
put down study or training activities. Other activities were mentioned by
a few of the respondents. That the evaluation of study or training
activities was most satisfactory to a majority of the administrators and
field workers may be attributed to the fact that many programme staff
put heavy emphasis on such activities to promote the social consciousness
of the participants and to recruit volunteers. Consequently, the assess-
ment of these activities' results will possibly be stressed. It is also
probable that the programme objective and programme content are quite
explicit in the study and training activities, which make it easier to
conduct successful evaluation.

The response to the question on the difficulties encountered
in evaluating the summer youth programme revealed some interesting
findings. More administrators (53.4%) than field workers (30.5%)
felt that it was difficult to evaluate the summer youth programme.

On the other hand, more field workers (69.5%) than administrators (43.3%) found the evaluation of the summer youth programme not very difficult or not difficult at all.

It is said that action speaks louder than words; but doing is often more difficult than knowing. Along this line of thinking, in doing the evaluation, the field workers are expected to ventilate on more difficulties than the administrators because the former always are the people who actually carry out the evaluation. The finding as disclosed above surprisingly is the opposite. One possible explanation is that the more one knows about evaluation, the less one feels competent in it. The administrators in this study generally are more knowledgeable and experienced than the field staff as far as evaluation is concerned. It is logical that many of them are aware of the problems of programme evaluation and thus expressed the feeling of difficulty concerning the evaluation of their summer youth activities. The tendency that much of the evaluation of summer youth activities is planned by administrators or by staff at headquarters may also account for the easy attitude of the field workers towards evaluation. Since the field workers' main responsibility in evaluation is to collect data or to give comments in respect to the instructions or guidelines provided by administrators, they usually do not feel their job is too much a problem. Nevertheless, if this is the case, necessary action must be taken to look into the situation. Evaluation should not be planned by one group of staff and carried out by another group. This makes evaluation more difficult and less meaningful. The best alternative is to bring together all those concerned --

the administrator, evaluator, and field worker -- to be involved at all
stages of the evaluation. It is only through the cooperative efforts
of various people that the evaluation activities will become more
successful and significant for decision making regarding the programme's
development.

Responding to another question, the respondents who stated that
it was difficult to evaluate their summer youth programme were asked to
list the reasons that caused the difficulty. Some of them mentioned
that it was difficult to set programme objectives and difficult to
evaluate them due to the short duration of programme; others said that
they lacked staff familiar with evaluation and the lack of objective
measurements; a majority of the administrators (87.5%) and field work-
ers (85.7%) who responded to this question pointed out that it was
difficult to measure programme results. In effect, the reasons given
are all relevant and interrelated. For example, most of the summer
youth activities last for a short period of time -- sometimes only a
few hours, which make it difficult to assess the effects of the
activities. The lack of evaluation staff and the absence of an object-
ive standard also leads to problems in setting a programme objective,
and measuring results. Remedial action should be taken if the present
system of evaluation of the summer youth programme is to be improved.

E. Attitude towards Evaluation

Six questions related to the attitude towards evaluation were
asked. The first two questions are concerned with the way the respondents

look upon evaluation in general. The third and fourth questions focus on
the respondents' feelings about doing evaluation on the summer youth
programme. The fifth and sixth questions are on the respondents'
perception of the coordinating bodies'/their supervisors' attitude
towards the budgeting and the outcomes of the summer youth programme.
That the last two questions were asked is based on the assumption that
the respondents' perception of the attitude of the coordination bodies/
their supervisors towards programme efficiency and effectiveness is
likely to affect their own. For instance, if the coordinating bodies/
their supervisors pay serious attention to the way of spending funds on
the summer youth programme, the administrators/field workers are inclined
to adopt the same attitude. From the same token, if the coordinating
bodies/their supervisors pay serious attention to the results of the
agency's summer youth programme, the administrators and the field
workers probably would become more serious about their programme
outcome.

The responses to these six questions were very uniform, with
most of the respondents generally having a favourable attitude towards
evaluation. A majority of both the administrators and field workers
expressed that they paid serious attention to programme evaluation;
agreed that it was through evaluation summer youth programme be
evaluated if the coordinating bodies/their supervisors intended to do so.
Answers to questions five and six indicated that most of the respondents
felt that the coordinating bodies/their supervisors paid serious

attention to the way funds were spent on summer youth programme and also to the programme's results.

The generally favourable attitude of the respondents toward evaluation as shown in the table possibly is a reflection of the real situation among the administrators and field workers of the summer youth programme agencies. However, caution has to be taken if firm conclusions are to be drawn from these findings. A scrutiny of the six questions indicates that they are all socially desirable questions; thus, positive or favourable responses are reasonably expected. How much of the "socially desirable" elements of the questions have influenced the answers of the respondents is not known. But by drawing attention to this bias, it would help to minimize possible mis-interpretations about the data. In fact, human biases are ever existing in social research. The best solution, perhaps, is to expose them all.

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

The continued support of the Government and the Jockey Club
given to the summer youth programme, to a certain extent, frees the
agencies from political pressure to conduct formal evaluation.
Fortunately or unfortunately, they do not have to make extra effort to
defend their programme for their existence, nor do they have to spend a
greater portion of their manpower to play around with figures and
statistics. In terms of programme evaluation, this is a very advantageous
situation, because it allows a greater autonomy and lesser pressure for
agencies to appraise and improve their programmes. The findings in this
study, however, pointed to the methodology problem as well as the
resource problem in terms of manpower and finance. The lack of staff
familiar with evaluation, the difficulty in formulating objectives and
measuring results, and the need for funds to evaluate the summer youth
programme are among those major problems that are faced by the agencies.

The fact that agencies suffer from a lack of staff familiar with
evaluation has some important implications. Staff who know very little
of evaluation tend to pay little attention to or ignore the need for
evaluation in programmes. Even if they are aware of the need for
programme evaluation, they are not likely to do it since they do not
possess the necessary evaluation knowledge and techniques. Thus, most
programmes may be carried out with little regard to evaluating their
results and improving their operation. Some workers may easily find
justification for this by saying that they are concerned more with

service, not with evaluation. Such justification is weak because service delivery must be linked with effectiveness and efficiency if our service recipients are to be benefited in the best possible way. In this connection, organizing agencies of the summer youth programme should consider equipping their staff with adequate knowledge and tools of evaluation, through which the programme will be further strengthened and better serve the youth in the future.

It may be difficult and expensive for individual agencies to train their staff separately, but by pulling together all resources and efforts it may be easier to provide the summer youth programme staff with the kind of training they need. Is it possible, for example, for the Social Welfare Department, the Hong Kong Council of Social Service, the Sociology and Social Work Departments of both Universities to jointly sponsor short-term training courses in evaluation? The above agencies and other bodies, either involved in the summer youth programme or have expertise in evaluation, should have a vital role to play and to contribute in the training of more effective workers in the summer youth programme.

Other than the training of staff in evaluation, the methodology problem is another difficult one. On one hand, there are different evaluation models that range from very simple to extremely complex and they serve different functions. On the other hand, the activities of the summer youth programme are varied in their objectives, duration and complexity that it is difficult to find one single model that is

appropriate for the evaluation of all activities. In particular, the
major problem lies in setting clear objectives and constructing
measurements to assess programme outcomes. It seems worth to consider
forming a working group comprising of summer youth programme staff
and evaluation experts to develop standard objectives and measurements
for the summer youth programme as a whole and for each summer youth
activity as well. The development of sound objectives and evaluation
technology as such by a working group would partially solve not only
the methodology problem, but also the resource probelm, because the
programme staff need not to spend too much time and efforts in finding
out their programme objectives and developing measurements if there are
already standard ones.

The previous discussion indicated that the evaluation need of the
summer youth programme raises different methodology problems. In view
of such problems and the different evaluation techniques discussed in
the literature, the following framework which consists of five steps
seems useful as a general guideline. The steps are proposed basing on
the assumption that there are basic elements of evaluation which are
required in the appraisal of most programmes. The proposed steps do
not necessarily fit all the summer youth activities completely, nor
should they be considered as a formula for conducting evaluation. The
primary purpose is to identify and discuss what might be workable, not
what must be done in evaluating each of the various summer youth
activities.

Step 1: Finding out the Purpose of Evaluation

Whether a programme evaluation is routine work of an agency or a requirement of the funding organization; conducted by the programme staff, an inside or outside evaluator, the first thing for the evaluator to do is to clarify the purpose of the evaluation, and to find out what is expected of him. A request to carry out an evaluation often turns out to have different meanings for different people, be they the programme sponsor or the administrator. Some hold that the purpose of evaluation is to describe what the programme looks like in operation; others see it as one way to assist those in authority to make decisions concerning the programme's fate; still others feel that evaluation should help the planners and programme staff get and keep the programme running smoothly. The evaluator should be able to comprehend these views of evaluation and to make predictions about what can be accomplished and what cannot. Thus he will be in a better position to negotiate with the programme sponsor or the administrator regarding their expectation of the evaluation. Failure to understand or to agree upon the nature of the evaluation will probably result in a waste of time and effort -- the data collected are useless to anyone. The evaluator and the programme staff may be frustrated and the programme sponsor may also feel that they have not obtained what they wanted.

Step 2: Identifying Objectives and Setting Corresponding Objective
        Criteria

The evaluator, if he is not a member of the programme team,

should work closely with the programme staff even before the planning
stage of the programme. This is important because by so doing, the
programme objectives can be clearly identified and agreed upon by each
party concerned, at an early stage of programme planning and imple-
mentation.

Writing good objectives is not too easy a task as perceived by
many programme staff. A sound objective should have at least the
following elements.

A. It should be measurable.

The most reliable measure is the raw materials that come out from
a programme, which can be counted and quantified. It can be a set of
expected behaviour, the number of changed individuals, and other products.
When raw data cannot be used, or is not available, a scale may be cons-
tructed. This is useful particularly in the assessment of attitudes,
feelings or values. Such scales may rate from one to ten certain variables
under study; or a check-list using different adjectives to describe the
programme, e.g., excellent, good, fair, poor; or an index designed to
find out the degree of agreement on certain statements, using strongly
agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, as the scale. If raw materials
and the scales are not available, general description of the programme
results can be employed. It is the least useful, but still has value in
noting change in the programme. If programme results cannot be counted,
measured, or described, the programme staff or the evaluator probably do
not know what they are doing and better forget the programme!

B. It should be specific.

Global phrases such as "to help members become good, responsible citizens", "to train individuals to become more creative", "to meet recreational needs" etc. should be avoided as objectives, or they should be further defined and operationalized. For example, if the objective of a summer youth programme is to provide youth with a variety of leisure opportunities which are accessible, safe and enjoyable, then the relevant terms must be explained and given evaluation criteria. The following evaluation criteria may be useful:

    i) Accessibility

        a. Percent of youth participants who feel that the accessibility of the summer youth programme is very good

        b. Percent of youth participants who feel the hours of operation are suitable

   ii) Helpfulness -- Attitude of staff

       Percent of youth participants who feel that the staff are helpful

  iii) Safety

       Percent of youth participants who feel that particular safety measures are very good

   iv) Participation

       Total attendance in the summer youth programme

    v) Enjoyableness

       Percent of youth participants who enjoy the summer youth programme very much

C. It should be as much outcome oriented as possible.

One common problem in objective writing is the failure to distinguish between means and ends -- a failure to differ process from outcome. For instance, the community service activity of the summer youth programme may state its objective as "to establish a peer group tutoring programme in a resettlement estate", or "to provide counselling and guidance service for youth at risk". These objectives are all process oriented, without mentioning the outcomes that are expected of the programme.

Most of the summer youth programme evaluations focus on the process, such as the number of activities and participants, duration of the summer youth programme, manpower input expenditure. In view of the nature of the summer youth programme, such as short duration of the activities and mass participation in certain large scale programme, it is difficult to detect significant changes in the participants during or after their involvement in the programme. Nonetheless, this does not mean that nothing can be done. The programme staff, in addition to collect the basic statistics, should be able to assess what the participants have gained from the programme, either quantitatively -- by means of figures or scales, or qualitatively -- through discussion with participants.

Step 3: Choosing the Appropriate Design

There are various types of evaluation design. Taking into consideration that the summer youth activities are usually short in duration, the "post-test only" and the "before and after" designs seem to be more appropriate.

The "post test only" design identifies the results of a programme with regard to the programme objectives. The purpose is to seek answers to the questions such as "How much the participants have enjoyed?" "How well they have participated in the activity?" "How much they have learned from the programme?" and etc. The "before and after" design aims at finding out the differences between the values of the evaluation criteria measured before and after the programmes introduction.

These two types of design are weak in that they cannot prove for sure that the outcome is a product of the programme. For this reason, they are not favoured by most evaluators. But the limitations of these two designs do not rule out their usefulness completely. They are useful and feasible when available time and personnel for evaluation are limited; and when the programme duration is short and of narrow scope.

Step 4: Collecting Data

Data collection is often considered a dirty job in evaluation. Nonetheless, it is one of the most important and yet time consuming tasks. It is a process to obtain information that is related to the programme objectives and the evaluation criteria. When to collect what kind of data is determined by the evaluation design. Take the "before and after" design for example, data should be collected from the same group of participants before and after its implementation.

Methods of data collection may include discussion meetings with volunteers and participants, staff conference, questionnaire, or rating

by professionals. The key thing is to prepare an appropriate discussion

outline, questionnaire, or rating scale so that relevant information will

be collected systematically.

Step 5: Comparing Outcome with Objective

The last step is to compare the final product of the programme with

its objectives. The concern is not only that how well the objectives are

achieved, but also how the objectives are being fulfilled. Factors other

than the programme itself should also be examined.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUDING NOTE

The Government's expenditure on social welfare has increased

considerably since the advent of the 70s, and in particular, after the

implementation of the Five Year Plan for Social Welfare Development in

1973. A close look at the social welfare spending during the past nine

years reveals a rapidly rising trend. In 1970-71, the total expenditure

on social welfare was 36 million; it increased to 144 million in 1973-74;

and in 1977-78, it amounted to 393 million.[18] This is an increase of more

than 10 fold in eight years. Subvention given to voluntary social welfare

agencies followed the same upward direction - from 12.4 million in 1970-71

to 68 million in 1977-78.[19] There have been an increasing number of

questions raised in the Legislative Council as to how public funds are

spent. A further development was that in 1977, the Financial Secretary,

Mr. Haddon-Cave, said that the Government - more specifically, the Director

of Audit - would be taking a close look at the subvented organizations.[20]

It is obvious that there is increasing demand for accountability as a

result of the climbing growth in the budget for social welfare expenditure.

In the United States of America, the pressure for accountability of social

programmes is much greater. The former President's chief domestic adviser,

Mr. John D. Erlichman, stated in 1972:

> "There seems to be a folk tradition around this town that
> it's somehow indecent to cut any social program. I don't
> think the second administration will be a believer in that
> folk tale. I think a President with a substantial mandate,
> who feels that the majority of the people are behind him,
> will feel very comfortable in saying to a vested interested

group, such as the social workers, 'Look, your social
program of the 1960s isn't working, and we're going
to dismantle it so you'll just have to go out and
find honest labor somewhere else'".[21]

The warning is threatening but the message is simple. Unless we can

demonstrate our effectiveness or show that our programmes are working well,

we shall be put out of business sooner or later.

For many decades, faith has been a close and genuine friend of

social work. The dedication of social workers in alleviating social pro-

blems and meeting social needs have won them praise and trust from those

who provide funds for their activities. But this comfortable situation is

gone. Social workers, some feel, make people less self-reliant and more

dependent. Others see social workers as trouble makers. More importantly,

critics of social work, such as politicians and cost-benefit analysts, are

becoming more hostile because they cannot see the effect of program on

the problems which we claim to be able to solve. And some of these critics

are decision-makers in the Government. While it is not necessary for us

to agree with our critics in any way; we must be able to prove that what

we are doing is worth supporting. There is nothing that can be taken for

granted at this time.

Thus, social workers are expected to perform at a quantitatively

and qualitatively acceptable level, and they are held accountable for the

services they provide. They are accountable to the public who pay for the

social services through taxes or donations. They are accountable to the

agency through which social services are delivered. And finally they are

accountable to the service recepients. This last but most important kind of accountability is the ultimate goal of accountability to the public and to the agency.

To be accountable is to be able to account for promised services. To be accountable means to justify the value or worth of our efforts. These concepts of accountability are nothing new to our fellow social work practitioners. However, mere discussion of the meaning of the word or a rhetorical answer alone will not satisfy our critics. What will help is to take the necessary action to evaluate and improve our efforts in delivering services. Our clients need compassion that works, not simply compassion that means well. We should be able to demonstrate our effectiveness in addition to showing our dedication. And it must be done, not simply to satisfy our critics, but to fulfill our obligation to those who support us and to the people who come to us for help.

Footnotes

1   Thiam-Swee Lee, "A Review of the Summer Youth Programme by the Voluntary Youth Agencies" Hong Kong Journal of Social Work, Vol. 12, No. 2 (Winter, 1978), p. 20.

2.   For example, the Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups and the Boys' & Girls' Club Association have begun organizing activities for children and youth during summer since the early 60's. On the other hand, the first attempt by the Social Welfare Department to provide constructive and creative activities in the summer was made by the Shum Shui Po Youth Centre in 1965, see Annual Departmental Report 1969-70 The Social Welfare Department, (Hong Kong: Government Printer, 1970), P. 9.

3   These figures are derived from the basic data in Hong Kong Population and Housing Census - 1971 Main Report, (Hong Kong: Census and Statistics Department, 1972), P. 21.

4   Kowloon Disturbances 1966 -- Report of Commission of Inquiry, (Hong Kong: Government Printer, 1967), p. 142.

5   Ibid., p. 147.

6   Ibid., p. 147.

7   "Report on Summer Youth Programme Survey", by Census & Statistics Department, January, 1979. (Mimeograph)

8   "Report on the 1970 & 1971 Summer Youth Activities" by Central Coordinating Committee for Youth Recreation, 1972, p. 3.

9,10 See the "Report on Evaluation Survey and Summer Youth Activities in 1971" (p. 3) and "Report on Summer Youth Programme Survey, 1978" (p. 5) by the Census & Statistics Department. (Mimeograph)

11   See the "Report on Evaluation Survey and Summer Youth Activities in 1971" (p. 2) and "Report on Summer Youth Programme Survey, 1978" (p. 4) by the Census & Statistics Department; "Sample survey on

Participants' Evaluation of the Summer Programme, SWD 1973" (p. 2) and "Sample Study of Participants of Summer Programmes, 1974" (p. 2) by the Research and Evaluation Unit of the Social Welfare Department; and "An Evaluation Study of Voluntary Organizations' Summer Programme, 1974" by the Research Department of the Hong Kong Council of Social Service, 1974, p. 9. (Mineograph)

12   See "An Evaluation Study of Voluntary Organizations' Summer Programme, 1974" by Research Department, Hong Kong Council of Social Service, 1974, p. 3; and also Welfare Digest, No. 52 (August, 1978), p. 2.

13, 14   Editorial, Welfare Digest, No. 52, (August, 1978), p. 3.

15   "An Evaluation Study of Voluntary Organizations' Summer Programme, 1974" by the Research Department, The Hong Kong Council of Social Service, 1974, p. 12.

16   Rino Patti, "Conceptions of Accountability" in Social Work in the New Age of Accountability, Papers presented at an Institute sponsored by the School of Social Work, University of Washington, June 1973, (Washington, 1974), pp. 99-100.

17   John F. Jones, "Government Funding of Voluntary Social Services," Working paper, Social Research Centre, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, January 1978, p. 72.

18, 19   See the Budget Speeches by the Financial Secretary. (Hong Kong: Government Press, 1976-79)

20   The 1977-78 Budget. Speech by the Financial Secretary, concluding the Debate on the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill, 20th April, 1977 (Hong Kong: Government Press, 1977), p. 18-19.

21   Quoted from Edward Newman and Jerry Turem, "The Crisis of Accountability", Social Work, Vol. II (New Work: NASW, 1977), p. 1199.