



Occasional Paper No. 1

Centre for Hong Kong Studies

香港研究中心

August, 1983

**Leaders, Officials, and Citizens
in Urban Service Delivery:
A Comparative Study of Four Localities in Hong Kong**

**Lau Siu-kai
Kuan Hsin-chi
Ho Kam-fai**

**Institute of Social Studies
The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Shatin, New Territories
Hong Kong**

Centre for Hong Kong Studies

The Centre for Hong Kong Studies was established in September 1982 as a result of a reorganization of research activities under the auspices of the Institute of Social Studies (formerly the Institute of Social Studies and the Humanities), The Chinese University of Hong Kong. The Centre, with a concentration of resources and manpower, is primarily charged with the task of developing and coordinating research on Hong Kong. The priority is on projects of an interdisciplinary nature, which can enhance the understanding of Hong Kong in its social, economic, political, cultural, and historical aspects.

The Centre pays equal attention to the theoretical and practical facets of Hong Kong studies. Through a multitude of channels — publications, workshops, symposia, and forums — the Centre disseminates research findings on Hong Kong and promotes exchanges with individuals and organizations outside the University.

Outside academicians, researchers, and policymakers who are interested in Hong Kong studies can become affiliated with the Centre and work independently or in collaboration with researchers in the University.

This paper was subsequently published as:

Lau, Siu-kai, Hsin-chi Kuan and Kam-fai Ho. 1986. "Leaders, Officials, and Citizens in Urban Service Delivery: A Comparative Study of Four Localities in Hong Kong," in Y. M. Yeung and T. G. McGee (eds.), *Community Participation in Delivering Urban Services in Asia*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, pp. 211–237.

LEADERS, OFFICIALS, AND CITIZENS
IN URBAN SERVICE DELIVERY:
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF FOUR LOCALITIES
IN HONG KONG

by
Lau Siu-kai
Kuan Hsin-chi
Ho Kam-fai

Institute of Social Studies
The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Shatin, New Territories
Hong Kong

Acknowledgement

We gratefully acknowledge financial support for the project by the International Development Research Centre in Canada.

About the Authors

The three authors are affiliated with The Chinese University of Hong Kong. Lau Siu-kai is Senior Lecturer in Sociology and Associate Director, Centre for Hong Kong Studies. Kuan Shin-chi is Senior Lecturer in Government and Public Administration and Director of the Centre for Contemporary Asian Studies. Ho Kam-fai is Senior Lecturer in Social Work.

LEADERS, OFFICIALS, AND CITIZENS
IN URBAN SERVICE DELIVERY:
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF FOUR LOCALITIES
IN HONG KONG

by
Lau Siu-kai
Kuan Hsin-chi
Ho Kam-fai

Opinions expressed in the publications of the Institute of Social Studies are the authors'. They do not necessarily reflect those of the Institute.

Copyright ©1983 by Lau Siu-kai, Kuan Hsin-chi and Ho Kam-fai.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form without written permission from the authors.

Institute of Social Studies
The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Shatin, New Territories
Hong Kong

LEADERS, OFFICIALS, AND CITIZENS IN URBAN SERVICE DELIVERY:
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF FOUR LOCALITIES IN HONG KONG

The key political/administrative problem that stands in the way of effective urban service delivery in Hong Kong is doubtlessly that of intermediate leadership. The problem expresses itself specifically in the incapability of the existing passive intermediate leadership to play a viable linkage role between the government and the people, and hence to integrate itself effectively in the service delivery process. Alternatively put, the urban service delivery system in Hong Kong is structurally deficient, and the woes thus engendered would be magnified if the system is not basically remodelled.

The general context in which the problem of intermediate leadership is located can be described briefly. Over the past two decades, the government had perforce assumed an expanded role in delivering services to a complex urban society whose populace, as a result of the decline of traditionalistic social organizations and rising expectations, were increasingly dependent on the public sector for meeting service and welfare needs. The profusion of demands on the public sector has recently brought to the surface the vexing issues of administrative overload, bureaucratic inefficiency, inadequate coordination of programmes and departments, insufficient resources and government-people conflict in regard to service provision. These issues unfortunately are aggravated by the languishing of the traditionalistic social leadership in Chinese society which leaves behind a wide gap between the government as the major service deliverer and the citizen recipients. Because of this gap, disagreement between government and the public on the extent and urgency of social needs, the scope and effectiveness of programme impact, and the adequacy and distribution of urban services flares up incessantly, creating in their wake political problems which carry the

potentiality of threatening social and political stability. The weakness of intermediate leadership has also a lot to do with the unstructured, sporadic, individualistic, isolated and even "uncompromising" character of the service demands directed to the government, which makes for their unmanageability. Without the service of intermediate leaders and organizations to channel and aggregate demands, government officials find it increasingly difficult to develop integrated service programmes and set up priorities of goals which can muster widespread support and sympathy. The combative stance of some of the activist leaders and clamant citizen groups is telling evidence of the amorphous and fluid situation. In the absence of a vibrant and active leadership, the government also finds it difficult to mobilize support from the people to initiate self-help activities and to assume some para-administrative duties on behalf of the government, both of which would relieve itself of some of its service loads and lay down the social organizational infrastructure necessary for the people to be able to better manage their own affairs.

That the moribund traditionalistic leadership has so far not been displaced by an active modern leadership has to do both with the government and Chinese society. As a colonial bureaucratic government, it has never been zealous in promoting organizational efforts among the ruled. Strictly speaking, an atomistic and fragmented society is conducive to political stability. The Chinese elite are co-opted by the government as individuals with professional or specialized expertise. They are favoured by the government because of their advisory functions and not because of their organizational or popular bases. The creaming off of the Chinese elite hampers efforts at reorganizing the Chinese society along modernist lines. In Chinese society, the pervasiveness of familistic ethos, materialistic aspirations and instrumental views toward joint efforts poses serious obstacles to collective action. And the natural, inexorable trend of social development will be toward further individualization, which is far from

THE FOUR LOCALITIES

4

congenial to organization-building, unless favorable conditions and events supervene.

As a tightly organized bureaucratic government encounters a minimally organized society in the process of service delivery, the lack of effective intermediate leadership is sorely felt. While the government is adopting a more tolerant posture towards activist grassroots leaders, it has yet to undertake more active efforts at leadership cultivation and organization building via sharing with them information, power and other resources requisite for participatory service delivery. Participatory devices designed by the government - mutual aid committees in residential buildings, area committees at the neighborhood level and lately district boards at the community level - are at best initial steps in that direction, and they need to be much enlarged.

What is urgently needed in Hong Kong at the present is information on the factors essential to the establishment of a more participatory service delivery system. More specifically, the variables that can explain the occurrence of active and organizationally involved leaders would be extremely useful to policy making. Nevertheless, a monocratic bureaucratic government does not leave much autonomy to locally assigned officials to initiate policies which are area specific or experimental in nature. A very much diluted sense of community identification and the dearth of strategic dissimilarities in the organizational, cultural and historical experiences among people in different localities also pose difficulties to identifying different patterns of leadership structure and performance. Therefore, in order to discover cues in Hong Kong that can lead to better understanding of leadership effectiveness, citizen participation, government responsiveness and linkages among the three parties, a research design that can maximize the minimal differences among localities is the most we can hope for.

In our study, we have selected four localities that are "maximally" different from one another and examined the interrelationships among officials, leaders and inhabitants there. On the whole, the general characteristics of the four localities provide corroborative evidence to the general picture of urban service delivery we have depicted for Hong Kong. Still, the slight differences among them are far from random and insignificant. That these differences tend to congregate and display patterns is informative. They give us the cues that are needed to establish relationships of a "casual" nature among variables. Consequently, while the findings churned out from this "maximum difference research design" are tentative and should be treated with utmost caution, still they serve as the means to develop future policy programmes and, to boot, the hints on the things to come in Hong Kong.

In selecting the sample of four localities, we try to maximize the number of locality characteristics that would be amenable to comparative analysis. The availability of a large battery of contextual parameters on the localities provides the opportunity to probe in a preliminary way into their variegated effects on the interrelationships among the major actors in the local scene and on participatory behaviour in general. As it is, the four localities we have selected - Kwun Tong (KT), Tuen Mun (TM), Tai Hang Tung (THT) and Sai Ying Pun (SYP) - span a wide spectrum of strategic variables.

Kwun Tong is basically an industrial community emerged after the Second World War. Socio-economically it is the most diversified locality in the sample. In 1981, it had a total population of 611,285, who made up 145,735 domestic households. 26% of the population were 14 years old or under, while 13% were 55 and over. A majority of the households lived in public housing estates (67.5%). 56% of the households earned a monthly income of less than HK\$3,000, while only 2% earned more than HK\$10,000. Home

ownership was limited, with 19.1% of households owning their flats. 304,753 persons were economically active, and 63% of them were production and related workers. The most distinctive feature of Kwun Tong seems to be its administrative innovativeness. Kwun Tong is the first urban district to establish a District Board, which is an advisory committee composed primarily of community leaders appointed by the government to assist in local administration. Institutionally speaking, Kwun Tong is the locality in our sample with the most "complete" manifestation of the local administrative structure in modern Hong Kong.

Tuen Mun was planned by the government in the late 1970s to be a new industrial town to ultimately provide living space to half a million people coming from the overcrowded urban areas. As it is still in the initial stage of development, the early in-comers are still experiencing the birth-pains of a new community, and the problems afflicting it are further complicated by the geographical isolation of the area from other urban areas. The need to work outside the community taxes severely the available transportation facilities, as their provision falls behind the construction of public housing. As of 1981, Tuen Mun had 27,782 domestic households and a population of 126,883. 57% of the households resided in public housing, while only 22% of them owned their home. Compared to the other three localities in this study, Tuen Mun had a particularly young population, as youngsters were less reluctant to make long-distance moves. 36% of Tuen Mun inhabitants had an age of 14 or under, and those whose age was 55 or over constituted but 10% of the total population. 65% of the households had a monthly income under HK\$3,000, and 2% enjoyed an income of more than HK\$10,000. The larger proportion of young persons in Tuen Mun was also reflected in the fact that 59% of the inhabitants there were first-time job-seekers or economically inactive. Among those economically active, a majority of them (58%) were employed as production and related workers. Despite its newness, Tuen Mun has one of the oldest and more effective local leadership in Hong Kong.

Local leaders come from the ranks of the original inhabitants who lived in the area long before the transformation of Tuen Mun into a new town and the influx of outsiders. While the original inhabitants constitute but a small minority of inhabitants in the area, they have long been involved in a representational system granted by the government to the original inhabitants in the rural areas of Hong Kong (called the New Territories). Though only advisory and consultative in function, representatives elected by the original inhabitants over time are able to cultivate the skills and courage that are required to deal with the government. In many other places in the New Territories, the process of rapid urbanization has brought about the decline of rural leadership. But the situation in Tuen Mun is somewhat different. It is blessed with the most active and aggressive local leadership which the original inhabitants can provide. In spite of the fact that the representational status of these leaders is based on a narrow franchise, they strenuously assert an expansive leadership role in the budding new town. Utilizing their seasoned political clout extensively, they target themselves to be community-wide leaders by enlarging their constituencies and addressing to general issues. To date, their efforts have reaped substantial success, and their towering presence in the newly appointed district board testifies to it.

Compared to the other three localities, Tai Hang Tung is a small residential area in which a group of relatively old, low-grade public housing estates dominates the scene. A total of 5,165 domestic households, with a population of 25,545, found accommodation in the area in 1981. 79% of the living quarters there were located in public housing. 20% of the inhabitants were 14 years old or under, and the same percentage were 55 or over. As the public housing estates were designed for low-income people, it is not surprising to find skilled and unskilled manual workers dominated the occupational structure there. In a general sense, Tai Hang Tung can be described as a homogeneous working-class residential neighbourhood. Nevertheless, it

differs from other similar neighbourhoods in the organization and activism of its residents. Tai Hang Tung is noted for the demand-making capability of its residents' organizations and the fair degree of success that their "protest" tactics have so far achieved. Through a succession of community organizations and with the help of external agents, a tiny group of active community leaders had come into being, and demands respect-cum-jealousy from the more numerous traditionalistic, pro-government local leaders in the area.

Compared to the other localities, Sai Ying Pun is the oldest community. As a matter of fact, it is one of the oldest residential neighbourhoods in Hong Kong. To any outsider, Sai Ying Pun presents the image of a placid, quiescent and eventless neighbourhood. Made up leargely of private apartment buildings, many residents have been living there for generations. There seems to be an absence of those salient social problems which afflict other parts of Hong Kong. All the inhabitants in Sai Ying Pun live in private housing. Among the 18,199 domestic households living there in 1981, 36% owned their home. The age structure of the population (68,456) was fairly balanced, with 22% of them 14 years old or below and 17% 55 or above. A perusal of the occupational structure of Sai Ying Pun finds a largely lower-middle class neighbourhood, as 21% of the economically active were clerical and related workers, 15% sales workers and 16% service workers. These non-manual workers, however, also found a contingent of 12,709 manual workers (37% of the economically active) among them. In terms of income, Sai Ying Pun's residents were neither poor nor affluent. 49% of the households had a monthly income of less than HK\$3,000, and only 5% had an income of HK\$10,000 or more. Despite its lower-middle class background, Sai Ying Pun seems to lag behind the other three localities in leadership activeness and administrative innovativeness. The latter observation can be confirmed by Sai Ying Pun's lateness in appointing its District Board.

The different configurations of features in the four localities enable us to make comparisons along several significant dimensions:

residential/industrial, old/new, heterogeneous/homogeneous, active leadership/inactive leadership, institutionalized influence tactics/"protest" influence tactics, public housing area/private housing area, administrative change/lack of administrative change, lower-middle class neighbourhood/lower class neighbourhood, and others. That the significant dimensions far outnumber the cases necessarily impedes the making of definitive statements on causal effects. Nonetheless, such a research layout would be ideal for a preliminary exploration of hypothetical relationships among phenomena.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND DATA COLLECTION

As the major focus of this study is the mediating role of local leaders in the urban service delivery system, the primary task is to identify and delineate the network of relationships in which local officials, local leaders and the inhabitants are embedded. In pursuit of this end, we need specific information on the normative and behavioural orientations of the three categories of people, their perception and evaluation of the roles of themselves and others, the ways they structure their relationships to others, their perception of and feelings for their communities and the major problems affecting them, and the collective efforts undertaken to improve community conditions and solve community problems. In short, the data collected should allow us to locate the patterns of interactions among officials, leaders and the people, as well as the factors which underlie these patterns.

Towards these ends we interviewed a group of local officials and local leaders in each locality in early 1982. In order to limit the scope of analysis, only local officials from four departments were selected for interview, and in each locality the number of departments represented ranged from two to three. The departments included in each of the localities were:

Kwun Tong: City District Office (Home Affairs Department), Housing Department, Social Welfare Department;

Tuen Mun: District Office (New Territories Administration), Housing Department and Social Welfare Department;

Tai Hang Tung: City District Office (Home Affairs Department), Housing Department and Social Welfare Department;

Sai Ying Pun: City District Office (Home Affairs Department) and Social Welfare Department.

As Tai Hang Tung and Sai Ying Pun were not full-scale administrative districts, the departmental officials we interviewed thus were in charge of larger territorial jurisdictions. Nevertheless, their attention were directed during the interviews specifically to the two areas by our interviewers.

The rationale underlying the selection of departments for interview was primarily to maximize the normative and behavioural differences among officials, while fully recognizing the fact that they all shared in a highly homogeneous administrative culture. The exercise is to assess the impact of different task structures and contextual settings on administrative outlook and behaviour. By virtue of the fact that three tasks areas are represented - management of public opinion and conflict, professional administration and delivery of services, and routine management of public housing estates - we expect to see differential approaches in appreciating and coping with participation by leaders and citizens.

Since the departments approached by us were fully cooperative, the response rates were very high. A cursory glance at them will bear it out: 97% in Kwun Tong, 95% in Tuen Mun, 72% in Tai Hang Tung and 78% in Sai Ying Pun. A total of 143 officials were interviewed in Kwun Tong, 75 in Tuen Mun, 39 in Tai Hang Tung and 21 in Sai Ying Pun. In each local office of a department, officials from all ranks were interviewed, thus enabling us to construct a complete profile of local officials.

The meaning of local leader is rather vague in Hong Kong and some discretion has to be exercised to circumscribe the domain of choice of individuals

for interview purposes. With our research goals in mind, we interviewed primarily the officers in charge of community associations of various kinds and at different territorial levels. As most of these officers were involved in government-initiated associations (mutual aid committees, area committees, district boards), a full list of them was obtained from the Home Affairs Department and the New Territories Administration. We also supplemented this list with names of local leaders culled from other sources, but they only made up a small minority. Overall, 73 leaders were interviewed in Kwun Tong, 34 in Tuen Mun, 26 in Tai Hang Tung and 58 in Sai Ying Pun, representing response rates of 73%, 71%, 87% and 78% respectively.

Residents were interviewed in the summer of 1982. The response rates of residents are rather disappointing, and this confirms the trend of increasing difficulties in administering structured questionnaire interviews in modern Hong Kong. The sampling frame we used was based on a 1% systematic sample of the household list prepared by the Census and Statistics Department for the 1981 Census. In all, 330 interviews were completed in Kwun Tong, 288 in Tuen Mun, 109 in Tai Hang Tung, and 226 in Sai Ying Pun, making for response rates of 52%, 70%, 53% and 50% respectively. These response rates compare poorly with response rates of 60-70% achieved by us in past years.

PERCEPTION OF PROBLEMS AND IDENTIFICATION OF AGENTS RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR SOLUTION

Hong Kong has been and still is outstanding among developing areas in having enviable economic growth rates and resourceful family systems. It is mainly for these reasons that the public sector has so far been able to abstain from taking up the heavy burden of catering to all the salient needs of the populace. Still, the increasing complexity of an urban-industrial society engenders problems which are general in nature and qualitatively different from those afflicting underdeveloped areas. And it is the growing

prominence of these problems which will impinge on government-people relationship in the years to come.

On the whole, substantial proportions of the residents in the four localities were satisfied with their living environment: 43% in KT, 69% in TM, 49% in THT and 52% in SYP. What is more gratifying to know is that when asked to compare their present living environment with the one they had before moving to the locality concerned, a majority reported an improvement: 70% in KT, 72% in TM, 82% in THT and 56% in SYP.

Against this background of satisfaction with living conditions, it is not surprising that when queried as to the most serious problem facing the locality, the answers we obtained from the resident respondents, as presented in Table 1, point to problems a step beyond the necessities (potable water, sewage and garbage disposal, food supply, etc.) of urban living. Rather they are more reflective of an aspiration for an improvement in lifestyle and expansion of urban facilities. To a certain extent, the perceptions of community problems by officials, leaders and residents were congruent, though

 Table 1 about here

there were enough discrepancies in the problems mentioned by the three parties to justify suspicions of inadequate communication among them and the existence of divergent criteria in ordering problem priorities. The similarities in socio-economic backgrounds of officials and leaders might thus facilitate perceptual congruence, and their largely "middle-class" outlook differentiated them from the mass public.

Closely related to the perception of urgent community problems in the locality is the residents' assessment of the adequacy of public facilities in their areas. After adding up the respondents who rated the public facilities in their areas to be "very adequate," "adequate," and "fairly adequate," we find that they made up 35% of the respondents in KT, 33% in

TM, 53% in THT and 29% in SYP. On the whole, a majority of the residents expressed dissatisfaction with the availability of public facilities in their areas. It is also instructive to observe, when comparing across the localities, that between the two residential areas - THT and SYP - the difference in levels of satisfaction was pretty substantial. Satisfaction with the provision of welfare and services by the government was greater. Only 33%, 53%, 29% and 36% of the residents in KT, TM, THT and SYP consider it inadequate. Again, while TM were more dissatisfied with the availability of welfares and services, THT residents were more satisfied than those in SYP.

As the urgent community problems mentioned by residents, leaders and officials tend to take on a "general" and "public-goods" character, it is almost inevitable that a majority of them pinpoint the government as the prime agent responsible for their solution. For the residents, the relevant figures KT, TM, THT and SYP were 63%, 56%, 42% and 56% respectively. For local leaders, the relevant figures in the four localities were 75%, 77%, 73% and 55%. For government officials, the figures in the four areas did not reveal significant differences, attesting to a common outlook on this matter: 59% in KT, 68% in TM, 66% in THT, and 67% in SYP. Upon closer scrutiny, the contrast between THT and SYP is most startling. While it does not run counter to common understanding to find residents in SYP, with their slightly higher socio-economic status, more inclined to hold the government responsible for tackling with community problems than the working-class residents of THT, it is astonishing to see the reverse true between the two groups of leaders. Among those respondents who mentioned agents responsible for solving community problems, only a minority of them in each locality considered efforts had been made by the agents to deal with them (32% in KT, 27% in TM, 22% in THT and 15% in SYP). Still, it is noteworthy here that residents in industrial communities (KT and TM) were slightly more disposed to consider efforts having been made in comparison to respondents in

residential communities (THT and SYP), reflecting maybe real differences in efforts spent by the responsible agents, the government in particular.

This dependence on the government to cope with community problems is quite overwhelming, as can be witnessed in the extremely low degree of efficacy in the mind of the residents. When asked whether those community problems could be dealt with by the residents themselves, those answering in the affirmative constituted but 13%, 17%, 11% and 16% of the respondents in KT, TM, THT and SYP respectively. This lack of sense of capability was well-nigh universal. As to the reasons for their felt incapability, it is remarkable that by and large personal attributes were alluded to, and factors such as leadership and organization were rarely called to mind. Likewise, subjective reliance on the government to deal with community problems was also evinced by local leaders and local officials. The respective figures for leaders in KT, TM, THT and SYP were 43%, 46%, 42% and 47%; while those for officials were 50%, 53%, 49% and 33%. While differences among communities are minor, again SYP was distinctive in having a group of local officials more willing to look beyond the government for ways of solving community problems. This anomaly is due primarily to the absence of the more "routine-oriented," and hence government-oriented, housing officials in the area. Thus, besides finding themselves in the midst of a resident body disposed to see action from the government, the less active leaders in SYP had to face a group of officials less inclined to expand government activities as the means to cope with community problems.

Considering the nature of community problems, the prominence of the government as a problem-solver is easy to comprehend. But it is much more difficult to interpret the finding that the government also featured saliently as the agent for solving family problems. Two major items - living conditions and financial needs - were most frequently cited by our respondents as the most urgent family problems. If the assumption that failure to provide answers to our probe means an absence of them is valid, then it is surprising

to find that residents in TM and THT, which we expect to suffer more from family problems, turned out to be less problem-stricken. Whereas 23% and 13% of the respondents in KT and TM respectively gave no answers to the question about family problems, 41% and 39% of the respondents in TM and THT respectively replied in the negative. Among respondents who reported the incidence of family problems, three agents - self, family and the government - were most often referred to as responsible problem-solvers. And the proportion of respondents naming the government was larger than that of either of the other two:

	<u>KT</u>	<u>TM</u>	<u>THT</u>	<u>SYP</u>
Self	17%	24%	20%	27%
Family	20%	20%	22%	22%
Government	48%	35%	40%	33%

As to whether the responsible problem-solvers had made attempts to deal with the family problems mentioned, a fair proportion of respondents answered in the affirmative: 49% in KT, 48% in TM, 47% in THT and only 29% in SYP. Again, SYP was outstanding in its less "responsible" problem-solving agents.

To conclude this section, it seems clear that while community and family problems were prevalent in the four localities, the residents generally lacked the subjective sense of efficacy to take these problems in their own hands. Instead, they looked to the government and held it responsible for their plight. On the surface, at least, localities that were industrial in character tended to receive more attention from the government. More important, however, localities reputedly having more active leaders saw more efforts on the part of the government to improve community and family conditions. KT, though having a less active leadership than TM and THT, could to a certain degree prompt the government to act through its institutionalized advisory mechanisms. Without an active leadership and an advanced advisory system, residents in SYP remained the most frustrated and received the least attention from the government, despite its more "liberal" populace (in comparison to THT)

UTILIZATION OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SERVICES

In view of the prevalence of community and family problems, the shortage of public facilities and the less than adequate provision of welfare and services by the government, it is most puzzling to discover that our respondents rarely took advantage of services provided by public and voluntary sectors. Nor did they supplement their resource shortfall by leaning back on their relatives and friends. Only an extremely small number of the respondents had ever contacted the following government departments for assistance: Social Welfare Department, Home Affairs Department, New Territories Administration, Housing Department and miscellaneous other departments. The same picture of resource under-utilization held true with regard to voluntary associations and public bodies such as the Kaifong Association (neighbourhood association), mutual aid committee, voluntary welfare organization, Urban Council, the Rural Committee, the District Board and others. Utilization of the service and assistance of friends and relatives was also minimal, indicating maybe the decline of the structural importance of informal and primary relationships in Hong Kong's urban service delivery system, even though most of our respondents denied that the willingness and ability of their friends and relatives to help had diminished.

The negligible significance of primary intimates as a source of help can be partially attributed to the changing nature of the problems that affect the people. It is indubitably true that when general, community-wide problems are concerned, friends and relatives are irrelevant. But it can also be argued that even the family problems mentioned by our respondents partake of a general character which renders futile the efforts of friends and relatives. Services from friends and relatives are most appropriate and most essential when it comes to basic needs that constitute the sine qua non of survival in the urban setting. Our respondents have already passed the stage of struggling for bare physical existence and are striving for an

improved standard of living, and towards this end primary intimates are and are seen to be more or less irrelevant.

Then why aren't the services and resources of the government, public organizations and voluntary associations utilized more extensively by our respondents. We think the most proximate cause is the general lack of organization and leadership among the people. The few respondents who reported having contacted these agencies did so as individuals seeking trivial concrete returns and not as groups pressing for changes in social conditions. The more active leadership in TM and THT, while slightly more effective in dealing with government officials, still did not possess sufficient organizational linkage with the residents to effectuate manifest changes in their participatory behaviour.

PROFILE OF LOCAL OFFICIALS

Governmental functions in Hong Kong are performed by a tightly organized and centralized bureaucracy headed primarily by officials of expatriate origin. Over the years, government officials have evolved a set of standardized, formalized and distinctive administrative procedures in conducting their public functions. The substantive content of these procedures owes largely to precedents, past experience, directives from superiors and the general penchant for efficiency, but very little to political pressure from society. Accountability of individual officials is attained mainly by in-house means: bureaucratic hierarchy, narrow but clear-cut quality-control regulations and vigilant budgetary control. Especially in the last two decades, the bureaucracy was criticized for its rigidity, non-responsiveness, insufficient concern for programmatic goals and over-emphasis on "value for money" as the measure of task priorities.

In this political/administrative setting, the distance between the

government and the people is getting increasingly intolerable. And this problem is not alleviated by a group of local governments which are closer to the people, because the latter simply do not exist. Only in recent years were efforts stepped up to deconcentrate the bureaucracy by setting up regional and district offices all over the colony. But officials dispatched to the localities still are denied important decision making power or financial autonomy. The cause of shortening the distance between officials and people is not helped either by the incessant turnover of locally assigned officials in the local areas.

The failure, or more exactly the reluctance, of the government to establish more stable and enduring relationship between officials and the people in the localities can be comprehended from several angles. They all boil down to the political imperative of the colonial government to rule in a depoliticized environment. The fear of political turbulence is always in the mind of top-level officials, and efforts on the part of the government which might be conducive to political troubles are minimized. To maintain its rule, the bureaucracy needs to be solidary, coherent, consensual and conflict-free. The positioning of "permanent" local officials responsive to local demands, bearing the imperative to rule in mind, will have several undesirable effects: the possibility of corruption among local officials, collusion between local officials and local interests, bureaucratic infighting among officials claiming to represent diverse local constituencies, erosion of central power and "dual" allegiances among rank-and-file officials. Consequent upon all these would be widespread politicization in that popular demand for public resources, partially championed by local officials, will increase, and a politically turbulent environment can no longer be forestalled.

Against this background, it is understandable that most officials in our sample had worked in the localities for less than five years: 91% in KT, 88% in TM, 90% in THT and 82% in SYP. And many of them expected to be re-assigned to other offices or localities in due time.

In our official respondents, we detect a relatively high sense of complacency and esprit de corps. Many would not accept job offers from the private sector and a majority were satisfied with their employment in the government. Relationships among officials were good, and this was also true in relationships across ranks.

In their value orientations, they are a homogeneous lot, and this bespeaks of the success of in-service socialization in instilling a common administrative culture among the officials. Table 2 presents the responses of the official respondents to a set of probing questions which are designed to gauge their values in regard to authority, decision-making style, participation, localism, action propensity, change and responsibility. Several observations flow out of a scrutiny of the figures. (1) Elitism was highly

Table 2 about here

visible in the outlook of our respondents, and it in turn led to an emphasis on a government which was able to exercise independent judgment unencumbered by the fleeting, whimsy desires of the people. (2) There was a moderate tendency to accommodate diverse interests and hence a fair level of tolerance for people speaking out for themselves. But responsiveness on the part of government did not mean acting in accordance to popular demands. (3) A general hesitancy to delve into quick but risky endeavours was also evident, though it was also granted by our respondents that under some circumstances moderate changes were necessary. (4) The sense of localism was fairly low. It can safely be presumed that in the mind of officials, "general" interests should override local interests. In short, what emerges from Table 2 is a group of officials wary of the guardian role of government, jealous of their decision-making autonomy, receptive to a limited degree of citizen participation and espousing cosmopolitan sentiments.

Homogeneity of administrative culture, however, does not necessarily preclude minor differences in outlook and behaviour among officials located in different layers of the bureaucratic ranking system, dispatched to different localities and charged with different responsibilities. And here it is to the differences among officials stationed in the four localities that our attention will be directed.

It does seem that the variegated social and problem settings represented in our sample of localities have wrought some expected modifications in the otherwise uniform outlook of local officials, despite their short tenure there.

(1) Officials stationed in the more homogeneous residential areas (THT and SYP), compared to those in industrial communities, were less likely to think that departmental rules were not applicable to local conditions. Obviously, the more heterogeneous environment in industrial areas pose more intricate and challenging problems to the uniform application of standard regulations and orders. More exactly, the proportions of official respondents who felt the inappropriateness of departmental regulations to local conditions in KT, TM, THT and SYP were 48%, 43%, 31% and 10% respectively.

What is intriguing here, nevertheless, is that compared to the supposedly problem-infected new town of TM, a slightly larger proportion of officials in KT felt the need to refrain from rigid imposition of official regulations (70% vs. 55%). One possible explanation for this may be entertained. As TM is a carefully planned new community, officials there might feel a greater obligation to abide by the prescriptions derived from a master plan.

As expected, officials in THT, faced with a more active leadership, were more disposed to avoid inflexible application of official regulations than those in SYP (77% vs. 48%).

(2) Officials also differed in their perception of the adequacy of their decision-making power at the local level. In KT, TM, THT and SYP.

57%, 35%, 51% and 57% respectively of the respondents considered their decision-making power adequate. The point to be noted here is that in areas with less active and assertive leaders, the feeling of lack of power was less apparent. Alternatively put, active leaders, by pressing their presence on local officials, would make them more aware of their inability to resolve issues in situ.

(3) We can also detect some minor differences in the value orientations of local officials. Officials in SYP were more sympathetic with citizen participation and more localistic, but at the same time more concerned with the maintenance of government's independence in decision-making and leadership. Overall, officials there betrayed an enlightened paternalistic posture. THT officials, on the other hand, were more inclined to adopt a compromising stance so as to avoid conflict with the people. Along with officials in TM, THT officials were more averse to preserving harmony at the expense of conflict resolution or management, and more agreeable to speedy decision-making. Officials in industrial areas (KT and TM) were less sympathetic to innovative ways of conducting public business, probably because of the more complicated impact of innovations on heterogeneous communities. Lastly, leadership activeness does not seem to lead to more localistic feelings among officials. In fact, in THT, where some active leaders can be found, the officials were the least localistic.

Summing up, differences in community settings do tend to bring about modifications in officials' valuational and behavioural proclivities. But the modicum of changes thus wrought is far from sufficient to bring into being officials willing to take up the causes of the localities. At best, what they would do was to inject a certain degree of flexibility in the process of rule application, but even in this respect their autonomy was circumscribed.

PROFILE OF LOCAL LEADERS

Compared to local officials and residents, local leaders in the four localities manifested more systematic contrasts. In a very crude manner, we can distinguish between four types of local leaders: (1) a moderately active leadership in KT enveloped in a more experienced local advisory system; (2) an active and assertive leadership in TM based largely on individual personalities cultured in demand-making actions; (3) an active and assertive leadership in THT sustained by externally-induced residential organizations and nurtured in "protest" and confrontational exercises; and (4) an inactive leadership in SYP.

Leaders in all four areas were involved in voluntary associations, and a majority of them were officers-in-charge (81% in KT, 80% in TM, 77% in THT, and 78% in SYP). Without doing violence to reality, it must be said that most of these voluntary community organizations were ineffective and insignificant. Inter-organizational relationship among them was almost non-existent, and their level of activity deplorable. To most leaders, the issue of competition or cooperation among organizations in the local areas simply did not come up. In fact, most of them joined less than two voluntary associations. Therefore, when we talk about active leaders, we refer only to that small number of leaders and organizations in each area which can measure up to that description. But we must not forget that it is the inactive leaders who make up the bulk of the leaders.

In order to determine the leadership structure, we asked our leader respondents to give us the names of the leaders in their community. Most of our respondents were able to come up with individual names. However, since a large number of names was mentioned, it is doubtful that well-established, locally prominent leaders really did exist (17 in KT, 16 in TM, 10 in THT and 12 in SYP). And this observation can be further confirmed by the fact that, except in TM, the most mentioned name(s) in each locality obtained only

a few "votes" (9 in KT, 29 in TM, 6 in THT and 8 in SYP). A large proportion of officials were also able to name local leaders, but basically the same pattern of answers was obtained. The numbers of names reported by officials in KT, TM, THT and SYP were 34, 16, 18 and 14 respectively. The numbers of "votes" received by the most-mentioned name in the four localities were 23, 60, 6 (for the top three names) and 5 respectively. Again, a single individual in TM stood out among the others. As to the residents, a vast majority of them failed to report names of local leaders. Among those who gave names, only a few names were recorded, and except for TM, each name managed merely to obtain one or two votes. Thus, 8 names were given by residents in KT, 14 in TM, 2 in THT and 2 in SYP. The most-mentioned 2 names in KT each was given 2 "votes," the oft-quoted name in TM obtained 75 "votes." In THT and SYP, each of the two names mentioned received only 1 "vote." While the case of TM may be a moderate exception, still it is generally true that to the residents, local leaders were inconspicuous and invisible. To push our argument a step further, judging from the slightly greater ability of local officials to recall the names of leaders, local leadership was more likely to be an administrative phenomenon rather than a social phenomenon. Leaders were more akin to adjuncts to the administrative structure deliberately nurtured by the government than spontaneous outgrowths from community organizations and popular needs.

The value orientations of local leaders can be vividly depicted by comparing them with those of local officials. Their answers to a set of probing questions similar to those given to local officials are recorded in Table 3.

 Table 3 about here

Compared to local officials, local leaders were more authoritarian,

more elitist and less daring in policy innovations. They gave more emphasis on social harmony and the accommodation of conflicting interests. They expressed more localistic sentiments and were more tolerant of a demand-making public, while stopping short of the point where the independence of government and leaders in decision-making would be jeopardized. They wanted more welfare and services, but they would rely on the government to provide them. On the whole, we have a stratum of inactive and dependent leaders still largely immersed in conservative and traditionalistic elite ethos.

Differences in value orientations among leaders in the localities can, however, be discerned. As these variations are fairly systematic, they serve to illuminate the conditions facilitating or impeding the appearance of active leaders.

(1) Leaders in residential areas (THT and SYP) were more authoritarian than leaders in industrial communities (KT and TM). They were more disposed to see government discarding new policies that would arouse opposition from society. They wanted more welfare and services from the government. They were more intolerant of unconventional influence tactics used to influence government policies. And they were more emphatic on the right of leaders to exercise independent judgment on behalf of the people.

(2) Between the two residential areas of THT and SYP, some differences in leadership orientation were somehow also evident. THT leaders were more disposed to allow the public to express their opinions, but at the same time they were more elitist in the sense that more of them would admit only people with the information and expertise into the decision-making process. Localistic feelings were stronger in THT. And THT leaders were more inclined to take speedy actions and less disposed to wait until oppositions were won over. In all the above characteristics, it should be noted that THT leaders not only surpassed the leaders in SYP in their salience, they also surpassed those in KT and TM.

(3) When comparing the two industrial communities of TM and KT, it is

difficult to escape the distinctiveness of TM's leaders. As a result of the existence of more potential sources of conflict in a new town, the role of the government as an arbitrator among conflicting interests was more evident. Under these circumstances, the greater desire of TM leaders to see an independent government capable of accommodating diverse interests made sense. This awareness of conflict by TM leaders is also reflected in their greater insistence on government refraining from making socially divisive policies. One puzzling finding, however, is that despite the geographical isolation of TM, its leaders showed the weakest sense of localism. This may be due to the newness of the new town and the shortness of the time many leaders had spent there. The age of the leaders might also be a relevant factor. With the youngest leadership (54% of the leaders were under 40 years of age) in the four localities, it is natural that a more cosmopolitan outlook was found in TM.

In terms of absolute differences in outlook between officials and leaders, it is interesting to note that the greatest difference was found in THT, and the smallest difference in TM, while KT and SYP fell in between. To what extent and in which direction would these differences impact on official-leader relationship is an intriguing question, and we shall turn to it in a later section.

PROFILE OF RESIDENTS

In outlining the profiles of the residents in the four localities, our attention will be directed to the social relationships, both inside and outside the locality, in which they are involved, and the ways they perceive and participate in their community and its affairs. We would try to lay out succinctly the degree of activeness and participatoriness of different resident populaces, thus setting the scene for a more extended analysis of their relationship to officials and leaders.

To anticipate more detailed presentation later, the residents we studies strike us as both passive and nonparticipative. The more apparent dissimilarities found among the four groups of leaders are not converted into parallel dissimilarities among the resident publics. While some small differences in attitudes, particularly those cognitive and evaluative in nature, were spotted, differences in actual participative behaviour were well-nigh nonexistent. In all, we feel compelled to conclude that leadership activeness in Hong Kong has yet to reach the threshold on which an actively participative people can appear.

Not too many residents in the localities were proud of their communities. Community pride was felt by only 33% of the resident respondents in KT, 51% in TM, 39% in THT and 37% in SYP. Their concern for local affairs was generally low. Those who claimed to have great and very great interests in local affairs made up 42% of the respondents in KT, 45% in TM, 32% in THT and 41% in SYP. Smaller still proportions of our respondents went out and discussed local affairs with others: 44% in KT, 46% in TM, 24% in THT and 27% in SYP. Here it is noteworthy that people in residential areas were less interested in local affairs than their counterparts in industrial areas. In their efforts to obtain information on local affairs, it is startling to know that mass media played the crucial role. 56% of the respondents in KT relied on them, and the figures for TM, THT and SYP were 43%, 16% and 42% respectively. In this connection, it is important to see that 10% of the respondents in TM cited neighbours as a source of local information; and in THT, neighbours were a source of information to 18% of the respondents and community leaders and organizations to 10% of them. Thus, in the two areas where more active leaders were found, the overwhelming dominance of mass media was thus lessened. But still the role of local leadership had not been sufficiently enhanced. When we recall that local press in Hong Kong is still in an infantile stage, and television does not pay too much attention on local affairs, the role of the mass media as transmitters of local information must be extremely limited.

And not surprisingly only 5% of the residents in KT claimed knowledge about local affairs, and the corresponding figures for TM, THT, and SYP were 5%, 9% and 12% respectively.

While their identification with and concern for their communities were not impressive, our respondents were nevertheless well integrated in small networks of social relationship. 57% of the respondents in KT, 44% in TM, 51% in THT and 69% in SYP had three or more friends and relatives in their communities. 43% of the respondents in KT, 29% in TM, 37% in THT and 43% in SYP had more than ten close friends in their localities. As to those who visited their relatives and friends outside the community once in a few weeks or more frequently, they constituted 35% of the respondents in KT, 59% in TM, 49% in THT and 50% in SYP. Relationships among neighbours were uniformly good across the localities, and it was confirmed by 52% of the respondents in KT, 65% in TM, 59% in THT and 56% in SYP. Neighbourly interactions were frequent. 68% of the respondents in KT talked to neighbours once in a few days or more frequently, and the same was true for 81% of the respondents in TM, 79% in THT and 69% in SYP. One phenomenon is noticeable in the neighbourly relationship. Residents in TM and THT tended to have closer neighbourly relationship than KT and SYP. To what extent and in what way this is related to leadership activeness is a moot question. But certainly a greater emphasis on the non-primary neighbourly ties is conducive to a more favourable perception of collective action, which in turn will make active leadership possible and sustainable. And this hunch seems to receive support from our data. When asked as to the most effective method to make the government help him/her to solve a problem, the distribution of answers shown below is illustrative:

	<u>KT</u>	<u>TM</u>	<u>THT</u>	<u>SYP</u>
Direct contact with an official	40%	31%	31%	50%
Take collective action with others	34%	43%	45%	26%

Though the differences are far from dramatic, they nevertheless serve to give a consistent ordering of the preferences of the respondents. Residents in TM and THT opted more for a collective approach, while a more individualistic approach was the modal choice of KT and SYP residents.

The slightly more collectivist predilection of TM and THT residents did not mean that they were more reliant or dependent on the government for tackling with community problems. On the contrary, it was also reflected in a higher level of confidence in their own ability to solve community problems by their own efforts. For example, in answering to the question "Which is the best way to solve community problems?", as can be seen below, even though the government was the most often quoted problem solver, respondents in TM and THT still showed more confidence in self-help endeavours:

	<u>KT</u>	<u>TM</u>	<u>THT</u>	<u>SYP</u>
Expand government activities	56%	49%	46%	39%
Mobilize and organize residents	17%	24%	26%	13%

Furthermore, if the residents were really organized to cope with a community problem, 35% of the respondents in KT were prepared to take part in it, and the figures for TM, THT and SYP were 45%, 53% and 40% respectively, again underlining the same point raised just now.

Nevertheless, these attitudinal differences were not paralleled by behavioural accomplishments. While 40% of the respondents in KT had heard of organized efforts to improve the living conditions in the area, only 22% of them had participated in them. The corresponding figures for the other localities were: 38% and 25% in TM, 46% and 16% in THT, 14% and 16% in SYP. In fact, the major division here is between the more active industrial communities and the less active residential communities. One caveat is in order though. The kinds of organized efforts mentioned by our respondents were trivial, small-scale and short-lived efforts. Their demand on the time and energy of the participants was minimal.

RELATIONSHIP AMONG OFFICIALS, LEADERS AND RESIDENTS

In disentangling the tripartite relationships among officials, leaders and residents in the four localities, we particularly look for the attitudes and evaluations of each group for the other two, and the ways the relationship are structured. In the process of description and analysis, we will be sensitive to any possible discrepancies in the reports of each pair of groups which might affect their interactional patterns. To simplify the matter, we shall start with official-leader relationship, then proceed to official-resident and leader-resident relationships.

Official-Leader Relationship

Local officials and leaders maintained a cordial but far from close relationship. Each group by and large harboured a certain level of respect for the other group, but nonetheless a strand of instrumentalism could be felt in the relationship. Local leaders most of the times approached officials as individuals, and they rarely resorted to collective actions with a confrontational implication. Leaders in general were only loosely integrated into administrative activities and decision-making. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that officials tended to have more favourable opinions about leaders than leaders had about themselves.

From the perspective of local officials, the most important criterion of good leadership was public-regardingness, and this trait was identified by 30% of the official respondents in KT, 41% in TM, 41% in THT and 39% in SYP. A further point to note is that as to the other criteria of good leadership, 18% of the respondents in THT chose "activeness in participation in local affairs," while 33% of them picked "capability" in SYP. Since the former characteristic touches upon the leaders' organizational involvement, while the latter has more to do with individual quality, we might then surmise that the more active leaders in THT had somehow impressed themselves on local officials.

Given their criteria for good leadership, about half of the officials would consider local leaders in their localities good leaders: 50% in KT, 41% in TM, 54% in THT and 48% in SYP. Be that as it may, still a significant proportion of respondents in each locality attributed private-regarding motives to local leaders, and the percentages were higher in the industrial communities: 37% in KT, 51% in TM, 23% in THT and 29% in SYP. One reason for it may be the greater ambitiousness of leaders in industrial localities, who had aspirations for career mobility. Judging from other observations, however, it does not seem that differential perceptions of private-regardingness by officials had measurable effects on their relationship to local leaders.

Contacts with local leaders maintained by officials were only fairly frequent. Less than half of them had "many" or "very many" contacts with leaders (34% in KT, 20% in TM, 47% in THT and 40% in SYP). The more frequent contacts found in the residential areas of THT and SYP might signify closer official-leader relationship in homogeneous residential settings. Nevertheless, it also seems that most of these contacts were conducted mainly in formal settings. For example, the most important channels used by officials to learn the opinions and suggestions of local leaders were meetings (31%) and personal contacts (19%) in KT, meetings (29%) and personal contact (15%) in TM, meetings (28%) in THT and likewise meetings (19%) in SYP. That personal contacts featured as one of the major channels in the industrial areas of KT and TM would certainly qualify our previous observation of closer relationship between officials and leaders in the two residential areas.

To tap into local officials' evaluations of local leaders, we asked them to assess leaders' usefulness in four functional areas, and the results are shown in Table 4.

 Table 4 about here

As can be seen, the opinions of officials towards the performance of local leaders were fairly favourable. Since the four functional areas are concerned with the para-administrative and supportive functions that leaders can perform on behalf of officials, the figures thus indicate that, to officials at least, local leaders had managed to play a fairly significant subsidiary/complementary role in day-to-day administration. In this regard, the less active leaders in SYP were less highly regarded.

How much influence did officials reckon leaders have on themselves? More than half of leaders (52% in KT, 78% in TM, 57% in THT and 57% in SYP) were seen by officials to possess multi-faceted influence, which in fact means that specialized leadership was still in short supply in local areas. In the eyes of officials, most of the leaders exerted their influence on local officials (67% in KT, 48% in TM, 58% in THT and 71% in SYP). Outsiders were less seen to possess influence in local affairs (48% in KT, 29% in TM, 46% in THT and nil in SYP). Two points can thus be noted. First, TM leaders were rated to be more influential than others, and they could apply their influence on higher level officials in central offices. And second, both the industrial community of KT and the residential community of THT could bolster the influence of local leaders with support from outside influentials. Thus, SYP was left behind with the least ability to influence officials for lack of access to higher officials and for want of intervention of outside leaders.

These differential abilities to influence on the part of local leaders, as perceived by officials, can also be seen in another finding. We asked our official respondents whether there were particularly influential organizations in their localities. Proportions of officials responding in the affirmative were: 47% in KT, 59% in TM, 62% in THT and 24% in SYP. TM and THT again stood out among the others. It is informative to learn the factors attributed by officials to account for the influence of these organizations. In KT, they were "representativeness" (48%) and government support (18%). It was "representativeness" in TM (40%). In THT, "representativeness" (23%) and popular

support (18%) went to the top of the list. Lastly they were "representativeness" (40%) and government support (20%) in SYP. That the activeness of TM leaders was based on institutionalized channels of representation and that of THT leaders on citizen organization were thus borne out in the words of local officials.

To our official respondents, the existence of influential organizations in local areas did not necessarily constitute an undesirable obstruction to administrative work. Most of them in fact agreed that government should work to strengthen these organizations (78% in KT, 79% in TM, 85% in THT and 81% in SYP). But it is difficult to determine at this point whether this favourable opinions of local officials were derived from general expectations stimulated by administrative "theories" or consequent upon the up-to-now non-threatening nature of local leadership. In the mind of officials, most of the leaders would not resort to unconventional influence tactics to change public policies. This can be shown in the fact that only a minority of them considered that an increasing number of leaders used inappropriate means to force the hand of the government: 29% in KT, 28% in TM, 31% in THT and 38% in SYP. In addition, not too many of them thought that local leaders had in the past successfully mobilized the residents to confront the government. Those who thought so were 15% in KT, 41% in TM, 33% in THT and nil in SYP. Less than half of our official respondents considered that local leaders were united when they approached the government, being 20% in KT, 27% in TM, 44% in THT and 19% in SYP. While the general picture is clear, still it is important to note the greater effectiveness of local leaders in TM and THT.

When we turn to the leaders, it is important to note their loose structural relationship to government and their fairly unfavourable evaluation of government performance. While many of them rated their relationship to government as good or very good (75% in KT, 71% in TM, 54% in THT and 69% in SYP), they had only meagre connections with officials. Few of them contacted local officials once a week or more frequently (16% in KT, 20% in TM, nil in

THT and 2% in SYP). And the same was true in their contacts with outside officials of higher rank (17% in KT, 9% in TM, 23% in THT and 5% in SYP). While most of them thought that contacts with local officials were more useful (55% in KT, 57% in TM, 58% in THT and 62% in SYP), they felt their influence on government was quite limited. 23% of them in KT thought their influence on government was great or very great, and the figures for TM, THT and SYP were 34%, 8% and 4% respectively. And here it can still be seen that against the backdrop of overall lack of influence, leaders in industrial areas fared a little bit better. But when on the issue of whether, in the eyes of leaders, their opinions were taken seriously by officials, again we found TM and THT stood out in their leaders' greater sense of self-importance. 69% and 66% of the leaders in TM and THT respectively thought that their opinions were taken seriously in official circles, as against 47% and 42% of the leaders in KT and SYP respectively who thought the same.

Local leaders were only occasionally involved in government work, and for leaders in residential areas, the involvement was even more limited. On the other hand, the government was seen by some leaders to deliberately seek to intervene in their and their organizations' activities. For instance, 27% of leaders in KT, 37% in TM, 46% in THT and 21% in SYP accused the government of such intervention. And it is noteworthy here that it was in areas with more active leadership that were more often found the accusation. This may bespeak of official efforts to "control" active elements in local areas. What is sad to know, however, is that those leaders who accused the government of intervention also admitted that the government was successful in influencing the structure and policies of their organizations (70% in KT, 88% in TM, 50% in THT and 75% in SYP). The government was also seen to favour particular leaders and accordingly meted out differential treatments to them. And this was more intensely felt in industrial communities (53% in KT, 63% in TM, 38% in THT and 33% in SYP). Who were more favoured by government? They were the wealthy (picked by 23% of respondents) and the cooperative (18%)

in KT, individual personalities (41%) and selected members of the Heung Yee Kuk (Rural Consultative Committee) and the Rural Committee (32%) in TM, those with leadership skills (30%) in THT and the wealthy (32%) in SYP. The government was also seen to attempt to divide local leaders so as to manipulate them. This was divulged by 30% of the leaders in KT, 34% in TM, 38% in THT and 19% in SYP. Again, leaders in more active areas had to face a more "active" divisive offensive by the government.

In face of inadequate influence on the government, the sense of frustration among local leaders must be even sorely felt when they were also found to be far from satisfied with government performance in their localities. Less than half of them would rate the government as having done a good or very good job in their areas: 37% in KT, 43% in TM, 42% in THT and 22% in SYP. Here areas with less active leadership (KT and SYP) were even less satisfied. Furthermore, less than half of them had great or very great confidence in government policies, being 38% in KT, 43% in TM, 27% in THT and 31% in SYP. The less confidence in government as shown in residential areas must be related to the scarcer attention paid to non-industrial areas of lower socio-economic status by the government. This differential evaluation of government performance was again manifested in the fact that leaders in THT and SYP had lower opinion of government officials. While 51% and 54% of leaders in KT and TM respectively considered officials to be smart, the figures for THT and SYP were 27% and 48% respectively.

Despite their felt sense of impotency and their dissatisfaction with government performance, leaders were in the main given to passivity and timidity. And this is understandable in view of the overwhelmingly powerful and cohesive bureaucracy and the organizational weakness of the leaders. Most of the leaders we interviewed did not have the idea of taking over some governmental functions in mind. Only 36% of them in KT, 29% in TM, 31% in THT and 16% in SYP thought that their organizations should be allowed to take over some of the existing functions of government. In their mind, they

might think that confrontational tactics were effective in forcing officials to respond, as 75% of them in KT, 86% in TM, 58% in THT and 52% in SYP claimed that they would or definitely would confront the government if they deemed it necessary. Among those who would do so, however, a smaller proportion would consider confrontation an effective technique to call the government to task (25% in KT, 57% in TM, 53% in THT and 10% in SYP). Notwithstanding this, the higher percentages recorded in TM and THT would still show that the more active leaders there had internalized a confrontational spirit to a greater extent, one through institutionalized, "official" channels, whereas the other via unconventional means. Moreover, about half of the leaders described other leaders in their localities as too timid to confront the government (52% in KT, 46% in TM, 42% in THT and 52% in SYP). More to the point, in actuality, a pitifully few of them had actually confronted the government in the past over an issue (21% in KT, 17% in TM, 23% in THT and 10% in SYP). The reluctance to take collective-confrontational tactics among leaders thus gives contextual meaning to the finding that a substantial proportion of them deemed it essential or extremely essential that personal connections with government officials be established for effective leadership (48% in KT, 51% in TM, 62% in THT and 44% in SYP).

In sum, while most leaders in the four localities can be described as inactive, the few individuals and organizations that displayed activeness in TM and THT seemed to have wrought some changes in the subjective realm of the leaders through their demonstrative and educative effects, which were out of proportion to their numerical representation in their localities.

OFFICIAL-RESIDENT RELATIONSHIP

In relating to citizens, our official respondents tended to uniformly display complacency, a sense of security in their power but at the same time a preparedness for an appreciation of citizen participation. However, with

respect to the performance of local officials, some discrepancies in perception and evaluation existed between officials and citizens. And the structural linkage between the two parties was scanty, resulting in a paucity of mutual contacts.

The complacency of the officials, which almost bordered upon self-appreciation, was quite obvious. Most of them declared that they had done a lot of good work for their localities (KT: 92%, TM: 89%, THT: 85%, and SYP: 86%). Among those who so declared, more than half of them stated that they were accordingly praised by the citizens (KT: 57%, TM: 45%, THT: 64%, and SYP: 39%). Moreover, on the whole they were satisfied with the utilization of their services by the citizens (74% in KT were satisfied or very satisfied, 64% in TM, 57% in THT and 81% in SYP). It is interesting to note here, nevertheless, that officials in areas with more active leaders and citizens were comparatively speaking less satisfied with service utilization by citizens. Whether it was because they set higher standards to evaluate service utilization or because they thought that citizens in these two localities by-passed them to procure services from government is difficult to determine.

Officials only maintained a moderate volume of contacts with citizens. Only 30% of officials in KT met with 50 or more citizens per month, and the figures for TM, THT and SYP were 21%, 26% and 29% respectively. The lower percentages in TM and THT might signify that direct contacts with officials were less resorted to by the residents there as a means to solve personal or community problems.

For those citizens who made contacts with officials, personal problems and needs loomed large. 69% of the officials in KT told us that more than 50% of the residents who approached them came to discuss personal problems. And the same was true for 53% of the officials in TM, 62% in THT and 70% in SYP. The lower figures on personal problems in TM and THT were made good by their higher figures on group and general problems. Proportions of officials who stated that more than 50% of the citizens who approached them

for group or general problems were 6% and 8% in KT, 14% and 14% in TM, 12% and 12% in THT, and 12% and 7% in SYP. These figures show that residents in TM and THT were slightly more conscious of problems pertaining to collectivities and more likely to act on them than were their counterparts in KT and SYP.

Officials also had relatively low opinions of citizens as participants in public affairs. Few officials regarded that residents were concerned or very concerned with local affairs, but still those in TM and THT were perceived to be more active than the others (KT: 14%, TM: 33%, THT: 28%, and SYP: nil). Most officials attributed this low level of participation to the lack of time on the part of residents. On the other hand, citizens were seen by officials as increasingly active in asserting their influence on government, particularly those in industrial communities (KT: 54%, TM: 65%, THT: 44% and SYP: 19%). And here, as expected, TM stood out among industrial areas and THT did likewise among residential communities. Among those who claimed that citizens were becoming more active, a majority of them would deem it a healthy phenomenon: 91% in KT, 77% in TM, 94% in THT and 100% in SYP. Most of the officials found that citizen participation in local affairs was useful or very useful to the government (83% in KT, 86% in TM, 78% in THT and 50% in SYP). And this was particularly true for TM among industrial communities and THT among residential areas. In fact, officials responded that they had devoted adequate efforts to encourage participation by citizens, especially those in industrial communities (41% in KT, 48% in TM, 28% in THT and 19% in SYP). Again, TM and THT distinguished themselves among industrial and residential areas respectively.

While expressing rhetorically their appreciation for citizen participation, it would be most crucial for us to know what, in the mind of officials, would be the limit for citizen participation to go beyond which an attitudinal turnabout would take place. While no conclusive remark can be made here, some data might however be revealing. As to the kind of citizens they liked most,

it is no accident that while a number of characteristics were named, "reasonableness" was the modal response, meaning that citizens who understood administrative procedures and were sympathetic with the administrative point of view were welcomed. And more than half of our official respondents asserted that more than half of the residents in their areas were of the kind they liked (KT: 49%, TM: 65%, THT: 47%, and SYP: 65%). Thus, in the meanwhile, officials had nothing to fear from citizens. But would a higher level of citizen participation frighten them? Here it is intriguing to find that officials in areas with more active participation by leaders and residents felt less strongly the need for government to account for its decisions (KT: 64%, TM: 51%, THT: 46%, and SYP: 81%). And a higher level of citizen participation did not seem to raise in the mind of officials that their decision-making power would thus be curtailed, as more than half of them maintained that they could retain decision-making power even in face of stepped-up citizen participation (54% in KT, 55% in TM, 77% in THT and 55% in SYP). Furthermore, most of them thought that a majority of the critics of government policies were ignorant (KT: 73%, TM: 79%, THT: 85%, and SYP: 75%). In sum, would it be reasonable for us to conclude that local officials in Hong Kong still viewed citizen participation instrumentally and as a subsidiary appendage to the administration, rather than saw it as a political issue requiring power reallocation.

Turning to the residents themselves, their relationship to officials was simple for it was a very detached one. Nevertheless, in general they endorsed the existing political system, and notwithstanding its deficiencies considered it appropriate to Hong Kong (KT: 53%, TM: 56%, THT: 49% and SYP: 58%). The government seemed to them a complex monster, and a substantial proportion of them had difficulty comprehending the work of the government (KT: 54%, TM: 62%, THT: 56% and SYP: 41%). That the residents of SYP, with a slightly higher socio-economic status, should feel the complexity more intensely than those in THT, we surmise, might be accounted for by their

passive leadership and lesser involvement in community affairs. Another paradoxical finding in citizens' relationship to officials is: while they had a fairly favourable assessment of the qualities of the officials, their overall rating for government performance was very low. Take the latter first, only 15% of the citizen respondents in KT, 18% in TM, 22% in THT and 16% in SYP were satisfied with the work of the government, and those in TM and THT were however slightly less dissatisfied. Turning to Table 5, which contain the figures on the percentages of respondents who had favourable opinion of

 Table 5 about here

officials, it is somewhat unexpectedly to find that while the overall evaluation was fairly encouraging, it is the residents in TM and THT who were more prone to give officials a lower rating. The coincidence of leadership activeness and poorer opinion of officials in TM and THT might not necessarily be merely accidental. We may even venture to propose that, in view of the isolation of citizens from both officials and leaders, the latter two might appear as alternative and yet competitive instruments for need satisfaction to citizens. At least up to the present moment, as we see it, the role of local leaders to link up the government and the people left much to be desired. Leaders seemed to be treasured by the people more for the expressive and instrumental purposes against the government than for the organizational ends of intermediation and linkage.

LEADER-RESIDENT RELATIONSHIP

The relationship between local leaders and residents can be briefly characterized because of paucity of substantive content. In the main, leaders and residents only maintained a distant relationship, and each group had a

depressingly low opinion of the other. What is more devastating is that it does not occur to us that they were conscious of the need for or enthusiastic about the establishment of closer ties between themselves. Obviously, the caliber and orientation of the existing leaders must be a major contributive factor to the leader-citizen gap.

At the outset, it would be unfair to the leaders if we deny them any awareness of leadership role and goal. In fact, most of them conceived their leadership role as a "representative" one (58% in KT, 57% in TM, 69% in THT and 64% in SYP), and the constituency of their representation was declared to be the residents in their communities (52% in KT, 60% in TM, 50% in THT and 60% in SYP). Moreover, their attention to local issues should not be overly distracted by higher ambitions which could only be realized outside the local areas, as a substantial proportion of them set their ultimate leadership goal as becoming a good community leader (37% in KT, 49% in TM, 65% in THT and 47% in SYP). However, they had pretty low evaluation of themselves as leaders, and quite sadly, they tended to attribute low leadership performance mostly to lack of government support. Except in TM and THT, where citizen participation was slightly more prominent, absence of popular support hardly featured in their mind as a key factor impeding leadership effectiveness. While they looked up to the government for support and initiative, and claimed to play a useful role for the government, still they considered themselves slighted by government as the rewards they received from it were judged to be neither bountiful nor generous. And a sense of frustration was readily palpable.

We can recall that local leaders were on the whole invisible to our citizen respondents. Against this background, it is startling to learn that, except for SYP, leaders in the other three localities claimed that their leadership position was recognized by the public (58% in KT, 54% in TM, 50% in THT and 24% in SYP). We do not know how they arrived at this understanding. At least we are sure that it is not due to their organizational involvement

with the people. As a matter of fact, their attitude towards the people was a contemptuous one. Most of them held the people to be apathetic and ignorant (KT: 52%, TM: 57%, THT: 77% and SYP: 59%). That this contemptuous posture was more evident in THT, we reckon, was because when compared to the minority of activist residents, most of the non-activist, low class residents there looked particularly awful in the eyes of local leaders. As can be readily seen, such haughty demeanor of the local leaders was not conducive to close leader-people contact. A substantial proportion of local leaders had absolutely no contact whatever with citizens, especially in the area with the least active leadership (KT: 34%, TM: 46%, THT: 35%, and SYP: 71%). Only a small minority of leaders took the initiative to contact citizens frequently (once a week or more): 25% in KT, 29% in TM, 34% in THT and 11% in SYP. It is again noteworthy that TM and THT led the other two communities in this respect.

From the point of view of the residents, what characteristics are most important in good community leadership. Table 6 lists the choices registered in the four communities. There were no great differences among the four

 Table 6 about here

localities. Three leadership traits received more emphasis: will to enhance community well-being, ability to enhance community well-being and acquaintance with community affairs. And unexceptionally they all have to do with the leaders' capacity to deliver services to the populace.

While what constitutes good leadership is clear, the reality is that to the residents, their leaders fell far short of expectations. In Table 7,

 Table 7 about here

the disappointment of residents with their leaders was crystally clear. But still it is gratifying to know that active leadership did not fail to be recognized and appreciated. The slightly higher ratings given to their leaders by the respondents from TM and THT in this respect are indicative

The small differences in leadership evaluation did not, however, translate into actual contact with leaders. In KT, TM, THT and SYP, only 2%, 2%, 2% and 1% respectively of our respondents had approached local leaders in the three months before the time of interview. For those who had not made any contacts with local leaders, only a small proportion of them would like to have local leaders approach them directly (16% in KT, 22% in TM, 32% in THT and 26% in SYP). As many times before, TM and THT stood out among industrial and residential communities respectively.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

While underscoring throughout this paper the indispensable role of local leadership in the urban service delivery system, the minimal differences in leadership behaviour found in the four localities do not warrant the formulation of conclusive statements on the subject in Hong Kong. We cannot even be sure that the systematic variations among leadership activeness, bureaucratic orientation/behaviour and citizen participation in our study are valid indicators of future patterns of relationship, or just vagarious events destined to be displaced by later developments. Inasmuch as the differences among the four localities are systematic, we think several tentative summative statements can mutatis mutandis be ventured.

(1) Availability of more active leaders does seem to foster, among citizens, more favourable judgment of service provision, more commendatory perception of local leaders, greater awareness of the effectiveness of organization and collective action in exercising influence in service delivery decisions and behaviour of bureaucrats and bureaucratic agencies.

(2) It seems to us that at least at the present stage in Hong Kong, more active leadership does not necessarily bring about better official-citizen relationship. Contrariwise, it can even be contended that, when leaders are not integrated into the decision-making structure of government, local leaders and government to a certain extent represent alternative channels to procure urban services in the eyes of citizens. As such, the two are competitive rather than complementary. Instead of bridging the gap between government and people, more active and assertive leadership, if deemed to be effective by the citizens, tends to coincide with a more unfavourable evaluation of government performance. In instances like this, local leaders together with residents deal with the government on a "we-they" basis, imposing demands on the latter but without the need nor the necessity to share in the cost and responsibility of service provision. The non-involvement of local leaders in public decision-making and in the process of balancing diverse demands each with its own sense of priority and urgency exempts them from being held accountable for the inadequate performance of the government.

(3) Local leaders in Hong Kong furthermore suffer from several deficiencies in their organization:

(a) Foremost is the low level of leadership specialization, which makes it difficult for leaders to work with or deal with officials on the bases of specialized grouping, professional knowledge and familiarization with administrative intricacies. And this is particularly true for leaders in lower class communities. Failure to interact with officials as equals is inimical to the cultivation of self-confidence among leaders. And officials do not feel compelled to oblige the leaders out of respect or mutual understanding. Tighter organization of the people would of course compensate for shortage of expertise, as shown in THT. But to ground government-people relationship on a more institutionalized and durable basis would definitely call for upgrading of the educational achievement and caliber of local leaders.

(b) Local leadership is embedded in an extremely weak and loose organizational structure. An overwhelming majority of local leaders are involved in a ridiculously large number of inert, debilitated and ineffectual organizations each of which can claim only a small nominal membership. Inter-organizational ties are conspicuous in their absence. Collaboration of leaders and their organizations on an institutionalized and continuous basis and on projects with express impact on the people is the exception rather than the rule. This amorphous and highly fragmented leadership structure makes it difficult to mobilize people and resources and to concentrate them on efforts to improve conditions in the locality or to apply pressure or influence on the government. The weak and loose local leadership naturally is reflected in the general anonymity of individual leaders in their communities. Tuen Mun perhaps is outstanding in that a single leader manages to enjoy wider recognition, owing to his institutional position and aggressiveness. But still a solidary and organized leadership structure is wanting in that area.

(c) Leaders also are devoid of organizational linkage with citizens. The detachment of the leaders hampers the promotion of rapport and support among citizens. This indirectly is conducive to the predominance of an instrumental view of leaders in the communities.

(4) The compatibility in orientations between officials and leaders constitutes another tricky problem in Hong Kong. What is most pertinent here is the lack of a more "militant" orientation on the part of local leaders or the preparedness on the part of officials to entertain aggressive leadership. As of now, local leaders are amenable to deliberate manipulation by officials, and their reluctance to seek popular support would only serve to perpetuate their dependency status and along the line exacerbate the communication gap between government and people.

(5) Tuen Mun and Tai Hang Tung present two kinds of active leadership. The former shows what an assertive leadership can do when incorporated into

government-initiated structures of representation which allows for a certain degree of leadership autonomy and cultivation of popular support. The latter points the way to render the bureaucracy more responsive through non-institutionalized and unconventional influence tactics with a modicum of protest and confrontation. In an absolute sense, both models are hardly successful. When compared to other communities in Hong Kong, however, their scores are quite impressive. Unfortunately, assertive leaders are until now still rare in Hong Kong. Their emergence will naturally pose a serious threat to the innumerable inactive leaders who still are intoxicated in a deluded sense of self-importance which has nothing to do with their performance of the role of local leader. The fact that the presence of active leaders in Tuen Mun and Tai Hang Tung coexists with a higher tendency of leaders there to suspect the motives of their fellow leaders is a telling evidence that the displacement of dormant leaders by active leaders must be an arduous and conflict-laden process.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

In the face of flimsy data, to propose policy recommendations with undisputed confidence is hazardous. Still, while acknowledging the tentativeness of our ideas, we think the key component in the weakness of local leadership in Hong Kong lies in its uncertain place in the political system. Already in a more advanced stage of economic and social development, which features a more expansive government and a more dependent society, it is no longer advisable for Hong Kong to confine the role of local leaders to that of a mere subordinate adjunct to the bureaucracy playing the peripheral role of reflecting "public" opinion. Local leaders in the meantime require a more secure and palpable presence in the decision-making and resource-allocating processes of the government even if they are still expected to do that "opinion-gathering" chores. But now we want more from them: from

performing para-administrative functions on a larger scale to organizing collective activities for various purposes in their communities. They should be relied upon to bring the government and the people together in a bond of partnership which will eventually be to the benefit of both. How to fit local leaders in an appropriate niche in the political power structure, however, is an exceedingly difficult problem which calls for imagination and experimentation. Bearing this in mind, we propose that the following steps should be helpful towards that end:

(1) In place of the relatively uncoordinated and non-programmatic policy making pattern in the government, we suggest the need for a coordinated planning and policy making agency at the top level of government guided by a set of explicitly spelled out policy goals and armed with adequate information gathering capability. Only after these are charted out would it be possible to situate local leadership clearly and securely in the general system. The whole refurbished centre is essential for coordinated efforts at coping simultaneously with general problems requiring centralized policy formulation and overseeing a more decentralized and deconcentrated model of problem solving. In other words, both centralization and decentralization should be pursued in tandem. Specifically, this means that problem-solving tasks can be classified into three kinds: those reserved exclusively for centralized solution for which an even higher level of centralization should be desirable, those tasks entailing joint efforts by government and community groups and demanding a certain level of decentralization to take into account the multiple manifestations and incidence of problems, and those tasks that should be delegated to social groups and community organizations (including the District Board) for definition and solution, thus requiring a much higher level of decentralization on the part of the government. In the latter two kinds of tasks, a local leadership with the requisite capacity for mobilization of resources, coordination of activities and administration of programmes will be highly indispensable. While this leadership cannot be churned out

overnight, it needs nevertheless this kind of structural setting to flourish.

(2) There should be more flexible deployment of resources and personnel within the government. Especially pertinent here is the need for government to place more emphasis on functional policy goals than on conventional departmental boundaries. Incrementalism and muddling-through are the scourges that must be exorcised. A more flexible government at the local level cannot but be conducive to the rise of a more vibrant and cooperative local leadership.

(3) In the same vein as (2), there is the need for more deconcentration and decentralization of decision-making inside the government. It implies more power and autonomy to the local offices, more stability in the assignment of tasks, resources, and personnel to the localities, and more reliance on local reactions to and people's evaluations of the performance of local officials in calculating their promotion prospects.

(4) There should be a step-by-step mobilization and organization of community groups for concrete problem solving by the government with the sincere intention of sharing power, resources and information, and of leadership development. It should be advisable for the government to encourage a certain level of group competition and experimentation in problem solution and programme design at the local level. It should encourage more local initiative in problem identification and organization building. In addition, groups manifesting certain levels of vitality and popularity should be linked up with the government via some institutionalized channels of partnership.

(5) Channels should be established which would enable the preferences of the social and community groups to be incorporated into the making of the major instrument of governmental action - the annual budget.

(6) In monitoring the activities of local leaders and organizations, detailed prescriptions and directives bolstered by rigid budgetary stipulations should be avoided. Instead, the clarification of broad goals,

explication of intended policy impact and enforcement of a decent budgetary discipline by the central government should be sufficient to set up the proper context for project guidance.

Table 1
Perception of Most Urgent Community Problems

	<u>KT</u>		<u>TM</u>		<u>THT</u>		<u>SYP</u>	
	L.	R.	L.	R.	L.	R.	L.	R.
Housing	40%	15%	-	-	19%	15%	14%	38%
Public services & facilities	23%	-	51%	51%	19%	28%	52%	38%
Social welfare & improvement	-	-	-	13%	19%	-	-	-
Public security	-	17%	18%	-	-	-	10%	-
Industrial/economic development	-	-	-	16%	-	-	-	-
Transportation	-	-	27%	-	-	55%	-	-
Medical and health services	-	-	-	-	-	16%	-	31%
Culture, recreation & Sports	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12%

KT: Kwun Tong; TM: Tuen Mun; THT: Tai Hang Tung; SYP: Sai Ying Pun.

L: Leaders; O: Officials; R: Residents.

Each figure indicates the percentage of respondents naming a particular issue the most urgent community problem in their locality.

Table 2

Value Orientations of Local Officials

(% of respondents who agreed with or agreed very much with the listed statements)

	<u>KT</u>	<u>TM</u>	<u>THT</u>	<u>SYP</u>
<u>Value Identification</u>				
To advance their interests, it is essential that citizens be allowed to elect their representatives to oversee the government.	73%	76%	74%	90%
Even if Hong Kong's economic development will thus be slowed down, still it is worthwhile for government to provide more social services.	46%	52%	44%	43%
If civil servants are allowed to criticize the government openly, its administrative performance will be improved.	37%	34%	48%	53%
<u>Decision-making Style</u>				
If the public disagrees with the policies of government, it should discard them.	28%	24%	33%	19%
Government should not seek to please everybody. It should act in accordance with conscience, and should not be concerned that some powerful figures in society will thus be offended.	92%	84%	77%	86%
<u>Conflict Orientation</u>				
It is more important to preserve social harmony than to successfully implement public policies	56%	48%	46%	57%
<u>Attitude Towards Citizen Participation</u>				
Problems in modern societies are too complicated, therefore only the simple ones should be thrown out for public discussion.	25%	19%	15%	19%
It is most important to let citizens express their opinions before policies are decided, even if doing so would slow down the decision making process.	77%	80%	77%	81%
Only those with good understanding of the relevant issues should be allowed to participate in the policy making process.	64%	69%	44%	62%
<u>Localism</u>				
Even though affairs related to Hong Kong as a whole are important, we should first of all concern ourselves with the problems in the locality where we work.	47%	55%	36%	67%
Things beneficial to the locality where I work must also be beneficial to Hong Kong as a whole.	13%	20%	21%	19%
<u>Action Tendencies</u>				
Even for a trivial matter, I like to think it over thoroughly before taking action.	72%	76%	64%	81%
Decision-making on major issues must be fast, even though doing so will result in certain undesirable after-effects.	27%	42%	31%	29%
<u>Change Orientation</u>				
A society should not adopt new programmes that would upset settled ways of conducting business.	16%	20%	10%	5%
Those who always express dissatisfaction with existing arrangements usually forget that new ways of doing things carry the possibility of bringing about even worse consequences.	63%	59%	46%	52%

Sense of Responsibility

A civil servant should not act against his sense of rightness, even though he will then lose his job.	<u>KT</u>	<u>TM</u>	<u>THT</u>	<u>SYP</u>
	49%	60%	54%	43%
Civil servants have the responsibility to act in accordance with public opinion, even if they consider it erroneous.	6%	9%	8%	38%

KT: Kwun Tong; TM: Tuen Mun; THT: Tai Hang Tung; SYP: Sai Ying Pun.

Table 3

Value Orientations of Local Leaders

(% of respondents who agreed with or agreed very much with the listed statements)

	<u>KT</u>	<u>TM</u>	<u>THT</u>	<u>SYP</u>
<u>Value Identification</u>				
"Obedience to and respect for those in authority" are virtues that every child should learn.	59%	43%	77%	74%
To advance their interests, it is essential that citizens be allowed to elect their representatives to oversee the government.	90%	97%	100%	90%
Even if Hong Kong's economic development will thus be slowed down, still it is worthwhile for government to provide more social services.	79%	83%	96%	84%
<u>Decision-making Style</u>				
If the policies of the government are opposed by the public, it should discard them.	51%	46%	61%	55%
Government should not seek to please everybody. It should act in accordance with conscience, and should not be concerned that some powerful figures in society will thus be offended.	75%	89%	77%	83%
Public policies should as far as possible accommodate diverse, conflicting interests.	85%	94%	81%	86%

	<u>KT</u>	<u>TM</u>	<u>THT</u>	<u>SYP</u>
<u>Conflict Orientation</u>				
It is more important to preserve social harmony than to successfully implement public policies.	67%	66%	88%	86%
A good government should refrain from proposing policies that would lead to conflicts among citizens, even though these policies are important to society as a whole.	48%	31%	46%	35%
The citizens of Hong Kong are increasingly active in pressing demands on government to further their interests and uphold their rights. This is a healthy phenomenon.	71%	86%	65%	64%
<u>Attitude Towards Citizen Participation</u>				
Problems in modern societies are too complicated, therefore only the simple ones should be thrown out for public discussion.	41%	20%	42%	38%
It is most important and worthwhile to let every citizen express his opinion before public policies are decided, even though doing so would mean that additional time is needed to finalize decisions.	90%	68%	93%	79%
Only those with good understanding of the relevant issues should be allowed to participate in the policy making process.	62%	57%	81%	64%
<u>Localism</u>				
Even though affairs related to Hong Kong as a whole are important, we should first of all concern ourselves with the problems in the locality where we belong.	62%	54%	69%	60%
Things beneficial to the locality where I belong must also be beneficial to Hong Kong as a whole.	53%	25%	50%	52%

	<u>KT</u>	<u>TM</u>	<u>THT</u>	<u>SYP</u>
<u>Action Tendencies</u>				
Even for a trivial matter, I like to think it over thoroughly before taking action.	88%	74%	88%	83%
Decision-making on major issues must be fast, even though doing so will result in certain undesirable after-effects.	37%	37%	61%	45%
<u>Change Orientation</u>				
A society should not adopt new programmes that would upset settled ways of conducting business.	29%	43%	39%	47%
Those who always express dissatisfaction with existing arrangements usually forget that new ways of doing things carry the possibility of bringing about even worse consequences.	56%	60%	39%	52%
<u>Sense of Responsibility</u>				
A community leader should not act against his sense of rightness, even though he will then lose his leadership position.	75%	89%	54%	43%
Community leaders have the responsibility to act in accordance with public opinion, even if they consider it to be erroneous.	12%	6%	19%	26%
A good community leader would first of all convince his opponents before he acts upon controversial problems.	81%	73%	65%	78%

Table 4

Officials' Evaluation of Leaders

	<u>KT</u>	<u>TM</u>	<u>THT</u>	<u>SYP</u>
Influence on policy-making	48%	44%	49%	24%
Provision of useful information on local officials	63%	57%	62%	67%
Assistance in policy implementation	62%	56%	64%	48%
Mobilizing public support for local officials	61%	63%	67%	57%

KT: Kwun Tong; TM: Tuen Mun; THT: Tai Hang Tung; SYP: Sai Ying Pun.

Percentages above indicate the proportions of officials who considered that local leaders possessed the quoted abilities.

Table 5

Evaluation of Local Officials by Residents

	<u>KT</u>	<u>TM</u>	<u>THT</u>	<u>SYP</u>
Trustworthiness	49%	38%	47%	42%
Concern with well-being of residents	44%	35%	43%	40%
Work efficiency	38%	31%	39%	36%
Fairness	37%	30%	39%	37%
Ability	44%	35%	37%	36%
Honesty	39%	28%	40%	32%
Professional knowledge	41%	37%	37%	41%
Knowledge of residents' needs	38%	33%	36%	35%
Willingness to help residents	40%	43%	40%	43%
Work attitudes	48%	44%	52%	48%

KT: Kwun Tong; TM: Tuen Mun; THT: Tai Hang Tung; SYP: Sai Ying Pun.

Figures above show the proportions of respondents who regarded that officials had a great or fair amount of the listed qualities.

Table 6

Major Leadership Qualities as Perceived by Residents

	<u>KT</u>	<u>TM</u>	<u>THT</u>	<u>SYP</u>
Will to enhance community well-being	39%	58%	66%	66%
Ability to enhance community well-being	37%	63%	50%	50%
Courage to confront government on behalf of community	19%	31%	-	12%
Honesty and reliability	40%	29%	-	35%
Acquaintance with community affairs	48%	42%	-	4%
Having 'face' in the eyes of officials	8%	7%	-	4%
Experience in community work	29%	30%	-	37%
Life experience and wisdom	16%	18%	-	23%
Good education	32%	27%	-	34%

KT: Kwun Tong; TM: Tuen Mun; THT: Tai Hang Tung; SYP: Sai Ying Pun.

Figures above show the proportions of respondents who considered the listed quality important to local leaders.

Table 7

Residents' Evaluation of Leaders

	<u>KT</u>	<u>TM</u>	<u>THT</u>	<u>SYP</u>
Local leaders possess good qualities	16%	31%	23%	21%
Local leaders are more concerned with the well-being of residents than their own self-interests	24%	29%	27%	17%
Local leaders have great influence on public policy	25%	41%	22%	23%
Local leaders listen to residents' opinion on local issues	19%	39%	28%	20%

KT: Kwun Tong; TM: Tuen Mun; THT: Tai Hang Tung; SYP: Sai Ying Pun.

Figures above represent the proportions of respondents who agreed with the listed statements.