



香 港 中 文 大 學  
社 會 研 究 中 心

Neighbourhood Associations  
in a New Town:  
The Mutual Aid Committees in Shatin

John F. Jones, K. F. Ho, B. Lo Chau,  
M. C. Lam and B. H. Mok

**SOCIAL RESEARCH CENTRE**  
**THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY**  
**OF HONG KONG**

**Suggested citation:**

Jones, John F., K. F. Ho, B. Lo Chau, M. C. Lam and B. H. Mok. 1978. *Neighbourhood Associations in a New Town: The Mutual Aid Committees in Shatin*. Hong Kong: Occasional Paper No. 76, Social Research Centre, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG  
SOCIAL RESEARCH CENTRE

NEIGHBOURHOOD ASSOCIATIONS IN A NEW  
TOWN: THE MUTUAL AID  
COMMITTEES IN SHATIN

by

John F. Jones, K.F. Ho, B. Lo Chau,  
M.C. Lam, B.H. Mok

(Not to be quoted or reproduced without permission)

August, 1978

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

Members of the Editorial Subcommittee:

Dr. Fai-ming Wong (Convenor)  
Prof. John Jones  
Dr. Siu-kai Lau  
Dr. Sung-hsing Wang

Copyright remains with the author.

Dr. John F. Jones (1929- ) received his B.A. (National University of Ireland) in 1953; M.S.W. (Michigan) in 1966; M.A.P.A. and Ph.D. (Minnesota) in 1967 and 1968, respectively. Currently he is Chairman and Professor of the Department of Social Work, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Dr. K.F. Ho (1933- ) received his B.A. (National Taiwan University) in 1957; Diploma in Social Studies (HKU) in 1958; M.S.W. and D.S.W. (Columbia University) in 1964 and 1974, respectively. Currently he is Senior Lecturer in Social Work, United College, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Mrs. B. Lo Chau received her B.A. and Diploma in Social Studies from the University of Hong Kong in 1965 and 1966, respectively. Currently she is Field Instructor of Social Work, United College, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Miss M.C. Lam received her B.S.Sc. from the Chinese University of Hong Kong in 1970 and M.S.W. from the University of Minnesota in 1975. Currently she is Field Instructor of Social Work, Chung Chi College, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

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

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The efforts of many individuals have contributed to our research on neighbourhood associations and to the production of this report. Reference is made in the text to private individuals and government officials who were kind enough to offer consultation, advice and information during the course of the research. The list is too long to be repeated here but we wish to acknowledge the contribution of each. Many others showed interest in the study and gave their assistance: Dr. Rance Lee, Director of the Social Research Centre, and Dr. S.K. Lau and Dr. F.M. Wong who read the manuscript. Mrs. Margaret Yaw typed the first draft of the report and Mr. Mok Kam-wah the final version.

To each and everyone we offer our thanks.

## PREFACE

The purpose of this research is to study the neighbourhood associations of Shatin, and to explore the relationship of these groups to bureaucratic institutions in terms of the neighbourhood associations' autonomy, effectiveness and satisfaction. One neighbourhood association in particular, the Mutual Aid Committee, has been chosen for in-depth examination in the hope that the collection and analysis of data will permit an understanding of primary-secondary group interrelationships, and afford the opportunity for the formulation of hypotheses for further research.

Community development is frequently faced with a dilemma between "top-down" planning aimed towards specific goals and people's immediate needs versus grassroots "bottom-up" organizational efforts intended to enable citizens to develop their problem-solving abilities. Much of the social and community organization literature describes this dilemma as one between what seems rational to planners versus what seems relevant to citizens. The conflict between "top-down" planning and grassroots citizen participation can be conceptualized in terms of the sociological perspective of bureaucracy-primary group relationships.

A study of neighbourhood associations in Shatin should yield a greater understanding of these relationships in a new town. The eventual outcome of such research might be to suggest ways in which experts and citizens can cooperate to develop programmes and policies to meet citizens' needs.

## CHAPTER ONE

### A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR EXAMINING NEIGHBOURHOOD ASSOCIATIONS

The term "popular participation" is by now a common one in development literature and part of the parlance of community organization. Its meaning embraces such diverse concepts as town and village councils, cooperatives, worker representation in industrial management, social mobilization schemes, equitable distribution of development benefits, political democracy, citizen involvement, social reform and popular revolution.<sup>1</sup> An examination of United Nations documents reveals a threefold way of looking at popular participation in the development context: mass sharing in the benefits of development; mass contribution to the development effort; and sharing in decision-making.

Popular participation is tied very closely to the notion of social development. Social development itself implies a focus on qualitative and distributional changes in the fabric of society through the elimination of discrimination and structurally determined exploitation, the creation and assurance of equal opportunities and the more equitable distribution of the benefits of economic

---

1 Popular Participation in Decision Making for Development  
(New York: United Nations, 1975), pp. 4-9.

growth among people. While there are various approaches to development, and different strategies, these approaches can be seen as emphasizing either the technocratic or democratic model.

The technocratic model assumes that national development requires a comprehensive and direct intervention by government under the guidance of a technocratic elite. The democratic model, on the other hand, assumes that national development is a popular endeavour and requires participation by all citizens, since it is their lives that are at stake. The democratic model favours the sharing of political power and the decentralization of administration. The critical difference between the two models is their prescription regarding the concentration or distribution of power. The technocratic model concentrates power at the top while the democratic model would distribute power by stipulating that citizens participate in decision-making.<sup>2</sup>

The purpose of constructing models is to present different or opposing approaches -- polarities -- but it should be obvious that not all aspects of those two models

---

2 Aurora Carbonnell, "A Case for Citizen Participation: The Role of Citizen Participation in Development." Concept Paper for Project Meeting on Citizen Participation in Governance and Development, College of Public Administration, University of the Philippines, August 1977.



are necessarily in opposition. Conceivably, a technocracy can exist side by side with citizen participation. Of itself, participation does not determine the nature of the model -- if participation is sufficiently controlled, it can be a management tool of government in a technocratic system. Participation, however, can also be a protective device for a community, counteracting force to government. Viewed in this way, many would see citizen participation as an end in itself, the foundation of freedom.<sup>3</sup>

Community development is frequently faced with a choice between, on the one hand, "top-down" planning for specific goals aimed at meeting people's immediate needs and, on the other, grassroots "bottom-up" organizational efforts intended to enable citizens to develop their own decision-making ability. Much of the literature of social work and community organization describes this dilemma

---

3 See Paulo Freire, Education for Critical Consciousness (New York: Seabury Press, 1973); Charles J. Grosser, New Directions in Community Organization: From Enabling to Advocacy (New York: Praeger, 1963); Jon Van Til and Sally Van Til, "Citizen Participation in Social Policy: The End of the Cycle," Social Problems, Vol. XVII, No. 3 (Winter 1970), p. 322; Roland Warren, Stephen M. Rose and Ann F. Burgunder, The Structure of Urban Reform (Lexington, Va.: Lexington Books, 1974); Harold C. Edelstone and Ferne K. Kolodner, "Are the Poor Capable of Planning for Themselves?" in Hans B. Spiegel (ed.), Citizen Participation in Urban Development (Baltimore: NIL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1968), Vol. I, pp. 225-232; Loretta Nizzi Benz, "Citizen Participation Reconsidered," Social Work, Vol. XX, No. 2 (March 1975), pp. 115-120.

as one between what seems rational to planners and what seems relevant to citizens.<sup>4</sup> The conflict of "top-down" planning versus grassroots participation can be conceptualized in terms of the sociological perspective of bureaucracy and primary group relationships.<sup>5</sup>

Some of the dichotomy of the technocratic and democratic models of planning may be avoided by constructing a model which allows for an ongoing partnership between bureaucracies and primary groups, based on a mutual respect for the separate roles of professionals and citizens. Such a model is constructed on the "balance theory" of Litwak and developed by Meyer, Hooyman and others.

---

4' In our analyse of the literature, we rely heavily on the research of Nancy Runkle Hooyman, "Strategies of Citizen Participation." Unpublished Paper, University of Minnesota, 1976.

5 Sherry Arnstein, "Eight Rungs on the Ladder of Citizen Participation," Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol. XXV, No. 4 (July 1969), pp. 216-224; James Riedel, "Citizen Participation: Myths and Realities," Public Administration Review, Vol. XXXII, No. 3 (May-June 1972), pp. 211-220; Phillip Selznick, TVA and the Grass Roots, (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), pp. 219 ff.; Elliott A. Krause, "Functions of a Bureaucratic Ideology: Citizen Participation," Social Forces, Vol. XVI, No. 2 (Fall 1968), pp. 129-143; Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba, The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963).

According to Hooyman, citizen participation in bureaucratic public decision-making is based on three major assumptions:<sup>6</sup>

1. That citizen participation is a democratic right;
2. That social justice is most likely to be attained when all citizens can effectively voice their interests;
3. That informed citizens must be involved in the governance of bureaucracies in order to keep institutions responsible to changing societal needs.

The main obstacles to popular participation can be classified as internal, interpersonal, and external. Internal obstacles lie within people's belief system -- feelings of powerlessness, resignation, disengagement, apathy, protest, or excessive reliance on professionals. Internal obstacles are also the lack of the necessary resources for participation: time, money, status, and knowledge of organizations and/or policy-making procedures.<sup>7</sup>

---

6 Nancy Runkle Hooyman, The Problem Definitions and World Views of Working Class Whites, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1974.

7 Robert Aleshire, "Power to the People: An Assessment of the Community Action and Model Cities Experience," Public Administration Review, Vol. XXXII, No. 5 (September-October 1972), p. 438; Frances F. Piven, "Participation of Residents in Neighbourhood Community Action Programs," in Speigel, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 118.

Interpersonal obstacles come from citizens' interactions with others, either with peers or those who are perceived as superior, e.g. government officials or higher-income people. External obstacles are those which arise from circumstances outside the citizens' control. It is these that are most critical and they imply a resistance on the part of the bureaucracy to allow real participation.

The bureaucracy normally controls the conditions of participation. The irony of most popular participation is that the power-holders and seldom the people decide whether citizens shall participate or not, the time period when they shall be involved, their areas of discretion, and their options for action. The common roles played by citizens in "top-down" citizen participation are:

1. The citizen as recipient of information concerning plans already made by technical experts and political officials.
2. The citizen as opinion leader who links public agencies and individuals or families. Basic to the utilization of opinion leaders are the assumption that the opinion leaders can serve a public relations function for agencies whose programmes are worthy of support.
3. The citizen as agency paraprofessional staff. Paraprofessionals are "common messengers" between agency and community. As employees of the agency, their loyalty is guaranteed.

4. The citizen as advisor on advisory boards or committees. Advisors are not policy-makers, and they are usually selected by officials. Officials control the sources of power -- information, budget, staff.<sup>8</sup>

But when citizens have attempted to take power for bureaucracies they find themselves hampered by a lack of technical resources and expertise. Protests may claim immediate attention yet fail to sustain public interest or move officials to do anything beyond a symbolic gesture.<sup>9</sup> Advocates of disruptive intervention in bureaucracies sometimes do not realize that planners, technocrats and officials possess skills and rights that come with their training and trade. Their expertise is indispensable. Any model for effective popular participation, and the ordinary citizen's lack of expertise required to solve complex technical problems.

---

8 Carl W. Stenberg, "Citizens and the Administrative State: From Participation to Power," Public Administration Review, Vol. XXXII, No. 3 (May-June 1972), p. 193.

9 Michael Lipsky, "Protest as a Political Resource," American Political Science Review, Vol. LXII, No. 4 (December 1968), p. 1150; Fred Cox et al. (eds.), Strategies of Community Organization (Itaska, Ill.: Peacock, 1974), p. 223.

The "balance theory" rejects both bureaucratic-sponsored involvement and grassroots protest as the primary strategies for increasing participation. Instead it assumes that both the bureaucracy and citizen groups have legitimate spheres of influence, are individually capable of performing certain tasks but must collaborate in the public domain to achieve other common social goals.<sup>10</sup>

Building or encouraging autonomous, self-help citizen organizations at the grassroots level can begin to resolve many of the problems encountered in top-down approaches to participation. The underlying assumption is that organization is a means to power -- in fact, the only viable means for low-income citizens lacking the power of money and knowledge. In terms of community organization, the focus must be on involving the ordinary citizen at the neighbourhood level. Bureaucracy-sponsored efforts to involve "representative" groupings fail to take account of class differences in people's ability and willingness to participate.<sup>11</sup> Even differences in dress,

---

10 Eugene Litwak and Josefina Figueria, "Technological Innovation and Theoretical Functions of Primary Groups and Bureaucratic Structures," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXXIII, No. 4 (January 1968), p. 470; Eugene Litwak, "Community Participation in Bureaucratic Organizations: Principles and Strategies," Interchange, Vol. I, No. 4 (1970), p. 50.

11 Bernard Barber, "Participation and Mass Apathy," in Alvin Gouldner (ed.), Studies in Leadership (New York: Russell and Russell, 1965), p. 477.

gestures, and manner of speech can be obstacles to low-income people participating in meetings. When low-income people are uncomfortable in "representative" gatherings, middle-class or official domination is likely to occur. What must be realized is that, given a chance, low-income people have the same ability to pursue their own interests as do higher income citizens. But to do this, they must have control of their own organizations.

To foster and maintain the autonomy of citizen organizations, indigenous leadership must be developed, rather than citizens' relying on established leaders, such as officials. When established leaders are involved in organizational activities citizens frequently show excessive deference to them. In matters concerning social planning or programming, the balance theory recognizes the need to differentiate complex tasks which require professionals' trained expertise from policy or value issues where citizens are as good judges as anyone else. Strategies based on the balance theory demand that citizens first mobilize their own resources to achieve their objectives rather than rely on experts or officials to do things for them. The neighbourhood organization should seek professional advice and assistance only when they cannot solve their own problems. This distinction is consistent with the balance theory assumption that both citizens and experts -- or, in another terminology, primary

and bureaucratic groups -- have legitimate spheres of influence. However, when knowledge is equal (as it more often is than officials like to admit), citizen groups are structurally more efficient than bureaucracies, since they can make decisions faster, more flexibly, and at a lower cost.<sup>12</sup>

In summary, when judging whether popular participation is a reality, the balance theory would suggest two criteria which should apply to neighbourhood organizations: (1) Are the associations effective in their utilization of their own resources and bureaucratic expertise? (2) Are the associations autonomous?

A third question which might be asked of neighbourhood associations is, hypothetically at least, linked to their effectiveness and autonomy -- i.e., what is the level of satisfaction among association members?

---

12 Eugene Litwak and Henry C. Meyer, "A Balance Theory of Coordination between Bureaucratic Organizations and Community Primary Groups" in Edwin J. Thomas (ed.), Behavioral Science for Social Workers (New York: Free Press, 1967), pp. 246-262; Eugene Litwak, "An Approach to Linkage in Grass Roots Community Organization," in Cox et al., Strategies of Community Organization, pp. 131-144.



CHAPTER TWO  
THE ORGANIZATIONS AND NEIGHBOURHOOD GROUPS OF  
LEK YUEN AND TAI WAI

In order to study Shatin's Mutual Aid Committees of Lek Yuen and Tai Wai, it is first necessary to understand their organizational context -- the formal and informal organizations of these estates. The formal structure is best grasped by examining the Liaison Office of Shatin's District Office, the Housing Management Office of Lek Yuen Estate and the Lek Yuen Community Hall run by the Social Welfare Department. They embody the official government bureaucracy. Other welfare agencies such as the Shatin Youth Centre, the Lek Yuen Hostel run by the Tung Wah Group of Hospital, and the Po Leung Kuk Lek Yuen Nursery probably touch the entire community in a less obvious manner, but they too represent bureaucracy, albeit of a voluntary nature. The informal organizations such as the Kai Fong, the Chiu Chow Welfare Association, and the Tung Koon Clansman Association exemplify the characteristics of primary groups.

The thumbnail sketch of the various primary and secondary groups does not present a complete picture of Shatin's social structure but it does throw light on interorganizational relationships. A description of these

organizations is useful not only as background information when studying the MACs, but provides further documentation on the life of the new town, Shatin.

A brief description of Lek Yuen and Tai Wai Estates is first presented for readers unfamiliar with the new town's development.

### Shatin

People have lived and farmed in the Sha Tin Valley at least since the Ming Dynasty (1368-1644), during which time the village of Tai Wai was founded. The flat ground of the valley is extremely fertile and previously rice-growing, but in recent years rice crops have given way to vegetables and flowers, and, as the valley's villagers have prospered and rebuilt their houses, little has been left of the earlier buildings.

In the late 1950s the Government commissioned a consultant's report which proposed building a dormitory town for approximately 270,000 people at Shatin. This report was not accepted, but in 1965 the Public Works Department prepared a comprehensive development scheme which recommended the development of a Shatin New Town with a population target of about 1,000,000. A Statutory Outline Zoning Plan based on this scheme was adopted in 1967.

Delay, coupled with Hong Kong's declining birth rate, allowed reappraisal of these proposals, and the Zoning Plan was referred back for amendments. A revised draft development plan was prepared in the early 1970's which provided for an ultimate population of about 500,000 by 1985.

Some 60 per cent of the population of Shatin New Town will live in 11 public housing estates which will accommodate about 300,000 people.

The first of these, Lek Yuen Estate, with accommodation for 23,000 people, was completed in early 1976. Lek Yuen comprises seven apartment blocks up to 20 storeys high, and covers an area of 10 hectares (25 acres). It is a self-contained development with its own shopping centre, community facilities, and public transport.

Adjoining Lek Yuen is the Wo Che Estate, where building commenced in late 1975. The estate, due for completion in early 1979, will house another 34,000 people on a 14-hectare (35-acre) site.

Nine more public housing estates of various sizes are planned for different locations in Shatin New Town over the next decade.

Other areas have been assigned for private housing developments to house another 200,000 people. Approximately two-thirds of the residential land within the new town will be allocated to private housing of varying population densities.

The Tai Wai Estate is a relatively recent housing development surrounding a large, established village.

Historically, Tai Wai was the largest village in Sha Tin district. People came to settle in Tai Wai in the Ming Dynasty. The native population in this village grew very slowly. Even in the pre-war time of 1941, there were less than 100 households. The 1971 By-Census indicated that 2,729 people lived in Tai Wai. However, the estimated population in this area in 1977 was in the region of 7,000. The vast increase in population is attributed to an influx of people from urban areas, who started to come to live in Tai Wai in the late 1960's for several reasons:

- i) cheaper rentals, coupled with a cleaner environment,
- ii) better law and order, and
- iii) convenient transportation to and from urban areas, partly due to physical proximity.

Residents in Tai Wai fall into two groups by origin of settlement. One group comprises native villagers who are the descendents of the early settlers. They owned property and agricultural land in the village and used to live by farming. However, in the early 1960's, a number of the native people, especially the younger generation in this village, emigrated to the United Kingdom to take up more lucrative jobs in restaurants and other types of business. Consequent to the recent government policy of

resumption of farm-land for public development, the villagers changed their means of livelihood by seeking employment in industrial and commercial undertakings in the more developed parts of Tai Wai.

The other group of residents are outsiders. A few of them live in rented houses in the village. But the great majority of them settled on other parts of Tai Wai, running business of all descriptions -- small-scale industries, workshops and factories. Because of these developments, these parts have become the centre of commerce and industry for Tai Wai.

In this modern section of Tai Wai, many multi-storey buildings have been constructed. At the time of this research project, there were twenty-two blocks of high-rise apartments of six to eleven storeys. In these tall buildings, there were in all about 448 dwelling units. The ground floors in each building are normally utilized for commercial purposes. Management of these high-rises is a concern of the District Office. Fourteen MACs were formed in these private buildings, to promote better housing management.

#### Government Organizations in Shatin

The official organizations which have most immediate impact on the people of Shatin are: the Liaison Office of the District Office, the Housing Management Office of Lek

Yuen Estate, and the Lek Yuen Community Hall run by the Social Welfare Department.

1. The Liaison Office

This office is a section of the Shatin District Office which, in turn, is a branch of the New Territories Administration. The main function of this office is to execute what has been laid down by the New Territories Administration and is totally responsible to it. It therefore has no absolute autonomy of its own.

There are only three staff in the office, namely the Liaison Officer and two assistants. It is anticipated that the number of staff will increase in direct proportion to the future population expansion in Shatin.

Residents bring to the office all sorts of matters for advise and assistance -- family disputes, marital problems. Many of the residents seem to regard its officials as their parental officials (父母官) and relate warmly to them.

The official channels of communication between the Liaison Office and the residents are as follows:

- (1) Through monthly meetings with the rural committees, (village representatives)

exchange of views and discussion of problems take place. However, it is the Liaison Officer who acts as convenor, and arranges the agenda, schedule, etc.

- (ii) Through inter-departmental meetings where resident representatives are present two-way communication is fostered. These meetings are devoted to issues of a temporary nature. For instance, the Ad Hoc Committee on Transportation consists of officials from the Transport Department, Public Works Department, the Liaison Office, and local residents. The agenda might call for discussion about the demolition of certain village huts for highway construction, as well as compensation for their demolition.

There are also informal channels of communication between the Liaison Office and the residents of Shatin. These include the Liaison Officer's regular visits to the villages around matters of mutual concern. The open door policy of the Liaison Office also gives residents an opportunity to air their views or express complaints.

With regard to the MACs, the Liaison Office is responsible for setting up MACs among the residents of low-cost housing estates of Lek Yuen and Tai Wai. With the help of the Housing Management, the Liaison Office establishes contact with the residents and urges them to form MACs. Assistance and control is provided in the following manner:

- (i) By attending MAC meetings;
- (ii) By keeping copies of minutes and relevant documents;
- (iii) By channeling activities towards recreational, educational, and cultural endeavours. Pressure group tactics are not encouraged.

In summary, there are grounds for believing that the attitude of the Liaison Office towards the residents of Shatin (both the native born and tenants of the public housing estate) is positive, close, and parental. For instance, in cases of compensation for demolition, villagers discuss their complaints with the Liaison Office which in turn forwards the villagers' complaints to a higher level of administration; in consequence, compensation is frequently increased. Another example of



"bottom-up" participation is the tenants request meeting space which the Liaison Office passes on to the Housing Management for consideration.

But the "top-down" approach is also obvious in the very structure of the Liaison Office. Policy and planning of a substantial nature takes place at a higher level than the District Office. While grievances are usually heard, residents' participation is limited to local activities generally of a recreational, educational and cultural nature. With its basic policies already determined, the District Office through its Liaison Office reaches out to citizens.

## 2. The Housing Management of Lek Yuen Estate

The Lek Yuen Housing Management Office is directly responsible to the Housing Authority Headquarters. It carried out its work in accordance with the general policy and regulations set by Headquarters and has little autonomy. However, the Housing Manager is allowed some discretion in making decisions, based on his professional judgment, on issues that are peculiar to his estate.

Originally the relationship between the Housing Management and residents was a strictly landlord-tenant one. The Housing Management

collected rents and attended to building maintenance. It made no attempt to gauge the residents' feelings about their living environment, much less attended to demands for improvement; nor did it address itself to matters relating to general issues of common welfare.

The Housing Management has gradually evolved more informal patterns, and broadened its concerns. Regular home visits as well as a standing invitation to residents to drop in when there are matters needing attention, have improved communication. The Housing Management is no longer simply interested in rent collection and building maintenance but is committed to working in cooperation with the tenants on problems which bother residents.

According to the Lek Yuen Estate Housing Manager, Mr. C.C. Hui, most of the tenants are happy with their new living environment since conditions are greatly improved in comparison to their previous residence. The improvements include the following:

- (i) improved physical conditions in housing - kitchen, piping, etc;
- (ii) better security against bad weather and crime;

- (iii) easy access to marketing and shopping centres;
- (iv) school facilities for their children;
- (v) adequate open space and play equipment for children;
- (vi) available channels of communication around landlord-tenant concerns and a willingness on the Housing Management's part to listen to complaints and take action.

The Housing Management adopts a top-down approach in its dealing with tenants. It offers no participation to tenants in policy making or management. Complaints, which can be attended to without infringing on established rulings or ordinances, receive attention, but residents' active involvement in the running of the housing estate is nil.

The Housing Management have rather extensive access to tenants through the MACs, and in this sense the MACs serve as a 'common messenger'. This communication is achieved through

- (a) regular meetings between housing assistants and MAC committee members;
- (b) regular meetings between the Housing Manager and MAC committee members;

(c) Ad hoc committee meetings for special social and cultural activities between the Housing Management, local service agencies and MAC committees.

The Housing Management of Lek Yuen Estate would appear to be very conscientious. Its officers are accessible to tenants and eager to grant requests when it has the authority to do so. The Housing Management initiates the mobilization of tenants and resources for activities and programmes for purposes of entertainment and more general benefit.

The Housing Management is very supportive and appreciative of the work of the MACs -- their organization of a night patrol to provide additional security (the rate of crimes of burglary and violence is very low); their educational efforts and publicity directed towards keeping the environment clean, etc.

But the Housing Management, like the Liaison Office, has no wish to see the MACs become a pressure group and would in all likelihood move against them if they showed political aspirations. The authorities are more eager to channel the MACs' attention, energy and resources to promoting festivals, educational projects and cultural affairs.

3. The Lek Yuen Community Hall, S.W.D.

The Lek Yuen community hall was formally declared open in April, 1977. It is a branch of the Group and Community Work Division (operational) of the Social Welfare Department. It operates in accordance with the establishments laid down by its headquarters. Hence, it has no absolute autonomy of its own.

There are four staff members in the hall, namely, one professionally trained social worker who is the officer-in-charge, one welfare assistant, one clerical staff and a labourer. The officer-in-charge is directly responsible to, and supervised by, the Community Youth Officer of the Kowloon District.

The main objective of the hall is to provide group work service, mostly for the children and youth of the estate. The emphasis is upon personality development and leadership training. Its goal is also to provide in the community the promotion of harmonious relations among neighbours, improvement in their quality of life by the development of voluntary community service and leadership, and the fostering of self-help and mutual aid projects with a stress on people's participation and involvement.

The hall serves as a focal point for community relations and activities. It provides space and equipment for the residents of the estate to have meetings and recreational activities and groups. In pursuit of group work aims, the hall has regular interest groups, friendship groups and the like, for children and young people. Recruitment and supervision of volunteers is also undertaken.

So far, staff members of the hall have not themselves initiated any work of a community nature.

The hall was established mainly for the well-being of the residents of Lek Yuen Estate. It therefore devotes most of its energy and time to serve these. Staff members communicate mostly with agencies in the estate. As it was only recently established, the staff has been busy in internal consolidation. Hence the hall's relationship with the other agencies remains weak and relatively insignificant. For example, much of its work has been confined so far to inviting the old people of the Lek Yuen Hostel for the Aged to attend some of its activities. Its relationship with the Shatin Youth Centre is very superficial and both

organizations have a somewhat competitive attitude toward each other. So far, there is no dialogue between the hall and the Po Leung Kuk nursery.

Usually there are ad hoc committees, called and chaired by the Liaison Officer to the District Office of Shatin, to plan and execute area-wide social, cultural and recreational activities. The ad hoc committees generally consist of all the government departments concerned and local organizations. The hall representative serves as a member of such committees and contributes accordingly. The ad hoc committees have so far been the major channel of communication with other agencies. The staff hope that in due course the hall can take a more active role in establishing relationships with other.

According to Mr. Y.C. Leung (the hall's officer-in-charge), relationships with the MACs are exceedingly good as reflected in the latter's enthusiasm and ready assistance in publicizing the services of the hall to the residents. Mr. Leung has taken the initiative in attending the regular meetings of the MACs and has supported their programmes and activities. The MACs have

in turn been cooperative, and in large measure because of MAC endeavours a total of some 600 children and youth have been registered as members in the hall. There are also frequent informal exchanges of ideas and information between the MACs and the hall.

The hall is in its formative stage and it is still too early to evaluate its services to the residents of Lek Yuen Estate and its communication and cooperation with other organizations.

Another point worth mentioning is that the hall and the Shatin Youth Centre have more or less the same objectives and functions, and there seems to have developed some negative competition. The parties do not quite recognize the danger of this and so far fail to take any appropriate action to promote better communication and coordination in their work.

### Voluntary Social Service Agencies

#### 1. Shatin Youth Centre

The Centre was established in August, 1976, by the Community Service Committee of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Hong Kong. The executive board consists of eight members who were all from the



Evangelical Lutheran Church of Hong Kong. The officer-in-charge is an official member of the board and serves as its secretary. The executive board is responsible for the general policy and planning of the Centre, supervising financial matters, and serving as the official channel of communication with outside bodies.

The Centre had four staff: one officer-in-charge, two youth workers and one messenger. Except for the minor staff, all staff members are graduates of the Lutheran Seminary and have not had any formal training in social work.

The major financial support has been from the Chinese Advisory Committee of the American and Swedish Lutheran Synod stationed at Geneva. For the first year, the Committee contributed \$250,000 for building-up and recurrent expense, and for the second year a sum of \$135,000 for recurrent expenses. However, the commitment of the Chinese Advisory Committee is for the beginning five years only, and after that, it is expected that the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Hong Kong will find its own funding. In its second year of operation, the Centre succeeded to obtain a subvention of \$36,000 from S.W.D. for the payment of rent and rates. Other sources of income are local donations and the membership fees, but these comprise only a very small portion of the total income.

The objectives of the Centre are to provide the chance for children and youth to develop their potential and to achieve a balanced development psychologically, physically and spiritually so as to become good citizens of Hong Kong. It is hoped that through the guidance of the Centre's staff, children and young people can express their various needs, and with their active participation in the planning process as well as in activities, they can learn and experience the meaning of group life.

The activities of the Centre fall into four main categories: small group activities, such as a Kung Fu club and a religious group; interest classes -- sewing, Judo, calligraphy; mass activities -- variety shows and picnics; and community services -- visits to homes for the aged, tutoring classes for children in Lek Yuen, a fun fair for children in resite areas and villages in Shatin. The Centre hopes to expend its efforts in time to include more educational and cultural programmes. The Centre's officer-in-charge, Mr. T.Y. Cheung has expressed a desire to start some family life education programmes.

Children and young people between the ages of 7 and 30 are eligible for membership in the Centre. (The fees are \$10 for youth members and \$5 for children.)

In June 1977 the Centre had a membership of 1,200; 80% of these were residents of Lek Yuen Estate while the remaining 20% were from the neighbouring villages in Shatin.

In its relationships with other agencies and Government departments, the Centre plays a rather independent role. Since the Centre's major funding is from overseas, the Centre has not been subject to much SWD supervision, but it has sought the department's advice and guidance on occasion, and expressed satisfaction with their cooperation. Relations with the Lek Yuen's Community Hall run by SWD remain distant and, as previously noted, there seems to exist some rivalry between these two agencies. No steps have been taken to open communication or establish cooperation.

The Centre's relationship with the Housing Department seems to be very good. In addition to official business conducted between the two agencies, there has developed an informal relationship which allows the Centre to approach staff members of the Housing Department on problems that can be solved without red tape.

The Centre has also worked closely and harmoniously with the Liaison Office of the Shatin District Office which serves as the coordinator of recreational activities for the entire Shatin district. The Centre has in the

past served on the Liaison Office's ad hoc committee for the planning and organization of recreational and mass activities for Shatin, along with other agencies and government departments.

The Centre's contact with other voluntary agencies has been limited, partly due to the Centre's newness and its preoccupation with its own programmes and initial problems.

Although the executive Board of the Community Service Committee of the Evangelical Lutheran Church controls the Centre, in fact the Centre manages its own affairs to a large extent. Because of board members' lack of knowledge of youth work and a reluctance to interfere, the Centre has had what amounts to a free hand in planning and implementation of programmes.

Since one of the Centre's aims is to foster participation of young people in planning and carrying out activities, staff members have tried to involve the young people both in the Centre's programmes and in volunteer work in the community. The Centre's officer-in-charge has expressed satisfaction with the manner in which young people have undertaken this work both in the planning phase and implementation, although so far the structure for their involvement is rather

informal and their efforts somewhat unsystematic. The intention is to establish a committee structure in the near future to ensure participation by the young in the planning of every programme of the Centre.

The Centre's relationship with the MACs is an interesting one in the light of Litwak's balance theory. Relations between the two have been harmonious. The Centre has in the past cooperated with the MACs in organizing such activities as fun fairs for the residents of Lek Yuen Estate; and the MACs have borrowed the Centre's facilities for their meetings on occasion. But the Centre is not prepared to build closer ties with the MACs for fear of a power struggle because of conflict of interest. The Centre's staff have expressed a lack of confidence in the MACs and wish to preserve the Centre's autonomy.

2. Tung Wah Group of Hospitals, Lek Yuen Hostel for the Elderly

The Lek Yuen Hostel for the Elderly is managed by the Social Welfare Committee of the Board of Directors, Tung Wah Group of Hospitals. The routine administration of the Hostel is supervised and administered by the Tung Wah Social Welfare Section. The Hostel staff includes one superintendent, one deputy superintendent, two welfare assistants, one nurse, five maids and three cooks.

The Tung Wah Group of Hospital is responsible for the building-up costs, and the recurrent expenses are met by a government subvention.

The hostel offers housing to the aged people so that the latter might enjoy a full, active and normal life and maintain their link with the community. The aim is to make the housing as non-institutional as possible. The hostel provides 30 living units, each with a capacity for four or five elderly people, depending on size of the unit. It accommodates 135 single elderly people and two couples. Each unit is equipped with basic furniture and appliances. The sitting rooms and the resting rooms are specially designed for such resident activities as reading, relaxing, playing chess, enjoying T.V. programmes and handicrafts.

Usually, the residents of the hostel must prepare their own food. For those who are physically incapable of self-care, meal services are provided, and the amahs of the hostel offer them assistance in laundry and cleaning work.

Professionally trained social workers and nurses are employed to offer guidance to the elderly in their individual and health problems. Other programs such as group activities, parties and outings are also arranged.

The residents, who come from different areas in Hong Kong with a few from the Shatin district, are generally over 60 years of age, although some who are over 50 are admitted if handicapped. Their admission is through the recommendation of the Family Service Division of S.W.D. and other recognized voluntary welfare agencies. The monthly bed charge is \$63, and those in need of meal service pay an additional \$144. Since the majority of the residents are destitute and without close relatives, the costs of residence are mainly covered by public assistance, infirmity allowance and disability allowance.

Although the management of the Hostel is quite open and liberal, and the administration conscientiously seeks to provide a good service, the atmosphere is on the whole paternalistic and the residents are not encouraged to participate in management or decision-making processes.

The Hostel's relationships with other agencies are generally good. The Housing Department, in the opinion of the Hostel's superintendent, has been helpful. While some initial difficulties were experienced when obtaining public assistance for aged residents, the Hostel is satisfied with the cooperation of S.W.D.

In regard to voluntary agencies, contact is limited to some service groups of schools and youth centres. During weekends, service groups from Caritas Community Centre, Shatin Youth Centres and others visit the old people or arrange picnics. There is some lack of coordination, but otherwise the service of these groups is greatly appreciated.

The Hostel's relationship with the MACs is minimal. Because the residents are old, it seems impractical to the Hostel staff to have Hostel residents join in such MAC activities as night patrols. So, although the Hostel is located in the same block as the MAC, the Hostel's involvement with that organization is confined to "moral support" and passive participation in some of the activities run by the MACs.

### 3. Po Leung Kuk Lek Yuen Nursery

Lek Yuen Nursery is one of the nine day nurseries run by the welfare department of the Po Leung Kuk. The Kuk's nurseries are coordinated by the Senior Supervisor (Out Centres) who works under the Superintendent who is in turn responsible to the Chairman for welfare and professional matters. At the Centre, the staff included a supervisor who had completed a two-year training course in nursery work, and seven nursery workers. The Kuk's day care nurseries are all government subvented.



The main aim of the Kuk's day care centres is the provision of suitable facilities and programmes to foster the children's physical, social, emotional and intellectual growth. Its programme activities emphasize pre-school education and prepare children for their future adjustment to school life.

Since the nursery is government subvented, admission is controlled by the criterion set by S.W.D. Generally speaking, this means that children come from large, low-income families whose parents work for a living. The capacity of the nursery is 100.

Because of S.W.D.'s eligibility requirements, admission of children to the nursery is difficult for most Lek Yuen Estate families. Since the total income of families in Lek Yuen usually exceeds the eligibility requirements of government, many of the estate families' applications must be turned down. Only 60% of the nursery's children are from Lek Yuen Estate, while the remaining number come from other villages in Shatin. This is a cause of dissatisfaction among Lek Yuen Estate residents, and the policy is not favoured by the nursery staff.

Relations with parents of children, in the opinion of the nursery's supervisor, Miss Y.M. Lee, are satisfactory. Because of the uniform rules and regulations governing all Kuk nurseries, Miss Lee

regards her role as largely house-keeping. Her authority in decision-making is limited to minor technical points. Parents are usually happy to have their children admitted to the nursery and make no further demands. They express no interest in becoming involved with policy or management. The nursery arranges parents' days from time to time and these foster closer ties with the nursery, and keep the parents in touch with the nursery activities of the children.

Contacts with other agencies in the community are minimal.

#### Neighbourhood Groups and Informal Associations

##### 1. The Shatin Kai Fong Welfare Association

This association was formally established six years ago. It was originally a Buddhist organization, called the Hop Hing Tung, formed by native-born Shatin people for the purpose of organizing public worship and rituals at certain times of the year. But the members of the Hop Hing Tung sensed the name of their organization had the connotation of a secret society and they wished besides to expand the scope of their activity to community service. Accordingly, they affiliated with the Kai Fong Welfare Association of Hong Kong to form a Shatin branch.

Although the explicit aim of the Association is to promote the general welfare of residents of the Shatin area, their services are quite limited. The impression is unavoidable that the chief beneficiaries are the office-bearers who use their position to establish status with the government and business community of Shatin.

While the Association is a branch of the Kai Fong Welfare Association of Hong Kong, it functions quite independently and receives little direction from the latter. There is a formal structure, and office-bearers are elected bi-annually, but the decision-making process is very informal and decisions fall largely to the Chairman, a wealthy contractor, and more involved committee members. Anyone who lives in Shatin is eligible for membership but the bulk of present membership (approximately 400) is composed of middle-age merchants of native origin. The entrance fee is \$40, and there is a monthly subscription of \$5 by each member.

The Association holds an annual spring dinners for its members, and about 100 old people of the Shatin area are invited as honourable guests. The function is mainly a gesture of respect to the elderly and at the dinner medals "of genuine gold" are presented to the three oldest participants and red-packets of money to the

other guests. The Association seems to regard this as its own most important and prestigious service to the community.

In times of natural disaster, the Association usually offers relief and shelter to victims. The office-bearers themselves visit the homeless and offer assistance.

The major service that the Association renders to its members is a funeral expenses subsidy. The fund for this subsidy comes from the Chairman and office-bearers.

Occasionally, the Association participates in area-wide mass activities, but it plays a relatively passive role and leaves the main organization of activities to other local bodies. In his personal capacity, the Association's Chairman has wide contacts with various Shatin organizations and serves on many boards and committees. However, the Association as a whole has minimal connections with local organizations or agencies.

## 2. Overseas Chiu Chow Welfare Association, Shatin.

According to Mr. Y. Chan, the Association's Chairman, the present Shatin Market was established mainly through the efforts of the Chiu Chow people.

The whole area (quoting the same source) covered by the market was bought from the government some 30 years ago. The majority of shop owners are Chiu Chow people. (no attempt has been made to check the accuracy of this statement.) With blood relationship and interest in business a common bond, Chiu Chow people formed the Overseas Chiu Chow Welfare Association, Shatin.

The Association has well-understood but vaguely defined objectives. The main purpose is to promote mutual business interests in Shatin. Social and cultural goals are subordinate to this aim.

The Association is a local, independent organization with no connections with other Chiu Chow Clansmen associations in Hong Kong. It has a formal structure, and office-bearers are elected by members bi-annually, but, as in the case of the Kai Fong, decision-making is normally informal. Those who are willing to contribute time and money come to the top of the organizations.

Anyone of Chiu Chow origin living in Shatin is eligible for membership. There are said to be some 4,000 Chiu Chow people in the area, of which a quarter are members. Membership is on a family basis. When the head of a household registers as a member, the rest of his family automatically become members.

Life-long membership entails a \$50 fee for the household; there are no annual subscriptions.

The organization holds meetings in an informal setting for members to exchange information and ideas. It also organizes annually a district-wide religious ceremony at Souls Festival, a sacrifice for the dead -- especially for the souls of victims of the 1963 typhoon Wanda. Other services which include emergency relief and a dinner in Spring are considered of lesser importance.

Interaction between government agencies is minimal. Occasionally, government officials are invited to officiate at the inaugural ceremony of the office-bearers. At the community level, the Association has almost no dealings with other voluntary organizations. They are not actively involved in any community affairs other than the Souls Festival. From time to time, when invited to join in mass activities of the Shatin district, they do so out of courtesy but their involvement is passive.

### 3. The Tung Koon Clansmen Association, Shatin Branch

This organization is a branch of the Tung Koon Clansmen Association of Hong Kong but it is quite independent of the head office which provides little supervision or assistance. In spite of the fact that it is a registered body with a well-structured

constitution and designated officers, its organization is rather loose and functions poorly.

All directors, who give a lump-sum donation of over \$500, have life-long and honorary appointments. The Chairman and other office-bearers are elected annually by members of the Association. There is little competition for these posts.

Although the title of the Association suggests a geographical limitation on membership, anyone of Tung Koon origin is eligible to become a member. Quite a number of members come from other parts of Hong Kong. Practically all members are over 40, the majority being old people. This, the Secretary of the Association explained, is because of the interest among older people in funeral arrangements. The total membership is somewhat less than 600.

The Association promotes mutual help among clansmen. Besides offering a channel of communication, the organization seeks to provide tangible services such as medical services for members and small scholarships for their children. But the clinic which the Association claims as its own is in Fanling and run by a private practitioner who was once employed by the Association. There is now almost no communication between the clinic and the Association.

The Association holds annual dinners and occasionally arranges picnics.

The main function of the organization at present is the funeral expenses subsidy which is arranged on a cooperative basis. All members contribute \$3 each towards the funeral expenses of a deceased fellow member.

The Association would appear to be typical of other clansmen associations with its origins in an agrarian past and built upon an older hierarchy than is commonly found among urban dwellers. It retains the symbols of the past and provides a nostalgic link with its place of origin. It is a burial society of the kind found in many rural cultures. The functions of the Association cannot be dismissed as unimportant and a new town such as Shatin would do well to cherish such organizations.

The Association has no links with other organizations.



References

The following persons were interviewed in the course of gathering information on the organizations and neighbourhood groups of Lek Yuen and Tai Wai:

<u>Names</u>	<u>Titles</u>
Mr. K.T. Leung	Liaison Officer, Liaison Office, Shatin District Office.
Mr. C.C. Hui	Housing Manager, Lek Yuen Estate, Housing Authority.
Mr. Y.C. Leung	Officer-in-charge, Lek Yuen Community Hall, S.W.D.
Mr. T.Y. Cheung	Director, Shatin Youth Centre, Lek Yuen Estate.
Mr. K. Cheung	Superintendent, Lek Yuen Hostel for the Aged, Tung Wah Group of Hospitals.
Miss Y.M. Lee	Superintendent, Lek Yuen Nursery, Po Leung Kuk.
Mr. S. Hung	Chairman, Shatin Kai Fong Welfare Association.
Mr. Y. Chan	Chairman, Chiu Chow Welfare Association.
Mr. C.P. Chow	Secretary, Tung Koon Clansmen Association, Shatin Branch.

## CHAPTER THREE

### THE MUTUAL AID COMMITTEES

#### Historical Development

The Mutual Aid Committees (MACs) had their origin in the "keep Hong Kong Clean Campaign," a government-sponsored community organization effort started in 1972. The Department of Home Affairs in an attempt to promote the campaign conceived the idea of organizing the Hong Kong community along geographic lines.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, Hong Kong Island and the Kowloon area, including New Kowloon, were divided into 74 campaign areas with an average population of 45,000 to 50,000 each. In each campaign area, an Area Committee was formed, comprising 15 to 20 citizens from all walks of life living or working in the area; the chairman of each Area Committee was appointed or elected from among the committee members.<sup>2</sup> Care was taken to make each Area Committee as representative of local interests as possible. The Government provided each Area Committee with a part-time, paid secretary -- the first time this had been done -- and gave

---

1 Martin Rowlands, Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs, "Towards a More Responsive Society." Speech to the Rotary Club, Hong Kong, August 1973.

2 "Community Involvement, Guidance Note No. 1," published by the Secretariat for Home Affairs, 18 May 1973.

financial aid toward the committee's activities. These Area Committees encountered little difficulty in mobilizing the residents in their respective geographical area in support of the "Clean Hong Kong Campaign". Action programmes were planned, residents and students were organized, and relevant Government Departments like the Urban Services Department, Police Department, Social Welfare Department and Housing Department were liaised.

Given the response from the public during the "Clean Hong Kong Campaign, 1972", the Government realized that local initiative could be generated and harnessed for projects which were of general interest and concern.

In 1973, the Department of Home Affairs laid down three target goals for the year, namely:

- (1) the Second Phase of the Clean Hong Kong Campaign -- the theme for 1973 being "Clean Our Buildings";
- (2) the Fight Violent Crime Campaign, and
- (3) the improvement of standards of building management, particularly in multi-storey residential and industrial buildings.

The Department of Home Affairs continued to rely on the organized and sustained support from members of the public to complete the three declared tasks. The Area Committees were seen as a viable mechanism to promote

community participation, and therefore the Department had broadened their functions to include Fight Violent Crime and Better Building Management.

The activities of the 74 Area Committees were co-ordinated under two regional offices, one on the Hong Kong Island and the other in Kowloon. However, in 1973 the Secretary for Home Affairs delegated the function of community involvement to the City District Officers. In order to improve leadership and co-ordination among Area Committees and to ensure inter-departmental co-operation, the City District Officers created a City District Committee in each of the ten city districts. On the average, there were seven to eight Area Committees working under a City District Committee. The membership to each City District Committee was to include the chairmen of Area Committees in the district concerned, representatives of Police, Urban Services Department, Housing Department and Social Welfare Department, district leaders and "notables" (community opinion leaders). Representatives from other Government departments could also be invited to attend when and as required.

The Department of Home Affairs believed that public initiative and participation could be further induced and effectively channelled if community organization effort was extended downward from the district and area levels

to the building or block level where residents' reactions to social issues or problems could be observed and detected at first-hand. Mutual Aid Committees were therefore planned to be established in each multi-storey building.

The first Mutual Aid Committees were set up in June 1973 as a simple form of community organization. Their long-range objectives included the promotion of friendship and a bond of mutual reliance among residents in the same building. However, the three specific, immediate tasks were those outlined by the Department of Home Affairs: to promote the Clean Hong Kong campaign; to promote the Fight Violent Crime campaign; and to improve better management within buildings.<sup>3</sup> The City District Committees, the Area Committees and the MACs all had a share in the effort to achieve those specific goals but at different and clearly delineated levels.

Prior to the creation of Mutual Aid Committees, residents in multi-storey buildings could come together to tackle their mutual problems by means of one of the following organizations:

---

3 "Mutual Aid Committees in Hong Kong," issued by the Home Affairs Department, 15 November 1974.

- a) an Owners' Incorporation under the Multi-Storey Buildings Ordinance,
- b) a Landlord and Tenant Association to be registered under the Societies Ordinance,
- c) a Building Management Association under the Companies Ordinance, and
- d) a Building Co-operative Society under the Co-operative Societies Ordinance.

But the setting up of any one of those four organizations involved formidable difficulties, such as the costs of legal incorporation, the time required to follow the procedures for registration, the problem of absentee landlords, and the need to enlist the support of 50 per cent of the owners and/or tenants. In addition, some of these organizations were established as narrow interest groups rather than community groups.

#### The Mutual Aid Committees

As stated earlier, the Government saw the Mutual Aid Committees as a simple but effective mechanism at the grassroots level to foster the spirit of neighbourly cooperation in the management of multi-storey buildings, enabling owners and tenants to work together to improve security and cleanliness in them. In view of tremendous chaos in building management and health-threatening garbage conditions often found in the private high-rises

in urban areas, the Government in June 1973 started to promote the creation of Mutual Aid Committees first in the private buildings. The response to this Government policy was unexpectedly encouraging. Owners and tenants came together to form Mutual Aid Committees in their blocks. In March 1974, a total of 1,214 such Committees were set up in various private buildings and residential groupings, with a total membership of some 110,380 households.<sup>4</sup>

Pleased with the favourable public support for this newly-tried Mutual Aid Committee scheme and with the establishment of a sustained dialogue with the Government on common affairs within the housing block, the Government decided in 1974 that "Mutual Aid Committees should be regarded as a permanent requirement in helping to ensure a stable society and that the legal requirement for registration, i.e. exemption from registration as societies under the Societies Ordinance provided they were approved by the Director of Home Affairs (or the Secretary for the New Territories, outside the urban area), would be continued."<sup>5</sup>

---

4 Director of Home Affairs, Annual Departmental Report, 1973-74 (English version). Para. 37 on Page 6.

5 Director of Home Affairs, Annual Departmental Report, 1974-75 (English version). Para. 27 on Page 5.

Convinced by the empirical success of the scheme in the urban areas, the Government expanded in 1974 its efforts to the forming of Mutual Aid Committees in public housing estates and in new towns. As a result of all these efforts, the number of Mutual Aid Committees multiplied. In March 1975, there were 1,636 such Committees. In terms of households and population covered, the figures stood at 188,022 and 1.2 million respectively.<sup>6</sup> In March 1976, the number of Mutual Aid Committees rose to 2,061, involving 266,601 households and 1,683,957 people.<sup>7</sup> At the time of writing this report, just in the small township of Tai Wai, Shatin, there are fourteen Mutual Aid Committees formed in private buildings: in Lek Yuen, Shatin, seven Mutual Aid Committees have been set up in the public housing estate.

As a measure to provide assistance to the community organizers and Liaison Officers, employed in City District Offices or in District Offices in New Territories, in coping with problems arising from their work in the forming of Mutual Aid Committees and also to co-ordinate the efforts of City District Offices in this respect, a

---

6 Director of Home Affairs, Annual Departmental Report, 1974-75 (English version). Para. 26 on Page 5.

7 Director of Home Affairs, Annual Departmental Report, 1975-76 (Chinese version). Para. 28 on Page 18.



Steering Committee on Mutual Aid Committees and Building Management was set up in 1973 in the Headquarters of the Department of Home Affairs. The Mutual Aid Committee scheme, as one of the units of the City District Office, benefitting from the collaboration and co-ordination with the Community and Youth Officers, the Recreation and Sports Officers, the Urban Services Officers and the Policy Community Relations Officers, is able to achieve wider goals of community building and involvement beyond the original three-fold purpose.

Community organizers working with the MACs are part-time, paid staff under the supervision of a Liaison Officer in the City District Office Scheme or in the District Office in the New Territories. They are recruited from the post-secondary students, university graduates and teachers in bi-sessional schools. Seminars and training courses are organized to educate these community organizers with the objectives of, and the procedures in setting up, a Mutual Aid Committee, and with the basic skill and knowledge in working with people in pursuit of a common purpose.

The normal process of setting up a MAC is as follows. A community organizer will visit the residents of a multi-storey building, usually where there have been complaints about crime, insanitary environment or

building mismanagement. The community organizer will explain to them the functions of a Mutual Aid Committee and how such a Committee may help to bring about desired answers to their complaints. If more than 20 per cent of the residents agree to form a Mutual Aid Committee, a meeting of the residents is called, in which the residents themselves elect a chairman, a secretary and a treasurer. Application for approval of the Committee is made on a standard form of model rules prepared by the Department of Home Affairs. Depending on how the MAC develops and its later interests, there may also be office-bearers for welfare or recreational services, educational or cultural services, and the like.

After the formation of a MAC in a multi-storey building in a public or private housing estate, the committee organizer continues to assist the Committee. He visits the Committee at monthly intervals and gives advice and assistance in attaining the objectives for which the Mutual Aid Committee is established. He may organize seminars and training courses on building management, fire prevention, security and cleanliness for the office-bearers and members of the Committee.

#### Reactions to the Mutual Aid Committees

Despite the fanfare in establishing the scheme, public reaction to the MACs was mixed. Not knowing

clearly the functions of the MACs, people were afraid that such organizations would duplicate or even replace the work of the Kaifong Associations, the owners' and tenants' associations. Other residents feared that the MACs were instruments of control by the Government.<sup>8</sup> In the New Territories, members of the Rural Committees were especially suspicious of the purposes of the MACs.<sup>9</sup>

As the MACs have developed with time, public opinion about the scheme has tended to be more favourable. Residents of multi-storey buildings, according to various press reports, have claimed for the Committees considerable success in attaining the initial objectives: development of a community spirit, increased security, cleanliness within and outside buildings and better building management. It would appear that people in some building estates consider MACs to be vital organizations for fostering the common well-being of residents.

A cursory review of the activities performed by the MACs shows that their activities have not been confined to narrow, cosmetic objectives. The MACs have played a part

---

8 "Grassroots -- Mutual Aid Committees," 3rd issue, Hong Kong Council of Social Service, 1976.

9 Interview with Mr. K.T. Leung, Liaison Officer, District Office, Shatin, N.T.; interview reports on "Mutual Aid Committees in Lek Yuen Estate, Shatin, N.T." by students of the Sociology Department, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

in resolving long-standing disputes around water and electricity charges, maintenance fees for lifts, garbage collection, and so on.<sup>10</sup> Where owners' associations and MACs co-exist, the MACs have served as a bridge in furthering mutual understanding and cooperation between landlords and tenants. In public housing, MACs have offered a mechanism for two-way communication between Housing Department staff and the estate dwellers. In general, the MAC are seen to provide an educational function in social awareness and the opportunity for civic involvement.

But citizen reaction to the MACs has by no means been uniformly positive. The Un Chau Estate Mutual Aid Committee was disbanded in March 1976 by the City District Officer and was ordered to return its office to the Housing Department. Some of the Mutual Aid Committees in Tze Wan Shan were reported in the press in May, 1976, to be "totally defunct". The Committees' office-bearers had held no meetings since their establishment six months previously. Residents lost interest in these Committees and their response to these Committees' projects was minimal.

---

10 "Mutual Aid Committees in Hong Kong," Home Affairs Department, 15 November 1974.

In May 1977, representatives of five Shek Kip Mei Lower Estate Mutual Aid Committees told a press conference that they decided to dissolve these Committees, because they felt that the City District Officers were not at all helpful to them in dealing with issues -- for instance, the rent increase -- which were of grave concern to the residents in the Estate. As an alternative, they said they would form independent associations to be known as the Shek Kip Mei Residents' Associations.

Viewing the picture as a whole, most MACs appear to be capable of involving the people of multi-storey buildings to achieve at least some of the goals for which the Committees were formed. It may be that frustration, dissatisfaction and disappointment are most likely to occur when residents utilize the MACs to achieve independent rather than government-sponsored objectives. Certainly, the Government's community organizers and the Liaison Officers in the City District Officers or (in the New Territories) the District Offices consider that they have an important role to play in helping members of the MACs and residents to understand the functions of these Committees.

Reference Material

"Towards A More Responsive Society", a speech by the Deputy Secretary for Home Affairs given on August 8, 1973.

"Community Involvement, Guidance Note No. 1", published by the Secretariat for Home Affairs on May 18, 1973.

"Community Involvement, Guidance Note No. 2", published by the Secretariat for Home Affairs in May 1973.

"Community Involvement, Guidance Note No. 3", published by the Secretariat for Home Affairs in May 1973.

"Mutual Aid Committees in Hong Kong", published by Home Affairs Department on November 15, 1974.

"Grassroots -- Mutual Aid Committees", 3rd issue, 1976, Hong Kong Council of Social Service.

Materials gathered in the Seminar on Mutual Aid Committee organized by the Hong Kong Council on October 16, 1976.

Annual Reports of the Home Affairs Department, 1973-74, 1974-75 and 1975-76.

Hong Kong Year Books, 1973-74, 1974-75 and 1975-76.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF THE MUTUAL AID COMMITTEES IN SHATIN

In examining whether popular participation is a reality, the balance theory, discussed in Chapter One, suggests two criteria which should apply to neighborhood associations: first, the association's effectiveness; and secondly, the association's autonomy. A third dimension might be added, that is, the satisfaction among association members. Accordingly, this empirical study of Mutual Aid Committees in Shatin raised the following research questions:

1. What is the degree of organizational effectiveness of MACs in Shatin?
2. What is the degree of organizational autonomy of MACs in Shatin?
3. What is the level of satisfaction among members of Shatin MACs?

Three questions were added to find out how these three variables (organizational effectiveness, organizational autonomy, and satisfaction) are related to each other and to the personal characteristics of the respondents who are all MAC chairmen or members in Shatin.

4. Are there any significant relationships between the type of housing (i.e. public and private) in

which the MAC members are living and their perception of organizational effectiveness, organizational autonomy and satisfaction?

5. Are MAC members' sex, age, and occupation associated with their feeling of organizational effectiveness, organizational autonomy, and satisfaction?
6. What are the relationships between organizational effectiveness, organizational autonomy and satisfaction?

It is hoped that the empirical data gathered will help answer these questions and thus throw some light on the ways of promoting popular participation. The formulation of research questions for further studies is also a focus of this study.

#### Definition of Major Terms

This study utilizes a few terms which are widely used but defined somewhat differently by social science researchers. In order to provide some clarity in understanding the content of this study, these terms are defined as follows:

Mutual Aid Committees: The term "Mutual Aid Committees" is used to refer to those grassroots neighborhood organizations in private buildings, residential groupings, and public housing estates in Shatin. They



are formed in accordance with the legal requirement for registration, i.e. exemption from registration as societies under the Societies Ordinance as approved by the Director of Home Affairs or the Secretary for the New Territories.

Organizational Effectiveness: Organizational effectiveness is defined here in terms of quality, volume and efficiency of goal attainment, as well as in terms of adaptability.<sup>1</sup> Quality of goal attainment refers to how well the goals are attained; volume of goal attainment addresses the question of how many of the goals are achieved; efficiency of goal attainment indicates how fast the goals are accomplished; and finally, adaptability refers to the ability to adapt to changing conditions and external contingencies.

Organizational Autonomy: Organizational autonomy refers to the degree of control over policies (low external bureaucratization), and the degree of control over resources and budget. Specific indicators may be used to gauge the relative independence of decision-making within various functional sectors, e.g. independence in critical decision-making to expand, diversify, merge, allocate resources, or

---

1 Wolf V. Hydebrand (ed.), Comparative Organizations: The Results of Empirical Research (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1973), p. 16.

generally commit the organization to certain long-term objectives or courses of action.<sup>2</sup>

Satisfaction: Satisfaction is defined here as the gratification one obtains from the various roles one plays in an organization. It includes the following four aspects:<sup>3</sup> a) Satisfaction with doing the actual content of the work; b) Satisfaction with being in the work group; c) Satisfaction with working in the organization; d) Satisfaction with job status. Specific indicators are the level of satisfaction and the respondents' perceived recognition of the status accorded them.

The Research Design: The purpose of this study was to gain familiarity with, and an understanding of, the MACs in Shatin in terms of their organizational effectiveness, organizational autonomy, and satisfaction among MAC members. A review of literature indicated that there was little knowledge available on this topic.

It would be unrealistic at this stage to set precise hypotheses. Therefore, an exploratory type of study to refine concepts and articulate hypotheses for

---

2 Ibid., p. 16.

3 Delbert C. Miller, Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement, 2nd ed., New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1971, p. 261.

further research seemed more appropriate. In this study, the MACs' degree of organizational effectiveness, organizational autonomy, and satisfaction among MAC members is first examined, followed by an analysis of the three variables' association with other items, i.e., the personal characteristics of responding MAC members; and the three variables' relationship among themselves.

The Sample: In this study, eight MACs were randomly selected from 21 MACs in Shatin. Assuming that each MAC consists of an average of seven to ten members, a total number of 56 to 80 MAC members were to be interviewed. If the selected MAC members or the MAC as a whole refused to be interviewed, other MACs or members would be chosen as substitutes. Again, random sampling would be used in their selection.

The field visit and interviews were carried out by six senior social work students in October and November of 1977. These students were briefed about the nature of the research project as well as the content of the questionnaire and were trained in interviewing skills. The procedures of conducting an interview were as follows: the student interviewer first called the MAC's chairman, whose name and address were obtained from the District Office of Shatin. If the chairman agreed to be interviewed, the student worker would make an appointment with him. After the interview, the student worker would proceed to ask

the chairman the names and addresses of the MAC's members. He would contact and interview them in the same manner. Since the first telephone call was so important in that it determined the success of subsequent interviews, the students were reminded to be as sensitive and tactful as possible over the phone. If the MACs' chairman refused to be interviewed, the intention was to drop that particular MAC and substitute another. The idea that the District Office's assistance should be sought in arranging interviews with the MACs' members to ensure a higher rate of response was discussed, but later on rejected on the grounds that by doing so the MAC members' response to the questions of this study might be influenced or biased. The research team finally decided to rely on their own efforts to arrange the interviews.

As a result of the field visits and interviews, all MACs (20) that were contacted responded positively, and 62 MAC members were interviewed, while 12 individual members contacted by phone refused an interview. The relatively low rejection rate (12 out of 74 or 16.22 per cent) for a field study might be attributed to the quality of the interviewers, each of whom had previous interviewing experience and were specially trained for this study.

It should be noted that the number of MACs had been increased to 20 from the expected number of eight for the

purpose of meeting the required sample size of 56-80. This was because (a) some of the MACs were rather small in size at the time of the study, e.g., some consisted three to five committee members; (b) some of the MAC members refused to participate in this study although the MACs' chairmen did; and this reduced the number of respondents.

The Instrument: Data for this exploratory study were obtained through the use of an interview schedule consisting of both "open-end" and "close-end" questions. This research instrument, for conceptual and analytical purposes, was divided into four parts.<sup>4</sup>

The first part was fourteen questions to measure organizational effectiveness in terms of the quality, volume and efficiency of goal attainment, as well as in terms of adaptability. The second part was another nine questions relating to organizational autonomy. A number of indicators were used; for example, independence in critical decision-making to expand, diversify, merge, allocate resources, or generally commit the organization to certain long term objectives or courses of action. The third part consisted of eight questions on satisfaction among MAC members regarding the actual content of their

---

<sup>4</sup> Refer to Appendix C.

work, their satisfaction with being in the work group, their satisfaction with their work in the organization and with their job status. Specific indicators were level of satisfaction and degree of recognition. Some of these questions were constructed solely for this study; and some were borrowed from scales of organizational effectiveness, organizational autonomy and satisfaction developed by other social scientists.<sup>5</sup> The borrowed scales were not totally adopted in this study because some questions were not suited to the nature of the study and some were not relevant to the social and cultural context of Hong Kong. The last part of the research instrument was four questions on the respondents' personal characteristics, i.e. their sex, age, occupation, and the type of housing they were living in.

The interview schedule was constructed in Cantonese to facilitate the interviewing process.

Pretest: A pretest was carried out with nine members of MACs in areas outside Shatin before the research questionnaire was finalized, to ensure that the questions were clear to the respondents and relevant.

---

5 For instance, the Morse index is of Employee Satisfaction (Delbert C. Miller, op. cit., p. 261); the Job Satisfaction Index is by Smith et al. (Wolf V. Heydebrand, op. cit., p. 105).

A few questions were added, and the wording refined in others; but no major revisions were necessary. Since the pretest group was rather small, it was not possible to conduct any kind of content or construct analysis of the items.

Data Analysis: All the data were coded and transferred into IBM computer cards for processing and analysis. The Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) was used to set computer programmes for data analysis. The processing and analysis of data were done in the Universities and Polytechnic Computer Centre at the Chinese University with the assistance of the Social Research Centre staff.

There were four stages involved in data analysis. The first stage was to obtain frequency distributions of all items in the questionnaire to get a rough idea about the degree of organizational effectiveness, organizational autonomy, and satisfaction among the MAC members. The second stage was to construct three scales, based on the questions in the interview schedule, to measure the three principal variables. Item analysis was used in the scale construction and the results are reported in the following section. The third stage was to analyse the associations between the three variables (in the form of scales as constructed in the second stage) and the respondents' personal characteristics. Chi-square was adopted as the

statistical test and the 0.05 level of statistical significance was used. The final stage was to examine the relationship between the three variables (also in the form of scales). Pearson correlation was used here and the significance level was again 0.05.

Although the interviews were conducted in the field by the research team, some questions were not applicable to some newly formed EACs and therefore there were some missing data in the tables. However, the number of missing data can be identified by subtracting the case number in the table from 62 which was the total number of the sample.

Item Analysis: In the construction of the three scales, namely Organizational Autonomy, Organizational Effectiveness and Satisfaction, arbitrary scales<sup>6</sup> composing of relevant items in the questionnaire were computed and then item analyzed.<sup>7</sup> In so doing, the discriminative

- 
- 6 Preliminary items composing the respective scales are:
- a) Autonomy Scale: Q.1a, Q.2a, Q.3a, Q.4 and Q.5a;
  - b) Effectiveness Scale: Q.12, Q.13, Q.14, Q.15, Q.19, Q.24b, Q.25, Q.27, Q.28 & Q.33;
  - c) Satisfaction Scale: Q.23a, Q.26a, Q.29, Q.31 and Q.32.

Some items were not used in these arbitrary scales because they employed nominal measurements. They could be classified into different categories but could not be quantified.

- 7 For details of the method of item analysis, see William J. Goode and Paul K. Hatt, Methods in Social Research, (New York: McGraw-Hall Book Company, Inc., 1952), pp. 275-276.



power (DP), that is, the ability to separate the 'high' score group from the 'low' score group on the total scale score continuum of items in the appropriate scale, were compared: those with low DP (less than 0.50) were discarded, while the remaining ones formed the final scale.

Tables 1, 2 and 3 were the results of the item analyses of the three scales. It was found that for the Autonomy Scale, the DP of item 5a is zero, indicating that this item is not a good discriminating item, and so was discarded. On the other hand, although item 3a has a relatively low DP (0.44) and should theoretically be dropped, in view of the already limited number of items in the Autonomy Scale this item was kept for computing the final scale. As for the Effectiveness and Satisfaction Scale, the DP of all items in the two scales were equal to or above the minimal value (0.50); hence, they were included in the final scale construction.

Table 1: Item Analysis of the Organizational Autonomy Scale (N=53)

Item no. Item mean	1a	2a	3a	4	5a
High (n=9)	4.556	6.111	1.444	1.889	1.000
Low (n=19)	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
DP=Mean(H)~ Mean(L)	3.556	5.111	0.444	0.889	0.000

Table 2: Item Analysis of the Organizational Effectiveness Scale (N=48)

Item no. Item mean	12	13	14	15	19	24b	25	27	28	33
High (n=12)	2.333	3.083	2.500	2.250	3.250	2.917	3.583	2.667	3.083	1.917
Low (n=12)	1.333	1.417	1.500	1.583	2.750	1.500	2.083	1.250	1.417	1.250
DP=Mean(H)~ Mean(L)	1.000	1.666	1.000	0.667	0.500	1.417	1.500	1.417	1.666	0.667

Table 3: Item Analysis of the Satisfaction Scale (N=57)

Item no. Item mean	23a	26a	29	31	32
High (n=15)	3.267	3.200	3.067	3.000	3.400
Low (n=11)	1.364	1.545	1.455	1.455	2.000
DP=Mean(H) - Mean(L)	1.903	1.655	1.612	1.545	1.400

## Findings

### Personal Characteristics

Four personal characteristics - sex, age, occupation and type of housing - are summarized in Table 4.

Sex: Among the 62 respondents, 87.1 percent were male and 12.9 percent female.

Age: The respondents' age range was quite large but the majority (91.8 percent) fell between 21 to 60 years. 17.7 percent of the respondents were between 21-30 years; 40.3 percent between 31-40 years; 21.0 percent between 41-50 years; 12.9 percent between 51-60 years; and only 1.6 percent and 6.5 percent belonged to the age groups below 21 and over 60 respectively.

Occupation: The occupation of respondents were arbitrarily classified into eight categories: blue collar worker, white collar worker, professional, teacher or school principal, businessman, student, housewife, and others. Blue collar worker accounted for 19.4 percent of the respondents; white collar 22.6 percent; professional 16.1 percent; teacher or school principal 4.8 percent, businessman 11.3 percent; student 3.2 percent; housewife 9.7 percent; and others 12.9 percent.

Of the respondents, 74.2 percent were employed at the time of the survey. The rest were composed of housewives, students and retired or unemployed persons.

Table 4: Characteristics of Respondents

Personal Characteristics	N	%
Sex (Total)	62	100
Male	54	87.1
Female	8	12.9
Age (Total)	62	100
20 and below	1	1.6
21 - 30	11	17.7
31 - 40	25	40.3
41 - 50	13	21.0
51 - 60	8	12.9
61 and above	4	6.5
Occupation (Total)	62	100
Blue collar worker (e.g. skilled and semi-skilled workers, driver, etc.)	12	19.4
White collar worker (e.g. clerical worker)	14	22.6
Professional (e.g. manager)	10	16.1
Teacher/School principal	3	4.8
Businessman	7	11.3
Student	2	3.2
Housewife	6	9.7
Others (retired, unemployed)	8	12.9
Type of Housing (Total)	62	100
Public	25	40.3
Private	37	59.7

Type of Housing: There were two types of housing in which the respondents were living during the time of this study, i.e. public and private. The public housing were rented while the private housing were either rented or owned by the respondents.

Of the respondents, 40.3 percent lived in public housing and 59.7 percent in private housing.

Perception of MACs' effectiveness

The respondents' perception of the MACs' effectiveness was examined in three areas. First, they were asked if they thought that their MAC could achieve their general objectives. Secondly, they were asked if they were able to participate satisfactorily in the MAC in terms of attendance in MAC meetings, interaction with other members, and feelings of accomplishment. Thirdly, they were asked to what extent they could manage their internal and external conflicts. Questions were asked in the forms of both "open-end" and "close-end". The close-end questions are presented in Table 5.

The respondents' responses to the first area which was the assessment of MACs' goal attainment are shown in Table 5. (Q.12, Q.13, Q.14, Q.15). The answers were generally found to be positive. In response to the question "Is your MAC able to promote mutual understanding among the residents?", 24.6 percent of the respondents

Table 5: Organizational Effectiveness

Item	Strongly Agree		Agree		Don't Know		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
12. Is your MAC able to promote mutual understanding among the residents?	15	24.6	35	57.4	7	11.5	4	6.6	0	0	62	100
13. Is your MAC able to promote the spirit of mutual aid among the residents?	14	23.0	34	55.7	5	8.2	8	13.1	0	0	62	100
14. Is your MAC able to work cooperatively with the police to fight violent crime?	10	16.4	36	59.0	12	19.7	3	4.9	0	0	62	100
15. Is your MAC able to work cooperatively with the Housing Office to keep your estate clean?	11	21.2	31	59.6	6	11.5	4	7.7	0	0	52	100
19. Do you feel that your MAC is doing a better job than other MACs in Shatin?	(Strongly) 3	4.8	(Moderately) 13	21.0	(D.K.) 34	54.8	(A little) 9	14.5	(Not at all) 3	4.8	62	100
24. Does it give you a chance to do the things you feel you do the best in your MAC?	(Strong Yes) 12	20.0	(Yes) 18	30.0	(D.K.) 18	30.0	(No) 8	13.3	(Strong no) 4	6.7	60	100
25. Do you get any feeling of accomplishment from the work you are doing?	(Strong sense of task accomplishment) 5	8.2	(Sense of task accomplishment) 22	36.1	(D.K.) 6	9.8	(Little sense of task accomplishment) 25	41.0	(No sense of task accomplishment) 3	4.9	61	100
27. Do you feel your MAC members are cooperative with each other?	(Strongly) 24	38.7	(Moderately) 28	45.2	(D.K.) 4	6.5	(A little) 5	8.1	(Not at all) 1	1.6	62	100
28. How often do you have personal contact with MAC members other than at the meetings?	(Most of all, (A good part of the time) of the time) 20	45.2	(A good part of the time) 23	37.1	(D.K.) 2	3.2	(A little of the time) 5	8.1	(Rarely or none of the time) 4	6.5	62	100
33. Do you always attend the MAC meetings?	44	77.2	7	12.3	0	0	5	8.8	1	1.8	57	100

strongly agreed; 57.4 percent agreed, and only 6.6 percent disagreed. To the question "Is your MAC able to promote the spirit of mutual aid among residents?", 23 percent strongly agreed, 55.7 percent agreed and 13.1 percent disagreed. To the question "Is your MAC able to work cooperatively with the police to fight violent crime?", 16.4 percent strongly agreed, 50 percent agreed, and 4.9 percent disagreed. To the question "Is your MAC able to work cooperatively with the Housing Office to keep your estate clean?", 21.2 percent strongly agreed, 59.6 percent agreed, and 7.7 percent disagreed. It seemed, at least from the respondents' viewpoint, the MACs being studied were able to achieve their objectives.

There was some apparent inconsistency in the respondents' answers to two questions. When the respondents were asked which one among the functions of the MAC they thought was most important (Q.9)\*, 32.8 percent said "fight violent crime"; 31 percent said "clean the estates"; 8.6 percent said "promote neighborliness"; 8.6 percent said "housing maintenance" and only 1.7 percent said "sponsor recreational activities". However, when they were asked what kind of activities their MAC had organized since it was set up (Q.10)\*, 59.5 percent of the respondents

---

\* Please refer to Appendix A.



said their MAC had organized recreational activities, 32.4 percent said they had worked on house management (e.g., water and electricity repair, collecting management fees, securing the gate, etc.), and 24.3 percent said they had done projects concerning cleaning. What they "thought" to be the important functions of their MAC was "fight violent crime", "clean the estates" and "promote neighborliness"; but what they actually "did" was mostly recreational activities. What are the factors contributing to this discrepancy between these two answers? Is it because the MACs are too "young" (78.6 percent of the respondents said their MACs were formed less than 2 years, see Q.20)\* to be able to "fight violent crime", and "clean the estates", and therefore the members concentrated on recreational activities in the hope of "promoting neighborliness" first? Or is it simply an inconsistency between "think" and "do" characteristic of human behavior? If the latter is true, the favourable responses to goal attainment questions (Q.12, 13, 14, 15) are open to doubt since the inconsistency affects their reliability.

The second area to be examined was the participation of MAC members in terms of their feelings of accomplishment, interaction with other members, and attendance at MAC meetings. Some of the findings are presented in Table 5

---

\* Please refer to Appendix A.

(Q.19, 24, 25, 27, 28, 33). 50 percent of the respondents said that they were given a chance to do the things they feel they do best in their MAC, 20 percent said they were not, and 30 percent said they did not know (Q.24). To the question "Do you feel your MAC members are cooperative with each other?" (Q.19), 38.7 percent said they felt strongly that there was cooperation, 45.2 percent moderately, and 9.7 percent just a little or not at all. When they were asked how often they had personal contact with MAC members other than in the meetings (Q.28), 45.2 percent said most or all of the time, 37.1 percent said a good part of the time, 8.1 percent said a little of the time, and 6.5 percent said rarely or none of the time. To another question "Do you always attend the MAC meeting?" (Q.33), 77.2 percent said most or all of the time, 12.3 percent said a good part of the time, 8.8 percent said a little of the time, and 1.8 percent said rarely or none of the time.

The answers given to the above questions by the respondents were all positive, but when they were asked if they get any feeling of accomplishment from the work they were doing (Q.25), the answer was not too favourable. 44.3 percent indicated that they had strong sense or moderately strong sense of task accomplishment; while 45.9 percent said they had little or no sense of task accomplishment. The relatively less positive reaction to

the question could be interpreted in at least three ways. First, the MACs organized very few activities. Secondly, the MACs did organize various programmes for local residents, but most of these were recreational and not much related to what members perceived as important objectives. Although the recreational activities were successful, their feeling of task accomplishment was not strong. Thirdly, the MACs did organize various projects but they were not very successful. Any one of these interpretations could be correct, and it would be unwise to jump to a conclusion at this stage. Perhaps a more detailed analysis of the MACs' activities could provide further information and contribute to a better understanding of the effectiveness of MACs.

To another question, "Do you feel that your MAC is doing a better job than other MACs in Shatin?" (Q.19), 25.8 percent of the respondents said they felt strongly or moderately that this was so, 54.8 percent said they did not know and 20.3 percent did not feel that their MAC was doing a better job than other MACs. The fact that more than 50 percent said they did not know can also be explained in three ways. First, the respondents were so humble that they did not want to claim credit for what they had done. Secondly, the respondents felt that it was impolite or difficult to compare their MAC with other MACs in Shatin and therefore said they did not know.

Thirdly, they were actually doing unsatisfactorily compared to others but refused to accept the fact, and by putting "don't know" as their answer they could evade the question.

The last area in assessing the respondents' perception of MAC's effectiveness was ability to manage their internal and external conflicts. Three questions were asked and the findings are presented in Table 6. When the respondents were asked the percentage of conflicts they could solve between MAC members, only 27 responded, while 35 said they did not have conflicts between members (Q.16A). Of the 27 respondents who answered this question, 22 of them (more than 80 percent) said they could solve most of the conflicts, only 1 (3.7 percent) said they could not solve their conflicts. The conflicts, according to the respondents, were mostly disputes over the use of money of the MACs, personal disagreements between MAC members, disputes over division of labour within the MACs (Q.16B).<sup>\*</sup> The respondents also pointed out that these conflicts arose as a result of their different educational backgrounds and economic status, e.g. differing nature of jobs which had a strong impact in their attitude and behaviour (Q.16C).<sup>\*</sup>

---

\* Refer to Appendix A.

Table 6: Organizational Effectiveness

	100%		76-99%		51-75%		DK		26-50%		1-25%		0%		Not Applicable (no conflict)	Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%			
16A. When your MAC members had conflicts with each other, on about what % of occasions could they solve the conflicts?	11	40.7	11	40.7	0	0	2	7.4	1	3.7	1	3.7	1	3.7	35	27	100
17. In the past, when your MAC was in conflict with outside organization, e.g. rural committee, other MAC, on about what % of occasions could your MAC solve these conflicts?	0	0	0	0	1	10.0	7	70.0	0	0	1	10.0	1	10.0	52	10	100
18. In the past, when your MAC was in conflict with government departments, e.g. District Office, Housing Department, etc., on about what % of occasions could your MAC solve the conflicts?	0	0	1	11.1	1	11.1	5	55.6	0	0	1	11.1	1	11.1	53	9	100

The other two questions were: "In the past, when your MAC was in conflict or disagreements with outside organizations, e.g. rural committee, other MACs, etc., on about what percentage of occasions could your MAC solve these conflicts?" (Q.17) and "In the past, when your MAC was in conflict or disagreements with Government Departments, e.g. District Offices, Housing Department etc., on about what percentage of occasions could your MAC solve the conflicts?" (Q.18). In answering the first question, 52 respondents said they did not have conflicts or they did not have contact with outside organizations, 7 (70.0 percent) said they did not know, 2 (20.0 percent) said that they could solve their conflicts to some extent and 1 (10 percent) said that could not. For the second question, 53 respondents said they did not have conflicts with Government Departments, 5 (55.6 percent) said they did not know, 3 (33.3 percent) said they could solve some of their conflicts and 1 (11.1 percent) said they could not. It sounds strange that 53 respondents stated that they did not have conflicts or even disagreements with Government Departments. Interpretations of this finding could range from harmony because of tight government control to harmony because of social distance or harmony because everything in the garden is rosy.

Judging from the respondents' favourable responses to the questions on the areas of MACs' goal attainment, participation in the MACs, and the MACs' ability in managing conflicts, the MACs under study were generally found to be effective. But some questions need further research. For example, what are the factors contributing to the apparently inconsistent answers around perceptions of MAC effectiveness. If the inconsistency is a characteristic of human behaviour, then what the respondents have claimed (goal attainment of their MAC) needs to be validated by further evidence. Another interesting finding was the number of respondents (45.9 percent) who said that they had little or no sense of task accomplishment. Why they gave such an answer deserves further investigation. Finally, why is it that more than 85 percent of the respondents said that they did not have conflicts or even disagreements with Government Departments? What are the reasons underlying such an answer given by the respondents?

In assessing the effectiveness of an organization, the opinions of the participants are of great importance. There are, in addition, two approaches to validate the opinions of the participants. One is an analysis of the activities of the organization on a factual basis; the other is to collect comments from the service recipients of the organization. These were not attempted in this research.

MACs' Autonomy

The MACs' autonomy was analysed in two ways. In the first place, the respondents' reactions to nine questions on the MACs' degree of control over policies, resources and budget were examined. Secondly, a MAC constitution and the "sample constitution" proposed by the Government were studied and compared.

Responses to five of the questions on the MAC's control over policies, resources and budget are presented in Table 7.

Of the respondents, 68.9 percent said that all their MACs' policies and objectives were set by their committee members, 19.7 percent said that more than half were, 4.9 percent said less than half, and 4.9 percent said none of the policies and objectives was set by the committee members (Q.1). When they were asked the percentage of their MACs' projects that need consultation with the District Office (Q.2), 17.9 percent said all; 17.9 percent said more than half; 5.4 percent said less than half, and 51.8 percent said none. When they were asked the percentage of the decisions made by their MACs' members in the MACs' meetings (Q.3), 84.5 percent said all; 10.3 percent said more than half; 1.7 percent said less than half; and 1.7 percent said none. The respondents gave a similar answer to another question "Who determines the



Table 7: Organizational Autonomy

	100%	76-99%	51-75%	D.K.	26-50%	1-25%	0%	Total								
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%								
1. About what % of your MAC's policies and objectives are set by your committee members?	42	68.9	4	6.6	8	13.1	1	1.6	2	3.3	1	1.6	3	4.9	61	100
2. About what % of your MAC's Projects need consultation with the District Office?	10	17.9	9	16.1	1	1.8	4	7.1	1	1.8	2	3.6	29	51.8	56	100
3. About what % of the decisions in your MAC's meetings are made by your MAC's members?	49	84.5	2	3.4	4	6.9	1	1.7	0	0	1	1.7	1	1.7	58	100
4. About what % of your MAC's members are elected by the residents?	59	96.7	0	0	1	1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.6	61	100
5. About what % of your MAC's budget is self-supporting?	61	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	100

content of projects whenever you have such?" (Q.8)\*. Almost 90 percent (N=48) of them said that the content of projects was determined by the committee members, 2.1 percent said it was suggested by the District Office and agreed by committee members, and 2.1 percent said it was determined by the District Office. To the question "About what percentage of your MAC's members are elected by the residents?" (Q.4), 96.7 percent of the respondents said all; 1.6 percent said more than half; and 1.6 percent said none. As to how they selected the resident representatives (Q.7)\*, 62.3 percent said that they were selected by the District Office; 36.1 percent said they were selected by the residents themselves. In response to the budget of the MACs (Q.5), all of the respondents said that they were 100 percent self-supporting.

In response to a related question, "Who do you think proposed to set up your MAC?" (Q.6)\*, 83.3 percent of the respondents said it was proposed by the District Office and agreed to by the residents, 6.7 percent said it was proposed by the residents; and 10 percent said they had their own resident organizations but changed their name to MAC as suggested by the District Office. The other questions were "Are there any Government officials

---

\* Refer to Appendix A.

attending your MAC meetings?" "What Departments of Government do they represent?" "What is their role in the MAC?" (Q.11, A.B.C.)\*. 63 percent of the respondents said they had Government officials attending the MAC meetings, 37 percent said they did not. Most of the respondents (71 percent) said that the Government officials came from the District Office, some (7.9 percent) said that they were from the Police Force and still some others (5.1%) said that they came from the S.W.D. Community Hall. According to the respondents, the Government officials in the MAC meeting acted mainly as advisors, liaison persons or mediators when there were conflicts.

In general, the respondents' answers to the above questions indicated that a relatively high degree of perceived autonomy existed within the MACs. However, it was noted that while 96.7 percent of the respondents said that all of the MAC members were elected by the residents, 62.3 percent of them in answering another question pointed out that the resident representatives (candidates in the election) were selected by the Shatin District Office. The question is: since a large number of the MACs' members were "selected" by the District Office and then "elected" by the residents, can the MAC be called an independent

---

\* Refer to Appendix A.

organization? A related question is: if the MACs' policies and objectives are "proposed" by another organization and "approved" by the MACs' members, can the process be defined as "independent decision-making?"

The MAC's autonomy was also assessed by an analysis of the MACs' constitution. Unfortunately, only a copy of one MAC's constitution was obtained. Most of the MACs' chairmen under study did not provide their constitution for the interviewers mainly because they did not have it at home or they did not have extra copies. When the interviewers suggested that they come later to pick up or to xerox the constitution, the MAC chairmen were hesitant to accept the suggestion but explained that their constitutions were similar to those of other MACs. The interviewer did not press further when the MACs' chairmen showed their reluctance. This unwillingness to cooperate further here was in all likelihood simply due to the fact that the MACs' chairmen did not want to take the trouble to get a copy of the constitution for the interviewers.

An examination of the constitution obtained in one of the interviews (Appendix B) showed that its content mostly followed that of the "Sample MAC constitution" proposed by the District Office of Shatin. Two areas in this constitution are worthy of attention in the context of autonomy: the objectives of the MAC and provision for dissolution. The objectives were to promote the mutual

understanding and the spirit of mutual aid among residents; and to improve the security, cleanliness and maintenance of the buildings (the same objectives as those already set forth by the Government.) The MACs would be dissolved if the Director of Home Affairs or the Secretary for New Territories were to withdraw the MAC's exemption from registration as a society under the Societies Ordinance. In other words, the MAC exists at the pleasure of the Government. Since most of the MACs' constitutions, as suggested by their chairmen, were similar to each other, it is doubtful that the MACs under study were really autonomous in the most basic sense.

The MACs under study were found to be financially independent, but legally dependent.

#### Satisfaction among MAC members

The satisfaction among MAC members was measured in terms of their feeling of satisfaction and the degree of recognition given to them. There were altogether six questions. The findings of five questions are shown in Table 8.

When the respondents were asked how they liked the sort of work they were doing in their MAC (Q.23), 15 percent said that they strongly liked it; 33.3 percent said they liked it; 40 percent did not know; and 11.7 percent disliked or strongly disliked the work. To the

Table 8: Satisfaction

	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Total N	%
23. How do you like the sort of work you are doing in your MAC?	9	15.0	20	33.3	24	40.0	6	10.0	1	1.7	60	100
	Strong like		Like		D.K.		Dislike		Strong dislike			
26. How do you feel about your work in your MAC, does it rate as an important job with you?	7	11.7	24	40.0	20	33.3	8	13.3	1	1.7	60	100
	Very important		Important		D.K.		Rather unimportant		Totally unimportant			
29. How do you feel about participating in your MAC?	13	21.3	28	45.9	13	21.3	7	11.5	0	0	61	100
	Very happy		Happy		D.K.		Unhappy		Very unhappy			
31. Do you feel that you are known to more people after joining your MAC?	24	38.7	26	41.9	3	4.8	8	12.9	1	1.6	62	100
	Strongly		Moderately		D.K.		A little		Not at all			
32. Do you feel that you can approach government officials easier after joining your MAC?	3	4.8	29	46.8	19	30.6	8	12.9	3	4.8	62	100
	Strongly		Moderately		D.K.		A little		Not at all			

question "How do you feel about your work in your MAC, does it rate as an important job with you?" (Q.26), 11.7 percent of the respondents rated it very important; 40 percent important; 33.3 percent did not know; and 15 percent felt it had little or no importance. When they were asked how they felt about participating in their MAC (Q.29), 21.3 percent said they were very happy; 45.8 percent happy, 21.3 percent did not know; and 11.6 percent unhappy.

In relation to their feeling of being recognized, they were asked if they felt that they were known to more people after joining their MAC (Q.31); 90.6 percent felt that they were known to more people; 4.8 percent said they did not know; and 1.6 percent did not feel that they were known to more people. Responding to another question (Q.32), 4.8 percent felt strongly that they could approach Government officials easier after joining the MAC; 46.8 felt moderately so, 30.6 percent did not know; and 17.7 did not feel this was so. The respondents were also asked how frequently they were invited to the District Office's social gathering during the past year. Of those who responded to this question, 79 percent (N=43) said they had been invited more than once to the District Office social gatherings during the past year (Q.34)\*.

---

\* Refer to Appendix A.

Overall a large number of the respondents liked their work in the MAC, rated their work in the MAC as important, felt happy about participating in the MAC, and felt they were recognized by the people and the Government. It would be safe to say that they were generally satisfied with what they were doing in the MAC.

Relationship between effectiveness, autonomy, satisfaction and sex, age, occupation, and type of housing

Effectiveness, autonomy, and satisfaction, each in the form of an independent scale, were correlated with four personal characteristics of the respondents -- sex, age, occupation and type of housing. They were found to be significantly associated with the type of housing of the respondents, but not related to sex, age, or occupation.

Table 9 shows that more respondents in private housing perceived a high degree of effectiveness and satisfaction (Table 11) than respondents in public housing.

On the other hand, more respondents of public housing perceived a high level of autonomy (Table 10) than respondents of private housing.

The finding that more respondents of private housing perceived a high degree of effectiveness and satisfaction might have various explanations. One guess is that the respondents feel they are living in their "own" places -- either owned or rented. They tend to have a stronger



identification with their building than those who are living in public housing. This sense of identification could have an impact on their comparatively effective performance and satisfaction in their MAC work. The other finding that more respondents of public housing perceived a high degree of autonomy, is more difficult to understand. One might have supposed that residents in public housing would perceive themselves to possess a low degree of autonomy because their housing estates were rented from, and managed by, the Housing Department; and that the Government's influence over their MACs' policies would be greater. This was not found to be so.

Relationship between effectiveness, autonomy, and satisfaction

The Pearson correlation coefficients shown in Table 12 indicates that only effectiveness was positively related to satisfaction. There was no significant relationship between effectiveness and autonomy; and autonomy was not associated with satisfaction. One might have conjectured that these three variables would be linked to each other; but in this study autonomy did not appear to be a significant factor affecting effectiveness and satisfaction.

Table 9: Effectiveness by Housing Type

	Public Housing	Private Housing	
<u>Effectiveness</u>			
low	16 (72.7%)	6 (27.3%)	22 (45.8%)
high	9 (34.6%)	17 (65.4%)	26 (54.2%)
	25 (52.1%)	23 (47.9%)	48 (100%)

$$\chi^2 = 5.49$$

$$df = 1$$

$$p = 0.0191$$

Table 10: Autonomy by Housing Type

	Public Housing	Private Housing	
<u>Autonomy</u>			
low	7 (25.9%)	20 (74.1%)	27 (50.9%)
high	17 (65.4%)	9 (34.6%)	26 (49.1%)
	24 (45.3%)	29 (54.7%)	53 (100%)

$$\chi^2 = 6.8$$

$$df = 1$$

$$p = 0.0091$$

Table 11: Satisfaction by Housing Type

	Public Housing	Private Housing	
<u>Satisfaction</u>			
low	16 (57.1%)	12 (42.9%)	28 (49.1%)
high	7 (24.1%)	22 (75.9%)	29 (50.9%)
	23 (40.4%)	34 (59.6%)	57 (100%)

$$\chi^2 = 5.14$$

$$df = 1$$

$$p = 0.0233$$

Table 12: Pearson Correlation Coefficients

Effectiveness with Autonomy	-0.0632 N (43) Sig. 0.344
Effectiveness with Satisfaction	0.7309 N (45) Sig. 0.001
Autonomy with Satisfaction	-0.1270 N (49) Sig. 0.192

## CHAPTER FIVE

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### Summary

We have identified some major neighborhood associations in Shatin and briefly discussed their structure, service and interorganizational relations. Among these neighborhood associations, the Mutual Aid Committees were chosen for analysis to permit a more in-depth understanding of the relationship of primary groups to secondary, bureaucratic institutions. In this report, the Mutual Aid Committee's historical development, objectives and activities were explored, followed by some evaluation of public reaction to the MACs. The empirical study of Mutual Aid Committees in Shatin disclosed that the committees' members generally responded positively to the questions related to their MACs' effectiveness, autonomy, and satisfaction. However, some questions arose from the analysis which deserve further exploration.

On perceptions of MAC effectiveness, one might ask what are the factors contributing to the inconsistent answers on what members think is important and what they do. The inconsistency suggests that the goal attainment of the MACs should be assessed more objectively. Also, why quite a number of respondents (45.9 percent) said

they had little or no sense of task accomplishment deserves further investigation. Finally, it sounds strange that 53 respondents said that they did not have conflicts or even disagreements with Government Departments. Can this be a reality for two organizations that have so frequent and constant contact? What are the reasons underlying such an answer given by the respondents? Two approaches are suggested to validate the respondents' opinions. One is an analysis of the activities of the organization on a factual basis; the other is to collect comment from the service recipients of the organization.

On the MACs' autonomy, it was noted that while 96.7 percent of the respondents said that all of the MAC members were elected by the residents, 62.3 percent of them in answering another question pointed out that the resident representatives (candidates in the election) were selected by the Shatin District Office. The question is: since a large number of the MACs' members were "selected" by the District Office and then "elected" by the residents, can the MACs be called independent organizations? A related question is: if the MACs' policies and objectives are "proposed" by another organization and "approved" by the MAC members, can the process be defined as "independent decision-making"? An examination of one MAC constitution demonstrated that the contents of the constitution were mostly the same as the "sample constitution" proposed by

the District Office of Shatin and that the existence of the MAC was legally sanctioned by the Government. If all the MACs' constitutions, as pointed out by the chairmen, were similar to each other, it is doubtful that the MACs under study were really autonomous. Their very existence is at the pleasure of the Government, and their operating procedures are those proposed by the authorities.

The respondents were found to be generally satisfied with what they were doing in the MAC. A large number of them liked their work in the MAC, rated their work in the MAC as important, felt happy about participating in the MAC, and felt that they were recognized by the people and the Government as well.

#### Discussion

Citizen participation is not a new concept to the people of Hong Kong. Its meaning, however, is somewhat ambiguous due to Hong Kong's unique political situation. In this regard, Professor Endacott had the following observations:<sup>1</sup>

An examination of the working of the Hong Kong constitution shows interested opinion is consulted continuously prior to any important government decision, .... and that on occasion .... the general public at large is invited to express its views. Indeed, consultation as

---

1 Quoted in Ambrose Yeo-chi King, The Administration Absorption of Politics in Hong Kong, With Emphasis on the City District Officer Scheme, Social Research Centre, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1973, p. 5.

practised by the Government is so extensive that the term "government by discussion" aptly describes one of its leading characteristics.

If "government by discussion" is a leading characteristic of the politics of Hong Kong, perhaps "participation through discussion" can be seen as another distinct feature. In Hong Kong, citizens are frequently invited to give comments and recommendations on certain government policies and there are platforms for public debate on social issues. But participation in discussion is obviously different from participation in policy-making and the latter lies completely in the hands of the Government. This form of participation is different from those practised in the western democratic countries and can only be understood in the local political context.<sup>2</sup>

Citizen participation, viewed in this way, has been elicited by the Government of Hong Kong. A number of machineries for participation established by the Government can be identified: the Executive Council, Legislative Council, Urban Council, Advisory Committees, City District Office, and New Territories Administration. The Executive Council advises the Governor on all matters of importance; apart from certain executive functions, it examines all government legislation before it is introduced into the

---

2 Ambrose King has pointed out that Hong Kong is not a democracy. It is a city-state governed by the British. See Ambrose Yeo-chi King, op. cit, p. 4.

Legislative Council. The Legislative Council enacts legislation and controls the expenditure of public funds. The Urban Council deals with environmental hygiene, public health, city cleaning, hawkers, markets, and recreational and cultural activities. The Advisory Committees advise Government on all aspects of public administration, and, finally, the City District Office and New Territories Administration are government departments established to assess the impact of contemplated new policies, explain adopted policies to the public, and report on trends of public opinion in the districts.<sup>3</sup>

Other than these Government bodies, the Government also stimulates citizen groups to participate in community affairs and contribute to the betterment of the community. The Kaifong Welfare Association was the earliest type of neighborhood organizations encouraged by the Government to provide welfare and relief for residents of a particular neighborhood and serve as a bridge between the Government and ordinary citizens.<sup>4</sup> Another form of voluntary

---

3 Development And Participation: Operational Implications For Social Welfare, The Hong Kong Report to the 17th International Conference on Social Welfare, Published by the Hong Kong Council of Social Service, 1974, pp. 12-14.

4 J.C. McDonall, the then Secretary for Chinese Affairs, described in an article the efforts of the Hong Kong Government in the initiation of the Kaifong Welfare Association in 1949. For details of the article, see Arthur H. Niehoff (ed.), A Casebook of Social Change (New York: Atherton, 1972), pp. 248-254.



association initiated and pushed by the Government was the Mutual Aid Committee which aimed at the promotion of the Clean Hong Kong Campaign, the Fight Violent Campaign, and better management within the multi-storey building where the particular Mutual Aid Committee is located. An examination of the activities of the Kaifong Welfare Associations and Mutual Aid Committees indicated that their work are, to a great extent, influenced by the Government. In their Kaifong study, Chia-Chien Hu and Aline K. Wong pointed out that the Kaifongs concentrated on rather passive endeavours and relief work in the beginning.<sup>5</sup> In the early 60's, they shifted their attention to community development, with emphasis on special youth activities, public recreation and popular educational classes. Later, they became more active in playing the role as an intermediary between Government and people. These changing functions of the Kaifong Welfare Associations, according to Hu and Wong, "must be taken as having been influenced by the changes in Government policies."<sup>6</sup>

---

5 Chia-chien Hu and Aline K. Wong, "A Preliminary Report on the Kaifong Study" In United College Journal, Vol. 7, (1968-69), pp. 27-48.

6 Ibid., p. 41.

The Mutual Aid Committees are legally sanctioned by the Government. The MACs must fulfil the legal requirement for registration, i.e., exemption from registration as societies under the Societies Ordinance provided they were approved by the Director of Home Affairs or the Secretary for the New Territories Administration when outside the Urban area. They will be automatically dissolved if the exemption from registration as societies is withdrawn by the Government. In addition, most of the MACs have adopted the Government-sponsored objectives. In some instances, frustration, dissatisfaction and disappointment occurred when citizens utilized the MACs to achieve independent goals rather than the objectives set forth by the Government.

Alongside the government-sponsored participation, grassroot involvement in protesting government policies seems to have increased in recent years. The Blind Workers' Strike, the relocation of the Yaumatei Typhoon Shelter Boat Squatters, the Anti-dust and Blasting Campaign in Tai Wan Shan, the Bathroom Doors protest in Tung Tau Estate, the Toilet Sanitation protest in Tai Hang Tung, and the recent demonstrations against public housing rent policy are just a few instances of community action. Residents in these cases used various strategies such as strikes, refusal to move, marches, mass meetings, sit-ins, sleep-ins, campaigns, petitions, press conferences,

etc., to express their grievances and bring them to the attention of the Government and the general public.

Neither the government-sponsored involvement nor grassroots protest seem to be ideal strategies for increasing citizen participation. The government-sponsored participation in which citizens usually play the roles of recipients of information, opinion leaders, and advisors on advisory boards or committees does not mean genuine citizen participation in the determination and implementation of social policies. The grassroots protest which is usually organized on a short-term or ad hoc basis can have some effects on certain government decisions. However, this approach can contribute little to comprehensive planning with far reaching effects. In terms of community development, the emphasis should be on the development of peoples' potential and problem-solving capacities, and this is more likely to be achieved in well-structured grassroots organizations with both short-term and long-term objectives.

Viewing the general situation of citizen participation as a whole, the "balance theory" suggests an alternative which may help in building a participation model that is more acceptable in the social and political context of Hong Kong. This theory as discussed in Chapter One assumes that both the bureaucracy and citizen groups have legitimate spheres of influence, are individually capable of performing

certain task but must collaborate in the public domain to achieve other common social goals. The assumption is that both parties should recognize they have their own roles to play and their collaboration must be based on mutual respect for each other. In this connection, the building of autonomous, self-help citizen organizations at the grassroot level, the development of indigenous leadership, and the effective use of local resources can begin to contribute to government-community participation and cooperation in the social development of Hong Kong.

Appendix A: Tables of All Questions

1A. Are all the policies and objectives of your MAC set by your committee members?

1.      Yes            2.      No

If not, about what % of them are by your committee members?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
(100%)	42	68.9
(76-99%)	4	6.6
(51-75%)	8	13.1
(Don't know)	1	1.6
(26-50%)	2	3.3
(1-25%)	1	1.6
( 0% )	3	4.9
No answer	1	
Total	62	100

1B. What are those policies or objectives that are not set by your committee members?

	<u>No.</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Not</u>	<u>Don't</u>	<u>Total</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Applicable</u>	<u>know</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Fightcrime	8	53.3	7	46.7	44	3	15	100
Cleaning	13	86.7	2	13.3	44	3	15	100
Transportation	14	93.3	1	6.7	44	3	15	100
Recreation	12	80.0	3	20.0	44	3	15	100
Others	5	33.3	10	66.7	44	3	15	100

2A. Is it necessary to consult the District Office beforehand when your MAC initiates projects of your own?

1.  Yes      2.  No

If yes, about what % of your MAC projects need consultation with the District Office?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
0%	29	51.8
1-25%	2	3.6
26-50%	1	1.8
Don't know	4	7.1
51-75%	1	1.8
76-99%	9	16.1
100%	10	17.9
Not Applicable	6	
Total	62	100

2B. What are those projects that need consultation with the Liaison Officer?

	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Not</u>	<u>Don't</u>	<u>Total</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Applicable</u>	<u>know</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Fightcrime	16	80	4	20	39	2	20	100
Cleaning	16	80	4	20	40	2	20	100
Recreation (picnicking)	10	50	10	50	40	2	20	100
Finance (membership fees, fund raising)	15	75	5	25	40	2	20	100
External Affairs	15	75	5	25	40	2	20	100
Others	14	10	6	30	40	2	20	100

- 3A. Are all the decisions in your MAC meetings made by the MAC members?  
 1. \_\_\_\_ Yes                      2. \_\_\_\_ No

If not, about what % of them are made by your MAC members?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
100%	49	84.5
76-99%	2	3.4
51-75%	4	6.9
Don't know	1	1.7
26-50%	0	0
1-25%	1	1.7
0%	1	1.7
Not Applicable	3	
No Answer	1	
Total	62	100

- 3B. What are those decisions that are not made by your MAC members?

	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Not</u>	<u>Don't</u>	<u>Total</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Applicable</u>	<u>know</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Fightcrime	6	66.7	3	33.3	50	3	9	100
Recreation	7	77.8	2	22.2	50	3	9	100
Cleaning	7	77.8	2	22.2	50	3	9	100
Management of Housing	8	88.9	1	11.1	50	3	9	100
Organization (constitution, office)	3	33.3	6	66.7	50	3	9	100
Others	4	44.4	5	55.6	50	3	9	100

4A. Are all the MAC members elected by the residents?

1.  Yes                      2.  No

If not, about what % of them are elected by the residents?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
100%	59	96.7
76-100%	0	0
51-75%	1	1.6
Don't know	0	0
26-50%	0	0
1-25%	0	0
0%	1	1.6
Not Applicable	1	
Total	62	100

5A. Is your MAC's budget completely self-supporting?

1.  Yes                      2.  No

If not, about what % of your MAC's budget is self-supporting?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
100%	61	100
Not Applicable	1	
Total	62	100

5B. How do you get the rest of the financial support?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Not Applicable	62	100



6. Who do you think proposed to set up your MAC?

	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Not Applicable</u>	<u>Total</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>		<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Proposed by District Office agreed by residents	10	16.7	50	83.3	2	60	100
Proposed by residents	56	93.3	4	6.7	2	60	100
Had own resident organization but changed name to MAC as suggested by District Office	54	90.0	6	10	2	60	100

7. How did you elect the resident representatives?

	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Not Applicable</u>	<u>Total</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>		<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
By residents themselves	39	63.9	22	36.1	1	61	100
By District Office	23	37.7	38	62.3	1	61	100
Others	58	95.1	3	4.9	1	61	100

8. Who determines the content of projects whenever you have such?

	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Not</u>	<u>Don't</u>	<u>Total</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Applicable</u> <u>N</u>	<u>know</u> <u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Suggested by District Office								
Approved by Committee	47	97.9	1	2.1	13	1	48	100
Determined by District Office	47	97.7	1	2.1	13	1	48	100
Determined by Committee (approved in the meeting)	5	10.4	43	89.6	13	1	48	100
Others (assist or participate in programs organized by other groups)	45	93.8	3	6.2	13	1	48	100

9. Among the functions of the MAC which one do you think is the most important?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Fightcrime	19	32.8
Recreation	1	1.7
Promotion of neighborliness	5	8.6
Cleaning	18	31.0
Building Management, Maintenance e.g. water, electricity, gate.	5	8.6
Others	10	17.2
Not Applicable	3	
Don't know	1	
Total	62	100

10A. What kinds of activity has your MAC organized since it was set up?

	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Not</u>	<u>Total</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Applicable</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Recreational	15	40.5	22	59.5	25	37	100
Management	25	67.6	12	32.4	25	37	100
Cleaning	28	75.7	9	24.3	25	37	100

10B. Why those activities, and not others?

	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Not</u>	<u>Don't</u>	<u>Total</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Applicable</u>	<u>know</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
It's necessary	15	51.7	14	48.3	28	5	29	100
To support MAC	27	93.1	2	6.9	28	5	29	100
To liaise other residents; to get together	18	62.1	11	37.9	28	5	29	100
For young people; to have appropriate activities	27	93.1	2	6.9	28	5	29	100
To promote understanding among residents	26	89.7	3	10.3	28	5	29	100

- 11A. Are there any Government officials attending your MAC meeting?  
 B. What Departments of Government do they represent?

	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Not</u> <u>Applicable</u>	<u>Total</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
District Office	11	29	27	71	24	38	100
Police	35	92.1	3	7.9	24	38	100
Community Hall	36	92.3	2	5.1	24	38	100
Others	32	84.2	6	15.8	24	38	100

- 11C. What is their role in the MAC?

	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Not</u> <u>Applicable</u>	<u>Total</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Advisor	5	17.2	23	79.3	34	28	100
Liaison Person	25	86.2	3	10.3	34	28	100
Mediator (when there are conflicts)	26	89.7	2	6.9	34	28	100

12. Is your MAC able to promote mutual understanding among the residents?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Strongly agree	15	24.6
Agree	35	57.4
Don't know	7	11.5
Disagree	4	6.6
Strongly disagree	0	0
Not Applicable	1	
Total	62	

13. Is your MAC able to promote the spirit of mutual aid among the residents?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Strongly agree	14	23.0
Agree	34	55.7
Don't know	5	8.2
Disagree	8	13.1
Strongly disagree	0	0
Not Applicable	1	
Total	62	100

14. Is your MAC able to work cooperatively with the police to fight violent crime?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Strongly agree	10	16.4
Agree	36	50.0
Don't know	12	19.7
Disagree	3	4.9
Strongly disagree	0	0
Not Applicable	1	
Total	62	100

15. Is your MAC able to work cooperatively with the Housing Office to keep your Estate clean?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Strongly agree	11	21.2
Agree	31	59.6
Don't know	6	11.5
Disagree	4	7.7
Strongly disagree	0	0
Not Applicable	9	
No Answer	1	
Total	62	100

16A. When your MAC members had conflicts with each other, about on what % of occasions could they solve the conflicts?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
100%	11	40.7
51-75%	11	40.7
Don't know	2	7.4
26-50%	1	3.7
1-25%	0	0
0%	1	3.7
no conflict	1	3.7
Not Applicable (No conflict)	35	
Total	62	100

16B. What were those conflicts?

	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Not</u> <u>Applicable</u>	<u>Don't</u> <u>know</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>
Personal	19	82.6	4	17.4	23	37	2
Division of labor	18	78.3	5	21.7	23	37	2
Managing conflict between residents	21	91.3	2	8.7	23	37	2
Use of money in MAC	12	52.2	11	47.8	23	37	2
Majority rule rejected	21	91.3	2	8.7	23	37	2

- 16C. What do you think are the reasons for having such conflicts among MAC members? (e.g. different educational background, different status, different nature of employment etc.)

	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Not</u>	<u>Don't</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Applicable</u>	<u>know</u>	
					<u>N</u>	<u>N</u>	
Different educational Background	15	75	5	25	39	3	20
Different nature of job(economic status)	13	65	7	35	39	3	20
Different views on the function of MAC	10	50	10	50	39	3	20

- 17A. In the past, when your MAC was in conflict with outside organizations, e.g., rural committee, other MACs, on about what % of occasions could your MAC solve the conflicts%

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
100%	0	0
76-99%	0	0
51-75%	1	10
Don't know	7	70
26-50%	0	0
1-25%	1	10
0%	1	10
Not Applicable (No conflict)	52	
Total	62	100

17B. What were those conflicts?

	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Not</u>	<u>Don't</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Applicable</u>	<u>know</u>	<u>N</u>
Nature of activities	1	50	1	50	57	3	2
Different viewpoint	1	50	1	50	57	3	2

17C. What do you think are the reasons for having such conflicts?

	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Not</u>	<u>Don't</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Applicable</u>	<u>know</u>	<u>N</u>
Different Traditional practice	1	50	1	50	57	3	2
Different viewpoint	1	50	1	50	57	3	2

18A. In the past, when your MAC was in conflict with Government Departments, e.g., District Office, Housing, etc., about on what % of occasions could your MAC solve the conflicts?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
100%	0	0
76-99%	1	11.1
51-75%	1	11.1
Don't know	5	55.6
26-50%	0	0
1-25%	1	11.1
0%	1	11.1
Not Applicable (no conflict)	53	
Total	62	100



18B. What were those conflicts?

	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Not</u>	<u>Don't</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Applicable</u>	<u>know</u>	<u>N</u>
Finance e.g. Govt. refuse to support financially	2	66.7	1	33.3	58	1	3
Request for tel. & light	2	66.7	1	33.3	58	1	3
Request for re-election	2	66.7	1	33.3	58	1	3

18C. What do you think are the reasons for having such conflicts?

	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Not</u>	<u>Don't</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Applicable</u>	<u>know</u>	<u>N</u>
Different viewpoint	1	33.3	2	66.7	58	1	3
Lack of resources	2	66.7	1	33.3	58	1	3

19. Do you feel that your MAC is doing a better job than other MACs in Shatin?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Strongly	3	4.8
Moderately	3	21.0
Don't know	34	54.8
A little	9	14.5
Not at all	3	4.8
Total	62	100

20. When was your MAC formed?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Less than one year	19	31.1
1 - 2 years	29	47.5
2 - 3 years	7	11.5
3 - 4 years	4	6.6
Don't know	2	3.3
Not Applicable	1	
Total	62	100

23A. How do you like the sort of work you are doing in your MAC?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Strongly like	9	15.0
like	20	33.3
Don't know	24	40.0
Dislike	6	10.0
Strongly dislike	1	1.7
No Answer	2	
Total	62	100

\* Questions 21 and 22 were not included in analysis because only very limited information was obtained.

23B. What kind of work do you strongly like?

	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Not</u>	<u>Don't</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Applicable</u> <u>N</u>	<u>know</u> <u>N</u>	<u>N</u>
Fightcrime	38	88.4	5	11.6	11	8	43
Treasurer	41	95.3	2	4.7	11	8	43
Recreation	35	81.4	8	18.6	11	8	43
Chairman	38	88.4	5	11.6	11	8	43
Secretary	39	90.7	4	9.3	11	8	43
Welfare	38	88.4	5	11.6	11	8	43
Others	19	44.2	24	55.8	11	8	43

23C. What kind of work do you strongly dislike?

	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Not</u>	<u>Don't</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Applicable</u> <u>N</u>	<u>know</u> <u>N</u>	<u>N</u>
All	25	92.6	2	7.4	26	9	27
Welfare	26	96.3	1	3.7	26	9	27
Collect fees	22	81.5	5	18.5	26	9	27
Call residents on security duty	25	92.6	2	7.4	26	9	27
Others	9	33.3	18	66.7	26	9	27

24B. Does it give you a chance to do the things you feel you do the best?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Strong yes	12	20
yes	18	30
Don't know	18	30
No	8	13.3
Strong no	4	6.7
Not Applicable	2	
Total	62	100

25. Do you get any feeling of accomplishment from the work you are doing?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Strong sense of task accomplishment	5	8.2
Sense of task accomplishment	22	36.1
Don't know	6	9.8
Little sense of task accomplishment	25	41.0
No sense of task accomplishment	3	4.9
Not Applicable	1	
Total	62	100

26A. How do you feel about your work in your MAC, does it rate as an important job with you?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Very important	7	11.7
Important	24	40.0
Don't know	20	33.3
Rather unimportant	8	13.3
Totally unimportant	1	1.7
Not Applicable	2	
Total	62	100

26B. Why?

	<u>No</u>		<u>Yes</u>		<u>Not</u>	<u>Don't</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Applicable</u>	<u>know</u>	<u>N</u>
Sense of responsibility (someone must care)	26	70.3	11	29.7	15	10	37
Meaningful, e.g. Mutual aid, like a family	14	37.8	23	62.2	15	10	37
Pass time	33	89.2	4	10.8	15	10	37

27. Do you feel your MAC members are cooperative with each other?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Strongly	24	38.7
Moderately	28	45.2
Don't know	4	6.5
A little	5	8.1
Not at all	1	1.6
Total	62	100

28. How often do you have personal contact with MAC members other than at the meetings?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Most or all of the time	28	45.2
A good part of the time	23	37.1
Don't know	2	3.2
A little of the time	5	8.1
Rarely or none of the time	4	6.5
Total	62	100

29. How do you feel about participating in your MAC?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Very happy	13	21.3
Happy	28	45.9
Don't know	13	21.3
Unhappy	7	11.5
Very unhappy	0	0
Not applicable	1	
Total	62	100

30. Have you ever encouraged your friends or relatives to participate in your MAC?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Yes	18	30
No	42	70
Not applicable	2	
Total	62	100

31. Do you feel that you are known to more people after joining your MAC?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Strongly	24	38.7
Moderately	26	41.9
Don't know	3	4.8
A little	8	12.9
Not at all	1	1.6
Total	62	100

32. Do you feel that you can approach Government officials more easily after joining your MAC?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Strongly	3	4.8
Moderately	29	46.8
Don't know	19	30.6
A little	8	12.9
Not at all	3	4.8
Total	62	100

33. Do you always attend the MAC meetings?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Most of the time	44	77.2
A good part of the time	7	12.3
Sometimes	0	0
A little of the time	5	8.8
None of the time	1	1.8
Not applicable	4	
No answer	1	
Total	62	100

34. How often were you invited to the Shatin District Officer's social gathering during the past year?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
None	9	20.9
Once	6	14.0
Twice	5	11.6
Thrice	6	14.0
Four times	4	9.3
Five and above	13	30.2
Not applicable	11	
No answer	8	
Total	62	100



35. How about the rural committee members? How often were they invited to the District Officer's social gatherings during the past year?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
All or most of the time	15	26.8
A good part of the time	13	23.2
Don't know	25	44.6
A little of the time	1	1.8
Rarely or none of the time	2	3.6
Not applicable	6	
Total	62	100

36. How many officials have resigned from the MAC since it was set up?

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
0	33	59
1 - 2	12	21.4
3 - 4	4	7.1
5 - 6	1	1.8
7+	6	10.7
Not applicable	5	
No answer	1	
Total	62	100

## 37. Sex

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Male	54	87.1
Female	8	12.9
Total	62	100

## 38. Age

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Below 20	1	1.6
21 - 30	11	17.7
31 - 40	25	40.3
41 - 50	13	21.0
51 - 60	8	12.9
61+	4	6.5
Total	62	100

## 39. Occupation

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Blue collar (skilled & semi-skilled workers, driver, etc.)	12	19.4
White collar (clerical staff)	14	22.6
Professional (e.g. manager)	10	16.1
Teacher/Principals	3	4.8
Students	2	3.2
Merchants/Businessmen	7	11.3
Housewife	6	9.7
Others	8	12.9
Total	62	100

## 40. Type of Housing

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Public Housing	25	40.3
Private Housing	37	59.7
Total	62	100

## 章 程

一、名稱：本委員會定名為 郵 座互助委員會。

二、地址：本委員會通訊地址為：

三、宗旨：本委員會宗旨為：

- 1 加深各住戶之了解，發揚互助合作精神。
- 2 與新邨管理處合作，加強保安措施，改善居住環境及維持現已達致之水準。

四、職責：本委員會得推行下列事項：

- 1 依法推行互助制度，並設法將有關政府宣傳資料分別轉知各住戶，務使此舉對於罪案之遏止與從速報警及事後偵查等事宜，均有所裨益。
- 2 與新邨管理處合作，採取必需步驟保持整座樓宇清潔尤以其中各公共地方為然。
- 3 向住客收取款項，以支付執行本條 1 至 2 兩款所列職責時所需之費用。

五、本委員會成員：

- 1 本委員會成員最少須有職員三名，即主席、秘書、及司庫。
- 2 其他委員人數及人選得由住戶依需要而決定選舉之。
- 3 本委員會之職員及其他委員（如有選出者）必須為本大廈之住客，且不得以收受薪酬。
- 4 本委員會之職員，如其在任內不再為本座樓宇之住客或經住客在依照本章程第六條所舉行之大會席上議決解除其職務者即須停止任職。
- 5 本委員會之職位如有空懸，得由本委員會設法填補之。
- 6 本委員會之職員如有任何變換，須於七天內通知沙田理民府。

## 六 住客會議：

- 1 主席得依需要而召開住戶大會。
- 2 召開大會通知書最少須於大會舉行前七天送達住客。
- 3 主席遇有下開情形，須於十四天內召開大會。
  - (甲) 如遇本委員會兩名以上委員要求召開；或
  - (乙) 遇本座不少過百分之五單位之住客要求召開。
- 4 大會如有本座百分之十單位之住戶出席，即足法定人數。
- 5 本委員會須負責執行由過半數之出席住戶在大會席上所通過之決議案。

七 帳目：司庫須造具適當帳簿以記錄本委員會一切收支，並須於住戶或沙田理民府索閱時出示之。

## 八 本委員會之解散：如遇下開情形，本委員會即須解散：

- 1 當理民官所發出之批准通知書內開期限屆滿，或
- 2 在接獲理民官之通知，謂民政司或新界政務司前此所批准本委員會豁免遵守社團條例規定之正式許可現經予以撤銷，或
- 3 在依照本章程第六條舉行之大會席上，由過半數之出席住戶議決解散。

上述三種解散理由，以較早發生者為準。

沙田區互助委員會泛查

日期：\_\_\_\_\_年\_\_\_\_月\_\_\_\_日（星期\_\_\_\_\_）

時間：\_\_\_\_\_時\_\_\_\_分至\_\_\_\_\_時\_\_\_\_分

訪問對象：第\_\_\_\_\_座／\_\_\_\_\_大廈互助委員會

意見

介紹：我姓\_\_\_\_\_，係中文大學社會工作系嘅學生，我地希望知多一的沙田區內互助委員會嘅情形，所以想同你約一個時間嚟訪問你，唔知可唔可以呢？

1A 你地互委會嘅政策同埋工作方針係唔係全部都係你地既委員自己揀出嚟架？

1. \_\_\_ 係      2. \_\_\_ 唔係

如果唔係，有幾多成係你地委員揀出嚟架？

1. \_\_\_ 100%      2. \_\_\_ 76-99%      3. \_\_\_ 51-75%      4. 唔知道

5. \_\_\_ 26-50%      6. \_\_\_ 1-25%      7. \_\_\_ 0%

B 有邊D政策同埋工作方針唔係由你地委員揀出嚟架？

2A 你地互委會每逢做一件事（例如舉辦活動），事前需唔需要問過理民府架？

1. \_\_\_ 需要      2. \_\_\_ 唔需要

如果需要，有幾多成要問過理民府架？

1. \_\_\_ 100%      2. \_\_\_ 76-99%      3. \_\_\_ 51-75%      4. 唔知道

5. \_\_\_ 26-50%      6. \_\_\_ 1-25%      7. \_\_\_ 0%

B 邊D活動需要先問過理民府？

3A 你地互委員開會時，係唔係所有既決定都係由你地既委員話事？

1. \_\_\_ 係      2. \_\_\_ 唔係

如果唔係，有幾多成係由你地委員話事？

1. \_\_\_ 100%      2. \_\_\_ 76-99%      3. \_\_\_ 51-75%      4. \_\_\_ 唔知道

5. \_\_\_ 26-50%      6. \_\_\_ 1-25%      7. \_\_\_ 0%

B 有邊D決定唔係由你地委員話事架

4 你地既委員係唔係全部都係由你地既委員話事架？

1. \_\_\_ 係      2. \_\_\_ 唔係

如果唔係，有幾多成係由居民選出嚟架？

1. \_\_\_ 100%      2. \_\_\_ 76-99%      3. \_\_\_ 51-75%      4. \_\_\_ 唔知道

5. \_\_\_ 26-50%      6. \_\_\_ 1-25%      7. \_\_\_ 0%

5A 你地互委會既經費係唔係自給自足架？

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 係      2. \_\_\_\_\_ 唔係

如果唔係，互委會既經費有幾多成係自給自足呢？

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 100%      2. \_\_\_\_\_ 76-99%      3. \_\_\_\_\_ 51-75%      4. \_\_\_\_\_ 唔知道

5. \_\_\_\_\_ 26-50%      6. \_\_\_\_\_ 1-25%      7. \_\_\_\_\_ 0%

B 其他經費從何而來？

6 邊個提議成立你地既互委會架？

7 你地點樣搵出居民代表架？

8 你地搞活動，其內容係邊個話事？

9 互委會所做既工作有好多種，你自己覺得邊種最重要？

10. 你地搞過邊類既活動？點解要搞那些活動？

11A 你地開常務會議既時候，有無政府代表？

1. \_\_\_\_\_ 有      2. \_\_\_\_\_ 無

B 佢地代表邊個部門？

C 佢地係互委員擔任乜野角色（如觀察員）？



12. 你地既互委會能唔能夠增進居民之間既認識同埋了解？

1. \_\_\_十分能夠      2. \_\_\_能夠      3. \_\_\_不知道  
4. \_\_\_不能夠      5. \_\_\_十分不能夠

13. 你地既互委會能唔能夠發揚互助既精神？

1. \_\_\_十分能夠      2. \_\_\_能夠      3. \_\_\_不知道  
4. \_\_\_不能夠      5. \_\_\_十分不能夠

14. 你地既互委會能唔能夠與警方合作撲滅罪行？

1. \_\_\_十分能夠      2. \_\_\_能夠      3. \_\_\_不知道  
4. \_\_\_不能夠      5. \_\_\_十分不能夠

15. 你地既互委會能唔能夠與房屋署合作，保持你地樓宇既清潔？

1. \_\_\_十分能夠      2. \_\_\_能夠      3. \_\_\_不知道  
4. \_\_\_不能夠      5. \_\_\_十分不能夠

16A. 以往當你地既委員之間有衝突或有唔同意見既時候，有幾多成係可以解決呢？

1. \_\_\_ 100%      2. \_\_\_ 76-99%      3. \_\_\_ 51-75%      4. \_\_\_ 唔知道  
5. \_\_\_ 26-50%      6. \_\_\_ 1-25%      7. \_\_\_ 0%      8. \_\_\_ 無

B. 多數係乜野既衝突或唔同意見？

C. 你認為點解會有呢D衝突或唔同意見？

(例如：唔同既教育背景，唔同既立場，唔同既工作等)

17A 以往當你地互委會與外界組織（例如鄉事會其他互委會等）有衝突既時候，有幾多成係可以獲得解決呢？

1. \_\_\_ 100%    2. \_\_\_ 76-99%    3. \_\_\_ 51-75%    4. \_\_\_ 唔知道  
5. \_\_\_ 26-50%    6. \_\_\_ 1-25%    7. \_\_\_ 0%    8. \_\_\_ 無

B 多數係咩野既衝突？

C 你認為點解會有呢D既衝突？

18A 以往當你地互委會與政府部門（例如理民府、房屋署等）有衝突既時候，有幾多成係可以獲得解決呢？

1. \_\_\_ 100%    2. \_\_\_ 76-99%    3. \_\_\_ 51-75%    4. \_\_\_ 唔知道  
5. \_\_\_ 26-50%    6. \_\_\_ 1-25%    7. \_\_\_ 0%    8. \_\_\_ 無

B 多數係咩野既衝突？

C 你認為點解有呢D既衝突？

19. 你覺得你地既互委會係唔係比沙田區其他既互委會做得更好？

1. \_\_\_ 十分覺得    2. \_\_\_ 頗為覺得    3. \_\_\_ 不知道  
4. \_\_\_ 不十分覺得    5. \_\_\_ 完全不覺得

20. 你地既互委會幾時成立架？

21. 你地互委會既內部組織係點樣架？（有邊D工作小組）

22. 在過去一年內，你地既互委會曾經舉辦過咩野活動呢？

活動一：性質

參加人數與你地既期望既多抑或少？

1. \_\_\_ 很多    2. \_\_\_ 多    3. \_\_\_ 普通    4. \_\_\_ 少    5. \_\_\_ 很少  
是否成功：1. \_\_\_ 十分成功    2. \_\_\_ 成功    3. 不知道  
4. \_\_\_ 不成功    5. \_\_\_ 十分不成功

活動二：性質

參加人數與你地既期望多抑或少？

1. \_\_\_ 很多    2. \_\_\_ 多    3. \_\_\_ 普通    4. \_\_\_ 少    5. \_\_\_ 很少  
是否成功：1. \_\_\_ 十分成功    2. \_\_\_ 成功    3. 不知道  
4. \_\_\_ 不成功    5. \_\_\_ 十分不成功

活動三：性質

參加人數與你地期望既多抑或少？

1. \_\_\_ 很多    2. \_\_\_ 多    3. \_\_\_ 普通    4. \_\_\_ 少    5. \_\_\_ 很少  
是否成功：1. \_\_\_ 十分成功    2. \_\_\_ 成功    3. 不知道  
4. \_\_\_ 不成功    5. \_\_\_ 十分不成功

23A 你鐘唔鐘意你係互委會既工作呢？

1. \_\_\_ 十分鐘意    2. \_\_\_ 鐘意    3. \_\_\_ 無所謂  
4. \_\_\_ 唔鐘意    5. \_\_\_ 十分唔鐘意

B 你最鐘意邊一種工作呢？

C 你最唔鐘意邊一種工作呢？

24A 你係互委會做 D 咩野工作呀？

B 你覺得呢 D 工作係唔係好適合你呀？

1. \_\_\_ 十分覺得    2. \_\_\_ 覺得    3. \_\_\_ 無所謂  
4. \_\_\_ 唔覺得    5. \_\_\_ 十分唔覺得

C 點解適合 / 唔適合呀？

25. 你覺得你係互委會裡係唔係做佐好多野？

1. \_\_\_ 十分覺得    2. \_\_\_ 覺得    3. \_\_\_ 唔知道  
4. \_\_\_ 唔覺得    5. \_\_\_ 十分唔覺得

26A. 你覺得你係互委會既工作對你係唔係好重要？

1. \_\_\_ 十分重要    2. \_\_\_ 重要    3. \_\_\_ 無所謂  
4. \_\_\_ 唔重要    5. \_\_\_ 十分唔重要

B 點解呢？

27. 你覺得委員之間係唔係好合作？

1. \_\_\_ 十分覺得    2. \_\_\_ 覺得    3. \_\_\_ 唔知道  
4. \_\_\_ 唔覺得    5. \_\_\_ 十分唔覺得

28. 除佐公事之外，你與其他既委員有無來往？

1. \_\_\_ 尋常    2. \_\_\_ 有時    3. \_\_\_ 不知道  
4. \_\_\_ 很少    5. \_\_\_ 極少

29. 你覺得參加互委會唔關心？

1. \_\_\_ 十分關心    2. \_\_\_ 關心    3. \_\_\_ 不知道  
4. \_\_\_ 不關心    5. \_\_\_ 十分不關心

30. 你有無叫過你既親戚或朋友參加互委會？

1. \_\_\_ 有，幾多個    2. \_\_\_ 無

31. 你覺唔覺得自從參加佐互委會，多佐人識得你？

1. \_\_\_ 十分覺得    2. \_\_\_ 覺得    3. \_\_\_ 不知道  
4. \_\_\_ 不覺得    5. \_\_\_ 十分不覺得

32. 你覺唔覺得自從參加佐互委會，與政府部門交涉比較容易佐？

1. \_\_\_十分覺得    2. \_\_\_覺得    3. \_\_\_不知道  
4. \_\_\_不覺得    5. \_\_\_十分不覺得

33. 你係唔係時時都參加互委會既會議？

1. \_\_\_時常    2. \_\_\_有時    3. \_\_\_不知道  
4. \_\_\_很少    5. \_\_\_極少

34. 理民府既社交活動（例如春茗，團拜），多唔多請你地互委會去參加？（過去一年有多少次）

35. 鄉事會又點樣，理民府多唔多請佢地參加？

1. \_\_\_時常    2. \_\_\_有時    3. \_\_\_不知道  
4. \_\_\_很少    5. \_\_\_極少

36. 自從你地互委會成立之後，有無人辭過職？幾多個？

1. \_\_\_有 \_\_\_個    2. \_\_\_無

37. 性別： 1. \_\_\_男    2. \_\_\_女

38. 年齡：

39. 職業：

40. 屋宇種類 \_\_\_\_\_ 公共屋邨 \_\_\_\_\_ 私人樓宇

附註：如果可能既話，請向被訪問者索取會章乙份

謝謝合作

Appendix C: Questionnaire

A Preliminary Study of Mutual Aid Committees In Shatin

Date : \_\_\_\_\_

Time : \_\_\_\_\_

Block No. of MAC : \_\_\_\_\_

Comment on Interview : \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Introductory Note : My name is \_\_\_\_\_.

I am a social work student of the Chinese  
University of Hong Kong. We would very  
much like to know more about MACs in Shatin.  
Can we make an appointment to talk to you?

1. (A) Are all the policies and objectives of your MAC set by your committee members?

1. \_\_\_ Yes                      2. \_\_\_ No

If not, about what % of them are by your committee members?

1. \_\_\_ 100%                      2. \_\_\_ 76-99%                      3. \_\_\_ 51-75%  
 4. \_\_\_ Don't know                      5. \_\_\_ 26-50%                      6. \_\_\_ 1-25%  
 7. \_\_\_ 0%

- (B) What are those policies or objectives that are not set by your committee members?
- 

2. (A) Is it necessary to consult the District Office beforehand when your MAC initiates projects of your own?

1. \_\_\_ Yes                      2. \_\_\_ No

If yes, about what % of your MAC projects need consultation with the District Office?

1. \_\_\_ 100%                      2. \_\_\_ 76-99%                      3. \_\_\_ 51-75%  
 4. \_\_\_ Don't know                      5. \_\_\_ 26-50%                      6. \_\_\_ 1-25%  
 7. \_\_\_ 0%

- (B) What are those projects that need consultation with the Liaison Officer?
- 

3. (A) Are all the decisions in your MAC meetings made by the MAC members?

1. \_\_\_ Yes                      2. \_\_\_ No

If not, about what % of them are made by your MAC members?

1. \_\_\_ 100%                      2. \_\_\_ 76-99%                      3. \_\_\_ 51-75%  
 4. \_\_\_ Don't know                      5. \_\_\_ 26-50%                      6. \_\_\_ 1-25%  
 7. \_\_\_ 0%

- (B) What are those decisions that are not made by your MAC members?
- 

4. (A) Are all the MAC members elected by the residents?

1. \_\_\_ Yes                      2. \_\_\_ No

If not, about what % of them are elected by the residents?

1. \_\_\_ 100%                      2. \_\_\_ 76-99%                      3. \_\_\_ 51-75%  
 4. \_\_\_ Don't know                      5. \_\_\_ 26-50%                      6. \_\_\_ 1-25%  
 7. \_\_\_ 0%

5. (A) Is your MAC's budget completely self-supporting?

1.  Yes                      2.  No

If not, about what % of your MAC's budget is self-supporting?

1.  100%                      2.  76-99%                      3.  51-75%  
 4.  Don't know                      5.  26-50%                      6.  1-25%  
 7.  0%

(B) How do you get the rest of the financial support?

---

6. Who do you think proposed to set up your MAC?

7. How did you elect the resident representatives?

8. Who determines the content of projects whenever you have such?

9. Among the functions of the MAC, which one do you think is the most important?

10. What kinds of activity has your MAC organized since it was set up? Why those activities, and not others?

11. (A) Are there any Government officials attending your MAC meeting?

---

(B) What Departments of Government do they represent? \_\_\_\_\_

(C) What is their role in the MAC? \_\_\_\_\_

12. Is your MAC able to promote mutual understanding among the residents?

1.  Strongly agree                      2.  Agree                      3.  Don't know  
 4.  Disagree                      5.  Strongly disagree

13. Is your MAC able to promote the spirit of mutual aid among the residents?

1.  Strongly agree                      2.  Agree                      3.  Don't know  
 4.  Disagree                      5.  Strongly disagree

14. Is your MAC able to work cooperatively with the police to fight violent crime?

1.  Strongly agree                      2.  Agree                      3.  Don't know  
 4.  Disagree                      5.  Strongly disagree



15. Is your MAC able to work cooperatively with the Housing Office to keep your Estate clean?

1.  Strongly agree      2.  Agree      3.  Don't know  
4.  Disagree              5.  Strongly disagree

16. (A) When your MAC members had conflicts with each other, on about what % of occasions could they solve the conflicts?

1.  100%      2.  76-99%      3.  51-75%      4.  Don't know  
5.  26-50%      6.  1-25%      7.  0%              8.  no conflict

(B) What were those conflicts?

---

(C) What do you think are the reasons for having such conflicts among MAC members? (e.g. different educational background, different status, different nature of employment etc.)

---

17. (A) In the past, when your MAC was in conflict with outside organizations, e.g., rural committee, other MACs, on about what % of occasions could your MAC solve the conflicts?

1.  100%      2.  76-99%      3.  51-75%      4.  Don't know  
5.  26-50%      6.  1-25%      7.  0%              8.  no conflict

(B) What were those conflicts?

---

(C) What do you think are the reasons for having such conflicts?

---

18. (A) In the past, when your MAC was in conflict with Government Departments e.g., District Office, Housing, etc., on about what % of occasions could your MAC solve the conflicts?

1.  100%      2.  76-99%      3.  51-75%      4.  Don't know  
5.  26-50%      6.  1-25%      7.  0%              8.  no conflict

(B) What were those conflicts?

---

(C) What do you think are the reasons for having such conflicts?

---

19. Do you feel that your MAC is doing a better job than other MACs in Shatin?

1.  Strongly      2.  Moderately      3.  Don't know  
 4.  A little      5.  Not at all
- 

20. When was your MAC formed? \_\_\_\_\_

21. What is the organization in your MAC (e.g., working groups)?

---



---

22. What kind of activities/projects has your MAC organized in the past year? And how was the participation?

Project I: Nature \_\_\_\_\_

- no. of people 1.  Many      2.  Quite many  
 3.  Some      4.  A few  
 5.  Don't know

level of success \_\_\_\_\_

1.  Very successful  
 2.  Quite successful  
 3.  Unsuccessful  
 4.  Very unsuccessful

Project II: Nature \_\_\_\_\_

- no. of people 1.  Many      2.  Quite many  
 3.  Some      4.  A few  
 5.  Don't know

level of success \_\_\_\_\_

1.  Very successful  
 2.  Quite successful  
 3.  Unsuccessful  
 4.  Very unsuccessful

Project III: Nature \_\_\_\_\_

- no. of people 1.  Many      2.  Quite many  
 3.  Some      4.  A few  
 5.  Don't know

level of success \_\_\_\_\_

1.  Very successful  
 2.  Quite successful  
 3.  Unsuccessful  
 4.  Very unsuccessful

23. (A) How do you like the sort of work you are doing in your MAC?  
 1.  Strongly like    2.  Like    3.  Don't know  
 4.  Dislike    5.  Strongly dislike
- (B) What kind of work you strongly like?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
- (C) What kind of work you strongly dislike?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
24. (A) What are your responsibilities in your MAC?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
- (B) Does it give you a chance to do the things you feel you do the best?  
 1.  Strong yes    2.  Yes    3.  Don't know  
 4.  No    5.  Strong no
- (C) Why? \_\_\_\_\_
25. Do you get any feeling of accomplishment from the work you are doing?  
 1.  Strong sense of task accomplishment  
 2.  Sense of task accomplishment  
 3.  Don't know  
 4.  Little sense of task accomplishment  
 5.  No sense of task accomplishment
26. (A) How do you feel about your work in your MAC; does it rate as an important job with you?  
 1.  Very important    2.  Important    3.  Don't know  
 4.  Rather important    5.  Totally unimportant
- (B) Why? \_\_\_\_\_
27. Do you feel your MAC members are cooperative with each other?  
 1.  Strongly    2.  Moderately    3.  Don't know  
 4.  A little    5.  Not at all
28. How often do you have personal contact with MAC members other than the meetings?  
 1.  Most or all of the time    2.  A good part of the time  
 3.  Don't know    4.  A little of the time  
 5.  Rarely or none of the time
29. How do you feel about participating in your MAC?  
 1.  Very happy    2.  Happy    3.  Don't know  
 4.  Unhappy    5.  Very unhappy

30. Have you ever encouraged your friends or relatives to participate in your MAC?  
 1.  Yes                      How many? \_\_\_\_\_  
 2.  No
31. Do you feel that you are known to more people after joining your MAC?  
 1.  Strongly    2.  Moderately    3.  Don't know  
 4.  A little    5.  Not at all
32. Do you feel that you can approach Government officials more easily after joining your MAC?  
 1.  Strongly    2.  Moderately    3.  Don't know  
 4.  A little    5.  Not at all
33. Do you always attend the MAC meetings?  
 1.  Most of the time    2.  A good part of the time  
 3.  Sometimes            4.  A little of the time  
 5.  None of the time
34. How often were you invited to the Shatin District Office's social gatherings during the past year?
35. How about the rural committee members? How often were they invited to the District Officer's social gatherings during the past year?
36. How many officials have resigned from the MAC since it was set up?
37. Sex: 1.  Male                      2.  Female
38. Age: \_\_\_\_\_
39. Occupation: \_\_\_\_\_
40. Type of Housing: 1.  public                      2.  private

Thank You !