

The CIIF Evaluation Consortium

Final Report of

An Evaluation Study on the Impacts of CIIF Intergenerational Programmes on the Development of Social Capital in Hong Kong

The Community Investment and Inclusion Fund (CIIF)

For the

Health, Welfare and Food Bureau

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary of Key Findings and Recommendations.....	i
Research team.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Part I. Aims of study.....	1
Part II. Research focus and evaluation scope.....	2
2.1 Review of social capital, intergenerational solidarity and intergenerational programmes.....	2
2.2 Theoretical framework for this study.....	5
2.3 Operationalized definitions of social capital, intergenerational solidarity and intergenerational programmes.....	8
2.4 Research questions for this study.....	9
Part III. Research method.....	10
3.1 Research design.....	10
3.2 Sampling.....	12
3.3 Data Analysis.....	13
3.4 Limitation of the study.....	14
Part IV. Findings	16
4.1 Results from in-depth interviews.....	16
4.1.1 Project nature and characteristics.....	16
4.1.2 Intergenerational solidarity.....	17
4.1.3 Project impacts.....	19
4.1.4 Critical factors to success	22
4.2 Results from the survey questionnaire.....	25
4.2.1. The sample profiles for selected projects.....	25
4.2.2 .The social and economic background of the participants....	28
4.2.3. The outcome impacts of the selected intergenerational projects	31
Conclusion and recommendations.....	41
References.....	45
Appendix I: Interview guidelines.....	52
Appendix II: Consent form.....	55
Appendix III: Sample profile.....	56

Appendix IV: Project profile and key outcome indicators.....	58
Appendix V: Formal invitation letter for the survey questionnaire.....	60
Appendix VI: The survey questionnaire for younger people.....	61
Appendix VII: The survey questionnaire for older people.....	67

Summary of Key Findings and Recommendations

Background

To support the policy initiative in the Policy Address 2001, the Community Investment and Inclusion Fund (CIIF) have been launched since 2002 which aims to support community initiated projects that would promote mutual aid and concern among people, and to promote community participation in district and across sectors. It enhances social cohesion, strengthen community network, support family and social solidarity and self-sustaining of the social disadvantage group. To consolidate and promote the successful experiences, a consortium from five universities has been formed since December 2004 to evaluate the aggregated impacts of the CIIF project and identify critical successful factors across projects. APIAS, Lingnan University, is one of the research teams that have been invited to conduct the joint evaluation of the impacts of CIIF which specifically focus on the intergenerational aspects.

Aims of study

In response to the negative consequences of social changes in result of family dysfunction and age segregation in the community, the present evaluation study aims to investigate outcome impacts of selected intergenerational projects funded by CIIF. The attempt is also to develop a set of outcome indicators to measure the effectiveness and outcomes of the intergenerational projects and identify the key successful factors to promote intergenerational solidarity and the development of social capital of Hong Kong.

Conceptual framework

The present study follows the World Bank and CIIF working definitions of social capital which comprises social network, norms of trust, reciprocity, as a resource to social action. That is the cognitive, relationship and structural dimensions of social capital. Also, the evaluation study has reviewed that the intergenerational relationship and support could enhance the intergenerational solidarity which could be considered as the integral part of social capital. In other words, strengthening the intergenerational solidarity is essential to develop the social capital of Hong Kong. The theoretical foundation of the study is guided by the Bengston's intergenerational solidarity theory in particular in the dimension of functional solidarity—reciprocal support.

Research methodology

A mixture of quantitative and qualitative research methodology has been employed for the evaluation study. First, the study has employed a qualitative bottom up approach by interviewing the key informants of the selected CIIF projects. The aim is to explore the nature and characteristics, the intergenerational relationship and support elements as well as the critical successful factors of the project implementations. A self-administered survey by the project participants have been conducted by using the self-developed outcomes indicators generated from the findings of the interviews. The attempt is to evaluate the outcome effectiveness and the aggregated impacts of the selected CIIF projects.

Sampling

A purposive sampling method has been adopted for the evaluation study. Ten projects from 59 CIIF projects were initially selected for in-depth interviews and field visits. The selection criteria are based on the relevant intergenerational elements i.e. having different age groups of participants and having the activities and cooperation between generations. Two of the key informants i.e. one project leader and one frontline worker have been invited for the in-depth interviews. A quota sampling with approximately 60 project participants from three age groups (1) aged 15 to 25 (2) aged 26 to 64 and (3) aged 65 or above (20 participants/ group) were recruited to conduct the survey. Six projects have finally been selected for the survey based on the per se selection criteria.

Data collection and analysis

The in-depth interviews and field visits were conducted between December 2004 and June 2005. Twenty key informants who have rich project experience with an average of 11.7 years in the field have been interviewed. Each interview was tape recorded and transcribed. Content analysis was used to generate the transcripts into themes. The surveys were distributed to project participants through the project coordinators from August to September 2005. The survey is basically self-administered with structured questionnaires. A total number of 316 valid questionnaires have been received. SPSS was used for descriptive analysis.

Research findings

Findings from in-depth interviews found that the nature and characteristics of the projects

are to strengthen support between disadvantage groups, enlarge their social supportive network and enhance their social competence. Though the primary focus of the projects is not on promoting intergenerational support, intergenerational tie or cooperation, mutual learning and support were encouraged. Also, the projects create a platform for interactions and cooperation between generations. It could be viewed as by-product or alternative outcomes of the projects. The major target groups of the intergenerational projects are mainly vulnerable groups such as retired older people, housewives, mental rehabilitants, unemployed youth and new arrival children from Mainland China. A total number of eight domains to measure the outcome of the intergenerational projects have been identified which include: (1) Perceived positive image towards older/younger people, (2) Intergenerational communications and relationships, (3) Social competence and skill transfer, (4) Volunteerism/Social Participations/Self-Help and Mutual help, (5) Trust, (6) Intergenerational solidarity and Reciprocal support, (7) Social Network and (8) Social Support. Eight domains generated from the in-depth interviews are the essential elements of the outcomes of the projects.

The survey findings indicated that the participants have gained benefits from the project. The project participants have highly rated for all domains with the mean scores over 3.75 out of 5. Taking the cutoff point as 3, the intergenerational solidarity and reciprocal support have the highest score (Mean=4.02, SD=0.59). Then, the volunteerism's domain (Mean=3.97, SD=0.55), perceived positive images (Mean=3.96, SD=0.58) and intergenerational communications (Mean=3.96, SD=0.58) are the second highest aspects while the trust (Mean=3.77, SD=0.55) and the social competence (Mean= 3.77, SD=0.77) the third. In addition, the survey showed that most of the participants have built up the social support network after participating in the projects. The survey also found that older participants tend to score lower than younger participants in particular in the aspects of social competence skills and self-confidence.

Several key factors have been identified. Through the in-depth interviews and observations, a clear project mission of intergenerational cooperation was transmitted to the project staff and the participants. It is significant as it has overcome the common prejudice of the youth against older people and older people's against the youth, which are often the causes of conflicts between generations. As a result, the degree of acceptances, project involvement and mutual support can be increased. Also, the study

revealed that the reciprocal support is a vital factor to strengthen the solidarity between generations and contributes the development of social capital in Hong Kong. One of the effective strategies is to promote volunteerism through the community based intergenerational projects.

Recommendations

It was found that intergenerational solidarity is a vital factor to contribute to the development of social capital. Future CIIF projects could consider project aims which have the ideas of prompting the intergenerational solidarity elements.

Notions of this research study for further implementation can be summarized as COKE. Communication – communication is the crucial element in intergenerational researches. Since the structural change of family and society, languages and signs could not be realized by different generations in common. Therefore, it is essential to build up a system of common language used by the generations. Organization – an intensive organization would not only be helpful to the success of research implementation, but also able to facilitate intergenerational interaction as well. Knowledge – there is no doubt that these researches are significant in realizing the relevant intragenerational knowledge in further. Evaluation – it is necessary to formulate an objective evaluation for ensuring the results of these researches. This would also lay down a solid foundation for future relevant research studies.

Three types of intergenerational programmes, namely i) empowering older people, ii) empowering younger people and iii) promoting cross/intergenerational relationships are found to be effective models in practice. It is suggested that future intergenerational programmes may provide a variety of learning platforms for increasing interactions and cooperation between generations.

Present study found that the reciprocal support between generations and the increase in the sense of volunteerism are the effective strategies to develop the social capital in Hong Kong. Finally, committed and outstanding staff are vital for the projects as not only do they have clear mindset of social capital but also skills in networking local resources in order to make the project sustainable in the long term.

Research team

Principal Investigator

Prof. CHAN Cheung Ming Alfred (PhD) Department of Politics and Sociology

Co-investigators

- a. Prof. LIN Ping (PhD) Department of Economics
- b. Ms. FONG Meng Soi Florence (BSocSc, MPhil) (Senior Project Officer)
- c. Mr. WONG Hon Yui Eric (BSocSc, MPhil) (Project Officer)

Research Team at Asia Pacific Ageing Studies, APIAS

- a. Ms. LUK Kit Ling (MSc, MA, CQSW, PhD Candidate) (Research Development Officer)
- b. Ms. LAU Sze Wai Ceci (BSocSc, MPhil) (Project Officer)
- c. Ms. LAU Wing No, Helen (BBA) (Project Officer)
- d. Ms. MA Hok Ka, Carol (BSocSc, PhD Candidate) (Project Officer)
- e. Mr. WONG Hoi To, Calvin (BA, MPhil) (Project Officer)

Collaborative Agency: Aberdeen Kai-fong Welfare Association Social Services Centre (AKWASSC)

- a. Mr. LAI Chi Tong (BSocSc, MBA) (Director of AKWASSC)
- b. Ms. CHENG Kit Ching (BA, MSc) (Social Worker and Researcher of AKWASSC)

Consortium research team

Signature: _____

Professor CHAN Cheung Ming, Alfred

Principal Investigator, PI

Director of Asia-Pacific Institute of Ageing Studies

Lingnan University

Date: _____

An Evaluation Study on the Impacts of CIIF Intergenerational Programmes on the Development of Social Capital in Hong Kong

Introduction

This is the final report of the evaluation study on the impacts of CIIF intergenerational programmes on the development of social capital in Hong Kong. The report is divided into five parts. Part I addresses the aims of the study while part II talks about the conceptual framework. The research methodology, sampling, data collection are presented in part III. Part IV and part V discuss the findings from key informant interviews and the survey respectively. The summary of the implications of the study and the policy recommendations will be presented in the last section.

Part I. The aims of the study

In response to the negative consequences of social changes in result of family dysfunction and age segregation in the community, the present evaluation study attempts to explore the factors that enhance intergenerational support from selected intergenerational programmes and result in the promotion of social capital in Hong Kong. Specifically, the aims of the present study are (1) to develop a set of outcome indicators to measure the intergenerational solidarity of the community; (2) to evaluate the effectiveness and outcomes of the ten CIIF-funded projects selected; (3) to identify critical factors that facilitate successful implementation of intergenerational programmes; and (4) to provide some insightful ideas or recommendations for relevant stakeholders.

Part II. Research focus and evaluation scope

The key concepts involved in the present study include social capital, intergenerational solidarity, intergenerational support and intergenerational programmes. These concepts are interrelated and it is assumed that intergenerational solidarity, which contributes the development of the social capital in Hong Kong, is a subset of the social capital. Intergenerational programmes help to develop intergenerational solidarity of the community.

2.1. Review of social capital, intergenerational solidarity and intergenerational programmes

Social Capital

Social capital has become one of predominant concerns of the academics, the society and the government over the last few decades. Its definition, though varies considerably, has been widely explored by numerous governmental bodies and scholars while debates have inspired the conceptual understanding of social capital. The following sections identify the key concepts of social capital and the significance of intergenerational solidarity in the scope of social capital.

Broadly speaking, social capital can be regarded as the institutions, relationships, attitudes, and values that govern interactions among people and contribute to sustainable development of economy and society (Serageldin, 1996; World Bank, 1998). Two elements, or forms, of the general definition of social capital can be distinguished implicitly. The first element, adopted by Uphoff (2000), called “structural social capital”, refers to a relatively objective and externally observable social structure, such as networks, associations, institutions, rules and procedures embodied. The second element of social capital, known as “cognitive social capital”,

comprises more subjective and intangible elements such as generally-accepted attitudes and norms of behaviour, shared values, reciprocity and trust.

In addition to the structural and cognitive definitions of social capital, a number of researchers have reviewed other aspects of social capital. Coleman (1988, 1990) stated that social capital included “obligations and expectation, trust, information potential, norms and effective sanctions, authority relations, appropriate social organizations, and social network”. Robert Putnam (1993, 1995a, 1995b, 2000, 2001), Bullen and Onyx (1998) and Stone (2001), described social capital as features of social organization, such as networks, norms, and trust that could increase a society’s productive potential while Bullen and Onyx (1998) concluded reciprocity, commons and pro-activity as inexorable components of social capital. Besides, Kreuter et al (1997) developed the concepts of social capital, based on Putnam’s works, to include civic involvement and social engagement. In recent years, the concepts of social capital have been widely extended by Balatti and Falk (2002), Sander and Lowney (2003) and, Grootaert, Narayan, Jones and Woolcock (2004). Balatti and Falk (2002) claimed that the resources of networks, shared values and trust, to which individuals had accessed as community members, were both individual and community social capital. Sander and Lowney (2003) stated that social capital referred to social networks and the norms of trust and reciprocity flourished through these networks. Grootaert, Narayan, Jones and Woolcock (2004) argued that social capital included groups and networks, trust and solidarity, collective action and co-operation, information and communication and social cohesion and inclusion.

From the above literature review, some core ideas on social capital are identified:

social networks, social norms, trust, and communication in the community.

Intergenerational solidarity

Solidarity is based on the idea of a feeling of togetherness and close ties. Intergenerational solidarity, hence, is the connection between the younger and the older generations (not limited to older people). These ties provide a strict and formal basis for identification which in turn leads to a willingness to provide mutual support and assistance. Solidarity between generations can be achieved in the forms of mentorship, sharing, cooperation in the family and the community, which can enhance the mutual perception among the generations (Vasiliou, PEO, Cyprus, 1999; Ellis and Granville, 1999; Silverstein and Bengtson, 2001, Keele University, 2002).

Intergenerational solidarity includes six components (Atkinson et al, 1989; Roberts and Bengtson, 1990; Bengtson et al, 2001, Bengtson, 2001, Silverstein and Bengtson, 2001), which are: a) associational solidarity: the frequency and patterns of interaction in various types and activities (*contact*); b) affectional solidarity: the type and degree of positive sentiment held for family members and the degree of reciprocity of these sentiments (*emotional attachment*); c) consensual solidarity: the degree of agreement on values, attitudes, and beliefs among family members (*agreement*); d) functional solidarity: the degree of helping and exchanges of resources (*patterns of instrumental support or resource sharing*); e) normative solidarity: the strength of commitment to the performance of familial roles in meeting familial obligations (*familism*); and f) structural solidarity: the opportunity structure for intergenerational relationships reflected in the number, type and geographic proximity of family members. The theory of intergenerational solidarity has captured considerable attention as a means of characterizing and explaining

relationships between nuclear kin in the adult years and in old age (Lawrence, Bennett and Markides, 1992). In measuring the intergenerational solidarity amongst social capital, functional solidarity has been chosen for development as a core component for measurement.

Intergenerational programmes

Intergenerational solidarity has become one of the global approaches towards sustainable social development, intergenerational programmes, thus, is regarded as “vehicles for the purposeful and ongoing exchange of resources and learning among older and younger generations for individual and social benefits” while being carried out in various countries, e.g. Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, Japan, Netherland, New Zealand, Spain, UK and USA (Hatton-Yeo and Ohsakom, 2000; Keele University, 2002). It is observed that intergenerational programmes, such as school-based learning and teaching programmes involving older persons and children, could help people become more aware of resources available in the community and develop a feeling of connectedness with others and their families, consolidating the social support, thus social capital in the community (Boström, 2003; Raynes, 2004; Roos, 2004; Duquin, McCrea, Fetterman and Nash, 2004).


2.2 Theoretical framework of the study

Reviewing the concepts as mentioned above, the current study presumes that intergenerational solidarity is one of the factors that contribute to the development of social capital in particular in the areas of resource exchange, network strengthening and enlargement, norms and values shared and trustful relationship building between generations. Therefore in order to enhance the overall social capital in the

community, it is necessary to increase the intergenerational solidarity. Intergenerational programmes may also be considered as one of effective strategies to build up the solidarity between generations according to the evidence shown in western societies for the past three decades. Hence, the present study will investigate the impacts of the intergenerational programmes of selected CIIF projects and explore plausible and effective strategies to build up the solidarity between generations for the community in Hong Kong. The theoretical framework of the study is shown in figure 1.

It is shown that negative consequences of social and economic development cause dysfunction of the family and conflict between generations. The society are lacking solidarity while the CIIF intergenerational projects are assumed to be an interventional strategy to promote solidarity between generations. In general, three types of the intergenerational projects has been found, namely young people oriented, older people oriented and cross generational oriented. These kinds of projects aim at empowering older people, empowering younger people and promoting the cooperation between generations respectively. The impact of the projects are to build up intergenerational support and relationships, (i.e. intergenerational solidarity). The extension of the social support network is also assumed to be one of the possible outcomes of the project. In other words, to promote intergenerational solidarity through the intergenerational projects can contribute to the development of social capital in Hong Kong.

Figure 1: Theoretical Framework of the study



2.3. Operationalized definitions of social capital, intergenerational solidarity and intergenerational programmes

Social capital

Social capital is a multidimensional concept with numerous definitions and conceptual approaches. To have consistent ideas of the concepts, the present study adopts the World Bank and CIIF's working definitions of social capital which include cognitive behaviour and its relationship to social capital as well as the structural dimensions of social capital as it is the most commonly used concept in researches. In brief, social capital comprises social network, norms of trust and reciprocity as resources for action.

To measure social capital, as reviewed, there are many approaches available, such as the network or functional approach; process or outcome oriented; and either dependent or independent variables (Van Deth, 2003). Indicators used frequently in social capital research can be classified into two groupings (Stone, 2001). That is (a) **Proximal indicators**: outcomes of social capital related to its core components of networks, trust and reciprocity, e.g. civic engagement, confidence in others, reciprocal acts or exchanges etc (*outcome indicators*); (b) **Distal indicators**: outcomes of social capital not directly related to its key components, e.g. employment rate, business confidence, etc. (*output indicators*). However, regarding the small sample size of the study, the present study will only take this as reference indicators and develop a set of outcome indicators to evaluate the effectiveness and outcomes of the CIIF projects.

Intergenerational solidarity

As reviewed, intergenerational solidarity builds the ties between the young, the adults and the old, which provides a strict and formal basis for identification and leads to the willingness to provide mutual support and assistance in the form of various kinds of reciprocal support and cooperation. This study adopts the framework of intergenerational solidarity developed by McChesney and Bengtson (1988) as theoretical foundation. Specifically it looks into the functional solidarity (i.e. the degree of mutual help and resource exchange or assistance) between generations in

the intergenerational programmes as it is closely relevant to the outcomes of social capital.

Intergenerational programmes

Three programme features which can be categorized as intergenerational programmes include (1) programmes that increase cooperation, interaction or exchange between any two generations; (2) programmes that promote the sharing of skills, knowledge or experience between older and younger people; (3) programmes that provide ongoing and planned interactions between biologically and non-biologically linked children, adults, and older people and which can be beneficial to all parties. Hence, the target projects chosen for the study are based on the fulfillment of one or all of the above characteristics.

2.4 Research questions for study

Three research questions underpinned the evaluation study. They are:

1. What are the nature and characteristics of the CIIF intergenerational projects?
2. What are the aggregated outcome impacts of the projects which help to enhance intergenerational relationships and support as well as to promote intergenerational solidarity (i.e. the social capital) of Hong Kong?
3. Are there any critical successful factors for project implementation?

Part III. Research method

3.1 Research design

This study employs qualitative and quantitative methodologies to investigate the outcome impacts of the selected intergenerational projects of CIIF. A bottom up approach is adopted and it is expected that a set of outcome indicators will be developed to measure the effectiveness and outcomes of the intergenerational programmes.

A bottom-up approach is a generally accepted strategy for reviewing intergenerational programmes. It creates an open-ended platform in pursuit of the effectiveness of these programmes while emphasizing the integration of theory and practice (Keele University, 2002). Followed by literature review to identify crucial aspects of intergenerational programmes, in-depth interviews with key informants, i.e. project leader and coordinator, are carried out to amass all necessary sources at the frontline level. Based on the verbatim transcription of the interviews, the data will be categorized through the process of open coding and thus content analysis. Then a set of outcome indicators will be developed to measure the outcomes and effectiveness of the intergenerational programmes on the development of intergenerational solidarity. (Please refer to the part IV for detail discussion). These can serve as references to measure the outcomes of future CIIF projects.

In consideration of the practical situations of different implementation schedule of the programmes and avoid over-disturbance to the programme participants, the research design for the captioned study has been slightly refined. The data collection process is mainly divided into two stages:

Stage 1: In-depth interviews cum field observation

This study adopted individual face-to-face interviews with project leaders and frontline coordinators (1 to 2 cases from each project) of selected CIIF projects. Occasional field visits were also conducted to observe the implementation of the programmes and the interactions between programme participants (each programme had at least one field visit). The aims are to explore the outcome indicators of

intergenerational relation, reciprocal support, quality of network built and overall project impacts of the programmes. By using a bottom-up approach, it is evident that the items (indicators) developed will be better fitted for the current situation of Hong Kong and will be more cultural sensitive. The interview guideline was developed with reference to conceptualization framework of the study as well as the literatures (See appendix I).

The in-depth interviews and field visits were conducted from September 2004 to June 2005. The sample sizes are based on theoretical saturation (no new concepts of intergenerational solidarity were explored, as indicated by qualitative methodology (Strauss and Corbin, 1988)). The collected qualitative data from interviews and field visits will be analyzed in different themes/domains. A set of outcome indicators will be developed and will be used for constructing survey questionnaires.

Stage 2: Survey

Following the in-depth interviews, a survey was employed for the evaluation study. Two set of well-structured questionnaires (Set 1 is for younger people aged 15-64 and set 2 is for older people aged 65 or above) were developed for the study to evaluate the outcome impacts of the selected intergenerational projects (Please refer to Appendix VI, and VII). The questionnaire items were mainly derived from the in-depth interviews. As the difference in project implementation and to avoid heavy disturbance to the participants, only one survey was conducted for the present study. The participants were asked to rate their agreement on statements describing their performances after participating in the intergenerational projects. The survey was self-administered by the participants. The questionnaires are mainly close-ended questions consisting of 40 items in the eight key domains of the project outcomes with the use of 5 point rating scale. Table 3.1 shows the key outcome indicators of the questionnaire.

Table 3.1: The key construct of the outcome indicators of the questionnaire

Domains		Question
(1)	The perceived positive images of older people or younger people	1-3
(2)	The intergenerational communications and relationships	4-14

(3)	Social competence and skill transfer	15-20
(4)	Volunteerism/social participation/ self help and mutual help	21-24
(5)	Trust	25-27
(6)	Intergenerational solidarity and reciprocal support	28-31
(7)	Social network	32-36
(8)	Social support.	37-40

3.2. Sampling

Purposive quota sampling method was used for the present evaluation study. Each project from which a total number of 60 participants from three age groups (1) aged 15 to 25, (2) Aged 26 to 64 and (3) Aged 65 or above were selected for the survey. The first two groups are regard as younger people while the third age group (aged 65 or above) are regarded as older people. Different sets of questionnaires were distributed to the older and the younger groups. The target projects chosen for the survey are based on two inclusion criteria which include: (1) the presence of three groups of participants (a) aged 15-25, (b) aged 26-54 and (c) aged 65 or above and (2) the consent to participate in the evaluation study and the sufficient number of participants within the scheduled period (July-Aug 2005). The projects characteristics and projects which meet or do not meet the inclusion criteria are listed in table 3.2 below. A total of six projects had finally been chosen for the study.

Table 3.2 Basic characteristics for the selected projects (N=10)

No	Project Name (Duration)	Project Aims	Target group	Inclusiveness / exclusiveness Remarks
1	It's all because of you: Community Cohesion Project/ 0091- 01D 全因有你 - 社區共融計劃 Duration: 1 year (4/2003-3/2004)	To promote mutual care and trust as well as build up community networks and mutual understandings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The youth, ◆ The elderly ◆ Mental rehabilitant 	Exclusive Remark: The project has completed for a year and the project co-coordinator found it difficult to identify the project participants to fill out the survey. Please refer to their extended project /0018 – 03D. (2 in 1 project)
2	"Caring Estates" in Southern District/ 0100/0101- 01C 南區「愛心」計劃 Duration:3 years (4/2003-3/2006)	To set up "caring estates" through networking of local communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Residents ◆ NGOs, ◆ Business 	Inclusive
3.	Cross Generational Community Integration Programme/0127- 01C 跨代同行互關懷 - 社區共融計劃 Duration:1 year(3/2003-2/2004)	To build mutual help support network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The elderly, ◆ New immigrants, ◆ The youth 	Inclusive Remark: The project has been completed for a year so it was difficult to collect 60 samples. The project co-ordinator will try to identify the project participants for survey.
4.	Retired Person Volunteers' Association-Community Mutual Help Network Project/0133/0134 - 01C	To build up skills and confidence of the senior to do volunteer services and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Retired older people, ◆ Unemployed 	Inclusive Remark: The project did not have sufficient age group of younger people

	退休人士義務工作協會 - 社區互助網絡計劃 Duration: 3 year (4/2003-3/2006)	encourage mutual support and enlarge social network in local communities	and deprived groups	aged 15 to 25 as the younger participants are primary school pupils.
5.	Community Integration-Developing Respective Strengths/0138-01D 社區共融 --- 各盡所長計劃 Duration: 1 year (9/2003-8/2004)	To promote a community life in which people help and love each other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ New immigrants ◆ Women ◆ The youth, 	Inclusive Remark: The project did not have sufficient participants in the old age group but the project co-ordinator will try to identify some of elderly participants for the survey.
6.	Project RAGE-Responsible Action, Genuine Encounter/0157 - 02E 勵志網絡 - 勇於承擔, 真誠接觸 Duration: 3 years (1/5/2004)	To provide quality mentors for marginalized and uninvolved youth so as to create positive network of supportive and caring relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Marginalized Youth at risk and their families 	Exclusive Remark: The project has built in survey itself and do not have the old age group
7.	Productive Aging: Elderly Shop Project/0057- 03E 老有所為篇「長者專門店計劃」 Duration: 3 years (4/2004-4/2007)	To nurture a group of elderly to venture business and integrate different sectors in the community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The elderly ◆ Unemployed middle-aged men and Youth-at-risk, ◆ House wives ◆ Local organizations 	Inclusive
8.	School and Centre hand in hand/0043 - 02D 社校共融展續紛計劃 Duration: 2 years (7/2004-6/2006)	To help families to function well and increase their resistance against hard time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Kindergarten/P primary/ secondary school students from low income families 	Exclusive Remark: The project did not include old age group. Also, the project was ceased at September 2005. Insufficient samples.
9.	Hand in Hand: Caring Community Project/0018 – 03D 同心互行-社區網絡發展計劃 Duration: 2 years (4/2004-3/2006)	To promote mutual care and trust and build up community network and mutual understandings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Ex-mentally ill people, ◆ The elderly, ◆ The youth ◆ Women 	Inclusive Remark: This is an extended project of project 0091/01D (2 in 1 project)
10.	Child-friendly network in SSP 「兒童友好」- 社區建造工程 Duration: 3 year(04/2005-03/2008)	To enhance the community well-being through creating a sustainable network that builds primarily on child-friendly community network initiatives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Low income and deprived families i.e. new arrivals/single parents 	Exclusive Remark: The project implements at an early stage i.e. just started trainings, and do not have sufficient old age group

3.3 Data Analysis

For qualitative data from in-depth interviews, content analysis was used to determine the themes and gain an in-depth understanding of the relationships between the impacts of intergenerational programmes on intergenerational solidarity and social capital in Hong Kong. SPSS was employed for data analysis of the quantitative survey, including simple descriptive statistics, comparison of means, standard deviation and frequency percentage. It is noted that the aims of the present evaluation study are to explore the aggregated impacts of the projects on intergenerational solidarity and identify critical successful factors for project implementation in future CIIF projects. Hence, the data analysis and the findings will not be presented separately but collectively. The overall outcomes impacts of the selected projects from in-depth interviews and survey will be discussed in part IV and V respectively.

3.4 Limitation of the study

There are several limitations of the study found in project samples. First of all, the selection of intergenerational projects for the evaluation study is based on reviewing the proposals sent to CIIF describing the target groups and the purpose of the projects at the initial stage. As the practical issues emerged during project implementation, some of the programme aims and major target participants might have to be modified accordingly. Therefore, some of the projects which have been chosen (10 out of 59 projects provided by CIIF) for the study might not focus on promoting intergenerational relationships and intergenerational solidarity. Besides, there might be the absence of one of the target groups. Hence, the findings we drawn from the in-depth interviews for the intergenerational elements may not be exhaustive enough to provide a whole picture of the intergenerational projects. Further researches have to be conducted to explore all the possible intergenerational elements and outcome indicators which come from the intergenerational projects.

Secondly, it is difficult to recruit interviewees from target participants in the project due to the progress of different projects. It is not possible to adhere to the original research proposal to conduct the pre-post test survey with larger samples of approximately 500 to evaluate the changes before and after the completion of the projects. Therefore, the present research adopted purposive sampling using summative questionnaire to evaluate their feedbacks for the project from time to time. Besides, the implementation of some of the projects had been postponed and some projects have their own research to implement while some were even ceased during the survey period (Please refer to Table 3.2). The number of samples collected in the selected projects were thus decreased. At the final stage, our study collected a total number of 316 valid questionnaires from 6 projects. In fact, distributed and collected with the assistance of project coordinators, the survey are on voluntarily basis which means that the survey sample are based on their willingness to participate in the survey in a given time period (August to September 2005). This made the control of the significant number of samples difficult. There were also problems in monitoring the questionnaires' administration process as some participants, reported by the project coordinator, were difficult to be reached or contacted. This also affected the collection

of samples.

Part IV. Findings

4.1 Results from in-depth interviews

This section presents the findings drawn from in-depth interviews which focus on the following four areas: 1) the description of the nature and characteristics of the ten selected CIIF intergenerational projects, 2) the identification of the key elements of the intergenerational solidarity found from the projects, 3) overall project impacts perceived by the interviewees, and 4) suggested critical factors drawn from the projects. As the aim of the in-depth interviews and field observations was to develop the outcome indicators for intergenerational programmes, and abundant quantitative and qualitative data have been collected from fieldwork (i.e. transcripts and programme reports, documents, output products from each programme), the saturation of preliminary analysis has been obtained. The section will summarize the key findings generated from the ten projects instead of reporting it case by case. For quick reference, please refer to Appendix IV: project profile and the outcome indicators.

A total number of 20 key informants, mainly project leaders and coordinators were interviewed from September 2004 to June 2005. Most of them were experienced workers with an average working experience of 11.7 years in the field and the average time spent per week for their projects was 25.3 hours (see Appendix III: sample profile). The interviews were conducted in a private room of the agencies. Each interview lasted for 1.5 – 2.5 hours and was taped and recorded.

4.1.1 Project nature and characteristics

The intergenerational elements

In view of the increasing trend of the dysfunction of family and the rise of individualism, most of the project coordinators found that it is a high time to promote intergenerational solidarity and social cohesion for the reason of social sustainability and capital advancement. By the written documents, all the ten selected CIIF projects have the elements of the activities or operations among different age groups. Broadly speaking, all the ten CIIF projects involved participants from different age groups, e.g. the youth, adults and older people, while some were aimed at two generations only such as the youth and adults. All the projects attempted to promote social support, social network and social cohesion in the community, the target groups of which

included not only the three age groups named above but also the deprived groups such as middle-aged housewives, the ex-mentally ill people and new arrivals from Mainland China. However, from the in-depth interviews, not all the interviewees defined their projects as intergenerational programmes and only five projects have clearly focused on promoting cross generational relationships, cooperation and support.

The characteristics of the projects

The projects aimed to enhance social network through a wide variety of means for all groups of ages to get known with each other and cooperate in organizing mass activities, such as sports and excursion. In addition, the projects attempted to foster social support by providing volunteering service in the community, such as house cleaning and home visits, with a promising goal to establish self-help team / association. Social cohesion was to be achieved by promoting positive understanding towards the deprived groups (e.g. the youth, elderly and new arrivals) whom were regarded as vulnerable groups without proper social support and network.

Most projects intended to empower the vulnerable groups from service recipients to service provider. They were equipped with proper volunteering training and provided with volunteering opportunity and participation in the community.

4.1.2 Intergenerational solidarity

The most obvious elements have been found to promote and enact intergenerational solidarity are the mutual help and support, skill transfer and experience sharing between various generations such as retired older people, housewives, unemployment adults and youth, secondary school students and primary school pupils.

Mutual help and social support

It was observed that a strong sense of mutual help and support was developed through life experience sharing, skills transfer and service delivery. In most of the projects, paying visit to home-alone elderly and elderly centres were core activities. The trained volunteers, such as pupils and middle-aged housewives, visited the elderly on a regular basis (weekly or monthly). The elderly, as expected, used to share their life

experience with the younger generations. In one of the projects, the retired electricians, as mentors, transferred their skills to the youngsters and they managed to repair household appliances under the guidance and supervision of mentors. The youngster taught the elderly basic computer skills at the same time. Besides, the elderly and secondary school students cooperated in publishing local newspaper and making ceramics.

Skills transfer

A few projects provided opportunity of skills transfer among different generations. In a mentorship project, the reciprocal exchange of skills was observed that mentors (university graduate professionals) taught different skills to mentees (non-engaged youngsters) such as basketball, computer and swimming. The mentors, on the other hand, also learned youth culture from the mentees such as pop music and idioms. In another project, housewives and non-engaged youth were recruited and trained by retired artisans with home appliance repairing skills so as to provide volunteering service for the elderly in the community. In regard to the widespread usage of Mandarin in Hong Kong, the new arrivals from Mainland China taught Mandarin, their mother-tongue, to the local people through mass games and activities in the community.

Experience sharing

Experience exchange is an important form of mutual support in functional solidarity (Hancock, Mangan and McChesney, 1988). The project coordinators reported that the participants were eager to share their experience and feelings with each other. In activities specifically designed for the new arrivals, when some participants said they usually felt frustrated about unpleasant discrimination against them in social life, other participants would have tried to console them and share their ways to overcome these kinds of difficulties with all the participants. Besides, it is found that when the adults and elderly were used to share their life experience with the youth, the adults usually shared their working experience while the elderly shared their relationship with families. As quoted from a report of the project coordinator of the Salvation Army, an older person reflected that “I feel needed and valued whenever I am given an opportunity to share my life experience and values to the younger generations.”

4.1.3 Project impacts

With the transfer of skills, mutual support and expanded social network, the projects were efficacious in yielding positive impacts on intergenerational solidarity and social capital in different aspects.

Intergenerational solidarity

Family relationship is an integral part of intergenerational solidarity. Some of the project coordinators reported that family relationship of certain participants was greatly improved since it provided an opportunity for them to interact with and understand each other. A participant of “Caring Estates” in Southern District had regarded his mother’s phone call as annoying and usually cut the line. After he joined several training workshops on communication skills and interpersonal skills, as well as sharing with housewife volunteers, he realized that his mother was very concerned about him and even presented gifts to her occasionally. He said, as quoted from one of the project coordinators’ report: “I now begin to realize my mother’s love.” Parents also learned how to communicate with younger generations. A volunteer, who was a father of three children, said: “I am so happy that I have joined this project because I have a chance to understand the thinking pattern of youngsters and the hot topics among them. We (his children and he) have more common topics for chats and they are willing to share their feelings with me now.”

Self help

Self-help association and shop were established and sustained by the target groups, with the assistance from social workers, to enhance social aid. St. James’ Settlement, for example, organized a retired person volunteers’ association involving different parties such as private corporations, government departments, local organizations to contribute and join the association. For instance, Lion’s Club donated and participated in their programmes. The volunteer groups of Swire Groups also joined the association. What was resulted was the snowball effect as the association expanded its connection with other associations. The self-help association will be finally operated by the volunteers themselves as executive committee has been formed and regular meetings are held. The self-administration of the association, therefore, enhanced the sustainability of the project.

Social harmony

The change in perception towards each other is another pleasant result to fostering social harmony. The elderly is generally but erroneously labeled as authoritative, nagging and inactive, whereas the images of older people are dismayed by prejudice. All of the projects were successful in instilling positive image by providing a platform for other age groups, particularly the youth, to communicate directly with the elderly through participating in mass activities and volunteering. The project coordinators revealed that, on the one hand, the youth found the elderly nice and easy-going, and the elderly were willing to listen to and accept their opinion. On the other hand, the elderly observed the youth to be disciplined and punctual throughout the projects while they initially perceived the youth to be irresponsible and dependent. One youngster reflected that “before this project (It’s all because of you: Community Cohesion Project) I thought the elderly were annoying and boring, and thus I am a little bit worried about working with them. But after I have joined this project, I realized that I was wrong. They are very nice and humorous. Whenever we seek advice from them, they are willing to help.” In addition, most of the selected projects attempted to help the deprived groups (e.g. single family, ex-mentally ill people, and new arrivals from Mainland China etc.) who were discriminated by the general public due to misunderstanding. For instance, the locals considered the new arrivals as disrespectful and uncivilized. Yet, a project coordinator of Youth Kwun Tong quoted from a local volunteer: “after a series of programmes working with them, my perception has completely changed. I once lost my wallet and had no money to get back home; one of them lent me money. They are in fact considerate and nice.”

Social participation

Volunteering service was commonplace of producing social impact and capital, which was carried out commonly in elderly centres, youth centres, single-living elderly homes and public areas in forms of home visits, mass activities, festival celebration, house cleaning, board exhibitions and, more specifically, home appliance repair. A brief on selected volunteering services are shown in below Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 volunteering services by selected projects

Project	District	No. of volunteers	No. of hours
Cross generational community integration programme	Eastern District	150 older persons and student volunteers	> 1000
Retired person volunteers' association community mutual help network	Central and Western District	100 older persons, housewives and youngsters	> 800
Community integration developing respective strengths	Kwun Tong	60 new arrivals of all ages	> 1800
It's all because of you	Tseung Kwan O	150 older persons, youth and ex-mentally ill people	> 1000
Productive Aging: Elderly Shop Project	Wong Tai Sin	170 older persons	> 1800

Social inclusion

As mentioned above, prejudice and discrimination against the disadvantaged and uninvolved groups, which deprived them of social activities, were eliminated since proper communication platforms were created to enhance mutual aid. These groups became more involved in social activities as one project coordinator mentioned: “the new arrivals now feel free to participate in our activities and even have strong incentive to play a key role in organizing activities.” The home-alone elderly and unemployed youth were no exception. “Home visits are beneficial to both of them. The home-alone elderly felt they were being cared while the unemployed felt recognized and the sense of belonging was strengthened,” a project coordinator observed. The elderly in turn joined volunteering team and visited other older people in need. Expanded participation in social activities, hence, resulted in advancement of social inclusion.

Individual cognitive social capital

The project coordinators unanimously agreed that individual social capital was enhanced, by their own observation and quantitative study, in different aspects, e.g. confidence, social network, sense of accomplishment etc. The deprived groups, those with little or no social support and network, benefited most in these areas. In regards to the ex-mentally ill people, a project coordinator of Richmond Fellowship of Hong Kong, for example, said: “they are totally capable of paying home visits to the older persons who are living alone. And they have become more and more confident in communicating with others”. The social support and network were expanded among the new arrivals and the elderly whose social network were limited. They knew where

and how to seek help in the community and the activities revived the reengagement to the community. In addition, the retired artisans also found feeling of accomplishment through teaching handcraft skills to the youth and mid-aged housewives. A project coordinator of St James' Settlement quoted older person's words: "I am so happy that I found myself contributing to the society because my skills are still valuable."

4.1.4 Critical factors to success

From the 10 projects' interviews, several critical factors are identified for successful implementation of the projects which could be useful references for the intergenerational practice or as the monitoring indicators for the CIIF projects in future.

Quality staffing

Project coordinators noted that dissemination of the related rationales among the staff and participants is one of the core successful factors in implementing the projects. The project coordinators of "It's all because of you: social cohesion project" unanimously agreed that "well-informed and trained staff with full understanding of the aims of the projects, as well as the rationales of intergenerational solidarity and social capital could facilitate the progress of the project and dissemination of the underlying rationales." Difficulties in implementation were found at the very beginning of the project since the frontline workers were not familiar with the aims and rationales. The role and responsibilities were not clearly explained to the participants. After an internal orientation session with the rationales and aims of the project being elaborated, they managed to delegate proper roles to the participants and disseminate the concepts to them succinctly. The participants, as the project coordinators said, therefore realized their roles in the project to interact with other age groups. The project, afterwards, was carried out smoothly and successfully.

Implementation strategies

Upon the implementation strategies, recognition of training for the participants are two vital factors to maintain their enthusiasm and thus sustainability of intergenerational projects. In "Cross generational community integration programme", older people and students co-worked in publishing a local newsletter themselves.

They took up every procedure of publication, e.g. reporting, editing, proofreading, formatting and distributing. The participants said that “being delegated to overseeing the newsletter, I felt a sense of accomplishment and recognition when I took and read the first copy in the publishing factory at once.” The project coordinators invited experienced reporters to deliver a series of training workshops to these “new reporters and editors” on interviewing, reporting and writing skills. “I have never thought of how complicated reporter’s job is. It is challenging though. I learned a lot from the workshops”, commented an older participant.

Network with local organizations

Network with other local organizations could bring about synergy impact on recruitment and effectiveness. Project coordinators claimed “liaisons with other organizations, either government-aided and private, is very important to expand the participant base to exert greater influence in the community.” They reported that collaboration with other local organizations was very important to recruit different types of participants, e.g. older persons from elderly centres, children from kindergartens, students from primary and secondary schools, and marginal youth from youth centres etc. Close cooperation with the local organizations made large amount of recruitment possible. For instance, project coordinator of Richmond Fellowship of Hong Kong recruited more than 60 pupils from three secondary schools and more than 50 older persons from one elderly centre. Kai-fong welfare association, owners and residents associations and district councilors were common collaborators for activities promotion via poster and leaflet distribution.

Family participation

The project coordinators pointed out that family participation is one of the successful factors in fostering intergenerational solidarity. In reference to the dysfunction of family as an integral part of support and shelter due to a number of reasons such as single family and long working hours, family-based activities created a bridge to link up the communication between parents and children especially to the new arrivals without social network from the community. The project coordinators noted that “on the one hand, parents begin to know how to care about their children through talks, workshops and outings; the children, on the other hand, realize that it is important to accept parental concerns for family harmony.” A case was observed that a youngster,

who felt distance from his parents and, therefore, hardly shared feelings with them because he found no support and encouragement from them, had attempted to open up to talk to parents after doing volunteering service in elderly centres together with his mother while she taught him how to communicate with the elderly effectively with love and patience. Yet, it should be noted that some project coordinators said that it was very difficult to invite participant's parents to join the project.

In conclusion, Part IV have described the key findings from the 10 project interviews which include the project characteristics, the key elements for enhancing the intergenerational solidarity, some observable project impacts and the critical factor for successfully implementation of the projects. Also, through the in-depth interviews, a set of the outcome indicators have been generated which will be use to measure the outcome impacts of the CIIF intergenerational projects The 8 domains are developed: ***(1) The perceived positive images of older people or younger people, (2) the intergenerational communications and relationships (3) social competence and skill transfer (4) Volunteerism/social participation/ self help and mutual help (5) Trust (6) intergenerational solidarity and reciprocal support (7) social network (8) social support.***

4.2 Results from survey questionnaire

This section consists of three parts. Table 4.2 presents the sample profiles of the selected projects. It gives a brief description of six selected projects and the number of valid samples collected. Table 4.3 describes the social and economic backgrounds of the participants while table 4.4 discusses the overall project impacts on the intergenerational relationships and support, the relationships between intergenerational solidarity and the development of social capital in Hong Kong. Eight key domains of the outcome impacts will be presented respectively.

4.2.1. The sample profiles for selected projects

Data collection

The survey was conducted between 18 August 2005 and 10 September 2005. From the ten CIIF projects, six projects have met our pre-set selection criteria which are: (1) the projects participants include three generations aged 14 to 25, aged 26 to 64 and aged 65 or over, (2) the project participants are accessible and (3) the participants are willing to participate in the survey study in a given time period. The starting time and completion time for the selected projects varied from the March 2003 to April 2007, lasting from one to three years. Among the six selected projects, two projects (project no. 0127-01C, 0138-01D) have been completed while the other four projects are still under implementation during our research period.

The number of valid samples collected

A total number of 316 valid survey questionnaires were received till 28 September 2005. One hundred and seventeen participants were aged 14 to 25, 105 participants were aged 26 to 64 and 94 participants are aged 65 or over (*see the below table 4.21 for details*). The survey findings bases on the six selected projects for evaluating the outcome impacts on the intergenerational solidarity of Hong Kong. As it is going to explore the aggregated effects of the project towards the community, the present survey findings will be analyzed and reported by grouped data instead of having individual analysis. It is noted that the research findings are by no means conclusive due to the limited sample collected in a given time as well as some project constrains during implementation.

Table 4.2 The number of collected cases by age by project

No	Project name (duration)	Valid Cases (aged 14 to 25)	Valid Cases (aged 26 to 64)	Valid Cases (Aged>=65)	Total
1	"Caring Estates" in Southern District/ 0100/0101-01C 南區「愛心」計劃 Duration: 3 years (4/2003-3/2006)	26	17	18	61
2.	Cross Generational Community Integration Programme/0127- 01C 跨代同行互關懷 - 社區共融計劃 Duration: 1 year (3/2003-2/2004)	19	12	19	50
3.	Retired Person Volunteers' Association-Community Mutual Help Network Project/0133/0134 - 01C 社區互助網絡計劃聖雅各福群會退休人士服務中心 Duration: 3 years (4/2003-3/2006)	1	24	19	44
4.	Community Integration-Developing Respective Strengths/0138-01D 社區共融 --- 各盡所長計劃 Duration: 1 year (9/2003-8/2004)	25	8	8	41
5.	Productive Aging: Elderly Shop Project/0057- 03E 老有所為篇「長者專門店計劃」 Duration: 3 years (4/2004-4/2007)	23	16	16	55
6.	Hand in Hand: Caring Community Project/0018 – 03D 同心互行-社區網絡發展計劃 Duration: 2 years (4/2004-3/2006)	23	28	14	65
Total		117	105	94	316

The duration of participating in the CIIF projects

The period of participation in the each project is relatively even. About half of the participants (53.5%) have been participated for one year while nearly half of the total participants (46.5%) have been participated for the project more than one year. However, It should be emphasized that one third of the participants (33.1%) have joined the project for less than 6 months which may not be long enough for them to acquire a clear understanding on the project and thus may not be able to present well of the project impacts (see table 4.3).

Table 4.3 The duration of participating in the project (N=260)

	Frequency	%
less than 6 months	86	33.1
6 months to 1 year	53	20.4
1 year to 2 years	76	29.2
More than 2 years	45	17.3

Average time spent on the project

Table 4.4 shows the average time spent on the project per month was 45.75 hours (Mean=45.75, SD=78.85). Fifty-three percent of the participants spent less than ten hours per week, 22% of the participants spent 10-20 hours while 24.4% of the participants spent more than 20 hours per week on the project activities. The findings

indicated that the participants are not very actively involved in the project issues and only one tenth (13.9%) of the participants are highly committed.

Table 4.4 The time spent on the project per week (N=245)

	Frequency	%
<10 hours	131	53.5
10-20 hours	54	22.0
21 to 30 hours	18	7.3
31 to 40 hours	2	0.8
41 to 50 hours	6	2.4
>=50 hours	34	13.9

The involvement of project participation

Table 4.5 indicated the degree of involvement of the project. It is found that the participants generally have a comparatively high involvement of the project activities as 42.1% and 39.2% of the participants rated that they have general and high involvement of the project respectively. 14.2% have very high involvement of the project. This reveals that the participants are a group of active project participants in general.

Table 4.5 The involvement of the project (N=309)

	Frequency	%
Very low	4	1.3
Low	10	3.2
General	130	42.1
High	121	39.2
Very high	44	14.2

The relationships with participants

The figures show that most of the participants have good relationships with other participants (see table 4.6). They have rated the relationship with others as general to very good, accounting for 96.5% of the total sample. Less than one percent (0.7%) or even none of them reported a poor relationship with other participants, reflecting that the project they participated help to build up better relationships among generations.

Table 4.6 The perceived relationship with other participants (N=307)

	Frequency	%
Very poor	0	0
Poor	2	.7
General	84	27.4
Good	165	53.7
Very Good	56	18.2

The relationship with project staff/coordinator(s)

As for the relationships with project staff or coordinators in Table 4.7, similarly, nearly all, or 98.8% of the total sample of the participants rated the relationships with the project workers as general to very good. Also, there is even 20.5% of the participants commented that they have very good relationships with the project coordinators. The figures implied that the good relationships between the participants and project staff might result from the high involvement of the project activities.

Table 4.7 The perceived relationship with project staff/coordinators (N=303)

	Frequency	%
Very poor	4	1.3
Poor	0	0
General	102	33.7
Good	135	44.6
Very Good	62	20.5

4.2.2 The social and economic background of the participants

The participants' profiles

Table 4.8 shows the social and demographic background of the participants. In general, the participants are healthy and active but not economically better-off. The age samples are relatively even distribution with almost one third of each age group (Aged 14 to 25, 37%, aged 26 to 64, 33.5% and aged 65 or above, 29.4%). Female participants (63.1%) are slightly more than male participants (36.9%) which more or less resembles the situation in Hong Kong that female tends to be more willing to participate in project activities. About half of the participants (49%) are single while one third of the participants are married (35.2%) as we have a large group of young participants. One-tenth of the participants (10.3%) are widowed and most of them are older participants. Most of the participants are local residents while only 6% of the participants are new arrivals which have been living in Hong Kong for less than 7 years. The health situation of most participants (90.4%) are perceived as general to

very good therefore they might account for the active group of participants. As for the educational level, about half of them (50%) have attained secondary school level while one-third of them have attained primary school (28.8%) or tertiary educational level or above (22.2%). Their financial situation is just right (69.2%) while 22% of the participants felt their financial situation are bad or very bad.

Table 4.8: The social and demographic background of the participants

	Frequency	%
Age (N=316)		
Age 14 to 25	117	37.0
Age 26 to 64	105	33.5
Age 65 or above	94	29.4
Sex (N=314)		
Male	116	36.9
Female	198	63.1
Marital status (N=310)		
Single	152	49.0
Married	109	35.2
Divorce/separated	17	5.5
Widowed	32	10.3
The years of residing in Hong Kong (N=296)		
< 7 years	18	6
7 to 15 years	26	8.88
16 to 30 years	93	31.5
30 years or above	153	51.4
Perceived Health condition (N=314)		
Very poor	5	1.6
Poor	25	8.0
General	121	38.5
Good	129	41.1
Very Good	34	10.8
Educational Level (N=306)		
Primary school or below	85	27.8
Secondary school	153	50.0
Post-secondary school	23	7.5
College or University	41	13.4
Postgraduate or above	4	1.3
Financial conditions (N=305)		
Very bad	24	7.9
Bad	43	14.1
Just right	211	69.2
Good	25	8.2
Very Good	2	.7

Family size and living arrangement

The type of living arrangement and family size of the participants is presented in table 4.9. The average family size of the participants is 3.14 (N=311) which is similar to the general family household size nowadays in Hong Kong. Most of the participants live with parents (N=130), spouse (N=97), children (N=88), close family relatives or siblings (N=82) while a few of the participants live grandparents (N=12) and grandchildren (N=8). The findings reflect that the participants tend to live in a nuclear type and this family structure might be the reason for fewer opportunities to meet with grandparents or grandchildren daily.

Table 4.9 The living arrangement of the participants (Multiple choices)

With whom	Frequency (N)
Living alone	38
With spouse	97
With children/Children in law	88
With parents	130
With grandparents	12
With grandchildren	8
With close family relatives/siblings	82
With friends	1
Others	14

Sources of incomes

The sources of incomes are mainly from their personal incomes or savings (N=121), parents or grandparents (N=100) and children or children in law (N=65) (see Table 4.10). Few of them received their incomes from the government and very few from their grandchildren or close family relatives or siblings. It reveals that their financial support are mainly relied on themselves or closed family members.

Table 4.10 The major sources of incomes of participants (Multiple choices)

Sources	Frequency
Personal incomes/savings	121
Children/Children in law	65
Parents/grandparents	100
Grandchildren	1
Close family relatives/siblings	8
Friends/neighbours	0
Government pensions/Social security/social charitable agencies/church	59
Others	13

Working status

The majority of participants are students (32.8%), retired people(30.5%) and housewives or general workers (20.8%). Less than 5% of the participants are professionals, businessmen or self employed while 6.2% does not have a regular job or unemployed (refer to table 4.11). It was found that this group are not economic better off group but they are not the most disadvantaged group in Hong Kong.

Table 4.11 The present job of the participants (N=308)

Work	Frequency	%
Students	101	32.8
No regular job/unemployed	19	6.2
Housewife	39	12.7
General worker/clerical work/ customer services	31	10.1
Technical eg computer technical/social worker/teacher/trainer/nurse	11	3.6
Businessman/self-employed	1	.3
Retired	94	30.5
Others	12	3.9

4.2.3. The outcome impacts of the selected intergenerational projects

This section reports the participants’ feedback on the CIIF projects. The survey results specifically focus on describing the results of the eight key domains of the study. The first to the fifth domains focus on the project impacts on intergenerational relationships and support while the sixth to eighth domains focus on the overall project outcomes of intergenerational solidarity and the development of social capital of Hong Kong. It particularly will look into the relationships between intergenerational solidarity and social capital, to what extent that the building up the intergenerational relationships and intergenerational solidarity can enhance the enlargement of the social networks and results in increase the social support and the social solidarity of the society. In other words, the domains of social network and social support are the project outcomes of social capital built in the community. As abundant data have been collected, the report will present the mean scores of each domain followed by the highlight of the differences among each age group. The simple statistical results (Mean, Standard Deviation, SD, and missing value) of the survey are presented by tables in the meantime.

Domain 1: The perceived positive images towards older/younger people

Table 4.12 shows the ratings of the perceived image of older/younger people in terms of age groups. All three age groups have high rating of the positive image of younger or older people with a mean score of 3.96. They highly agreed that older people are not troublesome, dependent, boring, difficult to get along with or burdensome to the society while young people are not impulsive, disrespectful, dependent on the society and do not follow the law and order (Mean=3.80, SD=0.98). The younger age group (aged 15 to 25) tended to perceive higher positive images of older people which the average rating is over 4 in question 1 and 2 while older people perceived less positive image of younger people.

As for the contribution to the society, however, younger people (Mean=3.93, SD=0.68), give lower scores than older people (Aged 65 or above) did (Mean=4.12, SD=0.60), implying that the younger people view older people are less capable in terms of informational technological skills and advanced knowledge.

Table 4.12 The ratings of the perceived image towards younger/older people by age group

Participants	Mean	SD	Missing (N)
Q1a. Young people are not impulsive/do not follow the law and order/ disrespectful, dependent on our society.			
Q1b. Older people are not troublesome/dependent/boring/difficult to get along well with and burdensome to our society.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117))	4.09	.79	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=105))	3.58	1.01	0
Age 65 or above (N=94)	3.70	1.08	0
Total participants (N=317)	3.80	.98	0
Q2a. Older people have a positive image eg having rich life experience, wisdom.			
Q2b. Young people are knowledgeable and active learning.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	4.09	.61	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=105)	4.07	.63	0
Age 65 or above (N=94)	3.85	.64	0
Total participants (N=316)	4.01	.64	0
Q3a. Older people are retired but still can make contributions to the society.			
Q3b. Young people are ambitious and can make contributions to the society.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.93	.68	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=103)	4.15	.67	2
Age 65 or above (N=91)	4.12	.60	3
Total participants (N=311)	4.06	.66	5
Mean Scores of Q1,Q2,Q3			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117))	4.04	.57	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=103))	3.94	.59	2
Age 65 or above (N=91))	3.89	.59	3
Total participants (N=311))	3.96	.58	5

Domain 2: Intergenerational communications and relationships

The statistics in table 4.13 shows that the participants have learnt the communication skills and built up good relationships among generations. Many items of the communication skills and relationships between generations (e.g. Q4, Q6, Q11, Q12) have scored over 4 points across age groups. Having joined the project, they felt that they learnt how to communication and get along well with the older/younger generations. Moreover, they have more interactions and cooperation and even tend to agree that this is the familial obligations to take care of the old and the young. The mean scores of the intergenerational communications are relatively high (Mean= 3.96, SD=0.58) for all participants.

Less favorable items are the relationships with their familial members particularly in building up good relationships with grandparents/ parents/grandchildren/children (Q13) and having more communications and interactions with grandparents/ parents/grandchildren/children (Q14), with the mean scores of 3.80(SD=0.77) and 3.78 (SD=0.79) respectively. The findings might imply that the project can be more effective on building up the community intergenerational relationships rather than familial intergenerational relationships and communications.

It is found that older people (aged 65 or above) rated relatively low (Mean=3.75, SD=0.62) for item Q8: I learnt the needs of younger people and make necessarily support than younger people did (aged 15 to 25 Mean=4.03, SD=0.59; aged 26 to 64 Mean=4.11, SD=0.46). It might be due to the insufficient ability of older people to provide support for younger people.

Table 4.13 The ratings of the intergenerational communication and solidaristic relationships by age group

Participants	Mean	SD	Missing (N)
Q4a. I learnt the skills to get along with older people eg care/respect/be patient.			
Q4b. I learnt the skills to get along with younger people eg be considering/respect/be patient.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	4.11	.69	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=105)	4.11	.57	0
Age 65 or above (N=94)	4.04	.61	0
Total participants (N=316)	4.09	.63	0
Q5a. I like working with older people.			
Q5b. I like working with younger people.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=116)	3.95	.60	1
Age 26 to 64 (N=105)	3.96	.55	0
Age 65 or above (N=94)	4.12	.59	0
Total participants (N=315)	4.00	.58	1
Q6a. I can get along well with older people.			
Q6b. I can get along well with younger people.			

Age 15 to 25 (N=116)	4.02	.65	1
Age 26 to 64 (N=105)	4.09	.54	0
Age 65 or above (N=93)	4.10	.71	1
Total participants (N=314)	4.07	.63	2
Q7a. I knew the characteristics of older people and learn from them.			
Q7b. I knew the characteristics of younger people and learn from them.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.95	.67	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=105)	4.08	.57	0
Age 65 or above (N=93)	3.90	.65	1
Total participants (N=315)	3.98	.63	1
Q8a. I knew the needs of older people and make necessarily support.			
Q8b. I knew the needs of younger people and make necessarily support.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	4.03	.59	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=103)	4.11	.46	2
Age 65 or above (N=94)	3.75	.62	0
Total participants (N=314)	3.97	.58	2
Q9a. I knew our strength and weakness and we (I & older people) can complement each other.			
Q9b. I knew our strength and weakness and we (I and younger people) can complement each other.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=115)	3.79	.72	2
Age 26 to 64 (N=104)	4.08	.60	1
Age 65 or above (N=93)	3.90	.68	1
Total participants (N=312)	3.92	.68	4
Q10a. I learnt to accept the ideas and values of older people.			
Q10b. I learnt to accept the ideas and values of younger people.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	4.04	.66	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=103)	3.99	.57	2
Age 65 or above (N=93)	3.91	.64	1
Total participants (N=313)	3.99	.63	3
Q11a. I have more opportunities to interact and communicate with older people (eg via chat, visit, listening, mutual learning, cooperation etc)			
Q11b. I have more opportunities to interact and communicate with younger people (eg via chat, visit, listening, mutual learning, cooperation etc)			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	4.07	.68	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=104)	4.28	.55	1
Age 65 or above (N=94)	4.06	.73	0
Total participants (N=315)	4.14	.66	1
Q12a. I think that Children (Younger generations) should have the responsibilities to take care of older parents, grandparents and older people.			
Q12b. I think that parents or grandparents (older generations) should have the responsibilities to teach and nurture children, grandchildren and younger people.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=116)	4.18	.73	1
Age 26 to 64 (N=105)	4.16	.71	0
Age 65 or above (N=87)	4.01	.73	7
Total participants (N=308)	4.13	.72	8
Q13a. I learnt how to build up good relationships with my parents/grandparents.			
Q13b. I learnt how to build up good relationships with my children/grandchildren.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.68	.71	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=104)	3.94	.81	1
Age 65 or above (N=84)	3.81	.80	10
Total participants (N=305)	3.80	.77	11
Q14a. I had more communications and interactions with my parents/grandparents.			
Q14b. I had more communications and interactions with my children/grandchildren.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.64	.76	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=105)	3.94	.78	0
Age 65 or above (N=84)	3.76	.81	10
Total participants (N=306)	3.78	.79	10
Mean scores of Q4 to Q14			

Age 15 to 25 (N=113)	3.95	.43	4
Age 26 to 64 (N=99)	4.06	.37	6
Age 65 or above (N=81)	3.96	.48	13
Total participants (N=293)	3.96	.58	23

Domain 3: Social competence and skills transfer

Regarding the social competence and the skills transfer (Refer to Table 4.14), the participants felt that they have learnt new knowledge and working skills, increased their confidence, interpersonal skills and positive value of themselves with relatively high ratings that the all items are scored over 3.5 points (Mean scores=3.77, SD=0.70). The performances that are particularly better are in confidence building (Mean=3.94, SD=0.73) and interpersonal skills (Mean=4.01; SD=0.67). However, the acquisition of new knowledge and working skills and the anti-adversities, with the mean scores of 3.53 (SD=0.85) and 3.57 (SD=0.80) respectively, are not as well as the other social competence aspects.

In addition, when asked about the impact on increasing the chance of getting a job (Table 4.15), 8.3 percent of the participants said that the CIIF projects had made them easier to get a job during the three months. This percentage is not considered as low, as the CIIF projects mainly provide skills related to social capital, rather specialized skills that can be directly used in working places. One should also note that the education levels of the participants are not high in general; over 77 percent of them received education below secondary school and almost 28% among this group did not attend secondary school (Table 4.8).

Lastly, 4.5 percent of the participants expressed that their income had increased through joining the project. From domain 3, it is found that older people tended to score lower than younger people did, probably due to the fact that older people cannot acquire new knowledge and skills as fast as younger people can.

Table 4.14 The ratings of the social competence and skills transfer by age group

Participants	Mean	SD	Missing (N)
Q15. I increased my confidence			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.80	..78	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=105)	4.08	..66	0
Age 65 or above (N=94)	3.96	..71	0
Total participants (N=316)	3.94	.73	0
Q16. I learnt the interpersonal skills			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	4.03	.73	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=105)	4.04	.58	0

Age 65 or above (N=94)	3.96	.67	0
Total participants (N=316)	4.01	.67	0
Q17. I learnt the new knowledge and the working skills			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.54	.84	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=105)	3.57	.82	0
Age 65 or above (N=94)	3.46	.92	0
Total participants (N=316)	3.53	.85	0
Q18. I increased my anti-adversity abilities eg. Solve living problems, adversity etc			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.48	.78	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=104)	3.70	.75	1
Age 65 or above (N=94)	3.52	.85	0
Total participants (N=315)	3.57	.80	1
Q19. I assured my abilities and values			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.60	.79	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=105)	3.92	.71	0
Age 65 or above (N=93)	3.74	.75	1
Total participants (N=315)	3.75	.76	1
Q20. I transferred my skills and knowledge to others			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.57	.80	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=105)	3.97	.77	0
Age 65 or above (N=94)	3.61	.82	0
Total participants (N=316)	3.72	.82	0
Mean scores of Q15 to Q20			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.73	.90	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=104)	3.88	.51	1
Age 65 or above (N=93)	3.71	.56	1
Total participants (N=314)	3.77	.70	2

Table 4.15: The percentage of feeling easier to get a job and increase the incomes in the past 3 months by the participants

Be easier to get a job (ie full-time or part-time) (N=289)		
	Frequency	%
Yes	24	8.3
No	265	91.7
Increase the incomes (N=287)		
Yes	13	4.5
No	274	95.1

Domain 4: Voluntarism/social participation/self-help and mutual help

The participants have actively participated in the voluntarily services or community activities (See table 4.16). They have high altruism and learn helping themselves and other people. They agreed that they have increased their awareness on the needs of the community, understanding on their responsibilities to contribute to the society, awareness on the rights of disadvantaged groups, active participation in community services and mutual help. The mean scores of this area is 3.97 (SD=0.55). The statistics indicates that the projects can enhance the participants’ community participations as well as mutual help.

Table 4.16 The ratings of Altruism/social participation/self-help and mutual help by age group

Participants	Mean	SD	Missing (N)
Q21. I understood the community needs and actively helping others voluntarily.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.94	.65	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=105)	4.17	.64	0
Age 65 or above (N=94)	3.81	.85	0
Total participants (N=316)	3.98	.72	0
Q22. I understood that I have the responsibilities to contribute our community.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.98	.68	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=102)	4.12	.49	3
Age 65 or above (N=94)	3.86	.79	0
Total participants (N=313)	3.99	.67	3
Q23. I am aware of the importance of giving the voice and the rights of disadvantaged group of our community(eg older people, new immigrants, ethic minority, unemployed people, mental rehabilitants)			
Age 15 to 25 (N=116)	3.84	.87	1
Age 26 to 64 (N=105)	3.90	.63	0
Age 65 or above (N=94)	3.85	.77	0
Total participants (N=315)	3.86	.77	1
Q24. I learnt self-help and mutual help and actively participated in community services/activities			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	4.44	4.68	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=105)	4.04	.62	0
Age 65 or above (N=94)	4.03	.73	0
Total participants (N=316)	4.19	2.90	0
Mean Scores of Q21 to Q24			
Age 15 to 25 (N=116)	3.94	.54	1
Age 26 to 64 (N=102)	4.08	.43	3
Age 65 or above (N=94)	3.89	.64	0
Total participants (N=312)	3.97	.55	4

Domain 5: Trust

Comparing with other aspects such as the positive image of younger/older people, intergenerational communications, self help and mutual help etc, the aspect of trust are not rated highly, with the mean scores of 3.77 (SD=0.60). There are no significant differences between generations (See table 4.17). The results reveal that it takes time

to build up trustful relationships among people.

Table 4.17: The ratings of trust to others by age group

Participants	Mean	SD	Missing (N)
Q25. I had more trust to my children/grandchildren.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.52	.81	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=104)	3.74	.83	1
Age 65 or above (N=83)	3.73	.85	11
Total participants (N=304)	3.65	.83	12
Q26. I increased the trust to disadvantaged group			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.72	.74	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=105)	3.76	.70	0
Age 65 or above (N=93)	3.77	.65	1
Total participants (N=315)	3.75	.70	1
Q27. I am willing to share my ideas, feelings and difficulties to others.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.85	.73	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=105)	3.86	.74	0
Age 65 or above (N=94)	3.96	.75	0
Total participants (N=316)	3.88	.74	0
Mean scores of Q25 to Q27			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.70	.59	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=104)	3.79	.63	1
Age 65 or above (N=82)	3.84	.57	12
Total participants (N=303)	3.77	.60	13

Domain 6: The intergenerational solidarity and reciprocal support

This domain discusses the participants' view on the relationships between intergenerational solidarity and social capital (See Table 4.18). They strongly agreed that better intergenerational relationships can enhance the harmony of our society (Mean=3.99, SD=0.7). Also, better intergenerational cooperation can build up solidarity of the society (Mean=4.0, SD=0.68). They confirmed that promotion of the intergenerational support is a key factor to increase the social capital (Mean=3.99; SD=0.71). They also strongly believed that continuous participation in the voluntary services is an effective way to promote intergenerational solidarity and increase the social capital of our society (Mean=4.09, SD=0.72). In other words, building up the intergenerational solidarity through the intergenerational projects can be one of the effective ways to enhance the development of social capital in Hong Kong.

Table 4.18 The ratings of intergenerational solidarity and reciprocal support by age group

Participants	Mean	SD	Missing (N)
Q28. I felt that better intergenerational relationship is a key factor to enhance the social harmony.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.85	.70	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=105)	4.08	.69	0

Age 65 or above (N=94)	4.06	.69	0
Total participants (N=316)	3.99	.70	0
Q29. I understood that the increase of the intergenerational cooperation is a key factor to build up the social solidarity.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.85	.71	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=104)	4.11	.71	1
Age 65 or above (N=94)	4.06	.57	0
Total participants (N=315)	4.00	.68	1
Q30. I learnt that the promotion of the intergenerational support is a key factor to increase the social capital.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.95	.74	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=104)	4.07	.67	1
Age 65 or above (N=94)	3.95	.70	0
Total participants (N=315)	3.99	.71	1
Q31. I believed that the continuously participation in the voluntary services is an effective way to promote the intergenerational solidarity and increase the social capital of our society.			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.99	.80	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=104)	4.15	.68	1
Age 65 or above (N=94)	4.15	.64	0
Total participants (N=315)	4.09	.72	1
Mean scores of Q28 to Q31			
Age 15 to 25 (N=117)	3.91	.60	0
Age 26 to 64 (N=104)	4.10	.60	1
Age 65 or above (N=94)	4.06	.55	0
Total participants (N=315)	4.02	.59	1

Domain 7: Social network

Table 4.19 shows the number of social network items, namely new friends, neighbours/community residents, non-government organization or business organizations, the participants have built after participating in the project and could be regarded as one of the project outcomes. The figures show that most of the participants had tremendous increase in at least one of their social network items, which are: having new friends (93.6%), having friends whom they can talk about private issue or become confidants (74.6%), having contacts with neighbours/community residents at least once per month (86.9%), having neighbours/community residents whom they can talk about private issues or become confidants (64.3%), learning from new non-governmental organizations or business organizations (86.1%). These results are very encouraging as they means that the project can enhance the social network to most of the participants and are not confined to friends but non-governmental /business organizations. However, it is also found that a significant number of participants who could not find friends and neighbours/community residents to talk about private issues or become confidants accounts for 25.4% and 35.7% in respectively. The figure give an implication that some of them could not build up close relationships with others.

Table 4.19: The number of social network built by the participants

People	Frequency	%
Q32. New friends (N=314)		
None	20	6.4
1 or 2	48	15.3
3 to 5	99	31.5
6 to 8	43	13.7
9 or above	104	33.1
Q33. Friends whom can talk about private issue or be confidant (N=315)		
None	80	25.4
1 or 2	112	35.6
3 to 5	71	22.5
6 to 8	25	7.9
9 or above	27	8.6
Q34. Neighbours/community residents at least contact one per month (N=314)		
None	41	13.1
1 or 2	101	32.2
3 to 5	83	26.4
6 to 8	35	11.1
9 or above	54	17.2
Q35. Neighbours/community residents whom can talk about private issue or be confidant (N=311)		
None	111	35.7
1 or 2	104	33.4
3 to 5	63	20.3
6 to 8	17	5.5
9 or above	16	5.1
Q36. Non-government/business organizations have learnt (N=316)		
None	44	13.9
1 or 2	151	47.8
3 to 5	91	28.8
6 to 8	20	6.3
9 or above	10	3.2

Domain 8: Social support

The frequency of support they provided or received by the social support network by the participants are relatively high (Refer to Table 4.20). Most of the participants have provided help to at least one of their friends (85.4%), their neighbours/community residents (75.1%) and non-governmental organizations or business organizations (75.6%). More than half of the participants have frequently helped others for about one to five times in the past one month. However, it is found that the support they

received from the non-governmental organizations or business organizations are relatively low. About half of the participants (41.2%) do not receive any support from these organizations in the past one month. What has been implied is that the participants do not need support. But on the other hand, it might also indicate that the social support in the community is not strong enough. This further reveals that the project might not have a great community impacts.

Table 4.20: The frequency of support by participants

Times	Frequency	%
Q37. Providing help to your friends in the past one month. (N=315)		
None	46	14.6
1 or 2	96	30.5
3 to 5	93	29.5
6 to 8	28	8.9
9 or above	52	16.5
Q38. Providing help to your neighbours or community residents in the past one month (N=313)		
None	78	24.9
1 or 2	134	42.8
3 to 5	60	19.2
6 to 8	14	4.5
9 or above	27	8.6
Q39. Providing help to non-government/business organizations in the past one month. (N=312)		
None	76	24.4
1 or 2	112	35.9
3 to 5	73	23.4
6 to 8	25	8.0
9 or above	26	8.3
Q40. Getting help from non-government/business organizations in the past one month. (N=311)		
None	128	41.2
1 or 2	119	38.3
3 to 5	43	13.8
6 to 8	12	3.9
9 or above	9	2.9

Conclusion and recommendations

Summary

The purpose of this evaluation study is to investigate the aggregated outcome impacts of the selected intergenerational projects funded by CIIF. A mixture of both quantitative and qualitative methodology was used to explore the nature and characteristics of the projects as well as the overall impacts of the project on the

participants. The attempt was also to identify a set of outcome indicators to measure the impacts on the participants and provide some possible crucial suggestions for project implementations. Also, the relationships between intergenerational programmes and the development of the intergenerational solidarity and social capital were also explored in the study.

Basically, the evaluation study consists of two stages. The first stage is to identify the intergenerational projects for the study. A qualitative approach was adopted by reviewing the relevant project proposals, project progress reports, literature reviews, relevant project deliverables as well as field observations, ten projects from the CIIF project pools have been chosen for further in-depth study. The selected projects basically share the intergenerational programmes' characteristics. For examples, the projects promote better relationships between generations and/ or promote intergenerational cooperation through various activities. Two of the project staff have been invited to the in-depth interviews from December 2004 to June 2005. The aims are to explore the possible outcome indicators to measure the outcome impacts of the intergenerational project as well as the practical experiences of the project implementation. Eight domains of the outcome indicator have been generated from the interviews which are: *(1) The perceived positive images of older people or younger people, (2) the intergenerational communications and relationships (3) social competence and skill transfer (4) Volunteerism/social participation/ self help and mutual help (5) Trust (6) intergenerational solidarity and reciprocal support (7) social network (8) social support.* The first to fifth domains are to measure the outcomes of the intergenerational solidarity of the individuals while the sixth domain is to explore the relationships between the intergenerational solidarity and the development of social capital. The last two domains are the overall project impacts on the development of the social capital.

Following up the in-depth interviews, in the second stage of the study, a survey was conducted from August to September 2005. Six projects have been chosen for the survey and a purposive sampling method was used with approximately 60 of the participants from each project. Two sets of structured questionnaires (one for older people and another one for younger people), comprising mainly closed-ended questions, were distributed to the project participants for self-administration. The aim

of the survey is to investigate the outcomes after participating in the selected projects.

A total number of 316 valid questionnaires have been obtained from this study in which 117 participants were aged 14 to 25, 105 participants were aged 26 to 64 and 94 participants were aged 65 or over. The participants are healthy and active in general but not better off. Their financial support mainly relied on themselves or close family members. However, they have very few interactions with their grandchildren/grandparents as they are not living together.

The findings reveal that the projects are very effective as the project participants have highly rated (on average over 3.7 out of 5 points) for every domain of the project outcomes. The domains of perceived positive images towards older/younger people, the intergenerational communications and relationships, voluntarism, social participations, self-help and mutual help are rated the highest (about 4 out of 5 points), which means that the projects have strong impact on improving the negative image of older/younger people, increasing their communications skills as well as the altruistic spirits of helping others in the community. Social network and social support are regarded as the outcome indicators for the social capital. Most participants have reported that they have enlarged their social support network by making new friends (1 to 5 people) and received or provided help (1 to 5 times) frequently every month. The result implies that the projects could make contributions to the development of social capital in our community. Besides, the project participants also confirmed that better intergenerational relationships and support can enhance the solidarity between generations, social harmony and result in the increase in social capital in Hong Kong (3.99 out of 5 points). After joining the projects, they have had better understanding on the importance of the intergenerational cooperation and the reciprocal support.

Recommendations

Intergenerational solidarity is a vital to the development of social capital. This study found that all the selected intergenerational projects which are implemented effectively do not only enhance the intergenerational solidarity but also the development of social capital in Hong Kong. The study also confirmed that the intergenerational programmes can enhance the solidarity between generations through

enhancing the positive image as well as the reciprocal support, which are vital for the development of social capital in Hong Kong given the increasing number of the older people, unemployed youth and new arrivals etc. Hence, the future CIIF projects could consider project aims which emphasize the ideas of prompting the intergenerational solidarity elements.

A learning platform is crucial to maximizing project outcomes. In general, three types of the intergenerational programmes have been examined in the study which are: (1) empowering older people (2) empowering younger people and (3) promoting cross/intergenerational relationships. From the result of this three types of interventional approaches, no big difference is found between them. This implies that the intergenerational programmes can provide a platform for increasing the interactions and cooperation between generations. Through the project activities, they can get a better understanding of each other and also have greater acceptance of their weaknesses. More importantly, through the interaction process, they can learn and support mutually. Hence, it is suggested that future project design should provide a variety of learning platforms for the participants. Meanwhile, there should be a better matching system which can enhance the partnership of the participants e.g. taking the available time, the needs, the interests and the personality of both the youth and the older people into consideration. Effectiveness and outcome impacts would be strengthened if these factors are taken into account in the project design process.

Another crucial factor is determined by the quality of the project staff. The study found that reciprocal support between generations and the increase in the sense of volunteerism are effective strategies in developing the social capital in Hong Kong. Although other domains such as trust, competence skills and human factors are as important, they are relatively time and resource consuming. Hence, it is necessary to have committed and outstanding staff who do not only have clear mindset of the social capital but are also skilled in networking local resources in order to make the project sustainable in the long term.

References

Atkinson, M. P., Kivett, V. R., Campbell, R. T. (1989). Intergenerational solidarity: an examination of a theoretical model. *Journal of Gerontology*, 41, 408-416.

Australia Bureau of Statistics. (2000). Measuring social capital: current collections and future directions. (<http://www.abs.gov.au/>, retrieved on 20 May 2005)

Balatti, J. and Falk, I. (2002). Social contributions of adult learning to community: a social capital perspective. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 52(4), 281-298.

Bengtson, V. L. (2001). Beyond the nuclear family: The increasing importance of multigenerational relationships in American society. 1998 Burgess Award Lecture. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 63(1), 1-16.

Bengtson, V. L., Silverstein, M., Giarrusso, R., and Schmeeckle, M. (2001). The longitudinal study of generations. In Maddox, G. (Ed.). *The encyclopedia of aging*, (3rd ed.). New York: Springer.

Berkman, L., and Lenonard S. (1979). Social networks, host resistance, and mortality: a nine-year follow-up study of Alameda County residents. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 109, 186-204.

Bingham, R. Felbinger, C. (2001). *Evaluation in practice: A methodology approach*. United States: Seven Bridges Press.

Bostrom, A.-K. (2002). Informal learning in a formal context: problematizing the concept of social capital in a contemporary Swedish context. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 21(6), 510-524.

Bostrom, A.-K. (2003). Intergenerational learning in Stockholm County in Sweden: a practical example of elderly men working in compulsory schools as a benefit for children. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 1(4), 7-24.

Bullen, P. and J. Onyx (1998) *Measuring Social Capital in Five Communities in New*

South Wales, Centre for Australian Community Organisations and Management, University of Technology, Sydney.

Cantor, M. H. (1979). The informal support system in New York's Inner City elderly: Is ethnicity a factor? In Gelfand, D. E. and Kutznik, A. J. (Ed.). *Ethnicity and aging*. New York: Springer.

Cantor, M. H. (1989). Social care: Family and community support systems: *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 503, 99-112.

Cantor, M. H. (1991). Family and community: changing roles in an aging society. *The Gerontologist*, 31, 337-346.

Chou, K. L., Chow, N. W. S. and Chi, I. (2003). Future elderly welfare recipients in Hong Kong, *International Journal of Aging*, 5(2), 183-199.

Chow, N. W. S. (2000). Ageing in Hong Kong. In D. R. Phillips, (Ed.). *Ageing in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, policies and future trends*. London: Rutledge.

Coleman, J. (1988). *Social capital in the creation of human capital*. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94-120.

Coleman, J. (1990). *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Cronbach, J. (1982). *Designing Evaluations of Educational and Social Programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Donati, P. (2002). Inter-generational solidarity: a sociological and social policy issue. In Malinvaud, E. (Ed.). *Intergenerational Solidarity: the Proceedings of the Eighth Plenary Session of the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences*, 8-13 April 2002.

Duquin, M., McCrea, J., Fetterman, D. and Nash, S. (2004). A faith-based intergenerational health and wellness program. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 2(3/4), 105-118.

Ellis, S. W. and Granville, G. (1999). Intergenerational solidarity: bridging the gap through mentoring programmes. *Mentoring & Tutoring*, 7(3), 181-194.

Glaeser, E. L. (2001). The formation of social capital. *Canadian Journal of Policy Research*, 2, 34-41. (www.isuma.net/v02n01/index_e.shtml retrieved on 20 May 2005)

Granville, G. (2001). An unlikely alliance: young offenders supporting elderly people in care settings. *Education and Ageing*, 16(1), 9-25.

Grootaert, C., Narayan, D., Jones, V. N., and Woolcock, M. (2004). Measuring social capital: an integrated questionnaire. *The World Bank Social Capital Initiative Working Paper No. 1*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Hancock, P., Mangen, D. J. and McChesney K.Y . (1988). The exchange dimension of solidarity: measuring intergenerational exchange and functional solidarity. In Mangen, D.J., Bengtson, V.L. and Landry, P.H. *Measurement of Intergenerational Relations*. Newbury Park: SAGE publications, 156-186.

Hatton-Yeo, A. and Ohsako, T. (2000). Intergenerational programmes: public policy and research implications: an international perspective, UNESCO Institute for Education, Hamburg and Beth Johnson Foundation, Stoke-on-Trent.

Kaplan, M., Kusano, A., Tsuji, I. Hisamichi., (1998). *Intergenerational programs: Support for children, youth and elderly in Japan*. New York: State University of New York.

Kawachi, I., Kennedy B., Lochner, K., and Prothrow-Stith, D. (1997). Social capital, income inequality and mortality. *American Journal of Public Health*, 87, 1491–1498.

Keele University. (2003). Conference report of First ICIP (The International

Consortium for Intergenerational Programmes) International Intergenerational Conference: Connecting Generations: A Global Perspective. 2-4 April 2002 at Keele University, England.

(<http://www.icip.info/Libraries/Local/68/Docs/ICIP%20conf%202002%20report%20final%20January%202003%20online.pdf>. retrieved on 30th June 2005)

Kingson, E. R. (1989). The Social Policy Implications of Intergenerational Exchanges. In Newman, S. and Brummel, S. (Eds). *Intergenerational programs: Imperatives, strategies, impacts, trends*. Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.

Kreuter, M., Young, L. and Lezin, N. (1997). *Measuring social capital in small communities*. Study Conducted by Health 2000 Inc., Atlanta, in cooperation with the St. Louis University School of Public Health.

Lawrence, Bennett and Markides (1992). Perceived intergenerational solidarity and psychological distress among older Mexican Americans. *Journal of Gerontology: Social Sciences*, 47, 55-65.

Litwak, E. (1985). *Helping the elderly: The complementary roles of informal networks and formal systems*. New York and London: The Guilford Press.

Litwak, E., Jessop, D. J. and Moulton, H. J. (1994). Optimal use of formal and informal systems over the life course. In Kahana, E., Biegel, D.E. and Wykle, M.L. (Eds.). *Family caregiving across the lifespan*. London: Sage Publication.

Lowney, K. and Sander, T. (2003). *Social capital building toolkit*, version 1.0.

Macionis, J. J. (2000). *Society: the basic*. (5 ed.). US: Prentice Hall.

Newman, S., Baum, M., and Vasudev, J. (1983). *The Experience of Senior Volunteers in Intergenerational Programs in Schools and the Relationship to their Life Satisfaction* (Final Report to the NRTA – AARP Andrus Foundation). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh, Generations Together.

Newman, S. (1986). *Creating effective intergenerational programs*. Unpublished manuscript. University of Pittsburgh., Generations Together.

Newman, S. (1992). *Innovative models and promising practices for older adults in child care*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Pittsburgh, Generations Together.

Padgett, D. K. (1998). *Qualitative methods in social work research*. Thousand Oaks, CA:Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Prince, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Putnam, R. D. (1995a). Tuning in, tuning out: The strange disappearance of social capital in America. *Political Science and Politics*, 28, 664-683.

Putnam, R. D. (1995b). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy*, 6, 65-78.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster).

Putnam, R. D. (2001). Social capital: Measurement and consequences. *Canadian Journal of Policy Research*, 2, 41-51. (www.isuma.net/v02n01/index_e.shtml. retrieved on 13 January 05)

Raynes, N. (2004). Recreating social capital: Inter-generational programmes and bridging networks: An English model - phase 1. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 2(1), 7-28.

Roberts, R. E., Bengtson, V. L. (1990). Is intergenerational solidarity a unidimensional Construct? A second test of a formal model. *Journal of Gerontology*, 45(1), 12-20.

Roos, V. (2004). Intergenerational interaction between institutionalised older persons and biologically unrelated university students. *Journal of Intergenerational Relationships*, 2(1), 79-94.

Royse, D., Thyer, B., Padgett, D. and Logan, T. K., (2001). *Programme evaluation: An introduction*, (3rd ed.). Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole-Wadsworth Thompson Learning.

Sander, T. H., & Lowney, K. (2003). *Social Capital Building Toolkit (Version 1.0)*. Retrieved December 23, 2003, from www.nelib.org/files/counterpartsSkillbuildingToolkit.pdf

Serageldin, I. (1996). Sustainability as opportunity and the problem of social capital. *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 3(2), 187-203.

Silverstein, M. and Bengtson, V. L. (2001). Intergenerational solidarity and the structure of adult child-parent relationships in American families. In A. J. Walker, M. Manoogian-O'Dell, L. A. McGraw, and White, D.L.G. (Eds.). *Families in later life: Connections and transitions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 53-61.

Stone, W. (2001). Measuring social capital. *Australian Institute of Family Studies, Research Paper, 24*. (<http://www.aifs.org.au/>. Retrieved on 13 January 2005).

Strauss and Corbin, (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

The World Bank, (1998). The initiative on defining, monitoring and measuring social capital: overview and program description. *The World Bank Social Capital Initiative Working Paper, 1*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Van Deth, J.W. (2003). Measuring social capital: orthodoxies and continuing controversies. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 6(1), 79-92.

Vasiliou, PEO, Cyprus (1999). European network on work, young people and trade

union: solidarity between generations.

Ventura-Merkel, K. and Lidoff, L. (1983). Program innovations in aging: volume VIII. *Community Planning for Intergenerational Programming*. Washington, DC: National Council on the Aging.

Weiss, C.H. (1998). *Evaluation* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Willms, J. D. (2001). Three hypotheses about community effects on social outcomes. *Canadian Journal of Policy Research*, 2, 53-62. (www.isuma.net/v02n01/index_e.shtml. retrieved on 13 January 2005)

Appendix I: Interview guidelines

Name of the programme: _____ Organization: _____

An evaluation study on the impacts of CIIF intergenerational projects on the development of Social Capital in Hong Kong (Interview guidelines)

Participant profile:

1. Interviewee's name: (Chinese) _____ (English) _____ 2. Sex: F/M
3. Major roles in the programmes: Leader/Co-ordinator/ Trainer/ Others _____
4. Key activities involved in the programme: _____
5. Time spent per week for the programme _____
6. Years of working in the field: _____ mainly for older people/youth/adult or mixture
7. Working experience/specialties/education background: _____
8. Contact (email address): _____ (Phone number): _____

(Interviewer briefly introduces the aims of the telephone interviews and probes the questions)

Aims of the study:

The aim of this interview is to explore how selected CIIF project(s) can enhance the intergenerational solidarity and the development of the social capital of Hong Kong. The attempts are also to get better understandings of the rationale underlying for designing the projects, implementation consideration, project(s) impacts on individual (older people/adult/children) and community as a whole. Through **in-depth interview(s) to project leader(s)/co-ordinator(s)**, it will provide some insightful ideas on how to implement the intergenerational projects in an effective way; and help further identify a set of possible outcome indicators to measure the impacts of intergenerational projects in future.

I. Project nature and characteristics:

1. Please describe the nature of your project? Could it be defined as an intergenerational project or not? Why?

2. What are the characteristics of your project including rationale underlying for planning and implementation? ie conceptual or theoretical foundation/outstanding activities/staffing patterns/ recognized identity/profile of participants/collaborative partners etc?

3. Any updated project proposal/progress report/ minutes of project reflection meetings/ evaluation report can be as reference?

II. Intergenerational solidarity—functional approach (Provide help and/ received help)

1. What do you think the key dimensions of Intergenerational solidarity in the context of intergenerational project? Why?

(Probe: Associational/affectual/consensual/functional/normative/structural)

2. What have you observed/found for intergenerational exchanges or reciprocal support of your project participants (within family members and or in community)? Please give concrete examples if any?

(Probe: Type of support eg. instrumental/emotional support in terms of personal help/daily activities/financial aids/sharing intimacy/trust/confidences with others/transmission of norms and (traditional/contemporary)cultural values/skills transfer/experiences sharing etc)

3. How frequent of intergenerational exchanges of assistance have been found/observed from your participants? For whom(within family and/ in community)? in what way? Why?

4. How do you rate the degree of reciprocity in intergenerational exchange of resources for your participants? In what way? Why?

5. Are there any pattern of intergenerational interaction, communication dynamics between the young and the old? Why? Any enabling factors could be observed?

(Probe: For whom? Older people vs young adult; Young adult vs older people; Children vs young adult; children vs older people) (within family and in community)

6. How do you rate the degree of satisfactions on the intergenerational relationship between project participants? Why?

(Probe: Older people vs young adult; Young adult vs older people; Children vs young adult; children vs older people) (within family and in community)

III. Project impacts

1. To what extent that your project can enhance intergenerational solidarity? How and why?

(Probe: How project participants (older people/young adult/children) extend what they learnt from their project experiences to whom and which aspect(s)? How they view and communicate with different generations within family or outside family?

2. To what extent that your project can benefit to the development of social capital in Hong Kong? How and Why?

(Probe: Benefits to the community eg social integration (solidarity)/self help and mutual support/social inclusion/social participation/ social harmonious/positive value).

IV. The key successful factors for intergenerational projects (Effectiveness, Impact, Benefit-cost)

1. Does your project plan match with the needs of participants? The outcomes achieved the goal? Cost-effective? If so, what are the crucial factors for development the intergenerational projects? Any successful activities/events, please describe it?

(Probe: Staffing/project planning/implementation issues/administrative strategies/challenges/substantiality etc)

2. What are the crucial factors for development the intergenerational projects so as to enhance the development of social capital in Hong Kong? Any successful activities/events, please describe it?

Interviewer: _____

Date & time of interview: _____

Follow up issue if any: _____

~Thank you~

社區投資共享基金聯校研究隊

嶺南大學亞太老年學研究中心

「跨代共融對開發社會資本的作用」研究調查

深入面談訪問

同意書

本人（姓名）_____ 身份証最後 4 個號碼（不包括弧內號碼）
_____ (x) 同意 / 不同意參與由社區投資共享基金聯校研究
隊之嶺南大學亞太老年學研究中心—「跨代共融對開發社會資本的作用」研究調查計劃，作深入面談訪問，並同意將訪問內容錄音，以供有關學術研究之用。

被訪者姓名：_____

被訪者簽署：_____

日期：_____

見證人姓名：_____

見證人簽署：_____

日期：_____

Appendix III: Sample profile

Programme name / project code / project holder	Interviewee name	Major role	Hour spent each week	Years of work in the field	Working experience/ specialties/education background
1. It's all because of you: Community Cohesion Project/ 0091- 01D Richmond Fellowship of Hong Kong	Ms. Yuen Suet Ting	Coordinator	44	1	Mentally ill people
	Ms. Ho Lai Ling	Coordinator	8	11	Mentally ill people
2. "Caring Estates" in Southern District/ 0100/0101- 01C HK Southern District Women's Association Ltd. and AKWASSC	Ms. Wan Ngai Teck, Alice	Leader	4	7	Women and elderly service
	Ms. Chan Lai Wah	Coordinator	44	30	Women and elderly service
3. Cross Generational Community Integration Programme/0127- 01C SAGE Eastern District Multi-service Centre for the Elderly	Ms. Shum So Ping	Coordinator	40	15	Elderly service
	Ms. Leung Wing Yee	Coordinator	5	4	Elderly service
4. Retired Person Volunteers' Association-Community Mutual Help Network Project/0133/0134 - 01C St James' Settlement	Ms. Chan Yuen Fan	Coordinator	16	7	Elderly service
	Mr. David Doo	Leader	44	7	Elderly service
5. Community Integration-Developing Respective Strengths/0138-01D Youth Kwun Tong	Mr. Hung Kam In	Leader	3	10	Youth service
	Ms. Yung Yi Man	Coordinator	44	1.5	Youth service
6. Project RAGE-Responsible Action, Genuine	Prof. Shek Tan Lei, Daniel	Leader	2	20	Elderly, youth and adult service

Encounter/0157 - 02E HKU – Dept. of Social Work and Social Administration and CUHK – Dept. of Social Work	Ms. Wong Wing Lun	Coordinator	50	1	Youth service
7. Productive Aging: Elderly Shop Project/0057-03E The Salvation Army	Mr. Leung Kwok Fai	Leader	15	28	Elderly, youth and adult service
	Ms. Lai Wai Tze	Coordinator	32	13	Elderly service
8. School and Centre hand in hand/0043 - 02D Buddhist Bright Pearl Primary School	Ms. Yung Pui King	Leader	10	34	Education
	Ms. Cheung Chong Yan	Coordinator	44	1	Counseling
9. Hand in Hand: Caring Community Project/0018 – 03D Richmond Fellowship of Hong Kong	Ms. Yuen Suet Ting	Coordinator	44	1	university
	Ms. Ho Lai Ling	Centre coordinator	8	11	Mentally ill people
10. Sham Shui Po Child-friendly Community Network/0001-04 Dept. of Applied Social Sciences, PolyU and BGCA	Ms. Fu Suk Yin	Coordinator	10	22	Children, family and youth-at-risk
	Ms. Kong Wai San	Centre coordinator	40	10	Children, youth and family

Appendix IV: Project profile and key outcome indicators

		It's all because of you: Community Cohesion Project	"Caring Estates" in Southern District	Cross Generational Community Integration Programme	Retired Person Volunteers' Association-Community Mutual Help Network Project	Community Integration-Developing Respective Strengths	RAGE – Responsible Action, Genuine Encounter	Productive Aging: Elderly Shop Project	School and Centre hand in hand	Hand in Hand: Caring Community Project	Sham Shui Po Child-friendly Community Network
Project nature	Youth-oriented					√	√		√		√
	Elderly-oriented							√			
	Cross generations	√	√	√	√					√	
Target age group	Below 25	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	25-64	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	65-74	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√
	75-84	√								√	
	Over 85										
Implementation	Activity	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	Sharing	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	Volunteering	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	Training	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	Mentorship						√				
Intergenerational solidarity (functional)	Skills transfer			√	√			√	√		
	Mutual support	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
	Experience sharing	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√

Impact	Intergenerational solidarity										
	Social harmony	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	
	Self help		√		√		√	√		√	
	Social participation	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	
	Individual cognitive social capital	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	
Successful factors	Quality staffing										
	Recognition and training										
	Network with other organizations	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	
	Family participation						√		√		

Appendix V: Formal invitation letter for the survey questionnaire

社區投資共享基金聯校研究隊--嶺南大學亞太老年學研究中心

「跨代共融對開發社會資本的作用」研究調查

邀請信

你好，多謝你一直支持及參與由社區投資共享基金聯校研究隊——嶺南大學亞太老年學研究中心所進行的一項關於「跨代共融對開發社會資本的作用」研究計劃。多謝閣下及有關同工的協助，使本中心研究員能順利進行深入面談訪問、實地觀察，就計劃提供很多寶貴的資料和意見，對是次研究計劃的執行帶來莫大幫助。本中心研究員就貴機構以及其他相關受訪計劃的意見作綜合分析，輔以學術文獻參考，整理了一套量度跨代共融計劃的成效指標，以探討受社區投資共享基金所資助的計劃在跨代共融及開發社會資本兩個方面的情況。研究計劃旨在進一步探討和發展跨代共融計劃的成效指標對計劃執行對社區資本產生的意義。

現在，誠意邀請閣下能協助本研究中心於 8 月 8 日至 18 日期間，分派問卷給與受社區共享基金計劃的參加者進行問卷調查，以自填形式作答，**期望收回有效問卷 60 份。** 問卷調查分兩組，年青人問卷，受訪對象為 15 - 64 歲（共 40 份），長者問卷，受訪對象為 65 歲或以上（共 20 份）。

由於研究時間及資源有限，煩請閣下能協助問卷調查工作，**並盡量於 8 月 23 日前填妥回條連同問卷一併寄回本中心**，或通知研究中心派同事收回問卷。謝謝！

如對研究計劃 / 問卷有任何問題，請致電嶺南大學亞太老年學研究中心，高級計劃主任，馮明穗小姐(Florence Fong)，電話：26167424 或 90346939。再次感謝你的幫助！

Appendix VI: The survey questionnaire for younger people

問卷編號: _____ (由研究中心填寫)

社區投資共享基金聯校研究隊--嶺南大學亞太老年學研究中心

「跨代共融對開發社會資本的作用」研究調查

(年青人部份：調查對象 15-64 歲)

問卷填寫指引：

你好，此問卷調查主要是對社區投資共享基金資助計劃的參加者進行一項關於「跨代共融對開發社會資本的作用」的研究，以探討參加者對長者／年青人形象、代際關係、代際溝通、代際支援、社區互助、團結、信任、共融等看法。請就你的意見或感覺作出選擇，答案並無對錯之分。你所提供的資料，將對探討如何促進跨代共融及開發社區資本的方法提供重要的參考數據，謝謝你的寶貴意見。整個問卷共分三個部份，**全部題目均需作答，以自填形式進行，大約需時 8-10 分鐘填寫，請細心閱讀，並圈出答案，不要漏空。填畢問卷後，請交回有關機構工作人員。**

如對研究計劃／問卷有任何問題，請致電馮明穗小姐，電話：26167424 或 90346939。再次感謝你的參與及時間。

請隨你的感覺選擇答案，不需要花太多時間在某一題上，並以圈○出答案。

題號	甲部份：長幼共融的元素（所有問題均需作答）	非常不同意	不同意	無意見	同意	非常同意
1.	本計劃能令我覺得長者 <u>並不是</u> 麻煩、依賴、沉悶、固執、難相處、是社會的包袱。	1	2	3	4	5
2.	本計劃能令我對長者產生 <u>正面形象</u> （如人生經驗豐富、有智慧）。	1	2	3	4	5
3.	本計劃能令我覺得長者能夠退而不休， <u>對社會有貢獻</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
4.	本計劃使我學會與長者 <u>溝通的技巧</u> ，如關懷 / 尊重 / 有耐性。	1	2	3	4	5
5.	本計劃使我喜歡和長者 <u>相處及合作</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
6.	本計劃使我能與長者建立 <u>良好的關係</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
7.	本計劃使我了解長者的特性， <u>學習他們的長處</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
8.	本計劃使我了解長者的需要， <u>作出幫助</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
9.	本計劃使我了解 <u>自己和長者</u> 的長短處，學會互補不足。	1	2	3	4	5
10.	本計劃使我學會接納長者的 <u>意見和價值觀</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
11.	本計劃使我與長者有 <u>更多的溝通及接觸</u> （如交談、探訪、聆聽、學習、合作等）。	1	2	3	4	5
12.	本計劃使我覺得照顧父母、祖父母、長者，是作為子女(年青一代) <u>應盡的責任</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
13.	本計劃使我能和 <u>家中的</u> 父母 / 祖父母建立良好關係。	1	2	3	4	5
14.	本計劃使我和 <u>家中的</u> 父母 / 祖父母有 <u>更多的溝通及接觸</u> (如交談、探訪、聆聽、學習、合作等)。	1	2	3	4	5
15.	本計劃使我提升了 <u>自信心</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
16.	本計劃使我學到更多 <u>的人際溝通技巧</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5

17.	本計劃使我學到 <u>新的知識及謀生技能</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
18.	本計劃提升了我的 <u>抗逆能力</u> (如解決生活難題，逆景等)。	1	2	3	4	5
19.	本計劃使我肯定我的 <u>能力及價值</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
20.	本計劃使我可以 <u>將我的所長（如技術，知識），傳授他人，貢獻社會</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
21.	本計劃使我 <u>認識社區的需要</u> ，主動及義務幫助他人。	1	2	3	4	5
22.	本計劃使我明白我有責任去 <u>為我的社區出力(貢獻)</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
23.	本計劃使我使意識到為社區弱勢社群(如長者，新移民，小數族裔，失業者，精神病康復者) <u>表達意願，爭取權益</u> 的重要性。	1	2	3	4	5
24.	本計劃使我使我投入社會服務（活動）學會 <u>互相幫助，利己利人</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
	乙部份：計劃的成效（所有問題均需作答）					
25.	參加本計劃後，我對 <u>家中的父母／祖父母</u> 更加信任。	1	2	3	4	5
26.	參加本計劃後，我提升了對 <u>弱勢社群</u> （如長者／失業青年人／新移民／精神病康復者／小數族裔）的信任。	1	2	3	4	5
27.	參加本計劃後，使我願意和 <u>他人表達和分享我的感受／經歷／困難</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
28.	參加本計劃後，使我了解 <u>良好的長幼溝通</u> ，是促進 <u>社會和諧</u> 的重要因素。	1	2	3	4	5
29.	參加本計劃後，使我明白 <u>增加長幼互相合作</u> ，是促進 <u>社會團結</u> 的重要因素。	1	2	3	4	5
30.	參加本計劃後，使我意識到 <u>鼓勵長幼支持／互助</u> ，是促進 <u>社會資本</u> 的關鍵因素。	1	2	3	4	5
31.	參與本計劃後，使我覺得 <u>持續參與義務工作</u> 是促進 <u>長幼共融</u> ，增加 <u>社會資本</u> 的有效方法。	1	2	3	4	5

題號	乙部份：計劃的成效（所有問題均需作答）	0個	1至2個	3至5個	6至8個	9個或以上
32.	參加了本計劃後，你認識了 <u>幾多個</u> 新朋友？	1	2	3	4	5
33.	參加了本計劃後，你認識了 <u>幾多個</u> 可以傾訴心事或請他們幫助的朋友？	1	2	3	4	5
34.	在你住的地區/邨，你有 <u>幾多個</u> 鄰居/地區朋友最少一個月見面/交談一次？	1	2	3	4	5
35.	參加了本計劃後，你認識了 <u>幾多個</u> 可以傾訴心事或請他們幫助的鄰居/地區朋友？	1	2	3	4	5
36.	參加了本計劃後，你認識了 <u>幾多個</u> 社會福利服務團體/商業組織/機構？	1	2	3	4	5
	（所有問題均需作答）	0次	1至2次	3至5次	6至8次	9次或以上
37.	在過去一個月，你試過多少次幫助你的朋友？	1	2	3	4	5
38.	在過去一個月，你試過多少次幫助你的鄰居/地區朋友？	1	2	3	4	5
39.	在過去一個月，你試過多少次幫助這些社會福利服務團體/商業組織/機構？	1	2	3	4	5
40.	在過去一個月，你試過多少次從這些社會福利服務團體/商業組織/機構得到幫助？	1	2	3	4	5

丙部份：參加者資料 (請填寫或以✓號作答，所有問題均需作答)

1. 你參與的計劃名稱及機構？	_____ (計劃) _____ (機構/會)
2. 你參加了這個計劃多長時間？	共_____年_____月
3. 你每月平均用多少時間參與這個計劃？	共_____
4. 參加了本計劃後，在過去三個月，你是否更容易找到工作機會？(包括兼職或全職工作)請指明所找到的工作及大約薪酬？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 是 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 否 工作職位：_____ 薪酬：_____
5. 參加了本計劃後，在過去三個月，你是否增加了收入？(包括從子女/朋友/他人給與的心意/禮物，有多少數量？總金額？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 是 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 否 收入來源：_____ 數量：_____ 總金額：_____
6. 你覺得你有幾投入參與這個計劃？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常低(2) <input type="checkbox"/> 低(3) <input type="checkbox"/> 一般(4)高(5) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常高
7. 你覺得你和參加者的關係是？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常差(2) <input type="checkbox"/> 差 (3) <input type="checkbox"/> 一般(4) <input type="checkbox"/> 好(5) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常好
8. 你覺得你和機構同工/計劃統籌員的關係是？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常差(2) <input type="checkbox"/> 差 (3) <input type="checkbox"/> 一般(4) <input type="checkbox"/> 好(5) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常好
9. 你今年幾多歲？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 15-18 歲 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 19-25 歲 (3) <input type="checkbox"/> 26-34 歲 (4) <input type="checkbox"/> 35-44 歲 (5) <input type="checkbox"/> 45-54 歲 (6) <input type="checkbox"/> 55-64 歲 (7) <input type="checkbox"/> 65-74 歲 (8) <input type="checkbox"/> 75-84 歲 (9) <input type="checkbox"/> 85 或以上
10. 你的性別是？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 男 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 女
11. 你現時的婚姻狀況是？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 未婚/(2) <input type="checkbox"/> 已婚/(3) <input type="checkbox"/> 離婚或分居(4) <input type="checkbox"/> 鰥/寡
12. 家庭住戶人口數目：和你一起居住的家庭總人數是 (包括你本人)	()個
13. 你和誰居住？(可選多項)	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 自己獨居 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 配偶 (3) <input type="checkbox"/> 子女/婿/媳 (4) <input type="checkbox"/> 父母 (5) <input type="checkbox"/> 祖父母 (6) <input type="checkbox"/> 孫 (7) <input type="checkbox"/> 親戚/兄弟姊妹 (8) <input type="checkbox"/> 朋友 (9) <input type="checkbox"/> 其他
14. 你在香港居住的年期？	()年 ()月
15. 你自評健康狀況？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常差 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 差 (3) <input type="checkbox"/> 普通 (4) <input type="checkbox"/> 良好 (5) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常好
16. 你的教育程度(請選最高學歷)？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 小學或以下 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 中學程度 (3) <input type="checkbox"/> 預科 (4) <input type="checkbox"/> 大專或大學 (5) <input type="checkbox"/> 碩士或以上
17. 你個人經濟狀況是？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常不好 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 不太好 (3) <input type="checkbox"/> 過得去

	(4) <input type="checkbox"/> 相當好 (5) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常好
18. 你的生活費主要來源 (可選多項)	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 自己收入 / 積蓄 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 子女 / 婿 / 媳 (3) <input type="checkbox"/> 父母 / 祖父母 (4) <input type="checkbox"/> 孫仔 / 女 (5) <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> 親戚 / 兄弟子妹 (6) <input type="checkbox"/> 朋友 / 鄰居 (7) <input type="checkbox"/> 政府 / 社會福利 / 宗教 / 慈善團體 (8) <input type="checkbox"/> 其他
19. 你目前的工作?	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 學生 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 沒有固定職業/失業 (3) <input type="checkbox"/> 家庭主婦 (4) <input type="checkbox"/> 一般工人/文職/服務業 (5) <input type="checkbox"/> 技術人員如電腦技術支援人員/社工/教師/護士 (6) <input type="checkbox"/> 商人/自僱人士 (7) <input type="checkbox"/> 退休 (8) <input type="checkbox"/> 其他(請註明_____)
20. 你的聯絡方法 / 電話	_____ (電郵) _____ (電話)

問卷填寫日期：___日___月___2005年

是否全部作答：是 / 否 (如否，請說明原因_____)

~ 問卷完結 ~

以下由核對員填寫：

問卷收回日期	___日___月___年
漏答/重答題數:	_____題
核對員檢定:	(0) <input type="checkbox"/> 不成功/無效問卷 (1) <input type="checkbox"/> 有效問卷
核對員姓名:	_____
核對員電話:	_____

備註: 機構負責同工請仔細查閱問卷有否漏答或重答，如全卷多於 **8** 條，問卷將被視為無效問卷，需作廢或要求被訪者重答。

Appendix VII: The survey questionnaire for older people

問卷編號: _____ (由研究中心填寫)

社區投資共享基金聯校研究隊--嶺南大學亞太老年學研究中心

「跨代共融對開發社會資本的作用」研究調查

(長者部份：調查對象 65 歲或以上)

問卷填寫指引：

你好，此問卷調查主要是對社區投資共享基金資助計劃的參加者進行一項關於「跨代共融對開發社會資本的作用」的研究，以探討參加者對長者／年青人形象、代際關係、代際溝通、代際支援、社區互助、團結、信任、共融等看法。請就你的意見或感覺作出選擇，答案並無對錯之分。你所提供的資料，將對探討如何促進跨代共融及開發社區資本的方法提供重要的參考數據，謝謝你的寶貴意見。整個問卷共分三個部份，**全部題目均需作答，以自填形式進行，大約需時 8-10 分鐘填寫，請細心閱讀，並圈出答案，不要漏空。填畢問卷後，請交回有關機構工作人員。**

如對研究計劃／問卷有任何問題，請致電馮明穗小姐，電話：26167424 或 90346939。再次感謝你的參與及時間。

請隨你的感覺選擇答案，不需要花太多時間在某一題上，並以圈○出答案。

題號	甲部份：長幼共融的元素(所有問題均需作答)	非常不同意	不同意	無意見	同意	非常同意
1.	本計劃能令我覺得年青人 <u>並不是</u> 衝動、不守規則、無禮貌、是社會的寄生蟲。	1	2	3	4	5
2.	本計劃能令我覺得年青人 <u>學識廣博，好學不倦</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
3.	本計劃能令我覺得年青人有抱負， <u>對社會有貢獻</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
4.	本計劃使我學會與年青人 <u>溝通的技巧</u> ，如體諒 / 尊重 / 關懷。	1	2	3	4	5
5.	本計劃使我喜歡和年青人 <u>相處及合作</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
6.	本計劃使我能與年青人建立 <u>良好的關係</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
7.	本計劃使我了解年青人的特性， <u>學習他們的長處</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
8.	本計劃使我了解年青人的需要， <u>作出幫助</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
9.	本計劃使我了解 <u>自己和年青人</u> 的長短處，學會互補不足。	1	2	3	4	5
10.	本計劃使我學會接納年青人的 <u>意見和價值觀</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
11.	本計劃使我與年青人有 <u>更多的溝通及接觸</u> (如交談、探訪、聆聽、學習、合作等)。	1	2	3	4	5
12.	本計劃使我覺得教養子女、孫兒、幼小，是作為祖父母(年長一代) <u>應盡的責任</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
13.	本計劃使我能和 <u>家中的</u> 子女 / 孫建立良好關係。	1	2	3	4	5
14.	本計劃使我和 <u>家中的</u> 子女 / 孫有更多的溝通及接觸(如交談、探訪、聆聽、學習、合作等)。	1	2	3	4	5
15.	本計劃使我提升了 <u>自信心</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
16.	本計劃使我學到更多 <u>的人際溝通技巧</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
17.	本計劃使我學到新的 <u>知識及謀生技能</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5

18.	本計劃提升了 <u>我的抗逆能力</u> (如解決生活難題，逆景等)。	1	2	3	4	5
19.	本計劃使我肯定我的 <u>能力及價值</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
20.	本計劃使我可以 <u>將我的所長（如技術，知識），傳授他人，貢獻社會</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
21.	本計劃使我 <u>認識社區的需要，主動及義務幫助他人</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
22.	本計劃使我明白我有責任去 <u>為我的社區出力(貢獻)</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
23.	本計劃使我使我意識到為社區弱勢社群(如長者，新移民，小數族裔，失業者，精神病康復者) <u>表達意願，爭取權益的重要性</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
24.	本計劃使我使我投入社會服務（活動）學會 <u>互相幫助，利己利人</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
	乙部份：計劃的成效（所有問題均需作答）					
25.	參加本計劃後，我對 <u>家中的子女／孫</u> 更加 <u>信任</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
26.	參加本計劃後，我提升了對 <u>弱勢社群</u> （如長者／失業青年人／新移民／精神病康復者／小數族裔）的 <u>信任</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
27.	參加本計劃後，使我願意和他人 <u>表達和分享我的感受／經歷／困難</u> 。	1	2	3	4	5
28.	參加本計劃後，使我了解 <u>良好的長幼溝通</u> ，是促進社會和諧的重要因素。	1	2	3	4	5
29.	參加本計劃後，使我明白 <u>增加長幼互相合作</u> ，是促進社會 <u>團結</u> 的重要因素。	1	2	3	4	5
30.	參加本計劃後，使我意識到 <u>鼓勵長幼支持／互助</u> ，是促進 <u>社區資本</u> 的關鍵因素。	1	2	3	4	5
31.	參與本計劃後，使我覺得 <u>持續參與義務工作</u> 是促進長幼共融，增加社會資本的有效方法。	1	2	3	4	5

題號	乙部份：計劃的成效(所有問題均需作答)	0 個	1 至 2 個	3 至 5 個	6 至 8 個	9 個 或 以上
32.	參加了本計劃後，你認識了 <u>幾多個新朋友</u> ？	1	2	3	4	5
33.	參加了本計劃後，你認識了 <u>幾多個可以傾訴心事或請他們幫助的朋友</u> ？	1	2	3	4	5
34.	在你住的地區/邨，你有 <u>幾多個鄰居/地區朋友最少一個月見面/交談一次</u> ？	1	2	3	4	5
35.	參加了本計劃後，你認識了 <u>幾多個可以傾訴心事或請他們幫助的鄰居/地區朋友</u> ？	1	2	3	4	5
36.	參加了本計劃後，你認識了 <u>幾多個社會福利服務團體 / 商業組織 / 機構</u> ？	1	2	3	4	5
	(所有問題均需作答)	0 次	1 至 2 次	3 至 5 次	6 至 8 次	9 次 或 以上
37.	<u>在過去一個月</u> ，你試過多少次幫助你的朋友？	1	2	3	4	5
38.	<u>在過去一個月</u> ，你試過多少次幫助你的鄰居/地區朋友？	1	2	3	4	5
39.	<u>在過去一個月</u> ，你試過多少次幫助這些社會福利服務團體 / 商業組織 / 機構？	1	2	3	4	5
40.	<u>在過去一個月</u> ，你試過多少次從這些社會福利服務團體 / 商業組織 / 機構得到幫助？	1	2	3	4	5

丙部份：參加者資料 (請填寫或以✓號作答，所有問題均需作答)

1. 你參與的計劃名稱及機構？	_____ (計劃) _____ (機構/會)
2. 你參加了這個計劃多長時間？	共_____年_____月
3. 你每月平均用多少時間參與這個計劃？	共_____
4. 參加了本計劃後，在過去三個月，你是否更容易找到工作機會？(包括兼職或全職工作)請指明所找到的工作及大約薪酬？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 是 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 否 工作職位：_____ 薪酬：_____
5. 參加了本計劃後，在過去三個月，你是否增加了收入？(包括從子女/朋友/他人給與的心意/禮物，有多少數量？總金額？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 是 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 否 收入來源：_____ 數量：_____ 總金額：_____
6. 你覺得你有幾投入參與這個計劃？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常低 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 低 (3) <input type="checkbox"/> 一般 (4) <input type="checkbox"/> 高 (5) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常高
7. 你覺得你和參加者的關係是？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常差 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 差 (3) <input type="checkbox"/> 一般 (4) <input type="checkbox"/> 好 (5) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常好
8. 你覺得你和機構同工/計劃統籌員的關係是？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常差 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 差 (3) <input type="checkbox"/> 一般 (4) <input type="checkbox"/> 好 (5) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常好
9. 你今年幾多歲？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 15-18 歲 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 19-25 歲 (3) <input type="checkbox"/> 26-34 歲 (4) <input type="checkbox"/> 35-44 歲 (5) <input type="checkbox"/> 45-54 歲 (6) <input type="checkbox"/> 55-64 歲 (7) <input type="checkbox"/> 65-74 歲 (8) <input type="checkbox"/> 75-84 歲 (9) <input type="checkbox"/> 85 或以上
10. 你的性別是？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 男 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 女
11. 你現時的婚姻狀況是？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 未婚/(2) <input type="checkbox"/> 已婚/(3) <input type="checkbox"/> 離婚或分居(4) <input type="checkbox"/> 鰥/寡
12. 家庭住戶人口數目：和你一起居住的家庭總人數是 (包括你本人)	()個
13. 你和誰居住？(可選多項)	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 自己獨居 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 配偶 (3) <input type="checkbox"/> 子女/婿/媳 (4) <input type="checkbox"/> 父母 (5) <input type="checkbox"/> 祖父母 (6) <input type="checkbox"/> 孫 (7) <input type="checkbox"/> 親戚/兄弟姊妹 (8) <input type="checkbox"/> 朋友 (9) <input type="checkbox"/> 其他
14. 你在香港居住的年期？	()年 ()月
15. 你自評健康狀況？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常差 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 差 (3) <input type="checkbox"/> 普通 (4) <input type="checkbox"/> 良好 (5) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常好
16. 你的教育程度(請選最高學歷)？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 小學或以下 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 中學程度 (3) <input type="checkbox"/> 預科 (4) <input type="checkbox"/> 大專或大學 (5) <input type="checkbox"/> 碩士或以上
17. 你個人經濟狀況是？	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常不好 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 不太好 (3) <input type="checkbox"/> 過得去

	(4) <input type="checkbox"/> 相當好 (5) <input type="checkbox"/> 非常好
18. 你的生活費主要來源 (可選多項)	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 自己收入 / 積蓄 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 子女 / 婿 / 媳 (3) <input type="checkbox"/> 父母 / 祖父母 (4) <input type="checkbox"/> 孫 (5) <input type="checkbox"/> 親戚 / 兄弟子妹 (6) <input type="checkbox"/> 朋友 / 鄰居 (7) <input type="checkbox"/> 政府 / 社會福利 / 宗教 / 慈善團體 (8) <input type="checkbox"/> 其他
19. 你目前的工作?	(1) <input type="checkbox"/> 學生 (2) <input type="checkbox"/> 沒有固定職業/失業 (3) <input type="checkbox"/> 家庭主婦 (4) <input type="checkbox"/> 一般工人/文職/服務業 (5) <input type="checkbox"/> 技術人員如電腦技術支援人員/社工/教師/護士 (6) <input type="checkbox"/> 商人/自僱人士 (7) <input type="checkbox"/> 退休 (8) <input type="checkbox"/> 其他(請註明_____)
20. 你的聯絡方法 / 電話	_____ (電郵) _____ (電話)

問卷填寫日期：___日___月___2005年

是否全部作答：是 / 否 (如否，請說明原因_____)

~ 問卷完結 ~

以下由核對員填寫：

問卷收回日期	___日___月___年
漏答/重答題數:	_____題
核對員檢定:	(0) <input type="checkbox"/> 不成功/無效問卷 (1) <input type="checkbox"/> 有效問卷
核對員姓名:	_____
核對員電話:	_____

備註: 機構負責同工請仔細查閱問卷有否漏答或重答，如全卷多於 **8** 條，問卷將被視為無效問卷，需作廢或要求被訪者重答。