

**Final Report**  
**on**  
**The Effectiveness of CIIF Projects in**  
**Social Capital Development in Tin Shui Wai**

**Submitted to**

**Community Investment Inclusion Fund (CIIF)**

**Labour and Welfare Bureau**

**Hong Kong SAR Government**

**By**

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several overlapping loops and lines, positioned above a horizontal line.

**Wai-fong TING, PhD**

**Department of Applied Social Sciences**

**Hong Kong Polytechnic University**

**November 2012**

## **Executive summary**

### **Background**

Tin Shui Wai (TSW) has attracted a lot of public attention due to the occurrence of a series of social mishap and a number of family tragedies in the past few years. Various concerned parties have contributed their concerted effort in building/rebuilding the community morale and improving the quality of life in TSW. The Community Investment and Inclusion Fund (CIIF) has been an exemplar of these parties. As at 15<sup>th</sup> June 2012, there are over 35 CIIF projects located in TSW.

### **Research objectives**

2. Whether these CIIF projects' endeavour will contribute to the building of community capacity and thus bringing positive impact on the well-being of the community and its residents is of crucial interest to both CIIF as well as the public. Hence, a community-wide study is conducted with the following objectives:

- 1) Examine whether the CIIF projects have successfully developed social capital among project participants and non-participants in Tin Shui Wai;
- 2) Document the mechanism and the process of social capital development and to identify the success factors and good practices of the CIIF projects.
- 3) Study the social capital effect on the well-being of project participants and the community in Tin Shui Wai.

### **Research methodology**

3. This study employed both quantitative and qualitative mode of inquiry. Residents of TSW who are participants and non-participants of CIIF projects are included in this study. A total of 17 active projects and 10 completed projects were studied.

### **Household survey and survey of participants in CIIF projects**

#### Development of survey questionnaire

4. Quantitative data was collected by conducting project-based and household questionnaire survey. A questionnaire based on the one developed by World Bank Social Capital Thematic Group (2002) was selected. Revision was done to shorten the questionnaire as well as make it more applicable to metropolitan city like Hong Kong. Both CIIF project respondents and TSW residents answered the same questionnaire, but the former answered a few more questions about their participation in CIIF projects.

### Response rate

5. A total of 239 questionnaires were collected from project participants of 12 active CIIF projects. A total of 1,011 household survey questionnaires were collected. The response rate for the household survey is 55.40%.

### Demographic profile

6. Table I below shows the housing types, sex, age and marital status of household survey respondents and project respondents. Over 72% household survey respondents and project respondents live in public housing. Around 20% and 16% household survey respondents and project respondents live in flats under Home Ownership Scheme respectively. Our sample could present the population of households from public housing and home ownership scheme but not private housing.

Table I: Demographic profile of household survey respondents and project respondents (I)

	Household Survey Respondents (N=1,011)	Project Participants (N=247)
<b>Housing Types</b>		
Public Housing	739 (73.1%)	177 (72.0%)
Home Ownership Scheme	204 (20.2%)	39 (15.8%)
Private Housing	68 (6.8%)	30 (12.2%)
<b>Sex</b>		
Female	611 (60.4%)	211 (85.4%)
Male	400 (39.6%)	36 (14.6%)
<b>Age</b>		
Below 16	/	5 (2.0%)
16-20	150 (14.8%)	29 (11.7%)
21-40	147 (14.5%)	18 (7.3%)
41-60	609 (60.2%)	165 (66.8%)
61 or above	103 (10.2%)	30 (12.1%)
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Married	604 (59.7%)	163 (66.0%)
Single	326 (32.2%)	57 (23.1%)
Divorced	58 (5.7%)	16 (6.5%)
Widowed	21 (2.1%)	10 (4.0%)

7. As shown in Table I, around 60% of the household survey respondents are female whereas 85% of the project respondents are female. Two groups of

respondents share a rather different picture in gender composition.

8. Besides, over 60% of two groups of respondents are middle age people and married. Two groups of respondents show a rather similar picture in age composition and in marital status.

9. Table II below shows respondents' number of years of living in Hong Kong and TSW, their education level and working status.

Table II: Demographic profile of household survey respondents and project respondents (II)

	Household Survey Respondents (N=1,011)	Project Participants (N=247)
<b>Number of years of living in Hong Kong</b>		
Since birth	447 (44.2%)	115 (46.6%)
11 years or longer	432 (42.7%)	86 (34.8%)
6-10 years	90 (8.9%)	27 (10.9%)
0-5 years	41 (4.1%)	12 (4.9%)
<b>Number of years of living in TSW</b>		
Since birth	96 (9.5%)	6 (2.4%)
11 years or longer	391 (38.7%)	116 (47.0%)
6-10 years	321 (31.8%)	64 (25.9%)
0-5 years	197 (19.5%)	35 (14.2%)
Not mainly living in TSW	5 (0.5%)	1 (7.3%)
<b>Education level</b>		
Primary school or below	221 (21.9%)	54 (21.9%)
Form 1 to Form 3	261 (25.8%)	81 (32.8%)
Form 4 to Form 7	402 (39.8%)	88 (35.7%)
Sub-degree programme, degree or above	122 (12.0%)	20 (8.1%)
<b>Working Status</b>		
Full-time job	304 (30.1%)	11 (4.5%)
House wife	287 (28.4%)	155 (62.8%)
Full-time student	179 (17.7%)	39 (15.8%)
Unemployed	66 (6.5%)	14 (5.7%)
Retired	63 (6.2%)	6 (2.4%)
Part-time job/ unstable job	106 (10.4%)	18 (7.3%)

10. From Table II, around 44% of household survey respondents and around 47% of project respondents have lived in Hong Kong since birth respectively. There were less project respondents (34.8%) than household survey respondents (42.7%) who have been living in Hong Kong for 11 year or longer. Different from the result of household survey respondents (39%), there were 9% more project respondents have lived in TSW over 11 years (47%). Nevertheless, only 2.4% of the project respondents have lived in TSW since birth, which is less than that of the household survey respondents (9.5%).

11. From Table II, nearly half of the project respondents and household survey respondents have received Form Three education or less. Higher proportion (12%) of household survey respondents is having education at sub-degree level or above, thus suggesting the general education of the project respondents is lower than that of household survey respondents.

12. The working status among two groups of survey respondents is quite different. There were more “house-wife” among project respondents, which is double to that of household survey respondents. Around 30% of household survey respondents whereas only 4.5% of project respondents worked in full-time.

#### Knowledge of and participation in CIIF projects

13. Among 1,011 household survey respondents, 10% of them have heard about CIIF while only 8 of them indicated that they have participated in CIIF projects. It is found that project A3 and A1 are the most popular projects. These two projects were school-based projects. It may help promote the projects as project information was easily accessible to both parents and students. Besides, it is found that project A3 made good use of multimedia tools to promote the project.

#### **Qualitative inquiry and research output**

14. A total of 21 participant observations were conducted to 16 active projects. Besides, for those active projects, a total of 54 individual semi-structured interviews and 11 focus groups with project participants were conducted. Furthermore, a total of 19 and 8 semi-structured interviews with project operators and project collaborators were done respectively. For those completed projects, interviews with the project operators of 8 projects and interviews with project participants were conducted for 2 projects. Apart from interviewing project operators and participants, a total of two focus groups have been conducted with CIIF committee members and CIIF Secretariat. Another focus group interview with representatives from District Planning

and Co-ordinating Team of Social Welfare Department (Yuen Long) is also conducted.

## **Social capital development**

### Associational participation

15. A total of 106 household survey respondents (R2)<sup>1</sup> (10.6%) reported that they had participated in community organizations. Among the 247 project respondents (R3)<sup>2</sup>, 48% (118) of them reported that they have participated in other community organizations. It seems that project respondents (R3) were more likely to have associational participation in TSW than household survey respondents (R1 and R2).

### *Types of community organization*

16. Around 60% of R2 participated in non-government welfare organizations and 20% in religious organizations. Similar to that of R2 respondents, around 60% of R3 participated in non government welfare organizations. Besides, about 9% of project respondents reported that they participated in mutual aid committees (MACs). The fact that project respondents were more likely to engage in MACs might be explained by: i) CIIF projects always cooperated with MACs, members of MACs became active participants of CIIF projects; and/ or ii) project respondents became MACs members because they care about the development of the estate they lived.

### *Level of participation and frequency of participation*

17. R2's level of participation in these community organizations was also explored. Only 40% of them (42) expressed that they were active or very active in participating in those community organizations. However, 87% of R3 reported that they were active or very active in participating in the 1<sup>st</sup> community organizations apart from the CIIF organizations they joined. Besides, around 48% of R2 and 78% of R3 reported that they participated in community organization twice a month or more. These results suggest that project respondents were more active in community organizations than the household survey respondents.

### *Overlapping membership*

18. More project respondents (R3) (60%) expressed that there was some overlap of membership in the community organizations they joined than household survey respondents (R2) (53.3%). There is a potential for not only the network building among members but also resources sharing among community organizations.

---

<sup>1</sup> For clarity of presentation, this group of respondents will be dubbed R2 to differentiate from R1, household survey respondents who reported having no experience in associational participation.

<sup>2</sup> For clarity of presentation, project respondents will be dubbed R3.

*Heterogeneity/Homogeneity of associational membership*

19. Heterogeneity/homogeneity of associational membership is also a matter to social capital development, around 87% and 70% of the R2 respondents expressed that members of those community organizations they participated in were mostly of different political viewpoints and were mostly of different religion respectively. For R3, over 90% of them indicated that there were differences in political viewpoints and religion. In addition, over 75% of R3 also indicated that members of those community organizations they participated in were mostly of different home town, level of education and age groups. Members' backgrounds were quite different in those community organizations that R2 and R3 joined. There is a great potential for the development of social capital since members are diverse, the resources they could bring to the community organizations or other members could also be diverse.

*Familiarity among members and organizers of the community organization*

20. Familiarity among members and organizers is also an important element for residents to build up bonding social capital. Around 58.6% and half of R2 respondents expressed that they were somewhat familiar or familiar with other members and organizers of the community organizations they involved respectively. However, around 80% and over 85% of project respondents (R3) reported that they were somewhat or very familiar with other members and organizers of the community organizations respectively. Since most R3 were more active and spent more time in those organizations than respondents from the household survey, this result should not come as a surprise.

*Implication of associational participation of TSW residents*

21. Project respondents (R3) were more likely to participate and more active in community organizations, while only 10% of household survey respondents (R1 and R2) mentioned that they had associational participation. R3 might have gained more information about their community and developed greater concern for their community. This in turn triggers off further aspiration and behavior to participate in other community organizations.

22. Concerned parties of community organizations as well as the operators of CIIF projects should capitalize the potential of overlap and heterogeneous membership and encourage their members to bring the resources from other organizations to the CIIF projects. They should also have better understanding on the associational life among TSW residents, recognize their participation and make the

best use of these community assets.

#### Participation in CIIF projects (R3 only)

##### *Length of membership in CIIF projects*

23. Around 32% of project respondents (R3) joined CIIF projects for over two years and 22% of R3 for one to two years.

##### *Level of participation, frequency, time spent and programme planning in CIIF projects*

24. Around 80% of project respondents (R3) indicated that they were active or very active in participating in CIIF projects. Moreover, over 80% of project respondents reported that they participated twice a month or more. It is found that over 80% of R3 spend five hours a month and around 45% of them spent more than 10 hrs. All these results suggest that R3 were very active in CIIF projects and spent quite a lot of time on CIIF projects. There were around 65% of R3 who had involved in programme planning.

##### *Heterogeneity/Homogeneity of membership among CIIF projects*

25. Over 90% of project respondents (R3) indicated that there were differences in political viewpoints and religious belief. Around two-third of R3 indicated that project respondents were with different level of education, home town, nationalities, age groups, occupations and gender. When compare this result with that of R2 respondents, there were more R3 indicated the differences. This result suggests that members among CIIF projects may be more diverse than those community organizations that household survey respondents participated in.

##### *Familiarity among members and with organizers*

26. Over 78% and nearly 84% of project respondents (R3) expressed that they were very or somewhat familiar with the project respondents and with the project operators of the CIIF projects respectively. It seems that R3 have good foundation to build up particularized trust among themselves and institutionalized trust on the project operators as well.

#### Structure of collective action and problem solving, and help given to various needs/problems in TSW

##### *Needs and needs satisfaction*

27. Nearly 90% of household survey respondents (R1and R2) expressed that they had needs on health services/clinics and 80% of them indicated the needs were



unmet. Around 57% of R1 and R2 also expressed that they had the needs of job training and employment services and 78% of them indicated this need was unmet. For project respondents (R3), the two most commonly perceived needs are “job training/employment services” (78%) and health services/clinics respectively (93%). There were more R3 than household survey respondents (R1 and R2) say ‘yes’ to 7 out of the 10 needs. It is also found more project respondents express their needs were not met consistently except the two most common needs. Indeed, it is a positive sign as R3 could identify the unmet needs. This is the necessary step for further improve the whole situation of the community.

#### *Help given to various needs/ problems*

28. Respondents were asked about whether someone will offer help if a person encounter personal crisis and financial crisis. It is found that more project respondents (R3) indicated that someone would offer all three kinds of help, namely help to personal crisis, financial help and non-financial help than household survey respondents (R1 and R2). It seems that R3 always trust that the community and think that someone would offer help to the needy.

29. Instead of personal networks such as family members or friends that household survey respondents (R1 and R2) always mentioned, project respondents (R3) were more likely to indicate formal institutions such as NGOs, government and members of District Council would offer these three kinds of help. This is a kind of linking social capital. However, more R1 and R2 expressed that neighbours could offer these help than project respondents, indicating R1 and R2 had good impression on their neighbourhood relationship.

30. Respondents were also asked about whether someone would offer help if a person needs to handle minor matters during the time they leave their home. Around 27% (274) of household survey respondents (R1 and R2) thought that no one would offer help while others think that relatives (who do not live together) (47.0%) , neighbours (19.3%), other (3.5%) and anyone from the community (2.9%) would offer help to family who have this need.

31. For project respondents (R3), only around 14.9% of them indicated that no one will offer help whereas 36% and 28.5% expressed that relatives (who do not live

together) and neighbours will offer the help respectively. There was less R3 thought that no one will help. It again shows that R3 had more confidence that people from the community would help the needy families.

32. When asked about whose help they will ask in taking care of children if they have emergency, over 40% of the household survey respondents (R1and R2) mentioned other family members' help, while nearly half (48%) of the project respondents (R3) mentioned neighbours. This percentage is nearly double when compare this result with that of R1and R2 (28.5%). There were more R3 indicated that they would ask for help from organizations, again indicating the existence of linking social capital.

#### *Conflict resolution*

33. Community capacity could also be indicated by the structure of problem solving. About 260 (25.9%) household survey respondents (R1and R2) expressed that neighbours could help resolve conflict, thus implying that neighbours are not only interested in their own welfare, but also what happen in the community. Different from R1and R2, project respondent (R3) always thought that conflict could be resolved by member of informal network such as family members (38.5%) and neighbours (35.8%), thus indicating community capacity of TSW is quite strong.

#### *Structure of collective action*

34. Around 73% of household survey respondents (R1and R2) expressed that the government, political leaders/parties, community organizations, community leaders and neighbours would get together to take actions on solving community problems while around 83% of project respondents (R3) expressed that different parties would join together to take actions. Only 16.8% of R3 expressed that no one in the community would get together to take action to address community problem in TSW, which is much less than the R1and R2 (26.6%). This finding suggests that as R3 were more active in community participation and and therefore knew different parties from the community who would join together to tackle community problems.

35. In addition, the percentage of project respondents (R3) (60%) who thought that neighbours would get together with other parties to tackle the community problems is 1.5 times of the respondents in household survey (R1and R2) (40%). It

seems that more project respondents recognized neighbours' contribution in improving the situation of TSW. This result indicates that TSW as a community has the capacity to deal with community problem not just by certain formal or organized groups of people, but the general residents/ neighbours too.

#### *Diversity in community and problems of diversity*

36. Around 67% and 64% of household survey respondents (R1and R2) indicated that there were differences between locally born and new arrivals and in education level (among residents) in TSW respectively. R1and R2 thought that differences between locally born and new arrivals (74%) and in education level (among residents) (64%) would bring negative impact to the community. Around 73% of project respondents (R3) indicated that differences existed between people who were born locally and new arrivals and 77% of them thought that these differences would bring negative impacts on TSW. It is apparent that more R3 than R1and R2 perceived "differences" and the negative impact. In addition, more R3 indicated all the 9 problems of diversities exist in TSW and thought that 7 out of 9 problems would have negative impact. Although this finding might present a rather gloomy picture, it is however possible that as R3 are more concerned about the community and therefore are more sensitive to the differences and their problem potential than general residents in TSW.

#### *Collective action*

37. There were 439 (43.9%) household survey respondents (R1and R2) knew that TSW residents had taken action to tackle problems in TSW last year. Among R1and R2, 54 (12.3%) of them have joined these actions. For project respondents (R3), there were 131(58.3%) R3 knew these collective actions of TSW residents. Among them, 57 (46%) of them have joined these actions, suggesting that R3 are more participative in collective action in addressing community problems.

#### TSW residents' stock of social capital

##### *Willingness to contribute money and time to community project which does not make direct benefit*

38. Among the three groups of respondents, R2, household survey respondents with experience in associational participation is the group most willing to contribute money (61.0%), R3, the project respondents are less likely to do so (56.6%) and R1,

household survey respondents without experience in associational participation is least likely to do so (50.9%). A different result is obtained when asked whether they would contribute time. R3 is the group most willing to contribute time (93.3%), followed by R2 (68.6%) while only half of R1 are willing to do so. Associational participation seems to have significant bearing on whether the residents are willing to contribute (time) for common cause of action. It seems that participation in CIIF projects definitely strengthens residents' willingness to contribute to others in the community.

### *Civic Engagement*

39. Among the three groups of respondents, R3 was most active in 9 out of 13 activities. R3 are more likely than the other two groups in volunteering for a charitable organization (83.4%) and actively participate in community activities (80.2%). Besides, R2 was more likely than the other two groups in making monetary or in-kind donation (81.9%). The mean test for civic engagement score shows that R1 scored the lowest (2.28) while R3 scored the highest (4.83, showing that project respondents are civically more active than the other residents in TSW. These findings again confirm the strong relationship between associational participation and civic participation, a core dimension of social capital development (in civic engagement), and.

40. Through in-depth interviews with project respondents (R3), it is also found that they were more aware of and concerned about the issues that occur in the neighbourhood or in the TSW community. Project respondents (R3) became more confident and being empowered as they already proved themselves that they served the community. Project respondents (R3) also mapped out feasible strategy to help people in the community who were in need. Their format of civic engagement was more diverse.

### *Trust and enhancement of the neighborhoods relationship*

41. Project respondents (R3) obtained the highest mean scores in five out of nine statements regarding 'trust'. They are more likely to believe that residents in TSW are more willing to trust each other and have the highest 'particularized trust'. Both groups of respondents who have experiences in associational participation (R2 and R3) have higher generalized trust than those who do not participate in

associations, thus indicating the positive relationship between associational participation and trust, a core dimension of social capital.

42. Through in-depth interviews, it is found that project respondents (R3) got to know their neighbours who were not CIIF project participants through their participation. Mutual support was found among R3 and their neighbours. It is also found that particularized trust could be developed gradually among R3 as they gained a lot of common experiences and became more familiar after joining the programmes. Trustful relationship was also developed between the R3 and their neighbours or other participants they served in the programmes. R3's generalized trust, especially for those new arrivals, was also developed. The positive experiences of getting along with Hong Kong people help R3 who were new arrivals build up good impression of and generalized trust towards Hong Kong people.

#### *Norms of reciprocity*

43. Among eight statements with regard to norms of reciprocity, the mean scores of R3 were highest in five statements. Specifically, project respondents (R3) were more likely to agree that TSW residents are willing to contribute time and money toward common development goals for TSW and they are more willing to do so than residents of other community. In addition, R2 was most likely to believe that help would be available for those in needs in TSW and were most likely to pay attention to the opinions of others in TSW. These findings clearly indicate the existence of 'norms of reciprocity' especially among R2 and R3 and support the claim that associational participation is positively associated with the 'norms of reciprocity', a core dimension of social capital.

44. The in-depth interview findings also suggest that reciprocal relationship was also built up among the project respondents (R3) in which the recipients of help and support were able to repay those people who have helped them. The sense of reciprocity was also generalized such that these R3 were also willing to help the general public (non-group members).

#### *Acceptance and understanding*

45. Through in-depth interviews with project respondents (R3), acceptance of

the new arrivals by local Hong Kong people was found. Moreover, through participating in different types of volunteer services, R3 better understood people of different age groups.

*Bonding social capital and supports among project respondents*

46. The in-depth interview findings also suggest that bonding social capital among project respondents (R3) has been developed. Support groups/ networks are formed among people in the neighborhood as well as people having common interest. With the establishment of the above groups/networks, social support, emotional support, financial support, tangible support and information were reciprocated among members.

*Bridging social capital*

47. In addition, it is also found that bridging social capital was developed among project respondents (R3). R3 were able to obtain the resources brought about by people of different backgrounds which would otherwise be unavailable to them. R3 learnt from different professionals and developed the skills that enabled them to seek employment and this increased their chance of earning money.

*Collective civic participation*

48. About 83% of R3 and 81% of R2 agreed or strongly agreed that residents would be called upon to participate in making decision over policy that aims to improve TSW. Besides, over 77% of R3 and nearly 70% of R2 and R1 also believed that residents of TSW are will to participate in community affairs. The results imply that majority of TSW residents believe in collective civic participation and this could be regarded as strong signal of a rich stock of social capital in TSW.

*Sense of belonging and sense of influence*

49. All the three groups of respondents reported a very strong sense of belonging to the community. Regarding the sense of influence, both R3 and R2 scored higher than R1 in believing other residents and themselves can make TSW a better place to live. However, all the three groups were the same in thinking that they were not as influential as others residents in making TSW a better place to live.

### *Views of community harmony*

50. There were over 80% of R1 and R2 respondents consider TSW residents are having harmonious relationship whereas about 75% of R3 respondents thought so. These results indicate a large majority of the respondents regard TSW as a harmonious community. However, when asked about whether they find TSW is more conflictive, only around 50% to 60% of the respondents disagreed that “compared with other villages/neighbourhoods, TSW is more conflictive”. The reasons why these respondents hold negative views should be further explored.

### *Overall implication*

51. Associational participation matters for both social capital and community capacity development. CIIF projects functioned very well in building up social capital among their participants in TSW. Respondents of two surveys always expressed TSW residents have positive impression of the community they lived in and believed that people there have the will and the ability to improve the situation of TSW.

### **Impact of CIIF projects on individual and community well-being**

#### Impact of associational participation on well-being (household survey respondents (R2)/ project respondents (R3))

52. Project respondents (R3) indicated that they got to know more friends after participated in CIIF projects (90%); learnt new knowledge and skills and had the chance to make a contribution to society after the participation (70%); got to know more information and their sense of belonging to community were increased (60%). When compare with R2, CIIF project respondents were apparently more able to have positive impact on well-being as a result of their associational participation. Project respondents are four times more likely than R2 to “Have the chance to contribute to society” and three times more likely to have “increased sense of belonging to community”. The results indicate the significance of the CIIF projects in bringing benefits to the TSW community as a whole.

#### Impact on individual’s well-being (R3)

##### *Personal growth and changes*

53. Project respondents (R3) felt empowered and their sense of competence was enhanced. They became more confident and were willing to extend their social network. They were willing to help more people and contributing themselves to serve

the community.

*Improvement of relationship within family*

54. Many project respondents (R3) mentioned that their relationships within family members were improved. As they learnt skills to communicate with children and elderly, they also applied these skills with their family members. This resulted in better communication and improved relationships with their family members.

*Enhancement of civic participation with mutual support from project participants*

55. Different kinds of mutual support were exchanged among project participants. With these mutual support, project participants were more empowered to participate in civic matters.

*Increase of income and job opportunities*

56. Project participants who had joined capability building projects expressed that their career plan become clearer and they could find job or gain income generation opportunities.

*Establishment of sense of belonging and satisfaction*

57. Project participants expressed that as their sense of belonging towards the community has been built up, they became more concern about the development of the community and involve in community affairs and become. This participation brought them sense of satisfaction which motivated them to have further participation.

Contribution of CIIF projects to the well-being of the Tin Shui Wai community

*Response to the needs of Tin Shui Wai residents*

58. Project operators had mobilized resources in the community to help the needy people in TSW. In particular, CIIF projects organized many neighbourhood support programmes like afterschool programmes which aimed at helping children whose parents were at work. TSW residents could feel more relieved after joining the programmes organized by the CIIF projects.

*Prevention of domestic violence and crime*

59. Project participants' relationships with their family members were improved after joining the CIIF projects. Besides, project respondents would pay



attention to those “at risk/ withdrawn family”. Their function as “safety valve” and “guardian angels” in the estates may help prevent domestic violence and help fighting crime in the community.

#### *Generation of new job opportunities*

60. Project participants further developed their job-related knowledge and skills and expanded their social networks after joining the training offered by business operators. As a result, they could gather and exchange job related information within networks and find it easier to enter the labour market than before.

#### *The building of community capacity*

61. Residents’ (project respondents) increase in sense of capability facilitates them to extend their social networks in the community. Project participants now have strong sense of belonging towards the community and want to improve the situation of TSW by contributing themselves. Social economy is developed as alternative since residents now could use their networks for barter purposes. Indeed, residents with different abilities and resources gathered through participating in the CIIF projects and their assets are turned into community assets. Project participants have potential ability to bring about community change.

62. Community organizations also contributed to build up community capacity. Through collaboration, their advantages could be well-utilized and their services could be extended to other sectors of the community. The situation of minority individuals and communities was improved. It is found that local people in TSW had changed their perception about new arrivals after they joined the CIIF projects. Local people also acknowledged new arrivals’ talent as well as their culture. All these findings suggest that TSW has laid good foundation in building community capacity.

#### **Impact of CIIF projects on business and welfare sector**

63. In addition, it is also found that CIIF projects brought a lot of positive impact on the business and welfare sectors. For business partners, CIIF projects provided platforms or opportunities for staff development. Moreover, as these business partners developed a culture of caring and serving for the welfare of community, they can actually practice corporate social responsibility (CSR). This

participation thus enables them to build up positive public image. For the welfare sector, new services were evolved and could potentially be developed into social enterprises that could help the disadvantaged groups to generate income.

### **Good practice models of social capital development**

64. Three models of social capital development, namely estate-based, schools-based and capability building could be identified in this study.

65. Among 17 active projects being studied, a total of 12 projects adopted the “estate-based” model. 16 of these projects were implemented in public housing estates and one in an estate under the Home Ownership Scheme. These projects aimed at promoting harmonious community as well as encouraging the building of social support networks in the neighborhood. The participants are mainly residents of the estate the project served. Volunteer training and building of volunteer teams to serve the community were the effective strategies. For better utilization of resources, collaboration with other CIIF projects such as sharing the pool of volunteers manpower and venues are also common strategy.

66. A total of 2 active CIIF projects were classified as school-based. These school-based projects were located at schools where daily after-school care taking programmes have carried out. These projects developed mutual help groups among the disadvantaged families in schools and they were also connected with community through volunteer service programmes. Volunteer services are significant means as members of disadvantaged families became volunteers to serve the community where they live.

67. A total of 3 active CIIF projects were classified as adopting the capability building model. These projects aimed at developing participants’ interest, knowledge and skills around certain themes with an ultimate aim of enhancing participants’ abilities in finding jobs or earning income. These projects also developed bridging social capital by connecting various professional parties to share their experiences and resources with project participants. Information technology, ecotourism and catering services were some special themes which were found to be effective in fostering social capital development in this community.

## **Critical success factors of the CIIF projects**

### Critical success factors contributing to social capital development

#### *Individual level*

68. At the individual level, time spent in the project is the key factor which affects the outcomes. The more they participated in the programmes and cooperated more with other project participants, the more effective it would be for them to expand their network. Project participants who participated in the projects at different levels have become more confident and their sense of belonging towards the projects and the community become stronger. In addition, the extra-programme contact among project participants is more likely to make the relationship and social capital sustains even the project is ended.

#### *Project level*

69. Project operators scheduled the most suitable/ flexible time to conduct the programmes could facilitate participants' participation. Project operators' encouragement and coaching contribute to the growth and positive changes of the project participants. Project was always successful if it provided the platform for participants' to contribute their knowledge and skills for common good. Sense of community could only be built if project participants had the platform to make contacts with the community. It is also important for the project operators to identify the community needs and recognize the strengths of certain target groups and find ways matching them. Engaging the mass media can help promote the project, build up its "brand name", and helps increase the project participants' chance of employment and opportunities for income generation. Other success factors include: project operators' knowledge of the relational dynamics among community organizations and helping the collaborators to understand more about the rationale as well as the needs of the project; project operators could plan for the route for participants' continuous participation in the community. "Referring" the project participants to other NGOs could be one method.

#### *Community level*

##### Inter-organization collaboration

70. It is found that CIIF projects in TSW always collaborated with different kinds of community association. These collaborative efforts often brought benefit not

just to project participants but also the whole community. CIIF projects were strategic partner among themselves and in doing so they could ensure that there were no overlapping so that resources could be utilized efficiently. Schools were always key collaborators of CIIF projects in TSW. Nearly all CIIF projects have collaborated with schools and the format of collaboration was not limited to the promotion of projects or the provision of volunteers but the building of strategic partnership for long term and in-depth collaboration.

71. Collaboration with PTAs helped the CIIF projects recruit volunteers. CIIF projects also collaborated with other NGOs in the community to develop opportunities for the project participants to serve the needy people and the community. Through collaborating with MAC/OC, CIIF project operators were able to recruit participants and provide services to residents. This mode of service provision was founded to be more sustainable. CIIF projects' collaboration with churches encourages the building up of relatively stable supporting relationships among members of churches and project participants. Collaboration with estate management companies, estate management advisory committee (EMAC) and community organizations allowed the projects to have more resources both in programme implementation and consolidation of the project's development in the community since the collaboration helped link up strategic community partners like MACs, district council members and residents. Project operators collaborated with different kinds of business operators or art and cultural organizations which they became the tutors and mentors of project participants. Project participants therefore have built up relatively stable relationships with people of different background and gained opportunities to broaden their horizon.

Supports and resources from CIIF Secretariat

72. CIIF Secretariat took the initiative to contact different types of association in the community and encouraged different stakeholders to apply for the fund. CIIF Secretariat also provided successful models of practice for the reference of associations who were interested to apply for the fund. The briefing seminar organized by the Secretariat always helped project operators to understand more about the requirement. Secretariat's comment on the proposals helped the applicants to sharpen the project focus, clarify and modify the proposals. All these were helpful to

the subsequent project implementation. CIIF Secretariat had also organized community-based seminar in TSW for all the CIIF projects operators there. This provided a “formal” platform for them to exchange experience and networking, thus building a foundation for later collaboration. CIIF Secretariats and CIIF committee members also utilized their networks to facilitate the development of the CIIF projects. The establishment of SC.Net is an important CIIF strategy in linking projects with experts and mentors.

#### Role and function of SWD

73. Social Welfare Department (Yuen Long District) (SWD) also encourages the development of CIIF projects in the community. SWD communicates with different government departments in the community to assess the community needs and explore different resources. Project operators could share the development of CIIF projects and explored different opportunities of collaboration in different platforms provided by SWD.

#### Critical success factors contributing to sustainability of outcomes

74. At individual level, whether project participants have further interaction with other participants affects the sustainability of social capital development. For those project participants who have further contacts with each other after the programmes, stronger relationship and mutual exchanges or support among them were also apparent.

75. At project level, project operators had planned the route for project participants’ continuous participation or involvement in the community. “Referring” the project participants to join other NGOs is another method to ensure the sustainability of community participation.

76. Collaboration is the critical success factor at community level. If reciprocal relationship could be built, the motivation for those community organizations to maintain the collaboration could be increased. CIIF Secretariat’s support and their facilitation to CIIF projects are crucial. Inter-project collaboration increased obviously after the community seminar.

### Difficulties and constraints

77. There were several notable difficulties and constraints as revealed in the study. These include: i) for project operators that were not based in TSW, they needed to borrow venues or other resources to carry out the programmes, thus spending more time and energy to explore the needs of the community and build up relationship with residents and community organizations; ii) administrative work in reporting and budget virement were heavy burden to some project operators; iii) some types of programmes design may limit project participants' further participation in the projects; and iv) staff reduction or the change of key staff also hampered healthy project development.

### **Reliability and validity test of social capital outcome indicators**

78. Social capital scale used in our study was a 26-item scale with five subscales originally developed by the World Bank. The reliability of the five subscales was assessed using Cronbach alpha coefficients. The underlying structure of the social capital scale was explored by using factor analysis. Generally speaking, the results of reliability test and factor analysis show that statement in each subscale were hanged together while the pattern matrix showed a separation of social capital subscales. From the results of further reliability test after conducting factor analysis, the new subscales of "trust" (with 8 statements), "norms of reciprocity" (with 4 statements) and "sense of belonging and sense of influence" (with 3 statements) were developed. Together with 4-statements subscale of "views of community harmony", the social capital scale with a total of 4 subscales (with a total of 19 statements) is recommended for future use and further examination.

### **Recommendations**

#### Recommendations for the government

79. Social capital could be seen as public good. The government should provide more resources to encourage the development of social capital as it plays a fundamental role in producing public goods. As such, it is recommended that:

- Different government departments can collaborate with CIIF projects, share their networks with CIIF projects, offer chance for projects to promote and link up CIIF projects with organizations in their respective sector;
- Government departments should organize competitions or reward

programmes to acknowledge business companies' outstanding participation and collaboration with the welfare sector; and

- Government institutes incentive schemes or measures such as provision of subsidy or tax allowance to facilitate further development of innovative services and social enterprise.

#### Recommendations for CIIF Secretariat

80. In view of the difficulties and constraints encountered by project operators, CIIF Secretariat is recommended to:

- Take effective measures to ensure that organizations receive enough support and resources to implement the project, especially for those organizations which are not based in the TSW;
- Carry out community-based workshops at different districts to foster collaboration among project operators of different projects;
- Facilitate project operators to form mutual support networks;
- Further enhance their promotion work as the more people learn about it, the more people would be attracted to participate and more social capital can be developed; and
- Encourage the collaboration between business sector and welfare sector, and to render support and provide platform to foster mutual understanding of expectations and the formats of collaboration; in particular, information needed to be shared include:
  - on the characteristics of welfare organizations and business companies,
  - the value each party uphold and the possible differences ;
  - profile of the districts; and
  - unique attributes of certain groups of services.

#### Recommendation for government and CIIF Secretariat

81. It is worthy for CIIF Secretariat as well as the government departments to note that human resources are gravely needed to sustain and further develop the innovative services or transform them into social enterprises. It is recommended that CIIF Secretariat should document models adopted by projects, assess the outcome of different models. Besides, as CIIF has been set up for 10 years, it is worthy for CIIF Secretariat to examine the sustainability of CIIF projects and develop tools for

measuring sustainability. CIIF Secretariat may support more academic research to help consolidate the experiences and conduct sustainability research.

#### Recommendations for project operators

82. Organizations should seriously consider their capacity in launching the projects when contemplating to apply for the Fund. In particular they need to consider the feasibility and applicability when considering replicate a particular model or strategy as different community may have their unique characteristics.

83. Project operators should find the entry-point to attract the participation of residents from private housing. If the rationale, purpose, details, role of participation as well as the outcome of the participation are succinctly explained and understood. They would most likely be joining the projects. It is believed that bridging social capital could have better development if people diverse backgrounds are involved.

84. Collaborating with schools is an effective way to promote CIIF projects. It is recommended that projects which do not adopt the school-based model could also promote their projects through collaboration with schools. Well-use of multimedia is another effective strategy to promote the projects. It is recommended that project operators could promote their projects through different platforms on internet, such as the youtube, facebook, blog, webpages, especially those projects that aim to solicit young people's participation. Project operators should also continue to develop "win-win" relationship through collaboration with different community organizations.

85. Overlapping membership could help the community organizations to exchange their resources. Project operators should observe and assess this phenomenon and make effective use of it to generate positive effects. Project operators should also capitalize on the heterogeneity of membership of project participants and provide platforms for different members to contribute their resources.

86. It is essential that there are sufficient platforms for residents to join, particularly at the programme planning level so as to enhance both personal capacity and social capital. As such, project operators could form various working groups with which to: i) encourage members' participation; ii) enhance familiarity among members through interaction and cooperation; and iii) connect participants with their



community.

87. When residents see the problems arising from unmet needs in the community, they would become critical. As such, project operators should: i) discuss with the project participants to facilitate further understanding of the situation; and ii) discuss possible action they can take to improve the situation.

88. Difference or diversities that exist in the community could have negative impact. As such, project operators should also note of these problems and help reduce the negative impact by organizing programmes that facilitate participants to consolidate their experiences and further understand the situations with a view to address the “misunderstanding” or “mistrust” that might exist.

89. Project operators should take initiatives to assist project participants’ knowledge and skills of civic engagement.

90. Both project operators and business partners should understand each others’ concern and expectations and explore the ways of collaboration based on sincere communication.

91. Project operators and project participants should consider with great care when determining whether to expand the innovative service they have developed or to maintain its status quo.

#### Recommendations for further study

92. Further study, possibly taking the longitudinal approach, is recommended to: i) examine the sustainability of CIIF projects, such as the forms of sustainability as well as factors which contribute to the sustainability of the project outcome and social capital development in the longer term and develop the tools for measuring sustainability; ii) explore the differences, if any, on social capital development between Hong Kong people and new arrivals; iii) international comparative study on community residents’ associational participation and social capital development; iv) explore why residents were not active in community problem-solving activities so as to shed light on the strategies that could foster the rate and level of social participation;

and v) explore why the norms of reciprocity generally exist in TSW but half of the respondents think that people there only care for themselves.

93. In this study, a social capital scale has been developed. Further study is recommended to examine whether the statements in social capital scale could reflect different concepts of social capital from the perspective of local people as the statements were all from overseas. It is also recommended that project operators can start using this scale to measure the social capital outcome of their projects. Similar study with the same measurement tool could also be carried out to explore the social capital outcome of CIIF projects in different districts. The results could help us to further develop and validate the scale to measure social capital in Hong Kong.

## 摘要

### 背景

近年，在天水圍發生的家庭慘劇往往都成為了傳媒及社會大眾的焦點。有見及此，不同的群體及相關的組織致力重建天水圍的社區氣氛及改善居民的生活質素。社區投資共享基金是這些組織的榜樣及先驅。截至 2012 年 6 月，基金共資助超過 35 個於天水圍執行的計劃。

### 研究目標

2. 由於社區投資共享基金（以下簡稱基金）在天水圍共資助了 29 項（截至 2010 年）計劃，這些計劃能否有效地建立社會資本及社區能力，並為天水圍社區及其居民的福祉帶來正面影響皆是基金及公眾的關注。有見及此，本研究有以下三個目標：

- 1) 瞭解基金計劃能否成功促進參加者及非參加者社會資本的建立；
- 2) 記錄社會資本建立的機制及識別基金計劃的成功因素及良好實踐；
- 3) 瞭解社會資本的建立對計劃參加者及天水圍福祉的影響。

### 研究方法

3. 本研究同時採用質性及量化的研究方法。基金計劃的參加者及非參加者皆是本研究的對象。共有 17 個正在推行（截至 2010 年 11 月）及 10 個已完成的計劃參與此研究。

### 住戶調查及計劃參加者問卷調查

#### 問卷的制定

4. 本研究透過住戶調查及計劃參加者問卷調查搜集量化研究所需的資料。本研究的問卷是參考世界銀行社會資本主題小組（2002）而制定的。相較其他學者或研究所制定的問卷，世界銀行社會資本問卷所包含的內容較完整。然而，基於香港及天水圍的獨特性，問卷的部份內容稍作修訂並簡短化。基金計劃參加者及天水圍的住戶皆填寫同一份問卷，但前者需要回答有關參與基金計劃狀況的相關題目。

#### 回應率

5. 本研究共收到來自 12 個基金計劃共 239 份計劃參加者的問卷。在住戶調查方面，本研究成功訪問了 1,011 位天水圍的住戶，回應率為 55.40%。

## 基本資料

6. 表 I 顯示了受訪住戶及計劃參加者居住的房屋類型、性別、年齡及婚姻狀況。超過 72% 受訪住戶及計劃參加者住在公共房屋，分別約 20% 受訪住戶及 16% 計劃參加者住在居屋。本研究的樣本較能反映公共房屋及居屋住戶的狀況。

表 I: 受訪住戶及計劃參加者的基本資料 (I)

	受訪住戶 (N=1,011)	計劃參加者 (N=247)
房屋類型		
公共房屋	739 (73.1%)	177 (72.0%)
居屋	204 (20.2%)	39 (15.8%)
私人屋苑	68 (6.8%)	30 (12.2%)
性別		
女	611 (60.4%)	211 (85.4%)
男	400 (39.6%)	36 (14.6%)
年齡		
16 歲以下	/	5 (2.0%)
16-20 歲	150 (14.8%)	29 (11.7%)
21-40 歲	147 (14.5%)	18 (7.3%)
41-60 歲	609 (60.2%)	165 (66.8%)
61 歲或以上	103 (10.2%)	30 (12.1%)
婚姻狀況		
已婚	604 (59.7%)	163 (66.0%)
單身	326 (32.2%)	57 (23.1%)
離婚	58 (5.7%)	16 (6.5%)
喪偶	21 (2.1%)	10 (4.0%)

7. 在性別方面，女性受訪住戶為 60% (611)。在計劃參加者方面，女性佔 85% (211)。數字反映參加者及住戶受訪者的性別結構不太相同。

8. 在年齡方面，超過 60% 的受訪住戶及計劃參加者是中年人及已婚。數字反映參加者及住戶受訪者的年齡結構及婚姻狀況大致相似。

9. 表 II 顯示受訪者居住在香港及天水圍的年數、教育程度及工作狀況。

表 II: 受訪住戶及計劃參加者的基本資料 (II)

	受訪住戶 (N=1,011)	計劃參加者 (N=247)
<b>居住在香港年期</b>		
由出世到現在	447 (44.2%)	115 (46.6%)
11 年或以上	432 (42.7%)	86 (34.8%)
6-10 年	90 (8.9%)	27 (10.9%)
0-5 年	41 (4.1%)	12 (4.9%)
<b>居住在水圍的年期</b>		
由出世到現在	96 (9.5%)	6 (2.4%)
11 年或以上	391 (38.7%)	116 (47.0%)
6-10 年	321 (31.8%)	64 (25.9%)
0-5 年	197 (19.5%)	35 (14.2%)
並不主要在水圍居住	5 (0.5%)	1 (7.3%)
<b>教育程度</b>		
小學或以下	221 (21.9%)	54 (21.9%)
中一至中三	261 (25.8%)	81 (32.8%)
中四至中七	402 (39.8%)	88 (35.7%)
非學位大專課程、大學學位或以上	122 (12.0%)	20 (8.1%)
<b>工作狀況</b>		
全職工作	304 (30.1%)	11 (4.5%)
家庭主婦	287 (28.4%)	155 (62.8%)
全日制學生	179 (17.7%)	39 (15.8%)
失業	66 (6.5%)	14 (5.7%)
退休	63 (6.2%)	6 (2.4%)
兼職工作/散工	106 (10.4%)	18 (7.3%)

10. 約 44% 受訪住戶及 47% 計劃參加者在香港出生。與受訪住戶比較 (42.7%)，較少的計劃參加者在香港居住十一年或以上 (34.8%)。約 47% 計劃參加者在水圍居住超過十一年，但只有約 39% 的受訪住戶居住在水圍超過十一年，較前者少 9%。約有 9.5% 受訪住戶由出生開始在水圍居住，但只有約 2.4% 的計劃參加者由出生開始在水圍居住，較前者為少。

11. 接近一半的計劃參加者及受訪住戶具中三或以上的教育程度。較多比例的受訪住戶有著大專或以上的學歷 (12%)。整體數字反映計劃參加者的教育程度較受訪住戶為低。

12. 兩組的受訪者有著不太相同的工作狀況。較多的計劃參加者是家庭主婦，其百分比是受訪住戶的兩倍。大約有三成的受訪住戶是全職工作，但只有4.5%的計劃參加者是全職工作。

### 對基金計劃的認識及參與

13. 在 1,011 受訪住戶中，約有 10% 的受訪住戶曾聽過基金的計劃。當中共有 8 位受訪住戶曾參與計劃。計劃 A3 及 A1 為最多受訪住戶認識的計劃。由於這兩個計劃皆是以學校為基礎，學校的家長及學生較容易接觸到基金計劃的資料，可見與學校的協作實有助計劃的宣傳。此外，計劃 A3 善於利用各種媒體工具有效地宣傳計劃。

### **質性研究及研究輸出**

14. 在質性研究方面，研究員共探訪了 16 個正進行的計劃，完成了 21 次的參與式觀察、54 個計劃參加者訪問、11 個計劃參加者聚焦小組。除此之外，本研究共完成了 19 個計劃統籌員的訪問及 8 個計劃協作者的訪問。在已完結計劃方面，研究員能與 8 個計劃的統籌員及 2 個計劃的參加者進行訪問。還有，研究員亦曾與基金委員及秘書處同事、元朗社會福利署的代表進行聚焦小組。

### **社會資本發展**

#### 組織參與

15. 在 1,011 名受訪住戶當中，共有 106 名受訪住戶表示他們曾經參與社區組織 (R2)<sup>3</sup> (10.6%)。然而，在 247 名計劃參加者 (R3)<sup>4</sup> 中，共有 118 名 (48%) 參加者表示他們曾經參與社區組織，數字表示較多的計劃參加者參與社區組織。

#### *參與的社區組織的類型*

16. 約有 60% 及 20% 的 R2 分別參與非政府組織及宗教組織。約有 60% 的 R3 參與非政府組織，與 R2 參與非政府組織的百分比接近。然而，較多的 R3 參與互助委員會。基金計劃常與互委會合作，而互委會的委員亦有機會積極參與基金計劃；另外，R3 亦由於他們關心屋邨的發展而成為互委會的委員，這些皆是較多計劃參與者參與互委會的原因。

#### *參與程度及頻率*

17. 在社區組織內的參與程度方面，只有約 40% 的 R2 表示他們積極或十分積極參與社區組織。然而，約有 87% 的 R3 表示他們積極或十分積極參與社區組織（非推行基金計劃的組織）。此外，約有 48% 的 R2 表示他們每月參與社區

---

<sup>3</sup> 為方便表達及比較，以 R2 代表曾參與社區組織的受訪住戶，以 R1 代表沒有參與社區組織的受訪住戶。

<sup>4</sup> 為方便表達及比較，計劃參加者會歸類為 R3。

組織兩次以上及 60%的 R3 表示他們每星期參與社區組織一次或以上，結果顯示 R3 比 R2 更積極參與社區組織。

#### *會員的重疊情況*

18. 約有 60%的 R3 表示他們參與的社區組織的會員有部份是重疊的，比 R2 (53.3%) 為多。結果除顯示會員網絡建立的潛力外，社區組織亦可善用會員的部份重疊促使資源互享。

#### *社區組織會員的同質性／異質性*

19. 社區組織會員的同質性／異質性影響著社會資本的發展。約有 87%及 70%的 R2 分別認為大多數組織內的會員都有著不同的政治理及宗教信仰。在 R3 方面，超過 90%的 R3 認為大多數組織內的會員都有著不同的政治理及宗教信仰。而超過 75%的 R3 認為大多數組織內的會員在家鄉、教育水準及年齡組別都有著差異。R2 及 R3 參與的社區組織內的會員都有著不同的背景。如果會員更多元化，他們能為社區組織及其他會員更多元化的資源，社會資本的發展更為理想。

#### *與社區組織會員及組織者的熟悉程度*

20. 與社區組織會員的熟悉程度是建立共鍵式社會資本 (Bonding Social Capital) 的重要元素。約有 58.6%的 R2 表示他們熟悉或大致熟悉其他會員；而約有半數的 R2 表示他們熟悉或大致熟悉組織者。另外，約有 80%的 R3 表示他們熟悉或大致熟悉其他會員；而超過 85%的 R3 表示他們熟悉或大致熟悉組織者。由於大部份的 R3 都更為積極及投放更多的時間參與社區組織，有這樣的結果實在並不意外。

#### *天水圍居民社區組織參與的啓示*

21. R3 較願意及較積極參與社區組織，然而，卻只有約 10%的受訪住戶 (R1 及 R2) 表示他們曾參與社區組織。由於 R3 有著更多的社區資訊及更關心他們居住的社區，因而引發更多參與其他社區組織的意向及具體行動。

22. 社區組織及基金計劃統籌需要善用會員的重疊情況及異質性，鼓勵其會從其他的社區組織引入資源以促進基金計劃的發展。社區組織及基金計劃統籌需要對天水圍居民的社區組織參與情況有一定的瞭解，肯定其參與及善用此社區資產。

#### 在基金計劃的參與 (R3)

##### *參與基金計劃的年期*

23. 約有 32%的 R3 參與基金計劃超過兩年，而約有 22%的 R3 參與基金計劃一至兩年。

### *參與層次、頻率、時間投放及參與活動策劃*

24. 約有 80% 的 R3 表示他們十分積極或積極參與計劃。超過 80% 的 R3 表示他們每月參與計劃兩次或更多。超過 80% 的 R3 每月參與計劃時數超過 5 小時，而約 45% 的 R3 的參與時數更加超過 10 小時。這些結果反映 R3 積極參與計劃並投放很多時間在計劃中。此外，約有 65% 的 R3 表示他們曾參與活動的策劃。

### *基金計劃參加者的同質性／異質性*

25. 超過 90% 的 R3 表示基金計劃的參加者有著不同的政治理念及宗教信仰。約三分之二的 R3 表示基金計劃的參加者在教育水準、籍貫、種族、年齡組別、職業及性別都有著差異。與 R2 的結果比較，較多的 R3 認為有著差異。結果反映 R3 較受訪住戶 (R1 及 R2) 參與的社區組織內的會員有著較不同的背景。

### *與基金計劃其他參加者及組織者的熟悉程度*

26. 超過 78% 的 R3 表示他們與其他參加者十分熟悉；而約有 84% 的 R3 表示他們與計劃組織者大致熟悉。從參加者與基金計劃其他參加者及組織者的熟悉程度可見，R3 有著良好的基礎以建立彼此的特定信任及對計劃組織者的機構性信任。

### *集體行動的結構、問題解決及對各種需要／天水圍問題提供的協助 需要及需要的滿意度*

27. 約有 90% 的受訪住戶 (R1 及 R2) 表示他們有著「醫療保健/診所服務」的需要，而其中約 80% 有需要的 R1 及 R2 表示他們的需要未能滿足。約 57% 的 R1 及 R2 表示他們有「工作訓練及就業」的需要。在計劃參加者 (R3) 方面，最多 R3 表示有著「工作訓練及就業」(78%) 和「醫療保健/診所服務」(93%) 的需要。在七項需要 (共提問了十項需要) 當中，表示有該項需要的 R3 的百分比較 R1 及 R2 為高。除了當中的兩項需要外，整體上，表示需要未被滿足的 R3 的百分比亦較 R1 及 R2 為高。基於 R3 能夠指出未被滿足的需要及反映處境，是進一步改善社區的重要一步，因此結果是有正面影響的。

### *為不同需要及問題作出的協助*

28. 受訪者問及如果有人面對個人危機或財政困難，會否有人給予援助。研究發現，與受訪住戶 (R1 及 R2) 比較，較多的計劃參加者 (R3) 指出有人會給予三種援助，包括對個人危機的協助、就財政困難施予的財政及財政以外的協助。R3 似乎較信任社區及相信有需要的人能夠得到別人的幫助。

29. 當問及那些類別的人士會協助有需要者，受訪住戶 (R1 及 R2) 常提到個人的網絡，如「家庭成員」、「朋友」。然而，較多的計劃參加者 (R3) 則



認為正規的組織會提供協助，如：「非政府組織」、「政府」和「區議員」等。這可視為聯接式社會資本(linking social capital)的一種。然而，較多的R1及R2認為「鄰居」會提供相關的協助，反映他們對鄰舍關係有著不錯的觀感。

30. 受訪者被問及當他們需要離開家庭一段時間而會否有人協助他們處理一些較瑣碎的事務。只有約27.3% (274) 的受訪住戶 (R1及R2) 表示沒有人會給予協助；認為「不同住的親戚」、「鄰居」、「其他人士」、及「社區內任何可協助的人士會提供協助」的受訪者分別有47%、19.3%、3.5%及2.9%。

31. 在計劃參加者 (R3) 方面，只有約14.9%的R3表示「沒有人會提供協助」。分別約有36%及28.5%的R3表示「不同住的親戚」及「鄰居」會提供協助。從較少的R3認為「沒有人會提供協助」來看，反映他們對社區人士有較多的信心，認為有需要的家庭是可獲得協助。較多的R3亦相信鄰舍間有著信任的關係。

32. 本研究亦探討當受訪者有急事需要離開數小時，會找誰協助他照顧孩子。超過40%的受訪住戶 (R1及R2) 表示會尋找他們的「家庭成員」協助。而超過半數的計劃參加者 (R3) 則表示他們會尋求「鄰居」的協助。而表示會尋求「鄰居」協助的參加者的百分比約是R1及R2 (表示會尋求「鄰居」的協助，28.5%) 的兩倍。還有，較多的R3表示他們會尋找一些「提供託兒服務的社區組織」協助，再一次反映R3的聯接式社會資本建立 (linking social capital) 的存在。

### *衝突解決*

33. 透過瞭解社區內解決問題的架構，我們可以瞭解一個社區的能力。當有兩個居民發生嚴重爭執，共有260名 (25.9%) 受訪住戶 (R1及R2) 表示「鄰居」會協助他們解決紛爭。結果顯示這群R1及R2認為「鄰居」不會只考慮他們的個人利益，而關心社區內發生的事。與R1及R2不同，計劃參加者 (R3) 認為衝突是可以透過非正式的組群／社區內的人士協助解決，如38.5%的R3選擇「家庭成員」而35.8%的R3選擇「鄰居」。這反映天水圍有著頗強的社區能力，因為鄰居及社區領袖願意出一分力致使整個鄰裡關係變得更和諧。

### *集體行動的結構*

34. 約 73%的受訪住戶 (R1 及 R2) 表示政府、政治領袖/政黨、社區組織、社區領袖及鄰居會聚在一起解決社區問題。約 83%的計劃參加者 (R3) 表示不同的組群會一起「解決社區問題。只有約 16.8%的 R3 表示天水圍內沒有任何人聚在一起解決社區問題，百分比較 R1 及 R2 (26.6%) 為少。與 R1 及 R2 相

比，由於較多的 R3 關心社區的事務，他們亦因此認為不同的組群會聚在一起去解決社區問題。

35. 還有，約有 60%的計劃參加者（R3）認為「鄰居」會為社區問題而作出行動，百份比是受訪住戶（R1 及 R2）的 1.5 倍。由此可見，R3 較 R1 及 R2 更傾向認為鄰居都可以為改善天水圍的處境而出力。結果同時反映，並不單是特定群組的人士才能協助解決天水圍的社區問題，普通的居民及鄰居皆會為天水圍出力。

#### *社區內存在的差異及差異所帶來的問題*

36. 分別約有 67%及 64%的受訪住戶（R1 及 R2）表示「香港出生的人及新來港人士」及「天水圍居民的教育程度」存在著差異。在指出差異的 R1 及 R2 中，分別有 74%及 64%的 R1 及 R2 表示「香港出生的人及新來港人士」及「天水圍居民的教育程度」這兩項的差異會為社區帶來負面的影響。整體上，較多的計劃參加者（R3）認為社區內存在著較多的差異及這些差異會為社區帶來負面影響。此外，在問及天水圍是否存在著分化居民的社會問題，較多的 R3 認為全部共九項的社會問題皆存在，亦認為當中七項的社會問題會為社區帶來負面影響。R3 較關心社區的發展，因此較普通的居民更留意社區差異及問題。

#### *集體行動*

37. 共有 439（43.9%）名 R1 及 R2 表示他們知道天水圍居民去年曾與政府或其他組織聯繫以解決天水圍的社區問題。在那些知道有聯合行動的受訪者當中，共有 54 名（12.3%）曾參與這些行動。在計劃參加者（R3）方面，共有 131 名（58.3%）表示他們知道天水圍居民去年曾與政府或其他組織聯繫以解決天水圍的社區問題，而當中共有 57 人曾參與這些行動（46%）。根據統計學上的分析（A chi-square test of independence），與 R1 及 R2 相比，R3 明顯地較願意參與集體行動以解決天水圍的社區問題。

#### 天水圍居民的社會資本

##### *為「沒有直接利益的社區計劃」付出金錢或時間的願意程度*

38. 在三個組別的受訪者中，曾參與社區組織的受訪住戶（R2）最願意為「沒有直接利益但對社區有貢獻的計劃」付出金錢（61.0%），其次的是計劃參加者（R3）（56.6%），最少的為沒有參與社區組織的受訪住戶（R1），但仍有 50.9%願意付出金錢。然而，當問及是否願意付出時間，調查結果與金錢付出略為不同。R3 為最願意付出時間的一個組群（93.3%），其次的為 R2（68.6%），最少的仍然是 R1，但仍有約半數的 R1 願意付出時間。究竟居民是否願意為「沒有直接利益但對社區有貢獻的計劃」付出似乎都頗為取決於他們是否有參與社區

組織。參與基金計劃看來是能夠強化居民為社區其他人士作出貢獻的願意程度。

### 公民參與

39. 在三組的受訪者當中，計劃參加者（R3）積極參與十三項公民參與項目中的九項。與其他兩個組別的受訪者作比較，較多的R3為慈善團體擔任義工（83.4%）及積極參與組織（80.2%）。此外，與另外兩個組別的受訪者作比較，較多的R2願意捐錢或捐助實物（81.9%）。根據公民參與分數的平均值測試（mean test for civic engagement score）的結果顯示，R3得分最高（4.83分）而R1則得分最低（2.28分）。結果再一次肯定組織參與與社會資本發展的關係，計劃參與者往往較天水圍的其他居民有著更多的社會資本。

40. 除了問卷數據外，透過與計劃參加者進行訪問，亦發現計劃參加者較以往更加關心社區或鄰舍間發生的事。透過計劃，他們證明瞭自己可以服務社區，他們比以往有更多的信心及已充權。計劃參加者更加嘗試製訂一些可行的策略以協助社區內有需要的人。

### 信任及鄰舍關係的加強

41. 在九項反映「信任」的語句中，計劃參加者（R3）在當中的五項得分最高。與另外兩個組別的受訪者相比，R3更傾向認為天水圍居民願意互相信任及有更強的特定信任。曾參與社區組織的兩個群組（R2及R3）較沒有組織參與的群組（R1）有著更多的普遍信任。

42. 在與計劃參加者（R3）進行訪問時亦發現他們往往可以透過參與計劃認識他們的鄰居。計劃參加者及鄰居能夠相互支持。參與計劃後，由於能夠有一些共同經歷及較以往更加熟悉，「特定的信任」（particularized trust）亦漸漸得以建立。這信任的關係亦漸漸發展至計劃參加者的鄰居及計劃內的其他參與者。新來港人士往往透過參與活動而獲得一些與香港人交往的正面經驗，這些經驗令新來港人士對香港人留下好印象，促進「普遍信任」（generalized trust）的建立。

### 互惠的規範

43. 在8項有關互惠的規範的指標當中，計劃參加者（R3）在其中5項的平均值為最高。他們較其他兩組群的受訪者更同意天水圍居住的人「願意為著共同的目標付出時間及金錢」。另外，R2亦較R1及R3更同意「有需要的人能夠在水圍尋找到協助」及他們更願意「留意天水圍這社區裡其他人的意見」。結果反映R2及R3持有互惠的信念及再一次指出參與組織和互惠的規範有著正向關係。

44. 與計劃參加者（R3）進行訪問的結果亦顯示參計劃加者之間的互惠關係亦得以發展。那些曾經得到協助及支援的參加者往往表示會報答那些曾經幫助過他們的人。互惠的關係亦進一步延伸至那些非參加者，R3 均表示他們願意協助社區內的其他人士（非計劃參加者）。

#### *接納及理解*

45. 此外，訪問的結果亦反映本地計劃參加者透過在計劃中與新來港人士接觸，對新來港人士表示接納。而透過參與不同類型的活動/義工服務，計劃參加者對不同年齡的組群亦有更多的認識及理解。

#### *計劃參加者的共鍵式社會資本（Bonding Social Capital）及社會支援*

46. 訪問的結果亦反映基金計劃推動了計劃參加者共鍵式社會資本（Bonding social capital）的發展。鄰居間或有共同興趣的組群建立了支援小組及網絡。在建立了支援網絡後，參加者互相交換不同的支援，包括：社會支援、情緒支援、經濟支援、物質支援及資訊交換等。

#### *搭橋式社會資本（Bridging Social Capital）*

47. 計劃參加者（R3）的搭橋式社會資本（Bridging Social Capital）亦得以建立。透過參與計劃，參加者能夠認識到不同背景人士及得到由他們帶來的資源，而這些資源是他們以往未能得到的。R3 可以向不同的專業人士學習及並得以發展一些可協助他們就業或增加收入的技能。

#### *集體性的公民參與*

48. 約有83%的R3及81%的R2十分同意或同意「如果有關改善天水圍社區的政策需要作出決定，天水圍的居民是可以參與決定的」。此外，超過77%的R3及約七成的R1及R2皆相信天水圍的居民是願意參與社區事務的。結果反映大部份的天水圍居民相信集體性的公民參與，顯示天水圍有著豐富的社會資本。

#### *對社區的歸屬感及影響力*

49. 三組的受訪對象均對天水圍的社區抱有很強的歸屬感。在影響力方面，R3及R2的分數亦較R1為高，反映他們更相信他們自己及天水圍的居民可以令天水圍成爲一個更美好的社區。然而，三組的受訪對象均認爲他們自己的影響力不及於其他的天水圍居民。

### *社區和諧的觀感*

50. 超過80%的R1及R2認為天水圍居民之間的關係是和諧；而約有75%的R3認為天水圍居民之間的關係是和諧。結果反映大部份的回應者認為天水圍是一個和諧的社區。然而，當受訪者被問及他們是否認為天水圍是一個充滿矛盾的社區，只有約50%至60%的受訪者不同意「與其他地方比較，天水圍這個社區有著更多的矛盾」，這與之前的結果有一些不一致，內裡的原因有待日後的研究作進一步深入瞭解。

### *整體意義*

51. 透過進行住戶調查、計劃參加者問卷調查及深入訪談，我們瞭解到組織參與對社會資本以至社區的發展尤其重要。基金計劃能有效地推動計劃參加者發展其社會資本。整體結果確認受訪者對天水圍有極正面的印象及相信天水圍居民願意及有能力改善天水圍的處境。

### **基金計劃對個人及社區福祉的影響**

#### 組織參與對個人及社區福祉的影響(曾參與組織的受訪住戶/計劃參加者)

52. 約 90%的計劃參加者(R3)指出他們在參與計劃後認識了更多的朋友。此外，超過 70%的 R3 指出他們能夠學習到新技能/新知識及有機會回饋社區。還有超過 60%的參加者表示他們在參與計劃後獲得更多的資訊及其對社區的歸屬感有所提昇。與 R2 作比較，參與基金計劃對 R3 的福祉明顯地有著正面的影響。R3 當中認為「有機會回饋社區」及「對社區的歸屬感有所提昇」的百分比分別是 R2 的四倍及三倍。結果顯示基金計劃的價值，因為此兩項影響都有利於整個天水圍社區。

#### 對個人福祉的影響

##### *個人成長及轉變*

53. 參與計劃後，計劃參加者(R3)大都感到被充權及他們的能力感有所增強。他們比以往更加有信心和意願去擴展他們的社會網絡及願意協助他人及為社區服務。

##### *家庭關係的改善*

54. 很多計劃參加者(R3)提到他們與家人的關係在參與計劃後有明顯的改善。他們指出除了在計劃中學習到如何與小朋友及長者溝通之外，他們亦與家人分享將在計劃內獲得的正面經驗。她們與丈夫或其他家庭成員的緊張關係得以緩和。

### *在獲得計劃參加者支持下有著更多的公民參與*

55. 計劃參加者（R3）之間能互相支援及提供不同的協助，在得到這些支援為後盾後，R3 能夠更安心從事更多的公民參與。

### *增加收入及就業的機會*

56. 曾參與「能力建立」計劃的參加者（R3）大都表示他們除了得到更多就業及增加收入的機會外，對自己的就業計劃比以往更加清晰。

### *歸屬感及滿足感的建立*

57. 計劃參加者（R3）能夠建立對社區的歸屬感。他們大都表示願意在社區有更多的參與及更加關心社區的發展。此外，在貢獻社區後獲得很多的滿足感；這些滿足感又進一步推動他們作更多的參與。

### *基金計劃對天水圍社區福祉的影響*

#### *回應天水圍居民的需要*

58. 由於計劃統籌員調動社區內不同的資源以協助有需要的人，雖然面對很多的生活壓力，但在參與基金計劃的活動後，天水圍的居民感到更加放鬆。部份的基金計劃透過推展「課後支援」等鄰舍互助計劃為雙職家長的兒童提供協助。

#### *家庭暴力及罪案的預防*

59. 計劃參加者（R3）與家庭成員的關係在參與計劃後得到改善，出現家庭暴力事件的機會亦會相應減少。此外，R3 亦更加留意社區內「高危／隱閉」的家庭，並成為屋邨的守護天使，關懷有需要的家庭，這些行動有助預防家庭暴力事件或減少罪案於社區發生。

#### *製造新的就業機會*

60. 透過參與計劃及得到商業夥伴提供的訓練，計劃參加者（R3）能進一步發展一些與就業相關的知識及技能，並因此獲得就業機會。由於 R3 的社會網絡在參與計劃後得到擴展，他們可以在當中交換與就業相關的資訊，這些行動讓他們能夠更容易進入勞動市場。

#### *社區能力的建立*

61. 天水圍的居民（計劃參加者，R3）在參加計劃後變得更有能力。這能力感能促進他們與社區內其他人士接觸，擴展他們的社會網絡。R3 對社區有更

強的歸屬感及願意為改善天水圍的處境貢獻自己。由於居民可以運用他們的網絡作物品/服務交換的用途，社區經濟亦得以發展。此外，擁有不同資源及能力的居民透過參與計劃凝聚起來，而他們的資產亦透過計劃所提供的平台轉化為社區的資產。R3 有著潛能去帶動社區轉變。

62. 社區組織亦能協助建立社區動力。透過不同的協作，它們的優勢得以善用，它們的服務亦可擴展到不同的對象/領域。少數族群的處境亦漸漸得到改善。在參與基金計劃後，天水圍居住的香港人對新來港人士觀感變得更正面，他們亦肯定新來港人士的才能及文化。這些結果皆反映天水圍在社區能力建設方面有了一個很好的基礎。

### **基金計劃對商界及社福界的影響**

63. 除此之外，本研究發現基金計劃能同時為商界及社福界帶來正面的影響。與基金計劃的協助為企業夥伴提供了職員培訓的機會。而由於企業夥伴建立了留意社區的福祉及服務社區的文化，企業夥伴能從而履行他們的企業社會責任。企業夥伴的參與亦能夠協助他們建立正面形象。在社福界方面，基金計劃能促進新服務的發展。而這些新服務亦有很大的潛能發展成社會企業並提供弱勢社群增加收入的機會。

### **理想的社會資本發展的實踐模式**

64. 本研究發現三種建立社會資本的計劃實踐模式，包括：屋邨為本、學校為本及能力建立的計劃。

65. 在 17 個在進行的計劃中，有 12 個可以歸類為「屋邨為本」計劃。除了其中一個計劃在居屋的屋苑推行外，其他計劃主要在公共屋邨推行。這些計劃主要推動和諧社區及鄰舍間社會支援網絡的建立。計劃的參加者主要為屋邨的居民。義工訓練及建立服務社區的義工隊伍均是這些計劃使用的有效策略。為了更有效地使用資源，不同的基金計劃亦會相互協作，如：共用義工網絡及活動地方等。

66. 除了屋邨為本的計劃外，有兩個計劃可歸類為「學校為本」的計劃。這類計劃主要在學校推行課後支援計劃。透過在學校舉辦不同的活動，發展弱勢家庭的互助小組；與此同時，亦透過不同的項目，鼓勵這些家庭與社區連繫。發展義工服務為此類計劃的重要策略，因其提供平台讓弱勢家庭的成員成為義工，

為他們居住的社區作出貢獻。

67. 共有三個計劃可以歸類為「能力建立」的計劃。這些計劃的目的為發展參加者某一特定範疇的興趣、知識及技能，以致參加者可以增強其就業或增加收入的能力。透過聯繫專業團體與計劃參加者分享相關的經驗及資源，搭橋式的社會資本（Bridging Social Capital）得以建立。資訊科技、生態遊及烹飪到會服務等特定主題的計劃皆有助社區建立社會資本。

## 基金計劃的成功因素

### 促進社會資本發展的成功因素

#### *個人層面*

68. 在個人層面，參加者在計劃內的時間投放是一個重要的因素影響其社會資本發展的成效。他們參加的活動越多及與其他計劃參加者的合作越多，他們更能夠有效地擴展其網絡。此外，計劃參加者如在計劃內有不同層次的參與，他們變得更有信心，對計劃及社區的歸屬感亦相應增加。還有，計劃參加者在活動後的接觸和交流亦有助維繫已建立的網絡及社會資本的持續發展。

#### *計劃層面*

69. 計劃統籌如能夠安排具彈性或最適合參加者的時間舉辦活動，能促進參加者的參與。計劃統籌如能夠給予參加者鼓勵及引導，亦能促進參加者的成長及正向改變。計劃的成功亦取決於它是否能提供平台讓計劃參加者與社區接觸，並為社區貢獻他們的知識及技能，進一步建立對社區的歸屬感。計劃統籌亦需要對社區需要及特定組群的能力有所瞭解及善用特定組群的能力以解決社區需要。計劃統籌引入媒體協助計劃的宣傳，能有效提昇計劃的知名度／品牌，亦有助參加者爭取更多的就業或增加收入機會。其他的成功因素包括：計劃統籌對社區組織間的關係及互動狀況的深入認識；計劃統籌能促進協作者理解計劃的理念及需要；計劃統籌能為參加者持續在社區參與預早作出計劃，將參加者轉介至其他非政府組織是其中一個可行的方法讓參加者可以繼續在社區參與。

#### *社區層面*

##### 組織之間的相互協作

70. 天水圍的基金計劃經常與不同類型的組織協作。這些協助不但為有利於計劃參加者，同時亦為整個社區帶來正面的影響。基金計劃之間的協作有助確認活動沒有重覆，而他們本身各自擁有的資源亦可以得到善用。學校是基金計劃



的重要夥伴，幾乎所有基金計劃均會與學校協作。合作的模式亦不局限於義工的提供，學校往往是基金計劃的策略性夥伴。

71. 此外，與家長教師會協作可以幫助計劃招募更多的義工。基金計劃透過與其他非政府組織協作，能為參加者探索更多為有需要人士及社區服務的機會。透過與互助委員會或業主立案法團的協作，計劃統籌能招募更多的參加者及為居民提供服務，亦使基金計劃為居民提供的服務更能夠持續。基金計劃與教會的協作能令教會信眾與計劃參加者建立一個相對穩定的支援網絡。與屋邨管理公司、屋邨管理委員會及社區組織的協作能讓基金計劃有更多的資源推行活動及鞏固計劃在社區的發展。因為彼此間的相互協作能替計劃連繫更多策略性夥伴，如互助委員會、區議員及居民。還有，基金計劃亦與不同類型的商業公司及文化藝術團體協作，為計劃參加者提供了不少導師或生命嚮導。計劃參加者亦因與不同背景的人士建立了穩定的關係而獲得不少擴闊眼界的機會。

#### 基金秘書處的支持

72. 基金秘書處主動聯絡不同類型的組織及鼓勵持分者申請計劃。對於有興趣申請計劃的團體，基金秘書處提供成功的實踐模式以作參考。基金秘書處舉辦的簡介會往往能協助有興趣申請的機構瞭解基金的要求。基金秘書處就計劃申請書給予意見，能使申請者更瞭解計劃的焦點以釐清及修訂計劃書的內容，有助計劃地成功申請和日後的推行。基金秘書處曾在水圍區內舉行地區性的研討會，提供了一個「正規」的平台，讓區內的基金計劃相互連繫及交流，為他們日後的協作打好了一個良好的基礎。基金秘書處及基金委員亦善用他們個別的網絡，促進基金計劃的發展。「社會資本摯友」是重要的平台以促進基金計劃與專業人士及其嚮導員互動交流。

#### 社會福利署的角色及功能

73. 社會福利署（元朗區）亦有著推動基金計劃在社區發展的角色。社會福利署（元朗區）會與不同的政府部門聯繫及溝通，評估地區需要及探索不同的資源。通過社會福利署（元朗區）建立的多個平台，計劃統籌可以在當中分享基金計劃的發展及探索不同的協作機會。

#### 成效能夠持續的成功因素

74. 在個人層面，參加者能否在活動後繼續有接觸，亦對社會資本發展的

持續性造成正面的影響。就那些參加者在活動後與其他參加者繼續接觸，他們之間往往能夠建立較強的關係，而相互的交流及支援亦更交頻繁及明顯。

75. 在計劃的層面，計劃統籌需要為參加者在社區內的持續參與儘早作出計劃。將參加者轉介至其他非政府組織是其中一個可行的方法以肯定他們能持續地參與社區。

76. 在社區層面，協作是成效能夠持續的成功因素。若社區組織之間的互惠關係可以建立，社區組織亦有更多的動力去維繫協作的關係。基金秘書處的支援及其協調角色尤其重要，特別在其舉辦的社區研討會後，基金計劃之間的協作明顯地加強。

### 困難與限制

77. 本研究亦發現一些需要注意的困難及限制，包括：i) 部份計劃的執行機構並不位於天水圍。它們在水圍並沒有固定的基地，因此需要借用場地及其他資源以舉辦活動。這些計劃的統籌往往都需要用較多的時間及能量以探索地區的需要及與居民和社區組織建立關；ii) 行政工作，如：報告撰寫、撥款用途更改申請等亦是計劃統籌的負擔；iii) 部份活動／程式設計亦會限制了計劃參加者在計劃內的持續參與及 iv) 重點職員的減少及更換亦是計劃普遍面對的困難。

### 社會資本成效指標的可信度及有效性

78. 本研究主要採用由世界銀行設計的 26 項指標量度社會資本，當中包括 5 組分類指標。透過計算其 Cronbach alpha coefficients，本研究為 5 組分類指標的可信度作出評估。此外，本研究亦透過進行因數分析探索社會資本指標的潛在結構。結果顯示每一個分類指標內的指標皆「連繫」在一起，而矩陣模式亦顯示分類指標的存在及分佈。在因數分析進行後，就結果再一次進行可信度的測試，並形成新的分類指標，包括：「信任」（8 項語句）、「互惠」（4 項語句）及「歸屬感」（3 項語句）。再加上「對社區和諧的觀感」（4 項語句），組成了新的社會資本指標（4 個分類指標，19 項語句），可於未來使用或再加以測試。

### 建議

#### 對政府的建議

79. 社會資本可以視為公共物品。政府應提供更多的資源以促進社會資本的發展，因為政府有著提供公共物品的角色。因此，研究建議：

- ✓ 不同的政府部門可以與基金計劃協作，分享相關的網絡，並提供機會讓

基金計劃宣傳及與協助基金計劃與政府部門有聯繫的機構連繫起來；

- ✓ 政府亦可以舉辦一些比賽或嘉許禮，讓那些與社福界協作並有出色參與的商業機構獲得肯定；
- ✓ 政府亦可推行相關的措施以促進社會企業或創新服務的發展，例如：提供相關的津貼及稅務的優惠等。

#### 對基金秘書處的建議

80. 鑑於計劃統籌面對的困難及限制，建議基金秘書處：
- 需認真審視申請機構是否有足夠的資源及支援以執行計劃，特別是那些在該社區沒有基地的機構；
  - 可在不同社區繼續舉辦社區為本的工作坊，以促進不同計劃之間的協作；
  - 可以協助計劃統籌建立一個地區的支援網絡；
  - 可加強其宣傳工作，如有更多人對基金有認識，可吸引更多的參加者參與而社會資本則可以有更好的發展；
  - 促進商界及社福界的協作，提供更多的支援及平台以致雙方對其期望及可協作的模式有更多的理解。基金秘書處亦可促進雙方認識：
    - 社福機構及商業公司的特性
    - 不同持分者持有的價值觀及其差異
    - 社區面貌
    - 服務對象的特性等

#### 對政府及基金秘書處的建議

81. 基金秘書處及政府相關部門必需投入更多的人力資源才能維持、持續發展基金計劃的創新服務或將其轉化為社會企業。建議基金秘書處紀錄基金計劃發展社會資本的模式及評估不同模式的成效。此外，基金已經成立了十年，建議基金秘書處評估基金計劃的可持續性及建立量度持續性的評估工具。由基金秘書處可支援更多的學術研究協助整理總結經驗及進行持續性的研究。

#### 對計劃統籌的建議

82. 在申請計劃前，機構需要慎重考慮其執行計劃的能力。當機構嘗試「複製」某些介入模式或策略的時候，需要瞭解社區的獨特性以作出調整。

83. 計劃統籌需要找到合適的切合點以吸引私人屋苑的居民有更多的參

與。計劃統籌可向私人屋苑的居民解釋計劃的理念、目的、內容、參與的角色及參與的成效。如果私人屋苑的居民對計劃有更多的掌握，他們或會更願意參與計劃。如果有更多不同背景的人士參與計劃，相信有助計劃發展搭橋式的社會資本（bridging social capital）。

84. 與學校協作往往是宣傳基金計劃的有效方法。建議那些不是以學校為基礎的計劃亦可透過與學校的協作為計劃作出宣傳。基金計劃亦可透過善用各種媒體工具進行宣傳。建議那些以鼓勵青少年參與為目標的計劃可利用網上不同的平台作出宣傳，如：youtube、facebook、網誌及網頁等。建議計劃統籌透過與不同團體的協作，持續發展雙贏的關係。

85. 會員的重疊情況是有利於社區組織的資源互換。計劃統籌可進行相關的觀察及評估，並促進會員重疊的正面影響。計劃統籌亦可充份利用參加者的異質性並提供平台讓不同的參加者貢獻他們的資源。

86. 要促進社會資本的發展及個人成長，為居民提供足夠的平台，特別是活動策劃的機會尤其重要。計劃統籌可以透過發展不同的工作小組以：i) 鼓勵參加者的參與；ii) 透過鼓勵參加者之間的互動及交流，促進彼此的熟悉程度；及 iii) 將參加者與社區連繫起來。

87. 計劃統籌需要注意參加者可能隨著參與的經驗的增長而變得較批判，如他們能夠指出天水圍內未能滿足的需要或問題。計劃統籌應：i) 多與參加者討論，讓他們對整個處境有更多的理解；ii) 鼓勵參加者為改善這些處境而作出適當的行動。

88. 計劃統籌亦需注意社區內存的差異及分化往往會對社區帶來負面的影響。計劃統籌需要瞭解問題所在及透過舉辦不同的活動，減少這些差異為社區帶來負面影響。計劃統籌可協助參加者總結經驗；當發現有誤解或不信任時，計劃統籌亦應與參加者持續探討。

89. 在讓參加者瞭解不同形式的社會參與中，計劃統籌扮演著一個積極的角色。參加者從而可以瞭解到最有效的或最合適的參與模式。

90. 計劃統籌及商界人士需要瞭解彼此所關心的及期望，並透過真誠的溝通探索最理想的協作模式。

91. 在基金計劃持續發展方面，計劃統籌及參加者需要認真考慮計劃發展出來的創新服務是否應維持其原本或擴大規模。

#### 對未來研究的建議

92. 建議進行追蹤性的研究：i) 以瞭解基金計劃的可持續性，包括：持續性的模式、影響計劃成效的持續性及社會資本長遠發展的因素，及建立可量度持續性的工具；ii) 探討香港人與新來港人士之間社會資本發展的差異；iii) 就居民參社區組織的參與及社會資本發展進行國際性的比較研究；iv) 可探討居民不太參與集體行動的原因，如果我們能夠對居民的參與的動機有更多的瞭解，相信我們更加能夠製訂促進他們有更多參與的策略；及 v) 探討為何天水圍的居民普遍有著互惠的信念，但約半數的天水圍居民表示他們只留意自己的利益。

93. 透過本研究，社會資本指標得以建立。由於社會資本指標的語句皆來自外國的研究，未來的研究亦可以再審視這些語句是否可以反映本地居民社會資本發展。建議計劃統籌可嘗試運用社會資本指標量度計劃的社會資本發展成果。另外，建議在不同的社區進行相類似的研究並運用相同的量度工具，以瞭解基金計劃在不同社區建立的社會資本發展成果。這些研究結果相信有助我們建立能有效量度本土社會資本的工具。