

**Jockey Club Age-friendly City Project  
Evaluation of District-based Programme  
from Caritas Mok Cheung Sui Kun Community Centre**

Submitted by

**Sau Po Centre on Ageing  
The University of Hong Kong**

February 2019

# Table of Content

1.	BACKGROUND.....	4
2.	EVALUATION OF THE DISTRICT-BASED PROGRAMMES.....	4
2.1	PROGRAMME SUMMARY .....	4
2.2	INPUT.....	4
2.3	ACTIVITIES.....	5
2.4	OUTPUT.....	5
2.5	OUTCOME EVALUATION.....	5
2.5.1	Study design .....	5
2.5.2	Questionnaire Survey.....	6
2.5.3	Focus Group Study .....	8
2.6	NEIGHBOURHOOD CARE SCHEME FOR ELDERLY CARER (CARITAS)...	8
2.6.1	Summary of programme activities .....	8
2.6.2	Results of Pre-and-Post Evaluation .....	9
2.6.3	Results of the Focus Group Study .....	13
	APPENDIX 1: PRE QUESTIONNAIRE.....	16
	APPENDIX 2: POST QUESTIONNAIRE .....	23
	APPENDIX 3: CROSS-SECTIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE.....	30

## Tables

**Table 1.** An overview of district-based programmes

**Table 2.** Input of district-based programmes

**Table 3.** Objectives and content district-based programmes

**Table 4.** Projected Output of district-based programmes

**Table 5.** Study measures

**Table 6.** Summary of the Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carer Programme

**Table 7.** Caritas Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carers - Sociodemographic characteristics of the participants – Pre-and-Post Evaluation (N=16)

**Table 8.** Caritas Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carers - Perceived age-friendliness – Pre-and-Post Evaluation (N=16)

**Table 9.** Caritas Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carers - Programme impact on perceived age-friendliness – Pre-and-Post Evaluation (N=16)

**Table 10.** Caritas Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carers - Change of sense of community, attitudes toward the elderly, and quality of life – Pre-and-Post Evaluation (N=16)<sup>#</sup>

**Table 11.** Caritas Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carers - Programme satisfaction – Pre-and-Post Evaluation (N=16)

**Table 12.** Caritas Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carers - Willingness to engage in activities that promote age-friendly city– Pre-and-Post Evaluation (N=16)<sup>§</sup>

**Table 13.** Caritas Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carers - Sociodemographic characteristics of participants – Focus Group (N=6)

## 1. BACKGROUND

The Hong Kong Jockey Club Charities Trust (“The Trust”) has taken a proactive role in tackling the challenges of ageing population, and stipulated building Hong Kong into an age-friendly city as one of the overarching strategic themes. The Trust is implementing the Jockey Club Age-friendly City Project in partnership with four gerontology research institutes in Hong Kong, including the Sau Po Centre on Ageing of The University of Hong Kong and three other institutions. The project aims to build momentum in districts to develop an age-friendly community, recommend a framework for districts to undertake continual improvement, as well as arouse public awareness and encourage community participation.

To build up age-friendly momentum in districts, the Trust provides a total funding of \$1.5 million to each district (annual funding of \$500,000 for three years) for supporting non-governmental organisations and community organisations to implement appropriate district-based programmes devised based on the baseline assessment findings. Sau Po Centre on Ageing has conducted evaluation of the third-batch of district-based programmes implemented in Central and Western District. This report presented the findings of the third-batch district-based programme from Caritas Mok Cheung Sui Kun Community Centre.

## 2. EVALUATION OF THE DISTRICT-BASED PROGRAMMES

### 2.1 PROGRAMME SUMMARY

Table 1 shows an overview of the district-based programme from Caritas Mok Cheung Sui Kun Community Centre.

**Table 1.** An overview of district-based programmes

Programme	Organizers	Co-organizers
<b>Third-batch</b>		
Jockey Club Age-friendly City Project: Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carers	Caritas Mok Cheung Sui Kun Community Centre	Caritas Elderly Centre-Central District 明愛中區長者中心 (NEC)
賽馬會齡活城市計劃: 留住安樂鄰里	明愛莫張瑞勤社區中心 (CC)	Caritas Caine Road Community Centre 明愛堅道社區中心 (CC)

### 2.2 INPUT

Table 2 presents the input of the programme. The programme was awarded an amount of \$200,000. It was mainly organized and implemented by regular centre staff of the host institution and co-organizers with assistance of paidworkshop instructors.

**Table 2.** Input of district-based programmes

Programme ( Organizer)	Approved funds	Human resources	Elderly involvement
<b>Third-batch</b>			
Jockey Club Age-friendly City Project: Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carers(Caritas)	\$200,000	Centre staff, part-time home visit staff, volunteers, Workshop instructors	Volunteer support (Including home visit and programme promotion), and elderly participants

## 2.3 ACTIVITIES

Table 3 demonstrates the objectives and content of the programme. The objectives were to encourage elderly's participation in the community and to enhance knowledge in elderly carers.

**Table 3.** Objectives and content district-based programmes

Programme (Organizer)	Objectives	Programme content	Duration/ Programme date	Target participants
<b>Third-batch</b>				
Jockey Club Age-friendly City Project: Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carers (Caritas)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To encourage older people in the participation of social activities and community activities.</li> <li>To support elderly carer through training workshops</li> <li>To enhance their knowledge in caring their senior family members</li> </ul>	Five programmes were held, namely part-time helper and neighbourhood care volunteers training, elderly carer workshops, neighbourhood care volunteers and elder carer support group outing, sharing session of neighbourhood care scheme, and community education by delivering phamlet in the district.	July – December 2018	Volunteers, Teenagers, Elderly, and other district residents

## 2.4 OUTPUT

Table 4 shows the output of the programme. It was estimated that the programme reached 4,340 direct beneficiaries who participated in the events and 1,200 indirect beneficiaries. The programmes engaged 60 volunteers and distributed nearly 4,000 leaflets in the community.

**Table 4.** Projected Output of district-based programmes

Programme (Organizer)	No. of direct beneficiaries	No. of indirect beneficiaries	No. of leaflets	No. of older people involved
<b>Third-batch</b>				
Jockey Club Age-friendly City Project: Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carers (Caritas)	4,340	1,200	4,000	Volunteer support: 60

## 2.5 OUTCOME EVALUATION

### 2.5.1 Study design

The evaluation of district-based programmes consisted of a quantitative study and a qualitative study. Depending on the type of activities, quantitative study used a cross-sectional or a pre-and-post questionnaire to evaluate the programme activities.

The cross-sectional survey for one-time events examined the effectiveness of programme activities in promoting age-friendly city and programme satisfaction. The pre-and-post survey for continued programmes examined changes in perceived age-friendliness of the district, sense of community, attitude towards older people, and quality of life. We also asked questions related to programme satisfaction and participants' willingness to engage in age-friendly city activities in the district. Basic demographic information was collected in both types of survey. Qualitative study used a focus group design to capture participants' experience and their in-depth opinions of the district-based programmes.

## **2.5.2 Questionnaire Survey**

### *(i) Participants*

For both cross-sectional and pre-and-post evaluation, respondents were programme participants in the Central and Western District aged 18 years or above. Exclusion criteria were foreign domestic helpers or individuals who are mentally incapable to participate in the study.

The study aimed to recruit all participants from continued programmes for pre-and-post evaluation and at least 30% participants from one-time events for cross-sectional evaluation.

### *(ii) Measures*

The questionnaire survey was conducted by face-to-face interviews and/or self-administration to cover the following areas (Appendix 1-3).

#### **a. Sociodemographic Information**

For both cross-sectional and pre-and-post evaluation, information on age, gender, and education of the participants were collected. The pre-and-post evaluation also asked participants to report their marital status, living arrangement, housing type, employment status, and income source.

#### **b. Sense of Community**

Sense of community of the participants was only assessed in the pre-and-post evaluation. The Brief Sense of Community Scale (BSCS)<sup>1,2</sup> contains 8 items that assess 4 domains: needs fulfilment (the perception that a person's needs is met by the community), group membership (a sense of belonging to the community), influence (a sense that a person can make a difference in a community and the community can make a difference to the person), and shared emotional connection (a feeling of attachment or bonding rooted in community members' shared history, place or experience). The possible responses are from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The possible range of each domain score is between 2 and 10, making the total score ranging from 8 to 40. A higher score

means a higher sense of community.

c. Perceived Age-friendliness

Participants of continued programme were asked in the pre-questionnaire to rate their perceived age-friendliness in eight domains, namely outdoor spaces and buildings; transportation; housing; social participation; respect and social inclusion, civic participation and employment; communication and information; and community support and health services. The possible responses of each item range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The percentage of participants who agreed or strongly agreed that the respective domain is age-friendly in the district were generated as well.

d. Impact of the programme activities on building an age-friendly city

For both cross-sectional and pre-and-post evaluation, participants were asked to rate the perceived impact of the programme on age-friendliness in the relevant domains upon completion of the activities.

e. Attitude towards older people

The pre-and-post evaluation assessed the attitude of participants towards older people using Kogan's Attitude toward Older People (KAOP) scale<sup>3</sup>. With negatively worded questions, score was reversed so that participants with higher score mean more positive attitude towards older people. The possible range of the total score is between 10 and 50.

f. Quality of life

The pre-and-post evaluation assessed the quality of life of participants using EUROHIS-QOL 8-item index adapted from the EHOQOL-100 and the WHOQOL-BREF<sup>4</sup>. The possible responses range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) and the total score is between 8 and 40. A higher score indicates better quality of life.

g. Programme satisfaction

Both the cross-sectional and pre-and-post evaluation assessed the satisfaction of the participant after the programmes. There were eight self-developed questions in total. Participants were asked about their understanding towards the concept of age-friendly city and the Jockey Club Age-friendly City Project, their opinions about the attractiveness, organization, usefulness, and arrangement of programme activities. The possible responses range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

h. Willingness to promote age-friendliness-related events

Two self-developed questions were for measuring the willingness of participants to join activities that increase their knowledge of age-friendly city and promote

the development of an age-friendly city. One more item asked participants to rate the importance of their own contribution to make Central and Western District an age-friendly city.

**Table 5.** Study measures

	Continued programmes		One-time events
	Pre	Post	Cross-sectional
(i) Socio-demographic information	X		X
(ii) Sense of community	X	X	
(iii) Perceived age-friendliness	X		
(iv) Impact of the programme activities on building an age-friendly city		X	X
(v) Attitude towards older people	X	X	
(vi) Quality of life	X	X	
(vii) Programme satisfaction		X	X
(viii) Willingness to engage in age-friendly city activities		X	
(ix) Home modification feedback		X	

*(iii) Data Analysis*

Descriptive analyses of individual programmes were performed to assess participants’ sense of community and perception of age-friendliness of the district, attitude towards older people, quality of life, programme satisfaction, and willingness to promote age-friendliness-related events. Differences in the above measures between pre and post assessments could be assessed by utilizing *t*-tests and linear regression.

**2.5.3 Focus Group Study**

The qualitative study used focus group to evaluate the continued programmes. Each focus group meeting lasted approximately 1 to 1.5 hours. Each focus group consisted of 6 to 8 people. Focus group sessions were held in community centres, with the discussions audio-recorded and transcribed.

**2.6 NEIGHBOURHOOD CARE SCHEME FOR ELDERLY CARER (CARITAS)**

**2.6.1 Summary of programme activities**

The “Neighbourhood Care Scheme For Elderly Carer” programme organized by Caritas Mok Cheung Sui Kun Community Centre targeted the social participation domain. Pre-and-post questionnaires and a focus group interview evaluated the part-time helpers and neighbourhood care volunteers training and elderly carer workshops. Other programme activities were not evaluated.



**Table 6.** Summary of the Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carer Programme

Programme (Host institution)	Target AFC domain(s)	Activities	Duration	Sample Size	Type of evaluation
Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carers (Caritas)	- Social participation	Part-time helper and neighbourhood care volunteers training (some of the part-time helpers became volunteers)	June – December 2018	10 part-time helpers and volunteers	Pre & post and focus group
		Elderly carer workshops	July – September 2018	6 elderly carers	
		Neighbourhood care volunteers and elderly carer support group outing (3 sessions)	October – December 2018	-	-
		Sharing session of neighbourhood care scheme	11 December 2018	-	-
		Community education by delivering pamphlet in the district	July 2018	-	-

## 2.6.2 Results of Pre-and-Post Evaluation

### (i) Participant Characteristics

A total of 16 participants, including 10 part-time helpers and neighbourhood care volunteers training and 6 elderly carers from the elderly carer workshops, completed the pre-and-post evaluation. As shown in Table 7, most of the participants were female (68.8%) and were aged 55 years or above (68.8%). Majority of them completed senior secondary or above (75%), were living in a privately-owned housing (75%), were living with other family members (62.5%), were retired (68.8%), and relied on either relative assistance or pension as the main source of income (68.8%).

**Table 7.** Caritas Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carers - Sociodemographic characteristics of the participants – Pre-and-Post Evaluation (N=16)

Characteristics	N=16	%
<b>Districts</b>		
Central and Western (C&W)	11	68.8
Wan Chai (WC)	0	0
Southern (S)	2	12.5
Eastern (E)	1	6.3
Other	2	12.5
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	5	31.3
Female	11	68.8
<b>Age group</b>		
18-24 years	3	18.8
25-34 years	1	6.3
45-54 years	1	6.3

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>N=16</b>	<b>%</b>
55-64 years	3	18.8
65-74 years	6	37.5
75-84 years	2	12.5
≥85 years	0	0
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Never married	7	43.7
Married	7	43.7
Widowed	1	6.3
Divorced	1	6.3
Separated	0	0
<b>Education</b>		
No formal education / pre-primary	2	12.5
Primary	0	0
Junior Secondary (F.1-3)	2	12.5
Senior Secondary (F.4-7)	3	18.8
Diploma / Certificate	3	18.8
Associate Degree	0	0
Degree or above	6	37.5
<b>Living arrangement</b>		
Living alone	3	18.8
With spouse only	4	25.0
Spouse & other family members	3	18.8
With children only	1	6.3
With other family members	5	62.5
Living with a domestic helper	0	0
<b>Housing</b>		
Public, rental	3	18.8
Subsidized sale flats	1	6.3
Private, owned	12	75.0
Private, rental (whole flat)	0	0
Private, rental (rooms/ cubicles/ cocklofts/ bed spaces)	0	0
Other	0	0
<b>Employment status</b>		
Employer/ Self-employed	0	0
Employee	1	6.3
Homemaker	0	0
Student	3	18.8
Retired	11	68.8
Unemployed and actively seeking employment	1	6.3
Unemployed and not actively seeking employment	0	0
<b>Source of income†</b>		
Salary	4	25.0
Family assistance	1	6.3
Relative assistance	5	31.3
Pension	6	37.5
Old Age Allowance	2	12.5
Old Age Living Allowance	0	0
CSSA	0	0
Saving	4	25.0
Rental income	2	12.5
Others	0	0
<b>How the participant heard about the programme†</b>		
Promotional leaflet	3	18.8
Website / social media	4	25.0
Emails	0	0
Family and friends	1	6.3
Centre/ Centre Staff	11	68.8
Other	0	0

†Multiple responses allowed.

(ii) *Perceived Age-friendliness*

Table 8 shows that participants generally held neutral attitudes towards age-friendliness in the district. Participants rated community support & health services (Mean=3.3, SD=0.5), transportation (Mean=3.3, SD=0.8), and respect & social inclusion (Mean=3.3, SD=0.6) as the most age-friendly domains, whereas housing (Mean=2.9, SD=0.9), social participation (Mean: 2.9, SD=0.7), and civic participation & employment (Mean: 2.9, SD=0.8) as the least age-friendly domains.

**Table 8.** Caritas Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carers - Perceived age-friendliness – Pre-and-Post Evaluation (N=16)

	Mean (SD) †	Participants agree or strongly agree (%)
Outdoor spaces & buildings	3.0 (0.5)	12.5
Transportation	3.3 (0.8)	13.8
Housing	2.9 (0.9)	25.0
Social participation	2.9 (0.7)	18.8
Respect & Social Inclusion	3.3 (0.6)	37.5
Civic participation & employment	2.9 (0.8)	25.0
Communication & information	3.0 (0.9)	31.3
Community support & health services	3.3 (0.5)	31.3

†1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree

(iii) *Programme Impact*

Table 9 shows that most of the participants (87.5%) agreed or strongly agreed that the programme activities increased the age-friendliness in social participation (Mean= 4.0, SD=0.5). There was no significant change in sense of community (28.9 to 30.2,  $p=0.351$ ), KAOP (38.1 to 37.9,  $p=0.880$ ), and quality fo life (29.6 to 29.3,  $p=0.693$ ) before and after the programme (Table 10). All the changes were non-significant that might a result of the small sample size.

**Table 9.** Caritas Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carers - Programme impact on perceived age-friendliness – Pre-and-Post Evaluation (N=16)

	Mean (SD) †	Participants agree or strongly agree (%)
Social participation	4.0 (0.5)	87.5

†1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree

**Table 10.** Caritas Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carers - Change of sense of community, attitudes toward the elderly, and quality of life – Pre-and-Post Evaluation (N=16)<sup>#</sup>

	Pre Mean (SD)	Post Mean (SD)	P Value †
<b>Sense of community<sup>†</sup></b>			
Need fulfilment	6.9 (1.7)	7.5 (0.9)	.237
Membership	7.8 (1.4)	8.0 (1.2)	.497
Influence	7.1 (1.2)	7.4 (1.1)	.370
Emotional connection	7.2 (1.2)	7.3 (1.1)	.743
Total score	28.9 (4.5)	30.2 (3.7)	.351

<b>KAOP</b> ‡	38.1 (5.8)	37.9 (4.0)	.880
<b>Quality of Life</b> §	29.6 (3.7)	29.3 (3.1)	.693

†Higher score refers to higher sense of community. Possible range of sub-scale score is from 2 to 10 and the total score is from 8 to 40.

‡Higher score refers to more positive attitude towards old people. Possible range is from 10 to 50.

§Higher score refers to higher quality of life. Possible range is from 8 to 40.

¶Significance levels at \* $p < 0.1$ , \*\* $p < 0.05$  and \*\*\* $p < 0.01$ .

#Non-significant changes may be due to the small sample size

#### (iv) Programme Satisfaction

As shown in Table 11, many of the participants (81.3%) were satisfied with the programmes (Mean=3.8, SD=0.8) and all of them (100%) would recommend the programmes to others. Most (>90%) agreed or strongly agreed that the activity improved their understanding of age-friendly city, the information presented were useful, and the staff were accommodating and helpful.

**Table 11.** Caritas Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carers - Programme satisfaction – Pre-and-Post Evaluation (N=16)

	Mean (SD) †	Participants agree or strongly agree (%)
1. The activity improves my understanding of age-friendly city.	3.9 (0.3)	93.8
2. The activity is attractive to me.	3.9 (0.4)	87.6
3. The information presented during the talk(s) / workshop(s) is useful to me.	4.0 (0.4)	93.8
4. The date and time of the activity are appropriate.	3.8 (0.8)	75.0
5. The location and venue are appropriate.	3.9 (0.7)	87.5
6. The activity is well organized.	3.9 (0.6)	81.3
7. The staff are accommodating and helpful.	4.1 (0.5)	93.8
8. The activity improves my understanding of Jockey Club Age-friendly City Project.	3.9 (0.4)	87.6
	<b>Mean (SD) ‡</b>	<b>Very good or good (%)</b>
9. How would you rate your overall experience in the programme / activity?	3.8 (0.8)	81.3
		<b>Yes (%)</b>
10. You would recommend this activity to your family and friends.		100

†1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree

‡1=Bad; 2= Fair; 3=Satisfactory; 4=Good; 5=Very good

#### (v) Willingness to engage in activities that promoting age-friendly city

The participants showed similar level of willingness to learn about age-friendly city (4.0 to 4.0;  $p=1.000$ ) and to participate in activities that contribute to the development of age-friendly city (4.1 to 4.0,  $p=0.430$ ). They maintained the belief that their contribution was important to development of age-friendly city in the district (4.0 to 4.0;  $p=1.000$ ). With a small sample size, all the changes were non-significant (Table 12).

**Table 12.** Caritas Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carers - Willingness to engage in activities that promote age-friendly city– Pre-and-Post Evaluation (N=16)<sup>§</sup>

	Pre <sup>†</sup>	Post <sup>†</sup>	P Value <sup>‡</sup>
1. I want to learn more about what an age-friendly city is like.	4.0 (0.4)	4.0 (0.0)	1.000
2. I want to participate in more activities that contribute to the development of age-friendly city in my district.	4.1 (0.6)	4.0 (0.4)	.430
3. My input is important to the development of age-friendly city in my district.	4.0 (0.9)	4.0 (0.4)	1.000

<sup>†</sup>1=Strongly Disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=Neutral; 4=Agree; 5=Strongly Agree

<sup>‡</sup>Significance levels at \*p<0.1, \*\*p<0.05 and \*\*\*p<0.01.

<sup>§</sup>Non-significant changes may be due to the small sample size

### 2.6.3 Results of the Focus Group Study

#### (i) Participant Characteristics

The focus group session recruited 6 participants. They were mostly female (83.3%) and married (83.3%) (Table 13). They either joined the part-time helper and neighbourhood care volunteer training or the elderly carer workshops.

**Table 13.** Caritas Neighbourhood Care Scheme for Elderly Carers - Sociodemographic characteristics of participants – Focus Group (N=6)

Characteristics	N	%
<b>Districts</b>		
Central and Western	5	83.3
Southern	1	16.7
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	1	16.7
Female	5	83.3
<b>Age group</b>		
45-54 years	1	16.7
55-64 years	1	16.7
65-74 years	2	33.3
75-84 years	1	16.7
≥85 years	1	16.7
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Never married	1	16.7
Married	5	83.3
Widowed	0	0
Divorced / Separated	0	0
<b>Education</b>		
Nil / pre-primary	3	50.0
Primary	0	0
Junior Secondary (F.1-3)	1	16.7
Senior Secondary (F.4-7)	1	16.7
Diploma or Certificate	1	16.7
Associate Degree	0	0
Degree	0	0
<b>Living arrangement</b>		
Living alone	0	0
With spouse only	5	83.3
Spouse & other family members	0	0
With children only	0	0
Others	1	16.7

<b>Living with domestic helper</b>	0	0
<b>Employment status</b>		
Employee	1	16.7
Homemaker	1	16.7
Retired	4	66.7
<b>Participation in programme activities†</b>		
Part-time helper and neighbourhood care volunteer training	4	66.7
Elderly carer workshop	2	33.3

†Multiple responses allowed.

Most of the participants from the programme agreed that the programme improved their understanding on age-friendly city. They elaborated that an age-friendly city was a place where the environment is safe and convenient for elderly people and encourage interaction between elderly people and the young generation with mutual respect.

The programme focused on the age-friendly city domain of social participation. Some participants were residents of the Central & Western district who joined the neighbourhood care volunteers. They regularly visited elderly carers during the implementation period and learnt a lot about the concept of age-friendly city and communication skills with elderly people. After the programme, they would like to continue to be a volunteer. The elderly carers appreciated the courses and talks provided to them. They complimented the outing activities of the programme as these activities encouraged them to stay connected with the society.

*(ii) Programme Strengths and Impact*

Attractiveness of outing events: Participants pointed out that the outing events encouraged elderly to increase their social participation. They complimented the well-organized outing events and believed that it could improve the quality of relationship between volunteers and the elderly carers. Apart from that, activities with meals and transportation provided could attract more elderly people in the district to participate in social events.

Volunteers as companions: Participants commented that volunteers were crucial in helping elderly people to reach out to the community. The elderly carer were happy when the volunteers visited their homes to provide support and care. Apart from being taken care by volunteers during the outing activities, elderly participants enjoyed the companion of the volunteers. The relationship between volunteers and elderly participants motivated them to join social activities.

Increasing commitment: Participants appreciated the opportunities to be part of the neighbourhood care scheme and they all reported the wish to continue visiting and providing neighbourhood support to elderly people after the completion of the programme. Partnering with experienced volunteers also increased volunteers' motivation to learn and join the social events as experienced volunteers could be the mentor of new volunteers and provide tips and support.

*(iii) Programme Challenge*

Arrangement issues: Some elderly carers were difficult to reach, as volunteers were scheduled to visit during the hours when elderly carers were typically unavailable. Volunteers also stated that the elderly participants complained about the arrangement of the sharing session, as they didn't have time to eat their box lunch provided by the centre.

Difficult to engage isolated elderly in the district: Participants expressed that the programme was unable to reach those who refused to leave their homes. Volunteers found it difficult to continuously engage the solitary elderly, as some of them refused to be visited. Centres need to adopt other methods to reach out and engage this group of elderly people.

**REFERENCES**

1. Huang YN, Wong H. Impacts of Sense of Community and Satisfaction with Governmental Recovery on Psychological Status of the Wenchuan Earthquake Survivors. *Social Indicators Research*. 2014;117(2):421-436.
2. Peterson NA, Speer PW, McMillan DW. Validation of a Brief Sense of Community Scale: Confirmation of the principal theory of sense of community. *Journal of Community Psychology*. 2008;36(1):61-73.
3. Kogan, N. Attitudes toward old people: the development of a scale and an examination of correlates. *J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol.* 1961;64:44-54.
4. Mühlán, H., Power, M., & Schmidt, S. (2006). The EUROHIS-QOL 8-item index: psychometric results of a cross-cultural field study. *European journal of public health*, 16 4, 420-8.





**A6. 最高教育程度**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (1) 沒有正式教育/學前教育(幼稚園) | <input type="checkbox"/> (2) 小學         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (3) 初中 (中一至中三)       | <input type="checkbox"/> (4) 高中 (中四至中七) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (5) 大專 (專科文憑)        | <input type="checkbox"/> (6) 大專 (副學士學位) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (7) 大學或以上            |   |

**A7. 與何人居住 (可選多項)**

- |                                   |                                   |                                 |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (1) 獨居   | <input type="checkbox"/> (2) 配偶   | <input type="checkbox"/> (3) 子女 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (4) 父母   | <input type="checkbox"/> (5) 兄弟姊妹 | <input type="checkbox"/> (6) 親屬 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (7) 家庭傭工 | <input type="checkbox"/> (8) 其他   |                                 |

**A8. 住房類型**

- (1) 公共房屋
- (2) 資助出售房屋 (不包括已補價單位)
- (3) 自置私人房屋 (包括已補價單位)
- (4) 租住房屋(整個單位)
- (5) 租住房屋(分租單位, 如板間房、床位)
- (6) 其他 (請列明: \_\_\_\_\_)

**A9. 經濟活動身分**

- (1) 僱主 / 自僱人士 (每星期平均工作小時: \_\_\_\_\_)\*
- (2) 僱員 (每星期平均工作小時: \_\_\_\_\_)\*
- (3) 學生
- (4) 家務料理者
- (5) 退休
- (6) 待業並正積極求職
- (7) 待業並沒有求職

\*每星期平均工作小時 = 一個月總工作小時的平均值

**A10. 現時應付日常開支的主要收入來源? (可選多項)**

- |   |                                   |                                     |
|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> (1) 工資               | <input type="checkbox"/> (2) 家屬資助 | <input type="checkbox"/> (3) 親屬資助   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (4) 退休金              | <input type="checkbox"/> (5) 高齡津貼 | <input type="checkbox"/> (6) 長者生活津貼 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (7) 綜援               | <input type="checkbox"/> (8) 儲蓄   | <input type="checkbox"/> (9) 放租房產   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> (10) 其他 (請列明: _____) |                                   |                                     |

## B. 建構長者友善城市計劃之活動成效

## Bi. 社群意識指數

請您就居住的地區，對以下句子的同意程度作出評分。

以 1 至 5 分代表：1 分為非常不同意，2 分為不同意，3 分為普通，4 分為同意，5 分為非常同意。

1	2	3	4	5
非常不同意	不同意	普通	同意	非常同意

		非常不同意	不同意	普通	同意	非常同意
Bi1.	我可以在社區滿足到自己的需要。	1	2	3	4	5
Bi2.	這個社區幫助我滿足自己的需要。	1	2	3	4	5
Bi3.	我覺得自己是社區的一份子。	1	2	3	4	5
Bi4.	我屬於這個社區。	1	2	3	4	5
Bi5.	我可以參與討論有關社區的事情。	1	2	3	4	5
Bi6.	這個社區的居民能互相影響。	1	2	3	4	5
Bi7.	我覺得自己與這個社區息息相關。	1	2	3	4	5
Bi8.	我與這個社區的人保持良好關係。	1	2	3	4	5
Bi9.	我熟識我居住的社區。	1	2	3	4	5

**Bii. 長者友善**

世界衛生組織（世衛）於 2005 年開展全球長者及年齡友善城市計劃，致力讓長者可以保持健康、積極參與並得到保障，從而提升他們的生活質素。在城市環境中，世衛確認了促進積極和健康晚年的主要八大範疇：室外空間和建築、交通、房屋、社會參與、尊重和社會包容、公民參與和就業、信息交流及社區與健康服務(請參考附錄一)。請您就居住的地區，對以下的句子的同意程度作出評分。

		非常不同意	不同意	普通	同意	非常同意	不適用
Bii1.	我認為區內在 <b>室外空間及建築</b> 方面達到長者友善。	1	2	3	4	5	9
Bii2.	我認為區內在 <b>交通</b> 方面達到長者友善。	1	2	3	4	5	9
Bii3.	我認為區內在 <b>房屋</b> 方面達到長者友善。	1	2	3	4	5	9
Bii4.	我認為區內在 <b>社會參與</b> 方面達到長者友善。	1	2	3	4	5	9
Bii5.	我認為區內在 <b>尊重和社會包容</b> 方面達到長者友善。	1	2	3	4	5	9
Bii6.	我認為區內在 <b>公民參與和就業</b> 方面達到長者友善。	1	2	3	4	5	9
Bii7.	我認為區內在 <b>信息交流</b> 方面達到長者友善。	1	2	3	4	5	9
Bii8.	我認為區內在 <b>社區與健康服務</b> 方面達到長者友善。	1	2	3	4	5	9

## Biii. 對老年人的印象和評價(KAOP)

	非常不同意	不同意	普通	同意	非常同意
Biii1. 老年人應該居住在安老院舍。	1	2	3	4	5
Biii2. 老年人常常犯錯，容易惹人生氣。	1	2	3	4	5
Biii3. 老年人容易讓人感覺不舒服。	1	2	3	4	5
Biii4. 老年人總愛說起他們的陳年往事，這讓人很反感。	1	2	3	4	5
Biii5. 老年人脾氣不好，愛抱怨，對人也不友善。	1	2	3	4	5
Biii6. 老年人總看年輕人不順眼。	1	2	3	4	5
Biii7. 老年人總是多管別人的閒事。	1	2	3	4	5
Biii8. 老年人的家一般是殘破不堪的。	1	2	3	4	5
Biii9. 老年人不修邊幅，很邋邋。	1	2	3	4	5
Biii10. 與其他人比，老年人不需要更多的關愛。	1	2	3	4	5

## C. 計劃活動對參加者的影響

## 生活質素 (EUROHIS-QOL 8-Item Index)

## C1. 您認為現時的生活質素怎樣?

- (1) 很差     (2) 差     (3) 一般/普通     (4) 好     (5) 很好

## C2. 您滿意自己的健康狀況?

- (1) 很不滿意     (2) 不滿意     (3) 一般/普通  
 (4) 滿意     (5) 很滿意

## C3. 您是否有精神去應付日常生活?

- (1) 完全沒有     (2) 有少許     (3) 剛剛足夠  
 (4) 有     (5) 完全充足

## C4. 您滿意自己處理日常事情的能力?

- (1) 很不滿意     (2) 不滿意     (3) 一般/普通  
 (4) 滿意     (5) 很滿意

C5. 您滿意自己?

- (1) 很不滿意                       (2) 不滿意                       (3) 一般/普通  
 (4) 滿意                               (5) 很滿意

C6. 您滿意自己的人際關係?

- (1) 很不滿意                       (2) 不滿意                       (3) 一般/普通  
 (4) 滿意                               (5) 很滿意

C7. 您有足夠金錢應付自身需要?

- (1) 完全沒有                       (2) 有少許                       (3) 剛剛足夠  
 (4) 有                                   (5) 完全充足

C8. 您滿意自己的居所環境?

- (1) 很不滿意                       (2) 不滿意                       (3) 一般/普通  
 (4) 滿意                               (5) 很滿意

參與宣傳長者友善活動的意願

	非常不同意	不同意	普通	同意	非常同意
C9.我想知道更多有關長者友善城市的概念。	1	2	3	4	5
C10. 我想參與區內更多促進長者友善城市發展的活動。	1	2	3	4	5
C11. 對於區內長者友善城市的發展，我的參與是很重要的。	1	2	3	4	5

~完，謝謝！~

室外空間和建築	乾淨、舒適及安全的綠化環境和休憩空間，以及完善和安全的行人過路設施和建築，都是適合長者的生活環境。
交通	便利、安全及可負擔的公共交通工具方便市民獲得醫療和社會服務，融入社區生活，享受積極晚年。
房屋	提供可負擔、設計合適、安全，並與社區和社會服務有良好連繫的房屋選擇，能夠讓長者享受舒適的生活，滿足他們不同的需要。
社會參與	提供多元化及可負擔的社區活動，以切合長者的不同興趣。長者參與休閒、社交、文化、教育或心靈方面的活動，有助他們持續融入社區生活。
尊重和社會包容	尊重和社會包容是指社會對長者的態度和行為。一個包容的社會是會肯定和尊重長者，並鼓勵他們積極參與社會、公民和經濟活動。
公民參與和就業	長者及年齡友善城市能夠為長者提供足夠的就業和義務工作的機會，並鼓勵他們參與公民活動，令長者在退休後仍能繼續貢獻社會。
信息交流	透過適時、便利及可負擔的渠道，適當地向長者發佈資訊，有助避免長者被社會孤立。
社區與健康服務	提供多元化、便利、可負擔的醫療和支援服務，對長者維持健康、獨立和積極的生活尤其重。

## 附錄一

## APPENDIX 2: POST QUESTIONNAIRE

計劃夥伴:

策劃及捐



香港大學秀圃老年研究中心  
Sau Po Centre on Ageing  
The University of Hong Kong

助:



香港賽馬會慈善信託基金  
The Hong Kong Jockey Club Charities Trust  
同心 同步 同進 RIDING HIGH TOGETHER

賽馬會齡活城市計劃  
地區計劃之檢討  
計劃後問卷調查  
(供持續性活動參加者)

地區計劃:		計劃相關範疇:	<input type="checkbox"/> (1) 室外空間及建築
地區:	<input type="checkbox"/> (1)中西區 <input type="checkbox"/> (2)灣仔區 <input type="checkbox"/> (3)南區 <input type="checkbox"/> (4)東區 <input type="checkbox"/> (5)黃大仙區		<input type="checkbox"/> (2) 交通
舉辦機構:			<input type="checkbox"/> (3) 房屋
訪問日期:			<input type="checkbox"/> (4) 社會參與
訪問員:			<input type="checkbox"/> (5) 尊重和社會包容
參加者編號:			<input type="checkbox"/> (6) 公民參與和就業
			<input type="checkbox"/> (7) 信息交流
			<input type="checkbox"/> (8) 社區與健康服務

## A. 個人資料

A11. 姓名: \_\_\_\_\_

## B. 建構長者友善城市計劃之活動成效

## Biv. 社群意識指數

請您就居住的地區，對以下句子的同意程度作出評分。

以 1 至 5 分代表：1 分為非常不同意，2 分為不同意，3 分為普通，4 分為同意，5 分為非常同意。

1	2	3	4	5
非常不同意	不同意	普通	同意	非常同意

		非常不同意	不同意	普通	同意	非常同意
Bi1.	我可以在社區滿足到自己的需要。	1	2	3	4	5
Bi2.	這個社區幫助我滿足自己的需要。	1	2	3	4	5

Bi3.	我覺得自己是社區的一份子。	1	2	3	4	5
Bi4.	我屬於這個社區。	1	2	3	4	5
Bi5.	我可以參與討論有關社區的事情。	1	2	3	4	5
Bi6.	這個社區的居民能互相影響。	1	2	3	4	5
Bi7.	我覺得自己與這個社區息息相關。	1	2	3	4	5
Bi8.	我與這個社區的人保持良好關係。	1	2	3	4	5
Bi9.	我熟識我居住的社區。	1	2	3	4	5

## Bv. 長者友善

世界衛生組織（世衛）於 2005 年開展全球長者及年齡友善城市計劃，致力讓長者可以保持健康、積極參與並得到保障，從而提升他們的生活質素。在城市環境中，世衛確認了促進積極和健康晚年的主要八大範疇：室外空間和建築、交通、房屋、社會參與、尊重和社會包容、公民參與和就業、信息交流及社區與健康服務(請參考附錄一)。請您就居住的地區，對以下的句子的同意程度作出評分。

		非常不同意	不同意	普通	同意	非常同意	不適用
Bii1.	此活動能令您感到區內的 <b>室外空間及建築</b> 的長者友善程度有所提升。	1	2	3	4	5	9
Bii2.	此活動能令您感到區內的 <b>交通</b> 的長者友善程度有所提升。	1	2	3	4	5	9
Bii3.	此活動能令您感到區內的 <b>房屋</b> 的長者友善程度有所提升。	1	2	3	4	5	9
Bii4.	此活動能令您感到區內的 <b>社會參與</b> 的長者友善程度有所提升。	1	2	3	4	5	9
Bii5.	此活動能令您感到區內的 <b>尊重和社會包容</b> 的長者友善程度有所提升。	1	2	3	4	5	9
Bii6.	此活動能令您感到區內的 <b>公民參與和就業</b> 的長者友善程度有所提升。	1	2	3	4	5	9
Bii7.	此活動能令您感到區內的 <b>信息交流</b> 的長者友善程度有所提升。	1	2	3	4	5	9



Bii8.	此活動能令您感到區內的社區與健康服務的長者友善程度有所提升。	1	2	3	4	5	9
-------	--------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

**Bvi. 對老年人的印象和評價(KAOP)**

	非常不同意	不同意	普通	同意	非常同意
Biii11. 老年人應該居住在安老院舍。	1	2	3	4	5
Biii12. 老年人常常犯錯，容易惹人生氣。	1	2	3	4	5
Biii13. 老年人容易讓人感覺不舒服。	1	2	3	4	5
Biii14. 老年人總愛說起他們的陳年往事，這讓人很反感。	1	2	3	4	5
Biii15. 老年人脾氣不好，愛抱怨，對人也不友善。	1	2	3	4	5
Biii16. 老年人總看年輕人不順眼。	1	2	3	4	5
Biii17. 老年人總是多管別人的閒事。	1	2	3	4	5
Biii18. 老年人的家一般是殘破不堪的。	1	2	3	4	5
Biii19. 老年人不修邊幅，很邇邇。	1	2	3	4	5
Biii20. 與其他人比，老年人不需要更多的關愛。	1	2	3	4	5

**C. 計劃滿意程度****1. 您從何得知是次活動? (可選多項)**

- (1) 宣傳單張                       (2) 網站 / 社交媒體                       (3) 電郵  
 (4) 家人及朋友                       (5) 其他 (請列明: \_\_\_\_\_)

**2. 您會如何評價是次計劃/活動的整體感受?**

- (1) 非常好                       (2) 好                       (3) 不錯  
 (4) 普通                       (5) 差

## 3. 請對以下句子的同意程度作出評分。

	非常不同意	不同意	普通	同意	非常同意
a. 參與活動後, 我對「長者及年齡友善城市」有更深的了解	1	2	3	4	5
b. 我認為是次活動很吸引。	1	2	3	4	5
c. 我認為講座/工作坊提供的資訊很有用。 ( <input type="checkbox"/> (9) 不適用)	1	2	3	4	5
d. 活動時間日期恰當。	1	2	3	4	5
e. 活動選址恰當。	1	2	3	4	5
f. 活動安排很好。	1	2	3	4	5
g. 當需要幫忙時, 職員樂於提供協助。	1	2	3	4	5
h. 參與活動後, 我對「賽馬會齡活城市計劃」有更深的了解	1	2	3	4	5

## 4. 您會否推介是次活動給家人及朋友?

(1) 會                       (2) 不會

## D. 計劃活動對參加者的影響

## 生活質素 (EUROHIS-QOL 8-Item Index)

## C12. 您認為現時的生活質素怎樣?

(1) 很差       (2) 差       (3) 一般/普通       (4) 好       (5) 很好

## C13. 您滿意自己的健康狀況?

(1) 很不滿意               (2) 不滿意               (3) 一般/普通  
 (4) 滿意                       (5) 很滿意

## C14. 您是否有精神去應付日常生活?

(1) 完全沒有       (2) 有少許               (3) 剛剛足夠  
 (4) 有                       (5) 完全充足

## C15. 您滿意自己處理日常事情的能力?

(1) 很不滿意               (2) 不滿意               (3) 一般/普通

(4) 滿意  (5) 很滿意

**C16. 您滿意自己?**

(1) 很不滿意  (2) 不滿意  (3) 一般/普通  
 (4) 滿意  (5) 很滿意

**C17. 您滿意自己的人際關係?**

(1) 很不滿意  (2) 不滿意  (3) 一般/普通  
 (4) 滿意  (5) 很滿意

**C18. 您有足夠金錢應付自身需要?**

(1) 完全沒有  (2) 有少許  (3) 剛剛足夠  
 (4) 有  (5) 完全充足

**C19. 您滿意自己的居所環境?**

(1) 很不滿意  (2) 不滿意  (3) 一般/普通  
 (4) 滿意  (5) 很滿意

**參與宣傳長者友善活動的意願**

	非常不同意	不同意	普通	同意	非常同意
C20. 我想知道更多有關長者友善城市的概念。	1	2	3	4	5
C21. 我想參與區內更多促進長者友善城市發展的活動。	1	2	3	4	5
C22. 對於區內長者友善城市的發展，我的參與是很重要的。	1	2	3	4	5

**E. 計劃後詳細意見 (開放式問題) (只適用於有家居改裝計劃)**

**E1. 您認為安裝或改裝後，您的日常生活有什麼改變?**

---



---

**E2. 您認為此計劃有沒有提升區內房屋的長者及年齡友善情況?**

(1) 有  (2) 沒有

**E3.** 承上題，您對將來舉辦相關的活動有沒有意見？

---

---

~完，謝謝！~

## 附錄一

室外空間和建築	乾淨、舒適及安全的綠化環境和休憩空間，以及完善和安全的行人過路設施和建築，都是適合長者的生活環境。
交通	便利、安全及可負擔的公共交通工具方便市民獲得醫療和社會服務，融入社區生活，享受積極晚年。
房屋	提供可負擔、設計合適、安全，並與社區和社會服務有良好連繫的房屋選擇，能夠讓長者享受舒適的生活，滿足他們不同的需要。
社會參與	提供多元化及可負擔的社區活動，以切合長者的不同興趣。長者參與休閒、社交、文化、教育或心靈方面的活動，有助他們持續融入社區生活。
尊重和社會包容	尊重和社會包容是指社會對長者的態度和行為。一個包容的社會是會肯定和尊重長者，並鼓勵他們積極參與社會、公民和經濟活動。
公民參與和就業	長者及年齡友善城市能夠為長者提供足夠的就業和義務工作的機會，並鼓勵他們參與公民活動，令長者在退休後仍能繼續貢獻社會。
信息交流	透過適時、便利及可負擔的渠道，適當地向長者發佈資訊，有助避免長者被社會孤立。
社區與健康服務	提供多元化、便利、可負擔的醫療和支援服務，對長者維持健康、獨立和積極的生活尤其重。





6. 您會如何評價是次計劃/活動的整體感受?

- (1) 非常好       (2) 好       (3) 不錯  
 (4) 普通       (5) 差

7. 請對以下句子的同意程度作出評分。

	非常不同意	不同意	普通	同意	非常同意
i. 參與活動後, 我對「長者及年齡友善城市」有更深的了解	1	2	3	4	5
j. 我認為是次活動很吸引。	1	2	3	4	5
k. 我認為講座/工作坊提供的資訊很有用。 ( <input type="checkbox"/> (9) 不適用)	1	2	3	4	5
l. 活動時間日期恰當。	1	2	3	4	5
m. 活動選址恰當。	1	2	3	4	5
n. 活動安排很好。	1	2	3	4	5
o. 當需要幫忙時, 職員樂於提供協助。	1	2	3	4	5
p. 參與活動後, 我對「賽馬會齡活城市計劃」有更深的了解	1	2	3	4	5

8. 您會否推介是次活動給家人及朋友?

- (1) 會       (2) 不會

~完, 謝謝!~



<b>室外空間和建築</b>	乾淨、舒適及安全的綠化環境和休憩空間，以及完善和安全的行人過路設施和建築，都是適合長者的生活環境。
<b>交通</b>	便利、安全及可負擔的公共交通工具方便市民獲得醫療和社會服務，融入社區生活，享受積極晚年。
<b>房屋</b>	提供可負擔、設計合適、安全，並與社區和社會服務有良好連繫的房屋選擇，能夠讓長者享受舒適的生活，滿足他們不同的需要。
<b>社會參與</b>	提供多元化及可負擔的社區活動，以切合長者的不同興趣。長者參與休閒、社交、文化、教育或心靈方面的活動，有助他們持續融入社區生活。
<b>尊重和社會包容</b>	尊重和社會包容是指社會對長者的態度和行為。一個包容的社會是會肯定和尊重長者，並鼓勵他們積極參與社會、公民和經濟活動。
<b>公民參與和就業</b>	長者及年齡友善城市能夠為長者提供足夠的就業和義務工作的機會，並鼓勵他們參與公民活動，令長者在退休後仍能繼續貢獻社會。
<b>信息交流</b>	透過適時、便利及可負擔的渠道，適當地向長者發佈資訊，有助避免長者被社會孤立。
<b>社區與健康服務</b>	提供多元化、便利、可負擔的醫療和支援服務，對長者維持健康、獨立和積極的生活尤其重。

## 附錄一