

SOCIAL IMPACT TRACKING STUDY

on

Hai Tan Street / Kweilin Street and Pei Ho Street Development Scheme

Final Report

October 2010



**Department of Social Work and Social Administration,
The University of Hong Kong**

**Dr. Wong, Yu Cheung
Dr. Law, Chi Kwong
Ms. Ho, Lai Shan**

Table of content

	Pages	Paragraphs
Study background	2	1-2
Methodology	2-3	3-6
Interview findings	4-39	7-52
Desktop Study on 28 Domestic Owner-occupiers	40-41	53-60
Concluding summary	42-45	61-79
Feasibility and recommendations of tracking studies	46	80-82
Appendix I: Questionnaires for the last tracking study	47-53	
Appendix II: Hai Tan Street/Kweilin Street and Pei Ho Street Development Scheme	54	
Appendix III: Three-stage study design	55	

Study Background

1. In March 2009, the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) commissioned the Term Consultancy Team of the Department of Social Work and Social Administration (SWSA) at The University of Hong Kong (HKU) to conduct a Social Impact Tracking Study on the Hai Tan Street/Kweilin Street and Pei Ho Street Development Scheme.
2. The study targets included the residents and business operators in the Shamshuipo area located along Hai Tan Street between Yen Chow Street and Nam Cheong Street and north of Tung Chau Street. The study areas comprises Nos. 169-203 (odd numbers) and 216-222 (even numbers) Hai Tan Street, Nos. 7-23 (odd numbers) Kweilin Street, Nos. 1-14 Pei Ho Street, and Nos. 230-250 (even numbers) Tung Chau Street. The total project area is approximately 7,740 sq. meters. The Development Scheme commenced on 17 February 2006 and acquisition offers were first made on 3 September 2008.

Methodology

3. The study adopted the quantitative method to examine the social impact of redevelopment on the affected households and business operators in the study area. A three-stage study (Appendix III) was proposed by the HKU Term Consultancy Team to URA. The number of affected households and operators in the Hai Tan Street/Kweilin Street and Pei Ho Street area was relatively small and a population survey involving all the households and operators was therefore proposed to obtain representative results. The subjects of the study were divided into four strata; 1) domestic tenants, 2) domestic owner-occupiers, 3) non-domestic tenants, and 4) non-domestic owner-operators. The HKU Term Consultancy Team was engaged in the design of the study and questionnaires, the analysis of data, and compiling the report, while Policy 21 Limited was responsible for the collection and tabulation of data.
4. Prior to the fieldwork, the URA had sent out invitation letters to all the heads of households and shops in the study area to seek their consent to take part in the study. Quite a number of the study targets had already moved out from their units when the study commenced and thus could not be reached. By August 2009, only around half of the expected consents (178 consents, 51.3%) were received by the URA. The interviewers of the Policy 21 Limited then interviewed the heads of households with the contact information in the consent forms provided by the URA. The fieldwork of the baseline study (T1) was completed in late August 2009 and the initial response rate of the study was 98.3% (175 successful cases).
5. The 'First tracking' study (T2) was conducted to collect information related to the initial conditions of the respondents after they had moved to their new homes. However, many of the households and business operators did not move immediately after accepting the acquisition or

compensation offered by the URA and some of them were still staying in their units in the affected area till the end of the study. Besides, quite a number of the interviewed households and operators could not be reached after the baseline study. The response rate in T2 was modest (44.6%). Only 78 interviews were successfully conducted.

6. The study was extended to ensure that more targeted households and shops could receive all three rounds of interviews and that these interviews would not be conducted too close together. The original design was to conduct the last tracking interview after six months of relocation to let respondents settle in their new homes and shops and enable study of the impacts over a longer time span. As many of the study targets just moved out from their units by the end of May 2010, we therefore adjust our study design to extend it to late September 2010 and conduct the ‘Second tracking’ study (T3) at least three months after T2. Finally 73 interviews were successfully conducted in T3 with a response rate of 93.6%. The proposed sampling size and the response rates of all three rounds of interviews are presented in the table below (Table 1.1).

Table 1.1 – Sample size for Hai Tan Street/Kweilin Street and Pei Ho Street Development Scheme

Proposed sample size			Baseline study/ T1	First tracking study/ T2	Second tracking study/ T3
Stratum	Stratum size	70% response rate	20% drop out	20% drop out	20% drop out
Domestic	Owner	75	53	42	34
	Tenant	200	140	112	90
Non-domestic	Owner	18	13	10	8
	Tenant	54	38	30	24
Total		347	244	194	156
Actual sample size		Baseline study (T1)			
Stratum		Received consents	Completed Cases	Response Rate	
Domestic	Owner	28	28	100%	
	Tenant	121	120	99.2%	
Non-domestic	Owner	5	4	80.0%	
	Tenant	24	23	95.8%	
Total		178	175	98.3%	
		First tracking study (T2)			
Stratum		Received consents	Completed Cases	Response Rate	
Domestic	Owner	28	16	57.1%	
	Tenant	120	52	43.3%	
Non-domestic	Owner	4	1	25.0%	
	Tenant	23	9	39.1%	
Total		175	78	44.6%	
		Second tracking study (T3)			
Stratum		Received consents	Completed Cases	Response Rate	
Domestic	Owner	16	15	93.8%	
	Tenant	52	49	94.2%	
Non-domestic	Owner	1	0	0%	
	Tenant	9	9	100%	
Total		78	73	93.6%	

Interview Findings

7. Among the 73 respondents in T3, there were 64 residents (owner: 15; tenant: 49), and 9 business operators (owner: 0; tenant: 9). The survey findings of different target groups in the tracking study are presented in the following sections.

8. A large majority of the owner-occupier households (T2: 87.5%) found new homes in Shamshuipo, while only around two thirds of the domestic tenants (T2: 63.5%) did so. Among the nine non-domestic tenants, seven of them stayed in Shamshuipo, and two moved out of the district in T2 (Table 2.1a). Among the respondents in T3, only four of them (T3: domestic tenant: 3, non-domestic tenant: 1) had moved out after T2.

Table 2.1a Change of location

Stay in SSP		T2					T3				
		Yes		No		Total	Yes		No		Total
		<i>n</i> [*]	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>
Domestic	Owner	14	87.5	2	12.5	16	13	86.7	2	13.3	15
	Tenant	33	63.5	19	36.5	52	31	63.3	18	36.7	49
Non-domestic	Owner	1	100	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
	Tenant	7	77.8	2	22.2	9	6	66.7	3	33.3	9
Total		55	70.5	23	29.5	78	50	68.5	23	31.5	73

* N: Whole sample; n: Elements in the sample.

Domestic Tenants and Owner-occupiers

9. Over two thirds of the domestic tenants (T1: 68.3%) had been living in the Shamshuipo area for not more than 10 years, however a large majority of the owner-occupier households (T1: 89.3%) had been living in Shamshuipo area for 10 years or more (Table 2.1b).

Table 2.1b Length of residency in SSP for those who did not move to other districts

Number of years	T1				T2				T3			
	T [*]		OO		T		OO		T		OO	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Below 1	1	0.8	1	3.6	1	3.0	3	21.4	0	0.0	2	15.4
1 to less than 10	81	67.5	2	7.1	22	66.7	1	7.1	21	67.7	2	15.4
10 to less than 20	14	11.7	5	17.9	1	3.0	1	7.1	1	3.2	1	7.7
20 to less than 30	9	7.5	8	28.6	3	9.1	5	35.7	3	9.7	4	30.8
30 to less than 40	7	5.8	6	21.4	3	9.1	2	14.3	3	9.7	2	15.4
40 to less than 50	5	4.2	4	14.3	3	9.1	1	7.1	3	9.7	1	7.7
50 or above	3	2.5	2	7.1	0	0.0	1	7.1	0	0.0	1	7.7
Move to other districts	0	-	0	-	19	-	2	-	18	-	2	-
Total	120	100[#]	28	100[#]	52	100[#]	16	100[#]	49	100[#]	15	100[#]

* T: Tenants; OO: Owner-occupiers.

Excluding those cases that had moved to other districts.

Dwelling Unit characteristics

10. Among the tenants, nearly 60% of the respondents moved to public housing provided by the Housing Authority upon relocation (public housing: T2: 53.8%; private housing: T2: 46.2%) (Table 2.2a). As shown in Table 2.2b, around half of the tenants (53.2%) moved to newer flats with less than 10 years building age after relocation. However, a large majority of the owner-occupier households (72.8%) moved to buildings with building age 30 years or more. It is believed that the buildings of their new homes for both tenants and owner-occupiers were better managed than their old ones in the redevelopment area and with the majority of these buildings had residents or owners' organizations and employed security guards (Table 2.2b).

Table 2.2a Type of property

Type of property	Tenant			
	T2		T3	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Private	24	46.2	21	42.9
Public	28	53.8	28	57.1
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	-
Total	52	100*	49	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Table 2.2b New homes building age and building management

Building age	T3 [#]			
	T		OO	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Below 10	25	53.2	1	9.1
10 to less than 20	1	2.1	1	9.1
20 to less than 30	9	19.1	1	9.1
30 to less than 40	4	8.5	4	36.4
40 to less than 50	5	10.6	3	27.3
50 or above	3	6.4	1	9.1
Missing/ Non-response	2	-	4	-
Total	49	100*	15	100*
Have the following building management arrangement/organization formed (Multiple response; can choose more than one option)				
Incorporated Owners / Mutual Aid Committee/ Owners' Committee	35	71.4	13	86.7
Employ property management company	34	69.4	7	46.7
Employ security guard	37	75.5	9	60.0
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	-
Total	49	-	15	-

[#] The age of buildings and building management details were not included in T2 interviews.

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

11. The percentage of tenants staying in units less than 26 sq. meters was much lower in the T2 than in T1 (T1: 80.6%, T2: 44.0%). There was not much difference in the size of units of owner-occupiers before and after relocation, but fewer of them were living in flats larger than 76 sq. meters

(owner-occupier: T1: 25.0%, T2: 12.6%) (Table 2.3a). Since only 3 of the tenant households we visited in T2 moved again in T3, the change in percentages in T3 was mild.

Table 2.3a Gross Floor Area (GFA) size of the unit (sq. m)

GFA of the unit (Sq. meter)	T1				T2				T3			
	T		OO		T		OO		T		OO	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Below 10	48	40.3	0	0.0	4	8.0	0	0.0	5	10.4	0	0.0
11-25	48	40.3	2	7.1	18	36.0	0	0.0	16	33.3	0	0.0
26-50	15	12.6	9	32.1	21	42.0	8	50.0	21	43.8	8	53.3
51-75	1	0.8	10	35.7	4	8.0	6	37.5	5	10.4	5	33.3
76-100	7	5.9	5	17.9	2	4.0	1	6.3	1	2.1	1	6.7
More than 100	0	0.0	2	7.1	1	2.0	1	6.3	0	0.0	1	6.7
Missing/ Non-response	1	-	0	-	2	-	0	-	1	-	0	-
Total	120	100*	28	100*	52	100*	16	100*	49	100*	15	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

12. When compared with the unit size change of individual households, 46% of the units of tenants increased by 11 sq. meters or more after relocation (T2) and with average increase of 8.02 sq. meters, also the size change was statistically significant ($p = .001$). Apparently, in general there was an increase in living space in tenant group after relocation. Among the 16 owner occupiers who took part in the interview in T2, more than half (56.4%) of them reported that they moved to units of larger size. However, 70% of the 16 owner occupiers moved to unit whose flat size did not differ more than 20 sq. meters from their original one. Nearly twenty percent (18.8%) reported that they moved to unit that was smaller than their previous one for more than 30 sq. meters. Most of the T3 respondents were living in the same units as in T2; however, some tenants partitioned and shared their units with others such as friends, in order to save money. Therefore some changes in flat size were recorded in T3 (Table 2.3b). In owner-occupier group, 37.6% of the units also increased by 11 sq. meters or more in T2 and with a mild increase on average (0.75 sq. meters).

Table 2.3b Changes in size of the unit (sq. m) T1 vs. T2 and T2 vs. T3 (change of individual households)

Changes in size of the unit (Sq. meter)	T1 vs. T2						T2 vs. T3					
	T		OO		Total		T		OO		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Below - 50	3	6.0	0	0.0	3	4.5	1	2.2	0	0.0	1	1.7
- 49 to - 40	0	0.0	1	6.3	1	1.5	1	2.2	0	0.0	1	0.7
- 39 to - 30	0	0.0	2	12.5	2	3.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
- 29 to - 20	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
- 19 to - 10	2	4.0	1	6.3	3	4.5	1	2.2	0	0.0	1	1.7
- 9 to 0	6	12.0	3	18.8	9	13.6	39	86.7	14	93.3	53	88.3
1 to 10	15	30.0	3	18.8	18	27.3	3	6.7	0	0.0	3	5.0
11 to 20	10	20.0	4	25.0	14	21.2	0	0.0	1	6.7	1	1.7
21 to 30	7	14.0	1	6.3	8	12.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
31 to 40	3	6.0	0	0.0	3	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

41 to 50	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
More than 50	2	4.0	1	6.3	3	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Missing/ Non-response	2	-	0	-	2	-	4	-	0	-	4	-
Total	52	100*	16	100*	68	100*	49	100*	15	100*	64	100*
Average changes	8.02		0.75		6.26		-2.81		0.93		-1.89	
Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.001 [#]		0.638		0.003 [#]		0.308		0.317		0.552	

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

[#] A two-tailed p-value of less than 0.05 is recognized as statistically significant.

Social demographic

13. Around two thirds of the tenant respondents were aged between 20 and 59 (T1: 66.7%, T2: 65.3%, T3: 67.3%), which were similar in all three studies. Relatively more, around half, of the owner-occupier respondents were of 60 or above (T1: 46.4%, T2: 50.0%, T3: 53.3%) (Table 2.4). Among the 64 interviewees in this tracking study, a small number of them were not the same persons being interviewed¹ in T1.

Table 2.4 Age of respondents

Age	T1				T2				T3			
	T		OO		T		OO		T		OO	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
20 – 29	3	2.5	0	0.0	1	1.9	1	6.3	1	2.0	0	0.0
30 – 39	19	15.8	2	7.1	5	9.6	2	12.5	7	14.3	0	0.0
40 – 49	29	24.2	1	3.6	14	26.9	2	12.5	12	24.5	1	6.7
50 – 59	29	24.2	12	42.9	14	26.9	3	18.8	13	26.5	6	40.0
60 – 69	29	24.2	9	32.1	13	25.0	6	37.5	12	24.5	5	33.3
70 or above	11	9.1	4	14.3	5	9.6	2	12.5	4	8.2	3	20
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Total	120	100*	28	100*	52	100*	16	100*	49	100*	15	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

14. Around half of the affected respondents (tenant: T1: 56.7%, T2: 50.9%, T3: 56.4%; owner-occupier: T1: 48.1%, T2: 43.9%, T3: 60.0%) were working at the time of study. Among those working, construction, wholesaling, retailing, trading, and catering industries were the relatively popular industries. The working rate was lower right after relocation (T2) in both tenant and owner-occupier groups, but then in T3 the rate increased very much (Table 2.5).

¹ In this study, the interviewees were the heads of households. The researchers obtained the consent replies and contact details from the URA and made interview visits. Some of the households provided two names as the heads of households. In the tracking studies, when the original interviewee could not answer the questions, another head of household would help to answer. For some of the cases, the original head of household had moved out to elderly residential homes because of health reasons and another household member then substituted the head of household for the interview.

Table 2.5 Industry

Industry	T1				T2				T3			
	T		OO		T		OO		T		OO	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Manufacturing	6	5.0	1	3.7	1	2.0	0	0.0	3	6.3	0	0.0
Construction	20	16.7	3	11.1	7	14.3	1	6.3	7	14.6	2	13.3
Wholesaling, retailing, trading, & catering	23	19.2	3	11.1	7	14.3	3	18.8	7	14.6	1	6.7
Transportation, warehouse & communication	2	1.7	2	7.4	0	0.0	2	12.5	1	2.1	2	13.3
Financial, insurance, property & commercial	4	3.3	3	11.1	3	6.1	0	0.0	2	4.2	3	20.0
Community, social & personal care	13	10.8	1	3.7	6	12.2	1	6.3	6	12.5	1	6.7
Other industry	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0
Student	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
Housewife	9	7.5	3	11.1	2	4.1	2	12.5	3	6.3	2	13.3
Looking for job/ unemployed	20	16.7	0	0.0	12	24.5	0	0.0	7	14.6	0	0.0
Retired	23	19.2	11	40.7	10	20.4	6	37.5	11	22.9	4	26.7
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	1	-	3	-	0	-	1	-	0	-
Total	120	100*	28	100*	52	100*	16	100*	49	100*	15	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

15. Among those respondents that were working, most of them were working as service workers/sales (tenant: T1: 36.8%, T2: 42.3%, T3: 40.0%; owner-occupier: T1: 23.1%, T2: 57.1%, T3: 22.2%), driver/technician/machine operators (tenant: T1: 16.2%, T2: 7.7%, T3: 28.0%; owner-occupier: T1: 30.8%, T2: 28.6%, T3: 33.3%), and elementary occupation (tenant: T1: 35.3%, T2: 34.6%, T3: 8.0%; owner-occupier: T1: 15.4%, T2: 0%, T3: 33.3%) (Table 2.6).

Table 2.6 Occupation

Occupation	T1				T2				T3			
	T		OO		T		OO		T		OO	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Manager/Administration officer	0	0.0	1	7.7	1	3.8	0	0.0	2	8.0	1	11.1
Professionals	1	1.5	2	15.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	8.0	0	0.0
Supporting professionals	2	2.9	0	0.0	2	7.7	0	0.0	1	4.0	0	0.0
Secretaries/Clerks	3	4.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Service workers/Sales	25	36.8	3	23.1	11	42.3	4	57.1	10	40.0	2	22.2
Craft and related workers	2	2.9	1	7.7	1	3.8	1	14.3	1	4.0	0	0.0
Driver/Technician/Machine operators	11	16.2	4	30.8	2	7.7	2	28.6	7	28.0	3	33.3
Elementary occupations	24	35.3	2	15.4	9	34.6	0	0.0	2	8.0	3	33.3
Economic inactive	52	-	14	-	24	-	9	-	21	-	6	-
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	1	-	2	-	0	-	3	-	0	-
Total	120	100*	28	100*	52	100*	16	100*	49	100*	15	100*

* Excluding missing/ non-response and economic inactive cases.

16. There were fewer respondents among tenants were working or studying in Shamshuipo after relocation (tenant: T1: 54.2%, T2: 34.6%, T3: 19.2%), however the distribution of respondents among owner-occupiers was just the opposite (owner-occupier: T1: 27.3%, T2: 28.6%, T3: 62.5%). Reflected in the transportation cost, a higher percentage of respondents among tenants (tenant: T1:

49.0%, T2: 52.7%, T3: 78.9%) had to pay for transport to work or study in T3. There was a smaller percentage of respondents among owner-occupiers that had to pay to do so in T3 (owner-occupier: T1: 63.7%, T2: 60.0%, T3: 25.0%) (Table 2.7a).

Table 2.7a Working/ studying area and transportation cost (respondents)

Working/ studying area (respondents)	T1				T2				T3			
	T		OO		T		OO		T		OO	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Shamshuipo	32	54.2	3	27.3	9	34.6	2	28.6	5	19.2	5	62.5
Other parts of Kowloon	9	15.3	3	27.3	5	19.2	1	14.3	6	23.1	1	12.5
Hong Kong Island	4	6.8	2	18.2	2	7.7	1	14.3	2	7.7	0	0.0
New Territories	8	13.6	0	0.0	3	11.5	1	14.3	4	15.4	0	0.0
Not fixed	6	10.2	3	27.3	7	26.9	2	28.6	9	34.6	2	25.0
Housewife, looking for job/ unemployed, retired	52	-	14	-	24	-	8	-	21	-	6	-
Missing/ Non-response	9	-	3	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	1	-
Total	120	100*	28	100*	52	100*	16	100*	49	100*	15	100*
Transportation cost (one way) (respondents)	T1				T2				T3			
	T		OO		T		OO		T		OO	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
None (walking, cycling)	27	50.9	4	36.4	9	47.4	2	40.0	4	21.1	6	75.0
Below \$5	6	11.3	1	9.1	3	15.8	0	0.0	3	15.8	0	0.0
\$5 - \$10	12	22.6	3	27.3	4	21.1	3	60.0	10	52.6	1	12.5
Above \$10	8	15.1	3	27.3	3	15.8	0	0.0	2	10.5	1	12.5
Housewife, looking for job/ unemployed, retired	52	-	14	-	24	-	8	-	21	-	6	-
Missing/ Non-response	15	-	3	-	9	-	3	-	9	-	1	-
Total	120	100*	28	100*	52	100*	16	100*	49	100*	15	100*

* Excluding missing/ non-response and not employed cases.

17. When examining the individual changes, no owner-occupier reported any change in the place of work or study throughout the study, only close to one third of the tenants (30.4%) report changes in T3 (Table 2.7b). In T2, nearly sixty percent (57.1%) of the respondents reported that they experienced no change in the transportation cost; the percentage of respondents reporting an increase in transportation cost (14.3%) were less than those who reported reduction (28.6%). However, the increase in transportation cost of tenants (40.0%) was obvious in T3 (Table 2.7c).

Table 2.7b Change in working/ studying area (respondents) (change of individuals)

Changes in Working/ studying area (respondents)	T1 vs. T2						T2 vs. T3					
	T		OO		Total		T		OO		Total	
	n	%	n	%	N	%	n	%	n	%	N	%
Change	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	30.4	0	0.0	7	24.1
No change	23	100	4	100	27	100	16	69.6	6	100	22	75.9
Missing/ Non-response	29	-	12	-	41	-	26	-	9	-	35	-
Total	52	100*	16	100*	68	100*	49	100*	15	100*	64	100*

* Excluding missing/ non-response and not employed cases.

Table 2.7c Changes in transportation cost (respondents) T1 vs. T2 and T2 vs. T3 (change of individuals)

Changes in transportation cost (respondents)	T1 vs. T2						T2 vs. T3					
	T		OO		Total		T		OO		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Reduced	5	27.8	1	33.3	6	28.6	2	13.3	0	0.0	2	11.1
No change	11	61.1	1	33.3	12	57.1	7	46.7	3	100	10	55.6
Increased	2	11.1	1	33.3	3	14.3	6	40.0	0	0.0	6	33.3
Missing/ Non-response	34	-	13	-	47	-	34	-	12	-	46	-
Total	52	100*	16	100*	68	100*	49	100*	15	100*	64	100*

* Excluding missing/ non-response and not employed cases.

Support network

18. A higher proportion of respondents among tenants did not or seldom made contact with their new neighbours after relocation (tenant: T1: 36.7%, T2: 74.5%) (Table 2.8a) and the changes were statistically significant ($p = 0.002$) (Table 2.8b). Over half of the tenants (56.5%) said they had reduced their contacts with their neighbours in T2. However 31.7% of the tenants reported that they had increased their contacts with neighbours in T3. The relocation impact on owner-occupiers was not as obvious compared with the tenants (no or seldom contact: owner-occupier: T1: 50.0%, T2: 50.0%) (Table 2.8a) and 42.9% said that there was no change in the frequency of contact in T2 among owner-occupiers compared with only 28.3% among tenants (Table 2.8b).

Table 2.8a Contact frequency with neighbours[#]

Contact frequency with neighbours	T1				T2				T3			
	T		OO		T		OO		T		OO	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
(0) No contact	14	11.7	2	7.1	7	13.7	2	12.5	8	16.3	2	13.3
(1) Seldom	30	25.0	12	42.9	31	60.8	6	37.5	26	53.1	5	33.3
(2) Sometimes	56	46.7	11	39.3	11	21.6	7	43.8	12	24.5	7	46.7
(3) Frequently	20	16.7	3	10.7	2	3.9	1	6.3	3	6.1	1	6.7
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	-	1	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Total	120	100*	28	100*	52	100*	16	100*	49	100*	15	100*

[#] Neighbours in this study refer to neighbours, friends and relatives living in the same district.

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Table 2.8b Changes in contact frequency with neighbours T1 vs. T2 and T2 vs. T3 (change of individuals)

Changes in contact frequency with neighbours (respondents)	T1 vs. T2						T2 vs. T3					
	T		OO		Total		T		OO		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Reduced	26	56.5	5	35.7	31	51.7	11	26.8	3	23.1	14	25.9
No change	13	28.3	6	42.9	19	31.7	17	41.5	7	53.8	24	44.4
Increased	7	15.2	3	21.4	10	16.7	13	31.7	3	23.1	16	29.6
Missing/ Non-response	6	-	2	-	8	-	8	-	2	-	10	-
Total	52	100*	16	100*	68	100*	49	100*	15	100*	64	100*

Average changes	-0.565	-0.143	-0.467	0.073	0.000	0.056
Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.002 [#]	0.608	0.003 [#]	0.597	1.000	0.650

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

[#] A two-tailed p-value of less than 0.05 is recognized as statistically significant.

19. The pattern of change in contact frequency was similar among different age groups (Table 2.8c). The contact frequency of around half of the respondents had reduced (reduced: under age 60: 55.6%; age 60 or above: 45.8%) right after relocation, and the change in the younger group was significant ($p = 0.017$). However, the contact frequency increased again in T3 (increased: age 60 or above: 36.4%) in the older group (Table 2.8d).

Table 2.8c Contact frequency with neighbours by age group

Contact frequency with neighbours	T1				T2				T3			
	Under 60		60 or above		Under 60		60 or above		Under 60		60 or above	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
(0) No contact	9	9.5	7	13.2	7	17.1	2	7.7	5	12.5	5	20.8
(1) Seldom	29	30.5	13	24.5	22	53.7	15	57.7	23	57.5	8	33.3
(2) Sometimes	42	44.2	25	47.2	10	24.4	8	30.8	10	25.0	9	37.5
(3) Frequently	15	15.8	8	15.1	2	4.9	1	3.8	2	5.0	2	8.3
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	-	1	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Total	95	100*	53	100*	42	100*	26	100*	40	100*	24	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Table 2.8d Changes in contact frequency with neighbours by age group T1 vs. T2 and T2 vs. T3 (change of individuals)

Changes in contact frequency with neighbours	T1 vs. T2						T2 vs. T3					
	Under 60		60 or above		Total		Under 60		60 or above		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Reduced	20	55.6	11	45.8	31	51.7	10	31.3	4	18.2	14	25.9
No change	10	27.8	9	37.5	19	31.7	14	43.8	10	45.5	24	44.4
Increased	6	16.7	4	16.7	10	16.7	8	25.0	8	36.4	16	29.6
Missing/ Non-response	6	-	2	-	8	-	8	-	2	-	10	-
Total	42	100*	26	100*	68	100*	40	100*	24	100*	64	100*
Average changes	-0.472		-0.458		-0.467		-0.031		0.182		0.056	
Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.017 [#]		0.109		0.003 [#]		0.827		0.464		0.650	

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

[#] A two-tailed p-value of less than 0.05 is recognized as statistically significant.

20. The percentage of respondents enjoying good relationships with neighbours reduced among tenants and owner-occupiers. The change in percentage was higher among tenants than owner-occupiers. Around half of the owner-occupiers at all three stages of study had good to very good relationship with their neighbours (owner-occupier: T1: 64.3%, T2: 53.3%, T3: 50.0%) (Table 2.9a). Among the respondents of the tenants, the percentage dropped drastically from 60.8% to 19.6%, but the percentage increased very much in T3 (tenant: T1: 60.8%, T2: 19.6%, T3: 40.8%) and

the changes were statistically significant (T2: $p = 0.001$, T3: $p = 0.005$). In general, individual tenant respondents tended to experience a weaker of relationship with their neighbours (52.2%) upon relocation (T2), but experienced an improvement (36.6%) in T3 (Table 2.9b).

Table 2.9a Relationships with neighbours

Relationships with neighbours	T1				T2				T3			
	T		OO		T		OO		T		OO	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
(1) Very bad	3	2.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
(2) Bad	2	1.7	0	0.0	2	3.9	0	0.0	1	2.0	0	0.0
(3) Normal	42	35.0	10	35.7	39	76.5	7	46.7	28	57.1	7	50.0
(4) Good	66	55.0	15	53.6	10	19.6	5	33.3	15	30.6	5	35.7
(5) Very good	7	5.8	3	10.7	0	0.0	3	20.0	5	10.2	2	14.3
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	-	1	-	1	-	0	-	1	-
Total	120	100*	28	100*	52	100*	16	100*	49	100*	15	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Table 2.9b Changes in relationships with neighbours T1 vs. T2 and T2 vs. T3 (change of individuals)

Changes in relationships with neighbours	T1 vs. T2						T2 vs. T3					
	T		OO		Total		T		OO		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Declined	24	52.2	4	28.6	28	46.7	3	7.3	4	33.3	7	13.2
No change	18	39.1	5	35.7	23	38.3	23	56.1	5	41.7	28	52.8
Improved	4	8.7	5	35.7	9	15.0	15	36.6	3	25.0	18	34.0
Missing/ Non-response	6	-	2	-	8	-	8	-	3	-	11	-
Total	52	100*	16	100*	68	100*	49	100*	15	100*	64	100*
Average changes	-0.478		0.000		-0.367		0.293		-0.083		0.208	
Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.001 [#]		0.951		0.005 [#]		0.005 [#]		0.705		0.028	

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

[#] A two-tailed p -value of less than 0.05 is recognized as statistically significant.

21. A lower percentage (17.5%) of respondents under age 60 indicated their relationships with neighbours was good to very good in T2 but the percentage was higher at 47.5% in T3 (under age 60: T1: 55.8%, T2: 17.5%, T3: 47.5%) (Table 2.9c). In terms of actual changes, nearly half of both the younger group (47.2%) and older group (45.8%) reported that the relationship with their neighbours declined in T2. However, in T3, it was the younger group who reported a higher percentage of improvement (43.8%) compared with the situation in T2 (T2: $p = 0.012$, T3: $p = 0.008$). Over half of the older group (61.9%) reported no change in T3 (Table 2.9d).

Table 2.9c Relationships with neighbours by age group

Relationships with neighbours	T1				T2				T3			
	Under 60		60 or above		Under 60		60 or above		Under 60		60 or above	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
(1) Very bad	1	1.1	2	3.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
(2) Bad	2	2.1	0	0.0	2	5.0	0	0.0	1	2.5	0	0.0

(3) Normal	39	41.1	13	24.5	31	77.5	15	57.7	20	50.0	15	65.2
(4) Good	49	51.6	32	60.4	7	17.5	8	30.8	14	35.0	6	26.1
(5) Very good	4	4.2	6	11.3	0	0.0	3	11.5	5	12.5	2	8.7
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	-	2	-	0	-	0	-	1	-
Total	95	100*	53	100*	42	100*	26	100*	40	100*	24	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Table 2.9d Changes in relationships with neighbours by age group T1 vs. T2 and T2 vs. T3 (change of individuals)

Changes in relationships with neighbours	T1 vs. T2						T2 vs. T3					
	Under 60		60 or above		Total		Under 60		60 or above		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Declined	17	47.2	11	45.8	28	46.7	3	9.4	4	19.0	7	13.2
No change	15	41.7	8	33.3	23	38.3	15	46.9	13	61.9	28	52.8
Improved	4	11.1	5	20.8	9	15.0	14	43.8	4	19.0	18	34.0
Missing/ Non-response	6	-	2	-	8	-	8	-	3	-	11	-
Total	42	100*	26	100*	68	100*	40	100*	24	100*	64	100*
Average changes	-0.389		-0.333		-0.367		0.344		0.000		0.208	
Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.012 [#]		0.134		0.005 [#]		0.008 [#]		1.000		0.028 [#]	

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

[#] A two-tailed p-value of less than 0.05 is recognized as statistically significant.

22. The percentage of respondents with a high level of trust (trust to trust very much) in their neighbours was very much lowered after relocation (tenant: T1: 84.9%, T2: 31.4%, T3: 32.6%; owner-occupier: T1: 91.6%, T2: 37.6%, T3: 42.9%) (Table 2.10a). 63.5% of the respondents reported that there was a reduction in the level of trust in their neighbours in T2 over T1, but the situation improved in T3: where 30.2% reported that there was an increased level of trust over T2 (Table 2.10b). The reduction in belief that their neighbours were concerned with the overall benefit of the community benefit among respondents was significant in T2 (tenant: $p = 0.005$; owner-occupier: $p = 0.024$).

Table 2.10a Attitude toward their neighbours

Attitude toward their neighbours	T1				T2				T3			
	T		OO		T		OO		T		OO	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Trust on neighbours												
(1) Very much distrust	1	0.9	0	0.0	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	2.0	0	0.0
(2) Distrust	15	14.2	2	8.3	3	5.9	1	6.3	2	4.1	1	7.1
(3) Average [#]	--	--	--	--	31	60.8	9	56.3	30	61.2	7	50.0
(4) Trust	85	80.2	20	83.3	16	31.4	5	31.3	13	26.5	6	42.9
(5) Very much trust	5	4.7	2	8.3	0	0.0	1	6.3	3	6.1	0	0.0
Missing/ Non-response	14	-	4	-	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	-
Total	120	100*	28	100*	52	100*	16	100*	49	100*	15	100*
You think your neighbours will help you when you need help												
(0) Surely will not	6	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.1	2	4.1	2	14.3

(1) Mostly will not	22	18.3	3	10.7	13	25.5	2	14.3	19	38.8	3	21.4
(2) Will (Half)	42	35.0	8	28.6	28	54.9	5	35.7	17	34.7	6	42.9
(3) Mostly will	43	35.8	13	46.4	8	15.7	6	42.9	8	16.3	3	21.4
(4) Surely will	7	5.8	4	14.3	2	3.9	0	0.0	3	6.1	0	0.0
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	-	1	-	2	-	0	-	1	-
Total	120	100*	28	100*	52	100*	16	100*	49	100*	15	100*
You think your neighbours are concerned with the overall benefit of the community												
(1) Strongly disagree	4	3.7	2	8.0	2	3.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
(2) Disagree	35	32.7	8	32.0	2	3.9	1	7.1	2	4.2	1	7.1
(3) Average [#]	--	--	--	--	30	58.8	8	57.1	24	50.0	6	42.9
(4) Agree	65	60.7	14	56.0	17	33.3	5	35.7	20	41.7	6	42.9
(4) Strongly agree	3	2.8	1	4.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.2	1	7.1
Missing/ Non-response	13	-	3	-	1	-	2	-	1	-	1	-
Total	120	100*	28	100*	52	100*	16	100*	49	100*	15	100*

[#] No option 'Average' in T1.

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Table 2.10b Changes in attitude toward their neighbours T1 vs. T2 and T2 vs. T3 (change of individuals)

Changes in Attitude toward their neighbours	T1 vs. T2						T2 vs. T3					
	T		OO		Total		T		OO		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Trust in neighbours												
Reduced	28	68.3	5	45.5	33	63.5	11	26.8	5	41.7	16	30.2
No change	12	29.3	4	36.4	16	30.8	17	41.5	4	33.3	21	39.6
Increased	1	2.4	2	18.2	3	5.8	13	31.7	3	25.0	16	30.2
Missing/ Non-response	11	-	5	-	16	-	8	-	3	-	11	-
Total	52	100*	16	100*	68	100*	49	100*	15	100*	64	100*
Average changes	-0.756		-0.455		-0.692		0.000		-0.083		-0.019	
Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000		0.206		0.000		0.963		0.763		0.872	
You think your neighbours will help you when you need help												
Reduced	15	32.6	6	50.0	21	36.2	17	26.8	4	36.4	21	40.4
No change	22	47.8	4	33.3	26	44.8	12	41.5	6	54.5	18	34.6
Increased	9	19.6	2	16.7	11	19.0	12	31.7	1	9.1	13	25.0
Missing/ Non-response	6	-	4	-	10	-	8	-	4	-	12	-
Total	52	100*	16	100*	68	100*	49	100*	15	100*	64	100*
Average changes	-0.217		-0.667		-0.310		-0.268		-0.364		-0.288	
Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.228		0.084		0.056		0.117		0.336		0.070	
You think your neighbours are concerned with the overall benefit of the community												
Reduced	23	57.5	4	40.0	27	54.0	10	25.0	4	36.4	14	27.5
No change	6	15.0	2	20.0	8	16.0	15	37.5	2	18.2	17	33.3
Increased	11	27.5	4	40.0	15	30.0	15	37.5	5	45.5	20	39.2
Missing/ Non-response	12	-	6	-	18	-	9	-	4	-	13	-
Total	52	100*	16	100*	68	100*	49	100*	15	100*	64	100*
Average changes	-0.200		0.300		-0.100		0.125		0.091		0.118	
Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.005 [#]		0.024 [#]		0.000		0.317		0.739		0.303	

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

A two-tailed p-value of less than 0.05 is recognized as statistically significant.

23. The percentage of respondents who had a higher level of trust (trust to very much trust) in their neighbours lowered drastically among those aged under 60 in T2. The percentage became higher in T3 (under age 60: T1: 82.9%, T2: 24.4%, T3: 35.0%) (Table 2.10c). For older respondents (age 60 or above: T1: 91.7%, T2: 46.1%, T3: 34.7%), the changes in percentage was not as drastic. However, comparing the changes of individuals, the change between the T1 and T2 studies was statistically significant ($p = 0.011$) (Table 2.10d). The pattern of change was consistent in whether they believed that their neighbours (mostly/surely) would offer them assistance when they needed help (under age 60: T1: 45.2%, T2: 15.0%, T3: 27.5%; age 60 or above: T1: 45.3%, T2: 40.0%, T3: 13.0%). Besides, there was a big drop in the percentage in whether the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their neighbours would be concerned with the overall benefit of the community in T2 (reduce: under age 60: 62.1%, $p = 0.043$; age 60 or above: 42.9%, $p = 0.003$) (Table 2.10d), but the percentage bounced back in T3 (under age 60: T1: 64.3%, T2: 35.0%, T3: 46.2%; age 60 or above: T1: 60.5%, T2: 32.0%, T3: 47.8%)(Table 2.10c).

Table 2.10c Attitude toward their neighbours by age group

Attitude toward their neighbours	T1				T2				T3			
	Under 60		60 or above		Under 60		60 or above		Under 60		60 or above	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Trust in neighbours												
(1) Very much distrust	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	1	3.8	1	2.5	0	0.0
(2) Distrust	14	17.1	3	6.3	3	7.3	1	3.8	1	2.5	2	8.7
(3) Average [#]	--	--	--	--	28	68.3	12	46.2	24	60.0	13	56.5
(4) Trust	63	76.8	42	87.5	10	24.4	11	42.3	12	30.0	7	30.4
(5) Very much trust	5	6.1	2	4.2	0	0.0	1	3.8	2	5.0	1	4.3
Missing/ Non-response	13	-	5	-	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	-
Total	95	100*	53	100*	42	100*	26	100*	40	100*	24	100*
You think your neighbours will help you when you need help												
(0) Surely will not	4	4.2	2	3.8	1	2.5	0	0.0	1	2.5	3	13.0
(1) Mostly will not	16	16.8	9	17.0	10	25.0	5	20.0	14	35.0	8	34.8
(2) Will (Half)	32	33.7	18	34.0	23	57.5	10	40.0	14	35.0	9	39.1
(3) Mostly will	35	36.8	21	39.6	6	15.0	8	32.0	9	22.5	2	8.7
(4) Surely will	8	8.4	3	5.7	0	0.0	2	8.0	2	5.0	1	4.3
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	-	2	-	1	-	0	-	1	-
Total	95	100*	53	100*	42	100*	26	100*	40	100*	24	100*
You think your neighbours are concerned with the overall benefit of the community												
(1) Strongly disagree	3	3.6	3	6.3	2	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
(2) Disagree	27	32.1	16	33.3	3	7.5	0	0.0	2	5.1	1	4.3
(3) Average [#]	--	--	--	--	21	52.5	17	68.0	19	48.7	11	47.8
(4) Agree	53	63.1	26	54.2	14	35.0	8	32.0	17	43.6	9	39.1
(5) Strongly agree	1	1.2	3	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.6	2	8.7
Missing/ Non-response	11	-	5	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	1	-
Total	95	100*	53	100*	42	100*	26	100*	40	100*	24	100*

No option 'Average' in T1.

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Table 2.10d Changes in attitude toward their neighbours by age group T1 vs. T2 and T2 vs. T3 (change of individuals)

Changes in Attitude toward their neighbours	T1 vs. T2						T2 vs. T3					
	Under 60		60 or above		Total		Under 60		60 or above		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Trust in neighbours												
Reduced	22	71.0	11	52.4	33	63.5	8	25.0	8	38.1	16	30.2
No change	7	22.6	9	42.9	16	30.8	14	43.8	7	33.3	21	39.6
Increased	2	6.5	1	4.8	3	5.8	10	31.3	6	28.6	16	30.2
Missing/ Non-response	11	-	5	-	16	-	8	-	3	-	11	-
Total	42	100*	26	100*	68	100*	40	100*	24	100*	64	100*
Average changes	-0.677		-0.714		-0.692		0.000		-0.048		-0.019	
Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000 [#]		0.011 [#]		0.000 [#]		0.981		0.868		0.872	
You think your neighbours will help you when you need help												
Reduced	12	34.3	9	39.1	21	36.2	12	37.5	9	45.0	21	40.4
No change	18	51.4	8	34.8	26	44.8	10	31.3	8	40.0	18	34.6
Increased	5	14.3	6	26.1	11	19.0	10	31.3	3	15.0	13	25.0
Missing/ Non-response	7	-	3	-	10	-	8	-	4	-	12	-
Total	42	100*	26	100*	68	100*	40	100*	24	100*	64	100*
Average changes	-0.343		-0.261		-0.310		-0.094		-0.600		-0.288	
Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.059		0.383		0.056		0.585		0.038		0.070	
You think your neighbours are concerned with the overall benefit of the community												
Reduced	18	62.1	9	42.9	27	54.0	10	32.3	4	20.0	14	27.5
No change	4	13.8	4	19.0	8	16.0	9	29.0	8	40.0	17	33.3
Increased	7	24.1	8	38.1	15	30.0	12	38.7	8	40.0	20	39.2
Missing/ Non-response	13	-	5	-	18	-	9	-	4	-	13	-
Total	42	100*	26	100*	68	100*	40	100*	24	100*	64	100*
Average changes	-0.310		0.190		-0.100		0.065		0.200		0.118	
Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.043 [#]		0.003 [#]		0.000		0.670		0.248		0.303	

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

[#] A two-tailed p-value of less than 0.05 is recognized as statistically significant.

24. In this tracking study, neighbours, relatives and friends living in the same district were always the major source of support of the respondents no matter on material (a, b and c), social (d and e) or problem solving (f) needs (Table 2.11a-c). However, the number of respondents that had indicated having such need in their households was small to make further analysis.

Table 2.11a Household support needs (tenants)

Household support needs	Tenants																				
	T1 (120)							T2 (52)						T3 (49)							
	1*	2	3	4	5	Total [#]		1	2	3	4	5	Total		1	2	3	4	5	Total	
	n	n	n	n	n	N	%	n	n	n	n	n	N	%	n	n	n	n	n	N	%
a. Help in family chores, such as cleaning, shopping, repairing & maintenance	0	24	2	3	0	29	24.2	0	2	1	0	0	3	5.8	3	1	1	0	0	5	10.2
b. Take care of children, old or sick family members	1	13	4	2	0	20	16.7	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.9	2	4	0	0	0	6	12.2
c. Hospital escort	0	26	9	2	0	37	30.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	3	0	0	0	0	3	6.1
d. Find someone to talk to, to provide psychological relief	0	50	20	5	0	75	62.5	1	2	5	1	0	9	17.3	2	10	7	0	1	20	40.8
e. Join social gatherings, such as Yam Cha & festival celebration	1	50	23	1	0	75	62.5	0	3	3	0	0	6	11.5	4	14	8	0	0	26	53.1
f. Discuss and solve problems	1	31	25	12	0	69	57.5	1	3	1	3	0	8	15.4	3	3	4	0	0	10	20.4

* 1: oneself; 2: neighbours, relatives and friends in the district; 3: relatives and friends in other districts; 4: public facilities in the district; 5: public facilities in other districts.

Percentage among total number of respondents (tenant).

Table 2.11b Household support needs (owner-occupier)

Household support needs	Owner-occupier																				
	T1 (28)							T2 (16)						T3 (15)							
	1*	2	3	4	5	Total [#]		1	2	3	4	5	Total		1	2	3	4	5	Total	
	n	n	n	n	n	N	%	n	n	n	n	n	N	%	n	n	n	n	n	N	%
a. Help in family chores, such as cleaning, shopping, repairing & maintenance	1	4	0	0	0	5	17.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	2	0	0	0	0	2	13.3
b. Take care of children, old or sick family members	0	2	0	0	0	2	7.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Hospital escort	1	5	3	0	0	9	32.1	0	0	1	0	0	1	6.3	0	1	0	0	0	1	6.7
d. Find someone to talk to, to provide psychological relief	2	12	2	3	0	19	67.9	0	1	6	0	0	7	43.8	0	4	1	0	0	5	33.3
e. Join social gatherings, such as Yam Cha & festival celebration	0	14	1	1	0	16	57.1	0	1	8	0	0	9	56.3	1	4	1	0	0	6	40.0
f. Discuss and solve problems	1	10	3	0	0	14	50.0	0	0	5	1	0	6	37.5	0	1	0	0	1	2	13.3

* 1: oneself; 2: neighbours, relatives and friends in the district; 3: relatives and friends in other districts; 4: public facilities in the district; 5: public facilities in other districts.

Percentage among total number of respondents (owner-occupier).

Table 2.11c Household support needs (age 60 or above)

Household support needs	60 or above																				
	T1 (53)							T2 (26)						T3 (24)							
	1*	2	3	4	5	Total [#]		1	2	3	4	5	Total		1	2	3	4	5	Total	
	n	n	n	n	n	N	%	n	n	n	n	n	N	%	n	n	n	n	n	N	%
a. Help in family chores, such as cleaning, shopping, repairing & maintenance	0	9	1	1	0	11	20.8	0	2	0	0	0	2	7.7	3	0	1	0	0	4	16.7
b. Take care of children, old or sick family members	1	3	0	0	0	4	7.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	1	1	0	0	0	2	8.3

c. Hospital escort	0	11	5	0	0	16	30.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	1	0	0	0	1	4.2	
d. Find someone to talk to, to provide psychological relief	0	22	4	2	0	28	52.8	0	3	5	1	0	9	34.6	0	5	1	0	1	7	29.2
e. Join social gatherings, such as Yam Cha & festival celebration	1	24	4	1	0	30	56.6	0	2	5	0	0	7	26.9	3	5	2	0	0	10	41.7
f. Discuss and solve problems	0	15	8	3	0	26	49.1	0	3	1	2	0	6	23.1	1	2	0	0	1	4	16.7

* 1: oneself; 2: neighbours, relatives and friends in the district; 3: relatives and friends in other districts; 4: public facilities in the district; 5: public facilities in other districts.

Percentage among total number of respondents (age 60 or above).

25. Both tangible and social-emotional support needs of tenants dropped in T2 and then the need increased again in T3 (tenant: tangible need: T1: 40.0%, T2: 5.8%, T3: 14.3%; social-emotional: T1: 74.2%, T2: 21.1%, T3: 49.0%) (Table 2.12a). The changes in the other groups in general were similar, but the social-emotional need dropped further in T3 (owner-occupier: tangible need: T1: 32.1%, T2: 6.3%, T3: 20.0%; social-emotional: T1: 78.6%, T2: 63.5%, T3: 40.0%) (Table 2.12b) (aged 60 or above: tangible need: T1: 43.4%, T2: 7.7%, T3: 20.8%; social-emotional: T1: 67.9%, T2: 38.5%, T3: 37.5%) (Table 2.12c). In general, more respondents indicated that they had social-emotional need than tangible needs. The number of responses on this subject was too low for further analysis.

Table 2.12a Household support needs (tangible/social-emotional, tenants)

Household needs	Tenant																	
	T1 (120)						T2 (52)						T3 (49)					
	Need support		Obtained neighbours support from*				Need support		Obtained neighbours support from#				Need support		Obtained neighbours support from			
			different districts		ONLY their district				other districts		own district				other districts		own district	
N	%	n	%	n	%	N	%	n	%	n	%	N	%	n	%	n	%	
Tangible need (a-c)	48	40.0	31	64.6	27	56.3	3	5.8	2	66.7	2	66.7	7	14.3	4	57.1	4	57.1
Social-emotional need (d-e)	89	74.2	60	67.4	53	59.6	11	21.1	5	45.5	2	18.2	24	49.0	16	66.7	15	62.5

* Respondents could choose more than one options, the answers were categorized into either obtaining support only from their district (“ONLY their district”) or obtaining support from more than one district (“different districts”) (不同地區))

The interview question was modified in T2 and T3, respondents could choose only one option; that was either obtaining support from the district they were living (“own district”) or from the other districts (“other districts”).

Table 2.12b Household support needs (tangible/social-emotional, owner-occupiers)

Household needs	Owner-occupier																	
	T1 (28)						T2 (16)						T3 (15)					
	Need support		Obtained neighbours support from*				Need support		Obtained neighbours support from#				Need support		Obtained neighbours support from			
			different districts		ONLY their district				other districts		own district				other districts		own district	
N	%	n	%	n	%	N	%	n	%	n	%	N	%	n	%	n	%	
Tangible need (a-c)	9	32.1	6	66.7	4	44.4	1	6.3	0	0	0	0.0	3	20.0	1	33.3	1	33.3
Social-emotional need (d-e)	22	78.6	18	81.8	4	18.2	10	63.5	1	10.0	1	10.0	6	40.0	5	83.3	5	83.3

* Respondents could choose more than one options, the answers were categorized into either obtaining support only from their district (“ONLY their district”) or obtaining support from more than one district (“different districts”) (不同地區))

The interview question was modified in T2 and T3, respondents could choose only one option; that was either obtaining

support from the district they were living (“own district”) or from the other districts (“other districts”).

Table 2.12c Household support needs (tangible/social-emotional, age 60 or above)

Household needs	Age 60 or above																	
	T1 (53)						T2 (26)						T3 (24)					
	Need support	Obtained neighbours support from*				Need support	Obtained neighbours support from#				Need support	Obtained neighbours support from						
		different districts		ONLY their district			other districts		own district			other districts		own district				
N	%	n	%	n	%	N	%	n	%	n	%	N	%	n	%	n	%	
Tangible need (a-c)	23	43.4	14	60.9	9	39.1	2	7.7	2	100	2	100	5	20.8	1	20.0	1	20.0
Social-emotional need (d-e)	36	67.9	27	75.0	10	27.8	10	38.5	4	40.0	1	10.0	9	37.5	7	77.8	6	66.7

* Respondents could choose more than one options, the answers were categorized into either obtaining support only from their district (“ONLY their district”) or obtaining support from more than one district (“different districts” (不同地區))

The interview question was modified in T2 and T3, respondents could choose only one option; that was either obtaining support from the district they were living (“own district”) or from the other districts (“other districts”).

26. For community facilities, apart from swimming pools, tenants in general reduced their use of them in T2, but then increased use again in T3 (Table 2.13a). For swimming pool and sports ground facilities, as most of the T2 interviews were conducted in summer, the relocation impact could be offset by seasonal factors and the reverse trend of usage (sometimes or frequently: tenant: T1: 38.4%, T2: 51.9%, T3: 25.5%). For owner-occupiers, their use in community facilities like libraries and town hall (sometimes or frequently: owner-occupier: T1: 42.9%, T2: 56.3%, T3: 46.6%), swimming pools and sports grounds (sometimes or frequently: owner-occupier: T1: 32.2%, T2: 43.8%, T3: 33.4%) and parks (sometimes or frequently: owner-occupier: T1: 67.8%, T2: 68.8%, T3: 80.0%) was more frequent in T2 and T3 than in T1 (Table 2.13b). Surprisingly, the frequency in the use of hospital and clinics dropped around 50% among tenants, owner-occupiers and even among those age 60 or above (sometimes or frequently: tenant: T1: 70.0%, T2: 11.5%, T3: 24.4%; owner-occupier: T1: 71.4%, T2: 25.0%, T3: 33.3%; age 60 or above: T1: 71.7%, T2: 26.9%, T3: 29.2%) (Table 2.13a-c). The reason for the reduction of the frequency in visiting hospitals and clinics is not clear.

Table 2.13a Community facilities usage (tenants)

Have used the following facilities in the district	Tenant																		
	T1						T2						T3						
	N*	R	S	F	Total		N	R	S	F	Total		N	R	S	F	M	Total	
	%	%	%	%	N	%	%	%	%	%	N	%	%	%	%	%	n	N	%
Hospital and clinic	14.2	15.8	39.2	30.8	120	100	32.7	55.8	9.6	1.9	52	100	36.7	38.8	22.4	2	0	49	100*
Library and town hall	45.8	9.2	20.8	24.2	120	100	40.4	42.3	11.5	5.8	52	100	53.1	16.3	28.6	2	0	49	100*
Swimming pool and sports ground	49.2	12.5	24.2	14.2	120	100	19.2	28.8	42.3	9.6	52	100	42.6	31.9	23.4	2.1	2	49	100*
Park	12.5	6.7	30	50.8	120	100	9.6	21.2	46.2	23.1	52	100	21.3	19.1	46.8	12.8	2	49	100*
Community centre	56.7	5.8	16.7	20.8	120	100	50	44.2	5.8	0.0	52	100	69.4	22.4	8.2	0.0	0	49	100*

N=Never, R=Rarely, S=Sometimes, F=Frequently, M= Missing/ Non-response

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Table 2.13b Community facilities usage (owner-occupiers)

Have used the following facilities in the district	Owner-occupier																	
	T1						T2						T3					
	N [#]	R	S	F	Total		N	R	S	F	Total		N	R	S	F	Total	
	%	%	%	%	N	%	%	%	%	%	N	%	%	%	%	%	N	%
Hospital and clinic	10.7	17.9	39.3	32.1	28	100	18.8	56.3	12.5	12.5	16	100	26.7	40.0	33.3	0.0	15	100
Library and town hall	39.3	17.9	28.6	14.3	28	100	18.8	25	25.0	31.3	16	100	53.3	0.0	33.3	13.3	15	100
Swimming pool and sports ground	60.7	7.1	17.9	14.3	28	100	37.5	18.8	31.3	12.5	16	100	53.3	13.3	6.7	26.7	15	100
Park	17.9	14.3	10.7	57.1	28	100	25	6.3	18.8	50	16	100	6.7	13.3	46.7	33.3	15	100
Community centre	67.9	14.3	7.1	10.7	28	100	75	12.5	12.5	0.0	16	100	80.0	6.7	13.3	0.0	15	100

N=Never, R=Rarely, S=Sometimes, F=Frequently.

Table 2.13c Community facilities usage (age 60 or above)

Have used the following facilities in the district	Age 60 or above																		
	T1						T2						T3						
	N [#]	R	S	F	Total		N	R	S	F	Total		N	R	S	F	M	Total	
	%	%	%	%	N	%	%	%	%	%	N	%	%	%	%	%	n	N	%
Hospital and clinic	15.1	13.2	30.2	41.5	53	100	11.5	61.5	15.4	11.5	26	100	41.7	29.2	29.2	0.0	0	24	100*
Library and town hall	49.1	5.7	26.4	18.9	53	100	26.9	38.5	19.2	15.4	26	100	50	16.7	25	8.3	0	24	100*
Swimming pool and sports ground	67.9	5.7	20.8	5.7	53	100	23.1	11.5	53.8	11.5	26	100	39.1	34.8	13	13	1	24	100*
Park	7.5	5.7	20.8	66	53	100	3.8	7.7	42.3	46.2	26	100	13	21.7	39.1	26.1	1	24	100*
Community centre	60.4	3.8	15.1	20.8	53	100	57.7	34.6	7.7	0.0	26	100	75	20.8	4.2	0.0	0	24	100*

N=Never, R=Rarely, S=Sometimes, F=Frequently, M= Missing/ Non-response

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

27. In T1, over three quarters of the tenants indicated that they rarely or would not participate in activities in the communities that they were living in (tenant: T1: 77.3%, T2: 98.1%, T3: 87.7%) (Table 2.14a), and the rate of non-participation further increased after relocation. The change was also similar among owner-occupiers (owner-occupier: T1: 77.7%, T2: 87.6%, T3: 80.0%) and people under age 60 (T1: 73.4%, T2: 95.2%, T3: 85.0%) (Table 2.14c). The short-term effect was statistically significant among tenants ($p = 0.026$) (Table 2.14b) and people under age 60 ($p = 0.024$) (Table 2.14d) when looking into the change of individuals in T2.

Table 2.14a Participation in community activities

Participate activities in the community	T1				T2				T3			
	T		OO		T		OO		T		OO	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
(0) Will not participate	63	52.9	12	44.4	34	65.4	9	56.3	40	81.6	9	60.0
(1) Rarely	29	24.4	9	33.3	17	32.7	5	31.3	3	6.1	3	20.0
(2) Sometimes	26	21.8	6	22.2	1	1.9	2	12.5	6	12.2	3	20.0
(3) Frequently	1	0.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Missing/ Non-response	1	-	1	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-

Total	120	100*	28	100*	52	100*	16	100*	49	100*	15	100*
--------------	------------	-------------	-----------	-------------	-----------	-------------	-----------	-------------	-----------	-------------	-----------	-------------

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Table 2.14b Changes in participation in community activities T1 vs. T2 and T2 vs. T3 (change of individuals)

Changes in participation in community activities	T1 vs. T2						T2 vs. T3					
	T		OO		Total		T		OO		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Reduced	15	34.9	3	25.0	18	32.7	9	21.4	3	23.1	12	21.8
No change	20	46.5	6	50.0	26	47.3	25	59.5	7	53.8	32	58.2
Increased	8	18.6	3	25.0	11	20.0	8	19.0	3	23.1	11	20.0
Missing/ Non-response	9	-	4	-	13	-	7	-	2	-	9	-
Total	52	100*	16	100*	68	100*	49	100*	15	100*	64	100*
Average changes	-0.349		0.000		-0.273		0.024		0.000		0.18	
Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.026 [#]		1.000		0.047 [#]		0.802		1.000		0.823	

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

[#] A two-tailed p-value of less than 0.05 is recognized as statistically significant.

Table 2.14c Participation in community activities by age

Participate activities in the community	T1				T2				T3			
	Under 60		60 or above		Under 60		60 or above		Under 60		60 or above	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
(0) Will not participate	51	54.3	24	46.2	29	69.0	14	53.8	33	82.5	16	66.7
(1) Rarely	18	19.1	20	38.5	11	26.2	11	42.3	1	2.5	5	20.8
(2) Sometimes	24	25.5	8	15.4	2	4.8	1	3.8	6	15.0	3	12.5
(3) Frequently	1	1.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Missing/ Non-response	1	-	1	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Total	95	100*	53	100*	42	100*	26	100*	40	100*	24	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Table 2.14d Changes in participation in community activities by age T1 vs. T2 and T2 vs. T3 (change of individuals)

Changes in participation in community activities	T1 vs. T2						T2 vs. T3					
	Under 60		60 or above		Total		Under 60		60 or above		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Reduced	12	35.3	6	28.6	18	32.7	5	15.2	7	31.8	12	21.8
No change	18	52.9	8	38.1	26	47.3	24	72.7	8	36.4	32	58.2
Increased	4	11.8	7	33.3	11	20.0	4	12.1	7	31.8	11	20.0
Missing/ Non-response	8	-	5	-	13	-	7	-	2	-	9	-
Total	34	100*	21	100*	55	100*	33	100*	22	100*	55	100*
Average changes	-0.441		0.000		-0.273		0.000		0.045		0.18	
Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.024 [#]		1.000		0.047 [#]		0.951		0.816		0.823	

[#] A two-tailed p-value of less than 0.05 is recognized as statistically significant.

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Living expenditure

28. The average monthly rent was \$2,095 in T1, \$2,907 in T2, and \$2,926 in T3 (Table 2.15a). For tenants of different age groups, a higher percentage of them paid more than \$3,000 monthly rent than in T2 (T2: under age 60: T1: 17.7%, T2: 20.5%, T3: 21.3%; age 60 or above: T1: 13.2%, T2: 22.2%, T3: 26.7%) (Table 2.15c). Most of those under 60 moved to places where they paid additional rent by \$500 or more (T2: under age 60: 35.5%; age 60 or above: 7.1%) but more tenants of age 60 or above move to places where they paid a lower rent. Over 40% of them had a reduction in rental payment by \$500 or more a month (T2: under age 60: 12.9%; age 60 or above: 42.9%) (Table 2.15d) in T2. Not much change on rental payments was recorded in T3. It is worth noting that most of the tenants were in the same unit in T2 and T3 and some tenants shared the unit space and rented with others in T3.

Table 2.15a Average monthly rent

Amount (\$)	T1	T2	T3
Average monthly rent	2,095	2,907	2,926

Table 2.15b Changes in average monthly rent T2 vs. T3 and T2 vs. T3 (change of individual households)

Change in average monthly rent	Tenant			
	T1 vs. T2		T2 vs. T3	
	N	%	N	%
Reduced by 2,000 or more	2	4.4	1	2.1
Reduced by 1,999 – 1,000	1	2.2	1	2.1
Reduced by 999 – 500	7	15.6	0	0.0
Change less than 500	23	51.1	44	93.6
Increased by 500 – 999	6	13.3	0	0.0
Increased by 1,000 – 1,999	3	6.7	0	0.0
Increased by 2,000 or more	3	6.7	1	2.1
Missing/ Non-response	7	-	2	-
Total	52	100*	49	100*
Average changes	301.1		-80.3	

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Table 2.15c Average monthly rent by age group

Average monthly rent (\$)	T1				T2				T3			
	Under 60		60 or above		Under 60		60 or above		Under 60		60 or above	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
below 1,000	5	6.3	7	18.4	2	5.9	5	27.8	1	3.0	3	20.0
1,000- below 2,000	40	50.6	19	50.0	12	35.3	6	33.3	11	33.3	5	33.3
2,000- below 3,000	20	25.3	7	18.4	13	38.2	3	16.7	14	42.4	3	20.0
3,000- below 4,000	8	10.1	2	5.3	1	2.9	2	11.1	2	6.1	1	6.7
4,000 or above	6	7.6	3	7.9	6	17.6	2	11.1	5	15.2	3	20.0
Missing/ Non-response	16	-	15	-	8	-	8	-	7	-	9	-
Total	95	100*	53	100*	42	100*	26	100*	40	100*	24	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Table 2.15d Change in average monthly rent by age group T1 vs. T2 and T2 vs. T3 (change of individual households)

Change in average monthly rent (\$)	T1 vs. T2						T2 vs. T3					
	Under 60		60 or above		Total		Under 60		60 or above		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Reduced by 2,000 or more	0	0.0	2	14.3	2	4.4	1	3.1	0	0.0	1	2.1
Reduced by 1,999 – 1,000	1	3.2	0	0.0	1	2.2	0	0.0	1	6.7	1	2.1
Reduced by 999 – 500	3	9.7	4	28.6	7	15.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Change less than 500	16	51.6	7	50.0	23	51.1	31	96.9	13	86.7	44	93.6
Increased by 500 – 999	5	16.1	1	7.1	6	13.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Increased by 1,000 – 1,999	3	9.7	0	0.0	3	6.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Increase by 2,000 or more	3	9.7	0	0.0	3	6.7	0	0.0	1	6.7	1	2.1
Missing/ Non-response	11	-	12	-	23	-	8	-	9	-	17	-
Total	42	100*	26	100*	68	100*	40	100*	24	100*	64	100*
Average changes	694.2		-569.5		301.1		-326.7		431.7		-80.3	

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

29. A similar percentage of tenants spent \$6,000 or more a month (tenant: T1: 37.8%, T2: 32.7%, T3: 32.5%) in different rounds of study and the percentage of respondents among tenants who spent less than \$3,000 a month maintained at around one-tenth level as shown in T3 (tenant: T1: 12.6%, T2: 23.1%, T3: 15.2%). The percentage of owner-occupiers who spent \$9,000 or more on average a month increased from around one third in T1 to over half in T3 (owner-occupier: T1: 32.2%, T2: 26.6%, T3: 50.0%) (Table 2.16a). However, among the tenant and owner-occupier groups, the average monthly expenditure dropped in T2 (individual household reduced \$1,000 or more: tenant: 51.0%; owner-occupier: 46.6%) before increasing again in T3 (individual household increased \$1,000 or more: tenant: 34.8%; owner-occupier: 57.2%) (Table 2.16b).

Table 2.16a Average monthly expenditure

Average monthly expenditure (\$)	T1				T2				T3			
	T		OO		T		OO		T		OO	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
2,999 or below	15	12.6	2	7.1	12	23.1	2	13.3	7	15.2	1	7.1
3,000-5,999	59	49.6	9	32.1	23	44.2	5	33.3	24	52.2	4	28.6
6,000-8,999	23	19.3	8	28.6	8	15.4	4	26.7	11	23.9	2	14.3
9,000-11,999	19	16.0	4	14.3	4	7.7	2	13.3	2	4.3	5	35.7
12,000 or above	3	2.5	5	17.9	5	9.6	2	13.3	2	4.3	2	14.3
Missing/ Non-response	1	-	0	-	0	-	1	-	3	-	1	-
Total	120	100*	28	100*	52	100*	16	100*	49	100*	15	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Table 2.16b Change in average monthly expenditure T1 vs. T2 and T2 vs. T3 (change of individual households)

Change in average monthly expenditure (\$)	T1 vs. T2						T2 vs. T3					
	T		OO		Total		T		OO		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Reduced by 2,000 or more	13	25.5	5	33.3	18	27.3	8	17.4	2	14.3	10	16.7
Reduced by 1,999 – 1,000	13	25.5	2	13.3	15	22.7	5	10.9	0	0.0	5	8.3
Reduced by 999 – 500	3	5.9	0	0.0	3	4.5	5	10.9	1	7.1	6	10.0
Change less than 500	5	9.8	2	13.3	7	10.6	9	19.6	3	21.4	12	20.0
Increased by 500 – 999	4	7.8	0	0.0	4	6.1	3	6.5	0	0.0	3	5.0
Increased by 1,000 – 1,999	5	9.8	4	26.7	9	13.6	7	15.2	2	14.3	9	15.0
Increase by 2,000 or more	8	15.7	2	13.3	10	15.2	9	19.6	6	42.9	15	25.0
Missing/ Non-response	1	-	1	-	2	-	3	-	1	-	4	-
Total	52	100*	16	100*	68	100*	49	100*	15	100*	64	100*
Average changes	-231.4		-1,266.7		-466.7		-415.4		800.0		-129.4	
Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.105		0.527		0.099		0.486		0.314		0.250	

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

30. The average monthly expenditure of people under age 60 dropped very much after relocation (average changes: T2: -\$843.9, T3: -\$1064.5) (Table 2.16d). Among respondents under age 60, around one tenth of them (under age 60: T1: 3.2%, T2: 12.2%, T3: 13.2%) had a monthly expenditure less than \$3,000 after relocation and the percentage of over \$9,000 average monthly expenditure dropped also from around one third to one tenth (under age 60: T1: 30.5%, T2: 17.1%, T3: 13.2%) (Table 2.16c). However, over one quarter of people age 60 or above were spending over \$9,000 monthly expenditure in T3 which was around 7 times before relocation² (age 60 or above: T1: 3.8%, T2: 23.1%, T3: 27.3%) (Table 2.16c), such change in T3 was also statistically significant ($p = 0.034$) (Table 2.16d).

Table 2.16c Average monthly expenditure by age group

Average monthly expenditure (\$)	T1				T2				T3			
	Under 60		60 or above		Under 60		60 or above		Under 60		60 or above	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
2,999 or below	3	3.2	14	26.9	5	12.2	9	34.6	5	13.2	3	13.6
3,000-5,999	42	44.2	26	50.0	19	46.3	9	34.6	19	50.0	9	40.9
6,000-8,999	21	22.1	10	19.2	10	24.4	2	7.7	9	23.7	4	18.2
9,000-11,999	21	22.1	2	3.8	4	9.8	2	7.7	3	7.9	4	18.2
12,000 or above	8	8.4	0	0.0	3	7.3	4	15.4	2	5.3	2	9.1
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	1	-	1	-	0	-	2	-	2	-
Total	95	100*	53	100*	42	100*	26	100*	40	100*	24	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

² However the number of cases who spent more than 9,000 a month was only 6 in the T3 sample. It could probably be accounted for by spending on decoration work and additional expenses after moving to new homes.

Table 2.16d Change in average monthly expenditure by age group T1 vs. T2 and T2 vs. T3 (change of individual households)

Change in average monthly expenditure (\$)	T1 vs. T2						T2 vs. T3					
	Under 60		60 or above		Total		Under 60		60 or above		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Reduced by 2,000 or more	12	29.3	6	24.0	18	27.3	7	18.4	3	13.6	10	16.7
Reduced by 1,999 – 1,000	10	24.4	5	20.0	15	22.7	4	10.5	1	4.5	5	8.3
Reduced by 999 – 500	2	4.9	1	4.0	3	4.5	5	13.2	1	4.5	6	10.0
Change less than 500	5	12.2	2	8.0	7	10.6	7	18.4	5	22.7	12	20.0
Increased by 500 – 999	2	4.9	2	8.0	4	6.1	1	2.6	2	9.1	3	5.0
Increased by 1,000 – 1,999	5	12.2	4	16.0	9	13.6	6	15.8	3	13.6	9	15.0
Increased by 2,000 or more	5	12.2	5	20.0	10	15.2	8	21.1	7	31.8	15	25.0
Missing/ Non-response	1	-	1	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	4	-
Total	42	100*	26	100*	68	100*	40	100*	24	100*	64	100*
Average changes	-843.9		152.0		-466.7		-1064.5		1320.0		-129.4	
Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	0.054		0.891		0.099		0.864		0.034 [#]		0.250	

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

[#] A two-tailed p-value of less than 0.05 is recognized as statistically significant.

31. Around two thirds of tenants indicated that salary, either earned by themselves or their family members, was the major source of household income throughout the study (tenant: T1: 68.1%, T2: 64.0%, T3: 63.6%). Besides, there was a lower percentage of tenants who were CSSA recipients in T3 (CSSA recipients: tenant: T1: 30.3%, T2: 34.0%, T3: 29.5%) (Table 2.16e).

Table 2.16e Source of household income

Source of household income	T1				T2				T3			
	T		OO		T		OO		T		OO	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Salary (Household)	81	68.1	26	96.3	32	64.0	13	81.3	28	63.6	7	77.8
Relatives/Friends	2	1.7	0	0.0	1	2.0	1	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
CSSA	36	30.3	0	0.0	17	34.0	0	0.0	13	29.5	0	0.0
Others	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	2	12.5	3	6.8	2	22.2
Missing/ Non-response	1	-	1	-	1	-	0	-	5	-	6	-
Total	120	100*	28	100*	52	100*	16	100*	49	100*	15	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Attitude toward redevelopment and relocation

32. The attitude of tenants towards the level of rehousing compensation (very satisfied to satisfied: tenant: T1: 48.4%, T2: 77.1%, T3: 73.2%), adequacy of consultation (very satisfied to satisfied: tenant: T1: 79.8%, T2: 84.1%, T3: 83.0%) and the work of the social service team (very satisfied to satisfied: tenant: T1: 53.4%, T2: 88.9%, T3: 85.7%) (Table 2.17a) arrangements were positive in general, and the level of satisfaction for compensation and SST arrangements further improved after relocation.

Table 2.17a Attitude toward the redevelopment arrangement in Hai Tan Street/Kweilin Street and Pei Ho Street (tenants)

Redevelopment arrangement	Tenant																				
	T1						T2						T3								
	VS [#]	S	DS	VDS	M	Total	VS	S	DS	VDS	M	Total	VS	S	DS	VDS	M	Total			
	%	%	%	%	n	N	%	%	%	%	n	N	%	%	%	%	n	N	%		
Rehousing Compensation	4.2	44.2	44.2	7.4	25	120	100*	4.2	72.9	18.8	4.2	4	52	100*	4.9	68.3	17.1	9.8	8	49	100*
Consultation	8.5	71.3	18.1	2.1	26	120	100*	0.0	84.1	13.6	2.3	8	52	100*	0.0	83.0	10.6	6.4	2	49	100*
Social service team	6.8	46.6	42.0	4.5	32	120	100*	0.0	88.9	11.1	0.0	43	52	100*	0.0	85.7	0.0	14.3	42	49	100*

[#] VS=Very satisfied; S=Satisfied; DS=Dissatisfied; VDS=Very dissatisfied; M= Missing/ Non-response.

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

33. Among owner-occupiers, there was an increase from two thirds to three quarters in the percentage of people feeling very satisfied to satisfied on acquisition (very satisfied to satisfied: owner-occupier: T1: 67.8%, T2: 62.6%, T3: 75.0%), and the satisfaction rating on consultation (very satisfied to satisfied: owner-occupier: T1: 85.7%, T2: 78.5%, T3: 81.8%) was even higher. Though the satisfaction rate on the work of the social service team (very satisfied to satisfied: owner-occupier: T1: 93.3%, T2: 87.5%, T3: 60.0%) (Table 2.17b) dropped in T2 and T3 studies, there were still 60% of them satisfied with the services.

Table 2.17b Attitude toward the redevelopment arrangement in Hai Tan Street/Kweilin Street and Pei Ho Street (owner-occupiers)

Redevelopment arrangement	Owner-occupier																				
	T1						T2						T3								
	VS [#]	S	DS	VDS	M	Total	VS	S	DS	VDS	M	Total	VS	S	DS	VDS	M	Total			
	%	%	%	%	n	N	%	%	%	%	n	N	%	%	%	%	n	N	%		
Payment on Property Acquisition	10.7	57.1	28.6	3.6	0	28	100*	18.8	43.8	25.0	12.5	0	16	100*	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	3	15	100*
Consultation	14.3	71.4	0.0	14.3	10	28	100*	7.1	71.4	21.4	0.0	2	16	100*	0.0	81.8	0.0	18.2	4	15	100*
Social service team	0.0	93.3	0.0	6.7	13	28	100*	0.0	87.5	12.5	0.0	8	16	100*	0.0	60.0	0.0	40.0	10	15	100*

[#] VS=Very satisfied; S=Satisfied; DS=Dissatisfied; VDS=Very dissatisfied; M= Missing/ Non-response.

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

34. The level of satisfaction for people aged 60 or above on acquisition (very satisfied to satisfied: T1: 84.6%, T2: 75.0%, T3: 46.2%), rehousing compensation (very satisfied to satisfied: T1: 53.4%, T2: 82.4%, T3: 88.9%), consultation (very satisfied to satisfied T1: 79.5%, T2: 86.3%, T3: 85.7%), and the work of the social service team (very satisfied to satisfied T1: 55.0%, T2: 87.5%, T3: 100%) was positive in general and then further increased in T2 (Table 2.17c). The reasons given by the respondents on the dissatisfaction towards different items in different studies are listed as below (Table 2.18a-c).

Table 2.17c Attitude toward the redevelopment arrangement in Hai Tan Street/Kweilin Street and Pei Ho Street (age 60 or above)

Redevelopment arrangement	Age 60 or above																				
	T1						T2						T3								
	VS [#]	S	DS	VDS	M	Total	VS	S	DS	VDS	M	Total	VS	S	DS	VDS	M	Total			
	%	%	%	%	n	N	%	%	%	%	n	N	%	%	%	%	n	N	%		
Rehousing Compensation	6.7	46.7	43.3	3.3	23	53	100*	5.9	76.5	11.8	5.9	9	26	100*	22.2	66.7	11.1	0.0	15	24	100*
Payment on Property Acquisition	23.1	61.5	7.7	7.7	40	53	100*	25.0	50.0	12.5	12.5	18	26	100*	0.0	46.2	30.8	23.1	11	24	100*
Consultation	13.6	65.9	15.9	4.5	9	53	100*	4.5	81.8	13.6	0.0	4	26	100*	0.0	85.7	4.8	9.5	3	24	100*
Social service team	12.5	42.5	40.0	5.0	13	53	100*	0.0	87.5	12.5	0.0	18	26	100*	0.0	100	0.0	0.0	21	24	100*

[#] VS=Very satisfied; S=Satisfied; DS=Dissatisfied; VDS=Very dissatisfied; M= Missing/ Non-response.

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Table 2.18a Reasons behind the dissatisfaction toward the redevelopment arrangement (T1 study)

Arrangement (T1 study)	Reason	T	OO
		Dissatisfied/Very dissatisfied (n)	
Payment on Property Acquisition	Too little	0	7
	Took too long/ too slow	0	2
Rehousing Compensation	Not enough	9	0
	No agreement	21	0
	Took too long/ too slow	3	0
	Unfair	2	0
	Not yet allocated public housing	1	0
	URA ignores information from tenants	1	0
Consultation	No actual help	9	1
	Not listening to opinion	0	1
	No consultation	3	0
	Unsure when to move/low transparency	1	0
	Too slow	1	0
Social service team	Have never seen any social workers	4	0
	Only received help once	1	0
	No actual help	16	0
Demolition arrangement	Too slow, no one cares	1	0

Table 2.18b Reasons behind the dissatisfaction toward the redevelopment arrangement (T2 study)

Arrangement (T2 study)	Reason	T	OO
		Dissatisfied/Very dissatisfied (n)	
Payment on Property Acquisition	Compensation too little	0	5
	No compensation	0	1
Rehousing Compensation	Compensation too little	6	0
	Good arrangement	1	0
	No compensation	1	0
Consultation	Compensation too little	1	0
	Not efficient	2	0
	Not enough explanation	0	2
	Good arrangement	1	0

Table 2.18c Reasons behind the dissatisfaction toward the redevelopment arrangement (T3 study)

Arrangement (T3 study)	Reason	T	OO
		Dissatisfied/Very dissatisfied (n)	
Payment on Property Acquisition	Compensation too little	0	2
Rehousing Compensation	Compensation too little	2	0
	Compensation unfair	2	0
Consultation	Views not considered	1	0
Social service team	-	1	0

Impact of redevelopment/relocation on daily activities

35. Many tenants found redevelopment/ relocation had mild or no impact at all on their daily life on aspects such as housing (tenant: T1: 46.5%, T2: 92.3%), work opportunity (tenant: T1: 70.8%, T2: 100%), education (tenant: T1: 78.5%, T2: 92.3%), medical (tenant: T1: 76.7%, T2: 98.1%), and social life (tenant: T1: 77.3%, T2: 98.1%) (Table 2.19a). The rate further increased in T2, especially in education ($p = 0.026$) and medical ($p = 0.001$) services, the changes were significant (Table 2.19d). As regards the nature of impact (if any) on relocation, over one quarter of them (27.1%) indicated improvement in housing conditions, but with similar percentage of them (27.3%) were negative on education aspects as shown in T3 of Table 2.19a.

Table 2.19a Impact of redevelopment/relocation (tenants)

Aspects of impact (%)	Tenant (%)										
	T1				T2				T3		
	No	Mild	Serious	Very serious	No	Mild	Serious	Very serious	VN#/N	No	P/VP
Housing	35.3	11.2	31.9	21.6	75.0	17.3	5.8	1.9	20.6	52.1	27.1
Work opportunity	55.7	15.1	20.8	8.5	90.4	9.6	0.0	0	11.1	88.9	0.0
Education	71.4	7.1	8.3	13.1	78.8	13.5	7.7	0	27.3	72.7	0.0
Medical	61.7	15	19.2	4.2	84.6	13.5	1.9	0	2.3	93.0	4.7
Social	52.9	24.4	17.6	5	90.4	7.7	1.9	0	6.4	87.2	6.4

VN= Very Negative; N=Negative; P= Positive; VP= Very Positive.

36. The situation was similar among owner-occupiers, and more of them felt either the impact of relocation was not significant or had no impact on housing (owner-occupier: T1: 75.0%, T2: 93.8%), work opportunity (owner-occupier: T1: 96.3%, T2: 100%), education (owner-occupier: T1: 90.5%, T2: 100%), medical (owner-occupier: T1: 88.9%, T2: 100%), and social life (owner-occupier: T1: 92.9%, T2: 93.8%) (Table 2.19b). Though not statistically significant, the “no impact” response increased in all aspects in T2 (Table 2.19d) and 26.7% of them indicated adverse impact of relocation on housing conditions in T3 (Table 2.19b).

Table 2.19b Impact of redevelopment/relocation (owner-occupiers)

Aspects of impact (%)	Owner-occupier (%)										
	T1				T2				T3		
	No	Mild	Serious	Very serious	No	Mild	Serious	Very serious	VN#/N	No	P/VP
Housing	57.1	17.9	10.7	14.3	75.0	18.8	0.0	6.3	26.7	66.7	6.7
Work opportunity	85.2	11.1	0.0	3.7	87.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	7.1	92.9	0.0
Education	90.5	0.0	4.8	4.8	100	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	92.3	0.0
Medical	74.1	14.8	11.1	0.0	93.8	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	0.0
Social	75.0	17.9	7.1	0.0	87.5	6.3	6.3	0.0	14.3	78.6	7.1

VN= Very Negative; N=Negative; P= Positive; VP= Very Positive.

37. Among people aged 60 or above, the situation was similar for both tenants and owner-occupiers that most of them felt the impact of relocation was not significant on housing (age 60 or above: T1: 52.8%, T2: 88.5%), work opportunity (age 60 or above: T1: 78.1%, T2: 100%), education (age 60 or above: T1: 88.2%, T2: 96.1%), medical (age 60 or above: T1: 75.5%, T2: 100%), and social life (age 60 or above: T1: 75.5%, T2: 96.2%) (Table 2.19c). The “no impact” response increased in all aspects and was found significant on housing ($p = 0.025$), medical ($p = 0.046$) and social ($p = 0.014$) between T1 and T2 studies (Table 2.19d).

Table 2.19c Impact of redevelopment/relocation (age 60 or above)

Aspects of impact (%)	Age 60 or above (%)										
	T1				T2				T3		
	No	Mild	Serious	Very serious	No	Mild	Serious	Very serious	VN#/N	No	P/VP
Housing	39.6	13.2	28.3	18.9	73.1	15.4	3.8	7.7	20.8	50.0	29.2
Work opportunity	73.2	4.9	17.1	4.9	96.2	3.8	0.0	0.0	8.7	91.3	0.0
Education	88.2	0.0	2.9	8.8	92.3	3.8	3.8	0.0	22.2	77.8	0.0
Medical	58.5	17.0	22.6	1.9	96.2	3.8	0	0.0	0.0	95.7	4.3
Social	49.1	26.4	22.6	1.9	96.2	0.0	3.8	0.0	12.5	79.2	8.3

VN= Very Negative; N=Negative; P= Positive; VP= Very Positive.

Table 2.19d Change in impact of redevelopment/relocation

Aspects of impact	T								OO							
	Reduced		No change		Increased		p -value#	M	Reduced		No change		Increased		p -value	M
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	T1 vs. T2	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	T1 vs. T2	<i>n</i>
Housing	31	63.3	14	28.6	4	8.2	0.000	3	7	43.8	6	37.5	3	18.8	0.100	3
Work opportunity	18	38.3	29	61.7	0	0.0	0.000	5	3	20.0	10	66.7	2	13.3	0.655	5
Education	10	27.8	24	66.7	2	5.6	0.026*	16	1	7.1	13	92.9	0	0.0	0.317	16
Medical	16	31.4	33	64.7	2	3.9	0.001*	1	3	18.8	13	81.3	0	0.0	0.083	1
Social	22	42.3	29	55.8	1	1.9	0.000	0	2	12.5	13	81.3	1	6.3	0.564	0
	Age 60 or above								All							
Housing	11	42.3	11	42.3	4	15.4	0.025*	0	38	58.5	20	30.8	7	10.8	0.000	0
Work opportunity	4	19.0	16	76.2	1	4.8	0.102	5	21	33.9	39	62.9	2	3.2	0.000	5
Education	3	17.6	12	70.6	2	11.8	0.276	9	11	22.0	37	74.0	2	4.0	0.015*	9
Medical	6	23.1	19	73.1	1	3.8	0.046*	0	19	28.4	46	68.7	2	3.0	0.000	0
Social	11	42.3	14	53.8	1	3.8	0.014*	0	24	35.3	42	61.8	2	2.9	0.000	0

(0) No; (1) Mild; (2) Serious; (3) Very serious. M= Missing/ Non-response

Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed).

* A two-tailed p-value of less than 0.05 is recognized as statistically significant.

38. A very high percentage of tenants found improvement on the new living environment in T2 and T3 studies from hygiene & sanitation (tenant: T2: 85.4%, T3: 80.9%) safety (Fire) (tenant: T2: 83.3%, T3: 76.6%), security (tenant: T2: 79.2%, T3: 80.4%), building structure (tenant: T2: 77.1%, T3: 75.6%), building services (tenant: T2: 75.0%, T3: 74.5%), and flat structure (tenant: T2: 72.9%, T3: 80.4%). However a lower percentage of tenants felt that there were improvements in the transportation (tenant: T2: 52.1%, T3: 40.4%) and the shopping facilities (tenant: T2: 39.6%, T3: 22.9%) after relocation, and the percentage lowered further in T3. The pattern of change was similar for the owner-occupiers (Table 2.20a).

Table 2.20a Satisfaction with the new accommodation

Satisfaction (%)	T2						T3					
	T			OO			T			OO		
	MB/B [#]	Same	W/MW	MB/B	Same	W/MW	MB/B	Same	W/MW	MB/B	Same	W/MW
Hygiene & sanitation	85.4	14.6	0.0	93.8	6.3	0.0	80.9	17.0	2.1	86.7	6.7	6.7
Safety (Fire)	83.3	16.7	0.0	93.8	6.3	0.0	76.6	23.4	0.0	73.3	13.3	13.3
Building services	75.0	20.8	4.2	87.5	12.5	0.0	74.5	25.5	0.0	73.3	20.0	6.7
Flat structure	72.9	20.8	6.3	62.5	37.5	0.0	80.4	17.4	2.2	66.7	33.3	0.0
Building structure	77.1	18.8	4.2	75.0	25.0	0.0	75.6	20.0	4.4	80.0	20.0	0.0
Transportation	52.1	25.0	22.9	87.5	6.3	6.3	40.4	34.0	25.5	26.7	60.0	13.1
Shopping	39.6	33.3	27.1	50.0	37.5	12.6	22.9	41.7	35.4	26.7	53.3	20.0
Security	79.2	16.7	4.2	93.8	6.3	0.0	80.4	19.6	0.0	73.3	20.0	6.7

[#] MB=Much better; B=Better; W=Worse; MW=Much worse.

39. A large majority of people of age 60 or above found improvement in the new living environment on aspects like hygiene & sanitation (age 60 or above: T2: 95.8%, T3: 79.2%), safety (Fire) (age 60 or above: T2: 91.7%, T3: 70.8%), building services (age 60 or above: T2: 83.3%, T3: 75.0%), security (age 60 or above: T2: 95.8%, T3: 82.6%), the building structure (age 60 or above: T2: 87.5%, T3: 69.6%), and flat structure (age 60 or above: T2: 87.5%, T3: 69.6%). However, same as the other groups, the rating of the transportation (age 60 or above: T2: 70.8%, T3: 39.1%) and shopping facilities (age 60 or above: T2: 50.0%, T3: 29.2%) were relatively low in both T2 and T3 studies in both age groups and with less than 50% satisfaction rate in T3 was recorded. The low rating on transportation and shopping facilities was similar in the younger group and with over a quarter of the younger group found the transportation (under age 60: T2: 27.5%, T3: 25.6%) and shopping facilities (under age 60: T2: 25.0%, T3: 35.9%) after relocation became worse in the tracking studies (Table 2.20b).

Table 2.20b Satisfaction with the new accommodation by age group

Satisfaction (%)	T2						T3					
	Under 60			60 or above			Under 60			60 or above		
	MB/B [#]	Same	W/MW	MB/B	Same	W/MW	MB/B	Same	W/MW	MB/B	Same	W/MW
Hygiene & sanitation	82.5	17.5	0.0	95.8	4.2	0.0	84.2	15.8	0.0	79.2	12.5	8.3
Safety (Fire)	82.5	17.5	0.0	91.7	8.3	0.0	78.9	18.4	2.6	70.8	25.0	4.2
Building services	75.0	22.5	2.5	83.3	12.5	4.2	73.7	26.3	0.0	75.0	20.8	4.2
Flat structure	60.0	32.5	7.5	87.5	12.5	0.0	81.6	18.4	0.0	69.6	26.1	4.3
Building structure	70.0	25.0	5.0	87.5	12.5	0.0	18.1	16.2	2.7	69.6	26.1	4.3
Transportation	55.0	17.5	27.5	70.8	25.0	4.2	35.9	38.5	25.6	39.1	43.5	17.4
Shopping	37.5	37.5	25.0	50.0	29.2	20.9	20.5	43.6	35.9	29.2	45.8	25.0
Security	75.0	20.0	5.0	95.8	4.2	0.0	76.3	21.1	2.6	82.6	17.4	0.0

[#] MB=Much better; B=Better; W=Worse; MW=Much worse.

40. Over half of the respondents decorated their new homes after relocation. For those who had done so, most of them had decorated the whole flat. Among them, the tenants would spent less than the owner-occupiers to decorate their new units (tenant: T2: \$32,575, T3: \$40,214; owner-occupier: T2: \$114,091, T3: \$138,000) (Table 2.21a).

Table 2.21a Decoration of the new accommodation

Cost of Decoration	T2				T3			
	T		OO		T		OO	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
No, no such plan	21	43.8	3	18.8	13	26.5	5	33.3
Yes, only the dilapidated parts	3	6.3	0	0.0	1	2.0	1	6.7
Average expenditure (\$)	3,000		--		5,000		--	
Yes, the whole flat	23	47.9	11	68.8	30	61.2	7	46.7
Average expenditure (\$)	32,575		114,091		40,214		138,000	
Not applicable	1	2.1	2	12.5	5	10.2	2	13.3
Missing/ Non-response	4	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Total	52	100*	16	100*	49	100*	15	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

41. More people age 60 or above had no plan to renovate their new units when compared with the younger group (under age 60: T2: 35.0%, T3: 22.5%; age 60 or above: T2: 41.7%, T3: 37.5%). For those who had renovated their units, on average the amount different age groups spent on decoration was similar (under age 60: T2: \$63,478, T3: \$58,060; age 60 or above: T2: \$55,813, T3: \$64,050) (Table 2.21b).

Table 2.21b Decoration of the new accommodation (age 60 or above)

Decoration	T2				T3			
	Under 60		60 or above		Under 60		60 or above	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
No, no such plan	14	35.0	10	41.7	9	22.5	9	37.5
Yes, only the dilapidated parts	1	2.5	2	8.3	1	2.5	1	4.2
Average expenditure (\$)	1,000		4,000		5,000		--	
Yes, the whole flat	24	60.0	10	41.7	26	65.0	11	45.8
Average expenditure (\$)	63,478		55,813		58,060		64,050	

Not applicable	1	2.5	2	8.3	4	10.0	3	12.5
Missing/ Non-response	2	-	2	-	0	-	0	-
Total	42	100*	26	100*	40	100*	24	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Household information

42. Many tenants indicated that their health conditions were good to extremely good in T2, but then dropped very much in T3 (tenant: T2: 82.7%, T3: 44.9%). And also about three quarters of the owner-occupiers expressed that their health conditions were good in T2 then decreased in T3 (owner-occupier: T2: 75.0%, T3: 66.6%) (Table 2.22a). The findings were consistent when we examined this between people under aged 60 (under age 60: T2: 83.3%, T3: 42.5%) and age 60 or above (age 60 or above: T2: 76.9%, T3: 62.5%) (Table 2.22c). When comparing the findings of individual respondents, more of the tenants (tenant: T3: 45.2%; owner-occupier: T3: 38.5%) (2.22b) and the younger group (under age 60: T3: 45.5%; age 60 or above: T3: 40.9%) found that their health condition lowered in T3 (Table 2.22d).

Table 2.22a Overall health conditions

Overall health conditions	T				OO			
	T2		T3		T2		T3	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
(5) Extremely good	7	13.5	2	4.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
(4) Very good	30	57.7	11	22.4	8	50.0	5	33.3
(3) Good	6	11.5	9	18.4	4	25.0	5	33.3
(2) Average	8	15.4	26	53.1	3	18.8	3	20.0
(1) Poor	1	1.9	1	2.0	1	6.3	2	13.3
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Total	52	100*	49	100*	16	100*	15	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Table 2.22b Changes in health conditions T2 vs. T3 (change of individuals)

Changes in overall health conditions	T2 vs. T3					
	T		OO		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Lowered	19	45.2	5	38.5	24	43.6
No change	15	35.7	4	30.8	19	34.5
Improved	8	19.0	4	30.8	12	21.8
Missing/ Non-response	7	-	2	-	9	-
Total	49	100*	15	100*	64	100*
Average changes	-0.452		-0.231		-0.400	

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Table 2.22c Overall health conditions by age

Overall health conditions	Under 60				60 or above			
	T2		T3		T2		T3	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
(5) Extremely good	5	11.9	2	5.0	2	7.7	0	0.0
(4) Very good	24	57.1	8	20.0	14	53.8	8	33.3
(3) Good	6	14.3	7	17.5	4	15.4	7	29.2
(2) Average	7	16.7	21	52.5	4	15.4	8	33.3
(1) Poor	0	0.0	2	5.0	2	7.7	1	4.2
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Total	42	100*	40	100*	26	100*	24	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Table 2.22d Changes in health conditions by age T2 vs. T3 (change of individuals)

Changes in overall health conditions	T2 vs. T3					
	Under 60		60 or above		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Lowered	15	45.5	9	40.9	24	43.6
No change	12	36.4	7	31.8	19	34.5
Improved	6	18.2	6	27.3	12	21.8
Missing/ Non-response	7	-	2	-	9	-
Total	40	100*	24	100*	64	100*
Mean changes	-0.424		-0.364		-0.400	

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

43. A large majority of the respondents were in good psychological health in the month leading to T2 and T3 interviews, and had indicated that they were feeling peaceful frequently, mostly to always (tenant: T2: 84.6%, T3: 83.7%; owner-occupier: T2: 75.1%, T3: 66.7%) (Table 2.23a), Most of them reported that they were feeling energetic frequently, mostly to always in T3 (tenant: T2: 84.6% T3: 81.6%; owner-occupier: T2: 62.6%, T3: 80.0%). Only a very small percentage reported that they frequently, mostly to always felt sad and depressed (tenant: T2: 11.5%, T3: 14.3%; owner-occupier: T2: 6.3%, T3: 6.7%) or had limited social life due to health and emotional problem (tenant: T2: 2.0%, T3: 0%; owner-occupier: T2: 6.3%, T3: 0%). Even among the respondents of age 60 or above, only a small number of them felt sad and depressed (T2: 19.2%) or had limited social life due to health and emotional problems (T2: 7.6%) frequently, mostly to always in T2, but then no respondent reported so in T3 (Table 2.23b). When comparing the findings of individual respondents, the increase in the percentage reported feeling peaceful (50.0%) and energetic (52.4%) and the reduction in the percentage reported feeling sad and depressed (40.5%) and limited social life due to health & emotional problem (35.1%) between T2 and T3 studies were particularly obvious among the tenants. For the changes among the older people, close to half of them increased in feeling peaceful (45.5%), and reduced in feeling sad and depressed (36.4%), however, around 40% of them reduced in feeling energetic (40.9%) (Table 2.23c).

Table 2.23a Health conditions in the past 4 weeks

Health conditions in the past 4 weeks	T2												T3											
	T						OO						T						OO					
	A [#]	M	F	S	R	N	A	M	F	S	R	N	A	M	F	S	R	N	A	M	F	S	R	N
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Feeling peaceful	19.2	50.0	15.4	11.5	3.8	0.0	31.3	37.5	6.3	18.8	0.0	6.3	34.7	42.9	6.1	8.2	8.2	0.0	20.0	26.7	20.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
Feeling energetic	23.1	44.2	17.3	9.6	5.8	0.0	25.0	31.3	6.3	31.3	0.0	6.3	46.9	26.5	8.2	2.0	8.2	8.2	53.3	6.7	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
Feeling sad, depressed	1.9	7.7	1.9	17.3	30.8	40.4	0.0	6.3	0.0	12.5	37.5	43.8	0.0	8.2	6.1	8.2	20.4	57.1	0.0	0.0	6.7	20.0	26.7	46.7
Limited social life due to health & emotional problem	2.0	0.0	--	14.0	22.0	62.0	0.0	6.3	--	18.8	12.5	62.5	0.0	0.0	--	4.4	4.4	91.1	0.0	0.0	--	13.3	13.3	73.3

[#] A=Always; M=Most of the time; F=Frequently; S=Sometimes; R=Rarely, N=Never.

"--" not an option in the survey questionnaire

Table 2.23b Health conditions in the past 4 weeks by age

Health conditions in the past 4 weeks	T2												T3											
	Under 60						60 or above						Under 60						60 or above					
	A [#]	M	F	S	R	N	A	M	F	S	R	N	A	M	F	S	R	N	A	M	F	S	R	N
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Feeling peaceful	14.3	50.0	21.4	11.9	2.4	0.0	34.6	42.3	0.0	15.4	3.8	3.8	35.0	45.0	7.5	5.0	7.5	0.0	25.0	29.2	12.5	29.2	4.2	0.0
Feeling energetic	14.3	50.0	16.7	19.0	0.0	0.0	38.5	26.9	11.5	7.7	11.5	3.8	57.5	20.0	7.5	2.5	5.0	7.5	33.3	25.0	16.7	12.5	8.3	4.2
Feeling sad, depressed	0.0	2.4	2.4	19.0	38.1	38.1	3.8	15.4	0.0	11.5	23.1	46.2	0.0	10.0	5.0	7.5	22.5	55.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	16.7	20.8	54.2
Limited social life due to health & emotional problem	0.0	0.0	--	20.0	17.5	62.5	3.8	3.8	--	7.7	23.1	61.5	0.0	0.0	--	0.0	8.1	91.9	0.0	0.0	--	17.4	4.3	78.3

[#] A=Always; M=Most of the time; F=Frequently; S=Sometimes; R=Rarely, N=Never.

"--" not an option in the survey questionnaire

Table 2.23c Change in health conditions in the past 4 weeks T2 vs. T3 (change of individuals)

Aspects of impact	T								OO							
	Reduced		No change		Increased		M [#]	Reduced		No change		Increased		M [#]		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	n	%	n	%	n	%	n		
Feeling peaceful	11	26.2	10	23.8	21	50	7	5	38.5	4	30.8	4	30.8	2		
Feeling energetic	12	28.6	4	19	22	52.4	11	3	23.1	5	38.5	5	38.5	2		
Feeling sad, depressed	17	40.5	13	31	12	28.6	7	3	23.1	7	53.8	3	23.1	2		
Limited social life due to health & emotional problem	13	35.1	23	62.2	1	2.7	12	3	23.1	8	61.5	2	15.4	2		
	Age 60 or above								All							
Feeling peaceful	9	40.9	3	13.6	10	45.5	2	16	29.1	14	25.5	25	45.5	9		
Feeling energetic	9	40.9	6	27.3	7	31.8	2	15	37.3	13	23.6	27	49.1	9		
Feeling sad, depressed	8	36.4	7	31.8	7	31.8	2	20	36.4	20	36.4	15	27.3	9		
Limited social life due to health & emotional problem	6	28.6	13	61.9	2	9.5	3	16	32.0	31	62.0	3	6.0	14		

[#]M= Missing/ Non-response.

44. The size of the majority of the households remained the same (tenant: T2: 86.5%, T3: 93.9%; owner-occupier: T2: 81.3%, T3: 60.0%) after moving. For those households with a reduction in

household size after moving in T3, there is a relatively higher rate in the owner-occupier group (tenant: T2: 5.8%, T3: 4.1%; owner-occupier: T2: 6.3%, T3: 20.0%) (Table 2.24a) and the older group (under age 60: T2: 7.1%, T3: 5.0%; age 60 or above: T2: 3.8%, T3: 12.5%) (Table 2.24b).

Table 2.24a Changes in household size

Changes	T2				T3			
	T		OO		T		OO	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Increased	4	7.7	2	12.5	1	2.0	3	20.0
No change	45	86.5	13	81.3	46	93.9	9	60.0
Decreased	3	5.8	1	6.3	2	4.1	3	20.0
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Total	52	100*	16	100*	49	100*	15	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Table 2.24b Changes in household size (age 60 or above)

Changes	T2				T3			
	Under 60		60 or above		Under 60		60 or above	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Increased	4	9.5	2	7.7	2	5.0	2	8.3
No change	35	83.3	23	88.5	36	90.0	49	79.2
Decreased	3	7.1	1	3.8	2	5.0	3	12.5
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Total	42	100*	26	100*	40	100*	24	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

45. Regarding new/ departed household members that needed help, the number obtained was too small for analysis (Table 2.25).

Table 2.25 Whether new/ departed household members need special help

New/ departed household members who need special help	T2				T3			
	T		OO		T		OO	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
No	6	85.7	2	66.7	2	66.7	6	100
Yes	1	14.3	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0.0
Old people (Above 60)	1	100	0	0.0	1	100	0	0.0
Young children (under 12)	0	0.0	1	100	0	0.0	0	0.0
Person with physical disability	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Person with learning disability	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Person with visual impairment	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Persons who need special nursing care	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Persons with mental illness	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Persons with other disability	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No change in the number of people	45	-	13	-	46	-	9	-
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Total	52	100*	16	100*	49	100*	15	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s) and no change in the number of people.

46. The household size of the respondents in general was small throughout the study and with over two thirds of them not more than 3 members (tenant: T1: 77.5%, T2: 73.1%, T3: 73.5%; owner-occupier: T1: 67.8%, T2: 75.1%, T3: 73.4%) (Table 2.26a). When comparing the change of individual household size, most of the respondents had no change after relocation (All: T2: 75.6%, T3: 81.3%), and relatively the change in household size after relocation in owner-occupier group was higher than tenant group (no change: tenant: T2: 82.7%, T3: 83.7%; owner-occupier: T2: 56.3%, T3: 73.3%) (Table 2.26b).

Table 2.26a Household size

No. of members in the unit	T1				T2				T3			
	T		OO		T		OO		T		OO	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
1	46	38.3	3	10.7	21	40.4	0	0.0	17	34.7	0	0.0
2	27	22.5	7	25.0	8	15.4	5	31.3	9	18.4	4	26.7
3	20	16.7	9	32.1	9	17.3	7	43.8	10	20.4	7	46.7
4	23	19.2	4	14.3	10	19.2	2	12.5	8	16.3	1	6.7
5	3	2.5	2	7.1	3	5.8	2	12.5	4	8.2	2	13.3
6 or above	1	0.8	3	10.7	1	1.9	0	0.0	1	2.0	1	6.7
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Total	120	100*	28	100*	52	100*	16	100*	49	100*	15	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Table 2.26b Change in household size T1 vs. T2 and T2 vs. T3 (change of individual households)

Change in Household size	T1 vs. T2						T2 vs. T3					
	T		OO		Total		T		OO		Total	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Reduced	4	7.7	4	25.0	8	11.8	4	8.2	1	6.7	5	7.8
No change	43	82.7	9	56.3	52	76.5	41	83.7	11	73.3	52	81.3
Increased	5	9.6	3	18.8	8	11.8	4	8.2	3	20	7	10.9
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Total	52	100*	16	100*	68	100*	49	100*	15	100*	64	100*
Average changes	0.10		-0.06		0.06		0.000		-0.0333		-0.78	

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

47. The socio-demographic background of household members was similar in different studies, but smaller in number in the tracking studies (Table 2.27).

Table 2.27 Gender and marital status of household members (including respondents)

Household members	T1				T2				T3			
	T		OO		T		OO		T		OO	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Gender												
Male	149	54.6	48	49.5	57	47.1	23	43.4	58	47.2	21	43.8
Female	124	45.4	49	50.5	64	52.9	30	56.6	65	52.8	27	56.3
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Total	273	100*	97	100*	121	100*	53	100*	123	100*	48	100*

Marital Status												
Singled	114	41.9	34	35.1	52	43.7	19	35.8	52	43.3	19	39.6
Married	134	49.3	57	58.8	53	44.5	31	58.5	52	43.3	27	56.3
Separated	7	2.6	0	0.0	2	1.7	0	0.0	5	4.2	0	0.0
Widowed	5	1.8	6	6.2	9	7.6	2	3.8	7	5.8	2	4.2
Divorced	12	4.4	0	0.0	3	2.5	1	1.9	4	3.3	0	0.0
Missing/ Non-response	1	-	0	-	2	-	0	-	3	-	0	-
Total	273	100*	97	100*	121	100*	53	100*	123	100*	48	100*
Relation with respondents												
Respondent	120	44.0	28	28.9	52	43.3	16	30.2	49	39.8	15	31.3
Spouse	54	19.8	18	18.6	20	16.7	14	26.4	22	17.9	11	22.9
Parent(in-law) of respondent	7	2.6	4	4.1	7	5.8	2	3.8	8	6.5	1	2.1
Children(in law) of respondent	78	28.6	29	29.9	38	31.7	19	35.8	39	31.7	18	37.5
Grand children	3	1.1	7	7.2	1	0.8	1	1.9	2	1.6	1	2.1
Sibling	2	0.7	4	4.1	1	0.8	1	1.9	1	0.8	0	0.0
Others	9	3.3	7	7.2	1	0.8	0	0.0	2	1.6	2	4.2
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	-	1	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Total	273	100*	97	100*	121	100*	53	100*	123	100*	48	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

48. A much lower percentage of the household members of tenants worked and studied in Shamshuipo after moving (tenant: T1: 58.2%, T2: 45.1%, T3: 39.7%) which is opposite to the owner-occupier group (owner-occupier: T1: 38.6%, T2: 28.6%, T3: 52.9%). Reflected in transportation cost, a lower percentage of the household members of tenants did not have to bear transportation costs (tenant: T1: 47.3%, T2: 33.3%, T3: 21.0%), and for the household members of the owner-occupiers, over one third of them (owner-occupier: T1: 35.3%, T2: 41.9%, T3: 39.4%) (Table 2.28) still did not bear transportation costs to work or study after relocation.

Table 2.28 Working/ studying area and transportation fee (household members)

Area of work/ study	T1				T2				T3			
	T		OO		T		OO		T		OO	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Shamshuipo	92	58.2	22	38.6	32	45.1	10	28.6	29	39.7	18	52.9
Other parts of Kowloon	28	17.7	12	21.1	16	22.5	10	28.6	5	6.8	4	11.8
Hong Kong Island	11	7.0	6	10.5	5	7.0	7	20.0	18	24.7	4	11.8
New Territories	12	7.6	10	17.5	7	9.9	4	11.4	8	11.0	5	14.7
Mainland China	2	1.3	0	0.0	1	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Not fixed	13	8.2	7	12.3	10	14.1	4	11.4	13	17.8	3	8.8
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Total	158	100*	57	100*	71	100*	35	100*	73	100*	34	100*
Transportation cost (one way)	T1				T2				T3			
	T		OO		T		OO		T		OO	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
No need (walking, cycling)	71	47.3	18	35.3	19	33.3	13	41.9	13	21.0	13	39.4
Below \$5	27	18.0	10	19.6	14	24.6	2	6.5	18	29.0	8	24.2

\$5 - \$10	31	20.7	13	25.5	15	26.3	12	38.7	26	41.9	8	24.2
Above \$10	21	14.0	10	19.6	9	15.8	4	12.9	5	8.1	4	12.1
Missing/ Non-response	8	-	6	-	14	-	4	-	11	-	1	-
Total	158	100*	57	100*	71	100*	35	100*	73	100*	34	100*

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

Non-domestic Tenants and Owner-operators

49. There was no change in the business nature reported by the non-domestic tenants and owner-occupiers. The results obtained were displayed as below. No non-domestic owner-operator has completed all three interviews, and among the seven non-domestic tenants that still operating businesses after relocation, 3 of them were working in the manufacturing industry (Table 3.1). As only a few of them could be located, the sample size was too small to make further analysis.

Table 3.1 Industry

Industry	T1		T2		T3				
	T	OO	T	OO	T	OO			
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>			
Manufacturing	2	8.7	3	4	50.0	1	3	42.9	0
Construction	3	13.0	0	1	12.5	0	1	14.3	0
Wholesaling, retailing, trading, & catering	9	39.1	1	1	12.5	0	1	14.3	0
Transportation, warehouse & communication	2	8.7	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0
Financial, insurance, property & commercial	3	13.0	0	2	25.0	0	2	28.6	0
Community, social & personal care	4	17.4	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	1	-	0	2	-	0
Total	23	100*	4	9	100*	1	9	100*	0

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

50. More than three quarters of the non-domestic tenants (7) were operating businesses again not long after relocation (tenant: T2: 88.9%, T3: 77.8 %) (Table 3.2) and six of them were still operating their businesses in the Shamshuipo area in T3 (tenant: T2: 77.8, T3: 66.7%) (Table 2.1a).

Table 3.2 Operating businesses after relocation

Operating businesses after relocation	T2			T3		
	T	OO	N	T	OO	n
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>
Yes	8	88.9	1	7	77.8	0
No	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0
Not yet decided	1	11.1	0	2	22.2	0
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	0	-	0
Total	9	100	1	9	100	0

51. Among the 7 non-domestic tenants, 3 of them (tenant: T1: 8.7%, T2: 12.5%, T3: 42.9%) had 6 or more staff members, and the rest were either having one member or no staff at all (Table 3.3) as shown in T3.

Table 3.3 Staff size

Staff size	T1			T2			T3		
	T		OO	T		OO	T		OO
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>
0	7	30.4	0	3	37.5	0	2	28.6	0
1	3	13.0	0	2	25.0	0	2	28.6	0
2	2	8.7	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0
3	1	4.3	0	2	25.0	0	0	0.0	0
4	6	26.1	1	0	0.0	1	0	0.0	0
5	2	8.7	1	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0
6 or above	2	8.7	2	1	12.5	0	3	42.9	0
Missing/ Non-response	0	-	0	1	-	0	2	-	0
Total	23	100*	4	9	100*	1	9	100*	0

* Excluding missing and non-response case(s).

52. In general, the level of satisfaction toward the business environment of Hai Tan Street/Kweilin Street and Pei Ho Street area was high throughout the study, but some dissatisfaction was recorded in areas like the operational cost (5) and usable area (3) (Table 3.4).

Table 3.4 Attitude toward the business environment of Hai Tan Street/Kweilin Street and Pei Ho Street area (tenants)

Items	Tenants																	
	T1						T2						T3					
	VS [#]	S	DS	VDS	M	Total	VS	S	DS	VDS	M	Total	VS	S	DS	VDS	M	Total
	%	%	%	%	<i>n</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>
Business nature	0.0	91.3	4.3	4.3	0	23	0	9	0	0	0	9	0	3	0	0	6	9
Purchasing	0.0	93.8	0.0	6.3	7	23	0	7	1	0	1	9	0	4	0	0	5	9
(Un)Loading	5.6	77.8	5.6	11.1	5	23	0	7	1	0	1	9	0	4	1	0	4	9
Revenue	8.7	65.2	21.7	4.3	0	23	2	5	1	1	0	9	0	5	2	0	2	9
Source of customer	13.6	72.7	9.1	4.5	1	23	1	4	3	0	1	9	0	6	0	0	3	9
Operational cost	4.3	78.3	13.0	4.3	0	23	0	4	4	1	0	9	0	3	5	0	1	9
Usable area	4.3	91.3	0.0	4.3	0	23	0	5	4	0	0	9	0	5	3	0	1	9

[#] VS=Very satisfied; S=Satisfied; DS=Dissatisfied; VDS=Very dissatisfied. M= Missing/ Non-response.

Desktop Study on 28 Domestic Owner-occupiers

53. In order to have a better understanding of the choice of replacement flats by the owner-occupiers who are less willing to participate in the tracking study, a desk top study based on market information available to the public has been conducted by the URA. 28 sample transactions were identified to match records of owner-occupiers within the project. Data such as the location, age, size and value of 28 new properties were then compared with the owner-occupiers' previous properties in the redevelopment project area to examine the impact of redevelopment on these households and the adequacy of the compensation obtained from the URA.

54. In order to protect personal privacy, all personal data were removed when the information was passed to the research team, and it was not possible to make direct comparison with the fieldwork data of this study to explain the findings. Only 28 cases can be tracked because some owner-occupiers might have purchased replacement flats under the names of other relatives.

55. Among these 28 owner-occupiers, 19 of them purchased properties in the Shamshuipo District (67.9%) after the acquisition of their properties by the URA. 3 cases moved to neighbouring MongKok areas, 1 to Hung Hom and the remaining 5 to Tsuen Wan, Shatin and Yuen Long (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1 Relocation districts of the 28 owner-occupiers

District		No. of Residents	
		<i>N</i>	%
Shamshuipo District	Shamshuipo	14	50.0
	Lai Chi Kok	4	14.3
	Cheung Sha Wan	1	3.6
Other Kowloon Districts	Mongkok	3	10.7
	Hung Hum	1	3.6
New Territories	Tsuen Wan	1	3.6
	Shatin	2	7.1
	Yuen Long	2	7.1
Total		28	100

56. Most replacement properties were over 10 years old. Over half of them (53.6%) bought properties of 31-50 years old (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2 Building age of the replacement units of the 28 owner-occupiers

New Building Age	No. of Respondents	
	<i>N</i>	%
1 – 10 years	3	10.7
11 – 20 years	3	10.7
21 – 30 years	7	25.0
31 – 40 years	8	28.6
41 – 50 years	7	25.0

Total	28	100
--------------	-----------	------------

57. Most replacement properties were over 10 years old. Over half of them (53.6%) bought properties of 31-50 years old (Table 4.2).

58. About forty percent (39.2%) of the 28 owner-occupiers purchased units at least 10 sq.m smaller than their original flats with maximum size difference up to 50 sq. m. There were however 4 of them (14.3%) who bought properties at least 11 meter square larger than their original ones (Table 4.3).

Table 4.3 Unit size difference of the 28 owner-occupiers after relocation

Size Difference (meter square) (approx.)	No. of Residents	
	<i>N</i>	%
- 49 to - 40	2	7.1
- 39 to - 30	2	7.1
- 29 to - 20	3	10.7
- 19 to - 10	4	14.3
- 9 to 0	5	17.9
1 to 10	8	28.6
11 to 20	2	7.1
21 to 30	1	3.6
31 to 40	0	0.0
41 to 50	1	3.6
Total	28	100

59. Close to half of the 28 owner-occupiers (46.3%) retained over \$1 million compensation from the URA after the purchase of the replacement unit, and over a quarter (28.5%) of them retained \$2 to 3.5 million (Table 4.4) for other purposes.

Table 4.4 Balance retained by the 28 owner-occupiers after relocation

Difference in Value (\$)	No. of Residents	
	<i>N</i>	%
- 500,000 to 0	2	7.1
1 to 500,000	6	21.4
500,001 to 1,000,000	7	25.0
1,000,001 to 1,500,000	2	7.1
1,500,001 to 2,000,000	3	10.7
2,000,001 to 2,500,000	2	7.1
2,500,001 to 3,000,000	3	10.7
3,000,001 to 3,500,000	3	10.7
Total	28	100

60. With reference to the data, the compensations obtained by the 28 affected owner-occupiers, in most cases, were sufficient for them to purchase replacement properties in the same or neighbouring areas and with a considerable sum retained. Apparently, a substantial proportion of owner-occupiers opted for relatively old and small flats, and kept the balance for other purposes.

Concluding Summary

61. In T3, we have interviewed 73 respondents, with 64 residents (owner: 15; tenant: 49), and 9 business operators (owner: 0; tenant: 9). A higher proportion of owner-occupiers had been staying in the study area for a longer period of time than tenants.

62. A very high percentage of respondents were still living in Shamshuipo or nearby areas after moving out of the redevelopment area.

Domestic Tenants and Owner-occupiers

63. The percentage of respondents working or studying in Shamshuipo was lower among tenants in the tracking studies. But there was not much change when we tracked the location of work or study of individual respondents (tenants and owner-occupiers included) (Table 2.7b). Around forty-five percent (44.9%) of the domestic respondents in T1 were not working in gainful employment, and many of them had reached retirement age (Table 2.5). The impact of redevelopment on employment was mild to the respondents. The percentage of respondents being employed was slightly lower among both domestic tenant and owner-occupier groups in T2, but the percentage became slightly higher in T3. The percentage of CSSA recipients increased slightly among the respondents in T2 (from 30.3% in T1 to 34.0% in T2, but the proportion reduced to 29.5% in T3) (Table 2.16e).

64. Among the domestic tenants, 53.8% of the respondents moved to public housing provided by the Housing Authority upon relocation in T2 (Table 2.2a). Around half of the tenants (53.2%) moved to newer flats with building age less than 10 years after relocation. However, a large majority of the owner-occupiers (72.8%) moved to buildings of 30 years of age or more. The new homes for both tenants and owner-occupiers were better managed than their old ones. For instance, the majority of the new buildings had residents or owners' organizations, and had employed security guards (Table 2.2b).

65. The percentage of domestic tenants staying in units less than 26 sq. meters was much lower in the T2 than in T1 (T1: 80.6%, T2: 44.0%). While tenants on average moved to more spacious homes, there was not much difference in the average size of units of owner-occupiers before and after relocation (Table 2.3a, b).

66. The average rental payment of the domestic tenants was \$2,095 a month in T1. The overall average monthly rental payment was around \$3,000 among them in T2 and T3. In tracking the rental payment of the individual tenants in T2, half (51.1%) of them had a difference in rental payment of less than \$500 after relocation. The percentage of respondents who had to pay an additional \$500 or more in rent a month was 26.7%. But a similar proportion (22.2%) paid at least \$500 less than their original rent. As a whole, the overall average was increased by \$300 only (Table 2.15a-b).

67. Looking at the tracking study results, both the domestic tenants and owner-occupiers reported a reduction of monthly expenditure in T2 as compared with the baseline study (on average spending \$466.7 less than in T1). The expenditure further decreased in T3 (on average \$129.4 less than in T2). The resultant change was an average decrease of \$596.1 per month in T3 compared with in T1 (Table 2.16b).

68. Regarding the social support network, the frequency of respondent's contact with neighbours was reduced in the tracking studies (all: 51.7%) (Table 2.8b). The drop in contact frequency and change in relationships was particularly significant among tenants or people under 60. Besides, the trust among neighbours (reduced, all respondents: 63.5%) and their attitude towards whether their neighbours would give them support when they needed help (reduced, all respondents: 36.2%) or their concern on the overall benefits for the community (reduced, all respondents: 54.0%) were more negative in T2 (Table 2.10b). In addition, the drop in trust was significant among people age 60 or above. However, the relationship with new neighbours, and the level of trust in them gradually improved in T3.

69. The number of people in the study who indicated that they were in need of material, social or problem solving support was small. For those who had such needs, most of them tend to seek for the support from neighbours, relatives and friends in the same district (Table 2.12a-c).

70. The usage of swimming pools and sports grounds increased across all respondent groups in T2, while visits to parks remained stable. Surprisingly, the percentage of respondents paying regular visits to hospitals and clinics reduced sharply among the respondents in T2 and did not increase back to the baseline percentage in T3. The pattern was similar among the older respondents (Table 2.13a-c). The reason for this change is not clear to us. The participation rate in community activities was lower after relocation, but indeed it was quite low even before relocation (Table 2.14a-d).

71. The satisfaction of respondents on payment on property acquisition, rehousing compensation, adequacy of consultation, and the social service team was good in general in all three rounds of interviews. The satisfaction rate fluctuated in T2 and T3, but the rating in general remained high even on controversial items including acquisition, rehousing compensation, and adequacy of consultation (Table 2.17a-c).

72. A very high percentage of residents found the relocation caused by redevelopment had no impact on them or their households on aspects like work opportunity, education, medical support, and social life in T2. A higher percentage expected that there would be serious impact on them in new housing arrangements at the baseline study (serious to very serious, tenant: 53.5%; age 60 or above: 47.2%), but the percentage greatly reduced in T2 (Table 2.19a, c).

73. A higher percentage of the respondents expressed that there were improvements in the new

living environment, including building hygiene, safety (fire hazard), building facilities, flat and building structure and security. On the other hand, a much lower percentage of the respondents found that there was improvement in transportation and shopping facilities after relocation (Table 2.20a).

74. The respondents in general enjoyed very good health conditions. A large majority (82.7%) of the tenants reported that they were in good health. The percentage among the owner-occupiers, who were generally older, was lower (75.0%). However, the tracking study showed that the self-reported health condition level was lower in T3 compared with the levels in T2 among both tenant and owner-occupier groups. (Table 2.22a, b).

75. A large majority of the respondents were in good psychological health in T2 and T3 interviews. Most of them indicated that they were feeling peaceful frequently, mostly to always (tenant: T2: 84.6%, T3: 83.7%; owner-occupier: T2: 75.1%, T3: 66.7%) (Table 2.23a) and the percentage remained high in T3. When asked about their changes in health conditions in the previous four weeks in T3, around half of the elderly felt more peaceful (45.5%), and less sad and depressed (36.4%), however, around 40% of them felt less energetic (40.9%) (Table 2.23c).

Non-domestic Tenants and Owner-operators

76. Only a few non-domestic tenants and owner-operators responded and therefore it is difficult to make accurate projections. However, the majority of the operators who responded to our interview indicated that they continued their business in the same district after relocation. This is consistent with the preference shown in the baseline study (Table 3.2).

Desktop study on 28 Domestic Owner-occupiers

77. A desktop study based on market information available to the public has been conducted by URA. 28 sample transactions were identified to match records of owner-occupiers within the project. Most of them bought flats in Shamshuipo or adjacent areas (Table 4.1).

78. Almost eighty percent (78.6%) of these 28 owner-occupier households bought flats that were over 20 years old; more than half of them (53.6%) bought flats that were more than 30 years old (Table 4.2). Over forty percent (42.9%) bought flats that were larger than their original ones, and 57.1% bought flats that were smaller. The new homes of about half (46.5%) of the households, however, did not differ more than 10 sq. meters from their previous one (Table 4.3).

79. Close to half of the 28 owner-occupiers (46.3%) retained over \$1 million from their cash compensation from the URA after the purchase of the replacement unit, and over a quarter (28.5%) of them retained \$2 to 3.5 million (Table 4.4). Apparently, a substantial proportion of owner-occupiers opted for relatively older and smaller flats, and kept the balance for other purposes.

Since many of them had been living in the units for many years, and as younger family members moved out, these owner-occupiers might not need flats of the same size.

Feasibility and Recommendations of Tracking Studies

80. Apart from examining the impact caused by redevelopment on the households and business operators, this study also studied the feasibility and effectiveness of using a tracking survey to understand how the people are affected in order to provide relevant information and analysis to government departments and public bodies to facilitate them to design appropriate measures to cater for the needs of the people affected by the redevelopment process.

81. Reviewing the study process and response rate, the accessibility of study targets was an issue that needs to be addressed. Experience learned from this study is worth noting when designing similar studies in the future and specifically the following points:

- People in the redevelopment area moved out at different times and the time difference can be longer than a year. In this study, the most obvious problem was that quite a number of the households had already moved out when the baseline study was started. However, there were households who were not yet moved out at T2 and even T3 dates.
- Some owner-occupiers have more than one property, they might not come back often to their old flats, especially when there are increasingly more vacant units in the buildings. This group of owners can hardly be reached.
- Some people, especially the poorer tenants, do not keep their contact phone numbers because they use pre-paid SIM cards, and the chances of changing their call number are higher. When they move out of the units, they can hardly be reached.
- While giving out coupons to residents is an effective incentive for conducting a study of multiple visits, the general incentive for business operators to take part in the study has been low.

82. Considering the conditions above that may affect the implementation of a similar study, some measures are suggested as below.

- Make contact for the baseline study as early as possible.
- Collect the contact numbers of all household members, relatives and friends nominated by them to facilitate future follow-up.
- The contact information of target respondents (and their household members or nominated contacts) should be updated at regular intervals (say monthly) between different stages of study by contacting the target respondents. In the follow up contacts, a few questions on their problems in the redevelopment or relocation process, if any, can be asked.
- The survey design should be more flexible and allow longer study period for different stages of study to cater for the moving schedule of different respondents.

Appendix I: Questionnaires for the Last Tracking Study

Questionnaire for resident

市區重建局社會影響追蹤研究 -- 住戶意見調查

你好，我叫_____，我是市區重建局（“市建局”）委託香港大學社會工作及社會行政學系的訪問員，跟進一項“海壇街/桂林街及北河街項目對住戶和商戶影響研究”的調查，作第三次訪問，亦是是項研究的最後一次訪問。而且，你和你住在一起的家人應已搬離受重建影響的單位一段時間。你所提供的意見和資料，是絕對保密的。所收集的意見和資料，只會用作綜合分析，以便市建局作檢討之用。

追蹤調查階段： 1 / 2 / 3

住戶類別： 業主住戶 / 租客

被調查住戶資料	
戶主姓名：	_____ (中文)
	_____ (英文)
單位住戶人數：	_____
電話號碼：	_____
手提號碼：	_____
搬遷後地址：	_____

內部專用	
受訪住戶參考編號：	_____
物業內住戶總數：	_____
所有調查員姓名：	_____
所有調查員編號：	_____
簽署：	_____
訪問日期：	_____
訪問時間：	_____

I. 單位資料

- 你在現址/這單位的最早入住日期：_____年_____月
- 你現址/這單位是：
 - 私人房屋
 - (一般情況下只適用於非業主)公營房屋提供自：(a)香港房屋委員會 (b)香港房屋協會
 - 其他_____ (如入住安老院)
- 這單位的建築面積：_____平方呎。
- 這單位所屬地區是：
 - 中西區 (2) 灣仔 (3) 東區 (4) 香港南區 (5) 油尖旺 (6) 深水埗 (7) 九龍城 (8) 黃大仙 (9) 觀塘 (10) 離島 (11) 葵青 (12) 荃灣 (13) 沙田 (14) 大埔 (15) 北區 (16) 屯門 (17) 元朗 (18) 西貢 (19) 中國大陸 (20) 其他，請註明_____
- 這單位所屬樓宇的樓齡是：
 - 10年以下 (3) 20年 - 30年以下 (5) 40年 - 50年以下
 - 10年 - 20年以下 (4) 30年 - 40年以下 (6) 50年或以上
- 這物業的用途： (1) 住宅 (2) 商住兩用
- 住用類別：
 - 全層 (3) 套房 (即連獨立廁所和廚房) (5) 閣仔
 - 房間 (4) 床位/碌架床 (6) 其他 (請說明)
- 住用身份：
 - 業主 (4) 三房客 (7) 寮屋(編號/顏色)
 - 租客 (5) 被許可人 (8) 其他，請說明_____
 - 二房東 (6) 佔用人(狀況不明)
- (只適用於重建前是業主的人士) 取得補償金後，你是否會另購物業？
 - 是， (a) 全部補償金用作另購物業 (b) 只用部份補償金重置物業
 - 否 (請註明原因，例如：租住、與家人同住、回鄉)_____
 - 未決定

10. (只適用於現時是非業主的人士)你是否計劃於未來三個月內自購物業?
 (1) 是 (2) 否

II. 社會網絡與支援網絡

1. 你會否積極維繫在舊址(重建搬遷前)已建立的街坊關係(如仍常通電話、相約飲茶)?
 (5) 一定會 (4) 多數會 (3) 會(一半半) (2) 多數不會 (1) 一定不會
2. 你會否在新社區積極重新建立街坊關係(如主動認識新街坊)?
 (5) 一定會 (4) 多數會 (3) 會(一半半) (2) 多數不會 (1) 一定不會
3. 你怎樣形容你跟現居社區鄰居或親友的往來,如傾偈、聚會和討論事情?
 (4) 經常往來 (3) 間中往來 (2) 甚少往來 (1) 沒有往來
4. 你怎樣形容你跟現居社區鄰居或親友的關係?
 (5) 很好 (4) 好 (3) 普通 (2) 不好 (1) 很不好
5. 你對附近的街坊是否信任?
 (5) 很信任 (4) 信任 (3) 一般/普通 (2) 不信任 (1) 很不信任
6. 你覺得住在附近的街坊在你需要的時候是否會幫你手:
 (5) 一定會 (4) 多數會 (3) 會(一半半) (2) 多數不會 (1) 一定不會
7. 你認為你現居社區內,居民對社區整體利益是否關注:
 (5) 很同意 (4) 同意 (3) 一般/普通 (2) 不同意 (1) 很不同意

8. 就以下各項,你現在有沒有需要接受支援/協助:

	沒有	有	9. 如有,主要是甚麼人/組織提供協助 (1-5 中,只選一項)				
			沒有人/靠自己	區內	區外	區內	區外
				鄰居/親屬	社會/公共服務		
	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
a. 家務上的支援,如清潔、購物及維修等	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. 照顧小孩、老弱及病患家庭成員	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. 陪同往醫院或診所求診	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. 找人傾偈、開解心事	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. 參加社交聚會,如去茶樓、節日慶祝等	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. 商討和解決問題	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. 其他,請說明: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. 如有,使用狀況:

10. 你有沒有使用現居社區內的以下設施:	沒有	有	經常使用	間中使用	甚少使用
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(2)	(1)
a. 公立醫院/診所	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. 文娛設施如公共圖書館、社區會堂	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. 公共康樂體育設施如泳池、球場	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. 休憩公園	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. 社會福利署或志願機構轄下社會服務中心	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. 其他,請註明: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. 你在參與區內社區或居民組織活動的情況:
 (4) 經常參與 (3) 間中參與 (2) 甚少參與 (1) 從不參與

III. 生活支出

1. 你於現址／這單位平均每月的租金(搬遷後)(只適用於現時是非業主的人士)： (約 HKD) _____
2. 你於現址／這單位平均每月的管理費／或垃圾費(搬遷後)： (約 HKD) _____
3. 你現時平均每月基本的生活支出(搬遷後)： (約 HKD) _____
4. 你現時家庭的主要收入來源：(只選一項)
- (1) 自己／家人薪金 (2) 綜援 (3) 其他親友支援
 (4) 其他，請註明： (0) 拒絕作答

5. 你或與你同住的家庭成員資料：

代號 (如大仔， 二女等)	性別		婚姻狀況					行業 / 就讀學校				上班/上學交通(單程)	
	男	女	單身	已婚	分居	喪偶	離婚	職業類別/ 學校名稱*	全職/ 全日	兼職/ 半日	地區**	時間*	費用*
受訪者	1	2	1	2	3	4	5		1	2		1/2/3	1/2/3/4

- * 1. 製造業 2. 建造業 3. 批發、零售、進出口貿易、飲食及酒店業 4. 運輸、倉庫及通訊業
 5. 金融、保險、地產及商用服務業 6. 社區、社會及個人服務業 7. 其他行業
 8. 學生(學校名稱) 9. 主婦 10. 待業/失業 11. 退休 12. 其他(請註明) _____

- ** 1. 中西區 2. 灣仔 3. 東區 4. 香港南區 5. 油尖旺 6. 深水埗 7. 九龍城 8. 黃大仙
 9. 觀塘 10. 離島 11. 葵青 12. 荃灣 13. 沙田 14. 大埔 15. 北區 16. 屯門
 17. 元朗 18. 西貢 19. 無固定 20. 中國大陸 21. 境外，請註明 _____

- # 1. 20分鐘以下 2. 20分鐘 – 1小時 3. 1小時以上
 ## 1. 無(如步行, 踏單車等) 2. \$5以下 3. \$5 - \$10 4. \$10以上

IV. 重建的安排

1. 有關你重建及搬遷事宜，社工服務隊伍是否有幫助？
 (1) 頗有幫助 (2) 少許幫助 (3) 完全沒有幫助 (4) 沒有接觸

2. 你對重建過程中以下各項的看法：

	很滿意 (4)	滿意 (3)	不滿意 (2)	很不滿意 (1)	不適用 (0)	為甚麼？
a. 收購安排(只適用於業主住戶)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. 賠償安排(只適用於租客)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
c. 諮詢工作	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
d. 社工服務隊伍	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
e. 其他，請註明：_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

3. 重建搬遷對你或與你同住的家庭成員於以下各項需要有沒有正面或負面的影響： (如有影響，即答案是'2-4'，請註明成員編號)	嚴重 負面	輕微 負面	沒影響	輕微 正面	非常 正面	不適用
	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
a. 住屋 編號：	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. 就業機會 編號：	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. 教育 編號：	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. 醫療 編號：	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. 社交 編號：	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. 其他一，請註明：_____ 編號：	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

V. 搬遷後的轉變

1. 你覺得搬遷後以下各方面的居住環境有沒有轉變：	比以前 差好多	比以前 差了些	沒有 改變	比以前 好了些	比以前 好得多
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
a. 衛生狀況（如屋宇內外的衛生情況，排水系統）	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. 樓宇安全（走火通道，防火門，消防喉籠）	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. 配套設施（如電力裝置，電梯，燃氣供應系統）	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. 單位整體結構	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. 樓宇整體結構	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. 交通網絡	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. 購物方便	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. 治安狀況	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. 你現址是否有升降機設施？

(1) 是 (2) 否

3. 樓宇管理：

	有	沒有
	(1)	(2)
a. 這座樓宇是否有成立業主立案法團？	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. 這座樓宇是否有成立互助委員會？	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. 這座樓宇是否有聘請物業管理公司？	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. 這座樓宇是否有成立業主委員會？	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. 這座樓宇是否有保安員/看更	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. 你是否喜歡於現址居住？

(4) 很喜歡 (3) 喜歡 (2) 不喜歡 (1) 很不喜歡

5. 你是否有裝修現址？

(3) 有，裝修整個單位 (2) 有，只裝修破舊的地方

(1) 沒有裝修的打算 (跳至 VI) (0) 不適用 (跳至 VI)

6. (如有裝修現址)你裝修現址大約用了幾多錢： (約 HKD)

(如未完成，請填寫預算數字)

VI. 健康狀況－對新環境的適應

1. 總括來說，你認為你的健康狀況是：

- (5) 極好 (4) 很好 (3) 好 (2) 一般 (1) 差

2. 在過去四個星期裏有多少時間，你感到心平氣和？

- (6) 常常如此 (5) 大部份時間 (4) 相當多時間
(3) 有時 (2) 偶爾 (1) 從來沒有

3. 在過去四個星期裏有多少時間，你感到精力充足？

- (6) 常常如此 (5) 大部份時間 (4) 相當多時間
(3) 有時 (2) 偶爾 (1) 從來沒有

4. 在過去四個星期裏有多少時間，你感到心情不好，悶悶不樂？

- (6) 常常如此 (5) 大部份時間 (4) 相當多時間
(3) 有時 (2) 偶爾 (1) 從來沒有

5. 在過去的四個星期裏，有多少時間由於你的身體健康或情緒問題妨礙了你的社交活動(比如探親、訪友等)？

- (5) 常常有 (4) 大部份時間有 (3) 有時有 (2) 偶爾有 (1) 完全沒有

VII. 住戶資料

1. 受訪者年齡：

- (1) 19 或以下 (3) 30 - 39 (5) 50 - 59 (7) 70 - 79
(2) 20 - 29 (4) 40 - 49 (6) 60 - 69 (8) 80 或以上

2. 受訪者性別： (1) 男 (2) 女

3. 受訪者從事什麼職業：(只適用於在職人士)

- (1) 經理／行政 (4) 秘書／文員 (7) 司機／技工／機械操作員
(2) 專業人員 (5) 服務員／售貨員 (8) 非技術工人
(3) 輔助專業人員 (6) 工藝及有關人員 (9) 農業及漁業工人／其他未能分類的職業

4. 搬遷後住戶單位人數是否有以下轉變：

- (1) 多了 (2) 少了 (3) 沒有轉變 (全卷完)

5. 單位新增／離開的成員是否有有特別照顧需要人士：

- (1) 有 (2) 沒有 (全卷完)

6. 如有，屬於以下哪一類：

- (1) 長者(六十歲以上) (5) 視障
(2) 年幼子女(十二歲以下) (6) 特別護理需要
(3) 肢體殘障 (7) 精神／心理病患
(4) 智障 (8) 其他殘疾(請註明) _____

~ 全卷完·多謝合作 ~

Questionnaire for business operator

6. 你在目前於現址經營生意於以下各項滿意程度的看法： (完成 Q6 跳至第三部份，不用答 Q7, Q8)	很滿意	滿意	不滿意	很不滿意	不適用
	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)
a. 生意性質／類型	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. 買貨、買原料	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. 上落貨	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. 生意額	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. 客源	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. 經營成本	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. 可用面積	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. 其他，請註明：_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. 現時就業狀況為何？
 (1) 全職受僱 (2) 兼職受僱 (3) 已退休 (4) 待業

8. 不繼續經營生意的主要原因為何？
 (1) 個人原因，如健康理由 (2) 新社區經營成本較高
 (3) 因搬遷失去經營牌照 (4) 其他，請註明 _____

III. 重建的影響與安排

1. 有關你重建及搬遷事宜，社工服務隊伍是否有幫助？
 (1) 頗有幫助 (2) 少許幫助 (3) 完全沒有幫助 (4) 沒有接觸

2. 你對重建過程中以下各項的看法：	很滿意	滿意	不滿意	很不滿意	不適用	為甚麼？
	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)	
a. 收購安排 (只適用於前業主)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. 賠償安排 (只適用於前單位租戶)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
c. 諮詢工作	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
d. 社工服務隊伍	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
e. 其他，請註明：_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

3. 你的公司在現址／這單位的租金是： _____ (約 HKD)
 (只適用於目前單位租用者)

4. 你是否有裝修現址？
 (3) 有，裝修整個單位 (2) 有，只裝修破舊的地方
 (1) 沒有，但打算裝修 **(全卷完)** (0) 沒有，也不打算裝修 **(全卷完)**

5. (如有裝修現址)你裝修現址大約用了幾多錢： _____ (約 HKD)
 (如未完成，請填寫預算數字)

IV. 健康狀況—對新環境的適應

1. 總括來說，你認為你的健康狀況是：

(5) 極好 (4) 很好 (3) 好 (2) 一般 (1) 差

2. 在過去四個星期裏有多少時間，你感到心平氣和？

(6) 常常如此 (5) 大部份時間 (4) 相當多時間
(3) 有時 (2) 偶爾 (1) 從來沒有

3. 在過去四個星期裏有多少時間，你感到精力充足？

(6) 常常如此 (5) 大部份時間 (4) 相當多時間
(3) 有時 (2) 偶爾 (1) 從來沒有

4. 在過去四個星期裏有多少時間，你感到心情不好，悶悶不樂？

(6) 常常如此 (5) 大部份時間 (4) 相當多時間
(3) 有時 (2) 偶爾 (1) 從來沒有

5. 在過去的四個星期裏，有多少時間由於你的身體健康或情緒問題妨礙了你的社交活動(比如探親、訪友等)？

(5) 常常有 (4) 大部份時間有 (3) 有時有 (2) 偶爾有 (1) 完全沒有

~ 全卷完·多謝合作 ~

Appendix II: Hai Tan Street/Kweilin Street and Pei Ho Street Development Scheme

Project Site Information

Area : 7,440 square metres
 Existing GFA : 25,344 square metres
 Affected buildings : 37
 Affected population : 1,233
 Affected property interests : 385

Project Development Information

Total GFA : 66,960 square metres
 Residential flats : 784
 Commercial space : 9,930 square metres
 G/IC GFA : 2,200 square metres
 Open space : 1,500 square metres



Junction of Pei Ho Street and Hai Tan Street (2007)



Hai Tan Street project area (2009)



Appendix III: Three-stage Study Design

Interview	Baseline interview	House-warming interview	Follow-up interview
Abbreviation	T1	T2	T3
Schedule	Prior to relocation	Immediately after relocation	Minimum 3 month* after T2
Purpose	To collect baseline data and to establish communication between the research team and the respondents.	To collect 1 st tracking data related to the initial conditions immediately after relocation.	To collect 2 nd tracking data related to changes and adjustments after relocation.

* Some informants moved out at a very late stage, the T3 interview was subsequently changed from six months after relocation to at least three month after T2.