



*Quality, Dedication & Expertise*

*Prepared For*

***Social Welfare Department***

**Survey on Persons with  
Mental/Physical handicap  
Using/Waitlisted/Not Waitlisted  
for Residential Home Service**

**- Executive Summary -**

**SURVEY ON PERSONS WITH MENTAL/PHYSICAL HANDICAP USING/  
WAITLISTED/NOT WAITLISTED FOR RESIDENTIAL SERVICE**

**- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY -**

**OBJECTIVES**

1. The objective of the survey is to collect information from persons with mental/physical handicap receiving or waitlisted for residential services and applicants receiving day services but not waitlisted for residential services regarding:

- (a) the type and severity of disability, functioning level in daily activities, challenging behaviour, types of community support services received, preferred accommodation as well as socio-economic profile; and
- (b) the general profile and coping resources of the families of these persons and factors affecting the decision of making applications for residential services.

**SURVEY COVERAGE**

2. The survey covered the following three target groups of persons with mental/physical handicap who were –

Group 1: receiving residential services (referred to as residential service users)<sup>1</sup>;

Group 2: waitlisted for residential services (referred to as applicants on waiting lists)<sup>1</sup>; and

Group 3: receiving day services but not waitlisted for residential services (referred to as day service users)<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The types of residential homes the target persons resided in/waitlisted for included care and attention homes for severely disabled persons (C&A/SD); hostels for severely mentally handicapped persons (HSMH); hostels for severely physically handicapped persons (HSPH); hostels for severely physically handicapped persons with mental handicap (HSPH/MH); hotels for moderately mentally handicapped persons (HMMH); and supported hostels for mentally handicapped persons (SHOS).

<sup>2</sup> The types of day services the target persons received included day activity centres (DAC), sheltered workshops (SW) and home based training (HBT).

## **SAMPLE DESIGN**

3. It is expected that the characteristics of the target persons, such as the type and severity of disability, health care and nursing care required, etc would vary according to the type of residential homes they resided in/waitlisted for or the type of day services they received. To ensure the selection of a representative sample and to facilitate subgroup analyses, the target persons were stratified by type of residential homes or type of day services and a random sample was taken from each stratum for interview. Within each type of residential home/day service, all handicapped persons were arranged in order of sex and age. A random sample of persons was then taken by systematic sampling.

4. Data collected in the survey have been suitably weighted according to the number of target persons belonging to different strata to arrive at estimations which represent the overall profile of all persons with mental/physical handicap.

## **DATA COLLECTION METHOD**

5. Data were collected from the target persons through face-to-face interviews based on a structured questionnaire. For those persons who had poor mental or physical conditions, their primary carers were asked to provide proxy answers for them. Altogether 1 051 target persons had their information provided by primary carers.

6. As regards the general profile and coping resources of their families, data were collected through face-to-face interviews with the parents or guardians of the target persons using a structured questionnaire.

## **ENUMERATION RESULTS**

7. Fieldwork was carried out from 23 January to 15 May 2002. Among the 2 037 handicapped persons initially sampled, 222 were invalid such as status changed, passed away, etc. For the remaining 1 815 cases, 20 were non-contacts, 222 refusals, and 1 573 were successfully interviewed. The overall response rate was 87%.

## MAJOR FINDINGS

8. Based on the survey findings, it is estimated that, there were effectively 4 482 residential service users, 3 063 applicants on waiting lists and 1 769 day service users. A summary of the key survey findings concerning these persons is presented in the following paragraphs. For residential service users and applicants on waiting lists, subgroup analyses by types of residential homes are also reported.

<b>A. RESIDENTIAL SERVICE USERS, APPLICANTS ON WAITING LISTS AND DAY SERVICE USERS</b>
--

### Socio-economic Profile

#### Age

9. 5.0% of residential service users were of age 15 to 20, 29.0% of age 21 to 30, 34.0% of age 31 to 40, 22.9% of age 41 to 50 and 8.0% of age 51 or above. The median age was 35.

- (a) Residential service users living in C&A/SD and HMMH were slightly older in age (median age being 39 and 37 respectively).

10. Applicants on waiting lists were younger in age. 29.8% were of age 15 to 20, 27.4% of age 21 to 30, 20.8% of age 31 to 40, 15.9% of age 41 to 50 and 6.1% of age 51 or above. The median age was 28.

- (a) Persons waitlisted for C&A/SD, SHOS and HSPH were slightly older (median age being 40, 34, 33 respectively).

11. As for day service users, 9.7% were of age 15 to 20, 40.2% of age 21 to 30, 30.1% of age 31 to 40, 14.4% of age 41 to 50 and 5.6% of age 51 or above. The median age was 31.

Whether were recipients of CSSA / DA

12. 68.1% of residential service users were recipients of Comprehensive Social Security Allowance (CSSA) and 26.8% only receiving DA.

- (a) A larger proportion of CSSA recipients was found in persons living in HSPH/MH (92.7%), HSPH (79.6%) and HSMH (77.3%).

13. A much smaller proportion (24.7%) of applicants on waiting lists were recipients of CSSA while a larger proportion (69.2%) only receiving DA

- (a) A larger proportion of CSSA recipients was recorded for persons waitlisted for C&A/SD (40.0%).

14. Results obtained from day service users were similar to those recorded for applicants on waiting lists, with 19.1% being CSSA recipients and 67.9% only receiving DA.

**Type and Severity of Disability**

Mental handicap

15. 95.1% of residential service users were mentally handicapped, with 18.0% being mildly, 49.4% moderately, 23.1% severely and 0.1% profoundly handicapped. There was only 4.0% who had not been diagnosed as having mental handicap.

- (a) The proportion of persons who were severely or profoundly mentally handicapped was larger for persons living in C&A/SD (66.5%), HSPH/MH (54.5%) and HSMH (32.7%).

16. 88.6% of applicants on waiting lists were mentally handicapped, with 18.7% being mildly, 52.5% moderately, 14.6% severely and 1.9% profoundly handicapped. There was only 9.6% who had not been diagnosed as having mental handicap.

- (a) The proportion of persons who were severely or profoundly mentally handicapped was larger for persons waitlisted for C&A/SD (46.6%) and HSMH (25.2%).

17. 92.1% of day service users were mentally handicapped, with 50.7% being mildly, 35.5% moderately, 1.4% severely and 0.2% profoundly handicapped. There was only 6.2% who had not been diagnosed as having mental handicap.

### Physical handicap

18. 75.9% of residential service users did not have physical handicap. A small proportion (0.3%) had loss of limb. 24.0% had restriction in body movement, mainly restriction in limb movement (16.4%), Spasm (8.7%), Paraplegia (2.6%), Hemiplegia (2.2%) and Quadriplegia (0.8%).

- (a) The proportion who had restriction in body movement was larger for persons living in HSPH/MH (96.4%), HSPH (93.5%) and C&A/SD (71.1%).

19. 76.3% of applicants on waiting lists did not have physical handicap. 23.7% had restriction in body movement, mainly restriction in limb movement (20.0%), Spasm (4.8%), Paraplegia (3.8%), Hemiplegia (1.6%) and restriction in finger movement (1.0%).

- (a) The proportion who had restriction in body movement was larger for persons waitlisted for HSPH (84.1%) and C&A/SD (83.3%).

20. 86.5% of day service users did not have physical handicap. 13.5% had restriction in body movement, mainly restriction in limb movement (11.1%), Spasm (3.4%) and restriction in finger movement (1.3%).

### **Functioning Level**

#### Whether required wheelchairs to move or walk around

21. 13.8% of residential service users required wheelchairs to move or walk around, with 12.9% using manual wheelchair and 0.9% power wheelchair. Another 2.7% required other specialised aids/tools to move or walk around.

- (a) A larger proportion of wheelchair users was found in persons living in HSPH (61.3%), C&A/SD (57.6%) and HSPH/MH (38.2%).

22. 10.3% of applicants on waiting lists required wheelchairs to move or walk around, with 10.0% using manual wheelchair and 0.3% power wheelchair. Another 3.6% required other specialised aids/tools to move or walk around.

- (a) A larger proportion of wheelchair users was found in persons waitlisted for C&A/SD (68.3%) and HSPH (31.8%).

23. As for day service users, 3.3% required manual wheelchairs to move or walk around and another 1.8% required other specialised aids/tools to move or walk around.

#### Ability in performing Activities of Daily Living (ADL)

24. In the survey, the target persons were asked whether they were able to perform the various ADL independently. These ADL included ‘mobility’, ‘eating’, ‘dressing’, ‘bathing’ and ‘toileting’. The results are present below.

#### *Mobility (for wheelchair users)*

- (a) 25.1% of residential service users were partially<sup>3</sup> and 34.4% totally dependent on others for ‘movement on the bed’. The corresponding proportions were 17.5% and 60.6% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and 7.3% and 57.9% respectively for day service users.
- (b) 32.6% of residential service users were partially and 41.0% totally dependent on others for ‘transferring between bed and wheelchair’. The corresponding proportions were 19.7% and 67.8% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and none and 65.2% respectively for day service users.
- (c) 32.0% of residential service users were partially and 41.8% totally dependent on others for ‘transferring between wheelchair and chair’. The corresponding proportions were 18.8% and 68.7% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and none and 65.2% respectively for day service users.

---

<sup>3</sup> Excluding verbal instructions

- (d) 31.3% of residential service users were partially and 41.8% totally dependent on others for 'transferring between wheelchair and toilet'. The corresponding proportions were 18.8% and 68.7% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and 15.7% and 65.2% respectively for day service users.
- (e) 34.7% of residential service users were partially and 43.4% totally dependent on others for 'transferring between wheelchair and bathtub'. The corresponding proportions were 15.4% and 72.1% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and 15.7% and 65.2% respectively for day service users.
- (f) 17.8% of residential service users were partially and 46.2% totally dependent on others for 'using wheelchair on indoor flat surface'. The corresponding proportions were 12.7% and 68.7% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and none and 49.5% respectively for day service users.
- (g) 22.7% of residential service users were partially and 64.8% totally dependent on others for 'using wheelchair on indoor slope'. The corresponding proportions were 14.8% and 74.7% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and 3.3% and 80.9% respectively for day service users.
- (h) 14.0% of residential service users were partially and 65.5% totally dependent on others for 'using wheelchair outdoors'. The corresponding proportions were 13.6% and 76.8% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and none and 65.2% respectively for day service users.

*Mobility (for non-wheelchair users)*

- (i) 3.4% of residential service users were partially dependent on others for 'movement on the bed'. The corresponding proportions were 1.4% for applicants on waiting lists and none for day service users.
- (j) 4.2% of residential service users were partially dependent on others for 'getting in and out of bed'. The corresponding proportions were 2.2% for applicants on waiting lists and none for day service users.

- (k) 4.9% of residential service users were partially dependent on others for 'walking indoors'. The corresponding proportions were 2.6% for applicants on waiting lists and 0.7% for day service users.
- (l) 8.4% of residential service users were partially and 1.3% totally dependent on others for 'walking outdoors'. The corresponding proportions were 4.7% and 1.2% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and 1.3% and none respectively for day service users.
- (m) 11.5% of residential service users were partially and 1.1% totally dependent on others for 'walking up or down stairs'. The corresponding proportions were 7.8% and 2.3% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and 3.6% and none respectively for day service users.

*Eating*

- (n) 4.6% of residential service users were partially and 3.5% totally dependent on others for 'eating'. The corresponding proportions were 4.5% and 4.7% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and 0.7% and 1.3% respectively for day service users.

*Dressing*

- (o) 14.6% of residential service users were partially and 8.7% totally dependent on others for 'dressing upper body part'. The corresponding proportions were 11.6% and 12.0% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and 1.2% and 2.8% respectively for day service users.
- (p) 14.0% of residential service users were partially and 10.0% totally dependent on others for 'dressing lower body part'. The corresponding proportions were 10.5% and 13.1% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and 0.7% and 3.4% respectively for day service users.

*Bathing*

- (q) 22.8% of residential service users were partially and 22.5% totally dependent on others for 'bathing'. The corresponding proportions were 15.3% and 23.4% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and 4.3% and 4.0% respectively for day service users.

*Toileting*

- (r) 13.1% of residential service users were partially and 10.2% totally dependent on others for 'toileting'. The corresponding proportions were 9.3% and 12.6% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and 0.9% and 3.1% respectively for day service users.

25. Subgroup analyses by type of residential homes reveal the following results —

- (a) the proportion who were not able to perform the various ADL independently was generally larger for those living in C&A/SD and HSPH/MH; and
- (b) the proportion was also larger for persons waitlisted for C&A/SD, HSMH and HSPH.

Abilities in performing Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADL)

26. The target persons were also asked whether they were able to perform six IADL independently. These six IADL included 'making phone calls', 'preparing meals', 'doing housework', 'handling medicine', 'shopping' and 'taking transportation'. The results are given below.

- (a) 11.0% of residential service users were partially<sup>4</sup> and 60.4% totally dependent on others for 'making phone calls'. The corresponding proportions were 10.0% and 57.2% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and 7.5% and 26.3% respectively for day service users.
- (b) 11.4% of residential service users were partially and 73.5% totally dependent on others for 'preparing meals'. The corresponding proportions were 10.1% and 73.7% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and 15.8% and 47.1% respectively for day service users.
- (c) 17.6% of residential service users were partially and 30.9% totally dependent on others for 'doing housework'. The corresponding proportions were 15.2% and 42.6% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and 9.3% and 17.5% respectively for day service users.

---

<sup>4</sup> Excluding verbal instructions

- (d) 11.3% of residential service users were partially and 69.6% totally dependent on others for 'handling medicine'. The corresponding proportions were 17.2% and 49.8% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and 19.0% and 20.3% respectively for day service users.
- (e) 24.1% of residential service users were partially and 51.1% totally dependent on others for 'shopping'. The corresponding proportions were 9.1% and 61.3% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and 10.4% and 30.7% respectively for day service users.
- (f) 19.7% of residential service users were partially and 60.1% totally dependent on others for 'taking transportation'. The corresponding proportions were 16.2% and 60.9% respectively for applicants on waiting lists; and 13.9% and 23.3% respectively for day service users.

27. Analysed by type of residential homes, the proportion who were not able to perform the various IADL independently was generally larger for residential service users living in C&A/SD, HSMH and HSPH/MH; and persons waitlisted for C&A/SD and HSMH.

### **Challenging Behaviour**

28. In the survey, the primary carers of the target persons were asked whether the handicapped persons frequently had any of the following severe challenging behaviour: (a) 'self-abusive behaviour', (b) 'aggression towards others', (c) 'destructive behaviour', (d) 'inappropriate sexual behaviour', (e) 'obnoxious behaviour', and (f) 'repetitive behaviour'. The results are presented below.

29. 94.8% of residential service users did not frequently have any of the six severe challenging behaviour while 4.1% had one, 0.7% two and 0.4% three.

- (a) A larger proportion of persons living in HSMH (7.7%) frequently had any of these severe challenging behaviour.

30. 93.8% of applicants on waiting lists did not frequently have any of the six severe challenging behaviour while 5.1% had one and 1.1% had two.

- (a) A larger proportion of persons waitlisted for HSMH (8.7%) frequently had any of these severe challenging behaviour.

31. 98.2% of day service users did not frequently have any of the six severe challenging behaviour while 1.8% had one.

32. As regards the prevalence of individual challenging behaviour,

- (a) 0.8% of residential service users frequently had severe 'self-abusive behaviour'. The corresponding proportion was 2.5% for applicants on waiting lists and 0.8% for day service users.
- (b) 1.1% of residential service users frequently had severe 'aggression towards others'. The corresponding proportion was 1.8% for applicants on waiting lists and 0.5% for day service users.
- (c) 0.8% of residential service users frequently had severe 'destructive behaviour'. The corresponding proportion was none for both applicants on waiting lists and day service users.
- (d) 1.3% of residential service users frequently had severe 'inappropriate sexual behaviour'. The corresponding proportion was 0.3% for applicants on waiting lists and none for day service users.
- (e) 0.6% of residential service users frequently had severe 'obnoxious behaviour'. The corresponding proportion was none for both applicants on waiting lists and day service users.
- (f) 2.1% of residential service users frequently had severe 'repetitive behaviour'. The corresponding proportion was 2.8% for applicants on waiting lists and 0.5% for day service users.

## **Factors Affecting the Decision of Making Applications for Residential Service**

### Reasons for applying for residential services

33. In the survey, the parents or guardians of the target persons were asked about the factors affecting the decision of making applications for residential services. There were 674 parents/guardians of residential service users, 360 parents/guardians of applicants on waiting lists and 223 parents/guardians of day service users successfully interviewed. Their responses are highlighted below.

34. A number of possible reasons were read out to the parents/guardians of residential users and applicants on waiting lists and they were asked to indicate if these were their reasons for applying for residential services. The results are given below.

- (a) Most (70% or over) mentioned that ‘carer getting old and afraid that nobody would take care of the handicapped person in the future’ (87.1% and 90.1% respectively for parents/guardians of residential service users and applicants on waiting lists); ‘residential homes providing better care for the handicapped person’ (83.3% and 70.3% respectively); ‘carer becoming physically less fit or less healthy’ (78.5% and 71.6% respectively); and ‘carer experiencing much stress in caring for the handicapped person’ (72.2% and 68.3% respectively) were their reasons for applying for residential services.
- (b) Relatively fewer (a quarter to half) indicated that ‘looking after the handicapped person affecting carer’s work or making carer unable to find a job’ (44.8% and 38.5% respectively); ‘crowded living environment at home’ (36.4% and 22.8% respectively); ‘behavioural problems of the handicapped person affecting daily living of other family members’ (34.4% and 33.4% respectively); and ‘poor health condition of the handicapped person’ (29.7% and 21.8% respectively) were their reasons of applying for residential services.
- (c) About one-fifth or less indicated that their reasons of applying residential service were ‘lack of supplementary equipment at home’ (22.2% and 11.4% respectively); ‘living place inconvenient for the handicapped person to get in and out’ (18.6% and 11.2% respectively); and ‘neighbours or relatives not accepting the handicapped person’ (16.5% and 13.9% respectively).

35. A number of community services were also read out to the parents/guardians of residential service users and applicants on waiting lists. They were then asked, if these services were provided, whether they would prefer the handicapped person using these services instead of moving into residential homes. 5.2% of parents/guardians of residential service users and 18.4% of parents/guardians of applicants on waiting lists said that they would, mainly if there was provision of the following services:

- (a) 'escort service for the handicapped person to day centre' (2.9% and 8.0% respectively for parents/guardians of residential service users and applicants on waiting lists);
- (b) 'home-based training' (1.8% and 5.2% respectively);
- (c) 'escort service for the handicapped person to receive medical treatment/follow-up' (1.7% and 5.4% respectively);
- (d) 'respite service' (1.7% and 9.7% respectively);
- (e) 'extension of service hours of day centre' (1.3% and 6.2% respectively );
- (f) 'emergency placement service' (1.1% and 8.8% respectively);
- (g) 'arranging domestic helpers to assist with the housework' (1.1% and 5.3% respectively) and
- (h) 'arranging domestic helpers to help the handicapped persons bath' (1.1% and 3.1% respectively).

Reasons for not applying for residential services

36. As for parents/guardians of day service users, a number of possible reasons were read out and they were then asked to indicate if these were the reasons for not applying for residential services. The results are given below.

- (a) Over half indicated that ‘the carers capable of taking care of the handicapped person’ (70.1%); ‘family members requiring the companion of the handicapped person’ (67.3%); and ‘the handicapped person unwilling to live in residential homes’ (56.6%) were their reasons for not applying for residential services.
- (b) Relatively fewer indicated that ‘family members feeling guilty about sending the handicapped person to residential homes’ (32.0%); ‘location of residential homes inconvenient for family members to visit the handicapped person’ (18.3%); and ‘unconfident in residential rooms’ (12.9%) were their reasons for not applying for residential services.
- (c) Less than one-tenth said that their reasons for not applying for residential services were ‘unaware of the residential services’ (8.9%); and ‘the handicapped person having unhappy experience of living in residential homes’ (4.7%).

37. When further asked under which circumstances they would consider apply for residential homes for the handicapped persons in future, about 70% said that they would do so if they were ‘physically less fit’ (70.9%) and ‘getting older’ (70.4%). Relatively fewer mentioned ‘deterioration in the health condition of the handicapped persons’ (56.5%) and ‘serious behavioural problems of the handicapped persons’ (51.2%).

<b>B. RESIDENTIAL SERVICE USERS LIVING IN HSMH AND HMMH AGED 51 OR ABOVE</b>
--

38. Facing the aging problem, the health condition of residential service users living in HSMH and HMMH aged 51 or above was investigated with a view to assessing the care required by these handicapped persons in future.

### **Age**

39. 5.3% of the residential service users living in HSMH were of age 51 or above. The corresponding proportion was larger for those living in HMMH (7.2%).

### **Type and Severity of Disability**

#### Mental handicap

40. 9.5% of the residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above were mildly mentally handicapped, 61.9% moderately and 22.2% severely handicapped. The corresponding proportions were 37.4%, 56.9% and 1.9% respectively for those living in HMMH aged 51 or above.

#### Physical handicap

41. 17.5% of the residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above had restriction in body movement, mainly restriction in limb movement (15.9%). The corresponding proportions were 13.3% and 9.5% respectively for residential service users living in HMMH aged 51 or above.

#### Whether required wheelchair to move or walk around

42. 7.9% of the residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above required wheelchairs to move or walk around and another 3.2% required other specialised aids/tools to move or walk around. The corresponding proportions were 3.8% and 3.8% respectively for residential service users living in HMMH aged 51 or above.

## **Functioning Level**

### Ability in performing Activities of Daily Living (ADL)

43. Survey results regarding the ability of residential service users living in HSMH and HMMH aged 51 or above in performing the various ADL are present below.

#### *Mobility (for non-wheelchair users)*

- (a) 6.9% of residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above were partially dependent on others for 'movement on the bed'. The corresponding proportion was 2.0% for residential service users living in HMMH aged 51 or above.
- (b) 10.3% of residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above were partially dependent on others for 'getting in and out of bed'. The corresponding proportion was 2.0% for residential service users living in HMMH aged 51 or above.
- (c) 8.6% of residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above were partially dependent on others for 'walking indoors'. The corresponding proportion was 2.0% for residential service users living in HMMH aged 51 or above.
- (d) 10.3% of residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above were partially and 1.7% totally dependent on others for 'walking outdoors'. The corresponding proportions were 2.0% and none respectively for residential service users living in HMMH aged 51 or above.
- (e) 13.8% of residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above were partially and 1.7% totally dependent on others for 'walking up or down stairs'. The corresponding proportions were 5.9% and none respectively for residential service users living in HMMH aged 51 or above.

*Eating*

- (f) 1.6% of residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above were partially and 3.2% totally dependent on others for 'eating'. The corresponding proportions were 1.9% and none respectively for residential service users living in HMMH aged 51 or above.

*Dressing*

- (g) 15.9% of residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above were partially and 3.2% totally dependent on others for 'dressing upper body part'. The corresponding proportions were 1.9% and none respectively for residential service users living in HMMH aged 51 or above.
- (h) 12.7% of residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above were partially and 3.2% totally dependent on others for 'dressing lower body part'. The corresponding proportions were 1.9% and none respectively for residential service users living in HMMH aged 51 or above.

*Bathing*

- (i) 33.4% of residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above and were partially and 23.8% totally dependent on others for 'bathing'. The corresponding proportions were 7.6% and 1.9% respectively for residential service users living in HMMH aged 51 or above.

*Toileting*

- (j) 19.0% of residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above were partially and 3.2% totally dependent on others for 'toileting'. The corresponding proportions were 3.8% and 1.9% respectively for residential service users living in HMMH aged 51 or above.

Abilities in performing Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADL)

44. Surveys results regarding their ability in performing six IADL are presented below.

- (a) 19.0% of residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above were partially and 68.3% totally dependent on others for 'making phone calls'. The corresponding proportions were 11.4% and 49.3% respectively for residential service users living in HMMH aged 51 or above.
- (b) 22.3% of residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above were partially and 63.5% totally dependent on others for 'preparing meals'. The corresponding proportions were 11.4% and 60.7% respectively for residential service users living in HMMH aged 51 or above.
- (c) 25.4% of residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above were partially and 20.6% totally dependent on others for 'doing housework'. The corresponding proportions were 3.8% and 13.3% respectively for residential service users living in HMMH aged 51 or above.
- (d) 20.6% of residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above were partially and 63.5% totally dependent on others 'handling medicine'. The corresponding proportions were 13.3% and 47.4% respectively for residential service users living in HMMH aged or above.
- (e) 27.0% of residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above were partially and 52.4% totally dependent on others for 'shopping'. The corresponding proportions were 17.1% and 37.9% respectively for residential service users living in HMMH aged 51 or above.
- (f) 28.5% of residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above were partially and 55.6% totally dependent on others for 'taking transportation'. The corresponding proportions were 15.2% and 49.3% respectively for residential service users living in HMMH aged 51 or above.

## **Challenging Behaviour**

45. Regarding the six severe challenging behaviour, 95.2% of the residential service users living in HSMH aged 51 or above did not have any of them while 4.8% had one. The corresponding proportions were 98.1% and 1.9% for residential service users living in HMMH aged 51 or above.

**C. APPLICANTS ON WAITING LISTS WITH AN URGENT NEED OF RESIDENTIAL SERVICES**

46. In the survey, parents/guardians of applicants on waiting lists were asked about their desirable time for the persons with mental/physical handicap to have a place in residential homes. 34.8% expressed a desired to have immediate allocation. 11.9% desired to have a place within a year, 11.2% one to less than two years, 13.9% two to less than five years and 24.5% five years or more<sup>5</sup>. There were 1.7% that the handicapped had just been allocated a place in residential homes.

47. Accordingly, there were 213 applicants who desired to have a place in residential homes for the handicapped persons within two years (referred to as applicants having first priority) and 45 within two to five years (referred to as applicants having second priority). The information regarding the types of residential homes these applicants waitlisted for, their health condition and needs of community support services required by their family are highlighted below.

**Types of residential homes waitlisted for**

48. 8.6% of the applicants having first priority were on the waiting list of C&A/SD, 48.5% HSMH, 5.8% HSPH, 33.9% HMMH and 3.2% SHOS. The corresponding proportions were 2.1%, 60.2%, 5.6%, 30.3% and 1.8% respectively for applicants having second priority.

**Age**

49. 55.8% of the applicants having first priority were of age 30 or less and 44.1% of age more than 30. The median age was 28. The corresponding proportions were 71.3% and 28.7% respectively for applicants having second priority and the median age was 22.

---

<sup>5</sup> Including those who did not indicate the desirable time of being allocated a place in residential homes

## **Type and Severity of Disability**

### Mental handicap

50. 19.0% of the applicants having first priority were mildly mentally handicapped, 52.9% moderately, 12.8% severely and 1.9% profoundly handicapped. The corresponding proportions were 22.2%, 43.7% and 27.5% respectively for applicants having second priority.

### Physical handicap

51. 24.1% of the applicants having first priority had restriction in body movement, mainly restriction in limb movement (21.2%), Spasm (3.0%) and Paraplegia (2.8%). The corresponding proportions were 20.5%, 19.8%, 0.7% and 7.0% respectively for applicants having second priority.

### Whether required wheelchairs to move or walk around

52. 9.6% of applicants having first priority required wheelchairs to move or walk around and another 5.2% required other specialised aids/tools to move or walk around. The corresponding proportions were 4.9% and 0.7% respectively for applicants having second priority.

## **Functioning Level**

### Ability in performing Activities of Daily Living (ADL)

53. Survey results regarding the ability of applicants having first and second priority in performing the various ADL are present below.

#### *Mobility (for non-wheelchair users)*

- (a) 1.9% of applicants having first priority were partially and 0.2% totally dependent on others for 'movement on the bed'. The corresponding proportions were 3.3% and none respectively for applicants having second priority.

- (b) 2.9% of applicants having first priority were partially and 0.2% totally dependent on others for 'getting in and out of bed'. The corresponding proportions were 3.3% and none respectively for applicants having second priority.
- (c) 2.7% of applicants having first priority were partially and 0.2% totally dependent on others for 'walking indoors'. The corresponding proportions were 7.7% and none respectively for applicants having second priority.
- (d) 4.3% of applicants having first priority were partially and 0.4% totally dependent on others for 'walking outdoors'. The corresponding proportions were 13.3% and 0.7% respectively for applicants having second priority.
- (e) 7.8% of applicants having first priority were partially and 2.5% totally dependent on others 'walking up or down stairs'. The corresponding proportions were 12.6% and 0.7% respectively for applicants having second priority.

*Eating*

- (f) 5.8% of applicants having first priority were partially and 5.1% totally dependent on others for 'eating'. The corresponding proportions were 1.0% and 1.0% respectively for applicants having second priority.

*Dressing*

- (g) 9.9% of applicants having first priority were partially and 13.7% totally dependent on others for 'dressing upper body part'. The corresponding proportions were 13.3% and 5.3% respectively for applicants who desired to have a place within two to five years.
- (h) 8.5% of applicants having first priority were partially and 14.5% totally dependent on others for 'dressing lower body part'. The corresponding proportions were 10.2% and 5.3% respectively for applicants having second priority.

*Bathing*

- (i) 10.5% of applicants having first priority were partially and 26.5% totally dependent on others for 'bathing'. The corresponding proportions were 20.1% and 14.8% respectively for applicants having second priority.

*Toileting*

- (j) 8.0% of applicants having first priority were partially and 12.9% totally dependent on others for 'toileting'. The corresponding proportions were 3.2% and 8.4% respectively for applicants having second priority.

Abilities in performing Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADL)

54. Surveys results regarding their ability in performing six IADL are presented below.

- (a) 8.7% of applicants having first priority were partially and 55.6% totally dependent on others for 'making phone calls'. The corresponding proportions were 18.8% and 53.9% respectively for applicants having second priority.
- (b) 7.0% of applicants having first priority were partially and 76.0% totally dependent on others for 'preparing meals'. The corresponding proportions were 11.0% and 75.2% respectively for applicants having second priority.
- (c) 12.7% of applicants having first priority were partially and 44.7% totally dependent on others for 'doing housework'. The corresponding proportions were 27.4% and 31.8% respectively for applicants having second priority.
- (d) 15.7% of applicants having first priority were partially and 47.3% totally dependent on others for 'handling medicine'. The corresponding proportions were 27.5% and 42.1% respectively for applicants having second priority.

- (e) 9.0% of applicants having first priority were partially and 59.6% totally dependent on others for 'shopping'. The corresponding proportions were 11.5% and 62.8% respectively for applicants having second priority.
  
- (f) 18.9% of applicants having first priority were partially and 57.3% totally dependent on others for 'taking transportation'. The corresponding proportions were 11.5% and 65.1% respectively for applicants having second priority.

### **Challenging Behaviour**

55. Regarding the six severe challenging behaviour, 92.8% of the applicants having first priority did not have any of them while 5.7% had one and 1.5% two. On the other hand, none of the applicants having second priority had severe challenging behaviour.

### **Reasons for Applying for Residential Services**

#### Age of Primary carers

56. 35.3% of primary carers of the applicants having first priority were of age 49 or below, 21.7% of age 50 to 59, 18.1% of age 60 to 69 and 21.1% of age 70 or above. The median age was 53. The corresponding proportions were 37.8%, 34.2%, 10.7% and 17.1% respectively for applicants having second priority and the median age was 52.

Reasons for applying for residential services

57. Parents/guardians of applicants having first and second priority were asked about the possible reasons for applying for residential services. The results are given below.

- (a) Most of the parents/guardians (about 70% or over) indicated that ‘carer getting old and afraid that nobody would take care of the handicapped person in the future’ (89.9% and 93.7% respectively for parents/guardians of applicants having first and second priority); ‘residential homes providing better care for the handicapped person’ (79.7% and 71.4% respectively); ‘carer becoming physically less fit or less healthy’ (72.4% and 80.9% respectively); and ‘carer experiencing much stress in caring for the handicapped person’ (69.8% and 71.2% respectively) would be their possible reasons for applying for residential services.
  
- (b) Relatively fewer indicated that the following were their possible reasons for applying for residential services — ‘looking after the handicapped person affecting carer’s work or making carer unable to find a job’ (39.6% and 39.5% respectively); ‘behavioural problems of the handicapped person affecting daily living of other family members’ (39.2% and 36.4% respectively); ‘crowded living environment at home’ (28.3% and 17.4% respectively); and ‘poor health condition of the handicapped person’ (23.2% and 13.4% respectively).
  
- (c) Less than one-fifth indicated that their possible reasons were ‘neighbours or relatives not accepting the handicapped person’ (16.2% and 15.0% respectively); ‘lack of supplementary equipment at home’ (14.0% and 13.2% respectively); and ‘living place inconvenient for the handicapped person to get in and out’ (12.1% and 14.2% respectively).

58. When asked whether they would consider not applying for residential services if various community support services were provided, 12.0% and 31.4% respectively of the parents/guardians of applicants having first priority and second priority answered in the affirmative. The results on respective services are presented below.

- (a) 'respite service' (5.2% and 18.0% respectively parents/guardians of applicants having first and second priority)
- (b) 'emergency placement service' (5.2% and 18.0% respectively)
- (c) 'escort service for the handicapped person to day centre' (5.7% and 18.9% respectively)
- (d) 'escort service for the handicapped person to receive medical treatment/follow-up' (3.7% and 12.5% respectively)
- (e) 'home-based training' (3.7% and 10.1% respectively)
- (f) 'arranging domestic helpers to assist with the housework' (2.8% and 16.4% respectively)
- (g) 'extension of service hours of day centre' (2.0% and 15.0% respectively)
- (h) 'meal delivery service' (2.1% and 5.5% respectively)
- (i) 'arranging domestic helpers to help the handicapped persons bath' (1.0% and 9.4% respectively)

