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This is the fourth Annual Report on Civil Society in Hong Kong published by the Centre for Civil Society and Governance and the Department of Politics and Public Administration, The University of Hong Kong. In 2009, we launched a multi-year research project to map the state of development of civil society in Hong Kong. The social services, environmental, and international civil society sectors have already been studied through baseline research.

The current report focuses on the arts and cultural sector. We adopted the International Classification of Nonprofit Organizations (ICNPO) originally developed for the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project (CNSP) to define arts and cultural non-profit organizations (ACNPOs) with adjustments for the local circumstances in Hong Kong. For the purpose of our study, we further classified the sector into six sub-sectors, namely, non-performing arts, dance, music, theatre, Xiqu (Chinese opera), and variety & pop shows and others. We constructed a database of 1,816 legally established local ACNPOs based on what we were able to identify. In the current report, we adopted with modification the framework of the Indiana Nonprofit Sector Project to study eight dimensions of capacity: operations and governance, human resources, financial resources, physical resources, programmes and planning, marketing, information technology, as well as networking and advocacy. Through stratified random sampling, we selected 632 ACNPOs and invited them to participate in a survey. 179 replies were received, resulting in a response rate of 37.4 per cent. We also conducted nine in-depth interviews with key personnel in the sector and archival research to fill in any missing information.

In the contemporary world, the government, the market and civil society all play some important role in shaping the development of arts and culture. In Hong Kong, since the 1970s, the government has provided funding and venues for arts and cultural programmes. However, a coherent policy and governance structure has been lacking. Instead, resources are highly concentrated in a small number of arts groups and the management of arts and cultural affairs are scattered among multiple government agencies.

We found that 65.3 per cent of the ACNPOs were established after 1997, with the Xiqu groups and cross-cultural and artistic groups being the largest sources of growth. 82.3 per cent of the organizations were registered under the Societies Ordinance; 50.4 per cent were governed by a formal board of directors. On average, each organization had 10 full-time staff, 136 members, and 21 part-time volunteers; while each of them organized 11 programmes or events in the last 12 months. 55 per cent of ACNPOs had a physical office space. These average figures, however, obscured the huge internal diversity of the sector.

The major sources of income of the sector were income generating projects and membership fees as well as government funding. Donations only constituted 20.1 per cent of the total income of the sector. We estimated the total yearly income of the ACNPO sector to be HKD1.6 billion in 2016, of which 76.8 per cent was obtained by 5 per cent of the organizations while 58.8 per cent of ACNPOs earned HKD100,000 or less, reflecting a huge income gap between the large and small organizations.

Even among the larger organizations, 45 per cent considered their financial resources to be inadequate and 63.3 per cent considered their office premises to be inadequate.

Differences among the six sub-sectors were evident in various aspects. In terms of mission, 77.2 per cent of performing ACNPOs ranked 'expression of arts and culture' as their first priority, whereas almost 36.4 per cent of the non-performing ACNPOs surveyed ranked 'cultivation or promotion of artistic, aesthetic, or humanistic values' as their top priority. Non-performing arts groups were also more likely to have a governing board; tended to have more
full-time staff and volunteers; more individual and corporate members; more likely to have physical offices; and organized more programmes and events per year. For performing arts groups, dance groups were more established than other sub-sectors in terms of staff number and membership size. The majority of Xiqu groups were small non-professional groups, and rarely hired staff and received little annual income.

The complexity of the non-profit arts and cultural sector was evident not only in the variety of sub-sectors but also in its internal and external networking patterns. We analyzed three kinds of networks within or outside the sector in the civil society, namely interlocking directorates, umbrella organization networks, and cooperation networks. We found data for the board of directors from 400 ACNPOs, of which almost half shared directors. Overlapping personnel mainly occurred within the same sub-sector rather than across sub-sectors. We identified 10 umbrella organizations that were connected to 269 ACNPOs in our database. About one third of all the ACNPO respondents had occasional cooperation with other NGOs in organizing events or programmes.

In terms of the relationship with the government, 92 ACNPO directors from 78 ACNPOs were found to be appointed members of 32 government advisory committees. 91.1 per cent of the organizations viewed themselves as “autonomous” or “very autonomous” from the government in operations or decision-making. Only 10.5 per cent participated in advocacy activities and 77.9 per cent said they did not consider themselves to have a role in monitoring the government. 83.5 per cent of respondents did not cooperate with business organizations in the past year.

In conclusion, the ACNPO sector exhibits weak capacity in human resources and physical resources (in terms of office and rehearsal space). The sector is heterogeneous and each sub-sector is confronted with different challenges, which means that more targeted public policies will be needed to support their development. It has long been the consensus of the arts and cultural sector that a dedicated policy bureau for arts and culture would be the first step in addressing a plethora of issues. Our observation is that in order for such a bureau to achieve its objectives, mechanisms for civic engagement have to be in place to include all the major stakeholders within this heterogeneous sector.

Key Figures:
- 65.3 per cent were established after 1997 (n=613)
- 82.3 per cent were registered under the Societies Ordinance (n=1,463)
- 50.3 per cent did not employ any kind of staff in the last 12 months (n=179)
- 50.1 per cent maintained a membership system (n=179)
- 58.8 per cent received an annual income between HKD 0 to HKD100,000 (n=577)
- 58.4 per cent claimed that their most important income source in the past year was “income-generating projects” (n=179)
- 58.4 per cent claimed they were very autonomous from the government in routine operations or decision-making (n=179)
- 10.5 per cent participated in advocacy activities in the last 12 months (n=179)
- 77.9 per cent saw themselves as having no role in monitoring the government (n=179)
- 83.5 per cent had no cooperation with the business sector in the past year (n=179)
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OBJECTIVES AND METHODS

The arts and cultural sector in Hong Kong consists of both for-profit and non-profit organizations, the latter representing about one-third of the sector. Altogether, the sector employs about one percent of Hong Kong’s workforce. Box office data reflect a vibrant cultural scene in the city: over 4.8 million visits to the top five most visited museums, 3.4 million admissions to theatres, about 8,500 performances, 1,600 visual arts exhibitions, and some HKD 470 million in box office income each year.¹

Arts and culture is a distinct sector in civil society studies. On the one hand, art can be viewed as an intangible public good that creates social value. On the other hand, it is a market commodity with certain tangible and measurable attributes. Indeed, compared with the other sectors such as social service or conservation, the arts and cultural sector has a much larger proportion of for-profit groups. According to a government-commissioned survey conducted in 2009 and published in 2012 on the human resources situation in the sector, there were over 9,500 establishments employing a total of 40,176 persons filling 66,350 jobs, which implied that on average each arts staff was responsible for more than one job, and that each arts and cultural establishment employed 11 personnel.² On the other hand, from our data collection, there were 1,816 arts and cultural non-profit organizations (ACNPOs) in 2014-15. These imply that around one-third of the sector consists of non-profit groups and the total employment of the non-profit arts and cultural sector would be approximately 17,000. While there was no previous research on the categorization of the arts and cultural sector, the government survey in 2012 showed that majority of the organizations in the sector were related to visual arts and performing arts.³

Background of the Project Series

Civic activism has been an important force in shaping the political and socio-economic development in Hong Kong. Yet, our understanding of the characteristics of the civil society remains inadequate. Relevant baseline research is limited where there is no government database or official statistics profiling the characteristics of civil society organizations (CSOs) or non-governmental organizations (NGOs).⁴

Since 2009, the Centre for Civil Society and Governance has published reports on the social services, conservation, and international sectors. This report on the arts and cultural non-profit organizations (ACNPOs) in Hong Kong (2015-16) is the fourth report of this series. The two primary objectives of this research series are to build a knowledge database of CSOs in Hong Kong and to promote understanding of and facilitate future research on civil society. In other words, our focus is the collection of baseline data rather than evaluation or impact studies.⁵

---


³ Ibid.

⁴ In this report, CSOs, NGOs, NPOs and non-profits are used interchangeably.

Specifically, the report series present data obtained through questionnaire surveys and extensive archival data search on different civil society sectors in Hong Kong, focusing on CSOs' organizational configurations, internal operation, and interrelations with external actors. Starting from the last report, an assessment of the sector's capacity has been added to the studies.

**Defining Capacity**

In this report, we examine the internal organizational characteristics of the ACNPOs and their external links with the government, the business sector, and peer groups. We also study their organizational capacity using a modified framework of the Indiana Non-profit Sector Project (INSP). There are eight dimensions of organizational capacity for the ACNPOs and each dimension includes the following indicators:

i) **Operations and governance capacity**
   - whether a board is set up, number of board members, number of meetings held each year, committee system in the board, etc.;

ii) **Human resource capacity**
    - number of staff, number of volunteers, adequacy of manpower, training of staff and volunteers, ability to recruit and retain staff and volunteers;

iii) **Financial resource capacity**
    - annual income, diversification of resources, adequacy of income, stability of income, whether a list of donors has been maintained, fundraising methods and funding activities;

iv) **Physical resource capacity**
    - this may include premises for operation, rehearsal or storage, and any other required facilities. This dimension was not in the original INSP scheme. We added it due to its relevance to arts and culture particularly in the local context;

v) **Programmes and planning capacity**
    - ability to evaluate programme outcomes or impact, ability to assess community needs, ability to attract new members or clients, focus on mission and vision;

vi) **Information technology capacity**
    - website development, use of communications technology;

vii) **Marketing capacity**
    - ability to expand the visibility and reputation of the organization, ability to communicate with clients, communication with the wider community; and

viii) **Networking & advocacy capacity**
    - relationship with the government and policymakers, interaction with other civil society organizations, relationship with business organizations, engagement in advocacy work.

**Defining and Mapping ACNPOs**

As with previous reports in the series, we use the definitions in the Johns Hopkins Comparative Non-Profit Sector Project (CNSP) with some adaptation to suit the local circumstances. In CNSP, CSOs are defined as entities that are organized, private, non-profit-distributing, self-governing and voluntary. Moreover, with necessary adaptations, we utilize the International Classification of Non-profit Organizations (ICNPO) scheme developed by researchers involved in CNSP to identify relevant CSO categories (Appendix A).

**Defining ACNPOs**

ACNPOs in this report are defined as organizations conducting activities related to arts and culture in general and in specialized fields in the Hong Kong context. These NPOs conduct activities primarily in one or more of the following areas, also described as 'sub-sectors' in this report.

- **Performing arts**
  - The following are regarded as five separate sub-sectors in the report:
    - **Theaters**
    - **Dance** includes ballet and Chinese dance.
    - **Music** includes opera, orchestras, choral and music ensembles.
    - **Xiqu** includes Cantonese and Chinese opera, and
    - **Variety & pop show** and others include various forms of performing arts and any kind of performing arts not included in other sub-sectors

---


7. In reference to an earlier study on the topic, we added "cross-cultural / artistic activities and others" to the non-performing arts sub-sector to better reflect the situation in Hong Kong. See Central Policy Unit, (2004). *Study on the Third Sector Landscape in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: The Central Policy Unit. Meanwhile, the sub-field of Arts Administration in John Hopkins' classification is considered irrelevant to the local context and not included in our study.
• Non-performing arts
The following are grouped under one "non-performing arts" sub-sector in the report.
- Media and communications: production and dissemination of information and communication; includes radio and TV stations, publishing of books, journals, newspapers and newsletters, film production and libraries;
- Visual arts, architecture, ceramic art: production, dissemination and display of visual arts and architecture; includes sculpture, photographic societies, painting, drawing, design centers and architectural associations;
- Historical, literary and humanistic societies: promotion and appreciation of the humanities, preservation of historical and cultural artifacts, commemoration of historical events; includes historical societies, poetry and literary societies, language associations, reading promotion, war memorials, commemorative funds and associations;
- Museums: general and specialized museums covering art, history, sciences, technology and culture; and
- Cross-cultural/artisanic activities and others: arts education, arts criticism, arts policy advocacy and multiple cultural/artisanic activities.

In Hong Kong, the dance and music sub-sectors include ACNPOs that perform both Western and Asian (mostly Chinese) choreography and music. The theatre sub-sector includes plays and drama performed in different languages based on original and adapted scripts. The sub-sector of variety & pop show and others is diverse and contains ACNPOs that mostly provide more than one form of artistic activities. Xiqu, known as Chinese opera, is a form of art unique to China and the sub-sector includes various genres, such as Beijing opera, Cantonese opera, and others.

Mapping ACNPOs
The ACNPOs database comprised 1,816 ACNPOs in Hong Kong up to 2015 (Box 1.1). The database population was generated by a meticulous search from five sources.

1) The List of Charitable Institutions and Trusts, which is published and regularly updated by the Inland Revenue Department (IRD) under section 88 of the Inland Revenue Ordinance ('S88 list'), is a major data source for identifying NPOs in Hong Kong. All organizations on the S88 list are tax-exempt and recognized as charities by IRD, which indicates their non-profit-distributing nature under the Hong Kong Law. Up to April 2012, the S88 list contained 12,666 charitable organizations. The S88 list contains the names of the organizations only. By way of identifying key words in the organization names manually, our research team classified the S88 list into eight different categories according to the ICNPO: 1) 'arts and culture', 2) 'international organization', 3) 'philanthropy', 4) 'sports and recreation', 5) 'civic and advocacy', 6) 'health', 7) 'welfare', and 8) 'environment'. To generate the ACNPO category, our team screened organization names for key words related to arts and culture such as 'visual arts', 'dance', 'theatre', 'opera', 'Cantonese opera', 'choir', and 'museum'.

For the remaining organizations with ambiguous titles that did not fit into any of the eight categories, our team conducted an online data search (if their websites were available) to confirm the nature of their operation. From the S88 list, we identified 348 charitable organizations (19.2 per cent of the total ACNPO population) that matched our ACNPO and signature, exclusive of chapters or subsidiaries of ACNPOs. Since the selection method might have had excluded ACNPOs with ambiguous titles or that were not registered for tax exemption, four additional sources below were also scrutinized.

2) The Hong Kong Arts Development Council's (ADC) database of arts organizations contains for-profit companies and non-profit groups that operate in or outside Hong Kong. Our team conducted online checks to verify their local and non-profit status, and yielded 937 ACNPOs (51.6 per cent of the total population), which were added to our database population.

---
8 Our Research Team identified 1,797 ACNPOs for the survey. After the survey, we further verified the information collected from the survey, the Company and other online sources. We finalized the total number of ACNPOs at 1,816 as of December 2015. The representativeness of the survey is not affected by this verification process as it is randomly sampled according to each sub-sector of the arts and cultural sector.
9 List of Charitable Institutions and Trust of a Public Character, which are exempted from tax under Section 88 of the Inland Revenue Ordinance up to 30 April 2012.
10 Three organizations that also register themselves on the S88 list are not contained in the research process. They are registered after the cut-off date of the S88 list we have used.
11 The ADC database contains the arts and cultural organizations that conducted performances at ADC venues as well as organizations from other publicly available sources such as (i) Hong Kong Annual Arts Survey (2007-2010), (ii) Hong Kong Dance Yearbook (2007-2010), (iii) Hong Kong Drama Yearbook (2010), and (iv) Hong Kong Visual Arts Yearbook (2010)
3) The third source was three publicly available Lists of Stakeholder Groups for Public Engagement Exercise on the development of the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) conducted by the West Kowloon Cultural District Authority (WKCD) between 2009 and 2011. Similarly, our team conducted online checks to verify the organizations' non-profit status and yielded 312 ACNPOs (17.2 per cent of the total population), many of which were related to historical, literary and humanistic societies.

4) The fourth source was the List of Specified Representative Organizations for ADC Representative Nomination Exercise of 2010. Every three years, the ADC undertakes the nomination exercise for the representatives of 10 arts constituencies to the ADC Council by way of voting. The list is publicly available online for voters who are registered for the nomination exercise. In the end, our team identified 184 ACNPOs (10.1 per cent of the total population) from this source.

5) Lastly, our team searched for relevant data sources from the Internet to identify any additional ACNPOs that were not included in the above four sources, for example, the Arts Promotion News Network (an online news agency specializing in arts and cultural issues) and identified 35 ACNPOs (1.9 per cent of the total population).

Our mapping exercise revealed that only a minority of ACNPOs in Hong Kong (19.2 per cent) were registered for tax exemption. This contrasts with 89 per cent of the NGOs in the international sector and 65 per cent in the conservation sector being found registered on the SBS list.

Our team made the best efforts to verify the status of all 1,816 valid ACNPOs in our database as of 2015 by checking the web page of each organization and extracting the contact information and other relevant data. When a web page was not available, we conducted an Internet search to confirm their status. Appendix B shows the full list of ACNPOs.

**Research Methods**

Our team constructed the database of individual ACNPOs by collecting primary and secondary data. Primary data were collected through a survey while secondary data were collected from official sources (including the Companies Registry records and relevant Internet sources) as well as nine personal interviews. We compiled a database of 1,816 ACNPOs with various levels of organizational details:

(a) 1,816 ACNPOs with names and operating in Hong Kong up to 2015;

(b) 1,225 ACNPOs with contact information;

(c) 1,462 ACNPOs with data of legal instruments of establishment under the Companies Ordinance and the Societies Ordinance, etc.;

(d) 613 ACNPOs with data of year of establishment (collected from survey results, companies' registry records, and the Internet);

(e) 400 ACNPOs with data of board directors (3,568 individuals);

(f) 577 ACNPOs with data of financial income and income sources, etc.;

(g) 179 ACNPOs with a comprehensive set of organizational data, operational data and self-evaluation obtained from the questionnaire survey.

In addition to presenting survey findings, this report utilizes network analysis techniques, including patterns of interaction and strength of ties between ACNPOs and other parties, to examine the external linkages of the sector.
Box 1.1 Distribution of ACNPOs

Chart 1.1a Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs by Sub-sector

Base: 1,816 (percentage may not add up to 100 per cent due to rounding)

Chart 1.1b Percentage Distribution of Performing ACNPOs by Sub-sector

Base: 1,356 (percentage may not add up to 100 per cent due to rounding)

Chart 1.1c Percentage Distribution of Non-Performing ACNPOs by Sub-sector

Base: 460 (percentage may not add up to 100 per cent due to rounding)
Survey

Given the large data population and the varying size of the sub-sectors, we adopted the stratified random sampling method in the survey. We stratified 1,225 ACNPOs with contact information in our database by sub-sectors and randomly sampled from the sub-sectors. A total of 632 sample targets from six sub-sectors were identified (Box 1.2). A pilot survey was conducted to test the usefulness of the questionnaire. The main survey was conducted from March 26 to October 19, 2015 by sending written questionnaires by post or the online version by email (Appendices C1 to C4). A range of contact methods was deployed to approach the targets including postal mail, local or international phone calls, facsimiles, emails and office visits. On average, each sample target was approached 15 times. After the survey was completed, 179 valid responses were collected, resulting in a response rate of 37.4 per cent (after excluding the non-contactable cases)\(^{17}\). This response rate was comparable to our past surveys in the report series (social service sector: 64 per cent; conservation sector: 41.5 per cent; international sector: 25.6 per cent). The survey results presented in this report were weighted to be statistically representative of the whole ACNPO population.

Our survey agency, Policy 21 Limited, reported challenges in the field work, which reflected certain characteristics of ACNPOs in Hong Kong. A number of the ACNPOs were inactive and very difficult to reach. In some cases, the survey team contacted them as many as 20 times before successfully completing a questionnaire.

---

**Box 1.2 Distribution of Random Samples of Survey by Sub-sector**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-sectors</th>
<th>Database (with contact information)</th>
<th>Sample Size(^{18})</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performing-arts ACNPOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiqu</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety &amp; pop show and others</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-performing-arts ACNPOs</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1225</strong></td>
<td><strong>632</strong></td>
<td><strong>179</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{17}\) Calculation method of response rate: The sample size includes 632 ACNPOs, of which 153 targets were found to have dissolved or could not be reached by any contact method during the survey. The number of valid cases was 479. The total number of responses was 179. The response rate was calculated as \(\frac{179}{479} = 37.4\) per cent.

\(^{18}\) For small sub-sectors of 100 ACNPOs or fewer, a full sampling of all organizations in those sub-sectors was taken.
In-Depth Interviews and Other Data Sources

In addition to the written survey, our research team conducted nine in-depth interviews with key personnel in the arts and cultural sector. Where there were gaps in information regarding the ACNPOs, our team looked to other sources to fill in the missing information. In particular, we collected information on the year of establishment, financial income, and directorates of 613, 577, and 400 ACNPOs respectively from the following sources:

- ACNPO websites (667 websites were available, 36.7 per cent of the total population);
- Annual reports and financial statements for the latest financial year filed to the Companies Registry (323 ACNPOs were registered as companies and 237 ACNPOs had financial data available in the Companies Registry);
- The list of registered groups under the Societies Ordinance published by the Hong Kong Police Force;
- Government websites that contained government committees and other information;
- Government census and statistics (which proved to contain little relevant data for this study); and
- Wisenews for media reports on ACNPOs in Hong Kong.

Limitations and Challenges

First and foremost, this report is not a full appraisal of the entire arts and cultural sector in Hong Kong, but only a study of its non-profit organizations. Our study was based on legally registered organizations; as such, the contribution of individual artists (notably in fields such as visual arts, literary, and art criticism) and ad hoc or informal networks of practitioners in the arts and cultural sector, which might be significant for arts and cultural development in Hong Kong, was not captured in the report.

Second, the ACNPO database was constructed to the best of our efforts and knowledge. There might still be inaccuracies despite our meticulous effort in verifying the non-profit status of the ACNPOs using the following three criteria:

1. While the arts and cultural organizations found on the S88 list were legally recognized as non-profits, compliance to the charitable requirement is not monitored vigorously by the government; instead, self-reporting is more prevalent. In our research, some arts and cultural groups on the S88 list appeared to have substantial linkages with for-profit companies and for this reason, our research team excluded these organizations from our ACNPO database.

2. ADC provides funding (e.g. one- or two-year grants) only to non-profits and our team included these grant recipients in the ACNPO database.

3. A number of non-S88 ACNPOs or their organization directors self-proclaimed their organization as non-profits (such as on their websites). In many cases, our team included these organizations in the ACNPO database unless our research found evidence that proved otherwise. In Hong Kong, the government permits organizations to proclaim themselves as “non-profits” hence be eligible for fund-raising activities under a wide range of legal instruments, including the organizations’ own articles of association. For these organizations, our criterion of inclusion follows the government’s lenient approach.

Third, the ACNPO database in this report might not be exhaustive. Organizations on the S88 list with names that did not reveal their arts and cultural linkage and without information on the Internet might have been wrongly excluded. Since our research team included only ACNPOs with a legal status in this report, other more informal groups such as student groups that were not registered entities might have been excluded from the database.

Fourth, our research team excluded organizations that had multiple missions or were already counted in other sectors. We screened out: (a) arts and cultural organizations established under government agencies (e.g. Music Office, Hong Kong Police), (b) subsidiary groups that organized arts and cultural activities under other organizations, such as political parties, religious institutions, social welfare organizations, schools, business associations or trade unions, which primarily served non-arts-related objectives, and (c) subsidiaries or chapters of larger ACNPOs so as to avoid double counting.
Arts and culture exist in many forms: dance, music, literature, painting, sculpture, theatre, film, and many more. They may be tangible or intangible; have measurable or immeasurable values. There are masterpieces exhibited in galleries and museums, stories and poems passed down from previous generations, and films and dramas available for viewing on-demand. At the same time, arts and culture are mediums through which people express their emotions, ideas, and values across place and time, share their aesthetic experiences, and articulate various conceptions of the self. In the contemporary world, the government, market, and civil society often play various roles in shaping the development of the arts and cultural sector and their influence on the sector can be significant (Chart 2.1).

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section provides a general overview of the role of the government, market, and civil society in the production of arts and culture. The second section provides a historical review of their development in Hong Kong from the 1950s through 2014. The final section analyses the development of arts and culture in relation to government policies, the market as well as the level of civic engagement and public participation in the sector.
The Role of Different Sectors in the Production of Arts and Culture: An Overview

Government's Role in Arts and Culture

From the government's point of view, arts and culture can be an economic or a social goal. In recent years, many governments have initiated proactive policies that underscore the economic and social value of arts and culture. In Britain, for example, the Arts Council England is committed to championing and developing the arts, museums, and libraries. A similar success story has been South Korea where the government has invested substantially to develop the country's film and pop culture and drive the country's economic development. Table 1 provides examples of strategies used by some governments to promote the development of arts and culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Cultural Policy Development in Major Cities Worldwide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recent cultural policy development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>London (UK)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first Mayoral Cultural Strategy for London was published in 2004 and was updated in 2014. (London Cultural Strategy Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York (US)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City passed legislation to create its first comprehensive cultural plan in 2015. (The New York City Department of Cultural Affairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seoul (South Korea)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural industry policies and support for artists were included in the City Administration Plans in 2016. (The Culture, Design &amp; Tourism Headquarters of the Seoul Metropolitan Government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singapore</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government-appointed Advisory Council on Culture and the Arts produced a report on the arts and cultural sector in 1989, which was considered a policy blueprint. (Ministry of Culture, Community and Youth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tokyo (Japan)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tokyo Metropolitan Government released the Tokyo Vision for Arts and Culture which set its basic direction and strategies for cultural policies. (Bureau of Citizens and Cultural Affairs, Tokyo Metropolitan Government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taipei (Taiwan)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department of Cultural Affairs has released a cultural policy address annually since 2003. (Department of Cultural Affairs, Taipei City Government)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the same time, artistic expressions can be highly political in nature, resulting in either government intervention or public controversy. As such, the government may take on a regulatory role by implementing various mechanisms of control and censorship, including laws that impact on freedom of speech and forms of expression. In April 2016, an orchestral performance in Germany was under fire for calling the massacre of Armenians by the Ottoman forces during World War I a genocide on the event's promotional website. The Turkish president protested to the European Commission, which was a main sponsor of the event, and the word ‘genocide’ was later removed. Germany’s cultural council asserted that the move by the Turkish president was not only an interference in artistic expression and freedom of expression, but amounted to an interference in a German domestic issue. Similarly, in 2000 and 2009,
an international auction house, Christie's, stirred controversy when it tried to sell bronze pieces from the Qing dynasty. The pieces were part of a 12-animal water-clock fountain crafted for the Qianlong Emperor in the Old Summer Palace that went missing during the Opium Wars. In both instances, the auction house received political pressure to withdraw the sales.32

Some countries such as Britain and the United States have special visa rules for artists, musicians, and performers that significantly affect their mobility.33 In 2015, the UK government denied the visa application of a Syrian artist who wanted to travel to the country for the opening of his own exhibition despite having submitted all the required documents.34 In these cases, arts and culture were put on the back burner when issues of national security and border control came to the forefront.

The importance of arts and culture as a social good is best illustrated by their broad educational value, their positive impact on people’s quality of life as well as the shaping of the private and the civic self. A recent report published by the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council argues that artistic and cultural engagement may help shape reflective individuals, produce engaged citizens, and improve their health and well-being. Arts in education contributes to better learning and improves cognitive abilities, confidence and motivation.35 Arts are also used for therapies and for treating psychological trauma (such as in armed conflict).36

**Arts and Culture in the Market Economy**

From the market’s perspective, arts and culture are commodities in both the local and global economy. Arts and culture can be a lucrative business: according to the National Trade Association for the Broadway Theatre Industry based in New York, nearly 13 million tickets were sold in 2015-16 for a gross sale amount of over USD 1.3 billion.37 Nowadays, international auction houses such as Christie’s and Sotheby’s operate in major cities around the world. In the last decade, China has emerged as a vibrant and fast growing market for arts, ranking third in the world’s art market in 2015 with 19 percent share.38

Business corporations may also become involved in arts and cultural promotional activities as a way to fulfill their corporate social responsibility or public relations. Many businesses and corporations set up their own foundations and philanthropic projects or set aside a budget to sponsor arts and cultural development. There are many examples around the world of art schools, museums, and venues that are funded by donations from business corporations. One example is American entrepreneur and film producer Walt Disney who funded the establishment of California Institute of the Arts in 1961.39 Entrepreneur and philanthropist Kay Kimbell and his wife built the open-to-the-public Kimbell Art Museum in the 1970s, which currently houses 350 works from a wide range of cultures, periods, and styles.40

---

Arts and Culture in Civil Society

Arts and civil society shape each other. On the one hand, arts and culture can be an expression of individual and collective values. On the other hand, societal developments provide inspiration for artistic and cultural creation. In the realm of civil society, arts and culture contribute to preserve a society’s collective memory, foster social cohesion, and promote cultural diversity. Arts and cultural projects may express social dissent, expose social injustice, frame the discourse of a social movement, and create social change.

Arts help preserve a society’s collective memory and foster a continuing dialogue about the past. The Act of Killing, a documentary released in 2012 about an extermination campaign that took place between late 1965 and early 1966 in which 500,000 Indonesians were murdered by that country’s anti-communist government, prompted renewed discussion of the historical tragedy. The documentary was viewed by millions of Indonesians and caused heated discussions on the killings, which had long been viewed as a taboo topic in the country. Due to renewed interest created by the documentary, the current President of Indonesia, Joko Widodo, began an official investigation into the tragic event.

Arts and culture can help foster social cohesion and celebrate diversity. Promotion of social interaction among members can create a sense of community, identity, and help build social capital. The Eurovision Song Contest held among the member countries of the European Broadcasting Union since 1956 is an example. The contest showcases the cultural uniqueness of participating countries in terms of their musical styles. In 2014 when Austrian drag queen singer Chonchita Wurst won the contest, several countries saw her victory as promoting lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) rights. Her victory also encouraged support for the international LGBT community and fostered social inclusion.

Finally, arts and culture can be seen as a form of social activism, dissent, and a tool for advocating social change. Arts activism has been a key element of social protests in many societies. For example, the western side of the Berlin Wall was fully decorated with graffiti, signifying solidarity and support for freedom in the other side of the divided city. These artistic expressions combine art and activism and serve as a form of cultural communication.

The above provides an overview of the values that arts and culture have in society and the different roles played by the government, market, and civil society. By now, one should note that these different roles and values may not be all that clear-cut. As Crossick and Kaszynska have stated, arts and culture “operate as part of a complex ecology of talent, finance, content and ideas” (their emphasis). Our discussion also brings home the internal heterogeneity of the sector that arts sub-sectors may differ in their form, expression, and condition for development. Accordingly, among the sub-sectors there are bound to be diverse missions, agendas, and concerns. The following section provides a more local focus by outlining arts and cultural development in Hong Kong.

---

Arts and Culture in Hong Kong

Freedom of speech and expression, which is essential for arts and cultural development, was quite established in the colonial years of Hong Kong. Under the "One Country, Two Systems" arrangement, the Basic Law promises the continuation of such freedom after 1997: Article 34 states that "Hong Kong residents shall have freedom to engage in academic research, literary and artistic creation, and other cultural activities." This clause has been interpreted to mean that Hong Kong would maintain the same level of freedom of speech and expression in arts and culture as before the handover.

Freedom of speech and expression alone is not sufficient to nurture arts and cultural development. The government is also a key player in shaping and promoting arts and culture. The Hong Kong government has long been criticized for lacking a coherent set of cultural policies, or worse, for not having any cultural policies at all to foster the sector's growth.

The Colonial Era

Prior to the 1960s, the transient nature of the local population and the limited capacity of the colonial government meant that arts and culture were not on the policy agenda of the government. In the 1950s, among the refugees from Mainland China were a large number of artists and intellectuals, many of whom became catalysts for the proliferation of arts and cultural activities.

In 1962, the City Hall was built and provided the first major performing venues in the colony. It was placed under the management of the Urban Council, which was then a partially elected statutory body in charge of municipal services. After the 1967 riots that directly challenged colonial governance, the government not only paid more attention to labour rights and social welfare, but also augmented arts and cultural programmes and services. The Hong Kong Festival, held annually from 1969 to 1973, included open-air air parties at Blake Pier and a Cantonese opera troupe for the general public.

In the 1970s, the Urban Council took a leading role in organizing the annual Arts Festival. From 1973 to 1979, major professional performing arts groups were established under government funding. These initiatives were largely regarded by the colonial government as entertainment, education, and more importantly, as a means of diverting the energy and attention of people (especially youth) from societal tensions and political unrest.

While the colonial government provided resources for arts and cultural activities and hence affected their directions of development, for the most part it refrained from stating an official policy position and stayed away from debates over cultural identity. The policy effect was hardly neutral, as its capacity to fund arts and cultural projects made it a powerful player in the sector. For example, Western high art received more funding and assistance; the performing groups that received government funding were often managed by people of non-Chinese heritage.

Post-handover Plans

After the handover, Chief Executive Tung Chee Hwa claimed in his first policy address in October 1997 that "Hong Kong has finally broken free from the psychological constraints brought about by the colonial era." He spoke of the role of cultural traditions in Hong Kong and the need to restructure district organizations and public services. While calling for a more active role from the government in the arts and cultural sector, Tung did not provide any specific policies in his address.

In 2001, the HKSAR government appointed the Culture and Heritage Commission, a high-level advisory body, to advise the government on cultural policies and funding priorities in the arts and cultural sector. In 2003, the Commission submitted its Policy Recommendation Report with 20 key suggestions, including six strategies to promote Hong Kong's long-term cultural development and the vision to make Hong Kong "an international cultural metropolis." Some critics were dissatisfied with the vagueness of the developmental goals.

---
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and the lack of a timetable to implement its recommendations. Although the government claimed to have accepted 90 per cent of the recommendations, it was largely silent about the "community-driven" principle of development, which was nowhere to be seen in the final cultural policy framework put forward by the HAB.57

The government's lack of enthusiasm towards the "community-driven" principle arguably gave rise to a series of conflicts between the government and the public over the proposed development of the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD). The large-scale development project was first introduced by Chief Executive Tung in 1998 with the goal of building a new performance venue in West Kowloon to host more world-class cultural events and to elevate Hong Kong's reputation as an Asian entertainment capital.58

In 2003, the government invited prospective developers to submit proposals for developing the arts hub. This resulted in public backlash due to fears that developers would turn the area into another property project. After public objections forced the government to amend the requirements it had set out for developers, prospective developers began to withdraw their proposals. Only after a number of public consultations and public engagement exercises did the government come up with an acceptable plan for the WKCD, and construction finally began in 2013.59

Compared to the colonial administration, the HKSAR government has taken on a more proactive role in developing arts and culture. Its vision, however, remains ill-defined, and long-term planning specifics on how to achieve them are lacking. The government's refusal to adopt community-driven development is consistent with its general reluctance to engage citizens in the policymaking process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1950s</td>
<td>Establishment of the Urban Council (UC), which was responsible for providing municipal services to Hong Kong Island and Kowloon (including New Kowloon). UC became partly elected in 1952.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950s</td>
<td>Migration of Mainland Chinese scholars and authors to Hong Kong.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>The Hong Kong City Hall was officially opened and was placed under UC.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-1979</td>
<td>Establishment of the Hong Kong Philharmonic, Hong Kong Chinese Orchestra, the Hong Kong Repertoire, Chung Ying Theatre Company, the Hong Kong Ballet, and City Contemporary Dance Company.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Establishment of the Hong Kong Arts Centre.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>The Executive Council of Hong Kong formulated seven policies to promote the development of arts; provide space and venues for performing arts, community development for the general public, provide pre-vocational and vocational training of the performing arts, develop professional performing groups, produce the best results under the financial and resource constraints, establish the Performing Arts Advisory Committee, and support and encourage performing arts groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Establishment of the Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts (HKAPA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Establishment of the Urban Services Department (USD) and the Regional Services Department (RSD).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Establishment of the partly elected Regional Council (RC), which was responsible for providing municipal services to the New Territories (excluding New Kowloon). USD and RSD were given the statutory power to set up and manage music and entertainment venues and facilities, as well as to organize, promote and sponsor performing art activities with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Establishment of the Recreation and Culture Branch (RCB), taking on duties such as culture and recreation, sports, antiquities and country parks management, broadcasting, and entertainment policy. RCB was dissolved on July 1, 1997.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Establishment of the Hong Kong Cultural Sector Joint Conference by professionals in the cultural sector, which demanded to be included as one of the new functional constituencies in the 1995 Legislative Election.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Establishment of the Hong Kong Arts Development Council (ADC) by the government as a statutory body with administrative autonomy. It had nine appointed and nine elected members. The ADC launches its first 5-year plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>USD and RSD issued a number of consultation papers on 5-year plans and cultural development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Chief Executive Tung Chee Hwa issued his first policy address that mentioned the need to review the structure of district organizations and the restructuring of public services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>The Sports, Performing Arts, Culture and Publication Functional Constituency was included in the Legislative Council elections of Hong Kong for the first time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Chief Executive Tung Chee-Hwa announced in his Policy Address “plans for a new state-of-the-art performance venue...to boost Hong Kong’s status as Asia’s entertainment and events capital.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Establishment of the Hong Kong Sinfonietta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>The abolition of the directly elected UC and RC and their executive arms USD and RSD. Cultural affairs were henceforth managed by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Establishment of the Culture and Heritage Commission by the government to formulate a set of principles and strategies to promote the long-term development of culture in Hong Kong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Establishment of the Art Promotion Office by the LCSD to raise the public's interest in art creation and appreciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Six committees were formed in the ADC and art-form groups were formed to replace the existing arts committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>The government launched an international West Kowloon Reclamation Concept Plan Competition. Foster Partners, an architectural firm based in London, was selected as the winner of the competition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>The government announced an Invitation for Proposal (IFP) for the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD). It called for a “single package” approach to grant one private consortium the job of designing, building, operating and managing the entire project and be offered the exclusive right to develop real estate projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>“Creative industry” was included in the Chief Executive’s policy address for the first time. Later in the same year, the Central Policy Unit released the findings on Hong Kong’s creative industries. The study was the first attempt by the government to define and map out the current state of local creative industries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Asia Cultural Co-operation Forum (ACCF) was initiated by the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) to foster regional cultural co-operation and promote the arts and culture industries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>The Committee on Performing Arts and the Cantonese Opera Advisory Committee was set up by the HAB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>The People’s Panel on West Kowloon (PPWK) was formed by members of the arts and cultural sector to conduct large-scale public engagement exercises on the WKCD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>The government announced its decision to halt the IFP process. The Consultative Committee on the Core Arts and Cultural Facilities of the West Kowloon Cultural District (the Consultative Committee) was established to study the way forward for WKCD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Establishment of the Hong Kong Film Development Council by the government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>The West Kowloon Cultural District Authority (WKCD) was established based on the recommendation of the Consultative Committee. The latter also recommended the WKCD to conduct public engagement exercises before making major decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>The first round of the Venue Partnership Scheme was implemented by the LCSD at most of its performing arts venues with the aim to foster partnership between the performance venues and performing arts groups/organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>The “Open Stage” Pilot Scheme was initiated by the LCSD to allow performing artists to perform at the piazzas of the three performing arts venues of the LCSD. The scheme was ended in July 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>The HAB launched the Arts Capacity Development Funding Scheme (ACDFS).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>ADC launched the first Arts Administration Scholarship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Establishment of the Hong Kong Culture Monitor by practicing artists, academics, arts administrators, and researchers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

86 The Hong Kong Film Development Council. (2016, June 1). Welcome to the Homepage of the Hong Kong. Retrieved June 8, 2016, from The Hong Kong Film Development Council: http://www.fdc.gov.hk/en/home/
Public Governance Structure

As Table 2 shows, there has been a long history of multiple governmental agencies being involved in managing arts and cultural affairs in a piecemeal fashion without integration under a single government authority. In 1999, Chief Executive Tung Chee-hwa abolished the Urban and Regional Councils, and their arts and cultural portfolios were taken up by the LCSD. In 2012, Chief Executive Leung Chun-ying tried to establish a cultural bureau, but his proposed appointee to the bureau stirred up controversy for her lack of experience in the arts and cultural sector. The sector was also highly suspicious that the ulterior political purpose was to control artistic expression. Ultimately, the idea failed to gain support from the sector and the general public. Since then, the government has not renewed the discussion on the establishment of a cultural bureau.

Three Main Institutions

Table 3 shows a list of current major government agencies involved in arts and cultural policy. The HAB, whose ambit includes district administration and community development, provides general oversight of the ADC and the LCSD. Each year, the HAB has to submit its policy initiatives to the Legislative Council Panel on Home Affairs for discussion before their inclusion in the Chief Executive's policy address.

The role of the LCSD has largely remained the same since its establishment. As the largest organizer and sponsor of arts and cultural events in Hong Kong, it has more resources at its disposal than any other government agencies or affiliated organisations relating to arts, including the ADC. Table 4 shows the concentration of discretionary funding power in the LCSD.

Table 3 The Roles and Responsibilities of HAB, LCSD, and ADC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Administrative Structure</th>
<th>Major aspects of work</th>
<th>Major funding projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Affairs Bureau (HAB)</td>
<td>Policy bureau</td>
<td>To provide quality leisure and cultural services, promote professionalism and excellence in leisure pursuits and cultural services, and preserve intangible cultural heritage</td>
<td>Headed by the Secretary for Home Affairs, who reports to the Chief Secretary for Administration</td>
<td>a. Arts Development Fund to promote cultural exchanges between Hong Kong and other places b. Contestable Funding Pilot Scheme for the nine major performing arts groups c. Arts Capacity Development Funding Scheme (ACDFS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD)</td>
<td>Government department</td>
<td>To provide quality leisure and cultural services</td>
<td>Headed by the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services, who reports to the Secretary for Home Affairs</td>
<td>a. Leisure and cultural facilities management b. Leisure and cultural services provision c. Leisure and cultural services provision d. Subsidizing arts and cultural groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong Arts Development Council (ADC)</td>
<td>Statutory body established under the Hong Kong Arts Development Council Ordinance, Chapter 472</td>
<td>To fund, support and promote the development of the arts in Hong Kong</td>
<td>Comprises 27 members appointed by the Chief Executive. Of these, 19 are elected by various arts constituencies</td>
<td>a. One-, two- and three-year grants to support local small and medium-sized art groups b. Multi-project grants to support projects by small and medium-sized local art groups c. Project grants to support art groups and practitioners who undertake various art projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Government Funding and Support

Government spending in arts and culture has grown substantially in recent years. Indeed, our findings show that government funding is the second biggest source of financing for ACNPOs (Chapter 3). This gives the government a significant role in shaping arts and cultural development in Hong Kong.

Table 4 breaks down the major expenditures on arts and culture from 2011 to 2015, which shows a trend of steady growth. At present, the HAB and the LCSD are the most important bodies that grant funding for arts and cultural development. The ADC receives funding from the HAB and uses it to provide grants to small and medium-sized local art groups for their projects.

In addition to financial grants, the Hong Kong government also provides venues, training, scholarships, and other support for groups, performers, and personnel within the sector. These are managed mainly by the HAB, the LCSD, and the ADC. The LCSD manages 41 performing venues in Hong Kong, making it the government agency with the most control over access to venues.118


Governance Issues

Three major issues warrant concern. First, the HAB and the LCSD are staffed largely by governmental officials and civil servants who have been criticized for having insufficient background or management experience in arts and cultural matters.119 At the same time, funding is scattered among multiple agencies with different missions, illustrating the lack of a unified and integrated policy portfolio for arts and culture.

Second, although 10 seats of the ADC are elected by its members, 14 are appointed by the HAB while the remaining three are government officials. This grants the government de facto control in the decision making process, even though the ADC is supposed to work more closely with the arts and cultural sector.

Third, there are very limited channels for the arts and cultural sector to express its views and concerns to the government. After the dissolution of the Culture and Heritage Commission in 2003, the government has yet to establish another advisory body on general arts and cultural policy development.

In short, the governance structure is fragmented and dominated by officials with little professional knowledge about the arts and cultural sector, and with limited channels for policy input from the latter. As a result, it does not afford high responsiveness to the need of the sector.

119 In-depth interview with the CEO of a local arts group on May 31, 2016.
## Table 4  Major Government Spending on the Arts and Cultural Sector, 2011-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bureau/Department</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>2011/2012&lt;sup&gt;109&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2012/2013&lt;sup&gt;110&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2013/2014&lt;sup&gt;111&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2014/2015&lt;sup&gt;112&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home Affairs Bureau</strong></td>
<td>No. of grants awarded</td>
<td>Total expenditure (in HK$ mn)</td>
<td>No. of grants awarded</td>
<td>Total expenditure (in HK$ mn)</td>
<td>No. of grants awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head 53 - Government Secretariat: Home Affairs Bureau</td>
<td>Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts (HKAPA)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>236.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>268.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kong Arts Development Council</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major Performing Arts Groups</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>264.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>303.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>596.9</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>672.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cantonese Opera Development Fund</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kong Jockey Club Music and Dance Fund</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lord Wilson Heritage Trust</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts and Sports Development Fund (arts portion)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts Development Fund</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>114.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home Affairs Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head 63 - Home Affairs Department</td>
<td>Community Building (arts and culture part)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure and Cultural Services Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head 95 - Leisure and Cultural Services Department</td>
<td>Heritage and Museums</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>636.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>673.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>907.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>973.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Libraries</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>783.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>2326.8</td>
<td>2498.4</td>
<td>2572.8</td>
<td>2789.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Bureau</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head 159 - Government Secretariat: Development Bureau (Works Branch)</td>
<td>Heritage Conservation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commerce and Economic Development Bureau (Communications and Technology Branch)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head 55 - Government Secretariat: Commerce and Economic Development Bureau (Communications and Technology Branch)</td>
<td>Broadcasting and Creative Industries</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>220.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>291.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9282.7</td>
<td>3652.7</td>
<td>5818.1</td>
<td>4088.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


Funding Inequality

Another problem with government funding is the vast disparity in the amount of funding received by different arts and culture groups. The Hong Kong government has designated nine performing arts groups as representatives of the arts in Hong Kong to receive funding from the HAB. Table 4 shows that the total amount of funding received by the nine groups from the HAB is more than either the ADC or the HKAPA.

This creates a yawning gap in capacity and financial stability between these few privileged performing arts groups and the many other smaller groups in Hong Kong (Chapter 3). Small and medium-sized groups instead rely on short-term and project-based funding options. For example, the Cantonese Opera Development Fund provides funding mostly for specific programmes, not for the long-term development of XiQu groups. In 2015/16, the Fund granted around HK$88.6 million to support 59 projects, all of which were either one-year grants or project grants.

The ADC can grant funding to small and medium-sized local art groups for up to three years via its one-year grant scheme if the grantees achieve meritorious performance. However, the grant is for administrative and operational use and art groups still have to apply for project grants for organizing different programmes.

Advocates of project-based funding may argue that short-term and project-based funding options encourage art groups to maintain at least a satisfactory level of performance in order to continue receiving funding. However, practitioners regard that project-based funding limits their ability to make long-term plans and increases their administrative burden. This also raises the question as to why the nine major performing arts groups are not held to the same standard, but are favourably treated with less restrictive funding.

To further restrict funding flexibility, the government only allows each project-based subsidy to be given to a single group instead of being split between multiple recipients, which has the effect of inhibiting greater collaboration and interaction within the sector.

The above discussion of governmental funding and support for arts and cultural development describes the inequality of funding between different art forms. With its substantial funding and resource capacity, the government is no doubt a key player in the sector. Yet, its funding policies remain problematic, especially towards the small and medium-sized arts groups that are most in need of support. Chapter 3 will present our data on the vast income gap and the dissatisfaction among ACNPOs on their financial capacity.

---

104 The nine performing groups are Hong Kong Philharmonic, Hong Kong Chinese Orchestra, the Hong Kong Repertoire, Ching Ying Theatre Company, the Hong Kong Ballet, City Contemporary Dance Company, the Hong Kong Dance Company and the Zank Rosenthal and the Hong Kong Sinfonietta.


108 In-depth interview with a representative from a medium-sized theatre group on 31 May 2016.

109 In-depth interview with a scholar on June 15, 2016.

110 In-depth interview with the CEO of a local arts group on May 31, 2016.
The Sports, Performing Arts, Culture and Publication Functional Constituency and the Composition of the ACNPOs Sector

The rather peculiar electoral system in Hong Kong has a significant impact on the composition of the ACNPOs sector. Currently, 35 seats (50 per cent) of the Legislative Council are returned by geographical constituencies through direct elections; the other 35 seats are returned by functional constituencies.

First introduced in 1985, functional constituencies, which consist of representatives who are elected by eligible voters within their respective sectors, were part of an overall plan to develop a representative government in Hong Kong. After the handover, the HKSAR government continued to stress the importance of functional constituencies as a way “to ensure that the economic and professional sectors which are substantial and of importance in the community are represented in the legislature.”

The inclusion of the arts and cultural sector in functional constituency elections can be traced back to 1995 when the then governor Chris Patten introduced new constituencies that extended the eligibility for voting to the whole working population. The arts and cultural sector was included under the new Community, Social and Personal Services Functional Constituency. In 1998, the SAR Government abolished Patten’s reform and introduced the Sports, Performing Arts, Culture and Publication Functional Constituency (“the FC” hereafter), which adopted a corporatist voting arrangement.

It was not made clear why the arts and cultural sector was combined with sports and publication, as these sectors are very different in their needs and concerns. From 1998 to 2012, the four-time councillor of the FC was Timothy Fok Tsun-ting, who had very close ties with the sports sector but not the arts and cultural sector. The current councillor of the FC is Ma Fung-kwok, who held public positions in the arts and cultural sector, but has been criticized by the latter for failing to represent the sector’s views in the Legislative Council.

Unequal Representation

Dominance of “organizational voters”

The FC has been criticized for distorting the representation of the arts and cultural sector mainly due to its rules on voting eligibility. The FC allows both organizations (known as “voting bodies”) and individuals to register as voters, but the rules clearly favour organizational registration over individuals. The total number of voters increased from 1,134 (38 voting individuals and 1,096 voting bodies) in 1998 to 2,586 (299 individuals and 2,287 voting bodies) in 2012. In 2016, the total number of voters rose further to 3,263 (395 individuals and 2,139 voting bodies).

Each of the four sub-sectors in the FC has its own rules on voting eligibility. In the culture sub-sub-sector, only voting bodies can register. In the performing arts sub-sub-sector, individual registration is limited to only members who are entitled to vote at general meetings of only seven of the cohort’s many voting bodies.

In other words, the arts and cultural sector is largely represented only by the organizations and the key individuals in those organizations. Moreover, the weight of an individual member’s voice can vary substantially with the number of members of a voting body, further distorting the representation. For example, it has been reported that 250 artists had to share one vote as members of one NPO.
that served as a voting body in the culture sub-sector. In the case of The Composers and Authors Society of Hong Kong Ltd, a voting body in the performing arts sub-sector, 3,909 members share one vote in the 2016 FC election.

Dominance of pro-establishment organizations

To qualify as a voter in the FC, one criterion is that the voter is a statutory body / registered body that has received grants, sponsorships or performance fees from the ADC, the LCSD or the HAB. This rule not only excludes individuals who receive funding from these governmental bodies, but also groups that do not apply for or receive government money. As such, any person who want to vote in the FC must do so through a registered group.

In practice, the pro-establishment camp is more organized and proactive in registering as FC voters. For example, it has been reported that the Association of Chinese Culture of Hong Kong, an umbrella organization with corporate members, has at least 188 voting bodies in the FC. The organization was co-founded in 2000 by former Chief Executive Leung Chun-ying and aims to “unite all groups and people in Hong Kong who love China and Hong Kong and are willing to promote Chinese culture.”

A further issue of concern is that the eligible voting bodies include governmental and quasi-governmental organizations. Protected by secret ballot, they do not have to be transparent about their voting preferences. For example, the ADC voted in the 2012 election without disclosing its choice of candidate. Several government-funded universities also have votes in the FC election, but have never accounted for their voting decisions to the public.
Business and Arts

The private sector in Hong Kong primarily interacts with the arts and cultural sector in two ways: via market activities and through donations and sponsorships. In general, business donations and sponsorships play a smaller part in ACNPOs’ income compared to ticketing revenues and government funding (to be elaborated in Chapter 3).

The Creative and Cultural Economy

Arts and cultural development contributes substantially to the city’s economy. Cantonese pop songs, movies, and TV dramas have long been popular and lucrative in the region. To name only one example, the film production company Shaw Brothers built a studio in 1961, came to be known as Movietown and was pivotal in developing Hong Kong’s film industry. It was said to be “the largest and best-equipped studio in Chinese filmmaking, with 15 stages, two permanent sets, the state-of-the-art film-making equipment and facilities as well as 1,300 staff”.[127] In 1967, Sir Run Shaw launched TVB, Hong Kong’s first wireless commercial television station with a total revenue of HK$ 4.455 billion in 2015.[128]

Hong Kong is also a favourite location for art exhibitions. Since 2013, the international art fair Art Basel has organized numerous art exhibitions in the city, presenting more than 200 galleries at the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre. In 2013-2016, Art Basel Hong Kong attracted more than 250,000 visitors in total, making it one of the most popular annual art events in Hong Kong as well as creating business opportunities for both artists and galleries.[129]

The comparatively stable political structure and the rule of law in Hong Kong have also made it a popular location for auction houses. In 1973 Sotheby’s became the first auction house to operate in Hong Kong and since then, more auction houses have set up branches in the city. In recent years, thanks to an economic boom in Mainland China, more art collectors and investors have come to Hong Kong, making it a prime location to bid for collections.[130]

Donation and Sponsorship

There are a number of corporate foundations that provide donations for arts and cultural development in Hong Kong. For instance, since 2006, the Swire Group Charitable Trust has been the Principal Patron of the Hong Kong Philharmonic Orchestra through sponsorship agreements, with its latest three-year commitment amounting to HK$42.2 million.[131] The Lee Hysan Foundation, founded in 1973, also reportedly provides financial support to various art groups.[132]

Businesses also occasionally sponsor arts and cultural events, usually taking the form of title sponsorships, general sponsorships, or the provision of other assistance. Sponsorship, unlike philanthropy, is often done with the expectation of business returns such as enhanced reputation and brand-building.[133] It is also more common for businesses such as banks, news agencies, and hotels to sponsor various arts events or major performing arts groups than individual projects.[134]

[130] In-depth interview with an arts administrator on June 3, 2016.
Civil Society’s Unleashed Potential

The Role of Arts and Cultural Philanthropy

The Hong Kong Jockey Club has been a major supporter of arts and cultural projects. In 1980, it donated HK$10 million to set up the Hong Kong Jockey Club Music and Dance Fund to "promote training and education in music and dance in Hong Kong by way of conferring scholarships." Since then, the Club has donated an additional HK$39 million to the Fund and has awarded 297 scholarships amounting to over HK$53 million to musicians and dancers.\(^{135}\) It contributed to the construction of the HKAPA building in 1984,\(^{136}\) and the Club’s total donation to the HKAPA has amounted to more than HK$398 million over the years.\(^{137}\)

There are philanthropic foundations that specifically focus on the arts and cultural sector. To mention a couple of examples, The Robert H. N. Ho Family Foundation fosters appreciation and development of Chinese cultural heritage and Chinese arts through sponsoring a variety of arts and cultural activities, including musical events, community cultural events, and research.\(^{138}\) The Jean CK Ho Family Foundation awards grants to support projects that utilize artistic expression to empower and uplift underprivileged children,\(^{139}\) making it one of the few foundations in Hong Kong that support education.\(^{140}\) In general, foundations dedicated to arts and culture are still quite small both in number and scale.

Individual donations are also vital to the arts and cultural sector. However, it is not easy to calculate the total amount of donation because such information is inconsistently disclosed.

Some organizations provide lists of individual donors and fund raising events in their annual reports,\(^{141}\) but small and medium-sized art groups may not provide such detailed information. Generally speaking, our study found that private donations and fundraising are the third largest source of income for local non-profit arts and cultural organizations (see more in Chapter 3).

Peer Collaboration

Networking is important for both individuals and groups as it facilitates resource-sharing, publicity, and partnership building. Many performers and artists are freelancers, giving them the flexibility to work with other groups and partners on an ad hoc basis.\(^{142}\)

At the organizational level, collaboration between art groups seems less common for small and medium-sized art groups.\(^{143}\) Collaboration may be easier between larger art groups with funding sources that do not impede collaboration. For example, the Hong Kong Chinese Orchestra and Chung Ying Theatre Company co-presented a musical in 2015 and the Hong Kong Sinfonietta has provided accompaniment for the Hong Kong Ballet.\(^{144}\)

Examples of partnerships are also found between large and small organizations. The City Contemporary Dance Company, funded by the HAB, co-organized the Good Morning Class series with other smaller-scale dance groups and invited artists from around the world to mentor freelance dancers and choreographers as well as to provide them with opportunities for training and creative development.\(^{145}\)


\(^{140}\) In-depth interview with the CEO of a local arts group on May 31, 2016, (The United Nations, n.d.)


\(^{142}\) In-depth interview with a local dance group on March 22, 2016; In-depth interview with the CEO of a local arts group on May 31, 2016.

\(^{143}\) Ibid.


Collaboration between non-performing arts groups is less known from publicly available sources. Non-performing arts groups may collaborate in events, educational training, and exhibitions for mutual support and synergy. Chapter 4 will present our findings on the sector's network patterns.

**Collaboration with Other Civil Society Sectors**

The arts and cultural sector collaborates with other civil society sectors. Performing arts groups often put on performances and classes at schools and non-performing arts groups would provide classes, exhibitions and other educational events. Collaboration is common with NGOs outside of the arts and cultural sector. For example, local performing arts group Zuni Icosahedron partnered with the Hong Kong Council of Social Service (HKCSS) to offer free theatre tickets to the latter's service users and Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA) recipients. At the community level, arts and culture groups also partner with District Councils and the LCSD for more district-based performances and events.

**Art as Political Expression**

Since the 2000s, arts and culture are increasingly utilized as a form of political commentary. Zuni Icosahedron has produced a sarcastic stage drama series *East Wing West Wing* criticizing local government and politics while long-running TV show *Headliner*, produced by Radio Television Hong Kong, mocks local current affairs.

Various art forms, ranging from drama, music, dance, and visual displays, have an increasing presence in social movements. In 2014, after the National People's Congress Standing Committee set down restrictive rules for constitutional reform in Hong Kong, frustration over the universal suffrage issue channelled into a series of protests and clashes with the police. Participants of the Umbrella Movement (referring to street protesters who protected themselves with umbrellas during confrontations with the police) expressed their demands through not only sit-ins but also an explosion of artistic creations. Among them, *The Umbrella Man*, a 3-meter high wooden statue created by local artist Milk, was the most prominent art installation of the movement. These works of art from the movement were later shown at the Victoria and Albert Museum's exhibition *Disobedient Objects* in London, and the Umbrella Movement Visual Archive was established to document and preserve various art pieces from the movement.

The above examples illustrate the close and interdependent relationship between arts and civil society in at least three ways. First, private philanthropy and donations serve as an important source of funding for local ACNPOs. Second, collaborations with other civil society organizations can be mutually beneficial. Third, art can be viewed as a form of social activism through its ability to convey complex meanings and powerful messages.

---


ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY

This chapter reports our findings on the organizational characteristics of ACNPOs and their capacities based on objective data, survey findings and self-evaluation. The arts and cultural sector is diverse with considerable differences among the different art forms. Each sub-sector may operate in a unique ecology and has different agendas and interests. Also, professional groups and non-professional groups have such contrasting objectives that a comparison of their organizational capacity would not be meaningful. In our survey, among the 179 cases, 109 were found to have an income of HKD10,000 or less. We assume that these low income groups are non-professional in nature. As capacity building may be more important for professional organizations than recreational groups, for the purpose of studying their self-evaluation on capacities, we categorized our data to create a sub-category called “larger groups” The latter exclude the 109 small groups that were either fully self-funded or operated on an annual budget of less than HKD10,000. Where appropriate, we will report the findings based on all the ACNPO respondents and the larger groups separately.

Overall Characteristics of the Arts and Cultural Sector

History, size and composition (Box 3.1)

Based on data collected on 613 ACNPOs (representing 33.8 per cent of the total population of 1,816 ACNPOs) from the survey, Companies Registry records and websites, we estimated that 65.3 per cent of all the ACNPOs were established after 1997. In particular, the Xiqu sub-sector expanded by 284 per cent; the non-performing arts sub-sector by 85.7 per cent and under it, the ‘cross-cultural and artistic activities’ sub-sub-sector increased by 84 per cent respectively. It is worth noting that the significant increase in the number of ACNPOs coincided with each electoral cycle after 1997, which we hypothesize to be related to the functional constituency elections (Charts 3.1c-d). Particularly, the surge of Xiqu NPOs (from 9.8 per cent of the sector before 1997 to 37.2 per cent presently) has significantly changed the composition of the sector. Up to 2016, the average age of an ACNPO was 19 years and the median age was 16.

Geographical distribution (Map 1)

ACNPOs were mainly concentrated in the following four areas: Wan Chai, Yau Tsim Mong, Kwun Tong and Sham Shui Po, which are also the older districts in Hong Kong. The geographical pattern is quite similar to that of the social service sector where NPOs were found to mostly clutter in Wanchai, Yau Tsim Mong, Sham Shui Po and Central and Western District.

Legal establishment (Box 3.2)

This analysis was based on the data of 1,462 ACNPOs. The data sources included the survey, the Companies Registry records which were open to the public, the list of registrations under the Societies Ordinance, and organizational websites. 82.3 per cent of the ACNPOs in our database were registered under the Societies Ordinance, while 22.1 per cent were registered under the Companies Ordinance either in the form of a company limited by shares or by guarantee. 19.2 per cent of them enjoyed tax exemption status under SSB (Chapter 1). The percentage of organizations that were established under the Societies Ordinance in the arts and cultural sector was much higher than the other three civil society sectors we studied previously (social services: 36.4 per cent, conservation: 28.6 per cent, international: 5.1 per cent). Also, the percentages of ACNPOs that were registered under the Companies Ordinance or were recognized for tax exemption were much lower than the other three sectors (social services: 53.1 per cent, no information; conservation: 55.3 per cent, 66.5 per cent; international: 87.5 per cent, 89 per cent).
Missions (Box 3.3)

77.2 per cent of the performing ACNPOs that responded to our survey ranked ‘expression of arts and culture’ as their first priority, whereas 36.4 per cent of the non-performing ACNPOs ranked ‘cultivation or promotion of artistic, aesthetic, or humanistic values’ as their first priority. 30.4 per cent of all the ACNPOs indicated ‘service delivery’ as either their first or second priority while 24.5 per cent selected ‘community-building’ as their top three priority. Advocacy was not considered important.

Capacity Assessment

Financial income and sources (Box 3.4 - 3.5)

The financial analysis was based on the data of 577 ACNPOs from three sources: the self-reported data from the survey (179 ACNPOs), annual financial reports filed to the Companies Registry by those ACNPOs registered as limited companies (237 ACNPOs) and ACNPO websites (358 ACNPOs). The data were from the latest financial records available, of which 85.7 per cent were in the years 2010-2015 (money of day as of January 2016). Based on the data we were able to compile, we calculated a total annual income of HKD 1.6 billion (in 2016 prices). The method for collecting financial data might be biased towards government subsidy/subvention and might have under-reported business sponsorships. This is because government subsidy/subvention are more often publicly available data, while we largely relied on self-reporting for other financial data. To address this limitation, we compared the analysis of the 577 ACNPOs and the data from the survey, which were conducted by stratified random sampling and thus, were statistically representative of the population (Chart 3.4d). We found analytical results from both datasets (179 cases from the survey and 577 cases from all sources) to be similar.

Major income sources are ranked below. The pattern is representative of the non-profit arts and cultural population.

1) Income generating projects and membership fees represented the largest share (40.1 per cent) of the total income. The largest proportion of ‘internally generated income’ was ‘earned income’ such as providing art classes, consultancy service and collecting rentals (40.4 per cent), followed by ‘ticketing income’ from arts performances (29.6 per cent).

2) Government funding mainly through projects and recurrent funding represented 35.2 per cent of the total income. ACNPOs usually receive government funds in the form of project grants from the HAB, LSCD and District Council. The eight ACNPOs at the top income band obtained as much as 58.2 per cent of the total government funding allocated to the whole sector, while only less than 4 per cent of that funding was given to groups with yearly income of less than 1 million.

3) Local private donations constituted 20.1 per cent of the total income of the sector.

4) The fourth funding source was from local foundations.

It is noteworthy that local business sponsorship was not a significant source of funding.

Our data indicated a significant income gap in the sector (Chart 3.4c). The yearly income ranged from zero to over HKD 50 million. While the average income was HKD 2.8 million, the median yearly income was only HKD 63,261. Five per cent of the ACNPOs were at the highest income bands (more than HKD 10 million) and they obtained 76.8 per cent of the sector’s total yearly income. The eight richest ACNPOs earned an average yearly income of HKD 88.5 million. At the other end of the spectrum, 58.8 per cent of the ACNPOs obtained only 0.59 per cent of the sector’s total annual income. The lowest income group secured a miniscule average yearly income of only HKD 4,340. We also found that ACNPOs that were financially stronger generated more income internally and obtained more government funding. The income gap among ACNPOs can be attributed to the government’s highly skewed funding policy towards a few prominent groups. While the government-initiated ‘Matching Grants Scheme’ encourages arts groups to seek business funding, the scheme provides more opportunities to well-established ACNPOs because businesses usually prefer to work with more prominent groups in corporate sponsorships.

As we mentioned in Chapter 2, with the exception of the nine biggest performing arts organizations that receive recurrent government subvention, funding of all arts and cultural groups is essentially short-term, piecemeal, and project-based. Other than contributions from directors and members, there appears to be a lack of sustainable long-term

---

154 The survey data were in the form of income bands and data approximation was made on this basis. If financial information was not provided by the ACNPOs concerned, where two or more data sources for an ACNPO were inconsistent, we used the official records filed in the Companies Registry (CR). Where there was no CR record, we chose the data that were more recent or better supported by evidence.

155 Under this Scheme, private donations and sponsorship secured by eligible local arts groups will be matched by government grants.
funding for most ACNPOs. Indeed, all professional ACNPOs with which we had in-depth interviews identified funding as the single biggest challenge in their development. Another important factor affecting the income gap is that a large number of organizations are non-professional in nature, and are formed for recreational and community networking purposes. Later on, we will further analyse the nature and characteristics of these non-professional groups.

We asked the ACNPOs to evaluate their own financial situation in terms of income adequacy, income stability, flexibility in fund allocation, adequacy of donation as well as cost-effectiveness in expenditure (Box 3.5):

- Only 27.6 per cent ‘agreed’ or ‘very much agreed’ that their financial resources in the previous year were adequate. The figure was 45 per cent for the larger groups (Chart 3.5a).

- Only 17.9 per cent ‘agreed’ or ‘very much agreed’ that their income was adequate over a longer evaluation period of five years. The figure was 36.4 per cent for the larger groups. (Chart 3.5b)

- Only 24.9 per cent ‘agreed’ or ‘very much agreed’ that they had stable financial sources in the last financial year. The figure was 40.9 per cent for the larger groups (Chart 3.5c).

- 36.3 per cent were satisfied with the flexibility they enjoyed in allocating their resources in the last financial year. The figure was 54.4 per cent for the larger groups (Chart 3.5d).

- 36 per cent said they were cost-effective in spending. The figure was 60.5 per cent for the larger groups (Chart 3.5e).

Perhaps due to manpower shortage, only a minority (27.7 per cent) of the ACNPOs conducted fundraising activities in the last 12 months (Chart 3.5f). Specifically, these ACNPOs fundraised online or organized performances. If only larger groups were counted, the figure would significantly increase to 47.8 per cent.

A small proportion (5.1 per cent) of the ACNPOs indicated they maintained a list of regular individual donors that numbered from 2 to 2,000 (Chart 3.5g). Even fewer ACNPOs (3.2 per cent) kept a list of business donors. Only 12.3 per cent felt they received adequate donation. Among the larger groups, only 21.2 per cent felt there was ‘adequate’ or ‘just adequate’ donation (Chart 3.5h).

In summary, our survey revealed that the non-profit arts and cultural sector had the lowest self-ratings among all the civil society sectors studied in terms of financial resource adequacy and stability. The self-ratings were generally better for the larger groups, but still worse than the average across sectors. Apparently, most ACNPOs, whether non-professional or professional groups, found themselves struggling for financial sustainability.

**Human Resources: Staff, Members and Volunteers (Box 3.6-3.9)**

**Staff employment (Box 3.6, 3.9)**

On average, an ACNPO employed less than 10 full-time staff, 12 part-timers, and 23 temporary or project staff in the last year (Chart 3.9a). The average number of full-time staff was comparable to that of the international sector but smaller than that of the conservation and social services sectors.

Nonetheless, these statistics do not fully reflect the actual ecology of the arts and cultural sector. 50.3 per cent of all ACNPOs indicated that they did not hire staff of any type. Only 30.7 per cent of them hired full-time staff; 25.1 per cent employed part-time staff; and 20.1 per cent hired temporary staff (Chart 3.6b). Of those that employed full-time staff, 74.5 per cent hired five or fewer persons and only 23.7 per cent hired more than five (Chart 3.6c).

In their self-evaluation, many ACNPOs felt that manpower shortage was a challenge to their organization:

- 47.6 per cent rated their human resources as ‘seriously inadequate’ or ‘inadequate.’ (Chart 3.9b)

- 43.5 per cent expressed difficulty in recruiting or retaining staff. (Chart 3.9c)

- 49 per cent were satisfied with their staff’s professional training while 24.1 per cent felt their training was ‘seriously inadequate’ or ‘inadequate.’ (Chart 3.9d)

**Membership and volunteers (Box 3.7 – 3.9)**

Membership may provide a potential source of volunteers and donor and helps expand an organization’s support network. 50.1 per cent of organizations had a membership system (either individual or corporate membership or a mix of both) (Chart 3.7a). Among them, each had an average of 136 individual members (an average of 206 members per organization for the larger groups) (Chart 3.9a). Those with
corporate membership had 63 corporate members on average. These figures are lower compared with most of the civil society sectors we have studied (social services: 84.5 per cent, 2,689; conservation: 60.7 per cent, 239; international: 52.7 per cent, 62).

Volunteers are a distinct human resource to non-profits. 57.3 per cent of the ACNPOs recruited full-time or part-time volunteers (Chart 3.8a). On average, each of them had 21 part-time volunteers in the previous year (Chart 3.9a). Most ACNPOs did not have any full-time volunteers. For those who did, the average number was 12. Only a minority of them (30.2 per cent) kept a regular volunteers list, which had an average of 50 regular volunteers. These figures were lower than those of all the other civil society sectors we have studied.

Also, 40.5 per cent of them indicated their number of volunteers was ‘seriously inadequate’ or ‘inadequate’ over the last 12 months; only 38.8 per cent felt they had ‘just adequate’ or ‘adequate’ volunteers (Chart 3.9e). Compared to the other three civil society sectors, ACNPOs were the least satisfied with the adequacy of volunteers.

**Operations and Governance (Box 3.10 – 3.11)**

**Governing boards and accountability**

50.4 per cent of the ACNPOs had a formal governing board, and the average number of board members was seven. 60.8 per cent had five or fewer board directors (Box 3.10). They met about once every six months on average. 41.8 per cent of the boards set up board committees. Among the larger groups, 80.8 per cent had a governing board with an average of eight board directors and three board meetings held per year (Box 3.11). The most common accountability mechanism was regular meetings with members, followed by newsletters, and other means (Chart 3.10e). Only 10.6 per cent disclosed financial statements to the public.

The arts and cultural sector had the lowest percentage of organizations with a board compared to the other sectors (social services: 88 per cent, conservation: 69.6 per cent, international: 89.1 per cent) and a lower proportion of boards with board committees. Also, there were fewer accountability mechanisms (including annual reports, regular newsletters, issue reports and regular emails) than other civil society sectors.

**Physical Resources: Office Premises and Venues (Box 3.12 – 3.13)**

For the arts and cultural sector, physical premises for office and arts activities are critical components for capacity building. In addition to office space, performing arts groups need premises for rehearsals and performances. Likewise, visual arts groups as well as other non-performing arts groups require space for art studios, storage, and exhibitions. According to our study, ACNPOs indicated that finding appropriate office space was challenging in light of the expensive property market in Hong Kong. In fact, only a tiny proportion of ACNPOs owned premises. 55 per cent occupied a physical office space, but only 4.4 per cent of them operated a branch office. (Charts 3.12a, b)

Furthermore, ACNPOs felt the need for space was a more serious concern than manpower shortage and financial sufficiency. They also indicated a high level of dissatisfaction in terms of having adequate office premises to carry out their various missions. The majority of them (70.6 per cent) felt they had ‘inadequate’ or ‘very inadequate’ office premises to carry out their organization’s activities in the past 12 months, while only 20.7 per cent felt they had adequate space (Box 3.13). The situation did not fare any better for the larger groups, as 63.3 per cent of them felt their premises was ‘inadequate’ or ‘very inadequate’. In all, ACNPOs were the most dissatisfied with their office premises among all the civil society sectors (social services: 39.8 per cent, conservation: 37.5 per cent, international: 35.4 per cent).

**Programmes and planning (Box 3.14 – 3.15)**

49.8 per cent of the ACNPOs organized one to five programmes, projects or events (“events”) in the past twelve months, and only 12.4 per cent organized 16 events or above. 25.1 per cent of these events had an audience of 500 or less, and 40.8 per cent had 1000 or above (Charts 3.14a, b).

In assessing an NPO’s programme and planning capacity, one measurable indicator is whether there are feedback mechanisms to channel views from the NPO’s target communities or audiences. 40.7 per cent of ACNPO respondents indicated that they
had put in place some sort of feedback mechanisms (c.f. international sector: 69.1 per cent), mostly (74.1 per cent) through consulting the target communities directly. A minority asked their staff or volunteers to collect information (21 per cent) or discuss community needs with peer organizations (18.3 per cent) (Charts 3.14g-h). Over half of the respondents (51.6 per cent) self-evaluated that they successfully addressed target communities’ needs in the past five years (Box 3.15).

Marketing (Box 3.14)

Marketing capacity refers to an organization’s capacity to reach out to clients and the wider community to promote the organization and its activities. Almost all ACNPOs (94.7 per cent) promoted their programmes (Chart 3.14c). The following channels were the most commonly used for promoting activities (in descending order): (a) email and mobile phone messages, (b) online social networking tools (e.g. Facebook) and (c) membership networks. Promotion on the street, advertising, and direct mailing, which tend to be costly, were ‘never’ or ‘rarely’ used by the majority of the ACNPOs (Chart 3.14d). The trend is similar to the international and conservation sectors where the NPOs also tended to be of smaller size.

In general, the same channels were used for communicating with the general public and their target communities, most commonly through online means and events and activities (Charts 3.14e-f). In general, digital media, which are low cost and less labor intensive, were more frequently used for marketing.

Information Technology (Box 3.16 – 3.17)

Information technology (IT) capacity refers to the use of IT to build an organization’s capacity in development. Of all the ACNPO respondents, 60.9 per cent operated a website (Charts 3.16a) but only 24.1 per cent updated the website regularly (Chart 3.16b). In other words, most of them would only update it on an if-needed basis. Almost all (95.3 per cent) of the larger groups operated a website (Chart 3.17a). For those who used digital means in their activities, many found the digital means effective in recruiting and mobilizing members (72.2 per cent) or volunteers (60.6 per cent) and promoting programmes (86.2 per cent) (Chart 3.17b).

Self-evaluation of Overall Performance (Box 3.18)

We asked the ACNPOs to evaluate their own performance in terms of maintaining good service quality and achieving their missions over the past five years.

- 70.5 per cent of all respondents ‘agreed’ or ‘very much agreed’ that they maintained good service quality (Chart 3.18a). The figure was 78.8 per cent among the larger groups (c.f. international sector: 94.5 per cent)
- 58.4 per cent of all respondents ‘agreed’ or ‘very much agreed’ that they had achieved their missions (Chart 3.18b). The figure was 76.3 per cent for larger groups (c.f. international sector: 92.7 per cent).

### Box 3.1 Years of History

**Chart 3.1a Distribution of Year of Establishment of ACNPOs in Ten-year Intervals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Interval</th>
<th>Performance arts</th>
<th>Non-performance arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2014</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2009</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-1999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1989</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1979</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1950</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 613
Chart 3.1b  Distribution of Year of Establishment of ACNPOs Before and After 1997

Base: 613

Chart 3.1c  Distribution of Year of Establishment of ACNPOs by Legislative Council Electoral Cycles*

Base: 613 (The data for 2012-16 was collected as of 2014)

Chart 3.1d  Distribution of the Year of Establishment of ACNPOs by Election Committee Electoral Cycles*

Base: 613 (The data for 2012-16 was collected up to 2014)

*Note: The time intervals in the two charts took into account that organizations were eligible to register as Functional Constituencies voters if they were established at least one year prior to the next election of the Legislative Council or Election Committee.
Map 1  Geographical Distribution of Office Located by ACNPOs Based in Hong Kong

Base: 179
Box 3.2 Legal Instruments of Establishment and Charity Status

Chart 3.2 Percentage Distribution of Legal Instruments of Establishing ACNPOs

- Societies Ordinance: 82.3%
- Companies Ordinance: 22.1%
- Registered as company limited by guarantee under Companies Ordinance: 1.5%
- Specific ordinance to establish organization as a statutory body: 0.0%
- Other: 0.0%

Base: 1,462 (Multiple answers were allowed.)

Box 3.3 Missions and Activities

Chart 3.3 Percentage Distribution of Primary Mission of ACNPOs

- Expression of arts and culture (N=157): 77.2%
- Cultivation or promotion of artistic, aesthetic, or humanistic values (N=23): 36.4%
- Service delivery: 16.65%
- Community-building: 6.3%
- Others: 5.3%
- Public Education: 4.5%
- Advocacy of certain values: 0.6%
- Religious: 0.2%
- Policy advocacy: 0.0%
- Advocacy of certain rights: 0.0%
- Monitoring government: 0.0%
- Monitoring business: 0.0%

Base: 179
Box 3.4  Financial Income and Funding Sources

Chart 3.4a  Distribution of Total Yearly Income Bands of ACNPOs

Chart 3.4b  Percentage Distribution of ACNPO Funding Sources

Base: 577
Chart 3.4c  Income Gap Among ACNPOs

Chart 3.4d  Relative Importance of ACNPOs’ Total Income by Source from Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative importance of funding source</th>
<th>% of ACNPOs receiving at least 40% of this income source in the previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st: income generating projects</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd: membership fee</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd: HKSAR Government or ADC project funding</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th: HKSAR Government or ADC regular funding</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th: local public</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th: local foundations or NGOs</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th: gift sales</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th: local businesses</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179
### Box 3.5  Financial Resource Capacity

#### Chart 3.5a  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ Self-evaluation of Adequacy of Financial Resources in the Last Twelve Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All ACNPOs</th>
<th>Larger groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much agree</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much disagree</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / No comment</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179

Base: 70

#### Chart 3.5b  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ Self-evaluation of Income Adequacy in the Last Five Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All ACNPOs</th>
<th>Larger groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much agree</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much disagree</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / No comment</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179

Base: 70

#### Chart 3.5c  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs Self-evaluation of Stability of Financial Resources in the Last Financial Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All ACNPOs</th>
<th>Larger groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much agree</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much disagree</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / No comment</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179

Base: 70
Chart 3.5d  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ Self-evaluation of Flexibility of Allocating Financial Resources in the Last Financial Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All ACNPOs</th>
<th>Larger groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much agree</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much disagree</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / No comment</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179

Base: 70

Chart 3.5e  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ Self-evaluation of Cost Effectiveness in the Last Five Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All ACNPOs</th>
<th>Larger groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much agree</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much disagree</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral / No comment</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179

Base: 70

Chart 3.5f  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ Engagement in Fundraising in the Last Twelve Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All ACNPOs</th>
<th>Larger groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179

Base: 70
Chart 3.5g  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs Maintaining a List of Regular Donors

- Yes: 5.1%
- No: 56.5%
- Not applicable: 38.4%

Base: 179

Chart 3.5h  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ Self-evaluation of Donation Sufficiency in the Last Twelve Months

For All ACNPOs:
- Adequate: 3.7%
- Just adequate: 8.6%
- Not adequate: 23.2%
- Seriously inadequate: 27.0%
- Refused to answer: 0.6%
- Not applicable: 36.9%

Base: 179

For Larger groups:
- Adequate: 4.4%
- Just adequate: 16.8%
- Not adequate: 35.5%
- Seriously inadequate: 14.3%
- Refused to answer: 29.1%

Base: 70
Box 3.6  Human Resources: Staff

Chart 3.6a  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs Employing Any Kind of Staff in the Last Twelve Months

- Employed staff, 49.7%
- Did not employ any staff, 50.3%

Base: 179

Chart 3.6b  Percentage Distribution of Types of ACNPO Staff in the Last Twelve Months

- Full Time: Yes 30.7%, No 69.3%
- Part Time: Yes 25.1%, No 74.9%
- Temporary: Yes 20.1%, No 79.9%

Base: 179

Chart 3.6c  Percentage Distribution of Total Number of ACNPO Full-time, Part-time and Temporary Staff

- Full Time: 10.9%, 3.6%, 9.1%, 74.5%
- Part Time: 13.3%, 13.3%, 0.0%, 66.7%
- Temporary: 13.9%, 22.2%, 25.0%, 36.1%

Base: 55 ACNPOs, 46 ACNPOs, 36 ACNPOs
Box 3.7  Human Resources: Membership

Chart 3.7a  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs with a Membership System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179

Chart 3.7b  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs with Individual Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 90

Chart 3.7c  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs with Corporate Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 90

Chart 3.7d  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs Recruiting New Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Refused to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 90

Chart 3.7e  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ Means of Recruiting New Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral by existing members</th>
<th>Membership drive through mass media (press, TV, radio, etc.)</th>
<th>Membership drive through online means (websites, social media, etc.)</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 68 (Multiple responses were allowed.)
Box 3.8 Human Resources: Volunteers

Chart 3.8a Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs Using Either Full-time or Part-time Volunteers in the Last Twelve Months

- Recruits volunteers: 57.3%
- Does not recruit any volunteers: 42.7%

Base: 179

Chart 3.8b Percentage Distribution of Full-time and Part-time Volunteers for ACNPOs in the Last Twelve Months

**Full Time Volunteers**
- Refused to answer: 0.5%
- Yes: 14.1%
- No: 85.3%

**Part Time Volunteers**
- No: 5.5%
- Yes: 94.5%

Base: 100

Chart 3.8c Percentage Distribution of Number of Part-time Volunteers for ACNPOs in the Last Twelve Months

- 1-10: 42.6%
- 11-20: 20.7%
- 21-30: 9.0%
- 31-40: 9.4%
- 41-50: 1.3%
- 51-60: 6.5%
- Refused to answer: 10.5%

Base: 84
Chart 3.8d  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs Keeping a List of Regular Volunteers

Yes  30.2%
No   69.8%

Base: 100

Chart 3.8e  Percentage Distribution of Number of Regular Volunteers on ACNPOs Lists

1-10  22.0%
11-20 4.5%
21-30 8.3%
31-40 12.7%
41-50 13.7%
51 or above 18.2%
Refused to answer 20.6%

Base: 100
Box 3.9 Human Resource Capacity

Chart 3.9a Average Numbers of Staff, Members and Volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All respondents (179)</th>
<th>Larger groups (70)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average number of full-time staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of individual members</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of part-time volunteers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 3.9b Percentage Distribution of Self-evaluation of Staff Adequacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All respondents</th>
<th>Larger groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just adequate</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adequate</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriously inadequate</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to answer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179

Base: 70

Chart 3.9c Percentage Distribution of Self-evaluation of Difficulty in Recruiting and Retaining Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All respondents</th>
<th>Larger groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to answer</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179

Base: 70
Chart 3.9d  Percentage Distribution of Self-evaluation of Sufficiency of Professional Training for Staff

All respondents

- Adequate: 20.6%
- Just adequate: 28.4%
- Not adequate: 19.5%
- Seriously inadequate: 4.6%
- Refused to answer: 0%
- Not applicable: 27.0%

Base: 179

Larger groups

- Adequate: 22.0%
- Just adequate: 28.9%
- Not adequate: 19.5%
- Seriously inadequate: 6.6%
- Not applicable: 23.0%

Base: 70

Chart 3.9e  Percentage Distribution of Self-Evaluation of Volunteer Adequacy

All respondents

- Adequate: 14.4%
- Just adequate: 24.4%
- Not adequate: 26.6%
- Seriously inadequate: 13.9%
- Refused to answer: 0.6%
- Not applicable: 20.2%

Base: 179

Larger groups

- Adequate: 12.9%
- Just adequate: 29.7%
- Not adequate: 26.5%
- Seriously inadequate: 7.2%
- Not applicable: 23.7%

Base: 70
Box 3.10  Boards

Chart 3.10a  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ Boards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>50.4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179

Chart 3.10b  Percentage Distribution of Number of ACNPO’s Board Directors

| 1-5       | 60.8% |
| 6-10      | 15.0% |
| 11-15     | 15.2% |
| 16 or above | 6.9%  |
| Refused to answer | 2.1% |

Base: 80

Chart 3.10c  Percentage Distribution of Frequency of ACNPOs’ Board Meetings

| Once a year | 32.8% |
| Twice a year | 22.0% |
| Quarterly    | 20.8% |
| Every month  | 10.7% |
| Others       | 10.0% |
| Refused to answer | 1.4% |

Base: 80

Chart 3.10d  Percentage Distribution of ACNPO Board Committees

| 0            | 54.8% |
| 1            | 9.8%  |
| 2            | 7.1%  |
| 3            | 9.9%  |
| More than 3  | 15.0% |
| Refused to answer | 3.3% |

Base: 80
Chart 3.10e  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ Accountability Mechanisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability Mechanism</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disclose annual financial reports to the public (N=174)</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular meetings for member (N=90)</td>
<td>63.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual reports (N=90)</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports on issues (N=90)</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular newsletters or updates (N=90)</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails (N=90)</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other means of communication (N=90)</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Multiple answers are allowed.

Box 3.11  Operations and Governance Capacity

Chart 3.11  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs with a Board, the Average Number of Board Directors and Board Meeting Per Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All respondents</th>
<th>Larger groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage with a board</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of board directors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of board meeting per year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 3.12  Office Premises

Chart 3.12a  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs with a Physical Office in Hong Kong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179

Chart 3.12b  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs Running a Branch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>95.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179
Chart 3.12c  Percentage Distribution of Performing ACNPOs’ Regular Premises for Rehearsals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 157

Box 3.13  Physical Resource Capacity

Chart 3.13  Percentage Distribution of Self-evaluation of Office Facility Sufficiency in the Last Twelve Months

### All ACNPOs

- **Adequate**: 5.0%
- **Just adequate**: 15.7%
- **Not adequate**: 37.1%
- **Seriously inadequate**: 33.5%
- **Refused to answer**: 0.6%
- **Not applicable**: 8.0%

**Base: 179**

### Larger groups

- **Adequate**: 11.4%
- **Just adequate**: 17.1%
- **Not adequate**: 39.6%
- **Seriously inadequate**: 23.7%
- **Not applicable**: 8.3%

**Base: 70**
Box 3.14  Programmes, Marketing and Feedback Mechanism

Chart 3.14a  Percentage Distribution of Number of Programmes/Projects/Events in the Past Twelve Months

- 0: 6.8%
- 1-5: 49.80%
- 6-10: 16.70%
- 11-15: 9.60%
- 16-20: 4.70%
- 21 or above: 7.70%
- Refused to answer: 4.80%

Base: 179

Chart 3.14b  Percentage Distribution of Participants in Programmes/Projects/Events Organized by ACNPOs in the Past Twelve Months

- 0: 6.8%
- 1-500: 25.1%
- 501-1000: 15.90%
- 1001-1500: 4.50%
- 1501-2000: 6.20%
- 2001 or above: 30.10%
- Refused to answer: 11.4%

Base: 179

Chart 3.14c  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs Promoting Activities

- Yes: 94.7%
- No: 5.3%

Base: 179
Chart 3.14d  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ Channel(s) for Promoting Activities

- Membership network: 23.0% Very Often/Frequently, 29.5% Sometimes, 47.4% Rarely/Never
- Emailing and mobile phone messages: 26.9% Very Often/Frequently, 37.5% Sometimes, 35.6% Rarely/Never
- Online social networking tools (e.g. Facebook, Twitter): 22.3% Very Often/Frequently, 34.9% Sometimes, 42.7% Rarely/Never
- Direct mailing: 5.9% Very Often/Frequently, 15.1% Sometimes, 79.0% Rarely/Never
- Promotion on street: 2.3% Very Often/Frequently, 7.3% Sometimes, 90.5% Rarely/Never
- Advertising: 3.6% Very Often/Frequently, 11.9% Sometimes, 84.5% Rarely/Never
- Mass media (press, radio and television): 3.3% Very Often/Frequently, 23.5% Sometimes, 73.1% Rarely/Never
- Others: 3.4% Very Often/Frequently, 5.1% Sometimes, 0.0% Rarely/Never

Base: 170 (multiple answers were allowed. The percentage total may exceed 100)

Chart 3.14e  Percentage Distribution of ACNPO’s Communications Channels with Target Community

- Publications and printed materials: 12.24% Very Often/Frequently, 20.6% Sometimes, 66.42% Rarely/Never
- Online means (websites, email, social media, etc.): 7.7% Very Often/Frequently, 29.64% Sometimes, 37.06% Rarely/Never
- Mass media (press, radio and television): 7.7% Very Often/Frequently, 20.1% Sometimes, 76.94% Rarely/Never
- Events and Activities: 7.7% Very Often/Frequently, 25.03% Sometimes, 45.0% Rarely/Never
- Face-to-face communication (e.g. focus groups, talks, etc.): 7.7% Very Often/Frequently, 15.82% Sometimes, 34.0% Rarely/Never

Base: 179 (multiple answers were allowed. The percentage total may exceed 100)
Chart 3.14f  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ Public Communication Channels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Channel</th>
<th>Very Often/Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely/Never</th>
<th>Refused to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face communication (e.g., focus groups, talks, etc.)</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events and Activities</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass media (press, radio and television)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online means (websites, email, social media, etc.)</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications and printed materials</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179 (multiple answers were allowed. The percentages on the chart may exceed 100 per cent)

Chart 3.14g  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs Having a Mechanism to Evaluate Programme Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to answer</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179

Chart 3.14h  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ Channels for Identifying the Needs of Target Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification Channel</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion with other arts and cultural organizations</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting or collecting feedback from the audience/clients</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment through professional consultancy firms</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information gathering by staff or volunteer</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179
Box 3.15  Programmes and Planning Capacity

Chart 3.15  Percentage Distribution of Self-evaluation of Success in Addressing Target Communities’ Needs in the Past Five Years

- Very much agree: 4.5%
- Agree: 47.1%
- Disagree: 20.7%
- Very much disagree: 12.7%
- Neutral / No comment: 15.0%

Base: 179

Box 3.16  Information Technology

Chart 3.16a  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs with Websites

- Yes: 60.9%
- No: 39.1%

Base: 179

Chart 3.16b  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ Frequency of Website Updates

- Yes, we update the website(s) regularly: 24.1%
- Yes, but we update our website(s) only when necessary: 71.8%
- No, we do not update our website(s): 4.1%

Base: 108

Chart 3.16c  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ Use of Digital Means in Organizing Activities

- Yes: 51.7%
- No: 48.3%

Base: 179
**Box 3.17  Information Technology Capacity**

**Chart 3.17a  Percentage of ACNPOs Operating a Website**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of ACNPO operating a website</th>
<th>All respondents (179)</th>
<th>Larger groups (70)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 3.17b  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ Perceived Effectiveness of Digital Means by Activity**

- **Fund raising (N=20):**
  - Very Effective/Slightly Effective: 10.0%
  - Slightly Ineffective/Very ineffective: 40.0%
  - Refused to answer: 50.0%
- **Member recruitment and mobilization (N=36):**
  - Very Effective/Slightly Effective: 5.6%
  - Slightly Ineffective/Very ineffective: 22.2%
  - Refused to answer: 72.2%
- **Volunteer recruitment and mobilization (N=33):**
  - Very Effective/Slightly Effective: 9.1%
  - Slightly Ineffective/Very ineffective: 30.3%
  - Refused to answer: 60.6%
- **Promote programs and activities (n=87):**
  - Very Effective/Slightly Effective: 9.2%
  - Slightly Ineffective/Very ineffective: 4.6%
  - Refused to answer: 86.2%
- **Advocacy (N=12):**
  - Very Effective/Slightly Effective: 33.3%
  - Slightly Ineffective/Very ineffective: 33.3%
  - Refused to answer: 33.3%
- **Others (N=2):**
  - Very Effective/Slightly Effective: 50.0%
  - Slightly Ineffective/Very ineffective: 50.0%
  - Refused to answer: 0.0%
Box 3.18 Self-evaluation of Overall Results

Chart 3.18a Percentage Distribution of Self-evaluation of Whether Service Quality was Maintained in the Past Five Years

All ACNPOs

- Very much agree: 18.3%
- Agree: 57.2%
- Disagree: 12.7%
- Very much disagree: 3.5%
- Neutral / No comment: 13.3%

Base: 179

Larger groups

- Very much agree: 8.5%
- Agree: 70.3%
- Disagree: 5.6%
- Very much disagree: 0.0%
- Neutral / No comment: 15.6%

Base: 70

Chart 3.18b Percentage Distribution of Self-evaluation of Whether Missions were Successfully Achieved in the Past Five Years

All ACNPOs

- Very much agree: 11.1%
- Agree: 47.3%
- Disagree: 20.3%
- Very much disagree: 5.2%
- Neutral / No comment: 16.2%

Base: 179

Larger groups

- Very much agree: 16.5%
- Agree: 59.8%
- Disagree: 9.3%
- Very much disagree: 0.6%
- Neutral / No comment: 13.8%

Base: 70 ACNPOs
The ability to network and collaborate with external stakeholders is an important measure of organizational capacity. NPOs may network with the government and business actors to achieve their organizational missions and pursue long-term development. This chapter analyzes the non-profit arts and cultural sector’s patterns of networking among peer ACNPOs, with the government and businesses based on both the survey data and publicly available records from different sources.

**Civil Society Linkages within and across Sectors**

Using network analysis techniques, we analyzed three different types of organizational linkage between ACNPOs and other NPOs in either the arts and cultural sector or other sectors. They are: interlocking directorate networks, networks of umbrella organizations and cooperative networks.

**Interlocking Directorates (Box 4.1)**

Interlocking directorates refer to scenarios in which individuals sit on the boards of multiple organizations. The analysis of interlocking directorates in a sector can offer information on the degree and patterns of cooperation between organizations at the level of strategic decision-making. A low degree of interlocking directorate may indicate that organizations do not interact much at the strategic level and operate primarily independently. A high degree of interlocking directorate may indicate that the sector’s strategic decision is dominated by a small group of individuals. An individual sitting on many boards in the same sector is assumed to be influential in that sector.

We measured the degree of interlocking directorates in terms of the percentage of groups sharing directors. We collected board membership data for 400 ACNPOs from their websites and records filed with the Companies Registry. This represented 22 per cent of our ACNPO population. 3,568 ACNPO directors were identified. There are situations in which different ACNPO boards listed their directors using different languages (English or Chinese) and varying naming conventions leading to some ambiguity in identifying whether two names in a different styles in reality referred to the same individual. While making best efforts to correct for this, we took a conservative approach towards disambiguation, and thus the number of interlocking directorates might be under-reported.

The findings of network analysis graphically presented in Box 4.1 are as follows:

- The interlocking directorates were mainly within rather than across sub-sectors.
- 189 (47.2 per cent) ACNPOs shared at least one director with another ACNPO.
- There were four clusters of ACNPOs (shown as yellow nodes) that shared directors with at least ten other ACNPOs.
- There were two connected ACNPOs (shown as green nodes) that had at least 18 shared directors.
- There were four connected ACNPOs (shown as red nodes and ties) that shared at least five directors.
- 211 (52.8 per cent) are isolates, meaning they did not share any director with another ACNPO.
- 37 individuals served as directors on three or more ACNPO boards.
- 3 individuals were board directors of four to seven ACNPOs.
The director on top of the list sat on seven boards across six sub-sectors, including arts education, visual arts, media, theatre, design and cross-cultural activities. The person is a prominent figure in the arts and cultural sector who advocates for cultural policy change and social innovation. She also served on three government committees/sub-committees relevant to arts and cultural matters.

Second on the list was a politician from the largest pro-establishment political party, who was until recently a Legislative Councilor and District Councilor. He was appointed to five ACNPO boards across sub-sectors, including two of the nine biggest government-subsidized performing arts groups and a district arts association.

Quite often, the core linking ACNPOs were umbrella organizations. The degree of interlocking directorates was higher than the conservation (22 per cent) and international sectors (13.8 per cent).

**Box 4.1 Interlocking Directorates**

Legend:

- **Nodes** — represent ACNPOs. The larger a node, the more directors the ACNPO shared with other peer groups and hence the closer bond between the ACNPOs.
- **Ties** — show the linkage of ACNPOs by sharing directors. The thicker an edge, the more directors shared between the two nodes (ACNPOs).
- **Yellow nodes** — ACNPOs that shared directors with at least 10 other ACNPOs.
- **Green nodes and edges** — Two connected ACNPOs having at least 18 shared directors.
- **Red nodes and edges** — Four connected ACNPOs that shared at least 5 directors.
- **Blue square nodes** — ACNPOs sharing directors with 1-6 peer groups.
- **Isolated nodes** — 211 isolates in total. Each isolated node represents 5 or more isolates.

Base: 400
Umbrella Organization Networks (Box 4.2 - 4.3)

Umbrella organizations serve to promote the common interests of member organizations through organizing joint activities (such as programmers, exhibitions and competition) or advocacy. The arts and cultural sector has more umbrella organizations than the other civil society sectors we have studied. (There is no umbrella organization in the conservation and international sectors. In the social service sector, the Hong Kong Council of Social Services provides a single common platform for most social service NGOs.)

We identified 12 umbrella organizations that self-claimed to have arts and cultural organizations as members. There were 10 which we could match the names of their organizational members with our ACNPO database. At least 269 ACNPOs (or 14.8 per cent of the 1,816 ACNPOs) were found to be connected to one or more of the 10 umbrella organizations (listed in Box 4.2). Box 4.3 graphically presents the network patterns. Some umbrella organizations have both profit and non-profit making organizational members, and not all of them are ACNPOs.

There are four major cross-sector umbrella organizations:

- **The Association of Chinese Culture of Hong Kong** has the largest membership and the largest number of connections with different arts and cultural sub-sectors (136 organizations, or 41.8 per cent of all its self-reported organizational members) (Box 4.2). According to its website, the Association was established in the year 2000 with "the support of the Central People's Government and the HKSAR Government". Through several of its ACNPO members, the Association has indirect linkages with seven other umbrella organizations (Box 4.3). As a result, the Association has direct or indirect linkages with almost all umbrella organizations in the arts and cultural sector.

- There are at least two district-based umbrella organizations not directly associated with arts and culture but are supposed to serve multiple purposes. They are The New Territories Association of Societies and the Kowloon Federation of Associations. Both have significant clusters of ACNPO members.

- The **Hong Kong Culture Association**, established in 2001, is another umbrella organization focusing on Chinese culture and "cultural exchanges between HKSAR and Mainland China." There were no membership details that we could match with our ACNPO database.

- Based on the data available, there was no overlapping ACNPO membership among the four umbrella organizations mentioned above.

There are also sub-sector-based umbrella organizations:

- The **dance sub-sector** has fairly strong networks (Box 4.2). We found at least three dance umbrella organizations plus two networks for both non-profit and for-profit dance groups. In particular, The Association of Hong Kong Dance Organizations had 39 ACNPO members (which comprised 42.9 per cent of all of its members). The dance umbrella organizations conduct policy advocacy for the sub-sector. The Hong Kong Dance Alliance was active in the Phase 1 development of the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD). It formed an alliance with other ACNPOs such as the Hong Kong Ballet Group and Hong Kong Dance Federation to participate actively in deliberation forums and lobby the government to build the Hong Kong Dance Pavilion in WKCD.

- There are networks of umbrella organizations in other sub-sectors: visual art (photography), music and theatre (Box 4.2). Another notable finding is that all five members of the Hong Kong Children's Arts Alliance were linked with other umbrella organizations (Box 4.3).

- Xiqu and variety & pop shows and others groups do not have any sub-sector umbrella organization. Nonetheless, many of these groups are members of the cross sub-sector or district-based umbrella organizations mentioned above (Box 4.2).
# Umbrella Organizations in the Arts and Cultural sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-sector</th>
<th>Name of Umbrella Organizations</th>
<th>Self-reported number of member organizations</th>
<th>Number of member organizations that are ACNPOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross sectors</td>
<td>1. The Association of Chinese Culture of Hong Kong 香港中華文化總會</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Hong Kong Children’s Arts Alliance 香港兒藝聯盟</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Hong Kong Culture Association 香港各界文化促進會</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions 工聯會^</td>
<td>More than 4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>5. Hong Kong Federation of Drama Societies 香港戲劇協會</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>6. Hong Kong Association of Choral Societies 香港合唱團協會^</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Art (Photography)</td>
<td>7. Federation of Asian Photographic Art 亞洲影藝聯盟</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>8. Association of Hong Kong Dance Organizations 香港舞蹈聯會</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Hong Kong Dance Alliance 香港舞蹈聯盟</td>
<td>More than 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Hong Kong Dance Federation Limited 香港舞蹈總會^^</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Based</td>
<td>11. New Territories Association of Societies 新界社團聯會^</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Kowloon Federation of Associations 九龍社團聯會^</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of ACNPO members in the 12 umbrella organizations 288

Total number of ACNPO in our database connected to one or more umbrella organizations 269

^ These umbrella organizations are not in our ACNPO database.

^^ Classified in our database as sports and recreation groups.
Box 4.3  Networks of Umbrella Organizations

Legend:

**Rounded squares** - umbrella organizations. The larger a rounded square, the more ACNPOs members it had.

**Circular nodes** - ACNPO member organizations

**Ties** - linkage by way of organizational membership

- **Blue:** Cross-cultural, artistic activities and others
- **Orange:** Performing arts: dance, theatre, music
- **Purple:** Visual arts, architecture and ceramic arts
- **Green:** History, literary and humanistic society
- **Red:** Media and communications
- **Grey:** District associations
- **Yellow:** Dance umbrella organizations

Base: 279 (10 umbrella organizations and 269 member ACNPOs)
Cooperation Networks (Box 4.4 - 4.5)

ACNPOs may cooperate with other NPOs of the same sector or different sectors so as to leverage each other’s resources to achieve their goals (e.g., by sharing expertise and manpower, reaching out to target communities, marketing and co-organizing activities). Forms of cooperation range from regular contact to collaborating in projects. Based on the survey data, regular contacts with other NPOs were quite scarce, be they from Hong Kong (18.4 per cent), Mainland China (9.5 per cent) or overseas (12.8 per cent) (Chart 4.4). 11.2 per cent had regular collaboration and 30.2 per cent had occasional collaboration with other NPOs in organizing events or programmes. Nonetheless, there were variations among different sub-sectors. For instance, the non-performing arts sub-sector had a high percentage of their members reporting regular contacts with local and overseas NPOs, as well as collaboration with other NPOs. In contrast, Xiqu groups had the lowest percentage with regular contact and collaboration (Chart 4.4).

Overall, the majority of ACNPO respondents (80.4 per cent) did not see competition with their peers for financial or human resources (Chart 4.4). Among the 35 respondents that reported having peer competition, 25 mentioned competition for subsidies and 14 for performing venues. Again, variations were large among sub-sectors. While no respondent from the Xiqu sub-sector perceived any competition, half of the theatre respondents reported having competition.

We mapped the networks of regular and occasional collaboration in organizing programmes / events (Box 4.5). The network was rather scattered for regular collaboration (Charts 4.5b) but quite dense for occasional collaboration (Chart 4.5c). Collaboration among ACNPOs mainly occurred within sub-sectors. Notably, the dance and theatre sub-sectors had more occasional collaboration with peers in the same sub-sectors. There was little collaboration across the arts and cultural sub-sectors. Interestingly, however, there was quite notable collaboration with other civil society sectors, especially social service NPOs, in organizing programmes (Chart 4.5c). Some collaboration was also noted with religious groups, green groups and education-related organizations. Patterns of collaboration with other civil society sectors are consistent with the role of arts in various aspects of social development, including health, therapy, education, etc.

### Box 4.4 Forms of Cooperation with Other NPOs

#### Chart 4.4 Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ Relationship with Other NPOs by Sub-sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-sector</th>
<th>Dance</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Variety, pop shows and others</th>
<th>Xiqu</th>
<th>Non-performing arts NPOs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular contact with international non-profits outside Hong Kong</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular contact with non-profits in Mainland China</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular contact with other non-profits in Hong Kong</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular collaboration with other non-profits in organizing events and programmes</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional collaboration with other non-profits in organizing events and programmes</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition with other non-profits on securing resources</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Box 4.5  Cooperation Networks

Chart 4.5a Regular Contact with Hong Kong, Mainland or Overseas NPOs

Legend:
Performing arts NPOs are on the upper part of the chart. Non-performing arts NPOs are on the lower part of the chart.

**Rounded Square Nodes** – represent ACNPOs. The bigger a node, the more cooperation partners it had.

**Ties** – represent cooperative relationships between two NPOs.

- **Blue nodes** – ACNPO respondents in the survey
- **Green nodes** – Hong Kong NPOs named by the survey respondents for regular contact.
- **Red nodes** – Mainland Chinese NPOs named by the survey respondents for regular contact.
- **Yellow nodes** – Overseas NPOs named by the survey respondents for regular contact.
- **Isolated black dots** – 134 isolates in total.

Chart 4.5a

Base: 179 ACNPOs in our Hong Kong database; 68 other NPOs mentioned by the ACNPO respondents
Chart 4.5b Regular Collaboration with Other NPOs

Legend:
**Rounded Square Nodes** – represent ACNPOs. The larger a node, the more cooperation partners it had.
**Triangular Nodes** – represent NPOs outside the arts and cultural sector named by the ACNPO respondents as collaborators.
**Ties** – represent cooperative relationships between two NPOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node Color</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yellow nodes</td>
<td>Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green nodes</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black nodes</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple nodes</td>
<td>Variety &amp; pop show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey nodes</td>
<td>Xiqu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red nodes</td>
<td>Non-performing art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink nodes</td>
<td>Social services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange nodes</td>
<td>Non-social services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White nodes</td>
<td>NPOs mentioned but with no names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated black dots</td>
<td>isolates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179 ACNPOs in our Hong Kong database; 12 other NPOs mentioned by survey respondents
Chart 4.5c  ACNPOs’ Occasional Collaboration with Other NPOs

Legend:
*Rounded Square Nodes* – represent ACNPOs. The bigger a node, the more cooperation partners it had.
*Up Triangular Nodes* – represent NPOs outside the arts and cultural sector named by the ACNPO respondents as collaborators
*Ties* – represent cooperative relationships between two NPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yellow nodes</td>
<td>Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green nodes</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black nodes</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple nodes</td>
<td>Variety &amp; pop show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey nodes</td>
<td>Xiqu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red nodes</td>
<td>Non-performing art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink nodes</td>
<td>Social services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange nodes</td>
<td>Non-social services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White nodes</td>
<td>NPOs mentioned but with no names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated black dots</td>
<td>isolates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179 ACNPOs in our Hong Kong database; 32 other NPOs mentioned by survey respondents
ACNPOs-Government Relations

Chapter 2 explained that some (not all) ACNPOs are eligible to register as corporate voters in the functional constituency of political representation. According to our survey, 36.9 per cent of the ACNPOs have registered as voters. 33 per cent of them did not register even though they knew they were eligible. 21.8 did not know if they were eligible (Box 4.6, Chart 4.6).

In addition, we studied ACNPOs-government relations in two ways: (a) mapping the relevant government advisory committee membership against the ACNPO directors; and (b) surveying the views of ACNPOs on their relationship with the Hong Kong SAR Government.

Box 4.6  ACNPOs as Voters

Chart 4.6 Percentage Distribution of the Sports, Performing Arts, Culture and Publication Functional Constituency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, eligible but not yet reg.</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, not eligible</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused to answer</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base cases: 179

ACNPOs-Government Committee Network (Box 4.7-4.8)

- 92 ACNPO directors (from 78 ACNPOs) were found appointed to 32 government committees. (Box 4.7)
- Six government committees or sub-committees appointed directors of 10 or more ACNPO boards as committee members.
- The largest clusters of interlocking memberships were concentrated in the following as graphically depicted in Box 4.8:
  - Art Museum Advisory Panel (the biggest blue square node), in which members were affiliated with 21 ACNPOs;
  - Consultation Panel of WKCDA (the biggest yellow square node), in which members were affiliated with 16 ACNPOs;
  - Museum Committee of WKCDA (the second biggest yellow square node), in which members were affiliated with 15 ACNPOs;
  - Board of WKCDA (the second biggest yellow square node), in which members were affiliated with 14 ACNPOs; and
  - Hong Kong Arts Development Council (the second biggest blue square node), in which members were affiliated with 14 ACNPOs.
- The percentage of ACNPO directors in government committees varied from less than 10 per cent (six government committees/sub-committees) to more than 50 per cent (nine government committees/sub-committees). On average, close to 32 per cent of the seats of the government committees and sub-committees studied were occupied by ACNPO board members. The pattern is reasonable as some government committees are directly related to arts development while a few are only indirectly related (e.g. heritage and communications).
We found a small group of people who were appointed to multiple government committees:

- 18 ACNPO board directors sat on two or more government committees.

- Two ACNPO board directors were appointed to four government committees or sub-committees. One is a scholar of local history who serves on government committees related to heritage preservation. Another has a legal background and focuses on heritage issues.

- Another two ACNPO board directors were appointed to three government committees or sub-committees. One has media business background and serves on government committees or sub-committees related to museums. Another one, who holds directorship on seven ACNPO boards, serves on government committees related to broader arts policies.

The ACNPO-government committee network pattern was much denser than any of the three civil society sectors (social service, conservation and international) previously studied. In particular, some government committees appointed members from a large number of ACNPOs. This phenomenon can be explained by two factors: (a) the arts and cultural sector has a much larger number of organizations than the other three sectors; and (b) the arts and cultural sector has many more characteristically distinct sub-sectors than other sectors. At the same time, offering multiple appointments to a few individuals has been a rather common practice of the government since the colonial years, a practice that has invited criticism for its lack of social representativeness.
### Box 4.7 Hong Kong Government Boards and Committees Relating to Arts and Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of boards and committees</th>
<th>Total number of government committee members</th>
<th>Number (and %) of committee members on ACNPO boards</th>
<th>No. of ACNPO boards affiliated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall arts and cultural development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong Arts Development Council 香港藝術發展局</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13 (54.2%)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee on Arts Development (ACAD) 藝術發展諮詢委員會</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6 (37.5%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-committee on the Arts Development Fund of ACAD 藝術發展基金諮詢委員會</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 (50.0%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-committee on Arts Education of ACAD 藝術教育諮詢委員會</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-committee on Funding for the Performing Arts of ACAD 表演藝術資助諮詢委員會</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4 (36.4%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-committee on Visual Arts of ACAD 視覺藝術諮詢委員會</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7 (53.8%)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of West Kowloon Cultural District Authority 西九文化區管理局董事局</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8 (53.3%)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee of West Kowloon Cultural District Authority 西九文化區管理局行政委員會</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (50.0%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Committee of West Kowloon Cultural District Authority 西九文化區管理局審計委員會</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 (40.0%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Committee of West Kowloon Cultural District Authority 西九文化區管理局發展委員會</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 (50.0%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts Committee of West Kowloon Cultural District Authority 西九文化區管理局表演藝術委員會</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7 (46.7%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration Committee of West Kowloon Cultural District Authority 西九文化區管理局薪酬委員會</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Committee of West Kowloon Cultural District Authority 西九文化區管理局投資委員會</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Acquisition Committee of West Kowloon Cultural District Authority 西九文化區管理局臨時購藏委員會</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5 (55.6%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Committee of West Kowloon Cultural District Authority 西九文化區管理局博物館委員會</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9 (52.9%)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Panel of West Kowloon Cultural District Authority 西九文化區管理局諮詢委員會</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7 (43.8%)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir David Trench Fund Committee (founder of Arts Development Fund) 戴麟趾爵士康樂基金委員會 (藝術發展基金)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 (11.1%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage and antiquities</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee on Revitalisation of Historic Buildings 活化歷史建築諮詢委員會</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiquities Advisory Board 古物諮詢委員會</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2 (8.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Museum Advisory Panel 藝術博物館諮詢委員會</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Trustees of the Lord Wilson Heritage Trust 廖繼勳爵士文物信託受託人委員會</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 (9.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Lord Wilson Heritage Trust 廖繼勳爵士文物信託理事會</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intangible Cultural Heritage Advisory Committee 非物質文化遺產諮詢委員會</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3 (17.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Museum Advisory Panel</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3 (15.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Museum Advisory Panel</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Review (Film Censorship)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performing arts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of The Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5 (31.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Trustees of The Hong Kong Jockey Club Music and Dance Fund</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5 (41.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese Opera and Xiqu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese Opera Advisory Committee</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7 (29.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese Opera Development Fund Advisory Committee</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5 (35.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Authority 通訊事務管理局</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Tribunal 版權審裁處</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mega Event Fund Assessment Committee (under Tourism Commission)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Libraries Advisory Committee</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Group on Manufacturing Industries, Innovative Technology, and Cultural and Creative Industries, Economic Development Commission</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6 (35.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Percentage of Government Committee Members who are ACNPO Board Directors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Box 4.8  Government Committee Network

**Legend:**
- **Yellow nodes**: West Kowloon Cultural District Authority Board (WKCDCA) and its sub-committees
- **Green nodes**: Advisory Committee on Arts Development (ACAD) and its sub-committees
- **Blue nodes**: Arts related government committees other than WKCDCA and ACAD. The larger the square node, the more government committee members are also ACNPO board directors
- **Red circles**: ACNPO board members appointed to Government committees relevant to the arts and cultural sector.

**Ties** – show the linkage between Government committees and ACNPOs

Base: 78 ACNPOs and 32 government committees/sub-committees

---

**Self-appraisal on governmental relations (Box 4.9)**

The vast majority of the ACNPOs surveyed (81.1 per cent) considered themselves “autonomous” or “very autonomous” from the government in their routine operations or decision-making (Chart 4.9a). The ACNPOs’ perception of high autonomy from the Hong Kong government is in line with the three other sectors of civil society we have studied (social services: 88.2 per cent, conservation: 87.5 per cent, international: 85.5 per cent). 37.7 per cent of the ACNPO respondents found the level of mutual trust with government unchanged in the past five years (Chart 4.9b). Only 6.9 per cent said that the mutual trust improved while 7 per cent reported deterioration. A high proportion of them (48.5 per cent) chose the answers “unknown / no opinion” or “not applicable,” which we took as a sign of their general detachment from the government. Similar pattern of opinions was found in the related question of perceived relationship with HKSAR officials, in which 39.1 per cent of the respondents answered “not applicable” while 34.8 per cent described the relationship as “neutral” (Chart 4.9c). Compared to the survey results on the social service, conservation and international sectors, the arts and cultural sector recorded the highest percentage of ‘no opinion / not applicable’ answer to the same questions.
Box 4.9 ACNPOs-Government Relations

Chart 4.9a Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ Perceived Independence from Government in Routine Operations or Decision-making

Base: 179

Chart 4.9b Percentage Distribution of ACNPO's Perceived Mutual Trust with the HKSAR Government in the Past Five Years

Base: 179

Chart 4.9c Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs' Perceived Relationship with HKSAR Officials

Base: 179
Minimal Advocacy Activities (Box 4.10)

Results from our survey indicated minimal political participation and advocacy activities from the ACNPOs. Only 10.5 per cent of all ACNPOs indicated they had participated in advocacy activities in the previous twelve months (Chart 4.10a). Specifically, many of these advocacy activities took the form of making submissions to the government or the press conferences. Only 15 per cent reported employing staff to conduct advocacy or related research work (Chart 4.10b). 77.9 per cent did not consider themselves to have a role in monitoring the HKSAR government (Chart 4.10c). Among the 40 ACNPOs which reported having such a monitoring role, 36.9 per cent felt their efforts in monitoring the government were “ineffective” or “very ineffective”. Overall, the ACNPO sector’s interest in advocacy was lower than other civil society sectors we studied previously.

Box 4.10 ACNPO’s Involvement in Advocacy

Chart 4.10a Percentage Distribution of Advocacy Activity by ACNPOs in the Last Twelve Months

- Yes: 10.5%
- No: 89.5%

Base: 179

Chart 4.10b Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs Employing Staff for Advocacy

- Yes: 15.0%
- No: 37.7%
- Not applicable: 47.4%

Base: 170

Chart 4.10c Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ View on Monitoring the HKSAR Government

- Yes: 18.7%
- No: 77.9%
- Refused to answer: 3.4%

Base: 179
Aloof from the Business Sector (Box 4.11)

Our survey findings showed a rather distant relationship between ACNPOs and the business sector. Only 16.5 per cent reported having cooperated with the business sector last year (c.f.: social services: 46.4 per cent, conservation: 60.7, international: 52.7 per cent) (Chart 4.11a). The cooperation was mostly in the forms of holding joint projects (52.1 per cent) or fund raising (21.7 per cent). None said they cooperated with businesses on advocacy and recruitment of volunteers. Very few ACNPOs (3.2 per cent) kept a list of regular business donors (Chart 4.11b).

Also, the majority (66.4 per cent) had no opinion when asked about the attitude of the business sector toward them (Charts 4.11c). 78.7 per cent said their relationship with the business sector remained unchanged compared with five years ago while 12.8 per cent said the relationship had improved (Chart 4.11d). 90.8 per cent did not think they had a role in monitoring business (Chart 4.11e). Among those that reported having such a role, 43.8 per cent did not think their role was effective.

Box 4.11  Relationship with Business Sector

Chart 4.11a  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ Cooperation with the Business Sector in the Past Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179

Chart 4.11b  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs Keeping a List of Business Donors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 179
Networking Capacity

From this chapter, many ACNPOs partnered with a few peer groups of the same sub-sector (or art form) or a few other NGOs such as social service agencies or religious groups to organize programmes. Each sub-sector had its own platform or umbrella network for liaison or general exchange. However, ACNPOs' reach to groups outside of their respective sub-sectors was quite limited. Inter-locking directorate mainly occurred within sub-sectors, which may indicate a lack of knowledge sharing with other sectors or sub-sectors, and fewer opportunities for collaboration on issues of common interest in civil society.

The vast majority of ACNPOs had no representation in the government's advisory system. Less than 5 per cent in the sector (78 ACNPOs) had board members sitting in government committees. However, the weakest external link was with the business sector. Except for the biggest groups in the sector such as the nine major performing arts groups, ACNPOs obtained very little corporate sponsorship. Art philanthropy was also underdeveloped in Hong Kong.
VARIATIONS AMONG SUB-SECTORS

As mentioned, the arts and cultural sector is characterized by diverse ecologies among their sub-sectors, which tend to have varying purposes, agendas and operational requirements. This chapter caters for those that are interested in understanding these different characteristics. We highlight the uniqueness of each of the six sub-sectors based on further analysis of our survey findings.

The Non-Performing Arts Sub-Sector

The non-performing arts sub-sector was composed of the following sub-sub-sectors: visual arts (50.9 per cent), cross-cultural (25.4 per cent), history, literary and humanistic society (15.2 per cent), media and communications (7 per cent) and museums (1.5 per cent) (Chart 1.1c). No separate statistical analysis could be conducted for each of them due to the limited sample size. The non-performing ACNPOs as a sub-sector is distinguished by the following characteristics:

Mission - 59.1 per cent of non-performing arts groups regard the 'cultivation or promotion of artistic, aesthetic, or humanistic values' as their primary or secondary mission (c.f. 'expression of arts and culture' was the primary or secondary mission for 86.7 per cent of the performing arts groups). 63.6 per cent of them also ranked 'service delivery' as their first or second priority. 22.7 per cent of them considered 'advocacy' (of rights, values or policy) as a priority, which was a significantly higher percentage than other sub-sectors (Box 3.3).

Board - 95.5 per cent of them were governed by a board of directors, and a higher percentage of them (ranging from 60 to 80 per cent) utilize various accountability mechanisms than other sub-sectors.

Human resources - An average non-performing arts group employed more full-time staff (15), recruited more individual and corporate members (214, 171) as well as full-time volunteers (14), but hired fewer part-time staff (6), temporary staff (13) and recruited fewer part-time volunteer (17) (Box 5.1: Chart 5.1a, 5.1b and 5.1f).

Office space - While only half of all ACNPOs occupied a physical office space, a vast majority (86.4 per cent) of non-performing arts groups rented an office in a commercial, an industrial or a government-owned building (Box 5.2).

Programmes - On average, non-performing arts groups organized 23 events per year (c.f. the sector's average was 11), with a total of 24,523 participants, the highest among all sub-sectors (Box 5.3). Non-performing arts groups often used three channels (email, social media and membership network) to promote their programmes.
Sub-Sectors in Performing Arts

The distinctiveness of each art form may substantially affect its organizational requirements. For example, theatrical performances often require stable team work whereas dance performances may be of individual creation or team efforts. Our data analysis identified significant differences in the priorities and organizational characteristics among the different performing arts sub-sectors.

Dance

- The dance sub-sector was more established than most performing arts groups. A typical dance group employed more full-time staff (13) and far fewer part-time (6) or temporary (5) staff than the sector-wide average (Chart 5.1a). Its individual membership size (143) was higher than average (Chart 5.1b). On the other hand, it had the lowest growth in the number of organizations since 1997 (Chart 3.1b).

Music

- A typical music group employed fewer full-time (6) but more part-time (19) and temporary (45) staff than the sector-wide average (Chart 5.1a). The membership size (98) was below average (Chart 5.1b). Last but not least, its number of full-time volunteers was below average while that of part-time volunteers was above average (Chart 5.1f).

- A typical music group organized 10 events in the last 12 months (which came close to the sector's average) and attracted a total of 19,337 audiences (which was higher than the sector's average) (Box 5.3).

Theatre

- There was a high increase in number after 1997 (Chart 3.1b). The newer ones tended to be smaller in size.

- The average number of individual membership (60) was less than half of the sector's average (Chart 5.1b).

- It organized fewer programmes (6) than most of the sub-sectors in the last 12 months. An average theatre group had a total of 4,815 participants in its programmes in the past year, which was less than half of the sector's average (Box 5.3).

Variety, pop shows and others

- This sub-sector was quite informal. Their groups kept a small team of staff and had only a few large scale productions each year.

- The rate of increase was moderate after 1997 (Chart 3.1b).

- It had a very high average number of part-time staff (151) (Chart 5.1a) and individual members (196) (Chart 5.1b). Its average number of full-time volunteers was low (4) but that of part-time volunteers was high (41) (Chart 5.1f).

- Only 17.6 per cent established a governing board.

- Each organization in the sub-sector only organized eight events last year, which were fewer than the sector's average of 11. The number of participants in these programmes (730) was the lowest among all sub-sectors (Box 5.3). 11.8 per cent of them did not even promote their programmes.

- Substantially lower percentage of them (41.2 per cent) operated a website. They were also less likely to use online channels to communicate with target communities.

Xiqu

At present, Xiqu is the largest sub-sector, its organizations representing 37.2 per cent of the total population of 1,816 ACNPOs. Of special interest is that there was a significant increase in the actual number of Xiqu groups after 1997 even though there was only a mild growth in audienceship (which includes a sizeable non-fee paying audience as a result of government policy and special funding. See Chapter 2). The growth in the number of organizations can be partly attributed to the availability of government funding to facilitate and promote Xiqu, which makes it easier for groups to apply for small funding (e.g. district council funding) and rent performance venues (Chapter 2). As well, an aging population might have helped revive the community's interest in Xiqu culture.

There are two types of Xiqu performances. The first type is a full-scale Cantonese opera.
performance that requires the assembly of a large team of artists, musicians, and stage professionals. The second type is Xiqu song performance that requires comparatively minimal resources and manpower for production. Our data showed that it was the second, simpler form of Xiqu that constituted the majority of performance in the sub-sector. Many organizational characteristics of Xiqu groups were found to deviate from other sub-sectors, and they are highlighted as follows:

**Mission** - 9.3 per cent of Xiqu groups considered 'community building' as their primary mission, while 18.5 per cent considered it as their secondary mission. The result was distinct from other sub-sectors.

**Human resources and membership** - A typical Xiqu group hired no more than two full-time staff, three part-timers, and 13 temporary staff, all far fewer than the sector's overall average (Chart 5.1a). Most Xiqu groups (61 per cent) hired temporary staff to cope with occasional needs. A typical Xiqu group also had far fewer individual members (65) than the sector's average of 136 (Chart 5.1b). All Xiqu groups in our survey reported that they recruited new members solely through referral by current members. Unlike groups in other sub-sectors, Xiqu groups did not organize any online membership campaigns.

**Income** - All but one Xiqu group in our survey either had an annual income of less than HKD 10,000 or were entirely self-funded. A vast majority of them (91.2 per cent) did not engage in any fundraising activities. Over 40 per cent of them answered 'no comment' or 'neutral' to the self-evaluation questions on financial capacity.

**Governance** - Compared to the sector-wide average of 50.4 per cent, a far smaller proportion (18.5 per cent) of Xiqu groups had a governing board. For those few that had governing boards, they almost exclusively used regular meetings among members (70.6 per cent) as their accountability mechanism and rarely adopted any other means.

**Office space** - The majority (68.5 per cent) did not occupy any office space whereas 55 per cent of all ACNPOs reported that they had such space (Chart 5.2a).

**Programmes and marketing** - On average, each Xiqu group organized only four programmes last year (the lowest among all sub-sectors) that were attended by 2,683 persons (the second lowest among all sub-sectors) (Box 5.3). Only 9.3 per cent of them promoted their programmes, and the sub-sector used the least of any kind of promotion channels.

**Information technology** - 79.6 per cent of Xiqu groups did not operate a website. Only a minority (22.2 per cent) of the Xiqu sub-sector used the Internet, social media or other digital means to organize activities.

In sum, Xiqu groups are typically non-professional groups, apparently organized by Xiqu lovers for recreation, hobby or community networking purposes, with no office space and, in many cases, not even full-time staff. They are most likely self-funded, have negligible outside income, and organized around the personal networks of current members.
Interlocking Directorates by Sub-sector

Box 5.4 presents the patterns of interlocking directorates in different sub-sectors and fields:

- **Visual arts sub-sector (Box 5.4, Chart 5.4a):** 50 per cent had interlocking directorates. The graph shows two sub-sub-sectors had a high degree of interlocking directorate.
  - All the six groups in the design sub-sub-sector shared directors. The two design groups represented by green nodes in Chart 5.4a (Hong Kong Design Centre; The Hong Kong Federation of Design Associations Limited) shared 21 and 18 directors with 12 and 11 groups in the same sub-sub-sector respectively.
  - Photography sub-sub-sector: 65 per cent of the photography groups shared directors. The four photography groups represented by yellow nodes in Chart 5.4a shared directors with four to six photography groups. One person sat on four photography boards. These may imply the lack of active people in the sub-sub-sector.
  - For the Chinese calligraphy sub-sub-sector, the degree of interlocking directorates was less prominent than the other two.

- **Dance sub-sector (Chart 5.4b):** 48 per cent had interlocking directorates. The network graph shows a web of three core dance groups (which included umbrella organizations such as the Association of Hong Kong Dance Organizations and the Hong Kong Dance Alliance) linking with other dance groups. Each core dance group had interlocking directorates with four to six other dance groups.

- **Medium degree of interlocking directorates (Chart 5.4c-e):** in the *theatre sub-sector*, there were four clusters of groups and one pair of groups sharing directors (Chart 5.4c). In the *media and communications sub-sub-sector*, there was a small cluster of liberal-leaning groups and one pair of groups with interlocking directorates (Chart 5.4d). In the *cross cultural and art sub-sub-sector*, there were two major clusters: one being a large umbrella organization (The Association of Chinese Culture of Hong Kong) and another one being linked through the Hong Kong Arts Centre (Chart 5.4e).

- **Low degree of interlocking directorates (Chart 5.4f-h):** in the *music sub-sector,* although the overall degree of direct sharing was low (26 per cent), there was a relatively big cluster linked by two big music groups (Hong Kong Philharmonic and the Asian Youth Orchestra). It is no surprise that there was only one pair of Xiqu groups with interlocking directorates because the vast majority of Xiqu NPOs did not have a board at all. No shared directorships were found in other fields such as museums.
Box 5.1 Variations in Human Resources

Chart 5.1a Average Number of Staff by Sub-sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Number of Staff</th>
<th>Dance</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Variety, pop shows and others</th>
<th>Xiqu</th>
<th>Non-performing arts NPOs</th>
<th>Whole Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary / project</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 55 for full-time, 46 for part-time and 36 for temporary/project staff.

Chart 5.1b Average Number of Members by Sub-sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Number of Members</th>
<th>Dance</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Variety, pop shows and others</th>
<th>Xiqu</th>
<th>Non-performing arts NPOs</th>
<th>Whole Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual *</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate #</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: 68, no response: 20 (two extreme cases of over 500 and 1,600 members were excluded)
# Base: 14 (one extreme case was excluded)

Chart 5.1c Percentage Distribution of Number of Individual Members by Sub-sector

Base: 68, no response: 20 (two extreme cases were excluded)
Chart 5.1d  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs Recruiting New Members

- Yes: 71.7%
- No: 25.9%
- Refused to answer: 2.4%

Base: 90

Chart 5.1e  Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs’ Means of Recruiting New Members

- Referral by existing members: 83.7%
- Membership drive through mass media (press, TV, radio, etc.): 13.9%
- Membership drive through online means (websites, social media, etc.): 54.3%
- Others: 11.0%

Base: 68 (Multiple responses were allowed)

Chart 5.1f  Average Number of Volunteers by Sub-sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Number of Volunteers</th>
<th>Dance</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Variety, pop shows and others</th>
<th>Xiqu</th>
<th>Non-performing arts NPOs</th>
<th>Whole Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 84 for part-time volunteers; 13 for full-time volunteers
Box 5.2 Variations in Office Premises

Chart 5.2a Percentage Distribution of ACNPOs with a Physical Office by Sub-Sector

- **Dance**: 50.0% Yes, 50.0% No
- **Music**: 35.7% Yes, 64.3% No
- **Theatre**: 50.0% Yes, 50.0% No
- **Variety & Pop Show**: 47.1% Yes, 52.9% No
- **Xiqu**: 31.5% Yes, 68.5% No
- **Non-performing arts NGOs**: 13.6% Yes, 86.4% No

Chart 5.2b Percentage Distribution of Types of Properties for Performing ACNPOs' Regular Rehearsals

- **Commercial building - Self-owned**: 1.4%
- **Government-owned/ Government-sponsored facilities - Rented**: 17.5%
- **Industrial building - Rented**: 16.5%
- **Industrial building - Self-owned**: 0.0%
- **Residential building - Rented**: 13.0%
- **Residential building - Self-owned**: 3.4%
- **Others - Rented**: 0.0%
- **Others - Self-owned**: 0.0%

Base: 106
Chart 5.2c  Percentage Distribution of Types of Properties for Non-Performing ACNPO Offices

- Commercial building - Rented: 31.80%
- Commercial building - Self-owned: 0.00%
- Government-owned/ Government-sponsored facilities - Rented: 18.20%
- Industrial building - Rented: 13.60%
- Industrial building - Self-owned: 4.50%
- Residential building - Rented: 4.50%
- Residential building - Self-owned: 9.10%
- Others - Rented: 0.00%
- Others - Self-owned: 0.00%

Base: 22

Box 5.3  Variation in Programmes

Chart 5.3  Average Number of Programmes / Projects / Events by Sub-sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Number</th>
<th>Dance</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Theatre</th>
<th>Variety, pop shows and others</th>
<th>Xiqu</th>
<th>Non - performing arts NPOs</th>
<th>Whole Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programmes/ projects/events</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants/audience</td>
<td>8,997</td>
<td>19,337</td>
<td>4,815</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>2,683</td>
<td>24,523</td>
<td>11,941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Box 5.4  Interlocking Directorates by Sub-sector**

Legend:
- **Red nodes**: ACNPOs that were connected with 1 to 3 peer ACNPO(s)
- **Yellow nodes**: ACNPOs that were connected with 4 or more peer ACNPOs.
- **Green nodes**: ACNPOs that shared more than 10 directors with another ACNPO

**High degree of interlocking directorate (45% or above)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart 5.4a</th>
<th>Chart 5.4b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Visual Arts Sub-sub-sector" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Dance Sub-sub-sector" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Cluster outlined in green**: Centred around design NPOs
- **Cluster outlined in yellow**: Centred around photography NPOs
- **Cluster outlined in red**: Centred around Chinese calligraphy NPOs

**Medium degree of interlocking directorate (30-45%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart 5.4c</th>
<th>Chart 5.4d</th>
<th>Chart 5.4e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Theatre Sub-sector" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Media and Communications Sub-sub-sector" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Cross Cultural and Art Sub-sub-sector" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chart 5.4f</td>
<td>Chart 5.4g</td>
<td>Chart 5.4h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Sub-sector</td>
<td>Variety &amp; Pop Show Sub-sector</td>
<td>History, Literary and Humanistic Society Sub-sub-sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low degree of interlocking directorate (25% or below)
CONCLUSION

Summary of Findings

As a pioneer project, our research aims to provide a baseline database of the non-profit arts and cultural groups registered in Hong Kong. Our research focused on the non-profit organizations, which represented about one-third of the entire arts and cultural sector. Since we did not examine for-profit organizations in the arts and cultural sector, our project findings are not representative of the entire arts and cultural sector, where a significant proportion of independent artists, as well as ad hoc and informal networks operate.

Our findings indicate there were 1,816 legally established local ACNPOs in Hong Kong, representing about one-third of the entire arts and cultural sector. The sector generated at least HK $1.6 billion in 2015 and employed approximately 17,000 full-time staff. On average, an ACNPO displayed the following organizational characteristics (Chart 6.1):

- It was registered under the Societies Ordinance.
- It had a 50 per cent chance of being governed by a board of seven members.
- It employed less than ten full-time staff, 12 part-timers, and 23 temporary staff in the past year.
- It had an annual income of HK$ 63,261, but did not raise any funds last year.
- It had slightly more than 50 per cent chance of renting an office space, but did not establish any branch offices.
- In the past year, it organized 11 programmes or events, which were watched or participated by 11,941 persons.
- It operated a website, but updated it on an as-needed basis.

Nonetheless, the sector consisted of multiple sub-sectors with considerable diversity (Chart 6.2)

Chart 6.1  Graphical Representation of a Statistically Average ACNPO
Chart 6.2

Highlights of the Differences within the Non-profit Arts and Cultural Sub-sectors

**Non-performing arts**
- 95.6% has board; Mostly use accountability measures
- More full-time staff (15)
- Fewer part-timers
- More members and volunteers
- 86.4% has an office
- Double the no. of annual programmes (23)

**Dance**
- Lowest growth in number post-1997 among all sub-sectors
- More full-time staff (13); far fewer part-timers (6) or temporary staff (5)
- More umbrella organizations and networks
- About sector average no. of annual programmes (12). But fewer than average participants (8,997)

**Music**
- Also lower growth in no. post-1997
- Less permanent manpower: 5 full-timers, 19 part-timers, 45 temporary staff
- About sector avg. no. of annual programmes (16). More than avg. participants (19,337)

**Theatre**
- More rapid growth in no. after 1997. Tend to be smaller groups
- Organized much fewer programmes (6) with an avg. of 4,815 participants
- Small staff: 7 full-timers, 5 part-timers, 21 temporary staff.
- Smaller membership (60)

**Variety & Pop**
- More informal. Less active outside the time of annual programmes. 17.6% has board
- Fewer avg. no. of annual programmes (8). Lowest avg. no. of participants (730)
- 11.8% didn’t promote its programmes
- 6 full-time staff. Large no. of part – timers (151)
- Much fewer has a website (41.2%)

**Xiqu**
- Primary missions include art expression and community building
- 18.5% has boards
- Time manpower: 2 full-timers, 3 part-timers and 13 temporary staff
- Fewer members (65).
- Only recruit by referral. No online recruitment
- All (except 1) Xiqu respondents to the survey are small groups
- 76.6% has no website. Only 22.2% used any digital means
Hong Kong's colonial legacy arguably shaped the ecology of the arts and cultural sector. An explicit arts and cultural policy was absent in the colonial era and as a way to avoid the sensitive issue of cultural identity, the colonial government tactfully promoted arts and culture as leisure and recreational activities. Since the 1970s, however, resources were heavily channelled to support the development of a few professional performing arts groups. The situation had not changed significantly after 1997. The SAR government has yet to establish a dedicated administrative unit to oversee the arts and cultural development in the city. Instead, the responsibility was scattered among various government units such as the HAB, LCSD, and ADC, which were tasked to fund different organizations and manage various performance venues in the city. In 2014-15, the HAB and LCSD allocated at least 41.2 per cent of the arts and cultural spending (more than HK$4 billion in total) to performing arts. As well, the total amount of funding received from the HAB by nine major performing arts groups in Hong Kong was more than either the ADC or the HKAPA.

Apart from the lack of coherence in policies and targeted measures for the arts and cultural sector, the advantage enjoyed by the few "early developers" coupled with the lopsided funding allocation mean that many medium and small-sized organizations are not able to scale up their operations due to inadequate support. Indeed, most of them can only rely on short-term and project-based funding for many of their operations. Their underdevelopment is reflected in our survey from 2014-15 on ACNP0 capacity (N=179 unless otherwise stated):

**Operations and Governance capacity** - 50.4 per cent were governed by a formal board of directors. Among the bigger and medium-sized groups, 80.8 per cent had a board and the average number of full-time staff was 10.

**Human resource capacity** - 30.7 per cent hired full-time staff, 25.1 per cent employed part-time staff, and 20.1 per cent hired temporary staff in the last 12 months. Among the bigger and medium-sized groups,

- 51.8 per cent considered their human resources 'seriously inadequate' or 'inadequate'.
- 45.7 per cent had difficulty in recruiting or retaining staff.
- 50.9 per cent were satisfied with their staff's professional training.
- 42.6 per cent had 'just adequate' or 'adequate' number of volunteers over the last 12 months.

**Financial resource capacity** - Our database of 577 ACNP0s showed that five per cent of them enjoyed an average yearly income of over HK$10 million (76.8 per cent of the sector's total yearly income); 36.2 per cent had a yearly income between HK$ 100,000 to HK$ 10 million (22.58 per cent of the sector's total yearly income); and 58.8 per cent received less than HK$ 100,000 annually (0.59 per cent of the sector's total yearly income). Among the bigger and medium-sized groups,

- Only 45 per cent 'agreed' or 'very much agreed' that their financial resources in the previous year were adequate.
- Only 40.9 per cent 'agreed' or 'very much agreed' that they had stable financial sources in the last financial year.
- 47.8 per cent conducted fund raising activities over the last 12 months in the form of online fund raising or performances while 21.2 per cent considered the donations from these activities to be adequate.

**Physical resource capacity**:

- 55 per cent occupied a physical office in Hong Kong.
- 68.5 per cent of the Xiqu groups did not have a physical office while 86.4 per cent of the non-performing arts groups occupied physical offices in Hong Kong.
- 67.5 per cent of the 157 performing ACNP0s interviewed had regular premises for rehearsals.
- 70.6 per cent had 'inadequate' or 'very inadequate' office premises to carry out the organization's activities in the past 12 months and 20.7 per cent found their premises adequate.
Marketing and information technology capacity:

- 60.9 per cent maintained a website.
- 24.1 per cent updated their websites regularly (n=108).
- 51.7 per cent used digital media in organizing programmes and marketing.
- 64.4 per cent used emails and text messages for marketing promotion and 26.9 per cent used online social networking tools (e.g. Facebook and Twitter). (n=170)
- 74.3 per cent mainly relied on events and activities to communicate with their target communities.
- 68.2 per cent mainly relied on events and activities to communicate with the public.

Programmes and planning capacity:

- 40.7 per cent had feedback mechanism(s) to evaluate the effectiveness of their programmes.
- 71.4 per cent used feedback mechanisms to consult or collect feedback from their audience and clients while 18.3 per cent used feedback mechanisms to discuss with other peer organizations within the sector.

Networking and advocacy capacity:

- 91.1 per cent considered themselves "autonomous" or "very autonomous" from the government in their routine operations or decision-making. 37.7 per cent found the level of mutual trust with the government unchanged in the past five years. 77.9 per cent did not consider themselves to have a role in monitoring the government.
- 83.5 per cent said they did not cooperate with any business organizations in the past year.
- 24.6 per cent said they had occasional collaboration with other ACNPOs in organizing events and programmes. Both the dance (50 per cent) and theatre sub-sectors (47.1 per cent) reported more collaboration with peer groups than other sub-sectors. 87.6 per cent did not see competition among their peers in securing financial resources or human resources.
- 10.5 per cent participated in advocacy activities, mainly in form of submissions to the government or press conferences in the last 12 months. 15 per cent reported they assigned staff to carry out advocacy or related research work.
- 189 ACNPOs (47.2 per cent) shared at least one director with another ACNPO.
- 12 umbrella organizations that claimed to have arts and cultural organizations as members were identified. 14.8 per cent of the 1,816 ACNPOs were connected to one or more of the identified umbrella organizations. The Association of Chinese Culture of Hong Kong had 136 member organizations and the highest number of connections with different arts and cultural sub-sectors.
Overall Analysis

While a more detailed and systematic comparison of the ACNPO sector with other civil society sectors will be the work of another report, our general observation is that ACNPOs exhibit weak capacity on various fronts. In particular, inadequacy in human resources, as well as office and venue space, stand out as the most pressing problems. ACNPOs capacity in terms of marketing, programme, and planning are also limited.

The problem of inadequacy in terms of finance, physical space, and human resources can be largely attributed to issues such as the lopsided funding arrangement and the lack of coherent policy to foster the development of the sector. Aside from the major performing arts groups, most organizations are underfunded and receive only project-based, short-term funding. The lack of regular funding means that it is difficult for many ACNPOs to make long-term plans and hire the necessary administrative staff. Funding opportunities beyond the government are rare as well. In addition, most performance venues are managed by the LCSD whereas private venues are too costly for most artists. Beyond these recurring problems, the heterogeneous nature of the sector means that each sub-sector has its own unique characteristics and is confronted with different challenges. More targeted public policies will be needed to support their development.

From our interviews and exchanges with practitioners, the sector acknowledged the strengths and potentials of the arts and cultural sector in Hong Kong despite the shortcomings of the status quo. The followings are some of the major strengths:

- There are artists, art administrators, educators, and practitioners in the field who are committed in the arts and cultural development in Hong Kong. Many ardent practitioners in the arts circle know each other well and form collaborations and partnerships.
- There is a younger generation of artists who are innovative and willing to explore new forms of artistic expressions in Hong Kong.
- As an economically developed city with a strong tradition of generosity in donation, Hong Kong has untapped potential for philanthropy, fund raising, and volunteering in the arts and cultural sector.
- As a global city, Hong Kong can be a unique cultural melting pot with distinct historical and geographical advantages to develop into a cosmopolitan arts hub.
- Freedom of expression (but noting potential threats such as political intervention and self-censorship), an increasingly well-educated population, and a supportive atmosphere are all favorable factors.

Some broad policy questions were also raised in our discussions held in August 2016 with members of various ACNPOs:

- How can funding sources for non-profit arts groups be developed and diversified?
- How should the government reform its funding policy especially to offer better scaffolding to small and medium-sized groups?
- Can there be more flexible and creative solutions to the lack of venues, such as the use of vacated school premises, industrial buildings or heritage buildings?
- How should the related policy-making process and governance structure be reformed to be more transparent and participatory?
- How can Hong Kong nurture more arts entrepreneurs?
- What can be done to support young artists who are at the beginning stage of their careers?
- How can tertiary education play a role in nurturing the future generations for the sector?
- How can our society, especially the school system, enhance arts education and instill aesthetic values upon the next generation?
How can Hong Kong continue to uphold the freedom of expression and amalgamate Western and Eastern cultures?

Many of these issues raised reflect the long-held viewpoints of the arts and cultural sector. They also echo the analysis reflected in the Policy Recommendation Report of the Culture and Heritage Commission (2003), which put forward six strategies for promoting Hong Kong's long-term cultural development: people-oriented, pluralism, freedom of expression and protection of intellectual property, holistic approach, partnership, and community-driven. While our current report does not intend to make a more detailed and systematic analysis of these issues, we wish to offer some elaboration and discussion about reforming the policymaking and governance structure.

Prospect of a Cultural Bureau

The idea of having a dedicated policy bureau for arts and culture has been advocated by the arts and cultural sector for a number of years. Indeed, many would agree that establishing the bureau would be the first step in addressing the plethora of issues in the sector such as the lack of funding, venues, and human resources.

In 2012, the new Chief Executive C.Y. Leung proposed to set up the Cultural Bureau. Allegedly, his initial aim was to appoint a long-time advocate for the arts and cultural sector who was highly respected within the community to head the Bureau. She was, however, opposed by pro-establishment political parties, prompting Leung to replace her with another candidate who was largely considered to be an outsider of the sector. Her nomination evoked widespread suspicion and concern. In the end, Leung’s proposal was defeated by a series of filibusters by the pro-democracy camp in the Legislative Council. While this report was being written, the incoming Chief Executive Carrie Lam proposed in her electoral platform that there should be a Cultural Bureau to integrate cultural and creative industries under its jurisdiction. Given the increasing confrontations between the HKSAR government and civil society in the past few years as well as the increasing political control by the Central Government over Hong Kong, we foresee substantial challenge for the Lam administration to implement this campaign pledge.

One crucial issue is how this Cultural Bureau has the prospect of earning the trust from the arts and cultural sector. Our study shows that the sector itself was highly heterogeneous in terms of the nature of work, the state of development, and the kinds of support required. More importantly, while our survey findings show that ACNPOs are generally not active in advocacy, over the years there were a few incidents of high-profile issue-based advocacy activities involving the sector. For example, Xiqu groups have actively lobbied for speeding up the redevelopment of the Yau Ma Tei Theatre in order to provide an additional venue for Xiqu groups to rehearse and perform. In 2008 when the government initiated a public consultation prior to the development of the West Kowloon Cultural District Project, different sub-sectors such as theatre groups, music groups, non-performing art groups and individual artists expressed their concerns about planning, facilities and venue provision, and public engagement. In 2012, when the government released its proposal for a cultural bureau and the possible candidate for bureau chief, The Hong Kong Culture Monitor, established by practicing artists, academics, arts administrators and researchers, expressed their concerns about the qualifications and background of the candidate favoured by the government. Also, individuals from the sector have demonstrated their readiness to engage in various social activism activities. Notably, numerous artists and cultural activists led the Community Museum Project to preserve the collective memory and community identity of Lee Tung Street as a result of an urban renewal project in the area (2003-2005).
Similarly, in 2004, activists set up the People’s Panel on West Kowloon (PPWK) and conducted a large-scale people-based public engagement exercise on the planning of the West Kowloon Cultural District. Past incidents like these suggest the importance of bottom-up processes of civic engagement. Accordingly, the prospect of a Cultural Bureau could very well depend on civic engagement activities with a high degree of openness and inclusiveness to all the major stakeholders.

While the motivation to establish a Cultural Bureau might be an economic one, there are also other important values to consider. Recently, the Council of Europe in collaboration with the Hertie School of Governance (Berlin) developed an Indicator Framework on Culture and Democracy (IFCD)\(^\text{104,105}\). In their framework, the relationship between culture and democracy were studied across 37 European countries. A country’s performance in culture is measured by seven components, namely, cultural participation, cultural funding, cultural openness, cultural education, cultural industries, cultural infrastructure, and cultural access and representation. According to the study, “robust relationships were identified between a number of culture and democracy dimensions such as active cultural engagement and democratic openness; political engagement; trust in society and well-being.”\(^\text{106}\) To put it briefly, their findings highlight the importance of putting in place an institutional foundation that is open, engaging, and inclusive upon which arts and culture can thrive and flourish.


\(^{106}\) For more details of the methodology and data of IFCD, please go to http://www.governmance-report.org/ifcd/

\(^{107}\) The quotation is from their official website: http://www.cos.int/en/web/culture-and-heritage/indicators-cultural-and-democracy.
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1. Culture and Recreation
   A. Culture and Arts
   B. Recreation
   C. Service Clubs

2. Education and Research
   A. Primary and Secondary Education
   B. Higher Education
   C. Other Education
   D. Research

3. Health
   A. Hospitals and Rehabilitation
   B. Nursing Homes
   C. Mental Health and Crisis Intervention
   D. Other Health Services

4. Social Services
   A. Social Services
   B. Emergency and Relief
   C. Income Support and Maintenance

5. Environment
   A. Environment
   B. Animals

6. Development and Housing
   A. Economic, Social and Community Development

7. Law, Advocacy and Politics
   A. Civic and Advocacy Organizations
   B. Law and Legal Services
   C. Political Organizations

8. Philanthropic Intermediaries and Voluntarism Promotion
   A. Philanthropic Intermediaries

9. International
   A. International Activities

10. Religion
    A. Religious Congregations and Associations

11. Business and Professional Associations, and Unions
    A. Business and Professional Associations, and Unions

12. [Not Elsewhere Classified]
Appendix B

List of ACNPOs by Sub-sector

Dance

Abby Dance Studio
Alan & Becky Dance Group
ARC
Association of Hong Kong Dance Organizations
Badlet Folk Dance Club
Chapio Youth & Children Ballet Company
Chinese Dance Art Association
City Contemporary Dance Company
Creeseendo Charity Club Crew 4
Change Limited
Crystal Youth Dance Troupe
Dance & Martial Arts Centre
Dance Art Hong Kong Ltd
Dance Factory Sporting Club
Elegance Society Dance Troupe
E-Side Modern Dance Company
Fans of Dance Club
Federation of Hong Kong Youth Ballet
Folksdance Association of Hong Kong
Fong Art Dance Association
Friends of Dance
Golden Phoenix Dancing Club
Great Chinese Martial Arts Association Limited
Harmonious Dance Troupe
Ho Ho Chuen Dance Organization
Hong Kong Academy of Dance and Performing Arts for Children
Hong Kong Art Troupe
Hong Kong Art Troupe of International Folklore
Hong Kong Ballet Limited
Hong Kong Ballroom Dancing Council Limited
Hong Kong City Arts Centre
Hong Kong Dance Alliance
Hong Kong Dance Company
Hong Kong Dance Federation Limited
Hong Kong Dance World
Hong Kong DanceSport Art and Cultural Association
Hong Kong East Century Dance Association
Hong Kong Folk Dance Troupe
Hong Kong International Professional Dance Sports Council Limited
Hong Kong Japanese Traditional Dance Institute
Hong Kong Schools Dance Association Limited
Hong Kong Shaolin Wushu Culture Centre
Hong Kong South East Asia Dance Troupe
Hong Kong Youth Arts Centre
Hong Kong Pearl Arts
Joy In Dance Club
Knack Cordial Folk Group
Lan Ling Dance Company
Lee's Dance & Culture Association
Legacy European Folk Dance Troupe
Ling Choi Dance Club
Manna Dance
Mini Variety Entertainment Group
Miranda Chan Dance (Mirandance) Company Ltd
Moondance Performance Troupe
MT Pulse
Muk Lan Song and Dance Group
Muse Motion
Nationalities Dance Institute
Passover Dance Company
Pui Ngai Friends Song & Dance Ensemble
Sea Rhythm Dance Society
Shatin Dancing & Art Association
Silk Road Dance Cultural Society
Sing Yue Dance Troupe
Sound of Wave Dance Group
South 'ASLF' Dance Workshop
Spring-Time Experimental Theatre Stage 64
Starwave Production
Suny Cantonese Opera Troupe
Suny Cantonese Opera Troupe
Susan Arts World
Tagessee
Tai Po Kwan Chi Club
Tango Tang (The Hong Kong Tango Club)
The Hong Kong Ballet Group Limited
The New Territories Dancing Group of Hong Kong
Tim Tim Dancing Team
Unidance
Unlock Dancing Plaza
Versatile Western Folk Dance Troupe
Walk Don't Run
Wan Kin Dance Troupe
Wan Wah Healthy Friends
World of Dancing
Y-Space
Youth Ballet of Asia

(Series of Chinese characters)
Yuen Hai Ariste Troupe
Yuen Long Dance Troupe
Zephyr Dance Troupe

中西樂集
國際兒童舞蹈團(香港)
妙舞軒

聲樂健康十八式同學會

妙舞軒

Music

Ad Lib Music & Art Association (香港演藝藝術團)
Allegro Singers (明聲合唱團)
Asian Chamber Orchestra Limited (亞洲室樂團有限公司)
Asian Youth Orchestra (亞洲青年音樂團)
Association of Sai Kung Children's Choir (西貢兒童合唱團協會)

Aurora Vocal Society (朝陽合唱社)
Bauhinia Troupe Hong Kong (香港紫荊藝術團)
Bel Canto Chorus (美聲合唱團)
CCC & Music Friends (中華友誼)
Charming Voice Music World Association (聲之坊音樂天地協會)
Cheung Fung Chorus of Hong Kong Children's Choir (鴻仔合唱團)
China Pride Arts Management Co (香港民謠藝術團)
Chinese Arts Performing Ensemble of Hong Kong (香港民間藝術團)
Chinese Music Virtuosi (華人音樂家協會)
Chinese Woman Composers' Association (華人女子作曲家協會)

Chinese-Scottish Band (中國蘇格蘭樂隊)
Chuen Ying Guezheng Ensemble (廣東箏樂團)
City Chamber Orchestra of Hong Kong (香港都市樂團)

Citywinds Ensemble (香港城市管樂團)
Concerto da Camera (銀樂合奏團)
Deyin Qin Society (笛音社)
Die Konzertis Ten Charity Institute Limited (細管子慈善機構)

Double Mallet Ringers (十二分音符手錶社)
Ella Kung Singers Limited (江梓合唱團有限公司)
Ensemble ad Infinitum (無限團)
Free Counter-Point (自由對位)
Free Sing Zheng Ensemble (綠聲箏樂團)
Friends of Radio 4 Society Limited (第四台之友協會)
Friends of the Harp Limited (香港鋼琴愛好者機構)
Friends of the Philharmon Orchestra of the Nations, HK (國際愛樂樂團)
Friendship Music Salon (友誼音樂會)
Frontline Music Limited (前線音樂有限公司)
Gefallig Singers (愉快唱歌團)
Glory Choir (香港樂團)
Good Hope Singers Limited (廣華合唱團)
Grandmaster Orchestra Music Society (藝術管弦樂團)

Guitar Music Limited (結他音樂有限公司)
Handbell Association of Hong Kong (香港手鈴音樂協會)
Happy Singers Club (樂堂樂團)
Healing Musical Club (健康SING唱會)
Healthy Singing Club (樂堂樂團)
Hong Kong Amateur Orchestra (香港樂隊管弦樂團)
Hong Kong Art Gathering (香港藝術會)
Hong Kong Art of Hujin Organization (香港新華藝術團)
Hong Kong Arts Association (香港藝術會)
Hong Kong Arts Society (香港藝術會)
Hong Kong Bach Choir (香港巴赫合唱團)
Hong Kong Band Directors Association (香港管樂協會)
Hong Kong Bell Canto Ensemble (香港伽倻琴樂團)
Hong Kong Cadence Music Association (香港校揚音樂協會)
Hong Kong Canabile Winds (香港少年樂團)
Hong Kong Cellist Society (香港大提琴家協會)
Hong Kong Chamber Chinese Orchestra (香港樂團)
Hong Kong Chamber Choir (香港樂團)
Hong Kong Chamber Music Society Limited (香港樂團)
Hong Kong Chamber of Musical Sow (香港樂團)
Hong Kong Children's Arts Alliance (香港樂團)

Hong Kong Children's Choir (香港兒童合唱團)
Hong Kong Children's Strings (香港兒童弦樂團)
Hong Kong Children's Symphony Orchestra (香港青少年交響樂團有限公司)

Hong Kong Chinese Instrumental Music Association (香港樂器協會)
Hong Kong Chinese Music Troupe (香港樂團)
Hong Kong Chinese Orchestra (香港樂團)
Hong Kong Chorus Society Limited (香港合唱團有限公司)
Hong Kong City Chinese Orchestra (香港城市鋼琴樂團)
Hong Kong City Choir (香港城市合唱團)
Hong Kong City Youth Choir (香港青少年合唱團)
Hong Kong Civic Youth Orchestra (香港青少年樂團)
Hong Kong Composers' Guild (香港作曲家聯會有限公司)
Hong Kong Double Bass Society (香港大提琴樂社)
Hong Kong Flute Association (香港笛子樂社)

Hong Kong Guitar Ensemble (香港吉他樂團)
Hong Kong Guitar Orchestra (香港樂團)
Hong Kong Harmonica Association (香港口琴協會)
Hong Kong International Cello Association (香港國際大提琴學會)
Hong Kong International Institute of Music (香港國際音樂學院)
Hong Kong Jazz Association (香港爵士樂團)

Hong Kong Juvenile & Youth Chinese Classical Orchestra (香港少年中國樂團)
Hong Kong Ling Nin Orchestra (香港龍吟樂團)
Hong Kong Music & Literature Society (香港音樂與文學學會)

Hong Kong Music and Performing Association Limited (香港音樂藝術家協會有限公司)
Hong Kong Music and Performing School (香港音樂藝術學校)
Hong Kong Music Institute (香港音樂學院)
Hong Kong Music Talents Orchestra (香港音樂才華交響樂團)
Soundpocket Ltd.
Southern District Music Promotion Limited
Spring Melody Chorus
Starwaves Production
Strings of Enlightenment
Summer Breeze
Swallow Gu Zheng Art Group
The Bel Canto Music Society
The Central Conservatory of Music (Hong Kong) Foundation Limited
The Chopin Society of Hong Kong Limited
The Contemporary A Cappella Society of Hong Kong and Macau
The Gay Singers
The Hong Kong Children's Zheng Ensemble
The Hong Kong Educators' Singers
The Hong Kong Philharmonic Orchestra
The Hong Kong Pianist Society
The Hong Kong Soloists Society
The Hong Kong Women's Choir
The Hong Kong Youth Choir
The Hong Kong Youth Guitar Ensemble
The Honour Chorus Hong Kong
The Klangen Ensemble
The Learner's Chorus
The Opera Society of Hong Kong
The Pro-Musical Society of Hong Kong
The Song Writer's Association of Hong Kong
The Segnis Singers
The Wells Music Society of Hong Kong
Tien Ma Chorus
Tivoli Choir
Tszun Lok Dizi Ensemble
Tuen Mun Children Choir
Tuen Mun Youth Chinese Orchestra
Tunhuang Art Club
Universal Music Interchange
Vibration Chorus
Vhuela Guitar Ensemble
Viva! Voice
Voices of the Larks
Wan Fung Performance Arts Group
Wang Kwong Chinese Orchestra Limited
Well Way Association
Windpipe Chinese Music Ensemble
Wong Tai Sin Children's Choir
YanYan Fans Club
Yao Yueh Chinese Music Association
Ying Ling Chorus
Yip's Children's Choir Limited
“古典”兒童音樂劇團
123 歌詠社
K 歌音樂軒

藝術 • 情感

藝術音樂研究社
黃俊偉青年優質樂團
金音樂社
金音樂社
金頂樂隊
金典遊戲樂隊
劇院藝術表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團

Theatre
321 Action
A Generation
Acting II
Action3actors
ArtKI
Actors Family
Actors' Square
Acts
Alice Theatre Laboratory Limited
Alumni On Stage
American Community Theatre
Art Home
Art Kiln Mission Limited
ArtHouse Drama
Arrochee Theatre
Asian People's Theatre Festival Society
Azure Shore Theatre
Betretham Drama Association
Big Stage Theatre
Black Bird Theatre

藝術 • 情感

藝術音樂研究社
黃俊偉青年優質樂團
金音樂社
金音樂社
金頂樂隊
金典遊戲樂隊
劇院藝術表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團
劇院音樂表演團

Artists

Artists • 事業

Artists

Artists

Artists

Artists

Artists

Artists
Variety & pop show and Others

Action Art Federation
Arts Sages Association
Arts with the Disabled Association
Hong Kong Central and Western District Association for Culture and Arts
Centre for Community Cultural Development
Eastern District Arts Council
Fly High Production
Green Cedar Society of Entertainment Service for the Aged
Green Hill Anglo-Chinese Arts Performance Troupe
Hong Kong Arts Festival Society
Hong Kong Caring Magic Circus
Hong Kong Islands Culture and Arts Association
Hong Kong Music Dancer's Association Co., Limited
Hong Kong People's Fringe Association (People's Fringe)
Hong Kong Putonghua Speech Association
Hong Kong Tian Shan Nation Art Conference
Hong Kong Wan Chai FANS Performance Association
Hong Kong Wan Nga Race Performance Association
Joseph & Loreta Law Society for the Advancement of Chinese Performing Arts Company Limited
Kowloon City District Arts and Culture Council
Kowloon City District Children's Chorus
Kwai Chung and Tsing Yi District Culture and Arts Coordinating Committee
Kwun Tong District Culture & Recreation Promotion Association
Lee Ming Ying Chinese Folk Songs and Art Association
Magician's Association of Hong Kong
Muses Arts Group of Hong Kong
New Territories North District Culture & Recreation Promotion Association
North District Arts Advancement Association Limited
Rainbow Cultural & Recreational Volunteer Services
Rainbow Swallow
Rendezvous Arts Club
Sai Kung Culture and Recreation Advancement Association
SAR Philharmonic Charitable Foundation Limited
Sha Tin Arts Association Limited
Shairt's Family
Sham Shui Po Arts Association
Shatin Friend's Arts Centre
Singer's Music Studio
Smiling Rose
Southern District Arts and Culture Association Co., Ltd.
Tai Po District Arts Development Association
The Cultural Association of Music and Arts
The Hong Kong Arts Group of Hong Kong
Tszung Wan Culture and Recreation Co-ordinating Association
Wan Chai District Arts Cultural Recreational and Sports Association Limited
Yau Ma Tei And Tsim Sha Tsui Culture and Arts Association Limited
Yuen Ling District Arts Committee

中國傳統藝術團
薔薇(香港)文化藝術團
觀塘公園文藝歌舞團
咏月聲樂研習社
從軍華人音樂團
宋門文藝協會

屯門文藝協會
屯門音樂團
快樂藝術歌舞團

慈濟跑馬會
振興藝術團

新界西文藝康樂協會
旺角區文娛康樂會

昇龍舞獅團
星河樂舞團
星聲相隨
春之聲藝術團
曾榮音樂團

朗琴歌舞團
樂之泉歌唱團

樂民兒童合唱團

香港樂劇團
香港欣樂歌舞團
香港樂劇團
香港樂劇團
香港樂劇團
香港樂劇團
香港樂劇團
Xiqiu

ACME Cantonese Opera Song Association (奇峰軒曲藝術社)
Aroma Cantonese Opera Troupe (鴻添花藝劇團)
Art of Cantonese Opera Association (粵劇戲院會)
Association of Harmony (鴻樂曲藝社)
Atomic Chinese Opera (月白曲藝會)
Best Friends Cantonese Opera Association (朋朋曲藝會)
Big Fight Cantonese Opera Society (聲韻曲藝社)
Blossom Cantonese Opera Society (春風曲藝社)
Brilliance Cantonese Opera Society (輝明曲藝社)
Canton Art Opera Troupe (粵劇樂興社)
Cantonese Operatic Songs Concert (粵劇樂興工作坊)
Cha Duk Chung Children's Cantonese Opera Association (卓自權兒童粵劇協會)
Chi Chuk Hin Cantonese Opera Society (卓智軒曲藝社)
Chin Chin Cantonese Opera Troupe (卓智軒曲藝社)
Chinese Artists Association of Hong Kong (香港八和會館)
Chinese Operatic Culture Institute (戲曲文化硏究院)
Ching Nga Cantonese Performing Arts Society (粵劇戲曲工作坊)
Choi Fung Cheung Opera Troupe (彩輝曲藝社)
Choi Lun Cantonese Opera Association (彩輝曲藝社)
Choi Yuan Art Centre (彩輝藝術中心)
Choy Sing Cantonese Opera Club (月浦曲藝社)
Club Sonoro (德國曲藝社)
Cultural Performing Arts Academy (香港藝術團)
Cun Tian Yi Shu Yuan (大堂藝術園)
Dai Hei Hing Chinese Opera Troupe (大喜劇團)
Down Radiance Opera Troupe (朝陽劇團)
Dragon & Phoenix Cantonese Opera Troupe (龍鳳劇團)
Dragon Art Society (龍的藝術社)
Duncan's Music Forum Limited (陳慶凱音樂會)
East Sing Cantonese Opera (東聲曲藝社)
Elegance Cantonese Opera Troupe (雅韻劇團)
Emily Music Forum (雅韻劇團)
Enchanting Chinese Opera Society (協和曲藝社)
Entertaining Music Association (協和曲藝社)
Evergreen Chinese Opera Musical Club (協和曲藝社)
Fai Wong Lok Hin (炳輝粵劇團)
Fai Ying Opera (炳輝粵劇團)
Fairly-Land Opera Troupe (炳輝粵劇團)
Fans Arts Association (炳輝粵劇團)
Fantastic Cantonese Opera (炳輝粵劇團)
Federation of the Promoting Arts (炳輝粵劇團)
Fu Wing Wah Cantonese Opera Troupe (炳輝粵劇團)
Fun Fong Cantonese Opera Society (炳輝粵劇團)
Fung Fei Cheung Chinese Opera (炳輝粵劇團)
Fung Ming Cantonese Opera Promotion Limited (炳輝粵劇團)
Fung Ming Cheung Chinese Opera (炳輝粵劇團)
Fung's Cantonese Opera Troupe (炳輝粵劇團)
Genesis Art Development Institute (炳輝粵劇團)
Golden Bean Chinese Music & Opera Society (炳輝粵劇團)
Golden Blossom Opera Troupe (炳輝粵劇團)
Grand Lark Opera (炳輝粵劇團)
H.K. Sunbeam Association for the Promotion of Cantonese Opera Limited (炳輝粵劇團)
Happy Melody House (炳輝粵劇團)
Happy Together Association (炳輝粵劇團)
Hing Sing Ping Opera Centre Hong Kong (炳輝粵劇團)
HK Chinese Opera & Performing Arts Group Association (炳輝粵劇團)
Hong Kong Arts and Cultural Committee (炳輝粵劇團)
Hong Kong Cantonese Opera Art Square Limited (炳輝粵劇團)
Hong Kong Cantonese Opera Troupe Limited (炳輝粵劇團)
Hong Kong Cantonese Opera Youth Association (炳輝粵劇團)
Hong Kong Children and Juvenile Chinese Opera Troupe Limited (炳輝粵劇團)
Hong Kong Te Ou Yue Opera Yu (炳輝粵劇團)
Hong Kong Traditional Operas Promotion Centre (炳輝粵劇團)
Hong Kong United Arts Cultural Exchange Centre (炳輝粵劇團)
Hong Kong Young Talent Cantonese Opera Troupe Company Ltd (炳輝粵劇團)
Hong Kong Youth Cantonese Opera Troupe (炳輝粵劇團)
Hong Kong Youth of Chinese Opera College (炳輝粵劇團)
Hong Kong Yue Opera Arts Institute (炳輝粵劇團)
Hong Kong Yue Opera Group (炳輝粵劇團)
Hundred Flowers Cantonese Opera Combination (炳輝粵劇團)
Hung Ka Po Cantonese Opera Troupe (炳輝粵劇團)
Hung Mui Chinese Opera (炳輝粵劇團)
Infeld Opera House (炳輝粵劇團)
Jade Butterfly (Clarity) Music Association (炳輝粵劇團)
Jade Chinese Opera Association (炳輝粵劇團)
Jingkun Theatre Limited (炳輝粵劇團)
Kam Chi King Chinese Opera (炳輝粵劇團)
Kam Yim Tong Cantonese Opera (炳輝粵劇團)
Karen's Meadow Cantonese Opera Studio (炳輝粵劇團)
Non-performing arts

1A Art Society
2s Group
25 Crops Watercolour Society
3040 Photographic Institute
Academy of Chinese Studies Limited

Active Arts Society
Alliance Francaise De Hong Kong
Alpha Beta Club - The Hong Kong Society of Western Calligraphic Art
Anatolian Cultural and Dialog Center Limited

Anthropological Survival Outreach Limited
Art and Culture Outreach Limited
Art Club of H.K.
Art Combination Club
Art for All
Art Horizon Printmaking Workshop
Art in Heritage Research

Art in Hong Kong
Art in Hospital
Art Link Club
Art of Living Society of Hong Kong Limited
Art Teachers' Links
Art Zone
Art-at-all
Artist Commune
Artist Cralde Co Limited
Artists Association of Hong Kong
Artists in a Lift
Artnatch Group
Arts Sages Association
Arts with the Disabled Association Hong Kong
Asia Art Archive
Asian Jewish Life Limited
Association of Hong Kong Visual Arts and Culture Education Limited
Bear Foundation of Music Education Association
Blakstave Books Limited
C & G Artprintemps
Calligraphy and Painting Study Association of Hong Kong Fukienese
Casa Italia Cultural Centre Limited
Cathy Camera Club
Cattle Depot Artist Village Management Committee

CHAN Shiou Man Photographic Alumni
Cheung Chau Photographic Society
Chili Lo Lou Art Promotion (Non-profiling) Limited
Children's Museum of Hong Kong Limited
China (Hong Kong) Painting Calligraphy for the Aged Study Association
China Heritage Fund, Hang Lung Group
China Hong Kong Artists Association
China Merchants Holdings Photographic Association
China Resources Group Staff Photographic Hobby Association
China Youth Art and Speech Association
Chinese Art and Culture Association of Hong Kong (CACHHK)
Chinese Artists Association of Hong Kong and Macau Limited
Chinese Arts Peraecuting Association
Chinese Contemporary Artists' Guild

Chinese Cultural Studies Association
Chinese Culture Club
Chinese Culture Communications Limited
Chinese Culture Promotion Society Limited
Chinese Figure Painting Association of Hong Kong
Chinese Five Arts Cultural Association Limited
Chinese Language Society of Hong Kong Limited
Chun Fung Art Club
Classic Auto-cycle Museum Limited

Community Art Network
Community Cultural Concern
Community Museum Project
Confederation of Hong Kong Visual Arts Artists Limited (Hong Kong Union of Visual Artists)
Conservancy Association Centre for Heritage Limited
Creation of Hong Kong Art Club
Creative Figure Studio
Creative Heritage Foundation Limited
Creative Horizon (Culture) Limited

Creative Photography Group
Cultural and Educational Association of the New Towns Limited
Cultural Care Move
Cultural Outings
Design and Cultural Studies
InDi Blue
Indian Art Circle
Ingroup
Inheritance of Chinese Traditional Culture Charitable Association
Ink Dimension
Ink Movement
Intellect Bad-Culture Limited
Interior Design Association (HK) Ltd.
International Association of Art Critics Hong Kong
International Association of Theatre Critics (Hong Kong)
International Education and Academic Exchanges Foundation Company Limited
International Women Artists Association
James Lung International Art and Cultural Exchange Association
Jia Shen Society of Chinese Art
Jockey Club Creative Arts Centre (JCCAC)
Joint School Campus TV Association
Kamruda Sangha Hong Kong
Kingdom Artist Cradle Co. Limited
Lai King Culture & Arts Association
Lawmap
Life Sensation
Ling Nga Art Association
Lok Tjan Chinese Calligraphy Society
Lumievision Company Ltd
Mak Studio Painting & Calligraphy Club
Man Yue Club Limited
Masan Art Appreciation
Mega Vision Contemporary Artist Guild
Member of Federation of Asian Photographic Art
Mere Independent Artists
Ming Ri Institute for Art Education
Museum of Contemporary Art Foundation Limited, Shanghai
Museum of Site Limited (MOST)
Muskeeters Education and Culture Charitable Foundation Limited
New Dimension Artists Association
New Life Literature Limited
New Media Art Association
One Art Group
Oriental Culture Research Centre Limited
Osage Foundation
Painting Association
Para/Site Art Space
PfS Photo Group
Philippe Charriol Foundation
Pictorial Photo
PIONEER Photographic Association of Hong Kong
Prima Club
Project 226
Psychic Image Calligraphy Society
Public Art Hong Kong Limited
Qing Cong Bookroom
Quantum Movement
Read-everything Company Limited
Reading Dreams
Rhythm Chinese Calligraphy and Painting Association
Room to Read (Hong Kong) Limited
Royal Asiatic Society Hong Kong Branch
Royal Conservatory of Music of Toronto, Canada, Hong Kong Office
Sai Kung Cultural Centre Community Development Foundations Limited
Sai Kung Culture Museum
San Chuan Art Society
Savannah College of Art and Design
Sea Gull Photographic Association Limited
Shown Tak Cultural Association Limited
Sino Art in Hong Kong Limited
SinoLand Heritage Conservation and Revitalization Limited
SinoLand Heritage Conservation Limited
SinoLand Heritage Revitalization Limited
Society of Cursive Calligraphy Studies
Society of Oral History on Modern China (Hong Kong)
SoREC
South China Film Industry Workers Union Photographic Club
Spicy Fish Cultural Production Ltd.
Stately Cultural Arts Development Centre
STRA
Su Yi Chuan Calligraphy Association of Hong Kong
Swire Organization for Youth Arts Limited
Tai Fong Art Society
Tai Ping Zhaung Arts Association
Tai Po Photography Club
Tang's Books
Teism Alliance Hong Kong Limited
The AIR Association Limited
The Art Seekers
The Artists Association
The Association of Chinese Culture of Hong Kong
The Beleime Association of Artistic Development
The Chinese Arts Promotion Association Worldwide

(國際藝術家協會)(香港分會)
(國際商務會(香港分會))
(國際高等教育交流基金有限公司)
(國際女性藝術家聯盟)
(國際皮影劇協會)
(國際電影節協會)
(國際書法專家學會)
(國際海事藝術中心)
(國際 televisit)
(國際藝術家協會(香港分會))
(國際電影節協會)
(國際書法專家學會)
(國際海事藝術中心)
(國際藝術家協會(香港分會))
(國際歷史文化協會有限公司)
(國際歷史文化協會有限公司)
(國際歷史文化協會有限公司)
(國際書畫藝術研究社)
(國際历史文物保存活化公司)
(國際歷史文化協會有限公司)
(國際書畫藝術研究社)
(國際歷史文化協會有限公司)
(國際書畫藝術研究社)
(國際歷史文化協會有限公司)
(國際書畫藝術研究社)
(國際歷史文化協會有限公司)
(國際書畫藝術研究社)
(國際歷史文化協會有限公司)
(國際書畫藝術研究社)
(國際歷史文化協會有限公司)
(國際書畫藝術研究社)
(國際歷史文化協會有限公司)
(國際書畫藝術研究社)
(國際歷史文化協會有限公司)
(國際書畫藝術研究社)
(國際歷史文化協會有限公司)
(國際書畫藝術研究社)
(國際歷史文化協會有限公司)
(國際書畫藝術研究社)
(國際歷史文化協會有限公司)
(國際書畫藝術研究社)
(國際歷史文化協會有限公司)
(國際書畫藝術研究社)
(國際歷史文化協會有限公司)
(國際書畫藝術研究社)
(國際歷史文化協會有限公司)
(國際書畫藝術研究社)
Appendix C  Questionnaire (Chinese versions are also available)
(Performing art)

1. The Centre for Civil Society and Governance, The University of Hong Kong

Sample ref.: ____________________  Interviewer ref.: ____________________

Civil Society Survey on Non-Profit Performing Arts Organizations/Groups

This survey aims at understanding the current situation and development of non-profit performing arts organizations/groups in Hong Kong. We are grateful for your help in providing information for this survey. All the information provided here is kept confidential and is solely for research purposes. Information of individual organizations/groups will not be disclosed in our research publications. Thank you again for your help and contribution.

A. Organizational Purposes and Service Targets

1. a) Under what legislation(s) is (are) your organization/group registered in Hong Kong? (May choose more than one)

(1) [ ] Companies Ordinance
(3) [ ] A specific ordinance to establish your organization/group as a statutory body, please specify:

(2) [ ] Registered as company limited by guarantee under Companies Ordinance
(4) [ ] Societies Ordinance

(5) [ ] Others, please specify: __________________

(6) [ ] If your organization/group did not register by the above ways, please describe your organization's/group's current status, e.g. an informal group, a network organized through online or other means, a loose alliance of various groups:

b) Is your organization/group a recognized charitable organization under section 88 of the Inland Revenue Ordinance?

(1) [ ] Yes
(2) [ ] No

2. In what year was your organization/group in Hong Kong established? Year: _______

3. Is your organization/group a branch or subsidiary of any international organizations/groups?

(1) [ ] Yes, please specify: __________________
(2) [ ] No

4. Please rank the applicable mission(s) of your organization/group in order of priorities.
(Please fill in the number, "1" is the most important and skip the ones that don't apply.)

  Rank

1
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1. Service delivery (including arts or culture related service, administration, commissioned work, consultancy), please specify: 

2. Expression of arts and culture (including performance, exhibition)

3. Policy advocacy, please specify:

4. Advocacy of certain rights, please specify:

5. Advocacy of certain values (including humanistic, artistic and cultural values), please specify:

6. Monitoring government, please specify:

7. Monitoring business, please specify:

8. Community-building (including community-building through arts or cultural activities), please specify:

9. Religious, please specify what religion:

10. Public education (including promotion of arts or culture):

11. Others, please specify:

5. Does your organization/group have a physical office?

Yes, it is located in:  

- [ ] Our organization/group does not have a physical office

In Hong Kong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>Kowloon</th>
<th>West New Territories</th>
<th>East New Territories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central and Western</td>
<td>Yau Tsim Mong</td>
<td>Kwai Tsing</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total no. ___)</td>
<td>(total no. ___)</td>
<td>(total no. ___)</td>
<td>(total no. ___)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wan Chai</td>
<td>Sham Shui Po</td>
<td>Tsuen Wan</td>
<td>Tai Po</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total no. ___)</td>
<td>(total no. ___)</td>
<td>(total no. ___)</td>
<td>(total no. ___)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>Kowloon City</td>
<td>Tuen Mun</td>
<td>Sha Tin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total no. ___)</td>
<td>(total no. ___)</td>
<td>(total no. ___)</td>
<td>(total no. ___)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Wong Tai Sin</td>
<td>Yuen Long</td>
<td>Sai Kung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(total no. ___)</td>
<td>(total no. ___)</td>
<td>(total no. ___)</td>
<td>(total no. ___)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kwun Tong</td>
<td>Islands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(total no. ___)</td>
<td>(total no. ___)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Does your organization/group run any branches?

- [ ] Yes, Total number of branches: _____  
- [ ] No, we do not have any branch

7. Does your organization/group have a regular place for rehearsals?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No, our organization/group does not have a regular place for rehearsals
What kind of premise(s)? (May choose more than one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rented</th>
<th>Self-owned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Government-owned/ Government-sponsored facilities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Commercial building</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Industrial building</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Residential building</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Others, please specify: __________________________</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. What is/are the major area(s) of concern for your organization/group? (May choose more than one)

   (1) ☐ Dance
   (2) ☐ Music
   (3) ☐ Theatre
   (4) ☐ Variety and Pop Shows
   (5) ☐ Xiqu
   (6) ☐ Other, please specify: __________________________

B. Internal Organization: Manpower, Governance and Management

9. How many paid employees have worked for your organization/group in the last 12 months? (If the number of employees fluctuated during the period, please indicate the range.)
   (1) ☐ Full Time, total no.: ________
   (2) ☐ Part Time (regular), total no.: ________
   (3) ☐ Temporary / project employees, total no.: ________
   (4) ☐ Not applicable, we do not recruit any paid staff (Please go to question 12)

10. Does your organization/group have any difficulty in recruiting/retaining staff?
   (1) ☐ Yes
   (2) ☐ No

11. Does your organization/group have any staff devoted to advocacy and relating research work?
   What is the percentage of man hours per month devoted to advocacy work duties in your organization/group?

   (1) ☐ Yes (please fill out the information in (i)-(iv):

   (i) ☐ On average, percentage of monthly man hours

   (ii) ☐ full-time advocacy and relating research staff

   %
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(iii) part-time advocacy and relating research staff _______ %

(iii) hired external consultants _______ %

(iv) volunteers working on advocacy and relating research _______ %

(2) no staff specifically working on advocacy and research

(3) Not applicable, advocacy is not a purpose of our organization/group

12. Do you have a Board of Directors for your organization/group?

(1) Yes, number of Directors in the Board: __________

(2) No, we do not have a Board of Director (Please go to question 15)

13. How often are Board meetings held in your organization/group each year?

(1) Never

(2) Once a year

(3) Twice a year

(4) Quarterly

(5) Every month

(6) Others, please specify: __________

14. How many committees are formed under the Board in your organization/group?

(1) 0

(2) 1

(3) 2

(4) 3

(5) More than 3, please specify: __________

15. Does your organization/group have a membership system?

(1) Yes

(2) No, our organization/group does not have a membership system (please go to question 18)

a) (1) We have individual membership. How many individual members are there in your organization/group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(i)</th>
<th>(v)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10</td>
<td>101 - 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-30</td>
<td>&gt; 500 please specify: __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(2) □ We do not have any individual members.

b) (1) □ We have corporate membership. How many corporate members are there in your organization/group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(i)</th>
<th>□ &lt; 10</th>
<th>(v)</th>
<th>□ 101 - 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td>□ 11-30</td>
<td>(vi)</td>
<td>□ &gt; 500 please specify: __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii)</td>
<td>□ 31-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)</td>
<td>□ 51-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) □ We do not have any corporate member.

16a. Does your organization/group hold regular meetings for members?

(1) □ Yes (2) □ No

16b. Does your organization/group provide any of the followings to members?

(May choose more than one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) □ Annual reports</th>
<th>(4) □ Emails</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) □ Reports on issues</td>
<td>(5) □ Other means of communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) □ Regular newsletters or updates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Does your organization/group recruit new members?

(1) □ Yes, how?

(May choose more than one)

| (i) □ Referral by existing members |
| (ii) □ Membership drive through mass media (press, TV, radio, etc.) |
| (iii) □ Membership drive through online means (websites, social media, etc.) |
| (iv) □ Others, please specify: __________ |

(2) □ No, our organization/group does not recruit new members.

C. Strategic Planning

18. Does your organization/group have a mechanism to evaluate program effectiveness (including output and impacts)?

(1) □ Yes (2) □ No

19. Does your organization/group find out the needs of the audience/clients participating in your programs/events?

(1) □ Yes (2) □ No
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(a) How? (May choose more than one)

(i) □ Discussion with other arts and cultural organizations
(ii) □ Consulting or collecting feedback from the audience/clients (e.g., surveys)
(iii) □ Assessment through professional consultancy firms
(iv) □ Information gathering by staff or volunteer
(v) □ Others, please specify: __________________

D. External Relationship with Volunteers, Donors, and Audience/clients

20. Over the last 12 months, how many volunteers (as an estimate) participated in your organization’s/group’s work?
   □ Full Time (Number of volunteers: ________)
   □ Part Time (Number of volunteers: ________)
   □ Not applicable; our organization/group does not recruit any volunteers (Please go to question 22)

21. Does your organization/group keep a list of regular volunteers?
   (1) □ Yes, number of regular volunteers within the list: ________
   (2) □ No, our organization/group does not keep the list of regular volunteers

22. Does your organization/group keep a list of regular donors?
   (1) □ Yes, number of regular donors within the list: ________
   (2) □ No, our organization/group does not keep the list of regular donors
   (3) □ Not applicable because our organization/group does not have any fundraising activities (Please go to question 24)
23. Over the last 12 months, has your organization/group carried out any fundraising activities?

(1) ☐ Yes, please state relevant information as follows:

(May choose more than one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Flag days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fundraising through performance, exhibition or shows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gala dinner for corporate donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Online fundraising activities, please specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Televised charity shows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Small scale charity carnival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Raffle tickets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fundraising on street (including district-based or housing estate-based fundraising)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Contacts with local/international philanthropists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Application for funding from non-profit foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gifts Sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Venue/art facilities for hire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Others, please specify:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) ☐ No
24. Does your organization/group use the Internet (including social media), mobile phone or other digital means in organizing activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of activities with usage of digital means</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Slightly Effective</th>
<th>Slightly ineffective</th>
<th>Very ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Fundraising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Member recruitment and mobilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Volunteer recruitment and mobilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Promote programs and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Does your organization/group have website(s)?

(1) Yes. Does your organization/group update the website(s)?

(2) No, we do not have a website.

Reason: ________________

(1) Yes, we update the website(s) regularly. How often?

(i) Daily
(ii) Monthly
(iii) Bi-monthly
(iv) Half yearly
(v) Yearly
(vi) Others, please specify: ________________

(2) Yes, but we update our website(s) only when necessary

(3) No, we do not update our website(s)
26. Through what channel(s) did your organization/group promote your performances and other activities (e.g. programs, fundraising, advocacy, etc.)? Please indicate frequency of use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channels to promote performances and other activities (e.g. programs, fundraising, advocacy, etc.)</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Membership network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Emailing and mobile phone messages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Online social networking tools (e.g. Facebook, Twitter), please specify:__________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Direct mailing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Promotion on street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Mass media (press, radio and television)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Others, please specify:_______________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ We do not promote our activities by any means.
27. Over the last 12 months, has your organization/group carried out or participated (either on your own or with other organizations/groups) any advocacy activities?

(1) ☐ Yes
(2) ☐ No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of advocacy activities</th>
<th>On what issue</th>
<th>Number of event(s)</th>
<th>Total number of participant(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Protest(s) or demonstration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Signature petition(s) on street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Signature petition(s) on the internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Forming oppositional organizations/groups on Facebook or other online tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Press conference(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Submission(s) to government</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Other activities, please specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28a. Through what channel(s) did your organization/group communicate with audience/clients? Please indicate frequency of use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channels to communicate with audience/clients</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Publications and printed materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Online means (websites, email, social media, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Mass media (press, radio and television)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Events and Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Face-to-face communication (e.g. focus groups, talks, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28b. Through what channel(s) did your organization/group communicate with the general public? Please indicate frequency of use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channels to communicate with the general public</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Publications and printed materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Online means (websites, email, social media, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Mass media (press, radio and television)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Events and Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Face-to-face communication (e.g. focus groups, talks, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29a. In the past 12 months, how many programmes/projects/events has your organization/group organized?
Number: __________

29b. In the past 12 months, how many persons in total have participated in the programmes/projects/events organized by your organization/group?
Number: __________

E. External Relationship with Other Non-profit Organizations/Groups

30. Please answer the following and fill out the relevant details.
### External Relationship with Hong Kong SAR Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) We have regular contact with international non-profit organizations/groups outside of Hong Kong</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) We have regular contact with non-profit organizations/groups in Mainland China</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) We have regular contact with other non-profit organizations/groups in Hong Kong</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) We have regular collaboration with other non-profit organizations/groups in organizing our events and programmes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) We have occasional collaboration with other non-profit organizations/groups in organizing our events and programmes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) We compete with other non-profit organizations/groups on securing resources (financial or manpower)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 31. Do you think your organization/group operates independently, free from Hong Kong SAR government intervention, during the routine operation or decision-making of your organization/group?

- (1) Very autonomous
- (2) Autonomous
- (3) Moderately autonomous
- (4) Not autonomous
- (5) Unknown / no opinion
- (6) Not applicable
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32. In the last five years, you regard the mutual trust between the Hong Kong SAR government and your organization/group as:

- (1) Increased
- (2) About the same
- (3) Decreased
- (4) Unknown / no opinion
- (5) Not applicable

33. In your opinion, your organization's/group's relationship with HKSAR officials is in general:

- (1) Very good
- (2) Good
- (3) Neutral
- (4) Poor
- (5) Very poor
- (6) Not Applicable
- (7) Other comments, please specify: __________

34. With regard to your missions and activities, does your organization/group consider that it has to play a role in monitoring the HKSAR government and holding the government accountable?

- (1) Yes, is that effective?
- (2) No
- (3) Very effective
- (4) Effective
- (5) Ineffective
- (6) Very ineffective
- (7) Unknown / no opinion

35. Is your organization/group a registered voter of the sector of the Sports, Performing Arts, Culture and Publication for the Functional Constituency of the Legislative Council?

- (1) Yes
- (2) No, we are eligible but have not registered
- (3) No, we are not eligible
- (4) Don't know

G. External Relationship with Business Sector

36. In the last 12 months, does your organization/group cooperate with any business companies (in or outside Hong Kong) for
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the following purpose(s)?

(May choose more than one)

1. Fundraising, donation or sponsorship
2. Advocacy, please specify: 
3. Recruitment of volunteers from business companies, please specify: 
4. Joint projects, please specify: 
5. Setting up social enterprises, please specify: 
6. Other collaboration, please specify: 
7. No cooperation (please go to question 38)

37. Does your organization/group have a list of business companies which are regular donors?

1. Yes, number of companies on the list: 
2. No

38. Does your organization/group think it has to play a role in monitoring the business companies?

1. Yes, is that effective? 
2. No

□ (i) Very effective  □ (iv) Very ineffective
□ (ii) Effective  □ (v) Unknown / no opinion
□ (iii) Ineffective

39. Overall, what is the general attitude held by business sector towards your organization/group?

1. Supportive with concrete action and willingness to donate
2. Supportive in name only
3. Indifferent
4. Not supportive
5. Hostile
6. Other comments, please specify: 
7. Not applicable (please go to question 41)

40. Compared with five years ago, how would you describe the above situation?

1. Improved
2. About the same
3. Deteriorated
4. Other comments, please specify: 

H. Self-evaluation

41. In the last 12 months, do you think:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate (4)</th>
<th>Just adequate (3)</th>
<th>Not adequate (2)</th>
<th>Seriously inadequate (1)</th>
<th>Not applicable (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Your organization/group has adequate number of staff to carry out the organization/group’s activities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. The staff in your organization/group has the adequate professional training?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Your organization/group has secured adequate donation to carry out the organization/group’s activities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Your organization/group has adequate office space/facility to carry out the organization/group’s activities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Your organization/group has adequate number of volunteers to deliver the organization’s missions?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
42. You think that in the past 5 years your organization/group has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very much agree (4)</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>very much disagree (1)</th>
<th>Neutral / No comment (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. achieved the mission(s) of your organization/group successfully</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. addressed the need of target communities successfully</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. maintained good service quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. generated incomes adequately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. spent expenditure cost-effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Resources

41. You think that in the last financial year your organization/group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very much agree (4)</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Very much disagree (1)</th>
<th>Neutral / No comment (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. has adequate financial resources to support the fulfillment of the missions and objectives of the organization/group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. has stable financial sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. can allocate financial resources flexibly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. Does your organization/group disclose annual financial reports to the general public?

[ ] Yes.  [ ] No
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45a. Your organization's/group's total income (HKD) in the last financial year was **(please tick where appropriate)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Below $10,000</th>
<th>$10,000-$50,000</th>
<th>$50,001-$100,000</th>
<th>$100,001-$300,000</th>
<th>$300,001-$500,000</th>
<th>$500,001-$1,000,000</th>
<th>$1,000,001-$3,000,000</th>
<th>Above $3,000,000, please specify:__________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45b. The percentage distribution of your organization's/group's total income in the last financial year that came from **(Please write down the estimated percentage)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Income</th>
<th>Percentage (estimated %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding by government bodies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) HKSAR Government's or Arts Development Council's regular subvention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) HKSAR Government's or Arts Development Council's project funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Funding from overseas government(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship or donations from Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Business in Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Business overseas (including Mainland China)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship or donations from NGOs/Individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Local foundations or NGOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(viii) Overseas foundations or NGOs (including Mainland China)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ix) Local individual/public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x) Individual/overseas (including Mainland China)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xi) Membership fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xii) Income-generating projects, please specify: _______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xiii) Gifts sales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xiv) Others, please specify: _______</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sample ref.: __________________________  Interviewer ref.: __________________________

Civil Society Survey on Non-Profit Arts and Cultural Organizations/Groups

This survey aims at understanding the current situation and development of non-profit arts and cultural organizations/groups in Hong Kong. We are grateful for your help in providing information for this survey. All the information provided here is kept confidential and is solely for research purposes. Information of individual organizations/groups will not be disclosed in our research publications. Thank you again for your help and contribution.

A. Organizational Purposes and Service Targets

1. a) Under what legislation(s) is (are) your organization/group registered in Hong Kong? (May choose more than one)

(1) □ Companies Ordinance

(2) □ Registered as company limited by guarantee under Companies Ordinance

(3) □ A specific ordinance to establish your organization/group as a statutory body, please specify:

(4) □ Societies Ordinance

(5) □ Others, please specify: __________________________

b) If your organization/group did not register by the above ways, please describe your organization’s/group’s current status, e.g., an informal group, a network organized through online or other means, a loose alliance of various groups:

b) Is your organization/group a recognized charitable organization under section 88 of the Inland Revenue Ordinance?

(1) □ Yes

(2) □ No

2. In what year was your organization/group in Hong Kong established?  Year: ________
3. Is your organization/group a branch or subsidiary of any international organizations/groups?

(1) [ ] Yes, please specify: __________________________
(2) [ ] No

4. Please rank the applicable mission(s) of your organization/group in order of priorities. (Please fill in the number; "1" is the most important and skip the ones that don’t apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Specify</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Service delivery (including arts or culture-related service, administration, consultancy, communication, commissioned work, education, etc.), please specify: __________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>Cultivation or promotion of artistic, aesthetic, or humanistic values (in various forms such as exhibitions, seminars, publications, installations, videos, etc.), please specify: __________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>Policy advocacy, please specify: __________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>Advocacy of certain rights, please specify: __________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>Advocacy of certain values (including humanistic, artistic and cultural values), please specify: __________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>Monitoring government, please specify: __________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>Monitoring business, please specify: __________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>Community-building (including community-building through arts or cultural activities), please specify: __________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>Religious, please specify what religion: __________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>Public education (including promotion of arts or culture): __________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>Others, please specify: __________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. Does your organization/group have a physical office?

Yes, it is located in: □ Our organization/group does not have a physical office in Hong Kong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>Kowloon</th>
<th>West New Territories</th>
<th>East New Territories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) □ Central and Western (total no. ___)</td>
<td>(5) □ Yau Yim Mong (total no. ___)</td>
<td>(10) □ Kwai Tsing (total no. ___)</td>
<td>(15) □ North (total no. ___)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) □ Wan Chai (total no. ___)</td>
<td>(6) □ Sham Shui Po (total no. ___)</td>
<td>(11) □ Tsuen Wan (total no. ___)</td>
<td>(16) □ Tai Po (total no. ___)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) □ Eastern (total no. ___)</td>
<td>(7) □ Kowloon City (total no. ___)</td>
<td>(12) □ Tsuen Mun (total no. ___)</td>
<td>(17) □ Sha Tin (total no. ___)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) □ Southern (total no. ___)</td>
<td>(8) □ Mong Kok (total no. ___)</td>
<td>(13) □ Yuen Long (total no. ___)</td>
<td>(18) □ Sai Kung (total no. ___)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) □ Kwun Tong (total no. ___)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Does your organization/group run any branches?

□ Yes, Total number of branches: _______ □ No, we do not have any branch

7. Does your organization/group have a regular place for rehearsals?

(1) □ Yes (2) □ No, our organization/group does not have a regular place for rehearsals

What kind of premise(s)? *(May choose more than one)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government-owned/ Government-sponsored facilities</th>
<th>Rented</th>
<th>Self-owned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Government-owned/ Government-sponsored facilities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Commercial building</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Industrial building</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Residential building</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Others, please specify: ___________________________</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. What is(are) the major area(s) of concern for your organization/group? [May choose more than one]

(1) ☐ Media and Communication (including movie production and publications)
(2) ☐ Visual arts, architecture and ceramic arts
(3) ☐ History, literary and humanistic activities
(4) ☐ Museum activities
(5) ☐ Cross-cultural and artistic activities (including arts education)
(6) ☐ Other, please specify: __________________________

9. Internal Organization: Manpower, Governance and Management

9. How many paid employees have worked for your organization/group in the last 12 months? (If the number of employees fluctuated during the period, please indicate the range.)

(1) ☐ Full Time, total no.: _________
(2) ☐ Part Time (regular), total no.: _________
(3) ☐ Temporary / project employees, total no.: _________
(4) ☐ Not applicable, we do not recruit any paid staff (Please go to question 12)

10. Does your organization/group have any difficulty in recruiting/retaining staff?

(1) ☐ Yes
(2) ☐ No

11. Does your organization/group have any staff devoted to advocacy and relating research work? What is the percentage of man hours per month devoted to advocacy work duties in your organization/group?

(1) ☐ Yes (please fill out the information in (i)-(iv):

(i) full-time advocacy and relating research staff _________%  
(ii) part-time advocacy and relating research staff _________%  
(iii) hired external consultants _________%  
(iv) volunteers working on advocacy and relating research _________%  

[2] ☐ No staff specifically working on advocacy and research
[3] ☐ Not applicable, advocacy is not a purpose of our organization/group

12. Do you have a Board of Directors for your organization/group?

(1) ☐ Yes, number of Directors in the Board ____________
(2) ☐ No, we do not have a Board of Director (Please go to question 15)
13. How often are Board meetings held in your organization/group each year?

(1) ☐ Never  (4) ☐ Quarterly
(2) ☐ Once a year  (5) ☐ Every month
(3) ☐ Twice a year  (6) ☐ Others, please specify:__________

14. How many committees are formed under the Board in your organization/group?

(1) ☐ 0  (4) ☐ 3
(2) ☐ 1  (5) ☐ More than 3, please specify:__________
(3) ☐ 2

15. Does your organization/group have a membership system?

(1) ☐ Yes  (2) ☐ No, our organization/group does not have a membership system (please go to question 18).

a) (1) ☐ We have **individual membership.** How many individual members are there in your organization/group?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) ☐ &lt; 10</td>
<td>(v) ☐ 101 - 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) ☐ 11-30</td>
<td>(vi) ☐ &gt; 500 please specify:__________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) ☐ 31-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) ☐ 51-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) ☐ We do not have any individual member

b) (1) ☐ We have **corporate membership.** How many corporate members are there in your organization/group?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) ☐ &lt; 10</td>
<td>(v) ☐ 101 - 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) ☐ 11-30</td>
<td>(vi) ☐ &gt; 500 please specify:__________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) ☐ 31-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) ☐ 51-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) ☐ We do not have any corporate member

16a. Does your organization/group hold regular meetings for members?

(1) ☐ Yes  (2) ☐ No

16b. Does your organization/group provide any of the followings to members?  

(May choose more than one)
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17. Does your organization/group recruit new members?
   (1) ☐ Yes, how? (may choose more than one)
   (2) ☐ No, our organization/group does not recruit new members

   (i) ☐ Referral by existing members
   (ii) ☐ Membership drive through mass media (press, TV, radio, etc.)
   (iii) ☐ Membership drive through online means (websites, social media, etc.)
   (iv) ☐ Others, please specify:_________________

C. Strategic Planning

18. Does your organization/group have a mechanism to evaluate programs effectiveness (including output and impacts)?
   (1) ☐ Yes
   (2) ☐ No

19. Does your organization/group find out the needs of the audience/clients participating in your programs/events?
   (1) ☐ Yes
   (2) ☐ No

   (a) How? (May choose more than one)
   (i) ☐ Discussion with other arts and cultural organizations
   (ii) ☐ Consulting or collecting feedback from the audience/clients (e.g., surveys)
   (iii) ☐ Assessment through professional consultancy firms
   (iv) ☐ Information gathering by staff or volunteer
   (v) ☐ Others, please specify:_________________

D. External Relationship with Volunteers, Donors, and Audience/clients

20. Over the last 12 months, how many volunteers (as an estimate) participated in your organization’s/group’s work?
   ☐ Full Time (Number of volunteers:_______)
   ☐ Part Time (Number of volunteers:_______)
   ☐ Not applicable, our organization/group does not recruit any volunteers (Please go to question 22)
21. Does your organization/group keep a list of regular volunteers?

(1) □ Yes, number of regular volunteers within the list: ______
(2) □ No, our organization/group does not keep the list of regular volunteers

22. Does your organization/group keep a list of regular donors?

(1) □ Yes, number of regular donors within the list: ______
(2) □ No, our organization/group does not keep the list of regular donors
(3) □ Not applicable because our organization/group does not have any fundraising activities [Please go to question 24]
23. Over the last 12 months, has your organization/group carried out any fundraising activities?

(1) [ ] Yes, please state relevant information as follows:

[May choose more than one]

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>[ ] Flag days</td>
<td>(8) [ ] Fundraising on street (including district-based or housing estate-based fundraising)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>[ ] Fundraising through performance, exhibition or shows</td>
<td>(9) [ ] Contacts with local/ international philanthropists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>[ ] Gala dinner for corporate donors</td>
<td>(10) [ ] Application for funding from non-profit foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>[ ] Online fundraising activities, please specify:</td>
<td>(11) [ ] Gifts Sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>[ ] Televised charity shows</td>
<td>(12) [ ] Venue/art facilities for hire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>[ ] Small scale charity carnival</td>
<td>(13) [ ] Others, please specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>[ ] Raffle tickets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Does your organization/group use the Internet (including social media), mobile phone or other digital means in organizing activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of activities with usage of digital means</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Slightly Effective</th>
<th>Slightly Ineffective</th>
<th>Very Ineffective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(May choose more than one)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. □ Fundraising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. □ Member recruitment and mobilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. □ Volunteer recruitment and mobilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. □ Promote programs and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. □ Advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. □ Others: _______________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Does your organization/group have website(s)?

| (1) □ Yes. Does your organization/group update the website(s)? | (2) □ No, we do not have a website. Reason: __________________________ |

(2) □ Yes, we update the website(s) regularly. How often?

- (i) □ Daily
- (ii) □ Monthly
- (iii) □ Bi-monthly
- (iv) □ Half-yearly
- (v) □ Yearly
- (vi) □ Others, please specify: __________________________

(2) □ Yes, but we update our website(s) only when necessary

(3) □ No, we do not update our website(s)
26. Through what channel(s) did your organization/group promote your performances and other activities (e.g. programs, fundraising, advocacy, etc.)? Please indicate frequency of use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channels to promote performances and other activities (e.g. programs, fundraising, advocacy, etc.)</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Membership network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Emailing and mobile phone messages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Online social networking tools (e.g. Facebook, Twitter), please specify:__________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Direct mailing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Promotion on street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Advertising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Mass media (press, radio and television)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Others, please specify:__________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ We do not promote our activities by any means.
27. Over the last 12 months, has your organization/group carried out or participated (either on your own or with other organizations/groups) any advocacy activities?

(1) ☐ Yes  (2) ☐ No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of advocacy activities (May choose more than one)</th>
<th>On what issue</th>
<th>Number of event(s)</th>
<th>Total number of participant(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Protest(s) or demonstration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Signature petition(s) on street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Signature petition(s) on the Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Forming oppositional organizations/groups on Facebook or other online tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Press conference(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Submission(s) to government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Other activities, please specify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**28a. Through what channel(s) did your organization/group communicate with audience/clients?** Please indicate frequency of use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channels to communicate with audience/clients</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Publications and printed materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Online means (websites, email, social media, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Mass media (press, radio and television)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Events and Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Face-to-face communication (e.g. focus groups, talks, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**28b. Through what channel(s) did your organization/group communicate with the general public?** Please indicate frequency of use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channels to communicate with the general public</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Publications and printed materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Online means (websites, email, social media, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Mass media (press, radio and television)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Events and Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Face-to-face communication (e.g. focus groups, talks, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**29a. In the past 12 months, how many programmes/projects/events has your organization/group organized?**

Number: __________

**29b. In the past 12 months, how many persons in total have participated in the programmes/projects/events organized by your organization/group?**

Number: __________

**E. External Relationship with Other Non-profit Organizations/Groups**

30. Please answer the following and fill out the relevant details.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the past 12 months,</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Please provide <strong>THREE</strong> names of most frequent organizations/groups</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (i) We have **regular** contact with international non-profit organizations/groups outside of Hong Kong | □  | Name(s) of international non-profit organizations/groups  
1. ___________________________________________  
2. ___________________________________________  
3. ___________________________________________ | □  |
| (ii) We have **regular** contact with non-profit organizations/groups in Mainland China | □  | Name(s) of non-profit organizations/groups in Mainland China  
1. ___________________________________________  
2. ___________________________________________  
3. ___________________________________________ | □  |
| (iii) We have **regular** contact with other non-profit organizations/groups in Hong Kong | □  | Name(s) of non-profit organizations/groups in Hong Kong  
1. ___________________________________________  
2. ___________________________________________  
3. ___________________________________________ | □  |
| (iv) We have **regular** collaboration with other non-profit organizations/groups in organizing our events and programmes | □  | Name(s) of non-profit organizations/groups  
1. ___________________________________________  
2. ___________________________________________  
3. ___________________________________________ | □  |
| (v) We have **occasional** collaboration with other non-profit organizations/groups in organizing our events and programmes | □  | Name(s) of non-profit organizations/groups  
1. ___________________________________________  
2. ___________________________________________  
3. ___________________________________________ | □  |
| (vi) We compete with other non-profit organizations/groups on securing resources (financial or manpower) | □  | Please elaborate  
1. ___________________________________________  
2. ___________________________________________  
3. ___________________________________________ | □  |
F. External Relationship with Hong Kong SAR Government

31. Do you think your organization/group operates independently, free from Hong Kong SAR government intervention, during the routine operation or decision-making of your organization/group?

(1) ☐ Very autonomous  (5) ☐ Unknown / no opinion
(2) ☐ Autonomous  (6) ☐ Not applicable
(3) ☐ Not autonomous  (7) ☐ Other comments, please specify:__________
(4) ☐ Very not autonomous

32. In the last five years, you regard the mutual trust between the Hong Kong SAR government and your organization/group as:

(1) ☐ Increased  (4) ☐ Unknown / no opinion
(2) ☐ About the same  (5) ☐ Not applicable
(3) ☐ Decreased

33. In your opinion, your organization’s/group’s relationship with HKSAR officials is in general:

(1) ☐ Very good  (6) ☐ Not Applicable
(2) ☐ Good  (7) ☐ Other comments, please specify:__________
(3) ☐ Neutral
(4) ☐ Poor
(5) ☐ Very poor

34. With regard to your missions and activities, does your organization/group consider that it has to play a role in monitoring the HKSAR government and holding the government accountable?

☐ A Yes, is that effective?  ☐ B No
☐ B Very effective  ☐ D Very ineffective
☐ C Effective  ☐ E Unknown / no opinion
☐ D Ineffective
35. Is your organization/group a registered voter of the sector of the Sports, Performing Arts, Culture and Publication for the Functional Constituency of the Legislative Council?

(1) ☐ Yes
(2) ☐ No, we are eligible but have not registered
(3) ☐ No, we are not eligible
(4) ☐ Don't know

G. External Relationship with Business Sector

36. In the last 12 months, does your organization/group cooperate with any business companies (in or outside Hong Kong) for the following purpose(s)?

(May choose more than one)

(1) ☐ Fundraising, donation or sponsorship
(2) ☐ Advocacy, please specify:____________________
(3) ☐ Recruitment of volunteers from business companies, please specify:______________
(4) ☐ Joint projects, please specify:____________________
(5) ☐ Setting up social enterprises, please specify:____________________
(6) ☐ Other collaboration, please specify:____________________
(7) ☐ No cooperation (please go to question 38)

37. Does your organization/group have a list of business companies which are regular donors?

(1) ☐ Yes, number of companies on the list: ________________
(2) ☐ No

38. Does your organization/group think it has to play a role in monitoring the business companies?

(1) ☐ Yes, is that effective?
(2) ☐ No

☐ [ ] Very effective
☐ [ ] Effective
☐ [ ] Ineffective
☐ [ ] Very ineffective
☐ [ ] Unknown / no opinion
39. Overall, what is the general attitude held by the business sector towards your organization/group?

(1) Supportive with concrete action and willingness to donate  
(2) Supportive in name only  
(3) Indifferent  
(4) Not supportive  
(5) Hostile  
(6) Other comments, please specify:  
(7) Not applicable (please go to question 41)

40. Compared with five years ago, how would you describe the above situation?

(1) Improved  
(2) About the same  
(3) Deteriorated  
(4) Other comments, please specify:  

H. Self-evaluation

41. In the last 12 months, do you think:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate (4)</th>
<th>Just adequate (3)</th>
<th>Not adequate (2)</th>
<th>Seriously inadequate (1)</th>
<th>Not applicable (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Your organization/group has adequate number of staff to carry out the organization/group’s activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. The staff in your organization/group has the adequate professional training?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Your organization/group has secured adequate donation to carry out the organization/group’s activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Your organization/group has adequate office space/facility to carry out the organization/group’s activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Your organization/group has adequate number of volunteers to deliver the organization’s missions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
42. You think that in the past 5 years your organization/group has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very much agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Very much disagree</th>
<th>Neutral / No comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. achieved the mission(s) of your organization/group successfully</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. addressed the need of target communities successfully</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. maintained good service quality</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. generated incomes adequately</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. spent expenditure cost-effectively</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Resources

43. You think that in the last financial year your organization/group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very much agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Very much disagree</th>
<th>Neutral / No comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. has adequate financial resources to support the fulfillment of the missions and objectives of the organization/group.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. has stable financial sources.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. can allocate financial resources flexibly.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. Does your organization/group disclose annual financial reports to the general public?

(1) ☐ Yes (2) ☐ No
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45a. Your organization’s/group’s total income (HKD) in the last financial year was \(\text{(please tick where appropriate)}\)

(1) □ Below $10,000  (5) □ $300,001-$500,000
(2) □ $10,001-$50,000  (6) □ $500,001-$1,000,000
(3) □ $50,001-$100,000  (7) □ $1,000,001-$3,000,000
(4) □ $100,001-$300,000  (8) □ Above $3,000,000, please specify: __________

45b. The percentage distribution of your organization’s/group’s total income in the last financial year that came from \(\text{[Please write down, the estimated percentage]}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of income</th>
<th>Percentage (estimated %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding by government bodies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) HKSAR Government’s or Arts Development Council’s regular subvention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) HKSAR Government’s or Arts Development Council’s project funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Funding from overseas government(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship or donations from Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Business in Hong Kong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Business overseas (including Mainland China)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship or donations from NGOs/individuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Local foundations or NGOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(viii) Overseas foundations or NGOs (including Mainland China)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ix) Local individuals/public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x) Individuals overseas (including Mainland China)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xi) Membership fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xii) Income-generating projects, please specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xiii) Gifts sales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xiv) Others, please specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- End of Questionnaire -
- Thank you very much for your help! -
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