

---

## Research Report on the Project

# Disability Awareness: A Baseline Study in the Property Management Sector

This project is supported by

Funding Programme of Research Projects on Equal Opportunities 2013/14  
Equal Opportunities Commission

---



Prepared by:

**Dr. Yung YAU**

Department of Public Policy

City University of Hong Kong

**Dr. Wai Kin LAU**

Technological and Higher Education Institute of Hong Kong

March 2015

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
1 Introduction.....	2
1.1 Background of the Research .....	2
1.2 Research Aims and Objectives.....	3
2 Literature Review .....	4
2.1 Inclusive Built Environment: Design and Management .....	4
2.2 Disability Awareness.....	4
3 Research Design .....	5
3.1 Company-based Questionnaire Survey .....	6
3.2 Practitioner-based Questionnaire Survey .....	6
3.3 In-depth Interviews .....	9
4 Research Findings.....	10
4.1 Findings from the Company-based Questionnaire Survey .....	10
4.2 Findings from the Practitioner-based Questionnaire Survey .....	13
4.3 Findings from the In-depth Interviews.....	21
5 Analyses and Discussion .....	23
5.1 Effects of Company Characteristics .....	23
5.2 Effects of Practitioner Characteristics.....	24
5.3 Other Discussions of the Research Findings.....	26
6 Recommendations.....	27
6.1 Guidebooks or Codes of Practice for Inclusive Property Management .....	27
6.2 Professional Development for Property Management Practitioners .....	27
6.3 Resources and Supports for Disability Awareness Training.....	28
6.4 Customer Care Charter for the PWDs.....	28
6.5 Sustainable Procurement .....	28
7 Concluding Remarks.....	29
References .....	30
Appendix A: A non-exhaustive list of accessibility audit reports in Hong Kong .....	32
Appendix B: Sample questionnaire for the company-based survey .....	33
Appendix C: Sample questionnaire for the practitioner-based survey .....	36

## **Executive Summary**

This research project was funded by the Equal Opportunities Commission under its Funding Programme of Research Projects on Equal Opportunities 2013/14. Two questionnaire surveys and four in-depth interviews were conducted from May to December 2014 to investigate the current state of provision of disability awareness training to employees and level of disability awareness within the local property management industry. The questionnaire surveys were conducted at two levels, namely the company level and practitioner level.

Based on the responses of 26 responding companies, findings showed that (1) larger companies, in terms of employing larger number of staff, tended to understand the liabilities as a management agent of a premise laid down in the Disability Discrimination Ordinance (DDO) more clearly; (2) companies with more years of management experience were more likely to have formulated comprehensible guidelines which set out the procedures and providing suggestions on how to conform the liabilities as a management agent of a premise laid down in the DDO; (3) more established property management companies possessed resources and capacity to ensure their employees to observe the interests of persons with disabilities (PWDs) in their property management tasks; (4) companies awarded with a caring company logo tended to evaluate the sufficiency of awareness, knowledge and ability of their employees to deal with the needs of PWDs in their daily management tasks more positively; and (5) companies with experiences of collaborating with interest groups or self-help organizations of PWDs to organize events or activities tended to understand the liabilities as a management agent of a premise laid down in the DDO more clearly.

According to the views of 342 responding property management practitioners, factors including 'education level', 'personal experience of disabilities', 'regular contact with PWDs' and 'attendance to disability-related training' were found to be significant determinants in enhancing their level of disability awareness. In particular, those respondents who had received training for enhancing their awareness and knowledge of the disabilities tended to have stronger beliefs in the importance of barrier-free built environment to PWDs and the importance of facility management to ensure that a barrier-free built environment. Besides, this group of respondents tended to understand the DDO and company policy more clearly and would more likely consider the interests of PWDs in their routine property management tasks.

Recommendations were proposed based on the afore-mentioned survey findings and in-depth interview data. These stakeholders suggested the provision of: (1) guidebooks or codes of practice for inclusive property management; (2) professional development for property management practitioners; (3) resources and supports for disability awareness training; (4) customer care charter for the PWDs; and (5) strategy of sustainable procurement.

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background of the Research

Inclusive built environment is conducive to full participation of the persons with disabilities (PWDs) and their enjoyment of equal opportunities. With the United Nations' advocacy of the rights of PWDs, the *Standard Rules on Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities* was introduced in 1993 and the *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* was adopted in 2006. The Convention stipulates that signatory states must identify and eliminate obstacles and barriers to accessibility in buildings and other types of physical environment (United Nations, 2006). In fact, barrier-free built environment has been a goal with universal appeal due to the huge number of PWDs around the world. According to the World Health Organization (2014), over a billion people (i.e., about 15% of the world population) have one or more forms of disability all over the world. In Hong Kong, the number of PWDs increased from 361,300 in 2007 to 578,600 in 2013 (Census and Statistics Department, 2014).<sup>1</sup> The PWDs accounted for 8.1% of Hong Kong's population in 2013.

In Hong Kong, the *Disability Discrimination Ordinance* (DDO; Chapter 487 of the *Laws of Hong Kong*) which was enacted in August 1995 provides statutory protection to people against discrimination on the ground of disability. With regard to the built facilities, the DDO prohibits discrimination against PWDs by failing to provide means of access to any premises that the public or a section of the public is entitled or allowed to enter or use, or by refusing to provide appropriate facilities. However, there is no discrimination in relation to the provision of access to premises if the premises are so designed or constructed as to be inaccessible to PWDs and any alteration to the premises to provide such access would impose unjustifiable hardship on the persons who would have to provide it. The *Design Manual: Barrier Free Access 2008* sets out the 'deemed-to-satisfy' standards of design and construction of new buildings or alterations and additions to existing buildings.

Apart from the design of built facility, the DDO also prohibits the 'managers' of premises from refusing or deliberately omitting to afford the PWDs' access to the premises. Nonetheless, no code of practice has been issued to guide these 'managers' the way to the fulfilment of the legislative requirements. Even if a building is designed and constructed so that it is accessible to PWDs, unthoughtful management of the building will result in a non-inclusive built environment for the PWDs. This problem is vividly demonstrated by the never-ending non-conforming cases which have been reported in the press or to the Equal Opportunities Commission (EOC). For example, the landlord of a private commercial complex in Mongkok was accused of unauthorized removal of access ramps and handrails for

---

<sup>1</sup> The figures include people had one or more of the following types of disability: 1) restriction in body movement; 2) seeing difficulty; 3) hearing difficulty; 4) speech difficulty; 5) mental illness/mood disorder; 6) Autism; 7) specific learning difficulties; and 8) attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder.

the PWDs in the complex.<sup>2</sup> The Link Management Limited was repeatedly complained for delaying the repairs of lifts and toilet facilities for the PWDs in its shopping centres.<sup>3,4</sup> Some wheelchair users also grumbled that the property managers were not aware of their difficulties in getting their ways through when designing the seasonal decorations or organizing marketing events in the shopping centres or housing developments. All these incidents can be largely ascribed to the lack of awareness among the local property management practitioners about the special needs of the PWDs and challenges facing them when using a particular built facility.

Disability awareness of the community has attracted much attention in the Western countries since the late 1980s. In the United States, the public and private sectors started providing disability awareness training to educate their employees on the anti-discrimination regulations and PWDs in the early 1990s. This kind of training, usually offered in a workshop format, aims to provide employees with a proven means to increase the knowledge and acceptance of disability. Various hand-on issues like how to communicate with a person who is deaf or hard of hearing, how to safely guide a person with vision impairment, and how to clamp and secure wheelchairs may be covered in the training workshops. However, similar training is sporadic in Hong Kong.

To encourage the participation and integration of the PWDs in the society of Hong Kong, it is necessary to remove the ‘manageable’ environmental obstacles in our buildings. From above, it is crystal clear that disability awareness is a precondition for an inclusive built environment. Yet, there has been no research on the disability awareness in the property management industry in Hong Kong (and other parts of the world as well). In this light, it is an urgent need for empirically evaluating the disability awareness in the property management sector in Hong Kong. Besides, it is insightful to know how much the employers in the industry (mainly the property management companies and landlords) have done on disability awareness promotion.

## ***1.2 Research Aims and Objectives***

This project aims to provide a preliminary inquiry into the disability awareness of the property management practitioners in Hong Kong and extent of disability awareness training provided by the employers. This aim is further broken down into the following objectives:

- (1) To evaluate the disability awareness of the property management practitioners in Hong Kong;

---

<sup>2</sup> For details, please refer to the website <http://www.info.gov.hk/gia/general/199808/27/0827150.htm>.

<sup>3</sup> For details, please refer to the website [http://orientaldaily.on.cc/cnt/news/20091010/00176\\_037.html](http://orientaldaily.on.cc/cnt/news/20091010/00176_037.html).

<sup>4</sup> For details, please refer to the website [http://orientaldaily.on.cc/cnt/news/20101025/00176\\_025.html](http://orientaldaily.on.cc/cnt/news/20101025/00176_025.html).

- (2) To provide an overview of disability awareness training in the property management industry in Hong Kong;
- (3) To offer valuable baseline data for tracking or comparison purposes in the future; and
- (4) To explore possible means to improve the disability awareness of the local property management industry.

## **2 Literature Review**

### ***2.1 Inclusive Built Environment: Design and Management***

While facilitating access for PWDs into and around the built environment has become an increasingly important function of governments around the world, inaccessible built environment is still one of the main forms of discrimination persisting against PWDs (Imrie & Wells, 1993). There is a large volume of literature on the assessment of accessibility of PWDs in different types of built environment. For example, Evcil (2009), Kadir and Jamaludin (2012) and Thapar *et al.* (2004) employed users' experience or opinions to evaluate disability inclusiveness or accessibility of buildings. Some other studies like Bendel (2006), Hashim *et al.* (2012) and Sawyer and Bright (2007) adopted accessibility audit for evaluating building accessibility. In Hong Kong, Chan *et al.* (2009) developed a multi-attribute model for assessing the accessibility of PWDs in public housing estates. Besides, various district councils, rehabilitation associations and PWD concern groups undertook accessibility audits on different types of property in Hong Kong. Examples of these audit reports are enlisted in **Appendix A**. In general, the literature on building accessibility suggested that our built environment is far from being disability-inclusive.

Nevertheless, the accessibility issue has long been "portrayed as essentially a design problem" (Thomas, 1992: 22). As criticized by Lau *et al.* (2014), nearly all previous empirical studies on building accessibility put too much emphasis on facility design and construction but ignoring the management and operations of the built environment. In fact, both the design and management of the built environment are crucial factors in creating what might be called truly inclusive space (Imrie, 1998; Imrie & Hall, 2001). While how the perceptions and practices of architects or designers affect the accessibility of buildings has been studied before (e.g. Hall & Imrie, 1999; Morrow, 2000), property managers have never been the focus of the research.

### ***2.2 Disability Awareness***

As argued by Brown (1995) and Olkin (2002), rather than viewing disability as a defect within individuals that inherently requires 'fixing' or 'rectification', disability should be perceived as

a social construct where problems resulting from disabilities are centred on the environment's failure to accommodate to the needs of PWDs. Yet, negative attitudes and limited physical access are typical obstacles faced by PWDs, which obstruct fulfilment of their desired roles in society (Brown, 1995; Gilson & Depoy, 2000). Disability awareness, as perceived from the cultural and social paradigm, is a step to remove these social and environmental barriers to enable the full social, physical and spiritual participation of individuals with disabilities in the community (Brown, 1995; Gilson & Depoy, 2000). As added by Columna *et al.* (2009), Reddy and Sujathamalini (2006) and Wilson and Lieberman (2000), key benefits to disability awareness include

- (1) acceptance of the PWDs by other people;
- (2) increase in socialization experienced by the PWDs;
- (3) improvement of the standard of living of the PWDs; and
- (4) enabling the PWDs to live independently.

Disability awareness is often defined as a positive attitude and increased empathy towards PWDs (Foley *et al.*, 2007; Wilson & Lieberman, 2000). In the opinion of Fittippaldi-Wert and Brock (2007), disability awareness may aid in providing people with an understanding of the challenges faced by people with different disabilities. This is a primary goal and essential component of disability awareness (Columna *et al.*, 2009). Disability awareness can help dispel negative societal attitudes and beliefs that often create an additional barrier to those with disabilities (Mullen, 2001). For operationalization, 'disability awareness' in this research is defined as having knowledge or well informed about the concepts of disabilities, and the special needs of PWDs.

Nearly all empirical studies on disability awareness focused on teachers, librarians and health professionals (e.g. Reddy & Sukathamalini, 2006; Sahin & Akyol, 2010; Wilson & Lieberman, 2000). The levels of disability awareness of other professionals, including property managers, have not been studied so far. In fact, this kind of research is highly valuable for finding ways to improve disability awareness among different professionals. As suggested by Daruwalla & Darcy (2005), introducing disability awareness to the service industry can help people change their attitudes towards PWDs, which could eventually reduce negative prejudice against PWDs and enhance integration of PWDs into the society.

### **3 Research Design**

To straddle the existing research gaps, the current research took both quantitative and qualitative approaches to study the issue of disability awareness in the property management industry in Hong Kong. Two questionnaire surveys and four in-depth interviews were conducted to investigate the current state of provision of disability awareness training to employees and levels of disability awareness within the local property management industry.

The questionnaire surveys were conducted at two levels, namely the company level and practitioner level.

### **3.1 Company-based Questionnaire Survey**

As estimated by the Home Affairs Department, there were around 800 property management companies as at December 2010.<sup>5</sup> However, about 40% of these companies managed single tenement buildings and provided basic services such as cleaning and security services only. They did not have any real power to manage and control the use of the built facilities. For the purpose of this research, these companies were disregarded and only sizeable property management companies would be targeted for the empirical studies. In this light, the 85 companies with full membership of the Hong Kong Association of Property Management Companies were chosen. The association's membership included most of Hong Kong's leading property management companies, all of whom were committed to enhancing the standard of professional property management. On this account, this sample of companies was representative enough for the research purpose.

A questionnaire set was designed to collate information about the provision of disability awareness training to their employees, and in what format and how regular the training was provided from the targeted property management companies. Besides, the perceptions of these companies about their employees' abilities to cope with the special needs of PWDs in their daily management tasks were asked in the questionnaire. To avoid ambiguity, the questionnaire set was pre-tested before the survey started. A sample questionnaire set can be found in **Appendix B**. The questionnaire sets for the company-based survey were sent to the 85 targeted companies by mail and via e-mail in May 2014. In total, 26 companies (31%) returned their completed replies. **Table 1** summarizes the characteristics of these responding companies. 21 out of 26 companies (80%) were awarded the caring company logos under the Caring Company Scheme administered by the Hong Kong Council of Social Service.

**Table 1: Characteristics of the 26 responding companies**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Max.</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Min.</b>
No. of staff	8,526	2,035	41
Management experience (in years)	127	36	10
No. of properties currently managed	474	116	1

### **3.2 Practitioner-based Questionnaire Survey**

To gauge the general level of disability awareness of the property management practitioners in Hong Kong, an anonymous questionnaire survey was conducted on individual practitioners.

<sup>5</sup> For more information, please refer to the *Consultation Paper on Putting in Place a Regulatory Framework for Property Management Industry* issued by the Home Affairs Department in 2010.



For the survey, a questionnaire set was designed. It contained questions about the practitioners' knowledge and awareness of disabilities, perceptions of equal opportunities in relation to property management practices, socio-economic profiles and working experience. Similarly, the questionnaire set was pretested by five practitioners before the survey started. A sample questionnaire set can be found in **Appendix C**. Instead of using the traditional questionnaire in a paper format, respondents were asked to complete an electronic questionnaire through *Qualtrics*, an online survey platform to ease the burdens of questionnaire delivery and data entry.

Random sampling for the target respondents of the practitioner-based survey was not feasible for this study. It is mainly because there has been no consolidated register of all property management practitioners in Hong Kong. Although one could rely on the member registers of the Hong Kong Institute of Housing, Chartered Institute of Housing (Asian Pacific Branch) and Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors, not all the practitioners were members of these institutions. For the sake of practicality, convenience sampling was performed. Requests were sent to those property management companies responding to the company-based survey to forward an invitation to their employees at different grade levels ranging from assistant officer to general manager to participate in the online survey. Besides, different channels like Facebook, online discussion forums and alumni networks of the Master of Arts in Housing Studies and Bachelor of Arts in Housing Studies programmes of City University of Hong Kong<sup>6</sup> were used to invite more local property management practitioners to participate in the survey.

Eventually, 369 property management practitioners responded to the online questionnaire survey in the period between 15 September 2014 and 30 November 2014. Among these 369 responses, 342 were complete. The incomplete responses were discarded. **Table 2** summarizes the characteristics of the respondents with complete responses. The ratio of male to female respondents was around 8:11. A relatively higher proportion of the respondents were aged 35–44 years old (35%). About 60% of the respondents attained degree or higher educational level. Furthermore, about 60% of the respondents had working experience of less than 5 years in the property management industry. Besides, none of the respondents has ever worked as an access coordinator or access officer for their companies. Six respondents (2%) claimed that they were PWDs. As shown in **Table 3**, 29% of the respondents had regular contact with persons with chronic illness while contact with persons with other disabilities was significantly less common (less than 6%).

---

<sup>6</sup> These two programmes aimed to train professional property managers for both the public and private sectors in Hong Kong and the Asia-Pacific Region. Therefore, over 90% of the graduates of these programmes worked in the property management industry.

**Table 2: Characteristics of the 342 respondents in the practitioner-based survey**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Gender		
Male	153	45%
Female	189	55%
Age		
18-24 years old	53	16%
25-34 years old	81	24%
35-44 years old	119	35%
45-54 years old	52	15%
55-64 years old	34	10%
65 years old or above	3	1%
Educational attainment		
Secondary 1-3 or below	7	2%
Secondary 4-7	32	9%
Diploma or certificate	48	14%
Associate degree	52	15%
Degree	131	38%
Postgraduate	72	21%
Working experience in property management industry		
Less than 1 year	36	11%
1-2.9 years	73	21%
3-4.9 years	99	29%
5-9.9 years	83	24%
10-19.9 years	42	13%
20 years or above	8	2%
Job position		
Graduate Trainee or equivalent	4	1%
Assistant Property Officer, Property Officer or equivalent	128	37%
Senior Officer or equivalent	69	20%
Assistant Manager, Manager or equivalent	94	28%
Senior Manager or equivalent	27	8%
Assistant General Manager, General Manager or equivalent	18	5%
Director or equivalent	2	1%
Types of property managed (can choose more than one options)		
Private housing (including clubhouse)	149	44%
Public rental housing	74	22%
Tenants Purchase Scheme / Home Ownership Scheme / Sandwich Class Scheme housing	98	29%
Shopping centres / shops	45	13%
Office / commercial buildings	107	31%
Industrial buildings	66	19%
Stores or logistic centres	34	10%
Schools	9	3%
Recreational or sport facilities	6	2%
Carparks	124	36%
Others (e.g. consulate, church and eco-park)	3	1%

**Table 3: Social contacts of the respondents with PWDs**

Type of PWD	No. of responses (Percentage)		
	Never	No regular contact, but sometimes meet	Yes, have regular contact
Physically handicapped persons	249 (73%)	79 (23%)	14 (4%)
Persons with sensory impairment	237 (69%)	88 (26%)	17 (5%)
Persons with chronic illness	93 (27%)	151 (44%)	98 (29%)
Persons with HIV/AIDS	333 (97%)	8 (2%)	1 (<1%)
Persons with mental illness	290 (85%)	48 (14%)	4 (1%)
Persons with intellectual disability	256 (75%)	67 (20%)	19 (6%)
Persons with special learning difficulties	313 (92%)	23 (7%)	6 (2%)
Persons with attention deficit or hyperactivity disorder	309 (90%)	25 (7%)	8 (2%)
Persons with autism	325 (95%)	14 (4%)	3 (1%)
Persons with visceral disability	300 (88%)	33 (10%)	9 (3%)

### 3.3 In-depth Interviews

To offer a richer narrative account, from the perspective of employers, on the promotion of disability awareness in the local property management industry, in-depth interviews were conducted with two senior managers of the property management companies. In the interviews, the interviewees were asked the following questions:

- (1) What were the major challenges you faced in achieving a barrier-free environment for the properties your company managed?
- (2) What were the difficulties you faced in cultivating disability awareness among your employees?
- (3) Could you give us some suggestions on how to promote disability awareness within the local property management industry?

Moreover, two property management practitioners were also invited for in-depth interviews for better understanding of how disability inclusion was positioned in the decision making processes in their routine property management tasks and their experience in dealing with the PWDs at work. The four in-depth interviews afore-mentioned were conducted in November and December 2014.

## 4 Research Findings

### 4.1 Findings from the Company-based Questionnaire Survey

As shown in **Table 4**, five out of 26 responding companies (19%) indicated that they understand the liabilities as a management agent of a premise laid down in the DDO very clearly or clearly. Eight companies (31%) rated their understanding as ‘not clearly’ or ‘not clearly at all’.

Furthermore, only three companies (12%) stated that comprehensible policies had been formulated for conforming the liabilities as a management agent of a premise laid down in the DDO. Similarly, six companies (23%) stated that comprehensible guidelines setting out the procedures and providing suggestions on how to conform the same liabilities had been formulated. Seven companies (27%) stated that they had reminded their employees to observe the same liabilities when performing their property management tasks. Among these seven companies, six (86%), four (57%) and three (43%) reminded their employees by means of notice, e-mail and training respectively. Two companies (8%) indicated that they had designated staff for coordinating accessibility issues in the developments or properties under their management. They both had the designated staff stationed in the head or regional office only rather than in every single development.

**Table 4: Level of understanding of the legal liabilities as a management agent of a premise**

Response	No. of Responses	Percentage
Very clearly	1	4%
Clearly	4	15%
Averagely	13	50%
Not clearly	6	23%
Not clearly at all	2	8%

When being asked to rate the relative importance of factors (“1” as the highest importance whereas “6” as the lowest one) in determining their decision on the provision of a barrier-free environment for PWDs, seven companies (27%) rated ‘economic factors’ as the most important factor, followed by ‘physical or environmental constraints’ (19%) and ‘ease of management’ (19%). Yet, with reference to the mean scores shown in **Table 5**, ‘legislative requirements’ (mean=3.00) was accorded the highest priority in the decision-making process, followed by ‘physical or environmental constraints’ (mean=3.15) and ‘economic factors’ (mean=3.38). On the other hand, ‘corporate social responsibility’ (mean=4.19) was accorded the lowest priority.

**Table 5: Importance of decision factors on the provision of barrier-free environment**

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>Priority</b>
Legislative requirements	3.00	1
Physical or environmental constraints	3.15	2
Economic factors	3.38	3
Ease of management	3.58	4
Reputation of the company	3.69	5
Corporate Social Responsibility	4.19	6

As shown in **Table 6**, about 15% of the surveyed companies indicated that they had front-line property management staff conversant with dactylology or sign language in some of the shopping centres or arcades they managed. The percentages dropped to 12% and 8% for the residential properties and office buildings respectively. None of the companies reported that they had front-line property management staff conversant with dactylology or sign language in the industrial buildings, schools, recreational and sports facilities and car parks in their management portfolios.

**Table 6: Front-line property management staff conversant with sign language**

<b>Type of property</b>	<b>No. of responses (percentage)</b>				
	<b>All</b>	<b>Most</b>	<b>Some</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Shopping centres or arcades	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (15%)	21 (81%)	1 (4%)
Residential properties (including club houses)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (12%)	23 (89%)	0 (0%)
Office buildings	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	23 (89%)	1 (4%)
Industrial buildings	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	22 (85%)	4 (15%)
Schools	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (12%)	23 (89%)
Recreational and sports facilities	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	24 (92%)
Carparks	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	20 (77%)	6 (23%)

For the 25 companies with shopping centres or arcades in their management portfolio, all (100%) stated that they welcomed guide dogs for the blind to enter the shopping centres or arcades managed by them. On the other hand, only one company (4%) indicated that it invited PWDs for trying out facilities after taking over a new property for management or completing a renovation project on an irregular basis. Eight companies (31%) stated that they had provided training to the employees to enhance their awareness and knowledge of the disabilities so as to achieve a barrier-free environment more effectively for the PWDs. As shown in **Table 7**, since April 2011, five companies (19%) provided training on usage of aids and equipment. Five (19%) and three (12%) companies organized seminars and workshops

respectively. Four companies (15%) provided various training courses to their employees. However, each of these types of employee training had not been organized for more than two times on average since April 2011. If all training types are counted, each of these eight companies had organized training for 3.4 times on average since April 2011.

**Table 7: Training offered to the employees since April 2011**

Type of training	No. of responses (Percentage)		Average no. of times
	Yes	No	
Training on aid and equipment usage	5 (19%)	21 (81%)	2
Seminar	5 (19%)	21 (81%)	2
Workshop	3 (12%)	23 (89%)	1
Training course	4 (15%)	22 (85%)	1

As shown in **Table 8**, of the 26 respondents, ten companies (39%) thought their employees had sufficient or very sufficient level of awareness, knowledge and abilities to deal with the needs of physically handicapped persons in their property management tasks. On the other hand, a majority of companies indicated their employees had insufficient or very insufficient awareness, knowledge and abilities to deal with the needs of mentally handicapped persons (77%), intellectually disabled persons (69%), persons with attention deficit or hyperactivity disorder (65%) and persons with autism (58%).

**Table 8: Evaluation of the employees' level of awareness, knowledge and abilities to deal with the needs of PWDs**

Type of PWD	No. of responses (percentage)		
	Very sufficient or sufficient	Average	Insufficient or Very Insufficient
Physically handicapped persons	10 (39%)	14 (54%)	2 (8%)
Hearing impaired persons	3 (12%)	15 (58%)	8 (31%)
Visually impaired persons	5 (19%)	12 (46%)	9 (35%)
Speech and language impaired persons	3 (12%)	14 (54%)	9 (35%)
Intellectually disabled persons	1 (4%)	7 (27%)	18 (69%)
Persons with autism	1 (4%)	10 (39%)	15 (58%)
Mentally handicapped persons	1 (4%)	5 (19%)	20 (77%)
Persons with HIV/AIDS	3 (12%)	14 (54 %)	9 (35%)
Persons with attention deficit or hyperactivity disorder	2 (8%)	6 (24%)	17 (65%)

Furthermore, 13 companies (50%) reported that they had collaborated with some non-governmental organizations of PWDs (e.g. Chosen Power, Heep Hong Society, Hong Kong Association of the Deaf and Hong Kong PHAB Association) to organize events or activities since April 2011. In case some organizations (e.g. EOC) launched a charter programme for promoting a more barrier-free environment for PWDs, 23 out of 26 companies (89%) stated their willingness to subscribe the charter.

#### ***4.2 Findings from the Practitioner-based Questionnaire Survey***

As shown in **Table 9**, all respondents (100%) indicated that persons with physical impairment belonged to PWDs. Among the 342 respondents, a majority indicated that persons with sensory impairment (87%) and those with intellectual disability (81%) belonged to PWDs. However, persons with specific learning difficulties (2%), autism (5%), attention deficit or hyperactivity disorder (5%), chronic illness (9%) and HIV/AIDS (9%) were comparatively difficult to be recognized as PWDs.

**Table 9: Understanding of different types of disability**

Type of PWD	No. of responses (Percentage)		
	Definitely or probably yes	No	Not sure
Physically handicapped persons	342 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Persons with sensory impairment	298 (87%)	5 (2%)	39 (11%)
Persons with intellectual disability	277 (81%)	21 (6%)	44 (13%)
Persons with visceral disability	168 (49%)	92 (27%)	82 (24%)
Persons with mental illness	153 (45%)	87 (25%)	102 (30%)
Persons with HIV/AIDS	32 (9%)	157 (46%)	153 (45%)
Persons with chronic illness	30 (9%)	145 (42%)	167 (49%)
Persons with attention deficit or hyperactivity disorder	17 (5%)	144 (42%)	181 (53%)
Persons with autism	16 (5%)	150 (44%)	176 (52%)
Persons with special learning difficulties	6 (2%)	215 (63%)	121 (35%)

As shown in **Table 10**, most of the respondents indicated that they could be able to recognize persons with physical impairment (100%), sensory impairment (90%), intellectual disability (71%) immediately or after watching for a while. On the other hand, less than 15% of the respondents indicated that they could recognize persons with HIV/AIDS (2%), special learning difficulties (14%) and chronic illness (14%).



**Table 10: Recognition of PWDs**

Type of PWD	No. of responses (Percentage)		
	Yes, immediately or after watching for a while	No, even after watching for a while	Not sure
Physically handicapped persons	342 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Persons with sensory impairment	306 (90%)	20 (6%)	16 (5%)
Persons with intellectual disability	243 (71%)	78 (23%)	21 (6%)
Persons with visceral disability	186 (54%)	92 (27%)	64 (19%)
Persons with attention deficit or hyperactivity disorder	167 (49%)	100 (29%)	75 (22%)
Persons with mental illness	153 (44%)	87 (25%)	102 (30%)
Persons with autism	114 (33%)	119 (35%)	109 (32%)
Persons with chronic illness	47 (14%)	151 (44%)	144 (42%)
Persons with special learning difficulties	47 (14%)	174 (51%)	121 (35%)
Persons with HIV/AIDS	5 (2%)	176 (52%)	161 (47%)

Among the 342 respondents, 70% regarded equal opportunity very important or quite important to PWDs. Only 12% thought that equal opportunity was not important or not important at all for PWDs. **Table 11** summarizes the respondents' responses to a number of statements about disability. Overall speaking, many respondents did not have any stance towards the statements, choosing the option 'no opinion'. About 26% of the respondents expressed that they did not mind living with PWDs. About 40% thought that PWDs represented a minority group in Hong Kong. One-third of the respondents thought that PWDs were discriminated when using public or private services and facilities. Almost half of the respondents disagreed that the community had adequate knowledge and understanding of PWDs. However, the majority of respondents agreed that persons with and without disabilities had the same rights (62%) and PWDs had the rights to choose where to live and whom to live with (61%).

There are still a lot of misconceptions and stereotypes about PWDs. Approximately 23% of the respondents thought that simple and repetitive tasks were suitable for employees with disabilities. About 30% disagreed that PWDs could be integrated into a competitive society. Similarly, about 32% of the respondents did not think that PWDs could lead a normal life in the way that persons without disabilities did. Furthermore, 29% of the respondents regarded PWDs as dependents on the charity, medical care and social security (yet 30% did not agree that PWDs needed other people's commiseration and sympathy). About 16% of the respondents perceived that PWDs were usually bad-tempered. One quarter of the

respondents agreed that wheelchair users liked other people to help them move towards their destinations. Around 30% of the respondents thought that visually impaired persons had to use their canes in order to walk.

**Table 11: Responses to the statements about disability**

Statement	No. of responses (Percentage)		
	Agree or strongly agree	Disagree or strongly disagree	No opinion
You do not mind living with PWDs.	88 (26%)	54 (16%)	200 (59%)
PWDs represent a minority group in Hong Kong.	138 (40%)	67 (20%)	137 (40%)
PWDs are discriminated when using public or private services and facilities.	114 (33%)	69 (20%)	159 (47%)
The community has adequate knowledge and understanding of PWDs.	43 (13%)	165 (48%)	134 (39%)
Persons with and without disabilities have the same rights.	213 (62%)	21 (6%)	108 (32%)
PWDs have the rights to choose where to live and whom to live with.	208 (61%)	18 (5%)	116 (34%)
Simple and repetitive tasks are suitable for employees with disabilities.	77 (23%)	62 (18%)	203 (59%)
PWDs can be integrated into a competitive society.	58 (17%)	98 (29%)	186 (54%)
PWDs can lead a normal life in the way that persons without disabilities do.	47 (14%)	110 (32%)	185 (54%)
PWDs need supports from the charity, medical care and social security.	99 (29%)	58 (17%)	185 (54%)
PWDs need other people's commiseration and sympathy.	57 (17%)	104 (30%)	181 (53%)
PWDs are usually bad-tempered.	53 (16%)	121 (35%)	168 (49%)
Wheelchair users like other people to help them move towards their destinations.	87 (25%)	52 (15%)	203 (59%)
Visually impaired persons have to use their canes in order to walk.	103 (30%)	41 (12%)	198 (58%)

Among the 342 respondents, 72% regarded barrier-free built environment very important or quite important to PWDs. Less than 10% thought that barrier-free built environment was not important or not important at all for PWDs. **Table 12** summarizes the respondents' responses to a number of statements about barrier-free built environment. On the statement "Provision of barrier-free built environment for PWDs is an overwhelming community consensus in Hong Kong", respondents with agreement (43%) and disagreement (40%) shared similar proportions. Nearly half (49%) of the respondents disagreed that provision of barrier-free accesses and facilities was a waste of money. On the other hand, 47% of the respondents did not think that provision of barrier-free accesses and facilities to a property could preserve or even enhance its value.

About 39% of the respondents agreed that barrier-free built environment enabled PWDs to have more opportunities that were enjoyed by those without disabilities. Almost half (49%) of the respondents agreed that application of universal design could achieve barrier-free built environment. The majority (62%) thought that apart from design and construction, facility management was an important element to ensure the built environment to be barrier-free.

**Table 12: Responses to the statements about barrier-free built environment**

Statement	No. of responses (Percentage)		
	Agree or strongly agree	Disagree or strongly disagree	No opinion
Provision of barrier-free built environment for PWDs is an overwhelming community consensus in Hong Kong.	146 (43%)	137 (40%)	59 (17%)
Provision of barrier-free accesses and facilities is a waste of money.	104 (30%)	166 (49%)	72 (21%)
Provision of barrier-free accesses and facilities to a property can preserve or even enhance its value.	67 (20%)	161 (47%)	114 (33%)
Barrier-free built environment enables PWDs to have more opportunities possessed by those without disabilities (e.g. opportunities for social interaction).	132 (39%)	62 (18%)	148 (43%)
Application of universal design (i.e., designing built environment for usage of all people, including PWDs, without the need for further adaptation and special design) can achieve barrier-free built environment.	167 (49%)	50 (15%)	125 (37%)
Apart from design and construction, facility management is an important element to ensure that the built environment is barrier-free.	213 (62%)	57 (17%)	72 (21%)

**Table 13** summarizes the responses when the respondents were asked if they took the interests of PWDs into consideration when performing different property management tasks. For the respective tasks, only responses from those respondents who had relevant experiences were shown. A vast majority of the respondents expressed that they had never considered or rarely considered providing instant sign language interpretation when holding events (86%), producing property guides, booklets and promotional leaflets with large-print and braille versions (83%), providing accessible versions to facilitate the browsing by persons with different types of disabilities when setting up a property website (80%) and formulating the contingency plans (71%). On the other hand, over half (52%) of the respondents always or often considered arranging PWDs to use lifts first. About 30% of the respondents expressed that they always or often checked the conditions of barrier-free facilities during property inspection, and arranged repair works immediately if case of damage and malfunction. In addition, 25% of the respondents expressed that they ensured barrier-free access of PWDs to

the built facilities when planning and executing alterations or renovation of the property.

**Table 13: Consideration of PWDs' interests in routine property management tasks.**

Property management task	No. of responses (Percentage)		
	Always or often	Sometimes	Rarely or never
Providing instant sign language interpretation when holding events	12 (4%)	33 (10%)	276 (86%)
Producing property guides, booklets and promotional leaflets with large-print and braille versions	17 (9%)	15 (8%)	157 (83%)
Providing accessible versions to facilitate the browsing by persons with different types of disabilities when setting up the website of the property	3 (3%)	18 (17%)	83 (80%)
Formulating the contingency plans (e.g. providing guidelines on how to help PWDs evacuate in case of emergency)	21 (9%)	49 (20%)	172 (71%)
Ensuring PWDs to be able to explore the exhibits without barriers when planning and holding exhibitions	33 (13%)	63 (26%)	151 (61%)
Reserving seats for PWDs to facilitate their enjoyment of the shows when planning and holding performance events	52 (19%)	73 (27%)	147 (54%)
Ensuring barrier-free access of PWDs to the built facilities as before when planning and holding events	70 (23%)	121 (39%)	120 (39%)
Ensuring barrier-free access of PWDs to the built facilities when planning and executing alterations or renovation of the property	73 (25%)	127 (44%)	91 (31%)
Checking the conditions of barrier-free facilities during property inspection, and arrange repair works immediately if case of damage and malfunction	92 (30%)	152 (50%)	64 (21%)
According priority use to PWDs when arranging passengers to use the lifts	138 (52%)	97 (36%)	32 (12%)

As shown in **Table 14**, over half of the respondents stated that their own knowledge and abilities (56%) and company policy (52%) were very or quite important in determining whether they observed the PWDs' interests in their routine property management tasks. About 49% of the respondents regarded legislative requirements as very important or quite important factors, while 42% considered 'personal, relative's or friend's experience of disabilities' as important factors. About 39% of the respondents rated social norms very important or quite important factors.

**Table 14: Factors affecting the respondents' decisions to observe the PWDs' interests**

Factor	No. of responses (Percentage)		
	Very important or quite important	Quite unimportant or unimportant at all	No opinion
Own knowledge and abilities	211 (56%)	89 (26%)	62 (18%)
Company policy	178 (52%)	91 (27%)	73 (21%)
Legislative requirements	183 (49%)	97 (28%)	76 (22%)
Personal, relative's or friend's experience of disabilities	143 (42%)	111 (32%)	88 (26%)
Social norms	132 (39%)	121 (35%)	89 (26%)

As shown in **Table 15**, over half (51%) of the respondents indicated that the availability of clear codes of practice or guidebooks were very or quite useful for facilitating them to observe the PWDs interests in their routine property management tasks. Respective 49% and 45% of the respondents regarded 'adequate disability awareness training' and 'clear company guidelines' as very or quite useful facilitating factors. On the other hand, 39% of the respondents rated 'adequate aid or facilities for PWDs' very or quite useful.

**Table 15: Factors facilitating the respondents to observe the PWDs' interests.**

Factor	No. of responses (Percentage)		
	Very useful or quite useful	Quite useless or useless at all	No opinion
Clear codes of practice or guidebooks	175 (51%)	52 (15%)	163 (34%)
Adequate disability awareness training	169 (49%)	57 (17%)	64 (34%)
Clear company guidelines	153 (45%)	67 (20%)	122 (36%)
Adequate aid or facilities for PWDs	134 (39%)	91 (27%)	117 (34%)

Since April 2011, about 37% of the respondents indicated that they had received training to enhance their awareness and knowledge of the disabilities so as to achieve a barrier-free environment more effectively for the PWDs. As shown in **Table 16**, respondents who had not attended any training on aid and equipment usage (79%), training course (88%), workshop (89%) and seminar (90%) represent large proportions. If all training types are counted, each of these respondents had joined training activities for 2 times on average since April 2011.

**Table 16: Disability-related training taken by the respondents since April 2011**

Type of training	No. of responses (Percentage)		Average no. of times
	Yes	No	
Training on aid and equipment usage	71 (19%)	271 (79%)	1.6
Training course	42 (12%)	300 (88%)	1.3
Workshop	37 (11%)	305 (89%)	1.2
Seminar	34 (10%)	308 (90%)	1.2

When being asked if they had sufficient awareness, knowledge and ability to deal with the needs of physically handicapped persons when performing their routine property management tasks, fewer respondents returned positive responses (i.e., ‘very sufficient’ or ‘sufficient’) which ranged from 3% to 24%. As shown in **Table 17**, a significant proportion of the respondents expressed that they had insufficient or very insufficient awareness, knowledge and abilities to deal with the needs of mentally handicapped persons (62%), intellectually disabled persons (53%), persons with autism (49%), persons with attention deficit or hyperactivity disorder (48%), hearing impaired persons (47%), speech and language impaired persons (44%) and visually impaired persons (44%).

**Table 17: Self-evaluation of awareness, knowledge and abilities to deal with the needs of PWDs**

Type of PWD	No. of responses (percentage)			
	Very sufficient or sufficient	Average	Insufficient or very insufficient	Not sure
Physically handicapped persons	82 (24%)	151 (44%)	43 (13%)	66 (19%)
Persons with HIV/AIDS	59 (17%)	132 (39%)	91 (27%)	60 (18%)
Visually impaired persons	45 (13%)	63 (18%)	151 (44%)	83 (24%)
Speech and language impaired persons	33 (10%)	71 (21%)	149 (44%)	89 (26%)
Hearing impaired persons	21 (9%)	65 (19%)	161 (47%)	85 (25%)
Persons with attention deficit or hyperactivity disorder	24 (7 %)	62 (18%)	163 (48%)	93 (27%)
Persons with autism	23 (7%)	54 (16%)	166 (49%)	99 (29%)
Intellectually disabled persons	21 (6%)	57 (17%)	181 (53%)	83 (24%)
Mentally handicapped persons	11 (3%)	46 (14%)	213 (62%)	72 (21%)

As shown in **Table 18**, a small proportion of the respondents stated that they had a clear understanding of the liabilities as a management agent of a premise laid down in the DDO (20%). Even lower proportions of respondents understood very clearly or quite clearly about their companies' policy (6%) and guidelines (7%) for conforming the liabilities as a management agent of a premise laid down in the DDO. About half of the respondents were not sure if their companies had related policy or guideline.

**Table 18: Understanding of the DDO, company policy and guidelines**

Type of document	No. of responses (percentage)			
	Very clearly or quite clearly	Not quite clearly or not clearly at all	Not sure if the company has related document	No opinion or the company does not have related document
Liabilities laid down in DDO	67 (20%)	189 (55%)	—	86 (25%)
Company policy	21 (6%)	63 (18%)	168 (49%)	90 (26%)
Company guidelines	23 (7%)	67 (20%)	165 (48%)	87 (25%)

### ***4.3 Findings from the In-depth Interviews***

The four interviewees shared the view that the major challenge facing property managers in achieving a barrier-free environment was the diverse interests of the stakeholders of the built environment. For example, the visually impaired would like to have tactile guide paths in most of the areas in a property. Nonetheless, tactile tiles unavoidably render the floor uneven. Some abled persons, particularly those wearing high-heels, often complain as they trip over the tactile tiles. Similarly, the admission of guide dogs into a property is often provocative. Negative attitudes towards the guide dogs may be driven by people's fears, worries or misunderstandings. Therefore, it is a thorny task for property managers to balance the interests of different stakeholders.

Both senior managers interviewed affirmed that disability awareness should be promoted among the employees of their companies. Nevertheless, they pointed out some difficulties in the promotion of disability awareness. Firstly, the breadth and depth of the disability awareness training are always trade-offs. There are so many different forms of disability, ranging from physical handicap and visual impairment to mental disorder and learning difficulty. Persons with a specific form of disability may have their special needs which are not shared by those with other forms of disability. On this account, it is difficult for the employers to provide comprehensive training to enhance disability awareness for all of their employees. Secondly, unlike knowledge about building management legislation which can be frequently applied in the daily job of a property management practitioner, knowledge to

deal with the needs of PWDs is less frequently applied, so refresher courses are needed to maintain the employees' competencies to deal with the needs of PWDs. This iterative nature of disability-related training necessitates continual resource commitments from the employers, which could result in heavy financial burdens. The high turnover rate of employees in the property management industry in Hong Kong makes the situation even worse.

From the perspective of front-line staff, one interviewee expressed that in the absence of clear guidelines or codes of practice, she did not know what should be done and what should not be done when handling PWDs in her routine property management work. Another interviewee experienced the great difficulties in communicating with persons with intellectual disabilities (e.g. persons with Down's syndrome) and mentally-ill persons. Also, he expressed that he did not know what PWDs desired. He was once ticked off after he had moved a wheelchair user to her destination. The wheelchair user said she was able to move by herself in spite of her disability.

For promoting disability awareness within the local property management industry, the interviewees offered the following suggestions:

- (1) The government, professional institutions or other interested bodies should issue some codes of practice or guidebooks to elaborate what shall be done or shall not be done in order to fulfil the legislative requirements laid down in the DDO.
- (2) Clear guidance on how to address the needs of different types of PWDs in their daily property management tasks for the property management practitioners is critical. Perhaps, guidelines should be developed based on the advices from the PWDs' interest groups.
- (3) Elements about equal opportunities or inclusive built environment should be covered in the curricula of tertiary education programmes which are tailored for training future property managers. At the same time, disability awareness training can form a part of the continuing professional development (CPD) of the professional institutions.
- (4) The government can subsidize property management companies, particularly the small- and medium-sized ones, to offer disability awareness training for their employees. Alternatively, the government, EOC or other bodies can offer free disability awareness training to the property management practitioners.



## 5 Analyses and Discussions

### 5.1 *Effects of Company Characteristics*

Various statistical tests (e.g. Pearson's correlation test, chi-square test and one-tail *t*-test) were conducted to explore how company characteristics affected the responses from the 26 companies in the survey. The analyses showed that larger companies, in terms of employing larger number of staff, tended to understand the liabilities as a management agent of a premise laid down in the DDO more clearly (significant at the 5% level). Besides, it was more likely that larger companies have formulated comprehensible policy for conforming the liabilities as a management agent of a premise laid down in the DDO (significant at the 10% level) and invited PDWs for trying out facilities after taking over a new property for management or completing a renovation project (significant at the 10% level). Larger companies were also more willing to subscribe to a charter programme for promoting barrier-free environment (significant at the 10% level).

On the other hand, companies with more years of management experience were more likely to have formulated comprehensible guidelines which set out the procedures and providing suggestions on how to conform the liabilities as a management agent of a premise laid down in the DDO (significant at the 5% level). At the same time, more experienced companies tended to remind the employees to observe the liabilities as management agent of a premise laid down in the DDO when performing their property management tasks (significant at the 5% level).

Although the number of properties currently managed was found to have no significant effect on the responses, the afore-mentioned analysis results indicated that more established property management companies tended to be better-prepared for conforming the liabilities laid down in the DDO. As shown in **Table 5**, the survey findings showed that a heavy loading was placed on economic factors when a company determined whether a barrier-free environment is provided for the PWDs. All these findings may imply that less resourceful or less established companies did not have the capacity to ensure their employees to observe the interests of PWDs in their property management tasks.

Companies awarded with a caring company logo were more willing to be the charter subscriber (significant at the 5% level). Besides, caring companies tended to evaluate the sufficiency of awareness, knowledge and ability of their employees to deal with the needs of PWDs in their daily management tasks more positively than companies that were not awarded with a caring company logo (significant at the 10% level). These findings suggested that property management companies which strived to observe corporate social responsibility were more willing to observe the interests of the PWDs and had strong self-perceived efficacies in handling the disability issues in their businesses. Nevertheless, corporate social responsibility was found to be the least important decision-making factor for a company to decide whether a barrier-free environment was provided for the PWDs, as shown in **Table 5**.

Apart from the factors aforementioned, past experiences of collaborating with interest groups or self-help organizations of PWDs to organize events or activities is influential to the survey responses. Those companies with such experiences tended to understand the liabilities as a management agent of a premise laid down in the DDO more clearly (significant at the 5% level). In addition, it was more likely that companies with such experiences had guidelines in place and reminded their employees to observe the legislative requirements in relation to the disabilities (both significant at the 5% level).

## ***5.2 Effects of Practitioner Characteristics***

Similarly, statistical tests (e.g. Pearson's correlation test, chi-square test and one-tail *t*-test) were conducted to explore how practitioner characteristics were correlated with the responses in the practitioner-based survey. The analysis results are summarized in **Table 19**. Education level, personal experience of disabilities and regular contact with PWDs and attendance to disability-related training were found to be significant determinants of the responses to quite a number of questions in the practitioner-based survey. In particular, we can see those respondents who had received training for enhancing their awareness and knowledge of the disabilities tended to have stronger beliefs in the importance of barrier-free built environment to PWDs and the importance of facility management to ensure that the built environment is barrier-free. Besides, this group of respondents tended to understand the DDO and company policy more clearly and would more likely consider the interests of PWDs in their routine property management tasks. Besides, they indicated a higher level of sufficiency of awareness, knowledge and ability to deal with the needs of the PWDs in their daily work. These analysis results imply the significance of disability-related training to improve the disability awareness and self-efficacy of the property management practitioners.

**Table 19: Results of analyses on the factors affecting the responses in the practitioner-based survey**

Response	Effect of the factor (significance level)							
	Male	Age	Educational Attainment	Working Experience	Job Position	With Disabilities	Regular Contact with PWDs	Training Attendance
Knowledge about who are classified as PWDs	Negative (10% level)	No effect	Positive (10% level)	No effect	No effect	Positive (5% level)	Positive (5% level)	No effect
Recognition of PWDs when seeing them	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	Positive (5% level)	Positive (10% level)	No effect
Belief in the importance of equal opportunity to PWDs	No effect	No effect	Positive (10% level)	No effect	No effect	Positive (1% level)	Positive (1% level)	No effect
Belief in the importance of barrier-free built environment to PWDs	No effect	No effect	Positive (10% level)	No effect	No effect	Positive (5% level)	Positive (5% level)	Positive (5% level)
Belief in the importance of facility management to ensure that the built environment is barrier-free	No effect	No effect	Positive (10% level)	No effect	No effect	Positive (10% level)	Positive (10% level)	Positive (5% level)
Consideration of the interests of PWDs in routine property management tasks	Negative (5% level)	Negative (10% level)	No effect	Negative (10% level)	No effect	No effect	Positive (5% level)	Positive (10% level)
Sufficiency of awareness, knowledge and ability to deal with the need of PWDs in routine property management tasks	Positive (10% level)	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	Positive (10% level)	Positive (10% level)
Understanding of liabilities laid down in the DDO	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	Positive (5% level)
Understanding of company policy	No effect	No effect	Positive (10% level)	No effect	Positive (10% level)	No effect	No effect	Positive (10% level)
Understanding of company guidelines	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect	No effect

### ***5.3 Other Discussions of the Research Findings***

The findings of the in-depth interviewees and practitioner-based survey suggest that the local property management sector generally recognized the importance of barrier-free or inclusive built environment to PWDs. The role played by the property or facility management in safeguarding the interests of PWDs was also regarded significant. However, it seems that some misconceptions about disabilities still prevail in the industry. For example, the majority of respondents in the practitioner-based survey thought that wheelchair users need other people to help them move towards their destinations and visually impaired persons have to use their canes in walking. A certain proportion of respondents thought that provision of a barrier-free built environment was money-wasting and brought no economic benefits to the properties, management companies or landlords. In fact, some empirical studies (e.g. Alonso, 2002; Lee, 2011) evidenced that people were willing to pay a premium for a more accessible or barrier-free residential property. All these indicate an urgent need to improve the understanding of disabilities and benefits of barrier-free built environment within the industry.

Moreover, it is obvious that the interests of PWDs have received inadequate consideration in the routine property management tasks performed by the practitioners, reflecting a lack of disability awareness in the local property management industry. Meanwhile, most respondents opined that possession of adequate knowledge and abilities is an essential factor driving them to consider the PWDs' interests in their daily work. In this light, training for disability-related knowledge and ability enhancement is crucial for promoting disability awareness in the industry. However, only about 30% of the companies provided such training and about 37% of the practitioners received such training in the previous three years. Apart from training, the availability of comprehensible guides and codes of practice could be helpful for the practitioners to observe and deal with the needs of PWDs, as reflected in the findings of the in-depth interviews and practitioner-based survey.

When comparing the responses in the surveys, we can see property management companies were relatively more confident that their employees possessed enough awareness, knowledge and ability to deal with the needs of the PWDs in their daily work. On the other hand, practitioners reported a lower sufficiency of awareness, knowledge and ability. These findings reflect the probable gap between the optimistic assessment made by the companies and the gloomy evaluation expressed by the practitioners.

## **6 Recommendations**

Based on the findings of the research, several recommendations are drawn for consideration by key stakeholders.

### ***6.1 Guidebooks or Codes of Practice for Inclusive Property Management***

To ensure equal opportunities in integrated education, the Education Bureau has issued different guides to learning and teaching as well as curricula for children with special educational needs (e.g. visual impairment, hearing impairment and intellectual disability). In the field of architecture and construction, many guidebooks or codes of practice have been issued by the government for setting out the minimum acceptable design and construction standards of buildings (e.g. *Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011* and *Code of Practice for Demolition of Buildings 2004* issued by the Buildings Department). In the arena of property management, the Secretary for Home Affairs issued the *Code of Practice on Procurement of Supplies, Goods and Services* and *Code of Practice on Building Management and Maintenance* for specifying the standards and practices of management of multi-owned properties in Hong Kong that are to be observed by owners' corporations and property managers.

Nonetheless, there is no guidebook or code of practice for assisting property management companies to develop policies and procedures that prevent and eliminate disability discrimination and provide property management practitioners with practical guidance on safeguarding the rights of PWDs to use built facilities that are consistent with the provisions set out in the DDO. Therefore, there is a need for the government, EOC or other appropriate organizations to issue guidebooks or codes of practice of this kind for relevant stakeholders.

### ***6.2 Professional Development for Property Management Practitioners***

As suggested by some interviewees, disability awareness training should start as early as possible. Perhaps, it can be more effective if our future property management practitioners come across the issues of PWDs in their professional education. In this regard, concepts and issues of equal opportunities and barrier-free built environment should be included in the curricula of undergraduate and postgraduate programmes in relation to property and facility management.

Apart from tertiary education, the CPD also plays an important role to ensure the disability awareness of the property management practitioners. The CPD, which is commonly a mandatory requirement imposed by the professional institutes, is the means by which professionals maintain their knowledge and skills related to their professional lives. The professional institutes related to the property management profession (e.g. Chartered Institute

of Housing, Hong Kong Institute of Housing and Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors) should provide adequate CPD events for enhancing their members' disability awareness.

### ***6.3 Resources and Supports for Disability Awareness Training***

Less established property management companies may not have enough resources to ensure their employees to observe the interests of PWDs in their property management tasks through developing guidelines and providing training. Perhaps, NGOs serving the PWDs can consider to apply for EOC's Community Participation Funding Programme so that they can get financial support through the programme to carry out workshops or produce training kits which promote disability awareness of the property management practitioners. Moreover, the government, EOC or other suitable organizations may produce kits for disability awareness training. The training kits will be provided to the property management companies and professional institutions for enhancing the disability awareness of their employees or members.

### ***6.4 Customer Care Charter for the PWDs***

Most of the surveyed companies stated that they were willing to subscribe to a charter programme for promoting a more barrier-free environment for the PWDs. In fact, key stakeholders can consider launching a charter programme for the local property management industry. Reference can be made to similar charter programmes overseas. For example, North West Leicestershire District Council which manages a number of leisure centres and colleges has adopted a customer care charter for the PWDs.<sup>7</sup> In accordance with the charter, the district council strives for ensuring that all frontline staff are trained in disability awareness and are sensitive to individual customer needs, consulting regularly with disabled groups and individuals on the service provided and providing comprehensive information on available activities (e.g. large print and audio tape versions available for the visually impaired).

### ***6.5 Sustainable Procurement***

To further promote disability awareness within the local property management industry, the government should consider adopting the strategy of sustainable procurement. Sustainable procurement has been widely used to address issues of social policy such as inclusiveness, equality and integration around the world. Currently, management services of various types of government property in Hong Kong (e.g. public rental housing, government offices and cultural and recreational facilities) are outsourced to private property management companies.

---

<sup>7</sup> For details, please refer to the website [http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/customer\\_care\\_charter\\_for\\_disabled\\_people](http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/customer_care_charter_for_disabled_people).

The government can stipulate in the tender document to require the prospective property management agent to appoint an access officer or access coordinator to handle all disability-related issues for the government properties to be managed. Moreover, apart from economic factors, consideration should be given to factors related to disability inclusiveness in tendering evaluation. For example, track record in relation to the observance of management agent liabilities stipulated in the DDO is considered as a criterion for tender evaluation. Discredits should be given to property management companies which did not perform their duties stipulated in the DDO duly in recent years. By the same logic, credits should be given to those companies providing regular training in disabilities to employees. We hope that the sustainable procurement adopted by the government can help cultivate a disability-friendly culture in the local property management industry so that similar sustainable procurement practices will then be followed by the private landlords in the future.

## **7 Concluding Remarks**

Creating an inclusive, accessible built environment does not end with the design and construction processes. No matter how inclusively a building is designed, if it is not managed effectively, it will soon start to become inaccessible. How a building is managed in its day-to-day running will have a huge impact on how easy the building is to be used by the PWDs, which serves as a yardstick for property owners in seeking to meet their duties under the DDO. Therefore, property management practitioners play an important role in determining the inclusiveness of a built facility. The current research aims to investigate the disability awareness of the property management practitioners in Hong Kong and extent of disability awareness training provided by the employers.

This research found that disability awareness within the local property management industry still remained at a low level. Disability awareness training has not been regarded as a norm to the employers and employees. The findings of this research provide a baseline reference for longitudinal tracking of the disability awareness among property management practitioners in the future. In addition, they can also be used for before-and-after analyses when the EOC and other bodies strive to evaluate the effectiveness of their programmes, training workshops or campaigns of disability awareness promotion in the property management industry.

## References

- Alonso, F. (2002) "The benefits of building barrier-free: A contingent valuation of accessibility as an attribute of housing". *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 2(2): 25-44.
- Bendel, J. (2006) "Decision support system for evaluating accessibility of facilities". *The Israeli Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 15(3): 1-17.
- Brown, S.E. (1995) *Disability Culture / Rights / Pride Paradigm*. Las Cruces, NM: Institute on Disability Culture.
- Census and Statistics Department (2014) *Special Topics Report No. 62: Persons with Disabilities and Chronic Diseases*. Hong Kong: Census and Statistics Department.
- Chan, E.H.W., Lee, G.K.L. & Chan, A.T.S. (2009) "Universal design for people with disabilities: A study of access provisions in public housing estates". *Property Management*, 27(2): 138-146.
- Columna, L., Yang, S., Arndt, K. & Lieberman, L. (2009) "Using online videos for disability awareness". *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 80(8): 19-24.
- Daruwalla, P. & Darcy, S. (2005) "Personal and societal attitudes to disability", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(3): 549-570.
- Evciil, A.N. (2009) "Wheelchair accessibility to public buildings in Istanbul". *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 4(2): 76-85.
- Fittippaldi-Wert, J. & Brock, S. (2007) "I can play too: Disability awareness activities for your physical education class". *Strategy*, 20(5): 30-33.
- Foley, J.T., Tindall, D., Lieberman, L. & Kim, S. (2007) "How to develop disability awareness using the sport education model". *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 78(8): 32-36.
- Gilson, S.F. & Depoy, E. (2000) "Multiculturalism and disability: a critical perspective". *Disability and Society*, 15(2): 207-218.
- Hall, P. & Imrie, R. (1999) "Architectural practices and disabling design in the built environment". *Environment and Planning B*, 26(3): 409-425.
- Hashim, A.E., Samikon, S.A., Ismail, F., Kamarudin, H., Jalil, M.N.M. & Arrif, N.M. (2012) "Access and accessibility audit in commercial complex: Effectiveness in respect to people with disabilities (PWDs)". *Procedia – Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 50: 452-461.
- Imrie, R. & Hall, P. (2001) "An exploration of disability and development process". *Urban Studies*, 38(2): 333-350.



- Imrie, R. (1998) "Oppression, disability and access in the built environment". In Shakespeare, T. (ed.) *Disability Reader*. London: Cassell, pp. 129-146.
- Imrie, R.F. & Wells, P.E. (1993) "Disablism, planning and the built environment". *Environment and Planning C*, 11(2): 213-231.
- Kadir, S. A. & Jamaludin, M. (2012) "Users' satisfaction and perception on accessibility of public building in Putrajaya: Access audit study". *Procedia – Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 50: 429-441.
- Lau, W.K., Ho, D.C.W. & Yau, Y. (2014) "Assessing the disability inclusiveness of university buildings". *International Journal of Business and Management Study*, 1(2): 114-118.
- Lee, S.-Y. (2011) "A value analysis of accessibility as an attribute of housing". *Journal of the Korean Housing Association*, 22(4): 43-50.
- Morrow, R. (2000) "Architectural assumptions and environmental discrimination: The case for more inclusive design in schools of architecture". In Nicol, D. & Pilling, S. (eds.) *Changing Architectural Education: Towards a New Professionalism*. London: E&FN Spon, pp. 43-48.
- Mullen, C.A. (2001) "Disability awareness and the pre-service teacher: A blueprint of a mentoring intervention". *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 27(1): 39-61.
- Olkin, R. (2002) "Could you hold the door for me? Including disability in diversity". *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 8(2): 130-137.
- Reddy, G.L. & Sukathamalini, J. (2006) *Children with Disabilities: Awareness, Attitude and Competencies of Teachers*. New Delhi: Discovery Publishing House.
- Sawyer, A. & Bright, K. (2007) *The Access Manual: Auditing and Managing Inclusive Built Environments*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Sahin, H. & Akyol, A.D. (2010) "Evaluation of nursing and medical students' attitudes towards people with disabilities". *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 19(15/16): 2271-2279.
- Thomas, H. (1992) "Disability, politics and the built environment". *Planning Practice and Research*, 7(1): 22-26.
- United Nations (2006) *Convention on the Rights of Persons of Disabilities*. New York: United Nations.
- Wilson, S. & Lieberman, L. (2000) "Disability awareness in physical education". *Strategies*, 13(6): 29-33.
- World Health Organization (2014) "Disability and health", available at website <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs352/en/> [last access on 10 Jan 2015].

## Appendix A: A non-exhaustive list of accessibility audit reports in Hong Kong

中西區區議會醫療衛生及復康服務工作小組 及 香港傷殘青年協會 (2009) *中西區無障礙設施調查報告書*。香港：香港傷殘青年協會。

香港大學社會工作及社會行政學系 (2009) *連鎖式快餐店無障礙環境調查報告書*。香港：香港大學社會工作及社會行政學系。

荃灣復康活動統籌委員會 及 荃灣明愛社區中心 (2000) *無阻隔建築物嘉許計劃報告書*。香港：荃灣明愛社區中心。

莫遠君 及 陳婉珊 (2011) *穗港深澳過境口岸無障礙調查報告書*。香港：香港復康聯盟。

黃大仙區議會 及 香港傷殘青年協會 (2007) *黃大仙無障礙設施調查報告書*。香港：黃大仙區議會 及 香港傷殘青年協會。

蕭敏康、方少麗、馮嘉儀、陳少芬、張秀嫻 及 杜子勝 (2007) *「商場暢通無障礙」問卷調查報告 2007*。香港：香港職業治療學會。

灣仔區議會社區建設委員會社區共融工作小組 及 香港傷殘青年協會 (2010) *灣仔區無障礙調查計劃報告書：2009-2010*。香港：灣仔區議會 及 香港傷殘青年協會。

灣仔區議會社區建設委員會社會服務工作小組、香港傷殘青年協會 及 灣仔民政事務處 (2006) *灣仔無障礙設施調查報告書*。香港：灣仔區議會 及 香港傷殘青年協會。

觀塘區國際復康日工作小組、香港專業進修學校 及 香港傷殘青年協會 (2008) *觀塘區社區人士對無障礙社區認知研究報告*。香港：觀塘區國際復康日工作小組。

觀塘區議會 及 香港傷殘青年協會 (2014) *觀塘區無障礙設施調查報告書：2013 年 8 月至 2014 年 2 月*。香港：觀塘區議會。

觀塘國際復康日工作小組、香港傷殘青年協會、香港視網膜病變協會 及 香港專業進修學校 (2007) *觀塘：無障礙社區研究報告書*。香港：香港傷殘青年協會。

## Appendix B: Sample questionnaire for the company-based survey

### Questionnaire Survey on Disability Awareness of Property Management Practitioners

With the financial support from the Equal Opportunities Commission, the Department of Public Policy, City University of Hong Kong is conducting a study on disability awareness of property management practitioners. It would be very much appreciated if your company could provide us with some information regarding this topic. The information we need include how your company offers a barrier-free environment in your property management services and whether training or staff development has been offered to the employees for dealing with the needs of the disabled in their daily practices. Your participation will immensely contribute to the current research. Please be assured that the information collected will be kept strictly confidential and will only be used for academic purpose. Upon the completion of the research, all information will be destroyed.

Should you have any questions regarding the research project, please contact Dr. Simon Y. Yau at 3442 8958.

- 
1. Does your company clearly understand the liabilities as a management agent of a premise laid down in the Disabilities Discrimination Ordinance?  

<input type="checkbox"/> Very clearly	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly	<input type="checkbox"/> Averagely
<input type="checkbox"/> Not clearly	<input type="checkbox"/> Not clearly at all	
  2. Has your company formulated any comprehensible policy for conforming the liabilities as a management agent of a premise laid down in the Disabilities Discrimination Ordinance?  

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
------------------------------	-----------------------------
  3. Has your company formulated any comprehensible guidelines which set out the procedures and providing suggestions on how to conform the liabilities as a management agent of a premise laid down in the Disabilities Discrimination Ordinance?  

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
------------------------------	-----------------------------
  4. Does your company have designated staff (e.g. access co-ordinator or access officer) for coordinating accessibility issues in the developments managed by your company, including helping persons with disabilities to access and use the premises and handle the enquires and complaints from the public about the accessibility issue of a development?  

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes for the head office or regional office only	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes for every development managed by your company	<input type="checkbox"/> No
--	--	-----------------------------
  5. Has your company reminded the employees to observe the liabilities as management agent of a premise laid down in the Disabilities Discrimination Ordinance when performing their property management tasks?  

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes (Methods : _____)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
--	-----------------------------
  6. How important are the following factors in determining your company's decision on the provision of a barrier-free environment for the persons with disabilities (1 for the most important factor and 6 for the least important one)?  

<input type="checkbox"/> Legislative requirements	<input type="checkbox"/> Corporate Social Responsibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Reputation of the company
<input type="checkbox"/> Economic factors	<input type="checkbox"/> Physical or environmental constraints	<input type="checkbox"/> Ease of management

7. Are there any front-line property management staff conversant with dactylogy or sign language in the following types of property managed by your company?

	All	Most	Some	No	N/A
- Shopping centres or arcades	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Residential properties (including club houses)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Office buildings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Industrial buildings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Recreational and sports facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Carparks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Does your company welcome guide dogs for the blind to enter the shopping centres or arcades managed by your company?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable

9. Does your company invite persons with disabilities for trying out facilities after taking over a new property for management or completing a renovation project?

☐ Yes and regularly ☐ Yes but not regularly ☐ No

10. Since April 2011, has your company provided the following types of training to the employees to enhance their awareness and knowledge of the disabilities so as to achieve a barrier-free environment more effectively for the persons with disabilities?

	Yes	Number of times	No
- Training on aid and equipment usage (e.g. operating a wheelchair lift)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Seminar	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Workshop	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Training courses (e.g. about sign language and how to receive persons with disabilities)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Others (Please specify : _____)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

11. Please evaluate if the employees of your company possess sufficient awareness, knowledge and abilities in their daily management tasks to deal with the needs of the following types of person of disabilities.

	Very sufficient	Sufficient	Average	Insufficient	Very Insufficient
- Physically handicapped persons	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Hearing impaired persons	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Visually impaired persons	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Speech and language impaired persons (including persons with mutism)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Intellectual disabled persons	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Autistic persons	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Mentally handicapped persons	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- HIV/AIDS patients	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Persons with attention deficit or hyperactivity disorder	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. Since April 2011, has your company collaborated with any interest groups or self-help organizations of persons with disabilities to organize events or activities?

☐ Yes, for example : \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ No

**13. If some organization (e.g. Equal Opportunities Commission) launches a charter programme for promoting a more barrier-free environment for the persons with disabilities, is your company willing to subscribe the charter?**

☐

Willing

☐

Unwilling

This is the end of the questionnaire.

Thanks for your time!

## Appendix C: Sample questionnaire for the practitioner-based survey

### Questionnaire Survey on Disability Awareness of Property Management Practitioners

With the financial support from the Equal Opportunities Commission, the Department of Public Policy, City University of Hong Kong is conducting a study on disability awareness of property management practitioners. It would be very much appreciated if you could spend ten minutes to answer the following questions. Your participation will immensely contribute to the current research. Please be assured that the information collected will be kept strictly confidential and will only be used for academic purpose. Upon the completion of the research, all information will be destroyed.

Should you have any questions regarding the research project, please contact Dr. Simon Y. Yau at 3442 8958.

#### Part A : Knowledge and Awareness of Disabilities

1. In your opinion, who are "persons with disabilities" :		Definitely yes	Probably yes	No	Not sure
a	Physically handicapped persons (e.g. loss of limbs)				
b	Persons with sensory impairment (e.g. deaf, dumb and blind)				
c	Persons with chronic illness (e.g. heart disease, diabetes and cancer)				
d	HIV/AIDS patients				
e	Persons with mental illness				
f	Persons with intellectual disability				
g	Persons with special learning difficulties (e.g. dyslexia)				
h	Persons with attention deficit or hyperactivity disorder				
i	Autistic persons				
j	Persons with visceral disability (e.g. stroke)				

  

2. Can you recognize the following persons when you see them?		Yes, immediately	Yes, after watching for a while	No, even after watching for a while	Not sure
a	Physically handicapped persons (e.g. loss of limbs)				
b	Persons with sensory impairment (e.g. deaf, dumb and blind)				
c	Persons with chronic illness (e.g. heart disease, diabetes and cancer)				
d	HIV/AIDS patients				
e	Persons with mental illness				
f	Persons with intellectual disability				
g	Persons with special learning difficulties (e.g. dyslexia)				
h	Persons with attention deficit or hyperactivity disorder				
i	Autistic persons				
j	Persons with visceral disability (e.g. stroke)				

  

3. Do you agree with the following statements about persons with disabilities?		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
a	You do not mind living with persons with disabilities.					
b	Persons with disabilities represent a minority group in Hong Kong.					
c	Persons with disabilities are discriminated when using public or private services and facilities.					
d	The community has adequate knowledge and understanding of persons with disabilities.					
e	Persons with and without disabilities have the same rights.					
f	Persons with disabilities have the rights to choose where to live and whom to live with.					
g	Simple and repetitive tasks are suitable for employees with disabilities.					
h	Persons with disabilities can be integrated into a competitive society.					



3. Do you agree with the following statements about persons with disabilities?	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
i Persons with disabilities can lead a normal life in the way that persons without disabilities do.					
j Persons with disabilities need supports from the charity, medical care and social security.					
k Persons with disabilities need other people's commiseration and sympathy.					
l Persons with disabilities are usually bad-tempered.					
m Wheelchair users like other people to help them move towards their destinations.					
n Visually impaired persons have to use their sticks in order to walk.					

4. Do you agree with the following statements about barrier-free built environment?	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No Opinion
a Provision of barrier-free built environment for persons with disabilities is an overwhelming community consensus in Hong Kong.					
b Provision of barrier-free accesses and facilities is a waste of money.					
c Provision of barrier-free accesses and facilities to a property can preserve or even enhance its value.					
d Barrier-free built environment enables persons with disabilities to have more opportunities possessed by those without disabilities (e.g. opportunities for social interaction).					
e Application of universal design (i.e., designing built environment for usage of all people, including persons with disabilities, without the need for further adaptation and special design) can achieve barrier-free built environment.					
f Apart from design and construction, facility management is an important element to ensure that the built environment is barrier-free.					

5. Do you think equal opportunity is important to persons with disabilities?

☐ Very Important ☐ Quite Important ☐ Not Important ☐ Not Important At all ☐ Not Sure / No Opinion

6. Do you think barrier-free built environment is important to persons with disabilities?

☐ Very Important ☐ Quite Important ☐ Not Important ☐ Not Important At all ☐ Not Sure / No Opinion

#### Part B: Routine Property Management Tasks and Disabilities

7. When performing the following property management tasks, do you take the interests of persons with disabilities into consideration?	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Never involved in the task
a Ensuring persons with disabilities to have opportunities to participate in the events when planning and holding events						
b Reserving seats for persons with disabilities to facilitate their enjoyment of the shows when planning and holding performance events						
c Ensuring persons with disabilities to be able to explore the exhibits without barriers when planning and holding exhibitions						
d Ensuring barrier-free access of persons with disabilities to the built facilities as before when planning and holding events						
e Providing instant sign language interpretation when holding events						

7. When performing the following property management tasks, do you take care of the interests of persons with disabilities?	Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Never involved in the task
f Ensuring barrier-free access of persons with disabilities to the built facilities when planning and executing alterations or renovation of the property						
g Producing property guides, booklets and promotional leaflets with large-print and braille versions						
h Providing accessible versions to facilitate the browsing by persons with different types of disabilities (e.g. blindness and low vision, deafness and hearing loss, learning disabilities, cognitive limitations, limited movement, speech disabilities and photosensitivity <i>etc.</i> ) when setting up the website of the property						
i Formulating the contingency plans (e.g. providing guidelines on how to help persons with disabilities evacuate in case of emergency)						
j According priority use to persons with disabilities (e.g. blindness, low vision or limited movement) when arranging passengers to use the lifts						
k Checking the conditions of barrier-free facilities (e.g. tactile guide paths and toilets for the disabled) during property inspection, and arrange repair works immediately if case of damage and malfunction						

8. To what extent do the following factors drive you to observe the interests of persons with disabilities when performing your property management tasks?	Very Important	Quite Important	Quite Unimportant	Unimportant At All	No Opinion
a Social norms					
b Legislative requirements					
c Company policy					
d Own knowledge and abilities					
e Personal, relative's or friend's experience of disabilities					
f Others (Please specify: _____)					

9. To what extent do the following factors facilitate you to observe the interests of persons with disabilities when performing your property management tasks?	Very Useful	Quite Useful	Quite Useless	Useless At All	No Opinion
a Clear codes of practice or guidebooks					
b Clear company guidelines					
c Adequate aid or facilities for PWDs					
d Adequate disability awareness training					
e Others (Please specify: _____)					

10. In the past three years, did you receive the following types of training to enhance their awareness and knowledge of the disabilities so as to achieve a barrier-free environment more effectively for the persons with disabilities?	Yes	Number of Times	No
a Training on aid and equipment usage (e.g. operating a wheelchair lift)			
b Seminar			
c Workshop			
d Training courses (e.g. about sign language and how to receive persons with disabilities)			
e Others (Please specify: _____)			



11. Do you think you have sufficient awareness, knowledge and abilities to deal with the needs of the following types of person with disabilities when performing your routine property management tasks?	Very Sufficient	Sufficient	Average	Insufficient	Very Insufficient	Not Sure
a Physically handicapped persons						
b Hearing impaired persons						
c Visually impaired persons						
d Speech and language impaired persons (including persons with mutism)						
e Intellectually disabled persons						
f Autistic persons						
g Mentally handicapped persons						
h HIV/AIDS patients						
i Persons with attention deficit or hyperactivity disorder						

12. Do you clearly understand the liabilities as a management agent of a premise laid down in the Disabilities Discrimination Ordinance?

☐ Very Clearly ☐ Quite Clearly ☐ Not Quite Clearly ☐ Not Clearly At All ☐ No Opinion

13. Do you clearly understand the policy formulated by your company for conforming the liabilities as a management agent of a premise laid down in the Disabilities Discrimination Ordinance?

☐ Very Clearly ☐ Quite Clearly ☐ Not Quite Clearly ☐ Not Clearly At All  
☐ Your Company Does Not Have Related Policy ☐ Not Sure If Your Company Has Related Policy  
☐ No Opinion

14. Do you clearly understand your company's guidelines which set out the procedures and providing suggestions on how to conform the liabilities as a management agent of a premise laid down in the Disabilities Discrimination Ordinance?

☐ Very Clearly ☐ Quite Clearly ☐ Not Quite Clearly ☐ Not Clearly At All  
☐ Your Company Does Not Have Related Guidelines ☐ Not Sure If Your Company Has Related Guidelines  
☐ No Opinion

### Part C: Respondent's Profile

15. Gender

☐ Male ☐ Female

16. Age (Years old)

☐ 18 - 24 ☐ 25 - 34 ☐ 35 - 44 ☐ 45 - 54  
☐ 55 - 64 ☐ 65 or above

17. Educational attainment

☐ Secondary 1-3 or below ☐ Secondary 4-7 ☐ Diploma or certificate  
☐ Associate degree ☐ Degree ☐ Postgraduate degree or above

18. How many years have you been working in the property management industry?

☐ < 1 ☐ 1 - 2.9 ☐ 3 - 4.9 ☐ 5 - 9.9  
☐ 10 - 19.9 ☐ ≥ 20

19. Your current job title :

\_\_\_\_\_

20. The company you are now working for :

\_\_\_\_\_

21. The types of property that you have managed (can choose more than one options)

- ☐ Private housing (including clubhouse)  
☐ Public rental housing  
☐ Tenants Purchase Scheme/Home Ownership Scheme/Sandwich Class Scheme housing  
☐ Shopping centres/shops  
☐ Office/commercial buildings  
☐ Industrial buildings  
☐ Stores or logistic centres  
☐ Schools  
☐ Recreational or sports facilities  
☐ Carparks  
☐ Others (Please specify : \_\_\_\_\_)

22. Have you ever worked as an access coordinator or access officer?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

23. Are you a person with disabilities?

- ☐ Yes (Type(s): \_\_\_\_\_) ☐ No

24. Do you have regular contact with the following persons with disabilities?		Never	No regular contact, but sometimes meet	Yes, have regular contact (Please choose all that apply)		
				As family members or relatives	As classmates or colleagues at work	As friends
a	Physically handicapped persons (e.g. loss of limbs)					
b	Persons with sensory impairment (e.g. deaf, dumb and blind)					
c	Persons with chronic illness (e.g. heart disease, diabetes and cancer)					
d	HIV/AIDS patients					
e	Persons with mental illness					
f	Persons with intellectual disability					
g	Persons with special learning difficulties (e.g. dyslexia)					
h	Persons with attention deficit or hyperactivity disorder					
i	Autistic persons					
j	Persons with visceral disability (e.g. stroke)					
k	Others (Please specify: )					

This is the end of the questionnaire.

Thank you very much!