<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Reintegrating ex-offenders: the role and the effectiveness of social enterprise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author(s)</strong></td>
<td>Cheung, Kit Yan (張杰茵); Lai, Wing Yee (黎颺怡)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citation</strong></td>
<td>Cheung, K. Y., &amp; Lai, W. Y. (2015). Reintegrating ex-offenders: The role and the effectiveness of social enterprise (Outstanding Academic Papers by Students (OAPS)). Retrieved from City University of Hong Kong, CityU Institutional Repository.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue Date</strong></td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>URL</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://hdl.handle.net/2031/8326">http://hdl.handle.net/2031/8326</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rights</strong></td>
<td>This work is protected by copyright. Reproduction or distribution of the work in any format is prohibited without written permission of the copyright owner. Access is unrestricted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department of Applied Social Sciences

2014-2015 Semester A & B

SS4296 Research Project in Criminology

Final Year Project

Reintegrating Ex-Offenders: The Role and the Effectiveness of Social Enterprise

**Supervisor:** Heng Choon (Oliver) Chan, Ph.D.

**Co-Supervisor:** Dr. Lena Zhong

**Student:** Cheung Kit Yan

Lai Wing Yee
Table of Contents

Abstract
Chapter 1 Introduction
  1.1 Background
  1.2 Objectives

Chapter 2 Literature Review
  2.1. Employment and ex-offender
    2.1.1 Employment among ex-offenders
    2.1.2 Difficulties for ex-offenders to be employed
    2.1.3 Unemployment and reoffending
  2.2. The concept of reintegration
    2.2.1 Definition
    2.2.2 Elements contributing to successful reintegration
  2.3. The social functions of social enterprise
    2.3.1 General functions
    2.3.2 Specific functions for ex-offenders

Chapter 3 Methodology
  Part A: In-depth interview
  Part B: Questionnaires

Chapter 4 Results
  4.1 The role of social enterprise on offender reintegration
  4.2 The effectiveness of social enterprise on offender reintegration

Chapter 5 Discussion
  5.1 Roles and effectiveness
  5.2 Implications of the findings
  5.3 Limitations and suggestions for future research

Chapter 6 Conclusion

References

Appendices
  Appendix 1: Interview questions and relevant documents
  Appendix 2: Interview transcripts
  Appendix 3: Questionnaires and relevant documents
Abstract

In consideration of the high unemployment rate among ex-offender and the increasing popularity of social enterprise in Hong Kong, this paper aimed to explore how social enterprises help ex-offenders reintegrating into society and its effectiveness. By interviewing six administrative staff from six social enterprises and distributing questionnaires to ex-offenders who are currently working in social enterprise (N=72), the results suggested that by providing job opportunities, social enterprises played an important role on facilitating ex-convicts to reintegrate into community and preventing them from recidivism. On the basis of Social Process Approach (Social Control Theory, Differential Association Theory, and Labeling Theory) and the Good Lives Model, social enterprises offer chances for them to strengthen their practical skills. They can help improve their family relationship, prosocial attitude, as well as prosocial friendship. Therefore, social enterprises can complement the shortcomings of current government and NGOs on the topic of offenders’ resettlement that their roles should not be looked down and their spirits should be spread out.
Chapter 1   Introduction

1.1 Background

In recent years, the employment rate of Hong Kong has been increasing and the employment rate in 2014 has reached 96.7% (Census and Statistic Department, 2014). Despite of high employment rate in current Hong Kong, ex-offender seems not to be the one who have benefited from it. Actually, after offenders released from the prison, it is not easy for them to find jobs. The employment rate of them is relatively low than general citizens. According to the surveys done by Society for Community Organization (SoCO, 2009), the successful employment rate of ex-offender is less than 50% and 70.5% of them have been discriminated due to their criminal records when they are finding jobs. If the ex-criminals are unable to go into the labor market and live without goal, this will possibly lead to other social problems. For example, lack of job opportunity may increase the recidivism rate that endanger public safety (Lee, Mhando, and Scheuble, 2012). Therefore, Hong Kong society should concern and has the responsibility to handle ex-offenders’ employment problems.

Without a doubt, Hong Kong government and non-government organizations (NGOs) are the traditional primary agencies who are able to put more resources to solve this issue. However, the high unemployment rate among ex-offender proves that the current services provided by them for ex-offenders to reintegrate into society are not enough and have certain limitations. In fact, Hong Kong government has rarely examined and reviewed entirely on laws, and policy of offenders in prison and after discharged. Besides, it has rarely set the social goal of preventing discrimination against ex-convicts in employment and also seldom encourage prisoners and ex-prisoners to take place in “Vocational Training Courses” and “Pre-release Employment Scheme” (SoCO, 2009). At the same time, the role of enterprises played on reintegration of ex-offenders
become more and more significant. In 2014, an enterprise had provided over 700 work opportunities for ex-offenders so as to improve the situation in Hong Kong (The Chinese Manufacturers’ Association of Hong Kong, 2014). It is indeed very important for employers to offer job opportunities for ex-offenders, giving them second chances and the platforms to develop social responsibility. Professor Lai of Centre for Criminology of the University of Hong Kong said that the most successful way for assisting ex-offender to reintegrate into the community is being employed (The University of Hong Kong, 2012).

Apart from the above, it is worth noting that social enterprise emerged as a response to the socio-economic problems and the changes of social welfare policies since 2001 in Hong Kong (Au and Birtch, 2010). In late 1990s, more social services were required by local citizens because of the rising unemployment rate, an increase in amount of disadvantaged groups as well as other social problems related to the economic downturn and Asian financial crisis. Accordingly, the government realized there were a need to promote community participation and self-reliance for those people who have social disadvantages. Thus, a number of funding schemes, like the 'Enhancing Employment of People with Disabilities through Small Enterprise', the ‘Community Investment and Inclusion Fund’, and the ‘Enhancing Self-Reliance Through District Partnership Program’, were initiated in Hong Kong since 2000s to encourage NGOs to establish social enterprises (Ho and Chan, 2010). Until 2006, there were 186 social enterprise projects run by 46 NGOs in Hong Kong (Hong Kong Council of Social Service [HKCSS], 2006). Most of these NGOs were traditional welfare organizations that employ social workers to manage these social enterprises (Ho and Chan, 2010). The number of social enterprise has grown continuously. According to the annual survey conducted by HKCSS (2014), there were 457 social enterprise units at the end of 2013,
which are 13% higher than the last year.

For the term “social enterprise”, there is a lack of a universally accepted definition. In the United Kingdom, it is defined as “a business with primarily social objectives whose surpluses are principally reinvested for that purpose in the business or in the community, rather than being driven by the need to maximize profit for shareholders and owners” (Department of Trade and Industry, 2002, p.13). Hong Kong government takes an alike view as the United Kingdom government and states those specific social objectives may include providing services or products to meet the demands of the society, providing employment and training chances for the socially disadvantaged, protecting the environment, endowing other social organization through the profits gained, etc. (Home Affairs Department, 2014).

1.2 Research Objectives

In view of the alarming issue of high unemployment rate among ex-offender and the increasing popularity of social enterprise in Hong Kong, the main research questions in this dissertation are: How social enterprises help ex-offenders reintegrating into society?; What are the roles they play in reintegrating ex-offenders?; and How effective is social enterprise on reintegrating ex-offenders? Accordingly, this paper aims to:

(i) explore how social enterprises help ex-offenders reintegrating into society;
(ii) discuss the roles of social enterprise on ex-offenders;
(iii) assess the effectiveness of social enterprise on reintegrating ex-offenders; and
(iv) provide suggestions on how society can better help ex-offenders.
Chapter 2  Literature Review

2.1 Employment and Ex-offender

2.1.1 Employment among Ex-offenders

Visher, Debus and Yahner (2011) had conducted a longitudinal research of ex-prisoners in three states in United States from 2001 to 2006, studying the situation, experience, and difficulties of former prisoner in finding and maintaining a job. The results showed 79% of respondents had spent time on looking for a job after release. The most common cause for those not finding job was already being employed before release (27%). Other causes were suffering from health issues (15%), being disabled (15%), having other matters to deal with, like going to school (10%), etc. Moreover, a number of respondents (72%) found job by asking family and friends; nevertheless, the most effective way for long-term employment was to return the previous working institution as suggested by the researchers.

Searching and having a job are definitely the issues that prisoners concern after they are released. A survey from National Offender Management Service (NOMS, 2009) showed that most prisoners perceived that they needed aid in finding a job (48%), acquiring qualifications (42%), learning career-related skills (41%), and accommodation (37%) after being released. Younger adult prisoners ranked the need of employment, qualification obtaining and career-related skills much ahead than other needs. In Hong Kong, Society for Community Organization (SoCO) has been concerning the need of people in prison and after prison since 2000. It launched a study of "Ex-offender Need Analysis" in 2002 and a study of "Recidivism among Ex-offender" in 2005. Two studies indicated that more and more people commit crime due to economic difficulties and there are lack of vocational training during imprisonment. Also, over 70% of the ex-prisoners expressed that they have the need of accommodation, economy, and
employment one month after release (SoCO, 2009). Among these needs, employment seems the most urgent and important because having a job implies that ex-offenders have the ability to solve the housing and economic problems (Kincaid and Lawrence, 2011). However, it is said that ex-offenders are hard to find and maintain a stable job in Hong Kong. Not more than 6% of the ex-offender had got a legitimate job one month after being released and only 25.9% were currently employed (SoCO, 2009).

In the United Kingdom, during the year of 2008 to 2009, only 26% of ex-jailbirds were in work after being released, leaving the remaining 74% unemployed (NOMS, 2010). A similar statistics from the Home Office Resettlement Survey (2005) also pointed out that approximately 75% of ex-prisoners did not have a paid job. The truth is that ex-offenders are thirteen times more likely to be jobless than the ordinary people demonstrating the seriousness of this problem (Working Links, 2011). The situation of high joblessness rate among ex-offenders also exists in United States. According to Visher, Debus and Yahner (2011), over half of ex-offenders were presently unemployed. All the above literatures consistently shows that unemployment is common among ex-offender and there are some difficulties for them to keep a job. Besides, a majority of the employed ex-prisoners showed high employee satisfaction two months after being released. 91% of them said that they maintained a good relationship with colleagues, 90% of them enjoyed their work, and 79% of them perceived that the current job could lead to greater opportunities. Yet, about 50% were dissatisfied with the salary (Visher, Debus and Yahner, 2011). While the higher the salary, the less likely that ex-offender will commit crime again (Schmitt and Warner, 2011).

2.1.2 Difficulties for Ex-offenders to be Employed

There are literatures worldwide related to community reentry of offenders and the
perception toward ex-offenders. These literatures show that there are various reasons which negatively affecting ex-offenders to be employed. They mainly are related to the image of ex-offenders, educational level or skills, labelling of criminal record, as well as the attitude of employer on hiring ex-offenders.

**(A) Public Image of Ex-offenders**

Image of ex-offenders are largely influenced by the media. The negative image of them have been shaped by mass media due to the fear of crime. It is said that people spend much of the leisure time in watching television and both newspapers and television were discovered to over-represent and exaggerate the crime incidence and hence create a “devil” image of offender (Kort-Butler and Sittner, 2011). Indeed, ex-offenders who carried criminal records have been always reviled and are subject to prejudice and being marginalized (Geiger, 2006). This exclusion are generalized from the stigma, which has been defined as a “mark”, and such “mark” will degrade the credibility of individuals, endow individuals with some undesirable and unpleasant characteristics (Chui and Cheng, 2013). And the mark of conviction will endure long even after ex-prisoners’ sentence have been served (Link and Phelan, 2001).

A research from Working Link (2011) implied that when comparing to those did not have criminal history, ex-convicts were commonly seen as less honest and less conscientious by most of the employer. Yet, over 60% of employer who had employed former convicts said that ex-offenders worked as diligent as, or even more diligent than, those without criminal records. And only 7% of employer respondents reported that they had a negative experience with ex-convicts. Although ex-offenders may have some beneficial characteristics, the majority of populations and businessmen still hesitate to hire them. According to the barometer check done by the Chartered Institute of personnel
and Development in 2005, employers told that they would have little intention to hire ex-offenders to be the potential labor source. The survey also showed that UK employers were more likely to eliminate those with criminal histories than any other core group with no job (CIPD, 2005).

(B) Low Education Level and Lack of Working Skills

A large proportion of ex-prisoners do not have high levels of educational attainment and job competence making them difficult to get a job. For instance, near half of the state and federal convicts do not have the achievement of high school or Tests of General Educational Development (Petersilia, 2005). Besides, based on the research result from Working Links (2011), many employers perceived former offenders as not having enough work skills and they worried that they need to spend more time and additional resources to train them up. Only 25% of the companies would definitely consider to hire former offenders and the majority of them (65%) stated that they maybe recruit former offenders. The high uncertainty of this issue implies that ex-offenders are not easy to be employed. In reality, not only are many companies unwilling to employ ex-offenders, but also many ex-offenders are legally banned from certain occupations (Stoll and Bushway, 2008).

In fact, regardless of the criminal record, lack of education and job skills are also the reasons resulting to the unemployment of ex-offenders. Thus, a number of in-prison programs have been launched widely so as to equip prisoners, and hence after release, they can have some marketable skills to be employed. Some official reports said that there were positive outcome and impacts of education in prison and programs of job training on recidivism and employment rate, and the recidivism rate was lower when the education level achieved by the ex-offender was higher (Phelps, 2011). However, some
studies showed that those programs cannot bring any remarkable changes in increasing the employment rate of ex-offenders (Ministry of Justice, 2010). For example, according to Visher, Debus and Yahner's study (2011), near half of respondents desired but did not take part in any programs to ameliorate their job skills. The main reason for this was they did not note the availability of the programs. In Hong Kong, industrial and vocational trainings are provided by Hong Kong Correctional Service to prisoners in order to assist their reintegration and rehabilitation. Yet, those programs for prisoners in Hong Kong are indeed not helping them to be employed after discharge. About 95% of the ex-offenders said that those programs could not assist them in finding jobs because of unpractical use of the vocational skills (SoCO, 2009). Therefore, without appropriate qualified qualifications and work-related competence, the employment of ex-offenders is barred.

2.1.3 Unemployment and Reoffending

A stable employment facilitates desistance, in the light of Laub and Sampson (2003), in four major modes; (i) by creating routine activities hence diminishing the chance for criminal behavior, (ii) by building social capital among proprietor and worker, (iii) by giving informal social control as well as (iv) by offering people a sense of self-identity and life goal. Laub and Sampson (2003) recognized that family and stable emotional relationship were the core elements for desistance from crime, but at the same time they believed that employment could bring the similar effect as family relationship did. The potential benefit of career on desistance has been early confirmed by Uggen (2000). In his study, 3,000 individuals who had an official arrest record from nine cities in United States were arranged to either a treatment group or control group. Those in treatment group were given a salaried job in the field of construction or service industries, while those in the control group did not. The results suggested that criminals who have a
vocation are less likely to reoffend than those do not. Employment not only helps ex-offenders earn money and learn job skills, but also strengthen their socio-cultural competence and facilitate their life-goal establishing. Hence, it is believed that having a job can help in lessening recidivism.

There are many studies support that employment is the principal factor on prohibiting ex-offender from crime again. For instance, research by the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (2004) in England indicated that employment was the principal and also the most effective elements on diminishing reoffending. A more recent study by Mistry of Justice (2008) analyzed several resettlement factors, including job status, accommodation, alcohol history, family relationship, etc., with the sample of near 5,000 ex-prisoners. Based on its regression analysis, employment was the most statistically important on offender’s resettlement. Besides, the recidivism rate from the total sample was 58%. Among all these sample populations, 1,105 had been employed, and among them the recidivism rate dropped significantly to 45%. Therefore, employment have a significant impact on reoffending. At the same time, it should be noticed that the high jobless rate is not purely exist in released prisoners or people who have criminal records. Instead the truth is that more than a half of criminals (and over 60% of juvenile offender) were jobless before their conviction (Samele, Keil, and Thomas, 2009). Hence, the direct association between unemployment and offending or reoffending deserves our investigation.

2.1 The Concept of Reintegration

2.2.1 Definition

Reintegration (sometimes referred to as reentry) involves all the activities and programs designed to prepare ex-offenders to go back to the society safely as well as
live as law-abiding citizens (James, 2014). It is both an event and a process. In general, reintegrating starts from the day the convict is freed from jail or other correctional institution. It is because prisoners may face lots of challenges after being released. Since they had been insulated from the society for some time, they need time and supports to readjust into society and resettle their lives (Travis and Petersilia, 2001). While, in the present day, some British scholars advocate that reintegration should start as earlier as the convict is taken into custody. Therefore, more broadly, reintegration is a long-time process which in fact can begin before release and continue well afterwards. Based on this broader definition, reintegration includes various concepts and processes, like 'resettlement', 'correction', 'rehabilitation', 'treatment', and the like (Maruna, Immarigeon, and LeBel, 2004). Actually, the UK Association of Chief Officers of Probation specified 'resettlement' as:

“A systematic and evidenced-based process by which actions are taken to work with the offender in custody and on release, so that communities are better protected from harm and re-offending is significantly reduced. It encompasses the totality of work with prisoners, their families and significant others in partnership with statutory and voluntary organizations” (Morgan and Owers, 2001, p.12).

It is believed that professionals can assist the reintegration process, but none of them can reintegrate anyone regardless of how expert they are. Only former offenders can reintegrate themselves as well as communities can reintegrate former offenders (Maruna, 2006). Besides, a certain amount of researches suggest that two of the most significant factors contributing toward the prosperous reintegration of ex-offenders into community are employment and education (Lichtenberger, 2012).
2.2.2 Elements Contributing to Successful Reintegration

Two major theoretical approaches will be discussed in the following to generate some ideas that lead to successful reintegration.

(A) Social Process Approach

Social process approach includes three principal branches: (i) social control theory emphasizes the importance of social bonds on deterring people from crimes; (ii) social learning theory describes how people learn to offend; and (iii) labeling theory holds that negative labels lead to recidivism. Each of these theories has their own interpretation of why people commit criminal behaviors, but they all perceived that socialization is the fundamental (Huck and Morris, 2014). Wong (2001) proposed that this approach is useful in accounting for delinquency as well as providing prevention and rehabilitation plan for potential offenders and offenders. The below figure shows the ideas of this approach:

Figure 2.1. Social Process Approach Source: Wong, D.S.W. (2001)
Regarding the social control theory, Travis Hirschi (1969) proposed that people who are strongly tied to the society and social groups are less likely to engage in delinquent activities. He suggested four main elements of creating and maintaining this social bond. The first element is attachment, which is the affection that people love someone or something and consider they are significant in their life. It is beneficial for an individual to attach to family, friends, school, career and community. The second one is commitment. It refers to the aspiration of participating in socially approved activities, such as schooling and job, and gaining conventional values. The third one is involvement. This is about the concept that involving in socially accepted activities remains less time for delinquent behavior. The last one is belief. Hirschi believed that delinquency is caused by the absence of a proper moral values of society. Sampson and Laub (1993) further pointed out that informal social control are the effective ways for desistance from crime. He believed that desistance is mainly the result of social bonds, like the attachment to family or a career, as they produce the individual with something to lose by breaking the law.

As for the differential association theory, Edwin Sutherland (1939) suggested that criminal act is not instinctive but is learned in interacting with intimate personal groups. People can learn the motives, skills, rationalizations, and attitudes of crime committing through modeling. According to Warr (2002), people who are employed and have stable marriages are less likely to commit crime since they have less time and opportunity to associate with rowdy friends. He argued that when an individual move away from criminal peers who promote and rationalize delinquent behaviors, people will lose motives and skills for offending.
According to Edwin Lemert (1951), labeling theory is associated with the ideas of self-fulfilling prophecy and stereotyping. It is explaining about how people's self-concept and their behaviors are affected by the terms used to portray and classify them. Once an individual is being negatively labeled, they may come to adopt the image expected by others, alter their self-identity, as well as keep violating standard cultural norms if their primordial self-concept is weak, resulting in secondary deviation or criminal career. Based on this theory, to prevent or intervene criminal acts, the important rules are to remove the primary negative label minimizing the labeling effect or to strengthen one’s self-concept (Issmer, Stellmacher, & Gollwitzer, 2013).

(B) Reintegrative Shaming Approach

Reintegrative Shaming Approach shows the relationship between efforts of social control and criminal behavior and it focuses on the significance of shame in the punishment of crime. And this theory holds the belief that instead of focusing on the offender, the penalty should be focused on the behaviors or acts of offenders (Braithwaite, 1989). Shaming was classified by Braithwaite (1989) into 2 categories: stigmatization and reintegrative. Stigmatization emphasizes in labeling the deviant behavior of the offender and do not pay much concern in delabeling so as to indicate reintegration and forgiveness. The labeling of this category of shaming is not focus on the deviant behavior but the person.

Reintegrative shaming will be occurred when prosocial members react with offenders with showing disapproval expression but after that reaccept reformed and changed offenders back into the society (Braithwaite, 1989). The main component of reintegrative shaming include (1) disapproval but maintaining respect relationship, (2) ceremonies to prove the termination of deviance by ceremonies to disprove deviance, (3)
disapproval of the deed’s evil without labelling people as evil, and (4) not letting deviance to turn into “master status trait” (Makki & Braithwaite, 1994). In order to reduce crime and recidivism, maintaining the bonds of respect and love and following the principles of reintegrative shaming are necessary (Miethe, Lu & Reese, 2000).

2.3. The Social Functions of Social Enterprise

2.3.1 General Functions

The primary goal of social enterprises is to bring advantages to the society or a particular beneficiary group. Different from traditional charitable institutions or NGOs, social enterprises accomplish their primary social goals through commercial means. Nonetheless, business activity is just secondary, they concern more about their contribution towards the community instead of their profits. In the local context, social enterprises have social objectives and aim at covering: work integration, community empowerment, service innovation, sector-wide capacity building, and enterprising philanthropic practices (Cheung and Chung, 2011).

To study the social impact of social enterprises, Ho and Chan (2010) had studied 51 social enterprises operated by 16 NGOs in Hong Kong. By critical review of the history of the enterprises, interviews, and focus group meeting, they found that social enterprises give disadvantaged groups a chance to be employed helping them move from welfare dependency to self-reliance since they can earn money by themselves. Besides, social enterprises provide disadvantaged people with on-the-job trainings that increase employability and therefore help them move out of poverty. Apart from the enhancement of employability and poverty alleviation, social enterprises lessen the social exclusion of stigmatized groups, facilitating their integration into both the labor market and the society. Moreover, social enterprises contribute to social capital building as employees
can expand their social and supportive networks through interacting with their employers, other staff members, customers, etc. The result also suggested that social enterprises can increase job satisfaction, especially for people with disability.

Actually, regarding the employment, the creation of employment opportunities for the disadvantaged individuals is one of the major social mission for most of the social enterprises. In many countries, like Finland and Korea, government promote the development of social enterprise with the aim of solving issues of unemployment, particularly among the disadvantaged groups in society (Park and Wilding, 2013). The United Kingdom government thinks that "social enterprises provide disadvantaged and excluded groups with a mechanism for joining the labor market” as well (Department of Trade and Industry, 2002, p.6). Aside from directly offering a job for the targeted persons to increase their self-reliance, a number of social enterprises focus on providing training or temporary employment programs to strength their working skills and enhance the chance of later employment. For instance, in Britain, Intermediate Labor Market programs are operated by social enterprises to offer salaried job or training to the socially disadvantaged citizens for not more than twelve months and then help them to find employment in the job market (Park and Wilding, 2013). In Hong Kong, some social enterprises also aid citizens in becoming self-employed by providing financial supports and technical advices for running their own business (Ho and Chan, 2010).

2.3.2 Specific Functions for Ex-offenders - Reintegration and Desistance

Based on the Good Lives Model, people offend because they lack of inner and outer resources to achieve their goals in socially acceptable means (Ward and Maruna, 2007). This model is widely applied in offender management and rehabilitation. It holds that to desist offender from illegal activities, society need to provide chances for them to learn,
develop skills, and give them resources and opportunities that lead them to live a ‘good life’ or ‘good lives’, which involves one of the concept that the life without socially destructive or morally wrong behavior. This model points out that people seek a number of primary human goods developed from basic needs, like knowledge, intelligence, education, acquiring experience, autonomy, goal, and meaning of life, as well as a sense of relatedness and community (Ward and Brown, 2004). People are likely to achieve a higher levels of well-being if these primary goods are achieved. Instrumental or secondary goods give concrete ways for people to accomplish these primary goods (Ward and Maruna, 2007).

An early study carried out by Maruna (2001) supports this Good Lives Model and the importance of primary goods in desistance by studying the living conditions of the criminals. He believed that the core idea on desistance was people realized the needs in their lives and the attempts to fulfill these needs. In 2002, Ward agreed Maruna's conclusion and further suggested that ex-criminal who stops criminal offenses was those “possesses a sense of empowerment and sense of agency over his or her destiny and life and who has a desire to be productive and give something back to the community, family, and other offenders” (Ward, 2002, p. 523). And more importantly, as said by Maruna (2001), it is hard for people to accomplish primary goods by their own. Instead, they require external supports to recognize opportunities, learn new skills, and thereby fulfill the primary goods. Social enterprises, which not only offer job and training for offenders but also facilitate them to construct self-esteem, a sense of purpose, and pro-social network, therefore, become one of the significant agencies to promote primary human goods, desist people from crimes and better enable ex-criminals to reintegrate into community.
Nevertheless, the relationship between social enterprise and reducing reoffending is unsure. There is a limited experimental or statistical evidence to prove that social enterprises can lessen recidivism. It is because (i) there are deficient in money and professionals to execute evaluations; (ii) it is hard to seek funding as the results are not interested by the mass population; and (iii) most of the social enterprises operate in a non-contractual setting. As a result, most of the existing evaluations focus on the outputs of the social enterprises, such as what kind of and how many training programs do they provide, instead of the specific impacts associated with arrest or reconviction (Acumen & Durham, 2011). In spite of these limitations, Professor Maggie O’Neil and Dr Faye Cosgrove were authorized by Acumen Community Enterprise Development Trust and The Economic and Social Research Council to carry out a review of academic and enterprise based literature regarding the connection between social enterprise, employment and recidivism. They had identified some social enterprises that are successful in either helping criminals to get a job, providing education and/or training, giving pecuniary and family aids or deter potential offenders from crime. For example, in United Kingdom, the social enterprise project “Blue Sky Regeneration and Development” had awarded in 2011 for its innovation and excellence in dealing with recommitment. It provided temporary jobs and vocational trainings for ex-offenders. It also helped solving their housing problems and supported them to maintain a stable job. Over 400 ex-offenders had participated in this project and in 2010, 70% of participants finished their involvement with validated job qualification. Besides, near half of the past participants got a full time job after three months leaving this enterprise and not more than 15% of participants had reoffended (Cosgrove and O’Neill, 2011).
Chapter 3  Methodology

Based on the above literature, it implies that the employment is very important on offender’s resettlement and employment issues on ex-offenders are worrying in global and local context. And there are certain limitations on the existing literature, firstly, most of the study focus on general or superficial program evaluation rather than evaluating the specific effectiveness of the program on reintegrating ex-offenders. Secondly, there is a lack of research on the effectiveness of social enterprises on offender reintegration in Hong Kong. Thirdly, it rarely studies the effectiveness of social enterprise in offender reintegration from ex-offender’s point of view. Therefore, to explore how social enterprise help ex-offenders reintegrating into society and to assess its effectiveness as well as to bridge the gap in previous researches, this study applied both qualitative and quantitative method. There included two portions: Part A was in-depth interview with the persons in charge of the social enterprises and Part B was self-administered questionnaire for ex-offenders who work in a social enterprise. All the sample was based on adult population aged 18 or above.

Inspiring by the three approaches (social process approach, reintegrative shaming approach, and Good Lives Model) that discussed previously, this study was designed to test the following three hypotheses:

I. Job satisfaction is positive correlated with life satisfaction

II. The perception of social enterprises is positive correlated with life and job satisfaction

III. The work done by social enterprise has positive impact on ex-offenders in term of family relationship, prosocial attitude, and prosocial friendship
More details of the research method will be specified below:

**Part A: In-depth Interview**

**Sampling Design and Participants**

This study adopted a selective sampling. The target was the administrators of a social enterprise unit that hires ex-offenders. They all was the employer, manager, or supervisor from the selected social enterprises. Six persons from six social enterprises units was finally interviewed (N=6). Their ages ranged from 31 to 55 (M=45; SD=8.21). Except for one administrator who had less than two years’ experience in current enterprise, the remains all had more than three years’ experience. Two of the respondents had an achievement on Associate degree or Higher Diploma and four of them got degree level or above. Besides, two third of the respondents had religious background and all of them were Christian.

**Procedures and Measures**

On the basis of the list “Caring Company Partnership 2014” from The Society of Rehabilitation and Crime Prevention, Hong Kong and the list “New Social Enterprises of the Enhancing Self-Reliance through District Partnership Program in Operation” from Home Affairs Department in Hong Kong, there were thirteen social enterprises being selected to be the suitable target populations for this study. They all had been employed former offenders as their staff. All the invitation emails had been sent to thirteen social enterprise units on 21 January 2015. Eventually, six social enterprises consented to take part in this research. The interview was conducted between early February and late March in 2015.

Before the interview start, participants needed to sign consent form, the agreement
of audio recording, and complete a demographic information sheet. The interview was carried out in Cantonese. Applying a semi-structured interview method, nine questions had been previously set to ask the participants, which included the areas of: reasons and perceived benefits of hiring ex-offenders, working performance of ex-offenders, the relationships with colleagues among ex-offender, training program or other assistance that the social enterprises provided to ex-offender worker, suggestions on helping ex-offenders to get an employment, and future plan of the enterprise in helping ex-offenders, etc. The full version of the interview questions and relevant documents are enclosed as Appendix 1.

**Qualitative Data Analysis**

The information collected from the interview section was transcribed in Chinese verbatim from audiotapes. For more details, the interview transcripts are enclosed in Appendix 2. The transcripts were used to identify which terms or sentences would be useful in the research analysis based on the nine interview questions. All the highlighted terms or sentences were putted together and were categorized into different conceptual themes which were then coded. The codes in each interview were then compared and codes presenting similar concepts were grouped together to form wider categories which connected codes across interviews. Besides, constant comparison of newly emerging issues and analysis in different case examples reported by the respondents further enriched our findings. Some representative dialogues would be quoted to illustrate the themes concretely in the results part. The validity of the coding framework was tested by two researchers. As said by Bachman and Schutt (2011), validity of the data is achieved when there are more than one researcher studying the transcription and coming up with alike categorizations according to the transcript. This current research had two researchers, who all study the transcripts and concluded with resembling categorizations,
Part B: Questionnaires

Sampling Design and Participants

Employees who worked in social enterprise had been invited to complete the self-administered questionnaires. All invited employees were ex-offenders who had criminal records or had an experience in the criminal justice system, such as had served the Community Service Order or Probation Order. Employees (N=72) from six social enterprises finally completed the questionnaires. The response rate was high (84.7%). It was possibly because the questionnaires were distributed by the authority of the social enterprise rather than by us (as students) and time was sufficient for them to finish (from a week to two months). Among 72 samples, 66.7% (48 persons) were male and 33.3% (24 persons) were female. They were in the age range of 18 to 59 (M=35.1; SD=11.5). 47.3% of the respondents were Christian, 9.7% were Buddhism, 4.1% were Catholic and 38.9% had no religious belief. As for the type of the job, most of them (58.3%) worked in the field of non-technical jobs. And a small proportion of them were service and sales workers (22.2%), machine operators (6.9%), craft and related workers (6.9%), and clerical support workers (5.7).

Data Collection Procedures

Firstly, invitations for conducting the questionnaire together with the invitations for conducting the interview were sent to thirteen social enterprises through email in order to gain permission from the persons in charge of the social enterprises to allow their employees to complete the questionnaires. In other words, those thirteen selected enterprises were received one email letter inviting for both interview and questionnaire. During the interview section, the representative of the social enterprise was asked to help
us to distribute the questionnaires to appropriate participants. Therefore, because of privacy and confidentiality, there were no direct contact with the appropriate participants. The questionnaires were conducted from early February 2015 to early April 2015. Contacts were received from employer/manager/supervisor of the social enterprises that questionnaires were completed and we visited the social enterprises again to collect the completed questionnaires which ensured no third party get involved.

**Questionnaire Design**

The self-administered questionnaire contained five parts with 44 questions in total. It was designed to ask participants about their current life satisfaction, job satisfaction, perceptions of ex-offender, perceptions of social enterprise and perceptions of their employment. It was conducted in Chinese and taken about 10 minutes to finish. The questionnaire (in both English and Chinese version) is enclosed as Appendix 3.

**Measurement**

1. Demographic Information

   The first part of the questionnaire was the demographic information, this part consisted of questions about their age, sex, education level, job, salary and other general information. Education level and job income were significant questions for the research, as education level can be one of the factors that ex-offenders were not desirable for employers other than criminal records. Low educational level and lack of job qualifications are the barriers to employment for both non-offenders and offenders, and generally, offenders have poor working experience (Travis and Petersila, 2001). Therefore, the linkage between level of education and the perceptions of ex-offender on their employment was tested by ANOVA. Also, job salary might have influence on job satisfactions, which thus was tested by ANOVA as well. In this research, education level
was divided into three groups: low (F.3 or below); medium (F.4-F.7); and high (Associate degree/Higher Diploma/ Degree or above). Salary, also considered as income, was categorized into three groups: low (below $5,000); medium ($5,001-15,000); and high (above 15,000).

2. Life Satisfaction

The concept subject well-being (SWB) is an evaluative reaction of individual to his or her life, either regard to life satisfaction which is cognitive evaluations or affective component which is processing emotional reaction (Diener and Diener, 2009). In this research, the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) proposed by Diener and Diener (2009), had been used to evaluate the life satisfaction of participants. As life satisfaction which evaluated by the SWLS can show the degree of stability temporally and discriminant validity came from the measures of emotional well-beings (Diener and Diener, 2009). Moreover, regarding the internal consistency of this scale, our results showed that it had a very good reliability, which Cronbach's alpha (α) was 0.923.

The SWLS is a scale which consists of 5 items to measure individual’s life satisfaction. Participants used a 7 point scale which ranges from 1 strongly disagree to 7 strongly agree to show the degree they agree or disagree with those 5 items. After participants chose their degree of agreement or disagreement, the score on each item were sum up, different range of score represent different degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Score between 5-9 represents “Extremely dissatisfied”, 10-14 represents “Dissatisfied”, 15-19 represents “Slightly dissatisfied”, 20 represents “Neutral”, 21-25 represents “Slightly satisfied”, 26-30 represents “Satisfied”, and 31-35 represents “Extremely satisfied”.
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3. Job Satisfaction

The job satisfaction was assessed by using the Yildirim-Kaptanoglu and Demir Job Satisfaction Scale (KDJS). The KDJS is a scale consists of 7 subscales with total 10 items to measure participants’ job satisfaction. The 7 subscales include personal satisfaction, satisfaction with workload, satisfaction with profession support, satisfaction with training, satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with prospects and satisfaction with standard of care. The internal consistency of this scale was very good in this study ($\alpha = 0.921$), which suggested that it was reliable.

Participants used a 5-point Likert-type scale which ranges from 1 not at all satisfied to 5 extremely satisfied. After participants chose their degree of agreement or disagreement with those 10 items, the standard satisfaction scale ranged from 1 to 5 was changed to a 0 to 100 scale by calculating with a formula ($\text{adjSS} = 100 \times \text{stdSS} - 1/5 - 1$) and the new scores were summed up. In this formula, adjSS and stdSS mean “adjusted satisfaction score” and “standard satisfaction score” respectively. Different range of score represents different degree of satisfaction toward job, and score between 10-29 represents “Not at all satisfied”, 30-49 represents “Not very satisfied”, 50-69 represents “Somewhat satisfied”, 70-89 represents ”Very satisfied”, 90-100 represents ”Extremely satisfied”.

4. Perceptions of Social Enterprise

To assess the ex-offenders’ perception of social enterprise, 5 items were provided for participants to score and participants used a 5-point Likert-type scale which ranges from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree to show the degree of their agreement with those 5 items. This was questioning about in what degree they think social enterprise can help them in terms of family relationship, prosocial thinking, prosocial friends,
employment support, and reintegration opportunity. Besides, the internal consistency of the scale measuring perception of social enterprise in this research was very reliable ($\alpha = 0.876$).

5. Perceptions of Employment

In evaluating the ex-offenders’ perception of employment, 7 items were provided for participants to score and participants used a 5-point Likert-type scale which ranges from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree to show the degree of their agreement with those 7 items. Within those 7 items, two main domains were classified which are perception of ex-offenders themselves and contribution of ex-offenders on social enterprises. The internal consistency of the scale measuring perception of employment was very reliable as well ($\alpha = 0.836$).

6. Family Relationship, Prosocial Attitude, and Prosocial Friendship

In view of the social control theory that previously mentioned on literature part, social bonding is an important factors for deterring people from delinquent behavior. Therefore, to evaluate whether a social enterprise can help ex-offenders to rehabilitation, the concepts of family relationship, prosocial attitude and prosocial friendship were measured. There were three items measuring family relationship, three items questioning prosocial attitude and two items asking prosocial friendship. As for the internal consistency, the scale of family relationship had a very good reliability ($\alpha = 0.820$). The scale of prosocial attitude had a good reliability ($\alpha = 0.793$) and prosocial friendship had a satisfied reliability ($\alpha = 0.690$).

5-point Likert-type scale were used, which ranges from 1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree, for all of the eight items. The higher the scores meant the more
improvement on these three areas after they had got a job in social enterprise. For family relationship and prosocial attitude, the total score below 9 represented having a negative improvement after working on a social enterprise; the score of 9 represented neutral; and the total score above 9 represented having a positive improvement. For prosocial attitude, the total score below 6 represented having a negative improvement; 6 represented neutral; and the total score above 6 represented having a positive improvement.
Chapter 4 Results

On the strength of the above data collection processes, the qualitative results were first applied to explore the roles of social enterprise on ex-offenders. Then, the quantitative data was used to assess the effectiveness of social enterprise on reintegrating ex-offenders.

4.1 The Role of Social Enterprise on Offender Reintegration

The findings of this study suggested that social enterprises play the role as job opportunity provider. Such opportunity serves as a starting point for ex-offenders to reintegrate into both community and labor market. It is said that many companies hesitate to employ ex-offenders and ex-offenders are commonly discriminated by the employers and the public. Hence, social enterprises offer career opportunity for this stigmatized group, which diminish the social exclusion towards ex-offenders, see the quotation as below.

The general employers have reservations about hiring former offenders because they worry they will offend again and worry about their work performance. Unlike us [as a social enterprise], many companies, who are pursuing profits and efficiency, are not willing to put resources and time on training an ex-criminal. For us, we realize that most of them indeed are normal persons that have ability to work. What they lack is just a vocational chance. (SE #1)

It is understand that most of businessmen are unwilling to employ ex-offenders. Ex-offenders are thus very difficult to get a job. As a social enterprise and based on the relationship with [an NGO], we hope that by giving them an employment opportunity, they can cultivate their working habits, which help desist them from
doing previous illegal behaviors and integrate them into the society more easily. (SE #3)

Apart from creating vocational chances and increasing former convicts’ social inclusion, social enterprises provide job training, allowing ex-offenders to learn new work skills, improve their employability and thereby get away from poverty. Social enterprises also train up ex-offenders’ discipline and accountabilities:

We believe that providing a job for ex-offenders to earn money by themselves are more important than relay on the government subsidy. We have put lots of tangible resources on training them up and enhancing their working skills. For instance, we have given money for some of them to obtain a driving license with test or to take job-related courses, like catering license courses. Besides, we have sent two persons to Korea to learn Korean food cooking skills. (SE #1)

Our apprenticeship program includes life-discipline training, on-the-job training, Christian belief, building positive life-value and personal relationships. After they have worked a period of time in our salon, they have gotten certain competence. Most of them would like to continue such disciplined life style and working habits after they have left. And we know that our program can increase the chance of later employment for them. (SE #4)

We are willing to teach them the work skills. Most of them are also willing to learn and we can see the changing of their working manner, from less active to more constructive and become more and more responsible. (SE #5)
Next, the result suggested that social enterprises help to build up prosocial attitude among ex-prisoners by providing them an occupation. Social enterprises cultivate and enhance their self-esteem and self-confidence. They also assist them to discover their potentials and talents, they can hence become a valuable individual and doing something that contribute to the company as well as the society. Besides, those social enterprises with special background, such as religious background, are relatively effective on spreading the positive belief to them, as the below quotes suggest.

One of our employees works very hard here, at first he was lazy and thought that he was not capable for doing the job. But we taught and talked to him patiently, and finally he become a contributor to our company. Our company is a place that he found a real him and rebuilt his confidence. He works here very well and stably. He has already worked here almost 5 years and we will not lay him off unless he do something extremely wrong. (SE #2)

Before they work in our company, most of them were lost and did not know what to do in the future. Our company hires these lost birds and gives them shelter. Most of them are now working happily in our company and become a brand new person. It’s glad that they really find their goals and talents by working in our company. (SE #4)

As we have religious background [Christianity], we offer them a special mental support. They can realize that there are some people loving them and they are valuable in the society. (SE #6)

Furthermore, the interview results indicated that social enterprises can help
strengthen social capital among their employees. Social capital is defined as “features of social organization such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefits” (Putnam, 1993, p.36). The normal working environment provided by social enterprise extend ex-convicts’ social as well as supportive networks, which facilitate their social recognition and integration. Criminal workers are able to cooperate with other colleagues for mutual benefit based on trust. In addition, social enterprises provide them an employment which helps them stay away from the old deviant friends and the old illegal business. The prosocial friendship and team spirit are also built among colleagues and employer. Accordingly, bonds and attachments are easily formed with prosocial people, that help breaking the vicious cycle of offending, as the following quotes present.

We have to break the vicious cycle of crime. If the people around them do not help them to change their old life style, it is rather difficult for them to have a new breakthrough. Therefore, we realized that it is important to change their social circle and give them stale jobs. We have, for example, a drug addict worker. He have a long history in drug taking but he can successfully move out of drug. The reason for this, we believe, is the working environment that we provided. They need to work punctually and cooperate with other staff. (SE #2)

Our experienced staff [who are criminals] are willing to teach newcomers [who are criminals as well]. They have maintained a good relationship that they are willing to share and listen and they go to the worship together. They have learnt how to get alone with each other. They have also realized that there are someone loving them. (SE #3)
Last but not least, fulfilling ex-offender's additional needs is one of the roles social enterprises play. Unlike other usual company, social enterprises offers more to their employees who have criminal records and treat them with more patient, mercy and empathy. They offer them psychological and financial assists giving them a sense of love and caring:

Money is the most important support for them and we try our best to increase their salary. For instance, one of our employees is a father of two daughters, at first he only got HKD 300 per day, however it was not enough for him to buy two milk powder and thus we increased his salary after two weeks. Also, we will be their counsellor to handle with their personal affair, for example, when wife argues with husband, I will talk with the wife and my husband will talk with the husband. We have visited him when he tried to commit suicide (SE #2).

If they did something wrong, we will give them not only the second chance, but the third chance, the forth chance or even the fifth chance. We need to pay more patient to them (SE #5)

Our employees with criminal records are sensitive and emotional unstable, therefore we have to give more care to them and pay more attention to their emotional change. If we find that they upset about work or daily life, we will talk to them and make them to think positively (SE #6).

4.2 The Effectiveness of Social Enterprise on Offender Reintegration

To start with, there were some bar charts showing the life satisfaction and job satisfaction among the respondents:
Figure 4.1 Frequency distributions of life satisfaction (N=72)

From the above two charts, it showed that most of the respondents did not feel satisfied with their current life. 30.56% of them felt dissatisfied and 27.78% of them felt
slightly dissatisfied while less than 21% of them felt either satisfied or slightly satisfied. Although most of them were unhappy with the life, the majority of them expressed that they were satisfied with the current job. 66.67% said somewhat satisfied, 9.72% were very satisfied, and 4.17% felt extremely satisfied.

Besides, as stated in Chapter 3 Methodology, the current study aims to test three hypotheses. First of all, whether job satisfaction is correlated with life satisfaction. As shown in Table 4.3, there was a very significant relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction ($r = 0.465$, $p<0.001$). It indicates that people who have higher job satisfaction tend to have higher life satisfaction. Secondly, it is designed to test whether the perception of social enterprises is correlated with life and job satisfaction. Correlation analysis (Table 4.3) presented that there was a very significant relationship between the perception of social enterprise and life satisfaction ($r = 0.625$, $p<0.001$). It implies that respondents who think their social enterprise more positively tend to feel more satisfied with their life satisfaction. As for job satisfaction, correlation analysis (Table 4.3) revealed that there was a significantly strong relationship between the perception of social enterprise and job satisfaction ($r = 0.811$, $p<0.001$). It suggests that respondents who think their social enterprise more positively tend to have higher job satisfaction.
Table 4.3 Correlation between life satisfaction, job satisfaction, and perception of social enterprise (N=72)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of SE</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Perception of SE</th>
<th>Life satisfaction</th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.625**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.811**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.465**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The third hypnosis is to test whether social enterprise has positive impact on ex-offenders in terms of family relationship, prosocial attitude, and prosocial friendship. As revealed by Table 4.4, the mean value of family relationship, prosocial attitude and prosocial friend was 9.36, 9.43 and 6.74 respectively. These values showed a slightly positive improvement in above three factors. This result indicated that social enterprise has a role to improve ex-criminals’ prosocial attitude and relationship with family members and friends.

Table 4.4 Distributions of family relationship, prosocial attitude and prosocial friend (N=72)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Relationship</td>
<td>9.3611</td>
<td>1.90851</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Attitude</td>
<td>9.4306</td>
<td>2.15476</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Friendship</td>
<td>6.7361</td>
<td>1.44371</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apart from the above hypotheses, as mentioned at the measurement before, this research also consider whether educational attainment affect ex-offenders’ perception of their own employment and whether salary influence one’s job satisfaction. Firstly, ANOVA analysis (Table 4.5) demonstrated that there was no statistically significant difference in the perception of self-employment between three groups in education level (low, medium and high) (F=0.102, Sig.= 0.903). It represents that people with different academic achievement will not perceive their employment differently. Next, ANOVA analysis (Table 4.6) presented that there was no statistically significant difference in job satisfaction between three groups in salary (low, medium and high) (F=2.078, Sig.= 0.133). It implies that job income has no effect on job satisfaction.

Table 4.5 Mean differences between education level and perception of employment (N=72)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Education (N=48)</th>
<th>Middle Education (N=10)</th>
<th>High Education (N=14)</th>
<th>ANOVA F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of employment</td>
<td>M 20.229  SD 5.108</td>
<td>M 20.400  SD 4.575</td>
<td>M 20.857  SD 1.610</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 Mean differences between salary and job satisfaction (N=72)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Salary (N=10)</th>
<th>Middle Salary (N=47)</th>
<th>High Salary (N=15)</th>
<th>ANOVA F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>M 5.200  SD 1.229</td>
<td>M 5.702  SD 1.041</td>
<td>M 6.333  SD 0.724</td>
<td>2.078</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1 Roles and Effectiveness

As stated in the literature before, the concept of offender reintegration has two main points. One is to enable ex-offenders to reenter to the society safely, and another one is to facilitate them to live law-abidingly (James, 2014). Based on the results, for the reentry, social enterprises address the problem of social exclusion in the job market. They are willing to give employment opportunity for released convicts and do not mind spending much more time on training them, caring them and, fulfilling their additional psychological and economic needs. They do show social acceptance for this decriminalized group and lessen public stigmatization by proving that ex-offenders can be capable and productive labor personnel. Besides, to further probe into the nature of social enterprise on criminal rehabilitation, it provides a community-based rehabilitation, allowing ex-offenders to get in contact with the community and learn to be a good person under a normal society setting.

With regard to law-abiding life, it can be analyzed from the viewpoint of crime prevention. Crime prevention can be categorized into three levels: (i) primary level targets at general population, which is to reduce crime by addressing underlying factors; (ii) secondary level targets at high risk groups, which is to prevent potential offenders from offending; (iii) tertiary level targets at offenders, preventing them from re-offending (Brangtingham, Brangtingham, and Taylor, 2005). Obviously, social enterprises play a critical role in tertiary crime prevention. They provide ex-criminals with vocational training, which help develop their abilities and thus increase their employability in the days to come. Moreover, through the good working environment, ex-offenders can meet certain prosocial colleagues, strengthening their social capitals and cultivating their prosocial belief. They can also build up a good working habits that
desist them from criminal activities again. According to Laub and Sampson (2003), employment can induce criminal desistance effects by four means: generating routine activities, social capital, informal social control, and a sense of purpose. As for the works done by social enterprise and their affiliated benefits, it is believed that social enterprises do have a significant role on preventing former criminals from reconviction.

Although it is hard to tell precisely how many diminution in ex-offenders’ reoffending is the result of the efforts from social enterprises, it is reasonable to infer that social enterprises can achieve this aim by reducing risk factors for crime and enlarging the protective factors that lower the likelihood of criminal behavior. For instance, working in a social enterprise reduce ex-offenders’ time in involving in criminal acts as well as help them get away from deviant peer. Also, they can make money by themselves through legal means that reduce their financial stresses and life strains. Meanwhile, their social capitals and social bonds are strengthened that they have higher resistance to crime. Aside from the risk and protective approach, it drives ex-offenders to become a good and constructive one through the process of positive reinforcement. In behavioral psychology, positive reinforcements are considered as rewards which reinforce positive behavior. A lot of studies indicated that it is the most effective way to change ones’ behavior. Based on our interview results, we noticed that the administrators of the social enterprise are willing to give words of praise and encouragement for ex-offenders when they finished the tasks well. These practices arouse their sense of pride and confidence, and thus the prosocial acts are likely to be repeated (Andrews and Bonta, 2006; Carey, 2010). That is one of the evidences supporting why most of the ex-offenders have positive modifications after they work in a social enterprise. For example, said by the head of SE#5, “we can see the changing of their working manner, from less active to more constructive and become more and more
responsible”.

Besides, in the light of the findings of the questionnaire, the majority of ex-offender workers were dissatisfied with their current life while the majority of them were somewhat satisfied with their current employment. Our results also show that there is a positive relationship between job satisfaction and life satisfaction. It suggests that ex-offenders who have higher job satisfaction tend to have higher life satisfaction. Therefore, in order to enhance ones’ life satisfaction, having a satisfied job may help.

When comparing commercial enterprise with social enterprise, it is not difficult to find that social enterprises do provide a better labor environment for ex-offenders to rehabilitate than commercial enterprises. For instance, (i) while commercial enterprises are market-driven focusing on profit gaining, social enterprises are both market-driven and social need-driven focusing on both profit gaining and social objectives; (ii) While commercial enterprises are highly competitive in business world, social enterprises are moderately competitive but willing to offer chances for those who are in need; (iii) While commercial enterprises emphasize on efficacy, efficiency, and effectiveness, social enterprises emphasize on efficacy and effectiveness but not necessarily efficiency. That is why social enterprises have greater tolerance towards ex-offenders’ working mistakes. Unlike traditional companies, they would like to give more chances for them to learn from mistakes instead of firing them immediately when they did something wrong or below the standard; (iv) While commercial enterprises are mainly customer-oriented, social enterprises are customer-oriented and also emphasize worker’s personal growth. It implies that workers who work in a social enterprise may receive more cares and additional supports. Grounded on the above characteristics of social enterprise, it is considered that social enterprise reintegrates ex-offenders in an effective environment.
In the meantime, on the basis of Good Lives Model, individuals are likely to get a higher levels of well-being when primary goods are fulfilled (Ward and Maruna, 2007). While primary goods involve the concept of knowledge, experience, meaning of life, sense of community, etc. (Ward and Brown, 2004), social enterprise giving ex-criminals a vocation allow them to obtain these primary goods. They provide opportunity for them to learn, develop skills, and offer resources for them to live a good life, which is considered as an important process of desisting ex-criminals from crimes. Accordingly, social enterprises, which enhance offenders’ skills, facilitate them to build up self-esteem, a sense of purpose, and sense of empowerment, are one of the significant agencies to promote primary human goods, assisting ex-criminals to reintegrate into community as well as desisting them from recidivism.

Next, regarding the family relationship, prosocial attitude and prosocial friendship, our results showed that social enterprises have positive influence on ex-offenders in term of these 3 three variables (referring to Table 4.4). After being employed, ex-offenders showed a slightly improvement in above three factors. By building up prosocial attitude and enhancing the relationship between family members and prosocial friends, successful reintegration can be achieved. Social control theory and differential association theory can be applied to explain how improvement on the above three factors can result in reintegration and gain success in against recidivism.

In reference to social control theory, people who are strongly tied to the society and social groups are less likely to engage in delinquent activities and it emphasizes on the importance of building social bonds on deterring people from committing crimes. Four elements were suggested to create and maintain the social bonds, which are attachment, commitment, involvement and belief (Hirschi, 1969). By being employed in social
enterprises, ex-offenders are able to fulfill the above four elements which deter them to commit crimes: For attachment which is the attachment with significant people. In the workplace, people can meet different staff and learn how to collaborate with others. This can improve their interpersonal skills and further attach to their co-workers, family members, friends, career and the society. The more they tied to these factors, the higher affection can be restricted by significant others and hence less likely to have delinquent behavior. Therefore, social enterprises help build up workers’ close attachment to family members and prosocial colleagues can restrict ex-offenders to engage in criminal activities again. For commitment which refers to the aspiration of taking part socially approved activities. In the study, ex-offenders have second chance by being employed in social enterprises. This encourages them investing themselves into their career and develops conformity as well as refraining from delinquent behavior. For involvement which refers to the aspiration of taking place in socially approved activities and involving in socially accepted activities left less time and energy for delinquent behavior, ex-offenders work regularly and have normal social life with family members or prosocial friends. These leave them less time to think of committing crime, but think more and involve more into their job and social life. For belief which Hirschi believed that delinquency is resulted by the absence of proper moral values of the society. Most of social enterprises provide additional psychological supports and some of them have a religious background that help develop workers’ positive moral sense. According to our results, after working in social enterprise, ex-offenders showed improvement in prosocial attitude. They think more positively and believe more in the social norms and values. Moreover, having a prosocial attitude and belief can strengthen the ability of self-control of individuals, and hence less likely to commit crime.

Apart from social control theory, differential association theory can be applied to
illustrate the benefits of maintaining a good relationship with family members and prosocial friends. After being employed in a social enterprise, ex-offenders not only can better communicate with family, but also meet lots of prosocial colleagues. With more interaction with family and prosocial friends, ex-offenders can learn positive motives, attitudes, norms and values. Besides, moving away from criminal peers who promote and rationalize delinquency, ex-offenders will lose motives and skills for offending again (Warr, 2002). Therefore, the more stable and better relationship with family and prosocial friends, the more likely ex-offenders to reintegrate into society and stay away from criminal acts.

5.2 Implications of the Findings

Social enterprises do play an important role on ex-offender reintegration. To better assist ex-offenders, social enterprises in fact need to be careful to handle with ex-criminals’ special needs. For example, they have to pay attention to their emotional, psychological, and financial needs as well as work as a facilitator to boost their positive family relationship and friendship among colleagues. For these purposes, more regular additional programs and consulting sessions should be provided by the social enterprise. As mentioned at the very beginning of this dissertation, the majority of local social enterprises were operated by NGOs and NGOs are used to assign social workers to manage these social enterprises. It is thus expected that they have absolute ability to do and they can do such tasks better than other commercial enterprises. Besides, as discussed before, positive reinforcement is very useful to lead ex-convicts back to the right track. Therefore, it implies that the administrators of social enterprise should not be parsimonious to offer this kind of reward for them. It not merely involves words of compliment, but a gift certificate, a more agreeable job tasks, acknowledgement of accomplishment in front of others, etc. Also, the managers have to designate a suitable
task according to ones’ ability so that former convicts can obtain self-confidence and be more responsible to the job mission. All these elements are believed to be positive reinforcers for employers to work hard and be more committed to the enterprise.

Nevertheless, the employment problems among ex-offenders cannot be solved only relying on social enterprises’ efforts, the whole society, including the authorities of criminal justice, other business companies and general citizens, can also take responsibility.

In reality, it rather difficult for people with low education level or less skills to be employed. However, in this study, many ex-offenders did not think that difference in education level will affect the chance in employment (Figure 4.5). Ex-offenders may think that the reason of not being employed is just because of criminal background and this kind of self-labelling may forbid them in finding job. In fact, employers consider education level and qualification as important factors to hire someone. For example, based on the research of Working Link (2011), many employers see ex-criminals as lack of skills and they worried that extra time and effort have to spend to equip them up. A large proportion of ex-prisoners are not well educated and lack of work experience making them difficult to be employed (Petersilia, 2005). Therefore, in prison programs for those with low skills and education are needed in order to assist them to find a job after release from the prison. However, despite Hong Kong Correctional Service Department (CSD) has provided industrial and vocational trainings to prisoners, the programs for prisoners are not essential for the current job industry and hence it was difficult for them to be employed after discharge (SoCO, 2009). Thus, CSD should provide ‘Up-to-date’ training and education programs which match nowadays Hong Kong job industry.
Aside from CSD, in order to reduce crime and recidivism, having the bonds of respect and love and following the principles of reintegrative shaming are necessary (Miethe, Lu & Reese, 2000). The main concept in the understanding of deviant behavior is social sigma. The definition of stigma is a brand or a mark which indicative of a low social position of bearer. (Homant & Kennedy, 1982). Therefore, people in the society should help to remove stigma by giving them love and support with respect. People are all equal in our society and no one should be stigmatized as a lower social position. Removing social stigma is as important for ex-offenders to reintegrate and therefore education of public is needed. Education is recommended to all people in the society in order to share the message that ex-offenders are not that bad and what they need are only a second chance. Actually, the majority of people have not interacted with offenders or ex-offenders, yet they just perceived them as ‘Evil’. So, chances should be offered to all people in the society to chat, work or interact with ex-offenders, therefore people can see the ‘angel’ part of ex-offenders. Government and associations can organize some talks or workshops in order provide chance for ex-offenders to express themselves and interact with others. Furthermore, mass media can produce some programs to tell stories of offenders after discharge and hence change the perception in people mind.

In fact, ex-offenders have faced different discrimination to remind themselves and others of their past, such as loss of some kind of civil rights and discrimination in employment (Harris & Keller, 2005). Sometimes, the reason for employers not to hire ex-prisoners is not because of discrimination, but, employers have no idea or experience to interact or work with ex-offenders. As a result, they hesitate to hire ex-prisoners. Therefore, some courses can be provided to employers so as to educate them how to get along with ex-prisoners. Apart from it, there are several advantages for employing ex-
offenders. Firstly, reoffending rate have been reduced. Secondly, research found that a large proportion of employers who hired ex-offenders knowingly have a positive experience. Besides, employers having a positive experience with ex-offenders said that ex-offenders can settle into work well with co-workers (86%), they were reliable (81%) and had a well performance (82%) (Work Link, 2011). Stop labelling and stigmatize ex-convicts, instead, giving them a second chance to change into a good man and treating ex-offenders as a normal people will contribute to their reintegration. Indeed, everyone has their unfavorable past and hopes to forget it, and the only different of the past of ex-offenders is their criminal background. So people should open their heart and accept ex-criminals.

At the same time, ex-offenders’ self-concept is extremely important for their reintegration. In accordance with the labeling theory, there are mainly two strategies to prevent criminal behaviors. One is to remove the primary aversive label labeled by the public or authorities, just like the suggestions mentioned in the above paragraph, to minimize the labeling effect, another one is to strengthen one’s self-concept so that criminals are less likely to be influenced by the negative label which results in secondary deviation. Hence, it is necessary to enhance criminals’ self-concept. They should identify their strengths, weaknesses, and talents. They also need to understand that everyone can be contributive to the community as well as learn to accept and love themselves. They need to realize that they have done something wrong do not mean they will no longer be successful in the future. They have to destroy any negative thought and have the desire to change. To reach these aims, special programs should be provided during incarceration to boost their self-esteem and construct their self-image. In addition, everyone around them should give encouragement and support to them.
5.3 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

As regards the significances of this study, this is an exploratory research on how social enterprises assist ex-offenders as well as measuring its effectiveness. As there are rare relevant studies in Hong Kong, this research provides a basic understanding about the local situations. Moreover, it cannot be denied that people who are released from any penal systems are really deserved society’s concerns and supports. They are the group that should not be ignored and the current study just helps increase the awareness of the public and other related authorities.

However, it is rather difficult to search for our sampling targets. It is because there is a lack of a list listing all the social enterprises who particular serve for ex-offenders. Despite our efforts, only thirteen enterprises were selected and only six of them finally agreed to take part in this study. It affects our sample sizes in both Part A interview (N=6) and Part B questionnaires (N=72). The simple size is not large enough that leads to low representativeness. To ameliorate this limitation, firstly, it would be better for Hong Kong government, HKCSS, or any NGOs to compile statistics and produce a clear list showing all social enterprises who are willing to provide employment opportunity for ex-offenders. It not only can benefit similar studies in the future, but also create a convenient channel for ex-offenders to find jobs by themselves. Secondly, more large-scale researches should be done by any authorities in the future so that a more representative findings can be concluded. Besides, the current research investigates the roles and the effectiveness of social enterprises on offender reintegration mainly from sociological perspectives, like applying social control theory, differential association theory and labeling theory. It generates a general picture of social enterprises’ social impacts on ex-offenders, but it did not measure the psychological aspects. Hence, more work in this field is required. Furthermore, longitudinal researches with standardized
measurement instruments are recommended to gather comparable statistics as well as enable to track the sustainability of the results.
Chapter 6 Conclusion

Ex-offenders’ employment issues have been indeed existing for a long period of time in Hong Kong and also the world over. Former criminals are hard to be employed and they are easily to be discriminated by the public and normal companies as well as be labeled as “bad guys”. It is a tough problem which can only be alleviated by long-term interventions and collective efforts. Social enterprises, which emerge with specific social objectives, do have significant functions on facilitating ex-convicts to reintegrate into community and preventing them from recidivism. They offer chances to strengthen their skills, empower them, and enrich their spirit. They can also help improve their family relationship, prosocial attitude, and prosocial friendship even the improvement is not very obvious.

In fact, ex-offenders, who have done something wrong before, should not be seen as the people who always do thing wrong. As long as they are willing to change, they deserve opportunity and fair treatments. Everyone has their own past, it is very important for them and others to accept it. Certain social enterprises realize these concepts and take the pioneer role in providing vocational chances for this disadvantaged group. They can complement the shortcomings of current government and NGOs on the topic of offenders’ resettlement that their roles should not be looked down and their spirits should be spread out.
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Appendix 1 - Interview questions and relevant documents (English Version)

Information Sheet and Consent Form
(For Interview)

Title of the study: Reintegrating Offenders: The Role and the Effectiveness of Social Enterprise

Dear Participant,
You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Rainbow Cheung Kit Yan and Winnie Lai Wing Yee in the Department of Applied Social Sciences at the City University of Hong Kong. We are the current bachelor students studying in Criminology and your help will be highly appreciated.

Purpose of the Study
The study aims to explore and investigate the reasons that lead to low employment rate among ex-offenders. Then, to discuss how social enterprises help with this problem and ultimately find out what roles do social enterprise play on reintegrating offenders and its effectiveness. In doing so, we would like to provide some suggestions on how social enterprise can better help ex-offenders in the future so as to construct a more harmonious society.

Procedures
You will be asked to attend the Individual Interview. An information sheet about our research will be provided. You will also be asked to sign in the consent form and complete the demographic information sheet before starting the interview. The interview will last for about 15-20 minutes and our interview questions will be provided earlier for you to have a look and be prepared. To make it simpler for us to analysis and jot notes later, the interviews will be audio recorded.

Potential Risks / Discomforts and their Minimization
The potential risk and discomfort in this interview is low. But your working routine may be slightly affected as the interview will take you some time. To minimize the influence of you, we will conduct the interview according to the previous agreed date and time and keep the interview short. We appreciate your help and sorry for any inconvenience caused. You have the right to stop and withdraw the interview anytime if you want. Furthermore, you can feel free to talk with us or our supervisor if you feel needed after the interview.
**Potential Benefits**
Your participation is voluntary and there are no any direct benefits. However, since our study is to discuss how social enterprises help with ex-offenders and its effectiveness, your opinion will greatly help improving the employment problem among ex-offenders and makes Hong Kong a better place for ex-offenders to reintegrate.

**Participation and Withdrawal**
Your participation is voluntary. This means that you can choose to stop at any time without negative outcome.

**Privacy and Confidentiality**
Your information that obtained from the study will be used for research purpose only and your privacy will be assured. We will not disclose any of your personal information, e.g. your name and your company name. Also, your identity will not be revealed in any publication resulting from this study.

**Question and Concerns**
If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact the researcher Rainbow Cheung via (email: ) or Winnie Lai via (email: ). Or you can contact our research supervisor Dr. CHAN, Heng Choon Oliver, at Email:

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Reply Slip**
I have read the above information statement and understand the procedures and other information described above.

I will/will not** participate in the research entitled “Reintegrating Offenders: The Role and the effectiveness of Social Enterprise”. And I agree/ disagree** to be audiotaped during this study. (** Please delete if inappropriate)

_________________________  _______________________________
(Signature of Participant)  (Printed Company Name of Participant)
Date of Participation:
Agreement of Use of Audio Recording

This is to confirm that I agree to have my voice recorded by Cheung Kit Yan and Lai Wing Yee (later as “the researcher) for the research study entitled “Reintegrating Offenders: The Role and the Effectiveness of Social Enterprise”. I also agree that all rights in such recorded sound will be the shared property of the researcher and myself. I hereby agree to indemnify and hold harmless the researcher any claim for violation, infringement or invasion of privacy, defamation or any right whatsoever that I now have or may have resulting from or relating to any use of the materials. I also give my consent to the researcher to use my voice for their academic and/or non-commercial purposes, without any limitations, in any manner and format worldwide in perpetuity. Without my written permission, however, the researcher cannot let others to use my voice in projects and products that are not their own. The researcher should not give my name, company name and other personal information to the third party without my written or signed permission.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study or agreement, please feel free to contact the researcher Cheung Kit Yan via (email: ) or Lai Wing Yee via (email: ).

Date
Signature

Company Name
Interview Questions (Employer/manager/supervisor)
1. How many percentage of your employee were ex-offenders?
2. What are the reasons of hiring ex-offenders?
3. What are the benefits of giving ex-offender a job opportunity?
4. Are there any concerns or worries about affect the company’s image or business because of hiring ex-offenders?
5. How ex-offenders assist your company? How’s t their works?
6. How are their relationships with colleagues?
7. What have your company provided to ex-offenders to help them?
8. Can you give some suggestions to improve the current situation in helping ex-offenders to find jobs?
9. Does your company have any future plan to help ex-offenders?

Demographic Information (For Interviewee Self-administered)

1. Age : _________________

2. Sex
   □ Male □ Female

3. Time in current job
   □ Less than 3 months   □ 3-6 months   □ 6-12 months   □ 1-2 years
   □ 2-3 years          □ more than 3 years

4. Education Level
   □ Primary school or below   □ F.1 – F.3  □ F.4 – F.7
   □ Associate degree/Higher Diploma   □ Degree or above

5. Religious
   □ Catholic □ Christian □ Buddhism □ none □ other________

6. Job title:____________________
你好，我們是香港城市大學應用社會科學系修讀犯罪學的學士學生張杰茵和黎煥怡。我們現正進行一項有關社會企業對於更生人士重返社會的學術研究，旨在探討社會企業如何幫助更生人士重投社會及其成效，從而提出可行的建議使社會企業能在將來更有效地幫助更多更生人士。

你將會參與一次個別訪談，需時約 15 至 20 分鐘。在訪問開始之前，你需要簽署知情同意書及填寫個人基本資料。是次訪問題目亦會預先給你作準備。為方便我們記錄及分析資料，訪問內容將會被錄音。感謝你的參與。

本問卷採不記名方式，請放心收集所得的資料只作研究用途，個人資料將絕對保密。是次個別訪談參與純屬自願性質，你可自由決定是否參加本研究；訪問過程中，你不需要任何理由，可隨時退出，且不會帶來任何不良後果。如日後你對是項研究項目或授權協議有任何查詢，請與研究員張杰茵（電郵地址：）或黎煥怡（電郵地址：）聯絡。

如你明白以上內容，並願意參與是項研究，請在下方簽署及填寫日期。

簽署: _________________________
日期: _________________________
訪問和錄音授權

本人同意 張杰茵 和 黎穎怡（此後稱“研究者”）為其研究項目“更生人士重返社會: 社會企業的角色及成效”所進行與我有關的錄音。我認可研究者和我本人共同擁有其所錄製的聲音的版權。並保證不會以侵犯隱私、造謠污蔑或其他類似理由對研究者提出指控或要求賠償。我在此授予研究者使用我聲音為其／他的研究作為學術或非商業用途的權利，並保證不會以任何形式在任何時間對此加以限制。但是，未經我的許可，研究者不得以任何形式將他們拍攝和錄製的材料讓第三方使用和播出。研究者未經我的書面或簽字的許可，不可將我的名字、公司名稱和其他私人信息透露給第三方。

如日後你對是項研究項目或授權協議有任何查詢，請與 張杰茵（電郵地址：）或 黎穎怡（電郵地址：）聯絡。

日期

簽署

公司名稱
訪問題目
1. 在你公司，有多少成的員工是更生人士？
2. 什麼原因驅使你去雇傭更生人士？
3. 對於更生人士，你覺得給他們一個工作機會對他們有什麼好處？
4. 有沒有任何的擔心雇傭更生人士會影響公司的形象或生意？
5. 更生人士如果協助你公司？他們的工作表現如何？
6. 他們跟其他同事的關係怎麼樣？
7. 你們公司提供了什麼支援給更生人士？
8. 可以給一些建議去改善及幫助現在更生人士找工作的情況嗎？
9. 你們公司有沒有未來的計劃去幫忙更生人士？

基本資料（訪問者自填）
1. 年齡：
2. 性別： □男  □女
3. 在現時這份工作工作了：
   □少於三個月   □三至六個月   □六至十二個月   □一至兩年
   □兩年至三年   □三年或以上
4. 你的教育程度為：
   □小學及以下   □中一至中三   □中四至中七
   □副學士或高級文憑   □學士或以上
5. 你的宗教信仰：
   □天主教   □基督教   □佛教   □無   □其他：
6. 你的工作職銜：
Appendix 2 - Interview transcript # 1

A: Interviewer 1
B: Interviewer 2
C: Interviewee

A: 咁想問呀，你公司大約有幾多員工到呀?
C: Er... 公司就如果全職同兼職夾埋呢，就大概 80 人左右。
B: 咁幾多成係更新人士呀?
C: 7 成左右。
B: 嗯，咁咩原因，你地公司會去顧用更新人士?
C: 其實呢我地就本身屬於一個社會服務機構啦，香港(Name of NGO)，咁香港
(Name of NGO)係專係 serve 呢個 target group 既，佢地都係 serve 佢地既。
A: 咁我地就係你地網頁到睇到，寫住話工作比政府資助重要啦，咁你覺得比佢
地一個工作機會佢地有咩好處呢?
C: 其實因為佢地通常大部份人都係 able，姐係正常人黎，佢地真係欠缺一個機
會，咁如果有呢個機會就會易 d 幫到佢地，令佢地可以行番正路咁樣，佢地
都係 serve 佢地既。
A: 咁我地就係你地網頁到睇到，寫住話工作比政府資助重要啦，咁你覺得比佢
地一個工作機會佢地有咩好處呢?
C: 咁印象都會有保留既，可能一般顧主都會有保留既，我之前其實係(Name of
NGO)到主要做就業服務既，咁都接觸到好多雇主，一般黎講，第一，佢地會
驚更新人士，驚佢會唔會犯事呀 d ；咁第二呢，咁有 d 可能試用過，但個
個人表現唔係太好，咁佢地就唔敢再試。正正係呢個過程之中，講多少少社
企同呢 d 公司分別就可能要處理佢地既私事，特別要花時間處理佢地多 d 呀，
佢地都係 serve 佢地既，咁個客用我地服務唔同，唔或者 d 同出事就兜佢
地出黎。同埋講開一般公司，好講個 efficiency，例如如果訓練個個人要花好
多時間，佢公司未必太有意圖花呢 d 資源或者時間。
B: 明白，咁你地有冇因為請左更新人士，影響左公司形象同生意呢?
C: 嗯，其實都有呢個可能，Er...咁你地要我公司請呢 d 人呢時會有 hesitation，
咁個客用我地服務同樣會有呢 d hesitation 既，咁個可能係佢 general 公
眾人士，可能對一般更新人士一 d stigma 啦可能係。咁個地自己特別都會小心
佢既，亦都好坦白講，我地講既更新人士，有一部份，你話如果透過一 d study 去睇佢地一 target group 人特別既特色可能係有既，就真係例如情緒嘅 d EQ，有咁高啦。
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要更多 d，或高 d，咁佢地就會覺得點解會咁樣呀……咁我地唔能夠坐天候睇住佢地，個個有時有 d 壓力既，咁當然有一部份係表現好多好，佢呢個要睇番我地唔同時候既員工有咩特性。

A: 咁你可唔可以再講多 d，頭先話好既員工，點幫到你公司呢？

C: 那就其實佢地一部份既責任感係好強既，佢係基本上係可以完全放心交 d 野比佢地，佢地真係會做到足比番我地既，咁佢真係睇番佢地個特質囉，可能有 d 真係唔想比人睇死呀，會特別要表現好 d 呀；咁有 d 真係佢地自己 label 左自己呀，個 d 就會放軟 d。但一部份佢地個態度同責任感係好既，可能係同普通人無分別，甚至好過 d 青年人出黎做野咁既。

B: 咁佢地同普通同事既相處同關係，有冇特別既點

C: 那如果係呢到，又真係冇話咩特別問題，因為黎個陣已經知有咩問題，我地都 well-prepared 既，佢地就如有 d 真係硬係覺得人地唔知點睇佢地呀，睇唔起佢地呀，呢 d 自信心偏睇既情況呢，反而係要係設個障礙比自己呀，可能係對普通人既一 d 說話，佢地會覺得係咪自己冇用呀，呢 d 野又要特別 handle with care 呀呀，如果普通溝通相處，冇咩大問題既。

A: 咁佢地同普通同事問有冇話咩特別既

C: 可能日常 operation 個到投放，同頭先講到既時間呀，可能佢地都唔覺我地放左好多時間，咁真係既，喺個例子，我地有搬屋生意，咁 confirm 左個客人，就要個日搬呀，有機會有 d 時候佢地突然間唔出現，可能變左唔夠人做野，咁個 d 時間人面我地就要打好電話搵後備呀，或者聯絡番佢呀問佢咩事呀，事後又要問佢點解呀...

A: 姐係咁 d 輔導佢？

C: 你可以咁講，姐係處理番發生咩事呀，點解咩樣，我地係實際 operation 上面要揾另一 d 人補上呀，姐係要解決個客人，姐係我地 backstage 去做個資源就係咁 daily 投放左落去，嘅啱話如果真係 tangible 既資源，就係一 d training 呀，例如我地想 train 一 d 人啦，佢地係 stable 呀，我地會比錢佢地去考車牌；又例如有 d 食品要有牌，我地會比錢佢地去上一 d course；以往兩年前，我地有間韓國餐廳，開始之前派兩個人去韓國到學野，番黎就開始個生意。呢 d 就實際 d 囉，咁我地黎講一有機會呢個人係 ok 既就會擺資源落去。

B: 姐係我聽到多數都係工作上機會，training 呀，會唔會間中有 d meeting 或者 program 同(Name of NGO)合作，關懷，關心下佢地情緒同特別需要咩？

C: 其實有一定係上我地大部份更新人士都係(Name of NGO)refer 過黎既，咁基本係佢地全部都有出面既社工去跟，但係有既進度係就係同個社工投放時間會多。如果個個係有行為問題既，就係會多 d 時間去睇佢地。但有時個限制係就係話，如果我就咁講個個 division of labor 好清楚既：社工去處理佢地 d 野，我地就照做個生意。不過賣真係唔係咁既，因為日常接觸佢地係我地最多，最能夠反應既時狀況係我地，所以我地同事係係個過程之中，倍伴佢地比較多，角色更加重要，因為社工
唔會日日見佢地，佢地都係一個禮拜見一次，或者一個月見一次，佢哋呢道
黎講係有 d 分工限制既，但又無可避免，我地一定係倍住佢地相處。

A: 可唔可以比一 d 建議，幫助更新人士搵工作既情況。
C: 建議...係 for...。
B: 一般公司，社會呀
C: 其實...點樣幫到佢地搵工情況...其實真係一個 education，但呢個又好難即時
係好慢既，一個好長既時間，例如我地 d NGO (Name of NGO)啦，或者有
d for 更新人士既團體啦，可能要做多 d 形象方面既工作，或者行 d 就係倡議
既工作啦。係呢 d 唷既活動比 d 人識認多 d，等 d 人一步步去試嘍。因為好
似之前係餐廳到，間唔時有 d 人黎包場去了解下間餐廳呀，點請更新人士呀，
咁其實個到入面有唔同公司既義工，過黎參觀咁樣，變左之後有 d 乜野都會
畀人識認多啦。因為好 slow，係好 slow 既，仲要等 d 人一啲啲去嘗試嘍。

B: 唸你地公司係黎緊有冇 d 實質既計劃，幫更多更新人士呀?
C: 其實我地不嬲，我地公司大老闆就想呢係，無時無刻都係想開拓更多生意，
因為佢地可能睇網頁，都知道我地幾樣野都唔係咁有關係，就正正就係大老
闆睇到佢地唔同既 skills...咁宜家可能係大老闆既武力性為主，例如搬屋呀，清潔呀，
做展覽，姐係搭個 d 架...咁就因為我地宜家大部份既 target 都係中年人士，
咁其實我地公司就 97 年開始，果時講緊我地 serve 中年男士為主。但近年就
多左青少年罪犯，於是老闆就話我地都可以 care 埋佢地，咁就於係餐飲業吧，
佢地學，有廚房同樣面，叫做都有 d 特色既野，因為佢特許經營，個面都
對樣面服務有 d 求既，咁所以我地個理念係佢地學到唔同文化，培養態度
同習慣咁。佢可能由呢個餐廳，引申到食品工場，我地之後啦就係想做 d 自家
品牌，或者供番 d 貨比唔同餐廳既，咁個到黎講又可以多番 d 職位咁既，唔
同種類既職位。咁宜家根本上又係可以 care 埋佢地，佢係一 d 事既，我地
咁有機會搬到個 formula 就可以自己煮既。咁宜家呢個概念係講勞動性為主，而舊
年我地開始想再進一步做多 d upstream d 啦，佢係做多啲既野，但設計
個設計既係唔係我地係一個 rack 去 hold d，宜家我地係想做 d 事既，
佢個判既係想做 d 事既，而舊年就 plan 緊去接 d 事既，佢係一 d show 由頭
做到尾由我地去處理咁，啲人面有 d skills 就唔好係勞動性既，啲睇到呢個又點
create 啲同 job opportunities 比佢地，姐係嘅 variety 可能會大 d，姐係一
直方向都睇住唔同 target group 啲需要，去設計一 d 野，佢呢個就係想黎
緊，或係唔好即係個方向。

B: 唸自己想知啦，你地有無請到 d 更新人士佢唔成功，真係會重犯，多唔多呢?
C: 拿，統計真係有統計既，一定係，你話唔多，唔會唔多既，唔會唔多既，但有 d 真係
失聯，唔知佢地去左邊囉，可能有好路數都唔知既，不過我地知有 d 真係重犯咗樣囉，如果舊年咁計真係一兩個嘅。係呀，如果個個唔成功係 in term of 培養唔到 d 習慣呀都會有一 d 既，要好多方面配合既，如果放工仲係個社區，有好多野會影響到，姐係影響得大 d，可能第二日已經唔番工，過往都有一部份，番左一日工，之後就搵唔到佢呀，咁一日我地就做唔到 d 咁啦，咁就所以睇你地點睇啦。

B: 好，個訪問係咁多啦，好多謝你，唔該哂你既意見!!!
Appendix 2 - Interview transcript # 2

A: Interviewer 1  
B: Interviewer 2  
C: Interviewee

A: 而家公司有幾多員工到呢？有幾多個成員係更生人士？  
C: 其實首先我想要了解佢係要知道佢地從返社會。  
A: 姐係你地間公司點樣幫助佢地，係 prisoner 出番黎有份工既話可能會幫到佢地重新投人社會。如果有份工既話可能令到佢地話再重犯。如果有份工到佢地既話，想睇下你地公司點幫佢地？  
C: Ok... Er...基本上我地而家，因為我地個個人數呢係好流動既，有時係會人少 d 既。但長期係到既呢都基本上，我地六個員工有三個 姐係差唔啱多係二分一嫁啦！  
A: 哦...  
C: 係啦咁！50 個% 如果數字黎講就咁樣啦。  
A: 第二就係咩野驅使你去顧用更生人士？  
C: Er...因為呢個係一個惡性循環黎，如果佢有一份工有一份正當既社交子呢，係因為呢個循環之下一定要打破佢先可以有得更生。姐係因為呢件事係更生呀嘛！咁所以呢如果更生擺埋一齊呢就係個甦醒個甦字。姐係你個人醒先有得更生，係因為你唔醒先有得更生。咁但係個係幫佢醒呢？咁如果你問個問題就係來自我啲 好多年前呢就已經做福音戒毒嫁啦！又或者係一啲關乎到人係一個 addicted situation 裏面，真係你都知好多犯都係 addict 嫣嘛咁！佢係一個 addicted situation 如果佢哋唔肯嘅話就係個生活習慣唔改變，基本上佢唔會有一個新啲位出嚟嘅嘛。所以以往例子我地先啦，我曾經幫一啲女仔戒毒。因為以前嘅毒品除咗咩毒除咗慢慢就開始興 k 仔天拿水呀咳嗽水呀！咁如果佢唔喺係個社交圈子上改變亦都有一份穩定既工作呢，其實佢地唔會可以好順利地戒完毒出番黎會有一個新既生活。其實同様你坐完監出黎會有一個社會既接納，唔比條路佢行呢，基本上佢唔會改變到。咁所以呢個係一個方案啦！咁好啦！我地係唔係咁偉大呢？咁_MULT! 係家裡會唔會擔心個 image 呢？咁啲會唔會擔心我地會唔會唔考慮佢地既話？咁係唔會考慮呢個係唔係真係咁偉大既話？咁一定要去搵呢堆人嘅嘛。因為我地都真係需要人開工即係，只不過大家都係有啲唔同既需要。  
B: 咁你有冇驚請更生人士會影響公司既形象或者聲譽？或者生意？  
C: 其實我地呢啲係有 d 難度既，因為我地係要幫客人搬野。咁你幫客人搬野時會有 d personal belongings。萬一啲唔楊野，嘅會好自然聯想，因為都係人性黎。咁你問我地會唔會擔心個 image 呢？咁啲會唔會擔心佢地係咁嫁啦！
因為其實人係揀野黎睇，我地係揀野接受嫁嘛！咁所以我地係一定要講多
佢地既進步囉！因為釋囚都好需要我地欣賞佢地有進步，唔好講釋囚呀，
佢地呢知背景之下，咁個個處景就係如果我地同公眾去講多 比條
生路佢地行，其實佢地係可以有進步，有好多進步既空間。

A:
嗯....咁更生人士點樣幫到你公司？佢地既工作表現又係點呢？

C:
拿！有個呃，而家我地有三個啦！咁有一個係非常之落力嫁！因為佢細個犯
事， 講緊佢好細個，佢麻雀館斬死左幾個，咁坐左十幾年監。其實佢黎
講個時都未有地下鐵就入去坐監，坐完出黎有地下鐵，姐係佢睇下個世界
已經唔同左。佢後未就黎到我地呢到啦，又係好安身立命既！所謂安身
立命就係佢知道佢要追番過去既光陰，而佢點追呀？咁咪賣力囉！所以
佢就比人特別勤力！一方面佢既個性係好勤力，呢到係一個地方可以比佢
坐穩。佢坐左差不多四至五年左右，我地基本上呢，我地都唔會要佢走。
除非佢真係犯左大錯，基本上都係會好比機會佢啦！同埋係佢學去做領導，
但其實佢係一堆過來人呢姐係佢，佢地有好多心理上既野需要跨過
心 理上既跨過姐係佢覺得自己坐過監啦！好多野佢都唔識啦，佢又唔係
識份子啦！佢又唔係管理人才啦！佢又唔係領袖啦，我同你咁高咁大咁
點解要我要叫佢做野呢？因為係佢地
眼裏冇一種 concept 叫做 teamwork 黑社會蝦蝦霸霸嫁嘛 team 乜鬼 work
姐係佢出去攞住把刀你就跟住我，咁我就係大佬你就係細佬，咁係佢地而
家既處境……佢地都會用番呢個諗法。佢地而家係到工作，因為冇人話佢係
大佬，其實某程度佢係要隱形做大佬咁你要教佢做大佬呢……但又唔用番
以前個套呢唔係容易，並且我地都唔想作用以前個套蝦蝦霸霸，所以要教佢例
如你信自己啦，出去學下野啦，係佢地黎講係困難嫁，原因係佢好悶嫁嘛…
咁……而家我地講 d theory 又要睇住個 power point 又要講幾句英文…咁佢
咪好 Lost 唔，咁所以係培訓佢地面上其實係遇到一 d 問題，佢係第一佢地
會睇自己，第二能力上佢有 d 難難，比較讀得書少，但佢咪所有都佢唔係呢？
又唔係既，另外有一個員工就好得意既個故事，我地都有比佢人嫁嘛，
佢係透過搵家俬而知道我地公司，咁佢係就冇工開，因為係坐完監出黎，佢
係又要鋸家啲，佢有兩個小朋友 咁佢老婆就叫佢敲門問下我地請唔請人…
咁基本上如果你肯黎，就算冇經驗我地都會比機會去教你，咁佢就做開 d
家俬裝拆，呢個人個背景都係比較複雜，佢咁複雜背景之下，佢係有兩個
小朋友，要養家……咁開頭佢係搵三百蚊一日，但三百蚊一日係佢買唔到兩罐
奶粉，所以我地好快就加左佢人工，兩個星期到就加左人工啦。其實身體
既同事都眼紅嫁，我係到做幾年先五百幾蚊一日，呢個嘅仔黎左一陣，又
唔識做，又要串人啲又脾氣唔好嚼，通常係都有系自己個性，做得大佬，犯
得事，梗係有自己一個個性啦……脾氣又爆燥，又講粗口，又唔聽人地講，
但又要鋸人工，又覺得自己好辛苦好委屈，不聰做開大佬嫁嘛，斬下人就
有幾皮野嫁嘛，但而家做一日先得個幾舊水，對佢黎講係好大對比，但係
佢地黎講，係咁咁講嘛係呢個正常既社會，我地出於體諒細佬份上先加人工，
亦知道佢要養家，亦知道佢有意圖或企圖向好，我地會比鼓勵佢去 enforce
佢，但對呢 d 人又唔可以一味對佢好，因為對佢好佢會輕飄飄 幫佢除左係一種體諒，亦都係信仰...係聖經既說話就係，人係要得生命，我地黎講係
淨係要自己生活得好，亦都要叫其他人都生活得好既，咁要生活得好要履
行佢工作既場合...要履行佢人與人之間...Er...唔單單係教會團契裏面，而
係一個普通既小圈子，你點可以將佢地教育呢，嘅咪試囉 因為每個處境
都唔同，例如個個衰仔佢可以夜晚飲完酒唔知醒番工，但係我地又要入手，
我地要同佢一起打佢，但對呢 d 人又唔可以一味對佢好，因為對佢好佢會
輕飄飄 唔單單係教會團契裏面，而係係一個普通既小圈子，你點可以將佢地
教育呢，嘅咪試囉 因為每個處境都唔同，例如個個衰仔佢可以夜晚飲完酒
唔知醒番工，但係我地又要手，我地要同佢一起打佢，但對呢 d 人又唔可以
一味對佢好，因為對佢好佢會輕飄飄 唔單單係教會團契裏面，而係係
一個普通既小圈子，你點可以將佢地教育呢，嘅咪試囉 因為每個處境
d 佢要定期去見 PO 撇，佢地一般紀律問題係好差，同埋佢地對於應承
佢既野，個誠信係好低，但我地睇如果佢地肯咁辛苦，肯流汗，上上落落，
有動力黎每日番工...呢個已經係 Highly motivated 如果 highly motivated 唔
繼續比機會佢囉，唔識既野咪教佢。
B: E...咁更生人士點協助你公司？
C: 點協助呀...有呀...我地都有時真係要人用既，年青人都唔會想人嘅，因為
係搬家係呢行 image 唔係啲 professional 唔係 professional 就冇人想做...
佢地同佢形勢係知識份子都未必搵到工做或者人工都係得一萬蚊到，因
為真係需要人，我地 encounter 到咩人咪比佢試囉。
A: 佢地同其間同事關係點嘅？
C: 一 d d 啦...嘅有 d 會難相處 d 有 d 會易相處 d 啦，但我地本身盡量鼓勵
大家合作，佢地暫時都有時話打交呀，頂多是吵架咗...
A: 佢地關係工作事 唔關背景事既？
C: 唔關唔關~
B: 佢地同佢係咩支援呢？
C: Er...有大有細呀既...錢銀的支援就最重要啦...倒如老婆同老錢吵架呀，我
會同老婆傾，我老公會同個老公傾，佢要上吊自殺我地去醫院探佢嘅。
A: 真係有 d 唔既事情發生過？
C: 佢係!你睇下就知嫁啦。
A: 妹係既輔導既角色？
C: 妹係真係做佢既輔導員，帶佢番教會嫁，當然佢未必肯長期番既，但我地相
信有一種在既助力幫佢既，我地只可以係人生既過客...我地有意冇意希望
透過一個團體既模式呢係去 support 佢既...但呢個團體呢係同教會團契係
異曲同工之妙，但呢件事係唔容易成立嫁，原因係係我地既運作上面都有好
多既限制，例如佢搬完屋放工，你好難叫佢留底，希望第日 launch 到一 d 教會，又帶到佢做 support group 的話...就等 support group 去做呢件事囉！但 support group 都係一個過客姐，咁如果帶到比佢信仰的話，咪等信仰 support 佢囉！但件事好處無飄渺嫁嘛，上帝又睇唔到既點樣愛姐，比錢相愛就最好嫁啦，咁所以要好多時間去慢慢滋生呢件事孕育呢件事囉，通常佢地欠人好多債，知道佢地等錢駛 咪叫佢地開工，你地而家係了解佢地點解要犯罪呀嘛，下一个步驟就係引導佢地去歸正，令佢地唔會重新再犯呀嘛 吩有好多個層面嫁，男仔同女仔係唔同...男仔要威，女仔要錢駛所以女仔做援交個 d 野係好 popular 咪係唔會有償還，債主會打黎公司，我地會話冇呢個人，但佢地又冇咩節制能力，咁我地咪幫佢地儲起糧還錢囉。

A: 有咩建議可以改善佢地既就業情況呢？
C: 吱不如你講下而家香港個更生 situation 徑點先？我再講建議
B: 佢地好難搵工，因為唔夠 skills education 吱係好夠，仲有大家市民對佢地既印象其實唔係咁好，所以令到佢地唔係咁易搵工，好多老闆都唔肯請佢地，因為怕影響生意，特別係服務性行業。
C: 像嘅...個僱主係驚個批釋囚趕客姐...其實所謂趕客係係一個自個釋囚既自我發放低自己，呢個係 self image 既問題，因為佢有過去呀嘛，佢唔係唔係唔係唔係，而係呢個字本身係指左以前既野呀嘛，其實平常既人呢個字係都有過去 嫁，失戀人都會喊啦，我有過去你有過去，不過我地揀過去同佢地既過去有少少唔同囉，佢既過去有 record 我地既過去我地係心入裏都有 record 嫁，所以我地就得將大家都有既過去睇為其實好平常的一件事。如果你問個老闆有冇過去呀...個老闆有冇過去嫁...佢可能唔想個過去再發生一次 係呢方面就係一個心理關口啦，第二個關口就係，其實個 d skills 呢...訓練個堆釋囚呢，驚佢趕客係佢係 EQ 上面，佢唔識大體地去應對個客，咁個係係一個 TRAINING 既問題，而個釋囚又會好敏感係覺得你講我呀，佢話我呀，敏感呢件事其實人人都會敏感，第三做多點比社會既教育，話比大家知其實佢地係咁同我地一樣嫁姐。
A: 你公司未來有冇計劃去幫助佢地呢？
C: 我地比足工佢地開已經好大幫助嫁啦，咁希望組到一個團契，不過呢個係唔容易去詡既係黎...一直都有詡既...但要去實踐會有點難度，要多點時間去蘊釀。
B: 多謝你接受我地訪問。
Appendix 2 - Interview transcript # 3

A: Interviewer 1
B: Interviewer 2
C: Interviewee

B: 請問呢你公司宜家大約有幾多員工？
C: 嗯...我地就唔係好大，最近請左兩位新同事...計埋我宜家有十位。
B: 咁有幾多成係更新人士？
C: 咁除左我同另一同事，基本上請得既人呢全部都係釋囚黎既。因為我地係專幫一 d 女既更生人士既。
A: 咁點解你地公司會去顧用呢 d 更新人士既？有咩原因呢？
C: Er...咁就要講翻我同呢間社企既背景啦，你地本身知唔知，有冇睇過下搵過下 d 資料...？
B: 有呀，我地有睇你地既網站...A: 我地知道你地係有基督教背景，專為女性更生人士而設既社企。
C: 嗯嗯...係喇喇喇...Er...其實我呢本身就係黎自香港基督教更新會既，咁自己都係基督徒...嗯...我地個會係特意一方係做緊 d 倡議更生人士既工作，主要既對象係係犯過事既人，唔理係在囚或係出黎係話係既，佢地都係我地個會想幫既對象。咁因為喇喇，係零八既時候更生會就發起左一個社企項目希望呢 d 女性更生人士有一份工作去支持佢地既生活，整到佢地可以自力更生。咁另外啦我地希望佢地係工作既過程中能夠令佢地體験神既愛，令佢地唔會覺得絕望自卑，令佢地知道神係會愛佢地會安排佢地既路咁樣囉。Er...仲有 Er 藉著工作去重建佢地既尊嚴自信咁。
B: 哦明白。Er...咁點解你地會簡女性為主要對象？
C: 因為當時留意到社會上專為女性更生人士提供工作既社企唔多，姐係唔係話無...好似餐廳呀買野既企業佢都做嘅，但始終男女需求唔同，所以我地既成立就係想專 d 比 d 女更生人士就業機會。Er...所以呢其實我地一開始係做製衣既，因為果時呢車衣係女監獄裡面係主要工業啦，好多女既更生人士呢都擅長車衣既。所以一開始就係番 d 技能去提供工作機會，但係呢，好似一到，我地就發覺製衣行業開始無咩吃香，Er 而且比較適合中年既婦女咁，我地又接觸既年輕既女既更生人士又愈黎愈多，佢地對呢行既興趣又唔大...咁所以後尾呢就轉左做提供婚紗呀晚裝呀既租借服務，之後又做埋新娘靚髮形呀化妝呀婚禮花飾呀攝影等等。
A: 咁你覺得比一個工作機會比更生人士對佢地有咩好處呢？
C: Er...正如我之前所講嘅，比份工佢地係可以自力更生，自己搵錢養自己養屋企人咁。仲有，正因為社會上唔少公司都會對更生人士有成見，佢地真係唔容易搵工，唔少老細都唔太願意請佢地，咁都好現實既，理解既。所
以就係因為佢地唔易搵工，作為社企同埋因為同更生會既關係，我地希望佢地加入我地到做野之後由壞變好。喵嘅，其實佢就由青少年既時候已經群埋一班壞朋友，又唔鐘意讀書，細細個就食煙吸毒唔返屋企，好似由九十年開頭就坐過四次監。喵佢分享返佢入社會後成個都定左洛黎，有左同事啦同教會既一班姊妹就無再揾 d 毒品，亦都無時間同機會再揾返以前 d 壞朋友。Er...而且佢仲話過宜家已經習慣左返工、放工，覺得好充實，放假都唔想出街，想係屋企休息多 d。喵佢除左佢真係變好左冇再接觸果 d 壞分子，佢都話過宜家就係喺黎學到唔少新知識，亦都學習到點同人相處同人合作分工完成一件事嘅。

Er...喵嘅確係唔單止係呢個同事啦，的確有唔少，其實都好驚嘅同事，入黎都唔至緊要係佢地變好，心態上啦有咗好觀積極左，工作態度又好左做野肯學又愈黎愈細心嘅...Er...真係可以話係睇住佢地變好嘅。喵仲有既，因為其實我地係有宗教背景嘅，入黎都係做野真係比佢地 feel 到原來呢個世界上仲有愛既，有人會 care 佢地，比個肯定佢地既。

B: 咁嘅確係變好嘅。
C: 真係好感恩。
B: 咁你地公司會唔會因為用左更新人士，影響左公司形象或者生意呢？
C: 嗯...喵喺，首先喺，Er...我地公司呢又真係唔單埋利既企業，Er 社會企業呀嘛，我地其實所賺既唔係本身又真係唔埋既，而且我地既全部盈餘都係比番會去做整個有關更新人士既服務...所以呢你話如果生意呀形象呀又真係唔係真係因為佢地而影響左既...喵我話啦，可能因為我地成立既目的呀對象呀本身係係佢地為中心嘅，根本呢冇去計較左去話會唔會因為係左佢地而影響我地生意咁嘅。喵...如果佢地街外客既話都有，但唔係要佢地 offset...喵我地既 website 知道我地，更覺得我地做緊既係有義義而唔係要先我地...所以呢你話響講呢，係因為佢地因為用左更新人士，反而我地既形象又好左反而有更多生意機會添，哈哈哈...喵...不過咁啲街外客外人因為我地既員工係係過客既而驚左我地既係又真係唔喺...無得計既。

A: 咁佢可唔可以講下呢班更新人士點樣幫到你協助到你公司呢？
C: Er...喵啲三...Er...我地請佢地再黎做份人工佢地既時候呢就已經當佢地係正常人正常做得嘅野。雖然喺佢地係係係既，工作喺家庭既背景可能唔係咁好嘅，但係我地會比多 d 心機時間耐性去 train 佢地，但係做既 duty 其實一樣一係係出面公司既接待員服務員係一樣。佢地一樣係要幫手招呼下 d 客呀，出下 job、接下電話、收下錢呀，清潔下舖頭呀喵...一樣係我地都唔會特別要佢地點樣既。
C: 拿，講真啦，一 dd 喔，有 d 呢本身好有決心學好既係真係幾勤力，姐係幾肯受教呀，聽教話既，做野都企企理理既，你要佢咁做佢又真係幾勤力做好比你既嘅...Er...但係有 d 喔，少部份啦，一兩個啦本身黎既時呢真係比較負面，被動，態度同埋脾氣都真係差 d...姐係唔會諗起唔住嘅，Er...我地可能真係純粹想教下佢地野，姐係好嘅話去俾佢地聽點做點，係出於善意既，但係佢地呢就真係會唔鐘意既，覺得我地歧視呀，點呀，勝呀，咁有既，不過佢地呢佢地進步囉，由一開始話兩句會唔高興既，到宜家可能真係有 d 耐性聽下我地講嘅。咁工作表現講講，大致上都中規中距，姐係唔會講特別好差嘅。

A: 啦～佢地同同事既關係又係點既呢？

C: 嗯...佢地既關係，有一兩呢本身黎既時呢真係差 d 既，EQ 低 d 喔，脾氣唔好，佢係好識話人相處嘅...Er...唔過唔過一段時間之後呢，又真係有改善...Er...咁可能係講緊佢地會肯主動講下佢地既係，講下佢地既係屋企企野，姐係會有講有笑嘅，番工都開心既。Er...我諗最緊要係佢地屋企，佢地情形會講緊我地公司呢本身做左好耐野既老臣子呢，佢地真係好開通，佢地都好願意嘗試新入黎既姊妹，宜家大家既關係都好好，一齊番早會團拜呀咁...最重要係佢地可以係到 feel 到愛，知道大家同神都愛住大家。

B: 嗯～咁啦，你地公司其實提供左咩支援比呢班更生人士呢？

C: Er...呢層呢...嗯...因為呢我地係屬於更生會啦，講緊 d 啥對佢地既支援啦都係講緊係個會比既...嗯好似你話一 d 心理健康既輔導呀小組既個別既輔導呢都有既。去教會呀參加禮拜呀團拜呀團契呀主日崇拜呀果 d 呢都正常既，幫到佢地打開心靈咁...

B: E...佢有冇 d 系工作上呀或者家庭上既幫助呢？

C: 哦，咁呢 d 都有既...Er 講下屋企先，因為我地會呢，都係講緊我地會啦，會有一 d 活動係 for 弟兄姊妹既屋企人既...Er...可能講下點樣樣係屋企既更生人士啦。姐係作為家人要多支持呀鼓勵呀佢地...Er 因為講緊如果屋企人都唔接納佢地...社會上呢都好難有人有條件咁去幫佢地...唔所以屋企既輔導都好重要既...嗯...咁另外呢 Er...話到...Er...係工作上 Er...咁我地公司啦 Er 其實都會姐係提供工作上既訓練啦，講緊既係佢係話佢係新入黎既新同事對新同事係做野既指導，教佢地對客既 skill 灘度喎...即個會會比錢 d 妹妹去讀一 d 同工作相關既課程，不過唯數就唔多...講緊一個去學攝影啦，一個上過 d 新娘化妝呀禮儀果咁樣囉。因為始终資金唔多啦，有可能個個人黎都可以比佢地去學到既 C...所以多數都係靠平時既交流呀咁樣囉。

A: 喔嗯嗯～咁你可唔可以比 d 建議去改善同幫助更新人士揾工作既情況？

C: Er...我諗兩方邊啦...黎更新人士要有信心自信去揾工，Er 唔好怕失敗唔好驚比人歧視咁...講到呢到可能政府要立法，唔啱同係立法係加強懲罰呀同埋加強執法咗，總之呢係防止公司既隻係去歧視佢地...嗯～黎啦，另外就係話要教育下市民呀僱主呀，唔好歧視呢班人，比機會佢地咁。
B: 嗯嗯...咁你地公司有冇未來既計劃去幫更多更新人士呀？
C: Er...都唔會有咩大改變，一路都係會同會合作，睇下會會點幫佢地啱，我地做到既係可能接收多 d 會介紹既更新人士咁嘅...但係都要睇番情況，始終我地公司範圍唔大，生意盈利真係唔係話好多，Er 見到有需要既就會幫得就幫，只能做到咁。
A: E...咁你地有無諗過擴大範圍，整到可以請啲多更生人士？
C: 咁我地公司呢都擴大過嫁啦，由初初啦只係做租借婚紗呀，到近一兩年開始做埋化妝 set 頭到錄影咁...Er 我諗暫時黎會有邊 d 方面想增加，做好宜家先，因為呢...Er 社企系咁賺既錢唔多，講緊如果唔係有更生會呀弟兄姊妹既 support 呢，本身我地呢就真係好難維持...嗯所以啦宜家啦今年啦冇諗啲啲。
A: 哦明白哂。咁我地要問既係野啲多，好多謝哂你寶貴既意見同時間。唔該哂你。
Appendix 2 - Interview transcript # 4

A: Interviewer 1
B: Interviewer 2
C: Interviewee

B: 你哋而家公司有幾多個係更生人士？
C: 我哋公司有九個人更新人士有四個佢哋全部係學師仔嘅。佢哋學會
A: 咁有咩原因係令到你哋公司去雇用更新人士呢？
C: Er…其實想俾一個機會班細路仔去重過一個新嘅生活，佢哋曾經誤入歧
姐，如果佢哋肯改過嘅話其實都可以一個唔錯嘅將來 Er…佢希望可
比佢哋一個生活目標俾佢哋做佢嘅公司做髮型師，佢…其實佢唔會
18 個月俾學徒訓練佢嘅。佢可以能夠戰勝自己
克服困難，成個學徒計劃包括生活嘅紀律職業技能培訓啦…基
督信仰人生價值觀呀…冇人際關係既建立…Er…因為其實佢係一個在職
培訓所以都會出糧佢。Er…仲有同佢地都係年青人，有唔少嘅黎黎
時好似迷失咗，好似迷失左既雀仔咁，唔知將來想點做 Er…佢哋都係
唔會將來出去社會都係有得落力嘅。Er…仲有始終佢地都係年青人，有唔少嘅黎黎
時好似迷失咗，好似迷失左既雀仔咁，唔知將來想點做 Er…佢哋都係
唔會將來出去社會都係有得落力嘅。
B: 咁你會唔驚請咗更新人士會影響公司嘅生意 image 呢？
C: Er…其實生意呢個幾小時其實都幾重要嘅，但係其實都唔驚得咁多，而且我
哋公司開設咗其中一個目的呢…就係為咗履行社會嘅責任啦，同埋幫助一啲
嘅邊緣少年，佢可以可以比到市民睇到佢哋嘅知識教育係一個改過嘅心噗我
覺得佢係好事，最緊要係要大眾睇到佢哋係有總改過，其實都有好多市民佢
係特登嚟幫佢哋嘅支持一啲年青唔好，佢知道有事問你特登支持佢哋都做得
好落力嘅佢心機。
A: 咁員工點樣幫到你公司嘅？
C: 唔…喺嘅初期轉介黎個時責任感真係冇乜，我要打電話叫佢黎做……Er…
不過喺細路初頭係唔，但當佢哋有咁成功嘅時候既，佢嘅責任感呢真係
佢變好多嘅，佢都好欣賞佢嘅工作態度做起一個稱職嘅髮型師…唔…雖然佢咁初時
時又執頭執尾幫人洗下頭兼整個畀師父拎下工具，但當佢哋開始嘅時候
而喺客又讚佢嘅話佢就會好開心好落力，有喺客仲因為佢嘅現在返
轉頭幫佢。Er…好多而家係…或者之前佢係做過下野既學生，我見佢地
其實大部分係做過下野既學生，我見佢地
佢係冇多大開心，佢係冇多大開心，佢係冇多大開心，佢係冇多大開心，佢係冇多大開心
B: 咁佢哋同普通同事嘅相處同關係有冇奇怪嘅？
C: 嗯...有乜特別因為其實最尾嘅陣時已經知道佢哋有咩背景，邊個有邊過去呀，不過佢哋嘅時候自信心有啲低，成日覺得人哋睇唔起佢咁樣既...
A: 哦...咁佢兩公司仲係唔啲其他支援呢？
C: 呦....除咗教佢哋啲業務上啲知識之外呢...咁...佢哋都好睇佢哋嘅情緒我哋會比啲溝通技巧呀...同佢情緒管理啊，社交型態嘅培訓，比佢啲啦...Er...仲有對住呢班小朋友要叫多啲耐性，可能要呢幾日唔返工我哋都能量夠炒佢啦，我哋要聯絡佢們...佢哋有咩原因底下地唔可以幫到手...總之唔好似一啲大公司唔係無故抗工就炒左佢既。
B: 咁可唔可以比啲建議去幫助更新人士搵工作的情況呢？
C: 哦...其實呢個問題呢...Er...除咗要一啲老板肯請佢哋，其實老闆都要睇生意即係數字做人嘅嘛...佢數字係點來呢，係市民觀咗就有生意啦，但係點樣令到市民光顧呢個數字係點來呢，係市民光顧就有生意啦，但係點樣令到市民光顧呢個數字係點來呢，係市民光顧就有生意啦，但係點樣令到市民光顧呢個數字係點來呢，係市民光顧就有生意啦，但係點樣令到市民光顧呢個數字係點來呢，係市民光顧就有生意啦，但係點樣令到市民光顧呢個數字係點來呢，係市民光顧就有生意啦，但係點樣令到市民光顧呢個數字係點來呢，係市民光顧就有生意啦，但係點樣令到市民光顧呢個數字係點來呢，係市民光顧就有生意啦，但係點樣令到市民光顧呢個數字係點來呢，係市民光顧就有生意啦，但係點樣令到市民光顧呢個數字係點來呢，係市民光顧就有生意啦，但係點樣令到市民光顧呢個數字係點來呢，係市民光顧就有生意啦，但係點樣令到市民光顧呢個數字係點來呢，係市民光顧就有生意啦，但係點樣令到市民光顧呢個數字係點來呢，係市民光顧就有生意啦，但係點樣令到市民光顧呢個數字係點來呢，係市民光顧就有生意啦，但係點樣令到市民光顧呢個數字係點來呢，係市民光顧就有生意啦，但係點樣令到市民光顧呢個數字係點來呢，係市民光顧就有生意啦，但係點樣令到市民光顧呢個數字係點來呢，係市民光顧就有生意啦，但係點樣令到市民光顧既。
D: 咁佢哋有好多優點去值得我哋去欣賞，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢哋有變，我哋要睇佢改變睇佢有進步啦...咁所以我覺得教育市民係好重要，其實佢咾，佢同我都知啦，更新人士個形象都唔會好似一啲大公司啲無故抗工就炒左佢既。
Appendix 2 - Interview transcript # 5

A: Interviewer 1
B: Interviewer 2
C: Interviewee

A: 係，咁想問下呢…你地公司有幾多人?
C: 我地就有大約十幾人。
A: 哦，咁有幾多成係更生人士黎既呢?
C: Er…有 5 個。
B: 咁咩原因你地會去請呢 d 更生人士呢?
C: 哦…係咁既…我最初呢係真係想幫下呢班人，因為都知道佢地好難搵工…之後就有機會同 (Name of NGO) 合作，Er…加入佢地既善導僱主計劃…Er…而家參加左
呢個計劃都有幾年，一直合作開既。
A: 哦…咁你覺得比個工作機會佢地對佢地黎講有咩好處呢?
C: 多囉…哈，錢啦…一黎…我認佢份工就等於咁個機會佢地搵錢…唔好話呢班
犯過事既人呀，普通人搵錢都好難生存啦，係咪先，嗯…佢仲有就真係算比
一份關懷支持佢地…Er 始終出面 d 公司都唔係咁中意請佢地…佢地係難搵
工呢一層我地係知既…咁所以…就出面唔要佢地我地就要佢地…Er…當係
一種接納啦。
B: E…佢除左錢啦同接納佢地，仲有咩其實好處呢?
C: 哈…我地都唔會教下佢地 d skills…雖然你話可能清潔呢一
行都唔係佢係無咩技巧…Er 其實都唔係啱 d 工具呀…講緊大型果 d 清潔
車呀吸塵機呀咁…但地都要學下點樣操作，拿，我地呢就好願意教佢地呢 d
工作技能既，而佢地都大部分都好願意學習，唔都唔錯嫁。我地都睇住佢地
既工作態度改變，由好少主動到愈黎愈主動同有建設性，好幫得手，而且越
黎越有責任心。
A: 喔都唔錯喎…聽你咁講都好樂意請班更生人士，但你會唔會驚
請左佢地會影響你地公司形象或者生意呢?
C: 拿，我真係 ok 既，我自己唔會介意佢地既背景同身世…我呢…我就無咩野
既，請得番黎就真係當佢地係自己員工佢睇嫁囉。至於生意方面呢…就唔覺
得有咩影響既…唔會呀…真係唔會因為用左佢地少左單，無咩變化咁…都係
正常生意咁啦…
B: 咁形象呢? 公司形象有冇影響到呢?
C: 哈…係咁地地講真呢…本身都唔係話好大，係行內形象都正常正常，真
係唔會話請左班更生人士而衰左…真係佢…唔關事既，姐係只要我地做得好，
交貨比個客係乾淨企理既，佢地自然會再番黎，都唔係佢係咩人做，做得好就
得。

A: 咁班更生人士點協助你公司呢？
C: 都係做番清潔工人做既人，幫到我地唔少嫁。
B: 咁佢地既工作表現呢？
C: 咁錯嫁，企企理理唔喇……因為佢同其他員工一齊合作去做一張單，一個任務，可能有其他人一齊啦，做出黎既野都係好見得人，收貨啦，唔錯嫁。Er...不過我都有試過有一個真係做野麻麻既，但而家無論到做啦，佢做左唔耐，好似唔夠兩個月啦……Er…係一個中年男人黎，佢性格好嘔燥，無記錯佢好似係打架定傷人咁既，類似果 d 啦佢就真係可能係自己性格問題，做野唔係好合作同都懶既，咁 d 真係好睇個人，如果個個人本身唔想改，點比機會都有用。但呢個講緊個別例子啦，一般係我公司既都真係唔錯，我地都會好比機會佢地唔會亂抄人。如果佢地做錯左 d 現，我地都希望係教佢下次唔好咁啦要點點咁……我地會比第二次機會，第三、第四、甚至第五個機會呀。只要佢地有心想係到做，我地都會唔介意。B: 咁頭先都講到佢地係要同其他同事一齊做野，講 teamwork 咁，可唔可以再講下佢地同同事既相處關係呀係點？
C: 我見佢地都正正常常，有傾有講咁 Er…我唔係話佢已經係我地公司本身唔會 label 佢地係更生人士，我地請佢地番黎經(Name of NGO)轉介，就只有我同佢自己知，我啦，作為老闆都唔會各界唔係佢犯過事嘅人，唔好咁咁麻……我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。我地講緊個單位個同事關係，佢地都係嘅嘛。
A: 嗯咁你地公司呢？黎緊有冇咩計劃去幫呢班更生人士？
C: 公司黎緊呢…Er…就冇咩大計係呢方邊…有特別去谂點樣幫多 d，不過都係会 keep 住同 (Name of NGO) 合作，睇下佢有冇啲既人介紹黎啲…咁我都唔會介紹請多一兩個既，但始終都係要睇返市場需求呀，我盤數既…唔知嫁，好難講。
B: 好，訪問咁咁多啦，真係唔該哂你。
Appendix 2 - Interview transcript # 6

A: Interviewer 1
B: Interviewer 2
C: Interviewee

A: 你哋而家公司有幾多個係更生人士？
C: 我地公司而家有 17 個員工啦，唯有 8 個係更生人士。之前就少 D 更生人士係我地到做野既，但最近有人走就需要請人，機緣巧合之下就請多左更生人士。

B: 哦...咁有咩原因係令到你哋公司去雇用更新人士呢
C: 其實一直都好想去為社會做番一 d 野，盡番個社會責任。啲啲有機會開設啲間公司，需要人手咁我第一時間就谂起不如可以請一啲弱細社群啊。啲更生人士我哋咁想幫助的一群。因為其實都知道更新人士唔容易搵工，Er… 所以呢... 我哋希望比個職位俾俾更新人士融入社會。

A: 咁你會唔驚請咗更新人士會影響公司嘅生意 image？
C: UM……. 咁我就唔會覺得請咗更新人士會影響公司嘅生意，而我總覺得會提升公司形象 TIM。因為我哋公司佢哋需要對住客人既服務，我哋大部分員 工只需要係一間工廠入面洗碗。不過我覺得就算要對住街外既客人，我地既員 工都有問題一樣應付到，Er... 都唔會影響我哋嘅生意同形象。其實佢哋出 咁黎都係普通人一個，你同佢哋相處過就知道架喇。我係佢哋身上仲可能學 到好多平時好難接觸到既野 TIM……

B: 員工點樣幫到你公司啊？同同事關係點樣？
C: Er... 咁洗碗呢啲係好需要人手，咁請更新人士呢就可以幫我地舒緩人手壓力。佢哋呢啲係好耐力架，佢哋有時特別多野做嘅日呢我唔想佢哋超時工作佢哋都會好願意。雖然一開始佢哋覺得做去做洗碗，係抑郁性嘅工作，但真係日子耐咗，佢同啲同事有啲關係好嘅，自己又開始上手，就覺得份工都唔錯啦。佢哋話到咁好啦佢係自己洗過之後變得好乾淨都覺得好開心，有個仲做到唔肯走。佢地都話原來用勞力同汗水賺番黎既錢係咁唔容易，雖然 勸，但係得開心係有必須 WO…… 咁地同同事 FRIEND 過畀 BAND 呀，番工洗碗既時刻有傾有講，有時仲會唱歌。佢同我啲唔會阻止佢地工作時傾計 呀個 D 既，咁你知啦企成洗碗又真係好勉嫁嘛，我都想員工係輕鬆愉快咁工 作既……

A: 除咗比份工佢哋你哋公司仲提供左咩其他支援呢？
C: 咁除咗幾份工佢哋教識佢哋去工作嘅技能之外呢，咁其實我都有呢個宗教背景嘅……，所以咁我俾可以就比到佢哋既心靈上既支援啊。咁我會同佢哋傾吓計啊，都會帶啲朋友去同佢地交流。佢令到佢哋知道佢哋唔係一個人，都有其他人關懷佢地同愛佢地嫁。咁可以令佢哋知道其實佢哋佢哋起個社會係有價值嘅…… Er…我地有案底嘅員工其實都比較敏感同埋情緒起伏好大，啱啱所以我俾要俾更多嘅時間去照顧佢地啦！同埋會留意多啲佢哋情緒變化既。

如果知道佢哋因為工作而唔開心嘅話呢，我俾會同佢哋傾計啦令佢地 think positive.

B: 咁可唔唔可以比啲建議去幫助更新人士搵工作的狀況呢？
C: 嗯…，咁當然真係要有人肯請佢哋啦。其實我都希望可以請更多更生人士工作既，但而家公司啱啱上軌道，暫時未有足夠嘅資金住既。Er…但將來將來一定會有機會可以開多一間，請更多有需要既人工作。如果覺得其實媒體都應該報道下更生人士既改變佢地既需要，咁可以令市民大眾對佢哋印象都咁差啱嘅。

B: 好多謝你既時間呀，訪問完成啦，唔該哂你！
Appendix 3: Questionnaires and relevant documents (English Version)

Information Sheet and Consent Form
(For Questionnaire)

Title of the study: Reintegrating Offenders: The Role and the Effectiveness of Social Enterprise

Dear participants,

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Rainbow Cheung Kit Yan and Winnie Lai Wing Yee in the Department of Applied Social Sciences at the City University of Hong Kong. We are the current bachelor students studying in Criminology and your help will be highly appreciated.

The study titled “Reintegrating Offenders: The Role and the Effectiveness of Social Enterprise” aims to explore and investigate the reasons that lead to low employment rate among ex-offenders. Then, to discuss how social enterprises help with this problem and its effectiveness. In doing so, we would like to provide some suggestions on how social enterprise can better help ex-offenders in the future. Therefore, your opinions are very important to us and we appreciate your cooperation for finishing this questionnaire.

The questionnaire is divided into four sections. Approximate time to complete this is about 10 minutes. This questionnaire is recorded on a naked-name method that you need not to disclose your name. The collected information is used for studying purpose only and the information provided will be kept strictly confidential. Your participation is voluntary and you can withdraw the study anytime if you want. After completing the questionnaire, please give back to your shop manager/ supervisor/ the collection box assigned by us.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact the researcher Rainbow Cheung via (email: ) or Winnie Lai via (email: ).

Thank you for your cooperation!
Informed Consent Form

I have read the above information statement and understand the procedures and other information described above. I agree to complete this questionnaire with the research title “Reintegrating Offenders: The Role and the Effectiveness of Social Enterprise”.

____________________________________  ______________________
(Signature of Participant)                (Date of Participation)
Part 1. Demographic Information

1. Age ________

2. Sex
   □ Male □ Female

3. Education Level
   □ Primary school or below □ F.1 – F.3 □ F.4 – F.7
   □ Associate degree/Higher Diploma □ Degree or above

4. Marital Status
   □ Single □ Married □ Separated □ Divorced □ Widowed

5. Time in Current Job
   □ Less than 3 months □ 3-6 months □ 6-12 months
   □ 1-2 years □ 2-3 years □ more than 3 years

6. Type of Current Job
   □ Elementary occupations (e.g. cleaner, guardian, freight workers, packer)
   □ Service and sales workers (e.g. cooks, waiters, hairdressers, beauticians)
   □ Plant and machine operators and assemblers
   □ Craft and related workers (e.g. carpenter, bakers, painters; textiles, clothing)
   □ Clerical support workers
   □ Professionals/Managers/administrators
   □ Other: ____________
7. Working Hour (per week)

- □ Below 11
- □ 12-20
- □ 21-30
- □ 31-40
- □ above 40

8. Salary (per month)

- □ Below $3,000
- □ $3,001-5,000
- □ $5,001-10,000
- □ $ 10,001-15,000
- □ Above 15,000

9. Religious

- □ Catholic
- □ Christian
- □ Buddhism
- □ None
- □ Other: _____________

Part 2. Life Satisfaction

Please use a 1-7 point scale, which ranges from 1 Strongly Disagree to 7 Strongly Agree to show the degree you agree or disagree with the below 5 statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. In most ways, my life is close to my dream life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The conditions of my life are well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I feel satisfied with my life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. So far I have had the important things I want in life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. If I could live my life again, I did not want to change anything</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 3. Job Satisfaction
Please use a 1-5 point scale, which ranges from 1 Not at all Satisfied to 5 Extremely Satisfied to show the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction regarding your current occupation.

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. I get worthwhile and personal growth from my work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I am satisfied with the extent to which I can use my skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I am satisfied with my workload</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I am satisfied with overall staffing level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I am satisfied with the support available to me in my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I am satisfied with the contact I have with colleagues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I am satisfied with my opportunities I have to advance my career</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I am satisfied with my salary/pay scale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I am satisfied with the amount of job security I have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I am satisfied with the standard of service given to customers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Employment could help me to improve my family relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Employment could foster prosocial thinking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part 4. Perceptions of Ex-offender

Please read the below statement and circle a number which indicates what the degree you are agree with the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. I feel difficult to be employed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Negative Labeling hinder my employment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Negative Labeling may lead to reoffend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I am easier to be employed in social enterprises</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I can gain financial benefits from social enterprises (e.g. salary)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I can gain employment benefits from social enterprises (e.g. job skills, work experience)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I can bring positive effect to social enterprises (e.g. profit gain, improvement of company’s image)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part 5. Perceptions of Social Enterprise and Your Job

Please read the below statement and circle a number which indicates what the degree you are agree with the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. Social enterprise provide employment support to me</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Social enterprises provide me an opportunity to reintegrate back into the community</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. The job I am working help me to improve family relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Being employed in social enterprises, I am more willing to communicate with my family</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Being employed in social enterprises, I spend more time with my family</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. The job I am working help me to build up prosocial thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Being employed in social enterprises, I rarely complaint my current situation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. The job I am working help me to establish prosocial friendship with prosocial attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. I met many colleagues with prosocial attitude after being employed in the current company</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I have maintained a good relationship with colleagues with prosocial attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
End of questionnaire, Thank you for participation
Appendix 3: Questionnaires and relevant documents (Chinese Version)

研究參與者知情同意書（問卷調查）

研究項目名稱：更生人士重返社會：社會企業的角色及成效
你好，我們是香港城市大學應用社會科學系修讀犯罪學的學士學生張杰茵和黎頴怡。我們現正進行一項有關社會企業對於更生人士重返社會的學術研究，旨在探討社會企業如何幫助更生人士重投社會及其成效，從而提出可行的建議使社會企業能在將來更有效地幫助更多更生人士。
本問卷分為五部分，約需時五至十分鐘。感謝你的參與。本問卷採不記名方式，請放心收集所得的資料只作研究用途，個人資料將絕對保密。是次問卷調查參與純屬自願性質，你可自由決定是否參加本研究；研究過程中，你不需要任何理由，可隨時退出研究，且不會帶來任何不良後果。如日後你對是項研究項目或授權協議有任何查詢，請與研究員 張杰茵（電郵地址：）或 黎頴怡（電郵地址：）聯絡。
如你明白以上內容，並願意參與是項研究，請在下方簽署及填寫日期。

簽署：______________________
日期：______________________
更生人士重返社會: 社會企業的角色及成效問卷調查

(以下問題，請你選出一項最能描述你的答案，並在方格內加 ✓。)

第一部分: 基本資料
1. 年齡：___________________

2. 性別： □男 □女

3. 你的教育程度為：
   □小學及以下 □中一至中三 □中四至中七
   □副學士或高級文憑 □學士或以上

4. 你現時的婚姻狀況為：
   □未婚 □已婚 □同居 □離婚 □分居 □喪偶

5. 在現時這份工作工作了：
   □少於三個月 □三至六個月 □六至十二個月 □一至兩年
   □兩年至三年 □三年或以上

6. 現時所從事的工作類別：
   □非技術工人 (如清潔工人、看更、貨運工人、包裝工人)
   □服務工作及銷售人員 (如廚師、侍應生、理髮師、美容師)
   □機台及機器操作員及裝配員
   □工藝及有關人員 (如木匠、油漆工人、麵包師傅、紡織、成衣)
   □文書支援人員 □專業人員、經理、行政人員 □其他: __________

7. 每星期平均工作時數：
   □11 小時或以下 □12-20 小時 □21-30 小時
   □31-40 小時 □40 小時或以上

8. 現時這份工作的月薪大約為：
   □$3,000 或以下 □$3,000-5,000 □$5,001-10,000
   □$10,001-15,000 □$15,000 或以上

9. 你的宗教信仰：
   □天主教 □基督教 □佛教 □無 □其他: __________
### 第二部分: 生活滿意程度

以下句子請以 1-7 分為評核分標準，1 分非常不同意至 7 分非常同意。請圈出最適合你的答案。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>非常不同意</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>輕微不同意</th>
<th>沒有意見</th>
<th>輕微同意</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>非常同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. 很多情況下，我的生活接近我理想中的人生</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 我現時的生活條件很好</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 我滿意現時的生活</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 我已得到我人生中覺得重要的東西</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 如果我的人生可以重頭再來一次，我不會希望改變什麼事情</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
第三部分: 工作滿意程度

以下句子請以 1-5 分為評核分標準，1 分非常不滿意至 5 分非常滿意。請圈出最適合你的答案。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>非常不满意</th>
<th>不滿意</th>
<th>有些滿意</th>
<th>十分滿意</th>
<th>非常滿意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. 我從我的工作中找到價值和個人成長</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. 我很滿意我可以用我的技能</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 我很滿意我的工作量</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. 我很滿意整體人員配備的水平</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. 我很滿意我的工作提供給我的支持</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. 我很滿意我與同事的接觸</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. 我很滿意我有提昇職業生涯的機會</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. 我很滿意我的工資/薪金</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. 我很滿意我的工作有保障</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. 我很滿意提供給客戶的標準服務</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. 就業可以幫助我改善我的家庭關係</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. 就業可促進正面思維</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. 通過就業平台，可以提供機會認識正面的朋友</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
第四部分: 對自己的看法
以下句子請以 1-5 分為評核分標準，1 分非常不同意至 5 分非常同意。請圈出最適合你的答案。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>非常不同意</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>中立</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>非常同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. 我容易找到工作</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. 負面標籤阻礙我找工作</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. 負面標籤可能導致重複犯罪</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. 我較容易被社會企業聘用</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. 我可以從社會企業得到經濟好處(如工資)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. 我可以從社會企業得到就業好處(如工作技能，工作經驗)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. 我可以為社會企業帶來正面的影響(如利潤收益，提高公司形象)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 第五部分：對社會企業和你的工作的看法

以下句子請以 1-5 分為評核分標準，1 分非常不同意至 5 分非常同意。請圈出最適合你的答案。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>非常不同意</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>中立</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>非常同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>社會企業為我提供就業支援</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>社會企業令我有機會重新回到社區</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>我的工作幫助我改善家庭關係</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>被社會企業僱用，我更願意和我家人的溝通</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>被社會企業僱用，我花更多的時間與我的家人一起</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>我的工作幫助我建立親社會的正面思考</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>被社會企業僱用，我很少抱怨我目前的狀況</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>我的工作幫助我建立有親社會態度友誼</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>受僱於目前的公司讓我遇到了許多有正面態度的同事</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>我一直與同事保持著良好關係</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--------問卷完，感謝你的參與--------