

**An Evaluation Study on the Outcome of the  
Community Investment and Inclusion Fund (CIIF)**

---

**Final Report**

Re-submitted by  
Department of Applied Social Studies  
City University of Hong Kong

9 November 2012

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Background of the evaluation study**

ES 1. In the 2001 Policy Address, the Chief Executive announced the establishment of the Community Investment and Inclusion Fund (CIIF). With a mission to engender social capital, and promote reciprocity, mutual aid, social participation and social inclusion, the CIIF uses its HK \$300 million to provide seed money for cross-strata community projects initiated by community stakeholders. As at 31 December 2010, the Fund has already supported 213 local or territory-wide initiatives with an approved amount of HK \$210 million.

ES 2. For the purposes of reviewing experiences and deriving insights for way-forward development, the Government of the Hong Kong Administrative Region (HKSAR) commissions this second consultancy study to evaluate the effectiveness of the CIIF in developing social capital since its establishment in 2002.

ES 3. The research is guided by three overarching objectives set forth by the CIIF:

Objective (1):

To see whether, and in what ways, the CIIF is effective in building up the capacities of communities to address and meet local social needs, and whether the planned outcomes for the groups involved can be achieved and sustained;

Objective (2):

To identify the critical success factors that make a difference in bringing about changes at individual, between-groups and community levels; and

Objective (3):

To generate findings useful for transferring knowledge that is important in the development/promotion of social capital, to the welfare and community service sectors. The knowledge of developing/promoting social capital can enable stakeholders in these sectors to modify the future design and orientation of mainstream welfare and community programs.

### **Methodology**

ES 4. The implementation analysis approach was applied to describe, assess and explain the effectiveness of CIIF Committee, the Secretariat and the funded projects. Both quantitative and qualitative research methods were employed, and the multiple data sources created triangulation and enhanced research reliability. Data collection was twofold. The first phase was a preliminary exploration with a plenary executive survey and focus groups; the second phase was an in-depth case study of the selected projects.

- ES 5. In the first phase (from March 2011 to October 2011), 143 completed self-administered survey questionnaires were completed and collected from project leaders or project operators who had good knowledge about the project. The response rate was 67.1%. Meanwhile, 22 focus groups were conducted for funded projects (including one of them for pilot study). Altogether, 173 project stakeholders - project staffs, participants, volunteers and collaborators - participated in the discussion. Additional two and one focus groups were held for CIIF Committee and the CIIF Secretariat, respectively.
- ES 6. Involved in the second phase (from November 2011 to January 2012) of the study were 22 selected projects (including one of them for pilot study). In this stage, 368 completed stakeholder survey questionnaires were collected. The response rates for project participant / volunteer survey, project operator survey, project collaborator survey and community representation survey were 74.6%, 62.8%, 61.9% and 34.9%, respectively. To enrich the dataset for analysis, 65 individual interviewees were conducted with project participants, volunteers, operators and collaborators as research participants; 22 document reviews and 10 on-site activity observations were completed.
- ES 7. Research instruments used in this study were developed with reference to literatures and the actual operation of the CIIF. The internal consistency reliability of each of the measures was good, with most of the measures attaining a reliability coefficient ( $\alpha$ ) of .7 or above. The Version 19 of the SPSS was used to process statistical data, whereas NVivo8 was used for coding and categorizing qualitative data.

## **Integration of quantitative and qualitative analyses**

### **(a) Evaluation of the impacts of the CIIF**

#### ***Development and sustainability of social capital***

- ES 8. Consistently revealed in qualitative and quantitative findings were the effectiveness of the CIIF in developing social capital at individual, group, project, organizational and community levels. In general, the result of bonding social capital (mean=96.6) was the most significant, bridging social capital (mean=90.54) the second and linking social capital (mean=88.8) the third. These might reveal that the development of bridging and linking social capital require longer time and more efforts than bonding social capital.
- ES 9. According to the surveys of the completed CIIF projects, the sustainability of social capital at organizational level was moderately high. Operators generally agreed that the trust and mutual-help culture, social participation platforms and networks built in the projects would continue functioning after the funding period. Structural and functional sustainability were at a moderate level with means of 67.7 and 74.6 respectively. The sustainability could not be achieved without the involvement of project collaborators. The project collaborators surveyed generally expressed willingness to continue their collaboration. Shown in the collaborator survey, the structural sustainability of social capital had a mean of 71.4, whereas the functional sustainability yielded a mean of 82.5. However, both project operators and collaborators worried about the depletion of resources over time.

ES 10. According to participants/volunteers in the completed CIIF projects, the structural and functional sustainability of social capital at participant/volunteer were only marginally satisfactory with means of 46.5 and 33.6 respectively. Compared with the sustainability of bonding and bridging social capital ( $M_s = 38.4-87.1$ ), the sustainability of linking social capital was weaker ( $M = 22.0-29.7$ ). Unveiled in qualitative analyses were four adverse factors hindering the generation of linking social capital. These factors were infrequent exchanges, the short-term commitment of resources from others, busyness, and perceived social barriers from people of low socio-economic status.

### ***Re-culturing***

ES 11. Apart from the development of social capital, the CIIF also contributed to the society by instilling the social capital concepts for community betterment. Not only the organizers had benefited from this re-culturing, the collaborating organizations also recognized these values. The concepts helped stretch the scope of collaboration and encourage tripartite partnership, hence the organizations had their resources augmented from the expansion. Concerning whether the organizers and collaborating partners would continue to apply the concepts, the means of these scales were 68.1 and 73 respectively.

### ***Development of social integration models***

ES 12. Emphasizing social inclusion, the CIIF funded projects successfully developed several models of social integration. These included cross-ethnic integration, ex-mentally ill integrated with other residents in the community, cross-generational integration, and cross-sectoral integration. Among them, the first two types performed the best.

### ***Contributions to betterment of community***

ES 13. The CIIF projects were believed to have contributed to the betterment of community. Compared with the last quarter of the project operation with the earlier periods, all dimensions of community wellbeing, including social inclusion, security, hygiene, employment and happiness, had experienced a growth. The three most significant improvements were in security, hygiene and happiness which might be results of an increased social belonging.

ES 14. The CIIF-funded projects also contributed by enhancing residents' bonding, bridging and linking social capital, cultivating volunteerism in communities. For corporate social responsibility, a majority of collaborators were willing to contribute to campaigns and projects that promote the well-being of the society (mean=69), set the community's sustainable growth as one of their organizational goals (mean=68) and encourage their members to participate in network building (mean=66.7). These outcomes were perceived to be sustainable as the mean of sustainability of corporate social responsibility was at moderate level (mean=62.6).

### *Factors contributing to the development of social capital*

- ES 15. Evident in the analyses, rewarding project experiences was necessary for the development of social capital. Six domains were explored, they included psychological gain (mean=75.2), socially inclusive experience (mean=73.0), rejoicing experience (mean=72.9), participant's attendance (mean=63.1), empowerment experience (mean=60.9), and resources obtained (mean=58.4). Through the positive experiences accumulated, the participants and volunteers gradually developed skills and confidence to connect with others.
- ES 16. Projects commencing after 2006 maintained significantly higher bonding social capital ( $\beta = .205$ , which was the net standardized effect based on regression analysis that controlled for various other factors, see 4.18), social inclusion ( $\beta = .228$ ), reciprocity ( $\beta = .163$ ), social capital functional sustainability ( $\beta = .540$ ), and social capital structural sustainability ( $\beta = .410$ ) among the project participants. These findings suggested that CIIF projects, perhaps with experiences accumulated, were increasingly effective in developing social capital and its sustainability. This also implied that the CIIF learned to become better and its development was on the right track.
- ES 17. A project with a larger team size had significantly higher social inclusion ( $\beta = .141$ , see 4.18) and social capital structural sustainability ( $\beta = .226$ ) and functional sustainability ( $\beta = .256$ ) in the project participant. These findings suggested the merit of economies of scale in expediting social capital development through the pooling of human resources in the project. This affirmed that staffing size (staff, in this context, included the paid staff supported by the CIIF and those staff who worked on a voluntary basis) was helpful for social capital development and optimizing the size within budget constraint would be a clue to successful social capital development.
- ES 18. Projects attached to a unit with more staffs showed pervasive advantages in social capital development. Accordingly, the project attained significantly higher bridging social capital ( $\beta = .392$ , see 4.21), linking social capital ( $\beta = .339$ ), community social capital ( $\beta = .240$ ), volunteerism ( $\beta = .344$ ), reciprocity ( $\beta = .367$ ), civility ( $\beta = .375$ ), and strength realization ( $\beta = .367$ ) among the project participants. In addition, such projects showed a significantly lower expectation for public assistance in the project participant ( $\beta = -.428$ ). These findings purported the strength of the economies of scale getting the staff support from the service unit for social capital development. That is, securing support from the service unit to which the project attached itself was favorable to social capital development. Importantly, this was a factor about service unit size, not the size of the whole organization. This meant that a large organization, especially that with dispersed staffing, would not have such an advantage in social capital development
- ES 19. Projects that had operated for a longer time exhibited significantly higher bridging social capital ( $\beta = .128$ , see 4.18), volunteerism ( $\beta = .219$ ), civility ( $\beta = .195$ ), role transformation ( $\beta = .107$ ), and social capital functional sustainability ( $\beta = .227$ ) among the project participants. These findings affirmed that time was a factor of success. This implies that keeping the project to run for a longer time was a key to successful social

capital development. Indeed, it takes time for relationships built in the projects to transform into a part of daily lives.

- ES 20. Projects having completed for a longer time displayed significantly lower structural and functional sustainability in social capital generally ( $\beta = -.634$  &  $-.725$ , see 4.21). Nevertheless, the decline was not significant concerning the sustainability of social capital involving fellow project participants. The findings suggested that time was an important but not decisive factor for the decline of the sustainability of social capital among project participants. Conversely, projects that had multiple phases were significantly higher in the functional sustainability of social capital ( $\beta = .297$ , see 4.22). Multiple phasing had nonetheless no significant effect on the structural sustainability of social capital generally and sustainability concerning fellow participants. Hence, support for multiple phasing in projects might be a way to uphold functional sustainability, but not structural sustainability.
- ES 21. Projects of a social service organization displayed significantly higher bonding social capital ( $\beta = .322$ , see 4.27), bridging social capital ( $\beta = .145$ ), community social capital ( $\beta = .145$ ), trust ( $\beta = .266$ ), volunteerism ( $\beta = .322$ ), social capital capacity ( $\beta = .332$ ), civility ( $\beta = .181$ ), and reciprocity ( $\beta = .256$ ). Hence, such projects had a pervasive advantage in social capital development. The findings suggested that the social service organization had expertise (knowledge, skills and experiences) and resources (manpower, money or space) conducive to social capital development. The results, while not excluding other types of organization, favored the expertise and resources of social service organizations for operating CIIF projects.
- ES 22. Projects whose collaborator was a social service organization had significantly higher bonding social capital ( $\beta = .107$ , see IV.29), community social capital ( $\beta = .188$ ), trust ( $\beta = .262$ ), and happiness ( $\beta = .188$ ) among the project participants. These findings showed that collaborating with a social service organization might have relevant expertise that was helpful to social capital development and well-being maintenance. This implied that collaboration with other social service organizations merits promotion.

### **(b) Appraisal of effectiveness of social capital strategies**

#### ***Effectiveness of social capital strategies at CIIF Committee and the Secretariat level***

- ES 23. Eight social capital strategies employed by the CIIF Committee and the Secretariat were identified. At community level, there were (1) achieving initial success in promoting the CIIF to wider public, and (2) transferring knowledge across organizations. At project level, there were (3) sowing quality seed by selecting projects with good potential, (4) promotion of corporate social responsibility, (5) maximizing gains from diversity, (6) bridging resources, and (7) coaching the projects for re-culturing, and (8) managing the operation of projects by reviewing documents and field visits.
- ES 24. Following the discussions of the effectiveness of these approaches were the recommendations:

- 24.1. Continue the endeavor to promote the social capital concepts and models to the wider public and invite organizations with different natures to participate for matching.
- 24.2. Help inculcating a new interpretation of CSR to the society. The encouraged behaviors included active participation, long-term commitment, taking initiative to start conversion and build relationships with people from different backgrounds.
- 24.3. Organize more district-based events to allow local stakeholders to sit around and discuss the possible ways to harness existing local resources.
- 24.4. To further strengthen the knowledge transfer by: a) develop a schedule of knowledge transfer functions at an earlier time; b) prepare more materials for project staff's reference which could be shared to others; c) face-to-face communication between CIIF and project staffs to facilitate mutual understanding about their concerns and constraints.
- 24.5. Consider different orientations and options when stretching projects' creativeness.
- 24.6. Base upon the existing social capital outcomes indicators to further develop data collection tools that can gauge the performance of funded projects, and to collect data overtime for longitudinal study.

***Effectiveness of social capital strategies at project level***

- ES 25. In the operation of the CIIF projects, one of the major challenges was to recruit participants, volunteers and collaborators from diverse backgrounds. Recruitment approaches encompassed recruitment via institutions and recruitment from project stakeholders' ecological systems. It was also important to ensure stakeholders' capability and availability.
- ES 26. Revealed in the Plenary Executive Survey was the effectiveness of the social identity approach and the sustainability-maintenance approaches. More project strategies were explored in the Case Study and eight of them were found to be more effective in generating social capital outcomes. They were functional sustainability strategy, staff empowerment strategy, emulation strategy, staff linking strategy, staff bonding strategy, involvement strategy, bridging strategy and institutional strategy. These interventions were positively related to project participant's resilience, happiness, trust, bonding social capital, civility, social capital structural sustainability, role enhancement, and strength realization.
- ES 27. Following discussion on project strategies were recommendations for recruitment of project stakeholders and for project operation:

***Recommendations for recruitment of project stakeholders***

- 27.1. Mobilize organizers' existing social networks and develop plans to engage more organizations and volunteer groups with a larger pool of human resources, and individuals, especially retired professionals and homemakers.
- 27.2. In recruiting more collaborators, place the long-term network building, win-win outcomes and balance of power as the centre of focus and practice principles.
- 27.3. Be flexible and respect the collaborators' values, constraints and limitation in order to facilitate their participation (e.g. homemakers).
- 27.4. Assess the availability and capability of different community stakeholders and their resources with needs.
- 27.5. Develop the teams to harness the power of the "word of mouth" and create the snowball effect.

***Recommendations for project operation:***

- 27.6. Facilitate all the project stakeholders to equip themselves with good knowledge about social capital.
- 27.7. Maximize coordination and communicate clear goals to all involved groups to develop mutual understanding and solidarity as well as collective wisdom for more feasible approaches and practices.
- 27.8. Solicit support from management and other integral units, especially in preparing necessary resources (including financial) and organizational setting for project sustenance.
- 27.9. Keep track of project development and provide adequate support to the volunteers and collaborators.
- 27.10. Encourage the participants and volunteers to develop relationships that persist beyond the project operation.
- 27.11. Help project participants to remove the perceived social gap to build linking social capital.
- 27.12. Transform assisted social capital into natural social capital.

**(c) Corporate social responsibility and social enterprise**

***Corporate social responsibility***

- ES 28. In all, involved stakeholders welcomed the concept as they saw it as a win-win strategy to enhance business' sustainability. One principle of the implementation of CSR was the balance of power of parties involved.



### *Social enterprise*

ES 29. Social capital was perceived to be an integral asset for the success of social enterprises. The networks, on one hand, offered human resources and brainpower for service management; and on the other hand, they also provided a steady flow of customers and an opportunity to reach and maintain contact with target service groups.

#### **(d) Critical success factors**

ES 30. Critical factors affecting the engenderment of social capital were explored. Tested in the Plenary Executive Survey were the eight success factors identified earlier by the CIIF – (1) enthusiasm of the agency (mean=81); (2) responsiveness to local needs (mean=78.8); (3) recognition of the concepts promoted by the CIIF (mean=77.9); (4) ability to break down organizational barriers, mobilize community resources, secure ownership from partners, and build mutual help networks (mean=76.1); (5) maximization of strengths of local networks (mean=76.1); (6) willingness to try new strategies (mean=73.9); (7) clear mindset shifts from providing services to developing the strengths and giving potentials of even the most marginalized groups (mean=73.5); and (8) clear focus on social capital outcomes (mean=68.3) The overall mean of these items was 75.7, which was of satisfactory level.

#### *Enthusiasm of the agency*

ES 31. Results have suggested that having quality project staffs was even more important than having a large organization to be organizer. Passion of staff, on one hand, could motivate other stakeholders to contribute and sustain the team; and on the other hand, could retain the staffs in the projects and stabilize the workforce.

#### *Responsiveness to local needs*

ES 32. To solicit supports from local organizations and local community members, it was of importance to identify and address the common concerns.

#### *Recognition of concepts promoted by the CIIF*

ES 33. The understanding and recognition of social capital concepts from all project stakeholders are found to be vital for the development of social capital. Hence, the project staffs not only need to have a good grasp of the ideas, but they are also responsible for the knowledge transfer and re-culturing. The key concepts here include trust, mutual help, and committing for long-term relationship.

#### *Development and mobilization of community resources*

ES 34. The availability of local networks was found to be critical for project development. Organizers who had their own local networks with volunteers and local organizational partners before the commencement of projects were much more likely to succeed in

developing social capitals, as these connections saved time in recruiting project stakeholders. For social capitals to sustain, the relationships built in the process had to be mature enough to be incorporated into daily lives, so that it could be maintained even without further interventions of the projects. For cultivating its maturity, it was necessary to have a 'base' for project stakeholders to meet and deepen their relationships.

### ***Willingness to try new strategies***

ES 35. Upholding the principle of creativity, the CIIF encouraged the funded projects to try new strategies and expand their service scope. The willingness to explore has brought the CIIF a success in developing various indigenous social capital development models. Although this stretching had its advantages, over-stretching caused burden to the project leaders and operators, and sometimes, a new service was provided at the expense of the old one. Hence, it is suggested to instill more flexibility in project design. Instead of requesting all projects to expand their service scope to serve new targets, the projects might further develop by deepening relationships built in projects, especially when bridging and linking social capitals require more time to develop.

### ***Mindset changes***

ES 36. The concepts promoted by the CIIF challenged all the project stakeholders to change. While the participants and volunteers were empowered and encouraged to step out from their comfort zones to contribute to the society, the projects staffs also need to let go of their privileged role of service provider and focus on training the volunteers to steer the projects, leading to an equal relationship among all stakeholders.

### ***Clear focus on social capital outcomes***

ES 37. Merely providing a platform for cross-strata interactions did not guarantee development of social capitals. Projects had to set clear common goal and focus the attention on network building. Interactions among project stakeholders with different backgrounds had to be promoted. To guard the development, regular progress review was also necessary.

### **(e) Identification of good practice model**

ES 38. Synthesizing research results to formulate good practice model - Capacity Building Model. The objective of it is to provide disadvantaged social groups with opportunities to participate in the community and build networks through service provision. Social inclusion is promoted through the alleviation of marginalization and stigmatization. Practice examples of this model on disadvantaged groups are provided.

ES 39. Apart from the Capacity Building Model, we also identified some working guidelines which concern business sector, child and family, and neighbourhood. These guidelines expounded the social capital development practices on social groups, aside from the disadvantaged ones.

#### **(f) Development of social capital outcome indicators**

ES 39. Social capital outcomes indicators were identified from the quantitative data collection tools. All these indices passed the concurrent validity and internal consistency reliability tests. It is suggested to use a five-point scale to administer the assessment. The higher the score, the better the result. Altogether, there were 40 items, with 19 of them concerning assisted social capital in the CIIF-funded projects, and 21 of them concerning social capital in the community (see section 4.F).

### **(g) LD-CIIF Projects**

ES 40. A separate preliminary study is conducted for the nine LD-CIIF projects. These projects aimed to motivate disadvantaged youths and equip them with employability skills, so that they could have capabilities, confidence and opportunities to engage with other community stakeholders.

#### ***Achievements of the LD-CIIF projects***

ES 41. The quantitative and qualitative analyses both affirmed the development of bonding, bridging and linking social capitals in the LD-CIIF projects. As the young people came to open themselves up for building friendship with peers, they also developed connectedness with mentors and employers. Through training for employability skills and social skills, the values and capabilities of these young people were also enhanced.

ES42. The young people were not the only beneficiaries. The mentors, trainers and employers in the LD-CIIF projects also saw their own rewards. These attainments included satisfaction derived from overcoming challenges, generativity, training up professionals to meet market needs, volunteer work done by the participants, and self-reflection that stimulated their personal development.

ES 43. Through these interactions with the once marginalized groups, the community stakeholders who participated in the projects soon realized the potential and strengths of the non-engaged youths, thus developed more understanding and acceptance of them. This promotion of social inclusion was a significant achievement of the LD-CIIF projects in improving community wellbeing.

#### ***Limitations faced by the LD-CIIF projects***

ES 44. Compared with non-LD-CIIF projects, the development of participants' social capital was slightly less effective. Given their mission to develop disadvantaged youths, most of the resources were usually allocated to skill training. The competing foci inevitably undermine the effectiveness of developing social capital and motivating the non-engaged young people was no easy task. It required a long-term investment to yield a little. With such a challenge, the capacity of these projects was only able to cater to a few; therefore, their positive externalities to the society were hindered. Meanwhile, the high dropout rate and the limited resources owned by the young people also exacerbated the situation.

#### **Thoughts on future development**

ES 45. The study confirmed that, with appropriate strategies, the CIIF projects have successfully promoted social capital, capacities communities and of individuals, community well-being, pro-social attitudes, corporate social responsibility as well as social integration among different social groups. Recent years, Hong Kong is facing increasing social

tension and threats to social cohesion. They are the issues that require the CIIF to conciliate, in order to safeguard social integration and cohesion.

ES46. The effectiveness of the Fund has been confirmed again in the current round of evaluation. In view of the contribution of the Fund and the social capital projects in promoting social cohesion and integration in Hong Kong, the government can consider regularizing the Fund to demonstrate its commitment to this type of initiative.

ES 47. The evaluation of the LD-CIIF projects demonstrated that a concerted effort between government departments could generate very positive effects on both social and human capital. Collaboration among departments and units involved is desirable.

ES48. In the near future, as discussed in above, there are several aspects for the Fund and the projects to work on to advance its current level of achievements.

- a) The Secretariat can further strengthen its role as a facilitator and enabler to support the projects and in public education.
- b) The Fund can consider providing extended funding support to projects capable to the development of linking and bridging social capital beyond three years, as the development of these require a longer time span.
- c) The project has to put emphasis on the common goals and equality among all stakeholders to reduce the perceived social gaps, promote equality and long-term commitment from the participating companies and professional groups, which will be conducive to the sustainable development of the project.

## 研究摘要

### 研究背景

摘要 1. 行政長官在《二零零一年施政報告》中宣佈成立社區投資共享基金。基金旨在建立社會資本，提倡互惠互助，推動各界參與社區發展及共融。爲了支持由社區持份者主導的跨界別社區計劃，基金利用其三億元的撥款，爲它們提供種子基金。截至二零一零年十二月三十一日，基金已經資助了二百一十三個地區性或全港性的計劃，總金額約二億一千萬元。

摘要 2. 爲總結過往經驗以幫助籌劃基金未來的發展，香港特別行政區政府委託顧問進行是次研究，以評估基金自二零零二年成立至今在社會資本發展方面的成效。

摘要 3. 本研究乃依據基金訂定的三個目標而進行：

目標一：

了解社區投資共享基金於建立社區力量及回應地區需要方面的有效度，並評估預期目標的達標率及延展性

目標二：

發掘促使個人、社群及社區改變的關鍵因素

目標三：

結集社會資本發展及推廣的重要經驗，將知識傳遞至福利界及社區服務組織。這些學問將有助優化服務及引導主流服務計劃的發展方向。

### 研究設計

摘要 4. 本研究採用了計劃推行分析法 (implementation analysis approach) 去描述、評估及分析基金委員會、秘書處及資助計劃的成效。爲了確保分析的整全性，我們同時用了量性和質性的研究方法去搜集資料，以多元驗證的原則去提升討論的可靠性。資料搜集過程共分兩個階段。第一階段包括計劃執行員問卷調查和聚焦小組訪問，第二階段是深入的個案分析。

摘要 5. 在第一階段的調查中(由 2011 年 3 月至 2011 年 10 月)，我們共搜集得 143 份由計劃負責人或計劃統籌員自行填寫的計劃執行員問卷，回應比率是 67.1%。除了問卷調查，我們亦與 22 個計劃進行了聚焦小組訪問 (其中一個計劃用作先導試驗)。計劃受訪者包括負責員工、參加者、義工和合作伙伴，共 173 人。此外，我們又分別爲基金委員會安排了兩次及爲基金的秘書處安排了一次小組訪問。

- 摘要 6. 第二階段的個案研究工作 (由 2011 年 11 月至 2012 年 1 月)，資料乃搜集自另外 22 個基金計劃，當中亦有一個計劃用作先導試驗。我們共收集得 368 份持份者問卷。計劃參加者/義工問卷、計劃員工問卷、計劃合作伙伴問卷及社區代表問卷的回應率分別為 74.6%、62.8%、61.9% 及 34.9%。同時，我們又訪問了 65 計劃參加者、義工、員工及合作伙伴，並完成了 22 個文字紀錄分析及 10 個活動觀察。
- 摘要 7. 此調查所採用的量表是參考當代文獻和基金運作所設計的。整理及分析資料時，我們選用了 SPSS 18 進行量性分析，並以 NVivo8 處理質性資料的編碼和分類。量表內的題目有良好的內部統一性，大部份的信度指數達到 0.7 或以上的程度。

## 綜合研究結果

### (a) 評估基金的效益

#### *建立及延續社會資本*

- 摘要 8. 根據搜集的資料顯示，基金在個人、社群、計劃、機構和社區層面上都建立了社會資本。整理來說，膠合型社會資本 (平均數為 96.6) 的發展最為顯著，其次是搭橋型的社會資本 (平均數為 90.5)，繼而是連結型社會資本 (平均數為 88.8)。要建立搭橋型的社會資本及連結型社會資本，可能需要一個較長的時間及更大的努力。
- 摘要 9. 根據對終結的資助計劃的調查，機構層面的社會資本延續性是略高的。計劃員工一般認同計劃內的互助互信文化、所建立的公眾參與平台及網絡會於資助完結後維持運作。在問卷調查的結果中，結構性及功能性的延展能力的表現不俗，平均分數為 67.7 及 74.6。這些成功實有賴於合作伙伴的支持，其結構性及功能性的延展能力分別為 71.4 及 82.5。對於計劃員工及合作伙伴來說，他們的最大的憂慮乃是資源將隨年日的過去至逐漸消磨。
- 摘要 10. 根據終結的受資助計劃參加者或義工的回應，參加者及義工的社會資本的延展能力未如理想。結構性及功能性延展能力的平均分數只有 46.5 及 33.6。與膠合型社會資本及搭橋型的社會資本比較 (平均為 38.4 到 87.1)，連結型社會資本的延續性較弱 (平均為 22.0 到 29.7)。從質性研究分析中，我們可略見延續連結型社會資本的四個挑戰 - 疏於溝通、資源的短期供應、生活繁忙及心理上的隔閡。

#### *改變文化*

- 摘要 11. 除了建立社會資本外，社區投資共享基金亦透過傳遞社本資本概念去改善社會。不但計劃主辦機構得了益處，其他參與計劃的機構也看到其意念的價值。這些社本資本概念拉闊了機構間的限制，鼓勵了多元合作，欲致各參與團體均能從新的合作模式中共享了更多的資源。主辦機構及合作伙伴時繼續沿用社本資本概念的平均分數為 68.1 及 73。

## 建立社會共融模式

摘要 12. 基金致力促進社會共融，並成功建立了多個社會融合模式。這些模式包括跨種族共融，精神病康復者與居民間的共融，跨代共融，和跨界別共融。當中以前二者的表現最為傑出。

## 對社區發展的貢獻

摘要 13. 基金計劃實對社區發展作出了貢獻。與較早時期相比，基金計劃服務的社區於社會共融、社區安全、社區衛生、就業情況及開心指數等社區健康方面都得著改善。其中，進步最大的是社區安全、衛生及開心程度。這些結果可能反映出區民對社區增強了歸屬感。

摘要 14. 基金計劃同時亦建立了居民的膠合型、搭橋型及連結型社會資本，提昇區內的義工參與度。另外，就提昇公司的社會企業責任來說，大部份的合作伙伴都表示願意繼續「支持改善社區健康的活動(平均數為 69)」、「以社區的持續發展為公司的發展方向之一(平均數為 68)」及鼓勵公司成員參加建立網絡的工作(平均數為 66.7)」。這些意願具一定的延展能力，平均效度為 62.2。

## 影響社會資本建立的因素

摘要 15. 計劃內的正面經驗有助建立社會資本。這些經驗可從六個層面去探討，他們分別是心靈的滿足(平均數為 7502)，被接納的經驗(平均數為 73.0)，愉快經歷(平均數為 72.9)，參加者的參與(平均數為 63.1)，充權的經驗(平均數為 60.9)及獲得資源(平均數為 58.4)。透過這些累積的正面經驗，計劃參加者及義工的技能及信心得以提昇，有助結交新朋友。

摘要 16. 結果顯示 2006 年以後開展的基金計劃較能夠建立膠合型社會資本( $\beta = .205$ )、改變社會共融( $\beta = .228$ )、提昇互助能力( $\beta = .163$ )及社會資本的功能性( $\beta = .540$ )和結構性( $\beta = .410$ )延展能力。這些結果揭示隨著經驗的累積，基金比前更能夠有效地建立及延續社會資本。這持續的進步見證著基金已走上正確的發展路線。

摘要 17. 結果顯示愈大的服務團隊愈能夠推動社會共融( $\beta = .141$ )及強化計劃參加者的結構性延展能力( $\beta = .187$ )，以及社會資本的結構( $\beta = .226$ )和功能的延展力( $\beta = .256$ )。這些結果揭示人力資源(包括利用基金資助聘請的員工反和義務協助的同事)充足的好處，並鼓勵計劃機構應盡量利用資源去組織有效的團隊。

摘要 18. 結果顯示計劃的所屬單位愈大愈有助建立搭橋型( $\beta = .392$ )及連結型( $\beta = .339$ )社會資本。同時，它對提昇計劃參加者的社區社會資本、義工參與度( $\beta = .334$ )、互助性( $\beta = .367$ )、公民心( $\beta = .375$ )、能力的建立( $\beta = .367$ )都有幫助。與此同時，



這些計劃的參加者一般都愈少期望會得到公共援助。這些結果再一次肯定規模經濟的效用，證明人力資源較多的單位愈能夠建立社會資本。要注意的是這些結果並不指出較大規模的機構對社會資本的建立會有較大的優勢，要緊的乃是人力資源的投放。

摘要 19. 結果顯示運作時間較長的計劃愈能夠有效地建立搭橋型社會資本( $\beta = .128$ )、並提昇義工參與度( $\beta = .219$ )、公民心( $\beta = .195$ )、角色轉化( $\beta = .107$ )及及功能性延展能力( $\beta = .227$ )。這些結果揭示出持續運作對建立及延續社會資本的重要性。畢竟，要將計劃建立的關係轉化為生活的一部份是需要時間的。

摘要 20. 完結較久的計劃，社會資本的結構性和功能性延展能力顯著較低 ( $\beta = -.634$  &  $-.725$ , 參考 4.21)。然而，對於計劃參加之間的社會資本的延展能力，並沒有顯著下降。這結果顯示時間對計劃參加者之間的社會資本的延展能力，是重要但並非決定性因素。相對地，多期延伸的計劃的社會資本有顯著較高的功能性延展能力 ( $\beta = .297$ , 參考 4.22)。多期延伸對於結構性延展能力和參加之間的的社會資本的延展能力，則沒有顯著作用。故此，對計劃多期延伸的支持，會增進功能性延展能力，但並非結構性延展能力。

摘要 21. 結果顯示由社會服務界主辦的基金計劃較能夠有效地建立膠合型社會資本( $\beta = .322$ , 參考 4.27)、搭橋型社會資本( $\beta = .145$ )及社區社會資本( $\beta = .145$ )，並提昇信任度( $\beta = .266$ )、義工參與度( $\beta = .322$ )、社會資本能力( $\beta = .332$ )、公民心( $\beta = .181$ )、及互助( $\beta = .256$ )。這些結果揭示社會服務界擁有專業知識(知識、技能及經驗)及資源(人手、金錢及地方)去建立社會資本，但這並不表示其他行業欠缺建立社會資本的能力。

摘要 22. 結果顯示以社會服務機構為合作伙伴的計劃更能有效地建立膠合型社會資本( $\beta = .107$ )及社區社會資本( $\beta = .188$ )，並提昇信任度( $\beta = .107$ )及開心指數( $\beta = .188$ )。這些結果揭示計劃可藉與社會服務機構的合作，善用它們的專業知識去建立及維持社會資本。這合作的模式是值得鼓勵的。

## (b) 計估基金的社會資本策略的成效

### 基金委員會及秘書處的社會資本策略

摘要 23. 基金委員會及秘書處採用了六個社會資本策略。社區層面的策略有：(1) 利用媒體，向公眾推廣社會資本的概念和模式和 (2) 推動機構之間互相學習。計劃層面的策略包括：(3) 挑選具有潛質的計劃、(4) 推廣企業社會責任、(5) 增加計劃持份者的多元性、(6) 聯繫社區資源和 (7) 指導計劃如何改變工作文化及 (8) 以覆核計劃的工作文件及探訪去管理計劃的發展。

摘要 24. 就基金委員會及秘書處的社會資本策略，我們提出以下建議：

- 24.1. 繼續積極推廣社會資本的概念和模式至普羅大眾，並邀請不同性質的機構參與其中以進行資源配對。
- 24.2. 向社會灌輸「企業社會責任」的價值觀。鼓勵各方積極參與、長時間投入社區發展、主動打開話匣子與不同背景人士建立關係。
- 24.3. 組織更多地區性的活動，聚集區內的持份者，讓他們一起討論善用地區資源的方法。
- 24.4. 鼓勵更多知識的交流：(a) 預先訂立基金活動的時間表，使受資助計劃的員工有更多時間準備參與其中、(b) 計劃員工出席交流活動時，為他們準備筆記及相關資料，好讓他們能夠與其他同事分享活動心得、(c) 多與計劃員工親身接觸，增進了解，謀求共識。
- 24.5. 拓展計劃的創意度時，須以彈性去考慮不同的向道及選擇。
- 24.6. 利用本研究提出的社會資本成效量表作為基礎去研發更合適的資料搜集工具，評估各計劃的表現及搜集資料供日後作跨時段的研究。

### 涉及社會資本發展的策略

摘要 25. 在基金計劃運作的過程裡，機構面對的一大挑戰是要招募背景各異的計劃參加者、義工及合作伙伴，以建立多樣化的計劃團隊。質性研究資料就此綜合了兩個建議——一方面，計劃可以與其他機構合作，從他們的網絡中招牌計劃持份者；另一方面就是從計劃持份者的人際網絡中進行招募。參與者除了要具有才能，更要有時間可以出席活動。

摘要 26. 計劃執行員問卷的分析肯定了「建立社區身份策略」及「維持延伸性策略」的效用。在個案研究中，更多的策略被加入問卷內。當中，功能性延展策略、員工充權策略、仿倣策略、員工連結策略、員工膠合策略、共同參與策略、搭橋策略及機構模式策略這八個方法有較顯著的表現。因著這些介入方法，計劃致能提昇參加者的抗逆力、開心指數、信任度、公民感、角色轉化及技能應用；同時，增強了社會資本的結構性可持續度。

摘要 27. 因應計劃策略的討論，我們就招募持份者及計劃運作提出以下建議：

### 針對招招募計劃持份者的建議

- 27.1. 動員機構已有的社會網絡，並網羅更多合作伙伴、義工團體及獨立單位。退休的專業人士及家庭照顧者較為彈性，有較多時間參與義工服務。
- 27.2. 以建立長遠的社會網絡作為計劃發展的重心。計劃團隊與合作伙伴建立平等地位，以互惠雙贏作為共同目標。
- 27.3. 尊重及具彈性地處理彼此的差異，嘗試瞭解和接納合作伙伴的價值觀及限制。
- 27.4. 評估社區內各方持份者的能力及參與時間，把他們的資源跟區內的需要進行配對，互補不足。
- 27.5. 鼓勵團隊為計劃建立「口碑」，帶動雪球效應，吸引更多人參與計劃。

## 對計劃運作的提議

- 27.6. 促使計劃持份者掌握社會資本概念
- 27.7. 訂定明確的目標，並向各計劃持份者清晰交代，讓大家互相了解，促進團結。群策群力，構思更多可行的方案和模式。
- 27.8. 爭取管理層及其他核心成員的支持以預備充足的資源、延展計劃所須的工作架構。
- 27.9. 跟進計劃的發展，並為參加計劃的義工和合作伙伴提供足夠的協助。
- 27.10. 鼓勵計劃參加者和義工建立長遠的關係。
- 27.11. 協助參加者除去格格不入的憂慮。
- 27.12. 轉化協助型社會資本為日常社會資本

## (c) 與社會資本相關的課題

### 企業社會責任

摘要 28. 作為香港社會企業責任的其中一名先導者，基金開了一道寬闊的門戶讓不同類型、大小各異的機構參與其中，以致社會各界的組織有機會實踐及履行企業社會責任。

### 社會企業

摘要 29. 社會資本被視為建立社會企業的基石。透過結網，機構不但可以獲得人力資源及集思廣益的好處；同時，又可以取得客源及接觸服務對象的機會。

## (d) 發掘基金計劃的成功關鍵

摘要 30. 計劃執行員問卷錄用了基金早前提出的 8 個成功因素去探討它們的重要性 - (1) 主辦機構的熱誠參與 (平均數為 81)、(2) 回應社區的需要 (平均數為 78.8)、(3) 對社區投資共享基金理念的正面認同 (平均數為 77.9)、(4) 打破機構之間的隔膜，動員社區資源，尋求伙伴的積極參與及建立互助網絡的能力 (平均數為 76.1)、(5) 充份利用本土網絡的力量 (平均數為 76.1)、(6) 願意嘗試新的策略 (平均數為 73.9)、(7) 框架由以服務為主導，轉為發掘及發展最邊緣社群的潛能，讓他們發揮主動互助的能力 (平均數為 73.5) 及 (8) 訂定清晰的社會資本成效目標 (平均數為 68.3)。八項題目的平均值為 75.7，這乃屬於中等程度。

### 主辦機構的熱誠參與

摘要 31. 研究結果指出，一個擁有優質員工的團隊較一個大規模的機構來得有效。計劃員工的熱誠參與一方面能夠激動其他計劃持份者，另一方面，工作的滿足感能夠讓員工堅持工作，維持團隊的穩定性。

## **回應社區的需要**

摘要 32. 爲了取得區內機構及社區成員的支持，計劃需要找出及回應大家的共同關注點。

## **對社區投資共享基金理念的正面認同**

摘要 33. 各計劃持份者社會資本概念的理解及支持對建立社會資本實爲重要。因此，計劃員工不但需要對概念有充分的認識，同時，他們需要承擔起傳遞知識及改變文化的使命。社會資本概念包括信任、互助及建立長期關係。

## **建立及動員社區資源**

摘要 34. 要基金計劃能夠順利開展，計劃機構需要擁有自己的地區機構網絡及義工網絡，以省卻時間去招募計劃持份者。要讓社會資本繼續延展，一個重要的關鍵是要讓這些在計劃內建立的關係深化，漸漸變爲生活的一部份。即使基金計劃沒有的參與，這些關係仍能自然地發展下去。在這過程中，計劃的持份者需要有一個地方聚集，讓關係隨著交往而進深。

## **願意嘗試新的策略**

摘要 35. 著眼於創新突破，基金積極鼓勵基金計劃去嘗試新的策略及拓展新的服務領域。這份願意嘗試的精神讓基金成功建立了多個具原創性的社會資本發展模式。著重創固然有其好處，可是當計劃過份擴充，那便會爲計劃領袖及執行員帶來沈重的壓力。有時候，爲了要滿足創新要求，計劃員工迫不得已要放棄原有的服務去拓展新的嘗試。有見過份擴充的壞處，我們建議需要在計劃設計的層面上多加一點彈性。與其開展新服務，計劃可考慮深化計劃中建立的關係。畢竟，建立搭橋型社會資本及連結型的社會資本是需要時間的。

## **思維模式的轉化**

摘要 36. 社會資本的概念推動各計劃持份者作出轉變。一方面，計劃參加者及義工增加了有能感，以致有勇氣踏出自己的安全地帶去貢獻社會。另一方面，計劃員工也需要脫去服務提供者的身份，集中培訓義工成爲計劃的當家，建立平等的關係。

## **訂定清晰的社會資本成效目標**

摘要 37. 單爲背景不同的持份者提供交流平台並不一定能夠促成社會資本的建立。計劃需要定下清晰的目標，將注意力集中在建立網絡上，並同時促進大家的互動。爲了確保計劃正順著既定的發展方向，我們建議設定期的回顧。

### **(e) 社會資本發展模式**

摘要 38. 我們從研究的成果的整合，整理出一個社會資本發展模式 – 力量建立模式。它旨在為社區內的弱勢社群提供服務社區的機會，從而提高他們的社會參與度，建立人際網絡。透過減低社會的邊緣化及標籤化問題，增強社區的融合。發展模式的宗旨、社會資本的建立過程及可能面對的挑戰都已在內文詳列。

摘要 39. 除了社區力量建立模式外，我們也提出了一些發展要點幫助商界、兒童及家庭和鄰舍。這些要點相信能夠補充以上「力量建立模式」的不足，為弱勢社群以外的群體提供建立社會資本的實用參考資料。

## **(f) 建構客觀及可量度的社會資本成果指標**

摘要 40. 社會資本成果指標由本研究的量性量表演變出來。所列的題目均通過併行信度及內部統一性的測試。應用時，我們建議用 5 分量表。分數愈高表示社會資本的成果愈大。指標內共有 40 條題目，當中 19 條量度基金計劃內的協助型社會資本，另外 21 條則量度社區內的社會資本 (請見 4.F)。

## **(g) 「新紮創奇職」計劃**

摘要 41. 有見「新紮創奇職」計劃為社區投資共享基金帶來的突破，我們在主要的調查項目外，另增設了一個研究，去初步地評估其成效。這九個計劃旨在促進弱勢青年的發展。透過推動他們的就業動機及提供就業培訓，讓年輕的參加者獲得提昇技能、增強自信及融入社會的機會。

### **建立個人能力和社會資本**

摘要 42. 量性及質性分析均肯定了「新紮創奇職」計劃於建立膠合型、搭橋型、和連結型社會資本的能力。透過參與計劃，青少年開放自己去建立朋輩友誼及師友關係。他們在過程中，學習了工作及社交技巧，提升了個人能力。

摘要 43. 青年人並非「新紮創奇職」計劃的唯一受惠者。據導航員、培訓導師及僱主的分享，他們在過程中亦有所得益。這些好處包括滿足感、培育下一代的機會、專才訓練、義工服務、及從反思而獲得的發展助力。

摘要 44. 與被邊緣化群體的相處，讓社區持份者認識隱蔽青年的潛質和能力，以致對他們建立更多的了解和接納。「新紮創奇職」計劃的其中一個顯著成效就是在於推動社會融合。

### **「新紮創奇職」計劃的限制**

摘要 45. 與其他計劃相比，「新紮創奇職」計劃於建立參加者的社會資本方面顯得較為遜色。「新紮創奇職」計劃不是沒有遇到挑戰的。由於它們著墨於發展弱勢青年的潛能，故此，其大部份的資源都集中在建立青少年的個人能力上。在多個計劃方向同時發展的情況下，難免會重此失彼，以致它們於建立社會資本方面的成效略較其他類型的計劃遜色。再者，協助低動機的青少年踏出社會並非朝夕之事。這須有賴長線的投資，逐漸改善他們的情況。因此，計劃只能夠照顧少部份的低動機青少年，對整體社區帶來的影響有限。同時，青年參加者的能力不足，流失率高，窒礙了計劃的發展。

### **對基金發展的建議**

摘要 46. 這研究肯定了社區投資共享基金的成果。透過適切的發展策略，基金計劃成功地建立了社會資本，提昇了社區及持份者的能力，改善了社區健康，灌輸了正面的社交態度、推廣了社會企業責任的概念及促進了跨群體的共融。近年來，香港的和諧面貌面對不少張力及挑戰。社區投資共享基金，在這時候，正可利用其優勢去回應社會需要，共同塑造社會的共融及和諧。

摘要 47. 是次研究再一次肯定基金的成效。有見基金於推廣社會共融及香港融和的成果，政府可以考慮將基金常規化，讓這努力得以延續。

摘要 48. 「新紮創奇職」計劃的果效反映出跨政府部門合作對建立社會資本及個人能力的正面效用。由此，我們建議鼓勵各政府部門可多加合作，共同建構社會。

摘要 49. 展望未來時，基金及基金計劃可在現有成功的基礎上，繼續發展以下幾方面：

- a) 基金秘書處可以強化其輔助角色，支持計劃發展及公眾教育。
- b) 有見搭橋型及連結型社會資本的建立需要較長的時間，基金可以考慮增加對計劃的支援，延長現以三年為限的資助年期。
- c) 基金計劃需要在各持份者間，提倡建立共同目標及平等關係，以挪去彼此的心理隔閡。促進平等待遇，鼓勵企業和專業團體建立長時間的合作默契，乃長遠發展的基石。