



天主教香港教區

# 教區勞工牧民中心(九龍)

本中心於2012年進行“南亞裔局民在港的法定最低工資保障及使用政府解困紓貧措施或服務的情況”調查，有下述的發現供扶貧小組委員會參考：

1. 有22.4%在港居住的南亞少數族裔人士的時薪低於當時的法定最低工資水平(28元)，當中接近六成(58.3%)人士為從事保安工作。
2. 認識及使用政府之扶貧政策方面，在港居住的南亞少數族裔人士就政府提供之相關扶貧政策「不知道」的情況比率依次為：
  - 2.1 學童課後託管服務(69.3%不知道)- 由社會福利署提供
  - 2.2 鼓勵就業交通津貼計劃(59.7%不知道)- 由勞工署提供
  - 2.3 幼稚園及幼兒中心學費減免計劃(52.5%不知道)-由學生資助辦事處提供
  - 2.4 中、小學資助計劃(33.6%不知道)-由學生資助辦事處提供
  - 2.5 學前教育學卷計劃(28.6%不知道)-由學生資助辦事處提供
  - 2.6 綜合社會保障援助計劃(22.3%不知道)- 由社會福利署提供

以上結果指出，除經濟拮据外，本地南亞裔貧窮社群更加面對工資保障不足及嚴重不認識政府扶貧紓困措施的額外雙重影響。

另外，根據統計處 2011 人口普查少數族裔專題報告處境根據上述結果顯示，巴基斯坦本港居民的受養人口比率高達 4.03(即工作人口供養受養人口比例)、尼泊爾則為 1.71；與此同時，南亞少數族裔的收入中位數（\$10,000）較整體工作人口(\$11,000)數額低接近一成。

現時種族歧視條例並沒有訂明政府公文須備有不同語言的譯本，而由政制及內地事務局所推行的促進種族平等行政指引並沒有任何法定效力，現時各個協助少數族裔人士融入社會的相關部門以其力度不一的方式執行有關指引，該指引極需盡快作出檢討。

教會與工人  承擔並同行

CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF HONG KONG – DIOCESAN PASTORAL CENTRE FOR WORKERS (KOWLOON)

電話 Tele : 2351 6333 傳真 Fax : 2327 6996 電郵 Email : dpcwkl@hkcccl.org.hk  
九龍油麻地上海街 399-401 號二樓 1/F., 399-401 Shenghai Steet, Yaumatei, Kowloon

---

**Research Report on the  
Enforcement of Statutory Minimum Wage and  
Accessibility of Anti-Poverty Government Social Services or  
Measures among South Asians Residents of Hong Kong**

(南亞裔居民在港的法定最低工資保障及  
使用政府解困紓貧措施或服務的情況 –  
調查結果研究報告)

**by  
Hong Kong Catholic Commission for Labour Affairs  
and  
Catholic Diocese of Hong Kong Diocesan Pastoral Centre for Workers (Kowloon)  
on  
December 2012**

# TABLE OF CONTENT

Acknowledgement.....	2
RESEARCH REPORT (English version).....	3
1. Introduction.....	3
2. Executive Summary.....	3
3. Objectives & Significance.....	5
4. Methodology.....	6
5. Discussions.....	6
5.1 Background Information of the Respondents.....	7
5.2 Employment Situation.....	12
5.3. The awareness of Minimum Wage Legislation and their opinions on reasonable Minimum wage rate	16
5.4 The Enforcement of Minimum Wage Law.....	17
5.5 The understandings of government labour department service.....	18
5.6 The understandings of other government departments services.....	21
5.7 Difficulties Experienced in applying the anti-poverty measures above.....	25
5.8 Difficulties Encountered in getting access to the Government Social Services and Measures.....	28
6. Utilization Rates of relevant Government Departments and Service Centres.....	30
6.1 Social Security Field Units of Social Welfare Department.....	30
6.2 Support service Centres for Ethnic Minorities of Home Affairs Department.....	31
6.3 Student Finance Assistance Agency.....	31
6.4 Use “None of the above” government departments/ service centres.....	32
6.5 Overall Accessibility of Government Departments and Services Centres.....	33
7. Conclusions and Recommendations.....	33
APPENDIX A (Chinese report 中文報告).....	37
APPENDIX B – CASES ILLUSTRATION ON LANGUAGE BARRIER IN USING GOVERNMENT SERVICE.....	66
APPENDIX C-1 (English- Urdu Questionnaire).....	74
APPENDIX C-2 (English – Nepali Questionnaire).....	78
Contact Us.....	82

## Acknowledgement

Our deepest and sincere gratitude to the following organizations and persons (in alphabetical order) to make this research become possible:

### *Organizations:*

Caritas Community Centre – Aberdeen

Caritas Community Centre – Kowloon

Caritas Community Centre – Ngau Tau Kok

Caritas Community Centre – Mok Cheung Sui Kun

Caritas Integrated Service for Young People – Lei Muk Shue

Heep Hong Society (Support Services for Ethnic Minority Families of Children with Special Needs)

Hong Kong Confederation of Trade Unions (Construction Site Workers General Union)

Hong Kong Women Workers' Association

Hong Kong SKH Lady MacLehose Centre (Group and Community Work Unit)

Hong Kong Unison

Yang Memorial Methodist Social Service

Yuen Long Town Hall Support Service Centre for Ethnic Minorities

YMCA of Hong Kong Multi-Cultural Enrichment and Exchange Network

### *Individuals:*

Mr Cheung hang-kwong, Joseph

Miss Chiu tsz-yan, Winnie

Mr Faisal

Mr Khan

Mr Kuo Chun-chuen

Miss Lau so-yuk, Evelyn

Mr Leung Wai-lap

Mr Madhav Khanal

Miss Ng shuk ching, June

Ms Sabina Sultana Runa

Mr Mohammad Saddique

Miss Wong wai-ling

Mr Wong kwan-yau, Xavier

# RESEARCH REPORT (English version)

## 1. Introduction

Regarding the latest statistics from Population Census in 2011, the number of ethnic minorities living in Hong Kong has been increased to a significant number at 451 183, which constitutes more than 5% of the whole population in Hong Kong.<sup>1</sup> Analyzed by ethnic groups of South Asians, a large proportion of them were Indians (6.3%), Pakistanis (4%) and Nepalese (3.7%). However, it is reported that most of the South Asians in Hong Kong are living in wretched poverty. According to the Thematic Report on ethnic minorities in 2006, a large proportion (83.8%) of Asians (other than Chinese) was engaged in the elementary low-wage occupations. The median monthly income of the working Pakistani and Nepalese were HK\$9000 and \$8500 respectively, which was about 10% lower than that of the whole working population in Hong Kong.<sup>2</sup>

The Minimum Wage Ordinance was passed by the Legislative Council (LegCo) in July 2010, with the aim of providing employees with a wage floor to sustain a basic living standard and to narrow the wage gap, without significantly jeopardizing economic growth and competitiveness. On 1 May 2011, the initial Minimum Wage at \$28 per hour and its ordinance came into force to every employee and his or her employers. There has been a saying that since the statutory minimum wage has implemented in Hong Kong for the first time, disadvantaged groups such as the elderly, women and young people, would be vulnerable to layoffs and work hours cut due to weak bargaining power. South Asians have always been regarded as one of the vulnerable groups being easily exposed to exploitations and discrimination. In this study, we are going to investigate on whether the ethnic minorities' residents in Hong Kong are under proper wage protection.

Statutory Minimum Wage is one of the ways to protect grass-root workers from living in wretched poverty. The government of Hong Kong is offering piecemeal anti-poverty services or measures as administered by various government departments. In this study, we are also going to investigate whether grass-roots South Asian workers are aware of and are using these patchworks in easing their plights.

## 2. Executive Summary

This study seeks to explore the employment conditions of the South Asian ethnic minorities in Hong Kong as well as the accessibility of anti-poverty government social services and measures to them. The target groups are the low income South Asian people

---

<sup>1</sup> Census and Statistics Department (2011). Population Census – Population by Ethnicity.

<sup>2</sup> Census and Statistics Department (2006). Population By-Census –Thematic Report on Ethnic Minorities.

living in Hong Kong, i.e. the Pakistanis, Nepalese, Indians and Bangladeshi. Because the target groups of this research are the low income South Asian ethnic minorities in Hong Kong, the income group is limited to a salary lower than \$12,000 which is set in accordance to the median monthly employment earnings in the Quarterly Report on General Household Survey conducted by the Census and Statistics Department in 2012 first Quarterly Report on General Household Survey.

The questionnaire covered three areas which are the target groups' employment condition, their knowledge on as well as the protection coverage of Minimum Wage, and the accessibility of anti-poverty social services or measures provided by local government departments including Labour Department, Social Welfare Department, Home Affairs Department as well as Student Finance Assistance Agency.

There are 238 successful respondents who are within the income group mentioned above in this study, 55.5% of respondents are employed. Out of the employed respondents, 76% of them are employed as full-time mode, 14.7% are working as part-time workers and only 9.3% are working in temporary jobs. However, 38.2% of respondents are unemployed. The median monthly income from the main employment of all respondents was \$9000. Nearly 20% (18.9%) of respondents in this research received \$6,000 or less per month, which was equal to or less than half of the median monthly employment earnings of the whole population (\$12,000) in the 2012 first Quarterly Report on General Household Survey. It unveils that a large number of respondents are living under the poverty line. Worse still, 92.2% of the employed respondents are having financial dependent families' member(s). Most of them are bread-winner at home. The data indicated that most of the respondents are working poor. The working hours are long for the respondents, the mean daily working hours was 9.4 hours. Among the 132 working respondents, there are respectively 47% indicated that they did not have paid meal break and 28% indicated they did not know whether they had paid meal break. For the paid rest day, there are also respectively 47.3% indicated they did not have paid rest day and 21.4% indicated they did not know whether they had paid rest day.

Regarding the knowledge on Statutory Minimum Wage, about 77% of respondents have heard about the Minimum Wage, but there are still 23% of them do not have any ideas of it. About 90% of the respondents expressed that the appropriate rate of minimum wage should not be less than HK\$33. Even after almost one year of the legislation of Minimum Wage, the protection coverage of statutory minimum wage do not extent to the South Asian ethnic minorities residents in Hong Kong, there are as high as 22.4% of employed respondents are receiving wage rate which is lower than the present statutory rate (i.e. HK\$28). Out of the underpaid respondents, almost 60 % (58.3%) of them are working as security guards.

Concerning the accessibility of other anti-poverty government social services and measures, when we ask the respondents whether they have heard about the measure and the

highest “don’t know” measure is “After School Care Program” by Social Welfare Department (as high as 69.3% of respondents did not hear about it), and the second “don’t know” measure is the “Work Incentive Transport Subsidy Scheme” by the Labour Department (as high as 59.7% of respondents did not hear about it), the third measure is the “Kindergarten & Child Care Centre Fee Remission Subsidy Scheme” by the Student Financial Assistance Agency (as high as 52.5% of respondents did not hear about it).

In view of the inadequate protection of Statutory Minimum Wage and the low accessibility to the anti-poverty government social services as unveiled in this questionnaire survey data, recommendations are made at the end of this report for a better ethnic workers’ labour protection as well as a more sensitive multicultural government policies.

### **3. Objectives & Significance**

Being minorities in Hong Kong, South Asians are believed to be easily deprived of the labor rights protection because of language barrier. Up till the present there are no researches to unveil working conditions of South Asians living in Hong Kong especially on the current employment situations of grass-roots South Asians after the implementation of Minimum Wage law.

We therefore survey on South Asians, with primary objective to disclose their latest employment conditions and in particular, examine whether they experience the illegal underpayment of minimum wage. The survey will also give substantial consideration to study their views on the reasonable minimum wage rate and their understandings to the existing government anti-poverty measures.

As this survey is one of the latest researches regarding the working conditions of South Asians living in Hong Kong after the Minimum Wage legislation, the findings will be meaningful for the new government of Hong Kong in practical field. It can alert our new chief executive and top officials on the plight of South Asian workers and appeal to them to take more serious actions to improve their working and living conditions.

The objectives of the survey are summarized as follows:

**3.1 To understand their employment situations, such as salaries, working hours and employment terms.**

**3.2 To study whether they have heard of “Minimum Wage” legislation and their opinions on the reasonable minimum wage rate.**

**3.3 To explore whether they experience underpayment of the Statutory Minimum Wage.**

### **3.4 To evaluate their awareness and using of the existing anti-poverty government social services and measures.**

## **4. Methodology**

A survey design was adopted in this research.

The targets of this survey included both employed and unemployed South Asian workers who were aged 15 or above. Also, with the intention of unveiling the employment situations of low-income South Asians, the targets who were employed were confined to those whose monthly salary was less than \$12000 per month. This benchmark was made with reference to median monthly wage of the whole population stated in the Quarterly Report on General Household Survey in October to December, 2011.

The convenient and snowball sampling methods were used. The samples were collected in three ways:

**4.1 Through street interviews and interviews conducted outside mosques and madrasahs.**

**4.2 Through trained ethnic minorities' interviewers who use snowball sampling among their own personal networks.**

**4.3 With the help of Non-governmental organizations' (NGOs) ethnic minorities' Program Workers which serve for the ethnic minority groups.**

A pilot test with 15 respondents was conducted before the questionnaire was finalized. After the questionnaire is finalized, training workshops were provided to both the South Asian interviewers and the NGOs South Asian Program Workers to help them understand the questionnaire. Also, the questionnaire was translated into Urdu (Pakistani language) and Nepali (Nepali language) so that both South Asian helpers and interviewees could understand and read the questionnaire in their own languages.

Data collection was taken place from March to June 2012. 238 South East Asians, mostly Pakistani and Nepali, living in Hong Kong were interviewed. The data was analyzed by the computer software, Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS).

## **5. Discussions**



## 5.1 Background Information of the Respondents

### 5.1.1 Country of Origin

A total of 238 respondents were successfully interviewed. Majority of respondents were Pakistani (52.4%). This was followed by Nepali (29.2%), Indian (9.9%), Bangladeshi (6.9%) and Sri Lankans (0.9%).

Table 5.1.1 Country of Origin

Ethnic Origin		Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
	<b>Pakistani</b>	122	51.3	52.4
	<b>Nepali</b>	68	28.6	29.2
	<b>Indian</b>	23	9.7	9.9
	<b>Bangladeshi</b>	16	6.7	6.9
	<b>Sri Lankans</b>	2	0.8	0.9
	<b>Others</b>	2	0.8	0.9
	<b>Total</b>	233	97.9	100
	<b>Missing</b>	5	2.1	
<b>Total</b>		238	100	

### 5.1.2 Gender and Age

Among 238 respondents, 117 (49.8%) were males, 118 (50.2%) were females. The samples of males and females are well distributed. Most of the respondents were over 35 years of age (61.4%), in which 42.8% were between 35 and 44 years old. It reflects that most of our respondents were middle-aged people. (See Table 5.1.2A)

Table 5.1.2A Age

		Frequency	Valid %	Accumulated %
<b>Valid</b>	<b>15-19</b>	6	2.6	2.6
	<b>20-24</b>	3	1.3	3.9
	<b>25-29</b>	27	11.7	15.6
	<b>30-34</b>	53	22.9	38.5
	<b>35-39</b>	53	22.9	61.5
	<b>40-44</b>	46	19.9	81.4
	<b>45-49</b>	21	9.1	90.5
	<b>50-54</b>	4	1.7	92.2
	<b>55-59</b>	6	2.6	94.8
	<b>60 or above</b>	12	5.2	100.0

	<b>Total</b>	231	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>		7		
	<b>Total</b>	238		

The proportion of respondents with no schooling and only attended primary education was 38.4%. Besides, more than 20% of respondents had attended lower secondary school. It reveals that more than half of the respondents (60.3%) were less-educated. (See Table5.1.2B) Among these 143 respondents, 49.6% of them were employed. It shows that most of the working respondents were not well-educated.

Table 5.1.2B Education level

		<b>Frequenc y</b>	<b>Valid %</b>	<b>Accumulated %</b>
<b>Valid</b>	<b>Primary school or below</b>	91	38.4	38.4
	<b>Lower secondary school</b>	52	21.9	60.3
	<b>Upper secondary school</b>	38	16.0	76.4
	<b>College</b>	29	12.2	88.6
	<b>University</b>	14	5.9	94.5
	<b>Postgraduate or above</b>	4	1.7	96.2
	<b>Others</b>	9	3.8	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	237	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>		1		
<b>Total</b>		238		

### 5.1.3 Years of Residence

Most of the respondents (67.4%) have been living in Hong Kong for more than 10 years. The mean year of living in Hong Kong was 14 years. It reveals that the majority of respondents were usual residents in Hong Kong. (See Table5.1.3)

Table5.1.3 Years of Residence

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid %</b>	<b>Accumulated %</b>
<b>Valid</b>	<b>1 year or less</b>	3	1.3	1.3
	<b>1 &gt; to 2 years</b>	11	4.8	6.1
	<b>2 &gt; to 4 years</b>	14	6.1	12.2
	<b>4 &gt; to years</b>	14	6.1	18.3
	<b>6 &gt; to 8 years</b>	14	6.1	24.3
	<b>8 &gt; to 10 years</b>	19	8.3	32.6
	<b>10 &gt; to 12 years</b>	23	10.0	42.6

	<b>12 &gt; to 14 years</b>	24	10.4	53.0
	<b>14 &gt; to 16 years</b>	40	17.4	70.4
	<b>16 &gt; to 18 years</b>	20	8.7	79.1
	<b>18 &gt; to 20 years</b>	9	3.9	83.0
	<b>&gt;20 years</b>	39	17.0	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	230	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	<b>System Missing</b>	8		
<b>Total</b>		238		

#### 5.1.4 Types of Housing living in

Of 238 respondents, over 60.4% were living in private rental housing, while 37.4% were living in public rental housing. There was only small proportion of them (2.2%) able to afford a self-owned private housing. (See Table 5.1.4A) Among those who were living in private rental housing, nearly 44% (43.5%) spent over \$4000 to \$6000 per month on their rental house. 10% of respondents even needed to pay \$ 6000 or more on their rental house. It is believed that their huge expenditure on private rental housing has posed a great burden on their living. (See Table5.1.4B)

Table 5.1.4A Types of Housing living in

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid %</b>	<b>Accumulated %</b>
<b>Valid</b>	<b>Public rental Housing</b>	86	37.4	37.4
	<b>Self-owned private housing</b>	5	2.2	39.6
	<b>Private rental housing</b>	139	60.4	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	230	100.0	
<b>Miss -ing</b>		8		
<b>Total</b>		238		

Table5.1.4B Rental Price for Private House

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid %</b>	<b>Accumulated %</b>
<b>Valid</b>	<b>\$2000 or less</b>	10	7.2	7.2
	<b>\$2000 &gt; to \$4000</b>	54	39.1	46.4
	<b>\$4000 &gt; to \$6000</b>	60	43.5	89.9
	<b>\$6000 &gt; to \$8000</b>	5	3.6	93.5
	<b>\$8000 &gt; to \$10000</b>	6	4.3	97.8
	<b>\$10000 &gt; to \$12000</b>	2	1.4	99.3

	<b>&gt;\$12000</b>	1	.7	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	138	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	<b>System Missing</b>	100		
<b>Total</b>		238		

#### 5.1.5 Household Income (including all family members living under the same roof)

Concerning the total household income of the respondents receiving in the previous month, the largest proportion, which is the income range from HK\$9001 to HK\$11000, occupies 21.2% (48 out of 226) of the valid sampling. The second large proportion is the range from HK\$7001 to HK\$9000, which occupies 19.5% (44 out of 226). Only 8% (18 out of 226) of the valid sampling is having total household income more than HK\$21000. (Table 5.1.5)

Table 5.1.5 Total Household income last month

<b>Income (\$)</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Valid %</b>
0	16	6.7	7.1
1-1000	1	0.4	0.4
1001-3000	4	1.7	1.8
3001-5000	15	6.3	6.6
5001-7000	20	8.4	8.8
7001-9000	44	18.5	19.5
9001-11000	48	20.2	21.2
11001-13000	27	11.3	11.9
13001-15000	16	6.7	7.1
15001-17000	9	3.8	4
17001-19000	5	2.1	2.2
19001-21000	3	1.3	1.3
>21000	18	7.6	8
<b>Total</b>	226	95	
<b>Missing</b>	12	5	
<b>Total</b>	238	100	

#### 5.1.6 Number of Children

According to table 5.1.6A, among 238 respondents, 166 of them have children in their families who are studying in Kindergarten, primary or secondary school. The percentage is

about 70% of the sampling. And only 29.7% (70 out of 236) of the respondents do not have children in families studying in Kindergarten, primary or secondary school.

Table 5.1.6A Having children who are studying in Kindergarten, Primary or Secondary school in family

Having children		Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
	Yes	166	69.7	70.3
	No	70	29.4	29.7
	Total	236	99.2	100
	Missing	2	0.8	
Total		238	100	

And based on table 5.1.6B, most of our respondents are having one to two children studying in Kindergarten, primary or secondary school in their families, which is about 40% (95 out of 156) among the total number of respondents. Only 3% (7 out of 156) of the total respondents are having more than four children in their families who are studying in Kindergarten, primary or secondary school.

Table 5.1.6B Number of Children

No. of children		Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
	1	43	18.1	27.6
	2	52	21.8	33.3
	3	37	15.5	23.7
	4	17	7.1	10.9
	>4	7	3	4.4
	Total	156	65.5	100
	Missing	82	34.5	
Total		238	100	

### 5.1.7 Number of Financial Dependent Family Members

Concerning the number of family members who need to be supported by the respondents financially in Hong Kong, based on table 5.1.7, 42.2% (99 out of 235) of the respondents need to support three to four family members financially. And 24.7% (58 out of 235) of the respondents need to support one to two family members. 3.4% of the respondents even need to support for more than six family members. Only 15 out of 235 respondents do not need to

support any family members financially.

Table 5.1.7 Number of Financial Dependent Family Members

No. of members		Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
	0	15	6.3	6.4
	1-2	58	24.4	24.7
	3-4	99	41.3	42.2
	5-6	45	23.1	23.4
	>6	8	3.4	3.4
	Total	235	98.7	100
	Missing	3	1.3	
<b>Total</b>		238	100	

## 5.2 Employment Situation

### 5.2.1 Employment Status

More than half of the total respondents (55.5%) were employed currently. Among those 129 respondents who were employed, 95 (73.6%) are males and 34 (26.4%) are females. The result of the survey indicates that labor force participation rates for males were higher than that of females. (See Table 5.2.1A and 5.2.1B) Also, among these 129 respondents who were employed, 76% were working in full time mode. 14.7% were working as part-time workers. Only 9.3% were engaging in temporary jobs (See Table 5.2.1C).

Table 5.2.1A Employment Status

		Frequency	Valid %	Accumulated %
<b>Valid</b>	<b>Yes</b>	132	55.5	55.5
	<b>No</b>	91	38.2	93.7
	<b>Not Applicable</b>	15	6.3	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	238	100.0	

Table 5.2.1B Correlation table between Gender and Employment Status

		Gender		Total	
		Male	Fe- male		
<b>Are you employ-ed</b>	<b>Yes</b>	Frequency	95	34	129
		With “ Are you employed currently? ”%	73.6%	26.4%	100.0%

<b>current-ly?</b>		With 'Gender' %	81.2%	28.8%	54.9%
		Total %	40.4%	14.5%	54.9%
	<b>No</b>	Frequency	21	70	91
		With "Are you employed currently?" %	23.1%	76.9%	100.0%
		With 'Gender' %	17.9%	59.3%	38.7%
		Total %	8.9%	29.8%	38.7%
	<b>Not Applicable</b>	Frequency	1	14	15
		With "Are you employed currently?" %	6.7%	93.3%	100.0%
		With 'Gender' %	.9%	11.9%	6.4%
		Total %	.4%	6.0%	6.4%
	<b>Total</b>	Frequency	117	118	235
		With "Are you employed currently?" %	49.8%	50.2%	100.0%
With 'Gender' %		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
Total %		49.8%	50.2%	100.0%	

Table 5.2.1C Employment Status

Status	Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
<b>Full-Time</b>	98	41.2	76
<b>Part-Time</b>	19	8	14.7
<b>Temporary Job</b>	12	5	9.3
<b>Total</b>	129	54.2	100
<b>Missing</b>	109	45.8	
<b>Total</b>	238	100	

### 5.2.2 Occupation

Analyzed by occupation category, the majority of working respondents were engaging in low-skilled or elementary occupations. A large proportion of them (26.5%) were security guards, while respectively 12.1% and 8.3% were construction workers and clerical workers. 6.8% were delivery workers. (See Table 5.2.2)

Table 5.2.2 Occupation

	Frequency	Valid %	Accumulated %
<b>Valid</b>	<b>Factory Worker</b>	7	5.3
	<b>Skilled Worker</b>	7	5.3
	<b>Clerical Worker</b>	11	8.3
	<b>Delivery Worker</b>	9	6.8
	<b>Salesperson</b>	4	3.0
	<b>Driver</b>	7	5.3
	<b>Waiter/Waitress</b>	4	3.0

	<b>Bar tender</b>	1	.8	37.9
	<b>Security guard</b>	35	26.5	64.4
	<b>Salon assistant</b>	4	3.0	67.4
	<b>Professional</b>	3	2.3	69.7
	<b>Construction Worker</b>	16	12.1	81.8
	<b>Cleaning worker</b>	6	4.5	86.4
	<b>Others</b>	18	13.6	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	132	100.0	
<b>Miss-ing</b>	<b>System Missing</b>	106		
<b>Total</b>		238		

### 5.2.3 Salary

Over 70% (72.5%) of respondents who were employed received their income on a monthly basis, while 16.8% and 10.7% of the total respondents received their income on a daily basis and hourly basis respectively.

Among those 95 samples who received their salary on a monthly basis, 41.1% of them earned over \$8000 to \$10000 per month. The median monthly income from the main employment of all respondents was \$9000, which was similar to the corresponding figures generated from the thematic report of ethnic minorities in 2006, in which the median monthly employment earnings of Pakistani was \$9000, while that of Nepalese was \$8500. However, it should be noted that nearly 20% (18.9%) of respondents in this research received \$6000 or less per month, which was equal to or less than half of the median monthly employment earnings of the whole population (\$12000) in the 2011 Quarterly Report on General Household Survey. It unveils that a large number of respondents are living under the poverty line. (See Table 5.2.3)

Table 5.2.3 Salary of the monthly paid workers

		Frequency	Valid %	Accumulated %
<b>Valid</b>	<b>\$2000 &gt; to \$4000</b>	5	5.3	5.3
	<b>\$4000 &gt; to \$6000</b>	13	13.7	18.9
	<b>\$6000 &gt; to \$8000</b>	19	20.0	38.9
	<b>\$8000 &gt; to \$10000</b>	39	41.1	80.0
	<b>\$10000 &gt; to \$12000</b>	19	20.0	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	95	100.0	
<b>Miss-ing</b>	<b>System Missing</b>	143		
<b>Total</b>		238		



#### 5.2.4 Working hours

34.9% (38 out of 109) of them reported that they worked for 9 to 10 hours per day. Another 31.2% of them even had to work for 11 to 12 hours per day. The mean working hours per day of total respondents was 9.4 hours. Overall speaking, a large proportion of employed respondents were likely to work long hours a day. (See Table 5.2.4)

Table 5.2.4 Working Hours

		Frequency	Valid %
Valid	1-4	2	1.8
	5-6	10	9.2
	7-8	25	22.9
	9-10	38	34.9
	11-12	34	31.2
	Total	109	100
Missing		23	
Total		132	

#### 5.2.5 Paid Meal Breaks and Rest Day

Among 132 working respondents, 25% of them enjoyed paid meal break. 47% and 28% respectively indicated that they did not have paid meal break and did not know whether they had paid meal break.

Besides, 31.3% of them had paid rest day, while 47.3% did not have paid rest day. Another 21.4% did not know whether they had paid rest day. Since the calculation of minimum wage excludes the time that is not hours worked, the payment to the employees for any time that is not hours worked, for examples rest days with pay, holiday pay, sickness allowances, are not to be counted as part of wages payable to the employees for computing minimum wage. Therefore, it is very important for workers getting understanding on their actual working hours and the payment for their actual hours worked. It is a concern that there are a number of respondents (21.4%) who are employed who do not know whether they have paid rest days. (See Table 5.2.5A and 5.2.5B)

Table 5.2.5A Paid meal break

	Frequency	Valid %	Accumulated %
--	-----------	---------	---------------

<b>Valid</b>	<b>Yes</b>	33	25.0	25.0
	<b>No</b>	62	47.0	72.0
	<b>Don't know</b>	37	28.0	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	132	100.0	
<b>Miss-ing</b>	<b>System missing</b>	106		
<b>Total</b>		238		

Table 5.2.5B Paid rest day

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid %</b>	<b>Accumulated %</b>
<b>Valid</b>	<b>Yes</b>	41	31.3	31.3
	<b>No</b>	62	47.3	78.6
	<b>Don't know</b>	28	21.4	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	131	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>		1		
	<b>System Missing</b>	106		
	<b>Total</b>	107		
<b>Total</b>		238		

### 5.3. The awareness of Minimum Wage Legislation and their opinions on reasonable Minimum wage rate

The result of the survey indicates that there were 77.6% of respondents who had heard of Minimum Wage law. The result is quite encouraging. Ethnic minority groups are used to indifference to government policies due to language barrier and inadequate government promotion. The large proportion of respondents aware of minimum wage law reflects they somehow realize that they are under the protection of minimum wage law. (Table 5.3A)

Table 5.3A Awareness of Minimum Wage legislation

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Valid %</b>	<b>Accumulated %</b>
<b>Valid</b>	<b>Yes</b>	184	77.6	77.6
	<b>No</b>	53	22.4	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	237	100.0	
<b>Miss-ing</b>		1		
<b>Total</b>		238		

Besides, 89.9% of respondents were dissatisfied with the current minimum rate. Only 6.3%

considered that the current rate was enough for them and their families living in Hong Kong. The large proportion of respondents (33.2%) suggested the new rate should be set at over \$35 to \$40. Another 25.7% suggested that it should be set at over \$33 to \$ 35. 32.3% even considered the reasonable amount should be over \$40. In sum, more than 90% (91.2%) of respondents considered the reasonable minimum hourly wage should be over \$33. It reflects that though the minimum wage may have increased the salary of low-income earners, high inflation has offset most of their salary growth. Low-income employees have been struggling for survival. Therefore, it is understandable that most of the respondents, who are also low-income workers, expect minimum wage rate to be increased in order to meet their daily life needs. (See Table 5.3B and 5.3C )

Table 5.3B Views on Minimum Wage Law to support living

		Frequency	Valid %	Accumulated %
<b>Valid</b>	<b>Yes</b>	15	6.3	6.3
	<b>No</b>	214	89.9	96.2
	<b>Don't know / No comment</b>	9	3.8	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	238	100.0	

Table 5.3C Views on reasonable minimum wage

		Frequency	Valid %	Accumulated %
<b>Valid</b>	<b>\$28&gt; to \$30</b>	8	3.7	3.7
	<b>\$30&gt; to \$33</b>	11	5.1	8.9
	<b>\$33&gt; to \$35</b>	55	25.7	34.6
	<b>\$35&gt; to \$40</b>	71	33.2	67.8
	<b>\$40&gt; to \$45</b>	13	6.1	73.8
	<b>&gt;\$45</b>	56	26.2	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	214	100.0	
<b>Valid</b>	<b>System Missing</b>	24		
<b>Total</b>		238		

#### 5.4 The Enforcement of Minimum Wage Law

The result of the research unveils that 22.4% working respondents are paid less than \$28 per hour. (See Table5.4A ) Among these 24 respondents, nearly 80% (79.2%) were males and 58.3% of them were security guards. (See Table5.4B) Also, more than half of respondents (54.2%) who were underpaid were middle-aged workers aged between 40 and 49. It pinpoints that the inspections and enforcement actions taken by the labour department are far from satisfactory. For the phenomenon that even most of the respondents (77.6%) were aware of minimum wage legislation but there are still 22.4% of South Asian workers received wages

less than the minimum wage, deserves to be further investigated.

Table 5.4A Hourly Wage for all respondents

Wage rate (\$)		Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
	<28	24	10.1	22.4
	More than or equal to 28	83	34.9	77.6
	<b>Total</b>	107	45	100
	<b>Missing</b>	131	55	
<b>Total</b>		238	100	

Table 5.4B Occupations and underpaid respondents

Occupations		Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
	<b>Security Guard</b>	14	58.3	58.3
	<b>Driver</b>	3	12.5	12.5
	<b>Salon Assistant</b>	1	4.2	4.2
	<b>Cleaning Worker</b>	2	8.3	8.3
	<b>Bar Tender</b>	1	4.2	4.2
	<b>Factory Worker</b>	1	4.2	4.2
	<b>Delivery Worker</b>	1	4.2	4.2
	<b>Salesperson</b>	1	4.2	4.2
<b>Total</b>		24	100	100

### 5.5 The understandings of government labour department service

The Work Incentive Transport Subsidy (WITS) Scheme is one of the anti-poverty measures proposed by the government to relieve the burden on travelling expenses commuting to and from work on the part of low-income households with employed members and promote sustained employment.

Nearly 60% (59.7%) were not aware of the scheme while 35.7% of the total respondents had heard about the Work Incentive Transport Subsidy Scheme and only. (See Table 5.5A) In particular, among 132 working respondents, 40.2% has heard about the Work Incentive Transport Subsidy Scheme, but they have not applied it before. Another 53.8% reported they were not aware of this measure. There were only 8 respondents (6.1%) indicated they had applied it before. It pinpoints that the Work Incentive Transport Subsidy Scheme is not popular among the low-income South Asians. It may due to the government's insufficient propaganda on this policy among South Asians and as a result they are not aware of those anti-poverty measures, which may help them to alleviate their living burden. (See Table 5.5B)

Table 5.5A Awareness and accessibility of the Work Incentive Transport Subsidy Scheme

		Frequency	Valid %	Accumulated %
<b>Valid</b>	<b>Heard, not applied</b>	85	35.7	35.7
	<b>Applied</b>	11	4.6	40.3
	<b>Don't know</b>	142	59.7	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	238	100.0	

Table5.5B Correlation Table between Employment Status and the Awareness of the WITS

			Are you employed currently?			Total
			Yes	No	Not Applicable	
<b>Work Incentive Transport Subsidy Scheme</b>	<b>Heard, not applied</b>	Frequency	53	27	5	85
		With “Work Incentive Transport Subsidy Scheme”%	62.4%	31.8%	5.9%	100.0%
		With “ Are you employed currently?” %	40.2%	29.7%	33.3%	35.7%
		Total %	22.3%	11.3%	2.1%	35.7%
	<b>Applied</b>	Frequency	8	3	0	11
		With “Work Incentive Transport Subsidy Scheme”%	72.7%	27.3%	.0%	100.0%
		With “ Are you employed currently?” %	6.1%	3.3%	.0%	4.6%
		Total %	3.4%	1.3%	.0%	4.6%
	<b>Don't know</b>	Frequency	71	61	10	142
		With “Work Incentive Transport Subsidy Scheme”%	50.0%	43.0%	7.0%	100.0%
		With “ Are you employed currently?” %	53.8%	67.0%	66.7%	59.7%
		Total %	29.8%	25.6%	4.2%	59.7%
	<b>Total</b>		Frequency	132	91	15
With “Work Incentive Transport Subsidy Scheme”%			55.5%	38.2%	6.3%	100.0%

	With “ Are you employed currently? ” %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Total %	55.5%	38.2%	6.3%	100.0%

Job Centers / Interactive Employment Service are also one of the important services provided by the Labour Department to help job-seekers to find suitable jobs. Of 238 respondents, over 80% (81.9%) reported that they had not accessed to the services provided by the Job Centre. When analyzed by employment status, only 21.2% of the working respondents had accessed to the service. There was also small proportion of unemployed respondents (16.5%) having used the service before. (See Table 5.5C and 5.5D)

In fact, with reference to the latest statistics provided by the government, of 21050 placements achieved through the referral services of Labor Department in 2011, only 72 ethnic minority job seekers secured placements through the employment services of the Labor Department.<sup>3</sup>

Both results reveal that the South Asian people seldom make use of the Job Center services for seeking jobs. We believe this has much to do with the language problem. It is because the Labour Department allows the employers to post their job vacancies provided in the Centers written in Chinese even in their English Website, in which South Asians are difficult to understand. In addition, in spite of getting job referral from the department, South Asians still find difficulties in approaching to the employers directly because of language barriers. Consequently, they lose confidence in Job Center Service and tend to find job through their own network instead.

Table 5.5C Utilization of Job Center service

		Frequency	Valid %	Accumulated %
<b>Valid</b>	<b>No</b>	195	81.9	81.9
	<b>Yes</b>	43	18.1	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	238	100.0	

<sup>3</sup> Sources: Document from Legislative Council - “Replies to initial written questions raised by Finance Committee Members in examining the Estimates of Expenditure 2012-13”.

Table 5.5D Correlation table between Employment Status and the unitization of Job Centre service

			Are you employed currently?			Total	
			Yes	No	Not Applicable		
Jobs Centres / Interactive Employment Service (Labour Department)	No	Frequency	104	76	15	195	
		With “Jobs Centres / Interactive Employment Service (Labour Department) “ %	53.3%	39.0%	7.7%	100.0%	
		with “Are you employed currently?”%	78.8%	83.5%	100.0%	81.9%	
		Total %	43.7%	31.9%	6.3%	81.9%	
	Yes	Frequency	28	15	0	43	
		With “Jobs Centres / Interactive Employment Service (Labour Department) “ %	65.1%	34.9%	.0%	100.0%	
		with “Are you employed currently?”%	21.2%	16.5%	.0%	18.1%	
		Total %	11.8%	6.3%	.0%	18.1%	
	Total		Frequency	132	91	15	238
			With “Jobs Centres / Interactive Employment Service (Labour Department) “ %	55.5%	38.2%	6.3%	100.0%
		with “Are you employed currently?”%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
		Total %	55.5%	38.2%	6.3%	100.0%	

## 5.6 The understandings of other government departments services

### 5.6.1 Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA) (by Social Welfare Department)

About the accessibility of the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA), 119 out of 238 (50%) respondents have heard about the scheme, but they have not applied for it. 53 out of 238 (22.3%) respondents do not know about the assistance. And 66 respondents have applied for the assistance, which occupies 27.7% of the total samples. (Table 5.6.1A)

Table 5.6.1A Comprehensive Social Security Assistance

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
<b>Heard, but not apply</b>	119	50	50
<b>Applied</b>	66	27.7	27.7
<b>Don't Know</b>	53	22.3	22.3
<b>Total</b>	238	100	100

Specifically about the accessibility of the CSSA of the unemployed respondents, according to table 5.6.1B, 40.7% (37 out of 91) of the unemployed respondents have heard about the assistance, but they have not applied for it. And 18 out of the 91 (19.8%) unemployed respondents do not know about the assistance. Moreover, 39.6% (36 out of 91) of the unemployed respondents have applied for it.

Table 5.6.1B Comprehensive Social Security Assistance of unemployed respondents (P=0.001)

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
<b>Heard, but not apply</b>	37	15.5	40.7
<b>Applied</b>	36	15.1	39.6
<b>Don't Know</b>	18	7.6	19.8
<b>Total</b>	91	38.2	100
<b>Missing</b>	146	61.3	
<b>Total</b>	238	100	

5.6.2 Pre-Primary Education Voucher Scheme (by Student Finance Assistance Agency)

About the accessibility of the Pre-Primary Education Voucher Scheme of all 238 respondents, 94 out of 238 respondents have applied for the scheme, which occupies 39.5% of the total numbers of samples. But still, 28.6% (68 out of 238) of the respondents do not know about the scheme, and 31.9% (76 out of 238) of the total numbers of respondents have only heard about the scheme without applying for it. (Table 5.6.2A)

Table 5.6.2A Pre-Primary Education Voucher Scheme

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
<b>Heard, but not apply</b>	76	31.9	31.9
<b>Applied</b>	94	39.5	39.5
<b>Don't Know</b>	68	28.6	28.6
<b>Total</b>	238	100	100

Specifically the 166 respondents who have children in their families studying Kindergarten, primary school or secondary school about the accessibility of the Pre-Primary



Education Voucher Scheme, 89 out of those 166 respondents have applied for the scheme, which occupies about 50% of the 166 respondents. 31.9% of those 166 respondents have heard about the scheme without applying. And only 24 respondents do not know about the scheme, which occupies 14.5% of the valid samples. (Table 5.6.2B)

Table 5.6.2B Pre-Primary Education Voucher Scheme of the respondents with children(P<0.001)

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
	<b>Heard, but not apply</b>	53	22.3	31.9
	<b>Applied</b>	89	37.4	53.6
	<b>Don't Know</b>	24	10.1	14.5
	<b>Total</b>	166	69.7	100
	<b>Missing</b>	72	30.3	
<b>Total</b>		238	100	

### 5.6.3 Kindergarten & Child Care Centre Fee Remission Scheme (by Student Finance Assistance Agency)

Concerning the accessibility of the Kindergarten & Child Care Centre Fee Remission Subsidy Scheme of all 238 respondents, about half of the respondents (125 out of 238) do not know about the scheme. Only 29.8% of the total numbers of respondents have heard about the scheme, but those 29.8% still have not applied for it. And only 17.6% of the 238 respondents have applied for the scheme. (Table 5.6.3A)

Table 5.6.3A Kindergarten & Child Care Centre Fee Remission Subsidy Scheme

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
<b>Heard, but not apply</b>	71	29.8	29.8
<b>Applied</b>	42	17.6	17.6
<b>Don't Know</b>	125	52.5	52.5
<b>Total</b>	238	100	100

About the accessibility of the 166 respondents with children in families studying in Kindergarten, primary or secondary school on the scheme of Kindergarten & Child Care Centre Fee Remission Subsidy specifically, about 45% (75 out of 166) of them do not know about the scheme based on table 5.6.3B, about 30% (51 out of 166) of the 166 respondents have heard about the scheme without applying. And only about 24% of those 166 respondents have applied for the scheme.

Table 5.6.3B Kindergarten & Child Care Centre Fee Remission Subsidy Scheme of the respondents with children (P<0.001)

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Valid %</b>
	<b>Heard, but not apply</b>	51	21.4	30.7
	<b>Applied</b>	40	16.8	24.1
	<b>Don't Know</b>	75	31.5	45.2
	<b>Total</b>	166	69.7	100
	<b>Missing</b>	72	30.3	
<b>Total</b>		238	100	

#### 5.6.4 Financial Assistance for Primary and Secondary Students (by Student Finance Assistance Agency)

About the accessibility of the Financial Assistance for Primary and Secondary Students of all the 238 respondents, 39.5% (94 out of 238) of them have heard about it without applying, and another 33.6% (80 out of 238) of the respondents do not know about the assistance. Only 64 out of the 238 respondents have applied for it, which occupies 26.9%. (Table 5.6.4A)

Table 5.6.4A Financial Assistance for Primary and Secondary Students

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Valid %</b>
<b>Heard, but not apply</b>	94	39.5	39.5
<b>Applied</b>	64	26.9	26.9
<b>Don't Know</b>	80	33.6	33.6
<b>Total</b>	238	100	100

Considering the accessibility of the Financial Assistance for Primary and Secondary Students of the 166 respondents who have children in families studying in Kindergarten, primary or secondary school, 61 out of those 166 respondents have applied for the assistance, which occupies 36.7%. And another 38.6% of 166 respondents have heard about the assistance without applying. But still, 41 out of those 166 respondents do not know about the assistance, which occupies 24.7%. (Table 5.6.4B)

Table 5.6.4B Financial Assistance for Primary and Secondary Students of the respondents with children (P<0.001)

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Valid %</b>
<b>Heard, but not apply</b>	64	26.9	38.6
<b>Applied</b>	61	25.6	36.7
<b>Don't Know</b>	41	17.2	24.7
<b>Total</b>	166	67.9	100
<b>Missing</b>	72	30.3	
<b>Total</b>	238	100	

#### 5.6.5 After School Care Programme (by Social Welfare Department)

Concerning the accessibility of the After School Care Programme of all of the 238 respondents, 69.3% (165 out of 238) of the respondents do not know about the program. 28.2% of those 238 respondents have heard about it without applying. And only 6 out of those 238 respondents have applied for it, which occupies 2.5% of the total sampling. (Table 5.6.5A)

Table 5.6.5A After School Care Programme

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
<b>Heard, but not apply</b>	67	28.2%	28.2%
<b>Applied</b>	6	2.5%	2.5%
<b>Don't Know</b>	165	69.3%	69.3%
<b>Total</b>	238	100	100

Specifically about the accessibility of the After School Care Program of the respondents with children in families studying in Kindergarten, primary or secondary school, only 6 out of the 166 respondents have applied for it. 32.5% of those 166 respondents have heard about the program without applying. And 63.9% of those 166 respondents do not even know about the program. (Table 5.6.5B)

Table 5.6.5B After School Care Programme of the respondents with children (P=0.017)

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
<b>Heard, but not apply</b>	54	22.7	32.5
<b>Applied</b>	6	2.5	3.6
<b>Don't Know</b>	106	44.5	63.9
<b>Total</b>	166	67.9	100
<b>Missing</b>	72	33.3	
<b>Total</b>	238	100	

### 5.7 Difficulties Experienced in applying the anti-poverty measures above

140 out of 238 (Table 5.7) respondents have applied for at least one government social services and measures listed on the questionnaire. However, some of them may have met certain kinds of difficulties in the application procedures. Table 5.7 shows that 57 out of 140 respondents have experienced difficulties in application, which occupies about 40%.

Table 5.7 Difficulties Experienced in Application

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
<b>Yes</b>	57	23.9	40.7
<b>No</b>	63	26.5	45

	<b>Don't Know/ No comments</b>	20	8.4	14.3
	<b>Total</b>	140	58.8	100
	<b>Missing</b>	98	41.2	
<b>Total</b>		238	100	

### 5.7.1 “The information are not written in your language”

Specifically, among the 57 respondents who have met difficulties in application, 42 of them (table 5.7.1) have experienced difficulties in reading and understanding of the information of services which is not written in their ethnical languages. That means most of the 57 respondents (73.7%) have met difficulties in receiving services’ information not written in their own ethnical languages.

Table 5.7.1 “The information is not written in your language”

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Valid %</b>
	<b>Yes</b>	42	17.6	73.7
	<b>No</b>	15	6.3	26.3
	<b>Total</b>	57	23.9	100
	<b>Missing</b>	181	76.1	
<b>Total</b>		238	100	

### 5.7.2 “The application form is lengthy and complicated”

Another difficulty is about the application form is too lengthy and complicated. 24 out of 57 (42.1%) respondents (table 5.7.2) expressed that it is one of the difficulties they have experienced in application. Reading and writing in a “foreign” language without any kind of help is understandable that they perceive the form as “too complicated” for the ethnic minorities’ residents especially for the low educated residents. About 40% of the 57 respondents have met this difficulty in application.

Table 5.7.2 “The application form is lengthy and complicated”

		<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Valid %</b>
	<b>Yes</b>	24	10.1	42.1
	<b>No</b>	33	13.9	57.9
	<b>Total</b>	57	23.9	100
	<b>Missing</b>	181	76.1	
<b>Total</b>		238	100	

### 5.7.3 “Application procedures are too time-consuming”

Besides, 23 out of 57 respondents (table 5.7.3) expressed that time-consuming

application procedures is one of their difficulties met in application. This difficulty also occupies for about 40% of the 57 respondents.

Table 5.7.3 “Time-Consuming Application Procedures”

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
	<b>Yes</b>	23	9.7	40.4
	<b>No</b>	34	14.3	59.6
	<b>Total</b>	57	23.9	100
	<b>Missing</b>	181	76.1	
<b>Total</b>		238	100	

#### 5.7.4 “Cannot communicate with staffs involved”

About the difficulty of communicating with staffs in government department or service centre, 18 out of those 57 respondents (table 5.7.4) expressed that it is one of their difficulty in application for services, which occupies 31.6% of the valid samples.

Table 5.7.4 “Cannot communicate with staffs involved”

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
	<b>Yes</b>	18	7.6	31.6
	<b>No</b>	39	16.4	68.4
	<b>Total</b>	57	23.9	100
	<b>Missing</b>	181	76.1	
<b>Total</b>		238	100	

#### 5.7.5 “The staff involved cannot help”

Moreover, 16 out of 57 respondents (table 5.7.5A) expressed that the staffs in the government department or services centres cannot help them to apply for the services, at which this difficulty occupies 28.1% of the valid samples.

Table 5.7.5A “Staffs Involved cannot Help”

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
	<b>Yes</b>	16	6.7	28.1
	<b>No</b>	41	17.2	71.9
	<b>Total</b>	57	23.9	100
	<b>Missing</b>	181	76.1	
<b>Total</b>		238	100	

In addition, 7 out of 57 respondents expressed that they have met other difficulties not suggested on the questionnaire. (Table 5.7.5B)

Table 5.7.5B “Other Difficulties”

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
	<b>Yes</b>	7	2.9	12.3
	<b>No</b>	50	21	87.7
	<b>Total</b>	57	23.9	100
	<b>Missing</b>	181	76.1	
<b>Total</b>		238	100	

Generally, 73.7% of those 57 respondents (table 5.7.5C) expressed that information not written in their ethnical languages is one of the difficulties they have met in applying for government social services. About 40% of those 57 respondents have experienced difficulties in dealing with lengthy and complicated application form, and also, about 40% of those 57 respondents have experienced very long time to deal with application procedures.

Table 5.7.5C Overall Difficulties Experienced in Application (n=57)

Difficulties		Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
	<b>Information is not written in your language</b>	42	17.6	73.7
	<b>Lengthy &amp; Complicated Application Form</b>	24	10.1	42.1
	<b>Time-Consuming Application Procedures</b>	23	9.7	40.4
	<b>Cannot communicate with staffs involved</b>	18	7.6	31.6
	<b>Staffs Involved cannot Help</b>	16	6.7	28.1
	<b>Others</b>	7	2.9	12.3

## 5.8 Difficulties Encountered in getting access to the Government Social Services and Measures

### 5.8.1 Limited Governmental Publicity to the South Asian communities

Many respondents never hear about all or some of the government social services. There are 7.1% (17 out of 238) of the respondents know none of the listed six government social services and measures. Moreover, the overall “don’t know” rate is also high in some of the measures, for example, 69.3% of the respondents do not know about the After School Care Programme, 59.7% of respondents do not know about the Work Incentive Transport Subsidy Scheme.

The first step to get access into the social services is to hear and know about the services. If many of the South Asian ethnic minorities have not even heard about the services, it is more difficult for them to be benefited by the social services and measures. It is suspected that the Hong Kong government has not publicized the social services and measures sufficiently to the ethnic minorities' community.

#### 5.8.2 Lack of assistance to the South Asian Communities

28.6% (28 out of 98) of respondents who have not applied for various social services because of not knowing how to apply for them. The Hong Kong government usual means of publicizing the social services included mass media, official website or leaflets. However, these means cannot reach South Asians community easily, and they might have difficulties in reading and understanding the Chinese and English instruction and procedures also.

#### 5.8.3 Language Barriers during the Application Procedures for the South Asian Communities

Based on the data above which discovered various difficulties in applying for the listed social services and measures in the research, 73% (42 out of 57) of respondents who have experiences in application for the services on the list expressed that the information of the services not written in their languages is one of the difficulties during their application procedures. And 31.6% of the respondents have experienced communication problem with the staffs in government departments. Nowadays in Hong Kong, the newly launched policies and measures like the Statutory Minimum Wage and the Work Incentive Transport Subsidy Scheme have been introduced for more than one year. Although ethnic minorities citizens can find the non-Chinese / English version of Labour Department policies' information in like Hindi, Nepali and Urdu, the translation are not comprehensive and only cover part of the policy. Other department like the Student Financial Assistance Agency website consisted of only Chinese and English versions of details of information. And the South Asians may perceive difficulties in reading and understanding the instruction and procedures. The South Asian ethnic minorities, especially the low income and low education groups are often not able to read Chinese and/or English. However, most of them are eligible target groups to be helped and supported by those assistance measures in the Hong Kong society.

#### 5.8.4 Complex Procedures

42.1% of respondents who have applied for government social services and measures

expressed that the application forms were lengthy and complicated. And 40.4% of respondents expressed that the application procedures are time-consuming. The low income South Asian ethnic minorities, who are usually without Chinese or English proficiency, probably perceive that the procedures of application are out of their capacities without proper and sensitive help from the relevant departments or non-governmental organizations.

## 6. Utilization Rates of relevant Government Departments and Service Centres

Apart from the particular anti-poverty social measures, the actual utilization rates of relevant government departments and / or service centres are also explored as below.

### 6.1 Social Security Field Units of Social Welfare Department

About the accessibility of the Social Security Field Units of Social Welfare Department, 79 out of 238 respondents (table 6.1A) have used the services provided by the Social Security Field Units, more than half (66.8%) of the total numbers of respondents have not used its services.

Table 6.1A Using of Social Security Field Units of Social Welfare Department

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
Yes	79	33.2	33.2
No	159	66.8	66.8
Total	238	100	100

Considering the accessibility of the Social Security Field Units to the unemployed respondents, only 39 out of those 91 unemployed respondents (table 6.1B) have used the services provided by the Social Security Field Units. 57.1% of those 91 unemployed respondents have not used its services.

Table 6.1B Using of Social Security Field Units of Social Welfare Department by unemployed respondents (P=0.003)

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
Yes	39	16.4	42.9



	<b>No</b>	52	21.8	57.1
	<b>Total</b>	91	38.2	100
	<b>Missing</b>	147	61.8	
<b>Total</b>		238	100	

### 6.2 Support service Centres for Ethnic Minorities of Home Affairs Department

Concerning the accessibility of the existing four Support service Centres for Ethnic Minorities of Home Affairs Department to the respondents, only 64 out of 238 respondents (table 6.2) have used the services provided by the Support service Centres for Ethnic Minorities. 174 out of those 238 respondents (73.1%) have not used its services.

Table 6.2 Support service Centres for Ethnic Minorities of Home Affairs Department

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Valid %</b>
<b>Yes</b>	64	26.9	26.9
<b>No</b>	174	73.1	73.1
<b>Total</b>	238	100	100

### 6.3 Student Finance Assistance Agency

Concerning the accessibility of the Student Finance Assistance Agency, only 60 out of 238 respondents (table 6.3A) have used the services provided by the Student Finance Assistance Agency. More than 70% (178 out of 238) of the respondents have not used its services.

Table 6.3A Using of Student Finance Assistance Agency

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Valid %</b>
<b>Yes</b>	60	25.2	25.2
<b>No</b>	178	74.8	74.8
<b>Total</b>	238	100	100

Specially, 50 out of 166 respondents (table 6.3B, 30.1%) who have children in their families studying in Kindergarten, primary or secondary school have used the services provided by the Student Finance Assistance Agency. However, 69.9% of those 166 respondents (116 out of 166) have not used its services.

Table 6.3B Using of Student Finance Assistance Agency of the respondents with children

		Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
	<b>Yes</b>	50	21	30.1
	<b>No</b>	116	48.7	69.9
	<b>Total</b>	166	69.7	100
	<b>Missing</b>	72	30.3	
<b>Total</b>		238	100	

#### 6.4 Use "None of the above" government departments/ service centres

About the overall accessibility of the services provided by the government departments or service centres, 88 out of 238 respondents (table 6.1A, 37%) have not used any of services provided by the government departments mentioned in the questionnaires, which are the Jobs Centres / Interactive Employment Service, Social Security Field Units, Support service Centres for Ethnic Minorities and the Student Finance Assistance Agency.

Table 6.4A Have used any of the services provided by the government departments above

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
<b>Yes</b>	150	63	63
<b>No</b>	88	37	37
<b>Total</b>	238	100	100

Moreover, the service centre using by the highest number of respondents is the Social Security Field Units of the Social Welfare Department, which is 79 out of 238 (33.2%) respondents. However, the Job Centres of the Labour Department occupy the least number of using respondents which is only 43 out of 238 (18.1%) respondents. And 37% (88 out of 238) of the respondents have not used any services provided by the government departments mentioned in the questionnaires.

Table 6.4B Overall Using of Government Department and Service Centres (n=238)

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid %
<b>Nil</b>	88	37	37
<b>Social Welfare Department: Social Security Field Units</b>	79	33.2	33.2
<b>Home Affairs Department: Support service Centres for Ethnic Minorities</b>	64	26.9	26.9
<b>Student Finance Assistance Agency</b>	60	25.2	25.2
<b>Labour Department: Jobs Centres / Interactive</b>	43	18.1	18.1

*6.5 Overall Accessibility of Government Departments and Services Centres*

6.5.1 Low Accessibility of Government Departments and Services Centres

According to the above data, the accessibility of government departments and service centres is not high that 52 out of 91 (57.1%) unemployed respondents have not used the services provided by the Social Security Field Units of the Social Welfare Department. Moreover, 116 out of 166 (69.9%) respondents who have children in their families studying in Kindergarten, primary or secondary school have not used the assistance provided by the Student Finance Assistance Agency. And for all 238 respondents, only 43 (18.1%) of them have used the Job centres' services provided by the Labour Department. The departments mentioned in the questionnaire are well-known by the Hong Kong residents. However, many South Asian ethnic minorities have not used their services even once.

6.5.2 Insufficient Quantity of Ethnic Minorities' Service Centres

Based on the data, only 26.9% of respondents have used the services provided by the Support Service Centres for Ethnic Minorities. And 73.1% (174 out of 238) respondents have not used any services provided by those Centres. According to the Race Relations Unit of the Home Affairs Department, there are only four support service centres for the ethnic minorities which are definitely not enough in quantity to take care of their needs.

## **7. Conclusions and Recommendations**

The result of the survey indicates that most of the grass-roots South Asians interviewed were usual residents in Hong Kong. Also, most of the working respondents were engaging in low-wage elementary occupations. Among these people, they were mostly less-educated and in their middle ages.

The research discovers that over 22.4% respondents who were employed were paid less than the minimum wage rate of \$28 per hour by their employers. Among these respondents, 58.3% were working as security guards. The survey also reveals that the respondents often worked long hours. The mean working hours per day of total respondents was 9.4 hours. At the same time, most of the respondents were not paid for their rest days and meal break.

Regarding their understandings to labor policy of Incentive Transport Subsidy Scheme and utilization of Job Center service, a large proportion of respondents expressed that they

had not heard of the Transport Scheme and has no access to the Job Centre Service. We believe that this has much to do with the language barrier and the inadequate government promotion on these services among them. Recommendations are suggested as follows to improve the situations.

### **7.1 Enhance enforcement of Minimum Wage legislation and increase the frequencies of labor inspection**

Although Statutory Minimum Wage has been legislated in Hong Kong recently, a number of South Asian workers interviewed were still receiving wage less than the statutory minimum rate. Among these people, most of them were security guards. It indicates that the enforcement of minimum wage law is far from satisfactory at the moment. We suggest the government to enhance the enforcement of the Minimum Wage law and increase the frequencies of labor inspection, especially in the security and investigation industry. Besides, the government should be more vigorous in prosecution of employers who contravene the Employment Ordinance and the Minimum Wage Ordinance.

Moreover, the government should raise the awareness of the public, particularly South Asians on their rights in terms of Minimum Wage protection and encourage them to seek for assistance at the Labor Department when they encounter underpayment of minimum wage and labor rights exploitations.

### **7.2 Review on Minimum Wage Rate**

Hong Kong is facing high inflation and uprising prices, people are struggling for their living. Moreover, misunderstanding or negligence in the calculation of minimum wage of their own and employers may take this advantage to underpay these workers. We urge the government to state clearly in the Employment Ordinance and the Minimum Wage Ordinance whether meal break and rest days should be paid. We suggest that the Hong Kong government should review the existing rate and definitions and the government should invite and consider the views of South Asians when revising the minimum wage rate. Furthermore, it is advised to review the rate of minimum wage each year so that the salary of the employees can catch up with the inflation growth.

### **7.3 Enhance the Legislation of Standard Working Hours**

Working long hours is detrimental to our health and family life. We suggest the

government to legislate law on standard working hours. We believe it can enable all employees to have more rest and have time to enjoy their leisure activities.

#### **7.4 Diversification of Official Languages and Increase of Publicity of the government services**

Hong Kong is an international city, cultural diversity should be respected. The government should take the initiative in promoting policies and equipping the government staffs with multicultural sense.

It is important and necessary to diversify languages used in government departments. The government should include the language of South Asians such as Urdu and Nepali in websites and leaflets for the introduction of government policies and services. Besides, the government should take the active role in promoting those policies and services to South Asian groups through consultations, assemblies as well as mass media such as radio and television broadcast and their local newspapers. By doing so, we believe South Asians can be more aware of and understanding of the government services and policies. They may be more willing to seek help from the government as a result.

#### **7.5 More Training to Front Line Officers**

The Hong Kong government should provide more training to front line officers in areas of labor and welfare services so that they can identify and address the needs of ethnic minorities. In order to solve the problem of language barrier, the government should take further step to recruit more South Asians and ethnic minorities in various departments, especially labor department and welfare department, as mediators in delivering services to the minority groups.

#### **7.6 Insufficient Quantity of Ethnic Minorities' Support Service Centres**

According to the Race Relations Unit of the Home Affairs Department, there are only four support service centres for ethnic minorities which are definitely not enough in quantity to take care of their needs. The Support Service Centres can serve as a bridge between the South Asian communities and the Hong Kong society and therefore their services should be strengthen in the future.

#### **7.7 Setting up of the Commission on Ethnic Minorities**

In the Manifesto of Mr. C. Y. Leung for the Chief Executive of Hong Kong Special Administration Region Election, Mr. Leung has highly appreciated the contribution of the ethnic minorities to Hong Kong society and has promised to review existing policies to reduce estrangement and help ethnic minorities, especially the younger generation, integrate into the local community. We urge the new government to set up a Commission on matters relating to Ethnic Minorities, with primary objective to study and address to the needs of ethnic minority groups. The commission is also advised to pay special attention to tackle their problems in the areas of education and labour affairs such as seeking jobs and accessing to job training and re-training services.

## APPENDIX A (Chinese report 中文報告)

### 南亞裔居民在港的法定最低工資保障及使用政府解困紓貧措施或服務的情況 - 調查結果研究報告

#### 一、簡介

根據政府統計處 2011 年人口普查統計報告顯示，現時在港居住的少數族裔人口有顯著上升，人數高達 451 183 人，佔香港整體人口 6% 以上<sup>4</sup>。當中以印度人最多，有 6.3%，巴基斯坦人佔 4%，尼泊爾人佔 3.7%。不過，統計報告顯示，大部分南亞少數族裔人士生活條件欠佳。根據 2006 年所發表的少數族裔專題研究報告顯示，人口比例最高的亞洲人士(並不包括中國人)佔 83.8%，他們多從事低級及低薪工作。當中，巴基斯坦人和尼泊爾人之入息中位數分別為 9000 元及 8500 元，相關數額比 2006 年全港整體勞動人口之收入低 10%。<sup>5</sup>

立法會已於 2010 年 7 月通過最低工資法例，旨在不損害社會經濟發展及競爭力的同時，確立工資下限，用以維護勞工階層的基本生活及收窄工資差距。2011 年 5 月 1 日最低工資法例正式，規定時薪不少於 28 元正。有意見認為，最低工資實施後，長者、婦女、年青人等弱勢社群，會成為最易被裁撤或削減工時的對象，這與他們較低的議價能力不無關係。同樣地，南亞裔人士一直也被指視為最脆弱的社群，較易遭受勞資剝削及歧視。是次研究，我們旨在調查南亞少數族裔人士是否未受最低工資法例保障。

法定最低工資是保護草根階層工人貧困生活的一項措施。不過現時香港政府未有提供長足的政策，仍流於頭痛醫頭，腳痛醫腳的服務，而服務亦分散由不同政府部門處理。是次調查亦希望瞭解南亞族裔草根階層對這些零散的紓困措施的認識及使用情況。

#### 二、摘要

本研究的研究範圍以瞭解在港南亞少數族裔人士的就業情況及使用政府之扶貧紓困措施的面貌。被邀受訪之人士為現居本港之南亞少數族裔人士，包括巴基斯坦人、尼泊爾人、印度人及孟加拉人。由於研究目標是要瞭解低收入南亞少數族裔人士的生活面貌，故所有在職受訪者之每月薪酬均少於 12000 元，這個基準是參考綜合住戶統計調查 2012 第一季度的按季統計報告之每月工資中位數來釐訂。

調查以問卷形式進行。問卷內容涵蓋三方面，包括：一、受訪者的就業情況；二、受訪者對最低工資法例的認識及受保障程度；三、受訪者對由勞工處、社會福利署、民政事務總署及

<sup>4</sup> 政府統計處(2011)，人口普查，人口的種族。

<sup>5</sup> 政府統計處(2006)，中期人口普查，少數族裔專題研究報告。

學生資助辦事處之認知與接觸。

成功完成訪問的受訪者共238人，當中超過一半(55%)受訪人士為受人僱人士，而其近八成(76%)為全職受僱，有14.7%人士從事半職工作，有近一成(9.3%)人士為臨時員工。不過值得注意的是有接受四成(38.2%)受訪者現正失業。受訪者的月薪中位數為9000元，有接近兩成(18.9%)受訪者表示其月薪只有6000元或以下。這個數額即等同於2012年綜合住戶統計按季統計調查首季報告所示之入息中位數(即12000元)的一半。(參考表9)。這反映不少的南亞裔的受訪者生活在貧窮線下。更嚴重的問題是，當中超過九成(92.2%)受僱人士為家庭經濟生活的支柱。數據顯示他們大部分均處於在職貧窮的狀態。調查發現受訪者的工作時間較長，平均為9.4小時。當中有132名受僱者中，有近一半人士(47%)表示他們並未獲得僱主提供有薪用膳的待遇，更有接近三成人士(28%)表示不知道是否享有相關待遇。有關有薪休息日方面，同樣分別有47.3%及21.4%人士表示未獲相關安排或不知道是否享有相關待遇。

對於最低工資法例的認識方面，有接近八成(77%)受訪者表示知悉相關法例，但仍有23%人士對此未有認識。超過九成受訪者更表示，不少於33元才是最低工資的合理水平。另外，即使有關法例已實施超過一年，我們發現，有關保障仍未惠及在港居住的南亞少數族裔人士，有22.4%受訪者表示他們的工作時薪是遠低於現時法定的28元，當中接近六成(58.3%)人士為從事保安工作。

至於認識及使用政府之扶貧政策方面，當中有最多受訪者表示「不知道」政府提供之相關扶貧政策，依次為由社會福利署提供之學童課後託管服務(69.3%)，其次為勞工署提供之在職交通津貼計劃(59.7%)，第三為由學生資助辦事處提供之幼稚園及幼兒中心學費減免計劃(52.5%)。

鑑於最低工資的保障不足，而使用政府扶貧政策率亦甚低，我們在本調查報告最後部分提出一些建議，期望相關建議在保障南亞少數族裔工人之生活同時，亦有助政府當局制定多元文化政策有更敏感的接觸覺。

### 三、目標及意義

我們相信，南亞少數族裔人士為現時因著語言阻隔，而經常成為在勞動市場中遭受剝削的一群。直至現在，坊間仍未就最低工資立法後，對南亞少數族裔人士之就業情況作出研究。

為此，我們進行一次調查，除了瞭解南亞少數族裔人士在最低工資立法後的最新就業情況外，更特別關注他們有否被短付最低工資。另外，我們亦大幅度關注他們對合理最低工資的素求及他們對香港政府扶貧措施的認識程度。

由於是次調查為最低工資立法後的最新研究，我們相信有關研究所得的資料，對特區政府制訂相關扶貧政策甚具參考價值。我們更希望新任行政長官及其高層官員，能致力深入瞭解及改善南亞少數族裔人士的就業情況和生活條件。



是次研究目的簡述如下：

- 3.1 瞭解他們的就業、工資、工時、工作待遇等情況；
- 3.2 研究他們對最低工資法例的認知程度及對合理最低工資水平的期望；
- 3.3 探討他們有否面對被短付最低工資及
- 3.4 檢視他們對政府現行扶貧政策的認識及使用程度。

## 四、研究方法

是次研究採取問卷形式進行。

本調查的訪問對象為 15 歲以上在職及非在職南亞族裔人士。為更好瞭解南亞族裔低收入人士之生活面貌，是次的在職受訪者每月薪酬均少於 12000 元，這個基準是參考綜合住戶統計調查 2011 年 10 月至 12 月的按季統計報告之每月工資中位數來釐訂。

是次調查以方便取樣及滾雪球方式(convenient and snowball sampling method) 進行。我們分別以以下三種方式來收集數據：

- 4.1 在街頭接觸受訪對象，同時也會在清真寺及伊斯蘭經學院門外接觸受訪者；
- 4.2 經培訓之南亞少數族裔人士以，在其熟識之網絡中以滾雪球方式收集數據；
- 4.3 由從事南亞裔人士服務之非政府組織轉介。

在問卷正式定稿前，我們曾以試驗性質邀請 15 名南亞裔人士接受問卷調查。問卷作最終修訂後，我們為所有參與問卷調查的南亞少數族裔調查員及非政府組織之工作人員舉辦工作坊，讓所有調查員能清楚明白問卷內容。另外，問卷用語兼備烏爾都語及尼泊爾文，務求令調查員及受訪者均清楚閱讀及明白問卷內容。

正式調查從 2012 年 3 月至 6 月進行。成功完成訪問的受訪者共 238 人，大部分為現居香港的尼泊爾裔及巴基斯坦裔人士。而是次調查所得之數據，均以 Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS；社會科學統計包)來運算及整理。

## 五、分析及討論

### 5.1 受訪者的背景資料

#### 5.1.1 國籍

238 名受訪者中，有 52.4% 為巴基斯坦裔人士，接近三成(29.2%) 為尼泊爾裔，印度裔也接近一成(9.9%)，孟加拉裔人士有 6.9%，斯里蘭卡裔有 0.9%。

表 5.1.1 國籍

國籍	人數	有效百分比 %	累積 %
巴基斯坦	122	51.3	52.4
尼泊爾	68	28.6	29.2
印度	23	9.7	9.9
孟加拉	16	6.7	6.9
斯里蘭卡	2	0.8	0.9
其他	2	0.8	0.9
總和	233	97.9	100
缺失資料	5	2.1	
總數	238	100	

### 5.1.2 性別和年齡

238 名受訪者中，接近一半即共 117 人(49.8%) 為男性，女性有 118 人，佔 50.2%。男女的受訪者數目分佈平均。大部份受訪者的年齡超過 35 歲者，佔 61.4%，介乎 34 至 44 歲者有 42.8%，可見大部份受訪者均為中年人士。(參考表 5.1.2A)

表 5.1.2A：年齡分佈

	人數	有效百分比 %	累積 %
有效樣本 15-19	6	2.6	2.6
20-24	3	1.3	3.9
25-29	27	11.7	15.6
30-34	53	22.9	38.5
35-39	53	22.9	61.5
40-44	46	19.9	81.4
45-49	21	9.1	90.5
50-54	4	1.7	92.2
55-59	6	2.6	94.8
60 或以上	12	5.2	100.0
總和	231	100.0	
缺失資料 99	7		
總數	238		

受訪者中，表示從未接受教育者或只有小學程度者佔 38.4%，超過 20% 的受訪者有初中程度。由此可見，有六成(60.3%) 受訪者屬低學歷人士(參考表 5.1.2B)。在這 143 名低學歷人士中，(49.6%) 為受僱人士。

表 5.1.2B：教育程度

		人數	有效百分比 %	累積 %
有效樣本	小學或以下	91	38.4	38.4
	初中程度	52	21.9	60.3
	高中程度	38	16.0	76.4
	專上學院	29	12.2	88.6
	大學	14	5.9	94.5
	研究院或以上	4	1.7	96.2
	其他	9	3.8	100.0
	總和	237	100.0	
缺失資料	1			
總數	238			

### 5.1.3 居港年期

有 67.4% 的受訪者表示他們居港有十年以上，而平均居港年期為 14 年，可以說大部份受訪人士為本港常住居民。(參考表 5.1.3)

表 5.1.3：居港年期

		人數	有效百分比 %	累積 %
有效樣本	1 年或以下	3	1.3	1.3
	1 > 至 2 年	11	4.8	6.1
	2 > 至 4 年	14	6.1	12.2
	4 > 至 6 年	14	6.1	18.3
	6 > 至 8 年	14	6.1	24.3
	8 > 至 10 年	19	8.3	32.6
	10 > 至 12 年	23	10.0	42.6
	12 > 至 14 年	24	10.4	53.0
	14 > 至 16 年	40	17.4	70.4
	16 > 至 18 年	20	8.7	79.1
	18 > 至 20 年	9	3.9	83.0
	>20 年	39	17.0	100.0
總和	230	100.0		
缺失資料	8			
總數	238			

### 5.1.4 居住房屋種別

238 名受訪者中，有六成(60.4%)受訪者表示現租住私人單位，有 37.4 受訪者則入住公共房屋，只有少數人士(2.2%)有能力自置私人物業居住(參考表 5.1.4A)。租住私人單位者當中，有四成多(43.5%)每月須以 4000 至 6000 元用於房租，更有多達一成人士表示須以 6000 元以上租住私人單位。我們相信南亞裔人士承受的租金壓力相當沉重(參考表 5.1.4B)。

表 5.1.4A：居住樓房種類

		數目	有效百分比 %	累積 %
有效樣本	公共房屋	86	37.4	37.4
	自置私人物業	5	2.2	39.6
	租住私人單位	139	60.4	100.0
	總和	230	100.0	
缺失資料		8		
總數		238		

表 5.1.4B：租住私人單位之租金

		頻率	有效%	累積 %
有效樣本	\$2000 或以下	10	7.2	7.2
	\$2000 > 至 \$4000	54	39.1	46.4
	\$4000 > 至 \$6000	60	43.5	89.9
	\$6000 > 至 \$8000	5	3.6	93.5
	\$8000 > 至 \$10000	6	4.3	97.8
	\$10000 >至 \$12000	2	1.4	99.3
	>\$12000	1	0.7	100.0
	總和	138	100.0	
缺失資料	系統缺失	100		
總數		238		

### 5.1.5 家庭收入(包括在同一戶籍中所有家庭成員)

226 名受訪者中， 48 人(即 21.2%)表示過去一個月的平均家庭總收入只有 9001 至 11000 元不等。其次接近兩成(19.5%)受訪者，即 44 人表示其家庭過去一個月之總收入為 7001 至 9000 元。只有 18 人(8%)受訪者，表示其家庭過去一個月之總收入超過 21000 元。(參考表 5.1.5)

Table 5.1.5 上月家庭總收入

收入(\$)	頻率	百分比	有效百分比
0	16	6.7	7.1
1-1000	1	0.4	0.4
1001-3000	4	1.7	1.8
3001-5000	15	6.3	6.6
5001-7000	20	8.4	8.8

7001-9000	44	18.5	19.5
9001-11000	48	20.2	21.2
11001-13000	27	11.3	11.9
13001-15000	16	6.7	7.1
15001-17000	9	3.8	4
17001-19000	5	2.1	2.2
19001-21000	3	1.3	1.3
>21000	18	7.6	8
總和	226	95	
缺失資料	12	5	
總數	238	100	

### 5.1.6 子女數目

根據表 5.1.6A 所示，238 名受訪者中，有約七成人士(166 人)育有兒女。他們的孩子分別在幼稚園、小學和中學上學。另外，有約三成(29.7%，70 人)受訪者表示沒有在學子女。

表 5.1.6A 家庭內有就讀幼稚園/ 小學/ 中學子女

家庭內就讀幼稚園/ 小學/ 中學子女	頻率	百分比	有效百分比
有	166	69.7	70.3
沒有	70	29.4	29.7
總和	236	99.2	100
缺失資料	2	0.8	
總數	238	100	

根據表 5.1.6B 之資料，有 156 名受訪者現時有子女在幼稚園、小學或中學接受教育，數目約佔四成(95 人)。而擁有 4 名或以上在學子女者僅佔 3% (7 人)。

表 5.1.6B 子女數目

子女數目	頻率	百分比	有效百分比
1	43	18.1	27.6
2	52	21.8	33.3
3	37	15.5	23.7

	4	17	7.1	10.9
	>4	7	3	4.4
	總和	156	65.5	100
	缺失資料	82	34.5	
總數		238	100	

### 5.1.7 受供養家庭成員人數

就表 5.1.7 所示，235 名受訪者中，有四成多(42.2%，99 人)表示他們須在經濟上照顧三至四名家庭成員。而有 58 人(24.7%)受訪者表示，須在經濟上照顧一至兩名家庭成員。另外，更有 3.4% 人士表示須照顧六名以上家庭成員的生活。只有 15 人表示並無這方面的負擔。

表 5.1.7 受供養家庭成員人數

家庭成員	人數	有效百分比 %	累積 %
0	15	6.3	6.4
1-2	58	24.4	24.7
3-4	99	41.3	42.2
5-6	45	23.1	23.4
>6	8	3.4	3.4
總和	235	98.7	100
缺失資料	3	1.3	
總數	238	100	

## 5.2. 就業資料

### 5.2.1 就業狀況

超過一半的受訪者(55.5%)現在受僱於各行業。其中有 129 人在職人士中，男性有 95 人佔 73.6%，女性佔 26.4%，共 34 人。由此可見，受訪者中的勞動人口以男性為主。(參考表 5.2.1A 及表 5.2.1B)。此外，129 在職人士中，有接近八成(76%)人士從事全職工作，而有 14.7% 人士從事半職工作，有近一成(9.3%)人士只能充當臨時工作(參考表 5.2.1C)。

表 5.2.1A：就業狀況

		人數	有效百分比 %	累積 %
有效樣本	是	132	55.5	55.5
	否	91	38.2	93.7
	不適用	15	6.3	100.0
	總數	238	100.0	

表 5.2.1B：性別和就業狀況之間的關係性

		性別		總數
		男	女	

你現時是否受僱？	是	經常	95	34	129
		包括「你現時是否受僱？」%	73.6%	26.4%	100.0%
		包括「性別」%	81.2%	28.8%	54.9%
		總和%	40.4%	14.5%	54.9%
	否	經常	21	70	91
		包括「你現時是否受僱？」%	23.1%	76.9%	100.0%
		包括「性別」%	17.9%	59.3%	38.7%
		總和%	8.9%	29.8%	38.7%
	不適用	經常	1	14	15
包括「你現時是否受僱？」%		6.7%	93.3%	100.0%	
包括「性別」%		0.9%	11.9%	6.4%	
總和 %		0.4%	6.0%	6.4%	
總數	經常	117	118	235	
	包括「你現時是否受僱？」%	49.8%	50.2%	100.0%	
	包括「性別」%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	總和 %	49.8%	50.2%	100.0%	

表 5.2.1C 受僱情況

受僱情況	人數	有效百分比 %	累積 %
全職	98	41.2	76
兼職	19	8	14.7
臨時工作	12	5	9.3
總和	129	54.2	100
缺失資料	109	45.8	
總數	238	100	

## 5.2.2 工作類別

通過分析受訪者的工作類別，我們發現大部分在職受訪者從事低技術或低級的工作。其中從事護衛保安的佔大多數，有 26.5%。而從事建造業工人或清潔工人分別有 12.1% 及 8.3%。而從事運輸送貨行業者佔 6.8%。(參考表 5.2.2)

表 5.2.2：工作類別

	人數	有效百分比 %	累積 %
有效樣本	工廠工人	7	5.3
	技術工人	7	5.3
	文員	11	8.3
	運輸送貨員	9	6.8
	售貨員	4	3.0
	司機	7	5.3
	侍應	4	3.0

酒保	1	.8	37.9
護衛員	35	26.5	64.4
髮廊助理	4	3.0	67.4
專業人士	3	2.3	69.7
建築工人	16	12.1	81.8
清潔工人	6	4.5	86.4
其他	18	13.6	100.0
總和	132	100.0	
缺失資料 系統缺失	106		
總數	238		

### 5.2.3 工資

超過七成(72.5%)受訪者表示他們，另外有 16.8%受訪者則以日薪形式受聘，而以時薪受僱的佔一成(10.7%)。

在 95 個以月薪形式受僱的樣本中，有四成(41.1%)受訪者月薪介乎 8000 至 10000 元。而受訪者的入息中位數為 9000 元。此數額跟 2006 年的同類形少數族裔專題研究報告接近。該報告顯示巴基斯坦籍人士的入息中位數同樣是 9000 元，而尼泊爾籍人士的入息中位數為 8500 元。值得注意的是，調查揭示有接近兩成(18.9%)受訪者的月薪為 6000 元或以下，而 6000 元即等同於 2011 年綜合住戶統計按季統計調查 10 月至 12 月的報告所示之入息中位數(即 12000 元)的一半。(參考表 5.2.3)。這反映不少的南亞裔的受訪者生活在貧窮線下。

表 5.2.3：受聘人士之月薪

		人數	有效百分比 %	累積 %
有效樣本	\$2000 > 至 \$4000	5	5.3	5.3
	\$4000 > 至 \$6000	13	13.7	18.9
	\$6000 > 至 \$8000	19	20.0	38.9
	\$8000 > 至 \$10000	39	41.1	80.0
	\$10000 > 至 \$12000	19	20.0	100.0
	總和	95	100.0	
缺失資料	系統缺失	143		
總數		238		

### 5.2.4 工時

有 38 位(34.9%)表示，他們的每日平均工時為 9 至 10 小時。另有三成(31.2%)受訪者指其每日平均工時長達 11 至 12 小時。是次受訪的在職南亞裔人士的平均工作時數為 9.4 小時。整體而言，大部份受訪者的每日需長時間工作。(參考表 5.2.4)

表 5.2.4 工時

		人數	有效百分比 %
有效樣本	1-4	2	1.8



	5-6	10	9.2
	7-8	25	22.9
	9-10	38	34.9
	11-12	34	31.2
	總和	109	100
缺失資料	系統缺失	23	
總數		132	

### 5.2.5 有薪用膳及有薪休息日

132 名受訪者中，四分之一人士享有有薪用膳的待遇，有接近一半受訪者(47%)表示僱主並沒有這樣安排，有 28%受訪者表示不知道是否享有相關待遇。

接近三分之一(31.3%)受訪者稱僱主給予有薪休息日，不過有接近一半受訪人士(47.3%)並未享有這種待遇。另有 21.4%受訪者指不知道是否有相關安排。因為現行的最低工資計算方法並不計算非工作時數的工資，所以諸如有薪休息日、假日薪酬、病假津貼等非工作時段所得的工資不可用作計算最低工資。因此，受僱人士有必要清楚知道其實際工時及實際工作時數所得之薪酬。我們對部分受訪者根本不知道自己是否享有有薪休息日的情況表示關注。因為相關誤解或忽視，會導致錯誤計算最低工資，而僱主可使用這個漏洞來短付員工薪酬。(參考表 5.2.5A 及表 5.2.5B)

表 5.2.5A 帶薪用膳(“飯鐘錢”)

		人數	有效百分比 %	累積 %
有效樣本	有	33	25.0	25.0
	沒有	62	47.0	72.0
	不知道	37	28.0	100.0
	總和	132	100.0	
缺失資料	系統缺失	106		
總數		238		

表 5.2.5B 有薪假期

		人數	有效百分比 %	累積 %
有效樣本	有	41	31.3	31.3
	沒有	62	47.3	78.6
	不知道	28	21.4	100.0
	總和	131	100.0	
缺失資料	99	1		
	系統缺失	106		
	總和	107		
總數		238		

### 5.3 對最低工資立法的認識及對最低工資水平之意見

調查發現，**77.6%**受訪者知道最低工資法例現已實施，結果令人鼓舞。過往，南亞裔人士一直對政府政策認識不足，這主要源於語言問題及政府的宣傳不足。故此，大多數受訪者表示知道最低工資已經立法，在某程度上顯示他們知道自己受最低工資法例的保障。(參考表 5.3A)

表 5.3A 認識最低工資立法

		人數	有效百分比 %	累積 %
有效樣本	是	184	77.6	77.6
	否	53	22.4	100.0
	總和	237	100.0	
缺失資料	99	1		
總數		238		

另外，**接近九成(89.9%)**受訪者表示對現時**的最低工資水平並不滿意**。只有 6.3%受訪者表示現行的最低工資水平足以維持其個人及家人在香的基本生活需要。此外，有接近三份一受訪者(33.2%)希望再釐訂最低工資水平時，時薪應介乎 35 至 40 元之間。有四份一受訪者(25.7%)建議比率應在 33 至 35 元之間，有 32.3%受訪者則期望時薪應提升至 40 元。**整體而言，九成以上(91.2%)**受訪者認為**最低工資的合理時薪應為 33 元**。從受訪者的訴求可見，即使最低工資法例實施後有助提升低收入人士的收入，但不斷飆升的通貨膨脹抵銷了基層勞工的薪酬增長，結果令最低工資無助改善市民的生活。所以我們可以理解，絕大部份低收入受訪者期望調高最低工資水平，用以滿足他們的生活需要。(參考表 5.3B 及表 5.3C)

表 5.3B 對最低工資立法有助支持生計的看法

		人數	有效百分比 %	累積 %
有效樣本	可以	15	6.3	6.3
	不能	214	89.9	96.2
	不知道/無意見	9	3.8	100.0
	總數	238	100.0	

表 5.3C 對合理時薪的意見

	時薪	人數	有效百分比 %	累積 %
有效樣本	\$28> 至 \$30	8	3.7	3.7
	\$30> 至 \$33	11	5.1	8.9
	\$33> 至 \$35	55	25.7	34.6
	\$35> 至 \$40	71	33.2	67.8
	\$40> 至 \$45	13	6.1	73.8
	>\$45	56	26.2	100.0
	總和	214	100.0	

	系統缺失	24		
總數		238		

#### 5.4 最低工資法例的保障情況

調查結果顯示，接近四份一的受訪者(22.4%)現時所得之時薪少於 28 元 (參考表 5.4A)。在這 24 名受訪者中，有近八成(79.2%)為男士，當中有一半以上(58.3%)人士從事保安員工作 (參考表 5.4B)。另外，當中有超過一半受訪者(54.2%)為介乎 40 至 49 歲之中年人士。雖然有接近八成受訪者(77.6%)知道他們受最低工資法例保障，但仍有超過兩成受訪者(22.4%)所得之工資低於法例所訂。由此可見，相關之調查及跟進工作實在刻不容緩。

表 5.4A 受訪者所獲時薪

薪金 (\$)		人數	有效百分比 %	累積 %
	<28	24	10.1	22.4
	多於或等如 28	83	34.9	77.6
	總和	107	45	100
	缺失資料	131	55	
總數		238	100	

5.4B 工作類別和短付工資的情況

工作種類		人數	有效百分比 %	累積 %
	護衛員	14	58.3	58.3
	司機	3	12.5	12.5
	髮廊助理	1	4.2	4.2
	清潔工人	2	8.3	8.3
	酒保	1	4.2	4.2
	工廠工人	1	4.2	4.2
	運輸送貨員	1	4.2	4.2
	售貨員	1	4.2	4.2
總和		24	100	100

#### 5.5 對勞工處服務之認識

鼓勵就業交通津貼計劃是政府扶貧的其中一項措施，旨在協助低收入家庭減輕往返工作地點的交通費用負擔，從而鼓勵持續就業。

調查結果顯示，有接近六成受訪者(59.7%)表示從不認識有關計劃，有三份一受訪者(35.7%)知悉有關計劃，但有近六成(59.7%)受訪者表示對有關計劃未有所聞 (參考表 5.5A)。值得注意

的是，132 名在職受訪者中，有 40.2% 雖然知道有此計劃，不過沒有申請；當中另一半受訪者 (53.8%) 稱從未聽聞有關津貼計劃；只有 6 名在職受訪者，即只有 6.1% 在職人士曾申請有關計劃。由此可見，鼓勵就業交通津貼計劃在在職的低收入南亞裔群中並未被廣泛認識。這種情況與政府未有向南亞少數族裔群作出充足宣傳不無關係，結果，他們根本無從得知能紓緩他們生活負擔的扶貧措施 (參考表 5.5B)。

表 5.5A 知悉鼓勵就業交通津貼計劃

		人數	有效百分比 %	累積 %
有效樣本	知悉但沒有申請	85	35.7	35.7
	已申請	11	4.6	40.3
	不知道有此計劃	142	59.7	100.0
	總數	238	100.0	

表 5.5B 就業情況及認識程度與申請「鼓勵就業交通津貼計劃」之關係

			你現時是受僱人士？			總數
			是	否	不適用	
鼓勵就業交通津貼計劃	知悉但沒有申請	人數	53	27	5	85
		與「就業交通津貼計劃」的關係百分比%	62.4%	31.8%	5.9%	100.0%
		與「就業情況」的關係百分比%	40.2%	29.7%	33.3%	35.7%
		總和%	22.3%	11.3%	2.1%	35.7%
	已申請	人數	8	3	0	11
		與「就業交通津貼計劃」的關係百分比%	72.7%	27.3%	0%	100.0%
		與「就業情況」的關係百分比%	6.1%	3.3%	0%	4.6%
		總和%	3.4%	1.3%	0%	4.6%
	不知道有此計劃	人數	71	61	10	142
		與「就業交通津貼計劃」的關係百分比%	50.0%	43.0%	7.0%	100.0%
		與「就業情況」的關係百分比%	53.8%	67.0%	66.7%	59.7%
		總和%	29.8%	25.6%	4.2%	59.7%
總數		人數	132	91	15	238
		與「就業交通津貼計劃」的關係百分比%	55.5%	38.2%	6.3%	100.0%
		與「就業情況」的關係百分比%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		總和%	55.5%	38.2%	6.3%	100.0%

勞工處設立的就業中心及提供的互動就業服務，都是為協助求職人士尋找合適工作的服務。是次調查的 238 名受訪者中，超過八成(81.9%)稱他們從未使用過有關服務。此外，根據就業狀態分析，有 21.2%的在職受訪者表示曾使用相關服務，使用該服務的待業人士也只是一成多(16.5%)，這顯示無論是在職或待業人士都很少使用使用勞工處就業中心的服務(參考表 5.5C 及表 5.5D)。

事實上，從新近一次的政府提供的統計資料所示，於 2011 年，由勞工處轉介服務的成功個案高達 20050 宗，但當中只有 72 宗是少數族裔人士的申請<sup>6</sup>。

從兩項資料顯示，可以發現南亞裔人士極少通過就業中心去尋找工作。我們相信這種情況源於語言問題。由於現行就業中心所提供的就業空缺資訊，均以中文展示，這對不諳中文的南亞裔人士而言是一大困難。此外，即使透過就業中心轉介而尋找工作的人士，在接觸僱主時亦面對語言溝通問題。礙於語言溝通困難，他們對就業中心的服務失去信心，最終他們寧願依賴其族群的人際網絡來尋求工作。

表 5.5C 使用就業中心服務

		人數	有效百分比 %	累積 %
有效樣本	沒有	195	81.9	81.9
	有	43	18.1	100.0
	總數	238	100.0	

表 5.5D 就業狀況與使用就業中心服務的關係

			你現時是受僱人士？			總數
			是	否	不適用	
勞工處設立 的就業中心 及提供的互 動就業服務	沒有	人數	104	76	15	195
		與「就業中心及提供的互動就業服務」關係的百分比%	53.3%	39.0%	7.7%	100.0%
		與「你現時是受僱人士？」關係的百分比%	78.8%	83.5%	100.0%	81.9%
	總和%	43.7%	31.9%	6.3%	81.9%	
	有	人數	28	15	0	43
		與「就業中心及提供的互動就業服務」關係的百分比%	65.1%	34.9%	0%	100.0%

<sup>6</sup> 資料來源：立法會「書面答覆財務委員會就審核 2012-13 年度預算案之提問」(“Replies to initial written questions raised by Finance Committee Members in examining the Estimates of Expenditure 2012-13”)。

		與「你現時是受僱人士？」關係的百分比%	21.2%	16.5%	0%	18.1%
		總和%	11.8%	6.3%	0%	18.1%
總數		人數	132	91	15	238
		與「就業中心及提供的互動就業服務」關係的百分比%	55.5%	38.2%	6.3%	100.0%
		與「你現時是受僱人士？」關係的百分比%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		總和%	55.5%	38.2%	6.3%	100.0%

## 5.6 對其他政府部門服務之認識

### 5.6.1 社會福利署提供之綜合社會保障援助計劃

238 名受訪者中，有一半人士(50%)表示曾聽聞社會福利署提供之綜合社會保障援助計劃，不過並沒有申請。有兩成受訪者(22.3%，53 人)則從未聽聞有關服務計劃。只有 66 名受訪者(27.7%)已申請有關計劃。(參考表 5.6.1A)

表 5.6.1A 綜合社會保障援助計劃

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
知悉但沒有申請	119	50	50
已申請	66	27.7	27.7
不知道有此計劃	53	22.3	22.3
總數	238	100	100

參考 5.6.1B，會發現在 91 現階段無業之受訪者中，有四成多(40.7%，37 人)表示曾聽聞有關支援計劃，但沒有申請。而另有 18 人，即接近兩成人士(19.8%)表示他們不悉有關支援計劃。而已申請者有約四成(39.6%，36 人)。

表 5.6.1B 失業人士領取綜合社會保障援助計劃情況 (P=0.001)

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
知悉但沒有申請	37	15.5	40.7

已申請	36	15.1	39.6
不知道有此計劃	18	7.6	19.8
總和	91	38.2	100
缺失資料	146	61.3	
總數	238	100	

### 5.6.2 學前教育學券計劃 (由學生資助辦事處提供)

受訪的 238 人中，有接近四成人士(39.5%，94 人)已申請由學生資助辦事處提供之學前教育學券計劃。不過，仍有接近三成受訪者(28.6%，68 人)不曾認識這項計劃，另外三成人士(31.9%，76 人)則知悉相關計劃但沒有申請。(參考表 5.6.2A)

表 5.6.2A 學前教育學券計劃

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
知悉但沒有申請	76	31.9	31.9
已申請	94	39.5	39.5
不知道有此計劃	68	28.6	28.6
總數	238	100	100

在 166 名現有孩子在幼稚園、小學或中學上學的受訪人士中，有約一半人士(89 人)名已申請相關計劃，不過，亦有三成人士(31.9%)即使知悉有關計劃卻沒有申請。另外，有 14.5%(24 人)受訪者表示從未有聽聞相關項目。(參考表 5.6.2B)

表 5.6.2B 有子女受訪者對學前教育學券計劃的認知 (P<0.001)

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
知悉但沒有申請	53	22.3	31.9
已申請	89	37.4	53.6
不知道有此計劃	24	10.1	14.5
總和	166	69.7	100
缺失資料	72	30.3	
總數	238	100	

### 5.6.3 幼稚園及幼兒中心學費減免計劃(由學生資助辦事處提供)

調查發現，在 238 名受訪者中，超過一半(125 人)從未聽聞由學生資助辦事處提供之幼稚園及幼兒中心學費減免計劃。而即使有 29.8% 人士表示知悉這計劃，不過他們沒有申請，只有 17.6% 受訪者已申請這項支援服務。(參考 5.6.3A)

表 5.6.3A 對幼稚園及幼兒中心學費減免計劃的認知

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
知悉但沒有申請	71	29.8	29.8
已申請	42	17.6	17.6
不知道有此計劃	125	52.5	52.5
總數	238	100	100

就表 5.6.3B 顯示，在 166 名現有子女在幼稚園、小學或中學上學的受訪人士中，有超過四成(45%，75 人)並不知道政府提供這項服務，另有三成(51 人)受訪者即使得悉有關服務卻沒有申請。只有約兩成人士(24%)已申請這項計劃。

表 5.6.3B 有子女受訪者對幼稚園及幼兒中心學費減免計劃的認知 (P<0.001)

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
知悉但沒有申請	51	21.4	30.7
已申請	40	16.8	24.1
不知道有此計劃	75	31.5	45.2
總和	166	69.7	100
缺失資料	72	30.3	
總數	238	100	

#### 5.6.4 中、小學生資助 (學校書簿津貼／學生車船津貼計劃／上網費津貼計劃) (由學生資助辦事處提供)

在 238 名受訪者中，有接近四成(39.5%，94 人)即使知悉中、小學生資助 (學校書簿津貼／學生車船津貼計劃／上網費津貼計劃)，但沒有申請，而有 80 人(33.6%)受訪者表示他們從未聽聞有關服務，只有 26.9%(64 人)受訪人士已申請有關計劃。(參考表 5.6.4A)

Table 5.6.4A 對中、小學生資助的認知

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
知悉但沒有申請	94	39.5	39.5
已申請	64	26.9	26.9
不知道有此計劃	80	33.6	33.6



總數	238	100	100
----	-----	-----	-----

另外，166 名有在學子女的受訪者中，只有近四成人士(36.7%，61 人)已申請有關服務，有 38.6% 人士即使知悉計劃也沒有申請，而從未聽聞者，亦佔 24.7%。(參考表 5.6.4B)

Table 5.6.4B 有子女受訪者對中、小學生資助的認知 (P<0.001)

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
知悉但沒有申請	64	26.9	38.6
已申請	61	25.6	36.7
不知道有此計劃	41	17.2	24.7
總和	166	67.9	100
缺失資料	72	30.3	
總數	238	100	

#### 5.6.5 課餘託管計劃(由社會福利署提供)

有關認識由社會福利署提供之課餘託管計劃方面，受訪的 238 名人士中，有接近七成 (69.3%，165 人) 從未聽聞有關服務，而有 28.2% 人士即使得知有關服務卻沒有申請，僅有 2.5% 受訪者(6 人)已申請這項服務。(參考表 5.6.5A)

表 5.6.5A 課餘託管計劃

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
知悉但沒有申請	67	28.2%	28.2%
已申請	6	2.5%	2.5%
不知道有此計劃	165	69.3%	69.3%
總數	238	100	100

而 166 名有在學子女的受訪者中，只有 6 人(32.5%)已申請是碰服務，有三成人士(32.5%)即使得悉也沒有申請，不過，更有六成多人士(63.9%)從未聽聞相關項目。(參考表 5.6.5B)

表 5.6.5B 有子女受訪者對課餘託管計劃的認知 (P=0.017)

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
知悉但沒有申請	54	22.7	32.5

	已申請	6	2.5	3.6
	不知道有此計劃	106	44.5	63.9
	總和	166	67.9	100
	缺失資料	72	33.3	
總數		238	100	

## 5.7 申請政府扶貧服務之困難

238 名受訪者中，有 140 名受訪者已申請最少一樣問卷所提及的政府服務或資助。不過，他們曾在申請過程中遇到不同的問題。就表 5.7 顯示，有 40%(57 人)人士表示曾在申請過程中遇到困難。

表 5.7 「曾在申請過程中遇到困難」

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
是	57	23.9	40.7
否	63	26.5	45
不知道有此計劃/ 無意見	20	8.4	14.3
總和	140	58.8	100
遺漏值	98	41.2	
總數	238	100	

### 5.7.1 「該資訊並不是使用我們的語言」

在 57 名曾在申請過程中遇到困難的人士，42 人(參考 5.7.1) 因相關服務的資訊並不是用他們的語言，使他們在閱讀和理解時遇到困難。換言之，大部份(73.7%)的受訪者因資訊並不是使用他們的文字而不能得悉有關服務的資訊。

表 5.7.1 「該資訊並不是使用我們的語言」

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
是	42	17.6	73.7
否	15	6.3	26.3
總和	57	23.9	100
遺漏值	181	76.1	
總數	238	100	

### 5.7.2 「申請表過長和複雜」

另一個困難是申請表過長和複雜。在 57 名曾在申請過程中遇到困難的人士中，24 人(約 40%)(參考 5.7.2) 表示這是其中一個在申請過程中遇到的問題。他們，特別是低學歷的南亞少數族裔人士，在沒有他人幫忙的情況下，需在申請過程中閱讀和書寫陌生的文字。對他們來說申請表過於複雜是能夠理解的。

表 5.7.2 「申請表過長和複雜」

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
是	24	10.1	42.1
否	33	13.9	57.9
總和	57	23.9	100
遺漏值	181	76.1	
總數	238	100	

### 5.7.3 「申請過程費時」

此外，在 57 名曾在申請過程中遇到困難的人士中，23 人 (參考 5.7.3)表示申請過程費時是他們遇到的另一困難。在 57 名受訪者中，反映遇到此問題的亦佔約 40%。

表 5.7.3 「申請過程費時」

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
是	23	9.7	40.4
否	34	14.3	59.6
總和	57	23.9	100
遺漏值	181	76.1	
總數	238	100	

### 5.7.4 「不能與政府部門或社區中心的員工溝通」

至於不能與政府部門或社區中心的員工溝通，在 57 名曾在申請過程中遇到困難的人士中，18 人(31.6%) (參考 5.7.4)認為是申請服務所遇到的其中一個問題。

表 5.7.4 「不能與政府部門或社區中心的員工溝通」

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
是	18	7.6	31.6
否	39	16.4	68.4
總和	57	23.9	100
遺漏值	181	76.1	
總數	238	100	

#### 5.7.5 「相關的員工未能幫忙解決問題」

另外，在 57 名受訪者中，16 人(28.1%) (參考表 5.7.5A)認為相關的員工未能幫忙解決問題。

表5.7.5A 「相關的員工未能協助」

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
是	16	6.7	28.1
否	41	17.2	71.9
總和	57	23.9	100
遺漏值	181	76.1	
總數	238	100	

此外，在 57 名受訪者中，7 人表示遇到問卷沒有提及的問題。(參考表 5.7.5B)

表 5.7.5B 「其它問題」

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
是	7	2.9	12.3
否	50	21	87.7
總和	57	23.9	100
遺漏值	181	76.1	
總數	238	100	

總括來話，在 57 名曾在申請過程中遇到困難的人士中，73.7%的受訪者 (參考表 5.7.5C)認為相關資訊並不是使用他們的語言是申請政府服務所面對的其中一個問題。此外，在 57 名受訪者中，有 40%的受訪者曾面對申請表過長和複雜的問題。另外，亦有 40%的受訪者曾試過需很

長的時間才能完成申請。

表 5.7.5C 申請政府扶貧服務之困難 (n=57)

困難	人數	百分比	有效百分比
該資訊並不是使用我們的語言	42	17.6	73.7
申請表過長和複雜	24	10.1	42.1
申請過程費時	23	9.7	40.4
不能與政府部門或社區中心的員工溝通	18	7.6	31.6
相關的員工未能幫忙解決問題	16	6.7	28.1
其它	7	2.9	12.3

## 5.8 在取得政府服務和資助之困難

5.8.1 政府未有向南亞少數族裔群眾提供充足宣傳 很多的受訪者未曾聽過所有或一些政府服務。有7.1%(238人中的17人)的受訪者未曾聽過上述六個政府服務和資助，尤其是一些政府資助，在整體上受訪者回應「不知道有此計劃」的百分比甚高。例如，有69.3%的受者並不知道有關社會福利署提供之學童課後託管服務，亦有59.7%的受訪者不知道有關「鼓勵就業交通津貼計劃」。

要接觸有關政府服務和資助首要的條件是要聽人提及和理解有關服務。要是大部份的南亞少數族裔群眾都從未聽說過有關服務，他們是很難受惠於政府服務和資助。而據受訪者對政府服務和資助的認知得知，政府疑未有向南亞少數族裔群眾提供充足宣傳。

5.8.2 未有向南亞少數族裔群眾提供充足援助 28.6% (98人中的28人) 的受訪者沒有申請多項政府服務是由於他們不知道該如何申請。政府主要是透過傳媒、網站或傳單宣傳其服務。但

是，由於一些南亞少數族裔群眾不能閱讀和理解中文和英文的指示和程序，這些媒介未能把有關的資訊傳播到他們那裡。

### 5.8.3 南亞少數族裔群眾在申請過程中遇到語言阻隔

根據上述有關申請政府扶貧服務之困難，73% (57人中的42人) 曾申請政府扶貧服務的受訪者表示該資訊並不是使用他們的語言是申請過程中的其中一個問題。此外，31.6%的受訪者曾遇過未能和政府部門的員工溝通的情況。近期，香港政府已推出最低工資和「鼓勵就業交通津貼計劃」約一年。雖然市民可在勞工處的網頁查閱非中文版的相關資訊，但是只有少部份的政策有出版非中文的版本，如印度語、尼泊爾語和烏都語。其他的資助如在職交通津貼計劃和學生資助的資訊只提供中文及英文兩個版本。因此，南亞少數族裔群眾，尤其是一些低收入和低學歷的，由於不能閱讀中文和/或英文，在閱讀和理解指示和程序遇到困難。可是，他們都是合乎資格申請並接受香港政府所提供的援助。

5.8.4 複雜的程序42.1% 曾申請政府扶貧服務的受訪者表示申請表過長和複雜。另外，有40.4%的受訪者反映申請過程費時。對一些沒有中文及英語能力的低收入南亞少數族裔群眾來說，在沒有得到有關政府部門或非政府機構的協助下，會認為申請程序煩瑣和難以完成。

## 6. 相關政府部門和服務中心的使用率

除特定的扶貧服務，以下將探討相關政府部門的使用率。

### 6.1 社會福利處核下的社會保障辦事處

有關社會福利處核下的社會保障辦事處之使用情況，在 238 名受者中，有 79 人(參考 6.1A) 曾使用社會保障辦事處所提供的服務，但是多於一半(66.8%)的受訪者未曾使用過其服務。

Table 6.1A 社會福利處核下的社會保障辦事處的使用率

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
是	79	33.2	33.2
否	159	66.8	66.8
總數	238	100	100

以失業人士來看社會保障辦事處的使用率，在 91 名失業的受訪者中(參考 6.1B)，39 人曾使用社會保障辦事處的服務，但是 57.1%失業的受訪者沒有使用該服務。

Table 6.1B 以失業人士來看社會福利處核下社會保障辦事處的使用率  
(P=0.003)

		人數	百分比	有效百分比
	是	39	16.4	42.9
	否	52	21.8	57.1
	總和	91	38.2	100
	遺漏值	147	61.8	
總數		238	100	

## 6.2 民政事務總署核下的少數族裔人士支援服務中心

有關民政事務署核下的四個少數族裔人士支援服務中心的使用率，在238名受訪者中(參考 6.2)，64人曾使用少數族裔人士支援服務中心所提供的服務，有174人(73.1%)從未使用該服務。

Table 6.2 民政事務署核下的少數族裔人士支援服務中心的使用率

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
是	64	26.9	26.9
否	174	73.1	73.1
總數	238	100	100

### 6.3 學生資助辦事處

至於學生資助辦事處的使用率，在 238 名受訪者中(參考 6.3A)，只 60 有人曾使用學生資助辦事處的服務，多於 70%(238 人中的 178 人)從未使用該服務。

Table 6.3A 學生資助辦事處的使用率

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
是	60	25.2	25.2
否	178	74.8	74.8
總數	238	100	100

準確來說，在166名(參考 6.3B)有子女就讀幼稚園、小學或中學的受訪者中，50人(30.1%)曾使用學生資助辦事處的服務。但是，有69.9%(166人中的116人)的受訪者沒有使用該事務處所提供的服務。

Table 6.3B 以有子女人士來看學生資助辦事處的使用率

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
是	50	21	30.1
否	116	48.7	69.9
總和	166	69.7	100
遺漏值	72	30.3	
總數	238	100	

### 6.4 從沒使用任何政府部門和服務中心所提供的服務

綜觀而言，在 238 名受訪者中(參考 6.4A)，88 人(37%)從未用過問卷所提及的政府所提供的服務。這些政府部門包括勞工處互動就業服務、社會保障辦事處、少數族裔人士支援服務中心和學生資助辦事處。



**Table 6.4A** 有否使用過上述提及的政府部門之服務

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
是	150	63	63
否	88	37	37
總數	238	100	100

此外，最多受訪者曾使用的政府部門為社會福利處核下社會保障辦事處，有 33.2% (238 人中有人)的受訪者曾經使用。相反，勞工處互動就業服務是最少受訪者曾使用的政府部門，只有 18.1% (238 人中的 41 人)的受訪者曾使用。另外，還有 37% (238 人中有 88 人)重沒使用任何問卷提及的政府部門所提供的服務。

**Table 6.4B** 整體政府部門和服務中心的使用率(n=238)

	人數	百分比	有效百分比
不適用	88	37	37
社會福利處：社會保障辦事處	79	33.2	33.2
民政事務署：的少數族裔人士支援服務中心	64	26.9	26.9
學生資助辦事處	60	25.2	25.2
勞工處：互動就業服務	43	18.1	18.1

## 6.5 整體政府部門和服務中心的使用

**6.5.1 低政府部門和服務中心使用率** 根據上述數據，政府部門和服務中心的使用率並不高。在 91 名失業的受訪者中， 25 名(57.1%)失業的受訪者沒有使用社會福利處核下社會保障辦事處所提供的服務。另外，在 166 名有子女就讀幼稚園、小學或中學的受訪者中， 116 名(69.9%)受訪者沒有使用該事務處所提供的援助。此外，在 238 名受訪者當中，只有 43 人(18.1%)曾使用勞工處

互動就業服務。雖然香港居民於上述提及的政府部門十分熟識，但對南亞少數族裔群眾來說是十分陌生，甚至從未使用服務。

### 6.5.2 少數族裔人士支援服務中心不足

據數據得知，在238名受訪者中，只有26.9%的受訪者曾使用少數族裔人士支援服務中心所提供的服務，而73.1%(174人)的受訪者從未使用。根據民政事務署核下的種族關係組，現時有四個少數族裔人士支援服務中心為南亞少數族裔群眾提供服務，但這並不能滿足和應付他們的需要。

## 總結及建議

調查發現，大部分受訪的南亞裔人士均從事低薪工作，且多為教育程度較低人士，當中以中年人士居多。

另外，有 22.4%受訪者表示，現時僱主所支付的工資少於法例所定每小時 28 元，當中有接近 58.3%從事護衛員工作。此外，大部分受訪者須長時間工作，其中超過一半(55%)受訪者的平均工時為每日 9.4 小時。另外，他們未有獲得用膳及休息日有薪的待遇。

大部份受訪者表示，從未聽聞有關政府鼓勵就業交通津貼計劃，亦從未到訪勞工處就業中心。我們相信政府就提升有關前線工作人員的語言能力和推廣政府提供的勞工權益等方面，仍有可進步的空間。

為此，我們作出以下建議：

#### 1. 加強執行最低工資法例及增加勞工巡查

縱使最低工資法案已通過，但仍有不少南亞族裔人士，尤其是從事保安員工作者，所獲薪酬遠低於每小時 28 元的規限。**我們建議政府加強執行低工資法例及增加勞工巡查，特別是護衛及保安行業，確保所有僱員享有合理待遇。**此外，政府亦應加強檢控違反僱傭合約及拒絕支付最低工資之僱主。

另一方面，特區政府應向南亞少數族裔人士多進行公眾教育，讓他們明白最低工資條例下應享有之權益。政府應多鼓勵南亞裔人士在遇有勞資糾紛及被短付最低工資時，主動尋求勞工處協助。

## 2. 重新檢討最低工資水平

香港正面對高通貨膨脹，物價持續攀升，普羅大眾正面對極大生活挑戰。南亞少數族裔人士的不利條件，所面對的壓力更大。我們建議香港特區政府應重新檢討現時的最低工資水平，並儘快提高有關比率，從而保障草根階層勞工及其家人的生活質素。更重要的是，政府在檢討及釐訂最低工資比率時，應聆聽及考慮各行各業從業員和南亞少數族裔人士的訴求。此外，我們建議政府應每年檢討最低工資比率一次，務求讓僱員的薪金貼近通貨膨脹率。

## 3. 加快立法推行標準工時

冗長的工作時間對我們的健康和家庭生活均無裨益，故此我們建議政府應立法制訂標準工時。我們相信推行有關法例能讓僱員有更多休息時間及享受他們的消閒活動。

## 4. 採用多種語言，並加強政府政策及服務之宣傳

香港作為一個國際城市，理應尊重多元文化。政府及其工作人員在推行政策及服務時應具備多元種族角度及文化視野。

政府各部門應採用多種語言宣傳政府政策及服務。政府網頁應增設烏爾都語及尼泊爾文等南亞文翻譯。此外，政府亦應印製以南亞語文書寫之單張，宣傳政府政策及服務。另外，政府亦應主動與南亞團體聯絡，並透過諮詢會、集會、電子媒體及各少數族裔的地區報刊，推廣政府的政策及服務。通過以上各項措施，我們相信南亞少數族裔人士能更好地認識及使用政府為他們提供之服務。

## 5. 為前線員工提供培訓

政府宜為從事勞工政策及社會福利服務等方面的政府官員提供培訓，務求他們能識別及解決少數族裔的需要。為減少語言的隔閡，政府亦應進一步採取措施，在政府各部門，特別是勞工處及社會福利處，增聘少數族裔員工，為少數族裔居民提供更適切的服務。

## 6. 成立少數族裔委員會

新任行政長官梁振英先生在行政長官競選期間，曾發表言論，高度讚賞少數族裔對香港社會發展所作出的貢獻。梁先生亦曾承諾就任行政長官後，重新檢討現行政策，以減少本地市民與少數族裔人士間的隔閡，並特別留意協助年青一代少數族裔人士融入社會。為此，我們建議特區政府成立少數族裔委員會，用以研究及處理少數族裔居民的需要。而委員會首要任務應關注少數族裔居民之教育及就業事宜，例如協助他們尋找工作、安排在職培訓及提供僱員再培訓等事務。

# APPENDIX B – CASES ILLUSTRATION ON LANGUAGE BARRIER IN USING GOVERNMENT SERVICE

## Difficulties in Using Student Financial Assistance Agency

### Case Study 1

#### Immigration to Hong Kong

Bibi<sup>7</sup> was born and educated in Pakistan. She migrated to Hong Kong four years ago to reunion with her husband who is working and living in Hong Kong. She gave birth to six children in Pakistan and two of them followed her to Hong Kong. Her sons are studying in Form 1 and Form 4 respectively in Hong Kong.

#### Form 4 Student Works as Night-time Security Guard

For her, educational expenses are a great burden. Since she follows the tradition of many Pakistani do, she is a housewife in the family. In other words, the family income is depended on her husband. However, like most ethnic minorities in Hong Kong, he can only engage in elementary employment and receive a relatively low income. His income is around \$8,000 per month. With increasing rental and electricity expenses due to inflation, now it almost costs the family \$7,000 per month on them. Therefore, she does not have much money left for her family expenses, not to mention her two sons' educational expenses. She estimated that she has to pay about \$5000 in textbooks and about \$2000 in school uniforms yearly. As the family do not take Comprehensive Social Security Assistance, her elder son, studying at Form 4, works as a night time security guard to supplement for the family expenses so as to relieve the family financial pressure.

#### Connections to Hong Kong Society

Since she received her education in Pakistan and her educational level is low, she did not have chance to learn English. Even with high education level, English are taught at university level and it is not a compulsory course, so Pakistanis educated in Pakistan have low proficiency in English. And Chinese is unfamiliar to them when they first arrived at Hong Kong. Therefore, they mainly speak Urdu. Due to their weak proficiency in both English and Chinese, **she and her husband are actually unable to understand circulars distributed from school.** They depend on their sons to translate briefly and tell them the content of the circulars every time. The father will sign whatever circulars produced to him no matter he understands or not. This shows that they have great difficulties in understanding circulars from schools, let alone the application of the subsidies provided by the Student Financial Assistance Agency which requires complicated procedures. Both sons are young

---

<sup>7</sup> The name is fake to protect the privacy of the case.

and new to Hong Kong and therefore do not understand the background of the subsidy from Student Financial Assistance Agency clearly. They had difficulties to apply for subsidy from the Agency. In their situations, even though they are eligible and in need of the subsidies, application forms in English and Chinese set as barrier for them to apply.

#### Weak Social Support Network

Besides, she has very weak social support network from the community. Even she was helped by someone to fill up the form for the family, she has much difficulties in understanding the subsequent requirement from the Agency on additional documents to be produced. As she is new to Hong Kong, she lacks of social network here. She has limited friends and relative living in Hong Kong and many of them have low proficiency in English and Chinese. Thus, she could not find any friends who are capable to explain the subsequent letter. Moreover, there is a culture of protecting the reputation of the family. So, she did not ask her friends about this as applying for aids from government is considered as a dishonor. She found that it is too shy for her to ask about this. She also added that they would not talk about this with their friends. This implies that the providence of education subsidies is rarely circulated around them and thus, not many of them notice that there are education subsidies provide by the government.

#### Inaccessibility of Social Service

In the interview process, she mentioned that some well-educated Indians or Pakistanis individual offer “interpretation services” if she pays them \$150 each time for help. Bibi found that \$150 is a large sum of money for low income family. Obviously she does not connect to the interpretation service as subsidized by the Home Affairs Department.

Furthermore, she has difficulties in the help-seeking process. She once went to a non-government organization to seek help in her neighbourhood community. However, none of the staff there understand Urdu. They cannot connect her need with the existing organizations serving ethnic minorities, but to send her away. In the end, the letter received from the Student Financial Assistance Agency remains at home for two months and the deadline of replying the agency has passed. It shows that the publicizing of service provided for ethnic minorities by government departments, particularly the Student Financial Assistance Agency and non-government organizations is far from enough.

## 個案一

### 移民來港

**Bibi**<sup>8</sup> 在巴基斯坦出生和接受教育。四年前，她與在香港工作和居住的丈夫團聚。她在巴基斯坦育有六個子女，但只有兩個現在分別就讀中一和中四的兒子跟隨她到香港居住。

### 中四學生在下課後作夜間保安員

對她來說，兒子的教育開支是一個很大的負擔。由於她現在還跟隨巴基斯坦人的傳統，是一個全職的家庭主婦。換言之，家庭的一切開支都依靠丈夫的收入。可是，如大部分在香港的少數族裔一樣，她的丈夫只能做一些低技術抵收入的工作。他的月收入大約是\$8000。但是由於通貨膨脹，租金和電費等費用不斷上升，現在佔他的月收入約\$7000。由此可見，剩下的錢並不能應付家庭的日常開支，更不用說用來支付兒子的教育費用。她預計每年都需要\$5000買教科書和\$2000校服。由於他們沒有申請綜援，故正在就讀中四的兒子在下課後作為夜間保安員來賺取自己的教育開支來舒緩家人的財政壓力。

### 與香港社會之聯繫

由於她在巴基斯坦接受教育，加上她的教育程度不高，她沒有機會學習英語。即使有高的教育程度，英語到大學才會教授，而且英語又不是一門必修課，因此在巴基斯坦接受教育的巴基斯坦人的英語能力都很低。當他們初來港時，中文對他們來說是完全陌生的。因此，他們大都是說烏都語。由於他們的英語和中文能力低，**她和她的丈夫不明白學校派發的通告**。他們每次都依靠兒子為他們把內容翻譯，即使當中有什麼不明白，丈夫都會在通告上簽名。由此可見，他們在理解學校派發的通告已經遇到困難，更何況是填寫複雜的學生資助事務署所提供的資助申請。尤其是她的兒子年幼和初來香港，還未能理解有關資助的背景和資料。因此，申請學生資助對他們來說是十分困難。以他們的情況來看，只有英文和中文兩個版本的申請書成為他們申請的障礙。

### 缺乏社交網絡支援

此外，她在香港又缺乏能夠尋求支援的社交網絡。即使她能夠成功找到人為她填寫表格，她並不明白其後要提交到辦事處的相關文件。這主要是因為她初來香港，所以她缺乏社交網絡，而她為數不多的朋友和親戚的中文和英語的能力又不高。因此，她不能找到一些能夠為她解釋其後接收到的信件內容。

另外，他們有一個保護家庭聲譽的傳統。她認為讓別人知道自己需要接受政府資助是一件不光彩的事，再加上向朋友談及有關申請政府資助的事使她感到害羞，因此她不會在他人面前談及政府資助的話題。換言之，有關政府提供教育資助的資訊甚少在他們的談話間傳開，使很多少數族裔的家長不知道政府所提供的教育資助。

### 未能接觸相關的社會服務

---

<sup>8</sup> 使用了偽名以保護受訪者的私穩。

在訪問的過程中，她說一些受過教育的印度人和巴基斯坦人會為她們提供「翻譯服務」，但是每次都需付\$150。Bibi 認為\$150 對低收入的家庭來說是十分昂貴。而她亦不知道最近民政事務總處有提供翻譯服務。

另外，她在尋求協助的過程中遇上不同的問題。她表示曾在區內的一間非政府機構尋求協助，但是那機構並沒有懂烏都語的員工。由於他們言語不通，而機構內的員工又未通轉介她到為少數族裔提供服務的機構，只能請她離開。最後，由於她未能在機構找到能為她翻譯由學生資助辦事處的信件，而信件則放在家中兩個月，而信中提及有關回覆的截止日期已經過去了。由這件事可看出政府在推廣有關政府和非政府機構所提供的少數族裔之服務並不足夠，而這些資訊亦未能在少數族裔的群眾流傳。

## **Case Studies 2 (Difficulties to apply subsidy at Student Financial Assistance Agency)**

Khan<sup>9</sup> was born in Pakistan. He migrated to Hong Kong in 1960s for better fortune. Although he has been to Hong Kong for over 40 years, he does not manage to speak Cantonese and English as he engaged in elementary work. He only knows how to speak and listen to little Cantonese. As for English, though he may be able to pronounce the English words, he cannot read and write English. Four years ago, three of his sons and his wife were migrated to Hong Kong, while two of his sons are studying. Recently when his eldest son started to work, he was not eligible of getting the low income Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA) therefore the educational special allowance also terminated for the family.

He has never heard of anything related to the Student Financial Assistance Agency (SFAA) until he was not eligible of getting the CSSA. The officer in the Social Welfare Department told him briefly that though he cannot apply for the CSSA, the government still has education subsidies from the SFAA for his sons. At that time, he did not have a clear picture on what it is as he does not understand what the CSSA officer is telling about. It reflects that even an ethnic minority resident who has lived here for 40 years, his Chinese and English proficiency is not enough for understanding complicated government policy terms as these are out of their social life context. After his CSSA stopped, he experienced a hard time. He was not able to pay for the textbook fees required by the school. He did not know where to find help, so he went to school and told the teacher about his situation. At that time, the teacher did not mention anything about the subsidies provided by the SFAA, but the kind-hearted teacher help the family personally and paid for him. As a matter of fact, schools fundamentally can work with the SFAA more closely and serve as a platform to channel the resource effectively. Actually, the government can do a better job in the dissemination of information by distributing leaflet in English and Urdu as well.

The schools his sons are studying also gave him the application of the education subsidies from SFAA this year. He filled in those form with the help of other but found difficulties in understanding

---

<sup>9</sup> This is a fake name to protect the privacy of the case.

the procedures that the SFAA required. He takes the form to a NGO and asks the ethnic minorities staff to contact the SFAA for him to ask further queries as he cannot communicate with the SFAA staff in English well. However, when the English-speaking ethnic minorities staff phone to the SFAA, the officer there hung up the phone when he heard, “Good morning” in English. The staff tried to phone twice and the SFAA officer hung up the phone twice. This indicates the unhelpful and unwelcome attitude of the SFAA officers in serving non-Cantonese speaking people. The SFAA should provide adequate training to their frontline staff and set ethnic-sensitive guideline to prepare for helping non-Chinese citizens equally access right to SFAA service and thus creates a multicultural atmosphere in Hong Kong.

## 個案二 – 申請學生資助辦事處的資助所面對的困難

Khan<sup>10</sup>在巴基斯坦出生。他為了未來能有美好的生活而在 1960 年代移民來港。雖然他已經在香港生活四十年多，但他仍不能說流利的廣東話和英語，只能從事低技術抵收入的工作。他只能聽和說少量的廣東話。而英語方面，雖然他能讀出一些英語單字，但他並不明白它們的意思。四年前，他的妻子和三個兒子移民來港，而其中兩個兒子正在港讀書。由於他的大兒子找到工作，他們不符合領取綜援的資格，因此綜援所提供的特別教育資助亦終止。

在他不符合資格領取綜援前，他從未聽過學生資助辦事處。在他被告知不符合領取綜援時，社會福利署的職員告訴他政府核下的學生資助辦事處能為他的兒子提供教育資助。由於他的英語和廣東語能力不佳，因此當時他並不清楚職員所提及的資助是什麼。這反映即使一些少數族裔在香港居住四十年，他們的中文和英文能力並不足以讓他們理解一些較少在日常生活接觸的複雜的政府政策名詞。當他被終止領取綜援的時候，他的生活艱苦。他沒有足夠的金錢支付學校的書簿費，而他又不知道該從那些途徑尋求協助，只好向學校的老師反映情況。當時學校的老師沒有提及有關學生資助辦事處之相關資助，只是私下為他付書簿費。然而，學校與學生資助辦事處可以有更緊密的合作，使學校能成為向家長提供有關教育資助的資訊的平臺。此外，政府可以英語和烏都語向少數族裔的家長提供有關資助的單張，使他們能有效地明白相關的內容。

今年，他的兒子所就讀的學校有提供學生資助辦事處的資助申請表。在別人的幫助下，他填寫了申請表，但是他仍不明白申請程序。由於他不善於以英語溝通，所以不能致電學生資助辦事處詢問有關學生資助的問題。因此，他拿了申請表到非牟利機構的中心尋找能夠與少數族裔溝通的職員幫忙打電話向學生資助辦事處的職員查詢。可是，當中心職員致電時，學生資助辦事處的職員聽到中心職員以英語說早安便立即把電話掛掉。中心職員嘗試致電兩次，但兩次都被學生資助辦事處的職員把電話掛掉。這表示學生資助辦事處的職員在服務非廣東語的人的時候是持有不予幫助和不歡迎的態度。學生資助辦事處該為前線職員提供足夠的培訓和訂下顧及不同族裔人士之需要的指引來為不懂中文的居民服務，使不同種族背景的居民能一視同仁地接受學生資助辦事處的服務，使香港成為多元文化的都會。

---

<sup>10</sup> 使用了偽名以保護受訪者的私穩。



### **Case Study 3 (Difficulties to apply subsidy at Student Financial Assistance Agency)**

Begum<sup>11</sup> was born in Pakistan. She came to Hong Kong 15 years ago as her husband who is a permanent resident, works and lives in Hong Kong. She gave birth to two sons in Hong Kong and they are studying in Primary 1 and Primary 6 respectively. Although her elder son is studying in Primary six now and she is supposed to be eligible to apply for the “Financial Assistance for Primary and Secondary Students” provided by the Student Financial Assistance Agency (SFAA) for many years according to her family income, this academic year is the first time for her to apply this successfully. She recalled that she experienced hard time in handling educational expenses for her sons. Since her husband is working as a construction worker, his salary can handle the family expenses only when he works every day in a month. In the past years, in those months when he does not get any job for a few days or even a week, it had been hard for him to handle the educational expenses.

Moreover, as she does not understand both English and Chinese, the whole application for her is difficult. She and her husband received their education in Pakistan. The village she was living in only has primary school and primary school did not teach English at that time. Therefore, when she first arrived at Hong Kong, she did not know both English and Chinese. She tried to learn them herself and she is able to recognize simple English and Chinese words now. Yet, it is far too difficult for her to deal with the application of the subsidies provided by the SFAA. She heard of the Financial Assistance for Primary and Secondary Schoolers from her friends and relatives when her elder son was Primary 3. So, she tried to apply for it with the help of her relatives and friends. After that, she received a letter from the agency. She asked her relatives to explain the content of the letter for her and they told her that the application is failed. As the letter and the application forms are written in either English or Chinese, she depends greatly on her relatives and friends who can understand English to interpret for her. Since they do not have a clear concept on the application procedure, information might be missed and may disable or delay the application.

It is believed that school is a platform for the government to circulate related information on its educational subsidies to parents in Hong Kong. However, it is found that Pakistani parents are unable to receive far from enough information on that. The kindergarten, which his younger son studied in, held a talk about the “Pre-primary Education Voucher Scheme”. She asked her sister’s daughter who is studying in secondary school and who can listen to Cantonese to go with her so that she could understand the content of the talk. After this talk, she knew about this scheme and applied for it successful. Though with one small step ahead, Begum still did not know that she could also apply for the “Kindergarten and Child Care Centre Fee Remission Scheme” to reduce the burden of her remaining educational expenses. This also reflects that the schools were not able to provide detailed

---

<sup>11</sup>This is a fake name to protect the privacy of the case.

and comprehensive information.

Besides, for those who want to apply Financial Assistance for Primary schoolers need to start their application in the second term of the Kindergarten 3. However, due to limited publicity by the government and unavailable information in Urdu, many Pakistani parents like Begum failed to start their application on time and thus delay the time they can receive the subsidies. School should be the best platform to disseminate government subsidies information, without thorough information in ethnic minorities language has been a great hindrance in helping those who are living in poverty.

In the latest application of the Financial Assistance for Primary and Secondary School, Begum also depends on other to help her to fill in the application. She asked her husband's friend to interpret the letter from the agency and returned required documents. Her husband's friend told her that the application of the elder son is successful, but it is unsuccessful for the younger son. She just accepted this result and did not question the agency. On the whole, she does not have a detail concept in the whole process of the application procedure as she was unable to understand the procedure written in English or Chinese. Our Centre came across with her case, we contacted the SFAA on behalf of her. Actually the SFAA is saying that the office sent further document for her to fill up but do not receive her return. The application is therefore hanged up. After clarification and asking the office to resend the form, the younger son's application is finally approved. In this enquiry process in Cantonese, the SFAA staff there is helpful and able to explain the reason that the younger son was not able to receive the subsidies and suggested us the way to complete the application.

### 個案三

Begum 在巴基斯坦出生。由於她的丈夫是香港的永久居民，並且在港工作和居住，因此她在十五年前移居香港。她在港生了兩個兒子，而他們分別就讀小一和小六。雖然她的大兒子已經是小六生，而他亦合資格申請學生資助辦事處提供的學生資助，但這學年是他第一次成功申請資助。她說過去她在支付兒子的教育費用曾面對困難。由於她的丈夫是地盤工人，收入並不穩定，當他在過去一個月內每天都有工作的話，就能輕易地支付教育費用，但是當過去一個月內有數天或一星期沒有工作的話，在支付教育費用上便會面對極大困難。

我們都認為學校是政府向家長推廣相關的教育資助的最佳平臺。但是，我們發現巴基斯坦的父母未能接收到全面的相關資訊。就像過去小兒子就讀的幼稚園，它舉辦了有關學前教育學卷計劃的講座。由於她姊姊的女兒現正就讀中學，因此她與兒甥女一起去聽講座，並讓她翻譯講座的內容。經過這個講座，她了解這計劃的內容並能成功申請。可是她並不知道她仍可申請幼稚園及幼兒中心學費減免計劃來資助餘下的部分教育費用。這反映學校未能向少數族裔的家長提供仔細和全面的教育資助的相關資訊。

另外，學生資助辦事處的中、小學生資助在幼稚園三年級的下學期已經開始接受申請。

但是，由於政府的宣傳不足，又沒有烏都語的申請表，很多巴基斯坦的家長與 Begum 一樣，未能及時提交申請，延遲他們獲得資助的時間。無可否認，學校是向家長提供有關政府政策的媒介，所以政府應把它好好善用。可是，使少數族裔能夠接收到和明白這些政府資助，以烏都語向他們提供相關資訊是最為有效和直截了當的方法。

此外，由於她不懂英文和中文，所以她在整個申請的過程中面對很大的困難。她和她的丈夫都在巴基斯坦接受教育。她居住的村莊只有小學，而當時的小學教育並沒有教授英語。因此，當她初來香港的時候並不懂英文和中文，故她嘗試自學英語和中文。現在，她能懂一些簡單的英文和中文字。但是，要理解和填寫有關學生資助的申請對她來說仍是一個很大的困難。當她的大兒子就讀小三的時候，她從朋友和親戚口中得知有關中、小學生資助的資訊，所以她靠親戚和朋友的幫助提交了申請。後來，她收到學生資助辦事處寄來的信，便請她的親戚翻譯其內容，而他們則告訴她申請未能成功。由於信件和申請表都只有英語或中文兩個版本，她都需要依靠懂英語的親戚或朋友的翻譯。而她的親戚和朋友對申請程序又沒有全面的認識，因此一些重要的資料可能遲遲未能補回，使申請過程延長。

而她最近亦靠親戚的幫忙再次填寫中、小學生資助的申請和翻譯學生資助辦事處的信件，並遞交了其要求的文件。她的親戚告訴她大兒子的申請成功，但小兒子的申請失敗。她沒有向學生資助辦事處提出詢問，只是接受了這個結果。整體上，因她不懂英文和中文，她並不明白整個申請步驟。當我們接觸到她的個案時，我們代她向學生資助辦事處的職員查詢。總括來說，辦事處的職員十分有善，能夠解釋小兒子未能接收資助的原因和提供完成申請的方法。

## APPENDIX C-1 (English- Urdu Questionnaire)

### Catholic Diocese of Hong Kong Diocesan Pastoral Centre for Workers (Kowloon)

کیتھولک ڈائیوسیسن پیسٹرول سینٹر فار ورکرز کولون

#### Questionnaire on the Accessibility of Government Social Services and Measures to South Asian People in Hong Kong

ہانگ کانگ میں رہنے والے جنوبی ایشیائی لوگوں کی گورنمنٹ کی معاشرتی خدمات اور ذرائع تک رسائی کی پیمائشیں

We are doing a survey to study the accessibility of government social services and measures to the South Asian people in Hong Kong. Your answers will be strictly anonymous. Please spend a few minutes to finish the questionnaire. Your participation to this questionnaire is vital to the improvement of the present South Asian situation.

ہم ہانگ کانگ میں رہنے والے جنوبی ایشیائی لوگوں کی گورنمنٹ کی معاشرتی خدمات اور ذرائع تک رسائی کے بارے میں ایک سروے کر رہے ہیں۔ آپ کے جوابات صیغہ راز میں رکھے جائیں گے۔ مہربانی کر کے کچھ منٹ سوالنامہ پُر کرنے میں لگائیں۔ آپ کی اس سوالنامے میں شمولیت جنوبی ایشیائی لوگوں کی موجودہ صورت حال بہتر کرنے میں اہم کردار ادا کرے گی۔

Please put a tick (√) in the answer boxes. مہربانی کر کے جوابات کے ڈبوں میں نشان لگائیں۔

#### 1. Have you heard of Minimum Wage Law?

کیا آپ نے منی مم ویج کے قانون (کم از کم تنخواہ کا قانون) کے بارے میں سنا ہے؟

1) Yes ہاں  2) No نہیں

**The Statutory Minimum Wage comes into force on 1 May 2011 and the initial Statutory Minimum Wage rate is \$28 per hour.**

کم از کم تنخواہ کا قانون یکم مئی ۲۰۱۱ سے لاگو کیا گیا ہے اور قانونی طور پر کم از کم تنخواہ کا ریٹ ۲۸ ڈالر گھنٹہ کا آغاز کیا گیا ہے۔

#### 2. Do you think that the minimum wage rate HK\$28 per hour is enough for workers and their family living in Hong Kong?

آپ کا کیا خیال ہے کہ ہانگ کانگ میں رہنے والے مزدوروں اور ان کے خاندانوں کے لیے منی مم ویج (کم از کم تنخواہ) کا ریٹ ۲۸ ڈالر گھنٹہ کافی ہے؟

1) Yes (go to Q.4) ہاں (سوال نمبر ۴ پر جائیں)  2) No نہیں  
 3) Don't know/No comment (go to Q.4) (سوال نمبر ۴ پر جائیں) (معلوم نہیں)

#### 3. How much do you think the appropriate minimum wage rate per hour should be?

آپ کے خیال میں ایک گھنٹے کی منی مم ویج (کم از کم تنخواہ) کا مناسب ریٹ کیا ہونا چاہئے؟

HK\$\_\_\_\_\_/hour فی گھنٹہ

#### 4. Are you employed currently?

کیا آپ ابھی نوکری کر رہے ہیں

1) Yes ہاں  2) No (go to Q.10) نہیں (سوال نمبر ۱۰ پر جائیں)  
 3.) Don't know (go to Q.10) (سوال نمبر ۱۰ پر جائیں) (معلوم نہیں)  
 4.) Not applicable (go to Q.10) (سوال نمبر ۱۰ پر جائیں) (غیر متعلقہ)

#### 5. What is the employment status of your current job? آپ کی موجودہ نوکری کی صورت کیا ہے؟

1) Full-time فل ٹائم  2) Part-time پارٹ ٹائم  3) Temporary worker والا عارضی کام کرنے والا

#### 6. What is your current occupation? آپ کا موجودہ کام یا پیشہ کیا ہے؟

1) Factory worker فیکٹری کا ملازم  2) Skilled worker ماہر ملازم  
 3) Clerical worker کلرک کا کام کرنے والا ملازم  4) Delivery Worker ڈیلیوری کرنے والا ملازم  
 5) Salesperson سیلز پرسن  6) Driver ڈرائیور  
 7) Waiter /Waitress ویٹرس، ویٹر  8) Bar tender بار ٹینڈر  
 9) Hawker پھیری والا  10) Security guard سیکورٹی  
 11) Salon assistant سیلون اسسٹنٹ  12) Professional پیشہ ور  
 13) Others: \_\_\_\_\_ دیگر

#### 7. What is your current wage payment mode, salary, number of working days per month, actual number of working hours per day, payment of meal hour and rest day?

آپ کی موجودہ تنخواہ کی وصولی کا کیا طریقہ ہے، ہر مہینے آپ کے کام کے کتنے گھنٹے ہیں، روزانہ آپ کے اصل کام کے کتنے گھنٹے ہیں۔ کھانے کے گھنٹے کی ادائیگی اور آرام کا دن؟

Wage payment mode	Salary تنخواہ	No. of working days per month in average	No. of working hours per day
-------------------	---------------	--	------------------------------

تتخواہ کی ادائیگی کا طریقہ	مہینے میں کام کرنے کے دن تقریباً	ہر دن میں کام کرنے کے گھنٹے
<input type="checkbox"/> 1) Monthly ماہانہ	\$ _____	_____ days دن _____ hours/ گھنٹے _____ to _____
<input type="checkbox"/> 2) Daily روزانہ	\$ _____ per day ایک دن کا	_____ hours/ گھنٹے _____ to _____
<input type="checkbox"/> 3) Hourly گھنٹہ	\$ _____ per hour ایک گھنٹے کا	_____ hours/ گھنٹے _____ to _____
8) Do you have paid meal hour? کیا آپ کے کھانے کے گھنٹے کی ادائیگی کی جاتی ہے؟ <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Yes ہاں <input type="checkbox"/> 2) No نہیں <input type="checkbox"/> 3) Don't know معلوم نہیں		
9) Do you have paid rest day? کیا آپ کو آرام کے دن کی تتخواہ ملتی ہے؟ <input type="checkbox"/> 1) Yes ہاں <input type="checkbox"/> 2) No نہیں <input type="checkbox"/> 3) Don't know معلوم نہیں		

10. Some government social services and measures are listed below, please put a tick (✓) in the appropriate box to show whether you have heard of or applied for them before.

گورنمنٹ کی کچھ معاشرتی خدمات اور پیمانہ نشیں نیچے لکھی ہیں، مہربانی کر کے مناسب ڈبے میں نشان لگائیں، کیا آپ نے ان کے بارے میں کبھی سنا ہے یا ان کے لینے درخواست دی ہے؟

(i) **Work Incentive Transport Subsidy Scheme** (Transport subsidy at full rate of \$600/month, or half rate of \$300/month for low income workers)

ورک ان سین ٹیو سپورٹ سبسڈی سکیم (محنت کی ترغیب دینے والی کرایے کی سکیم) (ٹرانسپورٹ کی امدادی سکیم کا فل ریٹ ۶۰۰ ڈالر مہینہ ہے، یا ادھا ریٹ ۳۰۰ ڈالر مہینہ ہے۔ یہ سکیم کم آمدن والے مزدوروں کے لینے ہے۔)

1) Heard, not applied  2) Applied  3) Don't know معلوم نہیں

(ii) **Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme** (Monthly Standard rates are paid to recipients/families to meet basic needs/ Supplements/ Special Grants)

کمپری ہینسیو سوشل سیکورٹی سکیم (عام لفظوں میں ویلفیئر) (ہر مہینہ وصول کرنے والوں کو سٹینڈرڈ ریٹ کے مطابق ادائیگی کی جاتی ہے، خاندانوں کی بنیادی ضروریات پوری کرنے کے لینے، اضافی امدادیں، خاص گرانٹیں)

1) Heard, not applied  2) Applied  3) Don't know معلوم نہیں

(iii) **Pre-Primary Education Voucher Scheme** (Direct fee subsidy for parents with children attending kindergarten to ease their financial burden)

پری پرائمری ایجوکیشن وونچر سکیم (پرائمری سے پہلے کی تعلیم کے لینے امدادی سکیم) (جن والدین کے بچے کنڈرگارٹن میں جا رہے ہیں، ان پر سے مالی بوجھ کم کرنے کے لینے ڈائریکٹ امدادی سکیم)

1) Heard, not applied  2) Applied  3) Don't know معلوم نہیں

(iv) **Kindergarten & Child Care Centre Fee Remission Scheme** (Children passing the means-test for assistance can get fee remission for whole-day or half-day pre-primary services)

کنڈرگارٹن اینڈ چائلڈ کیئر سینٹر فیس ریمیشن سکیم (کنڈرگارٹن اور بچوں کے خیال رکھنے والے سینٹروں کی فیس میں کمی کی سکیم) (امداد حاصل کرنے کے لینے آمدن کے جائزے پر پورا اترنے والے بچے پورے یا ادھے دن کی کنڈرگارٹن کی فیس میں کمی کراسکتے ہیں)

1) Heard, not applied  2) Applied  3) Don't know معلوم نہیں

(v) **Financial Assistance for Primary and Secondary Students** (School Textbook Assistance / Student Travel Subsidy Schemes/ Subsidy Scheme for Internet Access Charges/ Examination Fee Remission Scheme)

فنانشل اسسٹنٹ فا پرائمری اینڈ سیکنڈری سٹوڈنٹ (پرائمری اور سیکنڈری سکول کے بچوں کی معاشی امداد) (سکول کی کتابوں کی امدادی سکیم، طالب علموں کے کرایے کی امدادی سکیم، انٹرنیٹ کے بل کی امدادی سکیم، امتحانات کی فیس کی تخفیفی سکیم)

1) Heard, not applied  2) Applied  3) Don't know معلوم نہیں

(vi) **After School Care Programme** (Supportive services for children aged six to twelve whose parents are unable to provide proper care for them during after-school hours owing to work, i.e. homework guidance, meal service, parent guidance and education)

آفٹر سکول کیئر پروگرام سکول کے بعد بچوں کا خیال رکھنے کا پروگرام (۶ سے ۱۲ سال کے بچوں کے لیے امدادی پروگرام جن کے والدین سکول کے وقت کے بعد بھی کام کرتے ہیں اور اپنے بچوں کی مناسب دیکھ بھال نہیں کر سکتے جیسا کہ ہوم ورک میں مدد، کھانے کی فراہمی، والدین کی تعلیم اور رہنمائی وغیرہ) معلوم نہیں (3) Dont know (2) سنا ہے، لیکن درخواست نہیں دی (1) Heard, not applied

11. Have you applied for the social services and measures provided by the government listed above before?

کیا آپ نے اوپر دی گئی حکومت کی طرف سے فراہم کی گئی معاشرتی خدمات اور پیمانہ شیوں سے فائدہ اٹھانے کے لیے درخواست دی ہے؟

(1) Yes (go to Q.13) (نمبر سوال جانیں 13) ہاں (2) No نہیں

12. Why don't you apply any social services? (You can put more than one tick (√))

آپ نے کبھی کسی معاشرتی خدمت کے لیے درخواست کیوں نہیں دی ہے؟ (آپ ایک سے زیادہ ڈبوں پر نشان لگا سکتے ہیں وقت زیادہ لگتا ہے Time-consuming (3) مدد کار نہیں Not Helpful (2) ضرورت نہیں No need (1) اہل نہیں Not eligible (5) معلوم نہیں درخواست کیسے دینی ہے Don't know how to apply (4) دیگر Others (6)

(go to question 15) (سوال نمبر 15 پر جائیں)

13. Have you experienced any difficulties in applying the social services and measures?

کیا آپ کو کسی معاشرتی خدمات اور پیمانہ شیوں کی درخواست دینے میں مشکلات کا سامنا کرنا پڑا ہے؟  
(1) Yes ہاں (2) No (Go to Q. 15) (سوال نمبر 15 پر جائیں) نہیں  
(3) Don't know/ no comment (go to Q.15) (سوال نمبر 15 پر جائیں) معلوم نہیں

14. What kind of difficulties have you experienced? (You can put more than one tick (√))

درخواست دیتے وقت آپ کو کس قسم کی مشکلات کا سامنا کرنا پڑا؟ (آپ ایک سے زیادہ ڈبوں پر نشان لگا سکتے ہیں)  
(1) The information (e.g. school notice, leaflet) are not written in your language  
معلومات جیسا کہ کتابچے، سکول کے نوٹس وغیرہ آپ کی زبان میں دستیاب نہیں  
(2) The application form is lengthy and complicated  
درخواست فارم لمبا اور مشکل ہے  
(3) Application procedures are too time-consuming  
درخواست کے عمل میں بہت وقت لگتا ہے  
(4) Cannot communicate with staffs involved  
متعلقہ سٹاف سے بات کرنا مشکل ہے  
(5) The staff involved cannot help  
متعلقہ سٹاف مدد نہیں کرتا  
(6) Others: \_\_\_\_\_ دیگر

15. Which of the following Government departments/service centers have you used before? (You can put more than one (√) tick)

مندرجہ ذیل میں سے کون سے گورنمنٹ کے شعبے اور خدمات کے مراکز آپ نے اس سے پہلے استعمال کیے ہیں؟  
(آپ ایک سے زیادہ ڈبوں پر نشان لگا سکتے ہیں)  
(1) Jobs Centres / Interactive Employment Service (Labour Department)  
جاب سینٹر، انٹرایکٹیو ایمپلائمنٹ سروس (نوکاریوں کے سینٹر اور روزگار کے حصول کی دیگر خدمات) (لیبر ڈیپارٹمنٹ)  
(2) Social Security Field Units (Social Welfare Department)  
سوشل سیکیورٹی فیلڈ یونٹ (سماجی حفاظت کا یونٹ) (سوشل ویلفیئر ڈیپارٹمنٹ) (سماجی بہبود کا شعبہ)  
(3) Support service Centres for Ethnic Minorities (Home Affairs Department)  
سپورٹ سروس سینٹر فار ایٹھک منورٹیز (اقلیتوں کے لیے امدادی خدمات کے مراکز) (ہوم آفیسرز ڈیپارٹمنٹ)  
(4) Student Finance Assistance Agency (طالب علموں کی معاشی امداد کی ایجنسی)  
سٹوڈنٹ فنانشل اسسٹنٹ ایجنسی (طالب علموں کی معاشی امداد کی ایجنسی)  
(5) None of the above  
ان میں سے کوئی نہیں

### Personal Information

### ذاتی معلومات

16. What kind of housing are you living in?

(1) Public rental housing (Go to Q.18)  
(2) Self-owned private housing (Go to Q. 18)  
(3) Private rental housing  
(4) Others \_\_\_\_\_

آپ کس قسم کے گھر میں رہتے ہیں؟  
عوامی کرایے کا گھر (سوال نمبر 18 پر جائیں)  
ذاتی پرائیویٹ گھر (سوال نمبر 18 پر جائیں)  
پرائیویٹ کرایے کا گھر  
دیگر

17. How much did you spend for your private rental house last month? پرائیویٹ گھر کا آپ نے پچھلے ماہ  
کتنا کرایہ دیا تھا؟

HK\$ \_\_\_\_\_

18. How many family members you need to support financially in HK?

آپ کے گھر میں کتنے افراد ہیں؟ ہانگ میں آپ کتنے لوگوں کا خرچہ اٹھاتے ہیں؟  
\_\_\_\_\_ person(s) افراد

19. Do you have children who are studying in Kindergarten, Primary or Secondary school in your family?

کیا آپ کی فیملی میں بچے کنڈر گارٹن، پرائمری یا سیکنڈری سکول میں پڑھ رہے ہیں؟  
1) Yes, ہاں \_\_\_\_\_ (no. of children) بچوں کی تعداد 2) No نہیں

20. What is your total household income last month?  
HK\$ \_\_\_\_\_

آپ کی ماہانہ آمدن کیا ہے؟

21. How many years have you been living in Hong Kong?  
\_\_\_\_\_ year(s) سال

22. Gender جنس

1) Male مرد 2) Female عورت

23. Education level تعلیمی سطح

1) Primary school or below پرائمری یا اس سے کم

2) Lower secondary school سیکنڈری سے نیچے

3) Upper secondary school سیکنڈری سے اوپر

4) College کالج

5) University یونیورسٹی

6) Postgraduate or above پوسٹ گریجویٹ یا اس سے اوپر

7) Others دیگر \_\_\_\_\_

24. Age عمر

1)15-19 2)20-24 3)25-29 4)30-34 5)35-39 6)40-44

7)45-49 8)50-54 9) 55-59 10)60 or above 99) don't know/no comment

25. Country of origin قومیت والا ملک

1)Pakistani پاکستانی 2)Nepali نیپالی 3) Indian انڈین 4)Bangladeshi بنگلادیشی

5) Sri Lankans سری لنکن 6) Others: \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX C-2 (English - Nepali Questionnaire)

Catholic Diocese of Hong Kong Diocesan Pastoral Centre for Workers (Kowloon)  
Questionnaire on the Accessibility of Government Social Services and Measures to South Asian  
People in Hong Kong

हंगकंग क्याथलिक डायोसिस कामदारहरूका लागि डायोसियन पास्टरल सेन्टर (कोलन)  
सरकारी सामाजिक सेवा तथा कार्यक्रमहरूमाथि हंगकंगका दक्षिण एसियाली मानिसहरूको पहुँचबारे सर्वेक्षण

We are doing a survey to study the accessibility of government social services and measures to the South Asian people in Hong Kong. Your answers will be strictly anonymous. Please spend a few minutes to finish the questionnaire. Your participation to this questionnaire is vital to the improvement of the present South Asian situation.

सरकारी सामाजिक सेवा तथा कार्यक्रमहरूमाथि हंगकंगका दक्षिण एसियाली मानिसहरूको पहुँचबारे हामी एउटा सर्वेक्षण गर्दैछौं। तपाईंको जवाफ पूर्णतया बेनामी रहनेछ। कृपया प्रश्नावली पूरा गर्न केही समय दिनुहोला। वर्तमान दक्षिण एसियाली स्थितिमा सुधार गर्नलाई यस सर्वेक्षणमा तपाईंको सहभागिता महत्वपूर्ण हुनेछ।

Please put a tick (√) in the answer boxes.

कृपया उत्तर कोठामा एउटा ठीक चिन्ह (√) लगाउनुहोला।

1. Have you heard of Minimum Wage Law?

के तपाईंले मिनिमम वेज [न्यूनतम ज्याला] कानूनबारे सुन्नु भएको छ?

1) Yes सुनेको छु 2) No सुनेको छुइन

*The Statutory Minimum Wage comes into force on 1 May 2011 and the initial Statutory Minimum Wage rate is \$28 per hour.*

**वैधानिक न्यूनतम ज्याला 1 मे 2011 देखि लागू भएको हो र प्रारम्भिक वैधानिक न्यूनतम ज्यालाको दर \$28 प्रति घण्टा छ।**

2. Do you think that the minimum wage rate HK\$28 per hour is enough for workers and their family living in Hong Kong?

के तपाईंको विचारमा HK\$28 प्रति घण्टाको मिनिमम वेज [न्यूनतम ज्याला] दर हंगकंगमा बस्ने कामदार तथा उनीहरूका परिवारहरूका लागि पुग्ने छ?

1) Yes (go to Q.4) पुग्छ (Q.4 मा जानुहोस्) 2) No पुग्दैन  
3) Don't know/No comment (go to Q.4) थाहा भएन/केही भन्नु छैन (Q.4 मा जानुहोस्)

3. How much do you think the appropriate minimum wage rate per hour should be?

तपाईंको विचारमा उपयुक्त मिनिमम वेज [न्यूनतम ज्याला] दर प्रति घण्टा कति हुनु पर्ने जस्तो लाग्छ?  
HK\$ \_\_\_\_\_/hour घण्टा

4. Are you employed currently? के तपाईं हाल रोजगार गर्नुहुन्छ?

1) Yes गर्छु 2) No (go to Q.10) गर्दिन (Q.10 मा जानुहोस्)  
3.) Don't know (go to Q.10) थाहा भएन (Q.10 मा जानुहोस्)  
4) Not Applicable (go to Q.10) लागू छैन

5. What is the employment status of your current job? तपाईंको वर्तमान जागिरको रोजगार स्थिति के छ?

1) Full-time पूर्ण-कालीन 2) Part-time आंशिक-कालीन  
3) Temporary worker अस्थायी कामदार

6. What is your current occupation? तपाईं हाल कुन पेशामा हुनुहुन्छ?

1) Factory worker कारखानाको कामदार 2) Skilled worker सिपोलु कामदार 3) Clerical worker क्लरिक्ल कामदार  
4) Delivery Worker डेलिभारे कामदार 5) Salesperson सेल्सपसेन 6) Driver सवारी चालक  
7) Waiter /Waitress वेटर /वेट्रेस 8) Bar tender बार टेन्डर 9) Hawker हकर  
10) Security guard सुरक्षा गाडे 11) Salon assistant स्यालुन एसिस्टेन्ट 12) Professional पेशेवर

13) Others अन्य: \_\_\_\_\_



7. What is your current wage payment mode, salary, number of working days per month, number of **actual** working hours per day, payment of meal hour and rest day?  
तपाईंको वर्तमान तलव भुक्तानी विधि, तलव, प्रति महिना काम गर्ने दिन, प्रति दिन वास्तवमा काम गर्ने घण्टा, खाजा खाने छुट्टिको भुक्तान तथा विश्राम गरेको दिनको भुक्तान के कस्तो छ?

Wage payment mode तलव भुक्तानी विधि	Salary तलव	No. of <b>actual</b> working days per month in average औसतमा प्रति महिना वास्तवमा काम गर्ने दिन	No. of <b>actual</b> working hours per day प्रति दिन वास्तवमा काम गर्ने घण्टा
1) Monthly मासिक	\$ _____	_____ days दिन	देखि _____hoursघण्टा/ _____to
2) Daily दैनिक	\$ _____ per day प्रति दिन		देखि _____hoursघण्टा/ _____to
3) Hourly घण्टाको	\$ _____ per hour प्रति घण्टा		देखि _____hoursघण्टा/ _____to
8) Do you have paid meal hour? तपाईंले खाजा खाने छुट्टिको भुक्तान पाउनुहुन्छ? <input type="checkbox"/> 1)Yes पाउछ <input type="checkbox"/> 2)No पाउदैन <input type="checkbox"/> 3)Don't know थाहा भएन			
9) Do you have paid rest day? तपाईंले विश्राम गरेको दिनको भुक्तान पाउनुहुन्छ? <input type="checkbox"/> 1)Yes पाउछ <input type="checkbox"/> 2)No पाउदैन <input type="checkbox"/> 3)Don't know थाहा भएन			

10. Some government social services and measures are listed below, please put a tick (✓) in the appropriate box to show whether you have heard of or applied for them before.  
केही सरकारी सामाजिक सेवा तथा कार्यक्रमहरूको सूची तल दिइएको छ, यस भन्दा पहिला यिनीहरूको बारेमा तपाईंले सुन्नु भएको अथवा आवेदन गरेको भएमा कृपया उपयुक्त कोठामा ठीक चिन्ह (✓) लगाउनुहोस्।

**(iii) Work Incentive Transport Subsidy Scheme**

वर्क इन्सेन्टिभ ट्रान्सपोर्ट सब्सिडि स्कीम [कामदार प्रोत्साहन यातायात अनुदान योजना]

(Transport subsidy at full rate of \$600/month, or half rate of \$300/month for low income workers)

(न्यून आय हुने कामदारहरूका लागि \$600/महिनाको पूरा दर, अथवा \$300/महिनाको आधा दरमा यातायात अनुदान)

- 1) Heard, not applied सुनेको, आवेदन नगरेको 2) Applied आवेदन गरेको 3) Don't know थाहा भएन

**(iv) Comprehensive Social Security Assistance Scheme**

कम्प्रेहेन्सिभ सोशल सेक्युरिटी एसिस्टेन्स योजना [व्यापक सामाजिक सुरक्षा योजना]

(Monthly Standard rates are paid to recipients/ families to meet basic needs/ Supplements/ Special Grants)

(आधारभूत आवश्यकता परिपूरक विशेष अनुदानहरूको पूर्तिका लागि प्रापक परिवारहरूलाई मासिक प्रचलित दरमा भुक्तान गरिन्छ)

- 1) Heard, not applied सुनेको, आवेदन नगरेको 2) Applied आवेदन गरेको 3) Don't know थाहा भएन

**(v) Pre-Primary Education Voucher Scheme**

प्री प्राइमरि एड्युकेशन भाउचर स्कीम [पूर्व प्राथमिक शिक्षा भाउचर योजना]

(Direct fee subsidy for parents with children attending kindergarten to ease their financial burden)

(किन्डरगार्टनमा बच्चा पढ्ने मातापिताहरूको आर्थिक बोझ हल्का गराउन प्रत्यक्ष शुल्क अनुदान)

- 1) Heard, not applied सुनेको, आवेदन नगरेको 2) Applied आवेदन गरेको 3) Don't know थाहा भएन

**(vi) Kindergarten & Child Care Centre Fee Remission Scheme**

किन्डरगार्टन एण्ड चाइल्ड केयर सेन्टर फी रेमिसन स्कीम [किन्डरगार्टन तथा शिशु स्याहार केन्द्र शुल्क छुट योजना]

(Children passing the means-test for assistance can get fee remission for whole-day or half-day pre-primary services)

(मिन्स-टेस्ट उत्तीर्ण बच्चाहरूले पूरा दिन वा आधा दिन पूर्व-प्राथमिकका लागि शुल्कमा छुट पाउन सक्छन्)

- 1) Heard, not applied सुनेको, आवेदन नगरेको 2) Applied आवेदन गरेको 3) Don't know थाहा भएन

**(vii) Financial Assistance for Primary and Secondary Students**

फाइन्शियल एसिस्टन्स फर प्राइमरि एण्ड सेकेन्डरि स्ट्यूडन्ट्स [प्राथमिक एवं माध्यमिक विद्यार्थीहरूका लागि आर्थिक सहायता]

(School Textbook Assistance / Student Travel Subsidy Schemes/ Subsidy Scheme for Internet Access Charges/ Examination Fee Remission Scheme)

(विद्यालयको पाठ्यपुस्तकमा सहयोग/ विद्यार्थी यातायात अनुदान योजना/ इन्टरनेट एक्सेस शुल्क अनुदान योजना/ परीक्षा शुल्क छुट योजना)

1) Heard, not applied सुनेको, आवेदन नगरेको 2) Applied आवेदन गरेको 3) Don't know थाहा भएन

(viii) After School Care Programme

आफ्टर स्कूल केयर प्रोग्राम [विद्यालय पश्चात देखभाल कार्यक्रम]

(Supportive services for children aged six to twelve whose parents are unable to provide proper care for them during after-school hours owing to work, i.e. homework guidance, meal service, parent guidance and education)

(काममा जान परेकोले मातापिताहरूले विद्यालय पश्चात उनीहरूको उचित देखरेख जस्तै, गृहकार्यमा सहायता, खाना, मार्गनिर्देशन र शिक्षामा सहयोग गर्ने नसक्ने छ देखि बाह्र वर्षका बच्चाहरूका लागि सहयोगात्मक सेवा)

1) Heard, not applied सुनेको, आवेदन नगरेको 2) Applied आवेदन गरेको 3) Don't know थाहा भएन

11. Have you applied for the social services & measures provided by the government listed above before?

के विगतमा तपाईंले सरकारद्वारा उपलब्ध गरिने उपरोक्त सामाजिक सेवा तथा कार्यक्रमहरूका लागि आवेदन गर्नु भएको छ?

1) Yes (go to Q.13) गरेको छु (Q.13 मा जानुहोस्) 2) No गरेको छुइन

12. Why don't you apply any social services?

तपाईं किन कुनैपनि सामाजिक सेवामा आवेदन गर्नु हुँदैन?

(You can put more than one tick (✓) (तपाईंले एउटा भन्दा बेसीमा ठीक चिन्ह (✓) लगाउन सक्नुहुन्छ)

1) No need आवश्यक छैन 2) Not Helpful सहयोगी छैन

3) Time-consuming धेरै समय लाग्छ

4) Don't know how to apply आवेदन कसरी गर्ने थाहा नभएर

5) Not eligible यसको लागि योग्य नभएर 6) Others अन्य \_\_\_\_\_

(Go to question 15) (प्रश्न 15 मा जानुहोस्)

13. Have you experienced any difficulties in applying the social services and measures?

के सामाजिक सेवा तथा कार्यक्रमहरूका लागि आवेदन गर्दा तपाईंलाई कुनै अप्ठ्यारो परेको छ?

1) Yes परेको छ 2) No (Go to Q. 15) परेको छैन (Q.15 मा जानुहोस्)

3. Don't know/ no comment (go to Q.15) थाहा भएन/केही भन्नु छैन (Q.15 मा जानुहोस्)

14. What kind of difficulties have you experienced? तपाईंलाई कस्तो प्रकारको अप्ठ्यारो परेको थियो?

(You can put more than one tick (✓) (तपाईंले एउटा भन्दा बेसीमा ठीक चिन्ह (✓) लगाउन सक्नुहुन्छ)

1) The information (e.g. school notice, leaflet) are not written in your language

जानकारीहरू (जस्तै विद्यालयको सूचना, पर्चा) तपाईंको भाषामा लेखिएको थिएन

2) The application form is lengthy and complicated आवेदन फाराम लामो र अप्ठ्यारो थियो

3) Application procedures are too time-consuming आवेदन प्रक्रियामा धेरै समय लाग्छ

4) Cannot communicate with staffs involved

यसमा काम गर्ने कर्मचारीहरूसँग कुराकानी गर्न सकिँदैन

5) The staff involved cannot help यसमा काम गर्ने कर्मचारीहरूले सहयोग गर्न सक्दैनन्

6) Others अन्य: \_\_\_\_\_

15. Which of the following Government departments/service centers have you used before? (You can put

more than one (✓) tick)

तपाईंले विगतमा निम्न मध्ये कुन सरकारी विभाग/सेवा केन्द्रको प्रयोग गर्नु भएको छ? (तपाईंले एउटा भन्दा बेसीमा ठीक चिन्ह (✓) लगाउन सक्नुहुन्छ)

1) Jobs Centres / Interactive Employment Service (Labour Department)

जब सेन्टर/इन्टर्याक्टिभ इम्प्लवाइमेन्ट सर्भिस [जागिर केन्द्र/ अन्तरकृयात्मक रोजगार सेवा] (लेबर डिपार्टमेन्ट [श्रम विभाग])

- 2) Social Security Field Units (Social Welfare Department)  
सोशल सेक्युरिटी फिल्ड युनिट [सामाजिक सुरक्षा स्थलिय इकाइ]  
(सोशल वेल्फेयर डिपार्टमेन्ट [सामाजिक कल्याण विभाग])
- 3) Support service Centres for Ethnic Minorities (Home Affairs Department)  
सपोर्ट सर्भिस सेन्टर फर एथनिक माइनोरिटिज [जातिय अल्पसंख्यक जातिहरूका लागि सहयोगात्मक सेवा] (होम अफेयर्स डिपार्टमेन्ट [गृह मामला विभाग])
- 4) Student Finance Assistance Agency  
स्ट्युडन्ट फाइनेयन्स एसिस्टन्स एजेन्सि [विद्यार्थी आर्थिक सहायता निकाय]
- 5) None of the above माथिको कुनैपनि होइन

Personal Information

व्यक्तिगत विवरण

16. What kind of housing are you living in? तपाईं कस्तो प्रकारको आवासमा बस्नुहुन्छ?

- 1) Public rental housing (Go to Q.18) सार्वजनिक भाडाको घर (Q.18 मा जानुहोस्)
- 2) Self-owned private housing (Go to Q. 18) निजी स्वामित्वको घर (Q.18 मा जानुहोस्)
- 3) Private rental housing निजी भाडाको घर
- 4) Others अन्य \_\_\_\_\_ (Go to Q. 18) (Q.18 मा जानुहोस्)

17. How much did you spend for your private rental house last month?

तपाईंले गत महिना आफ्नो निजी भाडाको घरमा कति खर्च गर्नुभयो?

HK\$ \_\_\_\_\_

18. How many family members do you need to support financially in HK?

हंग कंगमा तपाईंका परिवारको कति जना सदस्यहरूलाई तपाईं ले आर्थिक मदत दिनु पर्छ ?  
\_\_\_\_\_ person(s) व्यक्ति(हरू)

19. Do you have children who are studying in Kindergarten, Primary or Secondary school in your family?

के तपाईंको परिवारमा किन्डरगार्टन, प्राथमिक वा माध्यमिक विद्यालयमा पढ्ने बच्चाहरू छन्?

- 1) Yes छन्, \_\_\_\_\_ (no. of children) (बच्चाहरूको सङ्ख्या) 2) No छैनन्

20. What is your total household income last month?

गत महिना तपाईंको कुल घरेलु आय कति छ?

HK\$ \_\_\_\_\_

21. How many years have you been living in Hong Kong?

तपाईं हंगकंगमा बसेको कति वर्ष भयो?

\_\_\_\_\_ year(s) वर्ष

22. Gender लिंग

- 1) Male पुरुष 2) Female स्त्री

23. Education level शैक्षिक स्तर

- 1) Primary school or below प्राथमिक विद्यालय अथवा यो भन्दा मुनि
- 2) Lower secondary school निम्न माध्यमिक विद्यालय
- 3) Upper secondary school उच्च माध्यमिक विद्यालय
- 4) College कलेज
- 5) University विश्वविद्यालय
- 6) Postgraduate or above स्नातकोत्तर वा माथि
- 7) Others अन्य \_\_\_\_\_

24. Age उमेर

- 1)15-19 2)20-24 3)25-29 4)30-34 5)35-39
- 6)40-44 7)45-49 8)50-54 9)55-59 10)60 or above वा माथि

25. Country of origin मूल देश

- 1) Pakistani पाकिस्तानी 2) Nepali नेपाली
- 3) Indian भारतीय 4) Bangladeshi बङ्गलादेशी
- 5) Sri Lankans श्री लङ्काली 6) Others अन्य: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Contact Us**

**Research team:** Ms LAW Pui Shan

Ms Dorothy C M, LEE

Miss WONG Ching Man

### **About Us:**

Our Centre, under the Hong Kong Catholic Commission for Labour Affairs, was established since 1991. The Centre dedicated to serve marginalized workers who are being socially marginalized, by the force of economic and cultural factors, regardless of their age, religion and sex. The Centre serve both Chinese and non-Chinese workers. The Service to the ethnic minorities groups citizens – Hongkongers, included:

1. To outreach and educate workers ethnic minorities residents, about their right at work in Hong Kong;
2. To conduct Workshop in promoting the awareness of statutory labour protection and other social protection for low income ethnic minorities families;
3. To form mutual support group and self- employed group in the centre for the ethnic minorities group.

**Catholic Diocese of Hong Kong**

**Diocesan Pastoral Centre for Workers (Kowloon)**

**Tel. 2351 6333**

**Fax. 2327 6996**

**Email: [dpcwkl@hkccla.org.hk](mailto:dpcwkl@hkccla.org.hk)**

**Website: <http://dpcwkl.hkccla.org.hk>**