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This study is funded by The Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and a collaboration from Swansea University.
Government is promoting social inclusion among marginalized groups
According to the World Bank’s definition, "Social Inclusion refers to promoting equal access to opportunities, enabling every member of the society to contribute to social and economic program and share in its rewards."
A robust measure of social inclusion [Social and Community Opportunities Profile (SCOPE)] has been developed in UK that is multidimensional and captures multiple life domains (Huxley et al., 2006).
A need to translate the UK measurement scale into the different cultures for cross-cultural studies
Process to develop a Chinese version of SCOPE (SCOPE-C)

- A focus group study using concept mapping method (Chan et al., 2013)
- Translation and back translation of the items
- Replacing selected items about local issues with questions from Hong Kong Population Census
- Pilot-testing the Chinese version of SCOPE
Method
Participants

- Altogether 168 participants were recruited through five mental health associations in Hong Kong.
- Ranged from 20 to 65 at baseline ($M = 43.95; SD = 11.21$).
Participants

- Service users of mental health service centers or half-way houses
- Diagnosed as severe mental health patients
- Had received more than 6 weeks of mental health treatment; and condition stabilized
Profile

- Roughly same no. of male \((n = 88)\) and female \((n = 80)\)
- Mainly living in Halfway house (42%) and Public rental housing units (37%)
- More than half (60%) were in paid employment
- Source of income: mainly social welfare (66%)
Procedures

- face-to-face individual interviews in Cantonese
- second interviews: two weeks later
- third interview: six months after the first interview (i.e. April to July 2014)
- Interviews for the first two rounds: between October 2013 and February 2014.
Measures: SCOPE-C

- Eight domains of inclusion
  - (1) leisure and participation,
  - (2) housing and accommodation,
  - (3) work,
  - (4) financial situation,
  - (5) safety,
  - (6) education,
  - (7) self-reported health, and
  - (8) family and social relationships
Measures: Other scales

- The Everyday Discrimination Scale: 9 items ranged from 1 (Never) to 6 (Almost everyday)
- Short Form Health Survey: measured general physical and mental health
Results
Mean of SatOpps in Different Social Domains (7-point)

- leisure activities
- suitable housing
- work (employed)
- work (unemployed)
- increase income
- live safely
- educational opp
- physical health care
- mental health care
- contact with family
- contact with friends
Test and re-test of SatOpps

- $r$ value: All significant
- Paired-$t$: All non-significant, except SatOpps to be involved with community groups/organisations
Mean of Perceived Opps in Different Social Domains (5-point)

- Involved with Community: 3.5
- Suitable Housing: 3.0
- Suitable Work: 2.5
- Increase Income: 2.0
- Education: 3.0
Test and re-test of Perceived Opps

- \( r \) value: All significant
- Paired-\( t \): All non-significant
Table 5.
Pearson correlations between overall social inclusion and key variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Overall Social Inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average of the SatOpps items</td>
<td>0.51***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of the Perceived Opps items</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Discrimination Scale</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF 12v2 Physical Health</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF 12v2 Mental Health</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

- showed a general satisfaction with the personal contacts with families and friends, living safely, recreational activities, and involvement in community groups
- did not find any of the five social domains provided them with good opportunities
- lowest opportunities to increase income and to get a suitable job
Discussion

- The strong link of overall satisfaction with opportunities and perceived opportunities indicated the construct validity of the SCOPE-C.
- The current study did not report high level of discrimination in participants’ daily lives.
- Respondents are in “protected” environment.
Discussion

- overall social inclusion had positive correlation with physical health.
- lack of correlation between overall social inclusion and mental health
- the relative mental health stability of the respondents meant that there was a lack of variance in the mental health compared to the physical health scores.
Add comparison to Wales results here
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