

Chapter 2

Social Capital

Section A. Demographic Characteristics

12. Population and Annual Growth

Table 2.1: Resident population and annual growth rates, 1971-2001

Census/By-census	Resident population	Net increase	Average annual growth rate (%)
1971	3936630	--	--
1976	4402990	466360	2.1
1981	5109812	706822	3.3
1986	5495488	385676	1.5
1991	5674114	178626	0.6
1996	6217556	543442	1.8
2001	6708389	295452	0.9

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2001)

Table 2.2: Number of Youths and Average Annual Growth Rate, 1961 to 2001

Population Census/By-census	Youths			Whole Population		
	Number	Change	Average Annual Growth Rate (%)	Number	Change	Average Annual Growth Rate (%)
1961	367 838	3 129 648 ⁽¹⁾
1966	585 100	217 262	9.7	3 708 920 ⁽¹⁾	579 272	3.5
1971	764 197	179 097	5.5	3 936 630 ⁽¹⁾	227 710	1.2
1976	968 080	203 883	4.5	4 402 990 ⁽¹⁾	466 360	2.1
1981	1 147 757	179 677	3.8	5 109 812 ⁽²⁾	706 822	3.3
1986	1 012 859	-134898	-2.5	5 495 488 ⁽³⁾	385 676	1.5
1991	839 841	-173018	-3.7	5 674 114 ⁽⁴⁾	178 626	0.6
1996	869 511	29 670	0.7	6 412 937 ⁽⁵⁾	543 442 ⁽⁶⁾	1.8 ⁽⁶⁾
2001	920 445	50 934	1.1	6 708 389 ⁽⁵⁾	295 452 ⁽⁵⁾	0.9 ⁽⁵⁾
1961-2001	..	552 607	2.3	..	3 578 741	1.9

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2001)

Notes: (1) The Hong Kong population figures of the 1961 Population Census, 1966 Population By-census, the 1971 Population Census and the 1976 Population By-census did not include residents temporarily away from Hong Kong.

(2) The figure includes 123 252 residents temporarily away from Hong Kong at the time of the 1981 Census conducted in March 1981.

(3) The figure includes 99491 residents temporarily away from Hong Kong at the time of the 1986 Census conducted in March 1986.

(4) The figure includes 123 252 residents temporarily away from Hong Kong at the time of the 1981 Census conducted in March 1981.

(5) The figures are compiled based on the Hong Kong Resident Population.

(6) The figures refer to residents present in Hong Kong at the census/by-census moment, including those who were temporarily away from Hong Kong. The population figure compiled on this basis at the 1996 Population By-census was 6 217 556.

According to the 2001 Census, the population of the Hong Kong was 6,708,393. Young people composed 13.7% of that population.

12. Population and Annual Growth

Table 2.3: Youth Population (10-24) And Its Size Relative To Total Population, 1961-2001

Year	Total population	Youth population (10-24)	Relative size (%)
1961	3129648	718819	23.0%
1966	3708920	1033490	27.9%
1971	3936630	1287797	32.7%
1976	4402990	1505520	34.2%
1981	4986560	1587691	31.8%
1986	5395997	1450248	26.9%
1991	5522281	1250059	22.6%
1996	6217556	1300085	20.9%
2001	6708389	1352637	20.2%

Source: Derived from Census Statistics (2001)

Table 2.4: Youths by Ethnicity, 2001

Ethnicity	Youths		Whole Population	
	Number	%	Number	%
Chinese	870 605	94.6	6 364 439	94.9
Filipino	12 227	1.3	142 556	2.1
Indonesian	21 098	2.3	50 494	0.8
British	933	0.1	18 909	0.3
Indian	2 580	0.3	18 543	0.3
Thai	910	0.1	14 342	0.2
Japanese	336	0.0	14 180	0.2
Nepalese	2 781	0.3	12 564	0.2
Pakistani	2 256	0.2	11 017	0.2
Others	6 719	0.7	61 345	0.9
Total	920 445	100.0	6 708 389	100.0

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2001)

Between 1961 and 2001 the number of 10-24 years old peaked in 1976 and has been declining, but has stabilised in the past 10 years. The proportion of this age group to the rest of the population fell after 1981 to 20.2% in 2001. Approximately 94.6% of the youth are composed of Chinese persons. This compares to a total of 94.9% for Hong Kong as a whole.

13. Age and Sex Distribution

Table 2.5: Population By Age Group And Sex (2001)

Sex	Age					
	0-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29
Male	145559	206160	222638	231329	225310	241708
Female	133520	191986	209554	218990	244816	284164
Total	279079	398146	432192	450319	470126	525872

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2001)

Table 2.6: Youths By Sex And Age Group, 1991, 1996 And 2001

Sex	Age Group	1991		1996		2001	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Youths							
Male	15-19	213 439	49.7	215 472	48.9	231 329	50.7
	20-24	216 280	50.3	225 172	51.1	225 310	49.3
	Sub-total	429 719	100.0	440 644	100.0	456 639	100.0
Female	15-19	196 203	47.8	201 538	47.0	218 990	47.2
	20-24	213 919	52.2	227 329	53.0	244 816	52.8
	Sub-total	410 122	100.0	428 867	100.0	463 806	100.0
Both Sexes	15-19	409 642	48.8	417 010	48.0	450 319	48.9
	20- 24	430 199	51.2	452 501	52.0	470 126	51.1
	Total	839 841	100.0	869 511	100.0	920 445	100.0
Whole Population							
Male		2 811 991	50.9	3 108 107	50.0	3 285 344	49.0
Female		2 710 290	49.1	3 109 449	50.0	3 423 045	51.0
Both Sexes		5 522 281	100.0	6 217 556	100.0	6 708 389	100.0
Sex Ratio*							
Youths							
15-19		1 088 (1 089)		1 069 (1 077)		1 056 (1 067)	
20-24		1 011(1 045)		991 (1 056)		920 (1 052)	
Overall		1 048(1 066)		1 027 (1 066)		985 (1 059)	
Whole Population		1 038(1 058)		1 000 (1 037)		960 (1 012)	

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2001)

Note: *The number of males per 1 000 females in the respective age group. Figures in brackets denote the sex ratio excluding foreign domestic helpers.

13. Age and Sex Distribution

Table 2.7: Sex Ratio* By Age, 1961-2001

Age group	1961	1966	1971	1976	1981	1986	1991	1996	2001
10-14	1126	1088	1046	1040	1067	1096	1081	1066	1062
15-19	1205	1131	1055	1049	1078	1085	1087	1087	1056
20-24	1216	1136	1062	1057	1114	1032	1014	1014	920
All ages	1056	1029	1033	1046	1093	1057	1038	1038	960

Source: Derived from Census Statistics (2001)

** No. of males per 1000 females in the respective age group*

In 2001, the sex distribution of youth was somewhat different than for the territory as a whole, with a slightly larger proportion of males (50.2%) than females (49.8%). Sex distribution by age is somewhat different. Males outnumbered females in all age categories except ages 20-24 and 25-29 in 2001. Males outnumbered females in all age categories except between the ages of 20 and 24 in 2001. Males made up a slight majority of the population over the twenty years. Nonetheless, females outnumbered males in the age category (20-24). In 2001, 52.1% of young people aged 20-24 were female.

14. Population Distribution by District

Table 2.8: Number and Proportion of Youths by New Town, 1991, 1996 and 2001

New Town	1991			1996			2001		
	Youths	Total Population	%	Youths	Total Population	%	Youths	Total Population	%
New Towns									
Tuen Mun	46 134 (5.5)	356 439 (6.5)	12.9	74 084 (8.5)	445 771 (7.2)	16.6	79 642 (8.7)	465 069 (6.9)	17.1
Sha Tin	74 333 (8.9)	493 866 (8.9)	15.1	76 577 (8.8)	445 383 (7.2)	17.2	72 636 (7.9)	443 687 (6.6)	16.4
Tai Po	23 650 (2.8)	188 248 (3.4)	12.6	37 605 (4.3)	271 661 (4.4)	13.8	47 461 (5.2)	289 417 (4.3)	16.4
Kwai Chung	83 158 (9.9)	430 852 (7.8)	19.3	49 061 (5.6)	285 231 (4.6)	17.2	36 147 (3.9)	283 638 (4.2)	12.7
Tsing Yi	.. (..)	.. (..)	..	28 985 (3.3)	185 495 (3.0)	15.6	32 761 (3.6)	193 463 (2.9)	16.9
Tsuen Wan	46 305 (5.5)	262 646 (4.8)	17.6	37 663 (4.3)	268 659 (4.3)	14.0	34 435 (3.7)	273 958 (4.1)	12.6
Tseung Kwan O	10 613 (1.3)	87 044 (1.6)	12.2	17 204 (2.0)	143 032 (2.3)	12.0	35 719 (3.9)	266 033 (4.0)	13.4
Fanling/Sheung Shui	12 98 (1.5)	120 063 (2.2)	10.8	24 069 (2.8)	192 321 (3.1)	12.5	38 538 (4.2)	253 770 (3.8)	15.2
Ma On Shan	.. (..)	.. (..)	..	18 047 (2.1)	137 305 (2.2)	13.1	29 478 (3.2)	184 54. (2.8)	16.0
Tin Shui Wai	.. (..)	.. (..)	..	12 724 (1.5)	96 129 (1.5)	13.2	25 623 (2.8)	177 813 (2.7)	14.4
Yuen Long	16 283 (1.9)	113 353 (2.1)	14.4	17 891 (2.1)	130 992 (2.1)	13.7	22 349 (2.4)	140 359 (2.1)	15.9
North Lantau	.. (..)	.. (..) (..)	.. (..)	..	2 605 (0.3)	20 115 (0.3)	13.0
Sub-total	313 464 (37.3)	2 052 511 (37.2)	15.3	393 910 (45.3)	2 601 979 (41.8)	15.1	457 394 (49.7)	2 991 831 (44.6)	15.3
Other Areas	44 528 (5.3)	269 150 (4.9)	16.5	43 642 (5.0)	304 754 (4.9)	14.3	47 673 (5.2)	351 215 (5.2)	13.6
New Territories	357 992 (42.6)	2 321 661 (42.0)	15.4	437 552 (50.3)	2 906 733 (46.8)	15.1	505 067 (54.9)	3 343 046 (49.8)	15.1
Hong Kong Island	168 633 (20.1)	1 214 253 (22.0)	13.9	162 445 (18.7)	1 312 637 (21.1)	12.4	161 581 (17.6)	1 335 469 (19.9)	12.1
Kowloon	311 085 (37.0)	1 975 265 (35.8)	15.7	267 452 (30.8)	1 987 996 (32.0)	13.5	253 003 (27.5)	2 023 979 (30.2)	12.5
Marine	2 131 (0.3)	11 102 (0.2)	19.2	2 062 (0.2)	10 190 (0.2)	20.2	794 (0.1)	5 895 (0.1)	13.5
Whole Territory	839 841 (100.0)	5 522 281 (100.0)	15.2	869 511 (100.0)	6 217 556 (100.0)	14.0	920 445 (100.0)	6 708 389 (100.0)	13.7

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2001)

** Figures in brackets represent the percentages in respect of the total.*

14. Population Distribution by District

Table 2.9: Youths by District Council District, 1991, 1996 and 2001

District Council District	Youths					
	1991		1996		2001	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Hong Kong Island						
Central and Western	32 361	3.9	29 609	3.4	29 609	3.2
Wan Chai	19 361	2.3	17 362	2.0	16 909	1.8
Eastern	74 123	8.8	75 989	8.7	75 985	8.3
Southern	42 788	5.1	39 485	4.5	39 094	4.2
Sub-total	168 633	20.1	162 445	18.7	161 581	17.6
Kowloon						
Yau Tsim Mong	38 199	4.5	32 819	3.8	33 642	3.7
Sham Shui Po	50 929	6.1	43 973	5.1	43 365	4.7
Kowloon City	60 061	7.2	49 307	5.7	44 718	4.9
Wong Tai Sin	62 615	7.5	54 504	6.3	56 794	6.2
Kwun Tong	99 281	11.8	86 849	10.0	74 484	8.1
Sub-total	311 085	37.0	267 452	30.8	253 003	27.5
New Territories						
Kwai Tsing	83 158	9.9	78 046	9.0	68 908	7.5
Tsuen Wan	46 667	5.6	38 030	4.4	34 626	3.8
Tuen Mun	49 097	5.8	76 585	8.8	82 934	9.0
Yuen Long	34 170	4.1	46 858	5.4	65 588	7.1
North	20 557	2.4	30 151	3.5	44 768	4.9
Tai Po	25 296	3.0	39 260	4.5	50 122	5.4
Sha Tin	74 379	8.9	94 677	10.9	102 159	11.1
Sai Kung	16 662	2.0	25 656	3.0	45 292	4.9
Islands	8 006	1.0	8 289	1.0	10 067	1.2
Sub-total	357 992	42.6	437 552	50.3	505 067	54.9
Land total	837 710	99.7	867 449	99.8	919 651	99.9
Whole territory	839 841	100.0	869 511	100.0	920 445	100.0

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2001)

The youth of Hong Kong are not distributed evenly across the districts. According to 2001 Census, the proportions of youth in Shatin and Tuen Mun are considerably higher than the average. Conversely, the districts with the lower proportions of youth are Wan Chai and Islands. The percentage breakdown and the total number of youths in each of the district are provided in Tables 2.8 and 2.9. Population distribution by district varies from one district council district to the next. There were slightly more young people in Shatin (11.1%) than other districts in 2001. In 2001, the greatest variation was found in the new towns where youth in Tuen Mun, Shatin, Ma On Shan, and Tsing Yi composed over 16% of the population. This is not particularly surprising, given that a large proportion of population migrated to the new towns in the past ten years.

15. Place of Birth

Table 2.10: Percentage of population by place of birth, 1971-2001

Place of birth	1971	1976	1981	1986	1991	1996	2001
Hong Kong	56.4	58.9	57.2	59.4	59.8	60.3	59.7
China	41.6	38.6	39.6	37.0	35.6	33.7	33.7
Elsewhere	2.0	2.5	3.2	3.6	4.6	6.0	6.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2001)

Table 2.11: Proportion of Population Born in Hong Kong by Age Group and Sex 1991, 1996 and 2001

Age Group	1991			1996			2001		
	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
0-14	90.5	91.1	90.8	87.6	88.4	88.0	83.5	83.5	83.5
15-24	80.8	80.9	80.8	80.2	78.0	79.2	81.7	76.0	78.8

Source: Derived from Census Statistics (2001)

According to census data in 2001, about 59.7% of youth were born in Hong Kong. A slight difference was found between the male and the female of youth: 76% of females were born in the territory, compared to 81.7% of males in the age 15-24. In contrast, 83.5% of males and females of youth aged below 15 were born in Hong Kong (Table 2.11).

16. Marital Status

Table 2.12: Marital status of youth population by age and sex, 1986-2001

Marital status/ Age group	1986	1991	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Never married								
Male								
15-19	224.1	212.9	222.8	232.2	236.2	235.8	234.6	228.4
20-29	461.5	402.1	399.0	401.7	401.8	399.2	401.7	399.9
Female								
15-19	206.4	197.5	210.2	222.9	226.8	225.3	221.8	215.4
20-29	340.2	340.0	355.6	363.0	375.8	376.5	391.6	391.5
Married								
Male								
15-19	0.5	0.2	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.3
20-29	112.4	77.7	72.4	72.9	66.9	65.6	60.8	59.0
Female								
15-19	2.4	1.4	2.2	2.2	2.2	1.5	1.2	1.0
20-29	212.6	164.5	160.9	159.5	148.0	146.9	135.9	127.2
Widowed and divorced/ separated								
Male								
15-19	-	-	-	*	-	*	-	-
20-29	1.5	1.3	1.0	0.9	1.1	1.2	0.9	1.3
Female								
15-19	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	*
20-29	2.5	2.0	2.0	2.4	2.5	3.5	2.9	4.1

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2001)

Notes: Includes land-based non-institutional population aged 15 and over only; Figures in thousand.

** Less than 200.*

16. Marital Status

Table 2.13: Proportion of Never Married Population Aged 15-54 by Sex and Age Group, 1991, 1996 and 2001

Proportion of Never Married Population (%)				
Sex	Age Group	1991	1996	2001
Male	15-19	99.4	99.2	99.7
	20-24	93.5	94	95.5
	25-29	67	70.9	75.5
Female	15-19	98.4	98.3	99.3
	20-24	82.9	85.3	89.2
	25-29	45.5	52	59.7
Both sexes	15-19	98.9	98.8	99.5
	20-24	88.2	89.6	92.2
	25-29	56	60.8	66.9

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2001)

Table 2.14: Youths by Marital Status, 1991, 1996 and 2001

Marital Status	1991		1996		2001	
	Youths	Whole Population Aged 15 and Over	Youths	Whole Population Aged 15 and Over	Youths	Whole Population Aged 17 and Over
	Number (Percentage*)					
Never married	784 660 (93.4)	1 433 997 (32.8)	817 407 (94.0)	1 592 267 (31.5)	881 287 (95.7)	1 787 519 (31.9)
Now married	54 376 (6.5)	2 623 909 (60.0)	50 798 (5.8)	3 072 785 (60.6)	37 723 (4.1)	3 325 482 (59.4)
Widowed	87 0	258 974 (5.9)	145 0.0	300 204 (5.9)	183 0.0	333 622 (6.0)
Divorced/Separated	718 (0.1)	53 485 (1.2)	1 161 (0.1)	97 262 (1.9)	1 252 (0.1)	152 349 (2.7)
Total	839 841 (100.0)	4 370 365 (100.0)	869 511 (100.0)	5 066 518 (100.0)	920 445 (100.0)	5 598 972 (100.0)

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2001)

Note: * Figures in brackets represent the percentages in respect of the total.

According to the 2001 Census, the number of youth married has dropped steadily over the years. Males aged 20-29 decreased from 112,400 in 1986 to 59,000 in 2001, females aged 20-29 decreased from 212,600 in 1986 to 127,200 in 2001.

17. Nationality

Table 2.15: Youths by Nationality*, 1991, 1996 and 2001

Nationality	1991		1996		2001	
	Youths	Whole Population	Youths	Whole Population	Youths	Whole Population
Chinese						
Place of Domicile Hong Kong	797 133	5 191 545	802 353	5 623 467	860 110	6 261 864
	(94.9)	(94.0)	(92.3)	(90.4)	(93.4)	(93.3)
Place of Domicile other than Hong Kong	8 713	48 029	9 611	64 717	9 747	76 898
	(1.0)	(0.9)	(1.1)	(1.0)	(1.1)	(1.1)
Filipino	8 449	64 658	12 525	120 730	12 453	143 662
	(1.0)	(1.2)	(1.4)	(1.9)	(1.4)	(2.1)
Indonesian	1 176	7 905	6 605	22 057	22 186	54 629
	(0.1)	(0.1)	(0.8)	(0.4)	(2.4)	(0.8)
British	10 010	68 502	18 478	175 395	1 714	25 418
	(1.2)	(1.2)	(2.1)	(2.8)	(0.2)	(0.4)
Indian	2 377	14 329	4 320	20 955	2 258	16 481
	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.5)	(0.3)	(0.2)	(0.2)
Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Sri-Lankan **					2 432	12 161
					(0.3)	(0.2)
Thai	1 429	11 787	1 736	15 993	1 008	14 791
	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.2)	(0.3)	(0.1)	(0.2)
Japanese	626	10 850	837	19 010	362	14 715
	(0.1)	(0.2)	(0.1)	(0.3)	0.0	(0.2)
American	1 066	18 383	1 945	28 946	1 461	14 379
	(0.1)	(0.3)	(0.2)	(0.5)	(0.2)	(0.2)
Nepalese	2 701	12 379
	(0.3)	(0.2)
Hong Kong	588	15 135	1 756	32 515	755	11 862
	(0.1)	(0.3)	(0.2)	(0.5)	(0.1)	(0.2)
Others	8 274	71 158	9 345	93 771	3 258	49 150
	(1.0)	(1.3)	(1.1)	(1.5)	(0.4)	(0.7)
Overall	839 841	5 522 281	869 511	6 217 556	920 445	6 708 389
	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)	(100.0)

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2001)

Notes: * Figures in brackets represent the percentages in respect of the total. ** These respondents were grouped under "Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi and Sri-Lankan" in the 1991 Population Census and the 1996 Population By-census. Hence no separate figures were available. These respondents were grouped under "Other Asian and Oceanian countries" in the 1991 Population Census and the 1996 Population By-census. Hence no separate figures were available.

17. Nationality

Table 2.16: Youths by Ethnicity, 2001

Ethnicity	Youths		Whole Population	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Chinese	870 605	94.6	6 364 439	94.9
Filipino	12 227	1.3	142 556	2.1
Indonesian	21 098	2.3	50 494	0.8
British	933	0.1	18 909	0.3
Indian	2 580	0.3	18 543	0.3
Thai	910	0.1	14 342	0.2
Japanese	336	0.0	14 180	0.2
Nepalese	2 781	0.3	12 564	0.2
Pakistani	2 256	0.2	11 017	0.2
Others	6 719	0.7	61 345	0.9
Total	920 445	100.0	6 708 389	100.0

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2001)

Table 2.16 shows the ethnic composition of youth in 2001. There were 49,840 aboriginal origin including 12,227 young people of Filipino, 21,098 young people of Indonesian, 2,781 Nepalese and 2,580 Indian. Chinese constituted 94.6% of the total population of youth in Hong Kong.

18. Language/Dialect

Table 2.17: Proportion of Youths* Able to Speak Selected Languages/Dialects, 1991, 1996 and 2001

Language/Dialect	Youths*			Whole Population Aged 5 and Over		
	As the Usual Language	As another Language/Dialect	Total	As the Usual Language	As another Language/Dialect	Total
1991						
Cantonese	91.7	5.6	97.3	88.7	7.1	95.8
English	1.6	55	56.6	2.2	29.4	31.6
Putonghua	0.8	15	15.8	1.1	16.9	18.1
Other Chinese dialects	5.0	9.0	14.0	7.0	14.2	21.2
Others	0.9	3.6	4.4	1.0	4.1	5.1
1996						
Cantonese	91.9	5.1	97.0	88.7	6.6	95.2
English	2.1	59.2	61.3	3.1	34.9	38.1
Putonghua	0.7	25.4	26.1	1.1	24.2	25.3
Other Chinese dialects	4.1	8.2	12.3	5.8	13.8	19.6
Others	1.2	4.9	6.1	1.3	5.4	6.6
2001						
Cantonese	92.8	4.8	97.5	89.2	6.8	96.1
English	2.1	65.6	67.6	3.2	39.8	43.0
Putonghua	0.4	37.4	37.8	0.9	33.3	34.1
Other Chinese dialects	3.3	7.6	10.9	5.5	13.9	19.3
Others	1.4	7.0	8.4	1.2	6.0	7.2

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2001)

*Note: * The figures exclude mute persons.*

Table 2.17 summarizes that the usual language and dialects spoken by youths in 1991, 1996 and 2001. As can be seen, most of the youth population in Hong Kong speak Cantonese that remained to be the most frequently used language for the local young people.

19. Housing Types

Table 2.18: Youths Living in Domestic Households by Living Arrangement and Type of Housing, 2001

Type of Housing ⁽¹⁾	Living alone	Living with parent(s) only	Living with spouse and/or child(ren) ⁽²⁾ Number (Percentage ⁽⁴⁾)	Others ⁽³⁾	Total
Public rental housing	996 (10.0)	333 110 (42.3)	6 653 (25.5)	10 098 (14.4)	350 857 (39.3)
Housing Authority subsidized sale flats	659 (6.6)	150 167 (19.1)	3 572 (13.7)	8 544 (12.2)	162 942 (18.2)
Housing Society subsidized sale flats	55 (0.5)	3 947 (0.5)	75 (0.3)	563 (0.8)	4 640 (0.5)
Private permanent housing	7 616 (76.1)	291 299 (37.0)	15 148 (58.0)	49 642 (70.7)	363 705 (40.7)
Temporary housing	327 (3.3)	7 280 (0.9)	461 (1.8)	1 082 (1.5)	9 150 (1.0)
Non-domestic housing	350 (3.5)	1 229 (0.2)	200 (0.8)	316 (0.4)	2 095 (0.2)
Total	10 003 (100.0)	787 032 (100.0)	26 109 (100.0)	70 245 (100.0)	893 389 (100.0)

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2001)

Notes: (1) Please see the Definition of Terms for the detailed coverage of the type of housing

(2) Figures include youths living with spouse and/or child(ren), no matter living with parent(s) or not.

(3) Figures include youths living with parent(s) other than parent(s), spouse and child(ren).

(4) Figures in brackets represent the percentages in respect of the total.

As shown in Tables 2.18, about 39.3% of the population lived in public rental housing while 40.7% lived in private permanent housing. Nevertheless, most of the young people (88.1%) live with parents.

Section B. Family Background and Dynamics

20. Household Composition

Table 2.19: Youths Living in Domestic Households by Living Arrangement, 1991, 1996 and 2001

Living Arrangement	1991	1996	2001
	Youths	Youths	Youths
		Number ⁽¹⁾ (Percentage ⁽²⁾)	
Living alone	13 074 (1.6)	11 587 (1.4)	10 003 (1.1)
Living with parent(s) only	676 639 (81.9)	736 564 (86.3)	787 032 (88.1)
Living with spouse and/or child(ren)			
And with parent(s)	5 675 (0.7)	5 624 (0.7)	4 779 (0.5)
And not with parent(s)	39 062 (4.7)	31 421 (3.7)	21 330 (2.4)
Sub-total	44 737 (5.4)	37 045 (4.3)	26 109 (2.9)
Others	91 294 (11.1)	68 727 (8.0)	70 245 (7.9)
Total	825 744 (100.0)	853 923 (100.0)	893 389 (100.0)

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2001)

Notes: (1) All figures exclude persons living in non-domestic households and student dormitories. There were 78 649, 79 128 and 169 192 persons living in non-domestic households and student dormitories in 1991, 1996 and 2001 respectively, of whom 14 097, 15 588 and 27 056 were youths. (2) Figures in brackets represent the percentages in respect of the total.

According to the 2001 Census, the majority of youth (88.1%) were living with parents up from 81.9% in 1991. Only 1.1% of young people were living alone while 2.9% were living with spouse and/or with children. 91.4% of unmarried youth were living with parents and only 14.4% of married youth were living with parents.

20. Household Composition

Table 2.20: Youths Living in Domestic Households by Living Arrangement and Marital Status, 2001

Living Arrangement	Youths Living in Domestic Households			Total
	Never married	Now married	Widowed/Divorced /Separated	
	Number (Percentage ⁽¹⁾)			
Living alone	9 497 (1.1)	391 (1.0)	115 (8.1)	10 003 (1.1)
Living with parent(s) only	781 161 (91.4)	5 395 (14.4)	476 (33.4)	787 032 (88.1)
Living with spouse and/or child(ren)				
And with parent(s)	241 0.0	4 220 (11.3)	318 (22.3)	4 779 (0.5)
And not with parent(s)	194 0.0	20 938 (56.0)	198 (13.9)	21 330 (2.4)
Sub-total	435 (0.1)	25 158 (67.2)	516 (36.2)	26 109 (2.9)
Others	63 457 (7.4)	6 470 (17.3)	318 (22.3)	70 245 (7.9)
Total	854 550 (100.0)	37 414 (100.0)	1 425 (100.0)	893 389 (100.0)

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2001)

Notes : (1) Figures in brackets represent the percentages in respect of the total. (2) Figures include youths living with parent(s) other than parent(s), spouse and child(ren).

In Hong Kong, the majority of youths are never married with a significant proportion of them living with parents. About 94.7% of non-working youth are living with parents in Hong Kong. 56.1% of youth in the Hong Kong are non-working population, as compared to 43.9% of working population. This difference is largely attributable to the greater proportion of youth in Hong Kong who are students.

20. Household Composition

Table 2.21: Youths Living in Domestic Households by Living Arrangement Economic Activity Status and Sex, 2001

Living Arrangement	Youths Living in Domestic Households								
	Economic Activity Status								
	Working Population			Non-working Population			Total		
	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes
Number (Percentage ⁽¹⁾)									
Living alone	4 140 (2.2)	3 081 (1.5)	7 221 (1.8)	1 661 (0.7)	1 121 (0.5)	2 782 (0.5)	5 801 (1.3)	4 202 (0.9)	10 003 (1.1)
Living with parent(s) only	164 637 (88.1)	147 984 (72.0)	312 621 (79.7)	245 974 (96.5)	228 437 (92.8)	474 411 (94.7)	410 611 (92.9)	376 421 (83.4)	787 032 (88.1)
Living with spouse And/or child(ren) And with parent(s)	2670 (1.4)	981 (0.5)	3 651 (0.9)	437 (0.2)	691 (0.3)	1 128 (0.2)	3 107 (0.7)	1 672 (0.4)	4 779 (0.5)
And not with parent(s)	3 173 (1.7)	9 124 (4.4)	12 297 (3.1)	371 (0.1)	8 662 (3.5)	9 033 (1.8)	3 544 (0.8)	17 786 (3.9)	21 330 (2.4)
Sub-total	5 843 (3.1)	10 105 (4.9)	15 948 (4.1)	808 (0.3)	9 353 (3.8)	10 161 (2.0)	6 651 (1.5)	19 458 (4.3)	26 109 (2.9)
Others⁽²⁾	12 237 (6.5)	44 258 (21.5)	56 495 (14.4)	6 576 (2.6)	7 174 (2.9)	13 750 (2.7)	18 813 (4.3)	51 432 (11.4)	70 245 (7.9)
Total	186 857 (100.0)	205 428 (100.0)	392 285 (100.0)	255 019 (100.0)	246 085 (100.0)	501 104 (100.0)	441 876 (100.0)	451 516 (100.0)	893 389 (100.0)

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2001)

Notes: (1) Figures in brackets represent the percentages in respect of the total. (2) Figures include youths living with parent(s) other than parent(s), spouse and child(ren).

Many non-working youth tend to live with their parents. In 2001, among non-working youth 94.7% lived with parents. In contrast, 79.7% of working youth lived with parents.

21. Household Size

Table 2.22: Domestic Households with Youths by Household Size and Number of Youths, 2001

Household Size	Domestic Households with Youths						Total Number	%
	Number of Youths in Households							
	1	2	3	4	5	6+		
1	11 352	-	-	-	-	-	11 352	1.9
2	42 098	4 916	-	-	-	-	47 014	7.9
3	109 472	17 976	704	-	-	-	128 152	21.5
4	127 506	86 593	4 078	174	-	-	218 351	36.6
5	59 738	44 100	21 185	613	42	-	125 678	21.0
6+	27 801	19 741	12 977	5 115	743	156	66 533	11.1
Total	377 967	173 326	38 944	5 902	785	156	597 080	100.0
							Average Domestic Household Size = 4.1	

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2001)

By 2001, the average size for domestic households with youth was 4.1 persons. 21.5% of domestic households had three family members, 36.6% had four family members and 21% had five family members.

22. Family Dynamics

Table 2.23: Adolescents' perceptions of family functioning by age group (Shek, 2000)

	Mean	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
Group 1	128.88				
Group 2	133.93	*			
Group 3	138.81	*	*		
Group 4	138.93	*	*		

$F(3 / 3094) = 36.14, p < .0001; * \text{ Duncan Multiple Range Test, } p < .05$

Notes: Group 1: age < 13; Group 2: age=13; Group 3: age = 14-15; Group 4 = age >15

Source: Shek (2000)

Table 2.24: Adolescents' perceptions of family functioning by different grades of the secondary school (Shek, 2000)

	Mean	Form 1	Form 2	Form 3	Form 4
Form 1	130.51				
Form 2	135.39	*			
Form 3	138.80	*	*		
Form 4	139.12	*	*		

$F(3 / 3094) = 29.37, p < .0001; * \text{ Duncan Multiple Range Test, } p < .05$

Source: Shek (2000)

Adolescents' perceptions of family functioning were examined in the research paper "Hong Kong Adolescents' perceptions of family functioning: Research findings based on the Family Assessment Device" published by Professor Daniel T.L. Shek in 2000. A total of 3,649 Chinese adolescents responded to the Chinese version of the Family Assessment Device (FAD). Results showed that based on the total scores of the Chinese FAD, adolescents' perceptions of family functioning were related to several correlates. Relative to younger adolescents, older adolescents had poorer perceptions of family functioning (Table 2.23) and adolescents studying in higher grades of the secondary school had relatively poorer perceptions of family functioning (Table 2.24).

22. Family Dynamics

Table 2.25: Adolescents' perceptions of family functioning by different academic abilities (Shek, 2000)

	Mean	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
Group 1	132.07					
Group 2	133.76					
Group 3	136.01	*	*			
Group 4	138.82	*	*	*		
Group 5	139.65	*	*	*		

$F(4 / 3093) = 14.49, p < .0001$; * Duncan Multiple Range Test, $p < .05$

Notes: Levels of the academic abilities are in the ascending order of Group 5 (lowest), Group 4, Group 3, Group 2, Group 1 (highest)

Source: Shek (2000)

Table 2.26: Adolescents' perceptions of family functioning by different types of schools (Shek, 2000)

	Mean	Public	Subsidized	Private
Public	135.09			
Subsidized	135.98			
Private	140.75	*	*	

$F(2 / 3095) = 6.9, p < .001$; * Duncan Multiple Range Test, $p < .05$

Source: Shek (2000)

In addition, adolescents studying in schools admitting students with higher academic abilities had relatively better perceptions of family functioning (Table 2.25) and students studying in private schools had relatively poorer perceptions of family functioning than those studying in government and aided schools (Table 2.26). The findings arising from Professor Shek's study suggest that there is a need to strengthen family life education for early adolescents and their parents.

22. Family Dynamics

Table 2.27: Adolescents' perceptions of family functioning by gender (Shek, 2002)

	Parental Concern	Parental Control
Male	5.37	7.07
Female	5.09	6.59

Parental Concern (t=3.5, p<0.001); Parental Control (t=5.2, p<0.001)

Source: Shek (2002)

Table 2.28: Adolescents' perceptions of family functioning by different age groups (Shek, 2002)

	SFI	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
Group 1	84				
Group 2	87.5	*			
Group 3	93.2	*	*		
Group 4	93.8	*	*		
<i>F (3/ 3267)= 38.3, p < .0001; * Duncan Multiple Range Test, p < .05; SFI=Self-Report Family Inventory</i>					
	FAI	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
Group 1	71.4				
Group 2	76.7	*			
Group 3	82.4	*	*		
Group 4	82.6	*	*		
<i>F (3/ 3359)= 37.3, p < .0001; * Duncan Multiple Range Test, p < .05; FAI=Family Assessment Instrument</i>					

Notes: Group 1: age < 13; Group 2: age=13; Group 3: age = 14-15; Group 4 = age >15

Source: Shek (2002)

Furthermore, adolescents' perceptions of family functioning were also examined in the research paper "Perceptions of family functioning amongst adolescents in Hong Kong" published by Professor Daniel T.L. Shek in 2002. Results showed that male adolescents had poorer perceptions of family functioning in comparison with female adolescents (Table 2.27). In addition, younger adolescents had better perceptions of family functioning than older adolescents (Table 2.28).

22. Family Dynamics

Table 2.29: Adolescents' perceptions of family functioning by different grades of the secondary school (Shek, 2002)

	SFI	Form 1	Form 2	Form 3	Form 4
Form 1	85.1				
Form 2	89.7	*			
Form 3	93.1	*	*		
Form 4	93.6	*	*		
<i>F (3 / 3267) = 31.5, p < .0001; * Duncan Multiple Range Test, p < .05; SFI=Self-Report Family Inventory</i>					
	FAI	Form 1	Form 2	Form 3	Form 4
Form 1	72.8				
Form 2	78.6	*			
Form 3	82.5	*	*		
Form 4	82.9	*	*		
<i>F (3 / 3359) = 33.2, p < .0001; * Duncan Multiple Range Test, p < .05; FAI=Family Assessment Instrument</i>					

Source: Shek (2002)

Results of Professor Shek's study also showed that while adolescents in general had positive perceptions of their family functioning. However, adolescents studying in higher grades had relatively poorer perceptions of family functioning (Table 2.29).

22. Family Dynamics

Table 2.30: Adolescents' perceptions of family functioning by different academic abilities (Shek, 2002)

	SFI	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
Group 1	86.8					
Group 2	89.7	*				
Group 3	90.4	*				
Group 4	92.2	*	*			
Group 5	92.8	*	*	*		
<i>F (4 / 3266) = 8.22, p < .0001; * Duncan Multiple Range Test, p < .05; SFI=Self-Report Family Inventory</i>						
	FAI	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
Group 1	75.4					
Group 2	77.9					
Group 3	79.8	*				
Group 4	81	*	*			
Group 5	81.5	*	*	*		
<i>F (4 / 3358) = 6.88, p < .0001; * Duncan Multiple Range Test, p < .05; FAI=Family Assessment Instrument</i>						

Notes: Levels of the academic abilities are in the ascending order of Group 5 (lowest), Group 4, Group 3, Group 2, Group 1 (highest)

Source: Shek (2002)

Based on the total scores of the Self-Report Family Inventory and Family Assessment Instrument, research results showed that adolescents studying in schools admitting students with higher academic abilities had relatively better perceptions of family functioning (Table 2.30).

22. Family Dynamics

Table 2.31: Adolescents' perceptions of family functioning by different types of schools (Shek, 2002)

	SFI	Public	Subsidized	Private
Public	89.2			
Subsidized	90.4			
Private	94	*	*	
<i>F (2 / 3268) = 5.01, p < .01; * Duncan Multiple Range Test, p < .05;</i> <i>SFI=Self-Report Family Inventory</i>				
	FAI	Public	Subsidized	Private
Public	78.1			
Subsidized	79.2			
Private	83.4	*	*	
<i>F (2 / 3360) = 4.8, p < .01; * Duncan Multiple Range Test, p < .05</i> <i>FAI=Family Assessment Instrument</i>				

Source: Shek (2002)

Moreover, students studying in private schools had relatively poorer perceptions of family functioning than those studying in government and aided schools (Table 2.31). The findings of Professor Shek's study revealed some of adolescents indicated that: (1) family members lacked communication; (2) family members lacked mutual understanding; (3) family members lacked emotional responsiveness; (4) family members failed to fulfill their family responsibilities; (5) family rules were not clear; and (6) the distribution of family tasks was not fair.

23. Missing Persons

Table 2.32: Persons Reported Missing By Age and Sex in Hong Kong from 1997 to 2002 (Jan-Jul)

Year	Age & Sex									
	Under 2		2 - 6		7 - 15		16 - 20		21 & Over	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
1997	8	7	28	32	892	1 691	278	583	1 373	1 136
1998	7	8	59	49	992	1 746	342	577	1 652	1 140
1999	10	9	46	33	1 092	1 680	364	692	1 933	1 217
2000	11	11	54	34	1 129	1 939	424	697	1 884	1 401
2001	6	5	46	32	1 212	1 809	366	653	2 113	1 564
2002 (Jan - Jul)	6	4	28	19	681	978	227	305	1 327	903

Source: Hong Kong Police Force (2002)

Table 2.33: Missing Persons Aged Under 16 Found by Reasons for Missing in Hong Kong from 1997 to 2002 (Jan-Jul)

Reason for Missing	Year					
	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002 (Jan-Jul)
(1) Family Dispute	367	458	498	609	574	288
(2) Lack of Parental Supervision	8	13	40	20	55	39
(3) Truancy	36	51	62	44	73	24
(4) Lost Way	24	30	38	23	29	17
(5) To become Independent	11	27	26	16	6	6
(6) Sickness (Amnesia or Mentally Unbalances)	8	10	10	11	18	5
(7) Escape from Institutional Custody	85	40	39	37	38	7
(8) Others	2 017	2 106	2 055	2 383	2 268	1 344
Total	2 556	2 735	2 768	3 143	3 061	1 730

Source: Hong Kong Police Force (2002)

The majority of missing persons were aged between 7–15 and family dispute is the major reason for missing of young people in Hong Kong.

Section C. Behaviours, Attitudes and Values

24. Voting Behaviour

Table 2.34: Registered Electors and Voter Turnout in Legislative Council Elections and District Board Elections by Age Group and Sex

Age group	Sex	1998 Legislative Council Elections		1999 District Board Elections		2000 Legislative Council Elections	
		Registered Elections	Voter Turnout	Registered Elections	Voter Turnout	Registered Elections	Voter Turnout
18-20	F	41 106	26 884	45 412	12 955	56 978	26 181
	M	42 403	26 112	44 083	12 175	55 470	24 403
21-25	F	107 937	51 609	105 304	21 460	110 932	40 025
	M	114 583	51 953	110 859	21 699	116 162	39 788
26-30	F	110 354	52 493	111 061	21 962	121 019	44 425
	M	116 679	54 629	117 224	22 820	126 663	44 468

Source: Registration and Electoral Office (2001)

Table 2.35: Registered to be voters

	Percentage
Yes	62.4%
No	37.1%
Don't know / Hard to tell	0.4%
Total	100.0%

Source: Hong Kong Federation of Youth Group (2000)

Table 2.36: Will respondents vote in the legislative council election?

	Percentage
Yes	
(Must vote)	35.2%
(Mostly likely to vote)	35.6%
No	12.6%
Don't know / Hard to tell	16.6%
Total	100%

Source: Hong Kong Federation of Youth Group (2000)

Table 2.34 summarizes the profile of voters of the 1998-2000 Legislative Council Elections and District Board Elections. Table 2.35 shows that about two-third (62.4%) of youth had registered to be voters in the election and Table 2.36 indicates that more than 70% of the respondents intended to vote in the legislative council election.

25. Voluntary Service

Table 2.37: Voluntary service means helping or working for people without Financial remuneration. Have respondents done any voluntary service over the past year?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes		
A great deal	40	4.6%
Sometimes	83	9.5%
Hardly	57	6.5%
No	688	79.3%
Total	868	100.0%

Source: Hong Kong Federation of Youth Group (2001)

**Table 2.38: (Respondents who had not volunteered)
Why didn't respondents do voluntary service?**

	Frequency	Percent
Too busy/ I have no time	566	82.3%
No channel/ No opportunities	148	21.5%
No interest in voluntary service	25	3.6%
Don't know the meaning of voluntary service	14	2.3%
Have no one that I know to accompany me	7	1.1%
No voluntary service skills	6	0.9%
It is meaningless	6	0.9%
It is unpaid	3	0.4%
Have no capability of helping people	2	0.3%
It is boring	1	0.1%
My family discourages me	1	0.1%
Unsuitable physically	1	0.1%
Others	7	1.1%
Don't know / hard to say	13	1.9%

Source: Hong Kong Federation of Youth Group (2001)

A survey conducted by the Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups in 2001 revealed that 20% of the respondents had volunteered over the past year. Most of them volunteered occasionally and the remaining 80% had not volunteered with most attributing the reason to “having no time” or “the lack of a proper channel or opportunities”.

25. Voluntary Service

Table 2.39: Please state whether respondents agree or not with the following statements.

	Agree		Disagree		Don't know / Hard to say	Total
	Strongly	Quite	Not agree	Not agree		
	Agree	Agree	As such	At all		
Helping people is the root of Happiness	402 46.4%	456 52.5%	5 0.6%	--	5 0.5%	868 100.0%
It is more blessed to give than to receive	428 49.3%	410 47.2%	19 2.2%	4 0.4%	7 0.9%	868 100.0%
Doing voluntary service is a waste of time	5 0.6%	70 8.1%	733 49.9%	340 39.2%	20 2.3%	868 100.0%
Doing voluntary service means being exploited	1 0.1%	190 2.2%	368 42.4%	467 53.8%	13 1.5%	868 100.0%

Source: Hong Kong Federation of Youth Group (2001)

Table 2.40: Do you agree that doing voluntary service is a waste of time?

	Agree		Disagree		Total
	Strongly agree	Quite agree	Not agree as such	Not agree at all	
Mar. 1995 (aged 15-29)	13 (2.5%)	35 (6.8%)	304 (58.9%)	164 (31.8%)	516 (100.0%)
Nov. 2000 (aged 15-29)	2 (0.4%)	36 (8.4%)	218 (50.4%)	177 (40.8%)	433 (100.0%)

Source: Hong Kong Federation of Youth Group (2001)

The survey found that nearly all respondents agreed that “Helping people is the root of happiness” (98.8%), with another overwhelming majority (96.5%) believing that “it is more blessed to give than to receive”. Only a few believed that “Doing voluntary services is a waste of time”, or “Doing voluntary service means being exploited” (2.3%). Table 2.39 and Table 2.40 show that Hong Kong youth have a positive attitude towards volunteering. Only 8.8% of respondent aged 15-19 agreed that doing voluntary service was a waste of time, a figure similar to that found in the 1995 survey.

25. Voluntary Service

Table 2.41: Have you participated in the following organization/ activity?

	Yes	No	Don't know/ hard to tell	Total
Voluntary service	312 41.2%	444 58.8%	--	756 100.0%
Student Association	237 31.4%	515 68.5%	1 0.1%	756 100.0%
Church Organization	136 18.0%	620 82.0%	--	756 100.0%
Community Organization	122 16.1%	634 83.9%	--	756 100.0%
Professional Organization	79 10.4%	676 89.4%	2 0.2%	756 100.0%
Labor Union	52 6.8%	703 93.0%	1 0.1%	756 100.0%
Political parties	10 1.3%	746 98.7%	--	756 100.0%

Source: Hong Kong Federation of Youth Group (2000)

Table 2.42: (Respondents who volunteered) Why did you do voluntary service?

	Frequency	Percent
It is meaningful/ Want to help people in need	62	34.4%
Many people volunteer, so should	46	25.6%
To kill time/ I have spare time	42	23.3%
Because it has a positive impact on myself	32	17.8%
Have an interest in it	31	17.2%
School or Workplace requires it	20	11.1%
Because it brings about a feeling of achievement or satisfaction	12	6.7%
Many people need help	11	6.1%
Want to create a caring community	7	3.9%
To fulfill civil duty/ To serve society	5	2.8%
It can help my future career	2	1.1%
Feel embarrassed to reject	1	0.6%
Others	8	4.4%
Don't know / hard to say	3	1.7%

Source: Hong Kong Federation of Youth Group (2001)

One-third of the respondents (34.4%) regarded that doing voluntary services is meaningful and they actually want to help people in need.

26. Cross-border Travel

Table 2.43: Demographic characteristics of school children crossing the border

	No. of Persons	Overall (%)
Sex		
Male	405	61.3
Female	255	38.7
Total	660	100.0
Age		
3-5	2	0.3
6-11	605	91.7
12-14	53	8.0
Total	660	100.0

Source: Planning Department (2000)

In 1998 Planning Department conducted a survey to examine the patterns of cross-boundary trips regarding origins, destinations, purposes and modes of transport. It was observed that majority of student (91.7%) who cross the borders were aged between 6-11 and the passage used by them was Lo Wu by bus.

27. Views about the government

Table 2.44: The views of the youth on the Basic Law

Views of the youth	Agree		Disagree		Don't Know/ Hard to say	Total
	Strongly Agree	Quite Agree	Not agree As such	Strongly Disagree		
(a) Citizens have a responsibility to make themselves familiar with the Basic Law	135 25.60%	357 67.90%	13 2.50%	3 0.50%	18 3.40%	526 100.00%
(b) Citizens with no knowledge on the Basic Law is not a problem	28 5.40%	147 28.00%	266 50.50%	56 10.70%	28 5.40%	526 100.00%
(c) The Basic Law is closely related to daily life	75 14.20%	262 49.90%	138 26.30%	7 1.40%	43 8.20%	526 100.00%

Source: Hong Kong Federation of Youth Group (2000)

Table 2.45: Attitude toward law and order

Attitude toward law and order	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No opinion/ Don't know Hard to say
It's very important to obey law	45.0	52.4	2.0	0.0	0.5
It's hard to avoid corruption in the commercial society	12.7	42.4	30.7	11.2	3.1
You will not obey the law that is unreasonable	6.1	31.8	45.7	9.7	6.8

Source: Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups (2001)

The survey noted that respondents were not familiar with the contents of the Basic Law. More than 20% of respondents said that they had no knowledge. Only a very few of respondents claimed that they had a very good understanding of the Basic Law.

28. Attitudes towards work and spending

Table 2.46: Average monthly expense of University Student

Items of Expense	Percentage	Average monthly expense
Living Expense	83.5%	\$4218
Eating	24.1%	\$1217
Service (Mobile Phone)	14.1%	\$712
Clothing	13.2%	\$670
Durable good	10.8%	\$544
Transportation	9.1%	\$463
Entertainment	4.8%	\$241
Sports	2.3%	\$115
Others	5.1%	\$256
Educational Expense	16.5%	\$832
Book and Stationary	4.2%	\$212
Individual subject expense	1.1%	\$55
Others	11.2%	\$565
Total	100%	\$5050

Source: Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups (2001)

Table 2.47: Attitude towards value of work

Attitude towards value of work	Strongly Agree		Strongly Disagree		No opinion/ Don't know Hard to say
	Agree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	
There are many opportunities in Hong Kong	13.7	60.2	20.7	2.4	2.9
Job satisfaction is important than monetary reward	16.0	47.1	28.0	4.3	4.7
Smart is important than hard-working	15.5	45.3	31.3	3.7	4.2
Starting business is better than getting employment	14.2	41.3	34.0	3.0	7.5
Not difficult to find job in Hong Kong	4.0	27.1	45.5	19.4	4.1

Source: Hong Kong Federation of Youth Groups (2001)

Table 2.41 shows how university student spent their money. It can be seen that apart from the living expense, most of the students spent their money on mobile phone as well as clothes. It can also be seen from the Table 2.47 that more than half of the respondents (73.9%) thought that there are many opportunities in Hong Kong.