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Survey Objectives

Specifically, the objectives of this survey were as follows:

(i) To collect information delineating the types and forms of families in Hong Kong, e.g. nuclear family, single parent family, extended family, modified extended family, childless family, split family, etc;
(ii) To collect information on relations, roles and distribution of power and responsibilities in the family;
(iii) To collect information on extended family and kinship networks in terms of, inter alia, frequency of contacts, performance of obligations, exchanges and transfers;
(iv) To collect information on family values and attitudes; and
(v) To collect information on work-family balance pattern.

Survey Coverage

The survey covered the land-based non-institutional population of Hong Kong. The following categories of people were excluded:

- Inmates of institutions; and
- Persons living on board vessels.

This survey did not include foreign domestic helpers and thus covered about 96% of the Hong Kong Resident Population.
Target Respondents

The target respondents of the topic ‘family’ were all Hong Kong Resident Population aged 18 and above, excluding foreign domestic helpers residing in the quarters.

As the study aimed to collect information on the characteristics of Hong Kong families as well as family roles, relationship with other family members and views on family related issues of individuals, different target respondents were identified accordingly.

Among all household members, including those aged below 18:

- Relationship with one another to delineate household / family composition / forms

Among all households with persons aged 18 and above collectively:

- Sharing of family responsibilities
- Frequency of family activities

Among all persons aged 18 and above:

- Relationship with family members (parents, children, siblings, etc.)
- Satisfaction with family life
- Attitudes and values towards family

Among all married persons / persons living with cohabiting partners aged 18 and above:

- Relationship with spouse and his / her family members

Among all employed persons aged 18 and above:

- Experience of work-family balance

Continued on next page
The survey adopted the Frame of Quarters maintained by C&SD as the sampling frame. The Frame consists of two parts, namely Register of Quarters (RQ) and Register of Segments (RS).

The RQ contains computerised records of all addresses of permanent quarters in built-up areas, including urban areas, new towns and other major developed areas. Each unit of quarters is identified by a unique address with details such as street name, building name, floor number and flat number.

The RS contains records of area segments in non-built-up areas which are delineated by some physical or easily identifiable boundaries such as streams, footpaths, lanes and ditches. Each area segment contains some 8 to 15 quarters. The use of segments as the sampling unit in non-built-up areas is necessary since the quarters in these areas may not have clear addresses and cannot readily be identified individually.

A sample of quarters was selected from this Frame in accordance with a scientifically designed sampling scheme in the first phase. While the sampling units were living quarters, all households in the selected living quarters were enumerated individually so that the probability of selection for each household was the same regardless of the degree of sharing.

Collective household information was collected from either the household head or the household member most knowledgeable about the family-related matters. Besides, the basic demographic characteristics and family background information of each and every household member aged 18 or above were enumerated.

For sections on family roles, relationship with other family members and views on family related issues of individuals aged 18 and above, one of the household member(s) aged 18 and above (excluding foreign domestic helpers) was selected randomly by the Kish Grid Method for enumeration.

For the section concerning marriage and cohabiting relationship, one person from each and every pair of married persons living together / cohabiting partners in a sampled household was randomly selected, whilst all married persons living apart from their spouses in a sampled household were invited to answer those questions addressed to married / cohabiting persons.
**Executive Summary, continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>The survey was conducted through household face-to-face interviews, except that information concerning marriage and cohabiting relationship was collected by a self-administered questionnaire.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Successful Interviews</td>
<td>A total of 10 725 households were identified in the sample of 10 440 occupied quarters. Among these 10 725 households, 8 044 households were successfully enumerated, constituting an overall response rate of 75.0%. Note that only 8 036 households with members aged 18 and above were included in the analysis of “family”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork Period</td>
<td>Fieldwork was conducted from 20 December 2008 to 27 February 2009.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Weighting | The **household-based** data collected from the survey were grossed up in accordance with the number of households in Hong Kong as provided by C&SD before tabulation and analysis.  

The **person-based** data collected from the survey were grossed up in accordance with the distribution of the Hong Kong Resident Population broken down by the age-sex groups in 2008 provided by C&SD before tabulation and analysis. Data were also adjusted with reference to the respective sampling method being used. For questions for which the respondents were randomly selected by the Kish Grid Method from all household members aged 18 and above, the grossing-up factors were adjusted by the number of eligible respondents in his / her household. For questions covering married / cohabiting persons, the grossing-up factors were adjusted by the probability of the respondent being sampled (i.e. 100% for married persons not living with his / her spouse and 50% for married persons living with his / her spouse and cohabiting persons). |

*Continued on next page*
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Highlights of Findings

Household composition, family forms and characteristics

There were 2 303 200 target households (i.e. households with members aged 18 and above) in Hong Kong. Their household compositions resembled that of all households as reported in the 2006 Population By-Census. The most dominant type was one unextended nuclear family, constituting about two-thirds (67.5%) of the households. One person household came next, constituting 17.1%.

Among these households, 1 861 400 households (80.8%) were family households while 441 900 (19.2%) households were non-family households.

(Figure 1.1)

(Figure 1.1) Households in Hong Kong by whether family household and family form

---

Family households

Among family households, 1 554 700 (67.5%) were unextended nuclear families and 244 200 (10.6%) were extended families. Another 62 600 households (2.7%) comprised related persons forming no nuclear family.

Unextended nuclear families

The major form of unextended nuclear family was "a married couple living with never married children", constituting 50.6% of family households or 40.9% of all households. When analysed by age of the never married children, majority (28.1% of family households or 22.7% of all households) had underage never married children while the remaining (22.5% of family households or 18.2% of all households) were with adult never married children only.

(Figures 1.1 and 1.2)
### Figure 1.2: Summary of family households in Hong Kong by family form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Form</th>
<th>No. of households ('000)</th>
<th>As a % of family households (%)</th>
<th>As a % of all households (%)</th>
<th>No. of persons in family households ('000)</th>
<th>% of persons in family households (%)</th>
<th>% of persons in all households (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Family Households</td>
<td>1,861.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>6,223.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unextended nuclear family</td>
<td>1,554.7</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>4,987.8</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single couple</td>
<td>340.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>674.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By age:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly couple</td>
<td>139.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>250.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(At least one aged 65+)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger couple</td>
<td>201.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>424.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Both aged&lt;65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By whether had children:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childless couple</td>
<td>154.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>327.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple with children living apart</td>
<td>185.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>346.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married couple living with never married children (NMC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With underage NMC (At least one NMC aged&lt;18)</td>
<td>523.3</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>2,068.8</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult NMC only (All NMC aged 18+)</td>
<td>418.2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>1,539.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent living with never married children (NMC)</td>
<td>272.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>705.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With underage NMC (At least one NMC aged&lt;18)</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>217.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult NMC only (All NMC aged 18+)</td>
<td>193.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>487.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended family</td>
<td>244.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>1,094.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married couple living with parent(s), with or without NMC / others</td>
<td>142.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>678.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which, living with parent(s) of the husband</td>
<td>112.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>545.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent living with parent(s) and NMC, with or without others</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>226.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other extended nuclear families</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>189.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related persons forming no nuclear family</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>140.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which, Siblings</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparent and grandchild(ren)</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Household-based and person-based weighting factors were used to derive the above statistics respectively.

Continued on next page
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Household composition, family forms and characteristics, continued

“A married couple only” was another common form of unextended nuclear family. 18.3% of family households (14.8% of all households) were formed by married couples only. When analysed by age of the couples, 59.1% of them were younger couples both aged below 65, while the other 40.9% were elderly couples with at least one aged 65 and above.

The other family form within unextended nuclear family – “a single parent living with never married children”, constituted 14.7% of family households or 11.8% of all households. When analysed by age of the never married children, 3.4% of all households were with never married children who were aged below 18 while 8.4% were with never married children who were aged 18 and above only.

Extended families

Within the extended family households, majority (7.6% of family households or 6.2% of all households) were formed by a married couple living with parent(s), with or without never married children and others. In fact, most of them were living with parent(s) of the husband (6.1% of family households and 4.9% of all households), which was a Chinese tradition. This might also be related to the fact that more of the females were with parent(s) living in the Mainland of China.

A single parent living with parent(s) and never married children, with or without others, constituted another one-fifth (2.9% of family households or 2.3% of all households).

Related persons forming no nuclear family

Amongst households of related persons forming no nuclear family, the most common form was family of siblings (1.8% of family households or 1.5% of all households). Cross-generational families formed by grandparent and grandchild(ren) only constituted 0.4% of family households or 0.3% of all households.

(Figure 1.2)
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Highlights of Findings, continued

**Household composition, family forms and characteristics, continued**

**Modified extended families**

Extended families were not very common in Hong Kong. Nevertheless, it was noted that there was a “modified” form of extended families, whereby married persons, though not living together with their parents, were actually living in close vicinity of their parents, maintaining close contacts with them and providing support to each other.

Among the 2,667,500 married persons aged 18 and above living in unextended nuclear family, 9.3% (248,200 persons) were living within walking distance from their parents, while 4.4% (117,900 persons) were living within walking distance from their adult children. Within these, 0.2% (4,800 persons) were living within walking distance from both their parents and their adult children.

The survey also showed that the closer the places of living, the more frequent people met and contacted their parents / adult children who were living apart, and so was the mutual assistance between them.

(Figure 1.3)

**Figure 1.3 : Married persons living in unextended nuclear families by whether living in close vicinity of parents and children**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Without parent but living together with all adult children</th>
<th>With parents/ adult children living apart</th>
<th>Not living in close vicinity of parents/ adult children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>903,900 (33.9%)</td>
<td>1,531,500 (57.4%)</td>
<td>1,170,300 (43.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without parents or adult children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232,100 (8.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All married persons aged 18 and above living in unextended nuclear family (N=2,667,500)

Continued on next page
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Household composition, family forms and characteristics, continued

Single parent families

There were 326,200 households containing single parent family (17.5% of family households or 14.2% of all households). Within these, 272,700 households were unextended nuclear families of single parent living with never married children only.

Split families

Among the 3,288,000 married persons aged 18 and above, 4.2% (139,500 persons) were living apart from their spouse and were regarded as living in split families.

Non-family households

441,900 (19.2%) households were non-family households. Non-family households were mostly one person households excluding live-in domestic helper(s). They amounted to 92.9% of non-family households or 17.8% of all households. The remaining 7.1% of non-family households (1.4% of all households) were composed of unrelated persons only.

Household characteristics

Excluding live-in domestic helpers, majority (72.5%) of households had 2 to 4 household members. Only less than 10% of the households had 5 or more household members. The average household size was 2.85 members. Extended families tended to have larger household size.

11.7% of the households hired domestic helpers, whether live-in or not. The incidence was higher among family households (13.0%) than among non-family households (5.9%).

The median household income was $16,800. A much higher proportion of low income (no income and monthly income less than $10,000) households was found among the elderly couples (83.3%), single parents living with underage children (70.3%) and one person households (67.9%).

58.7% were with male household heads while 41.3% were with female household heads. Male predominance as household head was particularly apparent amongst married couples (75.2%), as well as cohabiting partners (69.0%). Household heads were more commonly of age 45-54 (27.4%), 65 and above (22.0%) and 35-44 (21.1%).

Continued on next page
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Highlights of Findings, continued

**Frequency of family activities**

Amongst households with more than one member other than the live-in domestic helper(s), over 80% claimed that they often / very often got together on festive occasions (87.3%) or had dinner together (81.8%) during the year before enumeration. On the other hand, only around 40% claimed that they often / very often had heart-to-heart talks with one another (45.3%) or went out together on Sundays or public holidays (41.2%).

(Figure 1.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Activity</th>
<th>Often / very often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Rare / never</th>
<th>Refusal / no comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Got together on festive occasions</td>
<td>1 651 400 (87.3%)</td>
<td>6 800 (0.2%)</td>
<td>173 400 (9.2%)</td>
<td>45 000 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had dinner together</td>
<td>1 347 500 (81.8%)</td>
<td>234 200 (12.4%)</td>
<td>11 100 (0.6%)</td>
<td>7 800 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had heart-to-heart talks with one another</td>
<td>857 000 (45.3%)</td>
<td>602 400 (31.8%)</td>
<td>432 900 (22.9%)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Went out together on Sundays or public holidays</td>
<td>779 900 (41.2%)</td>
<td>521 100 (27.5%)</td>
<td>591 700 (31.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All households with more than one member other than the live-in domestic helper(s) (at least one aged 18 or above) (N=1 892 600)

* Less than 1 000 or 0.05%

In summary, over 80% of households claimed they often / very often engaged in at least two of the four selected family activities during the year before enumeration and about one-third engaged in all four activities.

35.0% of unextended nuclear families claimed they often / very often engaged in all four selected family activities during the year before enumeration. Higher percentages of frequent engagement were observed among families of younger couples (both aged below 65 and not living with children) (56.5%), married couples and single parents living with underage children (43.3% and 42.2% respectively). The percentages among couples and single parents with adult never married children living together only were just 20.3% and 18.5% respectively.

Similar to families of younger couples, households of cohabiting partners also engaged in these family activities rather frequently – 53.9% of them often / very often engaged in all four selected family activities.

Continued on next page
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Highlights of Findings, continued

Frequency of kinship activities

All households were covered in this analysis and less than 40% of households claimed that they often / very often maintained close contact with kin not living together (37.1%) and got together on festive occasions with kin not living together (36.0%) during the year before enumeration.

(Figure 1.5)

Figure 1.5: Frequency of kinship activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintained close contact</th>
<th>Got together on festive occasions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>855 300 (37.1%)</td>
<td>887 800 (38.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559 200 (24.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>828 600 (36.0%)</td>
<td>753 100 (32.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720 300 (31.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All households with at least one member aged 18 or above other than the live-in domestic helper(s) (N=2 303 200)
* Less than 1 000 or 0.05%

On the whole, kinship relations did not appear to be very close. 56.7% of households had not engaged in any of the two selected kinship activities during the year before enumeration. Only 29.8% of households claimed they often / very often engaged in both activities, while 13.5% engaged in either one of the two.

When analysed by family form, frequent engagement in both selected kinship activities was more common amongst single couples (35.3%), cohabiting partners (35.0%), married couples living with underage children (33.7%) and married couples living with parent(s), with or without children (32.8%).

Continued on next page
When problems occurred, most households inclined to solve them by themselves without any external help from family members/relatives living apart, friends and others. Majority (ranging from 62.7% to 73.5%) of households settled the problems by themselves in each of the five specified scenarios. Assistance was sought from family members/relatives living apart by about 17% to 28% of the households, depending on the nature of the problem. Support from other sources was rather uncommon, except for assistance from friends/colleagues/neighbours when there were difficulties in work or career and assistance from paid or commercial services was needed to mind a child (for which the proportions were around one-tenth).

In summary, 55.2% managed to settle the problems by themselves in at least four of the five specified scenarios. The proportion was relatively higher among married couple living with parent(s), with or without never married children/others (68.8%) and married couples living with never married children (64.8%).

(Figure 1.6)

Figure 1.6: Assistance sought by problem encountered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-help</th>
<th>Family members / relatives living apart</th>
<th>Neighbours / Colleagues / Friends</th>
<th>Paid / Commercial Service</th>
<th>Social Service</th>
<th>Don't Know / No Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When there was some member sick</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When it was needed to mind a child</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When there were marital or family problems</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When there were difficulties in work or career</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When there were financial problems</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All households with at least one member aged 18 or above (N=2 303 200), except for “When it was needed to mind a child” which only covers those with at least one member aged below 18 as well (N=744 900)

* Less than 1 000 or 0.05%
Sharing of financial responsibilities

It was common for just one person to assume the financial responsibilities in the household (62.1% of all households). In 26.4% of households, the financial responsibilities were shared between two members. On average, 1.4 persons shared the financial responsibilities in the household.

One person household typically had one person taking up the financial responsibilities (89.2%), and so were single parent living with underage never married children, with or without others (85.0%). Majority (63.7%) of households of cohabiting partners had the responsibilities shared between the two. As for younger married couples with no children living together, it was equally common for couples to share the financial responsibilities and for just one of them to take up these responsibilities. Three or more persons sharing the responsibilities was more commonly found in families of married couples living with adult never married children only (21.4%) and extended families (13.4%).

In 74.1% of households, the household head took up the financial responsibilities in the household, with 45.1% being the sole contributor. It was also common that the financial responsibilities were shared among all working persons aged 18 and above in the households (62.3%).

The seniors (aged 65 and above) were usually not the ones assuming financial responsibilities. In only 12.7% of households were elderly persons assuming financial responsibilities. This mainly occurred in households of single elderly aged 65 and above (79.4%), elderly couples, at least one aged 65 and above (65.1%) and households with household heads aged 65 and above (54.0%).

Giving instructions to domestic helpers

Only 11.7% of households had domestic helpers. Amongst these households with domestic helpers, it was more common for a female (71.8% for female vs. 25.6% for male), a working adult (62.6%) and a person aged below 65 to give instructions to the domestic helpers. It was very rare (2.6%) for a family member living apart to give instructions.
Executive Summary, continued

Highlights of Findings, continued

Living parents

67.0% of all persons aged 18 and above were with parents at the time of enumeration. 37.5% of them were living with parents whereas 62.5% had parents living apart. Among the latter, about one quarter (26.1%) had parents living on their own or living with domestic helper(s) and about one third (34.2%) had parents living with other kin. Very few (2.2%) had their parents living in elderly homes / rehabilitation centres.

Parents living apart

Amongst the 2 462 500 adults with parents living apart, the parents of nearly 60% (58.2%) were living within travel distance (i.e. more than 15 minutes’ walk in Hong Kong and transportation is usually required) and 14.9% were living within walking distance (i.e. within 15 minutes on foot) in Hong Kong. Another 25.8% had their parents living outside of Hong Kong, typically in the Mainland of China (19.4% among all adults with parents living apart).
Meeting and contacting parents living apart

About one third (32.9%) of adults with parents living apart met them about once a week or more often and another one third (32.9%) did so about once every two weeks / once a month. The remaining one third did this much less frequently, several times a year / once a year (27.6%) or even less than once a year / never (6.3%). In these latter cases, majority (over 70%) were with parents living outside of Hong Kong.

Contacting parents living apart was more frequent than meeting them. Almost 60% (58.5%) of adults with parents living apart contacted their parents about once a week or more often and some 30% (29.0%) maintained such contact about once every two weeks / once a month.

While males met their parents more often, females contacted their parents more often. Besides, the frequency of both meeting and contacting parents living apart decreased with increasing age, but increased with education level, personal income and household income in general.

The closer the parents lived, the more frequent were both the meeting and contact with them. Furthermore, the frequency of meeting parents living apart was highly correlated with frequency of contacting them.
Executive Summary, continued

Highlights of Findings, continued

**Assistance to / from parents**

Amongst the four selected types of assistance, the most common assistance given to parents was financial support, often / very often provided by almost 40% (38.5%) of all persons aged 18 and above with parents during the year before enumeration. This was followed by advice on important matters (23.4%) and listening to their concerns and views (21.9%). Helping with household chores and with taking care of children or family members was the least common, with fewer than 10% (9.4%) claimed they often / very often helped their parents with these.

Assistance received from parents was less often. The most common assistance received from parents was helping with household chores and with taking care of children or family members, often / very often received by 22.0% of all persons aged 18 and above with parents during the year before enumeration. This was followed by advice on important matters (18.0%) and listening to their concerns and views (16.6%). The least common assistance received from parents was financial support, often / very often received by only 8.5%.

(Figure 1.8)

**Figure 1.8: Assistance often / very often given to / received from parents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistance</th>
<th>To Parents</th>
<th>From Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial support</td>
<td>315 800 (8.5%)</td>
<td>1 431 600 (38.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on important matters</td>
<td>667 700 (18.0%)</td>
<td>869 300 (23.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to concerns and views</td>
<td>618 500 (16.6%)</td>
<td>815 500 (21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with the household chores and with taking care of children or family members</td>
<td>349 100 (9.4%)</td>
<td>819 000 (22.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All persons aged 18 and above with parent(s) (N=3 716 500)

In general, the closer one’s parents lived and the more frequent one met and contacted parents, the more often one gave the various types of assistance to parents. Similarly, relatively more people often received the named assistance from parents if they were living with parents. For those living apart from parents, the closer their parents lived, the more often they received the assistance from parents.

Continued on next page
Executive Summary, continued

Highlights of Findings, continued

**Satisfaction with relationship with parents**

Adults with parents were generally satisfied with their relationship with parents. Almost 90% (88.9%) claimed they were satisfied / very satisfied with the relationship. One in eight (12.4%) were very satisfied.

Higher proportion of people living with parents and with parents living within walking distance claimed they were satisfied / very satisfied with the relationship (90.9% and 91.1% respectively). So did those who met them (94.1%) and contacted them (93.7%) about once a week or more often if they were living apart. Relatively more females (91.0%), younger persons aged below 45 (89.9%-90.2%), persons of higher education level (92.8% for post-secondary), students (92.0%) or persons of higher monthly personal income (over 93% for income of $30,000 and above) and higher monthly household income (around 93% for income of $40,000 and above) claimed they were satisfied / very satisfied with the relationship. Furthermore, those in families of young married couple (both aged below 65) were also generally satisfied with the relationship (91.7%).

*Continued on next page*
Executive Summary, continued

Highlights of Findings, continued

**Living siblings**

88.2% of all persons aged 18 and above were with siblings at the time of enumeration. Within these, 39.0% were with 1 or 2 siblings while 49.2% had 3 or more siblings.

**siblings living apart**

Among those with siblings living apart (i.e. 85.5% of those who had siblings), 62.4% of them were living within travel distance from the sibling whom they contacted most often, and 14.0% were within walking distance. Another 23.2% had their most contacted sibling living outside Hong Kong, typically in the mainland of China (16.4%). The distribution was rather similar to that of place of living of parents living apart.

**Frequency of meeting and contacting siblings living apart**

Compared to meeting parents living apart, meeting siblings living apart was less frequent. Only 25.2% of adults with siblings living apart met their most contacted siblings about once a week or more often. 30.7% met them about once every two weeks / once a month. 35.5% met them only several times a year / once a year while 8.6% met them less than once a year / never.

Similar to parents, contacting siblings living apart was more often than meeting them. 43.6% of adults with siblings living apart contacted their siblings (i.e. the most often contacted ones) about once a week or more often. 33.2% contacted them about once every two weeks / once a month. Few contacted their siblings several times a year / once a year (19.8%) or even less than once a year / never (3.3%).

(Figure 1.9)

Figure 1.9: Frequency of meeting / contacting the most contacted sibling who was living apart

(Chart with data and notes)

Base: All persons aged 18 or above with sibling(s) living apart (N=4 185 100)
Note: Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

Continued on next page
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**Highlights of Findings, continued**

**Assistance to / from siblings**

The support between siblings was not as strong as that between parents and children. Amongst the four types of assistance named, the more common forms of assistance between siblings included listening to their concerns and views and advice on important matters. Both were given / received often / very often by about one-tenth and occasionally by about 35% - 38% during the year before enumeration. Fewer than 2% claimed they often / very often gave / received financial support or help with household chores and with taking care of children or family members to / from their siblings. Such assistance happened occasionally between siblings in 5% - 8% of the cases.

(Figure 1.10)

**Figure 1.10: Assistance often / very often given to / received from siblings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistance to Siblings</th>
<th>To Siblings</th>
<th>From Siblings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listen to concerns and views</td>
<td>623 700 (12.7%)</td>
<td>566 500 (11.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on important matters</td>
<td>545 100 (11.1%)</td>
<td>487 700 (10.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with household chores and with taking care of children or family members</td>
<td>94 300 (1.9%)</td>
<td>85 500 (1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support</td>
<td>68 200 (1.4%)</td>
<td>46 600 (1.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All persons aged 18 and above with sibling(s) (N=4 893 300)

In general, the assistance between siblings was relatively more common amongst those younger, never married, with higher education level and students (except for rendering financial support to siblings).

Except for financial support, more often support was observed among:

- Households of related persons forming no nuclear family
- Households of unrelated persons only
- Families comprising single parent living with underage children
- Families comprising single parent living with parents(s) and never married children

Assistance between siblings was also more common amongst those living together with siblings or in frequent meetings / contacts with siblings if they were living apart.

*Continued on next page*
Executive Summary, continued

**Highlights of Findings, continued**

*Satisfaction with relationship with siblings*

Adults with siblings were in general satisfied with their relationship with their siblings. 80.6% reported that they were satisfied / very satisfied with the relationship. Not as many adults were satisfied with their relationship with siblings than that with their parents (88.9%) and children (90.5%).

Relatively more of those living with their siblings (89.9%) and those with siblings living within walking distance (88.9%) reported a higher level of satisfaction (satisfied / very satisfied) with the relationship. So were those who often met and contacted their sibling(s).

**Living children**

66.5% of all persons aged 18 and above were with children at the time of enumeration. Within these, 46.7% had 1 to 2 children while 19.8% have 3 or more children.

When analysed by the age of children, 27.5% of adults had children aged below 18. 32.9% had children aged 18 and above. Only 6.1% had children in both age categories.

When analysed by whether they were living with children, 43.8% of adults were living together with all their children. 13.4% were living with some of their children. Only 9.2% were not living with any of their children.

**Adult children living apart**

Of those who had adult children living apart, around two-thirds (67.3%) were living within travel distance from the adult children whom they contacted most often, and 17.6% were within walking distance. Another 14.3% had their most contacted adult children living outside Hong Kong, with about half having children in the mainland of China (6.8%) and half having children in Macao / Taiwan / overseas (7.5%).

Continued on next page
Meeting and contacting adult children living apart

41.8% of persons aged 18 and above with adult children living apart met their most contacted children about once a week or more often. 35.8% met about once every two weeks / once a month. 19.0% and 3.3% of persons met their children several times a year / once a year or even less than once a year / never respectively.

On the other hand, 66.5% of adults with adult children living apart contacted their children (i.e. the most often contacted ones) about once a week or more often. 24.9% made such contacts about once every two weeks / once a month. 6.4% and 1.9% of persons contacted their children several times a year / once a year or even less than once a year / never contacted respectively.

(Figure 1.11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Contacting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About once a week or more often</td>
<td>505 800 (41.8%)</td>
<td>805 200 (68.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About every two weeks / once a month</td>
<td>433 600 (35.8%)</td>
<td>301 500 (24.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times a year / once a year</td>
<td>230 300 (19.0%)</td>
<td>77 400 (6.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a year / never</td>
<td>39 500 (3.3%)</td>
<td>23 400 (1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t remember</td>
<td>1 200 (0.1%)</td>
<td>2 900 (0.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All persons aged 18 and above with adult child living apart (N=1 210 300)
Note: Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding.
Executive Summary, continued

Highlights of Findings, continued

Assistance to / from adult children

Amongst the four selected types of assistance, the most common assistance from parents to adult children was help with household chores and with taking care of children or family members - often / very often offered by nearly one-third (33.6%) of parents during the year before enumeration. This was followed by advice on important matters (20.2%) and listening to their concerns and views (18.1%). Financial support was the least common (16.9%).

On the other hand, the most common assistance from adult children was financial support, often / very often received from adult children by 40.3% of the parents with adult children during the year before enumeration. This was followed by advice on important matters (18.4%) and listening to their concerns and views (17.5%). The least common assistance from children was help with household chores and with taking care of children or family members, often / very often received by only 13.7%.

(Figure 1.12)

Figure 1.12: Assistance often / very often given to / received from adult children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistance</th>
<th>Given to Children</th>
<th>Received from Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help with household chores and with taking care of children or family members</td>
<td>296 100 (13.7%)</td>
<td>727 700 (33.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice on important matters</td>
<td>397 200 (18.4%)</td>
<td>436 200 (20.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to concerns and views</td>
<td>379 500 (17.5%)</td>
<td>391 200 (18.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support</td>
<td>365 400 (16.9%)</td>
<td>872 100 (40.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All persons aged 18 and above with children aged 18 and above (N=2 163 600)

Continued on next page
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Highlights of Findings, continued

Activities with children

Amongst the five selected types of activities, the most common activities engaged with children were having heart-to-heart talks with children and accompanying each other in leisure activities. About 40% of persons with children claimed they often / very often did so (43.6% and 39.4% respectively). This was followed by going to gatherings / activities with relatives or friends together (32.2%) and going to children’s school activities together (26.5%). Taking part in community activities together with children was the least common, with less than 10% (9.1%) claimed they often / very often did so.

(Figure 1.13)

Figure 1.13: Frequency of activities with children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Rare</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Refusal / No comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having heart-to-heart talks</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying each other in leisure activities</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to gatherings / activities with relatives or friends together</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to children’s school activities together</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking part in community activities together</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: For “going to children’s school activities together”, the base is persons aged 18 and above with children studying (N=2 189 300). For the remaining, the base is persons aged 18 and above with children (N=3 687 200). Note: Figures may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

*Less than 1 000 or 0.05%

Continued on next page
In summary, only 14.3% of parents participated in 4 to 5 of the selected types of activities. On the other hand, 59.9% of parents reported that they participated in just one or even none of the selected types of activities with their children.

Parents living with children aged below 18 seemed to have closer relationship with their children as they were found to participate in all the five selected types of activities with their children more often.

It was also found that females, those younger, with higher education level, with higher household income and home makers tended to participate in the activities with their children more often.

When analysed by family form, participation in the activities with children were more often among those married couples and single parents living with underage never married children in unextended nuclear families.

**Satisfaction with relationship with children**

Parents, in general, were satisfied with their relationship with their children. Nearly three quarters (73.3%) of persons with children were “satisfied” with their relationship with children, and 17.2% were “very satisfied”.

94.8% of those living with their children aged below 18 were “satisfied / very satisfied” with their relationship with their children, higher than the corresponding percentage of 82.3% - 87.8% for those living with children aged 18 and above only and those not living with any of their children.

In addition, for those with adult children living apart, a larger proportion of those living within walking distance away from the most contacted adult children reported that they were satisfied / very satisfied with the relationship; and so were those who often met and contacted them.
Executive Summary, continued

**Highlights of Findings, continued**

*Married / cohabiting persons*

3,343,300 (60.3%) persons aged 18 and above were either married or cohabiting with a partner. The great majority of them (3,148,400 or 94.2%) were married and living with spouse. 139,500 (4.2%) were married but living apart from spouse. However, the place of living of their spouses had not been captured in the survey. The remaining 55,300 (1.7%) were cohabiting with a partner.

Wives were usually younger than husbands in marriages, so were the females in cohabiting relationships. 61.6% of married / cohabiting persons had same education level as their spouses / cohabiting partners. 21.5% were with wives / female partners of lower education level and 12.8% with husbands / male partners of lower education level.

Males were still the main breadwinners in a family. 46.1% of the married / cohabiting persons had the financial responsibility in their family borne by husbands / males but not wives / females. Another 30.3% shared these responsibilities with their spouses / partners. Less than one-tenth (9.0%) had these responsibilities borne by wives / female partners but not husbands / male partners. Most (61.9%) cohabiting persons shared these financial responsibilities with their partners.

*Share of housework between man and woman in married / cohabiting couples*

It was more common for the female in a married / cohabiting couple to spend more time on housework and uncommon for the husband / man to do so. 33.3% of the married / cohabiting persons claimed that husband / man spent much less time than wife / woman and 25.3% claimed that husband / man spent slightly less time than wife / woman. The distribution of housework was apparently lopsided. Interestingly, relatively more males than females perceived a bigger share by husband / man in housework (males: 20.9%; females: 7.7%).

Continued on next page
Executive Summary, continued

**Responsibilities for general family matters**

Among the four general family matters selected, females were found to be the ones mainly responsible for the household chores (52.2%) and similarly, though to a lesser extent, for taking care of the elderly and the children (47.4%) and supervising the children (44.7%). It was, however, fairly common for males and females to jointly organize family activities / gatherings (43.5%).

On the other hand, the wish most commonly shared, or “ideal” was to have both of the couples sharing the responsibilities for these four general family matters (38% - 59%), in particular, supervising the children (58.5%) and organising family activities / gatherings (56.0%).

(Figure 1.14)

**Figure 1.14: Person responsible for general family matters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organising family activities / gatherings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband / man</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife / woman</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband and wife/ both cohabiting partners</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family members</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole family</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic helpers</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No elderly or child in the family / no need to take care the elderly &amp; children</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household chores</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband / man</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife / woman</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband and wife/ both cohabiting partners</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family members</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole family</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic helpers</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No elderly or child in the family / no need to take care the elderly &amp; children</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervising children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband / man</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife / woman</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband and wife/ both cohabiting partners</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family members</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole family</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic helpers</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No elderly or child in the family / no need to take care the elderly &amp; children</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All married / cohabiting persons (N=3 343 300)

Continued on next page
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**Highlights of Findings, continued**

In general, it was even more common for wives / females to take up the responsibilities for the family matters if the husbands / males were younger (except for organizing family activities / gatherings), only one of the couple was working, the females had lower personal income, and the males but not the females had to shoulder the financial responsibilities of the families. However, it was relatively more common for there to be sharing of responsibilities amongst couples with post-secondary education, cohabiting, both of the couple were working and sharing the financial responsibilities of the family.

The responsibilities were more commonly taken up by other family members or the whole family for those with spouses living apart, living with parents, living with siblings, living in extended families or in large households.

Domestic helpers shared the responsibilities for household chores and taking care of the elderly and children, especially amongst those with higher household income and when both of the couple were working. However, they were seldom involved in supervising children or in organising family activities / gatherings.

**Decision making for family financial matters**

In general, married / cohabiting persons with demographics or socio-economic characteristics similar to those of their spouses / partners and those who were living together with their spouses / partners tended to have been making decision jointly with them in various financial matters.

Specifically, there was a great extent of sharing in responsibility and power in areas like children’s education expenditures (65.1%) and buying an apartment / a house (63.3%).

(Figure 1.15)
### Figure 1.15: Major decision maker for family financial matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Husband / man</th>
<th>Wife / woman</th>
<th>Joint decision by husband and wife / cohabiting partner</th>
<th>Other family members</th>
<th>Whole family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investing</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends / relatives ask you to lend them a considerable sum of money</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovating your apartment</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily expenses</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying an apartment / a house</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s education expenditures</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall household income &amp; expenditure</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All married / cohabiting persons (N=3,343,300)

### Highlights of Findings, continued

**Share of responsibilities in money saving / managing money**

35.8% of married / cohabiting persons saved money individually while 32.9% saved money together. If there was only one person in the couples saving money, it was slightly more frequent for women (8.3%) than for men (6.1%) to be the one saving money. 6.7% of married / cohabiting persons did it both ways, i.e. saving “both together as well as individually”.

The most common practice was for spouse / cohabiting partner to manage money individually (33.4%). Somewhat less common was for “all money being put together and withdrawn by either or both when necessary” (32.9%). Even less common was for “part of the money from both being put together, while the remaining being managed individually” (12.2%), and for “either one to be managing all the money” (woman: 12.1%; man: 8.7%).

Continued on next page
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### Highlights of Findings, continued

**Activities with spouse / cohabiting partner**

Of the selected types of activities, the most common activity among spouses / cohabiting partners was having heart-to-heart talks. Almost 60% (58.9%) of married / cohabiting persons often / very often did so. This was followed by accompanying each other in leisure activities (52.6%) and going to gatherings / activities with relatives or friends together (47.8%). Taking part in community activities together was the least common, with only 15.1% claiming that they often / very often did so.

In summary, only 36.6% of married / cohabiting persons often / very often participated in 3 to 4 of the selected types of activities with spouses / cohabiting partners. On the other hand, close to half claimed they often / very often participated in just one (16.9%) or even none (29.0%) of the selected types of activities.

(Figure 1.16)

**Figure 1.16: Frequency of activities with spouse / cohabiting partner**

- **Having heart-to-heart talks**
  - Very often: 58.9%
  - Often: 10.8%
  - Occasionally: 15.1%
  - Rare: 7%
  - Never: 12.4%

- **Accompanying each other in leisure activities**
  - Very often: 52.6%
  - Often: 16.0%
  - Occasionally: 47.8%
  - Rare: 8.8%
  - Never: 10.4%

- **Going to gatherings / activities with relatives or friends together**
  - Very often: 39.0%
  - Often: 34.3%
  - Occasionally: 15.7%
  - Rare: 7%
  - Never: 1.2%

- **Taking part in community activities together**
  - Very often: 66.7%
  - Often: 33.3%
  - Occasionally: 33.4%
  - Rare: 18.2%
  - Never: 7.2%

*Base: All married / cohabiting persons (N=3,343,300)*

**Satisfaction with married / cohabiting life**

Married / cohabiting persons were in general satisfied with married / cohabiting life. 88.1% claimed that they were satisfied / very satisfied with it (75.9% were satisfied and 12.2% were very satisfied). More cohabiting persons claimed that they were satisfied / very satisfied (94.9%) than married persons living with spouse (88.7%). Married persons living apart from spouse were relatively less satisfied. 73.2% said they were satisfied / very satisfied.

(Continued on next page)
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Highlights of Findings, continued

**Working hours**

57.2% of employed persons aged 18 and above worked 45 - 59 hours per week and 17.8% worked 35 - 44 hours per week. About one-fifth (19.2%), however, worked 60 hours or more per week. On average, employed persons worked 50.5 hours per week.

Relatively more males (23.1%) worked for 60 hours or more per week than females (13.9%).

The distribution of working hours was similar across age groups, except for persons aged 65 and above. There were both more who worked for fewer than 35 hours (20.3%) and more who worked for 60 hours or more (21.7%) in this than in other age groups.

The working hours of the sole bread-winner in the family were on average longer (51.9 hours per week) compared to those not sharing financial responsibilities within the family (48.0 hours per week).

**Occurrence of work-family imbalance**

Amongst the four work-family imbalance situations under analysis, 35.3% of employed persons aged 18 and above never experienced any work-family imbalance, whilst 64.7% had such experience. Among the latter, it was more common for work to affect family life (37.3%) than for family life to affect work (1.0%), which was rare.

Too tired to do housework at home after work was the most common type of work-family imbalance. 61.0% of employed persons aged 18 and above had such experience. About half (49.4%) of the employed persons aged 18 and above expressed that they were unable to fulfil family responsibilities as so much time was spent on work.

On the other hand, only 24.6% of employed persons aged 18 and above had the experience of being too tired to do the job well at work because of housework and 21.8% had the experience of not being able to concentrate at work because of family responsibilities.

*Continued on next page*
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**Highlights of Findings, continued**

**Satisfaction with work**

74.8% of employed persons aged 18 and above expressed that they were satisfied / very satisfied with their work. Only 2.6% claimed that they were dissatisfied / very dissatisfied with their work.

When analysed by work hours, more of those who worked for 35 - 44 hours per week said they were satisfied / very satisfied with their work (79.9%). Of the group who worked for 60 hours or more per week, fewer (68.7%) were satisfied / very satisfied with their work.

It was also observed that fewer of those who experienced work-family imbalance (especially in work affecting family life) claimed that they were satisfied / very satisfied with their work. 71.4% of those who ever experienced work-family imbalance were satisfied / very satisfied with their work, whereas 81.2% of those who never experienced work-family imbalance were satisfied / very satisfied.

**Satisfaction with work vs. satisfaction with family life**

In summary, 69.4% of employed persons aged 18 and above said that they were both satisfied / very satisfied with their family life and work. 16.8% said that they were satisfied / very satisfied with their family life but not work while 5.5% said that they were satisfied / very satisfied with their work but not family life. 8.4% claimed that they were neither satisfied / very satisfied with their family life nor satisfied / very satisfied with their work.

Those who worked 35-44 hours per week were found to have the highest satisfaction with both their work and family life at 75.4%.

*Continued on next page*
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**Satisfaction with family life**

Overall speaking, there was a high level of satisfaction with family life, with as many as 83.6% of adults claiming that they were satisfied / very satisfied with their family lives. Less than 2% (1.7%) said they were dissatisfied / very dissatisfied with their family lives.

Persons who were satisfied / very satisfied with the relationships with his / her family members were also more likely to be satisfied with their family life in general. For example,

- 89.1% of persons who were satisfied / very satisfied with relationships with parents were satisfied / very satisfied with family lives;
- 87.7% of persons who were satisfied / very satisfied with relationships with children were satisfied / very satisfied with family lives;
- 88.9% of persons who were satisfied / very satisfied with relationships with siblings were satisfied / very satisfied with family lives;
- 90.3% of persons who were satisfied / very satisfied with married / cohabiting lives were satisfied / very satisfied with family lives;
- 91.1% of persons who were satisfied / very satisfied with relationships with parents of spouse / cohabiting partner were satisfied / very satisfied with family lives;
- 90.7% of persons who were satisfied / very satisfied with relationships with siblings of spouse / cohabiting partner were satisfied / very satisfied with family lives;
- 94.9% of persons who were satisfied / very satisfied with relationships with relatives were satisfied / very satisfied with family lives.

**Mental healthiness**

Adults in Hong Kong in general felt happy. Over three quarters (76.9%) of persons aged 18 and above said they were happy / very happy. Only 2.3% were unhappy / very unhappy.

It was noted that about three quarters (73.2%) of persons were satisfied with their family lives and happy with life in general. Only 12.7% of persons were neither satisfied with their family lives nor regarded themselves as happy.

*Continued on next page*
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Highlights of Findings, continued

**Family values and norms**

It was noted that some traditional family values and norms were still held fast in Hong Kong. Majority of persons aged 18 and above agreed / strongly agreed with the following:

- “Family is very important to them” (91.6%)
- “It is children’s responsibility to support their parents” (85.7%)
- “A job is all right but what women really want is a home and children” (though to a lesser extent of 72.4%).

On the other hand, most of persons aged 18 and above also agreed / strongly agreed that “husband and wife should have equal shares of power in the family” (87.1%).

**Attitudes towards having children after marriage**

56.6% of adults agreed / strongly agreed that people must have children after marriage. Another 15.4% expressed that they disagreed / strongly disagreed with this attitude.

Nevertheless, a good majority (72.3%) still opined that it was desirable to have children after marriage, of whom a significant number (46.1%) preferred to have two children, followed by having only one child (17.8%) and having 3 or more children (8.3%). Some 4.9% of adults preferred having no children after marriage, while 17.8% said the decision would depend on the situation.

**Attitude towards marriage vs. cohabitation**

Survey results suggested that people had a rather liberal attitude towards cohabitation. About 42.2% of adults claimed that they would advise an unmarried person to marry without living together first, while 16.7% would advise this person to live with a steady partner and then marry and only 3.7% would advise this person to live with a steady partner. About a quarter (27.6%) was ambivalent and flexible. Their advice was that it would depend on the situation.

**Attitude towards gender equality in sharing of power in the family**

Most adults (87.1%) agreed / strongly agreed that husband and wife should be equalitarian in the sharing of power in the family (75.6% agreed and 11.4% strongly agreed). Very few (1.3%) disagreed / strongly disagreed. The value of gender equality was apparently widely shared in the population.

Nevertheless, such extensive support in attitude for gender equality in power sharing in the family was not fully echoed in the people’s actual relationship with their spouses / cohabiting partners. Amongst the married / cohabiting persons, only around 50% to 65% made the decision on various family financial matters jointly with their spouses / cohabiting partners.

*End*