

**For discussion  
on 14 December 2009**

## **Legislative Council Panel on Welfare Services**

### **New Dawn Project**

#### **Purpose**

This paper briefs Members on the outcome of the evaluation study on the New Dawn Project (the Project) and the way forward for the Project.

#### **The Project**

2. Special assistance is available to single parents and family carers under the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA) Scheme. First, we set higher standard rates for them (ranging from \$1,590 to \$1,990, which are respectively \$275 and \$360 higher than those for other able-bodied adults) and provide single parents with a monthly supplement of \$255 (which recognises the special difficulties they face in bringing up a family). Second, we recognise their need to get ready for active employment as their children grow up and no longer require full-time care. The Project has been designed to help single parents and family carers build up capacities for self-help, integrate into the community and move towards self-reliance through engagement in paid employment if the youngest child they care for is aged between 12 and 14. More specifically, they will be assisted by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) commissioned by the Social Welfare Department (SWD) to actively seek paid employment of not less than 32 working hours per month. When the youngest child they care for reaches the age of 15, they will take part in the Support for Self-reliance (SFS) Scheme like other able-bodied CSSA recipients. They will then be expected to find full-time jobs, work for not less than 120 hours and earn at least \$1,630 per month.

3. The Project was first launched in April 2006. By the end of August 2009, a total of 17 448 CSSA recipients had participated in it. Of these, 5 203 had secured paid jobs, with 1 865 and 3 338 taking up full-time and part-time employment respectively. The success rate was about 30%. Participants who had successfully secured employment mainly worked as cleaners, services workers, shop sale assistants and domestic helpers and other elementary jobs.

The average monthly working hours stood at 197 for full-time employment and 60 for part-time employment. The average monthly wage was \$4,875 and \$1,645 respectively<sup>1</sup>.

## **The Evaluation Study**

4. To help us assess the effectiveness of the Project and consider the way forward, SWD has commissioned the Department of Social Work and Social Administration of The University of Hong Kong (the Research Team) to conduct an evaluation study. The study examines the characteristics of the Project participants, their job-seeking behaviour, barriers to and factors facilitating their employment, outcome of their employment and the impact of employment on the participants themselves and their children.

5. We reported the initial findings to this Panel in July 2007. Having regard to Members' comments, the Research Team has further enriched the evaluation study by conducting –

- (a) a public opinion survey to gauge the views of the public on the Project; and
- (b) case studies over a longer period to look into key areas, including the way in which the additional income from employment is spent by families of the participants, whether participants have experienced conflicts in handling demands from work and child care, the roles played by the social network of participants in seeking employment and child caring, the availability of suitable jobs for participants in the market, etc.

6. These entailed a telephone survey with an effective sample size of 1 505, focus group interviews with 723 Project participants and their youngest child, as well as in-depth individual interviews with 16 Project participants who had different experiences in job-seeking and employment. In addition, the Research Team reviewed literature regarding child care arrangements for working single parents and child carers in other countries.

---

<sup>1</sup> Similar to the arrangement for other CSSA recipients, the monthly earnings of participants of the Project can be partially disregarded up to a maximum of \$2,500.

### ***Key findings***

7. The Executive Summary of the Study Report is at **Annex** for Members' reference. Overall speaking, the responses of both participants of the Project and the general public to the Project were positive -

- (a) a clear majority (87%) of Project participants in the focus group and individual interviews indicated that their participation in the Project had positive effect on family income, quality of life, self-confidence and self-esteem;
- (b) also a clear majority (85.1%) of the respondents from the public opinion survey supported the Project; and
- (c) nearly 60% of the respondents from the public opinion survey agreed that the requirement of working not less than 32 hours per month was appropriate, and that the Project could help participants move toward self-reliance.

8. Regarding the key aspects of the Project, the main findings are as follows -

- (a) Working hours
  - (i) over 75% of the employed Project participants considered their actual working hours (121.2 hours per month on average) suitable;
  - (ii) nearly 60% of the respondents in the public opinion survey also agreed to the requirement for Project participants to seek paid employment of not less than 32 working hours per month, while 30% of the respondents in the same survey considered 32 working hours too short;
- (b) Parent-child relationship
  - (iii) whether the parent was employed made no obvious difference in terms of parent-child relationship. In fact, a vast majority (over 83%) of the employed Project participants considered that their parent-child relationship had not deteriorated over the past year; 15.6% of them even considered that the relationship had improved. These results were in line with the finding that over 90% of the children of employed Project

participants considered that their overall relationship with their parents was good or very good;

- (iv) over half (54.2%) of the employed Project participants considered that the requirement for them to engage in paid employment had little or very little impact on their family and social life;

(c) Incentive for employed Project participants

- (v) the average monthly income of the employed Project participants was \$3,504.6. About 61% of them had remained in the current job for more than nine months (15.5 months on average);
- (vi) over 80% of the employed Project participants agreed that the additional income from employment had given them greater incentive to work. Nearly half (44.9%) of them reported having spent the additional income on food, while 30% spent the money on transportation expenses;
- (vii) of the 97 children whose parents only started working a year or less before the interview, nearly half (44.3%) considered that their quality of life had improved;
- (viii) over half (56.6%) of the respondents in the public opinion survey considered the deduction of \$200 per month for refusal to participate in the Project appropriate;

(d) Lowering the minimum age

- (ix) the majority (69.9%) of the respondents in the public opinion survey did not favour the idea of lowering the minimum age of the youngest child to below 12 as a requirement for participation in the Project;

(e) Other observations

- (x) in general, the Project participants interviewed considered that jobs in the manufacturing sector were more suitable for them although such jobs were rarely available, and that their choice of work had been constrained by their own education attainment;

- (xi) the majority of the interviewees (13 out of 16) got their jobs through referral by relatives/friends. Social network thus had considerable influence on job finding, especially for jobs requiring lower skills; and
- (xii) those who had not been able to find a job since admission to the Project appeared to have lower levels of self-confidence and self-image, and a higher level of anxiety.

### ***Recommendations***

9. The Research Team has concluded that the Project is beneficial to both the participants and their children. Given the positive response, they recommend continuation of the Project upon completion of its current phase in March 2010. The Research Team also considers that in future, the Project should focus more on facilitating and encouraging the participants to take up long-term employment, and that in due course the Government may also consider integrating the various employment assistance programmes/schemes under the CSSA Scheme<sup>2</sup> for more efficient use of resources.

10. The Research Team has highlighted the results of the public opinion survey which indicate that a heavier sanction for refusal to participate in the Project is not favoured, although the requirement to seek a job with longer working hours can be considered when the general economic and employment conditions improve. The Research Team also points out that in the light of overseas experience, it would be necessary to have in place appropriate after-school care service if single parents and family carers are to be required to take up employment when their children are at a younger age (i.e. below 12).

### **Way forward**

11. We are pleased to note the positive findings of the evaluation study and have accepted the Report. Based on the experience of the current phase, SWD plans to launch a new phase of the Project after March 2010. In this new phase, SWD will continue to work closely with NGO operators and provide the necessary support to Project participants. For special cases (e.g. if the single parent or carer has to take care of vulnerable family members who are disabled

---

<sup>2</sup> These include the Integrated Employment Assistance Scheme, the Special Training and Enhancement Programme for younger CSSA recipients and the New Dawn Project.

or in ill-health, or is a recent victim of domestic violence, or has other legitimate reasons as recommended by a social worker), the Director of Social Welfare will continue to exercise discretion and temporarily exempt him or her from joining the Project.

12. In due course, the Government will also look into the possibility of integrating the various employment assistance programmes/schemes, as recommended by the Research Team.

**Labour and Welfare Bureau  
Social Welfare Department  
December 2009**

**Executive Summary**  
**of**  
**Findings**  
**of**  
**The extension of the study to evaluate the New Dawn**  
**(ND) Project of single parents/child carers under the**  
**Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA)**  
**Scheme**

by

Co-Principal Investigators

Dr. WONG Yu-cheung

Mr. YIP Hak-kwong

Co-Investigators

Professor LEUNG Cho-bun, Joe

Dr. CHUI Wing-tak, Ernest

Dr. LEE Kar-mut, Carmel

Department of Social Work & Social Administration,

Policy21 Limited

The University of Hong Kong

# Executive Summary

## Background

The Social Welfare Department (SWD) commissioned the Department of Social Work and Social Administration and the Policy21 of The University of Hong Kong (the HKU Study Team) to conduct the study entitled “A Study to Evaluate the New Dawn (ND) Project of Single parents/ Child Carers under the Comprehensive Social Security Assistance (CSSA) Scheme”, which was completed in July 2007. At the request of SWD, the HKU Study Team has conducted this extended study, which included a public opinion survey about the views of the public regarding the ND Project, the way in which the additional income for work is being spent, the roles played by the participants’ social network in seeking employment and child caring, the availability of suitable jobs for the ND Project participants in the job market etc.

## Purposes of the study

The objectives of this study are:

- 1) To collect opinions from the general public about the ND Project for single parents and child carers receiving CSSA, including the aims of the work requirement, the minimum age of the participants’ youngest child, sanction amount, and the minimum working hours per month;
- 2) To adopt the “case follow-up” approach to identify changes, if any, in employment and other family, personal conditions within a period of 12-18 months after joining the ND Project;
- 3) To examine the barriers to employment for the ND Project participants and what improvement measures should be introduced to facilitate their job-seeking efforts;
- 4) To examine how the participating families spend their additional income from employment and to see whether there are increases in spending to improve children’s learning;
- 5) To investigate whether there are conflicts experienced by the participants in handling demands from work and child care (especially during non-school days and emergencies), and how those conflicts are being resolved;
- 6) To study what roles the social network of the participants play in their employment and child care;
- 7) To review what after-school activities and child cares are provided in overseas countries to support working single parents and child carers;
- 8) To examine whether suitable jobs (part-time, flexible hours) are available in the market for the participants;

- 9) To assess the impact of the ND project on children of its participants; and
- 10) To identify the necessary improvements to the ND Project and advise on the followings: (i) conclusions that may be drawn from the experience of the ND Project; (ii) what improvement measures should be introduced; and (iii) what changes, if any, should be adopted regarding the work requirements such as the minimum number of working hours per month, the amount of sanction for non-compliance and the minimum age of the youngest child of the single parents and family carers who are required to participate in the ND Project.

## **Study design**

A survey on public opinion about work requirements and sanctions for single parents/child carers was conducted by a telephone survey, with an effective sample size of 1,505, to gather views about work requirement for CSSA recipients in general, single parents and child carers. In particular, asking working mothers about their work-family arrangement. The response rate of the survey was 60.4%.

For the study of the ND Project participants, all of the 1,225 respondents who took part in the ND Project in the previous study in 2006/07 were included in the study; 723 of them were successfully interviewed representing a response rate of 59.0 %. Their youngest child was also interviewed during the study.

We have also conducted in-depth individual interviews with a total of 16 single parents and child carers with different experience in job-seeking and in the job-market to further understand the barriers and success factors in job-seeking as well as the impact of work to themselves and their children.

Literature regarding the child-care arrangement for working single parents and child carers in other countries was also reviewed (Table [1]).

## **Findings**

### ***Public opinion survey***

Table [2] provides the background of the respondents of the public opinion survey. It was found that among the respondents, only a small percentage (5.4%) of the respondents had ever heard of the ND Project (Table [4]). The respondents were then briefed about the rationale and purposes of the ND Project. When being asked about their opinion on the ND Project, a majority of the respondents (85.1%) supported the ND Project. Only a small percentage opposed it (Table [5]). Moreover, nearly 60% of the respondents agreed with the requirement of requiring participants of the ND project to seek paid employment with working hours of not less than 32 per month; nearly 30% of them considered the “not less than 32 working hours per month” requirement too short and only around 3% of them considered it too

long (Table [6]).

A majority of the respondents (69.9%) did not favor the idea of lowering the minimum age of the youngest child to below 12 as a requirement for the participants to join the ND Project (Table [7]). Also, over half of them (56.6%) considered the deduction of \$200 per month for non-compliance as appropriate (Table [8]). Only a small proportion considered the deduction of \$200 per month as too much or little. Most respondents opined that when the youngest child of ND Project participants studies full-time in school, they should start to play a more active role in employment (Tables [9] and [10]). Generally speaking, most of the respondents agreed the positive effect of the ND Project (Table [11]). Over sixty percent (63.5%) of the respondents considered that there was positive or no impact to parent-child relationship if single parents / child carers on CSSA go to work when their youngest child in the family is at the age between 9 and 11. The percentage was higher (76.0%) if their youngest child is at the age between 12 and 14 (Table [12]). Meanwhile, nearly thirty percent (28.8%) considered that there were negative impacts to the relationship if they go to work when their youngest child is at the age between 9 and 11.

### ***Summary of the study of the ND Project participants***

#### **Parents**

At the time of the interview, over half (53.5%) of the respondents were employed. This showed an increase in employment rate compared with the findings in the previous study in 2006/07, in which only about 38.5% of the ND Project participants were employed (2007 findings) at the time of interview; even those who were not employed at the time of interview, nearly one-fifths had been employed within a year before then. For those employed, the current average monthly income was \$3,504.6 per month (Table [18]), comparing to around \$2,700 in the previous study (2007 findings). Sixty percent (60.9%) of them remained in the current job more than 9 months. The overall average was 15.5 months (Table [18]). The most common jobs they held were cleaner, home-helper, miscellaneous worker, retail worker, restaurant waiter/waitress, etc. (Table [16]). Over half of them found their current job through tapping into their friends and relative networks, along with ways like newspapers/magazine and street bills etc. (Table [17]). For those who were unemployed at the time of interview but had job within a year, the majority of them quitted their job voluntarily, due to various reasons, like health problems, heavy workload and long working hours.

Regarding the balance between work and family, over half of the employed respondents considered that there was little or very little impact of meeting the demands of work on their family and social life. Only 12.6% considered the impact large or very large (Table [19]). Also over half of all respondents considered the increase of family income as the major benefit of work. Some of them also thought that there were increases in self-confidence and had become self-reliant and leave CSSA. Only 12.9% of the respondents considered there was no benefit for them at all (Table [20]).

Over 80% of the employed respondents agreed that additional income strengthened their incentive to work. The major benefits from additional income were increase in family income, increase in self-confidence, improvement in self-esteem, improvement in quality of living of themselves and children, and, ultimately, leaving the CSSA Scheme (Table [22]).

As regards how extra income from their job was being spent by those who were employed or have been employed within a year before the interview, nearly half of them spent the money on food with an average amount of \$1,353. About 29% reported additional spending on transportation with an average amount of \$419. While 20.7% reported spending on clothing with an average of \$461, 10.2% reported spending on employment-related expenses with an average of \$502. Spending on areas such as housing-related expenses (including rent, water, electricity, and gas, etc.), social and leisure, children's pocket money, and education and extra-curricular activities were also reported (Table [21]).

Among those who were employed at the time of interview and had hold other jobs within a year before the interview, most of them considered favorably about the present job. About three-quarters of them considered their present jobs stable or reasonable. Over 75% of them also considered the working hours of their current job suitable (Table [24]).

In terms of childcare methods, while the youngest children of participants' families were aged over 12, very few of them were taken care of by other persons when their parents went to work. But the majority of them would be taken care by their working parents when they got sick (Table [23]). On the other hand, almost none of ND project participants interviewed reported having received help from their neighbours or relatives living nearby in taking care of the children's daily living (Table [25]). Furthermore, most of the children of the ND Project participants had not used any formal services, such as School-Based After-School and Support Programmes, at the time of interview. The findings from the public opinion survey demonstrated a similar pattern in that most children would take care of themselves when their parents go to work while a low usage rate of such formal services by children aged 6-14 of the interviewees was also observed (Tables [13] – [14]).

A slightly higher percentage of the not-employed respondents as compared to the employed, spent time with their children on various areas such as taking care of children's daily living, reviewing children's study, talking to, going out and playing with children, and escorting children to and from school. However, there was not much difference between the two groups of respondents in terms of the amount of time spent in those activities for those who did so (Tables [26] – [31]). Meanwhile, most of the participants opined that there was no change in time spent with each other on these areas over the year before the interviews were conducted (Table [32]).

Over 83% parents who were employed reported that their parent-child relationship did not deteriorate over the past year. 15.6% of the employed even considered that the relationship had improved. In fact, both the employed and not employed reported similar level of stability in family life and family atmosphere. Around three-quarters of them reported no change in these areas over the year before the interview (Table [32]). Over 90% of the respondents reported a good or very good

relationship with their children. Consistently, more of the not employed respondents compared to those employed reported that their relationship with their children were very good (Table [33]).

### Children

Among all the children interviewed, about 70% was born in Hong Kong and for those who were not so, over 90% has stayed in Hong Kong for at least seven years. There was no obvious difference in their youngest child's characteristics between those who were employed and those not employed (Table [34]).

Most of the children considered their overall relationship with their parents as good or very good. Over 90% of those whose father was the major carer and 95.6% among those whose mother was the major carer considered their parent-child relationship as good or very good. There was no obvious difference in parent-child relationship between those whose parent was employed and those not (Table [35]). Moreover, among the 97 children whose parent only started working within a year before the interview, nearly half considered that their quality of life was improved; they could also learn how to be independent and take care of themselves. But it has to be noted that 40.2% of them said that there was no benefit at all (Table [36]).

The average self-esteem score and perceived level of performance changed very little in this study comparing to their scores in the previous study, when they were interviewed half-a-year after their parent/ child carer took part in the ND Project. The average Personal-Social Development Self-Efficacy Inventory (PSD-SEI) score reduced when compared to the result of measurement in the previous study (Table [37]).

### ***In-Depth Individual Interviews***

In general, the interviewees considered that jobs in the manufacturing sector were more suitable for them. However, there were very few jobs available in the sector and hence the interviewees opined that jobs available in the market did not meet their expectations. Due to their education attainment, their choice of work in the labour market was limited.

It has to be pointed out that besides salary and job nature, other personal issues such as personality, working attitude, and mentality towards CSSA are other key elements influencing their motivations in looking for jobs and how satisfying their jobs are. Some considered that the "investment" in employment, such as time, effort and other costs were not worthwhile as the additional income was not that much after deduction was made in CSSA payment (despite the Disregarding Earnings arrangement) and all costs accounted for. It is also worth noting that the majority (13/16) of the interviewees got their jobs through referral by relatives/friends, showing that social network influenced much on the successful rate of finding jobs, especially for jobs that required lower skills level.

For those who could not find a job since they were admitted to the ND Project, it appeared that their self-confidence and self-image were lower, and their anxiety level was higher.

### ***Employment situations***

We made use of the 2006 Population By-census data to compile the jobs per each working person in various District Council (DC) districts and new towns. These figures were based on the number of people reported working in each district/new town divided by the working population resided in that particular location.

Table [38] illustrates the employment situation and related information. The jobs per each working person varied greatly across districts and new towns. In general, jobs were more abundant in urban DC districts and much less in new towns. Comparing the jobs per each working person, Wan Chai (2.98), Yau Tsim Mong (2.52), and Central & Western (2.41) districts were the best, while Tin Shui Wai (0.20) had a relatively lower number of jobs per working person and was relatively far away from other districts where residents could find jobs. Nevertheless, the figures serve as a general comparison purpose because there are no delineation on the nature of these jobs and whether they are suitable for the ND Project participants, who usually require part-time employment.

### ***Child-care arrangement in other countries***

In most Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries, childcare referred to services provided to young children between the ages of 0 and before they receive primary education. The services focus both on the cognitive and social development of children as well as the employment support given to parents with young children. The services are normally targeted at helping mothers with young child to take up employment by providing subsidized centre-based child-care services, family care, kindergartens, and pre-school services. Nevertheless, the costs for such services can be very high if childcare expenses, taxation, contributions, and the reduction of income support are taken into account.

For students studying in primary schools, the out-of-school-hours services provide better support to working parents to take care of their children before and after school-hours, during lunch, and also during school vacations in some countries. In most OECD countries, employment policies are put in place to encourage mothers with young child to take up employment, adopting the notion of dual-function of enhancing the children's development and balancing child-caring and work life of the working mothers (OECD, 2007, 2008).

## **Discussion**

Comparing with the first phase of study in 2006/07, in which only about forty percent (38.5%) of the ND Project respondents were employed, 53.5% of them were employed in this study. The average number of work-hour per month and income has also increased. For those employed, the current average monthly income was \$3,504.6 per month (Table [18]), comparing to around \$2,700 in the previous study (2007 findings). The working-hour per month was 115.8 hours in the previous study (computed from the 2007 findings), and it has increased to 121.2 hours (Table [18] of

the current study). Since many of their youngest child was older than 14 by the time we interviewed them again, those who remained on CSSA were transferred to the Support for Self-Reliance Scheme (SFS), which required them to seek a job of longer working hours. Moreover, the average hourly pay computed from these figures was higher in this study.

When asked about the major barriers they encountered in finding a job, the three major barriers given by those who were not employed were: health problem (36.9%), old age (35.1%), and child-care responsibility (32.1%). Theoretically, when children are studying full-time at school, parents have enough time to take up part-time job during school-hours. However, many expressed that some jobs required them to work beyond normal school-hours, and the situation is more difficult during school holidays and summer vacations. It would be more difficult particularly for single parents with limited network which can provide supports when needed.

Based on overseas experience, the availability out-of-school-hours services is important, especially if the single parents are required to work when their youngest child is still in primary education. This is because as more women go to work, it is getting more difficult to find relatives like sisters and aunts, to look after their children during out-of-school hours. Nonetheless, while governments of OECD countries begin to initiate out-of-school-hours programmes, such programmes are still in the early stages of development and their coverage is by no means comprehensive (OECD, 2008).

Coverage of out-of-school-hours care varies significantly with the age of children. According to OCED, given the limited available information, the enrolment rate was higher among those aged below nine and dropped sharply as children become teenagers. As for those aged between 9 and 11, the enrolment rate was highest in Denmark (68.2%) (OECD, 2008). It was followed by Sweden with a rate of 28.2%. The third was Australia with the rate reaching only 17%. Most other OECD countries either had not made the data available, or had a rate of lower than 10% (Table [1]). In most OECD countries, parents have to juggle around with a mix of formal and informal child-care services, and adjust their work hours in order to meet the demand of their job and the childcare responsibilities when their children are not at schools. In Hong Kong, under the current ND Project, staff of the project operators will give advice and information on child care and after-school-care arrangements so that participants with children in need of such can make appropriate arrangement before they engage in paid employment. If the minimum age of youngest child of ND Project participants is to be lowered, concerted efforts should be made to see if out-of-school-hours services could be matched to facilitate the employment needs of the parents.

The explicit financial and other hidden costs involved for ND Project participants in taking up employment are not negligible. For instance, there might be costs of traveling, costs of meals out of home for their children and themselves if they could not cook at home, etc. Depending on individual cases, these costs could be significant comparing to the income they are able to keep under the Disregarded Earnings (DE) arrangement, not to mention the need to make substantial changes in the way of living from doing mainly housework and child-caring tasks to taking up paid employment. The explicit and hidden costs for doing so will have impact on

their incentive in seeking employment.

In fact, the administration has relaxed its DE arrangement under CSSA in December 2007. All categories of recipients in cases which have been on CSSA for not less than two months (used to be three months) are eligible for DE benefits. The revised DE arrangement allowed persons receiving CSSA who take up employment to keep the first \$800 of their monthly salary (used to be \$ 600) and 50% of the subsequent earnings. The total amount each employed person can keep is up to \$2,500 per month. We also notice that the Government has provided a variety of incentives in and out of the CSSA Scheme to provide incentives to low-income families to enhance their work skills and encourage them to engage in paid employment. For instance, training/ retraining allowance received by CSSA recipients can be disregarded up to a certain amount in recognition of the additional expenditure incurred in attending training/retraining course. It is thus not preferable to allow the ND Project participants to keep and use most of their income from work in addition to the CSSA payment and DE, because their household income could easily be higher than most of the non-CSSA working families.

We suggest that the Government should continue to provide incentives to ND Project participants through various means. They may also wish to examine other possible options proposed by NGOs and other concerned parties.

## **Recommendations**

- 1) The public opinion survey revealed that the public did not favour an increase of sanction for non-compliance. Thus, we recommend that the current level of sanction for non-compliance, i.e. \$200 per month be kept unchanged. In this regard, to improve the employment participation rate, incentives should be considered, e.g. by promoting productivity and self-reliance of CSSA recipients.
- 2) The second recommendation related to the work-hour requirements of the jobs that ND Project participants have to seek. It was found in the study that for those who were employed at the time of interview the average number of work hours per week was 30.3 hours (or 121.2 per month). Only 15.3% worked 40 hours or less per month. Since there is a strong intention for the ND Project participants to seek jobs requiring longer working hours than required, we recommend that the current work-hour requirement be kept at the same level. However, subject to public views and the general economic situation, there are rooms to increase the 32-hour per month requirement in the longer run.
- 3) The public opinion survey does not provide a consistent view on whether to require single parents and child carers on CSSA with younger child to join the ND Project. However, while acknowledging that many OECD countries require single parents receiving social benefits to seek employment when their youngest child were as young as 6 years old<sup>1</sup>, we recognize the benefits of work and the long-term employment prospects while there are also other factors that requires

---

<sup>1</sup> United Kingdom has introduced work requirement to lone parents starting from November 2008 for single parents with a youngest child aged 12 or above. The age requirements will be lowered to 7 by Oct 2010. See <http://www.dwp.gov.uk/welfarereform/parents.asp>.

further consideration in determining whether to lower the age of the youngest child of single parents/carers who need to join the ND Project. We recommend that at present, the minimum age requirement of the youngest child be kept at the same level. In the event that the minimum age of the youngest child is to be lowered, it is important that appropriate out-of-school-hours services are available and accessible for single parents/carers when they engage in paid employment outside normal school hours and at times of special circumstances such as sickness.

- 4) The 2006 By-census data confirms that the jobs per person in Tin Shui Wai and some other places remained relatively low. However, the job situation for Tin Shui Wai improves if Yuen Long is taken into consideration. Recognising that local jobs are usually more attractive, the government has intensified its effort to enhance job opportunities in Tin Shui Wai, it would be useful to monitor the effect of the additional jobs created and how they benefit the potential ND Project participants.
- 5) Currently, there exist three programmes under CSSA to promote employment and self-reliance for able-bodied recipients. The three programmes are Integrated Employment Assistance Scheme (IEAS), a new phase of the Special Training and Enhancement Programme (My STEP) and the current New Dawn (ND) Project. While IEAS targets able-bodied CSSA recipients in general, My STEP targets younger CSSA recipients. Various NGOs have received funding from SWD to take part in the operations of these programmes. Each of them, among other things, makes much effort in identifying job opportunities and providing job information to their participants. Because some of these job opportunities are common for all three programmes, some form of integration especially in searching and identifying job opportunities can be considered to enhance efficiency in the use of resources and to avoid overlapping.

## **Conclusion**

Most countries with a developed welfare system have work requirements for adults with work capabilities, including single parents, for receiving social security benefits. The results of the study of the ND Project participants also convinced us that the ND Project had brought positive benefits for both the ND Project participants and their children. The focus of the support measures for them should be more on facilitating and encouraging them to take up long-term employment. Nevertheless, similar to most other countries, income from work especially for those with low skills level is limited, and the cost involved in taking up employment will have impact on their incentive to take up employment. Meanwhile, based on overseas experience, appropriate matching of out-of-school-hours service is necessary if single parents and family carers are recommended to take up employment when their children are at younger age (e.g. below 12). The result of the public opinion indicates that a heavier sanction for the non-compliance of the ND Project requirement is not favored, and incentives should be considered to improve the employment participation rate. However, the requirement of seeking a job with longer working hours can be considered when employment condition improves.

As the public opinion survey reflects that the support towards the ND project was generally very high across individuals with different socio-demographic background, the research team recommends the Government to further extend or regularize the ND Project after the completion of existing phase in March 2010. Besides, it is also worth considering to integrate the three programmes, namely IEAS, My STEP, and the current ND Project so as to enhance efficiency in the use of resources, in particular those for searching and identifying job opportunities as well as in disseminating job information.

## **References**

OECD (2007). *Babies and bosses: Reconciling work and family life, A synthesis of findings for OECD countries*. Paris: OECD.

OECD (2008). *Out-of-school-hours care services* (Social Policy Division - Directorate of Employment, Labour and Social Affairs). Retrieved January 2, 2008, from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/53/9/41923706.pdf>

**Table 1 Key characteristics of Out-of-School-Hours Care (OECD, 2008, p.3)**

Country	Year	Ages	Enrolment rate	Types of OSHC services offered	Child-to-staff ratio (official guideline)	Public spending in '000 Euros
Australia	2005	3-4	n.a.	Combination	n.a.	n.a.
		5-8	15			
		9-12	17			
Austria	2007	3-5	n.a.	Combination	n.a.	n.a.
		6-8	13.7			
		9-11	5.3			
Belgium	2007	0-6	38.3	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Cyprus <sup>1,2</sup>	2007	3-12	2.4	After school	25:1	1,165
Czech Rep	2007	3-5	11	Combination	No official guideline	156
		6-11	-			
Denmark	2005	3-5	-	Combination	No official guideline	870
		6-8	85.2			
		9-11	68.2			
Estonia	2007	3-5	92.1	After school	n.a.	n.a.
		6-8	64.0			
		9-11	13.1			
Finland	2007	3-6	n.a.	Before and after school	n.a.	n.a.
		7-9	24.7			
France	2007	3-6	20.5	Before and after school	n.a.	n.a.
		7-11	n.a.			
Germany	2006	3-5	n.a.	Before and after school	Each Bundesland has own guidelines	n.a.
		6-8	9.5			
		9-11	4.9			
Greece	2007	4-5	40.8	Before and after school	25:1	n.a.
		6-11	22.9			
Hungary	2007	3-5	100.0	Combination	11:1	727
		6-8	58.8		n.a.	n.a.
		9-11	26.3		n.a.	n.a.
Japan	2007	3-5	n.a.	After school and during holidays	n.a.	n.a.
		6-11	10.5			
Malta	2007	3-5	5.1	Combination	No official guideline	452
		6-8	8.9			
		9-11	10.0			
Mexico	2007	6-14	2.3	Combination	n.a.	n.a.
Netherlands	2007	4-12	11.9	Before and after school	10:1	2,064
New Zealand	2005	3-4	not offered	Combination	10:1 on-site, 8:1 off-site	n.a.
		5-8	n.a.			
		9-11	n.a.			
Poland	2006	3-5	40.2	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
		6-11	3.8			
Portugal	2006	3-5	74.4	Combination	Each service has own guideline	n.a.
		6-10	19.1			
		11	15.1			
Romania	2007	3-11	n.a.	Combination	3:1 for 4-6 yr olds, 4:1 for 7-11 yr olds	n.a.
Slovak Rep	2007	3-5	n.a.	Combination	30:1	n.a.
		6-14	28.8			
Sweden	2005	3-5	80.7	Combination	5:1	4,020
		6-8	80.2		19:1	
		9-11	28.2		19:1	

Notes: " Combination includes activities before and after school hours, and during holidays; n.a. is not available.

1) Footnote by Turkey: The information in this document with reference to « Cyprus » relates to the southern part of the Island. There is no single authority representing both Turkish and Greek Cypriot people on the Island. Turkey recognizes the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). Until a lasting and equitable solution is found within the context of United Nations, Turkey shall preserve its position concerning the "Cyprus issue".

2) Footnote by all the European Union Member States of the OECD and the European Commission: The Republic of Cyprus is recognized by all members of the United Nations with the exception of Turkey. The information in this document relates to the area under the effective control of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus

Source: National Authorities.

**Table 2 Background of respondents (Q19-24)**

	<i>Unweighted No.</i>	<i>Unweighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	549	36.5	37.6
Female	956	63.5	62.4
<b>Age</b>			
18-19	60	4.1	5.5
20-24	99	6.8	9.2
25-29	65	4.4	5.3
30-39	190	13.0	12.6
40-49	274	18.7	18.0
50-59	240	16.4	17.8
60-69	201	13.7	14.2
70 or above	335	22.9	17.5
<b>Marital status</b>			
Single	314	22.5	25.4
Cohabiting	2	0.1	0.1
Married	897	64.2	66.8
Widowed/ Divorced/Separated	184	13.2	7.6
<b>Education attainment</b>			
No schooling / pre-primary	168	11.8	8.7
Primary	279	19.6	19.0
Junior secondary	209	14.7	15.1
Senior secondary	411	28.8	29.8
Matriculated	58	4.1	4.6
Diploma/certificate	33	2.3	2.5
Associate degree	14	1.0	1.1
Degree or above	254	17.8	19.3
<b>Place of birth</b>			
Hong Kong	888	61.6	63.4
Chinese mainland*	523	36.3	34.9
( $<7$ yrs in HK)	25	5.3	5.1
	<i>Unweighted No.</i>	<i>Unweighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>
( $\geq 7$ yrs in HK)	439	94.6	94.9
Other places*	30	2.1	1.7
( $<7$ yrs in HK)	1	3.8	3.6
( $\geq 7$ yrs in HK)	25	96.2	96.4

\*There are non-response cases about their duration of residency in Hong Kong.

**Table 3 Household background**

	<i>Weighted %</i>	2008 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter*
	Unit: Individuals	Unit: Household
<b>CSSA recipients?</b>		
No	94.2	
Yes	5.8	
<b>Family income</b>		
No income	12.9	
\$1 – 1,999	1.2	6.7
\$2,000 – 3,999	2.4	
\$4,000 – 5,999	2.6	5.6
\$6,000 – 7,999	3.5	6.5
\$8,000 – 9,999	4.3	6.5
\$10,000 – 14,999	15.3	14.6
\$15,000 – 19,999	10.9	12.7
	<i>Weighted %</i>	2008 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter*
	Unit: Individuals	Unit: Household
\$20,000 – 24,999	12.6	10.6
\$25,000 – 39,999	18.2	18.1
≥\$40,000	15.9	18.6

\* Computed from Quarterly Report on General Household Survey Fourth Quarter 2008, Table 10.4, Census and Statistics Department, HKSAR.

**Table 4 Awareness of the ND Project (Q1)**

	<i>Weighted %</i>
<b>No</b>	94.6
<b>Yes</b>	5.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 5 Support to the ND Project (Q2)**

	<i>Weighted %</i>
<b>No</b>	3.5
<b>Yes</b>	85.1
<b>No comment</b>	11.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 6 Opinion towards 32-hour-per-month requirement (Q3)**

	<i>Weighted %</i>
<b>Too long</b>	<b>2.9</b>
Reduced to	
4 or less per week	32.7
5 - 8 hours per week	57.0
Non-response	10.3
Average hrs per week	<i>4.4 hrs</i>
<b>Appropriate</b>	<b>58.2</b>
<b>Too short</b>	<b>28.6</b>
Increased to	
16 hrs or more per week	66.3
9 – 15 hrs per week	25.7
Non-response	8.0
Average hrs per week	<i>22.6 hrs</i>
<b>No comment</b>	<b>10.4</b>
	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 7 Opinion towards the lowering the 12-14 years-old youngest child requirement (Q4)**

	<i>Weighted %</i>
<b>No</b>	<b>69.9</b>
<b>Yes</b>	<b>17.7</b>
Lowered to	
Below 6 yrs	12.4
	<i>Weighted %</i>
6 - 8 yrs	42.9
9 -11 yrs	44.7
Average age	<i>7.9 hrs</i>
<b>No comment</b>	<b>12.4</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 8 Opinion towards deducting \$200 CSSA payment for non-compliance (Q5)**

	<i>Weighted %</i>
<b>Too much</b>	<b>10.9</b>
Deduction per month	
No deduction	52.8
\$100 or less	43.6
\$101-199	3.6
Average deduction (\$)	<b>\$46.9</b>
<b>Appropriate</b>	<b>56.6</b>
<b>Too little</b>	<b>15.5</b>
Deduction per month	
\$201-300	16.4
More than \$300	83.6
Average deduction (\$)	<b>\$568.9</b>
<b>No comment</b>	17.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 9 Opinion towards employment for single parents/ child carers receiving CSSA (Q6)**

<i>Preferred employment status</i>	<i>Age of child / schooling arrangement</i>		
	6-8yrs/non full-time schooling	6-8 yrs/ full-time schooling	9-11 yrs/ non full-time schooling
	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>
<b>Full-time</b>	4.1	13.7	9.3
<b>Part-time</b>	49.4	54.8	61.1
<b>No work, child-caring at home</b>	46.5	31.5	29.7
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table 10 Opinion towards employment for single parents/ child carers receiving CSSA (Q6, continued)**

<i>Preferred employment status</i>	<i>Age of child / schooling arrangement</i>		
	9-11 yrs/full-time schooling	12-14 yrs/ non full-time schooling	12-14 yrs/full-time schooling
	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>
<b>Full-time</b>	19.1	33.2	42.3
<b>Part-time</b>	60.2	56.6	50.0
<b>No work, child-caring at home</b>	20.7	10.1	7.7
<b>Total</b>	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table 11 Opinion towards the ideas of the ND Project (Q7)**

	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>No Comment</b>
	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>
a. Their own potentials can be maximized through engagement in work	14.1	69.8	5.7	0.8	9.6
b. Their self-esteem and self-confidence can be enhanced through engagement in work	16.4	70.4	3.7	0.3	9.2
c. They can better integrate into society through engagement in work	19.1	70.0	2.8	0.2	7.8
d. They can move towards self-reliance through engagement in work	19.7	68.9	2.7	0.3	8.3
e. They can become the role models for their children through engagement in work	21.9	67.0	2.3	0.5	8.3
f. The economic situation of their family can be improved through engagement in work	21.5	64.2	5.3	0.5	8.4

**Table 12 Impacts to parent-child relationship if single parents/ child carers on CSSA go to work (Q8)**

	<b>Very positive</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>No impact</b>	<b>Negative impact</b>	<b>Very negative impact</b>	<b>No comment</b>
	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>
a. When the youngest child in the family is at the age between 6-8	1.2	8.9	46.1	31.6	4.8	7.4
b. When the youngest child in the family is at the age between 9-11	0.6	10.6	52.3	25.7	3.1	7.6
c. When the youngest child in the family is at the age between 12-14	1.4	11.9	62.7	14.8	1.7	7.5

**Table 13 Person responsible for taking care of the child whose age is between 6 and 14 (Q15-17)**

Responsible persons	Child care arrangement when		
	Major carers goes to work	Child on holidays	Child get sick
	<i>Weighted%</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>
The child himself/herself	51.2	33.1	12.0
The child's elder brother & sister	3.3	3.3	5.1
Myself or my spouse taking leave from work	21.1	48.8	62.4
Relatives	10.6	15.7	14.5
Foreign / local domestic helper	15.4	11.6	13.7
NGOs	2.4	1.7	0.0
Difficult to say/depends /don't know	0.0	2.5	6.0
Others	0.0	0	1.7
Refused to answer	0.0	0.0	0.0

**Table 14 Whether having used the following child-care services (Q18)**

	<i>Weighted %</i>
School-based After-School Learning and Support Programmes	5.0
After School Care Service (only for 6-12 years)	4.2
None of the above	90.8

\* Respondents can choose more than one option

**Table 15 Opinion by household income & place of birth**

	Awareness of ND		Support ND		32 hours per week		
	No	Yes	No	Yes	Too long	Appropriate	Too short
	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>	<i>Weighted %</i>
<b>CSSA recipients?</b>							
No	94.8	5.2	3.6	96.4	3.2	64.4	32.4
Yes	89.5	10.5	0.6	99.4	1.8	75.1	23.1
<b>Family income</b>							
< 10000	94.3	5.7	1.0	99.0	1.7	71.8	26.5
10000-19999	94.8	5.2	5.5	94.5	2.5	62.6	34.9
20000-39999	95.2	4.8	5.0	95.0	3.9	60.4	35.7
≥\$40,000	90.1	9.9	3.9	96.1	5.2	60.6	34.2
<b>Place of birth</b>							
Hong Kong	94.4	5.6	4.2	95.8	3.7	63.0	33.4
Chinese mainland	94.7	5.3	3.0	97.0	2.0	69.2	28.8
● (<7 yrs in HK)	94.8	5.2	7.5	92.5	12.5	62.5	25.0
● (≥7 yrs in HK)	94.2	5.8	3.1	96.9	1.6	69.4	29.0
Other places	96.8	3.2	1.9	98.1	1.9	63.5	34.6

**Table 16 Occupation and industry of current job (Q30, 31)**

	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Major occupation (Q30)</b>										
Cleaner	3	7.5	87	25.1	56	21.1	34	27.9	<b>90</b>	<b>23.3</b>
Home-helper	0	0.0	40	11.5	32	12.1	8	6.6	<b>40</b>	<b>10.3</b>
Miscellaneous worker	3	7.5	32	9.2	19	7.2	16	13.1	<b>35</b>	<b>9.0</b>
Retail worker	0	0.0	33	9.5	28	10.6	5	4.1	<b>33</b>	<b>8.5</b>
Restaurant waiter/waitress	2	5.0	30	8.6	19	7.2	13	10.7	<b>32</b>	<b>8.3</b>
<b>Total (Q30)</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Major industry (Q31)</b>										
Community, social and personal services	11	27.5	174	50.1	123	46.4	62	50.8	<b>185</b>	<b>47.8</b>
Restaurants and hotels	2	5.0	73	21.0	51	19.2	24	19.7	<b>75</b>	<b>19.4</b>
Wholesale, retail	1	2.5	43	12.4	31	11.7	13	10.7	<b>44</b>	<b>11.4</b>
	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Financing, insurance, real estate and business services	1	2.5	21	6.1	13	4.9	9	7.4	<b>22</b>	<b>5.7</b>
Construction	14	35.0	7	2.0	15	5.7	6	4.9	<b>21</b>	<b>5.4</b>
Transport, storage and communications	9	22.5	12	3.5	16	6.0	5	4.1	<b>21</b>	<b>5.4</b>
<b>Total (Q31)</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 17 Ways to find the current job (Q32)**

Ways to find these jobs (Q32)	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Friends/ relatives network	28	70.0	171	49.3	132	49.8	67	54.9	<b>199</b>	<b>51.4</b>
Newspaper/ magazine	7	17.5	41	11.8	27	10.2	21	17.2	<b>48</b>	<b>12.4</b>
Street bills	0	0	36	10.4	25	9.4	11	9.0	<b>36</b>	<b>9.3</b>
Internet	1	2.5	8	2.3	8	3.0	1	0.8	<b>9</b>	<b>2.3</b>

Ways to find these jobs (Q32)	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Labor Department	1	2.5	29	8.4	25	9.4	5	4.1	<b>30</b>	<b>7.8</b>
Employment centre	1	2.5	7	2.0	4	1.5	4	3.3	<b>8</b>	<b>2.1</b>
Recruitment fair	0	0.0	4	1.2	4	1.5	0	0.0	<b>4</b>	<b>1.0</b>
NGOs	0	0.0	17	4.9	12	4.5	5	4.1	<b>17</b>	<b>4.4</b>
Employment development officer	0	0.0	8	2.3	7	2.6	1	0.8	<b>8</b>	<b>2.1</b>
Others	4	10.0	39	11.2	32	12.1	11	9.0	<b>43</b>	<b>11.1</b>
<b>Total no. of respondents (Q32)</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 18 Information about the current job (Q33-35)**

	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>No. of hours per month (Q33)</b>										
40 or less	6	15.8	52	15.3	41	16.0	17	14.0	<b>58</b>	<b>15.3</b>
41-80	7	18.4	67	19.7	48	18.7	26	21.5	<b>74</b>	<b>19.6</b>
81-120	6	15.8	79	23.2	59	23.0	26	21.5	<b>85</b>	<b>22.5</b>
121-140	2	5.3	16	4.7	10	3.9	8	6.6	<b>18</b>	<b>4.8</b>
Over 140	17	44.7	126	37.1	99	38.5	44	36.4	<b>143</b>	<b>37.8</b>
Total (Q33)	38	100	340	100	257	100	121	100	<b>378</b>	<b>100</b>
Average hours per month	126.5		120.6		121.0		121.8		<b>121.2</b>	
<b>Monthly salary (Q34)</b>										
1500 or less	7	18.9	70	20.5	51	19.8	26	21.7	<b>77</b>	<b>20.4</b>
1501-2500	5	13.5	68	19.9	54	20.9	19	15.8	<b>73</b>	<b>19.3</b>
2501-3500	4	10.8	75	22.0	44	17.1	35	29.2	<b>79</b>	<b>20.9</b>
3501-4500	3	8.1	37	10.9	33	12.8	7	5.8	<b>40</b>	<b>10.6</b>
4501-5000	1	2.7	31	9.1	22	8.5	10	8.3	<b>32</b>	<b>8.5</b>
5001 or more	17	45.9	60	17.6	54	20.9	23	19.2	<b>77</b>	<b>20.4</b>
Total (Q34)	37	100	341	100	258	100	120	100	<b>378</b>	<b>100</b>
Average salary/ month	5,066.2		3,335.1		3,575.5		3,352.0		<b>3,504.6</b>	
Average salary per hour	49.4		30.9		33.7		30.6		<b>32.7</b>	
<b>No. of months in the job (Q35)</b>										

	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Single parents</b>		<b>Child carers</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
	3 months or less	7	18.4	46	14.5	40	16.2	13	11.9	<b>53</b>
4-6 months	7	18.4	52	16.4	44	17.8	15	13.8	<b>59</b>	<b>16.6</b>
7-9 months	2	5.3	25	7.9	16	6.5	11	10.1	<b>27</b>	<b>7.6</b>
10-12 months	4	10.5	57	17.9	42	17.0	19	17.4	<b>61</b>	<b>17.1</b>
Over 12 months	18	47.4	138	43.4	105	42.5	51	46.8	<b>156</b>	<b>43.8</b>
	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Single parents</b>		<b>Child carers</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Total (Q35)	38	100	318	100	247	100	109	100	<b>356</b>	<b>100</b>
Average no. of months	35.0		13.2		16.3		13.8		<b>15.5</b>	

**Table 19 Impact of meeting work demand to family and personal social life (Q42)**

<b>Impacts (Q42)</b>	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Single parents</b>		<b>Child carers</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
	Very large	1	2.6	12	3.5	10	3.8	3	2.5	<b>13</b>
Large	4	10.3	31	9.0	25	9.5	10	8.3	<b>35</b>	<b>9.2</b>
Medium	16	41.0	111	32.4	85	32.4	42	35.0	<b>127</b>	<b>33.2</b>
Little	8	20.5	112	32.7	80	30.5	40	33.3	<b>120</b>	<b>31.4</b>
Very little	10	25.6	77	22.4	62	23.7	25	20.8	<b>87</b>	<b>22.8</b>
Total responded (Q42)	39	100	343	100	262	100	120	100	<b>382</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 20 Benefits of working (Q43)**

<b>Five major benefits mentioned (Q43)</b>	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Single parents</b>		<b>Child carers</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
	Increase family income	55	55.0	336	54.3	230	51.6	161	59.0	<b>391</b>
Increase self confidence	25	25.0	158	25.5	119	26.7	64	23.4	<b>183</b>	<b>25.5</b>
Improve quality of life (myself & children's )	15	15.0	115	18.6	81	18.2	49	17.9	<b>130</b>	<b>18.1</b>
Become self-reliant and	22	22.0	106	17.1	81	18.2	47	17.2	<b>128</b>	<b>17.8</b>

Five major benefits mentioned (Q43)	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
leave CSSA										
Improve self-esteem	16	16.0	93	15.0	76	17.0	33	12.1	<b>109</b>	<b>15.2</b>
No benefits at all	12	12.0	81	13.1	56	12.6	37	13.6	<b>93</b>	<b>12.9</b>
<b>Total (Q43)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>619</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>446</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>719</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 21 Additional monthly expenses from income (Q47)**

Expenditure items	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%*	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Employment related</b>										
< 200	2	4.3	2	0.5	1	0.3	3	2.1	4	0.9
200 or more	8	17.0	34	8.4	26	8.4	16	11.4	42	9.3
Total responded	10	21.3	36	8.9	27	8.7	19	13.6	46	10.2
Average	485.0		506.8		581.5		389.2		<b>502.1</b>	
<b>Clothing</b>										
< 200	0	0.0	7	1.7	4	1.3	3	2.1	7	1.6
200 or more	11	23.4	75	18.6	59	19.0	27	19.3	86	19.1
Total responded	11	23.4	82	20.3	63	20.3	30	21.4	93	20.7
Average	1,072.7		379.4		500.8		378.7		<b>461.4</b>	
<b>Food</b>										
< 200	2	4.3	8	2.0	6	1.9	4	2.9	10	2.2
200 or more	19	40.4	173	42.9	129	41.6	63	45.0	192	42.7
Total responded	21	44.7	181	44.9	135	43.5	67	47.9	202	44.9
Average	1,212.4		1,369.4		1,383.2		1,292.3		<b>1,353.0</b>	
<b>Transportation</b>										
< 200	4	8.5	14	3.5	11	3.5	7	5.0	18	4.0
200 or more	14	29.8	99	24.6	73	23.5	40	28.6	113	25.1
Total responded	18	38.3	113	28.0	84	27.1	47	33.6	131	29.1
Average	367.8		426.9		449.3		364.3		<b>418.8</b>	
<b>Medical</b>										
< 200	0	0.0	3	0.7	0	0.0	3	2.1	3	0.7
200 or more	1	2.1	8	2.0	5	1.6	4	2.9	9	2.0

Expenditure items	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%*	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total responded	1	2.1	11	2.7	5	1.6	7	5.0	12	2.7
Average	200.0		248.2		276.0		221.4		<b>244.2</b>	
<b>Housing</b>										
< 200	0	0.0	3	0.7	3	1.0	0	0.0	3	0.7
200 or more	14	29.8	109	27.0	91	29.4	32	22.9	123	27.3
Total responded	14	29.8	112	27.8	94	30.3	32	22.9	126	28.0
Average	2,657.1		1,917.8		2,006.3		1,981.3		<b>1,999.9</b>	
<b>Social</b>										
< 200	0	0.0	2	0.5	1	0.3	1	0.7	2	0.4
200 or more	11	23.4	42	10.4	29	9.4	24	17.1	53	11.8
Total responded	11	23.4	44	10.9	30	9.7	25	17.9	55	12.2
Average	454.5		325.0		380.0		316.0		<b>350.9</b>	
<b>Leisure</b>										
< 200	0	0.0	1	0.2	0	0.0	1	0.7	1	0.2
200 or more	6	12.8	20	5.0	18	5.8	8	5.7	26	5.8
Total responded	6	12.8	21	5.2	18	5.8	9	6.4	27	6.0
Average	666.7		375.2		487.8		344.4		<b>440.0</b>	
<b>Children's pocket money</b>										
< 200	1	2.1	7	1.7	2	0.6	6	4.3	8	1.8
200 or more	11	23.4	74	18.4	54	17.4	31	22.1	85	18.9
Total responded	12	25.5	81	20.1	56	18.1	37	26.4	93	20.7
Average	591.7		458.6		451.8		512.2		<b>475.8</b>	
<b>Education &amp; extra-curricula activities</b>										
< 200	0	0.0	4	1.0	3	1.0	1	0.7	4	0.9
200 or more	12	25.5	88	21.8	69	22.3	31	22.1	100	22.2
Total responded	12	25.5	92	22.8	72	23.2	32	22.9	104	23.1
Average	608.3		766.8		742.4		762.5		<b>748.6</b>	

\* % refers to the percentage of those who have a job now or have at least one within 1 year.

**Table 22 Benefits of the additional income (Q48, 49)**

	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%*	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Strengthen work incentive (Q48)</b>										
No	6	14.0	61	16.4	46	16.4	21	15.6	67	16.1
Yes	37	86.0	311	83.6	234	83.6	114	84.4	348	83.9
Total responded (Q48)	43	100	372	100	280	100	135	100	415	100
<b>Five major benefits (Q49)</b>										
Increase family income	25	58.1	208	52.3	161	53.5	72	51.4	233	52.8
Increase self confidence	14	32.6	111	27.9	86	28.6	39	27.9	125	28.3
Improve self-esteem	15	34.9	94	23.6	72	23.9	37	26.4	109	24.7
Improve quality of life (myself and children's )	10	23.3	88	22.1	67	22.3	31	22.1	98	22.2
Become self-reliant and leave CSSA	9	20.9	89	22.4	68	22.6	30	21.4	98	22.2
No benefits at all	0	0.0	35	8.8	24	8.0	11	7.9	35	7.9
<b>Total responded (Q49)</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>100</b>

Note: the difference between this table and Table 20 is that this table is about additional income and the previous one is about the benefits of working. In addition the previous question was for all respondents; this one was for those who were employed or have been employed within a year before the interview.

**Table 23 Child-care arrangement (Q50-52)**

	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>When you goes to work (Q50)</b>										
Self-care	33	75.0	320	80.4	243	80.5	110	78.6	<b>353</b>	<b>79.9</b>
Elder siblings	2	4.5	12	3.0	10	3.3	4	2.9	<b>14</b>	<b>3.2</b>
Myself or my spouse	10	22.7	87	21.9	58	19.2	39	27.9	<b>97</b>	<b>21.9</b>
Relatives	1	2.3	5	1.3	6	2.0	0	0.0	<b>6</b>	<b>1.4</b>
Teacher at school	1	2.3	12	3.0	8	2.6	5	3.6	<b>13</b>	<b>2.9</b>
Neighbors	0	0.0	1	0.3	1	0.3	0	0.0	<b>1</b>	<b>0.2</b>
NGOs	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
Hard to say/ others	0	0.0	6	1.5	5	1.7	1	0.7	<b>6</b>	<b>1.4</b>

	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Total (Q50)</b>	44		398		302		140		<b>442</b>	
<b>When children's are on school holidays (Q51)</b>										
Self-care	33	75.0	315	79.1	241	79.8	107	76.4	<b>348</b>	<b>78.7</b>
Elder siblings	2	4.5	11	2.8	10	3.3	3	2.1	<b>13</b>	<b>2.9</b>
Myself or my spouse	10	22.7	102	25.6	67	22.2	45	32.1	<b>112</b>	<b>25.3</b>
Relatives	1	2.3	4	1.0	5	1.7	0	0.0	<b>5</b>	<b>1.1</b>
Teacher at school	1	2.3	2	0.5	1	0.3	2	1.4	<b>3</b>	<b>0.7</b>
Neighbors	0	0.0	1	0.3	1	0.3	0	0.0	<b>1</b>	<b>0.2</b>
NGOs	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
Hard to say/ others	0	0.0	6	1.5	5	1.7	1	0.7	<b>6</b>	<b>1.4</b>
<b>Total (Q51)</b>	44		398		302		140		<b>442</b>	
<b>When children's are sick (Q52)</b>										
Self-care	15	34.1	160	40.2	131	43.4	44	31.4	<b>175</b>	<b>39.6</b>
Elder siblings	9	20.5	49	12.3	33	10.9	25	17.9	<b>58</b>	<b>13.1</b>
Myself or my spouse	26	59.1	226	56.8	162	53.6	90	64.3	<b>252</b>	<b>57.0</b>
Relatives	0	0.0	6	1.5	5	1.7	1	0.7	<b>6</b>	<b>1.4</b>
Teacher at school	1	2.3	1	0.3	1	0.3	1	0.7	<b>2</b>	<b>0.5</b>
Neighbors	0	0.0	1	0.3	1	0.3	0	0.0	<b>1</b>	<b>0.2</b>
NGOs	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
Hard to say/ others	4	9.1	42	10.6	36	11.9	10	7.1	<b>46</b>	<b>10.4</b>
<b>Total (Q52)</b>	44		398		302		140		<b>442</b>	

Note: Respondents can choice more than one answer; total is more than 100%

**Table 24 Comparing current work conditions with other jobs within one year (Q59-61)**

Current work conditions	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Stability (Q59)</b>										
Very unstable	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
Unstable	4	40.0	20	21.1	14	19.4	10	30.3	<b>24</b>	<b>22.9</b>
Reasonable	2	20.0	41	43.2	33	45.8	10	30.3	<b>43</b>	<b>41.0</b>

Stable	4	40.0	31	32.6	22	30.6	13	39.4	<b>35</b>	<b>33.3</b>
Very stable	0	0.0	3	3.2	3	4.2	0	0.0	<b>3</b>	<b>2.9</b>
Total (Q59)	10	100	95	100	72	100	33	100	<b>105</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Working hours (Q60)</b>										
Much longer	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
Longer	1	10.0	11	11.6	9	12.5	3	9.1	<b>12</b>	<b>11.4</b>
Suitable	7	70.0	73	76.8	54	75.0	26	78.8	<b>80</b>	<b>76.2</b>
Shorter	2	20.0	9	9.5	8	11.1	3	9.1	<b>11</b>	<b>10.5</b>
Much shorter	0	0.0	2	2.1	1	1.4	1	3.0	<b>2</b>	<b>1.9</b>
Total (Q60)	10	100	95	100	72	100	33	100	<b>105</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Salary (Q61)</b>										
Much lower	0	0.0	2	2.1	2	2.8	0	0.0	<b>2</b>	<b>1.9</b>
Lower	1	10.0	16	16.8	12	16.7	5	15.2	<b>17</b>	<b>16.2</b>
No change	6	60.0	56	58.9	41	56.9	21	63.6	<b>62</b>	<b>59.0</b>
Higher	3	30.0	21	22.1	17	23.6	7	21.2	<b>24</b>	<b>22.9</b>
Much higher	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
Total (Q61)	10	100	95	100	72	100	33	100	<b>105</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 25 Helps received from neighbours/relatives living close by (Q64)**

Helps received	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Children's daily living</b>										
No	100	99.0	613	98.6	440	98.4	273	98.9	<b>713</b>	<b>98.6</b>
Yes	1	1.0	9	1.4	7	1.6	3	1.1	<b>10</b>	<b>1.4</b>
1 to several times/ year	0	0.0	1	11.1	0	0.0	1	33.3	<b>1</b>	<b>10.0</b>
1 to several times/ month	0	0.0	5	55.6	4	57.1	1	33.3	<b>5</b>	<b>50.0</b>
1 to several times/ week	1	100.0	3	33.3	3	42.9	1	33.3	<b>4</b>	<b>40.0</b>
Every day	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Taking care of older/sick persons</b>										
No	101	100.0	619	99.5	445	99.6	275	99.6	<b>720</b>	<b>99.6</b>
Yes	0	0.0	3	0.5	2	0.4	1	0.4	<b>3</b>	<b>0.4</b>
1 to several times/ year	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
1 to several times/ month	0	0.0	1	33.3	1	50.0	0	0.0	<b>1</b>	<b>33.3</b>
1 to several times/ week	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	50.0	1	100.0	<b>2</b>	<b>66.7</b>

<b>Helps received</b>	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Single parents</b>		<b>Child carers</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Every day	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Buying things</b>										
No	101	100.0	608	97.7	439	98.2	270	97.8	<b>709</b>	<b>98.1</b>
Yes	0	0.0	14	2.3	8	1.8	6	2.2	<b>14</b>	<b>1.9</b>
1 to several times/ year	0	0.0	2	16.7	1	14.3	1	20.0	<b>2</b>	<b>16.7</b>
1 to several times/ month	0	0.0	3	25.0	1	14.3	2	40.0	<b>3</b>	<b>25.0</b>
1 to several times/ week	0	0.0	7	58.3	5	71.4	2	40.0	<b>7</b>	<b>58.3</b>
Every day	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
<b>Cleaning home</b>										
No	101	100.0	620	99.7	445	99.6	276	100.0	<b>721</b>	<b>99.7</b>
Yes	0	0.0	2	0.3	2	0.4	0	0.0	<b>2</b>	<b>0.3</b>
1 to several times/ year	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	<b>1</b>	<b>50.0</b>
1 to several times/ month	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>
1 to several times/ week	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	<b>1</b>	<b>50.0</b>
Every day	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	<b>0</b>	<b>0.0</b>

**Table 26 Time spent escorting children to and from school (Q66a)**

<b>Escort child to and from school</b>	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Single parents</b>		<b>Child carers</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Currently employed</b>										
<b>Weekdays arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	0	0.0	3	0.9	3	1.1	0	0.0	<b>3</b>	<b>0.8</b>
Avg. hour per day	NA		3.0		3.0		NA		<b>3.0</b>	
By children themselves	40	100.0	340	98.3	259	98.1	121	99.2	<b>380</b>	<b>98.4</b>
By others	0	0.0	3	0.9	2	0.8	1	0.8	<b>3</b>	<b>0.8</b>
<b>Weekend arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	0	0.0	1	0.3	1	0.4	0	0.0	<b>1</b>	<b>0.3</b>
Avg. hour per day	NA		3.0		3.0		NA		<b>3.0</b>	
By children themselves	39	97.5	319	92.2	243	92.0	115	94.3	<b>358</b>	<b>92.7</b>
By others	1	2.5	26	7.5	20	7.6	7	5.7	<b>27</b>	<b>7.0</b>
<b>Changes in the amount of time you spend</b>										

Escort child to and from school	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Decreased	1	2.5	7	2.0	7	2.7	1	0.8	<b>8</b>	<b>2.1</b>
Increased	0	0.0	1	0.3	1	0.4	0	0.0	<b>1</b>	<b>0.3</b>
No Change	39	97.5	335	97.7	254	96.9	120	99.2	<b>374</b>	<b>97.7</b>
Total	40	100	343	100	262	100	121	100	<b>383</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Currently not employed</b>										
<b>Weekdays arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	0	0.0	15	5.5	8	4.4	7	4.5	<b>15</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Avg. hour per day	NA		1.5		1.6		1.4		<b>1.5</b>	
By the child themselves	60	100.0	258	94.2	172	95.6	146	94.8	<b>318</b>	<b>95.2</b>
By others	0	0.0	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.6	<b>1</b>	<b>0.3</b>
<b>Weekend arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	0	0.0	7	2.6	3	1.7	4	2.6	<b>7</b>	<b>2.1</b>
Avg. hour per day	NA		2.0		2.7		1.5		<b>2.0</b>	
By children themselves	57	95.0	244	89.1	162	90.0	139	90.3	<b>301</b>	<b>90.1</b>
By others	3	5.0	23	8.4	15	8.3	11	7.1	<b>26</b>	<b>7.8</b>
<b>Changes in the amount of time you spend</b>										
Decreased	2	3.3	3	1.1	3	1.7	2	1.3	<b>5</b>	<b>1.5</b>
Increased	0	0.0	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.6	<b>1</b>	<b>0.3</b>
No Change	58	96.7	270	98.5	177	98.3	151	98.1	<b>328</b>	<b>98.2</b>
Total	60	100	274	100	180	100	154	100	<b>334</b>	<b>100</b>
All respondents (Q66a)	100	100	620	100	444	100	276	100	<b>720</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 27 Time spent taking care of children's daily living (Q66b)**

Take care of their daily living	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Currently employed</b>										
<b>Weekdays arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	19	47.5	303	87.6	225	85.2	97	79.5	322	83.4
Avg. hour per day	2.8		3.3		3.3		3.2		3.3	
By children themselves	12	30.0	40	11.6	36	13.6	16	13.1	52	13.5
By others	9	22.5	3	0.9	3	1.1	9	7.4	12	3.1

<b>Take care of their daily living</b>	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Single parents</b>		<b>Child carers</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Weekend arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	19	47.5	307	88.7	228	86.4	98	80.3	326	84.5
Avg. hour per day	2.9		3.5		3.4		3.4		3.5	
By children themselves	12	30.0	35	10.1	33	12.5	14	11.5	47	12.2
By others	9	22.5	4	1.2	3	1.1	10	8.2	13	3.4
<b>Changes in the amount of time you spend</b>										
Decreased	6	15.0	51	14.7	39	14.8	18	14.8	57	14.8
Increased	0	0.0	7	2.0	7	2.7	0	0.0	7	1.8
No Change	34	85.0	288	83.2	218	82.6	104	85.2	322	83.4
Total	40	100	346	100	264	100	122	100	386	100
<b>Currently not employed</b>										
<b>Weekdays arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	49	81.7	259	94.5	169	93.9	139	90.3	308	92.2
Avg. hour per day	3.6		4.7		4.5		4.4		4.6	
By the child themselves	6	10.0	12	4.4	10	5.6	8	5.2	18	5.4
By others	5	8.3	3	1.1	1	0.6	7	4.5	8	2.4
<b>Weekend arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	50	83.3	259	94.5	169	93.9	140	90.9	309	92.5
Avg. hour per day	3.8		4.9		4.7		4.7		4.8	
By children themselves	6	10.0	13	4.7	10	5.6	9	5.8	19	5.7
By others	4	6.7	2	0.7	1	0.6	5	3.2	6	1.8
<b>Changes in the amount of time you spend</b>										
Decreased	1	1.7	9	3.3	8	4.4	2	1.3	10	3.0
Increased	1	1.7	12	4.4	7	3.9	6	3.9	13	3.9
No Change	58	96.7	253	92.3	165	91.7	146	94.8	311	93.1
Total	60	100	274	100	180	100	154	100	334	100
All respondents (Q66b)	100	100	620	100	444	100	276	100	720	100

**Table 28 Time spent reviewing children's study (Q66c)**

Take care of their daily living	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Currently employed</b>										
<b>Weekdays arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	0	0.0	11	3.2	10	3.8	1	0.8	11	2.9
Avg. hour per day	NA		1.6		1.6		1.6		2.0	
By children themselves	39	97.5	332	96.5	252	95.8	119	98.3	371	96.6
By others	1	2.5	1	0.3	1	0.4	1	0.8	2	0.5
<b>Weekend arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	0	0.0	11	3.2	10	3.8	1	0.8	11	2.9
Avg. hour per day	NA		1.8		1.8		1.7		3.0	
By children themselves	39	97.5	331	96.2	251	95.4	119	98.3	370	96.4
By others	1	2.5	2	0.6	2	0.8	1	0.8	3	0.8
<b>Changes in the amount of time you spend (if applicable)</b>										
Decreased	1	2.5	8	2.3	8	3.0	1	0.8	9	2.3
Increased	0	0.0	2	0.6	1	0.4	1	0.8	2	0.5
No Change	39	97.5	334	97.1	254	96.6	119	98.3	373	97.1
Total	40	100	344	100	263	100	121	100	384	100
<b>Currently not employed</b>										
<b>Weekdays arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	2	3.3	17	6.2	12	6.7	7	4.5	19	5.7
Avg. hour per day	1.3		2.3		2.2		2.1		2.3	
By the child themselves	58	96.7	256	93.4	168	93.3	146	94.8	314	94.0
By others	0	0.0	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.6	1	0.3
<b>Weekend arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	2	3.3	16	5.8	11	6.1	7	4.5	18	5.4
Avg. hour per day	1.3		2.2		2.1		2.0		2.3	
By children themselves	57	95.0	257	93.8	169	93.9	145	94.2	314	94.0
By others	1	1.7	1	0.4	0	0.0	2	1.3	2	0.6
<b>Changes in the amount of time you spend (if applicable)</b>										
Decreased	0	0.0	1	0.4	1	0.6	0	0.0	1	0.3
Increased	0	0.0	3	1.1	2	1.1	1	0.6	3	0.9
No Change	60	100	270	98.5	177	98.3	153	99.4	330	98.8
Total	60	100	274	100	180	100	154	100	334	100

<b>Take care of their daily living</b>	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Single parents</b>		<b>Child carers</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
All respondents (Q66c)	100	100	618	100	443	100	275	100	718	100

**Table 29 Time spent talking to children (Q66d)**

<b>Talk to children</b>	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Single parents</b>		<b>Child carers</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Currently employed</b>										
<b>Weekdays arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	23	57.5	251	72.5	189	71.6	85	69.7	274	71.0
Avg. hour per day	1.2		1.2		1.2		1.2		1.2	
By children themselves	17	42.5	93	26.9	73	27.7	37	30.3	110	28.5
By others	0	0.0	2	0.6	2	0.8	0	0.0	2	0.5
<b>Weekend arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	29	72.5	258	74.6	195	73.9	92	75.4	287	74.4
Avg. hour per day	1.5		1.5		1.5		1.5		1.4	
By children themselves	11	27.5	86	24.9	67	25.4	30	24.6	97	25.1
By others	0	0.0	2	0.6	2	0.8	0	0.0	2	0.5
Changes in the amount of time you spend (if applicable)										
Decreased	10	25.0	61	17.6	49	18.6	22	18.0	71	18.4
Increased	1	2.5	7	2.0	7	2.7	1	0.8	8	2.1
No Change	29	72.5	278	80.3	208	78.8	99	81.1	307	79.5
Total	40	100	346	100	264	100	122	100	386	100
<b>Currently not employed</b>										
By the respondent	38	63.3	215	78.5	143	79.4	110	71.4	253	75.7
Avg. hour per day	1.3		1.4		1.4		1.4		1.4	
By the child themselves	22	36.7	58	21.2	36	20.0	44	28.6	80	24.0
By others	0	0.0	1	0.4	1	0.6	0	0.0	1	0.3
<b>Weekend arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	40	66.7	217	79.2	142	78.9	115	74.7	257	76.9
Avg. hour per day	1.5		1.7		1.7		1.7		1.7	
By children themselves	20	33.3	56	20.4	37	20.6	39	25.3	76	22.8
By others	0	0.0	1	0.4	1	0.6	0	0.0	1	0.3

Changes in the amount of time you spend (if applicable)										
Decreased	8	13.3	16	5.8	15	8.3	9	5.8	24	7.2
Increased	3	5.0	9	3.3	10	5.6	2	1.3	12	3.6
No Change	49	81.7	249	90.9	155	86.1	143	92.9	298	89.2
Total	60	100	274	100	180	100	154	100	334	100
All respondents (Q66d)	100	100	620	100	444	100	276	100	720	100

**Table 30 Time spent going out with children (Q66e)**

Go out with children	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Currently employed</b>										
<b>Weekdays arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	5	12.5	76	22.0	61	23.1	20	16.4	81	21.0
Avg. hour per day	1.2		1.4		1.4		1.5		1.2	
By children themselves	32	80.0	250	72.3	188	71.2	94	77.0	282	73.1
By others	3	7.5	20	5.8	15	5.7	8	6.6	23	6.0
<b>Weekend arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	21	52.5	165	47.7	125	47.3	61	50.0	186	48.2
Avg. hour per day	2.4		2.0		2.1		2.1		2.1	
By children themselves	18	45.0	171	49.4	131	49.6	58	47.5	189	49.0
By others	1	2.5	10	2.9	8	3.0	3	2.5	11	2.8
Changes in the amount of time you spend (if applicable)										
Decreased	6	15.0	55	15.9	39	14.8	22	18.0	61	15.8
Increased	0	0.0	7	2.0	7	2.7	0	0.0	7	1.8
No Change	34	85.0	284	82.1	218	82.6	100	82.0	318	82.4
Total	40	100	346	100	264	100	122	100	386	100
<b>Currently not employed</b>										
<b>Weekdays arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	15	25.0	68	24.8	49	27.2	34	22.1	83	24.9
Avg. hour per day	1.9		1.2		1.3		1.4		1.2	
By the child themselves	43	71.7	182	66.4	116	64.4	109	70.8	225	67.4
By others	2	3.3	24	8.8	15	8.3	11	7.1	26	7.8
<b>Weekend arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	27	45.0	132	48.2	86	47.8	73	47.4	159	47.6

Avg. hour per day	2.3		2.0		2.0		2.2		1.9	
By children themselves	32	53.3	123	44.9	83	46.1	72	46.8	155	46.4
By others	1	1.7	19	6.9	11	6.1	9	5.8	20	6.0
Changes in the amount of time you spend (if applicable)										
Decreased	11	18.3	22	8.0	22	12.2	11	7.1	33	9.9
Increased	0	0.0	7	2.6	5	2.8	2	1.3	7	2.1
No Change	49	81.7	245	89.4	153	85.0	141	91.6	294	88.0
Total	60	100	274	100	180	100	154	100	334	100
All respondents (Q66e)	100	100	620	100	444	100	276	100	720	100

**Table 31 Time spent playing with children (Q66f)**

Play with children	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Currently employed</b>										
<b>Weekdays arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	22	55.0	194	56.1	147	55.7	69	56.6	216	56.0
Avg. hour per day	2.0		2.0		2.0		2.0		2.1	
By children themselves	18	45.0	151	43.6	116	43.9	53	43.4	169	43.8
By others	0	0.0	1	0.3	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.3
<b>Weekend arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	29	72.5	216	62.4	162	61.4	83	68.0	245	63.5
Avg. hour per day	2.2		2.2		2.2		2.2		2.1	
By children themselves	11	27.5	129	37.3	101	38.3	39	32.0	140	36.3
By others	0	0.0	1	0.3	1	0.4	0	0.0	1	0.3
Changes in the amount of time you spend (if applicable)										
Decreased	5	12.5	47	13.6	36	13.6	16	13.1	52	13.5
Increased	1	2.5	9	2.6	8	3.0	2	1.6	10	2.6
No Change	34	85.0	290	83.8	220	83.3	104	85.2	324	83.9
Total	40	100	346	100	264	100	122	100	386	100
<b>Currently not employed</b>										
<b>Weekdays arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	28	46.7	177	64.6	115	63.9	90	58.4	205	61.4
Avg. hour per day	2.2		2.2		2.2		2.3		2.0	
By the child themselves	32	53.3	96	35.0	64	35.6	64	41.6	128	38.3

By others	0	0.0	1	0.4	1	0.6	0	0.0	1	0.3
<b>Weekend arrangement</b>										
By the respondent	31	51.7	191	69.7	125	69.4	97	63.0	222	66.5
Avg. hour per day	2.3		2.4		2.4		2.5		2.4	
By children themselves	29	48.3	83	30.3	55	30.6	57	37.0	112	33.5
By others	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Changes in the amount of time you spend (if applicable)										
Decreased	2	3.3	14	5.1	11	6.1	5	3.2	16	4.8
Increased	2	3.3	10	3.6	8	4.4	4	2.6	12	3.6
No Change	56	93.3	250	91.2	161	89.4	145	94.2	306	91.6
Total	60	100	274	100	180	100	154	100	334	100
All respondents (Q66f)	100	100	620	100	444	100	276	100	720	100

**Table 32 Changes in family comparing with the previous year (Q67)**

	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Currently employed</b>										
<b>Time spend together (Q67a)</b>										
Reduced	9	22.5	126	36.4	94	35.6	41	33.6	<b>135</b>	<b>35.0</b>
Increased	3	7.5	35	10.1	30	11.4	8	6.6	<b>38</b>	<b>9.8</b>
No change	28	70.0	185	53.5	140	53.0	73	59.8	<b>213</b>	<b>55.2</b>
<b>Parent-child relationship (Q67b)</b>										
Deteriorated	2	5.0	62	18.0	47	17.9	17	14.0	<b>64</b>	<b>16.7</b>
Improved	4	10.0	56	16.3	52	19.8	8	6.6	<b>60</b>	<b>15.6</b>
No change	34	85.0	226	65.7	164	62.4	96	79.3	<b>260</b>	<b>67.7</b>
<b>Family living (Q67c)</b>										
Not so happy	2	5.0	44	12.8	36	13.7	10	8.3	<b>46</b>	<b>12.0</b>
Happier	3	7.5	55	16.0	46	17.5	12	9.9	<b>58</b>	<b>15.1</b>
No change	35	87.5	245	71.2	181	68.8	99	81.8	<b>280</b>	<b>72.9</b>
<b>Family atmosphere (Q67d)</b>										
Not so happy	2	5.0	46	13.3	38	14.4	10	8.2	<b>48</b>	<b>12.5</b>
Happier	3	7.5	52	15.1	43	16.3	12	9.8	<b>55</b>	<b>14.3</b>
No change	35	87.5	247	71.6	182	69.2	100	82.0	<b>282</b>	<b>73.2</b>
<b>Responded (employed)*</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Currently not employed</b>										
<b>Time spend together (Q67a)</b>										
Reduced	5	8.3	28	10.3	21	11.7	12	7.8	<b>33</b>	<b>9.9</b>

	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Increased	5	8.3	45	16.5	25	13.9	25	16.3	<b>50</b>	<b>15.0</b>
No change	50	83.3	200	73.3	134	74.4	116	75.8	<b>250</b>	<b>75.1</b>
<b>Parent-child relationship (Q67b)</b>										
Deteriorated	9	15.0	19	7.0	17	9.4	11	7.2	<b>28</b>	<b>8.4</b>
Improved	9	15.0	49	17.9	29	16.1	29	19.0	<b>58</b>	<b>17.4</b>
No change	42	70.0	205	75.1	134	74.4	113	73.9	<b>247</b>	<b>74.2</b>
<b>Family living (Q67c)</b>										
Not so happy	8	13.3	27	9.9	20	11.1	15	9.8	<b>35</b>	<b>10.5</b>
Happier	8	13.3	47	17.2	33	18.3	22	14.4	<b>55</b>	<b>16.5</b>
No change	44	73.3	199	72.9	127	70.6	116	75.8	<b>243</b>	<b>73.0</b>
<b>Family atmosphere (Q67d)</b>										
Not so happy	7	11.7	23	8.4	18	10.0	12	7.8	<b>30</b>	<b>9.0</b>
Happier	8	13.3	46	16.8	33	18.3	21	13.7	<b>54</b>	<b>16.2</b>
No change	45	75.0	204	74.7	129	71.7	120	78.4	<b>249</b>	<b>74.8</b>
<b>Responded (not employed)</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>100</b>

\* There were 1 to 2 missing cases for Q67a to Q67d among the currently employed respondents. The total number of respondents in each of these items might not be added up to 386.

**Table 33 Overall relationships with children (Q68)**

Overall relationship (Q68)	Male		Female		Single parents		Child carers		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Currently employed</b>										
Very good	2	5.0	53	15.4	40	15.2	15	12.3	55	14.3
Good	33	82.5	262	75.9	198	75.3	97	79.5	295	76.6
Bad	5	12.5	27	7.8	23	8.7	9	7.4	32	8.3
Very bad	0	0.0	3	0.9	2	0.8	1	0.8	3	0.8
Responded (employed)	40	100	345	100	263	100	122	100	385	100
<b>Currently not employed</b>										
Very good	11	18.3	61	22.4	44	24.3	28	18.5	72	21.7
Good	45	75.0	185	68.0	115	63.5	115	76.2	230	69.3
Bad	4	6.7	26	9.6	22	12.2	8	5.3	30	9.0
Very bad	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Responded (not employed)	60	100	272	100	181	100	151	100	332	100
<b>Total responded (Q68)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>617</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 34 Background of children (Q1 to Q3)**

	Employed					Not employed					All
	SP		Carers		All	SP		Carers		All	
	No.	%	No.	%	%	No.	%	No.	%	%	
<b>Gender (Q1)</b>											
Male	136	55.1	56	49.1	53.2	75	44.4	74	52.9	48.2	50.9
Female	111	44.9	58	50.9	46.8	94	55.6	66	47.1	51.8	49.1
Total (Q1)	247	100	114	100	100	169	100	140	100	100	100
<b>Age of youngest child (Q2)</b>											
12-14	58	23.5	28	24.6	23.8	44	26.0	43	30.7	28.2	25.8
15 or above	189	76.5	86	75.4	76.2	125	74.0	97	69.3	71.8	74.2
Total (Q2)	247	100	114	100	100	169	100	140	100	100	100
<b>Reside in HK since birth (if Q2 &gt; Q3)</b>											
Yes	116	68.6	85	60.7	65.0	192	77.7	73	64.0	73.4	69.6
No	53	31.4	55	39.3	35.0	55	22.3	41	36.0	26.6	30.4
<b>No. of Years in HK</b>											
≥7 yrs	153	90.5	133	95.0	92.6	237	96.0	111	97.4	96.4	94.6
< 7 yrs	14	8.3	7	5.0	6.8	10	4.0	3	2.6	3.6	5.1
Refused	2	1.2	0	0.0	0.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.3
<b>Total (Q3)</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 35 Overall relationships with your carer (Q8, Q11)**

Relationship	Employed					Not employed					All
	SP		Carers		All	SP		Carers		All	
	No.	%	No.	%	%	No.	%	No.	%	%	
<b>Father alone as the major carer</b>											
Very good	1	5.9	2	9.1	7.7	4	21.1	6	15.8	17.5	13.5
Good	14	82.4	20	90.9	87.2	14	73.7	29	76.3	75.4	80.2
Bad	2	11.8	0	0.0	5.1	1	5.3	3	7.9	7.0	6.3
Very bad	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total (Q8)	17	100	22	100	100	19	100	38	100	100	100
<b>Mother alone as the major carer</b>											
Very good	38	17.6	15	14.2	16.5	31	23.0	23	19.5	21.3	18.6
Good	169	78.2	90	84.9	80.4	93	68.9	91	77.1	72.7	77.0
Bad	9	4.2	1	0.9	3.1	10	7.4	4	3.4	5.5	4.2

Relationship	Employed					Not employed					All
	SP		Carers		All	SP		Carers		All	
	No.	%	No.	%		No.	%	No.	%		
Very bad	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	0.4	0.2
Total (Q11)	216	100	106	100	100	135	100	118	100	100	100
<b>Total (Q8 &amp; Q11)</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

\* Total number of children who are either mainly taken care by their father or mother alone

**Table 36 Benefits of having additional income (parents work for 1 year or less) (Q17)**

5 major benefits mentioned (Q17)	Single parents		Carers		All	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Improve quality of life	27	39.7	16	55.2	<b>43</b>	<b>44.3</b>
To be independent, take care of myself	9	13.2	5	17.2	<b>14</b>	<b>14.4</b>
Improve psychological well-being	4	5.9	2	6.9	<b>6</b>	<b>6.2</b>
Improve self-confidence	3	4.4	3	10.3	<b>6</b>	<b>6.2</b>
Closer parent-child relationship	5	7.4	0	0.0	<b>5</b>	<b>5.2</b>
No benefit at all	29	42.6	10	34.5	<b>39</b>	<b>40.2</b>
<i>Total no. of respondents (Q17)</i>	<b>68</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>100.0</b>

**Table 37 Scores of Perceived level of performance, PSD-SEI and Self-Esteem (Q21-23)**

	Children of						
	Single Parent		Child Carers		All Respondents		All ND Participants in Previous Study
	Mean	SD <sup>a</sup>	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean
Perceived Performance <sup>b</sup>	28.03	4.05	27.74	3.97	27.92	4.02	27.4
PSD-SEI	84.28	11.46	83.37	11.8	83.93	11.59	88.4
Self-Esteem	28.36	2.59	28.76	2.52	28.51	2.57	28.7

<sup>a</sup> SD represents Standard Deviation. <sup>b</sup> A higher score represents a better perceived level of performance, higher self-efficacy and higher self-esteem.

**Table 38 Employment situations**

	Population	Working population	% of working population	People work in the district <sup>1</sup>	Jobs per each working person
<b>District Councils</b>					
Central & Western	250064	137128	54.8%	330860	2.41
Wan Chai	155196	86167	55.5%	257033	2.98
Eastern	587690	300293	51.1%	206812	0.69
Southern	275162	140096	50.9%	72884	0.52
Sham Shui Po	365540	166505	45.6%	173613	1.04
Kowloon City	362501	181370	50.0%	139488	0.77
Wong Tai Sin	423521	193263	45.6%	71099	0.37
Kwun Tong	587423	269500	45.9%	252724	0.94
Yau Tsim Mong	280548	144132	51.4%	362899	2.52
<b>New Towns</b>					
Tseung Kwan O	344872	181993	52.8%	44962	0.25
Tsuen Wan	277639	140337	50.5%	118187	0.84
Tuen Mun	500803	244179	48.8%	100169	0.41
Yuen Long	138711	69349	50.0%	49896	0.72
Tin Shui Wai*	268922	117407	43.7%	22897	0.20
Fanling/Sheung Shui*	235202	113397	48.2%	51230	0.45
Tai Po	265982	132194	49.7%	63579	0.48
Sha Tin	424658	212756	50.1%	133185	0.63
Ma On Shan*	187625	98550	52.5%	17773	0.18
Kwai Chung*	323948	141633	43.7%	168693	1.19
Tsing Yi*	199362	100249	50.3%	29425	0.29
North Lantau*.#	72183	33075	45.8%	9849	0.30

\* The figure about the number of working people does not exactly correspond to those working in the new town area in the By-census data. For example, the figure for Fanling/Sheung Shui New Town came from North (Fanling/ Sheung Shui), which might include the rural areas. However, since most working people worked in the New Town area,

<sup>1</sup> The place of work of a person refers to the district where the work place of a person is located and where the person concerned usually stayed or went during the seven days before the By-census for business matters. For a person who has more than one job during the reference period, the place of work refers to that of his main employment. For a person who changes his work place day to day (e.g. construction site worker) or has many work places (e.g. doctor working in both hospital and clinic, mobile hawker), the work place is here the person worked for the longest hours in the reference period. For a person who has no fixed place of work (e.g. salesman, driver) but needed to report duty every day, the location of the office or depot is the work place.

the figure should only be slightly larger than those actually working there.

# The figure of the working people in North Lantau came from Island (North Lantau), which probably covered the airport.