

# HK Social Development Index 2012

Press Conference

7 March 2012



香港公益金  
THE COMMUNITY CHEST

鳴謝：香港公益金資助「香港社會發展指數」

# Outline of Presentation


- 1) Introduction to Social Development Index, SDI
- 2) Report on SDI and its Sub-Indexes, with major observations
- 3) Prediction and Recommendations

# Introduction to SDI

- A system of objective indicators including :
  - 14 domains of development
  - 5 population groups
- Tracking local social development and overall assessment of social and economic needs
- Indexes serve as warning signals, drawing the public attention to specific patterns of development of various domains and groups
- This release is called SDI 2012, using data for 2010 to describe the social development of Hong Kong in 2010


Report on SDI and its Sub-  
Indexes  
and  
Major Observations

# Standardized Weighted Social Development Index Scores






# Overview of Social Development Sub-indexes



# Social Development Trends by Sub-index




	Family Solidarity	Health	Personal Safety	Economic	Environmental Quality	Crime and Public Safety	Arts and Entertainment	Sports and Recreation	Political Participation	Strength of Civil Society	Housing	Education	Internationalization	Science and Technology
2000 (SDI 2002)	-81	45	54	20	45	14	60	24	28	52	79	209	144	144
2002 (SDI 2004)	-158	51	47	50	30	-15	48	60	28	76	120	255	160	138
2004 (SDI 2006)	-215	-33	42	45	39	52	65	70	89	107	118	287	204	252
2006 (SDI 2008)	-535	32	15	30	46	116	29	110	89	139	97	296	205	320
2008 (SDI 2010)	-906	61	78	64	58	87	31	95	60	193	86	357	224	280
2010 (SDI 2012)	-309	67	152	109	110	63	46	111	60	252	-5	383	242	372

# Trends of Sub-indexes

- ❑ Economic subindex has increased, and our foreign reserve grown remarkably
- ❑ Housing subindex has decreased further to a negative level
- ❑ Family Solidarity subindex has improved but remained at the negative level
- ❑ Crime and Public Safety subindex has decreased. The major reason is the number of cases of conviction due to corruption increased from 2.75 per 100,000 population in 2008 to 3.32 in 2010
- ❑ Science and Technology subindex has gone up again. Scientific publication and the no. of patents granted have both increased
- ❑ Significant increase in the Strength of Civil Society Sub-index is recorded because the number of persons participating in unions has increased.
- ❑ Due to big drop in the number of fatal cases of food poisoning, personal safety sub-index has increased.



# SDI - Economic Sub-index



□ About 70% increase in Economic Sub-index.

# SDI - Economic Sub-index


	Raw data					
Economic sub-index	2000	2002	2004	2006	2008	2010
Per capita GDP (+)	175,320	177,331	196,976	223,309	238,856	245,536
Gross international reserves (months of import coverage) (+)	18.0	22.6	21.1	18.6	22.0	28.7
% of total household income earned by the bottom 50% of households (+)	18.6	18.1	18.0	17.7	17.5	16.8

- ❑ Both reserve and GDP per capita are on the rise.
- ❑ The share of the bottom 50% of households of total income dropped further.

# Stock of Foreign Currency Reserve



# SDI - Housing Sub-index



□ Significant regression is recorded in Housing Subindex.  
It has dropped by 106% since 2008.

# SDI - Housing Sub-index


	Raw data					
Housing sub-index	2000	2002	2004	2006	2008	2010
No. of waiting list applicants for Housing Authority rental flats (-)	109,600	91,600	92,600	106,600	111,300	145,000
% of expenditure on housing as share of total household expenditure (-)	32.2	32.2	32.2	30.6	30.6	32.8

❑ The drop is due to increase in no. of waiting list applicants for PRH rental flats, which was 145,000 in 2010.

❑ Expenditure on housing as share of total household expenditure has also gradually increased to 32.8%.



# Waiting list of Public Rental Housing




# Newly registered Non-elderly One-person Applicants

Age Group	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Aged below 30	3,600 (33%)	2,800 (34%)	4,200 (36%)	7,000 (44%)	11,000 (56%)
Aged 30 or above	7,400 (67%)	5,500 (66%)	7,600 (64%)	9,000 (56%)	8,500 (44%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>11,000 (100%)</b>	<b>8,300 (100%)</b>	<b>11,800 (100%)</b>	<b>16,000 (100%)</b>	<b>19,500 (100%)</b>
<b>Average age</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>32</b>

Source: Housing Authority, 2011

- ❑ New applicants of single non-elderly for public housing increased by 77.3% in 5 years.
- ❑ The share of cases by aged below 30 rose continuously.

# SDI - Family Solidarity Sub-index



□ Family solidarity sub-index has improved, though it remains at the negative.

# SDI - Family Solidarity Sub-index

	Raw data					
Family Solidarity sub-index	2000	2002	2004	2006	2008	2010
Marriages per 100,000 people aged 15+ (+)	552	562	714	849	778	845
Divorces as % of marriages (-)	43.4	40.6	37.8	34.7	37.6	34.6
Reported domestic violence cases per 100,000 households (-)	52.6	79.2	105.7	211.9	319.6	143.0

□ Increase in marriage, decrease in divorce as % of marriage and cases of domestic violence result in improvement in the Sub-index.

□ It should be cautioned that the no. of domestic violence decreased due<sub>17</sub> to a narrowing of definition adopted by the Police since 2009.

# Marriage, Divorce and Remarriage

		2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Number of marriages registered		50,328	47,453	47,331	51,175	52,558	57,900#
Number of people having first marriage		78,006	74,597	75,067	80,795	82,105	-
Median age at first marriage	Male	31.2	31.2	31.1	31.0	31.2	31.1#
	Female	28.2	28.3	28.4	28.5	28.7	28.8#
Number of divorce decrees		17,424	18,403	17,771	17,002	18,167	-

Source: Annual Digest 2011 & Website of Census and Statistics Department 2012

#Provisional figures

□ No. of marriage in 2011 increased by 22.3% compared with 2008, though increase in divorce decrees in 2010 by 6.8%.

□ In 2010, the no. of remarried persons was 23,011 representing a 17.4% increase compared with 2008.




# Percentage of children born outside of marriage




Source: Census and Statistics  
Department, 2011

# Number of Domestic Violence Cases



Source: Police Force, 2011

# Trend of Social Development of Population Groups, 2000–2010




	Children	Youth	Low income	Women	Elderly
■ 2000 (SDI2002)	-92	-63	-79	166	110
■ 2002 (SDI2004)	-124	-80	-139	230	198
■ 2004 (SDI2006)	-160	-55	-101	287	264
■ 2006 (SDI2008)	-249	-20	-52	338	361
■ 2008 (SDI2010)	-294	22	-2	365	417
■ 2010 (SDI2012)	-324	12	-30	385	510

# Trends of Social Groups

- ❑ Further drop in Child Status Sub-index is recorded. It has reached its historical low.
- ❑ Youth Status Subindex is positive but a slight drop is recorded compared to the previous release.
- ❑ Low Income Status Subindex is negative and a drop is recorded compared with the previous release.
- ❑ Women Status Subindex has been increasing, though the labour force of married women has dropped slightly.
- ❑ The growth of Elderly Status Subindex is kept though the no. of single elderly is on a constant rise.

# SDI – Child status sub-index



■ Child Status Sub-index dropped consecutively and recorded negative growth in past six releases from 2000 to 2010.




# SDI – Child status sub-index

Child status sun-index	Raw data					
	2000	2002	2004	2006	2008	2010
% of children aged 0-14 in low-income households (-)	26.0	27.2	25.8	25.8	25.3	23.9
% of children living in single-parent households (-)	5.5	6.6	7.3	8.1	8.7	9.1
Under-five child mortality per 100,000 (-)	71.9	61.6	62.4	72.3	77.5	80.6
Children (aged 2-6) enrolled in kindergarten or childcare centers per 100,000 (+)	60,381	62,904	67,271	57,722	58,087	60,512
Child abuse cases per 100,000 population aged 0-17 (-)	36.2	39.8	49.9	67.3	77.3	90.7
& of children fully immunized against diphtheria, tetanus and whooping cough (+)	89.5	86.4	79.8	95	95	95
No. of children aged 10-15 arrested per 100,000 (-)	1,164.5	991.3	971.1	907.8	882.9	830.9


□ There are significant increases in under-five child mortality, percentage of children living in single-parent households and child abuse cases.

# Number of Child Abuse Cases



Source: Social Welfare Department, 2011

# SDI – Low income Status Sub-index




□ Further negative growth is recorded for low income status sub-index.

# SDI – Low income Status Sub-index

Low income sub-index	Raw data					
	2000	2002	2004	2006	2008	2010
No. of people in low-income domestic households per 100,000 population (-)	18,388	19,239	18,611	18,498	18,061	17,324
% of household expenditure on housing and food for the low-income households (-)	58.9	58.9	58.9	60.5	60.5	62.0
Unemployment rate in low-income households (-)	20.8	30.0	29.1	22.1	17.5	20.7
Real Wage Index of wage workers (+)	112.8	117.8	115.5	115.9	123.4	121.7
Homeless people per 100,000 population (-)	18.9	11.6	6.6	5.3	5.4	5.6

□ Low income people experienced further deterioration in basic living, compared to year 2008, in terms of expenditure on housing and food, employment, and housing condition.

# Median monthly domestic household rent (HK\$)



Source: 2011 Population Census, Census and Statistics Department



# Observations

■ Despite two economic downturns in the past decade, our economy has grown significantly.

■ Yet, in terms of areas related to people's livelihood, our social development does not progress as well.

What's worse, regression is recorded in some areas.

■ As the waiting list for Public Rental housing gets longer and the expenditure on housing increases, Housing Subindex has, for the first time in the past decade, dropped to the negative level.

■ Family Solidarity and Child Status Sub-indexes are always at the negative level. The status of low income has also got worse.

# Observations

■ The government has a substantial amount of foreign reserve, but has never adequately invested in social development, thereby sharing the fruits of economic growth with the people. After 10 years, we have witnessed:

- Poverty rate remains at a high level
- No. of domestic violence cases has increased by two times
- Property price and rent rocket. The middle-class finds it hard to buy a flat while the housing conditions of the grassroots worsens though the expenditure on it keeps increasing
- Under aged 5 mortality keeps increasing and the no. of child abuse cases reaches its historical high

■ The alarm has been on for some time. The social problems have not been adequately responded to due to the following problems of governance:

- Lack of social policies ( family-focused policies in specific )
- Lack of social planning and development goals ( Population, service. and welfare )

# Future Development

■ Worried that the situation will get worse in the next release if the government still fails to find appropriate solutions :

- Housing Subindex will drop further, as the waiting list is still getting longer and the rent is still on the rise
- Gap between the rich and the poor is getting wider and the status of low income people may not improve
- The rise in Family Solidarity Sub-index observed this time due to change in definition may not last as we see more and more single-parent families, cross-border families etc. Family functions can't be preserved and the Child Status Sub-index will drop further.
- As the livelihood of people goes down, public negative sentiments accumulate. If the government fails to infuse new hopes into the public by making social policies, setting development goals and planning for the future, social discontents, exclusion, or even social hatred will fuel more social conflicts that further challenge its governance, endangering the social development of Hong Kong



# Recommendations

■ The new government has to re-think its overall social development targets & reaffirm the following ideas as the bases of its governance:

- Social investment: Develop “social capital,” enhance “human capital”
- Social cohesion: foster mutual respect and understanding among groups and prevent the disadvantaged from being marginalized
- Social protection: Render care and protection to the socially disadvantaged

■ Set up a high-level Committee on Social and Economic Development to craft out long-term strategy to balance social and economic development

■ Request the government to:

- Set long-term social welfare policy and timetable to shorten the waiting lists for various kinds of services and to set maximum service waiting time.
- Working with NGOs to start social welfare planning, allowing civil society to participate in planning and policy making, thereby affirming the partnership between NGO and the government in welfare development

# Recommendations

■ Housing the grassroots is important, particularly those of the low income.

The government should set up a long-term housing strategy and policy:

- Build more public rental housing flats (particularly in urban area), build Home-ownership Scheme housing flats, and review the role of the public sector in housing supply.
- Provide rental allowance for those on the public rental housing waiting list for 3 years
- Review the point-system of allocation for the single non-elderly applicants

■ Narrowing the gap between the rich and the poor, helping the latter employed and increase their income:

- Review taxation policy, increase its progressive element and redistributive effect so as to narrow the gap and reduce social conflicts resulting from income gap
- Formally set up low-income household subsidy system
- Implement Universal Retirement Protection System so as to tackle the problem of poverty among the elderly



# Recommendations

## ■ Set up policies which are family-focused to support the child-caring functions of the family:

- Strengthen support to parents, and release the pressure of child care on the parents, thereby reduce the risk of child abuse. Measures include: social work service made available to kindergarten, add community outreach service to reach out to the needy parents in the community
- Develop divorce adaptation education and counselling. Develop community network approach to support families experiencing separation and foster positive interaction among members.
- Set up standard working hours so as to foster family and parental communications and relationship.

## ■ Implement Family Impact Assessment

- Empower the Family Council, giving it the power to conduct Family Impact Assessment to assess public policies