

**CENTRAL POLICY UNIT**  
**THE GOVERNMENT OF THE HONG KONG**  
**SPECIAL ADMINISTRATIVE REGION**

**A STUDY ON HONG KONG YOUTH'S**  
**PERCEPTIONS OF THE MAINLAND**

**THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG**

**FEBRUARY 2016**

# **A Study on Hong Kong Youth's Perceptions of the Mainland**

## **Final Report**

**Submitted by**

**Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies  
The Chinese University of Hong Kong**

**February 2016**

## **Table of Contents**

Executive Summaries in English	i
Executive Summaries in Chinese	xiv
Chapter 1            Introduction	1
Chapter 2            Literature Review and Official Statistics	9
Chapter 3            Findings of the Telephone Survey	23
Chapter 4            Findings of the Focus Group Discussions	65
Chapter 5            Summary and Discussion	89
Bibliography	103
Appendices	105

## **A Study on Hong Kong Youth's Perceptions of the Mainland Executive Summary**

### **1. Background of the Study**

- Reports have shown a decline in national identification with China and insufficient knowledge of Mainland affairs among the youth population in Hong Kong. Today's young people have lower levels of optimism concerning China's impact on Hong Kong and higher levels of hostility towards any form of integration with the Mainland.
- Hong Kong youth's negative attitudes towards the Mainland contrast with the call of the Chief Executive, both in the Policy Address and on other occasions, for Hong Kong's young people to capitalize on the opportunities created by the growing Chinese economy.
- Using systematic research, this study aims to examine the Hong Kong youth generation's sentiments regarding Mainland society and how their perceptions and experiences of studying and working in the Mainland affect their incentives to go to the Mainland for personal development.
- Based on the study findings, policy recommendations on how to encourage Hong Kong's youth to study and/ or work in the Mainland are made.

### **2. Methodology**

- A territory-wide representative telephone survey was conducted between May 11 and June 23, 2015. A total of 1,005 respondents aged 15 to 35 were successfully interviewed, with a response rate of 45.8% and a cooperation rate of 79.5%.
- Six focus group discussions of 67 participants aged 15 to 35 were held in August and September of 2015. Within these six groups, two clusters of respondents were formed: (1) one with experience studying and/ or working in the Mainland and (2) one without such experience. In each cluster, there were three groups of respondents with different current education and working backgrounds: (1) students of secondary schools; (2)

students of tertiary institutions; and (3) fresh graduates (graduated within the past year, either working or seeking jobs), junior employees (three years or fewer of working experience) and young, mid-level employees (more than three years of working experience).

### **3. Statistical Facts on Hong Kong Youth's Participation in Mainland Exchange and Internship Programs and Mainland Study**

- Beginning in 2014/15, first, 3,249 Hong Kong students were enrolled, of whom 1,535 were admitted through the Scheme for the Admission of Hong Kong Students to Mainland Higher Education Institutions. Second, 152 and 111 eligible students obtained full-rate and half-rate subsidies, respectively, via the Mainland University Study Subsidy Scheme.
- Furthermore, the Funding Scheme for Youth Exchange in the Mainland sponsored approximately 11,000 Hong Kong youth to join exchange tours to the Mainland, and the Funding Scheme for Youth Internships in the Mainland sponsored approximately 1,700 Hong Kong youth to participate in Mainland internship programs.
- Figures from the Education Bureau reveal that the 2014/15 participation rates for post-secondary, secondary, and primary students in Mainland Exchange Programs were 1.2%, 9.4%, and 6.4%, respectively.
- Among the students of the eight UGC-funded higher education institutions participating in the internship programs, in 2014/15, 13.2% went to the Mainland, while 79.5% and 7.4% undertook internship programs in Hong Kong and other destinations, respectively.

### **4. Telephone Survey on Hong Kong Youth's Perceptions of the Mainland and Their Willingness To Study and/ or Work in the Mainland**

#### **4.1 Socio-demographic Characteristics**

- The 1,005 respondents were equally split between males (49.2%) and females (50.8%).
- In terms of age, 20.5% of the respondents were 15 to 19 years old, 23.5%

were between 20 and 24, a quarter (24.6%) were between 25 and 29, and 31.5% were between 30 and 35.

- A majority of our respondents (80.5%) were born in Hong Kong, 17.5% were born in the Mainland, and 2.0% were born somewhere else.
- Our respondents were well-educated. Over half (53.5%) were degree holders, and 14.3% received non-degree tertiary education. Another 29.1% reported upper secondary as the highest level of education attained at the time of the survey.
- While three-fifths of the respondents (61.9%) were currently working, 30.6% were students. Additionally, 3.8% were unemployed, and 3.7% were either home-makers or economically inactive.
- Of the 1,005 respondents, only 5% perceived their families as being in the upper-middle or upper social strata, 14.1% reported being in the lower social stratum, 44.8% subjectively identified with the lower-middle stratum, and over one-third (35.2%) reported being in the middle social stratum.
- Our young respondents had a strong sense of identification with Hong Kong, with 44.4% identifying themselves as “Hongkongers.” Only 39.1% said that they being Hongkongers, but also Chinese. Only 4.2% reported themselves as being Chinese, and 10.8% identified as Chinese, but also Hongkongers.
- In terms of political orientation, while two-fifths of the survey respondents (42.3%) were pan-democrats, only 5.3% were pro-establishment. Furthermore, 36.4% reported being neutral or in-between the two political positions, and 12.0% had no political orientation.

#### 4.2 Socio-political Perceptions of the Mainland

- Generally, respondents were optimistic about the economic prospects of Mainland society, but less optimistic about its political development. Two-thirds of our respondents (66.5%) agreed with the view that “the Mainland economy will maintain its rapid development” (with 8.2% and

58.3% stating that they “strongly agree” and “agree,” respectively), and 30.6% disagreed (with 3.5% and 27.1% stating that they “strongly disagree” and “disagree,” respectively).

- By contrast, only one-third of the respondents (32.8%) felt optimistic about the political development of the Mainland (with 2.0% being very optimistic and 30.8% being optimistic), while 64.5% were either “not optimistic” (44.8%) or “not optimistic at all” (19.7%). In total, while nearly half the respondents rated the quality of life in the Mainland as “very good” (2.6%) or “good” (44.5%), 42.9% noted that it was “bad,” and 6.4% said that it was “very bad.”
- In order to examine our respondents’ overall perceptions of the Mainland, we constructed a composite measure based on the youth’s assessments of the economic, social, and political situations within the three contexts presented above. Overall, the respondents had negative perceptions of the Mainland, resulting in a negative composite rating (4.80 out of adjusted mean score of 0 to 10).
- In terms of group differences, compared with their counterparts, females, the youngest and oldest respondents, respondents not born in Hong Kong, non-degree holders, respondents who were economically inactive, respondents from lower social classes, respondents who identified more with their Chinese backgrounds, and pro-establishment respondents perceived the Mainland society in a more positive light. Except in relation to subjective social strata, all socio-demographic profiles indicated significant statistical differences.

#### 4.3 Attitudes Towards Government Policies on Hong Kong-Mainland Relations

- Concerning their attitudes towards the implementation of “One Country, Two Systems,” while 27.1% of the 1,005 respondents wanted to strengthen ties between the two places, a majority (70.7%) preferred to keep their distance from the Mainland.
- Only 29.1% of the respondents perceived Individual Visit Scheme (IVS) visitors as beneficial to Hong Kong. By contrast, 57.1% saw these visitors

as being detrimental, and a handful (11.1%) were neutral about the impacts of IVS visitors.

- Although one-fifth of our respondents (20.1%) did not perceive any impacts of more Mainlanders studying and working in Hong Kong on the overall development of Hong Kong, around half saw Mainlanders as causing bad (36.2%) and very bad effects (13.2%). Only one-quarter perceived the influx of Mainlanders as beneficial to local society (with 1.7% and 25.8% noting very good and good impacts, respectively).
- Survey respondents felt more negative about the impact of Mainlanders studying and working in Hong Kong on their related opportunities. While over half of the respondents perceived this phenomenon as having bad (35.5%) and very bad (17.4%) impacts, less than a quarter reported the situation having good (21.2%) or very good (2.2%) impacts on their education and employment opportunities.
- Out of a composite score of four item ratings, respondents returned an adjusted average score of 3.76, indicating that our respondents, on average, tended to view government policies on the relationship between the two places in a less than favorable light.
- Statistical test results revealed that respondents born outside Hong Kong, who had secondary or lower levels of education, who identified more as Chinese, and who were pro-establishment had significantly positive attitudes towards policies implemented by the government in terms of the relationship between the Mainland and Hong Kong.

#### 4.4 Perceptions of China Opportunities

- Hong Kong youth generally had quite positive feelings about their counterparts engaging in different types of China opportunities, with over half of them reporting favorable views on internships (70.8%), exchange tours (67.8%), and employments (56.9%). However, respondents showed less support for Hong Kong youth pursuing academic study (39.4%) in the Mainland.
- The adjusted mean of the China opportunities rating was 5.34, indicating



that, overall, the respondents viewed China opportunities positively.

- Those born outside Hong Kong, those who were unemployed, those who were economically inactive (including students, home-makers, etc.), those from lower social strata, those who identified more as Chinese, and those who were pro-establishment had significantly more favorable views towards Hong Kong youth pursuing personal development in the Mainland.
- More respondents perceived higher levels of difficulty in getting suitable jobs (72.1%), securing internships (66.9%), and pursuing academic study (55.4%) across the border.
- In terms of group differences in the perceived levels of difficulty in securing China opportunities, the youngest respondents (aged 15 to 19) perceived the highest level of difficulty in pursuing academic study and participating in internship programs in the Mainland. Second, less educated respondents were less confident in going to the Mainland for personal development. Those from lower social strata also anticipated more difficulties in finding employment across the border.

#### 4.5 Views on Government Measures Encouraging Hong Kong Youth to Pursue Personal Development in the Mainland

- Concerning the arrangement of allowing local youth to use their HKDSE results to apply for study programs within Mainland higher education institutions, two-thirds of the 1,005 respondents rated the initiative “very useful” (14.5%) or “useful” (54.1%).
- A total of 63.8% of the respondents thought the maximum of HK\$15,000 granted by the Mainland University Study Subsidy Scheme was “very useful” (10.5%) or “useful” (53.2%) in encouraging Hong Kong youth to pursue personal development in the Mainland.
- A similar proportion of our young respondents viewed the government subsidies for Mainland exchange tours and internship programs as “very useful” (9.2%) or “useful” (55.9%).

- Contrary to the impression held by the government, Hong Kong youth found government measures supporting youth in pursuing personal development in the Mainland to be quite effective (5.70 out of an adjusted mean score of 0 to 10).
- A comparison of the groups revealed that the youngest respondents (aged 15 to 19), those who were born outside of Hong Kong, students, youth with some degree of Chinese identification, and pro-establishment respondents found related government measures significantly more useful in encouraging Hong Kong youth to study and work in the Mainland.

#### 4.6 Experiences of Studying and Working in the Mainland

- Only a minority of respondents had ever taken up employment (9.0%), pursued post-secondary education (3.8%), or become interns (6.9%) in the Mainland. Nonetheless, more than one-third of our young generation respondents (36.5%) had gone on at least one exchange tour to Mainland China.
- No systematic results on socio-demographic differences in “China experiences” were found.

#### 4.7 Intentions to Study and Work in the Mainland

- Compared to the level of support for their younger counterparts pursuing personal development in the Mainland, our respondents showed a lower degree of willingness to study and work across the border themselves. While 55.8% were willing to participate in Mainland internship programs, the corresponding figures for job seeking and academic study were 37.4% and 29.3%.
- The results of the statistical models show that respondents who were male, who had higher ratings for Mainland China, who had more favorable perceptions of China opportunities and who perceived lower levels of difficulty in getting a suitable job across the border were significantly more likely to be willing to work in the Mainland. However, neither previous study nor work experience in Mainland China had any significant effect on the respondents’ willingness to work across the border.

- Taking the other variables into account, positive ratings of China opportunities increased one's likelihood of intending to study in Mainland China. Compared with Hongkongers, respondents who identified as Chinese or as Chinese but also Hongkongers were more willing to pursue academic study across the border. These results were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Neither previous experience nor previous exchange tours on the Mainland had any impact on this variable.
- Favorable views of China opportunities were also related to greater willingness to take up internships across the border. After controlling for other variables, compared to respondents who identified solely as Hongkongers, respondents who identified as Hongkongers, but also Chinese, were significantly more likely to be willing to intern in the Mainland. It is critical to note that previous exchange tour or academic study experiences in the Mainland had no significant effect on respondents' intentions to participate in internship programs.

## **5. Focus Group Discussion of Hong Kong Youth's Perceptions of the Mainland and Willingness to Study and/ or Work in the Mainland**

### **5.1 Mainland Experiences**

- The research design of the focus group discussion divided our respondents into two clusters: those with and those without China experiences (including exchange tours, academic pursuits at the tertiary education level, internship programs, and employment in the Mainland). However, all participants, including those in the "without" cluster, had previously travelled to the Mainland for sightseeing and/ or visiting relatives.
- Focus groups were also formed according to the participants' life stages: secondary students, tertiary students, and working youth. Accordingly, in the "China experience" cluster, while the related experiences of secondary students were limited to exchange tours, those of working youth were more diverse, including exchange tours, internship programs, salaried employment, and business operations. The China experiences of tertiary students mainly included exchange tours and internship programs. None of our focus group respondents attended academic programs in Mainland higher education institutions.

- Generally, those who had participated in Mainland exchange tours recalled experiences of fun and joy. While secondary students emphasized the social nature of the tours, tertiary students and working youth said that exchange tours brought them more knowledge and a deeper understanding of Mainland society and Mainlanders.
- A few respondents participated in internship programs. With one exception, all found the experiences useless and non-applicable to practices adopted in Hong Kong. However, they did find the internship programs valuable in terms of polishing their CVs.

## 5.2 Perceptions of the Mainland

- The youth respondents in our focus groups had generally negative views of the Mainland. Pollution, corruption, lack of freedom, incomprehensive welfare and healthcare systems, the “rule of man,” low wages, poor food safety, and uncivilized people were frequently mentioned drawbacks.
- Compared to those who did not join exchange tours or participate in internship programs, participants with experiences in the Mainland had less negative attitudes towards Mainlanders and Mainland society. This latter group showed more sympathy for and more balanced views of Mainland society.
- Comparatively, participants in the “without China experiences” cluster were less willing to acquire greater knowledge and/ or understanding of the Mainland. They felt that their existing understandings and perceptions of Mainland society would not differ from any first-hand observations gained through working and/ or studying in Mainland China.

## 5.3 Intentions to Study and Work in the Mainland

- In terms of academic pursuits in the Mainland, regardless of their previous Mainland experiences, most respondents reported rejection. A lack of recognition of academic qualifications obtained in the Mainland was cited as the main reason.
- Secondary and tertiary students pointed out that, due to the differences in

language and professional practices, knowledge obtained in Mainland academic programs was irrelevant and not applicable to their study or their work in Hong Kong.

- A few secondary students were willing to pursue university study in the Mainland only if they were not offered a place in local universities. In other words, these students saw a Mainland degree as a second-rate option.
- Since participants with Mainland experience had less unfavorable perceptions of the Mainland, they were more open-minded in considering whether to pursue career development in the Mainland. Instead of highlighting the gaps and incompatibilities between “them” (the Mainland) and “us” (Hong Kong), respondents with “China experiences” viewed the Hong Kong-Mainland differences as business opportunities and potential markets that Hong Kong people could exploit.
- It should be noted that, to a large extent, those willing to develop their careers in the Mainland adopted instrumental approaches towards the relevant China opportunities and explicitly denied the possibility of living in the Mainland. Reasons deterring respondents from taking up employment across the border included: (1) Poor quality of life in the Mainland (in terms of food safety, air quality, law and order, and health care systems), (2) low Mainland employment prestige and wages, (3) a lack of knowledge of the Mainland labor market, and (4) the significant distance from home.

#### 5.4 Views of China opportunities

- Although the presence of China opportunities was fully acknowledged, many respondents believed that these China opportunities were not available to everyone in Hong Kong. In addition to being aware of the increasing popularity of Mainland returnees (“haigui”) among Mainland employers, our respondents witnessed the loss of a comparative advantage among young professionals and university graduates from Hong Kong in the Mainland labor market.
- Focus group participants repeatedly mentioned that the availability of China opportunities was restricted to certain industry sectors and fields of

study. These opportunities were more related to entrepreneurship and to financing and trading sectors.

- Without denying the presence of China opportunities, respondents with no exchange tour or internship program experiences were more skeptical, regarding these opportunities as illegitimate and unethical.

## 6. Policy Recommendations for Facilitating Hong Kong Youth to Study and/ or Work in the Mainland

- Internships should be more than CV items. In particular, **high-quality and relevant internship opportunities should be ensured** in order to motivate Hong Kong youth to go north. Hong Kong internship organizers (be they NGOs, post-secondary institutions, or government offices) and Mainland internship providers should communicate constantly to ensure that both young Hong Kong interns and Mainland companies get what they expect. Internship participants' feedback should be collected and used to improve the quality and relevancy of internship opportunities.
- Given the low level of trust in the Hong Kong government and the widespread negative perceptions of the Mainland among youth, **the offerings of Mainland internship programs should be conducted by post-secondary institutions**. With their endorsement and promotion, Hong Kong youth will be more likely to participate in Mainland internship programs.
- Given the importance of academic departments and faculties as major contact points for post-secondary students, **more career-related advising should be offered at the departmental and faculty level to give students more relevant information for career development**. These departmental and faculty representatives should be equipped with adequate knowledge on the nature and content of internship programs. As a result, students will be given useful and accurate information about internship programs, and mismatches will be minimized.
- **One urgent task is to ensure that the academic qualifications and credits earned by Hong Kong students in Mainland universities are “transferable,” especially within the labor market and to**

### **post-secondary institutions in Hong Kong.**

- **As an immediate step, more financial sponsorship should be provided for Mainland academic exchange programs.** Given that both Mainland and overseas exchange programs are fee-based, students may question whether overseas programs offer comparative “value for the money.” Thus, partial or even full financial support should be given to encourage Hong Kong youth to consider these less popular China opportunities.
- **Academic advising should be offered at both the departmental and faculty levels of local post-secondary institutions.** Advising should assist students in obtaining relevant academic experiences and professional knowledge through Mainland academic exchange programs. If the nature and content of these Mainland exchange opportunities are highly tied to the local academic programs, Hong Kong students will have more incentive to pursue short-term academic study in the Mainland to prepare for their future career and personal development.
- To encourage more Hong Kong youth to pursue career development in the Mainland, more **accurate information about different aspects of the Mainland working conditions and labor market should be provided.** A government office should be established to provide one-stop information support, which should be supplemented with such appropriate means as websites and enquiry services. Transparent and up-to-date information would enable young people in Hong Kong to better evaluate their suitability for pursuing employment in the Mainland.
- **More on-site practical support should be offered.** Such support should include information relating to medical consultation, hospitalization, food, health and personal safety, insurance, taxation, flat rentals, transportation, etc. Hong Kong offices should be established in various main cities in the Mainland to serve as contact points and information centers for Hong Kong natives working in the Mainland. Telephone hotlines should also be set up to answer Hong Kong natives’ enquiries about everyday life and practical issues in the Mainland. These channels of support would help to prepare Hong Kong youth for working and living in the Mainland.

- **The young generation should be exposed to comprehensive promotion and consultation on CEPA and Mainland business opportunities.** Specifically, the content and benefits of CEPA and other China opportunities relevant to local young people and young professionals should be discussed and shared with these target groups. More importantly, views and concerns of the local youth in relation to setting up businesses and professional practices in the Mainland must be collected to allow future policies and initiatives to better address their needs.
- **Regular reviews should be conducted of youth's attitudes towards government policies encouraging them to work and/ or study in the Mainland, as well as their intentions to participate in internship programs, attend higher education institutions, and engage in employment in the Mainland.** These efforts will help to better address the concerns and needs that Hong Kong youth in pursuing personal development in the Mainland.



## 香港青少年對中國內地的觀感研究 行政摘要

### 1. 研究背景

- 有調查指出，香港青年對中國國民身份認同感有下降的趨勢，對內地的認識亦不足夠。現時青年對內地與香港的關係相對不樂觀，部分甚至不接受陸港兩地任何方式的融合。
- 香港青年對內地的負面觀感，與行政長官在施政報告及其他場合上，主張香港青年應該把握由內地經濟增長帶來的「中國機遇」之說法形成對比。
- 本研究旨在探討香港年輕一代對內地社會的觀感，並分析這些觀感與到內地升學和工作實習的經驗如何影響他們決定是否到內地發展的考慮。
- 本研究之結果，將有助提出推動香港青年到內地升學及/或就業的政策建議。

### 2. 研究方法

- 是次研究透過全港性的電話調查收集受訪者意見，調查日期為 2015 年 5 月 11 日至 6 月 23 日。訪問對象是 15 至 35 歲的香港居民，即出生於 1976 至 2000 年之間。調查的成功回應率是 45.8%，合作率為 79.5%，最終成功訪問了 1,005 人。
- 是次研究亦進行了六個焦點小組訪談，調查日期為 2015 年 8 月至 9 月。訪問對象是 15 至 35 歲的香港青年。六個焦點小組主要分為兩大類別：一類是有到內地學習及/或工作經驗的，另一類則沒有上述經驗。每類受訪者按各自的就學和工作狀況分為三組：(1)中學生、(2) 專上學生和(3)畢業生（畢業少於一年，就業或待業）、有一至三年工作經驗的在職人士和有三年以上工作經驗的在職人士。

### 3. 香港青年參加內地交流團、工作實習計劃和升學的統計數字

- 在 2014/15 學年，報名參加內地部分高校免試招收香港學生計劃的學生人數為 3,249 人，根據該計劃獲內地高校錄取的學生人數為 1,535 人。

內地大學升學資助計劃方面，合資格領取全額資助的學生為 152 人，111 人則合資格領取半額資助。

- 此外，在同一期間，青年內地交流資助計劃資助了 11,000 人參加內地交流團，青年內地實習資助計劃資助了 1,700 人參加內地工作實習計劃。
- 教育局資料顯示，在 2014/15 學年，專上學生、中學生和小學生參加內地交流團的比率分別為 1.2%，9.4% 和 6.4%。
- 在 2014/15 學年，於八所接受大學教育資助委員會資助的大學就讀而且參加了工作實習計劃的學生中，13.2% 選擇到內地工作實習，79.5% 在本地工作實習，其餘 7.4% 則到海外工作實習。

#### 4. 香港青年對往內地工作及升學態度意見之電話調查結果

##### 4.1 受訪者人口特徵

- 在 1,005 名受訪者中，男（49.2%）女（50.8%）性別比例各佔一半。
- 四個年齡組別的分佈是：20.5% 為 15-19 歲，23.5% 為 20-24 歲，24.6% 為 25-29 歲，31.5% 為 30-35 歲。
- 絕大部份受訪者（80.5%）都是生於香港，17.5% 出生於內地，2.0% 則在外地出生。
- 受訪者普遍擁有高教育程度，過半數受訪者（53.5%）持學士或以上程度學歷，14.3% 持非學士專上程度學歷。29.1% 受訪者持高中學歷。
- 五分之三受訪者（61.9%）為在職人士，30.6% 為學生。3.8% 為失業或待業人士，3.7% 沒有從事經濟活動。
- 在 1,005 名受訪者中，只有 5% 認為其家庭屬於社會中上層或上層。14.1% 認為其家庭屬於社會下層，44.8% 主觀界定其家庭屬於社會中下層，超過三分之一受訪者（35.2%）認為其家庭屬於社會中層。
- 年輕受訪者對香港持強烈的歸屬感，44.4% 受訪者認同自己是「香港人」，39.1% 受訪者自認是「香港人，但都是中國人」。只有 4.2% 受訪

者認同自己為「中國人」，10.8%受訪者認同自己是「中國人，但都是香港人」。

- 政治取向方面，五分二受訪者（42.3%）指他們支持泛民主派，只有5.3%支持建制派。36.4%指他們是中間派，而12.0%表示沒有政治取向。

#### 4.2 對內地社會及政治現況之觀感

- 普遍而言，受訪者對內地的經濟前景持樂觀態度，對政治發展則較不樂觀。三分二受訪者（66.5%）認同「內地經濟會一直維持快速發展」（8.2%和58.3%分別表示「非常同意」和「同意」），30.6%不認同（3.5%和27.1%分別表示「非常不同意」和「不同意」）。
- 相反，只有三分一受訪者（32.8%）對內地的政治發展感到樂觀（2.0%和30.8%分別表示「非常樂觀」和「樂觀」），64.5%受訪者表示不樂觀（44.8%）或非常不樂觀（19.7%）。對內地生活質素的評價方面，過半的受訪者認為「非常好」（2.6%）或「好」（44.5%），42.9%表示「不好」，6.4%表示「非常不好」。
- 為探討受訪者對內地的整體觀感，本研究基於受訪者對上述內地經濟、社會和政治三方面的觀感得出一個綜合指標。整體而言，受訪者對內地的整體觀感為負面（已調整平均指標分數為4.80分，指標的數值介乎0-10分）。
- 比較不同人口特徵組別之差異方面，女性、最年輕和最年長、非在香港出生、非學士學位持有人、沒有從事經濟活動、主觀社會階層為下層、較認同「中國人」身份和支持建制派的受訪者，對內地抱持較正面的觀感。除了主觀社會階層外，上述所有受訪者人口特徵組別都在統計學上有顯著差異。

#### 4.3 對陸港政策及關係的態度

- 在落實「一國兩制」上，1,005名受訪者中有27.1%希望香港與內地加強融合，大部分受訪者（70.7%）則傾向與內地保持一定距離。
- 只有29.1%受訪者認為「個人遊」計劃對香港帶來裨益，57.1%表示內地旅客帶來的壞處更多，少數受訪者指出「個人遊」計劃對香港的影響好壞參半。

- 雖然五分之一受訪者（20.1%）認為近年愈來愈多內地人來港讀書和就業對香港的整體發展沒有影響，近半受訪者表示他們對香港帶來壞影響或非常壞的影響。只有四分之一受訪者認為這個趨勢對香港社會帶來正面的影響（1.7%和 25.8%分別表示「有非常好影響」和「有好影響」）。
- 電話調查的受訪者就愈來愈多內地人來港讀書和就業對本地青年的升學及工作機會所帶來的影響抱更負面的態度。過半受訪者指出這個趨勢對本地青年的發展機會帶來壞影響（35.5%）或非常壞影響（17.4%），少於四分之一受訪者認為這個趨勢對他們的升學及工作機會帶來好影響（21.2%）或非常好影響（2.2%）。
- 基於受訪者對上述四項的評分得出一個綜合指標，已調整平均指標分數為 3.76 分，這反映受訪者較不傾向支持與陸港兩地關係相關的政策。
- 統計分析結果顯示，非在香港出生、持中學或更低學歷、較認同「中國人」身份和支持建制派的受訪者，較傾向支持與陸港兩地關係相關的政策，並呈統計上的顯著差異。

#### 4.4 對「中國機遇」的觀感

- 香港年輕一代普遍對同輩到內地發展不同類型的「中國機遇」抱持正面的態度。過半受訪者支持香港青年參加內地工作實習計劃（70.8%），交流團（67.8%），和就業（56.9%）。然而，他們較少贊成香港青年到內地升學（39.4%）。
- 有關「中國機遇」觀感的已調整平均指標分數是 5.34 分，這顯示整體而言，受訪者對「中國機遇」持正面觀感。
- 非在香港出生、失業或待業或沒有從事經濟活動（包括學生和家庭主婦等）、主觀社會階層為下層、較認同「中國人」身份和支持建制派的受訪者，都較傾向支持香港青年到內地謀求個人發展，並呈統計上的顯著差異。
- 過半數受訪者認為能夠在內地找到合適的工作、工作實習機會和升學都是困難的。認為困難的百分比分別是 72.1%、66.9%和 55.4%。
- 在比較不同人口特徵組別對把握「中國機遇」的主觀困難程度之差異方面，首先，最年輕的年齡組別（15-19 歲）認為到內地升學及參加工

作實習計劃是較困難的。其次，較低教育水平的受訪者對到內地謀求個人發展的信心較低。主觀社會階層為下層的受訪者亦表示到內地就業是較困難的。

#### 4.5 對政府推動香港青年到內地謀求個人發展的政策措施之意見

- 就容許本地學生以香港中學文憑考試成績報讀內地高等院校的安排，1,005 位受訪者中，超過三分二認為這措施對鼓勵更多香港青年到內地升學或發展有很大幫助（14.5%）或有幫助（54.1%）。
- 63.7%的受訪者指出向每名學生資助每年最多 15,000 港元的「內地大學升學資助計劃」對鼓勵更多香港青年到內地升學或謀求個人發展有很大幫助（10.5%和 53.2%分別表示「有很大幫助」和「有幫助」）。
- 受訪者就政府資助青年參加內地交流團和工作實習計劃對鼓勵他們到內地謀求個人發展的作用持相近的評價（9.2%和 55.9%分別表示「有很大幫助」和「有幫助」）。
- 香港普遍青年認為當局推動香港青年到內地謀求個人發展的政策措施是有效的（已調整平均指標分數是 5.70 分，數值介乎 0-10 分）。
- 比較不同人口特徵組別的結果顯示，最年輕的年齡組別（15-19 歲）、非在香港出生、學生、較認同「中國人」身份和支持建制派的受訪者，較認為當局推動香港青年到內地升學和就業的政策措施是有效的，並呈統計上的顯著差異。

#### 4.6 內地升學和就業的經驗

- 只有少數的受訪者曾在內地就業（9.0%）、就讀專上課程（3.8%）和參加工作實習計劃（6.9%）。在現時大部分中、小學生最少參加過一次離港的交流團的趨勢下，超過三分一的受訪者曾參加過最少一個內地交流團（36.5%）。
- 研究沒有發現任何人口特徵組別在「內地經驗」上有統計學上顯著的差異。

#### 4.7 到內地升學和就業的意向

- 與上述香港青年普遍地支持同輩到內地謀求個人發展的態度相比，受

訪者對個人到內地升學和就業顯示出較低的願意程度。縱然 55.8%受訪者表示願意到內地參加工作實習計劃，較少青年願意到內地工作（37.4%）和升學（29.3%）。

- 統計分析結果顯示，男性、對內地整體社會持較正面觀感、對「中國機遇」持較正面觀感、和認為到內地就業較不困難的受訪者都較願意到內地工作，並呈統計上的顯著差異。然而，以往在內地讀書或工作的經驗對其到內地工作的意向沒有任何顯著的影響。
- 在加入其他變項作統計分析後，對「中國機遇」持正面觀感將提升其到內地升學的意願。與認同自己是「香港人」的受訪者相比，自認為「中國人」或「中國人，但都是香港人」則提升其到內地升學的意願。以上的分析結果都呈統計上顯著的關係。以往參加內地交流團的經驗對其到內地升學的意向沒有任何在統計學上顯著的影響。
- 此外，對「中國機遇」持正面觀感與參加內地工作實習計劃的意願亦有顯著的正面關係。在控制其他變項後，與認同自己是「香港人」的受訪者相比，認同自己是「香港人，但都是中國人」將提升其參加內地工作實習計劃的意願。值得一提的是，以往參加內地交流團或在內地讀書的經驗對其參加內地工作實習計劃的意向沒有任何在統計學上顯著的影響。

## 5. 香港青年對內地觀感及其到內地升學及就業意向之焦點小組訪談結果

### 5.1 內地經驗

- 焦點小組受訪者分為兩大類別：分別是有和沒有內地經驗（包括曾參加內地交流團、工作實習計劃、在內地就讀專上課程和工作）。不過，即使是沒有內地經驗的一組，差不多所有受訪者都曾經到內地觀光和/或探親。
- 焦點小組的受訪者亦按各自的就學和工作狀況分為三組：中學生、專上學生和在職青年。在有「內地經驗」的組別中，中學生的經驗僅限於參加了內地交流團。在職青年的「內地經驗」最多元化，包括參加內地交流團、工作實習計劃、在內地就業和公幹等。專上學生的「內地經驗」則包括參加內地交流團和工作實習計劃。沒有焦點小組的受訪者曾到內地的高等院校就讀專上課程。

- 普遍而言，參加內地交流團的經驗是有趣和愉快的。中學生較著重於分享與內地學生交流的體驗，專上學生和在職青年指內地交流團有助他們對內地社會和內地人獲得更多知識和了解。
- 少數受訪者曾參加內地工作實習計劃。除了一位例外，所有曾參加的受訪者都認為內地工作實習的經驗沒有實質作用，所學的亦未能在香港應用。然而，他們認為有關經驗對其工作履歷表有一定價值。

## 5.2 對內地的觀感

- 焦點小組受訪者普遍對內地人抱持負面觀感。在討論過程中，他們經常提及環境污染、貪污、限制個人自由、缺乏全面的社會福利及醫療保障制度、「人治」、低薪酬水平、差劣的食物安全水平和不文明的行為。
- 與沒有「內地經驗」的受訪者相比，有「內地經驗」的受訪者對內地人和內地社會抱持較少的負面觀感。後者對內地社會抱較同情和持平的觀點。
- 相對而言，沒有「內地經驗」的受訪者較不願意接收更多有關內地的資訊以對內地社會作更深入的了解。他們表示對內地社會的認知不會受任何第一身到內地工作和/或升學的觀察所改變。

## 5.3 到內地升學和就業的意向

- 內地升學方面，不論他們有否「內地經驗」，大部分受訪者都表示抗拒。最主要的原因是他們擔心在內地獲得的學歷缺乏認受性。
- 中學生和專上學生指出，基於教學語言和專業體制的不同，在內地升學所獲得的知識未必能夠應用於香港的學習和工作上。
- 少數中學生表示願意到內地升讀學士學位課程，但只會在他們不獲本地大學取錄的前提下才作考慮，這顯示他們視內地學士學位課程為次選。
- 有「內地經驗」的受訪者對內地抱持較少的負面觀感，因此他們亦對到內地謀求個人職業發展持較開放的態度。有別於其他受訪者經常強調陸港兩地各方面的差異和不協調，有「內地經驗」的受訪者視兩地的差異為香港一方的商業機會，香港人應該加以利用此市場潛力。

- 值得一提的是，很大程度上，願意到內地謀求職業發展的年輕受訪者只看到「中國機遇」工具性的利用價值，他們同時強調沒有打算到內地長期定居。不願意到內地謀求職業發展的受訪者表示：(1) 差劣的生活質素（包括食物安全、空氣質素、法律制度和醫療保障制度）、(2) 低工作聲望和低薪酬水平、(3) 缺乏內地勞動市場的資訊和(4) 遠離家庭都是他們不願意到內地就業的因素。

#### 5.4 對「中國機遇」的觀點

- 縱使中國充滿發展機遇是人所共知，但大部分受訪者認為並非每個香港人都可以掌握或受惠於「中國機遇」。不少受訪者已留意到海外留學回流內地的畢業生（「海歸」）愈來愈受內地僱主歡迎，香港的年輕專業人士和大學畢業生在內地勞動市場則失去相對優勢。
- 焦點小組受訪者重複地表示「中國機遇」的受惠者只局限於某些行業和學科。這些機會較有利於創業家、金融業和貿易業。
- 儘管沒有「內地經驗」的受訪者不否定「中國機遇」的存在，他們只是傾向質疑這些機會和發展潛力是不正當和不道德的。

#### 6. 推動香港青年到內地升學和/及就業的政策建議

- 內地工作實習計劃的參加者認為所學所得對個人日後發展幫助不大，故此，**當局應確保內地工作實習計劃的質素和相關性**，以吸引更多年輕人參與。香港一方組織工作實習計劃的機構（如非牟利團體、專上院校或政府部門）與內地一方提供工作實習計劃的機構應維持有效且持續的溝通協調，以滿足香港青年與內地企業雙方的合理期望。妥善收集參加者的意見和評價亦有助於改善和提升內地工作實習計劃的質素和相關性。
- 有見於年輕一代對特區政府的信任度低，以及對內地社會的整體觀感傾向負面，**內地工作實習計劃應由專上及大專院校提供**。由專上及大專院校認可和宣傳的內地工作實習計劃可給予有意參與的青年更大的信心。
- 學系部門和學院乃是專上學生的主要接觸點。**學系部門和學院應提供更多職業相關的輔導和資訊，輔助學生籌劃個人職業發展**。這些學系部門和學院之代表應對工作實習計劃的性質和內容有充足的認識，為



學生提供更有用和準確的工作實習計劃資訊，以減少錯配。

- **當務之急是要確保香港學生在內地大學升學所獲得的學歷和學分是「可轉移的」**，尤其是與本地專上院校的銜接，以增加內地學歷在本地勞動市場之認受性。
- **作為即時的措施，當局應為內地學術交換生計劃提供更多經費資助。**由於參加內地和海外學術交換生計劃都需要付費，學生傾向認為到海外當交換生較「划算」。因此，充足甚至全額經濟資助將有助於吸引更多青年參與較不受歡迎的內地學術交換生計劃。
- **專上院校的學系部門和學院應提供升學輔導**，以確保學生能透過參與內地學術交換生計劃獲得相關的學習經驗和專業知識。若內地學術交換生計劃的性質與內容與其本地的學科高度相關，香港學生將有更大的誘因到內地參與短期的交換生計劃以裝備其未來的職業和個人發展。
- **為鼓勵更多香港青年考慮到內地發展事業，政府及有關當局應為他們提供更準確的和多方面的內地工作環境和勞動市場資訊。**政府應提供一站式的資訊支援，輔以合適的網上資料庫和查詢服務。透明和最新的資訊將有助於香港青年更妥善的評估自己是否適合到內地就業。
- **在內地城市提供更多在地的實質支援。**這些支援包括醫療諮詢、住院治療、食物、健康和人身安全、保險、稅務、住宿、交通等資訊。當局應在內地的主要城市設置駐內地辦公室，作為在內地工作的香港人聯絡點和資訊中心。同時設立電話熱線以解答他們在內地工作和日常生活遇上的疑難。上述的支援將為有意到內地工作和居住的香港青年帶來最好的開始。
- **有關當局應向青年宣傳《內地與香港關於建立更緊密經貿關係的安排》的內容和裨益**，促使本地青年和年輕專業人士更有效的掌握有關「中國機遇」的資訊。更重要的是，當局應全面諮詢本地青年對到內地創業和從事專業服務的意見和顧慮，以更有效的滿足他們的需要。
- **當局應定期檢視香港青年對政府推動他們到內地升學或/及就業的政策**的取態，與及他們到內地參加工作實習計劃、升讀高等院校和就業的意向。以上措施將有助當局掌握青年到內地發展的考慮因素和需要。

## **Chapter 1**

### **Introduction**

#### **1. Background**

“A Study on Hong Kong Youth’s Perceptions of the Mainland” was commissioned by the Central Policy Unit of the HKSAR government. As stated in the consultancy brief, a decline in national identification with China has been observed. Our longitudinal surveys on Hong Kong identities show that, while the proportion of local residents identifying as “Hongkongers” remained unchanged, at around one quarter of the population, between 1996 and 2012, that of the residents identifying as “Chinese” decreased from 25.7 to 12.6% during the same period. Two types of mixed identity—(a) Hongkongers but also Chinese and (b) Chinese but also Hongkongers—also recorded percentage increases. According to the biannual surveys conducted by the Hong Kong University Public Opinion Poll Program, in June 2014, while 40.2% of respondents identified as “Hongkongers,” only 19.5% identified as “Chinese.” Disaggregated analyses further show that respondents aged 18 to 29 years old were less likely than their older counterparts to choose “Chinese” as their national identity. The corresponding figures were 3.6% and 23.7%.

Against the background of closer social and economic integration between Hong Kong and the Mainland, official data have also revealed a decline in the number of Hong Kong residents working in the Mainland over the past decade. For instance, though the proportion Mainland workers rose from 3.5% in 1995 to 7.6% in 2005, it then fell to 5.0% in 2010 (Census and Statistics Department, 2011b). It has been noted that the proportion of people aged 20 to 29 working in the Mainland decreased from around one-quarter in the late 1980s to less than one-tenth in 2009 (Lui, 2013). More recent figures show that, in the second quarter of 2013, among the 65,900 employed persons working across the border, only 4.9% were aged 20 to 29 (unpublished figures from the General Household Survey).

Similarly, only a minority of youth and young adults in Hong Kong today have had educational experiences in the Mainland. Among those aged 25 and younger who have studied outside of Hong Kong, the proportion who studied in the Mainland jumped from 4.1% in 2002 to 9.2% in 2010 (Census and

Statistics Department, 2002, 2011a). Furthermore, figures from the 2006 Population By-census and the 2011 Census show that the estimated number of Hong Kong people pursuing full-time tertiary education in the Mainland was about 7,356 in 2006 and 5,515 in 2011 (Education Bureau, 2015). Information provided by the Ministry of Education in Mainland China reveals that the number of Hong Kong students studying in Mainland higher education institutions and research institutes was 15,330 in October 2014 (Education Bureau, 2015).

Given the introduction of the Scheme for the Admission of Hong Kong Students to Mainland Higher Education Institutions (or “Admission Scheme”) in the 2012/13 academic year and that of the Mainland University Study Subsidy Scheme (or “MUSSS”) in 2014/15, it might be reasonable to speculate that more young people would explore the option of pursuing their post-secondary education in the Mainland. According to the Education Bureau, during the last two academic years, over 6,500 applications for the Admission Scheme were received and about 2,200 offers were given to Hong Kong students by the higher education institutions in the Mainland (Legco, 2014).

In a telephone survey conducted in mid-2014, it was found that 88% of respondents aged 18-29 thought that Hong Kong people now are not as well disposed towards Mainlanders as they were ten years ago (Mingpao, 2014). From this, it can be concluded that negative sentiments on Mainland society and an unwillingness to study and/ or work in the Mainland are evident among young people in Hong Kong. The survey results presented above contrast with the call of the Chief Executive in the 2014 Policy Address and other occasions for young people in Hong Kong to capitalize on the opportunities created by the growing Chinese economy.

As previously mentioned, there has been a continued decline in the number of Hong Kong young adults working across the border. It has been further pointed out that China opportunities related to employment are not available for all classes of people in Hong Kong; instead, such positions tend to be limited to middle-aged managers and professionals with substantial experience and skills (Lui, 2014). It is obvious that these China opportunities have not materialized for young people, who are purported to be a main target group of the “China opportunity” rhetoric advocated by the Hong Kong government. However, instead of seriously examining the meaning of “China opportunity” to our

young generation, government officials and the media tend to discredit young people as lacking courage and determination, having insufficient knowledge about Mainland society, and, hence, stubbornly refusing to seek opportunities for personal development in the Mainland (see Lui, 2013). To date, although young adults have been found to be less likely to work and study in the Mainland, little, if any, systematic research has been conducted to examine the reasons behind their negative attitudes or to identify the factors, be they personal or structural, holding them back from pursuing career and education in the Mainland.

## **2. Objectives**

Given the irreversible trend of deepening integration between Hong Kong and the Mainland in various arenas, a systematic study on Hong Kong youth's perceptions of Mainland society, in general, and China opportunities, in particular, is urgently needed. It is expected that a thorough understanding of these issues will not only help the government evaluate the effectiveness of existing policies in encouraging Hong Kong youth to study and work in the Mainland, but also help policy researchers formulate evidence-based suggestions for offering young people more personal development options.

The specific objectives of the current study are as follows:

- (1) To examine Hong Kong youth's common perceptions of Mainland social and political phenomena;
- (2) To investigate the impressions of Hong Kong youth on the policies implemented by the Government with regard to the relationship between the Mainland and Hong Kong;
- (3) To study the views and/ or experiences of Hong Kong youth in relation to studying and/ or working in the Mainland;
- (4) To analyze the extent to which the above views and/ or experiences of Hong Kong youth impact their incentives to study and/ or work in the Mainland; and
- (5) On the basis of the study findings, to make policy recommendations on how

to facilitate Hong Kong youth to study and/ or work in the Mainland.

### **3. Coverage**

In order to achieve the objectives stated above, in this study, we shall examine the population of Hong Kong youth aged 15 to 35. This group is composed of the post-80s and post-90s generations, whose members are currently engaged in education or at the relatively early stages of their working lives. The topics of personal development and life planning, in general, and of China opportunities, in particular, should be of great concern to this population. In order to collect their perceptions of China opportunities for studying and working, Mainland social and political phenomena, and government policies concerning the relationship between the Mainland and Hong Kong, a territory-wide representative telephone survey of around 1,000 respondents aged 15 to 35 and six focus group discussions of at least 60 young people of similar age ranges have been conducted.

Before illustrating the research design and methodology adopted in the current study, we shall provide the definition for studying and/ or working in the Mainland. In this study, respondents' experiences of studying and/ or working, as well as their intentions to study and/ or work in the Mainland, will be gauged. Given the small proportion of people in Hong Kong, in general, and among our young generation, in particular, who have pursued post-secondary education, participated in internship programs, or worked across the border, as afore-mentioned and as shown in the official statistics, in the telephone survey, and in the focus group discussions, previous experiences in the Mainland included (1) joining exchange tours, (2) pursuing post-secondary academic study, (3) participating in internship programs, and (4) working, regardless of the nature and/ or the duration of stay, in the Mainland. Concerning intention to study and/ or work in the Mainland, we asked the respondents about their level of willingness to (1) attend post-secondary academic programs, (2) participate in internship programs, and (3) work in a job in which at least half of the working time is spent in the Mainland.

### **4. Methodology**

Specifically, in addition to collecting first-hand data, this study reviews literature and previous surveys on Hong Kong youth's perceptions of the

Mainland and their incentives for studying and/ or working in the Mainland. In this section, the details of the telephone survey and the focus group discussions are presented.

A telephone survey is a comprehensive survey tool for collecting data from a large random sample in a relatively short period of time. In this survey, the process of the telephone interview was facilitated with the aid of a structured questionnaire, which was manually handled by the interviewers via a Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) system. Using the CATI system, the interviewers read each question displayed on the monitor and entered respondents' answers directly into the computer, thereby bypassing the time-consuming processes of data coding, editing, and entry. Moreover, a telephone survey promises greater control over the quality of an entire data collection process and has the advantages of higher levels of standardization.

The target population of this telephone survey was Hong Kong residents aged 15 to 35 who speak Cantonese or Putonghua. For the sampling frame, the initial telephone numbers were selected randomly from a pool of seed numbers based on the most updated Residential Telephone Directory (English and Chinese versions). In order to capture unlisted telephone numbers, the last two digits of each selected telephone number were then deleted and replaced with two random numbers generated by computer. Then, in each accessible residential unit, only one person aged 15 to 35 was selected for an interview, according to the Kish grid method.<sup>1</sup>

The fieldwork was carried out between May 11 and June 23, 2015. The entire telephone interview was conducted in the Telephone Survey Research Laboratory of the Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies, located at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, and the fieldwork process was fully supervised. In this survey, a total of 48,200 random telephone numbers were initially used. Of these, 29,694 cases were identified as non-eligible ("invalid line" (19,801), "fax number" (1,988), "non-residential line" (1,700), "call

---

<sup>1</sup> A pilot test of the telephone survey was carried out between February 24 and 27, 2015, by the Telephone Survey Research Laboratory, Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies, The Chinese University of Hong Kong. Using a semi-random digit dialing method and a CATI system, a total of 31 respondents aged 15 to 35 were successfully interviewed by well-trained interviewers. A primary purpose of this pilot survey was to fully test the questionnaire and, thus, to ensure that respondents in the main survey could comprehend each question and give meaningful answers. Modifications to the questionnaire were made accordingly.

diverted to places outside Hong Kong” (49), and “no eligible respondent living in the unit” (6,156)). Another 16,313 cases were considered to have unknown eligibility (“busy line” (1,031), “no answer” (8,716), “telephone answering device” (1,346), “language problem” (399), “break-off” (4,362), and others (459)). In addition, 1,028 cases refused to be interviewed, 30 eligible respondents terminated their telephone interviews mid-way, and 130 eligible respondents were unavailable (e.g., they were not at home or not in Hong Kong, they were ill, or they had a language mismatch with the focal study languages).

In the end, 1,005 eligible respondents were successfully interviewed, with a response rate of 45.8% and a cooperation rate of 79.5%. At a 95% confidence level, the standard error for a sample of 1,005 is 0.0158, and the estimated sampling error is within  $\pm 3.09\%$ . Thus, the achieved survey sample size can be considered to generally produce survey findings with acceptable levels of precision. Fieldwork details and response rate calculations for the telephone survey can be found in Appendix 1.1.

While the telephone survey aimed to provide a general portrait of Hong Kong young people’s perceptions of the Mainland, views of government policies facilitating Hong Kong youth to work and/ or study in the Mainland, and attitudes towards China opportunities in terms of work and study, the focus group discussions were conducted as a follow-up study designed to closely examine the rationales, motivations, and personal experiences of the respondents. Six focus group discussions were held in August and September of 2015.

The focus group participants were recruited following the completion of the telephone survey. There were two methods of recruitment. First, participants for two focus groups consisting of secondary school students were referred by five secondary schools. In order to ensure that the participants were from different societal sectors, secondary schools located in different districts and different school bandings were selected. Schools were also asked to nominate students with various socio-demographic characteristics. The five schools were selected from the personal network of the Principal Investigator. In total, 13 students with experiences of academic and cultural exchange tours in the Mainland (Group 1) and 10 students without any related experiences (Group 2) participated in these two focus groups.

Second, four focus groups of tertiary institution students, graduates, and working youth were recruited through the telephone survey. At the end of the telephone interviews, respondents were invited to participate in a focus group discussion. The interested respondents were screened according to their socio-economic and demographic characteristics, and only those who were eligible according to the focus group participant criteria were contacted and formally invited to join one of the six focus group discussions. The recruitment of focus group participants through territory-wide representative surveys for follow-up study is common and acceptable in academic research, as it ensures a certain extent of randomness in the sample selection of the focus groups. It should be noted that, owing to the difficulties in recruiting a sufficient number of focus group participants, a few respondents were obtained through our personal networks. One such respondent was in Group 3, and three were in Group 5.

In our focus group discussions, there were 11 tertiary students with experiences of exchange tours and/ or internship programs in the Mainland (Group 4) and 10 tertiary students without any of these Mainland experiences (Group 5). In addition, there were 12 graduates who had joined exchange tours, participated in internship programs, and/ or worked in the Mainland (Group 6) and 11 graduates and working youth with no experiences working or studying in the Mainland (Group 3).

The six focus groups were held on the campus of The Chinese University of Hong Kong in August and September 2015. Each participant was given book coupons or a transportation allowance.

## **5. Structure of the Report**

The remainder of this report is structured as follows. We shall first review previous literatures and surveys investigating Hong Kong youth's perceptions of the Mainland and their incentives for studying and/ or working in the Mainland. Official statistics on the number of youth joining government-funded exchange and internship schemes and the number of students of full-time, publicly funded post-secondary programs undertaking internship programs will also be presented. Second, the findings of the telephone survey and the focus group discussions will be reported in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4, respectively. After summarizing and discussing the research



results, policy recommendations for how to encourage Hong Kong youth to study and/ or work in the Mainland will be made.

## **Chapter 2**

### **Literature Review and Official Statistics**

#### **1. Introduction**

In this chapter, we shall first review the literatures and surveys investigating Hong Kong youth's perceptions of the Mainland and their incentives for studying and/ or working in the Mainland. Second, the rates of participation of Hong Kong youth in Government schemes facilitating their study and/ or work in the Mainland will be shown.

#### **2. Hong Kong Youth's Perceptions of the Mainland: Findings from Previous Surveys**

To date, only a few systematic studies on Hong Kong youth's attitudes towards Mainland society and Hong Kong-Mainland relations have been conducted. Most of these studies have focused primarily on the youth population, and comparisons of youth and their older counterparts are lacking. In this section, based on published results of territory-wide representative telephone surveys conducted over the past few years, we shall report age differences in terms of (1) level of trust in the Beijing government, (2) perceptions of future Hong Kong-Mainland relations, (3) evaluations of the China's impact on Hong Kong, (4) attitudes towards "One Country, Two Systems" and a closer integration with the Mainland, and (5) views of Hong Kong people studying and working in the Mainland. These findings provide an updated picture of our young generation's impressions of Mainland China from a comparative perspective.

According to a survey conducted in August 2015, a significantly smaller proportion of respondents aged 18 to 34 demonstrated trust in the Beijing government (9.5%) (Table 2.1). By contrast, 25.8% of people aged 35 to 54 and 35.9% of people aged 55 or above demonstrated similar. Furthermore, while three-fifths (61.2%) of the youngest respondents distrusted the Beijing government, less than one-third of the older respondents indicated a similar sentiment.

Table 2.1: Level of Trust in the Beijing Government, August 2015 (%)\*

	Trust	In-between	Distrust
Age 18-34	9.5	29.3	61.2
Age 35-54	25.8	44.6	29.5
Age 55 or above	35.9	34.6	29.5
Total	25.8	37.8	36.4

Source: Unpublished; \*p<0.05.

Findings from a 2012 survey on China's impact on Hong Kong revealed similar age pattern in terms of perceptions of the Mainland and Hong Kong-Mainland relations. From Table 2.2, we can see that, compared to older respondents, younger people had significantly more pessimistic views of future Hong Kong-Mainland relations. They also had significantly less favorable evaluations of China's impact on democratic development and the quality of life in Hong Kong (Table 2.3). It should be noted that no age differences were found in terms of perceptions of China's impact on Hong Kong's economic growth (data not shown).

Table 2.2: Perceptions of Future Hong Kong-Mainland Relations (%), December 2012\*

	Optimistic	Pessimistic
Age 18-34	46.5	53.5
Age 35-54	58.8	41.2
Age 55 or above	62.6	37.4
Total	56.2	43.8

Source: Hsiao and Wan (2014), Table 2; \*p<0.05.

Table 2.3: Evaluations of China's Impact on Democratic Development and Quality of Life in Hong Kong (%), December 2012\*

	Democratic Development		Quality of Life	
	Positive Impact	Negative Impact	Positive Impact	Negative Impact
Age 18-34	23.4	76.6	31.8	68.2
Age 35-54	35.0	65.0	50.9	49.1
Age 55 or above	45.6	54.4	51.9	48.1
Total	34.7	65.3	45.5	54.5

Source: Hsiao and Wan (2014), Table 3; \*p<0.05.

Unsurprisingly, a significantly larger proportion of those aged 18 to 34 preferred to maintain a distance from Mainland China, with two-thirds stating this preference in terms of the implementation of “One Country, Two Systems” (65.6%) (Table 2.4). On the contrary, a similar percentage of those aged 55 and above wanted to strengthen the ties between Hong Kong and the Mainland (64.2%). In 2013, around a quarter of the youth respondents (age 18-29) disagreed with strengthening economic or cultural ties with the Mainland (Table 2.5), though a significant age difference was observed in terms of attitudes towards closer integration with the Mainland, such that older respondents tended to favor a closer Hong Kong-Mainland relationship.

Table 2.4: Attitudes towards “One Country, Two Systems” (%), December 2012\*

	Strengthening Ties	Maintaining Distance
Age 18-34	34.4	65.6
Age 35-54	56.6	43.4
Age 55 or above	64.2	35.8
Total	52.8	47.2

Source: Hsiao and Wan (2014), Table 4; \*p<0.05.

Table 2.5: Attitudes towards a Closer Integration with the Mainland (%), April 2013\*

	Strengthening Economic Ties			Strengthening Cultural Ties		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Age 18-29	44.1	30.4	25.5	43.3	27.9	28.8
Age 30-49	60.0	26.2	13.8	65.1	24.7	10.3
Age 50 or above	67.1	23.5	9.4	71.4	19.3	9.3
Total	61.5	25.4	13.1	65.4	22.4	12.2

Source: Zheng and Wan (2013), Table 8; \*p<0.05.

It can be seen from the above that, compared with their older counterparts, our younger generation has generally less positive attitudes towards the Mainland and the relationship between Hong Kong and the Mainland. Specifically, to a large extent, Hong Kong youth show less favorable views of the Mainland in political arenas, with over three-fifths indicating a level of distrust in the Beijing government, a negative impact of China on the democratic development of Hong Kong, and a preference to maintain a distance from the Mainland under the “One Country, Two Systems” arrangement.

Table 2.6: Attitudes towards Hong Kong People Studying, Setting up Business, and Taking up Employment in the Mainland (%), April 2013

	Studying*			Setting up Business			Taking up Employment		
	Agree	In-between	Oppose	Agree	In-between	Oppose	Agree	In-between	Oppose
Age 18-29	39.8	38.8	21.4	55.3	36.9	7.8	49.0	42.3	8.7
Age 30-49	53.2	33.7	13.1	55.4	32.2	12.3	56.6	35.2	8.2
Age 50 or above	55.2	28.8	15.9	51.9	34.7	13.4	57.9	32.8	9.3
Total	52.3	32.0	15.6	53.7	34.1	12.3	56.2	35.0	8.8

Source: Zheng and Wan (2013), Table 2; \*p<0.05.

### 3. Hong Kong Youth's Attitudes Towards Studying and Working in the Mainland: Findings from Previous Surveys

In a 2013 survey, respondents were asked about their views of Hong Kong people undertaking different activities in the Mainland. While there were significant age differences in terms of respondents' agreement with Hong Kong people studying in the Mainland, no significant differences were found for the activities of setting up business and taking up employment across the border. As shown in Table 2.6, 39.8% of those aged 18 to 29 had favorable attitudes towards Hong Kong people studying in Mainland China, and the respective figures were 53.2% for people aged 30 to 49 and 55.2% for people aged 50 or above. On the contrary, 21.4%, 13.1% and 15.9% of respondents in these three age groups, respectively, opposed this activity. With regard to views of Hong Kong people setting up business and taking up employment in the Mainland, regardless of age, around half of the respondents indicated supportive attitudes.

Table 2.7: Level of Willingness to Work in the Mainland (%), Summer 2014

Not Willing at All	18.4
Not Willing	46.3
Willing	30.9
Very Willing	2.3
Don't know/Difficult to Say	2.0

Source: Bauhinia Foundation Research Centre (2015), Table 3.2.1.

Table 2.8: Action Taken to Develop a Career in the Mainland (among those who showed a willingness to work in the Mainland) (%), Summer 2014

No	85.1
Yes	14.9

Source: Bauhinia Foundation Research Centre (2015), Table 3.2.2.

However, the results of a 2014 survey on intentions to work in the Mainland focusing on Hong Kong youth aged 18 to 29 revealed that nearly two-thirds of our young generation are unwilling to work in the Mainland (64.7%) (Table 2.7). This figure starkly contrasts those in Table 2.6. It must be noted that, while the figures in Table 2.6 refer to respondents' views of Hong Kong people working and/ or studying in the Mainland, those of Table 2.7 point directly to young respondents' own willingness to work across the border. Therefore, it can be seen that only one-third of our young generation is willing to work in

Mainland China (33.1%) (Table 2.7).

Among these 333 youth, only a minority reported having taken action to develop careers across the border (14.9%) (Table 2.8). This implies that 4.9% of Hong Kong young people in the entire sample were proactively preparing themselves to work in the Mainland.

In this survey, respondents were also asked to rate the importance of different factors in their willingness to work in the Mainland. The scores range between 0 and 10, with higher scores representing greater levels of importance for each of the nine factors shown in Table 2.9. These nine factors are related to three aspects: personal, Mainland China, and Hong Kong. Among these factors, youth respondents rated the Mainland factors as the most important. The mean scores for quality of life, political future in the Mainland, and economic prospects in the Mainland were 7.98, 7.49, and 7.39, respectively (Table 2.9). If China factors are considered pull factors in the decision to work across the border, the results of Table 2.9 reveal that these pull factors, or China factors, are given more weight than individual factors and Hong Kong factors by our young Hong Kong generation. This might suggest that China factors play a very important role in determining Hong Kong young people's willingness to work in the Mainland.

Table 2.9: Factors Affecting the Decision to Work in the Mainland, Summer 2014

	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Quality of Life in the Mainland	7.98	1.88
Political Future of the Mainland	7.49	2.27
Economic Prospects of the Mainland	7.39	1.89
Family	7.39	2.17
Individual Ability	7.12	1.90
Quality of Life in Hong Kong	7.10	2.04
Economic Prospects of Hong Kong	7.05	1.93
Social Support	6.57	2.30
Political Future of Hong Kong	6.53	2.28

Source: Bauhinia Foundation Research Centre (2015), Table 3.1.1.

The 2014 survey also examines the inadequacies perceived by Hong Kong youth of working across the border. Among the six options, the largest

proportion reported being influenced by a “lack of knowledge about the law of the Mainland” (36.7%). Furthermore, nearly a quarter noted a “lack of knowledge about the employment environment of the Mainland” (23.3%), 11.8% noted a “lack of proficiency in Putonghua,” and 10.2% cited a “lack of knowledge about everyday life and culture of the Mainland.” The respective proportions for “lack of professional knowledge or qualification” and “low education level” were 9.2% and 3.7%.

Table 2.10: Perceived Inadequacies of Working in the Mainland (%), Summer 2014

Lack of Knowledge About the Law of the Mainland	36.7
Lack of Knowledge About the Employment Environment of the Mainland	23.3
Lack of Proficiency in Putonghua	11.8
Lack of Knowledge about Everyday Life and Culture of the Mainland	10.2
Lack of Professional Knowledge or Qualifications	9.2
Low Education Level	3.7
Others	4.0
Don't know/Difficult to Say/No Inadequacy	1.1

Source: Bauhinia Foundation Research Centre (2015), Table 3.2.7.

In this section, we report previous findings on Hong Kong youth's intentions to work in the Mainland and their incentives for and perceived inadequacies related to developing Mainland-based careers. Three points are observed. First, the willingness of our young generation to go north for career development is low, and only a negligible proportion of youth proactively prepare themselves to work across the border. Second, compared to factors related to Hong Kong and the self, China factors are most influential in determining young people's intentions to work across the border. Third, a lack of knowledge about the Mainland plays a sizeable role in deterring young people from participating in the Mainland labor market.

#### **4. Study in Mainland Higher Institutions and Participation in Mainland Exchange and Internship Programs among Hong Kong Students: Official Statistics**

The government has introduced various schemes to facilitate Hong Kong youth's ability to study and/ or work in the Mainland. First, in the 2014 Policy Address, the Chief Executive announced the introduction of the Mainland



University Study Subsidy Scheme (MUSSS) to help Hong Kong students in need of financial support pursue undergraduate studies in the Mainland under the Scheme for the Admission of Hong Kong Students to Mainland Higher Education Institutions (Admission Scheme). Second, the Admission Scheme was launched in academic year 2012/13. Under this scheme, more than 60 Mainland higher education institutions consider the admission of Hong Kong students based on their results in the Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education Examinations (HKDSE) and the Hong Kong Advanced Level Examination, thus exempting them from taking the Joint Entrance Examination for Mainland universities.

It was also announced in the 2014 Policy Address that, under the joint efforts of the Home Affairs Bureau and the Commission on Youth, community organizations would be sponsored to organize more youth exchange programs and youth internship programs in the Mainland. Specifically, the quota increased from 9,600 in 2014 to 14,000 in 2015. Furthermore, in the 2015/16 budget, the government promised to offer an additional \$205 million over the next three years for the Funding Scheme for Youth Exchange in the Mainland (Exchange Funding Scheme) and the Funding Scheme for Youth Internship in the Mainland (Internship Funding Scheme). In the following, we shall present official statistics about the numbers of youth engaging in these government-supported schemes.

The Admission Scheme was first launched in academic year 2012/13. As aforementioned, the Admission Scheme admits Hong Kong students to Mainland institutions based on their HKDSE results, thus exempting them from taking the Joint Entrance Examination for Mainland Institutions. The number of Mainland higher education institutions participating in the Admission Scheme will increase to 84 in 2016. Table 2.11 shows the number of students enrolled and admitted to Mainland institutions via the Admission Scheme. In 2014 and 2015, these numbers were 3,249 and 1,535 respectively.

Table 2.11: Number of Students Enrolled and Admitted via the Admission Scheme

Year	Number of students enrolled	Number of students admitted
2012/13	4248	976
2013/14	2278	1188
2014/15	3249	1535

Source: Education Bureau (2015).

Table 2.12: Figures of the Mainland University Study Subsidy Scheme

Year	Application Received	Applicant passed mean	Full-rate subsidy granted	Half-rate subsidy granted
2014/15	448	263	152	111

Source: Education Bureau (2015).

In July 2014, the Mainland University Study Subsidy Scheme was introduced to provide financial support to Hong Kong students admitted to first-year undergraduate programs in Mainland institutions under the Admission Scheme. Depending on need, those passing a means test obtain either a full-rate subsidy of \$15,000 or a half-rate subsidy of \$7,500 per student per year. Of the 448 applications received for 2014/15, nearly 60% of applicants passed the means test, with 152 and 111 being eligible for full-rate and half-rate subsidies, respectively (Table 2.12).

To broaden the exposure of young people and provide them with first-hand experiences of Mainland workplaces and work cultures, the Exchange Funding Scheme and the Internship Funding Scheme were launched by the Home Affairs Bureau and Commission on Youth. The former scheme targets youth aged 12 to 29, and the latter targets youth aged 18 to 29. While Table 2.13 shows the number of participants and the sponsorship approved under the Exchange Funding Scheme and the Internship Funding Scheme over the past five years, Table 2.14 presents the estimated numbers of participants in these two schemes in the next three years.

It can be seen that the numbers of youth approved in the Exchange Funding Scheme and the Internship Funding Scheme in 2014/15 were around 11,000 and 1,700, respectively (Table 2.13). The approved sponsorship reached \$26 million and \$24 million, respectively. The numbers of participants in these two schemes are estimated to increase substantially in 2017/18 (Table 2.14).

Table 2.13: Number of Participants and Sponsorship Approved under the Exchange Funding Scheme and the Internship Funding Scheme between 2010/11 and 2014/15

Year	Exchange Funding Scheme		Internship Funding Scheme	
	No. of Participants	Approved Sponsorship	No. of Participants	Approved Sponsorship
2010-11	About 9 400	\$20 million	-	-
2011-12	About 10 700	\$22 million	-	-
2012-13	About 9 800	\$26 million	-	-
2013-14	About 9 600	\$26 million	-	-
2014/15	About 11 000	\$26 million	About 1 700	\$24 million

Note: The Internship Funding Scheme was launched in 2014/15. Prior to this, sponsorship for Mainland youth internship programs was covered by the Exchange Funding Scheme.

Source: Home Affairs Bureau (2015).

Table 2.14: Estimated Number of Participants in the Exchange Funding Scheme and the Internship Funding Scheme between 2015/16 and 2017/18

	Estimated Number of Participants		
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Exchange Funding Scheme	15 500	20 000	20 000
Internship Funding Scheme	3 800	5 250	6 000

Source: Home Affairs Bureau (2015).

The figures displayed above refer to the sponsored numbers of participants. In the following, we present figures showing the actual numbers of participants and the actual government expenditures for Mainland exchange programs. From Table 2.15, we can see that 4,000, 34,900, and 21,000 post-secondary, secondary, and primary students participated in the Mainland Exchange Program in 2014/15. The participation rates for the Mainland Exchange Programs were calculated based on the total number of students enrolled in each academic year (shown in the left panel of Table 2.16). The participation rates for post-secondary, secondary, and primary students have been increasing over the past five years; the respective figures were 1.2%, 9.4%, and 6.4% in 2014/15.

Table 2.15: Number of Students Accepted to Mainland Exchange Programs and the Expenditures Involved between 2010/11 and 2014/15

School Year	Number of Students (rounded down to the nearest hundred)			Expenditure (\$ million) @		
	Post-secondary Students	Secondary Students	Primary Students	Post-secondary Students	Secondary Students	Primary Students
2010/11	-	21 500	16 000	-	28.9	11.8
2011/12	3 200 ✧	21 800	21 300	9.8	37.9	14.4
2012/13	7 700 ✧	18 200	10 900	23.2	26.1	6.9
2013/14 <sup>#</sup>	5 800 ✧	22 600	14 400	17.5	29.2	8.0
2014/15 <sup>*</sup>	4 000 ✧	34 900	21 100	12.0	42.4	14.5

@ Staffing resources in the provision of Mainland Exchange Programs are absorbed by the recurrent expenditures of the Education Bureau

# Actual figures revised from last year's estimates

\* Provisional figures

✧ Estimated number of beneficiaries given the provision of data on a pro-rata basis in terms of program implementation over eight years

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2015).

Figures on internships undertaken by post-secondary students in Hong Kong, Mainland China, and other places are kept by the Education Bureau (Table 2.17). We can see that, for students studying in full-time, publicly funded post-secondary programs in the 10 institutions that offer such programs, there was an overall increase in the percentage undertaking internships in the Mainland, from 8.8% in 2010/11 to 13.2% in 2014/15. In 2014/15, 2,378 post-secondary students participated in Mainland internship programs.

We can also observe that the Vocational Training Council (VTC) and the Hong Kong Academy of Performing Arts (HKAPA) provided several local internship programs for their students. For instance, in 2014/15, the percentage of students participating in local internship programs for VTC and HKAPA was 99.1% and 93.5%, respectively. After excluding the figures of these two institutions, the participation rate of post-secondary students in Mainland internship programs increased from 11.1% in 2010/11 to 13.9% in 2014/15.

Among the 10 institutions providing publicly-funded programs, the Hong Kong Polytechnic University and the Chinese University of Hong Kong have historically had the largest numbers of students participating in Mainland internship programs. In 2014 and 2015, 720 and 600 students, respectively, worked in the Mainland as interns.

Table 2.16: Total Number of Students and Participation Rates in Mainland Exchange Programs between 2010/11 and 2014/15

School Year	Number of Students			Participation Rates in MEPs		
	Post-secondary Students*	Secondary Students#	Primary Students@	Post-secondary Students	Secondary Students	Primary Students
2010/11	328 669	449 737	331 112	-	4.8%	4.8%
2011/12	304 000	467 087	322 881	1.1%	4.7%	6.6%
2012/13	342 364	418 787	317 442	2.2%	4.3%	3.4%
2013/14 <sup>#</sup>	343 021	395 345	320 918	1.7%	5.7%	4.5%
2014/15*	340 874	373 131	329 300	1.2%	9.4%	6.4%

@ Figures include ordinary primary schools, but not special schools.

# Figures include ordinary secondary day schools, but not special schools or secondary day courses operated by private schools offering tutorial, vocational, and adult education courses.

\* Figures include both full-time and part-time students attending post-secondary programs operated by UGC-funded institutions, Hong Kong Shue Yan University, The Open University of Hong Kong, approved post-secondary colleges, The Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts, Vocational Training Council, other (local and private) institutions, the Construction Industry Council, the Clothing Industry Training Authority, the Hospital Authority (nursing schools), and The Prince Philip Dental Hospital, as well as students attending the Project Yi Jin/Yi Jin Diploma Program and non-local higher and professional education courses.

Source: Census and Statistics Department (2015).

Table 2.17: Percentage of Students of Full-time Publicly-funded Post-secondary Programs Undertaking Internships by Destination between 2010/11 and 2014/15

Institution	Destination	Academic Year				
		2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15 (provisional)
City University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong	72.9%	70.9%	73.9%	72.3%	72.8%
	Mainland	<b>13.3%</b>	<b>11.5%</b>	<b>9.3%</b>	<b>9.7%</b>	<b>15.7%</b>
	Other destinations	13.8%	17.5%	16.8%	18.0%	11.5%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1 444</b>	<b>1 352</b>	<b>1 437</b>	<b>1 651</b>	<b>1 970</b>
Hong Kong Baptist University	Hong Kong	70.7%	71.4%	72.7%	80.4%	76.2%
	Mainland	<b>24.2%</b>	<b>24.1%</b>	<b>24.3%</b>	<b>17.1%</b>	<b>19.0%</b>
	Other destinations	5.1%	4.6%	3.1%	2.5%	4.8%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>591</b>	<b>611</b>	<b>878</b>	<b>1 135</b>	<b>1 090</b>
Lingnan University	Hong Kong	26.5%	27.1%	46.0%	44.9%	39.8%
	Mainland	<b>35.7%</b>	<b>28.0%</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>28.7%</b>	<b>31.2%</b>
	Other destinations	37.8%	44.9%	29.0%	26.4%	29.0%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>372</b>

Institution	Destination	Academic Year				
		2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15 (provisional)
The Chinese University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong	85.2%	81.5%	81.1%	78.2%	79.2%
	Mainland	<b>7.1%</b>	<b>9.2%</b>	<b>10.5%</b>	<b>12.4%</b>	<b>11.9%</b>
	Other destinations	7.7%	9.3%	8.4%	9.5%	8.9%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>4 731</b>	<b>4 813</b>	<b>4 884</b>	<b>5 230</b>	<b>5 050</b>
The Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts	Hong Kong	76.4%	83.0%	80.4%	96.6%	93.5%
	Mainland	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>4.1%</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>0.5%</b>
	Other destinations	15.3%	12.9%	14.5%	2.6%	6.0%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>200</b>
The Hong Kong Institute of Education	Hong Kong	43.7%	49.3%	46.1%	49.8%	54.8%
	Mainland	<b>17.2%</b>	<b>23.3%</b>	<b>25.7%</b>	<b>21.6%</b>	<b>21.9%</b>
	Other destinations	39.1%	27.4%	28.1%	28.5%	23.3%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>365</b>
The Hong Kong Polytechnic University	Hong Kong	86.1%	85.6%	88.5%	81.4%	76.1%
	Mainland	<b>10.0%</b>	<b>11.6%</b>	<b>8.0%</b>	<b>14.3%</b>	<b>18.3%</b>
	Other destinations	3.9%	2.8%	3.5%	4.3%	5.6%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>4 411</b>	<b>3 245</b>	<b>4 337</b>	<b>4 991</b>	<b>3 940</b>
The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology	Hong Kong	83.0%	83.4%	72.3%	87.2%	88.4%
	Mainland	<b>8.2%</b>	<b>7.6%</b>	<b>18.0%</b>	<b>6.8%</b>	<b>7.3%</b>
	Other destinations	8.8%	9.0%	9.7%	6.0%	4.3%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>545</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>328</b>
The University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong	80.6%	81.2%	84.0%	85.4%	87.9%
	Mainland	<b>13.7%</b>	<b>13.8%</b>	<b>11.0%</b>	<b>10.4%</b>	<b>8.1%</b>
	Other destinations	5.7%	5.0%	5.0%	4.2%	4.1%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3 076</b>	<b>3 171</b>	<b>3 045</b>	<b>4 091</b>	<b>3 948</b>
Vocational Training Council	Hong Kong	98.4%	97.5%	98.5%	98.7%	99.1%
	Mainland	<b>1.5%</b>	<b>2.4%</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>0.4%</b>
	Other destinations	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.5%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>4 583</b>	<b>5 069</b>	<b>6 399</b>	<b>9 106</b>	<b>816</b>
All Institutions	Hong Kong	85.6%	84.5%	86.3%	85.9%	79.5%
	Mainland	<b>8.8%</b>	<b>9.5%</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>8.9%</b>	<b>13.2%</b>
	Other destinations	5.6%	6.1%	5.4%	5.2%	7.4%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>19 521</b>	<b>19 096</b>	<b>22 147</b>	<b>27 485</b>	<b>18 079</b>
All Institutions	Hong Kong	81.7%	79.7%	81.3%	79.3%	78.4%

Institution	Destination	Academic Year				
		2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15 (provisional)
except for HKAPA and VTC	Mainland	<b>11.1%</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>11.2%</b>	<b>12.9%</b>	<b>13.9%</b>
	Other destinations	7.2%	8.2%	7.5%	7.8%	7.7%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>14 696</b>	<b>13 786</b>	<b>15 569</b>	<b>18 146</b>	<b>17 063</b>

Notes: (1) An internship refers to a period of work arranged or endorsed by the institution providing the publicly funded program in which a student is enrolled. There is no restriction on the duration of internship; that is, an internship can be a part-time or full-time work arrangement, provided that it forms a compulsory or elective (though not necessarily credit-bearing) component of the education program. (2) The 2014/15 figures are provisional figures as of the end of 2014. (3) Figures for The Hong Kong Institute of Education do not include student field experiences.

Source: Education Bureau (2015).

From the results presented in this section, we can see that, first, the number of students admitted through the Admission Scheme has been increasing since the scheme's introduction in academic year 2012/13. It is expected that, with the launch of the Mainland University Study Subsidy Scheme in 2014/15, the incentive for Hong Kong students to pursue undergraduate studies in the Mainland will rise. Second, over the past five years, higher quotas for the government-sponsored Funding Scheme for Youth Exchange in the Mainland and Funding Scheme for Youth Internship in the Mainland have been available for Hong Kong young people. With the government's commitment to increase funding and places over the next three years, more young people will be studying and/ or working in the Mainland. Similarly, a rising percentage of post-secondary students have undertaken internships in the Mainland. It must be noted that the proportion of young people going to the Mainland was almost twice that of young people going to other destinations.

## **Chapter 3**

### **Findings of the Telephone Survey**

#### **1. Introduction**

As stated in Chapter 1, in addition to collecting first-hand data via focus group discussions, we conducted a territory-wide representative telephone survey between May 11 and June 23, 2015. In brief, 1,005 respondents aged 15 to 35 were successfully interviewed, with a response rate of 45.8% and a cooperation rate of 79.5%. More details on the methodology and sampling of the telephone survey were elaborated in Chapter 1. In this chapter, we shall first introduce the coverage of the survey questionnaire. Second, we will describe the data management and weighting. After illustrating the socio-demographic profiles of the survey respondents, we will report the survey findings.

#### **2. Coverage of the Survey Questionnaire**

The specific objectives of the current survey are as follows:

- (1) To examine Hong Kong youth's common perceptions of the social and political phenomena of the Mainland;
- (2) To investigate the impressions of Hong Kong youth's on the policies implemented by the government concerning the relationship between the Mainland and Hong Kong;
- (3) To study the views and/ or experiences of Hong Kong youth's in relation to studying and/ or working in the Mainland;
- (4) To analyze the extent to which the above views and/ or experiences of Hong Kong youth's impact their incentives to study and/ or work in the Mainland; and
- (5) On the basis of the study findings, to make policy recommendations on how to encourage the Hong Kong young generation to study and/ or work in the Mainland.

As such, the survey questionnaire includes respondents' ratings for the social, economic, and political situations of the Mainland; their attitudes towards policies related to "One Country, Two Systems," the Individual Visit Scheme, and immigrants from the Mainland; their perceptions of government measures



encouraging Hong Kong youth to study and work in the Mainland; their views of “China opportunities;” their previous experiences of studying and working across the border; and their intentions to pursue personal development in the Mainland. Socio-demographic characteristics and other details, such as the respondents’ knowledge about Mainland society and Mainlanders and their intentions to stay and work overseas, are also included in the questionnaire. All of these data assist in the formulation of effective programs and policies for enhancing Hong Kong youth’s impressions of Mainland society and encouraging them to turn to the Mainland for personal development. The questionnaire for this telephone survey is shown in Appendix 3.1.

### **3. Data Management and Weighting**

All of the data collected in this survey were carefully validated, recoded, and analyzed using the statistical software package SPSS. In order to reflect the distribution of the population living in Hong Kong, the telephone survey data were weighted based on the population’s age-sex distribution (aged 15-35, excluding foreign domestic helpers), as taken from the mid-year statistics of 2014 reported by the Demographic Statistics Section of the Census and Statistics Department. The weighting factor was calculated using the proportion between the percentage of observation in a particular age-sex survey group and the percentage of distribution in the corresponding age-sex population group. For details on the weighting, see Appendix 3.2. The survey findings presented in this report are weighted.

### **4. Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Survey Respondents**

A total of 1,005 eligible respondents were interviewed. In this section, we describe the socio-demographic profiles of the respondents. These profiles are shown in Table 3.1. First, among the 1,005 respondents, males (49.2%) and females (50.8%) were equally represented. Second, in terms of age, 20.5% were 15 to 19 years old, 23.5% were 20 to 24 years old, a quarter (24.6%) were 25 to 29 years old, and 31.5% were 30 to 35 years old.

A majority of our respondents (80.5%) were born in Hong Kong, 17.5% were born in the Mainland, and 2.0% were born somewhere else. Among those who were born outside Hong Kong, nearly two-fifths (38.7%) moved to Hong Kong before the age of six. Cumulatively, three-quarters (75.4%) of these non-locally

born respondents moved to Hong Kong before age 12. Our respondents were well-educated, with over half (53.5%) being degree holders and 14.3% having received non-degree tertiary education. An additional 29.1% reported upper secondary as their highest level of education attained so far.

Table 3.1: Basic Socio-Demographic Profiles of the Respondents (%)

<i>Sex</i>	
Male	49.2
Female	50.8
<i>Age</i>	
15-19	20.5
20-24	23.5
25-29	24.6
30-35	31.5
<i>Place of Birth</i>	
Hong Kong	80.5
Mainland	17.5
Others	2.0
<i>Age of Starting to Reside in Hong Kong</i>	
Before age 6	38.7
Age 6 – Before age 12	36.7
Age 12 – Before age 18	13.8
Age 18 – Before age 22	5.7
Age 22 or after	5.1
<i>Level of Education Attainment</i>	
Lower secondary or below	3.2
Upper secondary	29.1
Tertiary: non-degree	14.3
Tertiary: undergraduate degree	44.7
Tertiary: post-graduate degree	8.8

While three-fifths of the respondents (61.9%) were currently working, 30.6% were students. Furthermore, 3.8% were unemployed, and 3.7% were either home-makers or economically inactive. Among those who were currently employed, 47.7% worked in high-level occupations (e.g., managers, administrators, professionals, and associate professionals), a quarter (25.5%) was clerical support workers, and 17.4% were service and sales workers. An additional 9.4% worked in other occupations (these included skilled

agricultural and fishery workers, craft and related workers, plant and machine operators and assemblers, and elementary occupations).

Table 3.1: Basic Socio-Demographic Profiles of the Respondents (%) (cont'd)

<i>Economic Activity Status</i>	
Currently working	61.9
Student	30.6
Unemployed	3.8
Others	3.7
<i>Occupation</i>	
Managers and administrators	10.7
Professionals	15.9
Associate professionals	21.1
Clerical support workers	25.5
Service and sales workers	17.4
Skilled agricultural and fishery workers	0.3
Craft and related workers	5.2
Plant and machine operators and assemblers	1.2
Elementary occupations	2.7
<i>Earnings from Employment</i>	
Below HK\$10,000	7.3
HK\$10,000 - <HK\$20,000	49.0
HK\$20,000 - <HK\$30,000	24.1
HK\$30,000 - <HK\$50,000	12.7
HK\$50,000 or above	5.5
Unstable	1.4
<i>Level of Job Satisfaction</i>	
Very satisfied	13.2
Satisfied	68.7
Dissatisfied	15.0
Very dissatisfied	1.6
Don't know/Hard to say	1.5

Half of the employed respondents (49.0%) earned HK\$10,000 to 19,000 from their main job monthly, a quarter (24.1%) received HK\$20,000 to 29,000, and 12.7% obtained HK\$30,000 to 49,999 monthly income. A majority of employed respondents (81.9%) were very satisfied or satisfied with their jobs. Of the 1,005 respondents, only 5% perceived their families being in the

upper-middle or upper strata. Another 14.1% reported being in the lower social stratum, 44.8% subjectively identified with the lower-middle stratum, and over one-third (35.2%) identified with the middle stratum. As in previous studies, our young respondents had a strong sense of identification with Hong Kong, with 44.4% identifying themselves as Hongkongers and 39.1% stating that they were Hongkongers, but also Chinese. Only 4.2% reported being Chinese, and 10.8% identified as Chinese, but also Hongkongers.

**Table 3.1: Basic Socio-Demographic Profiles of the Respondents (%) (cont'd)**

<i>Subjective Social Strata</i>	
Lower	14.1
Lower-middle	44.8
Middle	35.2
Upper-middle	4.8
Upper	0.2
Don't know/Hard to say	0.9
<i>National Identity</i>	
Hongkonger	44.4
Chinese	4.2
Hongkonger but also Chinese	39.1
Chinese but also Hongkonger	10.8
Others/Don't know/Hard to say	1.6
<i>Political Orientation</i>	
Pan-democratic	42.3
Between pan-democratic and pro-establishment	36.4
Pro-establishment	5.3
No political orientation	12.0
Don't know/Hard to say	4.0

In terms of political orientation, while two-fifths of the survey respondents (42.3%) were pan-democrats, only 5.3% were pro-establishment. A further 36.4% reported being neutral or in-between the two political positions, and 12.0% had no political orientation.

## **5. Main Findings of the Telephone Survey**

In this section, we will report Hong Kong youth's views and experiences of the Mainland and how their impressions and first-hand experiences of the

Mainland impact their incentive to study and work in the Mainland. Specifically, attitudes and intentions of pursuing academic study, joining internship programs, and taking up employment in the Mainland will be analyzed. In addition to investigating the effects of youth's views and experiences on their intentions, we will identify group differences in order to examine which groups have more positive perceptions and experiences of the Mainland and which have more negative perceptions and experiences. The findings will help policy makers design targeted measures to improve Hong Kong youth's impressions of the Mainland and to encourage them to further explore China opportunities as options for personal development.

### ***Socio-political Perceptions of the Mainland***

How did our respondents perceive the social and political phenomena of the Mainland? Generally, the respondents were more positive about the Mainland's economic prospects, but less optimistic about its political development. As shown in Table 3.2, two-thirds of our respondents (66.5%) agreed with the view that "the Mainland economy will maintain its rapid development" (with 8.2% and 58.3% responding "strongly agree" and "agree," respectively), and 30.6% disagreed (with 3.5% and 27.1% responding "strongly disagree" and "disagree," respectively).

On the contrary, only one-third of the respondents (32.8%) felt optimistic about the political development of the Mainland (with 2.0% being very optimistic and 30.8% being optimistic), and 64.5% were either "not optimistic" (44.8%) or "not optimistic at all" (19.7%). In total, while nearly half of the respondents rated the quality of life in the Mainland as "very good" (2.6%) or "good" (44.5%), 42.9% indicated that it was "bad," and 6.4% said that it was "very bad."

In order to examine the respondents' overall perceptions of the Mainland, we construct a composite measure based on their assessments of the economic, social, and political situations in the three items presented above. The respondents' assessments of each of the areas of Mainland society were measured using a 4-point rating scale, in which 0 was very unfavorable and 3 was very favorable. The composite rating scores for Mainland society in these three items range from 0 to 9. The higher the score, the more positive the respondents' perceptions of the Mainland were. To facilitate the interpretation,

an adjusted score with a range from 0 to 10 was calculated. This allowed respondents' ratings of various aspects of the Mainland and the Hong Kong-Mainland relations and policies to be compared.<sup>2</sup> The adjusted mean score was 4.80, which indicates that our respondents, on average, had bad perceptions of the Mainland (Table 3.2).

Table 3.2: Ratings of Mainland Society

	%
<i>Agreement with the statement, "the Mainland economy will remain a rapid development"</i>	
Strongly agree	8.2
Agree	58.3
Disagree	27.1
Strongly disagree	3.5
Don't know/Hard to say	3.0
<i>Level of optimism about the political prospects of the Mainland</i>	
Very optimistic	2.0
Optimistic	30.8
Not optimistic	44.8
Not optimistic at all	19.7
Don't know/Hard to say	2.7
<i>Rating for the quality of life in the Mainland</i>	
Very good	2.6
Good	44.5
Not good	42.9
Not good at all	6.4
Don't know/Hard to say	3.5
<i>Composite rating for Mainland society</i>	
Mean	4.32
S.D.	1.53
(n)	(922)
<i>Composite rating for Mainland society</i>	
Adjusted Mean	4.80
Adjusted S.D.	1.70
(n)	(922)

<sup>2</sup> We report an adjusted mean, which ranges from 0 to 10, for all composite scores only.

Table 3.3: Socio-demographic Differences in Ratings for Mainland Society

	Adjusted Mean	Adjusted S.D.
<b>**Sex</b>		
Male	4.62	1.80
Female	4.97	1.58
<b>**Age</b>		
15-19	4.79	1.59
20-24	4.61	1.52
25-29	4.61	1.62
30-35	5.11	1.93
<b>***Place of Birth</b>		
Hong Kong	4.65	1.69
Mainland/Others	5.41	1.61
<b>**Level of Educational Attainment</b>		
Secondary or below	5.00	1.71
Tertiary: non-degree	4.99	1.64
Tertiary: degree or above	4.62	1.68
<b>**Economic Activity Status</b>		
Currently working	4.80	1.76
Student	4.69	1.53
Unemployed	4.75	1.63
Home-makers/Others	5.86	1.83
<b>Subjective Social Strata</b>		
Lower	5.02	1.90
Lower-middle	4.80	1.62
Middle/Upper-middle/Upper	4.72	1.71
<b>***National Identity</b>		
Hongkonger	3.97	1.59
Chinese/Chinese but also Hongkonger	6.00	1.58
Hongkonger but also Chinese	5.29	1.39
<b>***Political Orientation</b>		
Pan-democratic	4.02	1.54
Between pan-democratic and pro-establishment	5.26	1.42
Pro-establishment	6.80	1.40
No political orientation	5.26	1.72

\*\*\*p<0.001; \*\*p<0.01; \*p<0.05

Before reporting the respondents' attitudes towards government policies on Hong Kong-Mainland relations, we will examine the differences, if any, among the perceptions of the Mainland society of the various socio-demographic groups. From Table 3.3, we can see that, compared with their counterparts, females, the youngest and oldest respondents, respondents not born in Hong Kong, non-degree holders, respondents who were economically inactive, respondents from lower social classes, respondents who identified more with their Chinese background, and pro-establishment respondents perceived Mainland society in a more positive light. Except for subjective social strata, all socio-demographic profiles indicated statistically significant differences.

### ***Attitudes towards Government Policies on Hong Kong-Mainland Relations***

In the current survey, we also asked our respondents about their impressions of the policies implemented by the government regarding the relationship between the Mainland and Hong Kong. The results are shown in Table 3.4. First, concerning their attitudes towards the implementation of "One Country, Two Systems," while 27.1% of the 1,005 respondents wanted to strengthen ties, a majority (70.7%) preferred to maintain the distance from the Mainland. Second, we gauged the respondents' opinions concerning the impacts of the Individual Visit Scheme (IVS) and more Mainlanders studying and working in Hong Kong on the local society. Overall, less than one-third of our young respondents viewed these policies as favorable. Specifically, only 29.1% perceived IVS visitors as being beneficial to Hong Kong, 57.1% saw these visitors as being detrimental, and a handful (11.1%) were neutral regarding the impacts of the IVS.

Similarly, although one-fifth of our respondents (20.1%) did not believe that more Mainlanders studying and working in Hong Kong would impact Hong Kong's overall development, around half foresaw these Mainlanders having bad (36.2%) and very bad (13.2%) impacts. Only one-quarter perceived this scenario as being beneficial to the local society (with 1.7% and 25.8% suggesting that more Mainlanders would have very good and good impacts, respectively). Unsurprisingly, the survey respondents felt more negatively about the impact of more Mainlanders studying and working in Hong Kong on their own opportunities. Over half of the respondents foresaw this phenomenon having bad (35.5%) and very bad (17.4%) impacts, while less than a quarter reported it having good (21.2%) and very good (2.2%) impacts on their



education and employment opportunities.

Table 3.4: Views on Government Policies on Hong Kong-Mainland Relations

	%
<i>Attitude Towards “One Country, Two Systems”</i>	
Keeping a distance from the Mainland	70.7
Strengthening ties between Hong Kong and Mainland	27.1
Don’t know/Hard to say	2.2
<i>Assessment of the Impact of Mainland Visitors from the IVS on Hong Kong</i>	
IVS visitors bring more benefits to Hong Kong	29.1
IVS visitors bring more detriments to Hong Kong	57.1
IVS visitors bring both benefits and detriments to Hong Kong	11.1
Don’t know/Hard to say	2.7
<i>Assessment of the Impact of More Mainlanders Studying and Working in Hong Kong on Hong Kong’s Overall Development</i>	
Very good impact	1.7
Good impact	25.8
Bad impact	36.2
Very bad impact	13.2
No impact at all	20.1
Don’t know/Hard to say	3.1
<i>Assessment of the Impact of More Mainlanders Studying and Working in Hong Kong on the Studying and Job Opportunities of Local Youth</i>	
Very good impact	2.2
Good impact	21.2
Bad impact	35.5
Very bad impact	17.4
No impact at all	21.4
Don’t know/Hard to say	2.3
<i>Composite Rating of Government Policies on Hong Kong-Mainland Relations</i>	
Mean	4.14
S.D.	2.60
(n)	(922)
<i>Composite Rating of Government Policies on Hong Kong-Mainland Relations</i>	
Adjusted Mean	3.76
Adjusted S.D.	2.36
(n)	(922)

Table 3.5: Socio-demographic Differences in Views on Government Policies on Hong Kong-Mainland Relations

	Adjusted Mean	Adjusted S.D.
<i>Sex</i>		
Male	3.76	2.40
Female	3.76	2.33
<i>Age</i>		
15-19	4.11	2.28
20-24	3.58	2.29
25-29	3.56	2.16
30-35	3.84	2.62
<i>***Place of Birth</i>		
Hong Kong	3.59	2.37
Mainland/Others	4.51	2.22
<i>*Level of Educational Attainment</i>		
Secondary or below	4.10	2.38
Tertiary: non-degree	3.60	2.31
Tertiary: degree or above	3.60	2.35
<i>Economic Activity Status</i>		
Currently working	3.61	2.35
Student	3.93	2.34
Unemployed	4.22	2.44
Home-makers/Others	4.36	2.68
<i>Subjective Social Strata</i>		
Lower	3.86	2.27
Lower-middle	3.69	2.32
Middle/Upper-middle/Upper	3.82	2.44
<i>***National Identity</i>		
Hongkonger	2.60	1.97
Chinese/Chinese but also Hongkonger	5.39	2.32
Hongkonger but also Chinese	4.53	2.12
<i>***Political Orientation</i>		
Pan-democratic	2.86	2.06
Between pan-democratic and pro-establishment	4.40	2.29
Pro-establishment	5.98	2.06
No political orientation	4.27	2.41

\*\*\*p<0.001; \*\*p<0.01; \*p<0.05

To facilitate a comparison of the attitudes of the different social groups towards government policies on Hong Kong-Mainland relations, we constructed a composite score based on these four questions. In general, higher scores indicate more favorable attitudes, and vice versa. Therefore, for the first item, while 0 represents the desire to maintain a distance from the Mainland, 1 suggests a closer tie between the two places. In assessing the impacts of IVS visitors, we used a 3-point rating scale: 0 indicates that the visitors will bring detriments to Hong Kong, 1 indicates both benefits and detriments, and 2 indicates benefits. The last two items on the impacts of more Mainlanders studying and working in Hong Kong were measured using a 5-point scale: 0 indicates very bad impacts, 2 indicates no impact, and 4 indicates very good impacts. The composite score ranges from 0 to 11, and the adjusted score is between 0 and 10.

The adjusted mean score for the rating of policy implementation of the Hong Kong-Mainland relationship was 3.76, indicating that our respondents, on average, tended to view government policies on the relationship between the two places less favorably (Table 3.4). The results of the statistical tests revealed that respondents born outside Hong Kong, respondents with secondary or lower levels of education, and respondents who identified more as Chinese and as pro-establishment had significantly positive attitudes towards government policies relating to the relationship between the Mainland and Hong Kong (Table 3.5).

### ***Perceptions of China Opportunities***

One of the indicators of closer integration between the Mainland and Hong Kong is the practice of Hong Kong people studying and working in the Mainland. Before measuring the willingness of our respondents to study and work in the Mainland, we gauged their general level of agreement with Hong Kong youth pursuing four types of activities for personal development in the Mainland, including joining exchange tours, participating in internship programs, pursuing academic study, and taking up employment. The results in Table 3.6 reveal that, generally, our respondents felt more favorable towards exchange tours, internship programs, and employment than towards academic study in the Mainland.

Table 3.6: General Views on Hong Kong Youth Pursuing Personal Development in the Mainland

	%
<i>Joining Exchange Tour</i>	
Strongly agree	7.0
Agree	61.8
Disagree	20.6
Strongly disagree	7.0
Don't know/Hard to say	3.6
<i>Participating in Internship Program</i>	
Strongly agree	8.0
Agree	62.8
Disagree	21.3
Strongly disagree	5.0
Don't know/Hard to say	2.9
<i>Studying</i>	
Strongly agree	2.3
Agree	37.1
Disagree	41.9
Strongly disagree	9.8
Don't know/Hard to say	8.9
<i>Working</i>	
Strongly agree	4.8
Agree	52.1
Disagree	30.3
Strongly disagree	5.4
Don't know/Hard to say	7.5
<i>Composite Rating of China Opportunities</i>	
Mean	6.41
S.D.	2.35
(n)	(858)
<i>Composite Rating of China Opportunities</i>	
Adjusted Mean	5.34
Adjusted S.D.	1.96
(n)	(858)

First, while almost 70% strongly agreed (7.0%) and agreed (61.8%) that Hong Kong youth should join exchange tours in the Mainland, 20.6% disagreed and

7.0% strongly disagreed. Second, a majority agreed with Hong Kong youth participating in internship programs in the Mainland (with 8.0% strongly agreeing and 62.8% agreeing). Additionally, more than half of the 1,005 respondents (56.9%) supported local youth taking up employment in the Mainland (with 4.8% and 52.1% stating that they “strongly agree” and “agree,” respectively). As mentioned above, a comparatively smaller proportion of respondents strongly agreed (2.3%) and agreed (37.1%) with Hong Kong youth pursuing study in the Mainland. The corresponding percentages for “disagree” and “strongly disagree” were 41.9% and 9.8%, respectively.

It is clear that, overall, Hong Kong youth perceive China opportunities quite positively. We assume that the reason for a larger proportion being less supportive of youth studying in the Mainland is related to the comparatively lower recognition given to Mainland academic qualifications in the labor markets of Hong Kong and other places. The overall views of Hong Kong youth on studying and working in the Mainland were measured using a composite score based on the 4-point scale for each of the China opportunities, in which higher scores represent more positive attitudes towards China opportunities. The adjusted composite rating scale for China opportunities was between 0 and 10, and the adjusted mean was 5.34. This indicates that, overall, respondents viewed China opportunities positively (Table 3.6).

The results of Table 3.7 show that respondents born outside Hong Kong, unemployed and economically inactive respondents (including students, home-makers, etc.), respondents from lower social strata, and respondents who identified as more Chinese and as pro-establishment were significantly more favorable towards Hong Kong youth pursuing personal development in the Mainland. In other words, these respondents found China opportunities to be more valuable than their counterparts did.

In addition to gauging the survey respondents’ general views on Hong Kong youth studying and working in the Mainland, we also questioned their perceived level of difficulty of obtaining suitable jobs, pursuing academic study, and securing internships in the Mainland themselves. We assume that the respondents’ attitudes towards different types of China opportunities could differ from their evaluations of their own capability to secure these opportunities. Data on the latter topic enable us to design specific measures to help those who are interested in pursuing China opportunities to achieve their

personal development goals in the Mainland, but who face challenges in obtaining these opportunities.

Table 3.7: Socio-demographic Differences in General Views towards Hong Kong Youth Going to the Mainland for Personal Development

	Adjusted Mean	Adjusted S.D.
<i>Sex</i>		
Male	5.34	1.94
Female	5.34	1.98
<i>Age</i>		
15-19	5.61	1.69
20-24	5.35	1.75
25-29	5.10	2.01
30-35	5.32	2.21
<i>***Place of Birth</i>		
Hong Kong	5.20	2.00
Mainland/Others	5.90	1.69
<i>Level of Educational Attainment</i>		
Secondary or below	5.51	1.89
Tertiary: non-degree	5.27	2.03
Tertiary: degree or above	5.24	1.97
<i>*Economic Activity Status</i>		
Currently working	5.19	2.10
Student	5.58	1.71
Unemployed	5.43	1.51
Home-makers/Others	5.65	1.76
<i>*Subjective Social Strata</i>		
Lower	5.76	1.90
Lower-middle	5.29	1.86
Middle/Upper-middle/Upper	5.26	2.05
<i>***National Identity</i>		
Hongkonger	4.38	2.02
Chinese/Chinese but also Hongkonger	6.50	1.58
Hongkonger but also Chinese	5.97	1.49
<i>***Political Orientation</i>		
Pan-democratic	4.66	1.88
Between pan-democratic and pro-establishment	5.79	1.65

Pro-establishment	7.25	1.27
No political orientation	5.65	2.44

\*\*\*p<0.001; \*\*p<0.01; \*p<0.05

Table 3.8 demonstrates the respondents' perceived levels of difficulty in getting suitable jobs in the Mainland, securing internship opportunities, and pursuing academic study. Table 3.9 shows which groups perceived the highest level of difficulty in obtaining these China opportunities. It should be noted that we only asked the student respondents about their perceived levels of difficulty in participating in internship programs and studying in the Mainland.

Table 3.8: Perceptions of Levels of Difficulty of Getting a Suitable Job, Studying, and Securing an Internship Opportunity in the Mainland (%)

<i>Getting a Suitable Job in the Mainland</i>	
Very difficult	28.4
Difficult	43.7
Not difficult	17.2
Not difficult at all	6.0
Don't know/Hard to say	4.7
<i>Securing an Internship Opportunity</i>	
Very difficult	10.2
Difficult	56.7
Not difficult	25.6
Not difficult at all	6.1
Don't know/Hard to say	1.4
<i>Studying in the Mainland</i>	
Very difficult	10.8
Difficult	44.7
Not difficult	30.6
Not difficult at all	11.4
Don't know/Hard to say	2.6

The results from Table 3.8 reveal that our young respondents generally perceived higher levels of difficulty related to securing job-related opportunities in the Mainland. While 72.1% reported that getting a suitable job in the Mainland would be "very difficult" or "difficult," the corresponding figure for securing an internship opportunity in the Mainland was 66.9%. More than half of the respondents (55.4%) also thought that pursuing study in the

Mainland would be “very difficult” or “difficult.”

In terms of group differences in perceived levels of difficulties in securing China opportunities, only a few statistically significant results were found (Table 3.9). First, the youngest respondents (aged 15-19) perceived higher levels of difficulty in pursuing academic study and participating in internship programs in the Mainland. Second, less educated respondents were less confident in going to the Mainland for personal development. Those from lower social strata also perceived taking up employment across the border to be more difficult.



Table 3.9: Socio-demographic Differences of Those who Perceived Pursuing China Opportunities to be “Very Difficult/Difficult” (%)

	Working	Studying	Internship
<i>Sex</i>			
Male	74.2	51.0	66.0
Female	77.0	62.3	69.2
<i>Age</i>			
		*	***
15-19	78.1	62.9	74.6
20-24	77.4	49.0	60.0
25-29	75.0	30.0	22.2
30-35	73.1	50.0	0.0
<i>Place of Birth</i>			
Hong Kong	75.7	56.0	67.3
Mainland/Others	75.4	60.8	71.2
<i>Level of Educational Attainment</i>			
	*	*	**
Secondary or below	78.5	64.9	74.5
Tertiary: non-degree	82.1	54.5	75.8
Tertiary: degree or above	72.3	47.5	56.8
<i>Economic Activity Status</i>			
Currently working	73.9	--	--
Student	78.9	--	--
Unemployed	80.6	--	--
Home-makers/Others	73.0	--	--
<i>Subjective Social Strata</i>			
	*		
Lower	83.6	69.2	70.0
Lower-middle	77.2	53.7	66.7
Middle/Upper-middle/Upper	71.5	55.6	67.7
<i>National Identity</i>			
Hongkonger	76.9	51.5	66.9
Chinese/Chinese but also Hongkonger	75.7	59.0	75.0
Hongkonger but also Chinese	74.5	62.0	66.7
<i>Political Orientation</i>			
Pan-democratic	77.4	56.5	66.7
Between pan-democratic and pro-establishment	75.2	56.3	69.3
Pro-establishment	76.5	56.3	60.0
No political orientation	72.0	60.7	70.4

\*\*\*p&lt;0.001; \*\*p&lt;0.01; \*p&lt;0.05

***Views on Government Measures Encouraging Hong Kong Youth to Pursue Personal Development in the Mainland***

Table 3.10: Views on the Usefulness of Government Measures Encouraging Local Youth to Study and Work in the Mainland

	%
<i>Views on the Arrangement of Using HKDSE Results in Applying for Academic Programs of Mainland Higher Education Institutions</i>	
Very useful	14.5
Useful	54.1
Not useful	23.9
Not useful at all	6.7
Don't know/Hard to say	0.7
<i>Views on the Mainland University Study Subsidy Scheme</i>	
Very useful	10.5
Useful	53.2
Not useful	28.3
Not useful at all	6.9
Don't know/Hard to say	1.0
<i>Views on the Provision of Subsidies to Join Exchange Tours and Internship Programs in the Mainland</i>	
Very useful	9.2
Useful	55.9
Not useful	26.6
Not useful at all	7.6
Don't know/Hard to say	0.7
<i>Composite Rating of Usefulness of Government Measures in Encouraging Local Youth to Study and Work in the MAINLAND</i>	
Mean	5.14
S.D.	1.89
(n)	(986)
<i>Composite Rating of Usefulness of Government Measures in Encouraging Local Youth to Study and Work in the Mainland</i>	
Adjusted Mean	5.70
Adjusted S.D.	2.10
(n)	(986)

Over the past few years, the Hong Kong government has been proactively introducing a series of measures to encourage local youth to study and work in the Mainland. We will examine the perceived usefulness of these measures from the perspective of our respondents (Table 3.10). Concerning the arrangement of allowing local youth to use their HKDSE results to apply for Mainland higher education study programs, two-thirds of the 1,005 respondents rated the initiative as “very useful” (14.5%) or “useful” (54.1%). Similarly, 63.8% of the respondents thought that the maximum subsidy of HK\$15,000 granted by the Mainland University Study Subsidy Scheme was “very useful” (10.5%) or “useful” (53.2%) in encouraging Hong Kong youth to pursue personal development in the Mainland. A similar proportion of our young respondents viewed government subsidies for Mainland exchange tours and internship programs to be “very useful” (9.2%) or “useful” (55.9%).

A composite score was constructed based on the 4-point scales of each item. The adjusted mean score of the usefulness rating for the three government measures encouraging youth to pursue personal development in the Mainland was 5.70, indicating that, overall, our respondents felt positively about these measures (Table 3.10). A comparison among the groups reveals that the youngest respondents (aged 15-19), respondents born outside Hong Kong, students, youth with some degree of Chinese identification, and respondents who were pro-establishment were significantly more likely to find these government measures useful in encouraging Hong Kong youth to study and work in the Mainland (Table 3.11).

Table 3.11: Socio-demographic Differences in Views on Government Measures to Encourage Youth to Study and Work in the Mainland

	Adjusted Mean	Adjusted S.D.
<i>Sex</i>		
Male	5.58	2.15
Female	5.82	2.06
<i>**Age</i>		
15-19	6.16	1.86
20-24	5.67	2.00
25-29	5.37	2.05
30-35	5.69	2.32
<i>**Place of Birth</i>		
Hong Kong	5.59	2.07
Mainland/Others	6.16	2.18
<i>Level of Educational Attainment</i>		
Secondary or below	5.93	2.21
Tertiary: non-degree	5.53	2.15
Tertiary: degree or above	5.60	2.00
<i>*Economic Activity Status</i>		
Currently working	5.56	2.18
Student	6.00	1.87
Unemployed	5.78	2.24
Home-makers/Others	5.49	2.33
<i>Subjective Social Strata</i>		
Lower	5.96	2.07
Lower-middle	5.62	2.09
Middle/Upper-middle/Upper	5.68	2.12
<i>***National Identity</i>		
Hongkonger	4.93	2.15
Chinese/Chinese but also Hongkonger	6.73	2.18
Hongkonger but also Chinese	6.20	1.68
<i>***Political Orientation</i>		
Pan-democratic	5.19	2.03
Between pan-democratic and pro-establishment	5.99	2.02
Pro-establishment	7.00	1.70
No political orientation	6.11	2.38

\*\*\*p<0.001; \*\*p<0.01; \*p<0.05

### *Experiences of Studying and Working in the Mainland*

The current study collected respondents' actual experiences of China opportunities. Table 3.12 shows that, among the different types of Mainland experiences, the largest number of our respondents joined exchange tours, with over one-third (36.5%) engaging in this type of China opportunity. The second most popular activity type was working in the Mainland. A quarter of our 1,005 respondents (25.9%) had working experience in the Mainland (including all types of working experience, such as taking up jobs, being on duty trips, attending business meetings, etc.).<sup>3</sup> Among these 260 respondents, 34.6% (90 respondents) were stationed in the Mainland or had their primary place of work in the Mainland. Specifically, 74 were employed in the Mainland, and 16 were currently spending at least half of their working time in the Mainland. All in all, these 90 respondents (9.0% of all respondents) are categorized as those who had worked or were working in the Mainland during the time of this study.

Table 3.12: Experiences of Studying and Working in the Mainland<sup>^</sup>

	n	%
<i>Joined exchange tour in the Mainland</i>	367	36.5
<i>Have had working experience in the Mainland</i>	260	25.9
<i>Previously took up employment in the Mainland</i>	74	7.4
<i>Currently taking up employment in the Mainland</i>	16	1.6
<i>Participated in an internship program in the Mainland</i>	69	6.9
<i>Studied in the Mainland</i>	149	14.9
<i>Studied in the Mainland at a post-secondary level</i>	38	3.8

<sup>^</sup>This table only reports figures regarding the different types of Mainland experiences undertaken by the respondents.

Furthermore, 6.9% of the respondents participated in internship programs in the Mainland. Additionally, 14.9% studied in the Mainland, and 3.8% pursued Mainland study at the post-secondary level. Among the latter group of respondents, since some were born in the Mainland and moved to Hong Kong at the age of 18 or older, the pursuit of post-secondary education in the Mainland may be relatively natural; these Mainland experiences may not be regarded as China opportunities.

<sup>3</sup> It should be noted that the proportion would be higher if respondents who had never been employed were excluded from the analysis.

No systematic results were found in relation to socio-demographic differences in China experiences (Table 3.13). First, while a greater proportion of the youngest respondents (aged 15-19) joined exchange tours, more of their older counterparts pursued post-secondary education, participated in internship programs, and worked in the Mainland. Second, compared to women, men were more likely to have work and study experiences (other than internships) in the Mainland. Third, a higher percentage of degree holders were involved in Mainland activities, and more student respondents tended to join Mainland exchange tours. While a greater proportion of youth from more affluent families had pursued post-secondary education in the Mainland, fewer youth from the lower-middle social stratum had taken up employment across the border. All of these differences between groups were significant statistically at the 0.05 level.

National identity was not found to be statistically associated with the three types of Mainland experiences other than studying in the Mainland. In addition, compared with their pro-establishment counterparts, a significantly higher proportion of pan-democratic supporters joined exchange tours in the Mainland. Place of birth, however, did have a significant impact on Mainland experiences, with fewer local-born youth receiving post-secondary levels of education and/or taking up employment in the Mainland.

Table 3.13: Socio-demographic Differences in Experiences of China Opportunities (%)^

	Exchange Tour	Post- secondary Education	Internship	Employment
<i>Sex</i>	*	**		**
Male	33.2	2.0	6.1	11.7
Female	39.7	5.5	7.6	6.5
<i>Age</i>	***	***	**	***
15-19	50.2	0.5	1.9	0.5
20-24	42.8	1.3	5.1	3.0
25-29	38.1	6.5	9.3	10.9
30-35	21.5	5.4	9.5	17.7
<i>Place of Birth</i>		***		**
Hong Kong	36.2	2.3	6.7	7.4
Mainland/Others	37.2	9.7	7.7	15.3

<i>Level of Educational Attainment</i>	*		***	***
Secondary or below	31.5	--	2.8	3.4
Tertiary: non-degree	34.0	--	0.0	3.5
Tertiary: degree or above	40.2	--	11.2	13.8
<i>Economic Activity Status</i>	***			
Currently working	30.5	--	--	--
Student	51.3	--	--	--
Unemployed	33.3	--	--	--
Home-makers/Others	18.9	--	--	--
<i>Subjective Social Strata</i>		**		*
Lower	38.0	2.1	5.7	9.2
Lower-middle	37.9	2.2	7.1	6.0
Middle/Upper-middle/Upper	34.2	6.0	7.0	11.9
<i>National Identity</i>		*		
Hongkonger	34.2	2.0	4.9	7.9
Chinese/Chinese but also Hongkonger	35.8	6.7	9.9	10.7
Hongkonger but also Chinese	38.8	4.6	7.7	9.4
<i>Political Orientation</i>	**			
Pan-democratic	38.2	2.8	6.8	8.0
Between pan-democratic and pro-establishment	39.2	5.5	6.3	9.6
Pro-establishment	34.6	1.9	7.5	17.0
No political orientation	19.2	4.2	5.8	7.5

\*\*\*p<0.001; \*\*p<0.01; \*p<0.05

^This table only reports percentages for those who engaged in specific types of China opportunities in their socio-demographic groups.

### ***Intentions to Study and Work in the Mainland***

In the current survey, out of 1,005 respondents, 91.0% had never taken up any employment in the Mainland. Among this group of 915 respondents, while more than one-third were “very much willing” (2.2%) or “willing” (35.2%) to work in the Mainland, three-fifths were not interested (with 41.5% being “not willing” and 19.8% being “not willing at all”) (Table 3.14). Apart from employment, we also asked student respondents about their intentions to pursue

academic study and participate in internship programs in the Mainland. Among those who had not yet studied in the Mainland, 29.3% indicated an interest in pursuing academic study in the Mainland (with 1.5% and 27.8% being “very much willing” and “willing,” respectively). Our survey results reveal that Hong Kong youth were generally not keen on taking up employment and/ or pursuing academic study in the Mainland.

Table 3.14: Willingness to Study and Work in the Mainland (only applicable to those who had not yet had the relevant experiences) (%)

<i>Working in the Mainland</i>	
Very much willing	2.2
Willing	35.2
Not willing	41.5
Not willing at all	19.8
Don't know/Hard to say	1.4
<i>Studying in the Mainland</i>	
Very much willing	1.5
Willing	27.8
Not willing	42.4
Not willing at all	26.5
Don't know/Hard to say	1.8
<i>Participating in an Internship Program in the Mainland</i>	
Very much willing	5.1
Willing	50.7
Not willing	32.8
Not willing at all	8.7
Don't know/Hard to say	2.8

Our respondents showed more interest in securing internship opportunities in the Mainland. Out of the 292 student respondents who had never participated in an internship program in the Mainland, more than half said that they would be “very much willing” (5.1%) or “willing” (50.7%) to intern across the border (Table 3.14). These findings may suggest that Hong Kong youth find China opportunities valuable to a certain extent, but that they are not prepared to commit to staying in the Mainland for a longer time period to study or work.

The figures shown in Table 3.15 reveal that age, level of educational attainment, economic activity status, and subjective social strata were not significantly



related to our respondents' intentions to take up China opportunities. Place of birth, national identity, and political orientation were, however, significantly associated with the willingness of Hong Kong youth to take up employment, pursue academic study, and intern in the Mainland. A significantly higher proportion of respondents with Chinese identities and pro-establishment orientations were "willing" or "very willing" to seize these three types of China opportunities. Respondents who were born outside Hong Kong showed significantly more willingness to work in the Mainland as either regular employees or interns. Furthermore, male respondents were significantly more willing to take up employment in the Mainland than their female counterparts, though no gender differences were found in intentions to pursue academic study or to intern.

In addition to socio-demographic differences, individuals' perceptions, views, attitudes, and previous experiences could also impact their willingness to seize China opportunities. In the following, we shall study how (1) socio-political perceptions of the Mainland, (2) views of government policies on relationship between the Mainland and Hong Kong, (3) attitudes towards China opportunities, (4) ratings of government measures encouraging youth to pursue personal development in the Mainland, (5) perceived levels of difficulty working and studying in the Mainland, and (6) previous experiences in the Mainland influenced our young respondents' willingness to (1) take up employment, (2) pursue academic study, and (3) participate in internship programs in the Mainland.

Table 3.16 displays results related to our respondents' willingness to work in the Mainland. All subjective indicators had a significant impact. First, those who rated the Mainland's socio-economic and political conditions, the government policies on Mainland-Hong Kong relations, China opportunities, and the government measures encouraging youth to study and work in the Mainland more favorably showed higher levels of willingness to take up employment in the Mainland. Specifically, the respective mean scores of the "very much willing/willing" respondents were 5.54, 4.91, 6.44, and 6.52. The corresponding scores for their "not willing/not willing at all" counterparts were 4.25, 2.99, 4.58, and 5.18. In other words, Hong Kong youth's impressions of the Mainland were positively associated with their willingness to work in the Mainland.

Table 3.15: Socio-demographic Differences among Those Who Were “Very Much Willing/Willing” to Pursue China Opportunities (%)^

	Taking up Employment	Pursuing Academic Study	Being an Intern
<i>Sex</i>	*		
Male	41.8	28.9	54.7
Female	34.3	30.7	60.0
<i>Age</i>			
15-19	39.0	30.2	57.8
20-24	40.5	29.5	56.5
25-29	37.8	14.3	66.7
30-35	34.6	100.0	0.0
<i>Place of Birth</i>	***		*
Hong Kong	33.9	28.3	54.7
Mainland/Others	56.1	44.4	70.8
<i>Level of Educational Attainment</i>			
Secondary or below	36.8	29.5	57.0
Tertiary: non-degree	34.8	31.0	50.0
Tertiary: degree or above	39.3	30.5	60.2
<i>Economic Activity Status</i>			
Currently working	36.6	--	--
Student	41.0	--	--
Unemployed	45.7	--	--
Home-makers/Others	20.0	--	--
<i>Subjective Social Strata</i>			
Lower	46.8	39.4	60.5
Lower-middle	36.0	27.7	60.2
Middle/Upper-middle/Upper	36.4	29.5	53.4
<i>National Identity</i>	***	***	***
Hongkonger	20.7	14.5	40.8
Chinese/Chinese but also Hongkonger	62.3	58.6	75.0
Hongkonger but also Chinese	49.3	41.3	70.9
<i>Political Orientation</i>	***	***	
Pan-democratic	27.5	18.0	50.0
Between pan-democratic and pro-establishment	45.6	40.2	63.6
Pro-establishment	52.5	61.5	64.3

No political orientation	44.8	41.7	60.7
--------------------------	------	------	------

\*\*\*p<0.001; \*\*p<0.01; \*p<0.05

^ This table only reports percentages for those who were “very much willing/willing” to pursue a specific type of China opportunity within their socio-demographic groups.

Furthermore, a significantly higher proportion of those who perceived more difficulties in getting a suitable job in the Mainland (63.7%) were unwilling to pursue career development in the Mainland. By contrast, 52.9% of those respondents who perceived fewer difficulties were unwilling to pursue such development. While previous experiences of studying and interning in the Mainland were significantly related to intentions to take up employment across the border, exchange tours had no impact on Hong Kong youth’s intentions to develop their careers in the Mainland.

In terms of willingness to both pursue academic study and participate in an internship program in the Mainland, similar results are shown in Tables 3.17 and 3.18, respectively. Subjective perceptions of Mainland society, views of China opportunities, and ratings of related government policies and measures had significant impacts on the Hong Kong young generation’s intentions to study and intern in the Mainland. Respondents who gave lower scores to the “China factor” showed a lower level of willingness to pursue academic study or participate in an internship program in the Mainland. Nonetheless, neither perceived level of difficulty in pursuing related personal development nor previous relevant experiences in the Mainland had a significant effect on Hong Kong youth’s incentives to engage in these activities.

Table 3.16: Group Differences in Respondents Who Reported Being “Very Much Willing/Willing” to Take Up Employment in the Mainland

	Very Much Willing/ Willing	Not Willing/ Not Willing at All
<i>***Composite Rating of Mainland Society</i>		
Adjusted Mean	5.54	4.25
Adjusted S.D.	1.51	1.60
<i>***Composite Rating of Government Policies on Hong Kong-Mainland Relations</i>		
Adjusted Mean	4.91	2.99
Adjusted S.D.	2.13	2.17
<i>***Composite Rating of China Opportunities</i>		
Adjusted Mean	6.44	4.58
Adjusted S.D.	1.41	1.93
<i>***Composite Rating of Usefulness of Government Measures in Encouraging Local Youth to Study and Work in the Mainland</i>		
Adjusted Mean	6.52	5.18
Adjusted S.D.	1.77	2.05
<i>**Perceived Level of Difficulty in Getting a Suitable Job in the Mainland</i>		
Not difficult/Not difficult at all	47.1%	52.9%
Very difficult/Difficult	36.3%	63.7%
<i>Previous Experience with an Exchange Tour</i>		
Yes	38.0%	62.0%
No	37.8%	62.2%
<i>***Previous Pursuit of Academic Study</i>		
Yes	58.3%	41.7%
No	34.8%	65.2%
<i>*Previous Participation in an Internship Program</i>		
Yes	54.2%	45.8%
No	36.9%	63.1%

\*\*\*p<0.001; \*\*p<0.01; \*p<0.05

Table 3.17: Group Differences in Respondents Who Reported Being “Very Much Willing/Willing” to Pursue Academic Study in the Mainland

	Very Much Willing/ Willing	Not Willing/ Not Willing at All
<i>***Composite Rating of the Mainland Society</i>		
Adjusted Mean	5.31	4.30
Adjusted S.D.	1.26	1.48
<i>***Composite Rating of Government Policies on Hong Kong-Mainland Relations</i>		
Adjusted Mean	5.30	3.24
Adjusted S.D.	2.19	2.13
<i>***Composite Rating of China Opportunities</i>		
Adjusted Mean	6.76	4.93
Adjusted S.D.	1.29	1.62
<i>***Composite Rating of Usefulness of Government Measures in Encouraging Local Youth to Study and Work in the Mainland</i>		
Adjusted Mean	6.87	5.55
Adjusted S.D.	1.56	1.79
<i>Perceived Level of Difficulty in Pursuing Academic Study in the Mainland</i>		
Not difficult/Not difficult at all	30.3%	69.7%
Very difficult/Difficult	30.5%	69.5%
<i>Whether had joined exchange tour</i>		
Yes	30.1%	69.9%
No	29.9%	70.1%

\*\*\*p<0.001; \*\*p<0.01; \*p<0.05

Table 3.18: Group Differences in Respondents who Reported to be “Very Much Willing/Willing” to Participate in Internship Program in the Mainland

	Very much willing/ Willing	Not willing/Not willing at all
<i>***Composite rating of the Mainland society</i>		
Adjusted Mean	5.12	4.04
Adjusted S.D.	1.25	1.68
<i>***Composite rating of government policies on Hong Kong-Mainland relations</i>		
Adjusted Mean	4.49	3.05
Adjusted S.D.	2.27	2.13
<i>***Composite rating of China opportunities</i>		
Adjusted Mean	6.25	4.50
Adjusted S.D.	1.35	1.72
<i>***Composite rating of usefulness of government measures in encouraging local youth to study and work in the Mainland</i>		
Adjusted Mean	5.86	4.77
Adjusted S.D.	1.46	1.80
<i>Perceived level of difficulty in participating in internship program in the Mainland</i>		
Not difficult/Not difficult at all	60.0%	40.0%
Very difficult/Difficult	55.8%	44.2%
<i>Previous Experience with an Exchange Tour</i>		
Yes	59.7%	40.3%
No	55.0%	45.0%
<i>Previous Pursuit of Academic Study</i>		
Yes	70.6%	29.4%
No	55.6%	44.4%

\*\*\*p<0.001; \*\*p<0.01; \*p<0.05

### Who Were Willing to Study and Work in the Mainland? Regression Analyses

In the last section, descriptive analyses were presented to show which respondents were more willing to study and work in the Mainland. In order to

examine the independent effects of individual characteristics, perceptions, attitudes, and experiences on intentions to study and work in the Mainland, this study will employ regression analyses. Specifically, binary logistic regression will be used, since the dependent variables include the following binary outcomes: (1) very much willing/willing and (2) not willing/not willing at all.

The following will present three sets of regression models to demonstrate which participants were willing to (1) take up employment, (2) pursue academic study, and (3) participate in internship programs in the Mainland. Each set of models is composed of four types of independent variables. The first type refers to the socio-demographic characteristics of individuals, including sex, place of birth, education level, economic activity status, subjective social class, national identity, political orientation, and age. The second type of independent variable reflects previous experiences (including exchange tours, academic study, and internship programs) in the Mainland. The third type refers to respondents' perceptions of the Mainland and of current policies on Hong Kong-Mainland relations. The fourth type reflects respondents' perceived levels of difficulty in obtaining China opportunities, whether they be taking up employment, pursuing academic study, or participating in internship programs. In sum, the specific variables are: (1) composite rating of Mainland society, (2) composite rating of government policies on Hong Kong-Mainland relations, (3) composite rating of China opportunities, and (4) composite rating of the usefulness of government measures in encouraging local youth to study and work in the Mainland.

Four regression models will be presented for each of the three outcome variables. We will focus on reporting and interpreting the results of Model 4 only, though those of Models 1 to 3 will be referenced necessary.

### ***Willingness to Take Up Employment in the Mainland***

To examine the effects of different variables on respondents' intentions to work across the border, binary logistic regression models were estimated (Table 3.19). From Model 4 of Table 3.19, we can see that while sex, perceptions of the Mainland society, attitudes towards China opportunities, and perceived levels of difficulty in getting a suitable job in the Mainland had statistically significant effects on respondents' willingness to take up employment in Mainland China at the 0.05 level, no significant effect was found for place of

birth, education level, economic activity status, subjective social class, national identity, political orientation, previous experiences in the Mainland (including exchange tours, academic study, and internship programs), views of government policies on Hong Kong-Mainland relations, and perceptions of the usefulness of government measures in encouraging local youth to study and work in the Mainland.

To be specific, first, after controlling for the other variables, men were found to be more likely than women to be willing to work in Mainland China. Second, positive perceptions of Mainland society and favorable views of China opportunities significantly increased a respondent's odds of being willing to take up employment across the border. Third, compared with those who perceived significant difficulties in getting a suitable job in the Mainland, individuals who predicted less or no difficulties showed a significantly higher (90% higher;  $e^{0.64}=1.90$ ) levels of willingness to pursue Mainland employment.

It is worthwhile to point out that, as shown in Models 1 and 2 (Table 3.19), although identifying as Chinese and having neutral or no political orientation had significantly positive impacts on intentions to work in the Mainland, the effects of these variables became insignificant in the full model (Model 4). Similarly, previous study or work experience in Mainland China did not have any significant effect on our respondents' willingness to work across the border.

### ***Willingness to Pursue Academic Study in the Mainland***

The results of Table 3.20 reveal the independent effects of different variables on our respondents' willingness to study in the Mainland. First, we can see from Model 4 that, compared with Hongkongers, respondents who identified as Chinese/Chinese but also Hongkongers were 297% ( $e^{1.38} = 3.97$ ) more likely to be willing to pursue academic study across the border. Second, after taking other variables into account, a positive rating of China opportunities also increased the likelihood of a respondent's intention to study in Mainland China. These results were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. The other variables did not have significant impacts on Hong Kong youth's intentions to study in the Mainland.

Similar to the results concerning the effects on respondents' willingness to



work across the border, in Models 1 and 2 (Table 3.20), which lacked the variables for respondents' attitudes towards Mainland China and policies on Hong Kong-Mainland relations, some degree of Chinese identification and a non-pan-democratic perspective significantly increased a respondent's willingness to pursue academic study in the Mainland. Previous exchange tour experience did not exhibit any such impact.

***Willingness to Participate in an Internship Program in the Mainland***

Results from the binary logistic regression models concerning respondents' willingness to participate in internship programs in the Mainland are shown in Table 3.21. The results of Model 4 reveal that, after controlling for other variables, compared with a purely Hongkonger identification, an identification as Hongkonger but also Chinese significantly increased one's likelihood of being willing to intern in the Mainland. Favorable views of China opportunities had a similar significant impact. The effects of other variables did not achieve the 0.05 level of significance.

Table 3.21 shows that the results of the full model (i.e., Model 4) did not differ significantly from those of Models 1 to 3. It should be noted that previous exchange tours or academic study experiences in the Mainland did not have any significant effect on respondents' willingness to participate in internship programs, after controlling for other variables.

Table 3.19: Binary Logistic Regression on Willingness to Take up Employment in the Mainland

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
	Coeff	se	p	Coeff	se	p	Coeff	se	p	Coeff	se	p
<b>Men</b>	0.52	0.16	***	0.52	0.17	**				0.84	0.20	***
<b>Born Outside Hong Kong</b>	0.55	0.21	**	0.43	0.25	#				0.49	0.30	
<b>Education Level (ref cat=Secondary or below)</b>												
Non-degree	0.05	0.27		0.09	0.27					-0.05	0.36	
Degree or above	0.47	0.23	*	0.46	0.24	#				0.46	0.30	
<b>Non-student</b>	-0.44	0.25	#	-0.41	0.25	#				-0.54	0.31	#
<b>Subjective Social Class (ref cat=Lower)</b>												
Lower-middle	-0.36	0.24		-0.36	0.24					-0.22	0.33	
Middle/Upper-middle/Upper	-0.34	0.25		-0.36	0.25					-0.40	0.33	
<b>National Identity (ref cat=Hongkonger)</b>												
Chinese/Chinese but also Hongkonger	1.64	0.26	***	1.62	0.26	***				0.45	0.35	
Hongkonger but also Chinese	1.18	0.18	***	1.18	0.18	***				0.42	0.23	#
<b>Political Orientation (ref cat=Pan-democratic)</b>												
Pro-establishment	0.47	0.41		0.51	0.42					-0.30	0.58	
Between pan-democratic and pro-establishment	0.55	0.18	**	0.54	0.19	**				-0.03	0.23	
No political orientation	0.74	0.26	**	0.73	0.26	**				0.39	0.35	
<b>Joined Exchange Tour in the Mainland</b>				-0.14	0.17					-0.26	0.21	
<b>Pursued Academic Study in the Mainland</b>				0.24	0.29					0.03	0.34	
<b>Participated in Internship Program in the Mainland</b>				0.62	0.38					0.25	0.41	
<b>Composite Rating of Mainland Society</b>							0.22	0.08	**	0.25	0.10	**
<b>Composite Rating of Government Policies on HK-Mainland Relations</b>							0.11	0.05	*	0.09	0.05	#
<b>Composite Rating of China Opportunities</b>							0.40	0.07	***	0.42	0.08	***
<b>Composite Rating of Usefulness of Government Measures</b>							0.10	0.06		0.12	0.07	#
<b>Encouraging Local Youth to Study and Work in the Mainland</b>												
<b>Perceived Level of Difficulty in Getting a Suitable Job in the Mainland (ref cat=very difficult/difficult)</b>												
Not difficult/Not difficult at all							0.61	0.21	**	0.64	0.23	**
<b>Constant</b>	-1.71	0.30	***	-1.64	0.31	***	-5.29	0.54	***	-6.09	0.77	***
Log Likelihood	-490.06			-487.91			-352.98			-318.84		
Pseudo R-square	0.12			0.13			0.21			0.26		
Un-weighted Number of Observations	864			864			703			671		

Notes: Age is added in the models; \*\*\*p<0.001, \*\*p<0.01, \*p<0.05, #p<0.10.

Table 3.20: Binary Logistic Regression on Willingness to Pursue Academic Study in the Mainland

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
	<i>Coeff</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Coeff</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Coeff</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Coeff</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>p</i>
<b>Men</b>	0.05	0.29		0.08	0.29					0.16	0.34	
<b>Born Outside Hong Kong</b>	0.67	0.40	#	0.68	0.40	#				0.70	0.47	
<b>Education Level (ref cat=Secondary or below)</b>												
Non-degree	0.14	0.51		0.13	0.51					0.17	0.73	
Degree or above	0.26	0.43		0.25	0.43					0.14	0.54	
<b>Subjective Social Class (ref cat=Lower)</b>												
Lower-middle	-0.32	0.41		-0.33	0.41					-0.33	0.54	
Middle/Upper-middle/Upper	-0.15	0.43		-0.14	0.43					-0.09	0.54	
<b>National Identity (ref cat=Hongkonger)</b>												
Chinese/Chinese but also Hongkonger	2.03	0.44	***	2.03	0.44	***				1.38	0.60	*
Hongkonger but also Chinese	1.11	0.31	***	1.11	0.31	***				0.60	0.41	
<b>Political Orientation (ref cat=Pan-democratic)</b>												
Pro-establishment	1.22	0.55	*	1.23	0.56	*				-0.21	0.65	
Between pan-democratic and pro-establishment	0.88	0.31	**	0.90	0.31	**				0.26	0.41	
No political orientation	0.81	0.47	#	0.82	0.47	#				1.06	0.62	#
<b>Joined Exchange Tour in the Mainland</b>				0.18	0.28					0.28	0.35	
<b>Composite Rating of Mainland Society</b>							0.07	0.14		0.02	0.17	
<b>Composite Rating of Government Policies on HK-Mainland Relations</b>							0.19	0.08	*	0.13	0.10	
<b>Composite Rating of China Opportunities</b>							0.68	0.16	***	0.72	0.19	***
<b>Composite Rating of Usefulness of Government Measures Encouraging Local Youth to Study and Work in the Mainland</b>							0.27	0.13	*	0.31	0.17	#
<b>Perceived Level of Difficulty in Pursuing Academic Study in the Mainland (ref cat=very difficult/difficult)</b>												
Not difficult/Not difficult at all							-0.01	0.33		0.25	0.36	
<b>Constant</b>	-2.16	0.50	***	-2.27	0.53	***	-8.31	1.24	***	-9.43	1.78	***
Log Likelihood	-131.60			-131.45			-97.34			-87.50		
Pseudo R-square	0.15			0.15			0.29			0.33		
Un-weighted Number of Observations	320			320			277			262		

Notes: Age is added in the models; \*\*\*p<0.001, \*\*p<0.01, \*p<0.05, #p<0.10.

Table 3.21: Binary Logistic Regression on Willingness to Participate in an Internship Program in the Mainland

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
	<i>Coeff</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Coeff</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Coeff</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Coeff</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>p</i>
<b>Men</b>	-0.16	0.24		-0.14	0.25					-0.12	0.30	
<b>Born Outside Hong Kong</b>	0.46	0.34		0.55	0.41					0.39	0.46	
<b>Education Level (ref cat=Secondary or below)</b>												
Non-degree	-0.52	0.46		-0.55	0.47					-0.53	0.67	
Degree or above	0.20	0.38		0.18	0.38					0.08	0.51	
<b>Subjective Social Class (ref cat=Lower)</b>												
Lower-middle	0.19	0.37		0.19	0.37					0.44	0.44	
Middle/Upper-middle/Upper	-0.07	0.38		-0.07	0.38					0.29	0.46	
<b>National Identity (ref cat=Hongkonger)</b>												
Chinese/Chinese but also Hongkonger	1.53	0.41	***	1.55	0.42	***				1.01	0.53	#
Hongkonger but also Chinese	1.28	0.27	***	1.29	0.27	***				0.77	0.35	*
<b>Political Orientation (ref cat=Pan-democratic)</b>												
Pro-establishment	0.07	0.53		0.09	0.52					-1.00	0.68	
Between pan-democratic and pro-establishment	0.13	0.27		0.15	0.28					-0.38	0.35	
No political orientation	-0.03	0.45		-0.02	0.45					-0.16	0.57	
<b>Joined Exchange Tour in the Mainland</b>				0.07	0.25					-0.01	0.30	
<b>Pursued Academic Study in the Mainland</b>				-0.22	0.47					-0.04	0.56	
<b>Composite Rating of Mainland Society</b>							0.22	0.12	#	0.17	0.15	
<b>Composite Rating of Government Policies on HK-Mainland Relations</b>							0.03	0.07		0.01	0.08	
<b>Composite Rating of China Opportunities</b>							0.54	0.11	***	0.58	0.12	***
<b>Composite Rating of Usefulness of Government Measures Encouraging Local Youth to Study and Work in the Mainland</b>							0.12	0.10		0.08	0.11	
<b>Perceived Level of Difficulty in Participating in an Internship Program in the Mainland (ref cat=very difficult/difficult)</b>												
Not difficult/Not difficult at all							0.30	0.30		0.32	0.32	
<b>Constant</b>	-0.51	0.41		-0.56	0.44		-4.90	0.75	***	-5.20	0.95	***
Log Likelihood	-167.66			-167.53			-124.88			-116.67		
Pseudo R-square	0.10			0.10			0.23			0.26		
Un-weighted Number of Observations	345			345			304			294		

Notes: Age is added in the models; \*\*\*p<0.001, \*\*p<0.01, \*p<0.05, #p<0.10.

## 6. Other Findings

In this section, we report a few findings that were asked as follow-up questions in the telephone survey. A main purpose of these items was to examine in more depth the respondents' intentions to pursue personal development in the Mainland, which helped the consulting team construct more relevant questions for the focus group discussions. These focus group discussions, then, enabled us to more closely examine the complexities of the rationales, decision-making processes, choices, and actions of our respondents. Hence, a rather brief description of these follow-up survey findings is presented here.

Table 3.22: Main Factors Affecting the Decision to Work in the Mainland (%)

Political prospects of the Mainland	24.8
Wages and employment benefits in the Mainland	24.6
Quality of life in the Mainland	18.6
Personal capability	10.4
Economic prospects of the Mainland	6.7
Existence of family members, relatives, and friends in the Mainland	6.4
Family support	6.1
Others	1.7
Don't know/Hard to say	0.8

Table 3.22 shows the main factors that were perceived by the respondents of the telephone survey as affecting their decision to work in the Mainland. While a quarter of Hong Kong youth (24.8%) regarded the political prospects of the Mainland China as the most important determinant in their decision to pursue (or not pursue) a career across the border, another quarter (24.6%) cited wages and employment benefits as the main factor. Furthermore, 18.6% cited quality of life in the Mainland as their most important concern in deciding whether to pursue career development in the Mainland. Intriguingly, only 6.7% of the respondents considered the prospects of the Mainland economy to be a major factor in their career choice.

Similarly, a significant minority of survey respondents (22.9%) quoted a lack of confidence in the Mainland political situation as the main challenge they perceived for working in the Mainland (Table 3.23). A slightly greater proportion of Hong Kong youth (24.4%) believed that cultural differences or

culture shock was the major challenge they would encounter. An additional 13.4% considered the Mainland's poor quality of life, and 9.0% saw the Mainland's non-attractive wages and employment benefits to be drawbacks of taking up employment in the Mainland.

Table 3.23: Challenges Perceived for Working in the Mainland (%)

Cultural differences	24.4
Lack of confidence in the political situation in the Mainland	22.9
Lack of social support in the Mainland	14.7
Poor quality of life in the Mainland	13.4
Unattractive wages and employment benefits in the Mainland	9.0
Lack of knowledge about the labor market in the Mainland	7.1
Lack of proficiency in Putonghua	5.3
Others	1.9
Don't know/Hard to say	1.1

Reasons for being not willing and willing to work in the Mainland are displayed in Tables 3.24 and 3.25. A quick look at the results reveals that negative views of the political and social situations of Mainland China are deterrents for Hong Kong youth working across the border, while a prosperous Mainland economy pulled our young generation to explore China opportunities. Indeed, the findings of Tables 3.22 to 3.25 portray a similar picture. On the one hand, perceptions of the political situation of Mainland China play a significant role in influencing the willingness of Hong Kong youth to take up Mainland employment. On the other, our young respondents were also materially oriented when came to the decision to work in the Mainland, as indicated by their significant concerns regarding their everyday lives (including the social, cultural, and money aspects of working and living in the Mainland). Given the dominance of these factors, during the focus group discussions, we focused primarily on the weightings of the material and political aspects of Mainland society in the career decisions of our young generation.

Table 3.24: Main Reasons for Being Unwilling to Work in the Mainland  
(open-ended and multiple responses allowed) (%)

<i>Personal Factors</i>	
Family-related	13.5
Mainland China is too far geographically	6.0
Lack of capability	4.1
Lack of social network in the Mainland	3.8
Others	2.5
<i>Factors Related to the Mainland Economy</i>	
Unattractive pay and employment benefits in the Mainland	8.6
Dislike or no knowledge of the employment and business culture of the Mainland	5.4
Uncertain economic and employment prospects of the Mainland	1.6
<i>Factors Related to the Political Situation of the Mainland</i>	
Pessimistic or negative perceptions of the political situation and prospects of the Mainland	26.0
Lack of confidence in the judicial system of the Mainland	7.8
<i>Factors Related to the Social Situation of the Mainland</i>	
Cultural differences/lack of knowledge about Mainland culture	27.6
Poor quality of life in the Mainland	25.4
Difficult to adapt to life in the Mainland	6.9
Negative perceptions of Mainland society	4.7
Others	1.6
<i>Other Mainland-related Factors</i>	5.7
<i>Factors Related to Hong Kong</i>	
Like Hong Kong/Want to stay in Hong Kong	3.8
Like the economic environment of Hong Kong	3.0
<i>Don't know/Hard to say</i>	2.5

Table 3.25: Main Reason for Being Willing to Work in the Mainland (open-ended and multiple responses allowed) (%)

<i>Personal Factors</i>	
Required by own job position	9.4
To accumulate Mainland working experiences	8.0
To learn and experience more	5.6
To be near family and relatives in the Mainland	4.6
To help establish social network	4.2
Having comparative advantages in the Mainland	1.4
<i>Factors Related to the Mainland Economy</i>	
Better economic prospects in the Mainland	23.1
Better wage and employment benefits in the Mainland	20.0
More job opportunities in the Mainland	19.9
Easier to find suitable jobs in the Mainland	4.8
<i>Factors Related to the Political Situation of the Mainland</i>	1.4
<i>Factors Related to the Social Situation of the Mainland</i>	
To enhance understanding between Hong Kong and the Mainland	5.6
Decent quality of life in the Mainland	2.2
Lower living standards and fewer pressures in the Mainland	2.0
<i>Factors Related to Hong Kong</i>	
Lack of job opportunities in Hong Kong/Hong Kong is too competitive	3.4
<i>Others</i>	2.1
<i>Don't know/Hard to say</i>	6.2

The telephone survey revealed interesting results concerning the respondents' willingness to study and work in the Mainland and overseas. In the previous section, we reported that 37.4% and 29.3% of our young generation intended to pursue career and academic study in the Mainland respectively. In other words, the survey data suggested a low popularity of the Mainland as a place for personal development. On the contrary, when asked in the follow-up questions about their intentions to study and work overseas (excluding Mainland China), a majority of respondents (over four-fifths) gave positive responses (Table 3.26).

A rather large discrepancy was, thus, observed in relation to the young generation's chosen destinations for pursuing personal development. Although our commonsensical understanding would explain this discrepancy of choice, in the focus group discussions, we aimed to examine whether there were



differences in terms of the impacts of taking up employment and of academic study on individuals' preferred places for future development. This comparison may not only facilitate the evaluation of the specific effectiveness of the government's existing policies and measures for both encouraging youth to pursue China opportunities and facilitating youth to take up working holidays in other regions, but also shed light on possible designs for more programs tailor-made to address the specific needs of youth to gain valuable work and study experiences outside of Hong Kong.

Table 3.26: Willingness to Study and Work Overseas and in the Mainland (%)

	Very Much Willing	Willing	Not Willing	Not Willing at All	Don't Know/Hard to Say	(n)
Working overseas	19.6	64.4	12.1	1.1	2.9	(1,002)
Studying overseas	27.9	60.8	7.9	1.8	1.6	(308)
Working in the Mainland	2.2	35.2	41.5	19.8	1.4	(915)
Studying in the Mainland	1.5	27.8	42.4	26.5	1.8	(271)

## **Chapter 4**

### **Findings of Focus Group Discussions**

#### **1. Introduction**

As stated in Chapter 1, while the telephone survey aimed to reveal a general portrait of Hong Kong young people's perceptions of the Mainland and attitudes towards China opportunities in terms of work and study, focus group discussions were conducted as a follow-up study that closely examined the rationales, motivations, and personal experiences of the respondents. Six focus group discussions of 67 participants aged 15 to 35 were held in August and September of 2015. Among these six groups, two clusters of respondents formed: (1) one with experiences studying and/ or working in the Mainland and (2) the other without such experiences. In each cluster, there were three groups of respondents with different current education and working backgrounds: (1) students of secondary schools, (2) students of tertiary institutions, and (3) fresh graduates (graduated within the past year and either working or seeking jobs), junior employees (three years or fewer of working experience) and young mid-level employees (more than three years of working experience).

As shown in Table 4.1, these focus group participants were in different study years for secondary schools and tertiary institutions and had different years of working experiences. A rather balanced socio-demographic split was attained among the participants in terms of sex, place of birth, subjective social class, and accommodation type.

In the following, we will describe the coverage of the discussion guides for the six focus groups. Next, summaries of the key findings for each focus group discussion will be presented along with analyses. Group differences between participants with and without China experiences and between life stages will then be reported. The discussion guides for the six focus groups can be found in Appendix 4.1.

Table 4.1: Socio-demographic Profiles of Focus Group Participants

		Gp1	Gp2	Gp3	Gp4	Gp5	Gp6
<b>Classification of Grouping</b>	<b>With China Experience</b>	Y			Y		Y
	<b>Secondary Students' Group</b>	Y	Y				
	<b>Tertiary Students' Group</b>				Y	Y	
	<b>Graduates' Group</b>			Y			Y
<b>No. of Informants</b>		13	10	11	11	10	12
<b>Age</b>	15-24	13	10	4	11	9	4
	25-35	0	0	7	0	1	8
<b>Sex</b>	Female	11	3	5	10	5	8
	Male	2	7	6	1	5	4
<b>Birth Place</b>	Hong Kong	5	10	11	9	8	9
	Mainland	8	0	0	2	2	3
<b>Attended/Attending Education Level (Highest)</b>	Secondary	13	10	2	0	0	0
	Sub-degree	0	0	2	0	3	1
	Degree	0	0	4	11	7	11
	Higher degree	0	0	3	0	0	0
<b>Current Level of Study</b>	Secondary 4	2	1	n/a			n/a
	Secondary 5	9	7				
	Secondary 6	2	2				
	Degree year 1				2	2	
	Degree year 2				1	1	
	Degree year 3				8	4	
<b>Working Experience</b>	Less than 1 year	n/a	n/a	3	n/a	n/a	4
	1-3 years			4			4
	More than 3 years			4			4
<b>Subjective Social Class</b>	Lower class	0	1	2	3	2	0
	Middle-lower class	7	7	4	6	6	8
	Middle class	6	2	4	1	2	2
	Middle-upper class	0	0	1	1	0	2
	Upper class	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Housing Type</b>	Private housing	2	5	6	0	2	4
	Public housing	11	5	5	11	7	8
	Others	0	0	0	0	1	0
<b>Ownership of Residence</b>	Owner-occupied property	2	5	8	2	4	7
	Tenant	11	5	3	9	6	5

## 2. Coverage of the Focus Group Discussions

In the focus groups, the participants' views of Mainland society, their experiences of (if any) and attitudes towards studying and/ or working in the Mainland, and their feedback on related government policies were solicited. Specifically, during the discussion, the participants were first asked to share

their “China experiences,” such as travelling with friends and families to the Mainland, joining Mainland exchange tours, pursuing academic study in the Mainland, participating in internship programs across the border, and working in the Mainland. Second, their perceptions of Mainlanders and the social and political phenomena of the Mainland were gauged. We then discussed the participants’ willingness to study and/ or work in the Mainland and their evaluations of the effectiveness of government policies in motivating young people to go to Mainland China to pursue personal development.

### **3. Findings and Analyses of Focus Group Discussions**

#### ***Findings of Tertiary Students without Work and/ or Study Experiences in the Mainland (Group 5)***

In addition to probing the participants’ attitudes towards the Mainland, in this group, our main focuses were on the participants’ motivations and rationales for considering working and studying in the Mainland. In this section, first, we will describe the general perceptions of Mainland China among this group of tertiary students. Second, the extent of their willingness to go north for work and study will be examined and analyzed. The participants’ views of China opportunities will also be illustrated.

Unlike many students pursuing tertiary education in Hong Kong, none (except one) of the participants in this group had participated in exchange tours or internship programs in the Mainland. Nevertheless, most of them had frequently travelled to Mainland China to visit relatives and sight-see. Furthermore, a few of their parents and family members ran businesses and/ or worked across the border. Therefore, in the focus group discussions, when sharing their perceptions of Mainland society, these participants could cite a lot of examples. Generally, their impressions of the Mainland were overwhelmingly negative. From what they heard from their families, corruption, an emphasis on “guanxi” (relationship) and other dark sides of the business environment were common in the Mainland. Problems of personal and food safety were frequently mentioned. A few participants raised concerns regarding the laws and regulations, human rights, freedom of speech, and medical and health care systems of Mainland China.

Due to these negative perceptions, some of the participants explicitly indicated

that they would not want to explore the Mainland any more:

*I don't attempt to obtain more understanding as I don't have any expectations of the Mainland. I think the reality would not be different from my knowledge [about Mainland China]. ... I have received a lot of information and also have had first-hand experiences about the Mainland. I have seen their lives, and they are negative. ... As I don't have any expectations, I don't really want to go north.*

Another respondent added, “my perceptions would not be changed by a deeper understanding [of the Mainland].”

Negative views of Mainland society deterred our participants from pursuing academic study and/ or participating in internship programs there. The following response was typical:

*My parents and I would be concerned about my personal safety if I were studying in the Mainland. Cultures and habits are different, and it would be difficult to adapt. I frequently visited my relatives in Guangdong in the past. Their rhythm of life was different from ours. There was no social order, and I felt my life was threatened. I was always with my parents and wouldn't be alone. I can't imagine myself living there, and I would feel very frightened.*

As shared by participants in other focus groups, perceptions that the Mainland was too far from home, differences in learning environments and languages, and a lack of recognition of Mainland qualifications in the Hong Kong labor market were the most common factors stopping these tertiary students from pursuing academic study or joining academic exchange programs across the border.

However, exceptions did occur. One student in an associate degree program in Chinese medicine said that she would consider furthering her study in a degree program at Guangzhou University of Chinese Medicine. However, she added that this would be a last resort; that is, if she could get a place in any degree program in Hong Kong, she would not study in the Mainland.

In explaining their reasons for not participating in short-term study or internship programs across the border, a few students highlighted the lack of usefulness of knowledge learnt in the Mainland. For example, one student studying social policy shared that the welfare tradition and socio-political environment of the Mainland were totally different that those in Hong Kong; hence, working experiences obtained in Mainland China could not be applicable to the Hong Kong context.

The focus groups reveal that the young generation's willingness to participate in academic exchange and internship programs in the Mainland is highly influenced by individual students' academic disciplines and fields of study. The afore-mentioned participant recognized the superior training of Chinese medicine in Guangzhou. Another student in the group who was currently studying accountancy also said that he was planning to go north as an intern when he was in the third year of his undergraduate study. However, the rest of the participants, as they were not planning to take up employment in the Mainland, did not see any type of Mainland experience relevant or useful for their future development. Their life plans were primarily oriented around Hong Kong.

Before moving on to illustrate the motivations of our participants in working in the Mainland, we will mention one participant's observation comparing the popularity of internship and academic exchange programs in the Mainland with those overseas.

*Our faculty organizes Mainland internships every year. I was told that since no one wanted to go, a "lucky draw" would be held. This phenomenon is strange. ... What I see is, these internship and exchange programs are going to top Mainland universities, but no one wants to join. ... Even if it is free of charge, no one goes. When every one isn't interested, you would then think if there is anything wrong with it. ... However, many students registered for those programs going to universities in England.*

From the above, it can be concluded that the majority of the participants' negative attitudes towards the Mainland were highly related to their lack of willingness to study and join internship programs in the Mainland. As such, it

is not surprising to find that not a single respondent planned to take up employment across the border.

Due to the business experiences of his parents, and despite seeing his own comparative advantages of working in the Mainland, one respondent was deterred by the Mainland's dark sides (such as the dominance of "guanxi" in the business world and the prevalence of corruption) and, thus, rejected the idea of taking up employment there. In addition to expecting a lower salary, this respondent was also concerned with the Mainland's unstable socio-political environment. Other participants in the group shared his views. They did not have confidence in the Mainland's legal or healthcare systems, and this made them hesitant to work or live there. These reasons are, indeed, consistent with our commonsensical perceptions.

It is worthwhile to note that, in the focus group discussions, many respondents cited low salaries as a main reason for their lack of willingness to work in the Mainland. One respondent said that if he was offered a job with better prospects and a superior salary, he would not mind working in the Mainland. Other respondents added that they would only consider the Mainland if the remuneration and benefit packages were a lot better than those offered in Hong Kong.

Furthermore, a couple of respondents pointed out that Hong Kong youth would be at a disadvantage in the job market, given the high volume of Mainland university graduates. Since Hong Kong students are more likely to ask for better remuneration packages, Mainland employers are likely to prefer hiring local graduates. This view deviates from the understanding of many Hong Kong government officials, who have repeatedly and openly emphasized the prevalence of opportunities for Hong Kong youth in the Mainland.

One of the topics in the discussion concerned perceptions of China opportunities. In general, our participants recognized many of these opportunities but added that most were related to starting up businesses. By contrast, possibilities for working in the Mainland as employees were few. Again, one important determinant concerned the respondents' fields of business and professions. One respondent optimistically shared:

*My Mainland classmates told me that there is a lack of social*

*workers in the Mainland, and they are willing to offer a comparable package to recruit social workers from Hong Kong. ... They are lacking these skills, and they turn to Hong Kong for related professionals.*

However, other participants opposed this view. One respondent stated that restrictions had been imposed to prevent accounting professionals from Hong Kong from performing certain related services in the Mainland. Another added:

*You would need to have 10 years of working experience in Hong Kong in order to get a managerial position in the Mainland. ... If you plan to work in the Mainland, you would make sure that you have to get a job which offers a higher salary than that in Hong Kong. If you are a clerk only, you would not be willing to work in a clerical position in the Mainland.*

A few of the participants supported the perspective that the China opportunities were limited to running businesses. Compared to Hong Kong, they saw the Mainland as a better setting for generating business profits. However, some pointed out that, given the need for startup capital, such opportunities were not very achievable for most ordinary young people in Hong Kong. One respondent, however, was more optimistic, saying that the amount of capital was not enormous because the business costs in the Mainland were lower. This respondent also said that there were many business opportunities in the Mainland because people in Hong Kong were more creative.

Overall, in this group of tertiary students without any working and/ or studying experiences in the Mainland, attitudes towards the Mainland were negative. The discussion suggested that these negative perceptions, which stemmed from the participants' first-hand experiences, had brought about their low levels of willingness to pursue academic study, participate in internship programs, and take up employment in the Mainland. In addition, the participants had high levels of suspicion concerning the usefulness of working and studying experiences in the Mainland. Above all, since they did not see themselves ever settling down in the Mainland, they did not find Mainland knowledge or experiences to be valuable for their future personal and career development, which would take place in Hong Kong. It is important to note that the



participants had mixed views concerning China opportunities, though most saw these opportunities as irrelevant to them due to a lack of work experience and financial capital.

***Findings of Tertiary Students with Work and/ or Study Experiences in the Mainland (Group 4)***

Unlike the respondents in the previous group, the respondents in this group had significant previous experience with Mainland China. Since the participants were primary school students, most of their experiences were obtained through participation in Mainland exchange tours. A couple of the participants had also joined internship programs during their tertiary studies. In the following, we will first report the participants' experiences and their perceptions of Mainland society and people. Second, we will explore the participants' levels of willingness to study and work in the Mainland, together with the factors affecting their decisions.

The members of this group had gained many positive experiences and impressions of the Mainland through Mainland exchange tours. Most of the participants recalled experiences of fun and joy on exchange tours during primary and secondary school. However, as tertiary students, most felt less enthusiastic about going on such tours. For example, one respondent said that he would not choose to go to the Mainland now because there were many overseas exchange tours available. There were few participants, though, who still found Mainland experiences rewarding. One respondent shared:

*My mentality has changed in the university. It is about political issues. ... In the end, I choose to go although I clearly know that the atmosphere and environment there are artificial. That said, you could still witness many things they don't want to show to outsiders. The biggest reward is that you could make friends in the Mainland and exchange views with them. That's why I choose to go.*

Other participants said that they could obtain a deeper understanding of Mainland people and engage in self-reflection, which could help them achieve a more balanced view of the Mainland.

Nevertheless, most of the participants in this group were not willing to study or join any academic exchange programs in the Mainland. Like their counterparts without any related Mainland experiences (Group 5), they were concerned about the lack of recognition of Mainland qualifications and saw themselves being unable to adapt to the Mainland living environment. The participants also had a lack of intentions to work in the Mainland, and, hence, did not see a need to pursue academic study there. Furthermore, differences in languages and professional systems between higher education institutions stopped our participants from joining any short-term academic exchange programs.

Although students in this group expressed more favorable views of the Mainland than the students in the first group, a negative impression was still present that directly affected their decision to study (or not) in the Mainland:

*I actually want to equip myself. In my institution, there is a summer program for academic exchange in Central China Normal University. It is a good university, and I thought the experience was useful. The bottom line is, I could obtain a certificate by joining the summer program. ... I was seriously considering that. But somehow I gave up this idea simply because of the negative attitudes towards people and the political situation in the Mainland.*

To a certain extent, a few participants in this group valued the work and study experiences of the Mainland. However, they explicitly stated that this value was purely instrumental, since they did not find the content of the experiences or the related knowledge to be helpful to their personal and career development. For example, one student who was an intern in a well known financial organization in the Mainland shared with us that all she did during the six weeks of her experience was to translate documents. She further commented that this internship was still valuable because even top Mainland students could not obtain this working opportunity; thus, the certificate issued by the organization was very presentable.

Another participant shared a similar experience. Although she found that her internship experience in a property firm in the Mainland deepened her understanding of related businesses in the Mainland, she did not consider it applicable to the context of Hong Kong. More importantly, the experience was

not pleasant and did not enhance her willingness to take up any employment in the Mainland in the future. Other students shared this perspective, and one said that she felt uncomfortable with her Mainland working environment.

From the above, it can be seen that, on the one hand, this group of students viewed Mainland China less negatively than the first group, and they even had some level of sympathetic understanding of Mainlanders. On the other hand, the participants still had less than favorable attitudes towards their short-term working and living experiences obtained in the Mainland.

Nevertheless, the participants saw the need to acquire more knowledge and understanding of the Mainland. A couple of the respondents mentioned their Chinese identity driving them to get to know Mainland China better, while others adopted a more practical stance.

*I believe that the prospects of Hong Kong are highly related to the Mainland. The development of Hong Kong cannot be separated from Mainland China. That's why we need to have more knowledge about the Mainland in order to understand Hong Kong issues better.*

It is noteworthy that the participants' urge to engage in more exchanges with the Mainland were mixed with their negative feelings regarding Mainland visitors to Hong Kong. These conflicting views of Mainlanders and the Mainland did, indeed play a non-negligible role in preventing our respondents from pursuing career development in the Mainland.

Some participants were worried about their personal safety and health if they worked or lived in the Mainland. A respondent directly pointed to the lower quality of Mainlanders. In imagining pursuing a teaching career in the Mainland, this participant said:

*I have been receiving education in Hong Kong all my life. I will use the education practice I have learnt in Hong Kong for my future teaching career. If I have to teach in the Mainland, I don't have any understanding about their professional practice, and my impression is that I would be forced to brainwash my students in the Mainland. ... I am*

*not willing to do that.*

A couple of the participants in this group who viewed the Mainland positively also hesitated to work or live in the Mainland. One shared:

*Compared to that of Hong Kong, the potential for development in the Mainland is a lot greater. ... There is a variety of industries and sectors in Mainland China. In this sense, I would be willing to work there. But I don't expect to stay there for 10 years. Three to five years are enough. I can't imagine myself settling down there. It is out of the question to let my kids study in the Mainland.*

Although participants in this group were generally less negative and more open-minded about the Mainland, their willingness to work or study there was low. Participants of this group shared some of the same negative perceptions of the Mainland held by their counterparts with no Mainland working or studying experiences (Group 5). Similarly, although the students in Group 4 believed that there were opportunities for starting businesses and developing careers in finance, information technology, and Chinese medicine, they did not consider there to be many China opportunities available to people in Hong Kong. One respondent commented:

*If you know officials and businessmen in the Mainland, you would fly high. For an ordinary university graduate from Hong Kong, his or her chance in the Mainland would be worse than that in Hong Kong. ... It is all about "guanxi" [in the Mainland].*

Other participants also highlighted the high level of competitiveness in getting a job in the Mainland, given the millions of university graduates produced in the Mainland each year. Instead of seeing Hong Kong graduates as competitive, the participants expressed a belief that Mainland employers preferred local graduates who had better knowledge of Mainland China. One respondent added that there were many Mainland returnees ("haigui") nowadays and that these were the most popular among Mainland employers.

***Findings of Secondary School Students with Work and/ or Study Experiences in the Mainland (Group 1)***

Two groups of secondary school students were interviewed. Every student in Group 1 had joined exchange tours to the Mainland. In this section, first, these students' perceptions of Mainland China will be presented. Second, we will examine their level of willingness to pursue academic study and take up employment across the border.

Like the tertiary students who participated in exchange tours and internship programs (Group 4), the group of secondary students who had Mainland experiences had less negative views of the Mainland. They were more able to appreciate the personalities of the Mainland students they had come across through exchange tours and to feel sympathy for the Mainland government. For instance, the diligence and frugality of the Mainland students were frequently mentioned in the focus group discussion. More importantly, their perceptions of the Mainlanders were changed through interactions with Mainland students in exchange tours. In addition, participants in this focus group felt more optimistic about the future development of the Mainland, not only economically, but also politically. These were the positive outcomes of the exchange tours in improving the image of Mainlanders among Hong Kong youth.

Nevertheless, members of this group also shared some of the negative impressions of Mainland society held by many participants in other focus groups. Poor air quality, serious pollution, a lack of freedom of speech, a low quality of people, widespread corruption, and a large gap between rich and poor were often cited. When asked why they had mixed views of the Mainland, two respondents stated:

*In the exchange tours, we were brought to visit good places and to experience a good atmosphere, and so we felt good about the Mainland. But when it comes to the Mainland politics and when you are reading newspapers, all we see are negative. We are receiving conflicting messages.*

*It all depends on your point of contact. You don't dig deep in exchange tours. But in the mass media, you are presented with in-depth reports and analysis. ... That's why we get*

*different impressions.*

In the focus group, we also discussed about the students' channels for obtaining information about the Mainland. In addition to mass media, the group participants saw their parents and first-hand experiences as major sources of knowledge. Since many participants believed in what they saw and heard from their significant others, and since most of this knowledge about Mainland China was not positive, the participants viewed the Mainland less favorably.

That said, compared with their counterparts who had never participated in exchange tours, most participants in this group tended to be more open-minded in terms of obtaining a more in-depth understanding of the Mainland and welcoming a closer integration of Hong Kong and the Mainland. Therefore, in terms of heightening the interest of Hong Kong youth in Mainland China, exchange tours can be said to be effective.

A major focus of discussion in these two groups of secondary school students was their intentions to pursue tertiary study in the Mainland. In the focus groups, most students acknowledged various admission and subsidy schemes provided by the local government for facilitating Hong Kong youth's ability to study in the Mainland. Noting the limited places available for them in Hong Kong universities, some participants in this group showed a willingness to pursue undergraduate study across the border. One said:

*I am considering. There are eight [UGC-funded] universities in Hong Kong. If I can't get into one of them, it would be quite expensive to enroll in an associate degree program. I have heard that the admission requirement for Hong Kong students is lower than that for Mainlanders and you could get into key universities there. ... It is a good value for the money. It is cheaper. But I am struggling, as you would probably pursue career development in the Mainland after getting a Mainland degree. Your chances of coming back to Hong Kong are lower.*

Another student also commented that it was less expensive to attend university in the Mainland than to pursue an associate degree in Hong Kong. However, one participant added that, after obtaining a qualification from the Mainland, getting another degree in Hong Kong was essential. Thus, although these

participants were willing to go north for study, they saw a Mainland degree as less valuable than a Hong Kong one. One respondent shared her views:

*If your academic results are okay and you can get into local universities, you would not choose to study in the Mainland. It is just far away. Also, other than top universities like Peking University or Tsinghua University, if you study in other universities in Mainland China, you would need to re-do an examination in order to have your Mainland qualifications recognized in Hong Kong. Otherwise, you will have to work there, and so you will be apart from your parents here.*

Similar remarks were made by participants in every focus group. Except for disciplines like Chinese medicine, in which Mainland China has acquired a worldwide reputation, our focus group participants were highly concerned about the lack of recognition and value of Mainland qualifications in labor markets outside Mainland China. Therefore, it was not surprising that more than half of the secondary school students in this group had no plans to pursue academic study across the border.

In fact, only one participant in this group stated that he would consider working in the Mainland. He said:

*I have been considering working in the Mainland. If I can't get into any university in Hong Kong, I will look for other studying opportunities. If not, I will work in a firm run by my relative in Shenzhen. ... I feel it is better to work in her firm, but living there is out of the question. ... I went there to work part-time. ... The working environment was quite good. The office was bigger and more convenient there. Working hours were shorter. Frankly, the level of salary was a bit lower than that in Hong Kong. ... I would watch their promotion prospects ... which are better than those in Hong Kong.*

One respondent who did not plan to go north argued that the living standards in Hong Kong and Shenzhen were totally different and that, thus, it was not practical to work in the Mainland and live in Hong Kong simultaneously. In addition to salary, issues of personal safety and pollution deterred many

respondents in this group from working in the Mainland.

On the one hand, most respondents had no intention to study and/ or work in the Mainland. On the other hand, these respondents were confident in getting a place in the Mainland universities and labor market. Compared to the tertiary students and the working youth in other focus groups, secondary school students in Group 1 were optimistic about pursuing personal and career development in the Mainland. This perspective may have been related to their high level of confidence in the Mainland economy.

***Findings of Secondary School Students without Work and/ or Study Experiences in the Mainland (Group 2)***

This group of secondary school students had never participated in any Mainland exchange tours, though most had travelled there. Compared to their counterparts with experiences in the Mainland (Group 1), participants in Group 2 viewed the Mainland less favorably. In addition to citing the same issues raised by participants in other focus groups, such as the Mainland's lack of freedom and information flow, the perceived poor quality of Mainlanders, the "rule of man," and other such problems, some participants found similarities between the Mainland and North Korea. These impressions of Mainland China were obtained from the participants' first-hand experiences and the mass media. However, it must be noted that a couple of the students in this group said good words about Mainlanders based on their travelling experiences in the Mainland.

This group's less positive image of the Mainland helped to explain why these students were not willing to join any Mainland exchange tours. A rather surprising finding from this focus group was that one of the other reasons they chose not to go north for exchange tours was the number of formalities required. One respondent noted:

*The selection mechanism is complicated, and the interview process is troublesome. There are many hassles. We will have to submit a statement.*

For these reasons, the students in this group did not bother to apply for Mainland exchanges. Furthermore, the students were discouraged from joining by the lack of interesting content on these exchange tours. They told us that,



based on what they had heard from classmates who had joined the tours, there would be nothing new to learn on a Mainland tour. Since they perceived the related experiences to be useless, no one in this group was interested in participating in an exchange tour to the Mainland.

Nonetheless, these students were highly confident in the economic prospects of the Mainland. From an instrumental point of view, they were willing to acquire more knowledge about the Mainland. They also saw closer Mainland-Hong Kong integration as an irreversible trend. That said, they had no concrete plan to equip themselves to go north.

Most students in other focus groups were not keen to study in the Mainland. Similarly, the students in this group viewed university in the Mainland as a second-best option. One respondent said:

*My thoughts are, it is not a bad thing to get a government subsidy to pursue university education in the Mainland. If you don't want to get into an associate degree program, you are not admitted to pursue an undergraduate degree program in Hong Kong, it is not bad to study in the Mainland.*

A lack of recognition of Mainland qualifications and the lack of value of such qualifications in the eyes of Hong Kong employers were reasons cited for ranking Mainland education lower than Hong Kong education. In fact, some participants had high levels of reservations related to studying in the Mainland. One respondent noted:

*It is all about the title. Undeniably, employers see a lot of economic potential in the Mainland market. But they won't hire a person with a low quality of education. Every employer has this belief, and this is the reality.*

Because of these negative perceptions, many participants in this group had no intention to take up any employment in the Mainland. While others saw more opportunities available in Mainland China, a few mentioned that salary levels were a major factor in determining their willingness to work in the Mainland.

Overall, likely due to their young age and lack of in-depth knowledge and

first-hand experiences of the Mainland, the discussion in this group was quite superficial. However, from a comparative perspective, it is certain that exchange tours and other study and/ or work experiences in the Mainland generate a more balanced view of Mainland China among young people in Hong Kong, though such experiences do not necessarily increase their level of willingness to pursue academic study and/ or take up employment there.

***Findings of Working Youth with Work and/ or Study Experiences in the Mainland (Group 6)***

Compared with young people in other focus groups, participants in this group had numerous personal experiences and first-hand views of the Mainland. Thus, both the bright and dark sides of the Mainland were presented, and positive and negative feelings were shared. Specifically, although none of the students pursued academic study across the border, many had either joined internship programs or travelled on business trips in the Mainland more than once.

In terms of experiences in exchange tours to the Mainland, the participants reported a positive impression of Mainlanders. In addition to appreciating the diligence of the students there, they were surprised by the open-mindedness of Mainlanders. One respondent said:

*We are used to thinking that there is no democracy in the Mainland. But I came across human rights lawyers and homosexual people there who fought hard for their rights. ... I have been impressed ... That's the rewarding experience I got over those few days [in the exchange tours].*

Other respondents also mentioned that, instead of brainwashing them, exchange tours could inspire students to see things more critically and allow them to come to their own conclusions and judgment.

It is interesting to note that quite extreme opinions were expressed among the participants concerning Mainland internship programs. One respondent explicitly stated that he simply wanted to make his CV look better through internship programs. His experience, to a large extent, was similar to those of the tertiary students in Group 4, since he was not given any meaningful tasks during the two-month period of his internship. A few other participants had

heard similar stories of useless Mainland internship experiences, which had discouraged them from participating.

An exception occurred for a participant engaged in social work in his university study, who found his internship role in a Mainland hospital fruitful. He explained:

*Related professional development in the Mainland is not very mature, and they are not ready to adopt the system and practices used in Hong Kong. ... Some people there do find your presence redundant. ... On the other hand, since it is something new to them, they would let you do whatever you want. You could just try. As long as you could handle that, they just let you try. In Hong Kong, there are a lot of regulations and rules to follow, and student interns have little chance to explore. In the Mainland, there is a lot of room for your own experiments, as long as your supervisor agrees.*

That said, this lack of rules in the Mainland was simultaneously cited as a negative by many participants in this group. For example, the same participant stated:

*We are used to following rules in Hong Kong, which we find very reasonable. ... My impression is, people in the Mainland perform their duties because of the presence of their supervisors, and it is not for the sake of the rules. ... I think it is quite bad, and I am not used to that. ... I feel that is very insecure.*

Other views of the Mainland, including poor food safety, serious pollution, a lack of personal freedom, and so on were also reported by the participants in this group. One respondent who was currently running a business in the Mainland openly complained of the healthcare system there: “I don’t want to get ill in the Mainland. Their hospitals are not comparable to those public ones in Hong Kong.”

These unfavorable environments and conditions deterred many of the participants from taking up employment across the border. Nevertheless,

respondents in this group had contrasting perspectives on Hong Kong-Mainland differences. On the one hand, a few of them perceived difficulties in making the necessary adjustments, should they decide to take up employment in the Mainland.

*In the exchange tour and internship program, I experienced cultural shocks. A lot of adjustments have to be made. That's why I have no intention to go north.*

On the other, one respondent saw the gap between Hong Kong and the Mainland as an advantage that Hong Kong people could exploit.

*People in the Mainland have no concept of overtime work. We still have comparative advantage, as their level of productivity is not high.*

*After all, Mainland China is a developing country, and Hong Kong belongs to the first world. ... The Mainland is still far away from us in terms of culture. From a business development perspective, there is a great deal of potential in Mainland China. As for us [Hong Kong people], we have comparative advantage which they are lacking. This difference creates room for us to develop its market. Otherwise, we are not wanted.*

As mentioned above, quite a few respondents in this group had travelled to the Mainland for work purposes. One noted that she had seriously considered basing her career in Shanghai, with her employer in Hong Kong. Her story was revealing:

*My Hong Kong employer gave me a job offer in Shanghai. I then tried to work there for two to three weeks and actually found it not working. It was about the living standard. Food safety was an issue, and so I needed to buy quality food, which was expensive. In the end, you spent far more money there. The second thing was about personal safety. It was a very frightening experience to go home alone in the evening there. ... It was plausible to have your purse and mobile phone stolen easily. If you chose to report the case to the*

*Mainland police, you might not trust them. All these things made me feel very uncomfortable.*

While Hong Kong people have been commented not being open-minded enough to pursue career development in the Mainland, the above cases show that it is not practical for many Hongkongers to go north without fearing for their personal safety in terms of health and life.

In sum, though they recognized the unfavorable living and business environments of Mainland China, many respondents in this group also pointed out the large potential inherent in the Mainland market. For example, despite the poor quality of healthcare services in the Mainland, one respondent believed that people in Hong Kong had an upper hand for gaining a foothold in the Mainland market, since Mainlanders tended to trust Hong Kong businessmen more than locals. However, some of these respondents also had reservations about the extent of China opportunities available for people in Hong Kong. While some acknowledged that these opportunities were all business-oriented and limited to professional occupations, others saw an increasing competitive force from the returnees (“haigui”).

### ***Findings of Working Youth without Work and/ or Study Experiences in the Mainland (Group 3)***

In this group, none of the participants had any working and/ or studying experiences in the Mainland. Nevertheless, during their tertiary studies, most of them lived and studied with Mainlanders in Hong Kong; hence, they quoted many examples when presenting their views of Mainland society and their intentions to work and/ or study there.

Like the respondents in other groups, participants in this group cited a lack of recognition of Mainland qualifications and the second-option nature of Mainland academic opportunities as reasons for not pursuing academic study or joining internship programs in the Mainland. The following examples clearly represent their attitudes towards these studying and working opportunities in the Mainland.

*You would only apply for exchange programs when you are good enough academically. But, if you are good, you would*

*prefer going farther away. It is totally not cool to tell others that you are going to the Mainland for an exchange. When I was in the university, there were overseas placements. None chose to join those in the Mainland. You would go to Singapore or Canada instead.*

*My friend is pursuing a master's degree in Chinese medicine in the Mainland. I think it is good to study Chinese medicine there. From what I have heard from her, she has to keep giving gifts to her "master." You better do that: the "master" would tell you more knowledge, and you would then be better equipped for your future career.*

Instead of appreciating the diligence of Mainland students, respondents in this group complained about the lack of flexibility of their Mainland university classmates. A few criticized the materialistic orientation of young people in the Mainland. Instead of seeing a closer Mainland-Hong Kong relationship as an opportunity for people in Hong Kong, these participants viewed Mainlanders and the Mainland economy as a threat. For example, one respondent mentioned that almost all first honors degrees in Hong Kong were awarded to Mainland students.

Although they acknowledged that there were more opportunities for personal development in the Mainland than in Hong Kong, the students' perceptions of these China opportunities were that they were "quick money" and "illegitimate." In brief, instead of emphasizing the positive side of the China opportunities, based on their personal experiences, most respondents in this group were overwhelmingly negative about the integrity of the academic and business worlds of the Mainland. Unavoidably, these impressions stopped them from pursuing personal development in the Mainland.

One related point that arose in this group is worth noting. During the discussion, a few respondents noted the clash between their moral values and their perceptions of Mainland China. While one respondent felt uneasy earning "corrupted" money, another one doubted whether she would be happy working for a company if she did not identify with its values.

*A few months ago, I was given a job offer with very good*

*employment terms by a Mainland-funded company in Hong Kong. They gave me 50% more salary than my current job. Supposedly, I would accept this without any hesitation; plus, it is a well-known company in the field. ... In the interview, they asked me if I was in the “yellow ribbon camp” [the pro-democracy camp in the Occupy Movement]. Of course, I gave appropriate answers in the interview. But, after much consideration and weighting different factors, including the culture of this company, I declined the offer. I felt regret, since a 50% salary increase was a lot. But I am frightened by even Mainland-funded companies based in Hong Kong.*

### ***Respondents with vs. without Mainland Experiences: Similarities and Differences***

Before making policy suggestions for increasing the interest of local youth in pursuing personal development in the Mainland in the next chapter, we shall first explore group differences. The research design of the focus group discussion was, first, to divide our respondents into two clusters: respondents with and without Mainland experiences. The second comparison was made according to the respondents' life stages: secondary students, tertiary students, and working youth. In this section, the differences and similarities of the respondents with and without Mainland experiences in terms of their perceptions of the Mainland, their willingness to pursue academic study, and their intentions to take up Mainland employment will be illustrated.

Our youth respondents in the focus groups held generally unfavorable views of the Mainland. Pollution, corruption, a lack of freedom, incomprehensive welfare and health care systems, “rule of men,” low wages, poor food safety, and uncivilized people were frequently mentioned in the discussions. Nevertheless, compared to those who did not join exchange tours or participate in internship programs, previous experiences of the Mainland were associated with less negative attitudes, more sympathy, and more balanced views of Mainland society and Mainlanders.

Since participants with Mainland experiences had less unfavorable perceptions of the Mainland, they were more open-minded when considering pursuing career development in the Mainland. Instead of highlighting the gaps and

incompatibilities between “them” (the Mainland) and “us” (Hong Kong), respondents with Mainland experiences viewed Hong Kong-Mainland-differences as business opportunities and market potentials that Hong Kong people could exploit.

It should be noted that, to a large extent, those respondents who were willing to develop their careers in the Mainland adopted an instrumental approach towards these China opportunities and explicitly denied the possibility of living in the Mainland. Factors deterring our respondents from taking up employment across the border included the poor quality of life in the Mainland (in terms of food safety, air quality, law and order, and the health care system), the low prestige and wages of Mainland employment, a lack of knowledge of the Mainland labor market, and the Mainland’s great distance from home.

Furthermore, in the focus group discussions, although the presence of China opportunities was fully acknowledged, many respondents believed that these China opportunities were not available to everyone in Hong Kong. In addition to acknowledging the increasing popularity of Mainland returnees (“haigui”) among employers in the Mainland, our respondents noted the loss of comparative advantage held by young Hong Kong professionals and university graduates in the Mainland labor market.

The focus group participants also repeatedly suggested that the availability of China opportunities was restricted to certain industry sectors and fields of study. These opportunities were more related to entrepreneurship and to the financing and trading sectors. Relatedly, without denying the presence of China opportunities, respondents with no experiences of exchange tours or internship programs were more skeptical and tended to regard these opportunities as illegitimate and unethical.

In terms of academic pursuits in the Mainland, regardless of their previous experiences, most respondents reported rejection. A lack of recognition of Mainland qualifications was cited as the main reason for this perspective. Some of the secondary students showed a willingness to pursue university study in the Mainland only if they were not offered a place in local universities. In other words, studying in the Mainland was seen as a second option or as a last resort.

### ***Respondents in Different Life Stages: Similarities and Differences***



In the focus groups, secondary students, tertiary students, and working youth were recruited, and two groups were formed for each of these three categories. Their statuses represent three distinct life stages of individuals in periods of school-to-work transition and early career, in which differences in terms of perceptions of the Mainland, plans for personal development, and their interplay can be found.

In terms of their views of Mainland China, older respondents had less negative attitudes and higher levels of tolerance than younger ones. As career planning became more central to their lives, working youth and tertiary students tended to be more realistic and open-minded when exploring their personal development plans. As such, a few members of these two groups of focus group respondents were proactively engaging in business and career development in the Mainland or had tried to work in the Mainland, whether successfully or not. It is worthwhile to highlight that an international orientation was found among the tertiary students, who were keener to obtain exposure to foreign countries. Comparatively, the working youth had more concrete personal development plans.

By contrast, not only did secondary students have less positive perceptions of the Mainland, they were also more locally oriented in terms of study and work. Although some showed a willingness to attend university in the Mainland, they regarded these China opportunities as inferior and second-rate. They were also more ambivalent in terms of their career development plans. Instead, secondary students put more emphasis on academic pursuits.

## **Chapter 5**

### **Summary and Discussion**

#### **1. Background**

A decline in national identification with China and insufficient knowledge of Mainland affairs among the youth population in Hong Kong have been reported. Today's young people have lower levels of optimism for China's impact on Hong Kong and higher levels of hostility towards any form of integration with the Mainland. These negative attitudes contrast with the call of the Chief Executive, both in the Policy Address and on other occasions, for young people in Hong Kong to capitalize on the opportunities created by the growing Chinese economy.

The specific objectives of the current study are as follows:

- (1) To examine Hong Kong youth's common perceptions of the social and political phenomena of the Mainland;
- (2) To investigate Hong Kong youth's impressions of the policies implemented by the government concerning the relationship between the Mainland and Hong Kong;
- (3) To study the views and/ or experiences of Hong Kong youth on studying and/ or working in the Mainland;
- (4) To analyze the extent to which the above views and/ or experiences of the Hong Kong young generation impact their incentives to study and/ or work in the Mainland; and
- (5) On the basis of the study findings, to make policy recommendations on how to facilitate the Hong Kong young generation to study and/ or work in the Mainland.

#### **2. Summary of Official Statistics and Research Findings**

Over the past decade, the Hong Kong government has introduced various

measures and schemes to facilitate Hong Kong people to study and/ or work in the Mainland. Based on official statistics, in 2014/15, first, 3,249 Hong Kong students were enrolled, of which 1,535 were admitted via the Scheme for Admission of Hong Kong Students to Mainland Higher Education Institutions. Second, 152 and 111 eligible students obtained full-rate and half rate subsidies, respectively, via the Mainland University Study Subsidy Scheme. Third, the Funding Scheme for Youth Exchange in the Mainland sponsored approximately 11,000 Hong Kong youth to join exchange tours to the Mainland, and the Funding Scheme for Youth Internships in the Mainland sponsored approximately 1,700 Hong Kong young people to participate in internship programs in the Mainland.

Figures from the Education Bureau reveal that the participation rates of post-secondary, secondary, and primary students in Mainland Exchange Programs were 1.2%, 9.4%, and 6.4% in 2014/15, respectively. Among students of eight UGC-funded higher education institutions that participated in internship programs in 2014/15, while 13.2% went to the Mainland, 79.5% and 7.4% undertook internship programs in Hong Kong and other destinations, respectively.

The methodology and main findings of the telephone survey are summarized as follows:

- (1) A territory-wide representative telephone survey of 1,005 Hong Kong youth aged 15 to 35 was conducted in May and June 2015, with a response rate of 45.8% and a cooperation rate of 79.5%.
- (2) Concerning subjective views on the Mainland society, our young respondents felt optimistic about the economic prospects of Mainland China, but were less so about its political development. Overall, they gave the Mainland a negative composite rating (4.80 out of an adjusted mean score of 0 to 10), implying poor overall perceptions of the Mainland.
- (3) The respondents also had negative sentiments of government policies on Hong Kong-Mainland relations, including the implementation of “One Country, Two Systems” and the Individual Visit Scheme, the impacts of Mainland immigrants, and so on. Out of a composite score of ratings for 4 items, they gave government policies an adjusted average score of 3.76.

Table 5.1: A Summary of the Results of a Binary Logistic Regression on Willingness to Take up Different Activities in the Mainland

	Take up Employment		Pursue Academic Study		Participate in an Internship Program	
	(Model 4 of Table 3.19)		(Model 4 of Table 3.20)		(Model 4 of Table 3.21)	
	<i>Coeff</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Coeff</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Coeff</i>	<i>p</i>
<b>Men</b>	+	***	+		-	
<b>Born Outside Hong Kong</b>	+		+		+	
<b>Education Level (ref cat=Secondary or below)</b>						
Non-degree	-		+		-	
Degree or above	+		+		+	
<b>Non-student</b>	-	#	N/A		N/A	
<b>Subjective Social Class (ref cat=Lower)</b>						
Lower-middle	-		-		+	
Middle/Upper-middle/Upper	-		-		+	
<b>National Identity (ref cat=Hongkonger)</b>						
Chinese/Chinese but also Hongkonger	+		+	*	+	#
Hongkonger but also Chinese	+	#	+		+	*
<b>Political Orientation (ref cat=Pan-democratic)</b>						
Pro-establishment	-		-		-	
Between pan-democratic and pro-establishment	-		+		-	
No political orientation	+		+	#	-	
<b>Joined Exchange Tour in the Mainland</b>	-		+		-	
<b>Pursued Academic Study in the Mainland</b>	+		N/A		-	
<b>Participated in an Internship Program in the Mainland</b>	+		+		N/A	
<b>Composite Rating of Mainland Society</b>	+	**	+		+	
<b>Composite Rating of Government Policies on HK-Mainland Relations</b>	+	#	+		+	
<b>Composite Rating of China Opportunities</b>	+	***	+	***	+	***
<b>Composite Rating of Usefulness of Government Measures Encouraging Local Youth to Study and Work in the Mainland</b>	+	#	+	#	+	
<b>Perceived Level of Difficulty in Getting a Suitable Job in the Mainland (ref cat=very difficult/difficult)</b>						
Not difficult/Not difficult at all	+	**	N/A		N/A	
<b>Perceived Level of Difficulty in Pursuing Academic Study in the Mainland (ref cat=very difficult/difficult)</b>						
Not difficult/Not difficult at all		N/A	+		N/A	
<b>Perceived Level of Difficulty in Participating in Internship Program in the Mainland (ref cat=very difficult/difficult)</b>						
Not difficult/Not difficult at all		N/A	N/A		+	

Notes: Age is added in the models; \*\*\*p&lt;0.001, \*\*p&lt;0.01, \*p&lt;0.05, #p&lt;0.10.

- (4) The Hong Kong young generation had generally positive feelings towards their counterparts engaging in different types of China opportunities. Over half of the respondents exhibited favorable views on internships (70.8%), exchange tours (67.8%), and employment (56.9%), though they showed less support for Hong Kong youth pursuing academic study (39.4%) in the Mainland. The adjusted mean for perceptions of China opportunities was 5.34.
- (5) Contrary to the impression held by the government, Hong Kong youth found government measures designed to support youth in pursuing personal development in the Mainland quite effective (5.70 out of an adjusted mean score of 0 to 10).
- (6) More respondents perceived higher levels of difficulty in getting a suitable job (72.1%), securing an internship (66.9%), and pursuing academic study (55.4%) across the border.
- (7) Only a minority group of respondents ever took up employment (9.0%), pursued post-secondary education (3.8%), or interned (6.9%) in the Mainland. Given the common modern practice of students joining at least one exchange tour outside of Hong Kong in their years of primary and secondary school, more than one-third of our young generation respondents (36.5%) went on at least one of these tours.
- (8) Intriguingly, compared to the level of support for their young counterparts pursuing personal development in the Mainland (as stated above), our respondents showed a lower degree of willingness to study and work across the border themselves. While 55.8% were willing to participate in internship programs, the respective figures for getting a job and pursuing academic study in the Mainland were 37.4% and 29.3%.
- (9) The results of the statistical models show that men, respondents with higher ratings of Mainland China, respondents with more favorable perceptions of China opportunities, and respondents with lower perceived levels of difficulty in getting a suitable job across the border were significantly more likely to be willing to work in the Mainland. However, neither previous study nor previous work experience in Mainland China was found to have any significant effect on respondents' willingness to work across the border.

A summary of the results of the binary logistic regression models on the respondents' willingness to take up different activities in the Mainland is shown in Table 5.1.

- (10) After taking other variables into account, positive ratings of China opportunities increased respondents' likelihood of intending to study in Mainland China. Compared to those who identified as Hongkongers, respondents who identified as Chinese/ Chinese but also Hongkongers were more willing to pursue academic study across the border. These results were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Previous experience in Mainland exchange tours was not shown to have any impact.
- (11) Favorable views of China opportunities were related to higher levels of willingness to intern across the border. After controlling for other variables, compared to respondents who identified as Hongkongers, respondents who identified as Hongkongers but also Chinese were more likely to be willing to intern in the Mainland. Interestingly, previous experiences in exchange tours or academic study in the Mainland had no significant effect on respondents' intention to participate in internship programs.

The methodology and main findings of the focus group discussions are summarized as follows:

- (1) The participants of the focus groups were recruited mostly through the telephone survey of this study and our personal network of secondary schools. Six focus group discussions of 67 participants aged 15 to 35 were held in August and September 2015. Among these six groups, two clusters of respondents were formed: (1) one with experience of studying and/ or working in the Mainland and (2) the other without such experience. In each cluster, there were three groups of respondents with different current education and working backgrounds: (1) students of secondary schools; (2) students of tertiary institutions; and (3) fresh graduates (graduated within the past year, who were either working or seeking jobs), junior employees (three years or fewer of working experience), and young mid-level employees (more than three years of working experience).
- (2) Generally, those who joined the exchange tours to the Mainland recalled experiences of fun and joy. However, while secondary students emphasized

the social nature of the tours, tertiary students and working youth said that the tours helped them obtain more knowledge and a deeper understanding of Mainland society and Mainlanders.

- (3) A few respondents had participated in internship programs. With one exception, all found their experiences useless and non-applicable to the practices adopted in Hong Kong. Still, they considered the internship programs to be valuable in terms of polishing their CVs.
- (4) Our youth respondents in the focus groups had generally negative views of the Mainland. Pollution, corruption, lack of freedom, incomprehensive welfare and health care systems, “rule of man,” low wages, poor food safety, and uncivilized people were frequently mentioned during the discussions.
- (5) Compared to those who did not join exchange tours or participate in internship programs, participants with experiences in the Mainland had less negative attitudes towards Mainlanders and Mainland society. This group exhibited greater sympathy for and more balanced views of the Mainland.
- (6) Comparatively, participants without China experiences were less willing to acquire more knowledge and/ or understanding of the Mainland, since they believed that any first-hand observations through working and/ or studying in Mainland China would not be different from their existing understandings and perceptions of the Mainland society.
- (7) In terms of academic pursuits in the Mainland, regardless of their previous experiences in the Mainland, most respondents reported rejection. A lack of recognition of academic qualifications obtained in the Mainland was cited as the main reason for the participants’ dismissal of Mainland education.
- (8) Secondary and tertiary students pointed out that, due to differences in languages and professional practices, knowledge obtained in Mainland academic programs was irrelevant and not transferable to their study and work in Hong Kong.
- (9) A few secondary students showed a willingness to pursue university study in the Mainland, but only if they were not offered a place in local universities. Thus, these students saw Mainland degrees as a second-rate

option.

- (10) Since participants with Mainland experiences had less unfavorable perceptions of the Mainland, they were more open-minded when considering the possibility of pursuing career development in the Mainland. Instead of highlighting the gaps and incompatibilities between “them” (the Mainland) and “us” (Hong Kong), respondents with Mainland experiences viewed Hong Kong-Mainland differences as business opportunities and market potentials, which Hong Kong people could exploit.
- (11) It should be noted that, to a large extent, those respondents who were willing to develop their careers in the Mainland adopted an instrumental approach towards these China opportunities and explicitly denied the possibility of living in the Mainland. These respondents were deterred from taking up employment across the border by the poor quality of life in the Mainland (in terms of food safety, air quality, law and order, and the health care system), the low prestige and wages of Mainland employment, a lack of knowledge about the Mainland labor market, and the Mainland’s distance from home.
- (12) Although the presence of China opportunities was fully acknowledged, many respondents believed that these opportunities were not available to everyone in Hong Kong. In addition to acknowledging the increasing popularity of Mainland returnees (“haigui”) among Mainland employers, our respondents noted the loss of comparative advantage of young Hong Kong professionals and university graduates in the Mainland labor market.
- (13) Focus group participants repeatedly mentioned that the availability of China opportunities was restricted to certain industry sectors and fields of study. Specifically, these opportunities were more related to entrepreneurship and to the financing and trading sectors.
- (14) Without denying the presence of China opportunities, respondents with no experiences of exchange tours or internship program expressed skepticism, often regarding these opportunities as illegitimate and unethical.



### **3. Policy Recommendations for Encouraging Hong Kong Young To Study and/ or Work in the Mainland**

Based on the findings from the telephone survey and focus group discussions, in this section, we will make policy recommendations for encouraging Hong Kong youth to participate in internship programs, pursue academic study at the post-secondary level, and/ or work in Mainland China. First, youth in Hong Kong today were found to view the Mainland and Hong Kong-Mainland relations negatively. Second, the Hong Kong young generation acknowledged the presence of China opportunities, but many of them thought that these opportunities were only available to people with many years of working experience and who were engaged in specific fields of work and study, such as finance, trading, and Chinese medicine. As such, unsurprisingly, Mainland China was a less preferred location for personal development among young people in Hong Kong.

While over half of the respondents in the telephone survey showed a willingness to take up internship programs across the border, the corresponding figures for working and studying in the Mainland dropped to just over one-third and one-quarter, respectively. In the focus group discussions, more in-depth information about the push and pull factors of these three types of Mainland activities were obtained. In the following, we will give policy recommendations on ways to encourage more Hong Kong youth to (1) participate in internship programs, (2) study, and (3) work in Mainland China. Given the prevalence of negative perceptions of the Mainland, we will focus on measures for providing high-quality and relevant “China experiences” and for offering adequate financial and information support. The proposed measures could skew the balance towards a more positive (or less negative) future outcome.

#### **3.1 Ways To Encourage More Hong Kong Youth To Participate in Internship Programs in the Mainland:**

##### ***(1) Ensuring the quality and relevancy of internship opportunities.***

In the focus group discussions, first, participants complained about the lack of meaningful job assignments in their Mainland internships. Second, even the few participants who did admit that they acquired more knowledge about

relevant professional systems and practices mentioned the lack of applicability of this Mainland knowledge to their studies and careers in Hong Kong. One participant told us that he was seen as redundant when performing his internship duties. Thus, the main advantage of these short-term “work” experiences in the Mainland was to improve the participants’ CVs.

Internships should accomplish more than CV-padding; thus, to motivate more Hong Kong youth to go north, high-quality and relevant internship opportunities must be ensured. On the Hong Kong side, organizers of Mainland internship opportunities for Hong Kong youth, be they NGOs, post-secondary institutions, or government offices, could develop a set of criteria to select Mainland internship providers for potential internship program participants. Among these criteria, the quality and relevancy of internship opportunities should be of paramount importance. Communication between these Hong Kong organizers and Mainland internship providers should be constant to ensure that both the young Hong Kong interns and the Mainland companies get what they expect. Furthermore, feedback should be collected from internship participants by Hong Kong organizers. More importantly, this feedback should be used to improve the quality and relevancy of internship opportunities.

### ***(2) Organizing internship programs through post-secondary institutions.***

Potential participants of both local and non-local internship programs are mostly post-secondary students. Given our young generation’s low level of trust in the Hong Kong government and widespread negative perceptions of the Mainland, the offering of Mainland internship programs should be done by post-secondary institutions. If endorsements are given and promotions are carried out by post-secondary institutions, Hong Kong youth will have higher levels of confidence in participating in internship programs in the Mainland. Thus, more recurrent and direct funding should be available to all post-secondary institutions, including both UGC-funded and non-UGC-funded. After all, more post-secondary students in Hong Kong pursue their post-secondary education in non-UGC-funded institutions. Given that over half of the respondents in the telephone survey showed a willingness to take internship positions in the Mainland, given the condition of greater trust through adequate financial resources, these steps may increase the proportion of Hong Kong youth appearing in Mainland internship programs.

### ***(3) Offering more career-related advising at the departmental and faculty***

***levels of post-secondary institutions.***

To provide Hong Kong youth with fruitful and useful Mainland working experiences, more career-related advising should be offered at the departmental and faculty levels of post-secondary institutions. Focus group participants pointed out that they obtained information about local and non-local internship programs primarily through their schools. Assuming that academic departments and faculties are major contact points for post-secondary students, more career-related advising should be offered at the departmental and faculty levels to allow students to gain more relevant information for their career development.

Along the same lines, departmental and faculty representatives should be equipped with adequate knowledge about the nature and content of internship programs. The students of informed representatives are more likely to receive useful and accurate information on internship programs, with minimal mismatch. More post-secondary students would also be willing to participate in high-quality and relevant Mainland internship programs recommended by their teachers and/ or academic faculty representatives.

**3.2 Ways To Encourage More Hong Kong Youth To Pursue Academic Study at the Post-Secondary Level in the Mainland:**

***(1) Ensuring the quality and transferability of academic qualifications attained in the Mainland.***

In the telephone survey, a negligible percentage of our young respondents reported a desire to pursue post-secondary education in the Mainland. None of the focus group participants studied in Mainland higher education institutions. Furthermore, participants in the groups of tertiary students rejected the idea of attending any Mainland academic programs whatsoever, and their secondary school counterparts saw Mainland university study as a last resort. The participants' main concern was the lack of recognition of Mainland academic qualifications, especially in the Hong Kong labor market. Due to differences in languages and professional practices, our focus group participants denied the feasibility of engaging in even short-term academic study, such as an academic exchange program, in the Mainland.

Thus, instead of simply increasing the number of Mainland higher education

institutions participating in the Scheme for Admission of Hong Kong Students to Mainland Higher Education Institutions, a more urgent task is to ensure that the academic qualifications and credits earned by Hong Kong students in Mainland universities are “transferable,” especially in the Hong Kong labor market and post-secondary education institutions. There is also a need for the authorities concerned to clarify how the academic qualifications obtained in different types of Mainland higher institutions and Mainland-based knowledge acquired in different academic programs are “useable” for Hong Kong youth to attain jobs and pursue further development outside of Mainland China.

After all, Hong Kong residents are used to adopting a pragmatic approach to career development. In the eyes of both employers and future employees (i.e., students), Chinese-language and non-internationally recognized qualifications, practices, and knowledge are usually considered lower quality.

## ***(2) Providing more financial support.***

While fewer than one-third of the respondents of the telephone survey showed a willingness to pursue academic study in the Mainland, the corresponding figure for those interested in studying overseas was nearly 90%. As repeatedly mentioned, Mainland study was considered a second-rate option by most, if not all, focus group participants. Therefore, it is clear that Mainland study options are considered undesirable by Hong Kong youth. To address this issue, in addition to ensuring the transferability of Mainland academic qualifications and academic credits to Hong Kong, adequate financial support should be offered to motivate our young generation to take up Mainland studying opportunities.

As an immediate step, more financial sponsorship should be provided for academic exchange programs to the Mainland. In the focus group discussions, a few participants told us that financial incentives would be the only way to attract them to participate in short-term academic study in Mainland China. Given that both Mainland and overseas exchange programs are fee-based, they saw the overseas ones as comparatively more “value for the money.” Thus, adequate or even full financial support should be given to ensure that these less popular China opportunities are considered by Hong Kong youth.

## ***(3) Offering more academic advising at the departmental and faculty levels of***

*post-secondary institutions.*

To attract students to enroll in Mainland academic exchange programs, academic advising should be offered at both the departmental and faculty levels of local post-secondary institutions. As previously mentioned, academic departments and faculties are major sources of academic information for students. Academic advising is a valuable chance for students to gain tailor-made and useful academic information. Furthermore, through academic advising, high-quality academic exchange programs can be effectively promoted to students. Such advising may further guarantee that students can obtain relevant academic experiences and professional knowledge by attending Mainland academic exchange programs. If the nature and content of these Mainland exchange opportunities are closely tied to those of local academic programs, Hong Kong students would have more incentive to pursue short-term academic study in the Mainland to support their future career and personal development.

### **3.3 Ways To Encourage More Hong Kong Youth To Work in the Mainland:**

*(1) Providing accurate information from the authorities concerned about Mainland working conditions.*

In the telephone survey, 7.1% of our young respondents reported that a lack of knowledge about the Mainland labor market was the main challenge they perceived related to working in the Mainland. Another 9.0% stated that unattractive wages and employment benefits were the main challenges. An overall inadequate understanding of Mainland employment conditions was well reflected in the focus group discussion. To encourage more Hong Kong youth to consider pursuing career development in the Mainland, more accurate information about different aspects of the working conditions and labor market of the Mainland should be provided.

Wage levels in the Mainland were a main concern for our focus group participants. Instead of blaming Hong Kong youth for being money-oriented, the authorities concerned should provide more transparent information concerning the different wage levels, living standards, and labor market conditions of various Mainland cities. A government office could be established to provide one-stop information support, which should be

supplemented with appropriate means, such as websites and enquiry services. Accurate and up-to-date information on Mainland working conditions would enable young people in Hong Kong to better evaluate their suitability for taking up employment in the Mainland.

***(2) Providing more on-site practical support to Hong Kong people working in the Mainland.***

Cultural differences, a lack of social support, and the poor quality of life in the Mainland were mentioned by the respondents of our telephone survey as primary challenges related to working in the Mainland. Similar first-hand personal experiences of the Mainland were shared by the focus group participants. Before urging the Hong Kong young generation to go north, the relevant authorities should offer more on-site practical support. This support should include information on medical consultation, hospitalization, food, health and personal safety, insurance, taxation, flat rentals, transportation, etc.

Hong Kong offices should be established in various main cities of the Mainland to serve as contact points and information centers for Hong Kong people working in the Mainland. Telephone hotlines should be set up to answer enquiries about everyday life and practical issues. Such assistance would help to prepare Hong Kong youth with the best possible foundation on which to begin working and living in the Mainland.

Should they choose to work in the Mainland, most young people can only attain entry-level job positions, in which they are not offered comprehensive remuneration packages. As such, adequate and practical support offered by the relevant authorities should be of paramount importance in motivating Hong Kong youth to pursue career development in Mainland China.

***(3) Offering comprehensive promotion and consultation of CEPA and Mainland business opportunities for young stakeholders in Hong Kong.***

Currently, the Mainland and Hong Kong Closer Economic Partnership Arrangement (CEPA) maintain a major free trade agreement between the two places, which benefits Hong Kong businesses, professionals, and entrepreneurs. For example, under the CEPA, in the areas of trade in services, service suppliers in Hong Kong enjoy preferential treatment in providing various

services to the Mainland market. Furthermore, mutual recognition of professional qualifications under the CEPA has been passed by a few professional bodies in Hong Kong and the regulatory authorities in the Mainland. On November 27, 2015, the Agreement on Trade in Services was signed; this concluded a further extension of the liberalization of trade in services and represents significant opportunities for Hong Kong businesses to gain further and greater access to the Mainland market.

Although many focus group participants acknowledged the numerous business opportunities present in Mainland China, they believed that these opportunities were limited to entrepreneurs, experienced professionals, and people working in the finance and trading sectors. In addition to further extending CEPA coverage to more areas of trade in services and professional qualifications, comprehensive CEPA promotion and consultation should be provided to our young generation.

Specifically, the content and benefits of CEPA and other China opportunities relevant to local young people and young professionals should be directed towards these target groups. More importantly, local young people's views and concerns with regard to setting up businesses and professional practices in the Mainland should be collected in order to better address their needs. Since it takes time for young people to obtain sufficient experience to run their own practices and firms in the Mainland, it is best to equip them with more up-to-date and comprehensive information about tapping the future (i.e., in a few years) opportunities of the Mainland market.

### **3.4 Other Recommendations:**

A regular review of youth's attitudes towards government policies facilitating their work and/ or study in the Mainland, as well as their intentions to participate in internship programs, attend higher education institutions, and take up employment in the Mainland, should be conducted. These efforts will help to better address the concerns and needs of Hong Kong youth in pursuing personal development in the Mainland.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Census and Statistics Department. (2002). *Thematic household survey* (Report No. 9). Hong Kong: Census and Statistics Department.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2011a). *Thematic household survey* (Report No. 46). Hong Kong: Census and Statistics Department.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2011b). *Special topics: Hong Kong residents working in the Mainland of China* (Report No. 57). Hong Kong: Census and Statistics Department.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2015). *Hong Kong annual digest of statistics*. Hong Kong: Census and Statistics Department. Retrieved from [http://www.censtatd.gov.hk/fd.jsp?file=B10100032015AN15B0100.pdf&product\\_id=B1010003&lang=1](http://www.censtatd.gov.hk/fd.jsp?file=B10100032015AN15B0100.pdf&product_id=B1010003&lang=1)
- Education Bureau. (2015, March 27). “Administration's replies to Members initial written questions in examining the Estimates of Expenditure 2015-16 (Education).” *Minutes of special meeting of the Finance Committee* (04. 02.). Legislative Council, Hong Kong, China. Retrieved from <http://library.legco.gov.hk:1080/record=b1179134>
- Home Affairs Bureau. (2015, March 27). “Administration's replies to Members initial written questions in examining the Estimates of Expenditure 2015-16 (Home Affairs).” *Minutes of special meeting of the Finance Committee* (04. 02.). Legislative Council, Hong Kong, China. <http://library.legco.gov.hk:1080/record=b1179129>
- Legislative Council. (2014). *Increasing subsidised higher education opportunities* (LC Paper No. CB(4)545/13-14(01)). Panel on Education, Legislative Council Secretariat, HKSAR Government.
- Leung, S.-W. (2005). Cross-border consumption in China. In S.K. Lau et al. (Eds.), *Indicators of social development: Hong Kong 2004* (pp. 123–50). Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies, the Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Lui, T.-L. (2014). Fading opportunities: Hong Kong in the context of regional integration. *China Perspectives* 1, 35–42.



王家英、尹寶珊。2004a。「香港的『一國兩制』實踐：特區政府和中國政府的表現認受性比較」。香港：香港中文大學香港亞太研究所，頁 193- 212。

\_\_\_\_\_。2004b。「對中國的『重新想像』：回歸後身分認同的延續與變化」，載劉兆佳、王家英、尹寶珊編，《香港社會政治的延續與變遷》。香港：香港中文大學香港亞太研究所，頁 213-41。

\_\_\_\_\_。2008。《從民意看香港的社會與政治》。香港：香港中文大學香港亞太研究所。

呂大樂。2013。「這麼近，那麼遠——機會結構之轉變與期望的落差」，9月20日，《明報》，版 B06。

《明報》。2014。「中港 10 年愈依賴愈生厭」，9月22日，版 A06。

智經研究中心。2015。《香港青年往內地就業態度》意見調查。

鄭宏泰、尹寶珊。2013。「香港與中國內地的融合進程：迴歸後『內地行』與『自由行』的比較和檢視」，於 2013 年 11 月 30 日至 12 月 1 日舉行之台灣社會學年會發表。

蕭新煌、尹寶珊、王家英。2008。「『中國印象』的變與不變：台港民眾認知的比較，1997-2004」，載黃紹倫、尹寶珊、梁世榮編，《新世紀台港社會風貌》。香港：香港中文大學香港亞太研究所，頁 259-90。

蕭新煌、尹寶珊。2014。「評估『中國關係』：比較台灣與香港的民意」，載趙永佳、蕭新煌、尹寶珊編，《一衣帶水：台港社會議題縱橫》，頁 277- 320。

## Appendix 1.1: Details of the Fieldwork of Telephone Survey

Date	: 11 May – 23 June 2015 (Most interviews were conducted between 6.15 and 10.15pm and the rest were held during day time as requested by the respondents)
Target population	: Hong Kong residents aged 15 to 35
Method	: Random sample telephone survey
Sampling	: Firstly, telephone numbers were randomly selected from the latest Hong Kong Residential Telephone Directory (both the Chinese and English versions) as seed numbers. To include unpublished telephone numbers, we replaced by computer the last two digits of the selected telephone numbers with two new, random digits. This became the sample of the study. Secondly when telephone contact was successfully established with a target household, only a person aged 15 to 35 was randomly selected for an interview via Kish grid method.
Successful sample size	: 1,005
Fieldwork results	:
<i>Total telephone numbers</i>	48,200
<i>Non-eligible cases :</i>	29,694
Invalid line	19,801
Fax number	1,988
Non-residential	1,700
Calls diverted to places outside Hong Kong	49
No eligible respondent	6,156
<i>Cases of unknown eligibility :</i>	16,313
Always busy	1,031
No answer	8,716
Telephone answering device	1,346
Call-blocking	341
Break-off	4,362

Language	399	
Others	118	
<i>Eligible but non-interview cases :</i>		<i>1,188</i>
Household-level refusal	929	
Known respondent refusal	99	
Termination mid-way	30	
Respondent never available	103	
Respondent language problem/ physically unable or incompetent	27	
<i>Successfully interviewed :</i>		<i>1,005</i>
Response rate	: 45.8% [1,005 / (1,005 + 929 + 99 + 30 + 103 + 27)]	
Co-operation rate	: 79.5% [1,005 / (1,005 + 99 + 30 + 103 + 27)]	

## Appendix 3.1: Questionnaire of the Telephone Survey

### 香港青年對往內地工作及讀書的意見調查

SCREEN1 「我地香港中文大學香港亞太研究所依家做緊一個有關香港青年對往內地工作及讀書嘅意見調查。請問你府上有無住戶成員係介乎 15 至 35 歲非外籍家庭傭工嘅香港居民？」

1. 有
2. 無 【沒有合乎資格的訪問的對象，訪問結束】

SCREEN2 「請問你府上總共有幾多個介乎 15 至 35 歲非外籍家庭傭工嘅香港居民？」

Use “Kish Grid” method to identify 1 eligible target respondent in each household.

「我地香港中文大學香港亞太研究所依家做緊一個有關香港青年對往內地工作及讀書嘅意見調查。咁我地依家開始依個訪問。」

SEX 受訪者性別： 1. 男 3. 女

AGE 「你屬於以下邊一個年齡組別呢？係 15 至 17、18 至 19、20 至 24、25 至 29，定係 30 至 35 歲呢？」

1. 15 -- 17 歲
2. 18 -- 19 歲
3. 20 -- 24 歲
4. 25 -- 29 歲
5. 30 -- 35 歲

## Perceptions of Chinese society and Mainlanders

「首先，想問你一啲對內地嘅睇法。」

Q1 「有人認為『內地經濟會一直維持快速發展』，你同唔同意呢種講法呢？  
係非常同意、同意、不同意，定係非常不同意呢？」

【如受訪者回答：先快速後緩慢、唔一定會一直快速發展者歸入「不同意」，  
然後追問程度】

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 非常同意  | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 同意    | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 不同意   |            |
| 4. 非常不同意 |            |

Q2 「你對內地未來嘅政治發展樂唔樂觀呢？係非常樂觀、樂觀、不樂觀，  
定係非常不樂觀呢？」

【未來：三至五年】【例如政局是否穩定、廉潔程度等】

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 非常樂觀  | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 樂觀    | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 不樂觀   |            |
| 4. 非常不樂觀 |            |

Q3 「你認為內地依家嘅生活質素好唔好呢？係非常好、幾好、唔係幾好，定係  
非常唔好呢？」〔例如居住環境、治安、物價、食品安全、交通等〕

- |         |            |
|---------|------------|
| 1. 非常好  | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 幾好   | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 唔係幾好 |            |
| 4. 非常唔好 |            |

Q4 「係香港，你有無家人、親友或者同事係由內地黎香港未夠七年嘅新移民呢？」

- |             |                   |
|-------------|-------------------|
| 1. 有【續問 Q5】 | 8. 唔知道／好難講【跳問 Q6】 |
| 2. 無【跳問 Q6】 | 9. 拒絕回答【跳問 Q6】    |

【只問 Q4 回答有的受訪者】

Q5 「你平時有幾經常同佢哋聯繫呢？係完全無、好少、間中、定係經常呢？」

- |        |            |
|--------|------------|
| 1. 完全無 | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 好少  | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 間中  |            |

## 4. 經常

Q6「係過去 12 個月內，您有無返過內地呢？如果有，咁你大約幾耐返一次呢？係每日一次及以上、每星期一至六次、每月一至三次，定係每年一至十一次？」

【回答「無」，追問：「係過去 12 個月內無，定係從未返過內地？」】

- |            |          |
|------------|----------|
| 1. 每日一次及以上 | 97. 其他   |
| 2. 每星期一至六次 | 99. 拒絕回答 |
| 3. 每月一至三次  |          |
| 4. 每年一至十一次 |          |

**Knowledge about Mainland**

Q7「你平時有幾經常留意有關內地嘅新聞呢？係完全無、好少、間中、定係經常呢？」

- |        |            |
|--------|------------|
| 1. 完全無 | 8. 不知道／好難講 |
| 2. 好少  | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 間中  |            |
| 4. 經常  |            |

**Attitudes towards govt policies on Mainland-HK relations**

Q8「喺落實『一國兩制』上，你希望香港同內地保持一定距離多啲，定係同內地加強融合多啲呢？」

（若受訪者問乜嘢叫加強融合，可回答：「即加強兩地經濟互通、簡化出入境、學歷及專業互相承認等」）

- |              |            |
|--------------|------------|
| 1. 與內地保持一定距離 | 8. 不知道／好難講 |
| 2. 與內地加強融合   | 9. 拒絕回答    |

Q9「你覺得對香港嚟講，內地自由行旅客帶嚟嘅好處多啲，定係壞處多啲呢？」

- |                  |            |
|------------------|------------|
| 1. 好處多啲          | 8. 不知道／好難講 |
| 2. 壞處多啲          | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 好壞參半／差唔多【不讀出】 |            |

Q10A「近年，政府大力鼓勵同資助本地學生同青年到內地交流同實習。整體嚟講，你認為依啲措施對鼓勵更多香港年輕人到內地進修或發展事業有幾大幫助呢？係有好大幫助、有幫助、無乜幫助，定係完全無幫助呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 有好大幫助 | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 有幫助   | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 無乜幫助  |            |
| 4. 完全無幫助 |            |

Q10B「由 2012 至 2013 學年開始，香港學生可以只係以香港中學文憑考試成績報讀內地嘅高等院校。你認為依個措施對鼓勵更多香港年輕人到內地進修或發展事業有幾大幫助呢？係有好大幫助、有幫助、無乜幫助，定係完全無幫助呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 有好大幫助 | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 有幫助   | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 無乜幫助  |            |
| 4. 完全無幫助 |            |

Q10C「係舊年，特區政府推出「內地大學升學資助計劃」。由 2014 至 2015 學年開始，每名學生可以獲得每年最多 15,000 港元嘅資助到內地修讀學士學位課程。你認為依個措施對鼓勵更多香港年輕人到內地進修或發展事業有幾大幫助呢？係有好大幫助、有幫助、無乜幫助，定係完全無幫助呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 有好大幫助 | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 有幫助   | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 無乜幫助  |            |
| 4. 完全無幫助 |            |

Q11「過去幾年，愈來愈多內地人黎香港讀書或者工作。你認為依個趨勢對本地青年升學同工作機會有乜野嘅影響呢？係非常好、幾好、幾壞、非常壞，定係無影響呢？」

- |           |            |
|-----------|------------|
| 1. 有非常好影響 | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 有幾好影響  | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 有幾壞影響  |            |
| 4. 有非常壞影響 |            |
| 5. 無影響    |            |

Q12 「過去幾年，愈來愈多內地人黎香港讀書或者工作。你認為依個趨勢對香港整體嘅發展有乜野嘅影響呢？係非常好、幾好、幾壞、非常壞，定係無影響呢？」

- |           |            |
|-----------|------------|
| 1. 有非常好影響 | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 有幾好影響  | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 有幾壞影響  |            |
| 4. 有非常壞影響 |            |
| 5. 無影響    |            |

### Perceptions of China opportunity

「對於往內地工作抑或留港工作，唔同人冇同睇法，以下係有關呢方面嘅意見。」【Q13-Q16 會隨機顯示】

Q13 「你贊唔贊成香港年輕人返內地讀書呢？係非常贊成、贊成、不贊成，定係非常不贊成呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 非常贊成  | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 贊成    | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 不贊成   |            |
| 4. 非常不贊成 |            |

Q14 「你贊唔贊成香港年輕人參加返內地嘅交流團呢？係非常贊成、贊成、不贊成，定係非常不贊成呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 非常贊成  | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 贊成    | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 不贊成   |            |
| 4. 非常不贊成 |            |

Q15 「你贊唔贊成香港年輕人參加內地工作實習計劃呢？係非常贊成、贊成、不贊成，定係非常不贊成呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 非常贊成  | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 贊成    | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 不贊成   |            |
| 4. 非常不贊成 |            |



Q16「你贊唔贊成香港年輕人返內地工作呢？係非常贊成、贊成、不贊成，定係非常不贊成呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 非常贊成  | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 贊成    | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 不贊成   |            |
| 4. 非常不贊成 |            |

【Q17-Q18 會隨機顯示】

Q17「你覺得自己要喺內地搵倒一份適合嘅工作有幾大困難呢？係有好大困難、有困難、無乜困難，定係完全無困難呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 有好大困難 | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 有困難   | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 無乜困難  |            |
| 4. 完全無困難 |            |

Q18「你覺得自己要係香港搵倒一份適合嘅工作有幾大困難呢？係有好大困難、有困難、無乜困難，定係完全無困難呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 有好大困難 | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 有困難   | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 無乜困難  |            |
| 4. 完全無困難 |            |

Q19「整體嚟講，你覺得自己要喺內地搵倒一份適合嘅工作難啲、要係香港搵倒一份適合嘅工作難啲，定係兩者差唔多呢？」

- |                    |            |
|--------------------|------------|
| 1. 要喺內地搵倒一份適合嘅工作難啲 | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 要係香港搵倒一份適合嘅工作難啲 | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 兩者差唔多           |            |

Q20 「係你考慮會唔會返內地工作時，以下邊個內地因素對你嚟講係最重要嘅呢？」【讀出 1-7，只選一項】【選項 1-7 會隨機顯示】

1. 自己嘅個人能力
2. 家人嘅態度
3. 內地嘅經濟前景【例如經濟會唔會持續增長等】
4. 內地嘅政治前景【例如政局是否穩定、廉潔程度等】
5. 內地嘅生活質素【例如居住環境、治安、物價、食品安全、交通等】
6. 喺內地是否有家人、親屬或朋友
7. 內地工作嘅薪酬福利
8. 其他（請註明）
88. 不知道／好難講
99. 拒絕回答

Q21 「假如真係要返內地工作，你覺得自己將會面對最大嘅困難係乜呢？」【讀出 1-7，只選一項】【選項 1-7 會隨機顯示】

1. 普通話唔夠好
2. 對內地政治狀況欠缺信心
3. 擔心內地生活質素欠佳〔例如居住環境、治安、物價、食品安全、交通等〕
4. 喺內地沒有人際網絡
5. 對內地就業市場認識不足
6. 內地工作薪酬福利唔吸引
7. 有文化差異
77. 其他（註明）
88. 唔知道／好難講
99. 拒絕回答

Q22 「假如真係要返內地工作，同其他年紀相若嘅內地人士比較，你覺得自己有幾大優勢呢？係有好大優勢、有優勢、無乜優勢，定係完全無優勢呢？」【優勢：可以搵到合適工作、份工可以發展得好好】

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 有好大優勢 | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 有優勢   | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 無乜優勢  |            |
| 4. 完全無優勢 |            |

Q23 「假如真係要返內地工作，你覺得家人會唔會支持你咁做呢？係一定會、可能會、可能唔會，定係一定唔會支持呢？」

- |         |            |
|---------|------------|
| 1. 一定會  | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 可能會  | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 可能唔會 |            |
| 4. 一定唔會 |            |

Q24 「你有無家人、親屬或朋友依家喺內地居住或工作，喺有需要時可以搵拒咗幫忙呢？係無、幾少、幾多，定係有好多呢？」

- |        |            |
|--------|------------|
| 1. 無   | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 幾少  | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 幾多  |            |
| 4. 有好多 |            |

WORK 「你現時係唔係在職人士呢？」(包括全職及兼職)

【非在職：追問是以下邊類人士（讀出 2-6）】

1. 在職人士
2. 非在職：失業／搵工（曾工作）
3. 非在職：待業（從未工作）
4. 非在職：學生
5. 非在職：主要料理家務
6. 非在職：其他
9. 拒絕回答

【此題只問學生】

Q25 「你認為自己要返內地升學有幾大困難呢？係有好大困難、有困難、無乜困難，

定係完全無困難呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 有好大困難 | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 有困難   | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 無乜困難  |            |
| 4. 完全無困難 |            |

【此題只問學生】

Q26 「你認為自己要喺內地搵倒一個工作實習嘅機會有幾大困難呢？係有好大困難、有困難、無乜困難，定係完全無困難呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 有好大困難 | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 有困難   | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 無乜困難  |            |
| 4. 完全無困難 |            |

### Working and Studying in the Mainland: Experiences and Willingness

「以下我哋希望了解你有無喺內地讀書或者工作嘅經驗。」

ASK ALL

Q27 「請問你有無喺內地讀過書呢？」(只包括交換生計劃和正規課程等)

1. 有【續問 Q28】
2. 無【如學生，跳問 Q30；如非學生，跳問 Q32】
9. 拒絕回答【如學生，跳問 Q31；如非學生，跳問 Q32】

【此題只問有喺內地讀過書的受訪者】

Q28 「你喺內地讀到最高嘅邊個程度呢？」

【回答中學：追問初中還是高中；回答大專：追問是否學士 degree】

- |                          |         |
|--------------------------|---------|
| 1. 小學或以下                 | 9. 拒絕回答 |
| 2. 初中 (中一至中三)            |         |
| 3. 高中 (中四至中六／職業高中／中專／中技) |         |
| 4. 非學位大專／社區學院            |         |
| 5. 大學 (包括大學學士等)          |         |
| 6. 研究院 (包括碩士／博士等)        |         |
| 7. 其他(請註明)               |         |

【此題只問有喺內地讀過書的受訪者】

Q29 「整體黎講，你認為你喺內地讀書嘅經驗對你自己往後嘅發展有無幫助呢？係有好大幫助、有幫助、無乜幫助，定係完全無幫助呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 有好大幫助 | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 有幫助   | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 無乜幫助  |            |
| 4. 完全無幫助 |            |

【此題只問學生以及同時從來沒有嚟內地讀過書的受訪者】

Q30「如有機會，你願唔願意返內地讀書呢？係非常願意、願意、不願意，定係非常不願意呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 非常願意  | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 願意    | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 不願意   |            |
| 4. 非常不願意 |            |

【此題只問學生】

Q31「除咗內地，如有機會，你願唔願意去其他地方讀書呢？係非常願意、願意、不願意，定係非常不願意呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 非常願意  | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 願意    | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 不願意   |            |
| 4. 非常不願意 |            |

ASK ALL

Q32「喺讀書嘅時候，請問你有無參加過返內地嘅交流團呢？」(不包括旅行)

- |              |                 |
|--------------|-----------------|
| 1. 有【續問 Q33】 | 9. 拒絕回答【跳問 Q35】 |
| 2. 無【跳問 Q35】 |                 |

【此題只問有參加過返內地交流團的受訪者】

Q33「你總共參加過返內地嘅交流團幾多次呢？」

- |                 |          |
|-----------------|----------|
| _____次 【由訪問員記錄】 | 77. 忘記   |
|                 | 99. 拒絕回答 |

【此題只問有參加過返內地交流團的受訪者】

Q34「整體黎講，你認為你參加返內地交流團嘅經驗對你自己往後嘅發展有無幫助呢？係有好大幫助、有幫助、無乜幫助，定係完全無幫助呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 有好大幫助 | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 有幫助   | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 無乜幫助  |            |
| 4. 完全無幫助 |            |

ASK ALL

Q35「請問你有無參加過返內地工作實習計劃呢？」

- |               |                 |
|---------------|-----------------|
| 1. 有【跳問 Q36】  | 9. 拒絕回答【跳問 Q38】 |
| 2. 無【續問 Q35A】 |                 |

【此題只問學生以及同時從來沒有參加過返內地工作實習計劃的受訪者】

Q35A「如有機會，你願唔願意參加返內地既工作實習計劃呢？係非常願意、願意、不願意，定係非常不願意呢？」

- |                  |                    |
|------------------|--------------------|
| 1. 非常願意【跳問 Q38】  | 8. 唔知道／好難講【跳問 Q38】 |
| 2. 願意【跳問 Q38】    | 9. 拒絕回答【跳問 Q38】    |
| 3. 不願意【跳問 Q38】   |                    |
| 4. 非常不願意【跳問 Q38】 |                    |

【此題只問參加過返內地工作實習計劃的受訪者】

Q36「計晒所有嘅內地工作實習經驗，你總共喺內地工作實習咗幾耐呢？係少過1個月、1個月至少過3個月、3個月至少過半年、半年至少過1年，定係1年或以上呢？」

- |              |         |
|--------------|---------|
| 1. 少過1個月     | 7. 忘記   |
| 2. 1個月至少過3個月 | 9. 拒絕回答 |
| 3. 3個月至少過半年  |         |
| 4. 半年至少過1年   |         |
| 5. 1年或以上     |         |

【此題只問參加過返內地工作實習計劃的受訪者】

Q37「整體黎講，你認為你喺內地工作實習嘅經驗對你自己往後嘅發展有無幫助呢？係有好大幫助、有幫助、無乜幫助，定係完全無幫助呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 有好大幫助 | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 有幫助   | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 無乜幫助  |            |
| 4. 完全無幫助 |            |

ASK ALL

Q38「請問你有無返過內地工作或者公幹呢？」

- |              |                 |
|--------------|-----------------|
| 1. 有【續問 Q39】 | 9. 拒絕回答【跳問 Q45】 |
| 2. 無【跳問 Q45】 |                 |

【此題只問有返過內地工作或者公幹的受訪者】

Q39「咁你喺內地工作或者公幹時，有無需要過長駐、每天往返內地或者主要工作地點為內地（即最少一半時間是在內地）？」

- |                    |                 |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| 1. 有【續問 Q40】       | 9. 拒絕回答【跳問 Q45】 |
| 2. 無【跳問 Q45】       |                 |
| 7. 其他(請註明)【跳問 Q45】 |                 |

【Q40-Q44 只問長駐、每天往返內地或主要工作地點為內地的受訪者】

Q40「請問你係喺以前抑或依家要長期逗留喺內地工作嘅呢？」【以前同依家都要=依家】

- |               |                 |
|---------------|-----------------|
| 1. 以前【跳問 Q42】 | 9. 拒絕回答【跳問 Q43】 |
| 2. 依家【續問 Q41】 |                 |

【只問 Q40 回答依家要長期逗留喺內地工作的受訪者】

Q41「如果有得俾你揀，你願唔願意長遠地逗留喺內地工作呢？係非常願意、願意、不願意，定係非常不願意呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 非常願意  | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 願意    | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 不願意   |            |
| 4. 非常不願意 |            |
- 【此題完成後跳問 Q43】

【此題只問 Q40 回答以前要長期逗留喺內地工作的受訪者】

Q42「如有機會，你願唔願意再返內地工作呢？係非常願意、願意、不願意，定係非常不願意呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 非常願意  | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 願意    | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 不願意   |            |
| 4. 非常不願意 |            |

【此題只問以前及依家要長期逗留嚟內地工作的受訪者】

Q43 「我哋希望了解你嚟以前同埋依家要長期逗留嚟內地工作嘅上班模式，總共維持咗幾耐呢？係少過半年、半年至少過 1 年、1 年至少過兩年、兩年至少過 4 年，定係 4 年或以上呢？」

- |              |          |
|--------------|----------|
| 1. 少過半年      | 77. 忘記   |
| 2. 半年至少過 1 年 | 99. 拒絕回答 |
| 3. 1 年至少過兩年  |          |
| 4. 兩年至少過 4 年 |          |
| 5. 4 年或以上    |          |
| 7. 其他(請註明)   |          |

【此題只問以前及依家要長期逗留嚟內地工作的受訪者】

Q44 「整體黎講，你認為你嚟內地工作嘅經驗對你自己往後嘅發展有無幫助呢？係有好大幫助、有幫助、無乜幫助，定係完全無幫助呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 有好大幫助 | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 有幫助   | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 無乜幫助  |            |
| 4. 完全無幫助 |            |

【Q45-Q49 不問以前或依家需要長駐、每天往返內地或者主要工作地點為內地（即最少一半時間是在內地）的受訪者】

「以下我希望能了解你對往內地工作嘅意願。而返內地工作包括：長駐內地工作；每天往返內地工作；或者主要工作地點為內地」(即最少一半時間是在內地)

Q45 「如有機會，你願唔願意返內地工作呢？係非常願意、願意、不願意，定係非常不願意呢？」

- |                  |                    |
|------------------|--------------------|
| 1. 非常願意【跳問 Q47】  | 8. 唔知道／好難講【跳問 Q50】 |
| 2. 願意【跳問 Q47】    | 9. 拒絕回答【跳問 Q50】    |
| 3. 不願意【續問 Q46】   |                    |
| 4. 非常不願意【續問 Q46】 |                    |



【此題只問表示不願意返內地工作的受訪者】

Q46 「你唔願意返內地工作嘅最主要原因係乜呢？」

【開放式問題，沒有預設答案】

\_\_\_\_\_ 【由訪問員詳細記錄】      888. 唔知道／好難講  
999. 拒絕回答

**A. 與個人層面有關的原因**

1. 家庭：不想離開家人／家人反對／照顧家人等
2. 個人能力：普通話程度不足／學歷不夠等
3. 目前工作：滿意目前工作

**B. 與內地經濟層面有關的原因**

4. 內地工作薪酬福利唔吸引
5. 內地就業前景不明朗
6. 不喜歡內地的職場文化

**C. 與內地政治層面有關的原因**

7. 對內地法治欠缺信心
8. 對內地政治環境有負面印象

**D. 與內地社會層面有關的原因**

9. 不習慣內地生活
10. 對內地社會有負面印象
11. 內地生活質素差〔例如居住環境、治安、物價、食品安全、交通等〕
12. 有文化差異／對內地的文化認識不足

**E. 與香港層面有關的原因**

13. 想留在香港發展
14. 喜歡香港工作環境
15. 其他(請註明)

【此題完成後，跳問 Q50】

【此題只問表示願意返內地工作的受訪者】

Q47 「你願意返內地就業嘅最主要原因係乜呢？」

【開放式問題，沒有預設答案】

\_\_\_\_\_ 【由訪問員詳細記錄】      888. 唔知道／好難講  
999. 拒絕回答

**A. 與個人層面有關的原因**

1. 可累積內地工作經驗
2. 有助建立人際網絡
3. 在內地有親友聯繫
4. 覺得自己有能力及優勢
5. 自己工作上需要

**B. 與內地經濟層面有關的原因**

6. 內地經濟前景較好／未來經濟中心將在大陸
7. 內地工作機會較多
8. 較易找到合適的工作
9. 內地薪酬福利較吸引

**C. 與內地政治層面有關的原因**

10. 政治環境較穩定
11. 可以幫國家發展

**D. 與內地社會層面有關的原因**

12. 內地住屋租金低／內地消費水平低
13. 內地生活質素不差〔例如居住環境、治安、物價、食品安全、交通等〕
14. 可了解／促進兩地文化

**E. 與香港層面有關的原因**

15. 香港欠缺就業機會
16. 香港將會被內地超越
17. 其他(請註明)

【此題只問表示願意返內地就業的受訪者】

Q48 「你願意返內地就業，咁你有無做過任何嘅準備去達成呢個目標呢？」

- |              |                 |
|--------------|-----------------|
| 1. 有【續問 Q49】 | 9. 拒絕回答【跳問 Q50】 |
| 2. 無【跳問 Q50】 |                 |

【此題只問有做過準備的受訪者】

Q49「咁你有無做過以下嘅準備呢？」【讀出 1-5，可選多項】

- |                     |         |
|---------------------|---------|
| 1. 學普通話             | 9. 拒絕回答 |
| 2. 搵內地嘅就業市場資料       |         |
| 3. 去有關內地嘅就業講座或者就業展覽 |         |
| 4. 建立與內地工作有關嘅人際網絡   |         |
| 5. 其他(請註明)          |         |

[ASK ALL]

Q50「除咗內地，如有機會，你願唔願意去其他地方工作呢？係非常願意、願意、不願意，定係非常不願意呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 非常願意  | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 願意    | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 不願意   |            |
| 4. 非常不願意 |            |

Q51「整體嚟講，你覺得自己嘅普通話好唔好呢？係非常好、幾好、幾差，定係非常差呢？」

- |        |            |
|--------|------------|
| 1. 非常好 | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 幾好  | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 幾差  |            |
| 4. 非常差 |            |

「為咗方便分析不同背景人士嘅意見，想問你一啲簡單嘅個人資料。」

EDU「請問你嘅教育程度去到邊呢？」

【回答中學：追問初中還是高中；回答大專：追問是否學士 degree】

- |                           |         |
|---------------------------|---------|
| 1. 小學或以下                  | 9. 拒絕回答 |
| 2. 初中 (中一至中三)             |         |
| 3. 高中 (中四至中七)             |         |
| 4. 大專非學士 (包括文憑／副學士／IVE 等) |         |
| 5. 大專學士 (包括大學學士等)         |         |
| 6. 研究院 (包括碩士／博士等)         |         |

【如非在職，此題完成後跳問 BIRTH】

## 【此題只問在職人士】

OCCUP「你目前嘅職業或職位係乜嘢呢？」

- |                 |         |
|-----------------|---------|
| 1. 經理及行政人員      | 9. 拒絕回答 |
| 2. 專業人員         |         |
| 3. 輔助專業人員       |         |
| 4. 文員           |         |
| 5. 服務工作及商店銷售人員  |         |
| 6. 漁農業熟練工人      |         |
| 7. 工藝及有關人員      |         |
| 8. 機台及機器操作員及裝配員 |         |
| 9. 非技術工人        |         |

## 【此題只問在職人士】

SATISFY「整體嚟講，你滿唔滿意自己份工呢？係非常滿意、滿意、不滿意，定係非常不滿意呢？」

- |          |            |
|----------|------------|
| 1. 非常滿意  | 8. 唔知道／好難講 |
| 2. 滿意    | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 不滿意   |            |
| 4. 非常不滿意 |            |

## 【此題只問在職人士】

INCOME「請問你依家份工嘅總收入大約有幾多呢？」

## 【讀出 1-6】

- |            |         |
|------------|---------|
| 1. 五千以下    | 8. 收入不定 |
| 2. 五千至一萬以下 | 9. 拒絕回答 |
| 3. 一萬至二萬以下 |         |
| 4. 二萬至三萬以下 |         |
| 5. 三萬至五萬以下 |         |
| 6. 五萬或以上   |         |

BIRTH「請問你係喺香港、內地，定係其他地方出生呢？」

- |                   |                     |
|-------------------|---------------------|
| 1. 香港【跳問 S_CLASS】 | 9. 拒絕回答【跳問 S_CLASS】 |
| 2. 內地【續問 YEARS】   |                     |
| 3. 其他地方【續問 YEARS】 |                     |

【此題只問非香港出生的受訪者】

YEARS「你係喺幾多歲嘅時係黎香港定居嘅呢？係6歲之前、6歲至12歲之前、12歲至18歲之前、18歲至22歲之前，定係22歲或之後？」  
(定居包括因讀書或工作原因而需要在香港居住)

- |              |         |
|--------------|---------|
| 1. 6歲之前      | 9. 拒絕回答 |
| 2. 6歲至12歲之前  |         |
| 3. 12歲至18歲之前 |         |
| 4. 18歲至22歲之前 |         |
| 5. 22歲或之後    |         |

S\_CLASS「當講到你屋企係邊一個社會階層嘅時候，你又會覺得你屋企屬於下層、中下層、中層、中上層，定係上層呢？」

- |        |            |
|--------|------------|
| 1. 下層  | 8. 不知道／好難講 |
| 2. 中下層 | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 中層  |            |
| 4. 中上層 |            |
| 5. 上層  |            |

IDENTITY「喺考慮到你身份時，你覺得你係1香港人、2中國人、3係香港人，但都係中國人、4係中國人，但都係香港人。」

- |                |            |
|----------------|------------|
| 1. 香港人         | 8. 不知道／好難講 |
| 2. 中國人         | 9. 拒絕回答    |
| 3. 係香港人，但都係中國人 |            |
| 4. 係中國人，但都係香港人 |            |
| 5. 其他          |            |

POLIT「講到你嘅政治取向或意見時，你覺得你自己傾向以下邊一個政治陣營多啲

呢？係泛民主派、中間派，定係建制派呢？」

- |         |            |
|---------|------------|
| 1. 泛民主派 | 6. 冇政治取向   |
| 2. 中間派  | 8. 不知道／好難講 |
| 3. 建制派  | 9. 拒絕回答    |

(完)

### Appendix 3.2: Details of Weighting in the Telephone Survey

In order to be in line with the distribution of the population living in Hong Kong, the data of this survey has been weighted based on the age-sex distribution of resident population (excluding foreign domestic helpers) aged between 15 and 35 in the mid-year of 2014 provided by the Demographic Statistics Section, the Census and Statistics Department.

The calculation is summarized in the following table:

Age group	Age-sex distribution of residents in the mid-year of 2014 (%)		Age-sex distribution of respondents from the survey (%)		Weighting factor	
	Male (A)	Female (B)	Male (C)	Female (D)	Male (A÷C)	Female (B÷D)
15-19	10.53	9.95	13.23	13.43	0.79591837	0.74087863
20-24	11.91	11.57	14.43	13.83	0.82536383	0.83658713
25-29	11.91	12.66	13.33	12.84	0.89347337	0.98598131
30-35	14.8	16.66	9.15	9.75	1.61748634	1.70871795

## Appendix 4.1 Discussion Guides

### 訪談大綱（適用於有內地交流經驗的中學生）

本研究旨在了解香港青少年對內地升學及就業的看法。我們希望就此了解你們的看法。在研究過程中，研究隊伍會遵守大學的研究倫理(research ethics)守則，亦不洩露受訪者名稱，相關資料只作匿名及集體報告之用。

#### Part 1—內地升學及就業的經驗 (20 mins)

##### a) 交流或留學活動

- 1) 你們參加過什麼內地交流或留學活動？
- 2) 為什麼你們會參加這些內地交流或留學活動？
- 3) （ 在你參與這些內地交流或留學活動之前，你們有相熟的人參加過類似的內地交流或留學活動？如有的話，他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們參與內地交流或留學活動的決定？ ）
- 4) 你們對參與過的內地交流或留學活動有什麼意見/評價？
- 5) 你們認為你們參加內地交流或留學活動的經驗對你們自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 6) 參與內地交流或留學活動的經驗有沒有改變你們對內地的觀感？

#### Part 2—對內地的觀感 (30 mins)

##### a) 政治及社會方面

- 7) 你們對內地整體的政治及社會現況有什麼看法？
- 8) 你們有沒有留意內地的政治、社會、民生議題的資訊？如有，主要透過什麼渠道獲得這些資訊？
- 9) 你們對內地未來的政治發展抱有什麼態度呢？它對你們重要嗎？

##### b) 經濟方面

- 10) 你們對內地整體的經濟狀況有什麼看法？
- 11) 你們有沒有留意內地的經濟發展的資訊？如有，主要透過什麼渠道獲得這些資訊？
- 12) 你們對內地就業市場和工作狀況有多少認識？你們從什麼途徑得知內地就業的資訊？

##### c) 陸港關係

- 13) 你對內地和香港兩地有關的政策有多少認識呢？

- 14) 你對這些兩地政策有什麼看法？
- 15) 近年，愈來愈多內地人到香港升學及就業，你們認為這個趨勢對本地青年的升學及就業機會有什麼影響呢？你們認為這個趨勢對香港整體發展有什麼影響呢？
- 16) 近年，政府鼓勵和資助本地學生及青年到內地交流和工作實習，例如由 2012 至 2013 學年開始，香港學生可以香港中學文憑考試成績報讀內地的高等院校，去年亦推出了「內地大學升學資助計劃」，你們有否聽聞過這些措施？
- 17) 整體而言，你認為這些措施對鼓勵你們及香港年輕人到內地進修或發展事業有多大幫助呢？
- 18) 整體而言，以上你們對內地的觀感會否影響你考慮是否到內地升學或發展事業的決定？

### **Part 3—到內地升學及就業的考慮因素 (45 mins)**

#### **a) 內地升學**

- 19) 在中學畢業後，你們會否申請到內地升學？
- 20) \*如會，在選擇升學地點時，你會考慮什麼因素呢？ \*如不會，為什麼你們不會考慮到內地升學呢？
- 21) 除了內地，你們是否願意去其他地方讀書呢？如會，為什麼呢？其他地方比內地升學有什麼優勢？在香港升學比到內地有什麼優勢？
- 22) 你們有否認識一些曾到過/正在內地讀書的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮是否到內地升學的決定？
- 23) 整體而言，你們估計你們在內地讀書的經驗對你們自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 24) 整體而言，你們認為香港青少年到內地升學困難嗎？

#### **b) 內地工作實習**

- 25) 如有機會，你們將來會不會申請內地的工作實習的計劃？你們是否願意參加呢？為什麼呢？
- 26) 你們有否認識一些曾參與/正在內地工作實習的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮是否申請內地的工作實習計劃的決定？
- 27) 整體而言，你們估計你們在內地工作實習的經驗對你自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 28) 整體而言，你們認為香港青少年到內地工作實習困難嗎？

#### **c) 內地工作**

- 29) 完成學業後，你會不會申請在內地工作的職位？如果你有機會選擇，你是否願意長遠地逗留在內地工作呢？
- 30) 在考慮是否到內地長期工作時，你們覺得最重要的因素是什麼呢？



- 31) 除了考慮是否到內地工作之外，你們會否考慮在畢業後前往其他國家發展事業？\* 如有，什麼因素驅使你們考慮到其他國家發展事業？/\* 如沒有，是未曾考慮過還是有什麼因素令你卻步？
- 32) 你們有否認識一些曾在/正在內地工作的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮是否申請內地的工作的決定？
- 33) 整體而言，你估計你在內地工作的經驗對你自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 34) 整體而言，你認為香港青少年到內地工作困難嗎？

**Part 4—對支援青年到內地升學及就業政策的建議 (10-15 mins)**

- 35) 你們是從什麼途徑接收任何有關到內地升學、工作實習、就業的資訊？你們覺得這些有關內地機會的資訊足夠嗎？這些資訊對推動你們與其他同學到內地升學及發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 36) 你們從來有沒有認真為自己的升學和就業作出任何計劃呢？如有，是什麼時候開始有這些計劃和打算呢？
- 37) 可否分享一下你們在中學所經歷的「生涯規劃」學習過程？老師及學校能否幫助你們規劃個人的升學及職業志向？可否分享你們認為可取及有待改善的地方？
- 38) 整體而言，你們認為政府(包括香港及中國政府) 應該推動什麼措施去鼓勵及支持你們和其他香港青少年到內地升學及就業呢？

## 訪談大綱（適用於沒有內地交流經驗的中學生）

本研究旨在了解香港青少年對內地升學及就業的看法。我們希望就此了解你們的看法。在研究過程中，研究隊伍會遵守大學的研究倫理(research ethics)守則，亦不洩露受訪者名稱，相關資料只作匿名及集體報告之用。

### Part 1—內地升學及就業的經驗 (20 mins)

#### a) 交流或留學活動

- 1) 你們的學校有沒有舉辦內地交流或留學活動？
- 2) \*如有，為什麼你不參加呢？ / \*如無，你有沒有留意其他青年組織舉辦的內地交流或留學活動？如有，為什麼你不參加呢？
- 3) 如果有機會，你將來會參與內地交流或留學活動嗎？ 為何會/不會呢？
- 4) 你們有相熟的人參加過類似的內地交流或留學活動？ 如有的話，他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們不參與/將來是否參與內地交流或留學活動的決定？

### Part 2—對內地的觀感 (30 mins)

#### a) 政治及社會方面

- 5) 你們對內地整體的政治及社會現況有什麼看法？
- 6) 你們有沒有留意內地的政治、社會、民生議題的資訊？如有，主要透過什麼渠道獲得這些資訊？
- 7) 你們對內地未來的政治發展抱有什麼態度呢？它對你們重要嗎？

#### b) 經濟方面

- 8) 你們對內地整體的經濟狀況有什麼看法？
- 9) 你們有沒有留意內地的經濟發展的資訊？如有，主要透過什麼渠道獲得這些資訊？
- 10) 你們對內地就業市場和工作狀況有多少認識？你們從什麼途徑得知內地就業的資訊？

#### c) 陸港關係

- 11) 你對內地和香港兩地有關的政策有多少認識呢？
- 12) 你對這些兩地政策有什麼看法？
- 13) 近年，愈來愈多內地人到香港升學及就業，你們認為這個趨勢對本地青年的升學及就業機會有什麼影響呢？你們認為這個趨勢對香港整體發展有什麼影響呢？
- 14) 近年，政府鼓勵和資助本地學生及青年到內地交流和工作實習，例如由 2012 至 2013 學年開始，香港學生可以香港中學文憑考試成績報讀內地的高等院校，去年亦推出

了「內地大學升學資助計劃」，你們有否聽聞過這些措施？

- 15) 整體而言，你認為這些措施對鼓勵你們及香港年輕人到內地進修或發展事業有多大幫助呢？
- 16) 整體而言，以上你們對內地的觀感會否影響你考慮是否到內地升學或發展事業的決定？

### **Part 3—到內地升學及就業的考慮因素 (45 mins)**

#### **a) 內地升學**

- 17) 在中學畢業後，你們會否申請到內地升學？
- 18) \*如會，在選擇升學地點時，你會考慮什麼因素呢？ \*如不會，為什麼你們不會考慮到內地升學呢？
- 19) 除了內地，你們是否願意去其他地方讀書呢？如會，為什麼呢？其他地方比內地升學有什麼優勢？在香港升學比到內地有什麼優勢？
- 20) 你們有否認識一些曾到過/正在內地讀書的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮是否到內地升學的決定？
- 21) 整體而言，你們估計你們在內地讀書的經驗對你們自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 22) 整體而言，你們認為香港青少年到內地升學困難嗎？

#### **b) 內地工作實習**

- 23) 如有機會，你們將來會不會申請內地的工作實習的計劃？你們是否願意參加呢？為什麼呢？
- 24) 你們有否認識一些曾參與/正在內地工作實習的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮是否申請內地的工作實習計劃的決定？
- 25) 整體而言，你們估計你們在內地工作實習的經驗對你自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 26) 整體而言，你們認為香港青少年到內地工作實習困難嗎？

#### **c) 內地工作**

- 27) 完成學業後，你會不會申請在內地工作的職位？ 如果你有機會選擇，你是否願意長遠地逗留在內地工作呢？
- 28) 在考慮是否到內地長期工作時，你們覺得最重要的因素是什麼呢？
- 29) 除了考慮是否到內地工作之外，你們會否考慮在畢業後前往其他國家發展事業？\* 如有，什麼因素驅使你們考慮到其他國家發展事業？/\* 如沒有，是未曾考慮過還是有什麼因素令你卻步？
- 30) 你們有否認識一些曾在/正在內地工作的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮是否申請內地的工作的決定？
- 31) 整體而言，你估計你在內地工作的經驗對你自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 32) 整體而言，你認為香港青少年到內地工作困難嗎？

**Part 4—對支援青年到內地升學及就業政策的認知 (10-15 mins)**

- 33) 你們是從什麼途徑接收任何有關到內地升學、工作實習、就業的資訊？你們覺得這些有關內地機會的資訊足夠嗎？這些資訊對推動你們與其他同學到內地升學及發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 34) 你們從來有沒有認真為自己的升學和就業作出任何計劃呢？如有，是什麼時候開始有這些計劃和打算呢？
- 35) 可否分享一下你們在中學所經歷的「生涯規劃」學習過程？老師及學校能否幫助你們規劃個人的升學及職業志向？可否分享你們認為可取及有待改善的地方？
- 36) 整體而言，你們認為政府(包括香港及中國政府) 應該推動什麼措施去鼓勵及支持你們和其他香港青少年到內地升學及就業呢？

## 訪談大綱（適用於沒有內地交流/升學/工作實習經驗的大專生）

本研究旨在了解香港青少年對內地升學及就業的看法。我們希望就此了解你們的看法。在研究過程中，研究隊伍會遵守大學的研究倫理(research ethics)守則，亦不洩露受訪者名稱，相關資料只作匿名及集體報告之用。

### Part 1—內地升學及就業的經驗

#### a) 交流和留學活動 (10 mins)

- 1) 你們的學校有沒有舉辦內地交流或留學活動？
- 2) \*如有，為什麼你不參加呢？ / \*如無，你有沒有留意其他青年組織舉辦的內地交流或留學活動？如有，為什麼你不參加呢？
- 3) 如果有機會，你將來會參與內地交流或留學活動嗎？ 為何會/不會呢？
- 4) 你們有相熟的人參加過類似的內地交流或留學活動？ 如有的話，他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們不參與/將來是否參與內地交流或留學活動的決定？

#### b) 內地升學

- 5) 在中學畢業後，你們到了什麼地方升學呢？你們有沒有考慮過申請到內地升學？
- 6) 為什麼你們不選擇到內地升學呢？除了內地，你們是否願意去其他地方讀書呢？如會，為什麼呢？其他地方比內地升學有什麼優勢？在香港升學比到內地有什麼優勢？
- 7) 你們有否認識一些曾到過/正在內地讀書的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮是否到內地升學的決定？
- 8) 如果有機會，你將來會到內地升學嗎？ 為何會/不會呢？
- 9) 整體而言，你們估計你們在內地讀書的經驗對你們自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 10) 整體而言，你們認為香港青少年到內地升學困難嗎？

#### c) 內地工作實習

- 11) 你們的學校有沒有舉辦內地工作實習計劃？
- 12) \*如有，為什麼你不參加呢？ / \*如無，你有沒有留意其他青年組織/公司機構舉辦的內地工作實習計劃？如有，為什麼你不參加呢？
- 13) 你們為什麼沒有申請內地的工作實習的計劃？
- 14) 你們有否認識一些曾參與/正在內地工作實習的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮申請內地工作實習計劃的決定？
- 15) 如果有機會，你將來會到參加內地工作實習計劃嗎？ 為何會/不會呢？

- 16) 整體而言，你們估計你們在內地工作實習的經驗對你自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 17) 整體而言，你們認為香港青少年到內地工作實習困難嗎？

## **Part 2—對內地的觀感 (30 mins)**

### **a) 政治及社會方面**

- 18) 你們對內地整體的政治及社會現況有什麼看法？
- 19) 你們有沒有留意內地的政治、社會、民生議題的資訊？如有，主要透過什麼渠道獲得這些資訊？
- 20) 你們對內地未來的政治發展抱有什麼態度呢？它對你們重要嗎？

### **b) 經濟方面**

- 21) 你們對內地整體的經濟狀況有什麼看法？
- 22) 你們有沒有留意內地的經濟發展的資訊？如有，主要透過什麼渠道獲得這些資訊？
- 23) 你們對內地就業市場和工作狀況有多少認識？你們從什麼途徑得知內地就業的資訊？

### **c) 陸港關係**

- 24) 你對內地和香港兩地有關的政策有多少認識呢？
- 25) 你對這些兩地政策有什麼看法？
- 26) 近年，愈來愈多內地人到香港升學及就業，你們認為這個趨勢對本地青年的升學及就業機會有什麼影響呢？你們認為這個趨勢對香港整體發展有什麼影響呢？
- 27) 近年，政府鼓勵和資助本地學生及青年到內地交流和工作實習，例如由 2012 至 2013 學年開始，香港學生可以香港中學文憑考試成績報讀內地的高等院校，去年亦推出了「內地大學升學資助計劃」，你們有否聽聞過這些措施？
- 28) 整體而言，你認為這些措施對鼓勵你們及香港年輕人到內地進修或發展事業有多大幫助呢？
- 29) 整體而言，以上你們對內地的觀感會否影響你考慮是否到內地升學或發展事業的決定？

## **Part 3—到內地工作的考慮因素 (30 mins)**

- 30) 完成學業後，你會不會申請在內地工作的職位？如果你有機會選擇，你是否願意長遠地逗留在內地工作呢？
- 31) 在考慮是否到內地長期工作時，你們覺得最重要的因素是什麼呢？
- 32) 除了考慮是否到內地工作之外，你們會否考慮在畢業後前往其他國家發展事業？\* 如有，什麼因素驅使你們考慮到其他國家發展事業？/\* 如沒有，是未曾考慮過還是有什麼因素令你卻步？

- 33) 你們有否認識一些曾在/正在內地工作的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮是否申請內地的工作的決定？
- 34) 整體而言，你估計你在內地工作的經驗對你自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 35) 整體而言，你認為香港青少年到內地工作困難嗎？

**Part 4—對支援青年到內地升學及就業政策的認知 (10-15 mins)**

- 36) 你們是從什麼途徑接收任何有關到內地升學、工作實習、就業的資訊？你們覺得這些有關內地機會的資訊足夠嗎？這些資訊對推動你們與其他同學到內地升學及發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 37) 你們從來有沒有認真為自己的升學和就業作出任何計劃呢？如有，是什麼時候開始有這些計劃和打算呢？
- 38) 可否分享一下你們在中學所經歷的「生涯規劃」學習過程？老師及學校能否幫助你們規劃個人的升學及職業志向？可否分享你們認為可取及有待改善的地方？
- 39) 整體而言，你們認為政府(包括香港及中國政府) 應該推動什麼措施去鼓勵及支持你們和其他香港青少年到內地升學及就業呢？

## 訪談大綱（適用於有內地交流/升學/工作實習經驗的大專生）

本研究旨在了解香港青少年對內地升學及就業的看法。我們希望就此了解你們的看法。在研究過程中，研究隊伍會遵守大學的研究倫理(research ethics)守則，亦不洩露受訪者名稱，相關資料只作匿名及集體報告之用。

### Part 1—內地升學及就業的經驗

1) 你們參加過什麼內地交流、留學、升學及工作實習的活動？(把受訪者分類)

#### a) 交流和留學活動 (15 mins)

註：以下問題只問有內地交流和留學經驗的大專受訪者

- 2) 你們參加過什麼內地交流或留學活動？
- 3) 為什麼你們會參加這些內地交流或留學活動？
- 4) （在你參與這些內地交流或留學活動之前，你們有相熟的人參加過類似的內地交流或留學活動？如有的話，他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們參與內地交流或留學活動的決定？）
- 5) 你們對參與過的內地交流或留學活動有什麼意見/評價？
- 6) 你們認為你們參加內地交流或留學活動的經驗對你們自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 7) 參與內地交流或留學活動的經驗有沒有改變你們對內地的觀感？如有，是什麼方面的觀感呢？

註：以下問題只問沒有內地交流和留學經驗的大專受訪者

- 8) 你們的學校有沒有舉辦內地交流或留學活動？\*如有，為什麼你不參加呢？/ \*如無，你有沒有留意其他青年組織舉辦的內地交流或留學活動？如有，為什麼你不參加呢？
- 9) 如果有機會，你將來會參與內地交流或留學活動嗎？為何會/不會呢？
- 10) 你們有相熟的人參加過類似的內地交流或留學活動？如有的話，他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們不參與/將來是否參與內地交流或留學活動的決定？

#### b) 內地升學 (15 mins)

註：以下問題只問有內地升學經驗的大專受訪者

- 11) 在中學畢業後，你們如何申請到內地升學？你們正在修讀什麼學校的什麼課程呢？
- 12) 在你們選擇到內地升學的時候，除了內地，你們是否願意到其他地方讀書呢？在選



擇升學地點時，你會考慮什麼因素呢？

- 13) ( 你們有否認識一些曾在/正在內地讀書的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮到內地升學的決定？ )
- 14) ( 註：此問題只問同時有內地交流或留學和升學經驗的大專受訪者)  
你們之前參與過的內地交流/留學活動的經驗是否會影響你們選擇到內地升學的決定？
- 15) 可否分享一下你們到內地升學的經驗？你們到內地升學的經驗有沒有改變你們對內地的觀感？如有，是什麼方面的觀感？
- 16) 你們在內地讀書時有沒有遇上什麼困難？你會鼓勵其他香港朋友及青少年到內地升學嗎？
- 17) 你們到內地升學的經驗會否影響你考慮是否到內地就業的決定？

註：以下問題只問沒有內地升學經驗的大專受訪者

- 18) 在中學畢業後，你們到了什麼地方升學呢？你們有沒有考慮過申請到內地升學？
- 19) 為什麼你們不選擇到內地升學呢？除了內地，你們是否願意去其他地方讀書呢？如會，為什麼呢？其他地方比內地升學有什麼優勢？在香港升學比到內地有什麼優勢？
- 20) (註：此問題只問有內地交流或留學而沒有到內地升學的大專受訪者)  
你們不選擇到內地升學是否與你們參與過的內地交流/留學活動的經驗有關呢？
- 21) 你們有否認識一些曾到過/正在內地讀書的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮是否到內地升學的決定？
- 22) 如果有機會，你將來會到內地升學嗎？ 為何會/不會呢？

註：以下問題問所有受訪者

- 23) 整體而言，你們認為 / 估計你們在內地讀書的經驗對你們自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 24) 整體而言，你們認為香港青少年到內地升學困難嗎？

### **c) 內地工作實習 (30 mins)**

註：以下問題只問有內地工作實習經驗的大專受訪者

- 25) 你們參加過什麼內地工作實習？
- 26) 為什麼你們會參加這些內地工作實習？
- 27) ( 註：此問題只問同時有內地交流或留學和工作實習經驗的大專受訪者)  
你們以往曾參與的內地交流/留學活動的經驗是否會影響你們參加這些內地工作實習計劃的決定？
- 28) ( 你們有否認識一些曾參與/正在內地工作實習的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們

的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮申請內地工作實習計劃的決定？ )

- 29) 可否分享一下你們到內地工作實習的經驗？是正面還是負面的呢？你們到內地工作實習的經驗有沒有改變你們對內地的觀感？如有，是什麼方面的觀感？
- 30) 你們到內地工作實習的經驗會否影響你考慮是否到內地就業的決定？
- 31) 你們會鼓勵其他香港朋友及青少年參與內地工作實習嗎？

註：以下問題只問沒有內地工作實習經驗的大專受訪者

- 32) 你們的學校有沒有舉辦內地工作實習計劃？
- 33) \*如有，為什麼你不參加呢？ / \*如無，你有沒有留意其他青年組織/公司機構舉辦的內地內地工作實習計劃？如有，為什麼你不參加呢？
- 34) 你們為什麼沒有申請內地的工作實習的計劃？
- 35) (註：此問題只問有內地交流或留學而沒有工作實習經驗的大專受訪者)  
你們不參加內地工作實習計劃是否與你們曾經參與內地交流/留學活動的經驗有關呢？
- 36) 你們有否認識一些曾參與/正在內地工作實習的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮申請內地工作實習計劃的決定？
- 37) 如果有機會，你將來會到參加內地工作實習計劃嗎？ 為何會/不會呢？

註：以下問題問所有受訪者

- 38) 整體而言，你們認為 / 估計你們在內地工作實習的經驗對你自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 39) 整體而言，你們認為香港青少年到內地工作實習困難嗎？

## **Part 2—對內地的觀感 (20 mins)**

### **a) 政治及社會方面**

- 40) 你們對內地整體的政治及社會現況有什麼看法？
- 41) 你們有沒有留意內地的政治、社會、民生議題的資訊？如有，主要透過什麼渠道獲得這些資訊？
- 42) 你們對內地未來的政治發展抱有什麼態度呢？它對你們重要嗎？

### **b) 經濟方面**

- 43) 你們對內地整體的經濟狀況有什麼看法？
- 44) 你們有沒有留意內地的經濟發展的資訊？如有，主要透過什麼渠道獲得這些資訊？
- 45) 你們對內地就業市場和工作狀況有多少認識？你們從什麼途徑得知內地就業的資訊？

**c) 陸港關係**

- 46) 你對內地和香港兩地有關的政策有多少認識呢？你對兩地政策有什麼看法？
- 47) 近年，愈來愈多內地人到香港升學及就業，你們認為這個趨勢對本地青年的升學及就業機會有什麼影響呢？你們認為這個趨勢對香港整體發展有什麼影響呢？
- 48) 近年，政府鼓勵和資助本地學生及青年到內地交流和工作實習，例如由 2012 至 2013 學年開始，香港學生可以香港中學文憑考試成績報讀內地的高等院校，去年亦推出了「內地大學升學資助計劃」，你們有否聽聞過這些措施？
- 49) 整體而言，你認為這些措施對鼓勵你們及香港年輕人到內地進修或發展事業有多大幫助呢？
- 50) 整體而言，以上你們對內地的觀感會否影響你考慮是否到內地升學或發展事業的決定？

**Part 3—到內地工作的考慮因素 (30 mins)**

- 51) 完成學業後，你會不會申請在內地工作的職位？如果你有機會選擇，你是否願意長遠地逗留在內地工作呢？
- 52) 在考慮是否到內地長期工作時，你們覺得最重要的因素是什麼呢？
- 53) 除了考慮是否到內地工作之外，你們會否考慮在畢業後前往其他國家發展事業？\* 如有，什麼因素驅使你們考慮到其他國家發展事業？/\* 如沒有，是未曾考慮過還是有什麼因素令你卻步？
- 54) 你們有否認識一些曾在/正在內地工作的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮是否申請內地的工作的決定？
- 55) 整體而言，你估計你在內地工作的經驗對你自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 56) 整體而言，你認為香港青少年到內地工作困難嗎？

**Part 4—對支援青年到內地升學及就業政策的認知 (10-15 mins)**

- 57) 你們是從什麼途徑接收任何有關到內地升學、工作實習、就業的資訊？你們覺得這些有關內地機會的資訊足夠嗎？這些資訊對推動你們與其他同學到內地升學及發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 58) 你們從來有沒有認真為自己的升學和就業作出任何計劃呢？如有，是什麼時候開始有這些計劃和打算呢？
- 59) 可否分享一下你們在中學所經歷的「生涯規劃」學習過程？老師及學校能否幫助你們規劃個人的升學及職業志向？可否分享你們認為可取及有待改善的地方？  
整體而言，你們認為政府(包括香港及中國政府) 應該推動什麼措施去鼓勵及支持你們和其他香港青少年到內地升學及就業呢？

## 訪談大綱（適用於沒有內地交流/升學/工作實習/就業經驗的畢業生）

本研究旨在了解香港青少年對內地升學及就業的看法。我們希望就此了解你們的看法。在研究過程中，研究隊伍會遵守大學的研究倫理(research ethics)守則，亦不洩露受訪者名稱，相關資料只作匿名及集體報告之用。

### Part 1—內地升學及就業的經驗 (15 mins)

#### a) 交流和留學活動

- 1) 你們的學校有沒有舉辦內地交流或留學活動？ \*如有，為什麼你不參加呢？ / \*如無，你有沒有留意其他青年組織舉辦的內地交流或留學活動？如有，為什麼你不參加呢？
- 2) 如果有機會，你將來會參與內地交流或留學活動嗎？ 為何會/不會呢？
- 3) 你們有相熟的人參加過類似的內地交流或留學活動？ 如有的話，他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們不參與/將來是否參與內地交流或留學活動的決定？

#### b) 內地升學 (15 mins)

- 4) 在中學畢業後，你們到了什麼地方升學呢？你們有沒有考慮過申請到內地升學？
- 5) 為什麼你們不選擇到內地升學呢？除了內地，你們是否願意去其他地方讀書呢？如會，為什麼呢？其他地方比內地升學有什麼優勢？在香港升學比到內地有什麼優勢？
- 6) 你們有否認識一些曾在/正在內地讀書的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮是否到內地升學的決定？
- 7) 如果有機會，你將來會到內地升學/進修嗎？ 為何會/不會呢？
- 8) 整體而言，你們估計你們在內地讀書的經驗對你們自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 9) 整體而言，你們認為香港青少年到內地升學困難嗎？

#### c) 內地工作實習 (15 mins)

- 10) 你們的學校有沒有舉辦內地工作實習計劃？
- 11) \*如有，為什麼你不參加呢？ / \*如無，你有沒有留意其他青年組織/公司機構舉辦的內地工作實習計劃？如有，為什麼你不參加呢？
- 12) 你們為什麼沒有申請內地的工作實習的計劃？
- 13) 你們有否認識一些曾參與/正在內地工作實習的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮申請內地工作實習計劃的決定？
- 14) 整體而言，你們估計你們在內地工作實習的經驗對你自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？

15) 整體而言，你們認為香港青少年到內地工作實習困難嗎？

**d) 工作方面 (30 mins)**

- 16) 你們畢業後到過什麼地方工作？
- 17) 你們為什麼沒有到過內地工作？如果有機會，你們會去嗎？
- 18) 你們考慮是否到內地工作的因素有什麼呢？
- 19) 除了考慮是否到內地工作之外，你們會否考慮前往其他國家發展事業？\*如有，什麼因素驅使你們考慮到其他國家發展事業？/\* 如沒有，是未曾考慮過還是有什麼因素令你卻步？
- 20) 你們有否認識一些曾在/正在內地工作的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮是否申請內地的工作的決定？
- 21) 整體而言，你們估計你們在內地工作的經驗對你自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 22) 整體而言，你們認為香港青少年到內地工作困難嗎？

**Part 2—對內地的觀感 (30 mins)**

**a) 政治及社會方面**

- 23) 你們對內地整體的政治及社會現況有什麼看法？
- 24) 你們有沒有留意內地的政治、社會、民生議題的資訊？如有，主要透過什麼渠道獲得這些資訊？
- 25) 你們對內地未來的政治發展抱有什麼態度呢？它對你們重要嗎？

**b) 經濟方面**

- 26) 你們對內地整體的經濟狀況有什麼看法？
- 27) 你們有沒有留意內地的經濟發展的資訊？如有，主要透過什麼渠道獲得這些資訊？
- 28) 你們對內地就業市場和工作狀況有多少認識？你們從什麼途徑得知內地就業的資訊？

**c) 陸港關係**

- 29) 你對內地和香港兩地有關的政策有多少認識呢？
- 30) 你對這些兩地政策有什麼看法？
- 31) 近年，愈來愈多內地人到香港升學及就業，你們認為這個趨勢對本地青年的升學及就業機會有什麼影響呢？你們認為這個趨勢對香港整體發展有什麼影響呢？
- 32) 近年，政府鼓勵和資助本地學生及青年到內地交流和工作實習，例如由 2012 至 2013 學年開始，香港學生可以香港中學文憑考試成績報讀內地的高等院校，去年亦推出了「內地大學升學資助計劃」，你們有否聽聞過這些措施？
- 33) 整體而言，你認為這些措施對鼓勵香港年輕人到內地進修或發展事業有多大幫助呢？

- 34) 整體而言，以上你們對內地的觀感會否影響你考慮是否到內地升學或發展事業的決定？

**Part 3—對支援青年到內地升學及就業政策的認知 (10-15 mins)**

- 35) 你們是從什麼途徑接收任何有關到內地升學、工作實習、就業的資訊？你們覺得這些有關內地機會的資訊足夠嗎？這些資訊對推動你們與其他年青人到內地升學及發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 36) 你們從來有沒有認真為自己的升學和就業作出任何計劃呢？如有，是什麼時候開始有這些計劃和打算呢？
- 37) 可否分享一下你們在中學及大專院校所經歷的就業規劃學習過程？老師及學校能否幫助你們規劃個人的升學及職業志向？可否分享你們認為可取及有待改善的地方？
- 38) 整體而言，你們認為政府(包括香港及中國政府) 應該推動什麼措施去鼓勵及支持你們和其他香港青少年到內地升學及就業呢？

## 訪談大綱（適用於有內地交流/升學/工作實習/就業經驗的畢業生）

本研究旨在了解香港青少年對內地升學及就業的看法。我們希望就此了解你們的看法。在研究過程中，研究隊伍會遵守大學的研究倫理(research ethics)守則，亦不洩露受訪者名稱，相關資料只作匿名及集體報告之用。

### Part 1—內地升學及就業的經驗

1) 你們有什麼內地交流、留學、升學、工作實習及工作的經驗？(把受訪者分類)

#### a) 交流和留學活動 (20 mins)

註：以下問題只問有內地交流和留學經驗的畢業生受訪者

- 2) 你們參加過什麼內地交流或留學活動？
- 3) 為什麼你們會參加這些內地交流或留學活動？
- 4) （在你參與這些內地交流或留學活動之前，你們有相熟的人參加過類似的內地交流或留學活動？如有的話，他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們參與內地交流或留學活動的決定？）
- 5) 你們對參與過的內地交流或留學活動有什麼意見/評價？你們認為你們參加內地交流或留學活動的經驗對你們自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 6) 參與內地交流或留學活動的經驗有沒有改變你們對內地的觀感？如有，是什麼方面的觀感呢？

註：以下問題只問沒有內地交流和留學經驗的畢業生受訪者

- 7) 你們的學校有沒有舉辦內地交流或留學活動？
- 8) \*如有，為什麼你不參加呢？ / \*如無，你有沒有留意其他青年組織舉辦的內地交流或留學活動？如有，為什麼你不參加呢？
- 9) 如果有機會，你將來會參與內地交流或留學活動嗎？為何會/不會呢？
- 10) 你們有相熟的人參加過類似的內地交流或留學活動？如有的話，他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們不參與/將來是否參與內地交流或留學活動的決定？

#### b) 內地升學 (20 mins)

註：以下問題只問有內地升學經驗的畢業生受訪者

- 11) 在中學畢業後，你們如何申請到內地升學？你們正在修讀什麼學校的什麼課程呢？
- 12) 在你們選擇到內地升學的時候，除了內地，你們是否願意到其他地方讀書呢？在選擇升學地點時，你會考慮什麼因素呢？
- 13) （你們有否認識一些曾到過/正在內地讀書的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗

分享有否影響你們考慮到內地升學的決定？)

14) ( 註：此問題只問同時有內地交流或留學和內地升學經驗的畢業生受訪者)

你們之前參與過的內地交流/留學活動的經驗會不會影響你們選擇到內地升學的決定？

15) 可否分享一下你們到內地升學的經驗？你們到內地升學的經驗有沒有改變你們對內地的觀感？如有，是什麼方面的觀感？

16) 你們在內地讀書時有沒有遇上什麼困難？你會鼓勵其他香港朋友及青少年到內地升學嗎？

17) 你們到內地讀書的經驗會否影響你考慮是否到內地就業的決定？

註：以下問題只問沒有內地升學經驗的畢業生受訪者

18) 在中學畢業後，你們到了什麼地方升學呢？你們有沒有考慮過申請到內地升學？

19) 為什麼你們不選擇到內地升學呢？除了內地，你們是否願意去其他地方讀書呢？如會，為什麼呢？其他地方比內地升學有什麼優勢？在香港升學比到內地有什麼優勢？

20) (註：此問題只問有內地交流而沒有內地升學經驗的畢業生受訪者)

你們不選擇到內地升學會否與參與過的內地交流的經驗有關？

21) 你們有否認識一些曾在/正在內地讀書的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮是否到內地升學的決定？

22) 如果有機會，你將來會到內地升學/進修嗎？ 為何會/不會呢？

註：以下問題問所有受訪者

23) 整體而言，你們認為 /估計你們在內地讀書的經驗對你們自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？

24) 整體而言，你們認為香港青少年到內地升學困難嗎？

**c) 內地工作實習 (20 mins)**

註：以下問題只問有內地工作實習經驗的畢業生受訪者

25) 你們參加過什麼內地工作實習的活動？

26) 為什麼你們會參加這些內地工作實習活動？

27) ( 註：此問題只問同時有內地交流或留學和工作實習經驗的畢業生受訪者)

你們以往參與的內地交流/留學活動的經驗會不會影響你們參加這些內地工作實習計劃的決定？

28) ( 你們有否認識一些曾參與過/正在內地工作實習的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮申請內地工作實習計劃的決定？ )

29) 可否分享一下你們到內地工作實習的經驗？你們到內地工作實習的經驗有沒有改變你們對內地的觀感？如有，是什麼方面的觀感？



- 30) 你們到內地工作實習的經驗會否影響你考慮是否到內地就業的決定？  
 31) 你會鼓勵其他香港朋友及青少年到內地工作實習嗎？

註：以下問題只問沒有內地工作實習經驗的畢業生受訪者

- 32) 你們的學校有沒有舉辦內地工作實習計劃？  
 33) \*如有，為什麼你不參加呢？ / \*如無，你有沒有留意其他青年組織/公司機構舉辦的內地工作實習計劃？如有，為什麼你不參加呢？  
 34) 你們為什麼沒有申請內地的工作實習的計劃？  
 35) (註：此問題只問有內地交流或留學而沒有工作實習經驗的畢業生受訪者)  
 你們不參加內地工作實習計劃會否與你們以往參與的內地交流/留學活動的經驗有關呢？  
 36) 你們有否認識一些曾參與/正在內地工作實習的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮申請內地工作實習計劃的決定？

註：以下問題問所有受訪者

- 37) 整體而言，你們認為 / 估計你們在內地工作實習的經驗對你自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？  
 38) 整體而言，你們認為香港青少年到內地工作實習困難嗎？

#### **d) 內地工作方面 (30 mins)**

註：以下問題只問有內地工作經驗的畢業生受訪者

- 39) 完成學業後，你們到了什麼地方工作？你們在內地工作職位是什麼？你們到內地工作的性質是什麼？是一次性，還是長期逗留的？你們需要經常穿梭兩地嗎？  
 40) 你們選擇到內地就業的最主要原因是什麼呢？  
 41) 你們有沒有打算長遠地逗留在內地工作呢？  
 42) 除了考慮是否到內地工作之外，你們會否考慮前往其他國家發展事業？\*如有，什麼因素驅使你們考慮到其他國家發展事業？/\* 如沒有，是未曾考慮過還是有什麼因素令你卻步？  
 43) ( 你們有否認識一些曾到/正在內地工作的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮是否申請內地的工作的決定？)  
 44) (註：此問題只問同時有內地交流/留學/工作實習和內地工作經驗的畢業生受訪者)  
 你們之前參與過的內地交流/留學/工作實習活動的經驗會不會影響你們選擇到內地工作的決定？  
 45) 可否分享一下你們到內地工作的經驗？你們到內地工作的經驗有沒有改變你們對內地的觀感？如有，是什麼方面的觀感？  
 46) 你會鼓勵其他香港朋友及青少年到內地工作嗎？

註：以下問題只問沒有內地工作經驗的畢業生受訪者

- 47) 你們畢業後到過什麼地方工作？

- 48) 你們為什麼沒有到過內地工作？如果有機會，你們會去嗎？
- 49) 你們考慮是否到內地工作的因素有什麼呢？
- 50) (註：此問題只問有內地交流/留學/工作實習而沒有內地工作經驗的畢業生受訪者  
你們不到內地工作會否與以往參與的內地交流/留學/工作實習活動的經驗有關？
- 51) 你們有否認識一些曾在/正在內地工作的人？他們怎樣評價其經驗？他們的經驗分享有否影響你們考慮是否申請內地的工作的決定？

註：以下問題問所有受訪者

- 52) 整體而言，你們認為 / 估計你們在內地工作的經驗對你自己往後的發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 53) 整體而言，你們認為香港青少年到內地工作困難嗎？

## **Part 2—對內地的觀感 (20 mins)**

### **a) 政治及社會方面**

- 54) 你們對內地整體的政治及社會現況有什麼看法？
- 55) 你們有沒有留意內地的政治、社會、民生議題的資訊？如有，主要透過什麼渠道獲得這些資訊？
- 56) 你們對內地未來的政治發展抱有什麼態度呢？它對你們重要嗎？

### **b) 經濟方面**

- 57) 你們對內地整體的經濟狀況有什麼看法？
- 58) 你們有沒有留意內地的經濟發展的資訊？如有，主要透過什麼渠道獲得這些資訊？
- 59) 你們對內地就業市場和工作狀況有多少認識？你們從什麼途徑得知內地就業的資訊？

### **c) 陸港關係**

- 60) 你對內地和香港兩地有關的政策有多少認識呢？
- 61) 你對這些兩地政策有什麼看法？
- 62) 近年，愈來愈多內地人到香港升學及就業，你們認為這個趨勢對本地青年的升學及就業機會有什麼影響呢？你們認為這個趨勢對香港整體發展有什麼影響呢？
- 63) 近年，政府鼓勵和資助本地學生及青年到內地交流和工作實習，例如由 2012 至 2013 學年開始，香港學生可以香港中學文憑考試成績報讀內地的高等院校，去年亦推出了「內地大學升學資助計劃」，你們有否聽聞過這些措施？
- 64) 整體而言，你認為這些措施對鼓勵香港年輕人到內地進修或發展事業有多大幫助呢？
- 65) 整體而言，以上你們對內地的觀感會否影響你考慮是否到內地升學或發展事業的決

定？

**Part 3—對支援青年到內地升學及就業政策的認知 (10 mins)**

- 66) 你們從什麼途徑接收任何有關到內地升學、工作實習、就業的資訊？你們覺得這些有關內地機會的資訊足夠嗎？這些資訊對推動你們與其他年青人到內地升學及發展有沒有幫助呢？
- 67) 你們從來有沒有認真為自己的升學和就業作出任何計劃呢？如有，是什麼時候開始有這些計劃和打算呢？
- 68) 可否分享一下你們在中學及大專院校所經歷的就業規劃學習過程？老師及學校能否幫助你們規劃個人的升學及職業志向？可否分享你們認為可取及有待改善的地方？
- 69) 整體而言，你們認為政府(包括香港及中國政府) 應該推動什麼措施去鼓勵及支持你們和其他香港青少年到內地升學及就業呢？